



---

Charles Darwin University

## Status of mammals on Groote Eylandt

### Safe haven or slow burn?

Heiniger, Jaime; Davies, Hugh F.; Gillespie, Graeme R.

*Published in:*  
Austral Ecology

*DOI:*  
[10.1111/aec.12892](https://doi.org/10.1111/aec.12892)

Published: 01/09/2020

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

#### *Citation for published version (APA):*

Heiniger, J., Davies, H. F., & Gillespie, G. R. (2020). Status of mammals on Groote Eylandt: Safe haven or slow burn? *Austral Ecology*, 45(6), 759-772. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aec.12892>

#### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

#### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1                   **Status of mammals on Groote Eylandt: safe haven or slow burn?**

2   Jaime Heiniger <sup>a</sup>, Hugh F Davies <sup>b</sup> and Graeme Gillespie <sup>a, c</sup>

3   <sup>a</sup> Flora and Fauna Division, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Northern  
4   Territory Government, Berrimah NT 0828, Australia

5   <sup>b</sup> NESP Threatened Species Recovery Hub, Research Institute for the Environment and  
6   Livelihoods, Charles Darwin University, Casuarina Northern Territory 0909, Australia

7   <sup>c</sup> School of Biosciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville Victoria 3010, Australia

8   \* Corresponding author: [jaim.heiniger@uqconnect.edu.au](mailto:jaim.heiniger@uqconnect.edu.au)

9  
10   **Abstract**

11   Native mammals across northern Australia have suffered severe decline, with feral cats (*Felis*  
12   *catus*), introduced herbivores and changed fire regimes being implicated as drivers. However,  
13   uncertainty surrounding the relative contribution of each of these threats, and the interactions  
14   between them, is limiting the development of effective management strategies. The absence of  
15   introduced herbivores and cane toads (*Rhinella marina*) on Groote Eylandt, Northern Territory,  
16   provides an opportunity to evaluate some hypothesised threats in isolation of others. We used  
17   camera traps to investigate the correlates of native mammal distribution and abundance at 112  
18   lowland savanna sites across Groote Eylandt. Two large grids of camera traps were also  
19   deployed to obtain estimates of feral cat density. We hypothesised that native mammal  
20   populations would be negatively associated with feral cat occupancy as well as frequent, large  
21   fires. Native mammal site-occupancy on Groote Eylandt was generally higher compared to  
22   mainland Northern Territory. Feral cats were infrequently detected, precluding both an estimate

23 of feral cat density, or an evaluation of the relationship between feral cats and native mammals.  
24 We found no evidence that native mammal site-occupancy or relative abundance are negatively  
25 associated with frequent, large fires. The relatively healthy state of native mammal populations  
26 on Groote Eylandt is likely due to the low density of feral cats, the benign fire regime and the  
27 absence of large introduced herbivores and cane toads. However, due to a lack of historical  
28 data, the current state of mammals should not be taken as evidence that these populations are  
29 safe from decline. This study highlights that the apparent resilience of mammal populations is  
30 a result of complex interactions between factors that vary substantially across the landscape.  
31 Caution is therefore required when making broad inferences about the drivers of mammal  
32 decline from studies that are spatially and temporally limited.

33

34 **Keywords:** islands, feral cats, fire, declines, threatened mammals.

35

## 36 **Introduction**

37 In the 230 years since European arrival, Australia has lost >10% of its terrestrial mammal fauna  
38 and contributed more than 30% of global mammal extinctions recorded since 1500 (Woinarski  
39 *et al.* 2015). In contrast to other continents, where large-bodied mammals near areas with high  
40 human population density have been most prone to extinction (Cardillo *et al.*, 2005), Australian  
41 species with body sizes between 35 – 5500 g (henceforth referred to as the critical weight range:  
42 CWR), in remote and relatively unmodified areas, have suffered the highest extinction rates  
43 (Woinarski *et al.*, 2015). Worryingly, this trend has continued in recent decades, with  
44 widespread, significant declines of CWR mammals recorded across Australia's northern

45 savanna landscapes (Woinarski et al., 2010, Ziembicki et al., 2015, Fisher et al., 2014, Davies  
46 et al., 2018).

47 Factors implicated in the current mammal decline across northern Australia include the higher  
48 incidence of large-scale, intense fires occurring since the breakdown of traditional Aboriginal  
49 burning practices (Russell-Smith and Edwards, 2006, Russell-Smith et al., 2003), habitat  
50 degradation by large, feral herbivores and pigs (*Sus scrofa*) (Legge et al., 2011a, Kutt and  
51 Woinarski, 2007), and predation by feral cats (*Felis catus*) (Ziembicki et al., 2015, Fisher et  
52 al., 2014, Woinarski et al., 2011a, Frank et al., 2014). Due to a lack of empirical data, we do  
53 not know if the initiation of mammal population declines in northern Australia coincided with  
54 the establishment of any one of these hypothesised threats. Although northern Australian  
55 mammal declines were quantitatively documented only relatively recently, it is plausible that  
56 mammal populations have been declining over a much longer period. The uncertainty regarding  
57 the relative contribution of each threat to northern mammal declines is limiting our ability to  
58 develop and implement effective mitigation strategies.

59 Further complicating our ability to understand the factors implicated in declines of native  
60 mammal populations across northern Australia are potentially complex interactions between  
61 them. For example, frequent fire and feral herbivores may exacerbate the impact of feral cat  
62 predation by simplifying vegetation structure (McGregor et al., 2014, McGregor et al., 2015,  
63 Leahy et al., 2016, Davies et al., *in press*), while fire concurrently degrades the availability of  
64 critical resources such as tree hollows (Woolley et al., 2018), perennial grasses and a fleshy  
65 fruit-bearing shrub layer (Vigilante and Bowman, 2004). However, not only do fire regimes  
66 vary significantly in frequency and intensity across northern Australian savanna landscapes, so  
67 too does the occurrence and density of feral herbivores. Superimposed on these are a range of  
68 environmental conditions (such as rainfall, climate, productivity and landscape complexity)  
69 and land-use histories (i.e. indigenous management vs. pastoral use) that also influence the

70 resilience of mammal populations. Resolving the contribution of these factors in such a vast,  
71 complex landscape is crucial to developing informed and effective management.

72 Islands provide important refugia for biota because factors responsible for mainland declines  
73 are often absent or less intense (Legge et al., 2018, Ziembicki et al., 2015). However, as island  
74 populations are generally small, with limited potential for recolonisation, they are often more  
75 vulnerable to local extinction if threats do arrive (Woinarski et al., 2011b, Ziembicki et al.,  
76 2015, Burbidge and Manly, 2002). For example, northern quolls (*Dasyurus hallucatus*) were  
77 extirpated from Vanderlin Island in the Gulf of Carpentaria following the establishment of cane  
78 toads (*Rhinella marina*), and native mammals declined to undetectable levels on West Island  
79 following the introduction of feral cats (Paltridge et al., 2016, Woinarski et al., 2011b). Until  
80 recently, Melville Island was also considered an important refuge for threatened mammal  
81 species, however, Davies et al. (2017, 2018) reported evidence of population declines. This  
82 pattern may indicate that declines may simply be lagging on these large northern Australian  
83 islands compared to the mainland.

84 Groote Eylandt is Australia's fourth largest island and has high conservation values (Northern  
85 Territory Government, 2017). It supports most of the global population of the northern  
86 hopping-mouse (*Notomys aquilo*); one of few extant populations of the brush-tailed rabbit-rat  
87 (*Conilurus penicillatus*); is an important refuge for the northern quoll; and several other small  
88 and medium sized mammal species occur at seemingly much higher densities than on the  
89 mainland (Diete et al., 2016, Mahney et al., 2009, Taylor and ALC, 2016). The relatively intact  
90 state of the mammal fauna may be due to the absence, or low levels, of threatening processes  
91 operating on Groote Eylandt. While feral cats are present, the island remains free of cane toads,  
92 has no feral herbivores or pigs, and retains a relatively benign fire regime compared to the  
93 mainland of northern Australia (Northern Territory Government, 2017, NAFI, 2017).  
94 However, recent research suggests that some mammal declines may have occurred on Groote

95 Eylandt (Diete et al., 2016), and the presence of feral cats poses a potentially major threat to  
96 CWR mammals. In light of recent findings on Melville Island (Davies et al., 2017), mammals  
97 on Groote Eylandt may also be vulnerable to some of the processes driving declines elsewhere  
98 across northern Australia.

99 Understanding the responses of species to different threats under varying environmental  
100 conditions is crucial to optimising management strategies in different ecological settings.  
101 Groote Eylandt provides a useful opportunity to evaluate some factors implicated in the decline  
102 of native mammal species in isolation of other potentially interacting threats. We conducted a  
103 survey of lowland forest and woodland habitats on Groote Eylandt to ascertain if frequent,  
104 large fires and feral cats, are influencing native mammal distribution and abundance.

