



Hedmark University College

Faculty of applied ecology and agricultural sciences

BRAGE

Hedmark University College's Open Research Archive

<http://brage.bibsys.no/hhe/>

This is the author's version of the article published in

European journal of wildlife research

The article has been peer-reviewed, but does not include the publisher's layout, page numbers and proof-corrections

Citation for the published paper:

Carricondo-Sanchez, D., Samelius, G., Odden, M. et al. Eur J Wildl Res
(2016) 62: 211.

doi:10.1007/s10344-016-0995-z

[Click here to view linked References](#)

1
2
3
4 **Spatial and temporal variation in the distribution and**
5 **abundance of red foxes in the tundra and taiga of northern**
6
7
8 **Sweden.**
9
10

11
12
13
14
15 **David Carricondo-Sanchez · Gustaf Samelius · Morten Odden · Tomas Willebrand**
16
17
18
19
20

21 David Carricondo-Sanchez: Faculty of Applied Ecology and Agricultural Sciences, Hedmark
22 University College, 2480 Koppang, Norway. email: david.carricondo.sanchez@gmail.com. Tel:
23
24 (+47)97868196
25
26

27
28 Gustaf Samelius: Grimsö Wildlife Research Station, Department of Ecology, Swedish University of
29 Agricultural Sciences, SE-730 91 Riddarhyttan, Sweden and Snow Leopard Trust, 4649 Sunnyside
30 Avenue North, Suite 325, Seattle, Washington 98103, USA
31
32

33
34
35
36 Morten Odden: Faculty of Applied Ecology and Agricultural Sciences, Hedmark University
37 College, 2480 Koppang, Norway
38
39

40
41 Tomas Willebrand: Faculty of Applied Ecology and Agricultural Sciences, Hedmark University
42 College, 2480 Koppang, Norway
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract Variation in the distribution and abundance of animals in space and time are key concepts of population ecology. We studied these variations in a population of red foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*) in the tundra and taiga of northern Sweden. We analysed 12 years (1974-1985) of snow tracking data from a large area of 65,375 km². Specifically, we evaluated to what extent the distribution of red foxes was explained by the presence of prey and how this interacted with snow depth and altitude. We also tested for temporal linear trends in the distribution and abundance of red foxes during the study period. The distribution of red foxes was explained by the presence of rodents, hares, tetraonid species, and ungulates (i.e. carcasses). Snow depth had a negative effect on the impact of small prey on the distribution of the red foxes, whereas it had a positive effect on the impact of ungulates. The influence of hares increased with altitude. Neither distribution nor abundance of red foxes showed a positive or negative linear trend, suggesting a stable population in northern Sweden during our study. This study showed that the distribution of red foxes was not only influenced by the presence of their main prey (rodents), but also by interactions between alternative prey, altitude, and snow depth. This study also emphasizes the importance of ungulate carcasses for red foxes and for wildlife management.

Keywords *Vulpes vulpes*, carcass, snow depth, temporal trends, alternative prey

1
2
3
4 **Introduction**
5
6
7

8 Understanding how the distribution and abundance of animals vary in space and time is one of the
9 main aims of ecology (Begon et al. 1996). The need for this knowledge is increasingly important
10 today when human alteration of habitats and environmental changes are strongly affecting the
11 majority of ecosystems worldwide (Walther et al. 2002). Food abundance and competition for
12 resources are key determinants for the distribution of organisms (Osenberg and Mittelbach 1996;
13 Persson et al. 1996) although several studies show that the mechanisms governing spatial and
14 temporal variation in these distributions often are complex even in relatively simple food webs (e.g.
15 Krebs et al. 1995; Post et al. 2000).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 In recent years, much attention has been focused on top-down effects on the abundance and
27 distribution of mesopredators due to the previous decline and recent return of apex predator
28 populations, e.g. mesopredator release (Courchamp 1999; Prugh et al. 2009; Ritchie and Johnson
29 2009). However, bottom-up effects mediated by changes in food availability may also affect
30 mesopredator abundance and distribution (Ritchie and Johnson 2009). Increased human population
31 densities and habitat fragmentation may provide new food resources and alter prey abundance,
32 respectively (Kurki et al. 1998; Fahrig 2003).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The red fox (*Vulpes vulpes* Linnaeus, 1758) has one of the largest natural distributions of all
44 mammals (Zimen 1980). It preys on a wide range of animal species and feed opportunistically on
45 food resources such as berries and human garbage (Hartova-Nentvichova et al. 2010; Rosalino et al.
46 2010; Dell'Arte et al. 2007). The red fox occupies highly contrasting habitats (Lariviere and
47 Pasitschniak-Arts 1996), and its distribution and abundance is determined to a large extent by food
48 availability (Barton and Zalewski 2007; Rosalino et al. 2010; Gallant et al. 2012). In Scandinavia,
49 the main prey of the red fox is microtine rodents (Lindström 1987). Consequently the production of
50 young in Scandinavia is known to follow the 3-4 year cycle of rodents (Englund 1970; Lindström
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 1989; Lindström et al. 1994). During periods of low availability of main prey, the red fox includes a
5
6 larger proportion of alternative food resources in its diet, including small game (Angelstam et al
7
8 1984; Lindström et al. 1987) or ungulate carcasses (Jedrzejewski and Jedrzejewska 1992; Selås and
9
10 Vik 2006; Killengreen et al 2011). Recent studies have shown that moose carcasses are a main part
11
12 of the winter diet of the red fox (Needham et al. 2014) and that red fox occupancy increases with
13
14 higher densities of reindeer in the area (Henden et al. 2014).
15
16
17

