


## RESEARCH ARTICLE

# FoxNet: An individual-based model framework to support management of an invasive predator, the red fox

Bronwyn A. Hradsky<sup>1,2</sup>  | Luke T. Kelly<sup>1,3,4</sup> | Alan Robley<sup>5</sup> | Brendan A. Wintle<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Quantitative and Applied Ecology, School of BioSciences, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Vic., Australia

<sup>2</sup>NESP Threatened Species Recovery Hub, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Vic., Australia

<sup>3</sup>ARC Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions, School of BioSciences, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Vic., Australia

<sup>4</sup>School of Ecosystem and Forest Sciences, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Vic., Australia

<sup>5</sup>Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, Arthur Rylah Institute, Heidelberg, Vic., Australia

## Correspondence

Bronwyn A. Hradsky  
Email: hradskyb@unimelb.edu.au

## Funding information

Australian Government's National Environmental Science Program through the Threatened Species Recovery Hub; Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, State Government of Victoria; Parks Victoria; ARC Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions

Handling Editor: Marie-Josée Fortin

## Abstract

1. Invasive predators are a key driver of biodiversity decline, and effective predator management is an important conservation issue globally. The red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) poses a significant threat to wildlife, livestock and human health across Eurasia, North America and Australia. Despite worldwide investment in red fox management, decision makers still lack flexible tools for predicting control efficacy.
2. We have developed FoxNet, a spatially explicit, individual-based model (IBM) framework that can be customised to predict red fox population dynamics, including responses to control and landscape productivity. High-resolution models can be run across northern and southern hemisphere landscapes. We present four case-study models to verify FoxNet outputs, explore key sensitivities and demonstrate the framework's utility as a management planning tool.
3. FoxNet models were largely successful in reproducing the demographic structure of two red fox populations in highly contrasting landscapes. They also accurately generated the relationship between home-range size and fox-family density for home-range sizes between 1.0 and 9.6 km<sup>2</sup>, and captured the rapid decline and seasonally driven recovery of a red fox population following poison-baiting.
4. An exploration of alternative poison-baiting scenarios for a conservation reserve predicted that current management suppresses red fox density by ~70% and showed that frequent baiting is required to combat recolonisation. Baiting at higher densities or establishing a baited buffer would further reduce red fox density. Predictions were sensitive to home-range and litter size assumptions, illustrating the value of region-specific data on red fox movement and biology.
5. *Synthesis and applications.* We have developed a versatile individual-based model framework to guide management of the red fox, a globally significant invasive predator. Our framework, FoxNet, can be customised to generate realistic predictions of red fox population dynamics in diverse landscapes, making it immediately applicable to the design and optimisation of predator control programmes at scales relevant to management. Future extensions could explore competitor and prey responses to red fox control and the effects of habitat disturbance on predator population dynamics.

## KEYWORDS

biodiversity conservation, carnivore, individual-based model, invasive species, population dynamics, predator control, red fox, spatially explicit population model

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

Invasive mammalian predators are among the leading causes of global biodiversity decline (Bellard, Genovesi, & Jeschke, 2016; Doherty, Glen, Nimmo, Ritchie, & Dickman, 2016). Understanding the effectiveness of predator control is therefore a key conservation issue across urban and natural landscapes (Bonnell & Breck, 2017; O'Donnell, Pryde, van Dam-Bates, & Elliott, 2017). One of the world's most widespread predators, the red fox *Vulpes vulpes*, is invasive or overabundant across much of its range (Larivière & Pasitschniak-Arts, 1996). Red foxes (hereafter 'foxes') pose a significant threat to numerous birds and mammals (Doherty et al., 2016; Kamler & Ballard, 2002), impact livestock (Baker, Boitani, Harris, Saunders, & White, 2008), and host zoonoses (Budgey, Learmount, & Smith, 2017; Muller et al., 2015). Thus, there is substantial investment in the design and deployment of fox management programmes across Europe, North America and Australia (McLeod, 2004; Muller et al., 2015; Shwiff, Nunan, Kirkpatrick, & Shwiff, 2011). For example, Australia spends more than \$16 million AUD on fox management annually (McLeod, 2004).

