



UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Behavioral reactions of brown bears to approaching humans in Fennoscandia

Moen, Gro Kvelprud; Ordiz, Andres; Kindberg, Jonas; Swenson, Jon E.; Sundell, Janne ...

2019

Taylor and Francis Ltd.

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/307591>

Moen, G K, Ordiz, A, Kindberg, J, Swenson, J E, Sundell, J & Stoen, O-G 2019, 'Behavioral reactions of brown bears to approaching humans in Fennoscandia', *Écoscience*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 23-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11956860.2018.1513387>

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository. <https://helda.helsinki.fi>
This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.
Please cite the original version.

1 **Behavioral reactions of brown bears to approaching humans in Fennoscandia**

2

3 **Authors and affiliations**

4 Gro Kvelprud Moen^{1,*}, Andrés Ordiz¹, Jonas Kindberg^{2,3}, Jon E. Swenson^{1,3}, Janne Sundell⁴,
5 Ole-Gunnar Støen^{3,1,*}

6 ¹Faculty of Environmental Sciences and Natural Resource Management, Norwegian

7 University of Life Sciences, Postbox 5003, NO-1432 Ås, Norway

8 ²Department of Wildlife, Fish, and Environmental Studies, Swedish University of

9 Agricultural Sciences, SE-901 83 Umeå, Sweden

10 ³Norwegian Institute for Nature Research, NO-7485 Trondheim, Norway

11 ⁴University of Helsinki, Lammi Biological Station, Pääjärventie 320, FI-16900 Lammi,

12 Finland.

13 * Corresponding authors. Email address: gro.moen@nmbu.no; Tel number: +4799721009.

14 Email address: ole.stoen@nina.no; Tel number: +4797119945.

15 **Summary**

16 Human disturbance causes behavioral responses in wildlife, including large carnivores.
17 Previous research in Scandinavia has documented that brown bears (*Ursus arctos*) show a
18 variety of behavioral reactions to different human activities. We investigated how proximity
19 to human settlements and roads, as proxies of human influence, affected brown bears'
20 reactions to encountering humans. We analyzed experimental approaches to GPS collared
21 bears, 18 males and 23 single females, in Sweden (n = 148 approaches) and Finland (n = 33),
22 conducted between 2004 and 2012. The bears in Finland inhabited areas with higher human
23 density compared to Sweden. However, the proportion of bears staying or moving when
24 approached and the flight initiation distances were similar in both countries. In Sweden, the
25 flight responses were not dependent on human densities or roads inside the bears' home
26 ranges or the distances from the bears to roads and settlements. Brown bears in Fennoscandia
27 live in areas with relatively low human population densities, but in many areas with high
28 forestry road densities. Our results show that bears' flight reactions were consistent between
29 areas, which is an important message for management, reinforcing previous studies that have
30 documented human avoidance by bears at very different spatial and temporal scales.

31

32 **Keywords:** experimental human disturbance, Finland, flight initiation distance, flight
33 responses, human density, road density, Sweden

34

35 **Introduction**

36 Wildlife generally react to and avoid human activities. However, behavioral responses vary
37 in relation to factors such as the individuals' previous experience, physical condition, age,
38 degree of gregariousness, antipredator strategies, type of disturbance, and time of day when it
39 occurs (e.g., Whittaker and Knight 1998, Beale and Monaghan 2004a, Stankowich 2008,

40 Vincze et al. 2016, Tablado and Jenni 2017). Human disturbance can have short- and long-
41 term effects, such as changes in distribution and activity patterns, and reduced breeding
42 success (Beale and Monaghan 2004b, Stankowich 2008 and references therein).

43 Moving away from or avoiding areas with human activity is indeed an antipredator
44 response, with disturbance perceived as predation risk by the responding animal (e.g., Gill et
45 al. 1996, Lima 1998, Frid and Dill 2002). Antipredator responses reduce risk and are therefore
46 crucial in modulating animal behavior (e.g., Deecke et al. 2002). Nevertheless, risk avoidance
47 implies costs, which animals try to minimize while maximizing survival (e.g., Gill et al. 1996,
48 Lima 1998).

49 Mammalian carnivores can be especially vulnerable to human disturbance (e.g., George
50 and Crooks 2006). Large carnivores, such as brown bears (*Ursus arctos*), show spatial and
51 temporal reactions to a variety of human activities across their wide distribution range in
52 North America (e.g., Gibeau et al. 2002, Nielsen et al. 2004, Rode et al. 2006) and Europe
53 (e.g., Naves et al. 2003, Nellemann et al. 2007, Ordiz et al. 2017). In Scandinavia, as
54 elsewhere, most brown bear mortality is caused by humans (Sahlén et al. 2006, Bischof et al.
55 2009) and mortality risk is higher closer to villages and roads (Steyaert et al. 2016). Not
56 surprisingly, brown bears generally select for rugged areas far from people (Nellemann et al.
57 2007). Bears' resting sites are concealed by denser vegetation when bears are closer to
58 villages and during daytime compared to nighttime, suggesting that bears perceive and react
59 to proximity to people, especially in summer-autumn, when human activities outdoors are
60 most common (Ordiz et al. 2011). Bears' stress levels are also higher when they are closer to
61 humans (Støen et al. 2015).

62 Brown bears have been expanding in Scandinavia in the last century following a severe
63 population decline, from approximately 130 bears around 1930 to ~3,000 bears in recent
64 times (Swenson et al. 1995, Swenson et al. 2017), and some people express concern about

65 human safety in the forest. Similarly, in Finland there were only about 150 bears by the
66 1960's (Pulliainen 1983), and the population reached 1,150-1,950 bears in 2009 (Wikman
67 2010, Kopatz et al. 2014). Therefore, to better understand bear behavior and to inform
68 management agencies and the public about the reactions of bears to casual encounters with
69 outdoor users (hikers, berry or mushroom pickers, hunters, etc.), we have conducted several
70 studies in Sweden that included experimental approaches to radio-collared bears. Most bears
71 react by moving away, which holds for both single bears (Moen et al. 2012) and females with
72 cubs (Sahlén et al. 2015). After the encounters, bears become more nocturnal (Ordiz et al.
73 2013), as they do when bear hunting seasons start (Ordiz et al. 2012), and when they live in
74 areas with higher road densities (Ordiz et al. 2014). That is, the behavioral reaction of the
75 bears goes beyond their initial flight after encountering a person, which can change bears'
76 daily activity patterns for several days (Ordiz et al. 2013).

77 Whereas the research summarized above shows a solid pattern of bears' avoidance of
78 people, it was conducted in areas with low human densities. There is a need for research on
79 bear reactions to humans also in areas with higher human densities, because the range of
80 brown bears has been expanding in Fennoscandia, with bears moving into more human-
81 dominated landscapes (Swenson et al. 1998, Kojola and Heikkinen 2006). It is possible that
82 bears relax their behavioral responses if they encounter humans more often and eventually
83 habituate to their proximity. This could in turn make encounters with bears more dangerous, if
84 they do not move away as consistently as we have documented so far (Moen et al. 2012,
85 Sahlén et al. 2015).

86 In this study, we have conducted experimental approaches of radio-collared bears in
87 Sweden and Finland to assess whether bears' behavioral responses, i.e., flight reactions,
88 change in relation to the level of human activity. We used distance to roads and human
89 settlements from the bears' initial sites and the densities of human population and roads in

90 bears' home ranges as proxies for human activity. We also controlled for variables that
91 influence the bears' flight reactions, i.e., bear behavior (if it was active or passive when
92 approached), vegetation concealment, season of the year, and individual characteristics of the
93 bears (Moen et al. 2012, Ordiz et al. 2013, Sahlén et al. 2015). As previous studies show that
94 brown bears in Scandinavia avoid humans on different scales, we did not expect to see a
95 reduced behavioral response of bears encountered by people due to living in areas with higher
96 human or road densities, but a consistent pattern of human avoidance by the bears.