105

## 106 **Methods**

### 107 *Study site*

108 Groote Eylandt is in the Gulf of Carpentaria, approximately 50 km from the Northern Territory  
109 mainland (Fig. 1). The island is of low relief (<220 m above sea level) and has a monsoonal  
110 tropical climate (Bureau of Meteorology, 2017b). It is characterised by laterite plains and  
111 sandstone plateaux, with eucalypt woodland the dominant vegetation. Several other habitats  
112 are present, including mangroves, monsoon vine thickets, coastal grasslands and shrublands.  
113 The Groote archipelago is an Indigenous Protected Area and is managed by the Anindilyakwa  
114 Land Council. There is a large manganese mine (Groote Eylandt Mining Company: GEMCO)  
115 with an associated port and settlement (Alyangula) on the western side of Groote Eylandt,  
116 which has been a significant driver of economic and infrastructure development. Two other  
117 settlements are present on the island; Umbakumba and Angurugu (Fig. 1).

119 We surveyed 112 lowland woodland sites across Groote Eylandt between April and September  
120 2016 (Fig. 1). Lowland woodlands comprise a complex of vegetation associations that  
121 collectively dominate the non-plateaux areas of Groote Eylandt. They are the preferred habitats  
122 for the brush-tailed rabbit-rat and support a range of other CWR mammals, including the  
123 northern hopping-mouse (Firth et al., 2006b, Diете et al., 2016). Surveying a broader range of  
124 habitat types would have diluted our sampling effort and we were interested in investigating  
125 environmental determinants of mammal species distribution rather than broad habitat  
126 associations. Survey sites were stratified across land systems with lowland woodland (Lynch  
127 and Wilson, 1998) by fire history (time since last fire; NAFI, 2017). All sites were a minimum  
128 of 1 km apart and located within 2 km of vehicle access tracks.

129 At each site, six Reconyx Hyperfire camera traps (Reconyx Inc., Holmen, WI, USA) were  
130 deployed for a minimum of 35 consecutive nights. Five cameras were deployed in a diamond  
131 configuration with four cameras deployed approximately 50 m away from the centre camera.  
132 Cameras were deployed facing south with a near-horizontal field of view; with the top of the  
133 camera 35 cm above ground level and facing the base of a bait station 150 cm away containing  
134 a mixture of peanut butter, honey and oats. Cameras comprised four white flash (either  
135 Reconyx PC850 or HC550) and one infrared flash camera (either Reconyx HC500 or HC600).  
136 This combination reflected camera availability and was the same at each site to control for  
137 operational variability amongst models (Heiniger and Gillespie, 2018). This camera  
138 configuration has been shown to adequately detect feral cats for occupancy modelling in  
139 northern Australian (Stokeld et al., 2015), and to achieve high detection probabilities for a suite  
140 of native species (Gillespie et al., 2015).

141 A sixth white flash camera was deployed within the diamond with a setup modified from  
142 Welbourne (2013). A Reconyx PC850 camera modified for higher sensitivity and with a focal  
143 length reduced to 90 cm (henceforth referred to as modified PC850) was deployed 65 cm from  
144 ground level and angled downwards at 45° to face the middle of a corkboard 90 cm away. The  
145 30 x 30 cm corkboard was used to improve small mammal detections in the tropical  
146 environment by creating a substrate with a more homogenous temperature, therefore increasing  
147 contrast with the thermal signature of small animals (Welbourne, 2013). A bait station was  
148 placed at the centre of the rear edge of the corkboard, and drift fences extended 4 m either side  
149 of the corkboard to direct mammals towards the detection zone.

150 All camera deployments were undertaken with high precision, using tape measures for  
151 distances and test photos to ensure alignment of camera sensor zones with target areas.  
152 Vegetation within each camera's field of view was cleared to increase detections, reduce false  
153 triggers and risk of camera damage from fires. All cameras operated continuously and were set  
154 to take three photos per trigger, with a one-second delay between each photo. Camera  
155 sensitivities were set to high, with no quiet period.

#### 156 *Feral cat density*

157 To further evaluate the relationships between feral cats and native mammal occurrence, we  
158 investigated feral cat population density in two areas; (i) a northern site with high brush-tailed  
159 rabbit-rat occupancy, and (ii) a southern site with no brush-tailed rabbit-rat detections (Fig. 1).  
160 At each location camera trap arrays were established for a minimum of eight weeks from mid-  
161 September to mid-November 2016, using methods modified from McGregor (2015). Each  
162 array overlaid a vehicle track and comprised 70 camera traps arranged in 5 rows of 14 stations  
163 spaced between 400 – 600 m apart. Each array contained the same combination of three white  
164 flash camera models (PC850, modified PC850 and HC550), which were assigned randomly to



165 stations. Cameras were positioned locally to maximise feral cat detections, for example along  
166 dry creek-lines, bush tracks or naturally open areas. Cameras were deployed at a height of 45  
167 cm to the top of the casing, facing south and focused on an attractant 2.5 m away. The attractant  
168 consisted of a non-toxic feral cat bait (kangaroo and chicken meat sausage; Scientec Research  
169 Pty Ltd, Warrandyte, Australia) and a stick soaked in cat urine. Camera operating settings were  
170 the same as the mammal survey.

### 171 *Data analysis*

172 We chose a set of environmental predictor variables that best described the fire regime, site-  
173 specific habitat characteristics, landscape attributes and anthropogenic disturbances, based on  
174 current knowledge of factors influencing northern Australian mammal declines (Kutt and  
175 Woinarski, 2007, Woinarski et al., 2011a, Woinarski et al., 2010, Davies et al., 2017). It was  
176 not possible to incorporate the occupancy of large mammalian predators (feral cats or dingoes)  
177 as predictor variables in analyses because detections of these species during the survey were  
178 too sparse.

179 Following Lawes et al. (2015), we derived multiple variables to quantify the fire regime at each  
180 site, including the proportion of surrounding area burnt, patchiness, fire frequency and time  
181 since fire. However, preliminary investigation of these fire variables demonstrated significant  
182 collinearity. Therefore, we constrained our analyses to include one fire variable: the proportion  
183 of the circular area (radius of 3200 m or 250 m depending on the species home range)  
184 surrounding each site that is burnt each year, averaged over the five years preceding the  
185 mammal surveys.

186 All predictor variables were centred and standardised by subtracting means and dividing by  
187 standard deviations (Gelman and Hill, 2006). Collinearity was assessed amongst all variable  
188 pairs and the most biologically relevant variable was retained for analysis when the Pearson

189 correlation coefficient was greater than 0.5 (positively or negatively). The resultant set of  
190 predictor variables (Table 1) was used to develop occupancy models for species with adequate  
191 detection probabilities (MacKenzie et al., 2002) and to evaluate patterns of species diversity  
192 (Shannon diversity index). Occupancy modelling was conducted using the “unmarked”  
193 package in R (Fiske and Chandler, 2011, R Core Team, 2017).

194 Single-season occupancy modelling was applied in two steps due to the large number of  
195 predictor variables. First, the variables that best explained the detectability of each species were  
196 determined by running all combinations of the eight predictor variables (i.e. 256 models) which  
197 could potentially influence detectability (Table 1). This was done with occupancy constrained  
198 to a saturated model of the eight occupancy variables. Model selection based on Akaike  
199 Information Criteria (AIC) was then used to select the most parsimonious detectability model  
200 in the candidate set. Second, all combinations of the eight occupancy variables were run (256  
201 models) with detectability constrained to the most parsimonious model identified in step one.  
202 Model selection based on AIC was used again to determine the best occupancy model. Where  
203 no single model explaining the occurrence of the species emerged as superior ( $\Delta AIC < 2$ ),  
204 model averaging was performed to provide parameter estimates (Burnham and Anderson,  
205 2002). The detection probability over the survey period was determined for the best and null  
206 model using the formula:  $1 - ((1-p)^n)$ , where  $p$  is the nightly detection probability and  $n$  is the  
207 number of survey nights. We assessed the goodness of fit of the most saturated model for each  
208 species using three tests based on parametric bootstrapping: Pearson’s chi-square statistic, sum  
209 of squared errors and Freeman-Tukey chi-square statistic. These tests repeatedly simulate  
210 datasets based on the fitted model and then evaluate the probability that the observed history  
211 of outcomes has a reasonable chance of happening (MacKenzie and Bailey, 2004).

212 For species with highly saturated occupancies, Royle-Nichols occupancy modelling was  
213 applied, which assumes that heterogeneity in detection frequency is indicative of variability in

214 species abundance (Royle and Nichols, 2003). Modelling was otherwise conducted using the  
215 same process as above.

216 Linear regression models were used to investigate the relationship between species diversity  
217 and environmental parameters. Species diversity was modelled using the Shannon diversity  
218 index (H), which takes into account the number of different species at a site and how even their  
219 abundances are (Shannon, 1948). Because individuals of a species generally cannot be  
220 distinguished using camera traps, we used the number of nights each species was detected as a  
221 proxy for relative abundance. Model selection based on AIC was used to determine the best  
222 model. Where no single model emerged as superior (i.e.  $\Delta AIC < 2$ ), model averaging was  
223 performed to provide parameter estimates (Burnham and Anderson, 2002).

224

## 225 **Results**

### 226 *Mammal survey*

227 Twelve native mammal species were detected (Table 2). Naïve occupancy rates varied from  
228 2% for short-eared rock wallabies (*Petrogale brachyotis*) to 100% for northern brown  
229 bandicoots (*Isodon macrourus*). Brush-tailed rabbit-rats were detected at 17% of survey sites,  
230 mostly clustered on the northern peninsula (Appendix S1) and northern hopping-mice were  
231 detected at only 3% of sites (Appendix S1). Feral cats were detected on nine occasions at eight  
232 highly dispersed sites (Appendix S2), resulting in low overall detection probability (0.22).

