

Provision of supplementary food for wild birds may increase the risk of local nest predation

Article

Accepted Version

Hanmer, H. J., Thomas, R. L. and Fellowes, M. D. E. (2017) Provision of supplementary food for wild birds may increase the risk of local nest predation. *Ibis*, 159 (1). pp. 158-167. ISSN 0019-1019 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12432> Available at <http://centaur.reading.ac.uk/68066/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ibi.12432>

Publisher: Wiley

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

1 **Running head:** *Supplementary feeding increases risk of nest predation*

2
3 **Provision of supplementary food for wild birds may increase the risk of**
4 **local nest predation**

5
6 HUGH J. HANMER¹, REBECCA L. THOMAS^{1,2} & MARK D. E.
7 FELLOWES^{1*}

8
9 ¹*People and Wildlife Research Group, School of Biological Sciences, Harborne Building,*
10 *University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading, Berkshire, RG6 6AS, UK*

11 ²*School of Biological Sciences, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, Surrey,*
12 *TW20 0EX, UK*

13
14 * Corresponding author.

15 Email: m.fellowes@reading.ac.uk

16
17 In countries such as the UK, USA and Australia, approximately half of households provide
18 supplementary food for wild birds, making this the public's most common form of active engagement
19 with nature. Year round supplementary feeding is currently encouraged by major conservation
20 charities in the UK as it is thought to be of benefit to bird conservation. However, little is understood
21 of how the provision of supplementary food affects the behaviour and ecology of target and non-target
22 species. Given the scale of supplementary feeding, any negative effects may have important
23 implications for conservation. Potential nest predators are abundant in urban areas and some species
24 frequently visit supplementary feeding stations. We asked if providing supplementary food affected
25 the likelihood of nest predation in the vicinity of the feeder, by acting as a point attractant for potential
26 nest predators. We provided feeding stations (empty, peanut feeder, peanut feeder with guard to
27 exclude potential nest predators) in an area of suburban parkland in the UK and monitored the
28 predation rate experienced by eggs placed in artificial nests located at distances which replicate the
29 size of typical suburban gardens. Nest predators (Magpies *Pica pica*, Grey Squirrels *Sciurus*
30 *carolinensis*) were frequent visitors to filled feeders, and predation caused by Magpies, European Jays
31 *Garrulus glandarius* and Grey Squirrels was significantly higher when nests were adjacent to filled
32 feeders. The presence of a feeder guard did not significantly reduce nest predation. As supplementary
33 feeding is becoming increasingly common during the breeding season in suburban habitats, we
34 suggest that providing point attractants to nest predators at this time may have previously
35 unconsidered consequences for the breeding success of urban birds.

36
37 **Keywords:** artificial nest, predation, bird feeding, garden, corvid, Grey Squirrel, Eurasian Magpie,
38 Eurasian Jay, urban ecology

40 **Introduction**

41 Garden bird feeding engages more people with wildlife than any other activity. Some 48% of
42 households in Britain (Davies *et al.* 2009) and 53 million households in the USA feed wild birds (U.S.
43 Fish and Wildlife Service 2011), providing an enormous and highly localised additional food
44 resource. For example, in suburban Reading, UK, over 55% of householders provide supplementary
45 food for wild birds, two-thirds of whom feed year round (Orros & Fellowes 2015a). The majority of
46 individuals provide peanuts, a range of seed types (e.g. sunflower, nyger, wheat) and fat to birds
47 visiting their gardens. A conservative estimate suggests that enough food is annually provided in the
48 UK to support over 30 million garden birds (Orros & Fellowes 2015a). This is reflected by the size of
49 the bird feeding industry, which ten years ago was estimated to be worth £200 million *per annum*
50 (British Trust for Ornithology 2006). This figure is likely to be considerably higher today.

51 Supplementary feeding in urban areas affects the abundance and distribution of species as diverse as
52 the Red Kite *Milvus milvus* (Orros & Fellowes 2014, 2015b), hummingbirds (Hill *et al.* 1998, Courter
53 *et al.* 2013) and the Blackcap *Sylvia atricapilla* (Chamberlain *et al.* 2005, Rolshausen *et al.* 2009,
54 Plummer *et al.* 2015). While feeding has been shown to increase adult overwinter survival (Jansson *et*
55 *al.* 1981, Brittingham & Temple 1988), effects on bird productivity are variable, and overwinter
56 supplementary feeding has been found to both increase (Robb *et al.* 2008) and decrease (Plummer *et*
57 *al.* 2013a, b) breeding success in subsequent seasons. Similarly, supplementary feeding experiments
58 during the breeding period have found mixed results, with evidence for both decreases (Harrison *et al.*
59 2010) and increases (Peach *et al.* 2013, Smith & Smith 2013) in productivity. Furthermore, feeding
60 stations may facilitate the transmission of disease (Bradley & Altizer 2007), which can lead to rapid
61 population declines (e.g. trichomonosis in greenfinch; Robinson *et al.* 2010).

62 Urban birds tend to lay eggs earlier, have smaller clutch sizes, lower nestling weight and lower
63 productivity per nesting attempt (Chamberlain *et al.* 2009). Open-cup nesters decline with increasing
64 urbanisation but remain part of the avifauna (Máthé & Batáry 2015) and UK gardens hold significant
65 populations of several such species (Bland *et al.* 2004). While food availability and habitat suitability
66 are important limiting factors for urban bird populations (Shochat 2004, Máthé & Batáry 2015), nest

67 predation is a key cause of nest failure for open-cup nesters (Ricklefs 1969, Martin & Li 1992),
68 possibly also limiting their populations (Jokimaki & Huhta 2000). Predator densities in urban areas
69 may be higher than in rural areas for some nest predators, such as corvids (Jokimaki & Huhta 2000,
70 Antonov & Atanasova 2003, Jokimäki et al., 2005, Sorace & Gustin 2009), although it is unclear if
71 this apparent increase in potential predator density depresses prey populations (Shochat 2004, Madden
72 et al. 2015). Eurasian Magpies *Pica pica* and introduced Grey Squirrels *Sciurus carolinensis* are
73 common in UK urban areas and are frequent nest predators (Eaton et al. 2013, Bonnington et al.
74 2014a). Increased nest predation in an urban area is associated with increased corvid density, although
75 no association was found with grey squirrel population size (Bonnington et al. 2015).