97

98 **Methods**

99 **Study areas**

100 The experimental approaches were conducted in Sweden and Finland. The study area in
101 southcentral Sweden (61.5°N 15° E, Gävleborg and Dalarna counties) consists of bogs and
102 heavily managed coniferous forest of mainly Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*) and Norway spruce
103 (*Picea abies*). There are few main roads in the area, but a dense network of gravel roads (1.0
104 ± 0.8 km/km², mean \pm SD) (Road map: Swedish National Land Survey). The human
105 population in the area is low, 3.6 - 6.2 inhabitants/km² in the four municipalities where the
106 study was conducted (Statistics Sweden). The whole study area is located below the
107 timberline, which is at approximately 750 m a.s.l. (Dahle and Swenson 2003). Temperatures
108 in the study area average -7° C in January and 15° C in July (Swedish Meteorological and
109 Hydrological Institute 2017a, b). The density of bears in the study area was estimated to ~30
110 bears/1000 km² (Solberg et al. 2006).

111 The study area in central and southeastern Finland (62.5°N 27°E) also consists of bogs and
112 managed coniferous forest of Scots pine and Norway spruce. Altitudes range from 75 to 200
113 m a.s.l., all below the timberline. Temperatures average -8° C in January and 17° C in July
114 (Finnish Meteorological Institute). There is a dense network of roads in the area (1.5 ± 1.1

115 km/km²) (National Land Survey of Finland), and the average human population is higher than
116 in the Swedish study area (11.3 - 16.2 inhabitants/km²) (Statistics Finland 2008). An estimate
117 of the bear density in the study area is ≥ 6 bears/1000 km² (Wikman 2010). The bears are
118 hunted in the fall in both areas, with hunting quotas averaging about 10% of the estimated
119 populations in recent years, i.e., ~300 bears are annually harvested in Sweden (National
120 Veterinary Institute 2017) and ~100 in Finland (The Finnish Wildlife Agency 2017).

121 **Bears and the experimental approaches**

122 We analyzed 148 experimental approaches between humans and adult solitary brown bears
123 (9 males and 21 females) conducted in Sweden from 2006 to 2009, and 33 approaches on
124 solitary bears (9 males and 2 females) carried out in the Finnish study area from 2004 to 2012.
125 The bears were either followed from birth, being captured with previously known mothers, or
126 their age was determined through cross-section of the premolar roots (Matson et al. 1993).
127 Bears were from four to twenty years old in Sweden, and three to eleven years old in Finland.
128 In Sweden, we approached the bears between one and six times per season, with a minimum
129 of 13 days and maximum of 92 days between each approach. Most of the bears in Sweden
130 were approached during one season (n = 18), although some were approached during two (n =
131 10) or three seasons (n = 2). We approached the bears in Finland with a minimum of seven
132 days and maximum of 50 days between the approaches. The bears in Finland were
133 approached between one and six times per season, during one (n = 9) or three (n = 2) seasons.

134 The bears were captured and equipped with GPS Plus-3 or GPS Pro-4 neck collars
135 (VECTRONIC Aerospace GmbH, Berlin, Germany) and a VHF transmitter implant (IMP
136 400L) (Telonics, USA) in Sweden, and Tracker GSM/GPS without VHF (Tracker Inc.,
137 Oulunsalo, Finland) in Finland (see Sundell et al. (2006) and Arnemo et al. (2007) for details).
138 The females in Finland were equipped with the same collar as the Swedish bears. Handling
139 was approved by the Swedish Ethical Committee on Animal Research and the Swedish

140 Environmental Protection Agency in Sweden, and the National Animal Experiment Board and
141 the Finnish Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry in Finland.

142 On the day of the approach in Sweden, the bears' GPS collars were scheduled to send
143 positions every minute for three hours; one hour before the approach started and two hours
144 after. The position data in Sweden was collected into the Wireless Remote Animal
145 Monitoring (Dettki et al. 2013) database system for data validation and management. In
146 Finland, the collars were scheduled to send positions every 25 seconds at the start of the
147 approach, resulting in a poorer determination of pre-encounter behavior than in Sweden, and
148 the interval of positions was gradually increased to 24 hours after the bear was passed by the
149 observers. The females' collars were scheduled to send positions every minute. The
150 approaches in Sweden were conducted between 10:00 and 16:00 local time, when most bears
151 usually rest (Moe et al. 2007). The approaches in Finland were conducted between 08:00 and
152 19:00 local time. Prior to the approaches, the bears in Sweden were located based on
153 triangulation of the VHF-signals from the neck collars and the implant. In Finland, bears'
154 locations before the approach were obtained from GPS positions in real time. The approaches
155 were conducted by one to six people (1.9 ± 0.7 observers), hereafter referred to as the
156 observers, who mimicked hikers and talked to each other during the encounters. If only one
157 observer conducted the approach, this person talked to him- or herself during the approach.
158 The observers started the approaches 841 ± 336 m from the bear in Sweden and 952 ± 455 m
159 in Finland, walked towards it, passing the initial sites at 57 ± 67 m in Sweden and 52 ± 21 m
160 in Finland (the goal was passing the bears at approximately 50 m). During the approaches, the
161 bear's location and movement were monitored using VHF-tracking equipment in Sweden and
162 by observing the GPS positions on a computer by another observer who was in telephone
163 contact with the observers in the field in Finland. After passing the bear, the observers
164 continued walking away (approximately 500 m), keeping a distance to the bear to avoid

165 disturbing it a second time. The track of the observers in Sweden was registered with
166 positions every 10 m using a hand-held GPS receiver and the observers' track in Finland was
167 recorded with a GPS GSM device, similar to the bear collar (Benefon ESC!, Benefon Oyj,
168 Salo, Finland), set for sending positions every 20 seconds.

169 Based on the GPS positions, bears were categorized as either 'passive', most typically
170 resting in a daybed, or 'active', e.g., foraging or moving around. If the diameter of the
171 positions in the control period, from start of minute positioning to the start of the approach,
172 did not exceed 70 m (min: 6 m, max: 68 m), the bears were judged as 'passive' (Moen et al.
173 2012, Sahlén et al. 2015). Bears were considered 'active' if the diameter exceeded 70 m (min;
174 80 m, max; 1728 m), and the positions indicated movement in the time before approach
175 (Moen et al. 2012, Sahlén et al. 2015). This was visually checked in ArcGIS 10.1 (ESRI
176 2012). Some bears changed their activity during the control period, and the new activity level
177 was the basis for the analysis.

178 **Site visits after encounters**

179 In Sweden, field personnel visited both the initial site (IS), where the bear stayed prior to
180 the encounter, and the second site (SS), where the bear settled down after being disturbed, a
181 few days after the approaches were conducted. We located daybeds, verified by presence of
182 bear hair, and used this as the center of the IS of the passive bears and SS. For passive bears
183 without confirmed daybeds, the center of the cluster of GPS positions was defined as the IS,
184 and the last position before the approach started was defined as the IS for active bears. As a
185 proxy for concealment, the horizontal vegetation cover was measured as sighting distance
186 (Ordiz et al. 2009) in both IS and SS. The average sighting distance of the four cardinal

187 directions gave a sighting distance for each of the sites (see Ordiz et al. (2009) and Moen et
188 al. (2012) for more details).

