

**Please cite the Published Version**

Duarte, J, García, FJ and Fa, JE (2016) Depredatory impact of free-roaming dogs (*Canis lupus familiaris*) on Mediterranean deer in southern Spain: implications for the human-wolf conflict. *Folia Zoologica*, 65 (2). pp. 135-141. ISSN 1210-9681

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.25225/fozo.v65.i2.a8.2016>

**Version:** Accepted Version

**Downloaded from:** <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/374/>

**Usage rights:** © In Copyright

**Enquiries:**

If you have questions about this document, contact [openresearch@mmu.ac.uk](mailto:openresearch@mmu.ac.uk). Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

1 **Depredatory impact of free-roaming dogs (*Canis lupus familiaris*) on**  
2 **Mediterranean deer in southern Spain: implications for the human-wolf conflict**

3

4 Jesús DUARTE<sup>\*</sup>, Francisco José GARCÍA<sup>2</sup> and John E. FA<sup>3</sup>

5

6 1. Ofitecma. Calle Colombia 5, 29400 Ronda (Málaga) & Biogeography, Diversity and  
7 Conservation research group, Dept. of Animal Biology, University of Málaga, 29071  
8 Málaga, Spain: email: jddofitecma@gmail.com

9 2. Biogeography, Diversity and Conservation research group, Dept. of Animal Biology,  
10 University of Málaga, 29071 Málaga, Spain: email: ffg.bio@gmail.com

11 3. Division of Biology and Conservation Ecology, School of Science and the  
12 Environment, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester M1 5GD (UK) &  
13 Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), CIFOR Headquarters, Bogor  
14 16115, Indonesia: email: jfa949@gmail.com

15

16 \* Corresponding author: jddofitecma@gmail.com

17

1 **Abstract**

2 Feral dogs (*Canis lupus familiaris*) are efficient wild ungulate hunters in many parts of  
3 the world. This has not been confirmed in Mediterranean ecosystems. However, if feral  
4 dogs can predate upon wild Mediterranean ungulates, they can also do so upon  
5 livestock. Therefore, to more realistically understand human-wolf conflict in areas  
6 where wolves and feral dogs overlap, the possible role of the latter taking domestic prey  
7 should be considered. . During a 6-month study period, we carried out daily  
8 observations of a pack of medium-sized dogs, where they were the only large-bodied  
9 carnivore capable of killing ungulates, in a fenced estate in southern Spain. The estate  
10 contained sizeable populations of red deer, fallow deer and mouflons, but no livestock.  
11 We described feral dog predation patterns and depredatory impact. We found that dogs  
12 preyed upon a total of 57 ungulates killed; fallow deer (47%) red deer (37%), and  
13 mouflon (16%). Red deer adults were the least frequent prey, but dogs killed  
14 significantly more females and fawns of red and fallow deer. Mouflons were attacked  
15 indistinctly. Our results suggest that dogs in our study exhibited a kill pattern similar to  
16 Iberian wolves. Therefore, in areas where wolves and feral dogs coexist, a significant  
17 proportion of livestock predation could be falsely attributed to the wild canid. In  
18 addition, the presence of feral dogs may be a cause of risk in big game hunting estates.

19

20 **Key words**

21 Fallow deer, feral dogs, human-wolf conflict, mouflon, red deer

22

## 1 **Introduction**

2           Dogs (*Canis lupus familiaris*), that become free-living after escaping from  
3 domestic situations, abandoned, unwanted or not kept as typical pets as in many  
4 western societies, can become a threat to native wildlife (Hughes & Macdonald 2013).  
5 Free-living dogs suffer the process of feralization (Daniels & Bekoff 1989a). This  
6 involves domestic animals becoming desocialized from humans and behaving like non-  
7 domestic animals. These dogs do not differ morphologically from domestic dogs, the  
8 only difference being the degree to which they do not depend on humans and in their  
9 aggressive, suspicious or avoidance behaviour towards people (Rubin & Beck 1982).  
10 These animals can survive in non-domestic conditions by searching for food in dumps,  
11 hunting prey (wild or domestic fauna), or in general scavenging (Daniels & Bekoff  
12 1989b, Manor & Saltz 2004). Where numbers are high, dogs live in packs and, similar  
13 to other carnivores exhibit a hierarchy and have distinctive home ranges (Macdonald  
14 1983).

