A non-invasive faecal survey for the study of spatial ecology and kinship of solitary felids in the Virua National Park, Amazon Basin

F. Palomares^{a,*}, B. Adrados^a, M. Zanin^b, L. Silveira^c and C. Keller^d

^a Department of Conservation Biology, Estación Biológica de Doñana, CSIC, Avda. Américo Vespucio s/n, 41092 Sevilla, Spain

^b Department of Biology, Centro de Ciências Humanas e Naturais, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Av. Fernando Ferrari, 514 - Goiabeiras, Vitória - ES, 29075-910, Brazil

^c Jaguar Conservation Fund, Mineiros, Goias, Brazil

^d Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazônia (INPA), Department of Biodiversity, CP 2223, 69065-970 Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil

* *Corresponding author*: ffpaloma@ebd.csic.es

Short running title: Non-invasive survey of large American felids

Abstract Jaguars and pumas are the largest felids in the Americas. Information about these two species is scarce, especially where both species are sympatric. We studied the use and selection of macrohabitats, spatial segregation and kinship in jaguars and pumas in the Viruá National Park (Amazonian lowlands) by non-invasive genetic analyses of faecal samples. Seven different jaguars (six males and one female) and nine different pumas (five males and four females) were identified. We found space use segregation between the two species, with pumas using mostly forested habitats and jaguars using open habitats slightly more than the forested ones. This result is unexpected since previous studies have found that pumas favour more open habitats than jaguars. The results suggest that jaguars use the areas in a more random manner, corresponding to the habits of a dominant generalist species, whereas pumas use the area to reduce encounter rates with jaguars. Nevertheless, both species mainly used areas near upland forest-flooding habitats. Some kinship categories were supported with a $p < 0.05$ in 57% and 83% of the pair comparisons between the identified jaguars and identified pumas, respectively. Non-invasive genetic analysis of faeces was useful to study the spatial ecology of solitary, rare and cryptic species in the Amazon.

Key words Jaguar, macrohabitat use and selection, puma, relatedness, spatial segregation

Introduction

Jaguars (*Panthera onca*) and pumas (*Puma concolor*) are the largest felids in the Americas. The species coexist throughout the jaguar's distribution area, basically in the Neotropics, and share a similar life history and behavioural traits (Sunquist and Sunquist 2002). Although jaguars and pumas are respectively listed by IUCN as Near Threatened and of Least Concern, and in CITES Appendix I and II, in many areas of

their distribution range are of conservation concern (Caso et al. 2008; Nielsen et al. 2015). Some of their populations have been extirpated, are at high risk of extirpation, or are declining due to loss of habitat quality and fragmentation, poaching of their main prey and retaliatory killing due to livestock depredation (Nowell and Jackson 1996; Zanin et al. 2015; Petracca et al. 2014). This situation is particularly accentuated for the jaguar, which has lost more than 50% of its former distribution area (Sanderson et al. 2002). Much of the jaguar's remaining habitat is the rainforest of the Amazon Basin (88% of its remaining area of occupancy; Caso et al. 2008), which is also considered of relatively low suitability (Torres et al. 2007). Despite the importance of the Amazon Basin for jaguars, little information exists on the ecology of the species in that region and in the rest of Latin America, which is also true for pumas (Haines 2006; Caso et al. 2008; Laundré & Hernández 2010; Nielsen et al. 2015; Palomares et al. 2016). The only published information for the Amazon Basin relates to jaguar density estimations by camera-trapping in the Colombian, Bolivian and Peruvian Amazon (Silver et al. 2004; Payan 2008; Tobler et al. 2013).

In this paper, we provide information on jaguar and puma spatial ecology and some population parameters of both felids in the Viruá National Park (northern Brazilian Amazon Basin) by non-invasive genetic analyses of faeces that is an increasingly efficient method for studying the use and selection of macrohabitats, and relationships among individuals in secretive mammals. Furthermore, we examined whether there was any spatial segregation between the species, as would be expected due to their ecologically similar requirements (Sunkist & Sunkist 2002; Haines 2006; Caso et al. 2008; Nielsen et al. 2015).

Materials and methods

Study area

The study was conducted in Viruá National Park (Caracaraí municipality, Roraima state, Brazil; 1°29'9'' N, 61°2'10'' W; 227.000 ha; Fig. 1), which is limited by the Branco River to the west, a national road to the northeast, an abandoned dirt road to the east and the Anauá River to the south. The climate is wet tropical, with a rainy period and a marked dry period from November to March (Marengo et al. 2001). The mean daily temperature and annual rainfall during the study years were 27°C and 2300 mm, respectively. The vegetation is characterised by mosaics formed by transitions between savannahs and tropical upland forests, with the former being frequently flooded in some months of the year (Machado et al. 2004).

The area has a sampling infrastructure that includes a trail system forming a 5x5 km grid (Magnusson et al. 2005). A description of the trail system and infrastructure can be obtained from the Program for Biodiversity Research (PPBio) website <<http://ppbio.inpa.gov.br>>. The grid consists of six parallel 5-km trails and six 5-km trails perpendicular to those, totalling 60 km.

Sample collection and preservation

Faecal sampling was carried out during the end of the dry season (February-March) in 2008, 2009 and 2011, by slowly walking along the trails of the 5x5 km grid system, the access trails to the park headquarters, and the 56 km of the abandoned dirt road to the east. Additionally, in 2011, several cross-country transects were walked along the river border in the confluence area of the Branco and Anauá Rivers to the south of the Park. In total, we walked 261 km on dirt roads and trails. In 2009 and 2011, some faeces were collected with the help of a scat detector dog (Smith et al. 2001).