76 Nest predators, such as Eurasian Magpies and Grey Squirrels, can be attracted by garden feeding
77 stations (Chamberlain et al. 2005, Väisänen 2008, Bonnington et al. 2014b). As a result, those
78 providing supplementary food can also purchase caged feeders, which aim to exclude larger species,
79 including squirrels and corvids. At a domestic garden scale the provision of bird feeders reduces the
80 local abundance of insects (Orros & Fellowes 2012, Orros et al. 2015), and the provision of
81 supplementary food for ungulates (Cooper & Ginnett 2000, Selva et al. 2014) and woodland predators
82 (Borgmann et al. 2013) increased local nest predation. In each case the supplementary food appears to
83 attract predators to a point source, which in turn foraged locally on other prey. The most parsimonious
84 explanation is that the presence of a reliable or high quality food resource both increases the numbers
85 of potential nest predators and the time they spend foraging near the food source.

86 It is not known if supplementary feeding of the type practised by tens of millions of garden owners
87 increases the risk of local nest predation in urban and suburban habitats. These habitats support
88 significant populations of native bird species in the UK including a number of open-cup nesting
89 species that have undergone national declines in recent decades, such as the Blackbird (*Turdus*
90 *merula*), the Dunnock (*Prunella modularis*), and the UK red-listed Song Thrush (*Turdus philomelos*)
91 (Gregory & Baillie 1998, Bland et al. 2004). Given the near ubiquity of supplementary feeding in
92 urban areas, and the recommendation from bird conservation NGOs (e.g. RSPB 2009) to feed birds
93 throughout the year, it is possible that individuals providing supplementary food in their gardens are

94 inadvertently increasing nest predation rates suffered by their garden birds. To investigate this further
95 it is first necessary to establish if nest predation is elevated near bird feeding stations. By using both
96 guarded (food inaccessible to nest predators) and unguarded feeders (food accessible), we can test if it
97 is the presence of food (both accessible and inaccessible) or the availability (food accessible in
98 unguarded feeders) of food which affects predation rates.

99 Studying nest predation using real nests would result in considerable practical and ethical challenges.
100 As a result, artificial nests provide an important tool for studying bird nest predation (Major & Kendal
101 1996, Miller & Hobbs 2000). Typically nests are baited with quail and/or model eggs and monitored
102 over a set period. Artificial nests are undefended by adults and lack the activity of real nests;
103 nevertheless, they provide experimental nest predation data at scales which would be difficult to
104 achieve in natural studies, while avoiding the ethical issues of experimenting with natural nests
105 (Major & Kendal 1996, Moore & Robinson 2004). Using camera monitored artificial nests we
106 investigated nest survival around caged, uncaged and empty bird feeders. Our objectives were to
107 determine if a) potential nest predators were attracted to bird feeding stations providing
108 supplementary food, b) if so, if this was associated with differences in rates of nest predation, c) if
109 increased nest predation was associated with access to food (unguarded feeders) or the presence of
110 food (guarded and unguarded feeders) and d) if nest predation rates were affected by distance from
111 the supplementary food source.

112 **Materials and methods**

113 *Study area*

114 The study was conducted at the University of Reading's Whiteknights Campus (UK; 51°27'N,
115 0°58'W), in an area of open parkland and woodland comprising approximately 68% natural surfaces
116 overall, embedded in a typical UK suburban landscape broadly conforming to Marzluff *et al.* (2001).
117 The town of Reading covers approximately 40 km² with a population of 230 000 people (Office for
118 National Statistics 2013).

119 *Experimental design*

120 Experimental work was carried out between the 5th of May and the 17th of June 2014, which is during
121 the peak bird breeding season for the UK (Robinson 2005). Fifty-four locations were selected on the
122 edge of grassy clearings and open spaces with adjacent areas of shrubs and bushes, 50-100m apart,
123 replicating typical suburban feeder distribution (Fuller *et al.* 2008). The experiment consisted of six
124 two-week sample cycles. During each cycle, nine peanut feeders (CJ Wildlife small defender feeder,
125 Shrewsbury, UK) were positioned (three each of empty, filled and unguarded, filled and fitted with a
126 cage guard). Feeders were randomly placed in each of the study locations, one week before the nests,
127 to allow habituation. Sites were not reused and all were at least 20 m away from the closest building.
128 Experimental cycles were staggered at one week intervals to reduce the sampling time required for the
129 whole experiment.

130 Two artificial nests were placed diametrically opposed ca. 5m ('near') and 10m ('far') from each
131 feeder (± 1 m), replicating typical distances between feeders and suburban garden boundaries (Gaston
132 *et al.* 2007). In total 108 nests were placed (one 'near', one 'far', at each of the 54 feeder locations).
133 Nests were constructed of 15x15cm squares of small-gauge wire mesh lined with dried grass and
134 attached to branches to imitate a Blackbird nest (Kurucz *et al.* 2010, Kurucz *et al.* 2012). Nest height
135 was at 1.5 ± 0.5 m and were placed to mimic natural blackbird nest-sites and attempted to provide
136 similar visual accessibility to potential predators following Swanson *et al.* (2012). Two fresh Quail
137 *Coturnix japonica* eggs were placed in each nest (Buler & Hamilton 2000). Blackbirds are a common
138 breeding species in UK gardens along with the less common but similarly sized Song Thrush (Bland
139 *et al.* 2004), making them an appropriate species to simulate. Nests were monitored for seven days
140 (168 hours) as 90% of predation events occur within 6 days of placement (Burke *et al.* 2004).