15           Feral dogs hunt in a similar fashion to African wild dogs (*Lycaon pictus*), or  
16 spotted hyaenas (*Crocuta crocuta*). They can be hunters of ungulates in forested (Silva-  
17 Rodríguez & Sieving 2012) or steppe landscapes (Young et al. 2011). Dogs can develop  
18 hunting strategies that allow them to compete out large carnivores in areas where their  
19 community is impoverished or to occupy their role where they are absent (Vanak &  
20 Gompper 2009). The main strategy is to harass and chase their prey, attempting to  
21 separate targets from herds or groups, and distracting individuals from each other, e.g.  
22 young animals from their mothers, in order to isolate and overpower them (Cooper  
23 1990, Muro et al. 2011). Cooperative hunting enables the capture of larger, stronger,  
24 faster, and more dangerous prey (Packer & Ruttan 1988) as well as giving them the

1 ability to cope effectively with interference competition from other carnivores at the kill  
2 (Lamprecht 1981).

3 Free-roaming dogs can have a significant negative effect on fragmented or  
4 isolated animal populations (Manor & Saltz 2004, Whiteman et al. 2007), and more  
5 generally can reduce diversity and abundance of wild animals in natural areas (Banks &  
6 Bryant 2007). Dogs predate upon game species (Caussey & Cude 1980, Duarte &  
7 Vargas 2001) and can become naturalised aliens in new habitats and areas (Paschoal et  
8 al. 2012). In addition, they threaten endangered species (Salvador & Abad 1987,  
9 Hughes & Macdonald 2013) and act as reservoirs and disseminators of disease that can  
10 affect resident wildlife (Martínez et al. 2013) as well as humans (Hughes & Macdonald  
11 2013). In some situations, dogs may hybridize with wild canids, as in the case of dog-  
12 wolf crosses (Hindrikson et al. 2012). In the United Kingdom, where wolves are absent,  
13 an estimated 30,000 sheep and 5000 – 10,000 lambs are killed each year by dogs  
14 (Taylor et al. 2005).

15 The Iberian wolf (*Canis lupus*) is an endangered carnivore in Spain distributed  
16 mainly in the north-western sector of the Iberian Peninsula (Blanco 2004). There is also  
17 a small and very endangered population in Sierra Morena, north Andalusia (Junta de  
18 Andalucía 2012) and isolated individuals in North-Eastern Spain (Blanco et al. 2007).  
19 Although the main population may be expanding (Blanco 2004), the lack of  
20 standardized censuses (Echegaray & Vilà 2008) and the always present human-wolf  
21 conflict, especially their impact on livestock, increases the threat for the species  
22 (Ministerio de Medio Ambiente 2006, European Commission 2015). It is estimated that  
23 more than 1.1 million Euros are paid every year as compensation for damages (Sigatus  
24 2015). The wolf raises much social controversy (Blanco & Cortés 2002), a critical point  
25 source of conflict being whether all reported damages are actually caused by wolves.

1 Feral dogs may be causing damages falsely attributed to wolves (Echegaray & Vilà  
2 2010).

3 In this study, we present new data on the predatory impact of feral dogs on deer  
4 in Spain. Within a fenced hunting estate, we describe how dogs were able to predate  
5 upon ungulates, and we tested whether predation was carried out indiscriminately or  
6 selectively (by sex, age, or size). By understanding the impact of feral dogs on wild  
7 prey, it is possible to suggest ways of improving big game species management and  
8 adequately contrast potential predation by feral dog vs wolves in the Iberian Peninsula  
9 in areas where both predators are sympatric.

10

## 11 **Study Area**

12 The study area was located in a 824.3 ha private estate (municipality of Benahavís,  
13 Málaga province, southern Spain; Fig. 1). The site was completely surrounded by forest  
14 and 780.9 ha (94.7%) of its surface area lies within the protected natural area  
15 ES6170010 *Sierras Bermeja y Real*, a Site of Community Importance (SCI) under the  
16 Natura 2000 network. Elevation within the property ranges between 165 m and 760 m  
17 above sea level. The climate was temperate-subtropical Mediterranean with average  
18 temperatures of 11°C in January and 25°C in July, and an annual rainfall of 1,068 mm  
19 (Capel-Molina 1981). Vegetation was typically Mediterranean. Some forest patches are  
20 found; dominated by maritime pine (*Pinus pinaster*), mixed with carob (*Ceratonia*  
21 *siliqua*), wild olive (*Olea europaea* var. *Sylvestris*), and cork oak (*Quercus suber*).  
22 There were also gall oak (*Quercus faginea*) stands in the foothills. Along the more  
23 shaded mountain slopes and limestone areas holm oak (*Quercus rotundifolia*)  
24 dominated. However, most of the study area consists of Mediterranean scrubland,

1 largely composed of rock rose (*Cistus sp.*), European dwarf palm (*Chamaerops*  
2 *humilis*), Labiatae, and gorse (*Ulex sp.*), with some heather (*Erica sp.*) and strawberry  
3 trees (*Arbutus unedo*).