The samples were stored in 200-ml plastic containers with silica gel and their location geo-referenced using a GPS. A few samples in 2008 were not georeferenced. Type of macrohabitat (upland forest, campinarana and campina; see below) and height of the vegetation in a circle of 25 m diameter around the faecal position were also recorded during the 2011 sampling.

DNA extraction for species, sex and individual identification

DNA extraction of faecal samples was conducted according to protocols based on the GuSCN/silica method (Boom et al. 1990; Höss & Pääbo, 1993; Frantz et al. 2003). Each batch of extractions (n = 15) included one PCR negative extraction control to monitor for contamination by exogenous DNA. DNA extractions of faecal samples were performed in a UV-sterilized laminar flow hood in an isolated laboratory specially designated for the manipulation of non-invasive material.

Faecal samples were screened for species identity using species-specific primers as described in Roques et al. (2011). The method consists of a single-tube multiplex PCR yielding species-specific banding patterns on agarose gel, allowing the unambiguous identification of jaguars and pumas among other felid species. For sex identification, we used the method described by Pilgrim et al. (2005), based on the difference in size between the PCR products amplified from the male Y-chromosome copy (AMELY) and the X-chromosome gene (AMELX), optimised for faecal samples from Neotropical felid species such as jaguar, puma, ocelot and margay, as described by Palomares et al. (2012).

Individual genotyping for jaguars and pumas was conducted using an optimised set of 11 (Fca024, Fca026, Fca043, Fca077, Fca082b, Fca090, F115a, Fca126, Fca176, Fca547b, Fca566b; Menotti-Raymond et al. 1999) and 12 (Fca077, Fca82b, Fca126,

Fca547b, PcoB003w, PcoB010w, PcoA208w, PcoB210w, PcoA216w, PcoC108w, PcoC112w and PcoA339w, Menotti-Raymond et al. 1999; Kurushima et al. 2006) microsatellite markers, respectively (Palomares et al. 2012; Roques et al. 2014; Zanin et al. 2016). Before genotyping the whole set of microsatellites, DNA extracts were evaluated for quality by direct amplification of the Fca82b locus, which was selected for its high amplification robustness. The samples that failed to amplify this locus would probably not amplify the remaining loci and were not genotyped.

A two-step strategy was used to improve genotyping success rate and accuracy through two sequential amplifications (Bellemain & Taberlet 2004; Piggott et al. 2004): a multiplex PCR that included the whole set of primer pairs and a reduced number of cycles (pre-PCR) at a moderate annealing temperature, followed by the amplification of each locus separately, using the PCR products as templates (post-PCR). Pre-PCR was performed in a multiplex reaction with 7 µL of DNA extract in a 30 µL reaction including 67 mM Tris-HCl pH 8, 16mM (NH₄)₂SO₄, 1.5 mM MgCl₂, 0.8 µM dNTPs, 0.8 mg/ml BSA, 0.02 or 0.03 µM each primer, and 0.6 U of Taq DNA polymerase (Bioline). Pre-PCR conditions were as follows: initial denaturation at 94 °C for 2 min, 25 cycles of 30s at 92 °C, 55 °C and 72 °C and a final extension of 5 min at 72 °C.

Second-stage post-PCR amplifications were performed independently for each marker using 4 µl of PCR product in a final volume of 20 µl reactions containing 67 mM Tris-HCl pH 8, 16mM (NH₄)₂SO₄, 2mM MgCl₂, 0.25mM dNTPs, 0.8 mg/ml BSA, 0.2 µM of each primer and 0.5 U of Taq polimerase. Post-PCR conditions were: initial denaturation at 94 °C for 2 min, 40 cycles of 30s at 92 °C, specific annealing temperature (see Roques et al. 2014; Zanin et al. 2016) and 72 °C and a final extension of 5 min at 72 °C. Up to 6 PCR products of jaguar samples from the second amplification step, with fluorescently labelled primers, or 12 PCR products in the case

of puma samples, were combined on an ABI PRISM 3130 XL Genetic Analyzer. Alleles were sized using GeneMapper Software version 3.7 (Applied Biosystems). Samples were genotyped using a multi-tube approach (Navidi et al 1992; Taberlet et al 1996, 1999; Taberlet & Luikart, 1999; Goossens et al. 2000) with four replicates per locus per individual. For a locus to be considered homozygous, only the same allele could be observed in at least three independent replicates, without observing an additional allele in the fourth replicate. The heterozygous loci were those with the same two different alleles in at least two replicates. A quality index (QI) similar to the one described by Miquel et al. (2006) was calculated for each sample, referred to individual alleles instead of the genotype of a given locus. We calculated the percentage of replicates that were equal to the consensus for each given allele, and then we averaged the values across individuals and loci. Samples with QI below 0.5 or with less than seven loci genotyped were discarded from further analyses.

All molecular analyses were carried out in the Laboratory of Molecular Ecology of the Doñana Biological Station (Seville, Spain).

Data analysis

Spatial segregation

We tested for spatial overlap between jaguars and pumas with a null model (Gotelli and Graves 1996), which randomised the spatial distributions of jaguar and puma samples. Given the apparent stability of jaguar and puma detection over time (see Fig. 1), we pooled the data from all years. For the randomisation process, we first assigned each faecal sample to a 1 km² cell, and then computed the observed spatial overlap between the species (i.e., number of 1 km² cells with detection of both species in relation to the total number of cells with detections). In a second step, we built the randomisation

procedure based on the mean percentage of overlapping jaguar and puma occurrence cells, to test whether the puma or jaguar cells were distributed randomly relative to the other species' cells. At each step of the process, we randomly distributed the samples of each species over the total number of occurrence cells containing any sample, and computed the percentage again. We repeated this process 1000 times and then compared the observed percentages with the distribution of simulated percentages, to compute a p-value. This algorithm was built in R software, and it is available on request.