18
19 The red fox population in Scandinavia increased rapidly from the 1940s to the 1970s (Selås
20
21 and Vik 2006). This increase was probably facilitated by reduced harvest, absence of large
22
23 carnivores, and increased food availability (Selås and Vik 2006; Elmhagen and Rushton 2007). The
24
25 latter may have been caused by both direct and indirect human influences; an increase on human
26
27 living standards providing more garbage (Killengreen et al. 2011), carcasses, and slaughter remains
28
29 from increased ungulate populations including semi-domesticated reindeer (Ims et al. 2007;
30
31 Angerbjörn et al. 2013) and increased abundance of rodents as a result of increased clear-cutting in
32
33 forestry (Michal and Rafal 2014).
34
35
36

37
38 It has been suggested that the increase in the red fox abundance resulted in an expansion to
39
40 higher altitudes and more northern latitudes since the early twentieth century (Hersteinsson and
41
42 Macdonald 1992; Post et al. 2009; Killengreen et al. 2011). The overabundance of semi-domestic
43
44 reindeer in northern Norway (Ims et al. 2007) has probably provided red foxes with carcasses as an
45
46 important food resource during winter (Henden et al. 2010; Killengreen et al. 2011). Moreover, a
47
48 warmer climate and an increase in primary production would ultimately lead to higher prey
49
50 availability (Hersteinsson et al 1989; Hersteinsson and Macdonald 1992). On the other hand, red
51
52 foxes were already reported to breed in the open tundra in the first half of the 20th century
53
54 (Lönnberg 1926). It is thus unclear if the increased number of red foxes in the tundra is due to range
55
56 expansion, or if it mirrored a general increase in abundance throughout Fennoscandia.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 An increase in the red fox abundance may lead to elevated predation rates which may affect
5
6 the structure and function of the ecosystem (Lindström et al 1987; Danell and Hörnfeldt 1987;
7
8 Lindström et al. 1994). For example, the densities of mountain hare (*Lepus timidus*), black grouse
9
10 (*Tetrao tetrix*) and capercaillie (*Tetrao urogallus*) have increased in periods when the abundance of
11
12 red foxes was reduced through control or disease (Lindström et al. 1987; Marcström et al. 1988;
13
14 Lindström et al. 1994; Smedshaug et al. 1999). Furthermore, Kjellander and Nordström (2003)
15
16 found a negative correlation between the number of red fox litters and the ratio of roe deer fawns
17
18 per doe.
19
20

21
22 Another example of the ecological impact of an increase in the red fox abundance is the
23
24 case of the Scandinavian arctic fox (*Vulpes lagopus*). The arctic fox population in Scandinavia
25
26 experienced a decline due to an intensive harvesting during the first part of the 20th century
27
28 (Lönnberg 1926) and has since not recovered. This has been partially attributed to competitive
29
30 exclusion by red foxes (Hersteinsson and Macdonald 1992; Killengreen et al. 2007; Selås and Vik
31
32 2007; Henden et al. 2009) and therefore lethal control of red foxes has been used in experimental
33
34 management in the tundra region (Angerbjörn et al. 2013). Despite the importance of red foxes and
35
36 their anticipated positive response to climate change, information on the distribution and population
37
38 trends of red foxes in the tundra and taiga region of northern Scandinavia is very limited.
39
40

41
42 The main objective of our study was to investigate how the distribution of red foxes varied
43
44 in space in relation to the presence of main prey and alternative food resources, and to depict the
45
46 relationships between these bottom up effects, altitude and snow depth. We also investigated the
47
48 relationship between the red fox distribution and prey species richness. In order to examine factors
49
50 affecting the distribution of red foxes, we analysed snow tracking data on distribution and
51
52 abundance of various wildlife species collected during 12 years in the tundra and taiga region of
53
54 northern Sweden. Additionally we also examined the relationship between linear temporal trends
55
56 and altitude in the distribution and relative abundance of this red fox population.
57
58

Methods

Study area

This study was part of a monitoring program for the tundra and taiga area in the northernmost county (Norrbotten) in Sweden from 1974 to 1985 (Fig. 1). The data collection was conducted by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA). The study area (65,375 km²) had a human population density of 0.33 people per km² (Statistics Sweden (SCB) 2015) with ca. 5% of the area was covered by human settlements and consisted of four townships. There are several large national parks (5,932 km²) situated in the study area, and most of the land (ca. 42,000 km²) is managed by the state. Traditional semi-domestic reindeer herding by the indigenous Sami people is extensive in the study area.

The landscape can be divided into three main categories: (1) treeless open tundra with limited vegetation, (2) mountain birch (*Betulla pubescens tortuosa*) forest, and (3) mixed boreal conifer forest dominated by Norway spruce (*Picea abies*) and Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*). The tree line in the study area is approximately 950 masl in the southern part and about 600 masl in the northern part. The highest peaks are about 2,100 masl and more than 200 glaciers can be found in the area. Potential prey species for the red fox in the study area included mountain hare, red squirrel (*Sciurus vulgaris*), black grouse, capercaillie, hazel grouse (*Bonasa bonasia*), willow grouse (*Lagopus lagopus*), rock ptarmigan (*Lagopus muta*), and small rodents, which consisted of bank vole (*Myodes glareolus*), northern red-backed vole (*Myodes rutilus*), field vole (*Microtus agrestis*), tundra vole (*Microtus oeconomus*), grey-sided vole (*Myodes rufocanus*), water vole (*Arvicola amphibius*), and Norwegian lemming (*Lemmus lemmus*). Large carnivores present in the area

1
2
3
4 included brown bears (*Ursus arctos*), wolverines (*Gulo gulo*), Eurasian lynx (*Lynx lynx*), wolves
5
6 (*Canis lupus*), and golden eagles (*Aquila chrysaetos*).
7
8
9