A range of techniques have been used to study fox management, including field experiments (Bino et al., 2010; Lieury et al., 2015; Thomson, Marlow, Rose, & Kok, 2000), mathematical models (Harding, Doak, & Albertson, 2001; McLeod & Saunders, 2001) and individual-based models (IBMs; Budgey et al., 2017; Rushton, Shirley, Macdonald, & Reynolds, 2006; Smith & Wilkinson, 2003; Thulke et al., 1999). IBMs (also known as agent-based models) can be used to investigate how individual behaviours and local interactions create spatial and temporal patterns in population dynamics (Grimm et al., 2005). They represent the components of a system as unique, autonomous 'agents' (or 'individuals') which use adaptive behaviours such as seeking food resources to achieve goals (Grimm et al., 2005). IBMs have considerably advanced our understanding of fox management, demonstrating that lethal approaches are more effective than fertility control for suppressing foxes and eradicating diseases, and that fox density, immigration and the timing and configuration of intervention influence control efficacy (Budgey et al., 2017; Eisinger & Thulke, 2008; Rushton et al., 2006; Smith & Wilkinson, 2003).

Nonetheless, several factors limit the broader relevance of previous fox management IBMs. First, the proportion of individuals 'treated' (i.e. poisoned, immunised or sterilised) within the management area is pre-determined by the modeller. This prevents comparison of different management designs (e.g. the intensity of bait deployments) and ignores issues such as spatial variation in bait uptake (Carter & Luck, 2013). Second, most IBMs have been developed for specific landscapes, and do not support customisation of

demographic parameters, which vary widely among fox populations (Devenish-Nelson, Harris, Soulsbury, Richards, & Stephens, 2013). Finally, existing models fix the distribution and number of fox territories from the outset of implementation, preventing exploration of the dynamic nature of fox territories (Bino et al., 2010; Hradsky, Robley, et al., 2017). Recent advances in modelling carnivore territories based on resource acquisition and individual interactions (e.g. Carter, Levin, Barlow, & Grimm, 2015) provide opportunities for more sophisticated explorations of these dynamics.

Poison baiting with 1080 (sodium fluoroacetate) is the primary fox management approach in Australia (Saunders, Gentle, & Dickman, 2010). Baiting at large scales (>500 km<sup>2</sup>) and high densities (≥5 baits per km<sup>2</sup>) can greatly reduce fox densities, with populations remaining low for several months (Berry et al., 2014; Thomson et al., 2000). In contrast, patchy or smaller-scale control may result in little detectable change in fox density (Bengsen, 2014; Newsome, Crowther, & Dickman, 2014), or even increase fox activity or abundance through compensatory immigration (Lieury et al., 2015; Towerton, Dickman, Kavanagh, & Penman, 2016). Considerable uncertainty remains about the efficacy of low-intensity landscape-scale fox management for biodiversity conservation (Robley, Gormley, Forsyth, & Triggs, 2014; Towerton et al., 2016; Walsh, Wilson, Benshemesh, & Possingham, 2012), and the design of more effective management is hampered by a lack of tools for predicting the effects of control.

The aim of this study was to develop a spatially explicit IBM framework to facilitate predictive modelling of fox populations under spatially and temporally variable management regimes. Our modelling framework, FoxNet, can be customised to heterogeneous landscapes and northern and southern hemisphere scenarios. We 'evaluated' (i.e. evaluated and validated) FoxNet using a hierarchically structured approach to analyse processes at an individual- and population-level (Augusiak, Van den Brink, & Grimm, 2014; Kubicek, Jopp, Breckling, Lange, & Reuter, 2015). Case-study models are presented to demonstrate different aspects of FoxNet's generality and application to management problems, including output verifications and sensitivity analyses for key parameters. Additional demonstrations, worked examples and implementation verifications are provided in the User Guide (see Appendix S1).