Macrohabitat selection

Macrohabitats were determined directly in the field only for a few samples and for all samples with GPS location using ArcGIS®. Three different types of macrohabitats were distinguished: upland forest (forest areas with 15-30 m canopy height, which are not flooded during the rainy period), campina (savannah-like open areas normally flooded during the rainy period, presenting scrub areas up to 6-8 m high), and campinarara (more open forest, with 8-12 m canopy height, in transition areas between upland forest and campina, normally flooded during the rainy period).

For macrohabitat characterisation using ArcGIS® we used a detailed landcover map elaborated for the management plan of Viruá National Park and surrounding areas (ICMBio 2014), with a resolution of 1m² grid cells. Nine different landcover types are defined in the map, which were re-classified in the three macrohabitats described above (upland forest, campina and campinarana; Supporting Information Table S1). Since there were few samples for the flooding macrohabitats, for analyses we only considered two general types of macrohabitat: upland forest and flooding habitats (comprising campina and campinarana).

Differences between jaguars and pumas in the number of scats located within each macrohabitat were examined by a chi-square test. We counted the number of scats in each type of macrohabitat and related it to their availability in the study area using the Jacobs index (Jacobs, 1974), which varies from +1 for maximum preference to -1 for maximum avoidance. Availability of macrohabitats was measured within the minimum convex polygon traced around all the scat samples collected. From the actual location of scat samples of jaguars and pumas (Fig. 1), we examined the relationship between the probability of finding a scat from a jaguar or puma and the distance to the upland forest-flooding habitat edge using a logistic regression. The logistic regression was conducted in R software with the “stats” package.

Relatedness and categories of relationship among individuals

We calculated maximum likelihood estimates of relatedness and relationship (see Blouin 2003 for definitions) between dyads of jaguars and dyads of pumas with the program ML-Relate (Kalinowski et al. 2006) for all the different individuals identified in the study area. This program uses microsatellite data and can accommodate null alleles. Thus, we determined the probability ($p < 0.05$) among four common categories of relationships between individuals of each species (i.e., parent-offspring, full-sibs, half-sibs, and unrelated), and the index r of relatedness between each dyad using 999 simulated genotypes.

Relationship categories and relatedness are more confidently estimated when allele frequencies of the population are well sampled, so to calculate allele frequencies we used a total of 24 genotypes of jaguars and 20 genotypes of pumas from the Amazon Basin that we had in our data bases from samples of both species. Both jaguars and

pumas from the Amazon Basin (including those of the Virua area) belong to the same genetic populations, respectively (Roques et al. 2016; authors unpublished), thus, the inclusion of these samples increased robustness of analyses. These genotypes were obtained using the same molecular techniques previously described and in the same laboratory, and were collected between 2005 and 2011 in a total of four study areas in the Amazon basin (see Roques et al. 2016 for a description of the study areas).

Results

Scat analyses

We collected 175 scats, of which 51.4% were identified: 25 from jaguars and 35 from pumas. Overall, we collected 0.10 and 0.13 jaguar and puma scats/km, respectively. Eighty four percent of jaguar scats and 55% of puma scats were from males. The number of samples genotyped after positive amplification of the Fca82b locus were 19 for jaguars and 29 for pumas. Ten out of 11 microsatellite loci used for jaguars had an amplification success higher than 77%, except one (locus Fca176) with 48% success. For pumas, three microsatellite markers (locus PcoB3, locus Fca82, and locus Fca547) had an amplification success of 66-67%, and the nine remaining between 71-94%. The probability of identity estimated for the 11 and 12 analysed loci indicated that our microsatellite panel was sufficient to discriminate individuals within the entire dataset ($P_{(ID)sib} = 4.23 \times 10^{-5}$, and 1.01×10^{-4} , for jaguars and pumas, respectively). Fourteen jaguar genotypes and 26 puma genotypes obtained a QI value greater than 0.5 and reached more than 7 loci genotyped, thus, meeting our quality requirements. Seven different jaguars (six males and one female) and nine different pumas (five males and four females) were identified using these high quality genotypes, with a mean number of 2.0 (SE= 0.49, range=1-4) and 2.8 (SE= 1.92, range= 1-9) scats collected per

individual for jaguars and pumas, respectively. Only one male jaguar was resampled in 2009 and 2011, and only one female puma was resampled in all surveyed years (Fig. 1).

Spatial distribution and macrohabitat selection

We recorded the location of 56 scats (21 of jaguar and 35 of puma; four scats were not georeferenced), which were distributed within 32 1 km² cells, of which 12.5% contained samples of both species. The null model clearly showed that both species segregated in space more than expected by random (simulated percentage of simultaneous occurrence was 31.3%, significantly higher than the 12.5% observed with a $p < 0.001$).