141 Each nest was continually monitored by a concealed motion-triggered camera trap (Ltl Acorn 5310;
142 Ltl Acorn Inc, USA), set to the highest sensitivity setting, taking three photographs with a three
143 second interval when triggered.

144 Feeders were checked every 3.5 days and refilled where necessary. Feeder usage was sampled using
145 camera traps, but each was monitored for 3.5 days either at the beginning or end of the week to ensure

146 coverage with limited traps. At any one time one of each feeder type was monitored and two thirds of
147 all feeders were sampled for usage.

148 Nest fate was recorded and for predated nests, predation time and predator identity determined. Any
149 damage to or removal of eggs was considered a predation event. Visitation rates per species were
150 recorded at the feeders; as visitors could not be individually identified, a visitor was considered an
151 individual when either separated by a photograph without the animal or when four or more minutes
152 had elapsed without a feeding event.

153 *Data Analysis*

154 All analyses were carried out within the program R (R Core Team 2016), with nest survival tested
155 using Cox's proportional hazard model in base R survival package (version 2.39-4, Therneau 2015).
156 This approach was used over a logistic exposure or regression approach (Shaffer 2004) because exact
157 survival time and fate was known for each nest and exposure period did not vary. Covariates were
158 feeder type (empty, guarded, unguarded), distance from feeder (near, far) and study week block (as a
159 random effect) with time until predation (hours) and predation status as response variables. No
160 interaction terms were used. We evaluated the relative fit of each candidate model using Akaike's
161 Information Criterion with a small-sample bias adjustment, comparing models using Akaike weights
162 and delta AICc (Burnham & Anderson 2002).

163 Mean daily feeder visitation (as a proxy for usage) was first compared using Kruskal-Wallis tests
164 between treatment, by individual species, all potential 'predator' species, all small birds and all
165 animals. Binomial logistic mixed model regression was then used to test for specific relationships
166 between animal feeder usage and predation overall. Two separate global models were constructed
167 both with study week block as a random effect factor and whether a nest was predated as the binomial
168 response variable in the R lme4 package (version 1.1-12, Bates et al 2015). First, a model that
169 considered overall predator visits and small bird visits to feeders as variables effecting nest predation.
170 Second, a model considering feeder visits by Squirrels, Magpies and small birds as variables effecting
171 nest predation. Because Magpie and squirrel visits are subsets of overall predator visits it is not

172 possible to utilise species and overall visits in the same model. Jays were not included in the
173 individual models due to their infrequent visits. Relative model fit was then separately evaluated using
174 delta AICc and Akaike weights for both global models as above against a null model containing only
175 the intercept and study week as a random factor. There was insufficient data to effectively compare
176 effectors on predation for individual predator species or at specific feeder types.

177 **Results**

178 *Feeder visitation*

179 Thirty-three of the 54 feeders were monitored (10 empty, 11 guarded, 12 unguarded). Eleven species
180 were recorded making 5251 individual feeder visits (empty feeders: 17; guarded: 3522; unguarded:
181 1712 visits).

182 Grey Squirrels contributed 43.9% of visits to unguarded and 9.3% of visits to guarded feeders while
183 smaller birds were more likely to visit guarded feeders (Table 1). Magpies were a regular visitor to
184 unguarded feeders but rare at empty and guarded feeders. One exception was an individual guarded
185 feeder, which did receive frequent visits (Figure 1). Despite predating 27.5% of all recorded nests,
186 Jays only visited feeders eight times. All species visiting more than two individual feeders (excluding
187 unknowns) show a significant difference between their feeder usages (Table 1; Figure 1).

188 *Nest survival*

189 Of the 108 experimental nests, 102 were successfully monitored, with 74 recorded predation events
190 (magpie: 37; jay: 28; grey squirrel: 8; one unknown). Six nest predation events were missed due to
191 camera errors or human interference and so were omitted from the analysis (3 empty, 2 guarded and 1
192 unguarded). From the different feeder types 51.5% of empty feeder nests, 76.5% of guarded feeder
193 nests and 88.6% of unguarded feeder nests were predated during the course of the experiment. No
194 predation events were recorded between 20:10 and 05:32.

195 When AICc selection was carried out on the global hazard model, the AICc selected model with
196 distance from feeder removed had a delta AICc of less than 2 from the global model so for

197 completeness we present both the global (Wald = 23.05, d.f. = 6.42, $p < 0.001$, AICc = 600.4, model
198 weight = 0.210; Table 2) and AICc selected model (Wald = 22.93, d.f. = 5.43, $p < 0.001$, AICc =
199 598.5, model weight = 0.672; Table 2). Separate post hoc ANOVAs of both models (following
200 Therneau 2015) found feeder type and week were significant effectors of nest survival overall ($\chi^2 =$
201 11.8, d.f. = 2, $p = 0.003$ and $\chi^2 = 17.6$, d.f. = 3.4, $p < 0.001$ for feeder type and study week
202 respectively in both models). In both models nests near filled feeders were significantly more likely to
203 be predated than those near empty feeders and week was a significant covariate with identical hazard
204 ratios after rounding (Table 2; Figure 2). Nest distance from feeder did not significantly affect
205 predation rates in the global model ($p = 0.67$) and was eliminated in the AICc selected model (Table
206 2). No significant difference in survival was found between nests adjacent to guarded and unguarded
207 feeders (post-hoc Tukey test $p = 0.82$; Figure 2).

208 *Nest predation and feeder usage*

209 Overall feeder activity by predators (Grey Squirrels, Jays and Magpies) was significantly associated
210 with increased nest predation (Wald $Z = 2.518$, $p = 0.019$) in the AICc selected mixed effect model
211 (Table 3). In the model considering individual predator usage, Grey Squirrel usage was significantly
212 associated with increased overall nest predation (Wald $Z = 2.305$, $p = 0.021$) in the AICc selected
213 model (Table 3). However, support for this model is weak with little separation between all possible
214 model AICcs and similar Akaike weights in several models (Table 3). Usage by small birds was not a
215 significant factor in any model (Table 3).