10 11 12 **Monitoring the abundance and distribution of mammals and birds** 13

14
15 The study area consisted of 2,080 squared sampling blocks of 25 km² that followed the Swedish
16 map grid (RT90) on 5x5 km intersections. The distribution and abundance of red foxes and
17 potential prey species was monitored by recording the number of signs per species observed per
18 sampling block. In each block, all signs of mammals and birds were recorded in areas that were
19 accessible with snow mobiles. These signs included tracks in the snow, observations of animals,
20 nesting sites, scats and signs of foraging. Observers attempted to scan and drive the whole study
21 block and would scan the area with binoculars from natural observation points (e.g. knolls or
22 ridges). The length driven within an area was dependent on the degree of tree cover and boulders
23 obstructing the line of sight (5.56 ± 0.10 km per block in average). All tracks were registered as
24 independent tracks unless further investigation showed otherwise. For example, observers followed
25 the tracks in cases when they were uncertain if it was from one or two animals to check if tracks
26 joined up or if two animals had walked in the same track. Snow depth, snow condition, cloud cover,
27 wind and temperature data were also measured in the field. Sampling blocks were monitored once
28 per year from January to May plus a second visit to sampling blocks where bears, wolverines, lynx
29 and wolves had been detected. The same two observers would travel through the same areas, mostly
30 following the same route.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Wind and precipitation can make it difficult to read tracks on the snow. Hence, we only
53 included data collected during periods when favourable conditions of wind, precipitation and snow
54 allowed for the detection of rodent tracks. We used box plots to identify outliers and removed 4
55 observations with values higher than 100 times the average. The resulting data set consisted of
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 9,984 surveys of the 2080 different sampling blocks. Among these blocks, 1,195 were visited three
5
6 or more years (lack of snow and severe weather prevented full coverage in all years).
7
8

9 **Environmental data**

10
11
12 We calculated the proportion of boreal forest and alpine tundra for each sampling block by using
13
14 the Intersect function in ArcGis 9.3 (ESRI 2009) where we used a 1:250,000 map from the National
15
16 Land Survey of Sweden as input data. We calculated mean elevation for each block by using the
17
18 Zonal Statistics function in ArcGIS 9.3 where we used elevation data from the National Land
19
20 Survey of Sweden as input data (the resolution of input data was 50 m).
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Statistical analysis**

28 *Distribution of red foxes*

29
30
31
32
33
34 We used model selection to assess how the distribution (presence/absence per sampling block) of
35
36 red foxes varied in relation to the presence of potential prey species. For this we fitted logistic
37
38 mixed effect models by using the function ‘glmer’ in the R package lme4 (Bates et al. 2014; R
39
40 Development Core Team 2012). We derived a set of 17 candidate models constituted by models
41
42 with different combinations of the main prey and alternative prey species as explanatory variables,
43
44 models with an index of prey species richness (number of prey species present in the sampling
45
46 block), and models with snow depth and altitude interacting in different combinations with the
47
48 variables listed above. All candidate models included sampling block ID as a random effect for the
49
50 intercept to control for repeated measures. We were interested in explaining the variations in the
51
52 data rather than obtaining a strong predicting power and therefore we included models that
53
54 contained up to 14 explanatory variables. We used variation around the grand mean as a *null model*
55
56 (i.e. model with no explanatory variables) of no effect of neither of the variables examined. We
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 used Akaike's information criterion (AIC) to rank models and considered models within 2 AIC
5
6 units to be of similar quality (Anderson et al. 1998).
7
8

9
10 Prey species categories were mountain hares, tetraonid species (i.e. black grouse,
11 capercaillie, hazel grouse, willow ptarmigan and rock ptarmigan), small rodents and ungulates (i.e.
12 moose and reindeer as a source of carcasses). The index of species richness was defined as the
13 number of different potential prey species present in the sampling block (i.e. small rodent, mountain
14 hare, black grouse, capercaillie, hazel grouse, willow- and rock ptarmigans, moose and reindeer).
15 We standardized altitude and snow depth variables by using the following equation: $(x_i - \bar{X}) / (2 \times$
16 SD) (Gelman and Hill 2007). Altitude was highly correlated with both the proportion of boreal
17 forest (Pearson's $r = -0.75$, $p < 0.001$) and the proportion of tundra ($r = 0.84$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, the
18 variable altitude represented both altitude and habitat composition and we excluded proportion of
19 forest and tundra variables from the models. We checked for collinearity of the explanatory
20 variables, and we found no correlation between any of them.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 35 *Temporal trends*

36
37
38 When examining for temporal trends in the red fox distribution and relative abundance (average
39 number of signs per sampling block), we restricted the analysis to only include sampling blocks that
40 had been monitored six or more years ($n=756$ sampling blocks). These blocks were surveyed a total
41 of 6,142 times.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 We examined temporal trends in the red fox distribution and abundance by using mixed
49 effect models (R Development Core Team 2012). In order to assess the relationship between the
50 linear temporal trends and altitude, we defined three altitude categories by dividing the total altitude
51 range, from 299 to 1419 masl, into three zones of 373.3 meters altitude range each, i.e. "low
52 altitude" (<672.5 masl, $n = 3693$ surveys of 452 sampling blocks), "medium altitude" ($672.5 -$
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 1016.1 masl, n = 1,832 surveys of 224 sampling blocks) and “high altitude” (>1016.1 masl, n = 617
5
6 surveys of 80 sampling blocks). The altitude categories contained different proportions of boreal
7
8 forest and tundra (Low altitude: 61.51% Boreal forest, 13.10% Tundra; Medium altitude: 16.35%
9
10 Boreal forest, 74.80% Tundra; High altitude: 1.18% Boreal forest, 95.5% Tundra). Both models
11
12 included sampling block ID as a random effect for the intercept to control for repeated measures.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Results**