## 2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 | The FoxNet modelling framework

FoxNet is a customisable, spatially explicit, individual-based modelling framework for running red fox population models, based in NETLOGO (version 6.0.2; Wilensky, 1999). It has four main types of agent: *habitat-cells*, *foxes*, *fox-families* and *bait-stations*. It progresses

in weekly, fortnightly or 4-weekly time-steps, with 52 weeks per year. A detailed User Guide and description of FoxNet following the revised Overview, Design Details (ODD) protocol (Grimm et al., 2010) are provided in Appendix S1.


FoxNet forms a landscape of square habitat-cells, which can be generated within FoxNet or imported as a raster via a GIS extension. Habitat-cells specify the layout of habitat types and monitoring regions(s). Their size is user-specified; we find 0.01 km<sup>2</sup> provides a good compromise between computational efficiency and intra-home-range variation, given fox home-range size varies from less than 0.5 km<sup>2</sup> to more than 9 km<sup>2</sup> (Trehwella, Harris, & McAllister, 1988). To facilitate scenario customisation, the productivity of each habitat-cell in the primary habitat type is calculated from the average size of a fox home-range (input by the user) and the daily food requirements of an adult fox (378 g/day; Lockie, 1959); an approach similar to Carter et al. (2015). For example if input fox home-range size was 1 km<sup>2</sup>, the productivity of each 0.01 km<sup>2</sup> habitat-cell in the primary habitat type would be 3.78 g/day. The productivity of other habitat types is specified relative to this primary habitat type. Productivity determines fox-family territory size and so limits the carrying capacity of the landscape (see Appendix S1: Sections 7.1 and 7.2).

Foxes are mobile agents whose behaviour is determined by their age, status (cub, subordinate, disperser or alpha) and the time of year (Larivière & Pasitschniak-Arts, 1996). Each alpha fox is a member of a fox-family—another agent, which is used to establish and update the territory of its family-members (foxes within a family share a semi-exclusive territory; Sargeant, 1972). A fox-family must contain at least one alpha fox, and may also include the alpha's mate, cubs and subordinate offspring (Baker, Robertson, Funk, & Harris, 1998).

Bait-station agents indicate the habitat-cells where baits are laid. They can be positioned at regular, random or customised locations, and only affect foxes who can access that habitat-cell. Baiting occurs at user-specified intervals (maximum frequency of once each time-step), lasts one time-step by default, and is lethal or non-lethal (i.e. foxes may die or survive after encountering a bait).

FoxNet repeats a series of processes consecutively each time-step (Figure 1):

1. Year and week counters are updated (by 1, 2 or 4 weeks, as applicable). Key seasonal events are linked to week-of-year, making FoxNet customisable to northern- and southern-hemisphere scenarios.
2. The age of each fox is updated by the appropriate number of weeks. Cub foxes become subordinates if they reach the age-of-independence. If it is the dispersal season, subordinate male and females have user-specified probabilities of becoming dispersers.
3. Natal succession occurs. That is, if a fox-family is missing an alpha fox, one of the family's subordinates that is the appropriate sex and  $\geq 24$  weeks old becomes the alpha (Baker et al., 1998).
4. Fox-families acquire/replace habitat-cells to maximise the productivity and efficiency of their territory (Appendix S1: Section 7.1). This enables fox-families to take over unoccupied



**FIGURE 1** Key processes in the FoxNet modelling framework. The sequence is repeated each time-step (1, 2 or 4 weeks)

productive habitat-cells (Sargeant, 1972) and respond to changes in resource availability (Bino et al., 2010; Hradsky, Robley, et al., 2017). If the productivity of a fox-family's territory is less than an adult fox's minimum food requirements (<295 g/day; Winstanley, Buttemer, & Saunders, 2003), the fox-family fails, causing all adults to become dispersers and cubs to die.

5. If scheduled, baits are laid at bait-stations and the cost of baiting is calculated. Foxes belonging to a fox-family with a territory that overlaps a toxic bait are at risk of dying. Risk scales directly with

the number of bait-stations and bait efficacy, and inversely with territory size and the number of foxes in the fox-family (Appendix S1: Section 7.3). Each bait-station only affects one fox each time-step.