189 **Data management and analysis**

190 We calculated the speed between the bears' successive GPS positions and identified the
191 reactions to the encounters using statistical quality control (Montgomery 2005) and an
192 estimated upper control limit (UCL) for the control period, as described in Moen et al. (2012);
193 flight reaction identified for passive bears when movement was > 33.5 m/min (> 2.01 km/h),
194 and for active bears with movement > 101.3 m/min (> 6.08 km/h). The flight initiation
195 distance (FID) was defined as the distance from the observer to the bears' last position prior
196 to an increased movement, i.e., where the speed between the bear's two successive GPS
197 positions exceeded the activity-specific UCL and the bear left the initial site. This was also
198 checked visually in ArcGIS 10.1 (ESRI 2012). We did not include approaches where the
199 positions were missing for more than two minutes around the disturbance event; therefore, 19
200 approaches were excluded from the analysis of FID. Three bears left their IS without
201 exceeding the activity-specific UCL, hence no FID was registered.

202 Passing distance was calculated as the shortest distance between the IS and the observer,
203 regardless of whether the bear was still in the IS when it was passed by the observer. The
204 minimum distance from the observer to the bear (distance to observer) was calculated as the
205 shortest distance from the observer to the bear during the encounter. If the bear was at the IS,
206 distance to observer was calculated as distance from observer to IS. When a FID was recorded
207 and the bear settled down in a SS before the end of the scheduled minute positioning, the
208 distance between the position of FID and SS was defined as distance moved (DM). The
209 difference between time of FID and the first position in SS was defined as the time the bears
210 spent moving after disturbance (TSM). The method of data collection was different in
211 Finland, which resulted in fewer GPS positions after the observer passed the bears' initial

212 sites. DM and TSM were therefore only calculated for the bears in the Swedish study area. In
213 Sweden, two bears were encountered twice during one experiment, and DM and TSM were
214 not included in the analysis. One bear left after the end of the encounter, and this was not
215 included in the analysis of FID, DM, or TSM. In cases where the positioning prior to the
216 approaches was insufficient, we could not decide on the activity level of the bear, and the
217 encounters were not included in the analysis of FID, DM or TSM.

218 We used linear regression to analyze which variables affected whether bears stayed or
219 moved when encountered, and their FID, DM, and TSM in Sweden. We included horizontal
220 vegetation cover (sighting distance) at IS, the bears' age and sex, activity pattern prior to the
221 encounter, season, number of observers, and passing distance or distance to observer as
222 potential explanatory variables (Table 1), following previous studies (Moen et al. 2012, Ordiz
223 et al. 2013, Sahlén et al. 2015). Horizontal vegetation cover (sighting distance) at SS was also
224 included in the analysis of DM and TSM. The annual study periods were divided into pre-
225 berry season (< 15 July) and berry season (\geq 15 July), which accounts for seasonality in bear
226 phenology and intensity of outdoor human activities (Ordiz et al. 2013).

227 In addition, variables that could describe how bears perceive human disturbance in the area
228 around the IS and in their home ranges were included (Table 1). Based on maps from
229 Statistics Sweden and Swedish National Land Survey in Sweden, and National Land Survey
230 of Finland in Finland, we calculated the distances from the bears' IS and SS to the closest
231 road and the closest settlement using ArcGis 10.1 (ESRI 2012). Distance from IS and SS to
232 the closest settlement was highly correlated ($r > 0.90$), hence we only used distance from IS to
233 settlements in the regression models for DM and TSM.

234 The R package 'adehabitatHR' (Calenge 2006) was used to calculate the home range
235 kernels for each bear and year, based on half-hour GPS positions from the bears, using "href"
236 as the smoothing parameter (Calenge 2015). We calculated the home range kernels with

237 percentage levels of 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, and 95%. Densities of roads (km road/km²) and human
238 population (inhabitants/km²) were identified within each home range level using PostGIS
239 2.2.2 (<http://postgis.net/>) and GEOSTAT 1 km² population grid for 2006 (Eurostat) for density
240 of inhabitants and property map from 2016 (Swedish National Land Survey) for road density.
241 We could not identify a significant difference in the variation of road density between the
242 different levels of home range kernels (Levene's test: $p = 0.63$) (R package 'car': Fox and
243 Weisberg 2011) (50% level: 1.06 ± 0.03 km road/km² (mean \pm SE), 60% level: 1.09 ± 0.03
244 km road/km², 70% level: 1.12 ± 0.03 km road/km², 80% level: 1.12 ± 0.03 km road/km², 90%
245 level: 1.14 ± 0.02 km road/km², 95% level: 1.14 ± 0.02 km road/km²), so we used the 95%
246 home range kernels in the analysis. Similarly, we could not identify a significant difference in
247 the variation of human population density between the different levels of home range kernels
248 (Levene's test: $p = 0.96$) (50% level: 0.14 ± 0.03 inhabitants/km² (mean \pm SE), 60% level:
249 0.17 ± 0.05 inhabitants/km², 70% level: 0.18 ± 0.05 inhabitants/km², 80% level: 0.19 ± 0.04
250 inhabitants/km², 90% level: 0.2 ± 0.04 inhabitants/km², 95% level: 0.22 ± 0.06
251 inhabitants/km²), and we also used the 95% home range kernel here.

252 We compared how close the bears' ISs were to settlements and roads in Sweden and
253 Finland. We also tested if bears' FIDs were similar or not, and if approached bears stayed or
254 moved away similarly in both countries. However, the method of data collection in Finland
255 was different, which did not allow us to identify the bears' home ranges, hence we did not
256 calculate the densities of roads or human population within the home ranges, and we did not
257 include the data from Finland in the regression models to explore which variables affected the
258 flight reactions of bears.

259 Table 1. Overview of the potential explanatory variables included in the regression models to analyze
260 flight reactions of brown bears in Sweden. The response variables were stayed or moved, flight
261 initiation distance (FID), distance moved after being disturbed (DM), and time spent moving after
262 being disturbed (TSM). Activity = activity of the bear prior to the encounter; passive (0) or active (1),
263 Age = age of bear in years, Sex = sex of the bear; male (0) or female (1), Sighting distance in IS or SS
264 = Sighting distance at initial site (IS) or second site (SS) in m, i.e., horizontal vegetation cover at the
265 site, Season = pre-berry season (0) or berry season (1), Passing distance = closest distance from

266 observer to initial site in m, Distance to observer = minimum distance between observer and bear
 267 during the encounter in m, Number of observers = number of observers conducting the encounter,
 268 Distance to settlements from IS = distance from initial site to the closest settlement in m, Distance to
 269 road from IS or SS = distance from initial site (IS) or second site (SS) to the closest road in m, Road
 270 HR = km road/km² within the bear's 95% home range kernel, Human HR = density of human
 271 population as inhabitants/km² within the bear's 95% home range kernel.
 272

| Response variable | Exploratory variables |
|-------------------|---|
| Stayed or moved | Activity + Age + Sex + Sighting distance in IS + Season + Number of observers + Distance to observer + Distance to settlements from IS + Distance to road from IS + Road HR + Human HR |
| FID | Activity + Age + Sex + Sighting distance in IS + Season + Number of observers + Passing distance + Distance to settlements from IS + Distance to road from IS + Road HR + Human HR |
| DM and TSM | Activity + Age + Sex + Sighting distance in IS + Sighting distance in SS + Season + Number of observers + Distance to observer + Distance to settlements from IS + Distance to road from IS + Distance to road from SS + Road HR + Human HR |

273
 274 We used generalized linear mixed models with a binomial link function in 'glmer' in R
 275 package 'lme4' (Bates et al. 2015) to analyze which factors explained that bears stayed or
 276 moved when encountered. We used linear mixed models with function 'lmer' in R package
 277 'lme4' (Bates et al. 2015) to analyze FID, DM, and TSM, which were all log transformed to
 278 account for left-skewed distributions. Using the function 'dredge' in R package 'MuMIn'
 279 (Barton 2017), possible candidate models for each of the flight responses were identified after
 280 standardizing the continuous variables to a mean of 0 and SD of 1 (Grueber et al. 2011) using
 281 package 'standardize' (Eager 2017). The random factor bear ID was used for all of the
 282 response variables. We calculated variance inflation factors (VIF) for the regression models
 283 for the different response variables, and they did not show sign of multicollinearity among
 284 variables. We did not identify any correlation between the covariates at $r > 0.6$.