20 **Distribution of red foxes**

21
22
23
24
25 Red foxes were present in the majority of the study area in all years. On average, red fox signs were
26
27 found in 84.29% (± 0.36 S.E.) of the sampling blocks in each year. Hare signs were present in
28
29 63.60% (± 0.50 S.E.) of the sampling blocks, rodents in 17.53% (± 0.38 S.E.), tetraonid species in
30
31 81.72% (± 0.39 S.E.) and ungulates in 54.18% (± 0.49 S.E.). The model in which the red fox
32
33 distribution was explained by the species richness index was 170.23 AIC units away from the top
34
35 model. Instead, the presence of rodents, hares, tetraonids and ungulates were important to explain
36
37 the distribution of red foxes as indicated by these variables being included in the best models that
38
39 accounted for 62% of the overall model fit (Table 1). When excluding the main prey (i.e. rodents),
40
41 the model showed a delta AIC of 69.57. The best model presented a marginal R^2 of 0.40 (see
42
43 Nakagawa and Schielzeth 2013). The presence of hares, tetraonid species and ungulates as
44
45 alternative prey had highly positive effects on the distribution of red foxes (Table 2). These
46
47 variables interacted with snow depth and altitude in different ways. The interaction with altitude
48
49 was positive for hares. The confidence intervals of the interaction with altitude for large ungulates
50
51 and for tetraonids included zero and the effect was therefore inconclusive. The best model also
52
53 showed a negative interaction with snow depth for hares and a less pronounced positive interaction
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 between snow depth and ungulates. The interaction between tetraonids and snow depth included
5
6 zero in the confidence intervals, and hence we were uncertain of its effect (Table 2).
7
8
9

10 11 12 **Temporal trends** 13

14
15 The presence and number of signs of red foxes per sampling block varied among years (Fig. 2).
16
17 However, there was no positive or negative linear temporal trend in these variables during the study
18
19 period (Table 3). Similarly, there was no positive or negative linear temporal trend in any of the
20
21 different altitude categories neither for the distribution nor the relative abundance of red foxes in the
22
23 study area (Table 3).
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 31 **Discussion** 32

33
34 The close association between the distributions of red foxes and prey species observed in our study
35
36 is in accordance with previous findings (Angelstam et al. 1984; Lindström 1987; Hersteinson and
37
38 Macdonalds 1992). Halpin and Bissonette (1988) found that snow depth affected habitat use of red
39
40 foxes by shifting the availability of the prey species. However, we show that the magnitude of the
41
42 effects of different prey categories on the distribution of red fox also depends on altitude and snow
43
44 depth. This demonstrates that several interacting factors must be taken into account in order to
45
46 predict the distribution of red foxes, and not only prey abundance or presence.
47
48
49

50
51 Ungulates as a source of carcasses has been shown to be a significant part of the diet of red
52
53 foxes during the winter period or during low density phases in the rodent cycle (Jedrzejewski and
54
55 Jedrzejewska 1992, Cagnacci et al 2003; Killegreen et al. 2011; Needham et al. 2014). In our study
56
57 we show that the presence of ungulates also affects the spatial distribution of the red fox.. Henden et
58
59

1
2
3
4 al. (2014) recently showed that the occupancy of the community of scavengers, including the red
5
6 fox, was higher where the density of reindeer was larger. Selås and Vik (2006) also found a positive
7
8 correlation between the increase of red fox hunting bags and the increase of ungulate numbers in
9
10 Norway. During the twelve years of our study, the population of moose experienced a dramatic
11
12 increase in northern Sweden (Cederlund and Bergström 1996). Similarly, the reindeer population in
13
14 our study area increased markedly and peaked in 1990 (Moen and Danell 2003). Accordingly, the
15
16 availability of carcasses for the red fox probably increased. The origin of these carcasses possibly
17
18 was death by disease, inanition under harsh winter conditions, human hunting and predation
19
20 (Saether et al 1996; Lavsund et al. 1999; Tveraa et al 2003). Our results show that the importance of
21
22 carcasses for the distribution of red foxes interacted with altitude and snow depth. This importance
23
24 increased as snow depth increased. Is probably easier for the red fox to feed on carcasses rather than
25
26 on live prey in areas where deep snow makes moving, and therefore hunting, difficult (see
27
28 Lindström 1983). Also, our study shows that the interaction of altitude with the availability of
29
30 carcasses was important for the distribution of red foxes. However, the confidence interval included
31
32 zero, and hence we are uncertain of the impact of this effect. Given the habitat use of moose and
33
34 reindeer, the effect of this interaction could represent a bias towards the use of carcasses of one of
35
36 these species. Nonetheless, the second ranked model in the model selection process differed from
37
38 the best model in that it did not include the interaction of altitude and snow depth with ungulates.
39
40 This model was 2.04 AIC points away from the best model. This tells us that the effect of these
41
42 interactions might not be very strong, but it is important to take them into account, especially in
43
44 areas with contrasting numbers of different ungulate species. In conclusion, the access to moose and
45
46 reindeer carcasses may have sustained the population of red foxes in northern Sweden during harsh
47
48 winters and years of low density of rodents (Killengreen et al. 2011; Needham et al. 2014).
49
50 Nowadays, the recovery of large carnivores in Scandinavia (Chapron et al 2014) may increase the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 availability of ungulate carcasses for red foxes. We believe that a higher availability of carcasses for
5
6 the red fox could stabilize the temporal dynamics of the red fox populations in Scandinavia.
7
8