216

217 **Discussion**

218 We that the provision of supplementary food during the breeding season for wild birds in a form
219 common in urban and suburban habitats may increase the likelihood of local nest predation. The
220 survivorship of nests adjacent to unguarded feeders was less than 20% of that seen when artificial
221 nests were placed near empty feeders. There was no difference in nest survival near guarded feeders
222 when compared with those placed adjacent to unguarded feeders. Increased predation was associated

223 with Magpies, Jays and Grey Squirrels. Magpies and Grey Squirrels were significantly more likely to
224 visit unguarded feeders, while Jays were largely absent. Overall, nest predation was associated with
225 increased predator visits, particularly by Grey Squirrels, to feeders. There was no effect on nest
226 predation rates of distance to feeder at the scales we considered. Species assemblages differed
227 between treatments; empty feeders received few visits or no visits, guarded feeders were mostly
228 visited by small passerines and unguarded feeders attracted a higher proportion of corvids and
229 Squirrels. Despite being unable to feed at guarded feeders, predators still made up 9.4% of total visits
230 to them. No mammalian nest predators other than Grey Squirrels were recorded despite being present
231 at the study site and in UK urban areas generally (e.g. Brown Rat *Rattus norvegicus*, mice *Apodemus*
232 spp., Red Fox *Vulpes vulpes*, Domestic Cats *Felis catus*: Baker & Harris 2007, Thomas *et al.* 2012).
233 Two nests recorded mouse visits but no predation attempts were observed.

234 Nests adjacent to filled feeders suffered greatly increased predation rates, with the majority of nest
235 predation events caused by corvids (Magpies and Jays) and Grey Squirrels. Nest predation by corvids
236 is a frequent occurrence in urban habitats (Jokimaki & Huhta 2000, Thorington & Bowman 2003,
237 Jokimäki *et al.*, 2005, Bonnington *et al.* 2015), where densities are high due to their omnivorous diet
238 and adaptability, as well as reduced numbers of larger predators and/or competitors (Soh *et al.* 2002,
239 Marzluff *et al.* 2007).

240 Despite our record of animal usage and clear evidence for an effect of the presence of supplementary
241 food, the exact nature of the link between feeder usage and local nest predation remains unclear.
242 There is a significant positive relationship overall between feeder usage by predators, in particular
243 Grey Squirrels, and increased nest predation. Predation by Grey Squirrels themselves was lower than
244 the two corvid species, suggesting there was not a direct link between Squirrel feeder usage and nest
245 predation by Squirrels. We lack sufficient samples and model support to investigate this further, but
246 we speculate that their presence at bird feeders may influence predation rates by Jays and Magpies.
247 We propose two non-mutually exclusive mechanisms that may lead to this.

248 First, Jays and Magpies may be responding to the increased density of other omnivores which have
249 been attracted by the presence of supplementary food. They in turn may be more likely to enter the

250 feeder area, associating it with increased feeding potential, even if they themselves are not primary
251 users of the bird feeders. In particular the frequency of Jay predation was unexpected due to their
252 infrequent attendance at feeders, while Magpies did utilise feeders, but in low numbers. Second, the
253 presence of Squirrels on feeders may exclude other omnivorous predators as well as small birds,
254 resulting in increased foraging in the vicinity of the feeders, hence increasing local nest predation.
255 Taken together, these results suggest that feeder usage by nest predators is associated with increased
256 predation on our experimental nests, but this effect is not simply a result of nest predators being
257 attracted to a point source, but instead perhaps also by being attracted by other feeder users to the
258 vicinity of the food source.

259 We tested to see if nest predation changed with distance from the feeder, but there was no effect. The
260 distances chosen for the study (5 and 10 metres) were relatively small and are consistent with the
261 layout of a typical UK suburban garden (Smith *et al.* 2006, Loram *et al.* 2007). However, we suggest
262 that there could still be a distance effect. While not explicitly recorded, we observed no evidence of
263 increased predation suffered by nests placed close to an empty feeder when the closest replicate was a
264 filled feeder. Therefore we suggest that while the increased risk of nest predation is present when
265 nests are within 10 metres of a feeder, this effect may be lost at a distance up to 40 metres away (the
266 minimum distance between a feeder and the next closest nest associated with another feeder under our
267 experimental design). Further testing over a larger range of distances with independent nests would be
268 required to effectively test this theory.

269 The use of artificial nests does present some interpretive challenges (Buler & Hamilton 2000, Burke
270 *et al.* 2004, Moore & Robinson 2004). They lack the odours, activity and defending adults of natural
271 nests (Swanson *et al.* 2012). Concerns have also been raised over the use of Quail eggs in artificial
272 nests, with suggestions that they may be too large for some small predators (Burke *et al.* 2004). This
273 also means that artificial nests may not be representative of smaller common UK open cup nesting
274 birds, such as Robins *Erithacus rubecula* and Dunnocks, in terms of egg and nest size as well as
275 concealment. Some studies have substituted model eggs made from modelling clay, both to give a
276 smaller prey item and so that when nests are not monitored by cameras it allows predator

277 identification through marks left on the eggs (Major & Kendal 1996, Burke *et al.* 2004). These studies
278 have found that rodents (not including Squirrels) cause a significant proportion of artificial nest
279 predation events. As only two nests were visited by mice and none by rats (and no feeder visits by rats
280 were recorded) either the system in this experiment is different or previous results have been skewed
281 by the attraction of these rodents to the smell and/or taste of the model eggs (Rangen *et al.* 2000).
282 While for practical and ethical reasons the use of artificial nests remains the standard approach for
283 understanding the causes and consequences of nest predation, such caveats suggest that interpreting
284 the results of artificial nest studies should be taken as indicative rather than definitive, particularly
285 when applied to bird species of different sizes or with different nesting habits such as ground or cavity
286 nesting birds.

