

Supplementary Material

Successional changes in feeding activity by threatened cockatoos in revegetated mine sites

Tim S. Doherty^{A,D,E,G}, Briana N. Wingfield^{A,F}, Vicki L. Stokes^B, Michael D. Craig^{A,C}, Jessica G. H. Lee^A, Hugh C. Finn^A and Michael C. Calver^A

^ASchool of Veterinary and Life Sciences, Murdoch University, Murdoch, WA 6150, Australia.

^BAlcoa of Australia Ltd, Huntly mine site, WA 6208, Australia.

^CSchool of Plant Biology, University of Western Australia, Crawley, WA 6009, Australia.

^DSchool of Natural Sciences, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup, WA 6027, Australia.

^ECurrent address: Centre for Integrative Ecology, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Deakin University, Burwood, Vic. 3125, Australia.

^FCurrent address: MWH Global, Jolimont, WA 6014, Australia.

^GCorresponding author. Email: tim.doherty.0@gmail.com

Table S1. General linear modelling results to test for differences in vegetation and feeding residue variables between the two types of exterior plots at AA and BBM (10 × 10 m and 20 × 5 m)

Significant results ($\alpha = 0.05$) are shown with bold text

Response variable	Exterior plot type
Feeding present/absent	$F_{1,105} = 0.40$ $P = 0.529$
<i>Banksia</i> stem density	$F_{1,105} = \mathbf{7.38}$ $P = \mathbf{0.008}$
<i>Hakea</i> stem density	$F_{1,105} = 0.09$ $P = 0.771$
Jarrah stem density	$F_{1,105} = 0.62$ $P = 0.432$
Marri stem density	$F_{1,105} = 0.42$ $P = 0.517$
Species richness of potential food plants	$F_{1,105} = 0.01$ $P = 0.926$
Canopy cover	$F_{1,105} = 0.17$ $P = 0.680$
Canopy height	$F_{1,105} = 0.01$ $P = 0.906$
Understorey height	$F_{1,105} = 0.35$ $P = 0.558$
<i>Banksia</i> spp. residues	$F_{1,105} = 0.91$ $P = 0.341$
<i>Hakea</i> spp. residues	$F_{1,105} = 0.21$ $P = 0.645$
Jarrah residues	$F_{1,105} = 0.92$ $P = 0.339$
Marri residues	$F_{1,105} = 0.56$ $P = 0.456$