### 233 *Correlates of species occupancy and relative abundance*

234 Data were adequate for single-season occupancy modelling for the delicate mouse (*Pseudomys*  
235 *delicatus*), grassland melomys (*Melomys burtoni*), and the brush-tailed rabbit-rat. Nightly  
236 detectability from the best model ranged from 0.13 for the grassland melomys to 0.18 for the

237 brush-tailed rabbit-rat (Table 3). Due to the length of time cameras were deployed (minimum  
238 of 35 nights) the overall detectability of each species was very high ( $>0.99$ ; Table 3). No single  
239 occupancy model arose as superior for any of the three species (i.e.  $\Delta AIC < 2$ ; Appendix S3),  
240 so model averaging was conducted to calculate parameter coefficients. Distance from mine or  
241 town was the strongest predictor variable for the brush-tailed rabbit-rat (Fig. 2a), with the  
242 species occupying sites further from these features. Occurrence of brush-tailed rabbit-rat and  
243 grassland melomys were also positively associated with shrubs (Fig. 2). In contrast, these  
244 variables had only marginal influences on delicate mouse occurrence, which was positively  
245 associated with proportion of area burnt (Fig. 2b).

246 Northern brown bandicoots were detected at every site and northern quolls at all but two.  
247 Royle-Nichols occupancy modelling did not produce a single superior model for either species  
248 (i.e.  $\Delta AIC < 2$ ; Table 4 & Appendix S4) and model averaging was conducted. Northern brown  
249 bandicoots had greater relative abundance at sites with more logs and shrubs, and a greater  
250 proportion of the site burnt (Fig. 3a). Relative abundance of northern quolls increased with  
251 ruggedness and proximity to major anthropogenic disturbance and roads (Fig. 3b).

252 Eight mammal species were included in species diversity analyses: northern quoll, northern  
253 brown bandicoot, northern hopping-mouse, brush-tailed rabbit-rat, delicate mouse, grassland  
254 melomys, common planigale (*Planigale maculata*) and short-beaked echidna (*Tachyglossus*  
255 *aculeatus*). No single model of species diversity was superior and model averaging did not  
256 identify any significant relationships between Shannon's diversity indices and predictor  
257 variables.

#### 258 *Feral cat density*

259 There were no feral cat detections on the northern camera array and only seven detections, at  
260 four different camera stations, on the southern array (Appendix S2). Based upon distinct pelage

261 patterns, these detections comprised four individual cats, but detections were too sparse to  
262 estimate density.

263

## 264 **Discussion**

265 Native mammal populations have suffered widespread contraction across mainland northern  
266 Australia (Woinarski et al., 2001, Woinarski et al., 2010). Research suggests that mammal  
267 populations on some large islands are now also exhibiting similar signs of decline to those  
268 recorded earlier on the mainland (Davies et al. 2017; 2018). On Groote Eylandt, naïve  
269 occupancy estimates of all CWR native mammals were higher compared to lowland savanna  
270 woodland habitats across mainland Northern Territory (Table 2; Stokeld et al., 2016). This  
271 reaffirms that, although fewer mammal species occur on Groote Eylandt (as with other large  
272 Northern Territory islands), their populations remain healthier than those on the mainland. This  
273 is likely related to several interrelated factors, including the low density of feral cats, the  
274 relatively benign fire regime and the absence of large introduced herbivores and cane toads.

275 Feral cats have been implicated as a major driver in the decline of mammals across northern  
276 Australia. Although widely distributed across Groote Eylandt, naïve occupancy and detection  
277 probability of feral cats were low compared to similar habitats on mainland northern Australia  
278 and the Tiwi Islands (Table 2). This precluded both an evaluation of environmental patterns of  
279 feral cat occurrence, as well as our ability to investigate the relationship between feral cats and  
280 the distribution/abundance of native mammals. The number of cat detections on camera grids  
281 was also too low to estimate population density. In contrast, feral cat density estimates from  
282 mainland Northern Territory using similar methods have ranged from 0.09 - 0.5 cats per km<sup>2</sup>  
283 (Stokeld et al., 2016; Northern Territory Government, unpublished data, 2019) and McGregor  
284 (2015) estimated a mean density of 0.18 cats per km<sup>2</sup> in woodland habitats in the Kimberley,

285 Western Australia. The detection of zero and four individual cats on our two camera grids,  
286 combined with the low overall naïve occupancy, suggests that cat densities on Groote Eylandt  
287 are far lower than those on the mainland. This finding contrasts with recent modelling  
288 predicting that feral cat densities should be higher on islands than on the mainland (Legge et  
289 al., 2017).

290 Interestingly, the density of feral cats remains low on Groote Eylandt despite well-established  
291 populations of cats in two towns and one out-station (Anindilyakwa Land Council, unpublished  
292 data, 2018), as well as high densities of their preferred prey (as inferred from the high  
293 occupancy rates of CWR mammals presented in this study). This suggests that the population  
294 dynamics of feral cats on Groote Eylandt is not simply influenced by prey availability. Due to  
295 a range of factors (i.e. high prey availability, the absence of both cane toads and dingo control),  
296 Groote Eylandt supports healthy populations of native predators that are known to prey on cats,  
297 including dingoes (Kennedy et al., 2012, Moseby et al., 2012, Allen and Leung, 2012,  
298 Paltridge, 2002, Wysong et al., 2019), olive pythons (H. McGregor, unpublished data, 2018)  
299 and sand goannas (T. Jessop, unpublished data, 2018). It is plausible that the healthy  
300 assemblage of native predators may suppress feral cat populations through both direct  
301 predation and interference competition. The combination of a relatively benign fire regime and  
302 the absence of large feral herbivores, may also have maintained the vegetation in a state that  
303 reduces feral cat hunting success (McGregor et al., 2015, McGregor et al., 2017, McGregor et  
304 al., 2016), although how these constraints may be offset by high prey availability is unknown.  
305 The contrasting densities of feral cats on Groote Eylandt and the Northern Territory mainland  
306 highlights our limited understanding of the factors that regulate their population dynamics.

307 In northern Australian savannas, frequent, high-intensity fires reduce the availability of critical  
308 resources for native mammals, such as tree hollows (Woolley et al., 2018), fleshy-fruit bearing  
309 shrubs (Vigilante and Bowman, 2004) and perennial grasses (Crowley, 2008). We found no

310 significant negative association between the occupancy or abundance of native mammals and  
311 frequent, large fires on Groote Eylandt. In fact, we found a significant positive association  
312 between our fire variable and northern brown bandicoot abundance and delicate mouse  
313 occurrence. There are several potential explanations for these results. First, Groote Eylandt is  
314 characterised as having a relatively benign fire regime compared to mainland northern  
315 Australia. For example, the average annual area burnt on Groote Eylandt between 2000 and  
316 2018 was 18.1% (ranging from as low as 1.5% to 40.1%; Department of Environment and  
317 Natural Resources and Anindilyakwa Land Council, 2019), compared to Kakadu National Park  
318 where around 50% is burnt annually (Russell-Smith et al., 1997). As such, native mammals  
319 may simply not be strongly impacted by the fire regime on Groote Eylandt. Second, fire  
320 influences fauna indirectly, via effects on vegetation structure and composition, including  
321 complex interactions with other exacerbating factors such as predation (McGregor et al., 2017,  
322 McGregor et al., 2015) and grazing by large introduced herbivores (Legge et al., 2019).  
323 Therefore, given the absence of large introduced herbivores, as well as the low density of feral  
324 cats on Groote Eylandt, such positive associations with fire are not necessarily surprising  
325 (Radford, 2012). Third, while our fire variable, the proportion of area burnt averaged over the  
326 preceding five years, captured the spatial and temporal variation in fire regimes on Groote  
327 Eylandt, we do not have a firm understanding of how this variable encapsulates other  
328 characteristics of the fire regime, such as intensity and patchiness. Due to issues of collinearity,  
329 we did not investigate the influence of these other fire variables. In reality, the absence of strong  
330 negative fire effects in our analyses likely reflects a combination of these explanations. We  
331 suggest that future research should aim to elucidate how different fire characteristics influence  
332 biodiversity on Groote Eylandt.

333 The high naïve occupancy rates of native mammals on Groote Eylandt suggest that populations  
334 are relatively healthy when compared to mainland northern Australia (Table 2). However, due

335 to a lack of standardised historical data on Groote Eylandt, we cannot properly evaluate the  
336 trajectory of native mammal populations. As such, the current state of native mammals on  
337 Groote Eylandt should not be taken as evidence that these populations are safe from decline,  
338 or that they are not currently declining. Despite the availability of seemingly suitable habitat,  
339 the distribution of the northern hopping-mouse was highly restricted. This suggests that  
340 populations of this species may have suffered declines on Groote Eylandt. However, the  
341 reasons for this remain unclear.

342 Although less restricted, the brush-tailed rabbit-rat was absent from a large proportion of sites  
343 in seemingly suitable lowland woodland. As with the findings of Davies et al. (2017), site-  
344 occupancy of the brush-tailed rabbit-rat was positively associated with shrub density, which  
345 has been hypothesised to reflect a greater availability of resources for native mammals (Friend,  
346 1987, Davies et al., 2017), as well as shelter from predators (Briani et al., 2004). Our results  
347 may also reflect a combination of these factors; however further research is required to  
348 ascertain what factors may be limiting the distribution of this species on Groote Eylandt and  
349 how they contrast with those operating on other extant populations.