Eighty-six percent of jaguar faeces ($n=21$) were found in flooding habitats, whereas only 11% of puma scats ($n=35$) were found in this type of vegetation (Table 1; Fig. 1; $\chi^2 = 27.3$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$). Data obtained directly in the field during sampling, greatly coincided with map-derived data (Table 1). The height of the vegetation canopy was 2-12 m for flooding habitats and 15-25 m for upland forests. Comparing the use with the availability of these macrohabitats, pumas clearly avoided flooding areas (Jacobs index = -0.94) and selected upland forests (Jacobs index = 0.94), whereas jaguars seemed to use close to available the two types of macrohabitats (Jacobs indexes = 0.17 and -0.16, respectively; Table 1). The logistic regression showed that the probability of a scat belonging to a jaguar or puma increased with distance from the forest edge (jaguar to flooding habitats and puma to upland forest interior; $p < 0.001$). Nevertheless, both species preferred to be near the edge (86% and 89% jaguar and puma detections, respectively, < 1 km from the edge; Figs. 1 and 2).

Relatedness and categories of relationship among individuals

Some level of relatedness was supported under a $p < 0.05$ in 57.1% of the 21 pair comparisons between the seven identified jaguars (Supplementary Information Table S2). However, all of them also included “unrelated” as a possibility, and in only one case (JVIRH1-JVIRM6) a half-sib relationship was clearly ranked first (Supplementary Information Table S2) according to its maximum likelihood estimate. On the other hand, 83.3% out of the 36 pair comparisons in pumas may be from related individuals according to a $p < 0.05$, although in only 8.3% (three cases) the lack of relatedness was totally discarded (Supplementary Information Table S2). According to the maximum likelihood estimates, the parent-offspring relationships between PVIRH1-PVIRH4 and PVIRH3-PVIRH4, and full sibs between PVIRM2-PVIRH4 and PVIRM6-PVIRM5 were ranked as the most probable (Supplementary Information Table S2). Differences in percentage of pairs with a possible relationship between jaguars and pumas approached significance ($Z = 1.854$, $p = 0.064$; Z test), and the number of pair comparisons with higher values of the maximum likelihood estimates of relatedness (i.e., a closer relationship) was clearly higher in pumas than in jaguars (Supplementary Information Table S2). This result did not seem to be biased due to the fact that we detected mainly males in jaguars, and a similar number of both sexes in pumas. Considering only comparisons between males, percentages of pairs with a possible relationship was 46.7% and 90.0%, for jaguars and pumas, respectively ($Z = 1.771$, $p = 0.077$). However, the indices of relatedness were often higher for pair comparisons involving a female (Supplementary Information Table S2), although the few available samples prevented statistical testing of this trend.

Discussion

Both jaguars and pumas are considered as habitat generalists, found from arid areas to rain forests. In sympatric areas, the species can be found in the same areas and macrohabitats (Núñez et al. 2002; Scognamillo et al. 2003; Noss et al. 2006, Estrada Hernández 2008; Monroy-Vilchis et al. 2009; Harmsen et al. 2009, Di Bitetti et al. 2010; Palomares et al. 2016). In a few cases, very small differences in macrohabitat use were recorded within local scale studies (Schaller & Crawshaw 1980; Emmons 1987; Chávez 2010; Sollman et al. 2012), which pointed to pumas favouring more open habitats, although also using forest areas, and jaguars using both open and forested habitats in proportion to availability (Farrell and Sunquist 2000; Scognamillo et al. 2003; Silveira 2004). Pumas have also been described as more tolerant to human-influenced landscapes than jaguars (De Angelo et al. 2011; Sollman et al. 2012; but also see Foster et al. (2010) for a contrary result).

We found an apparently clear segregation in space use between the species, as well as a differential use of macrohabitats, with pumas mostly using the forested habitats and jaguars slightly favouring the open areas. The latter result is unexpected, since previous studies have found the pumas favour more open habitats than jaguars. The reasons for this discrepancy are not clear, but might be related to food availability and competition interactions between the species. We believe that the low sample size obtained for the two species or the sampling procedure to collect faecal samples did not affect this result, because the sampling procedure and effort was identical for both species, and the statistical analyses clearly confirmed the observed spatial patterns.

Under a potential competition scenario, jaguars should be dominant over pumas (Ruth & Murphy, 2010; Oliveira & Pereira, 2014), and if so, both theoretical and empirical studies predict that pumas should avoid habitats or areas used by jaguars to decrease the risk of interspecific encounters (Case and Gilpin 1974; Palomares and Caro 1999,

Linnell and Strand 2000). The threat of aggression can create a ‘landscape of fear’ (Laundré, Hernández & Altendorf 2001) that excludes prey or subordinate species from suitable habitats, normally in core areas of the dominant species (e.g. Palomares et al. 1996; Swanson et al. 2014). This was partially the case in our study, as both species segregated in the use of space, and pumas mainly selected upland forests and avoided flooding habitats, but jaguars did not avoid upland forests. Therefore, our results suggest that jaguars use the study area in a more random manner, probably triggered by prey availability, as would be expected from a dominant generalist species. Pumas behave spatially in a way to diminish encounter rates with jaguars, preferring forest areas, where visibility is lower and escape possibilities higher if a jaguar is close. In a larger scale study, Palomares et al. (2016) found microhabitat segregation between jaguars and pumas, which was explained well by a scenario of interference competition between the two species with pumas being subordinate. Furthermore, both species mainly used areas close to upland forest-flooding habitat transitions, where prey-species richness is expected to be higher (Schluter & Ricklefs 1993; Brown 1995).

Most solitary carnivore species exhibit female philopatry and male-biased dispersal (Logan & Sweanor 2001; Støen et al. 2005). Our results seem to support this, since relatedness was higher when females were included. Nevertheless, our data did not allow for testing this hypothesis. In other studies with pumas, contrasting results have been found. Biek et al. (2006) and Miotto et al. (2012) found that females were closer related among them than males with other males, while Onorato et al. (2011) found that males were closer related among them than females with other females.

