Results – Abridged

**Sentinel presence:** 25 vids, 13 obs in comm, 20 in green (small af sample size)

19 obs w/ sent 14 obs w/ no sent

G.Env did not affect sent pres

* makes sense since all still in urb env. So potentially higher energetic levels. Further research required across gradient of urbanization from natural to urban.
* Could be small sample size, making effect impossible to see. Needs more data

Group size did not affect sent pres

* Contrary to literature
* More inds in group = less ind contribution to sent BUT more overall sent
* Small sample size and gaps in the distribution of data (many at zero, some in the middle, few were high)

Dist freq did not affect sent pres

* Contrary to literature, risk did not increase the likelihood of a sentinel being present.
* Small sample size
* When dist too high, all group members left

Overall point to make: Cannot make any inferences about sentinel likelihood based on our results due to small sample size.

**Allocation of time to each behav:**

Similar proportion of time allocated to each behaviour

* Could be that the proportion of time remains largely fixed, and variations in the behaviours occur at the bout level (how often and for how long).
* Makes sense to remain constant since the needs remain relatively constant
* Would be interesting if these proportions change if comparing with “natural” populations outside of urban areas (less energy, more need for foraging)

No effect of sentinel presence

* Contrary to literature
* Sent. Pres should decrease prop time spent being alert.
* Decrease in alert behav or increase in foraging could be observed at the bout level

No effect of g.Env

* Could be that the env. Is perceived similarly, no extra threat associated with the env. Could also be that the proportion remains the same regardless of env, with variations occurring at a the bout level

**Duration of bouts**

Average duration of all bouts 1.75s

* Bouts of alert behav shorter than bouts of foraging
  + Less time required to be alert than to forage
  + More time required to manipulate and eat while foraging
  + Time required to look around much shorter

Sentinel presence increased the duration of all bouts, yet separately had no significant effect on either alert or foraging behaviour.

* Unsure why not significant when separate but significant together.

Generalized environment had a significant effect

* Longer bouts in green areas
* Could be driven by increase in duration of bouts of foraging behaviour
* Green areas perceived as safer?

Disturbance freq decreased duration of all bouts

* In line with literature
* Urgency! Could be a decrease in the duration of bouts of foraging as a result of needing to be alert more frequently

Interaction between sentinel presence and generalized environment

Discussion organization:

Subheadings to separate topics

First paragraph should be main points of interest (big findings, if present)

Have a separate section for “limitations” where you can put all the (repeated) limitations of the study design

Here’s how I see the discussion going:

1st Par. Main findings! Outline exactly what the reader should know.

2nd + Par. Go measurement by measurement and explain “at a smaller scale”

ONCE DONE, group effects (e.g. how does dist. Freq. affect forager behaviour), discuss while linking to literature

After, outline and discuss the limitations of the experiment. Mainly talk about small sample size, impossibility to distinguish anti-predator vigilance from looking for patches/at other foragers, etc

Last par. Repeat main findings and conclude discussion

EZ PZ, probably…