9
10 Tetraonids species such as black grouse and ptarmigan represent an important alternative
11 prey for red foxes (Lindström et al. 1987; Lindström et al. 1994; Smedshaug et al 1999). Indeed, the
12 presence of these species had a pronounced effect on the red fox distribution in our study. However,
13
14 the confidence intervals of the interactions of tetraonids with altitude and snow depth contained
15
16 zero. Although the interactions *per se* were important for the distribution of red fox, the direction of
17
18 the effects was inconclusive. This uncertainty may be attributed to the fact that we did not
19
20 differentiated different tetraonid species and pooled species with different ecologies like
21
22 capercallies and rock ptarmigans. Future studies differentiating bird prey into species may reveal
23
24 more detailed patterns.
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 The presence of hares was also an important factor explaining the distribution of the red fox
32 in northern Sweden. Many studies have previously shown the role of this species as an alternative
33 prey of the red fox (Danell and Hörnfeldt 1987; Jedrzejewski and Jedrzejewska 1992; Lindström
34
35 et al. 1994, Kauhala and Helle 2000). However, here we show that the importance of this species, as
36
37 in tetraonids, decreased with snow depth. On the other hand, the interaction between hares and
38
39 altitude was positive. In contrast to tetraonids, hares may be more exposed in the open landscape
40
41 and thus easier to detect and catch by the red fox at higher altitudes.
42
43
44
45
46

47 According some authors (e.g. Hersteinsson and Macdonald 1992, Fuglei and Ims 2008)
48 warmer temperatures during recent years may have facilitated an expansion of the red fox
49 populations to higher altitudes. Even though a warming trend has been reported in our study area
50 during the period of our study (Jonsell et al. 2013), neither the distribution nor the relative
51 abundance of the red fox showed an increase in northern Sweden. Instead, our data showed a stable
52
53 population that, despite annual fluctuations, did not manifest any positive or negative temporal
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 linear trend during the study period (i.e. 1974-1985). The red fox was present in an average of 70%
5
6 (± 2.27 S.E.) of the sampling blocks in the highest altitudes (>1016.1 masl) which were areas
7
8 consisting almost solely of open tundra and glaciers. Hence, it seems that the red fox was well-
9
10 established in high altitudes in northern Sweden during the study period. According to Lönnberg
11
12 (1926), the red fox was breeding in the open tundra already in the early 20th century.
13
14

15
16 The sarcoptic mange had a pronounced negative impact on the red fox population in
17
18 Scandinavia on a large scale (Mörner 1992; Lindström et al. 1994). However, our data show no
19
20 decrease in the distribution and relative abundance of the red fox despite sarcoptic mange appearing
21
22 in our study area around 1977-1978 (Lindström and Mörner 1985). We therefore suggest that the
23
24 sarcoptic mange had a low impact on the red fox population in this part of northern Sweden due to
25
26 the low population densities and harsh winter conditions.
27
28
29

30
31 In our study we have depicted factors explaining the distribution of the red fox in northern
32
33 Sweden and their interactions with snow depth and altitude. Moreover, we show that there is a
34
35 relationship between the distributions of red foxes and ungulates. Management of the Scandinavian
36
37 red fox populations in high altitudes should take into account the increasing availability of carcasses
38
39 given the increase in the abundance of several ungulate species (e.g. moose and semi-domestic
40
41 reindeer; Ims et al. 2007). Furthermore, the relationship between small game, altitude and snow
42
43 depth has not previously been described. Our study thus demonstrates that several interacting
44
45 factors may be important for predicting the distribution and dynamics of the red fox in mountain
46
47 ecosystems.
48
49
50

51
52
53
54 **Acknowledgements** We would like to thank Robert Franzén in the Swedish Environmental Protection
55
56 Agency for providing access to the entire wildlife census data used in this paper.
57
58
59