6. New disperser foxes leave their natal family and move in a random direction for a random distance drawn from a sex-specific exponential distribution, scaled by their home-range size (Trehwella et al., 1988). Disperser foxes then explore an area three times the radius of an average home range (Soulsbury, Iossa, Baker, White, & Harris, 2011) where they (a) are exposed to any active bait-stations; (b) attempt to join a fox-family that lacks an alpha fox of the appropriate sex; (c) try to establish a new fox-family. If unsuccessful, they remain a disperser until the next time-step.
7. If it is the breeding season, fox-families that contain an alpha male and an alpha female fox breed, producing a Poisson-distributed number of cubs. If an alpha fox of either sex is absent, all family members become dispersers and attempt to join other nearby fox-families, promoting the persistence of the population at low densities.
8. Stochastic background mortality of foxes occurs, based purely on their age.
9. Cub foxes belonging to fox-families without any adults die, reflecting their dependence on food-provision (Baker et al., 1998). This allows baiting to affect reproductive success. Fox-families that no longer have any family members are removed.
10. Model outputs are updated and plotted. Outputs can include age structure, population structure, dispersal distances, density or number of neighbours of foxes within the monitoring region(s), the number of foxes with territories overlapping a monitoring transect, and/or bait-take rates.
11. If baits were deployed at bait-stations at step 5, un-eaten baits are removed to mimic the degradation of the poison to non-toxic levels (Saunders, McLeod, & Kay, 2000).
12. The time-step counter increases by one.
13. The model checks if any fox agents are alive. If all foxes are dead, the model stops.

## 2.2 | FoxNet case studies

Case-study models were run in R v3.5.1 (R Core Team, 2018) using RNetLogo (Thiele, 2014), with 30 iterations of each parameter set. Unless otherwise specified, models were run for 15 years to remove founding effects before experiments commenced. Input parameters were extracted from field studies (see Table S1 for sources) and were not calibrated to improve output fit. Output verification (Augusiak et al., 2014) was conducted through quantitative comparison of model outputs and field estimates as per Bennett et al. (2013).

### 2.2.1 | Bristol, UK

The fox population in the city of Bristol, United Kingdom, is dense (>6 foxes per km<sup>2</sup>) and socially complex. Parameters from

field studies (Table S1) were used to build a FoxNet model with a homogenous 1,600 km<sup>2</sup> landscape (Figure S1). The number of foxes in each demographic group and the proportion of foxes in each age class were output for a central 116 km<sup>2</sup> area in April and compared to field estimates by Harris and Smith (1987). Harris and Smith (1987) only provide point estimates without uncertainty bounds and so we could not test whether modelled output bounds lay within their observation error. Instead, we verified demographic group outputs by calculating the probability of the field observation coming from the modelled distribution, and verified age-structure outputs by fitting a linear regression to mean model outputs against field observations and checking whether the regression differed from 1:1. Harris and Smith (1987) reported net annual emigration of 17.6% male cubs, 5.9% female cubs and 3.4% of adult females, and so we ran a second 'emigration' version of the model with a customised code to incorporate these rates as mortality at the start of each dispersal season.

### 2.2.2 | Northern Hemisphere

We used similar inputs to the Bristol case-study (Table S1) to verify that FoxNet models reproduced the relationship between home-range size and fox-family density observed across 22 northern hemisphere fox populations (Trehwella et al., 1988). We varied the home-range size input from 0.45 to 9.6 km<sup>2</sup> (the minimum and maximum values recorded by Trehwella et al. 1988) and ran models for 5 years as fox-family densities stabilised within this time. We fitted a linear regression to the relationship between 1/home-range size and fox-family density for the FoxNet outputs and field observations, and tested whether data source influenced the regression intercept or slope.