4         The estate was privately-owned game land, where red deer (*Cervus elaphus*),  
5 fallow deer (*Dama dama*), and Corsico-Sardinian mouflon (*Ovis orientalis*) were  
6 introduced during the 1970's for hunting purposes. Ungulate density around the estate  
7 was high (Duarte et al. 2015): 49 to 57 red deer/km<sup>2</sup>, 28 to 37 fallow deer/km<sup>2</sup>, and 2.4  
8 mouflon/km<sup>2</sup>. Deer were provided with supplementary feeding during a part of the year.  
9 Other ungulates present were wild boar (*Sus scrofa*) and a small population of wild goat  
10 (*Capra pyrenaica*). The estate bordered other hunting estates along most of its perimeter  
11 (75%) as well as more developed exurban habitats (the southern sector alone). There  
12 was no livestock within the estate. The only medium-sized carnivore present in the  
13 estate was the Red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*).

14

## 15 **Material and Methods**

16         Between June 2013 and December 2013 we monitored daily the presence of  
17 feral dogs in the estate with the help of two gamekeepers employed by the estate. Dogs  
18 were detected in spring 2013 and the estate managers took the decision to cull the dogs  
19 at the end of December 2013, thus our monitoring period extended between these two  
20 dates.

21         Our feral dog study group was composed of medium-sized dogs (20-30 kg in  
22 weight). These animals (Fig. 2) probably escaped from one of the hunting beats for big  
23 game hunting in the adjacent hunting estates. The dogs were not always found inside the

1 estate but entered by climbing through holes in the fence or jumping it, mainly along the  
2 north-western side of the property.

3 We undertook driven transects over the entire estate (39.9 km) using paved road,  
4 tracks, and firebreak networks, as part of the routine surveillance tasks undertaken by  
5 the estate's gamekeepers. In each transect we made several stops in high visibility  
6 elevation points (each 1-2 kilometres) to observe the dogs. We used binoculars. When  
7 dogs were detected we noted their group size, GPS location, and their general behaviour  
8 [resting; active (running, walking, looking for prey); feeding on prey]. All carcasses of  
9 prey encountered by gamekeepers during their daily duties were communicated to the  
10 survey team and examined in-situ during the first three hours after discovery. The  
11 location of each carcass was recorded and a gamekeeper watched over it until the survey  
12 team arrived and examined it. By doing this, we avoided any possible inference and  
13 contamination by carrion feeders that could jeopardise a proper forensic predator  
14 identification. We examined all carcasses to identify species, sex, and age as well as the  
15 type of injuries.

16 We also carried out detailed forensic examinations of both the site and the  
17 carcasses. The aim was to differentiate between deaths due to predation or other causes  
18 and assess if dogs were scavenging or predated upon deer (Wade & Bowns 1994,  
19 Canadian Sheep Federation 2015, Government of Western Australia 2015). The  
20 forensic exam consisted of: 1) dissection to show bruising and tissue damages when  
21 skinning of the throat and hind legs. Scavenging does not cause tissue damage after  
22 death and tooth punctures and hidden haemorrhages only occur if the animal is bitten  
23 while still alive; 2) presence of blood caked on the hind legs and flowed down, meaning  
24 attacks from behind as they run away; 3) presence of bites to the throat and blood  
25 vessels of the neck or blood found at the mouth and nose (body fluid drained, i.e.



1 decomposing carcass); 4) presence of tracks and struggles, freshly broken vegetation,  
2 holding tufts of skin, drag marks on the ground as well as blood trails at the site. After  
3 examination we did not remove the carcasses thus allowing the dogs to return to  
4 scavenge. In this manner we tried to reduce any effect we may have on the dog's  
5 predatory behaviour and kill rate.