Our data showed that pumas presented higher levels of relatedness than jaguars. Three non-exclusive facts might explain these differences: 1) Puma home ranges may be smaller than jaguar home ranges in Viruá. If puma home ranges are smaller, and

accepting female philopatry, the number of potentially related individuals in pumas would be higher than in jaguars. There is no information on home range size for jaguars or pumas in the Amazon Basin, but in the savannah habitat of Emas National Park, where both species have been radio-tracked, pumas had home ranges of 124-763 km², and jaguars of 401-1102 km² (Silveira 2004). 2) Jaguars might have higher mortality rates than pumas in the area, promoting a higher exchange of unrelated individuals in the population. Jaguars are usually more persecuted by retaliatory hunting due to livestock depredation than pumas (e.g. Conforti & Cascelli de Azevedo 2003; Michalski et al. 2006). 3) Differential reproductive parameters might allow, for a given time period, for more related individuals of pumas than jaguars to be present in the area. For example, litter size is usually larger in pumas than in jaguars (Shaw 2010; Desbiez et al. 2012).

Our results show that non-invasive faecal surveys of solitary and elusive felids may be a suitable methodology to provide information on space use and spatial relationships between species, in addition to several genetic population parameters (see Roques et al. 2016).

Acknowledgements This study was supported by project BIOCON 05 - 100/06 of Fundación BBVA, project CGL2010-16902 of the Spanish Ministry of Research and Innovation, project CGL2013-46026-P of MINECO, and the excellence project RNM 2300 of Junta de Andalucía (Spain). MZ was supported by CNPq DCR fellowship number 312627/2015-7. Sampling in Brazil was carried out under licenses IBAMA/CGFAU/LIC # 131/2005, IBAMA/SISBIO # 13883-1 and IBAMA/ICMBio/SISBIO # 15664-1 and # 18336-1. Faecal samples were exported from Brazil to Spain for molecular analysis under IBAMA/CGEN Autorização de

Acesso licence nº 063/05 and IBAMA/CITES export licences nº 0123242BR,
 08BR002056/DF and 09BR003006/DF. Logistic support was provided by Laboratorio
 de Ecología Molecular, Estación Biológica de Doñana, CSIC (LEM-EBD). Raphael de
 Almeida, Severine Roques, Javier Calzada, Miguel Delibes, Eloy Revilla, Julia
 Martínez, Carolina Jorge dos Santos, Xênya Garcia Bernardes da Luz, Denise Mello do
 Prado, and Patricia Carignano Torres helped with the collection of samples. We thank
 the managers of Viruá National Park (Beatriz Lisboa and Antonio Lisboa) for their
 logistical support.

References

- De Angelo C, Paviolo A, Di Bitetti M (2011) Differential impact of landscape
 transformation on pumas (*Puma concolor*) and jaguars (*Panthera onca*) in the
 Upper Paraná Atlantic Forest. *Divers Distrib* 17:422-436
- Bellemain E & Taberlet E (2004) Improved non-invasive genotyping method:
 application to brown bear (*Ursus arctos*) faeces. *Molecular Ecology Notes*, 4,
 519–522
- Biek R, Akamine N, Schwartz MK, Ruth TK, Murphy KM, Poss M (2006) Genetic
 consequences of sex-biased dispersal in a solitary carnivore: Yellowstone
 cougars. *Biol Lett* 2:312-315
- Blouin MS (2003) DNA-based methods for pedigree reconstruction and kinship
 analysis in natural populations. *Trends Ecol Evol* 18:503–511
- Boom R, Sol CJA, Salimans MMM, Jansen CL, Wertheimvandillen PME,
 Vandernoordaa J (1990) Rapid and Simple Method for Purification of Nucleic-
 Acids. *J Clin Microbiol* 28:495-503
- Brown JH (1995) *Macroecology*. University of Chicago Press, Illinois
- Case TJ, Gilpin ME (1974) Interference competition and niche theory. *PNAS* 71:3073-
 3077
- Caso A, Lopez-Gonzalez C, Payan E, Eizirik E, de Oliveira T, Leite-Pitman R, Kelly
 M, Valderrama C (2008) *Panthera onca*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened
 Species 2008: e.T15953A5327466