### 2.2.3 | Carnarvon, Western Australia

An arid rangeland at Carnarvon, Western Australia, supports a low density of foxes (~0.5 foxes per km<sup>2</sup>) with a monogamous mating system (Marlow et al., 2000). A destructive sample across 200 km<sup>2</sup> in December 1992 provided a snapshot of population age structure and abundance (Marlow et al., 2000). We used parameters from field studies (Table S1) to build a model of this population and verified age-structure outputs using a linear regression of mean output values against field observations, as for the Bristol case-study above.

We then built a model with the same input parameters but a 13,628 km<sup>2</sup> landscape to reproduce a management experiment at Carnarvon described by Thomson et al. (2000). We imported the landscape as a raster with land, ocean and an asymmetric monitoring region (Figure S2). We wrote a customised baiting code to deploy five poison baits per km<sup>2</sup> across a 3,180 km<sup>2</sup> zone in August, followed by baiting of the outermost 5 km of the zone in May and the outermost 10 km in February and May of the third year. We determined whether the range of output fox densities in a core ~1,000 km<sup>2</sup> baited region over 96 weeks overlapped Thomson et al. (2000) field estimates, for three modelled levels of bait efficacy.

Only foxes >12 weeks old were included in the output densities, as field survey methods were unlikely to detect young cubs.

## 2.2.4 | Mt Clay Reserve, Vic., Australia

Government agencies have been poison-baiting foxes at Mt Clay State Forest and Narrawong Flora Reserve (hereafter 'Mt Clay Reserve') in south-eastern Australia since 2005 as part of a landscape-scale fox management programme to protect threatened native mammals (Robley et al., 2014). The programme has reduced fox activity but some foxes persist in the 4,703-ha reserve and surrounding farmland, and priority native species have not shown a substantial positive response (Robley, Moloney, Neave, & Pitts, 2017). Poison baits are buried at 45 stations at 1-km intervals along roads within the reserve, and replaced fortnightly (Robley et al., 2014). Alternative baiting designs, including changes to baiting density and frequency, need to be explored to enhance conservation management (Robley et al., 2017).

We customised a FoxNet model with parameters from field studies (Table S1) and imported a 4,971 km<sup>2</sup> landscape raster which delineated forest, farmland and ocean (Figure S3). We applied the following alternative baiting programmes:

- Current management: Baits deployed fortnightly at 1-km intervals along roads.
- Variation in baiting frequency: Baits replaced every fortnight, 4 weeks, quarter, or once a year (in January, April, July or September).
- Variation in bait density: A grid of baits across the reserve, with 0.5–8 baits per km<sup>2</sup>.
- Variation in baited area: A 1 bait per km<sup>2</sup> grid across the reserve and a 1–10-km surrounding baited buffer.

We sampled modelled fox density in the reserve fortnightly. We determined mean, minimum and maximum fox densities across 10

years of baiting, after a 2-year transition phase. Field estimates were not available for validation, but we analysed the sensitivity of model outputs to fox home-range area, litter size, female dispersal rates, bait efficacy and the relative productivity of forest and farmland by independently varying each parameter by  $\pm 20\%$  and  $\pm 50\%$  (Table S1).

## 3 | RESULTS

### 3.1 | Bristol, UK

The numbers of non-breeding female, alpha male and subordinate male foxes output by the initial Bristol model were consistent with field estimates (Table 1). However, the modelled numbers of fox-families, breeding females and cubs were approximately 4%, 10% and 9% higher than field estimates, respectively, and the itinerant population was also substantially larger than observed (Table 1). This led to the overall modelled population size being approximately 24% larger than the field estimate. Including additional mortality to mimic net emigration reduced, but did not entirely reconcile, these differences, with the modelled population remaining 16% larger than the field estimate (Table 1).

The population age structure output by the initial Bristol model entirely overlapped field estimates (Figure 2a) with no evidence that the regression of modelled outputs against field estimates differed from 1:1 (mean  $\pm$  1.96 SE:  $\beta_0 = 0.17 \pm 0.22$ ;  $\beta_1 = 0.99 \pm 0.01$ ). Including net emigration had little effect on modelled age structure (Figure 2a) but caused the slope of the regression to become slightly higher than 1:1 ( $\beta_0 = -0.71 \pm 0.95$ ;  $\beta_1 = 1.06 \pm 0.05$ ).