350 Despite the seemingly low densities, cats could be impacting native mammal populations if  
351 predation rates exceed recruitment and recolonisation (Ceballos and Cruzado 2004, Frank et  
352 al., 2014, Short, 2016, Moseby et al., 2015). Both threatened rodent species may have relatively  
353 limited dispersal capabilities (Firth et al., 2006a, Diete et al., 2016), and the brush-tailed rabbit-  
354 rat has low fecundity, giving birth to one to three young each year (Taylor and Horner, 1971).  
355 These species may therefore be limited in their ability to recolonise areas following disturbance  
356 such as fire. Furthermore, studies have shown that cats selectively target CWR mammal species  
357 (Kutt, 2012, Wysong et al., 2019), and that even at low densities, cats can exert significant  
358 predation pressure on mammal populations (Frank et al., 2014). As such, despite their low



359 density on Groote Eylandt, feral cats could still be posing a significant threat to populations of  
360 the brush-tailed rabbit-rat and northern hopping-mouse.

361 This research has identified important knowledge gaps that warrant further investigation to  
362 better inform management:

- 363 • Greater understanding of the factors that regulate feral cat population densities in  
364 northern Australia; in particular, to what extent are they limited by native predators;
- 365 • The impact of feral cats at varying densities on CWR mammal populations, and in  
366 different environmental settings; and
- 367 • How fine-scale fire regimes are changing over time on Groote Eylandt and other  
368 offshore islands, and what impacts these are having on biodiversity.

369 The greater resilience of mammal populations on Groote Eylandt compared to the northern  
370 Australian mainland is likely due to the low density of feral cats, the relatively benign fire  
371 regime and the absence of large introduced herbivores and cane toads. These factors have likely  
372 benefited mammal populations by maintaining the availability of critical resources, while  
373 concurrently reducing predation pressure. The resilience of mammal populations on Groote  
374 Eylandt appears comparable to that of mammal populations on the Tiwi Islands. However, the  
375 sources of resilience may differ between these areas. Compared to Groote Eylandt, there is a  
376 greater number of threatening processes present on the Tiwi Islands, including a higher naïve  
377 occupancy rate of cats, higher fire frequency, large introduced herbivores (buffalo and horse)  
378 and feral pigs. While the Tiwi Islands have substantially higher rainfall (with some areas  
379 receiving more than 2000 mm of annual rainfall compared to 1300 mm on Groote Eylandt),  
380 they lack the rugged sandstone escarpment habitat that likely provide important refugia for  
381 some native mammals on Groote Eylandt (Radford et al., 2014). As such, mammal populations  
382 on Groote Eylandt may be more resilient to decline due to higher overall ecological integrity,

383 whereas mammal populations on the Tiwi Islands may be more resilient primarily due to higher  
384 productivity. This contrast highlights that the way in which native mammal population declines  
385 manifest themselves (in terms of severity or apparent resilience) is influenced by complex  
386 interactions of factors that vary substantially across the landscape. Caution is therefore required  
387 in making broad inferences about primary factors driving mammal species declines from a few  
388 studies that are spatially and temporally limited. Management responses to conserve these  
389 species need to be developed at appropriate ecological and management scales. They also need  
390 to be adaptive to respond to new insights into threats and management responses as they  
391 emerge.

392

### 393 **Acknowledgements**

394 This research was carried out as part of a larger study on Groote Eylandt funded by the  
395 Australian Government Department of the Environment and Energy, and the Northern  
396 Territory Department of Environment and Natural Resources. First and foremost, we thank the  
397 Anindilyakwa People for allowing us onto their land and for the ongoing support of scientific  
398 research on their country. We also thank the Anindilyakwa Land Council, Land and Sea  
399 Rangers, and specifically Stacey Taylor, for seeking permission to access land, collaboration  
400 on the project, assistance in the field and for the use of resources. We acknowledge the  
401 invaluable field assistance provided by Kym Brennan, Tim Gentles, Tom Parkin and Kim  
402 Adair. Lastly, we thank Danielle Stokeld, Alyson Stobo-Wilson, Alaric Fisher and two  
403 anonymous referees for comments on drafts. The research was conducted in accordance with  
404 the Charles Darwin University Animal Ethics Committee (A16020).

405

406

407

408

409

410 **References**

- 411 ALLEN, B. L. & LEUNG, L. K. P. 2012. Assessing predation risk to threatened fauna from  
412 their prevalence in predator scats: dingoes and rodents in arid Australia. *PLoS One*, 7,  
413 e36426.
- 414 ANDERSEN, A. N., COOK, G. D., CORBETT, L. K., DOUGLAS, M. M., EAGER, R. W.,  
415 RUSSELL-SMITH, J., SETTERFIELD, S. A., WILLIAMS, R. J. & WOINARSKI, J.  
416 C. Z. 2005. Fire frequency and biodiversity conservation in Australian tropical  
417 savannas: implications from the Kapalga fire experiment. *Austral Ecology*, 30, 155-  
418 167.
- 419 BRAITHWAITE, R. W. & GRIFFITHS, A. D. 1994. Demographic variation and range  
420 contraction in the northern quoll, *Dasyurus hallucatus* (Marsupialia : Dasyuridae).  
421 *Wildlife Research*, 21, 203-217.
- 422 BRIANI, D. C., PALMA, A. R., VIEIRA, E. M. & HENRIQUES, R. P. 2004. Post-fire  
423 succession of small mammals in the Cerrado of central Brazil. *Biodiversity &*  
424 *Conservation*, 13, 1023-1037.
- 425 BURBIDGE, A. A. & MANLY, B. F. J. 2002. Mammal extinctions on Australian islands:  
426 causes and conservation implications. *Journal of Biogeography*, 29, 465-473.
- 427 BUREAU OF METEOROLOGY. 2017a. *Australian Hydological Geospatial Fabric*  
428 *(Geofabric)* [Online]. Australian Government. Available:  
429 <http://www.bom.gov.au/water/geofabric/index.shtml> [Accessed 1 December 2016].
- 430 BUREAU OF METEOROLOGY. 2017b. *Climate data online* [Online]. Australian  
431 Government. Available: <http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/data/> [Accessed 20 August  
432 2017].
- 433 BURNHAM, K. P. & ANDERSON, D. R. 2002. *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference:*  
434 *a Practical Information-theoretic Approach*, New York, NY, Springer.
- 435 CARDILLO, M., MACE, G. M., JONES, K. E., BIELBY, J., BININDA-EMONDS, O. R.,  
436 SECHREST, W., ORME, C. D. L. & PURVIS, A. 2005. Multiple causes of high  
437 extinction risk in large mammal species. *Science*, 309, 1239-1241.
- 438 CEBALLOS, G. & CRUZADO, J. 2004. Extirpation of an insular subspecies by a single  
439 introduced cat: the case of the endemic deer mouse *Peromyscus guardia* on Estanque  
440 Island, Mexico. *Oryx*, 38, 347-350.
- 441 CROWLEY, G. 2008. Cockatoo grass *Alloteropsis semialata* as a keystone species in  
442 northern Australia. *Northern Territory Naturalist*, 20, 58-63.
- 443 DAVIES, H. F., MCCARTHY, M. A., FIRTH, R. S. C., WOINARSKI, J. C. Z., GILLESPIE,  
444 G. R., ANDERSEN, A. N., GEYLE, H. M., NICHOLSON, E. & MURPHY, B. P.  
445 2017. Top-down control of species distributions: feral cats driving the regional  
446 extinction of a threatened rodent in northern Australia. *Diversity and Distributions*,  
447 23, 272-283.
- 448 DAVIES, H. F., MCCARTHY, M. A., FIRTH, R. S. C., WOINARSKI, J. C. Z., GILLESPIE,  
449 G. R., ANDERSEN, A. N., RIOLI, W., PURUNTATAMERI, J., ROBERTS, W.,

450 KERINAIUA, C., KERINAUIA, V., WOMATAKIMI, K. B. & MURPHY, B. P.  
451 2018. Declining populations in one of the last refuges for threatened mammal species  
452 in northern Australia. *Austral Ecology*, 43, 602-612.

453 DAVIES, H. F., MAIER, S. W. & MURPHY, B. P. *in press*. Feral cats are more abundant  
454 under severe disturbance regimes in an Australian tropical savanna. *Wildlife*  
455 *Research*.

456 DE FRETES, Y. 1992. Community versus company based rattan industry in Indonesia. *In*:  
457 COUNSELL, S. & RICE, T. (eds.) *The Rainforest Harvest: Sustainable Strategies for*  
458 *Saving the Tropical Forests*. London: Friends of the Earth Trust.

459 DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES &  
460 ANINDILYAKWA LAND COUNCIL 2019. Groote Archipelago Threatened Species  
461 Management Plan 2019-2028. Darwin, Northern Territory: Department of  
462 Environment and Natural Resources.

463 DIETE, R. L., MEEK, P. D., DICKMAN, C. R. & LEUNG, L. K.-P. 2016. Ecology and  
464 conservation of the northern hopping-mouse (*Notomys aquilo*). *Australian Journal of*  
465 *Zoology*, 64, 21-32.