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **References**
8
9

- 10 Anderson DR, Burnham KP, White GC (1998) Comparison of Akaike information criterion and
11 consistent Akaike information criterion for model selection and statistical inference from
12 capture-recapture studies. *Journal of Applied Statistics* 25:263-282
13
14
15
16
17 Angelstam, P, Lindström E, Widen P (1984) Role of predation in short-term population fluctuations
18 of some birds and mammals in fennoscandia. *Oecologia* 62(2): 199-208. doi:
19 10.1007/bf00379014
20
21
22
23
24 Angerbjörn A et al. (2013) Carnivore conservation in practice: replicated management actions on a
25 large spatial scale. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 50:59-67. doi:10.1111/1365-2664.12033
26
27
28 Barton KA, Zalewski A (2007) Winter severity limits red fox populations in Eurasia. *Global*
29 *Ecology and Biogeography* 16:281-289. doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2007.00299.x
30
31
32
33 Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S (2014) lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using Eigen
34 and S4. R package version 1.1-7, <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4>
35
36
37 Begon M, Sait SM, Thompson DJ (1996) Predator-prey cycles with period shifts between two- and
38 three-species systems. *Nature* 381:311-315. doi:10.1038/381311a0
39
40
41
42 Cagnacci F, Lovari S, Meriggi A (2003) Carrion dependence and food habits of the red fox in an
43 Alpine area. *Italian Journal of Zoology* 70:31-38
44
45
46 Cederlund G, R. Bergstrom (1996) Trends in the moose-forest system in Fennoscandia, with special
47 reference to Sweden. In: DeGraaf RM, Miller RI (Eds) *Conservation of faunal diversity in*
48 *forested landscapes*. Chapman & Hall, London, pp 265-281.
49
50
51
52
53 Chapron G et al. (2014) Recovery of large carnivores in Europe's modern human-dominated
54 landscapes. *Science* 346(6216): 1517-1519. doi: 10.1126/science.1257553
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Courchamp F, Langlais M, Sugihara G (1999) Cats protecting birds: modelling the mesopredator
5
6 release effect. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 68(2): 282-292. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-
7
8 2656.1999.00285.x
9
- 10 Danell K, Hornfeldt B (1987) Numerical responses by populations of red fox and mountain hare
11
12 during an outbreak of sarcoptic mange. *Oecologia* 73(4): 533-536. doi:
13
14 10.1007/bf00379412
15
- 16
17 Dell'Arte GL, Laaksonen T, Norrdahl K, Korpimäki E (2007) Variation in the diet composition of a
18
19 generalist predator, the red fox, in relation to season and density of main prey. *Acta Oecol-*
20
21 *Int J Ecol* 31:276-281. doi:10.1016/j.actao.2006.12.007
22
23
- 24 Elmhagen B, Rushton SP (2007) Trophic control of mesopredators in terrestrial ecosystems: top-
25
26 down or bottom-up? *Ecology Letters* 10:197-206. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.01010.x
27
28
- 29 Englund J (1970) Some aspects of reproduction and mortality rates in Swedish foxes (*Vulpes*
30
31 *vulpes*) 1961-63 and 1966-69. *Viltrevy* 8:1-82
32
- 33 ESRI (2009) ARCGIS Desktop. Environmental Systems Research Institute, Redland, CA
34
- 35 Fahrig L (2003) Effects of habitat fragmentation on biodiversity. *Annual Review of Ecology*
36
37 *Evolution and Systematics* 34: 487-515.
38
39
- 40 Fuglei E, Ims RA (2008) Global warming and effects on the Arctic fox. *Science progress* 91(Pt 2):
41
42 175-191. doi: 10.3184/003685008x327468
43
- 44 Gallant D, Slough BG, Reid DG, Berteaux D (2012) Arctic fox versus red fox in the warming
45
46 Arctic: four decades of den surveys in north Yukon. *Polar Biology* 35:1421-1431.
47
48 doi:10.1007/s00300-012-1181-8
49
- 50
51 Gelman A, Hill J (2007) Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models.
52
53 Analytical methods for social research. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Halpin MA, Bissonette JA (1988) Influence of snow depth on prey availability and habitat use by
5
6 red fox. *Canadian Journal of Zoology-Revue Canadienne De Zoologie* 66:587-592.
7
8 doi:10.1139/z88-086
9
- 10
11 Hartova-Nentvichova M, Salek M, Cerveny J, Koubek P (2010) Variation in the diet of the red fox
12
13 (*Vulpes vulpes*) in mountain habitats: Effects of altitude and season. *Mammalian Biology*
14
15 75:334-340. doi:10.1016/j.mambio.2009.09.003
16
- 17
18 Henden JA, Ims RA, Yoccoz NG (2009) Nonstationary spatio-temporal small rodent dynamics:
19
20 evidence from long-term Norwegian fox bounty data. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 78:636-
21
22 645. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01510.x
23
- 24
25 Henden JA, Ims RA, Yoccoz NG, Hellström P, Angerbjörn A (2010) Strength of asymmetric
26
27 competition between predators in food webs ruled by fluctuating prey: the case of foxes in
28
29 tundra. *Oikos* 119:27-34. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2009.17604.x
30
- 31
32 Henden JA, Stien A, Bårdsen BJ, Yoccoz NG, Ims RA (2014) Community-wide mesocarnivore
33
34 response to partial ungulate migration. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 51(6): 1525-1533. doi:
35
36 10.1111/1365-2664.12328
37
- 38
39 Hersteinsson P, Angerbjörn A, Frafjord K, Kaikusalo A (1989) The arctic fox in fennoscandia and
40
41 iceland: management problems. *Biological Conservation* 49:67-81. doi:10.1016/0006-
42
43 3207(89)90113-4
44
- 45
46 Hersteinsson P, Macdonald DW (1992) Interspecific competition and the geographical distribution
47
48 of red and arctic foxes *vulpes-vulpes* and *alopex-lagopus*. *Oikos* 64:505-515.
49
50 doi:10.2307/3545168
51
- 52
53 Ims RA, Yoccoz NG, Bråthen KA, Fauchald P, Tveraa T, Hausner V (2007) Can reindeer
54
55 overabundance cause a trophic cascade? *Ecosystems* 10:607-622. doi:10.1007/s10021-007-
56
57 9060-9
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Jedrzejewski W, Jedrzejewska B (1992) Foraging and diet of the red fox *vulpes vulpes* in relation to
5
6 variable food resources in bialowieza-national-park, poland. *Ecography* 15:212-220.
7
8 doi:10.1111/j.1600-0587.1992.tb00027.x
9
- 10
11 Jonsell U, Hock R, Duguay M (2013) Recent air and ground temperature increases at Tarfala
12
13 Research Station, Sweden. *Polar Research* 32. doi:10.3402/polar.v32i0.19807
14
- 15
16 Kauhala K, Helle P (2000) The interactions of predator and hare populations in Finland - a study
17
18 based on wildlife monitoring counts. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* 37(3): 151-160
19
- 20
21 Killengreen ST, Ims RA, Yoccoz NG, Brathen KA, Henden J-A, Schott T (2007) Structural
22
23 characteristics of a low Arctic tundra ecosystem and the retreat of the Arctic fox. *Biological*
24
25 *Conservation* 135:459-472. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2006.10.039
26
- 27
28 Killengreen ST, Lecomte N, Ehrich D, Schott T, Yoccoz NG, Ims RA (2011) The importance of
29
30 marine vs. human-induced subsidies in the maintenance of an expanding mesocarnivore in
31
32 the arctic tundra. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 80:1049-1060. doi:10.1111/j.1365-
33