385 Chávez C (2010) Ecología y Conservación del Jaguar (*Panthera onca*) y Puma (*Puma*
 386 *concolor*) en la región de Calakmul y sus implicaciones para la conservación de la
 387 Península del Yucatan. PhD thesis, University of Granada
 388 Conforti VA, Cascellide Azevedo FC (2003) Local perceptions of jaguars (*Panthera*
 389 *onca*) and pumas (*Puma concolor*) in the Iguazu National Park area, south
 390 Brazil. Biol Conserv 111:215-221.
 391 Desbiez ALJ, Traylor-Holzer K, Lacy B, Beisiegel BM, Breitenmoser-Würsten C, Sana
 392 DA, Moraes EA Jr, Carvalho EAR Jr, Lima F, Boulhosa RLP (2012) Population
 393 viability analysis of jaguar populations in Brazil. Cat News 7:35–37
 394 Di Bitetti M, De Angelo C, Di Blanco YE, Paviolo A (2010) Niche partitioning and
 395 species coexistence in a Neotropical felid assemblage. Acta Oecol 36:403-412
 396 Emmons LH (1987) Comparative feeding ecology of felids in a neotropical rainforest.
 397 Behav Ecol Sociobiol 20:271-283
 398 Estrada Hernández CG (2008) Dieta, uso de hábitat y patrones de actividad del puma
 399 (*Puma concolor*) y el jaguar (*Panthera onca*) en la selva Maya, centroamerica.
 400 Rev Mex Mastozool 12:113-130
 401 Farrell LE, Roman J, Sunquist M.E. 2000. Dietary separation of sympatric carnivores
 402 identified by molecular analysis of scats. Mol Ecol 9:1583-1590
 403 Foster RJ, Harmsen BJ, Doncaster CP (2010) Habitat use by sympatric jaguars and
 404 pumas across a gradient of human disturbance in Belize. Biotropica 42:724-731
 405 Frantz AC, Pope LC, Carpenter PJ, Roper TJ, Wilson GJ, Delahay RJ, Burke T (2003)
 406 Reliable microsatellite genotyping of the Eurasian badger (*Meles meles*) using
 407 faecal DNA. Mol Ecol 12:1649-1661
 408 Fuller TK, Keith LB (1981) Non-overlapping ranges of coyotes and wolves in
 409 northeastern Alberta. J Mammal 62:403-405
 410 Goossens B, Chikhi L, Utami SS, De Ruiter D, Briford MW (2000) A multi-samples,
 411 multi-extracts approach for microsatellite analysis of faecal samples in an
 412 arboreal ape. Conserv Genet, 1:1157–1162
 413 Gotelli NJ, Graves GR (1996) Null Models in Ecology. Smithsonian Institution Press,
 414 Washington, D.C.
 415 Haines AM (2006) Is there competition between sympatric jaguar *Panthera onca* and
 416 puma *Puma concolor*? Acta Zool Sin 52:1142-1147

- Harmsen BJ., Foster RJ., Silver SC, Ostro LET, Doncaster CP (2009) Spatial and Temporal Interactions of Sympatric Jaguars (*Panthera Onca*) and Pumas (*Puma Concolor*) in a Neotropical Forest. J Mammal 90:612-620
- Höss M, Pääbo S (1993) DNA Extraction from pleistocene bones by a silica-based purification method. Nucleic Acids Res 21:3913-3914
- <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008.RLTS.T15953A5327466.en/> Accessed 10.02.16.
- ICMBIO (2014) Plano de Manejo do Parque Nacional do Viruá. Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade, ICMBio, Brasil, 231 pp, http://www.icmbio.gov.br/portal/images/stories/docs-planos-de-manejo/parna_virua_pm_diag1.pdf
- Jacobs J (1974) Quantitative measurements of food selection. A modification of the forage ratio and Ivlev's Electivity Index. Oecologia 14:413-417
- Kalinowski ST, Wagner AP, Taper ML (2006) ML-Relate: A computer program for maximum likelihood estimation of relatedness and relationship. Mol Ecol Notes 6:576-579
- Kurushima JD, Collins JA, Well JA, Ernest HB (2006) Development of 21 microsatellite loci for puma (*Puma concolor*) ecology and forensics. Mol Ecol Notes 6:1260–1262
- Laundré JW, Hernández L (2010) What We Know about Pumas in Latin America. In: Hornocker M., Negri S (eds) Cougar: ecology and conservation, Univ Chicago Press, Chicago, pp.76-90
- Linnell JDC, Strand O (2000) Interference interactions, co-existence and conservation of mammalian carnivores. Divers Distrib 6:169-176
- Logan K, Sweanor L (2001) Desert Puma: Evolutionary ecology and conservation of an enduring carnivore. Hornocker Wildlife Institute, Island Press, Washington
- Machado RB, Aguiar LM, Sramos-Neto MB, Rodrigues FHG, Hass A, Aquino FG (2004) Atlas de Conservação da natureza brasileira. Unidades Federais. Metalivros, São Paulo, Brasil
- Magnusson WE, Lima AP, Luizao R, Luizao F, Costa FRC, de Castilho CV, Kinupp VF (2005) RAPELD: A modification of the gentry method for biodiversity surveys in long-term ecological research sites. Biota Neotropica 5:1-6
- Marengo JA, Liebmann B, Kousky VE, Filizola NP, Wainer IC (2001) Onset and End of the Rainy Season in the Brazilian Amazon Basin. J Clim 14:833–852

450 Menotti-Raymond M, David VA, Lyons LA et al (1999) A genetic link- age map of
 451 microsatellites in the domestic cat (*Felis catus*). *Genomics* 57:9–23

452 Michalski F, Boulhosa RLP, Faira A, Peres CA (2006) Human–wildlife conflicts in a
 453 fragmented Amazonian forest landscape: determinants of large felid depredation
 454 on livestock. *Anim Conserv* 9:179-188

455 Miotto RA, Cervini M, Begotti RA, Galetti PM (2012) Monitoring a Puma (*Puma*
 456 *concolor*) Population in a fragmented landscape in Southeast Brazil. *Biotropica*
 457 44:98-104

458 Miquel C, Bellemain E, Poillot C, Bessière J, Durand A, Taberlet P (2006) Quality
 459 indexes to assess the reliability of genotypes in studies using noninvasive
 460 sampling and multiple-tube approach. *Mol Ecol Notes* 6:985–988

461 Monroy-Vilchis O, Rodriguez-Soto C, Zarco-Gonzalez M, Urios V (2009) Cougar and
 462 jaguar habitat use and activity patterns in central Mexico. *Anim Biol* 59:145-157

463 Navidi W, Arnheim N, Waterman MS (1992) A multiple-tubes approach for accurate
 464 genotyping of very small DNA samples by using PCR: statistical considerations.
 465 *Am J Hum Genet* 50:347–359

466 Nielsen C, Thompson D, Kelly M, Lopez-Gonzalez CA (2015) *Puma concolor*. The
 467 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2015, e.T18868A50663436
 468 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2015-4.RLTS.T18868A50663436.en/>
 469 Accessed 10.02.16.