285 Because there were several candidate models with $\Delta AICc < 2$ for the models with the
 286 response variables stayed or moved, DM and TSM, we averaged each set of models with the
 287 function 'model.avg' in package 'MuMIn' (Barton 2017), and we report the outcome of the
 288 full average models (Burnham and Anderson 2002, Grueber et al. 2011). We interpreted the
 289 direction of the effects of the parameters included in the models with the 95% confidence

290 intervals (CI) of the effect sizes (β). When the 95% CI did not include zero, the effect had a
291 positive or negative effect on the response variable (Arnold 2010). We used R software (R
292 Core Team 2018) for all statistical analysis.

293

294 **Results**

295 In Sweden, the bears' ISs were 20.0 ± 8.6 km (mean \pm SD) ($n = 147$) from the closest
296 settlement, and 0.35 ± 0.21 km from the closest road. In Finland, the bears' ISs were $11.8 \pm$
297 6.2 km ($n = 20$) from the closest settlement, and 0.25 ± 0.13 km from the closest road, i.e.,
298 distances from IS to settlements (Wilcoxon rank-sum test: $W = 2256$, p -value = 0.0001) and
299 distances from IS to roads (Wilcoxon rank-sum test: $W = 1876$, p -value = 0.046) were shorter
300 in Finland than in Sweden. On average, the home range kernels (95%) of the bears
301 approached in Sweden had a density of 1.1 ± 0.1 km road/km² and a human population
302 density of 0.2 ± 0.4 inhabitants/km².


303 In Sweden, bears stayed in their IS in 40 encounters and moved away in 107, and they
304 stayed in seven cases and moved away in 16 in Finland. The proportion of bears that stayed
305 and moved was not significantly different in Sweden and Finland (Fisher's Exact test for
306 count data: p -value = 0.803, $n = 170$). In Sweden, bears moved away more often during the
307 berry season than before, and with a higher number of approaching observers. The 95% CI of
308 the effect estimates of other variables included the zero value, and therefore the direction of
309 the effect on the response was unclear (Tables 2 and 1A). Here we provide the results of the
310 model averaging for each response variable. The sets of top candidate models ($\Delta\text{AICc} < 2$
311 compared to the model with the lowest AICc for each response variable) are in Appendix 1.

312 Table 2. Results from the generalized linear mixed regression (binomial link function) explaining the
313 factors that influenced whether bears stayed (0) or moved (1), with test statistics (full average) for the
314 averaged models with $\Delta\text{AICc} < 2$. The bears were experimentally approached in southcentral Sweden
315 in 2006-2009 ($n = 118$). The continuous variables are scaled to 1 SD. See Table 1 for explanation of

316 the variables. β is the effect size and SE the standard error.
 317

| Parameter | β | SE | 95% CI |
|---|---------|-------|-----------------|
| Intercept | -1.631 | 0.864 | (-3.342, 0.080) |
| Season (pre-berry season = 0, berry season = 1) | 1.659 | 0.502 | (0.664, 2.654) |
| Number of observers | 0.762 | 0.382 | (0.006, 1.519) |
| Distance to observer | -0.093 | 0.186 | (-0.459, 0.274) |
| Human HR | 0.068 | 0.180 | (-0.286, 0.422) |
| Road HR | 0.050 | 0.144 | (-0.234, 0.334) |
| Distance to road from IS | 0.014 | 0.082 | (-0.148, 0.176) |
| Activity (passive = 0, active = 1) | -0.037 | 0.232 | (-0.494, 0.421) |

318
 319 Average FID for bears that left before the observer passed the bear was $87 \text{ m} \pm 72 \text{ m}$ (median
 320 = 63 m , $n = 78$) in Sweden and $120 \text{ m} \pm 129 \text{ m}$ (median = 69 m , $n = 11$) in Finland. FID was
 321 not significantly different in the two countries (Wilcoxon rank-sum test: $W = 393$, $p\text{-value} =$
 322 0.658) (Fig. 1). FID for bears in Sweden increased with longer sighting distance, i.e., less
 323 concealment at initial sites and longer passing distance (Table 3).



324
 325 Figure 1: Distribution of flight initiation distances (in meters) in Finland ($n = 11$) and Sweden ($n = 78$)
 326 following experimental approaches conducted from 2004 to 2012 on radio-collared brown bears, when
 327 the bears left their initial sites before the observers passed them.
 328

329 Table 3. Results from the linear mixed regression of flight initiation distance (FID), with test statistics
 330 for the model with $\Delta\text{AICc} < 2$. The bears were experimentally approached in southcentral Sweden in
 331 2006-2009 ($n = 72$). FID was log transformed. The continuous variables were scaled to 1 SD. See

332 Table 1 for explanation of the variables. β is the effect size and SE the standard error.
 333

| | AICc | Δ AICc | Model weight | β | SE | 95% CI |
|---|-------|---------------|--------------|---------|-------|-----------------|
| Model: FID ~ Sighting distance in IS + Passing distance | 190.2 | 0.00 | 1 | | | |
| Intercept | | | | -0.001 | 0.106 | (-0.211, 0.207) |
| Sighting distance in IS | | | | 0.342 | 0.097 | (0.152, 0.534) |
| Passing distance | | | | 0.453 | 0.094 | (0.269, 0.642) |

334
 335 Bears in Sweden that moved away from the initial site when encountered, moved on
 336 average $1,002 \pm 809$ m ($n = 87$) in 22 ± 21 min ($n = 69$). DM was longer for active than for
 337 passive bears, with more concealment in IS, and with more observers (Tables 4 and 2A). For
 338 TSM, the CI of the variables included in the model included zero, i.e., none of the variables
 339 had a clearly negative or positive effect on the response (Tables 5 and 3A).