### 3.2 | Northern Hemisphere

The relationship between fox home-range size and fox-family density was very similar for model outputs and the field observations from 22 northern hemisphere studies (Figure 3). There was no evidence


**TABLE 1** Number of foxes in each demographic group for Bristol, UK, in early April.  $\Delta\%$  is the percentage difference between the mean FoxNet model output and the field estimate by Harris and Smith (1987),  $p$  is the probability of observing the field estimate, given the distribution of FoxNet model outputs

Demographic group	Field est.	Original model outputs			Emigration model outputs		
	<i>n</i>	Mean (min–max)	$\Delta\%$	<i>p</i>	Mean (min–max)	$\Delta\%$	<i>p</i>
Territorial population							
Family groups	211	220 (213–226)	4	0.002	221 (216–228)	5	0.001
Breeding females	190	209 (199–215)	10	<0.001	210 (193–220)	11	<0.001
Non-breeding females	143	151 (124–183)	6	0.299	135 (103–165)	–6	0.719
Alpha males	211	210 (201–218)	0	0.607	210 (201–217)	0	0.579
Subordinate males	44	44 (36–58)	0	0.481	38 (25–54)	–14	0.779
Cubs	897	981 (918–1036)	9	0.003	991 (896–1052)	10	0.011
Itinerant population							
Itinerant females	0	145 (112–184)	na	<0.001	114 (84–146)	na	<0.001
Itinerant males	128	260 (227–288)	103	<0.001	172 (143–205)	34	0.002
Total population	1613	1,999 (1,907–2,096)	24	<0.001	1,870 (1,781–1,945)	16	<0.001





**FIGURE 2** Age structure of fox populations in (a) Bristol, England, and (b) Carnarvon, Australia from FoxNet model outputs (mean [min–max],  $n = 30$ ) and field point estimates




**FIGURE 3** Relationship between fox home-range size and density from FoxNet outputs and field data collated by Trehwella et al. (1988). Curves are separate linear models fitted to the inverse of home-range size for FoxNet (dashed) and field (dotted) data, with shading indicating 95% confidence intervals

that data-source influenced either the intercept ( $0.15 \pm 0.29$ ,  $p = 0.32$ ) or slope ( $-0.24 \pm 0.27$ ,  $p = 0.09$ ) of the relationship. Model outputs showed much less variation than field data, likely because FoxNet models do not currently include stochastic environmental variation in mean survival, fecundity or home-range size.

### 3.3 | Carnarvon, Western Australia

The output age structure for Carnarvon followed a similar pattern to field estimates, with no evidence that the regression of mean modelled outputs against observations differed from 1:1 ( $\beta_0 = 1.49 \pm 5.11$ ;  $\beta_1 = 0.88 \pm 0.24$ ). However, model outputs included proportionally more 1–2 and 2–3 year old animals and fewer 3– to 4-year-old and >6-year-old animals (Figure 2b). This is likely because the field observations were not from a stable population: There were more animals in the 3- to 4-year-old age class than the younger age classes (Figure 2b). The output density of adult foxes (mean, min–max: 0.42, 0.34–0.49 foxes per  $\text{km}^2$ ) overlapped the field estimate of 0.46–0.52 foxes per  $\text{km}^2$ .




**FIGURE 4** Effects of pulse baiting on relative fox density at Carnarvon, Western Australia. FoxNet outputs are for 0.3 (dotted line), 0.5 (dashed line) and 0.7 (solid line) bait efficacy, with shaded ribbons indicating minimum and maximum values from 30 replicates. Black dots show field data from Thomson et al. (2000); arrows indicate repeat baiting events

Modelled bait efficacies of 0.3 and 0.5 did not result in sufficient suppression of the Carnarvon fox population. However, a bait efficacy of 0.7 (i.e. a ~13% chance of death per time-step for a fox with one bait on its territory) produced a decline comparable to Thomson et al. (2000) observations (Figure 4). Recovery rates were also consistent with observations: Remaining very low for 6 months then increasing sharply with the dispersal of young foxes in autumn. Modelled densities were 45 (30–54)% lower than field data for week 40, but approached observed values by weeks 82–87 (Figure 4).