34 2656.2011.01840.x
35
- 36
37 Kjellander P, Nordström J (2003) Cyclic voles, prey switching in red fox, and roe deer dynamics - a
38
39 test of the alternative prey hypothesis. *Oikos* 101:338-344. doi:10.1034/j.1600-
40
41 0706.2003.11986.x
42
- 43
44 Krebs CJ, Boutin S, Boonstra R, Sinclair A, Smith J, Dale M, Martin K, Turkington R (1995)
45
46 Impact of food and predation on the snowshoe hare cycle. *Science* 269:1112-1115.
47
48 doi:10.1126/science.269.5227.1112
49
- 50
51 Kurki S, Nikula A, Helle P, Lindén H (1998) Abundances of red fox and pine marten in relation to
52
53 the composition of boreal forest landscapes. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 67:874-886.
54
55 doi:10.1046/j.1365-2656.1998.6760874.x
56
- 57
58 Lariviere S, Pasitschniak-Arts M (1996) *Vulpes vulpes*. *Mammalian Species* 537:1-11
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Lav Sund S, Nygren T, Solberg EJ (2003). Status of moose populations and challenges to moose
5
6 management in Fennoscandia *Alces* 39: 109-130
7
8
9 Lindström E (1983) Condition and growth of red foxes (*vulpes-vulpes*) in relation to food-supply.
10
11 *Journal of Zoology* 199:117-122
12
13 Lindström E, Mörner T (1985) The spreading of sarcoptic mange among swedish red foxes (*vulpes-*
14
15 *vulpes* l) in relation to fox population-dynamics. *Revue D Ecologie-La Terre Et La Vie*
16
17 40:211-216
18
19
20 Lindström E, Angelstam P, Widen P, Andren H (1987). Do predators synchronize vole and grouse
21
22 fluctuations?: An experiment. *Oikos* 48(2): 121-124.
23
24 Lindström E (1989) Food limitation and social regulation in a red fox population. *Holarctic Ecology*
25
26 12:70-79
27
28
29 Lindström E, Andrén H, Angelstam P, Cederlund G, Hörnfeldt B, Jäderberg L, Lemnell PA,
30
31 Martinsson B, Sköld K, Swenson JE (1994) Disease reveals the predator: sarcoptic mange,
32
33 red fox predation, and prey populations. *Ecology* 75:1042-1049. doi:10.2307/1939428
34
35
36 Lönnberg E (1926) Fjällrävstammen i Sverige 1926. Kungl. Svenska Vetenskapsakademiens
37
38 skrifter i naturskyddsärenden, 0374-8820 ; 7. Almqvist & Wiksell
39
40 Marcström V, Kenward RE, Engren E (1988) The impact of predation on boreal tetraonids during
41
42 vole cycles: An experimental study. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 57:859-872.
43
44 doi:10.2307/5097
45
46
47 Michal B, Rafal Z (2014) Responses of small mammals to clear-cutting in temperate and boreal
48
49 forests of Europe: a meta-analysis and review. *European Journal of Forest Research* 133:1-
50
51 11. doi:10.1007/s10342-013-0726-x
52
53
54 Moen J, Danell O (2003) Reindeer in the Swedish mountains: An assessment of grazing impacts.
55
56 *Ambio* 32:397-402. doi:10.1639/0044-7447(2003)032[0397:ritsma]2.0.co;2
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Mörner T (1992) Sarcoptic mange in Swedish wildlife. *Revue scientifique et technique*
5
6 (International Office of Epizootics) 11:1115-1121
7
8
9 Nakagawa S, Schielzeth H (2013) A general and simple method for obtaining R² from generalized
10 linear mixed-effects models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 4:133-142.
11
12 doi:10.1111/j.2041-210x.2012.00261.x
13
14
15 Needham R, Odden M, Lundstadsveen SK, Wegge P (2014) Seasonal diets of red foxes in a boreal
16 forest with a dense population of moose: the importance of winter scavenging. *Acta*
17
18 *Theriologica* 59:391-398. doi:10.1007/s13364-014-0188-7
19
20
21
22 Osenberg CW, Mittelbach GG (1996) The relative importance of resource limitation and predator
23 limitation in food chains. In: A. Polis and K. O. Winemiller (ed) *Food webs: integration of*
24
25 *patterns and dynamics*. Chapman and Hall, pp 134-148
26
27
28
29 Persson L, Bengtsson J, Menge BA, Power ME (1996) Productivity and consumer regulation –
30 concepts, patterns, and mechanisms. In: Polis A and Winemiller KO (ed) *Food webs:*
31
32 *integration of patterns and dynamics*. Chapman and Hall, pp 396-434
33
34
35
36 Post DM, Connors ME, Goldberg DS (2000) Prey preference by a top predator and the stability of
37 linked food chains. *Ecology* 81:8-14. doi:10.1890/0012-
38
39 9658(2000)081[0008:ppbatp]2.0.co;2
40
41
42 Post E et al. (2009) Ecological Dynamics Across the Arctic Associated with Recent Climate
43 Change. *Science* 325:1355-1358. doi:10.1126/science.1173113
44
45
46
47 Prugh LR, Stoner CJ, Epps CW, Bean WT, Ripple WJ, Laliberte AS, Brashares JS (2009) The Rise
48 of the Mesopredator. *Bioscience* 59:779-791. doi:10.1525/bio.2009.59.9.9
49
50
51 R Development Core Team (2012) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*,
52
53 2.15.1 edn. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria
54
55
56 Ritchie EG, Johnson CN (2009) Predator interactions, mesopredator release and biodiversity
57 conservation. *Ecology Letters* 12:982-998. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01347.x
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Rosalino LM, Sousa M, Pedroso NM, Basto M, Rosario J, Santos MJ, Loureiro F (2010) The
5
6 influence of food resources on red fox local distribution in a mountain area of the western
7
8 mediterranean. *Vie Et Milieu-Life and Environment* 60:39-45
9
- 10
11 Saether BE, Andersen R, Hjeljord O, Heim M (1996). Ecological correlates of regional variation in
12
13 life history of the moose *Alces alces*. *Ecology* 77(5): 1493-1500. doi: 10.2307/2265546
14
- 15
16 Selås V, Vik JO (2006) Possible impact of snow depth and ungulate carcasses on red fox (*Vulpes*
17
18 *vulpes*) populations in Norway, 1897-1976. *Journal of Zoology* 269:299-308.
19
20 doi:10.1111/j.1469-7998.2006.00048.x
21
- 22
23 Selås V, Vik JO (2007) The arctic fox *Alopex lagopus* in Fennoscandia: a victim of human-induced
24
25 changes in interspecific competition and predation? *Biodiversity and Conservation*
26
27 16:3575-3583. doi:10.1007/s10531-006-9118-6
28
- 29
30 Smedshaug CA, Selås V, Lund SE, Sonerud GA (1999) The effect of a natural reduction of red fox
31
32 *Vulpes vulpes* on small game hunting bags in Norway. *Wildlife Biology* 5:157-166
33
- 34
35 Statistics Sweden (SCB) (2015). [http://www.scb.se/en_/Finding-statistics/Statistics-by-subject-](http://www.scb.se/en_/Finding-statistics/Statistics-by-subject-area/Population/Population-composition/Population-statistics/)
36
37 [area/Population/Population-composition/Population-statistics/](http://www.scb.se/en_/Finding-statistics/Statistics-by-subject-area/Population/Population-composition/Population-statistics/). Accessed 7 of December
38
39 2015
40
- 41
42 Tveraa T, Fauchald P, Henaug C, Yoccoz NG (2003) An examination of a compensatory
43
44 relationship between food limitation and predation in semi-domestic reindeer. *Oecologia*
45
46 137(3): 370-376. doi: 10.1007/s00442-003-1373-6
47
- 48
49 Walther GR, Post E, Convey P, Menzel A, Parmesan C, Beebee TJC, Fromentin JM, Hoegh-
50
51 Guldberg O, Bairlein F (2002) Ecological responses to recent climate change. *Nature*
52
53 416:389-395. doi:10.1038/416389a
54
- 55
56 Zimen E (1980) *The red fox (Biogeographica; v.18)*. Springer, Netherlands. doi: 10.1007/978-94-
57
58 017-5592-4
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