6 We compared age and sex class frequencies of prey using contingency tables by  
7 applying Yates' correction for continuity with one degree of freedom (Fowler & Cohen  
8 1992). We also used contingency tables to test if the capture frequency of each prey  
9 species was proportional to its availability. To estimate prey availability we considered  
10 the three introduced ungulate species present in the estate. Given that densities of each  
11 species in the estate were known (see study area description) and that these were closed  
12 populations, we estimated the absolute size of each population of ungulate inhabiting  
13 the total surface occupied by the estate with its 95% confidence interval. For further  
14 analyses, we considered the population size of each prey species as the mean and  
15 confidence interval. We used Bonferroni 95% confidence intervals around the available  
16 sample proportion of each prey (Neu et al. 1974, Byers et al. 1984) to test if they were  
17 captured according to their availability. We considered that prey were captured  
18 selectively (i.e. not random) if the proportion of a given species was either above or  
19 below the confidence intervals, i.e. captured in a lower or higher proportion than  
20 expected, respectively. All reported means are given with their standard error.

21

## 22 **Results**

23 We detected dogs on 105 separate days (57.4% of the sampling period). Average  
24 group size was  $4.2 \pm 0.5$  dogs. Dogs sighted were always adults and the sex-ratio was

1 2:3 (Males-Females). We did not observe any mating or presence of puppies during the  
2 monitoring period. Pack size was relatively constant during the entire monitoring period  
3 (range 3 to 5 dogs) and dogs sighted (identified by their individual pelage and colour)  
4 were always the same ones; thus no immigration or emigration. When sighted, dogs  
5 were seen resting (34.3%), active, (42.9%) or eating prey (22.9%).

6 We observed dog groups directly attack the three deer species under study (from  
7 now on: Rd, red deer; Fd, Fallow deer; Mo, mouflon) on six separate occasions. In all  
8 other cases we found the carcasses. In total, we accounted for 59 carcasses of which,  
9 based on forensic exams, 2 were scavenging incidents and 57 were predation cases.  
10 Three species and 57 individuals were preyed upon (Rd 37%, Fd 47%, and Mo 16%).  
11 Adults (mostly females: 5 Rd, 6 Fd and 1 Mo vs only 1 Mo adult male) contributed  
12 40.4% of the prey and youngs 77.2% (9 Rd, 9 Fd and 3 Mo males vs 7 Rd, 12 Fd and 4  
13 Mo females). Dogs did not kill any adult male ungulate, except for one adult male  
14 mouflon. The sex ratio of prey (young and adults together) did not differ significantly  
15 from unity for Rd ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 0.190$ ; d.f. = 1;  $p = 0.662$ ), Fd ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 2.370$ ; d.f. = 1;  $p =$   
16  $0.123$ ), or Mo ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 0.444$ ; d.f. = 1;  $p = 0.504$ ). However, the age ratio was  
17 significantly skewed towards young individuals in the case of the Rd ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 4.761$ ; d.f.  
18 = 1;  $p = 0.029$ ) and Fd ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 7.259$ ; d.f. = 1;  $p = 0.007$ ), but not for Mo ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 1.777$ ;  
19 d.f. = 1;  $p = 0.182$ ).

20 Dogs were selective according to prey availability in the estate ( $\text{Chi}^2 = 11.923$ ;  
21 d.f. = 2;  $p = 0.002$ ). Red deer, although the most abundant and larger bodied prey  
22 species, was negatively selected. In contrast, the smaller-sized and less abundant fallow  
23 deer and mouflon were positively selected (Fig. 3).

1           Of the prey detected, 89.5% were already dead and presented serious injuries:  
2 tears and bites in the neck (42.9%) and hindquarters (57.1%). Entrails were absent from  
3 the majority of carcasses. All prey were found along forested patches of low scrubland  
4 and pastures and close to the perimeter fence ( $358.2 \pm 32.3$  m.) but far away from deer  
5 feeding points ( $> 900$  m.).

6

## 7 **Discussion**

8           In this study, we demonstrated that dogs are efficient predators of Mediterranean  
9 deer. Although our study was relatively short, we were able to show that a small pack of  
10 dogs was able to prey on more than 50 deer. Only 3.4% of the deer carcasses showed  
11 signs of being scavenged while all others had forensic evidence of predation. The high  
12 density of prey within a fenced range and under intensive management may have  
13 favoured the high predation rates observed in this study.

14           Dogs have been observed to prey upon ungulates or livestock in other areas  
15 (Lowry & McArthur 1978, Mitchell & Banks 2005, Silva-Rodríguez & Sieving 2012).  
16 As in the case of wolves, the level of dog predation may be influenced by prey  
17 abundance (Vos 2000). In our study area, dumped garbage and waste was not available.  
18 In addition, there were no livestock in our study area. In contrast, there was an  
19 overabundant wild ungulate population. Therefore, we can assume that the dogs focused  
20 on these.

