Response to Reviewer #2

Thank you for your comments, they were very helpful and very clear. Below are the changes made in response to your suggestions and critiques. We hope that you will find the revisions to your satisfaction.

Line 5: replaced “towards having to coexist” to “towards living with”. The meaning is similar, but doesn’t oppose the idea of coexistence so strongly. Also replaced “people” with “some members of the public” to emphasize that this is not necessarily the general opinion of the entire population. In fact, some members of the public *would* like to have coyotes eradicated from their neighbourhood or even the entire city, though I agree, this is not the general opinion.

Line 13: deleted “their”

Line 27: replaced “have even been called” with “are considered”

Line 33: Revised sentence to: “Though coyote diet has been studied in some suburban and urban areas in North America (e.g., Quinn 1997, Morey et al. 2007, Grigione et al. 2011), it has never been investigated in Calgary, despite apparent public concerns towards coyotes”

Line 52: removed “previous”

Line 65: changed “feces” to “scat” throughout

Line 84: replaced hyphen with en dash

Line 87: removed “survey trail”

Line 91: changed hyphen to en dash

Line 101: Provided further details on the difference between coyote and dog scat. Also included “Coyote scat was typically easy to distinguish from dog scat, however when identification was doubted, scat was discarded” for further clarification.

Line 111: replaced “determined” with “recorded”; used en dash where it previously read “6-10m”

Line 112: removed “recorded to allow the mapping of results at a finer scale”

Line 130: replaced “ie:” with “e.g.,”

Line 157: replaced “amongst” with “among” throughout manuscript

Line 197: replaced “while” with “although”

Line 247: replaced “was” with “were”

Line 252: used en dash for date periods in caption

Line 264: used en dash for date periods in caption

Line 295: changed

If the hypothesis that anthropogenic food content in coyote diet is linked to human-coyote attacks is correct (Carbyn 1989), our work suggests Calgary may face coyote conflict issues related to food conditioning and habituations, particularly if anthropogenic food items become a greater part of coyote diet in the future

to

If the hypothesis that anthropogenic food content in coyote diet is linked to human-coyote attacks is correct (Carbyn 1989), our work suggests that the city of Calgary should be concerned with reducing coyote access to these food sources. Though we have no trend evidence to support this conclusion, other studies have found that coyote diet with elevated anthropogenic food content can predispose animals to conflict with people, related to food conditioning and habituation.

Line 305: replaced “2005-2008” to “2005–2008”

Line 312: replaced “while” with “although”

Line 315: replaced “while” with “although”

Line 332-337: moved paragraph from discussion to conclusion and incorporated by placing at end of first paragraph in the conclusion.

Line 401-403: deleted

Line 436-444: deleted

Response to General Comments:

1) We have made an attempt to make the discussion less wordy and reduce redundancy without sacrificing clarity.

2) Unfortunately, we have no data on coyote densities or population figures in order to estimate coyote densities in any of our study sites or even for Calgary in general.

3) It is difficult to make valuable estimates of the availability of anthropogenic items at/near each site because we don’t know the movements or home ranges of coyotes in Calgary. Without this information, availability information might be measured in either too large or small an area around our study sites. Also, this data was not collected at the time of the study, and thus is not available. We cannot assume that the availability present now is equivalent to that during the study.

4) Due to differences in socio-economic factors from one community to the next, we did not feel it was reliable to assume that the communities with higher human density necessarily had more pets and more trash available to coyotes. In fact, some high-density communities likely have fewer pets (pets often are not allowed in apartment buildings) than lower-density communities, thus communities with greater human population might not have a greater number of pets.