287 The urban landscape presents a challenging environment for wild birds to live and breed (Chace &
288 Walsh 2006, Chamberlain *et al.* 2009). Together with potentially limited natural food (McKinney
289 2008) and high numbers of generalist predators (Sorace & Gustin 2009), urban areas also hold the
290 majority of the UK's estimated 10.3 million Cats (Murray *et al.* 2010) which predate millions of birds
291 annually (Thomas *et al.* 2012, Thomas *et al.* 2014). Nevertheless, significant populations of birds are
292 supported within urban environments (Bland *et al.* 2004) and species richness can be greater than in
293 adjacent rural areas (Chace & Walsh 2006), in part because of the combined efforts of millions of
294 people providing supplementary food (Fuller *et al.* 2008).

295 However, while some species are effectively human commensals, others including open-cup nesters
296 such as thrushes, are increasingly under challenge in urban habitats (Máthé & Batáry 2015) and do not
297 necessarily use the supplementary food people supply. In consequence, supplementary feeding may
298 strongly benefit one avian guild to the detriment of others through increased local nest predation. Any
299 effect we have on their demographic processes through supplementary feeding may have important
300 conservation consequences and warrants further investigation. However, while we have shown that
301 nests close to filled feeders suffer considerably higher predation rates, it is not clear if such predation
302 would affect the population dynamics of urban birds. As with other anthropogenic pressures (e.g. the
303 presence of Cats), testing this would not be straight-forward, in particular given the ubiquity of

304 supplementary feeding in urban ecosystems. Nevertheless, while difficult, this work suggests that the
305 question is worthy of further exploration.

306 Furthermore, we find that feeder type affects the assemblage of species feeding upon it. When feeders
307 are unguarded, corvids and Grey Squirrels exclude small passerines (this study; Bonnington *et al.*
308 2014a, Orros & Fellowes 2015a). We suggest that this not only reduces the volume of food available
309 to target species through competition, it may also support increased population sizes of predatory
310 species through a demographic response (Davies *et al.* 2009). We suggest that people who choose to
311 provide supplementary food for birds consider using guarded feeders to minimise opportunities to
312 support predatory species, and consider in the context of the ecology of their own gardens if feeding
313 during the breeding season is appropriate.

314 Providing supplementary food during the breeding season is widespread (Orros & Fellowes 2015a)
315 and can increase local bird population size (Peach *et al.* 2013, Smith & Smith 2013). Urban areas may
316 be important for the conservation of some bird species and species richness in suburban areas can be
317 greater than that found in adjacent urban and rural areas largely as a result of the decisions made by
318 millions of homeowners (Marzluff 2001, Chace & Walsh 2006, Väisänen 2008, Jokimäki &
319 Kaisanlahti-Jokimäki 2012). Our results suggest a possible negative indirect effect of supplementary
320 garden bird feeding on local nesting success by attracting nest predators to point sources of food. It
321 would be unfortunate if our most common act of engagement with wildlife was counter-productive
322 during the breeding season.

323 **Acknowledgements**

324 This work was supported by a studentship funded by the Keith Duckworth Trust and Songbird
325 Survival. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or
326 preparation of the paper. We thank anonymous reviewers whose comments greatly improved the
327 manuscript.

328

329

330 **References**

- 331 Antonov, A. & Atanasova, D. 2003. Small-scale differences in the breeding ecology of urban and
332 rural Magpies *Pica pica*. *Ornis Fennica*, **80**: 21-30.
333
- 334 Baker, P. J. & Harris, S. 2007. Urban mammals: what does the future hold? An analysis of the factors
335 affecting patterns of use of residential gardens in Great Britain. *Mammal Review*, **37**: 297-
336 315.
337
- 338 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using
339 lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **67**: 1-48.
340
- 341 Bland, R. L., Tully, J. & Greenwood, J. J. D. 2004. Birds breeding in British gardens: an
342 underestimated population? *Bird Study*, **51**: 97-106.
343
- 344 Bonnington, C., Gaston, K. J. & Evans, K. L. 2014a. Squirrels in suburbia: influence of urbanisation
345 on the occurrence and distribution of a common exotic mammal. *Urban Ecosystems*, **17**: 533-
346 546.
347
- 348 Bonnington, C., Gaston, K. J. & Evans, K. L. 2014b. Assessing the potential for Grey Squirrels
349 *Sciurus carolinensis* to compete with birds at supplementary feeding stations. *Ibis*, **156**: 220-
350 226.
351
- 352 Bonnington, C., Gaston, K. J. & Evans, K. L. 2015. Ecological traps and behavioural adjustments of
353 urban songbirds to fine-scale spatial variation in predator activity. *Animal Conservation*, **16**:
354 529-538.
355
- 356 Borgmann, K. L., Conway, C. J. & Morrison, M. L. 2013. Breeding phenology of birds: mechanisms
357 underlying seasonal declines in the risk of nest predation. *Plos One*, **8**: 10.
358
- 359 Bradley, C.A. & Altizer, S. 2007. Urbanization and the ecology of wildlife diseases. *Trends in*
360 *Ecology and Evolution*, **22**: 95–102.
361
- 362 British Trust for Ornithology. 2006. We spend £200 million a year on wild bird food. In *British Trust*
363 *for Ornithology Press Release No. 2006/12/76*. Thetford: British Trust for Ornithology.
364

365 Brittingham, M. C. & Temple, S. A. 1988. Impacts of supplemental feeding on survival rates of
366 Black-Capped Chickadees. *Ecology*, **69**: 581-589.

367

368 Buler, J. J. & Hamilton, R. B. 2000. Predation of natural and artificial nests in a southern pine forest.
369 *Auk*, **117**: 739-747.

370

371 Burke, D. M., Eliliott, K., Moore, L., Dunford, W., Nol, E., Phillips, J., Holmes, S. & Freemark, K.
372 2004. Patterns of nest predation on artificial and natural nests in forests. *Conservation*
373 *Biology*, **18**: 381-388.

374

375 Burnham, K. P. & Anderson, D. R. (2002) *Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical*
376 *information-theoretic approach*, New York: Springer-Verlag.