466 EINODER, L. D., SOUTHWELL, D. M., GILLESPIE, G. R., FISHER, A., LAHOZ-  
467 MONFORT, J. J. & WINTLE, B. A. 2018. Optimising broad-scale monitoring for  
468 trend detection: review and re-design of a long-term program in northern Australia.  
469 *In*: LEGGE, S., LINDEMAN, M., ROBINSON, N., SOUTHWELL, D. M. &  
470 WINTLE, B. (eds.) *Monitoring Threatened Species and Ecological Communities*.  
471 Melbourne, Victoria: CSIRO Publishing.

472 FIRTH, R., WOINARSKI, J. & NOSKE, R. 2006a. Home range and den characteristics of  
473 the brush-tailed rabbit-rat (*Conilurus penicillatus*) in the monsoonal tropics of the  
474 Northern Territory, Australia. *Wildlife Research*, 33, 397-407.

475 FIRTH, R. S. C., WOINARSKI, J. C. Z., BRENNAN, K. G. & HEMPEL, C. 2006b.  
476 Environmental relationships of the brush-tailed rabbit-rat, *Conilurus penicillatus*, and  
477 other small mammals on the Tiwi Islands, northern Australia. *Journal of*  
478 *Biogeography*, 33, 1820-1837.

479 FISHER, D. O., JOHNSON, C. N., LAWES, M. J., FRITZ, S. A., MCCALLUM, H.,  
480 BLOMBERG, S. P., VANDERWAL, J., ABBOTT, B., FRANK, A., LEGGE, S.,  
481 LETNIC, M., THOMAS, C. R., FISHER, A., GORDON, I. J. & KUTT, A. 2014. The  
482 current decline of tropical marsupials in Australia: is history repeating? *Global*  
483 *Ecology and Biogeography*, 23, 181-190.

484 FISKE, I. & CHANDLER, R. 2011. Unmarked: an R package for fitting hierarchical models  
485 of wildlife occurrence and abundance. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 43, 1-23.

486 FRANK, A. S. K., JOHNSON, C. N., POTTS, J. M., FISHER, A., LAWES, M. J.,  
487 WOINARSKI, J. C. Z., TUFT, K., RADFORD, I. J., GORDON, I. J., COLLIS, M.-A.  
488 & LEGGE, S. 2014. Experimental evidence that feral cats cause local extirpation of  
489 small mammals in Australia's tropical savannas. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 51,  
490 1486-1493.

491 FRIEND, G. R. 1987. Population ecology of *Mesembriomys-Gouldii* (Rodentia, Muridae) in  
492 the wet-dry tropics of the Northern-Territory. *Wildlife Research*, 14, 293-303.

493 GELMAN, A. & HILL, J. 2006. *Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical*  
494 *models*, Cambridge University Press.

495 GEOSCIENCE AUSTRALIA. 2017. *Australian Water Observations from Space (WofS)*  
496 [Online]. Australian Government. Available: [http://www.ga.gov.au/interactive-](http://www.ga.gov.au/interactive-maps/#/theme/water/map/wofs)  
497 [maps/#/theme/water/map/wofs](http://www.ga.gov.au/interactive-maps/#/theme/water/map/wofs) [Accessed 1 December 2016].

498 GEOSCIENCE AUSTRALIA. 2017. *ELVIS - Elevation Information System* [Online].  
499 Australian Government. Available: <http://www.ga.gov.au/elvis/> [Accessed 1  
500 December 2016].

501 GILLESPIE, G. R., BRENNAN, K., GENTLES, T., HILL, B., LOW CHOY, J., MAHNEY,  
502 T., STEVENS, A. & STOKELD, D. 2015. *A guide for the use of remote cameras for*  
503 *wildlife survey in Northern Australia*, Charles Darwin University, Casuarina, NT,  
504 National Environmental Research Program, Northern Australia Hub.

505 HEINIGER, J. & GILLESPIE, G. 2018. High variation in camera trap-model sensitivity for  
506 surveying mammal species in northern Australia. *Wildlife Research*, 45, 578-585.

507 HOHNEN, R., TUFT, K., MCGREGOR, H. W., LEGGE, S., RADFORD, I. J. &  
508 JOHNSON, C. N. 2016. Occupancy of the invasive feral cat varies with habitat  
509 complexity. *PLOS ONE*, 11, e0152520.

510 KARANTH, K. K., CURRAN, L. M. & REUNING-SCHERER, J. D. 2006. Village size and  
511 forest disturbance in Bhadra wildlife sanctuary, Western Ghats, India. *Biological*  
512 *conservation*, 128, 147-157.

513 KENNEDY, M., PHILLIPS, B. L., LEGGE, S., MURPHY, S. A. & FAULKNER, R. A.  
514 2012. Do dingoes suppress the activity of feral cats in northern Australia? *Austral*  
515 *Ecology*, 37, 134-139.

516 KUTT, A. S. 2012. Feral cat (*Felis catus*) prey size and selectivity in north-eastern Australia:  
517 implications for mammal conservation. *Journal of Zoology*, 287, 292-300.

518 KUTT, A. S. & WOINARSKI, J. 2007. The effects of grazing and fire on vegetation and the  
519 vertebrate assemblage in a tropical savanna woodland in north-eastern Australia.  
520 *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, 23, 95-106.

521 LAURANCE, W. F., GOOSEM, M. & LAURANCE, S. G. 2009. Impacts of roads and linear  
522 clearings on tropical forests. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 24, 659-669.

523 LAWES, M. J., FISHER, D. O., JOHNSON, C. N., BLOMBERG, S. P., FRANK, A. S.,  
524 FRITZ, S. A., MCCALLUM, H., VANDERWAL, J., ABBOTT, B. N. & LEGGE, S.  
525 2015a. Correlates of recent declines of rodents in northern and southern Australia:  
526 habitat structure is critical. *PloS one*, 10, e0130626.

527 LAWES, M. J., MURPHY, B. P., FISHER, A., WOINARSKI, J. C. Z., EDWARDS, A. C. &  
528 RUSSELL-SMITH, J. 2015b. Small mammals decline with increasing fire extent in  
529 northern Australia: evidence from long-term monitoring in Kakadu National Park.  
530 *International Journal of Wildland Fire*, 24, 712-722.

531 LEAHY, L., LEGGE, S. M., TUFT, K., MCGREGOR, H. W., BARMUTA, L. A., JONES,  
532 M. E. & JOHNSON, C. N. 2016. Amplified predation after fire suppresses rodent  
533 populations in Australia's tropical savannas. *Wildlife Research*, 42, 705-716.

534 LEGGE, S., KENNEDY, M. S., LLOYD, R. A. Y., MURPHY, S. A. & FISHER, A. 2011a.  
535 Rapid recovery of mammal fauna in the central Kimberley, northern Australia,  
536 following the removal of introduced herbivores. *Austral Ecology*, 36, 791-799.

537 LEGGE, S., MURPHY, B. P., MCGREGOR, H., WOINARSKI, J. C. Z., AUGUSTEYN, J.,  
538 BALLARD, G., BASELER, M., BUCKMASTER, T., DICKMAN, C. R.,  
539 DOHERTY, T., EDWARDS, G., EYRE, T., FANCOURT, B. A., FERGUSON, D.,  
540 FORSYTH, D. M., GEARY, W. L., GENTLE, M., GILLESPIE, G., GREENWOOD,  
541 L., HOHNEN, R., HUME, S., JOHNSON, C. N., MAXWELL, M., MCDONALD, P.  
542 J., MORRIS, K., MOSEBY, K., NEWSOME, T., NIMMO, D., PALTRIDGE, R.,  
543 RAMSEY, D., READ, J., RENDALL, A., RICH, M., RITCHIE, E., ROWLAND, J.,  
544 SHORT, J., STOKELD, D., SUTHERLAND, D. R., WAYNE, A. F., WOODFORD,  
545 L. & ZEWE, F. 2017. Enumerating a continental-scale threat: how many feral cats are  
546 in Australia? *Biological Conservation*, 206, 293-303.