TABLES

Table 1 Top ranked models explaining the distribution (presence/absence of signs per sampling block) of red foxes in northern Sweden in 1974 to 1985. The table shows model candidates, number of parameters in the model (K), difference in the Akaike's Information Criterion (ΔAIC), model weights (AICWt), and negative likelihood (LL). Sampling block ID was included as a random effect in all the models.

Table 2 Best model coefficients explaining the distribution of red foxes in northern Sweden in 1974 to 1985 and 95% confident intervals.

Table 3 Generalized linear mixed model coefficients for the analysis of linear temporal trends in red fox distribution and abundance and 95% confident intervals.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1

	Distribution Model	K	ΔAIC	AICWt	LL
mod.1	Rodents+ (Hares+Tetraonids+Ungulates)*Snow Depth+(Hares+Tetraonids+Ungulates)*Altitude	14	0.00	0.62	-3788.97
mod.2	Rodents+Ungulates+(Hares+Tetraonids)*Snow Depth+(Hare+Tetraonids)*Altitude	12	2.04	0.22	-3792.00

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 2

Model coefficients		
	Estimates	95% CI
Intercept	0.081	(-0.062, 0.225)
Rodents	0.707	(0.511, 0.904)
Hares	1.116	(0.968, 1.264)
Tetraonids	1.208	(1.064, 1.352)
Ungulates	0.375	(0.246, 0.504)
SnowDepth	0.244	(0.007, 0.482)
Altitude	-0.071	(-0.293, 0.150)
Hares:SnowDepth	-0.467	(-0.73, -0.206)
Tetraonids:SnowDepth	-0.218	(-0.481, 0.046)
Ungulates:SnowDepth	0.265	(0.022, 0.508)
Hares:Altitude	0.398	(0.118, 0.679)
Tetraonids:Altitude	-0.147	(-0.387, 0.092)
Ungulates:Altitude	0.137	(-0.095, 0.370)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 3

	Presence of red fox signs		Number of red fox signs	
	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
(Intercept)	-5.493	(-106.424,100.989)	16.358	(-35.884,68.469)
Year	0.003	(-0.050,0.054)	-0.008	(-0.03,0.018)
Low altitude	-44.986	(-166.495,74.353)	3.305	(-49.217,60.721)
Medium altitude	-1.934	(-135.626 ,124.012)	-5.349	(-62.890,53.146)
Year:Low altitude	0.023	(-0.036,0.084)	-0.001	(-0.030,0.025)
Year:Medium altitude	0.001	(-0.062,0.069)	0.003	(-0.02,0.032)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


FIGURES

Fig. 1 The location and extent of the study area in northern Sweden where mammals and birds were monitored from 1974 to 1985.

Fig. 2 Annual variation in % of sampling blocks with red fox signs \pm 95% CI (solid line) and average number of signs of red fox per sampling block \pm 95% CI (dash line) in northern Sweden during the study period.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Fig. 1



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Fig. 2