377

378 Chace, J. F. & Walsh, J. J. 2006. Urban effects on native avifauna: a review. *Landscape and Urban*
379 *Planning*, **74**: 46-69.

380

381 Chamberlain, D. E., Vickery, J. A., Glue, D. E., Robinson, R. A., Conway, G. J., Woodburn, R. J. W.
382 & Cannon, A. R. 2005. Annual and seasonal trends in the use of garden feeders by birds in
383 winter. *Ibis*, **147**: 563-575.

384

385 Chamberlain, D. E., Cannon, A. R., Toms, M. P., Leech, D. I., Hatchwell, B. J. & Gaston, K. J. 2009.
386 Avian productivity in urban landscapes: a review and meta-analysis. *Ibis*, **151**: 1-18.

387

388 Cooper, S. M. & Ginnett, T. F. 2000. Potential effects of supplemental feeding of deer on nest
389 predation. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, **28**: 660-666.

390

391 Courter, J. R., Johnson, R. J., Bridges, W. C. & Hubbard, K. G. 2013. Assessing migration of Ruby-
392 throated Hummingbirds (*Archilochus colubris*) at broad spatial and temporal scales. *Auk*, **130**:
393 107-117.

394

395 Davies, Z. G., Fuller, R. A., Loram, A., Irvine, K. N., Sims, V. & Gaston, K. J. 2009. A national scale
396 inventory of resource provision for biodiversity within domestic gardens. *Biological*
397 *Conservation*, **142**: 761-771.

398

399 Eaton, M. A., Balmer, D. E., Bright, J., Cuthbert, R., Grice, P. V., Hall, C., Hayhow, D. B., Hearn, R.
400 D., Holt, C. A., Knipe, A., Mavor, R., Noble, D. G., Opper, S., Risely, K., Stroud, D. A. &

401 Wotton, S. 2013. The state of the UK's birds 2013. Sandy, Bedfordshire.: The RSPB, BTO,
402 WWT, NRW, JNCC, NE, NIEA and SNH.
403

404 Fuller, R. A., Warren, P. H., Armsworth, P. R., Barbosa, O. & Gaston, K. J. 2008. Garden bird
405 feeding predicts the structure of urban avian assemblages. *Diversity and Distributions*, **14**:
406 131-137.
407

408 Gaston, K. J., Fuller, R. A., Loram, A., MacDonald, C., Power, S. & Dempsey, N. 2007. Urban
409 domestic gardens (XI): variation in urban wildlife gardening in the United Kingdom.
410 *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **16**: 3227-3238.
411

412 Gregory, R. D. & Baillie, S. R. 1998. Large-scale habitat use of some declining British birds. *Journal*
413 *of Applied Ecology*, **35**: 785-799.
414

415 Harrison, T. J. E., Smith, J. A., Martin, G. R., Chamberlain, D. E., Bearhop, S., Robb, G. N. &
416 Reynolds, S. J. 2010. Does food supplementation really enhance productivity of breeding
417 birds? *Oecologia*, **164**: 311-320.
418

419 Hill, G. E., Sargent, R. R. & Sargent, M. B. 1998. Recent change in the winter distribution of Rufous
420 Hummingbirds. *Auk*, **115**: 240-245.
421

422 Jansson, C., Ekman, J. & Anders von, B. 1981. Winter mortality and food supply in tits *Parus* spp.
423 *Oikos*, **37**: 313-322.
424

425 Jokimaki, J. & Huhta, E. 2000. Artificial nest predation and abundance of birds along an urban
426 gradient. *Condor*, **102**: 838-847.
427

428 Jokimäki, J., Kaisanlahti-Jokimäki, M.-L., Sorace, A., Fernández-Juricic, E., Rodriguez-Prieto, I. &
429 Jimenez, M. D. 2005. Evaluation of the "safe nesting zone" hypothesis across an urban
430 gradient: a multi-scale study. *Ecography*, **28**: 59-70.
431

432 Kurucz, K., Kallenberger, H., Szigeti, C. & Purger, J. J. 2010. Survival probabilities of first and
433 second clutches of blackbird (*Turdus merula*) in an urban environment. *Archives of Biological*
434 *Sciences*, **62**: 489-493.
435

436 Kurucz, K., Bertalan, L. & Purger, J. J. 2012. Survival of blackbird (*Turdus merula*) clutches in an
437 urban environment: experiment with real and artificial nests. *North-Western Journal of*
438 *Zoology*, **8**: 362-364.

439

440 Loram, A., Tratalos, J., Warren, P. H. & Gaston, K. J. 2007. Urban domestic gardens (X): the extent
441 & structure of the resource in five major cities. *Landscape Ecology*, **22**: 601-615.

442

443 Madden, C. F., Arroyo, B. & Amar, A. 2015. A review of the impacts of corvids on bird productivity
444 and abundance. *Ibis*, **157**: 1-16.

445

446 Major, R. E. & Kendal, C. E. 1996. The contribution of artificial nest experiments to understanding
447 avian reproductive success: A review of methods and conclusions. *Ibis*, **138**: 298-307.

448

449 Martin, T. E. & Li, P. 1992. Life History Traits of Open- vs. Cavity-Nesting Birds. *Ecology*, **73**: 579-
450 592.

451

452 Marzluff, J. M., Bowman, R. & Donnelly, R. 2001. A historical perspective on urban bird research:
453 trends, terms, and approaches. In *Avian Ecology and Conservation in an Urbanizing World*.
454 (eds. J. M. Marzluff, R. Bowman & R. Donnelly), pp. 1-17. New York: Springer US.

455

456 Marzluff, J. M. 2001. Worldwide urbanization and its effects on birds. In *Avian Ecology and*
457 *Conservation in an Urbanizing World*. (eds. J. M. Marzluff, R. Bowman & R. Donnelly), pp.
458 19-47. New York: Springer US.

459

460 Marzluff, J. M., Withey, J. C., Whittaker, K. A., Oleyar, M. D., Unfried, T. M., Rullman, S. & DeLap,
461 J. 2007. Consequences of habitat utilization by nest predators and breeding songbirds across
462 multiple scales in an urbanizing landscape. *Condor*, **109**: 516-534.