- 547 LEGGE, S., MURPHY, S., KINGSWOOD, R., MAHER, B. & SWAN, D. 2011b. EcoFire:  
548 restoring the biodiversity values of the Kimberley region by managing fire.  
549 *Ecological Management & Restoration*, 12, 84-92.
- 550 LEGGE, S., SMITH, J. G., JAMES, A., TUFT, K. D., WEBB, T. & WOINARSKI, J. C. Z.  
551 2019. Interactions among threats affect conservation management outcomes: livestock  
552 grazing removes the benefits of fire management for small mammals in Australian  
553 tropical savannas. 1, e52.
- 554 LEGGE, S., WOINARSKI, J. C. Z., BURBIDGE, A. A., PALMER, R., RINGMA, J.,  
555 RADFORD, J. Q., MITCHELL, N., BODE, M., WINTLE, B., BASELER, M.,  
556 BENTLEY, J., COPLEY, P., DEXTER, N., DICKMAN, C. R., GILLESPIE, G. R.,  
557 HILL, B., JOHNSON, C. N., LATCH, P., LETNIC, M., MANNING, A.,  
558 MCCRELESS, E. E., MENKHORST, P., MORRIS, K., MOSEBY, K., PAGE, M.,  
559 PANNELL, D. & TUFT, K. 2018. Havens for threatened Australian mammals: the  
560 contributions of fenced areas and offshore islands to the protection of mammal  
561 species susceptible to introduced predators. *Wildlife Research*, 45, 627-644.
- 562 LYNCH, B. T. & WILSON, P. L. 1998. Land systems of Arnhem Land Darwin, NT:  
563 Department of Lands, Planning and Environment.
- 564 MACKENZIE, D. I. & BAILEY, L. L. 2004. Assessing the fit of site-occupancy models.  
565 *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics*, 9, 300-318.
- 566 MACKENZIE, D. I., NICHOLS, J. D., LACHMAN, G. B., DROEGE, S., ANDREW  
567 ROYLE, J. & LANGTIMM, C. A. 2002. Estimating site occupancy rates when  
568 detection probabilities are less than one. *Ecology*, 83, 2248-2255.
- 569 MAHNEY, T., MCKAY, L., LIDDLE, D., FISHER, A., WESTAWAY, J., FEGAN, M. &  
570 DALLY, G. 2009. Bickerton, Winchelsea and south east Groote Eylandt Wildlife  
571 Survey, September 2009. Darwin, NT: Department of Natural Resources Environment  
572 the Arts and Sport.
- 573 MCGREGOR, H. 2015. *Density, movements and hunting of feral cats in relation to fire and*  
574 *grazing in northern Australia*. University of Tasmania.
- 575 MCGREGOR, H., LEGGE, S., JONES, M. E. & JOHNSON, C. N. 2015. Feral cats are better  
576 killers in open habitats, revealed by animal-borne video. *PLOS ONE*, 10, e0133915.
- 577 MCGREGOR, H. W., CLIFF, H. B. & KANOWSKI, J. 2017. Habitat preference for fire  
578 scars by feral cats in Cape York Peninsula, Australia. *Wildlife Research*, 43, 623-633.
- 579 MCGREGOR, H. W., LEGGE, S., JONES, M. E. & JOHNSON, C. N. 2014. Landscape  
580 management of fire and grazing regimes alters the fine-scale habitat utilisation by  
581 feral cats. *PLOS ONE*, 9, e109097.
- 582 MCGREGOR, H. W., LEGGE, S., JONES, M. E. & JOHNSON, C. N. 2016. Extraterritorial  
583 hunting expeditions to intense fire scars by feral cats. *Scientific reports*, 6, 22559.
- 584 MOSEBY, K. E., NEILLY, H., READ, J. L. & CRISP, H. A. 2012. Interactions between a  
585 top order predator and exotic mesopredators in the Australian rangelands.  
586 *International Journal of Ecology*, 2012, 1-15.
- 587 MOSEBY, K. E., PEACOCK, D. E. & READ, J. L. 2015. Catastrophic cat predation: a call  
588 for predator profiling in wildlife protection programs. *Biological Conservation*, 191,  
589 331-340.
- 590 NAFL. 2017. *North Australia and rangelands fire information* [Online]. Charles Darwin  
591 University. Available: <https://www.firenorth.org.au/nafi3/> [Accessed 20 October  
592 2016].
- 593 NORTHERN TERRITORY GOVERNMENT. 2017. *Important biodiversity conservation*  
594 *sites* [Online]. Darwin: Northern Territory Government. Available:  
595 [https://nt.gov.au/environment/environment-data-maps/important-biodiversity-](https://nt.gov.au/environment/environment-data-maps/important-biodiversity-conservation-sites/conservation-significance-list)  
596 [conservation-sites/conservation-significance-list](https://nt.gov.au/environment/environment-data-maps/important-biodiversity-conservation-sites/conservation-significance-list) [Accessed 10 October 2017].

597 PALTRIDGE, R. 2002. The diets of cats, foxes and dingoes in relation to prey availability in  
598 the Tanami Desert, Northern Territory. *Wildlife Research*, 29, 389-403.

599 PALTRIDGE, R., JOHNSTON, A., FITZPATRICK, S. & GOODMAN, C. 2016. Reversing  
600 the decline of mammals in northern Australia: response of native mammals to cat  
601 management on the Pellew Island 2011-2015. Alice Springs.

602 R CORE TEAM 2017. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,  
603 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

604 RADFORD, I. J. 2012. Threatened mammals become more predatory after small-scale  
605 prescribed fires in a high-rainfall rocky savanna. *Austral Ecology*, 37, 926-935.

606 RADFORD, I. J., DICKMAN, C. R., START, A. N., PALMER, C., CARNES, K.,  
607 EVERITT, C., FAIRMAN, R., GRAHAM, G., PARTRIDGE, T. & THOMSON, A.  
608 2014. Mammals of Australia's tropical savannas: A conceptual model of assemblage  
609 structure and regulatory factors in the Kimberley region. *PLoS ONE*, 9, e92341.

610 ROYLE, J. A. & NICHOLS, J. D. 2003. Estimating abundance from repeated presence–  
611 absence data or point counts. *Ecology*, 84, 777-790.

612 RUSSELL-SMITH, J. & EDWARDS, A. C. 2006. Seasonality and fire severity in savanna  
613 landscapes of monsoonal northern Australia. *International Journal of Wildland Fire*,  
614 15, 541-550.

615 RUSSELL-SMITH, J., RYAN, P. G. & DURIEU, R. 1997. A LANDSAT MSS-derived fire  
616 history of Kakadu National Park, monsoonal northern Australia, 1980-94: seasonal  
617 extent, frequency and patchiness. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 34, 748-766.

618 RUSSELL-SMITH, J., YATES, C., EDWARDS, A., ALLAN, G. E., COOK, G. D.,  
619 COOKE, P., CRAIG, R., HEATH, B. & SMITH, R. 2003. Contemporary fire regimes  
620 of northern Australia, 1997–2001: change since Aboriginal occupancy, challenges for  
621 sustainable management. *International Journal of Wildland Fire*, 12, 283-297.

622 SHANNON, C. E. 1948. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell System*  
623 *Technical Journal*, 27, 379-423.

624 SHORT, J. 2016. Predation by feral cats key to the failure of a long-term reintroduction of  
625 the western barred bandicoot (*Perameles bougainville*). *Wildlife Research*, 43, 38-50.

626 SODHI, N. S., KOH, L. P., CLEMENTS, R., WANGER, T. C., HILL, J. K., HAMER, K. C.,  
627 CLOUGH, Y., TSCHARNTKE, T., POSA, M. R. C. & LEE, T. M. 2010. Conserving  
628 Southeast Asian forest biodiversity in human-modified landscapes. *Biological*  
629 *Conservation*, 143, 2375-2384.

630 STOKELD, D., FRANK, A. S. K., HILL, B., CHOY, J. L., MAHNEY, T., STEVENS, A.,  
631 YOUNG, S., RANGERS, D., RANGERS, W. & GILLESPIE, G. R. 2015. Multiple  
632 cameras required to reliably detect feral cats in northern Australian tropical savanna:  
633 an evaluation of sampling design when using camera traps. *Wildlife Research*, 42,  
634 642-649.

635 STOKELD, D., GENTLES, T., YOUNG, S., HILL, B., FISHER, A., WOINARSKI, J. C. Z.  
636 & GILLESPIE, G. 2016. Experimental evaluation of the role of feral cat predation in  
637 the decline of small mammals in Kakadu National Park. Berrimah: Department of  
638 Land Resource Management.

639 TAYLOR, J. & HORNER, E. 1971. Reproduction in the Australian Tree-rat *Conilurus*  
640 *penicillatus* (Rodentia: Muridae). *CSIRO Wildlife Research*, 16, 1-9.

641 TAYLOR, S. & ALC 2016. Anindilyawka Indigenous Protected Area Plan of Management  
642 2016. Groote Eylandt, NT: Anindilyakwa Land Council.

643 VIGILANTE, T. & BOWMAN, D. 2004. Effects of individual fire events on the flower  
644 production of fruit-bearing tree species, with reference to Aboriginal people's  
645 management and use, at Kalumburu, North Kimberley, Australia. *Australian Journal*  
646 *of Botany*, 52, 405-416.