21           We showed that dogs always preyed upon the most vulnerable animals i.e.  
22 fawns and females. Adult males of any of the species were not found as prey. Even  
23 though the larger-bodied red deer was the most abundant species, dogs primarily chose

1 the other, smaller species. This pattern of prey selection is similar to wolves (Smith et  
2 al. 2004) which select young individuals, fawns or smaller prey, usually coinciding with  
3 the birth season of ungulates (Baja 2009), as well as the older individuals.

4 It is probable that the greater difficulty to follow and tackle adult ungulates that  
5 makes fawns or females more cost-effective prey for medium-sized dogs and possibly  
6 wolves. In the case of mouflons, the smallest ungulate prey in the study area, dogs  
7 would kill young as well as adult animals indistinctly.

8 A dogs' ability to roam over large foray distances (Meek 1999) and its  
9 proficiency to move freely in the wild depends on its previous behaviour as a pet or  
10 domestic dog (Rubin & Beck 1982). Dogs that had been used to hunt wild boar or  
11 ungulates in 'rehalas' (packs of dogs commonly used to hunt deer and wild boar in  
12 Spain) would not encounter survival problems. Furthermore, the hunting strategy of  
13 'rehalas' consists in harassing, chasing, and biting prey. The same hunting strategy, type  
14 of injuries and bite pattern (Queensland Government 2013) appears to be used by the  
15 dogs entering the estate.

16 We show that without any control measures, dogs are able to cause serious  
17 damage to big game species. Big game estates are usually fenced and include high deer  
18 population densities whose diets are supplemented with artificial feed (Pérez-González  
19 et al. 2010). In our study, even without removing carcasses and allowing possible  
20 scavenging, dogs still preferred to kill preys. Probably the high density of prey  
21 (supported by the hunting management, i.e. artificial feeding) was a main driver of the  
22 number of deer taken by the dogs. Although supplementary feeding could make deer  
23 more susceptible to dogs we did not find carcasses close to feeding points. Nevertheless,

1 this management activity is so widespread in Spain that differences between our study  
2 area and other big game hunting estates are unlikely.

3 Most captures were less than 300 m away from the fences. Although  
4 experimental studies have shown that deer avoid using fenced areas (Sánchez-Prieto et  
5 al. 2010), it has also been observed that fences act as barriers for the movement of deer  
6 between areas (Hayward & Kerley 2009) and that some habitat features may expose  
7 prey to risk (Stahl et al. 2002). Therefore, is likely that feral dogs drive deer to fences to  
8 prevent their escape or that deer found the fences while running away and were  
9 cornered. Thus, kill rates in non-fenced areas could be lower than the numbers we found  
10 here. However, as most big game estates are usually fenced, the risk of predation may  
11 be artificially high in these situations, as occurs in livestock sheds with damages  
12 attributed to wolf.

13 Some factors could have biased our findings. First, to determine if carcasses  
14 were preyed or already dead and dog only scavenged on them. However, the forensic  
15 exams revealed in most cases that predation was the cause of death, especially from  
16 observations of tissue damages and hidden haemorrhages after skinning. Secondly, the  
17 existence of other potential predators may have influenced our findings. In the study  
18 area the only other predator that could predate on ungulates was the red fox (*Vulpes*  
19 *vulpes*) but it is unlikely that this species preyed upon large ungulates. In Spain, the diet  
20 of the red fox is small to medium-sized prey (Fedrani 1996, Padial et al. 2002, Delibes-  
21 Mateos et al. 2008) and although some incidents of predation upon ungulates have been  
22 reported (Jarnemo 2004, Helldin & Danielsson 2007, Panzacchi et al. 2007) these are  
23 rare. It is more likely that solitary red foxes scavenged on carcasses than predate upon  
24 adult deer or fawns.

1           In conclusion, Echegaray & Vilà (2010) showed that dogs were the main  
2 animals responsible for livestock predation in the north of Spain even when their home  
3 ranges overlapped with those of wolves. Our findings support this suggestion. If feral  
4 dogs can have a significant impact on ungulates, which are theoretically more difficult  
5 to catch than livestock, some carcasses found can be wrongly attributed to wolf  
6 predation.