463

464 Máthé, O. & Batáry, P. 2015. Insectivorous and open-cup nester bird species suffer the most from
465 urbanization. *Bird Study*, **62**: 78-86.

466

467 McKinney, M. L. 2008. Effects of urbanization on species richness: A review of plants and animals.
468 *Urban Ecosystems*, **11**: 161-176.

469

470 Miller, J. R. & Hobbs, N. T. 2000. Recreational trails, human activity, and nest predation in lowland
471 riparian areas. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, **50**: 227-236.

472

473 Moore, R. P. & Robinson, W. D. 2004. Artificial bird nests, external validity, and bias in ecological
474 field studies. *Ecology*, **85**: 1562-1567.
475

476 Murray, J. K., Browne, W. J., Roberts, M. A., Whitmarsh, A. & Gruffydd-Jones, T. J. 2010. Number
477 and ownership profiles of cats and dogs in the UK. *Veterinary Record*, **166**: 163-168.
478

479 Office for National Statistics. 2013. Neighbourhood statistics. 2011 census data. HM Government.
480 Crown Copyright. In *2011 census data*. HM Government. Crown Copyright.
481

482 Orros, M. E. & Fellowes, M. D. E. 2012. Supplementary feeding of wild birds indirectly affects the
483 local abundance of arthropod prey. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, **13**: 286-293.
484

485 Orros, M. E. & Fellowes, M. D. E. 2014. Supplementary feeding of the reintroduced Red Kite *Milvus*
486 *milvus* in UK gardens. *Bird Study*, **61**: 260-263.
487

488 Orros, M. E. & Fellowes, M. D. E. 2015a. Wild bird feeding in an urban area: intensity, economics
489 and numbers of individuals supported. *Acta Ornithologica*, **50**: 43-58.
490

491 Orros, M. E. & Fellowes, M. D. E. 2015b. Widespread supplementary feeding in domestic gardens
492 explains the return of reintroduced Red Kites *Milvus milvus* to an urban area. *Ibis*, **157**: 230-
493 238.
494

495 Orros, M. E., Thomas, R. L., Holloway, G. J. & Fellowes, M. D. E. 2015. Supplementary feeding of
496 wild birds indirectly affects ground beetle populations in suburban gardens. *Urban*
497 *Ecosystems*, **18**: 465-475.
498

499 Peach, W. J., Mallord, J. W., Orsman, C. J., Ockendon, N. & Haines, W. G. 2013. Testing
500 assumptions of a supplementary feeding experiment aimed at suburban House Sparrows
501 *Passer domesticus*. *Bird Study*, **60**: 308-320.
502

503 Plummer, K. E., Bearhop, S., Leech, D. I., Chamberlain, D. E. & Blount, J. D. 2013a. Fat
504 provisioning in winter impairs egg production during the following spring: a landscape-scale
505 study of blue tits. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **82**: 673-682.
506

507 Plummer, K. E., Bearhop, S., Leech, D. I., Chamberlain, D. E. & Blount, J. D. 2013b. Winter food
508 provisioning reduces future breeding performance in a wild bird. *Scientific Reports*, **3**: 6.
509

510 Plummer, K. E., Siriwardena, G. M., Conway, G. J., Risely, K. & Toms, M. P. 2015. Is supplementary
511 feeding in gardens a driver of evolutionary change in a migratory bird species? *Global*
512 *Change Biology*, **21**: 4353-4363.

513

514 R Core Team (2016) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*, Vienna, Austria.: R
515 Foundation for Statistical Computing.

516

517 Rangen, S. A., Clark, R. G. & Hobson, K. A. 2000. Visual and olfactory attributes of artificial nests.
518 *Auk*, **117**: 136-146.

519

520 Ricklefs, R. E. 1969. An analysis of nesting mortality in birds. *Smithsonian Contributions to Zoology*:
521 1-48.

522

523 Robb, G. N., McDonald, R. A., Chamberlain, D. E., Reynolds, S. J., Harrison, T. J. E. & Bearhop, S.
524 2008. Winter feeding of birds increases productivity in the subsequent breeding season.
525 *Biology Letters*, **4**: 220-223.

526

527 Robinson, R. 2005. BirdFacts: species profiles of birds occurring in Britain and Ireland. In *BTO*
528 *Research Report*. Vol. 407. Thetford: BTO.

529

530 Robinson, R.A., Lawson, B., Toms, M.P., Peck, K.M., Kirkwood, J.K., Chantrey, J., et al. 2010.
531 Emerging infectious disease leads to rapid population declines of common British birds. *PLoS*
532 *ONE*, **5**: e12215.

533

534 Rolshausen, G., Segelbacher, G., Hobson, K. A. & Schaefer, H. M. 2009. Contemporary evolution of
535 reproductive isolation and phenotypic divergence in sympatry along a migratory divide.
536 *Current Biology*, **19**: 2097-2101.

537

538 RSPB (2009) *When to feed wild birds.*, Sandy, Bedfordshire: The Royal Society for the Protection of
539 Birds.

540

541 Selva, N., Berezowska-Cnota, T. & Elguero-Claramunt, I. 2014. Unforeseen effects of supplementary
542 feeding: ungulate baiting sites as hotspots for ground-nest predation. *Plos One*, **9**: e90740.

