

Appendix D. Variables and their definitions used in the systematic review on human-carnivore relations in the American West.

Variables	Description	Type of variable	References
<i>Publication characteristics</i>			
Year	Year of the publication	Quantitative	
Journal	Journal where the paper is published	Nominal	
State	State where the research was conducted. It includes 12 dummy variables: (1) Alaska, (2) Arizona, (3) California, (4) Colorado, (5) Idaho, (6) Montana, (7) Nevada , (8) New Mexico, (9) Oregon, (10) Utah, (11)Washington, (12) Wyoming.	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	
<i>Biological components</i>			
Biome	Type of biome based on Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA, 2005), which includes 12 dummy variables: (1) Boreal forest, (2) Temperate forest, (3) Tropical forest, (4) Temperate grassland, (5) Tropical grassland, (6) Mediterranean system, (7) Arid system, (8) Freshwater system, (9) Coastal system, (10) Island, (11) Mountain, and (12) Polar	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	MA 2005
Species of carnivore	Species of carnivores that are the object of research	Nominal	
Number of species	Number of species studied in the research	Quantitative	
Family	Taxonomic family of the species that is object of research. It includes 3 dummy variables: (1) Canidae, (2) Felidae, (3) Ursidae	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	

Reintroduced	Whether the carnivore species have been reintroduced in the case study	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	
<i>Coexistence and tolerance</i>			
Coexistence	Whether the paper mentioned “coexistence”	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	Carter and Linnell 2016
Tolerance	Whether the paper mentioned “tolerance” / “acceptance” or whether the paper evaluated human attitudes/perceptions toward carnivores or management actions in order to foster tolerance toward carnivores	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	Gore et al 2006, Kansky et al 2014, Bruskotter and Wilson 2014
<i>Social actors</i>			
Social actors	What social actors were mentioned in the paper	Nominal	Kansky et al 2014
Type of social actor	Eleven dummy variables were considered as type of social actor: (1) rural residents, (2) commercial farmers (i.e. broad-scale producers of crop and animal products primarily for commercial sale), (3) subsistence farmers (i.e. small-scale crop and animal producers who primarily produce for subsistence or possibly for sale), (4) indigenous communities, (5) hunters, (6) urban residents, (7) general public, (8) tourists, (9) environmental NGOs, (10) environmental managers and (11) other decision-makers	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	
Number of actors	Number of social actors considered in the paper	Quantitative	
<i>Management actions</i>			
Management actions	What management actions were mentioned in the paper	Nominal	

Type of management actions	Thirteen dummy variables were considered as type of management actions: (1) use of deterrents and barriers, (2) livestock husbandry, (3) livestock guarding, (4) zoning, (5) aversive conditioning, (6) translocation, (7) attack verification, (8) lethal control, (9) regulate local hunting, (10) education, (11) financial incentives, (12) co-management and (13) restauration of habitat and/or prey populations (Lozano et al 2019)	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	Inskip and Zimmermann 2009, Lozano et al 2019
<i>Ecosystem services</i>			
Provider of ecosystem services	Whether carnivore species are considered providers of ecosystem service in the article	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	
Provisioning	Whether the study mentioned provisioning services of carnivores, i.e. benefits derived from material resources such as fur or skin	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	MA 2005
Regulating	Whether the study mentioned regulating services of carnivores, i.e. benefits derived from regulating processes	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	MA 2005
Cultural	Whether the mentioned cultural benefits provided by carnivores, such as being the basis of recreational, cultural or spiritual experiences	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	MA 2005
Number of ecosystem services	Number of ecosystem services provided by carnivores that are studied or mentioned in the research	Quantitative	
<i>Conflicts</i>			
Conflicts	Whether carnivore species are considered as source of conflict in the research	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	
Threats to biodiversity	Whether the paper mentioned the damage of biodiversity (non-game species) generated by carnivores, such as predation on endangered species	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	Lozano et al 2019

Damage to human food	Whether the paper mentioned the damages caused by carnivores on crops, livestock, poultry, fisheries, beehives and game species	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	Peterson et al 2010, Lozano et al 2019
Damage to human property	Whether the paper mentioned the damages caused by carnivores on human properties, including buildings and vehicles	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	Peterson et al 2010, Lozano et al 2019
Damage to human safety	Whether the paper mentioned direct attacks of carnivores to humans or transmission of diseases to humans	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	Peterson et al 2010, Lozano et al 2019
Human-human conflict	Whether the paper mentioned conflicts derived from human disagreements over carnivore management decisions	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	Peterson et al 2010, Lozano et al 2019
Number of conflicts	Number of different conflicts generated by carnivores that are studied or mentioned in the research	Quantitative	
<i>Human-nature connection</i>			
Emotional	Whether the paper mentioned emotional connection to carnivores, which are based on extended immersion in nature that may inspire and enliven one's spirit or can invoke strong affective responses	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	Ives et al 2017
Experiential	Whether the paper mentioned experiential connection to carnivores, which are based on outdoor sports and recreation, facilitated eco-adventure and field trips	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	Ives et al 2017
Cognitive	Whether the paper mentioned cognitive connection to carnivores, which are based on cognitive concepts, intellect, and information as obtained through education or media to satisfy the mind's curiosity and increase knowledge	Dummy: 0 (no) / 1 (yes)	Ives et al 2017

References used in this Appendix

- Bruskotter J T, Wilson R S 2014 Determining where the wild things will be: using psychological theory to find tolerance for large carnivores. *Conserv. Lett.* **7** 158–165. doi: 10.1111/conl.12072
- Gore M L, Knuth B A, Curtis P D, Shanahan J 2006 Stakeholder Perceptions of Risk Associated with Human-Black Bear Conflicts in New York's Adirondack Park Campgrounds: Implications for Theory and Practice. *Wildl. Soc. Bull.* **34** (1) 36-43.
- Inskip C, Zimmermann A 2009 Human-felid conflict: a review of patterns and priorities worldwide. *Oryx* **43** 18-34.
- Ives C D et al 2017 Human-nature connection: a multidisciplinary review. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **26-27** 106-113.
- Jacobs S et al 2018 The means determine the end – Pursuing integrated valuation in practice. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **29** 515-528.
- Kansky R, Kidd M, Knight A T 2014 Meta-Analysis of Attitudes toward Damage-Causing Mammalian Wildlife. *Conserv. Biol.* **28** 924-938.
- Lozano J et al 2019 Human-carnivore relations: a systematic review. *Biol. Conserv.* **237** 480–492
- MA (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment) 2005 Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis. Island Press, Washington DC.
- Peterson M N, Birckhead J L, Leong K, Peterson M J, Peterson T R 2010 Rearticulating the myth of human-wildlife conflict. *Conserv. Lett.* **3** 74-82.