### 3.4 | Mt Clay Reserve, Vic., Australia

For an unbaited Mt Clay model scenario, output fox densities over a 10-year period fluctuated between 1.01 (0.81–1.12) and 2.61 (2.15–2.84) foxes per  $\text{km}^2$  (excluding cubs <12 weeks of age). Densities were lowest pre-breeding and peaked in early summer each year with the recruitment of subordinates (Figure 5a). These



**FIGURE 5** Modelled fox density at Mt Clay Reserve, south-eastern Australia. (a) Fox density for 0–12 years post-baiting for unbaited (dotted line) and current baiting (solid line) regimes. (b)–(d) average maximum fox density over a 10-year period, under altered (b) bait frequency, (c) bait density and (d) baited buffer width. Grey horizontal lines in (b)–(d) indicate equivalent values from the unbaited (dashed) and current baiting (solid) scenarios. Ribbons and error bars indicate minimum and maximum values from 30 replicates

patterns are corroborated by a field study from a site 300-km away that found fox densities fluctuate between 1.2 foxes per km<sup>2</sup> immediately prior to breeding and 3.0 foxes per km<sup>2</sup> in early summer (Coman, Robinson, & Beaumont, 1991). The model predicted that the current baiting regime reduces average maximum fox density by 73% and dampens annual fluctuations, with a small peak associated with recruitment, and a larger peak around autumn dispersal (Figure 5a).

Decreasing baiting frequency from fortnightly to 4-weekly or quarterly intervals would increase maximum fox density to 122% or 255% of current levels (Figure 5b). Baiting once per year would mean that maximum fox densities remained at 91%–95% of unbaited levels (Figure 5b).

The current baiting regime deploys 0.96 baits per km<sup>2</sup> patchily across Mt Clay. A regular grid with 1 bait per km<sup>2</sup> would only require one extra bait-station but would reduce maximum fox density to 92% of current levels due to more even coverage. Grids with higher bait densities would achieve greater reductions (Figure 5c). At 8 baits per km<sup>2</sup>, maximum fox density would be reduced to 37% (0.27 foxes per km<sup>2</sup>) of current densities (Figure 5c).

Establishing a 1,000-m baited buffer around Mt Clay would reduce maximum fox density within the reserve to 58% of the current baiting scenario, or 63% of the regular 1 bait per km<sup>2</sup> grid (without a buffer) scenario (Figure 5d). Larger reductions would occur with a wider buffer, although returns diminish with increasing buffer width (Figure 5d).

Output maximum fox densities for Mt Clay were relatively robust to changes in the proportion of dispersing females, the relative productivity of forest and farmland, the efficacy of baits, and increases in home-range area, with no more than a 26% change in maximum density for the  $\pm 50\%$  change scenarios (Figure S4). Outputs were more sensitive to the litter size and home-range area inputs; these affected fox density in the unbaited landscape and the population's capacity to recover from baiting. A 50% decrease in mean litter size (to 1.87 cubs per breeding female) reduced maximum fox density to just 0.05 (0.00–0.17) foxes per km<sup>2</sup> in the year prior to baiting, and often resulted in extinction post-baiting (Figure S4); however, this value is unrealistically low compared to observed litter sizes of 2.8–6.74 cubs per breeding female worldwide (McIlroy, Saunders, & Hinds, 2001). In contrast, a 50% decrease in mean home-range area (to 1.07 km<sup>2</sup>) increased maximum fox density to 4.66 (3.96–5.14) foxes per km<sup>2</sup> in the year prior to baiting; densities remained nearly twice the baseline scenario after baiting (Figure S4). This value falls within the lowest 20th percentile of fox home-ranges sizes observed in south-eastern Victoria (Hradsky, Robley, et al., 2017; B. Hradsky, unpubl. data).