- 647 WELBOURNE, D. 2013. A method for surveying diurnal terrestrial reptiles with passive  
648 infrared automatically triggered cameras. *Herpetological Review*, 44, 247-250.
- 649 WOINARSKI, J., BURBIDGE, A. A. & HARRISON, P. L. 2015. Ongoing unraveling of a  
650 continental fauna: decline and extinction of Australian mammals since European  
651 settlement. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112, 4531-4540.
- 652 WOINARSKI, J., MILNE, D. & WANGANEEEN, G. 2001. Changes in mammal populations  
653 in relatively intact landscapes of Kakadu National Park, Northern Territory, Australia.  
654 *Austral Ecology*, 26, 360-370.
- 655 WOINARSKI, J. C. Z., ARMSTRONG, M., BRENNAN, K., FISHER, A., GRIFFITHS, A.  
656 D., HILL, B., MILNE, D. J., PALMER, C., WARD, S., WATSON, M.,  
657 WINDERLICH, S. & YOUNG, S. 2010. Monitoring indicates rapid and severe  
658 decline of native small mammals in Kakadu National Park, northern Australia.  
659 *Wildlife Research*, 37, 116-126.
- 660 WOINARSKI, J. C. Z., LEGGE, S., FITZSIMONS, J. A., TRAILL, B. J., BURBIDGE, A.  
661 A., FISHER, A., FIRTH, R. S. C., GORDON, I. J., GRIFFITHS, A. D., JOHNSON,  
662 C. N., MCKENZIE, N. L., PALMER, C., RADFORD, I., RANKMORE, B.,  
663 RITCHIE, E. G., WARD, S. & ZIEMBICKI, M. 2011a. The disappearing mammal  
664 fauna of northern Australia: context, cause, and response. *Conservation Letters*, 4,  
665 192-201.
- 666 WOINARSKI, J. C. Z., WARD, S., MAHNEY, T., BRADLEY, J., BRENNAN, K.,  
667 ZIEMBICKI, M. & FISHER, A. 2011b. The mammal fauna of the Sir Edward Pellew  
668 island group, Northern Territory, Australia: refuge and death-trap. *Wildlife Research*,  
669 38, 307-322.
- 670 WOOLLEY, L. A., MURPHY, B. P., RADFORD, I. J., WESTAWAY, J. & WOINARSKI,  
671 J. C. 2018. Cyclones, fire, and termites: the drivers of tree hollow abundance in  
672 northern Australia's mesic tropical savanna. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 419,  
673 146-159.
- 674 WYSONG, M. L., TULLOCH, A. I. T., VALENTINE, L. E., HOBBS, R. J., MORRIS, K. &  
675 RITCHIE, E. G. 2019. The truth about cats and dogs: assessment of apex- and  
676 mesopredator diets improves with reduced observer uncertainty. *Journal of*  
677 *Mammalogy*, 100, 410-422.
- 678 ZIEMBICKI, M. R., WOINARSKI, J. C. Z., WEBB, J. K., VANDERDUYS, E., TUFT, K.,  
679 SMITH, J., RITCHIE, E. G., REARDON, T. B., RADFORD, I. J., PREECE, N.,  
680 PERRY, J., MURPHY, B. P., MCGREGOR, H., LEGGE, S., LEAHY, L., LAWES,  
681 M. J., KANOWSKI, J., JOHNSON, C. N., JAMES, A., GRIFFITHS, A. D.,  
682 GILLESPIE, G., FRANK, A. S. K., FISHER, A. & BURBIDGE, A. A. 2015.  
683 Stemming the tide: progress towards resolving the causes of decline and  
684 implementing management responses for the disappearing mammal fauna of northern  
685 Australia. *Therya*, 6, 169-225.

686

687



688 **Supporting information**

689 **Appendix S1.** Location of brush-tailed rabbit-rat and northern hopping-mouse records on  
690 Groote Eylandt.

691 **Appendix S2.** Location of feral cat detections on Groote Eylandt.

692 **Appendix S3.** Occupancy covariates and AIC values of models with an AIC<2 for each  
693 species.

694 **Appendix S4.** Occupancy covariates and AIC values of Royle-Nichols occupancy models  
695 with an AIC<2 for each species.

696

697 **Tables**

698 **Table 1.** Description of landscape and site-specific environmental variables used in analyses.

Variable	Description	Rationale
Proportion burnt	Proportion of area surrounding each site that is burnt each year, averaged over the preceding five years. Area used was scaled to reflect different species home range sizes: 250 m radius for brush-tailed rabbit-rat, delicate mouse and grassland melomys (Firth et al., 2006a), and 3200 m radius for northern quoll, northern brown bandicoot and species diversity (Lawes et al., 2015b). Derived from	Too frequent and/or intense fires have been implicated in CWR mammal declines across northern Australia (Lawes et al., 2015a, Lawes et al., 2015b, Legge et al., 2011b, Andersen et al., 2005).

---

fine-scale (30 m x 30 m) LANDSAT imagery following Lawes *et al.* (2015b). This variable was correlated with fire frequency, total ground cover (perennial, annual, sedge, forb and herb cover) and perennial grass cover.

Ruggedness      Standard deviation in elevation (Geoscience Australia, 2017) estimated over 250 m and 3200 m radius, as per proportion burnt. Ruggedness was correlated with rainfall.      Rugged habitats provide refugia for CWR mammal species (Hohnen *et al.*, 2016, Braithwaite and Griffiths, 1994).

Shrubs      The presence of shrubs under 1.5 m was recorded every metre along two edges of a 50 x 50 m quadrat.      Shrubs provide shelter from predators and food resources for CWR mammal species (McGregor *et al.*, 2015), and predicted brush-tailed rabbit-rat occupancy on Melville Island (Davies *et al.*, 2017).

---

---

Logs	Number of logs (diameter $\geq 5$ cm) crossing the perimeter of a 50 x 50 m quadrat.	Logs provide den sites and shelter for some CWR mammal species (Firth et al., 2006b).
Distance to anthropogenic disturbance	Minimum distance from each site to GEMCO mining operations or one of the three towns (Alyangula, Angurugu or Umbakumba). This covariate was not used to predict mammal detectability.	Disturbances from human settlements and roads may have pervasive effects on biodiversity proximal and distal from these sources (Sodhi et al., 2010, Laurance et al., 2009, Karanth et al., 2006, de Fretes, 1992).
Distance to roads	Minimum distance to a mapped road. This covariate was not used to predict mammal detectability.	
Distance to water	Distance to the closest permanent waterbody, defined by presence of water for more than 50% of all Landsat 5 and Landsat 7 satellite observations (Geoscience Australia, 2015). Permanent water body distribution was determined using the Australian Hydrological Geospatial Fabric (Bureau of Meteorology, 2017a).	Proximity to watercourses can influence the occurrence of CWR mammal species (Firth et al., 2006b).

---

---

Basal area	Calculated from the circumferences of all trees (diameter at 1.3 m > 5 cm) within a 5 m belt around the 50 x 50 m quadrat. Correlated with number of large trees (diameter at 1.3 m > 40 cm) within 5 m of the 50 x 50 m quadrat.	Tree basal area can influence the occurrence of CWR mammal species (Firth et al., 2006b).
Number of cameras operating	An observation-level covariate of the number of cameras operating at each site for each sampling day. Used as a covariate to estimate mammal detectability only.	Variation in detectability can arise from uneven numbers of cameras operating at sites due to camera malfunction (Stokeld et al., 2015).
Julian day	Date that sampling started at each site. Used as a covariate to estimate mammal detectability only.	Seasonal differences can influence mammal detectability (Einoder et al., 2018)

---

699

700 **Table 2.** Naïve occupancy estimates of mammal species detected during camera trapping  
701 surveys in lowland woodland across the Northern Territory. Groote Eylandt estimates are from  
702 the current survey, Tiwi Island estimates are derived from surveys conducted on Melville

703 (2015) and Bathurst Island (2014), and mainland estimates are derived from surveys conducted  
 704 at Cobourg peninsula (2014), Fish River Station (2014), Kakadu National Park (2015),  
 705 Litchfield National Park (2016), Nitmiluk National Park (2015), peri-urban areas of Darwin  
 706 (2014) and Warddeken IPA (2013 – 2015).

707 <sup>NA</sup> Species is known to occur in the area, but naïve occupancy estimate is not available.

708 - Species not known to occur in the area.

709 <sup>+</sup> Estimate from Melville Island only as the species is not known to occur on Bathurst Island.

Common name	Scientific name	Naïve occupancy		
		Groote Eylandt (n=112)	Tiwi Islands (n=110)	Mainland (n=131)
Brush-tailed rabbit-rat	<i>Conilurus penicillatus</i>	0.17	0.318	0.128
Dingo	<i>Canis lupus dingo</i>	0.36	0.46	0.5
Northern quoll	<i>Dasyurus hallucatus</i>	0.98	-	0.015
Feral cat	<i>Felis catus</i>	0.07	0.24	0.23
Northern brown bandicoot	<i>Isoodon macrourus</i>	1.00	0.918	0.471
Agile wallaby	<i>Macropus agilis</i>	0.85	0.855	0.572
Grassland melomys	<i>Melomys burtoni</i>	0.08	0.091	0.056
Northern hopping-mouse	<i>Notomys aquilo</i>	0.03	-	NA

---

Sugar glider	<i>Petaurus breviceps</i>	0.05	NA	NA
Short-eared rock-wallaby	<i>Petrogale brachyotis</i>	0.02	-	NA
Common planigale	<i>Planigale maculata</i>	0.03	-	NA
Delicate mouse	<i>Pseudomys delicatulus</i>	0.47	0.027	NA
Short-beaked echidna	<i>Tachyglossus aculeatus</i>	0.39	-	0.05
Fawn antechinus	<i>Antechinus bellus</i>	-	-	NA
Water rat	<i>Hydromys chrysogaster</i>	NA	NA	0.03
Antilopine wallaroo	<i>Macropus antilopinus</i>	-	-	0.122
Black wallaroo	<i>Macropus bernardus</i>	-	-	0.036
Common wallaroo	<i>Macropus robustus</i>	-	-	0.121
Black-footed tree-rat	<i>Mesembriomys gouldii</i>	-	0.636 <sup>+</sup>	0.315
Northern nail-tail wallaby	<i>Onychogalea unguifera</i>	-	-	0.007
Western chestnut mouse	<i>Pseudomys nanus</i>	-	0.009	0.013
Black rat	<i>Rattus rattus</i>	NA	NA	0.039
Pale field rat	<i>Rattus tunneyi</i>	NA	0.109	0.006
Butler's dunnart	<i>Sminthopsis butleri</i>	-	0.064	-
Red-cheeked dunnart	<i>Sminthopsis virginiae</i>	-	0.018	0.013
	<i>Trichosurus vulpecula</i>	-	0.393	0.05

---

---

Common brushtail

possum

---

711 **Table 3.** Comparison of  $\Delta AIC$ , occupancy, nightly and overall detection probabilities (over 37  
712 nights) for the null model (where occupancy and detectability parameters are assumed to be  
713 constant across all survey sites), and the most parsimonious single-season occupancy model  
714 for each species.