7           Additionally, our findings highlight the importance of controlling feral dogs not  
8 only for improving small game species success, but also the need to enhance the  
9 conservation of wild ungulates in big game hunting estates or wildlife reserves in the  
10 Mediterranean area, where other canid top predators are absent. This is especially  
11 important in fenced and intensively managed big game estates where feral dogs could  
12 cause considerable damage to deer populations.

13

1 **Literature**

- 2 Banks P.B. & Bryant J.V. 2007: Four-legged friends or foe? Dog walking displaces  
3 native birds from natural areas. *Biol. Letters* 3: 611-613.
- 4 Barja, I. 2009: Prey and prey-age preference by the Iberian wolf *Canis lupus signatus* in  
5 a multiple-prey ecosystem. *Wildlife Biol.* 15: 147-154.
- 6 Blanco, J.C. 2004: Lobo - *Canis lupus*. In: Carrascal, L.M. & Salvador, A. (eds.),  
7 Enciclopedia Virtual de los Vertebrados Españoles. *Museo Nacional de Ciencias*  
8 *Naturales, Madrid*. <http://www.vertebradosibericos.org/> (In Spanish).
- 9 Blanco, J.C. & Cortés, Y. 2002: Ecología, censos, percepción y evolución del lobo en  
10 España: Análisis de un conflicto. *SECEM, Málaga, Spain*. (In Spanish).
- 11 Blanco, J.C., Sáenz de Buruaga, M., Llana, L. 2007: *Canis lupus* Linnaeus, 1758. In:  
12 Palomo, L.J., Gisbert, J., Blanco, J.C. (eds.). Atlas y libro rojo de los mamíferos  
13 terrestres de España. *Dirección General de Conservación de la Naturaleza,*  
14 *SECEM, SECEMU, Madrid, Spain*: 272-276. (In Spanish).
- 15 Byers, C.R., Steinhorst, R.K. & Krausman, P.R. 1984: Clarification of a technique for  
16 analysis of utilization-availability data. *J. Wildlife Manage* 48: 1050-1053.
- 17 Canadian Sheep Federation 2015. Predation.  
18 <http://www.cansheep.ca/User/Docs/VTBox/Predation%20Section%207.pdf>.
- 19 Capel-Molina J.J. 1981: Los climas de España. *Tau, Barcelona*. (in Spanish).
- 20 Causey M.K. & Cude C.A. 1980: Feral dog and white-tailed deer interactions in  
21 Alabama. *J. Wildlife Manage.* 44: 481-484.
- 22 Cooper S.M. 1990: The hunting behavior of spotted hyaenas (*Crocuta crocuta*) in a  
23 region containing both sedentary and migratory populations of herbivores. *African*  
24 *J. Ecol.* 28: 131-141.

- 1 Daniels T.J. & Bekoff M. 1989a: Feralization: the making of wild domestic dogs.  
2 *Behav. Process* 19: 79-94.
- 3 Daniels T.J. & Bekoff M. 1989b: Population and social biology of free-ranging dogs,  
4 *Canis familiaris*. *J. Mammal.* 70: 754-762.
- 5 Delibes-Mateos M., Fernández De Simon J., Villafuerte R. & Ferreras P. 2008: Feeding  
6 responses of the red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) to different wild rabbit (*Oryctolagus*  
7 *cuniculus*) densities: A regional approach. *Eur. J. Wildlife Res.* 54: 71-78.
- 8 Duarte J., Farfán M.A. & Fa J.E. 2015: Deer population inhabiting urban areas in the  
9 south of Spain: habitat and conflicts. *Eur. J. Wildlife Res.* 61: 365-377.
- 10 Duarte J. & Vargas J.M. 2001: Mamíferos predadores de nidos de perdiz roja (*Alectoris*  
11 *rufa*) en olivares del sur de España. *Galemys*, 13(n.e.): 47-58. (in Spanish).
- 12 Echegaray J. & Vilà C. 2008: ¿Hay tantos lobos en España?. *Quercus*, 272: 80-81. (In  
13 Spanish).
- 14 Echegaray J. & Vilà C. 2010: Noninvasive monitoring of wolves at the edge of their  
15 distribution and the cost of their conservation. *Anim. Conserv.* 13: 157-161.
- 16 European Commission. 2015: La predación del lobo sobre el ganado vacuno,  
17 Caracterización del conflicto y propuestas para reducirlo
- 18 Fedriani J.M. 1996: Dieta anual del zorro, *Vulpes vulpes*, en dos hábitats del Parque  
19 Nacional de Doñana. *Doñana Acta Vertebrata* 23: 143-152. (in Spanish).
- 20 Fowler J. & Cohen L. 1992: Practical statistics for field biology. *Wiley, Chichester, UK.*
- 21 Gortazar C., Acevedo P., Ruiz-Fons F. & Vicente, J. 2006: Disease risks and  
22 overabundance of game species. *Eur. J. Wildlife Res.* 52: 81-87.