340 Table 4. Results from the linear mixed regression of distance moved (DM), with test statistics (full
 341 average) for the averaged models with Δ AICc < 2. The bears were experimentally approached in
 342 southcentral Sweden in 2006-2009 ($n = 71$). DM is log transformed. The continuous variables are
 343 scaled to 1 SD. See Table 1 for explanation of the variables. β is the effect size and SE the standard
 344 error.
 345

| Parameter | β | SE | 95% CI |
|---|---------|-------|------------------|
| Intercept | -1.186 | 0.419 | (-2.018, -0.354) |
| Activity (passive = 0, active = 1) | 0.918 | 0.324 | (0.270, 1.566) |
| Sex (male = 0, female = 1) | 0.410 | 0.315 | (-0.213, 1.032) |
| Sighting distance in IS | -0.326 | 0.112 | (-0.550, -0.102) |
| Number of observers | 0.378 | 0.130 | (0.118, 0.639) |
| Season (pre-berry season = 0, berry season = 1) | 0.066 | 0.179 | (-0.288, 0.421) |

346
 347 Table 5. Results from the linear mixed regression of time spent moving after disturbance (TSM), with
 348 test statistics (full average) for the averaged models with Δ AICc < 2. The bears were experimentally
 349 approached in southcentral Sweden in 2006-2009 ($n = 63$). TSM is log transformed. The continuous
 350 variables are scaled to 1 SD. See Table 1 for explanation of the variables. β is the effect size and SE
 351 the standard error.
 352

| Parameter | β | SE | 95% CI |
|----------------------------|---------|-------|-----------------|
| Intercept | 2.217 | 0.405 | (1.415, 3.019) |
| Number of observers | 0.246 | 0.168 | (-0.086, 0.579) |
| Sighting distance in IS | -0.062 | 0.117 | (-0.293, 0.169) |
| Sex (male = 0, female = 1) | 0.055 | 0.172 | (-0.285, 0.396) |

353
 354 **Discussion**

355 Our experimental approaches of brown bears in Sweden and Finland showed similar flight
356 reactions by the bears in both countries. The distance from bears' initial sites to settlements
357 and roads were shorter in Finland than in Sweden, reflecting the higher densities of human
358 population and roads in the study area in Finland. Nevertheless, the bears' responses showed a
359 consistent pattern of human avoidance. The proportion of bears that stayed at their initial sites
360 and the FID of the bears that moved were not different in Sweden and Finland. This
361 consistency in bear behavior can be explained by several reasons. First, the bear populations
362 in Sweden and Finland show similar historical trends, with recent population recovery after
363 centuries of intense persecution (Pulliainen 1983, Swenson et al. 1995, Wikman 2010, Kopatz
364 et al. 2014, Swenson et al. 2017). Second, bears are managed as game species in both
365 countries, with similar annual levels of legal hunting (National Veterinary Institute 2017, The
366 Finnish Wildlife Agency 2017), as explained in Methods. Third, it has also been suggested
367 that some flight responses to disturbance, e.g., FID, are species-specific and therefore
368 responses may be predictable and repeatable at different sites (Blumstein et al. 2003). In
369 addition, large carnivores living in human-dominated landscapes are generally elusive, likely
370 as a response to long-term human persecution, and European bears are no exception (Ordiz et
371 al. 2011, Zedrosser et al. 2011).

372 We were able to analyze, at a finer scale, if human-related variables influenced the bears'
373 behavioral responses when they were approached in Sweden. The human-related variables
374 road density and human population density inside home ranges of the approached bears, and
375 distances to roads from the bears' initial sites when they were approached, were retained in
376 the final, averaged model for the flight response variable stayed/moved (Table 2). However,
377 the 95% CI of the effect estimates of those variables included zero, i.e., they explained some
378 variation in the bears' flight response, but the direction of their effects was not clear. The
379 human population density inside the home ranges of the approached bears in Sweden ($0.2 \pm$

380 0.4 inhabitants/km²) was lower than the average human population density in the study area
381 generally (3.6 - 6.2 inhabitants/km²). However, the road density inside the home ranges (1.1 ±
382 0.1 km road/km²) was virtually identical to the average values in the study area (1.0 ± 0.8 km
383 road/ km²). The low human densities and the lack of variation in road density may help
384 explain the low effect of the human-related variables in these analyses. Regarding human
385 density, bears avoid humans on the landscape scale, residing far from people (Nellemann et
386 al. 2007), even if human density is generally low in our study area. Regarding road density, it
387 reflects the dense network of forest roads built over the years to harvest the coniferous forest,
388 and these roads are virtually impossible for bears to avoid, given their large home ranges.
389 Previous research helps interpret these results as well. Whereas proximity to settlements did
390 not influence how diurnal or nocturnal daily bear movements were, bears moved primarily in
391 the nocturnal and twilight hours and less during daytime in areas with higher road density,
392 compared to areas with no roads (Ordiz et al. 2014). In fact, roads have many negative effects
393 on wildlife, e.g., causing direct mortality and favoring human activity (e.g., Trombulak and
394 Frissell 2000), and the road network is indeed an impediment for Scandinavian bear
395 movements (Bischof et al. 2017). Nevertheless, in the present study, we worked in an area
396 with high and very constant gravel road density, and this lack of variation likely explains the
397 relatively low magnitude of the road effect on the bears' flight responses.

398 Bears moved more often from their initial sites when approached in the berry season (≥ 15
399 July), a period when bears spend most time foraging (“hyperphagia”) and human activity
400 levels are generally higher, than in the pre-berry season (Table 2), when the bear mating
401 season occurs and there are fewer human activities outdoors (Ordiz et al. 2011). Previous
402 research in Sweden has also shown that the bears' behavioral reactions are accentuated in
403 summer, compared to spring. For instance, bears seek denser vegetation cover in summer to
404 avoid human activities, including hunting (Ordiz et al. 2011, Ordiz et al. 2012). Number of

405 observers was important for whether the bears stayed or moved away and for DM. The effects
406 of human disturbance on wildlife reflect perceived predation risk, which has often been
407 shown to vary, as in our case, with factors such as the distance between humans and animals
408 and with the number of humans causing disturbance (Beale and Monaghan 2004b).

409 We do not claim that the observed flight responses by the bears in Fennoscandia provide a
410 full picture of their perceived predation risk. For instance, in the absence of visible behavioral
411 responses, physiological responses have been documented for several species (e.g., Fowler
412 1999). Stress can cause a reduction in fitness, which can be due to higher metabolic needs in
413 response to increased heart rate after disturbance (e.g., Beale and Monaghan 2004b). In
414 Sweden, previous research has shown that bears have higher stress levels, measured in terms
415 of heart rate variability, when they are closer to people than when they are farther away
416 (Støen et al. 2015). Bears also change daily movement patterns for several days after
417 disturbance, therefore altering optimal foraging and resting times (Ordiz et al. 2013).

418 As in previous studies (Moen et al. 2012, Ordiz et al. 2013, Sahlén et al. 2015), we
419 experienced no aggressive reactions by bears towards the observers, neither in Sweden nor in
420 Finland, reinforcing the pattern of human avoidance by European brown bears. At the fine
421 scale, bears rely on vegetation concealment or flee (Moen et al. 2012, Sahlén et al. 2015, this
422 study) and at the landscape scale, bears spend most of the time far from human settlements
423 (Nellemann et al. 2007).

424 Our study in Fennoscandia includes the lowest human densities across the distribution
425 range of brown bears in Europe, but bear populations also thrive in eastern and southern
426 Europe with much higher human densities (Swenson et al. 2000). Although bears and other
427 large carnivores are generally elusive, as described above, behavioral reactions to approaching
428 humans might differ if encounters occur more often, as they may do in areas with a higher
429 human population and outdoor activity elsewhere than in Fennoscandia. Our results provide

430 important knowledge about bear reactions encountering people in the forest, but similar
431 studies might be needed in other areas to reveal potential differences and similarities in large
432 carnivore behavior when facing different human densities, activities and alternative
433 management scenarios; e.g., bears are hunted in several European countries, but they are
434 protected in southern Europe (Swenson et al. 2000).

435 **Management implications**

436 With expanding bear populations, bears are expected to settle closer to humans, and an
437 important message to managers is that the bears' behavior to approaching humans does not
438 seem to change solely based on the density of humans or roads in the bears' home ranges.
439 Also, the lack of aggressive reactions by bears to observers on one hand, and the effects of
440 human disturbance on bear behavior, which may cause fitness reduction as the ultimate cost
441 of disturbance (Gill et al. 2001), on the other hand, are important messages for managers. In
442 human-dominated landscapes, conservation-oriented management of large carnivores under
443 hunting regimes, such as bears in Sweden and Finland, should aim to quantify and eventually
444 account for the subtle, indirect effects of hunting and other human activities that cause
445 disturbance, in addition to pay attention to more intuitive, lethal demographic effects (Frank et
446 al. 2017, Bischof et al. 2018).