543

544 Shaffer, T. L. 2004. A unified approach to analyzing nest success. *Auk*, **121**: 526-540.

545

546 Shochat, E. 2004. Credit or debit? Resource input changes population dynamics of city-slicker birds.
547 *Oikos*, **106**: 622-626.
548

549 Smith, R. M., Thompson, K., Hodgson, J. G., Warren, P. H. & Gaston, K. J. 2006. Urban domestic
550 gardens (IX): Composition and richness of the vascular plant flora, and implications for
551 native biodiversity. *Biological Conservation*, **129**: 312-322.
552

553 Smith, K. W. & Smith, L. 2013. The effect of supplementary feeding in early spring on the breeding
554 performance of the great spotted woodpecker *Dendrocopos major*. *Bird Study*, **60**: 169-175.
555

556 Soh, M. C. K., Sodhi, N. S., Seoh, R. K. H. & Brook, B. W. 2002. Nest site selection of the house
557 crow (*Corvus splendens*), an urban invasive bird species in Singapore and implications for its
558 management. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, **59**: 217-226.
559

560 Sorace, A. & Gustin, M. 2009. Distribution of generalist and specialist predators along urban
561 gradients. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, **90**: 111-118.
562

563 Swanson, L., Sanyaolu, R. A., Gnoske, T., Whelan, C. J., Lonsdorf, E. V. & Cordeiro, N. J. 2012.
564 Differential response of nest predators to the presence of a decoy parent in artificial nests.
565 *Bird Study*, **59**: 96-101.
566

567 Therneau, T. M. (2015) *A Package for Survival Analysis in S. R package version 2.37-7*.
568

569 Thomas, R. L., Fellowes, M. D. E. & Baker, P. J. 2012. Spatio-temporal variation in predation by
570 urban domestic cats (*Felis catus*) and the acceptability of possible management actions in the
571 UK. *Plos One*, **7**: 13.
572


573 Thomas, R. L., Baker, P. J. & Fellowes, M. D. E. 2014. Ranging characteristics of the domestic cat
574 (*Felis catus*) in an urban environment. *Urban Ecosystems*, **17**: 911-921.
575

576 Thorington, K. K. & Bowman, R. 2003. Predation rate on artificial nests increases with human
577 housing density in suburban habitats. *Ecography*, **26**: 188-196.
578

579 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2011. National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated
580 Recreation.
581

582 Väisänen, R. A. 2008: Talviruokintapaikkojen lintujen seuranta 1989–2007. *Linnut-vuosikirja*, **2007**:
583 60–79.
584
585


586



587

588 **Figure 1.** Median (+/-IQR) daily animal visits to each feeder treatment by species/grouping. Only species that
589 visited at least two individual bird feeders are included. Small bird species are great tit (*Parus major*), blue tit
590 (*Cyanistes caeruleus*), nuthatch (*Sitta europaea*) and robin (*Erithacus rubecula*).

591



592

593 **Figure 2.** Predicted Cox’s proportional hazard survival distribution by feeder nest type over the course of a
 594 mean experimental week (bold lines) with individual 95% confidence intervals (grey). Final predicted survival
 595 rates were 0.49, 0.12 and 0.08 for empty, guarded and unguarded feeder nests respectively.

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603 **Table 1.** Median daily species visits and Kruskal-Wallis tests by feeder type (all d.f. = 2). Only common species
 604 that visited at least two individual bird feeders are included.

Species	Empty median	Guarded median	Unguarded median	Kruskal-Wallis chi-squared	P	Number of feeders where species was recorded
Grey Squirrel	0.0	6.9	17.86	23.02	<0.001	26
Magpie	0.0	0.0	0.9	6.88	0.032	13
Great Tit	0.0	47.7	4.1	25.59	<0.001	27
Blue Tit	0.0	24.6	1.6	18.18	<0.001	21
Nuthatch	0.0	4.9	0.0	13.76	0.001	14
Robin	0.0	0.3	0.0	8.12	0.017	14

605

606

607 **Table 2.** Hazard ratios (relative predation risk; +/- CI) and P values for covariates in the global model where h =
608 1 is the control (empty) feeder hazard ratio (d.f. = 6.42, AICc = 600.4, model weight = 0.210). After the removal
609 of distance from the AICc selected model (d.f. = 5.43, AICc = 598.5, model weight = 0.672) the hazard ratios,
610 CI and P values were identical after rounding.

Covariate	Hazard ratio (h)	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI	P
Guarded	2.14	1.14	3.99	0.017
Unguarded	3.09	1.67	5.73	<0.001
Week (random effect)	1.00	0.58	1.73	0.010
<i>Distance (removed in AICc selected model)</i>	<i>1.08</i>	<i>0.68</i>	<i>1.71</i>	<i>0.740</i>

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623 **Table 3.** Binomial generalised linear mixed effect models of predation against daily visitors with model AICc
624 values and weights. The grouped predator models consider all predator visits together while the individual
625 predator models consider them separately. The null model includes only the intercept and study week random
626 effect. *indicates significance at the 95% level.

Predator variables	Model	Visit Coefficients	Estimate (95% CIs)	Std. Error	P	Model AICc	Model weight
Grouped predators	Null	Intercept only	0.751 (-0.263 – 2.061)	0.4533	0.0976	84.1	0.024
	Global	All Predators	0.079 (0.022 – 0.155)	0.033	0.016*	79.4	0.255
		All small birds	0.004 (-0.012 – 0.021)	0.008	0.620		
	AICc selected	All Predators	0.068 (0.025 – 0.157)	0.029	0.019*	77.3	0.705
Individual predators	Null	Intercept only	0.751 (-0.263 – 2.061)	0.4533	0.0976	84.1	0.024
	Global	Squirrel	0.068 (-0.004 – 0.141)	0.037	0.066	81.5	0.095
		Magpie	0.131 (-0.081 – 0.342)	0.108	0.225		
		All small birds	0.004 (-0.012 – 0.020)	0.008	0.645		
	Model 2	Magpie	0.178 (0.0197 – 0.414)	0.097	0.068	81.2	0.108
	Model 3	Squirrel	0.084 (0.017 – 0.174)	0.039	0.029*	80.9	0.124
		All small birds	0.005 (-0.010 – 0.219)	0.008	0.519		
	Model 4	Squirrel	0.070 (0.003 – 0.158)	0.038	0.063	79.3	0.277
		Magpie	0.061	0.084	0.469		

			(-0.045 – 0.391)				
	AICc selected	Squirrel	0.090 (0.022 – 0.179)	0.039	0.021*	79.1	0.314

627