- 1 Government of Western Australia. 2015. Wild dogs: recognizing sheep predation.  
2 *Department of Agriculture and Food*. [https://www.agric.wa.gov.au/state-barrier-  
4 fence/wild-dogs-recognising-sheep-predation](https://www.agric.wa.gov.au/state-barrier-<br/>3 fence/wild-dogs-recognising-sheep-predation).
- 4 Hayward M.W. & Kerley G.I.H. 2009: Fencing for conservation: restrictions of  
5 evolutionary potential or a riposte to threatening processes? *Biol. Conserv.* 142: 1-  
6 13.
- 7 Helldin J.O. & Danielsson A.V. 2007: Changes in red fox *Vulpes vulpes* diet due to  
8 colonisation by lynx *Lynx lynx*. *Wildlife Biol.* 13: 475-480.
- 9 Hindrikson M., Männil P., Ozolins J., Krzywinski A. & Saarma U. 2012: Bucking the  
10 trend in wolf-dog hybridization: first evidence from Europe of hybridization  
11 between feral dogs and male wolves. *PlosOne* 7(10): e46465.
- 12 Hughes J. & Macdonald D.W. 2013: A review of the interactions between free-roaming  
13 domestic dogs and wildlife. *Biol. Conserv.* 157: 341-351.
- 14 Jarnemo A. 2004: Predation processes: behavioural interactions between red fox and roe  
15 deer during the fawning season. *J. Ethol.* 22: 167-173.
- 16 Junta de Andalucía. 2012: Programa de actuaciones para la conservación del lobo  
17 *Canis lupus signatus* en Andalucía. Informe Anual 2012. *Consejería de Medio  
18 Ambiente, Sevilla, Spain. (In Spanish)*.
- 19 Lamprecht J. 1981: The function of social hunting in larger terrestrial carnivores.  
20 *Mammal Rev.* 11: 169-179.
- 21 Lowry D.A. & McArthur K.L. 1978: Domestic dogs as predators on deer. *Wildlife Soc.*  
22 *B.* 6: 38-39.
- 23 Macdonald D.W. 1983: The ecology of carnivore social behaviour. *Nature* 301: 379-  
24 384.

- 1 Manor R. & Saltz D. 2004: The impact of free-roaming dogs on gazelle kid/female  
2 ratio in a fragmented area. *Biol. Conserv.* 119: 231-236.
- 3 Martínez E., Cesário C., de Oliveira I. & Boere V. 2013: Domestic dogs in rural area of  
4 fragmented Atlantic forest: potential threats to wild animals. *Ciência Rural* 43:  
5 1998-2003.
- 6 Meek P.D. 1999: The movement, roaming behaviour and home range of free-roaming  
7 domestic dogs, *Canis lupus familiaris*, in coastal New South Wales. *Wildlife Res.*  
8 26: 847-855.
- 9 Ministerio de Medio Ambiente. 2006: Estrategia para la conservación y la gestión del  
10 lobo (*Canis lupus*) en España. *Dirección General para la Biodiversidad,*  
11 *Ministerio de Medio Ambiente, Madrid, Spain. (In Spanish).*
- 12 Mitchell B.D. & Banks P.B. 2005: Do wild dogs exclude foxes? Evidence for  
13 competition from dietary and spatial overlaps. *Austral Ecol.* 30: 581-591.
- 14 Muro C., Escobedo R., Spector L. & Coppinger R.P. 2011: Wold-pack (*Canis lupus*)  
15 hunting strategies emerge from simple rules in computational simulations. *Behav.*  
16 *Process.* 88: 192-197.
- 17 Neu, C.C., Byers, C.R. & Peek, J.M. 1974: A technique for analysis of utilization-  
18 availability data. *J. Wildlife Manage* 38: 541-545.
- 19 Packer C. & Ruttan L. 1988: The evolution of cooperative hunting. *Am. Nat.* 132: 159-  
20 198.
- 21 Padial J.M., Avila E. & Gil-Sánchez J.M. 2002: Feeding habits and overlap among red  
22 fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) and stone marten (*Martes foina*) in two Mediterranean  
23 mountain habitats. *Mamm. Biol.* 67: 137-146.