447

448 **Acknowledgements**

449 The study was conducted within the Scandinavian Brown Bear Research Project (SBBRP),
450 which has primarily been funded by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, the
451 Norwegian Environment Agency, the Austrian Science Fund, and the Swedish Association for
452 Hunting and Wildlife Management. The study in Finland was funded by Jenny and Antti
453 Wihuri, Ella and Georg Ehrnrooth, Kone and Oskar Öflund foundations, and grants to Janne
454 Sundell. We thank the field personnel in SBBRP and at Finnish Game and Fisheries Research

455 Institute (currently Natural Resources Institute Finland) for assistance in field, Stefan
456 Blumentrath for assistance with spatial analysis and John Stuver for advice on spatial data
457 handling. The reviews provided by Joacim Näslund and Ladislav Paule improved our original
458 manuscript, which was reviewed in the frame of Peerage of Science. This is publication
459 number 256 from the SBBRP.

460

461 **References**

- 462 Arnemo, J. M., Å. Fahlman, P. Ahlqvist, R. Andersen, H. Andrén, S. Brunberg, A. Landa, O. Liberg, J.
463 Odden, J. Persson, P. Segerström, and J. E. Swenson. 2007. Biomedical protocols for free-
464 ranging brown bears, gray wolves, wolverines and lynx. Norwegian School of Veterinary
465 Science, Tromsø, Norway.
- 466 Arnold, T. W. 2010. Uninformative parameters and model selection using Akaike's Information
467 Criterion. *The Journal of Wildlife Management* **74**:1175-1178.
- 468 Barton, K. 2017. MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. R package version 1.40.0.
- 469 Bates, D., M. Mächler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4.
470 *Journal of Statistical Software* **67**:1-48.
- 471 Beale, C. M., and P. Monaghan. 2004a. Behavioural responses to human disturbance: a matter of
472 choice? *Animal Behaviour* **68**:1065-1069.
- 473 Beale, C. M., and P. Monaghan. 2004b. Human disturbance: people as predation-free predators?
474 *Journal of Applied Ecology* **41**:335-343.
- 475 Bischof, R., C. Bonenfant, I. M. Rivrud, A. Zedrosser, A. Friebe, T. Coulson, A. Mysterud, and J. E.
476 Swenson. 2018. Regulated hunting re-shapes the life history of brown bears. *Nature Ecology
477 and Evolution* **2**:116-123.
- 478 Bischof, R., S. M. J. G. Steyaert, and J. Kindberg. 2017. Caught in the mesh: roads and their network-
479 scale impediment to animal movement. *Ecography* **40**:1369-1380.
- 480 Bischof, R., J. E. Swenson, N. G. Yoccoz, A. Mysterud, and O. Gimenez. 2009. The magnitude and
481 selectivity of natural and multiple anthropogenic mortality causes in hunted brown bears.
482 *Journal of Animal Ecology* **78**:656-665.
- 483 Blumstein, D. T., L. L. Anthony, R. Harcourt, and G. Ross. 2003. Testing a key assumption of wildlife
484 buffer zones: is flight initiation distance a species-specific trait? *Biological Conservation*
485 **110**:97-100.
- 486 Burnham, K. P., and D. R. Anderson. 2002. Model selection and multimodel inference. A practical
487 information-theoretic approach. 2nd edition. Springer, New York, USA.
- 488 Calenge, C. 2006. The package "adehabitat" for the R software: a tool for the analysis of space and
489 habitat use by animals. *Ecological Modelling* **197**:516-519.
- 490 Calenge, C. 2015. Home range estimation in R: the adehabitatHR package. [https://cran.r-
491 project.org/web/packages/adehabitatHR/vignettes/adehabitatHR.pdf](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/adehabitatHR/vignettes/adehabitatHR.pdf)
- 492 Dahle, B., and J. E. Swenson. 2003. Home ranges in adult Scadinavian brown bears (*Ursus arctos*):
493 effect of mass, sex, reproductive category, population density and habitat type. *Journal of
494 Zoology* **260**:329-335.
- 495 Deecke, V. B., P. J. B. Slater, and J. K. B. Ford. 2002. Selective habituation shapes acoustic predator
496 recognition in harbour seals. *Nature* **420**:171-173.
- 497 Dettki, H., G. Ericsson, T. Giles, and M. Norrskén-Ericsson. 2013. Wireless Remote Animal Monitoring
498 (WRAM) - A new international database e-infrastructure for telemetry sensor data from fish

499 and wildlife. p. 247-256. In: Proceedings Etc 2012: Convention for Telemetry, Test
500 Instrumentation and Telecontrol (Eds. The European Society of Telemetry). Books on
501 Demand, pp. 292, ISBN: 978-3-7322-5646-4.

502 Eager, C. D. 2017. standardize: Tools for standardizing variables for regression in R. R package version
503 0.2.1.

504 ESRI. 2012. ArcGIS Desktop: Release 10.1. Environmental Systems Research Institute, Redlands, CA.

505 Eurostat. GEOSTAT 1km² population grid for 2006.
506 [http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/gisco/geodata/reference-data/population-distribution-](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/gisco/geodata/reference-data/population-distribution-demography/)
507 [demography/](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/gisco/geodata/reference-data/population-distribution-demography/).

508 Finnish Meteorological Institute. Temperature and precipitation statistics from 1961 onwards.
509 <http://en.ilmatieteenlaitos.fi/statistics-from-1961-onwards>.

510 Fowler, G. S. 1999. Behavioral and hormonal responses of Magellanic penguins (*Spheniscus*
511 *magellanicus*) to tourism and nest site visitation. *Biological Conservation* **90**:143-149.

512 Fox, J., and S. Weisberg. 2011. An {R} Companion to Applied Regression. 2nd edition. Sage, Thousand
513 Oaks, CA.

514 Frank, S. C., A. Ordiz, J. Gosselin, A. Hertel, J. Kindberg, M. Leclerc, F. Pelletier, S. M. J. G. Steyaert, O.-
515 G. Støen, J. Van de Walle, A. Zedrosser, and J. E. Swenson. 2017. Indirect effects of bear
516 hunting: a review from Scandinavia. *Ursus* **28**:150-164.

517 Frid, A., and L. M. Dill. 2002. Human-caused disturbance stimuli as a form of predation risk.
518 *Conservation Ecology* **6**:11.

519 George, S. L., and K. R. Crooks. 2006. Recreation and large mammal activity in an urban nature
520 reserve. *Biological Conservation* **133**:107-117.

521 Gibeau, M. L., A. P. Clevenger, S. Herrero, and J. Wierzchowski. 2002. Grizzly bear response to human
522 development and activities in the Bow River Watershed, Alberta, Canada. *Biological*
523 *Conservation* **103**:227-236.

524 Gill, J. A., K. Norris, and W. J. Sutherland. 2001. Why behavioural responses may not reflect the
525 population consequences of human disturbance. *Biological Conservation* **97**:265-268.

526 Gill, J. A., W. J. Sutherland, and A. R. Watkinson. 1996. A method to quantify the effects of human
527 disturbance on animal populations. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **33**:786-792.

528 Grueber, C. E., S. Nakagawa, R. J. Laws, and I. G. Jamieson. 2011. Multimodel inference in ecology
529 and evolution: challenges and solutions. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **24**:699-711.