Species	Model	$\Delta AIC$	Occupancy ( $\Psi$ ) ( $\pm SE$ )	Nightly detection probability ( $p$ ) ( $\pm$ SE)	Overall detection probability
Brush-tailed rabbit-rat	Null model	199.58	0.17 (0.04)	0.24 (0.02)	0.99
	Best model	0.0	0.20 (0.06)	0.18 (0.03)	0.99
Grassland melomys	Null model	18.33	0.09 (0.03)	0.07 (0.02)	0.94
	Best model	0.0	0.11 (0.05)	0.13 (0.06)	0.99
Delicate mouse	Null model	0.0	0.52 (0.08)	0.13 (0.02)	0.99
	Best model	129.04	0.47 (0.05)	0.15 (0.01)	0.99

715

716



717 **Table 4.** Comparison of  $\Delta AIC$ , relative abundance, nightly probability of detection and the  
 718 overall probability of detection (over 37 nights) for the null model (where relative abundance  
 719 and detectability parameters are assumed to be constant across all survey sites), and the most  
 720 parsimonious Royle-Nichols occupancy model.

<b>Species</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b><math>\Delta AIC</math></b>	<b>Relative abundance (<math>\lambda</math>) (<math>\pm SE</math>)</b>	<b>Nightly detection probability (<math>p</math>) (<math>\pm SE</math>)</b>	<b>Overall detection probability</b>
Northern	Null model	55.24	3.76 (0.38)	0.14 (0.01)	0.99
brown	Best model	0	5.22 (1.15)	0.11 (0.02)	0.99
bandicoot					
Northern quoll	Null model	34.99	3.06 (0.37)	0.09 (0.01)	0.96
	Best model	0	4.35 (1.27)	0.07 (0.01)	0.92

721

722

723

724

725

726

727 **Figure legends**


728 **Figure 1.** Groote Eylandt and its location in Australia. Location of the 112 survey sites (black  
729 circles) and cat density grids (black open rectangles). Light grey – lowland forest and  
730 woodlands; clear – sandstone outcrop and coastal grassland and shrubland complex; dark grey  
731 – GEMCO mining operation area; dashed lines – roads.

732 **Figure 2.** Model averaged regression coefficient estimates for (a) the brush-tailed rabbit-rat,  
733 (b) the delicate mouse and (c) the grassland melomys. Error bars indicate 95% confidence  
734 intervals and asterisks indicate significant parameters where confidence intervals do not  
735 overlap zero.


736 **Figure 3.** Model averaged regression coefficient estimates of relative abundance for (a) the  
737 northern brown bandicoot and (b) the northern quoll. Error bars indicate 95% confidence  
738 intervals and asterisks indicate significant parameters where confidence intervals do not  
739 overlap zero.

## Figures


Figure 1:



**Figure 2:**



**Figure 3:**



## **Supporting information**

**Appendix S1.** The locations of past and present records of (a) the brush-tailed rabbit-rat and (b) the northern hopping-mouse on Grootte Eylandt. Black diamonds - detected in the current study; open circles - previous records.

**Appendix S2.** Locations of feral cat detections on Grootte Eylandt. Black diamonds - mammal survey; filled circles - cat density array records.

**Appendix S3:** The occupancy variables, number of parameters (K), AIC,  $\Delta$ AIC and AIC weight for the occupancy models with an AIC < 2 for each species.

Occupancy variables	K	AIC	$\Delta$ AIC	AIC weight
<b>Brush-tailed rabbit-rat</b>				
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + disturbance + basal area + roads + shrubs</i>	<b>13</b>	<b>707.64</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.097</b>
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + disturbance + basal area + logs + roads + shrubs</i>	14	708.26	0.62	0.071
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + disturbance + basal area + roads + shrubs</i>	14	709.38	1.74	0.041
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + disturbance + basal area + shrubs</i>	12	709.5	1.86	0.038
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + disturbance + roads + shrubs</i>	12	709.64	2	0.036
<b>Grassland melomys</b>				
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + shrubs</i>	<b>8</b>	<b>238.82</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.086</b>
<i>proportion burnt + water + logs + shrubs</i>	8	238.91	0.085	0.083
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + roads + shrubs</i>	9	239.36	0.534	0.066
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + disturbance + basal area + logs + shrubs</i>	11	239.87	1.048	0.051
<i>water + logs + shrubs</i>	7	240	1.179	0.048
<i>proportion burnt + water + logs + roads + shrubs</i>	9	240.17	1.352	0.044
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + disturbance + shrubs</i>	9	240.21	1.384	0.043
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + disturbance + roads + shrubs</i>	10	240.57	1.744	0.036
<i>ruggedness + water + logs + roads + shrubs</i>	9	240.71	1.884	0.034
<b>Delicate mouse</b>				
<i>proportion burnt + logs</i>	<b>10</b>	<b>1714.19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.038</b>
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water</i>	11	1714.27	0.076	0.037
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness</i>	10	1714.45	0.256	0.033
<i>proportion burnt</i>	9	1714.45	0.256	0.033
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + logs</i>	12	1714.97	0.781	0.026
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + logs</i>	11	1714.98	0.785	0.026
<i>proportion burnt + water + logs</i>	11	1715.01	0.815	0.025
<i>proportion burnt + water</i>	10	1715.26	1.071	0.022

---

<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + disturbance</i>	11	1715.36	1.165	0.021
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + disturbance + logs</i>	12	1715.43	1.238	0.020
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + disturbance</i>	12	1715.55	1.354	0.019
<i>proportion burnt + disturbance + logs</i>	11	1715.61	1.419	0.019
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + disturbance + logs</i>	13	1715.88	1.689	0.016
<i>proportion burnt + basal area</i>	10	1716.01	1.816	0.015
<i>proportion burnt + logs + roads</i>	11	1716.07	1.883	0.015
<i>proportion burnt + basal area + logs</i>	11	1716.08	1.892	0.015
<i>proportion burnt + logs + shrubs</i>	11	1716.09	1.894	0.015
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + shrubs</i>	11	1716.1	1.909	0.015
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + basal area</i>	11	1716.11	1.919	0.015
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + basal area</i>	12	1716.15	1.956	0.014

---



**Appendix S4:** The occupancy variables, number of parameters (K), AIC,  $\Delta$ AIC and AIC weight for the Royle-Nichols occupancy models with an AIC < 2 for each species.

Occupancy variables	K	AIC	$\Delta$ AIC	AIC weight
<b>Northern quoll</b>				
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + disturbance + basal area + roads</i>	<b>11</b>	<b>4189.22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.062</b>
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + disturbance + roads</i>	10	4189.54	0.32	0.053
<i>ruggedness + water + disturbance + roads</i>	9	4189.9	0.68	0.044
<i>ruggedness + water + disturbance + basal area + roads</i>	10	4190.1	0.88	0.040
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + disturbance + basal area + logs + roads</i>	12	4190.38	1.16	0.035
<i>ruggedness + water + disturbance + basal area + logs + roads</i>	11	4190.68	1.46	0.030
<i>ruggedness + disturbance + basal area + logs + roads</i>	10	4190.94	1.72	0.026
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + disturbance + basal area + roads</i>	10	4190.97	1.76	0.026
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + disturbance + basal area + logs + roads</i>	11	4191.05	1.84	0.025
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + water + disturbance + basal area + roads + shrubs</i>	12	4191.22	2	0.023
<b>Northern brown bandicoot</b>				
<i>proportion burnt + basal area + logs + shrubs</i>	<b>10</b>	<b>5157.47</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.069</b>
<i>proportion burnt + disturbance + basal area + logs + shrubs</i>	11	5157.49	0.023	0.069
<i>proportion burnt + shrubs</i>	8	5158.12	0.658	0.050
<i>proportion burnt + logs + shrubs</i>	9	5158.39	0.924	0.044
<i>proportion burnt + disturbance + shrubs</i>	9	5158.44	0.977	0.043
<i>proportion burnt + disturbance + logs + shrubs</i>	10	5158.67	1.205	0.038
<i>proportion burnt + water + basal area + logs + shrubs</i>	11	5158.89	1.426	0.034
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + basal area + logs + shrubs</i>	11	5159	1.529	0.032
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + disturbance + basal area + logs + shrubs</i>	12	5159.29	1.822	0.028
<i>proportion burnt + water + disturbance + basal area + logs + shrubs</i>	12	5159.3	1.83	0.028
<i>proportion burnt + ruggedness + shrubs</i>	9	5159.44	1.979	0.026