Supplementary information

Appendix A:

Table A1. Proportion of cameras and transects in each habitat type in areas with and without feral dogs. Data are means (± SD) for three sites.

Habitat	Cameras[1]		Transects[2]	
	Dogs present	Dogs absent	Dogs present	Dogs absent
Grass páramo	54.8±6.7	55.8±4.9	51.2±6.5	53.0±5.4
Shrub páramo	18.2+4.7	15.3+5.3	21.2+5.1	18.2+6.1
Cushion páramo	4.5±3.0	5.1±2.6	5.8±3.6	4.9±0.5
Andean forest	22.5±5.8	23.8±3.0	21.8±8.7	23.9±1.2

[1]Yates $X^2_{15} = 14.8.0$, $p>0.4$; [2]Yates $X^2_{15} = 22.0$, $p>0.2$;

Our information on habitat types was taken from a digital vegetation map obtained from the Ecuador's Ministerio del Ambiente (2012). A detailed description of the methods for construction of this map is available with the map from the Ministerio del Ambiente. We present a brief summary of these methods here. This map was based on classification of Landsat 7 ETM+ and Spot 5 HRG images taken 14 days apart. Images were orthorectified to remove relief displacement. An unsupervised classification of vegetation types was conducted using a traditional maximum likelihood. Training areas then were defined through fieldwork, and a supervised classification was performed. The final hybrid classification combined the maximum likelihood classification with visual edits based on aerial photographs, expert knowledge, and contextual information. For the area of the map used for our study, this process included acquisition, orthorectification, and interpretation of 38 black and white aerial photos (1:7000).