530 Kojola, I., and S. Heikkinen. 2006. The structure of the expanded brown bear population at the edge
531 of the Finnish range. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* **43**:258-262.

532 Kopatz, A., H. G. Eiken, J. Aspi, I. Kojola, C. Tobiassen, K. F. Tirronen, P. I. Danilov, and S. B. Hagen.
533 2014. Admixture and gene flow from Russia in the recovering northern European brown bear
534 (*Ursus arctos*). *Plos One* **9**:e97558.

535 Lima, S. L. 1998. Nonlethal effects in the ecology of predator-prey interactions. *BioScience* **48**:25-34.

536 Matson, G., L. Van Daele, E. Goodwin, L. Aumiller, H. Reynolds, and H. Hristienko. 1993. A laboratory
537 manual for cementum age determination of Alaska brown bear first premolar teeth.
538 Matson's Laboratory, Milltown, Montana, USA.

539 Moe, T. F., J. Kindberg, I. Jansson, and J. E. Swenson. 2007. Importance of diel behaviour when
540 studying habitat selection: examples from female Scandinavian brown bears (*Ursus arctos*).
541 *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **85**:518-525.

542 Moen, G. K., O.-G. Støen, V. Sahlén, and J. E. Swenson. 2012. Behaviour of solitary adult Scandinavian
543 brown bears (*Ursus arctos*) when approached by humans on foot. *Plos One* **7**:e31699.

544 Montgomery, D. C. 2005. Introduction to statistical quality control. 5th edition. Wiley, New York,
545 USA.

546 National Land Survey of Finland. Terrängkarta 1:100,000.
547 <https://tiedostopalvelu.maanmittauslaitos.fi/tp/kartta?lang=sv>.

548 National Veterinary Institute. 2017. Licensjakt på björn. [http://sva.se/djurhalsa/vilda-djur/stora-](http://sva.se/djurhalsa/vilda-djur/stora-rovdjur/licensjakt_pa_bjorn)
549 [rovdjur/licensjakt_pa_bjorn](http://sva.se/djurhalsa/vilda-djur/stora-rovdjur/licensjakt_pa_bjorn).

550 Naves, J., T. Wiegand, E. Revilla, and M. Delibes. 2003. Endangered species constrained by natural
551 and human factors: the case of brown bears in northern Spain. *Conservation Biology*
552 **17**:1276-1289.

553 Nellemann, C., O.-G. Støen, J. Kindberg, J. E. Swenson, I. Vistnes, G. Ericsson, J. Katajisto, B. P.
554 Kaltenborn, J. Martin, and A. Ordiz. 2007. Terrain use by an expanding brown bear
555 population in relation to age, recreational resorts and human settlements. *Biological*
556 *Conservation* **138**:157-165.

557 Nielsen, S. E., M. S. Boyce, and G. B. Stenhouse. 2004. Grizzly bears and forestry: I. Selection of
558 clearcuts by grizzly bears in west-central Alberta, Canada. *Forest Ecology and Management*
559 **199**:51-65.

560 Ordiz, A., J. Kindberg, S. Sæbø, J. E. Swenson, and O.-G. Støen. 2014. Brown bear circadian behavior
561 reveals human environmental encroachment. *Biological Conservation* **173**:1-9.

562 Ordiz, A., O.-G. Støen, M. Delibes, and J. E. Swenson. 2011. Predators or prey? Spatio-temporal
563 discrimination of human-derived risk by brown bears. *Oecologia* **166**:59-67.

564 Ordiz, A., O.-G. Støen, L. G. Langebro, S. Brunberg, and J. E. Swenson. 2009. A practical method for
565 measuring horizontal cover. *Ursus* **20**:109-113.

566 Ordiz, A., O.-G. Støen, S. Sæbø, J. Kindberg, M. Delibes, and J. E. Swenson. 2012. Do bears know they
567 are being hunted? *Biological Conservation* **152**:21-28.

568 Ordiz, A., O.-G. Støen, S. Sæbø, V. Sahlén, B. E. Pedersen, J. Kindberg, and J. E. Swenson. 2013. Lasting
569 behavioural responses of brown bears to experimental encounters with humans. *Journal of*
570 *Applied Ecology* **50**:306-314.

571 Ordiz, A., S. Sæbø, J. Kindberg, J. E. Swenson, and O.-G. Støen. 2017. Seasonality and human
572 disturbance alter brown bear activity patterns: implications for circumpolar carnivore
573 conservation? *Animal Conservation* **20**:51-60.

574 Pulliainen. 1983. Behaviour of an expanding population of the brown bear (*Ursus arctos*) in northern
575 Europe. *Z. Säugetierkunde* **48**:290-297.

576 R Core Team. 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R foundation for
577 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

578 Rode, K. D., S. D. Farley, and C. T. Robbins. 2006. Sexual dimorphism, reproductive strategy, and
579 human activities determine resource use by brown bears. *Ecology* **87**:2636-2646.

580 Sahlén, V., A. Ordiz, J. E. Swenson, and O. G. Støen. 2015. Behavioural differences between single
581 Scandinavian brown bears (*Ursus arctos*) and females with dependent young when
582 experimentally approached by humans. *Plos One* **10**:e0121576.

583 Sahlén, V., Swenson, J. E., Brunberg, S., Kindberg, J. 2006. Björnen i Sverige. A report from the
584 Scandinavian Brown Bear Research Project to the Swedish White Paper on Predator
585 Management, Stockholm, Sweden.

586 Solberg, K. H., E. Bellemain, O.-M. Drageset, P. Taberlet, and J. E. Swenson. 2006. An evaluation of
587 field and non-invasive genetic methods to estimate brown bear (*Ursus arctos*) population
588 size. *Biological Conservation* **128**:158-168.

589 Stankowich, T. 2008. Ungulate flight responses to human disturbance: A review and meta-analysis.
590 *Biological Conservation* **141**:2159-2173.

591 Statistics Finland. 2008. Statistical Yearbook of Finland 2008. Multiprint Oy, Finland.

592 Statistics Sweden. Population density per sq. km, population and land area by region and sex. Year
593 1991 - 2017.
594 [http://www.statistikdatabasen.scb.se/pxweb/en/ssd/START__BE__BE0101__BE0101C/BefAr
595 ealTathetKon/?rxid=ac8a9f3d-fc94-4c9f-b33e-a5fbf8d4c8ab](http://www.statistikdatabasen.scb.se/pxweb/en/ssd/START__BE__BE0101__BE0101C/BefAr

595 ealTathetKon/?rxid=ac8a9f3d-fc94-4c9f-b33e-a5fbf8d4c8ab).

596 Statistics Sweden. Öppna geodata för tätorter. [http://www.scb.se/hitta-statistik/regional-statistik-
597 och-kartor/geodata/oppna-geodata/tatorter/](http://www.scb.se/hitta-statistik/regional-statistik-

597 och-kartor/geodata/oppna-geodata/tatorter/).

598 Steyaert, S. M. J. G., A. Zedrosser, M. Elfström, A. Ordiz, M. Leclerc, S. C. Frank, J. Kindberg, O.-G.
599 Støen, S. Brunberg, and J. E. Swenson. 2016. Ecological implications from spatial patterns in
600 human-caused brown bear mortality. *Wildlife Biology* **22**:144-152.

601 Støen, O.-G., A. Ordiz, A. L. Evans, T. G. Laske, J. Kindberg, O. Frøbert, J. E. Swenson, and J. M.
602 Arnemo. 2015. Physiological evidence for a human-induced landscape of fear in brown bears
603 (*Ursus arctos*). *Physiology & Behavior* **152**:244-248.