470 Noss AJ, Kelly MJ, Camblos HB, Rumiz DI (2006) Pumas y jaguares simpátricos:
 471 Datos de trampas-cámara en Bolivia y Belize. *Memorias: Manejo de Fauna*
 472 *silvestre en Amazonia y Latinoamérica*, 229-237.

473 Nowell K, Jackson P (1996) Wild cats: status survey and conservation action plan.:
 474 IUCN Publications, The Burlington Press, Cambridge

475 Núñez R, Miller B, Lindzey F (2002) Ecología del jaguar en la reserva de la biosfera
 476 Chamela-Cuixmala, Jalisco, México. In: Medellín R, Equihua C, Chetkiewics C,
 477 Taber A (eds) *El Jaguar en el Nuevo Milenio*. Fondo de Cultura Económica-
 478 Wildlife Conservation Society-UNAM México DF, pp. 107-126

479 Oliveira TG, Pereira JA (2014) Intraguild Predation and Interspecific Killing as
 480 Structuring Forces of Carnivoran Communities in South America. *J Mamm Evol*
 481 21:427-436

482 Onorato D, Desimone R, White C, Waits LP (2011) Genetic assessment of paternity and
 483 relatedness in a managed population of cougars. *J Wildl Manage* 75:378-384

484 Palomares F, Caro T (1999) Interspecific killing among Mammalian Carnivores. Am
 485 Nat 153:492-508

486 Palomares F, Fernández N, Roques S, Chávez C, Silveira L, Keller C, Adrados B
 487 (2016) Fine-Scale Habitat Segregation between Two Ecologically Similar Top
 488 Predators. PLoS ONE 11:e0155626.

489 Palomares F, Ferreras P, Fedriani JM, Delibes M (1996) Spatial relationships between
 490 Iberian lynx and other carnivores in an area of southwestern Spain. J Appl Ecol
 491 33:5-13

492 Palomares F, Godoy JA, Lopez-Bao JV, Rodríguez A, Roques S, Casas-Marcé M,
 493 Revilla E, Delibes M (2012) Possible Extinction Vortex for a Population of
 494 Iberian Lynx on the Verge of Extirpation. Conserv Biol 26:689-697

495 Payan E (2008) Jaguars, ocelots and prey ecology across sites with different hunting
 496 pressure in Colombian Amazonia PhD thesis, University College London and
 497 Institue of Zoology, Zoological Society of London, United Kingdom

498 Petracca LS, Hernández-Potosme S, Obando-Sampson L, Salom-Perez R, Quigley H,
 499 Robinson HS (2014) Agricultural encroachment and lack of enforcement
 500 threaten connectivity of range-wide jaguar (*Panthera onca*) corridor. J Nat
 501 Conserv 22:436–444

502 Piggott MP, Bellemain E, Taberlet P, Taylor AC (2004) A multiplex pre-amplification
 503 method that significantly improves microsatellite amplification and error rates
 504 for faecal DNA in limiting conditions. Conserv Genet, 5:417–420 Pilgrim KL,
 505 Mckelvey KS, Riddle AE, Schwartz MK (2005) Felid sex identification based
 506 on noninvasive genetic samples. Mol Ecol Notes 5:60-61

507 Roques S, Adrados B, Chávez C, Keller C, Magnusson WE, Palomares F (2011)
 508 Identification of Neotropical felids using RCP-PCR. Mol Ecol Res 11:171-175

509 Roques S, Furtado M, Jácomo ATA, Silveira L, Sollmann R, Torres NM, Godoy JA,
 510 Palomares F (2014) Monitoring jaguar populations *Panthera onca* with non-
 511 invasive genetics: a pilot study in brazilian ecosystems. Oryx 48:361-369

512 Roques S, Sollman R, Jacomo A, Torres N, Silveira L, Chávez C, Keller C, Mello do
 513 Prado D, Carignano Torres P, dos Santos C J, Bernardes Garcia da Luz X,
 514 Magnusson WE, Godoy JA, Ceballos G, Palomares F (2016) Effects of hábitat
 515 deterioration on the population genetics and conservation of the jaguar. Conserv
 516 Genet 17:125-139

517 Ruth TK, Murphy K (2010) Competition with other carnivores for prey. In: Hornocker
518 M, Negri S (eds) Cougar: ecology and conservation. University of Chicago
519 Press, Chicago, pp. 163–172

520 Sanderson EW, Redford KH, Chetkiewicz CLB, Medellin RA, Rabinowitz AR,
521 Robinson JG, Taber AB (2002) Planning to save a species: the jaguar as a
522 model. *Conserv Biol* 16:58-72

523 Schaller GB, Crawshaw PG (1980) Movement patterns of jaguar. *Biotropica* 12:161-
524 168

525 Schluter D, Ricklefs RE (1993) Species diversity: an introduction to the problem. In:
526 Ricklefs RE, Schluter D (eds) Species diversity in ecological communities.
527 University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, pp. 1-10

528 Scognamillo D, Maxit IE, Sunquist M, Polisar J (2003) Coexistence of jaguar (*Panthera*
529 *onca*) and puma (*Puma concolor*) in a mosaic landscape in the Venezuelan
530 llanos. *J Zool* 259:269-279.