- 1 Panzacchi M., Linnell J.D.C., Serrao G., Eie S., Odden M., Odden J. & Andersen R.  
2 2007: Evaluation of the importance of roe deer fawns in the spring-summer diet of  
3 red foxes in southeastern Norway. *Ecol. Res.* 23: 889-896.
- 4 Paschoal A.M.O., Massara R.L., Santos J.L. & Chiarello A.G. 2012: Is the domestic  
5 dog becoming an abundant species in the Atlantic forest? A study case in southern  
6 Brazil. *Mammalia* 76: 67-76.
- 7 Pérez-González J., Marcia Barbosa A., Carranza J. & Torres-Porras J. 2010: Relative  
8 effect of food supplementation and natural resources on female red deer  
9 distribution in a Mediterranean ecosystem. *J. Wildlife Manage.* 74: 1701-1708.
- 10 Queensland Government. 2013: Predation of livestock. Recognising the signs. Fact  
11 sheet. Pest animals. *Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry,*  
12 *Biosecurity Queensland, Australia.*
- 13 Rubin H.D. & Beck A.M. 1982: Ecological behaviour of free-ranging urban pet dogs.  
14 *Appl. Anim. Ethol.* 8: 161-168.
- 15 Sánchez-Prieto C.B., Carranza J., Pérez-González J., Alarcos S. & Mateos C. 2010:  
16 Effects of small barriers in habitat use by red deer: implication for conservation  
17 practices. *J. Nat. Conserv.* 18: 196-201.
- 18 Salvador A. & Abad P.L. 1987: Food habits of a wolf population (*Canis lupus*) in León  
19 province, Spain. *Mammalia* 51: 45-52.
- 20 Signatus (2015). Daños causados por lobos. *Signatus.org.*  
21 <http://www.signatus.org/danos-lobo>.
- 22 Silva-Rodríguez E. & Siewing K.E. 2012: Domestic dogs shape the landscape-scale  
23 distribution of a threatened ungulate. *Biol. Conser.* 150: 103-110.

- 1 Smith D.W., Drummer T.D., Murphy K.M., Guernsey D.S. & Evans S.B. 2004: Winter  
2 prey selection and estimation of wolf kill rates in Yellowstone national park,  
3 1995-2000. *J. Wildlife Manage.* 68: 153-166.
- 4 Stahl P., Vandel J.M., Ruelle S., Coat L., Coat Y. & Balestra L. 2002: Factors affecting  
5 lynx predation on sheep in French Jura. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 39: 204-216.
- 6 Taylor K., Anderson R., Taylor P., Longden K. & Fisher P. 2005: Dogs, access and  
7 nature conservation. *English Nature Research Report 649, Peterborough.*
- 8 Vanak A.T. & Gompper M.E. 2009: Dogs *Canis familiaris* as carnivores: their role and  
9 function in intraguild competition. *Mammal Rev.* 39: 265-283.
- 10 Vos J. 2000: Food habits and livestock depredation on two Iberian wolf packs (*Canis*  
11 *lupus signatus*) in the north of Portugal. *J. Zool.* 251: 457-462.
- 12 Wade D.A. & Bowns J.E. 1994: Livestock and animal predation identification. In:  
13 Hysnstrom S.E., Timm R.M. & Larson G.E. (eds.), Prevention and Control of  
14 Wildlife Damage. *University of Nebraska, Lincoln:* 42-55.
- 15 Whiteman C.W., Matushima E.R., Confalonieri U.E.C., Palha M.D.C., da Silva A.S.L.  
16 & Monteiro V.C. 2007: Human and domestic animal populations as a potential  
17 threat to wild carnivore conservation in a fragmented landscape from the Eastern  
18 Brazilian Amazon. *Biol. Conserv.* 138: 290-296.
- 19 Young, J.K., Olson, K.A., Reading, R.P., Amgalanbaatar, S. & Berger, J. 2011: Is  
20 wildlife going to the dogs? Impact of feral and free-roaming dogs on wildlife  
21 populations. *BioScience* 61: 125-132.

22

23

1 **Figure legends**

2

3 **Fig. 1.** Location of the estate where the study was carried out, southern Spain (Málaga  
4 province).

5

6 **Fig. 2.** Free-roaming dog in the study area

7

8 **Fig. 3.** Predation pattern of dogs upon deer in the study area. Bars represent prey  
9 availability and dots the number of prey captured

10

11

12

13



1

2

3


4

5

6

1

2



3