604 Sundell, J., I. Kojola, and I. Hanski. 2006. A new GPS-GSM-based method to study behavior of brown
605 bears. *Wildlife Society Bulletin (1973-2006)* **34**:446-450.

606 Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological Institute. 2017a. Normal medeltemperatur för januari.
607 [http://www.smhi.se/klimatdata/meteorologi/temperatur/normal-medeltemperatur-for-](http://www.smhi.se/klimatdata/meteorologi/temperatur/normal-medeltemperatur-for-januari-1.3976)
608 [januari-1.3976](http://www.smhi.se/klimatdata/meteorologi/temperatur/normal-medeltemperatur-for-januari-1.3976).

609 Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological Institute. 2017b. Normal medeltemperatur för juli.
610 [http://www.smhi.se/klimatdata/meteorologi/temperatur/normal-medeltemperatur-for-juli-](http://www.smhi.se/klimatdata/meteorologi/temperatur/normal-medeltemperatur-for-juli-1.3991)
611 [1.3991](http://www.smhi.se/klimatdata/meteorologi/temperatur/normal-medeltemperatur-for-juli-1.3991).

612 Swedish National Land Survey. Fastighetskartan. [https://www.lantmateriet.se/sv/Kartor-och-](https://www.lantmateriet.se/sv/Kartor-och-geografisk-information/Kartor/Fastighetskartan/)
613 [geografisk-information/Kartor/Fastighetskartan/](https://www.lantmateriet.se/sv/Kartor-och-geografisk-information/Kartor/Fastighetskartan/)

614 Swedish National Land Survey. Vägkartan. [https://www.lantmateriet.se/sv/Kartor-och-geografisk-](https://www.lantmateriet.se/sv/Kartor-och-geografisk-information/Kartor/Vagkartan/)
615 [information/Kartor/Vagkartan/](https://www.lantmateriet.se/sv/Kartor-och-geografisk-information/Kartor/Vagkartan/).

616 Swenson, J. E., N. Gerstl, B. Dahle, and A. Zedrosser. 2000. Action plan for the conservation of the
617 brown bear in Europe (*Ursus arctos*). Strasbourg Cedex, Council of Europe. Nature and
618 environment.

619 Swenson, J. E., F. Sandegren, and A. Söderberg. 1998. Geographic expansion of an increasing brown
620 bear population: evidence for presaturation dispersal. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **67**:819-826.

621 Swenson, J. E., M. Schneider, A. Zedrosser, A. Söderberg, R. Franzén, and J. Kindberg. 2017.
622 Challenges of managing a European brown bear population; lessons from Sweden, 1943–
623 2013. *Wildlife Biology* **2017**:wlb.00251.

624 Swenson, J. E., P. Wabakken, F. Sandegren, A. Bjärvall, R. Franzén, and A. Söderberg. 1995. The near
625 extinction and recovery of brown bears in Scandinavia in relation to the bear management
626 policies of Norway and Sweden. *Wildlife Biology* **1**:11-25.

627 Tablado, Z., and L. Jenni. 2017. Determinants of uncertainty in wildlife responses to human
628 disturbance. *Biological Reviews* **92**:216-233.

629 The Finnish Wildlife Agency. 2017. Karhusaaliit.
630 <https://riista.fi/metsastys/saalisuuranta/karhusaaliit/>.

631 Trombulak, S. C., and C. A. Frissell. 2000. Review of ecological effects of roads on terrestrial and
632 aquatic communities. *Conservation Biology* **14**:18-30.

633 Vincze, E., S. Papp, B. Preiszner, G. Seress, V. Bókony, and A. Liker. 2016. Habituation to human
634 disturbance is faster in urban than rural house sparrows. *Behavioral Ecology* **27**:1304-1313.

635 Whittaker, D., and R. L. Knight. 1998. Understanding wildlife responses to humans. *Wildlife Society*
636 *Bulletin* **26**:312-317.

637 Wikman, M. 2010. Riistakannat 2010. Riistaseurantojen tulokset. Riista- ja kalatalouden
638 tutkimuslaitos, Helsinki, Finland.

639 Zedrosser, A., S. M. J. G. Steyaert, H. Gossow, and J. E. Swenson. 2011. Brown bear conservation and
640 the ghost of persecution past. *Biological Conservation* **144**:2163-2170.

641 Zuur, A. F., E. N. Ieno, N. J. Walker, A. A. Saveliev, and G. M. Smith. 2009. Mixed effects models and
642 extensions in ecology with R. Springer Science+Business Media, New York, USA.

643

644 **Appendix 1**

645 Sets of top candidate models, with $\Delta AICc < 2$ compared to the model with the lowest $AICc$ for each
 646 response variable, for flight reactions of brown bears experimentally approached in southcentral
 647 Sweden.

648
 649 Table 1A: Best candidate models ($\Delta AICc < 2$) following generalized linear mixed regression
 650 (binominal link function) explaining the factors that influenced whether brown bears stayed (0) or
 651 moved away (1) when approached by humans in southcentral Sweden, from 2006 to 2009 ($n = 118$).
 652 The continuous variables were scaled to 1 SD. See Table 1 for explanation of the variables.
 653

| Model | AICc | $\Delta AICc$ | weight |
|--|--------|---------------|--------|
| Season + Number of observers | 134.41 | 0.00 | 0.21 |
| Season + Number of observers + Distance to observer | 134.99 | 0.58 | 0.16 |
| Season + Number of observers + Human HR | 135.24 | 0.83 | 0.14 |
| Season + Number of observers + Road HR | 135.49 | 1.08 | 0.12 |
| Season + Number of observers + Distance to observer + Human HR | 135.94 | 1.53 | 0.10 |
| Season + Number of observers + Distance to road from IS | 136.11 | 1.70 | 0.09 |
| Season + Number of observers + Distance to observer + Road HR | 136.18 | 1.78 | 0.09 |
| Season + Number of observers + Activity | 136.21 | 1.80 | 0.09 |

654
 655
 656 Table 2A. The best candidate models ($\Delta AICc < 2$) following linear mixed regression explaining
 657 distance moved (DM) for bears when approached by humans in southcentral Sweden from 2006 to
 658 2009 ($n = 71$). The bears left their initial sites before the observers passed them. DM is log
 659 transformed. The continuous variables are scaled to 1 SD. See Table 1 for explanation of the variables.
 660

| Model | AICc | $\Delta AICc$ | weight |
|---|--------|---------------|--------|
| Activity + Sex + Sighting distance in IS + Number of observers | 202.93 | 0.00 | 0.55 |
| Activity + Sighting distance in IS + Number of observers | 204.51 | 1.58 | 0.25 |
| Activity + Sex + Sighting distance in IS + Number of observers + Season | 204.87 | 1.94 | 0.21 |

661
 662
 663 Table 3A. The best candidate models ($\Delta AICc < 2$) following linear mixed regression explaining time
 664 spent moving after disturbance (TSM) for bears when approached by humans in southcentral Sweden
 665 from 2006 to 2009 ($n = 63$). The bears left their initial sites before the observers passed them. TSM is
 666 log transformed. The continuous variables are scaled to 1 SD. See Table 1 for explanation of the
 667 variables.
 668

| Model | AICc | $\Delta AICc$ | weight |
|---|--------|---------------|--------|
| Number of observers | 167.62 | 0.00 | 0.37 |
| Number of observers + Sighting distance in IS | 168.31 | 0.68 | 0.26 |
| NULL | 168.74 | 1.12 | 0.21 |
| Number of observers + Sex | 169.26 | 1.64 | 0.16 |

669