531 Shaw HG (2010) The Emerging Cougar Chronicle. In: Hornocker MG, Negri S (eds),
532 Cougar: Ecology and Conservation. The University of Chicago Press, London,
533 pp. 17-26

534 Silveira L (2004) Ecologia comparada e conservação da Onça-pintada (*Panthera onca*) e
535 Onça-parda (*Puma concolor*), no cerrado e pantanal. PhD thesis, Universidade
536 de Brasília

537 Silver SC, Ostro LEE, Marsh LK, Maffei L, Noss AJ, Kelly MJ, Wallace RB, Gómez
538 H, Ayala G (2004) The use of camera traps for estimating jaguar *Panthera onca*
539 abundance and density using capture/recapture analysis. *Oryx* 38:148-154

540 Smith DA, Ralls K, Davenport B, Adams B, Maldonado JE (2001) Canine assistants for
541 conservationists. *Science* 291:435.

542 Sollmann R, Furtado MM, Hofer H, Jácomo ATA, Torres NM, Silveira L (2012) Using
543 occupancy models to investigate space partitioning between two sympatric large
544 predators, the jaguar and puma in central Brazil. *Mamm Biol* 77:41-46

545 Støen OG, Bellemain E, Sæbø S, Swenson JE (2005) Kinrelated spatial structure in
546 brown bears *Ursus arctos*. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 59:191-197

547 Sunquist M, Sunquist F (2002) Wild Cats of the world. University of Chicago Press,
548 USA

- Swanson A, Caro T, Davis-Mostert H, Mills MGL, Macdonald DW, Borner M,
Masenga E Packer C (2014) Cheetahs and wild dogs show contrasting patterns
of suppression by lions. *J Anim Ecol* 83:1418-1427
- Taberlet P, Griffen S, Goossens B, Questiau S, Manceau V, Escaravage N, Waits LP,
Bouvet J (1996) Reliable genotyping of samples with very low DNA quantities
using PCR. *Nucleic Acids Res* 24:3189–3194
- Taberlet P, Luikart G (1999) Non-invasive genetic sampling and individual
identification. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 68:41–55
- Tobler MW, Carrillo-Percegué SE, Zúñiga Hartley A, Powell GVN (2013) High
jaguar densities and large population sizes in the core habitat of the southwestern
Amazon. *Biol Conserv* 159:375–381
- Torres NM, Filho JAFD, De Marco Jr. P, Jacomo ATA, Silveira L (2007) Jaguar
distribution and conservation status in Brazil. In: Hughes J, Mercer R (eds),
Felid Biology and Conservation Conference 17-20 September: Abstracts,
WildCRU, Oxford, UK, pp. 109
- Valière N (2002) GIMLET: a computer program for analysing genetic individual
identification data. *Mol Ecol Notes* 2:377–379
- Voigt DR, Earle BD (1983). Avoidance of coyotes by red foxes families. *J Wildl
Manage* 47:852-857
- Wulsch C, Waits LP, Kelly MJ (2016) A Comparative Analysis of Genetic Diversity
and Structure in Jaguars (*Panthera onca*), Pumas (*Puma concolor*), and Ocelots
(*Leopardus pardalis*) in Fragmented Landscapes of a Critical Mesoamerican
Linkage Zone. *PLoS ONE* 11:e0151043.
- Zanin M, Adrados B, González N, Roques S, Brito D, Chávez C, Rubio Y, Palomares F
(2016) Gene flow and genetic structure of the puma and jaguar in Mexico. *Eur J
Wildl Res* 62:461-469
- Zanin M, Palomares F, Brito D (2015) What we (don't) know about the effects of
habitat loss and fragmentation on felids. *Oryx* 49:96-106

Table 1 Macrohabitats where jaguar and puma faeces were found according to data directly gathered during fieldwork and from vegetation maps of Viruá National Park. For data recorded during fieldwork, height of the vegetation is also shown.

Macrohabitats	Availability (220.4 km ²)	Percentage of use					
		Jaguar			Puma		
		Field (n=9)	Height range (m)	Map (n=21)	Field (n=10)	Height range (m)	Map (N=35)
Upland forest	18.6%	33.3	15-20	14.3	80.0	20-25	88.6
Flooding habitats	80.9%	66.7	3-12	85.7	20.0	4-6	11.4

Figure captions

Fig. 1 Location of Viruá National Park in Brazil and of the study area (the grey square within the dashed rectangle of the study area indicates the location of the 25-km² trail grid; left hand panels). The right-hand panels show the locations of identified jaguar and puma samples in each study year (black points= females; white squares= males; white circles with black point= samples with no sex identification; numbers close to samples indicate the ID of individual when genotyping was possible). Number of identified jaguar and pumas in the years 2008, 2009 and 2011 were 6, 4, 5 and 20, 14, 11 in case of faecal samples, and 1, 1, 2 and 5, 5, 5 in case of individuals, respectively.

Fig. 2 Logistic regression testing the probability of finding a scat from a jaguar or a puma in relation to the distance to the upland forest-flooding habitat edge. Logit $P = -0.0137 + (0.00411 * \text{Distance})$; likelihood ratio test statistic= 28.14, $p < 0.001$ (one puma sample located 6.8 km from the edge in flooding habitats was removed from the analysis; the next sample was located 1.1 km from the edge). Points represent raw data from jaguars (black) and puma (grey).

604

605

606   FIGURE 2

607

608

609

610