## 4 | DISCUSSION

Our modelling framework, FoxNet, provides a new tool to support management of a globally-significant pest species, the red fox.

The case-study models reproduced numerous field observations from northern- and southern-hemisphere environments, indicating considerable promise in generality and predictive accuracy. Our exploration of fox densities under alternative baiting strategies demonstrates FoxNet's value for answering critical questions about the optimal design of predator control at scales relevant to policy and on-ground management.

#### 4.1 | Model verification

Models generated using the FoxNet framework reproduced the structure of fox populations from two highly contrasting landscapes. The Bristol city model generated a dense fox population with an age structure and breeding population largely consistent with observed values, although it included a higher number of itinerant foxes. Incorporating emigration improved but did not fully reconcile this difference. Discrepancies between model outputs and field estimates may lay within the error margins of Harris and Smith's (1987) observations, but other possible causes are also discussed below. The Carnarvon arid rangeland model generated a sparse fox population with an age structure and density similar to that observed by Marlow et al. (2000), but with more young foxes and fewer old foxes, likely due to a historic legacy in the field data: A stable population would not have more animals in an older age class than a younger one. This highlights the need to consider whether populations are at equilibrium or in transition when analysing data, fitting and evaluating models, and designing management responses.

FoxNet models were highly successful in predicting *fox-family* density from northern hemisphere home-range size data across an order of magnitude. FoxNet's greater accuracy in generating *fox-family* than *fox* density estimates is likely because the number of fox-families remains relatively constant throughout the year, whereas fox densities fluctuate substantially, peaking with the recruitment of cubs (as shown for the Mt Clay model). Small discrepancies in the timing of seasonal events such as births or dispersal (Marlow, Thomson, Rose, & Kok, 2016) and seasonal variation in mortality rates (Harris & Smith, 1987; Storm et al., 1976) could cause differences between modelled fox densities and field estimates. Ideally, model performance would be evaluated over several years to capture seasonal and annual variation due to climate and other interacting factors. The FoxNet framework could be easily adjusted to include intra-annual and sex-specific survival dynamics where data are available.

Based on realistic assumptions about bait efficacy, the Carnarvon model reproduced the response of a fox population to pulse baiting, including population decline and recovery. In the short-term, modelled population recovery was somewhat slower than observed (Thomson et al., 2000), indicating an opportunity to improve model fit via experiments that explore compensatory fecundity and immigration hypotheses (Marlow et al., 2016; Zakharov, Safronov, Koryakina, & Smetanin, 2016).

#### 4.2 | Designing strategies for invasive predator management

The Mt Clay case-study demonstrates FoxNet's utility for planning red fox control programmes. For this relatively small nature reserve, the model showed that frequent baiting was required to combat recolonisation from the surrounding landscape. The current baiting strategy was predicted to suppress maximum fox population densities by approximately 70%. This concurs with annual motion-sensing camera surveys conducted between 2013 and 2015, which detected foxes at 66%–91% fewer sites at Mt Clay than a nearby unbaited reserve (A. Robley, unpubl. data). The model indicated that foxes remained present within Mt Clay at low densities, which is again supported by the detection of foxes at 8%–28% of baited sites in annual surveys (A. Robley, unpubl. data).

Reducing the frequency of bait replacement at Mt Clay from fortnightly to every 4 weeks would result in an approximately 20% increase in maximum fox density, while annual baiting would be largely ineffectual. In contrast, increasing the number of bait-stations would substantially reduce fox densities, relative to the current regime. For example maximum fox densities could be maintained at <0.4 foxes per km<sup>2</sup> by increasing bait density to 4 baits per km<sup>2</sup> or by baiting at 1 bait per km<sup>2</sup> across the reserve and a 2,000-m buffer. To maintain fox densities at consistently low levels, it is more effective to bait a buffer zone than increase bait density, as this dampens the annual peak caused by dispersing individuals. These results are immediately useful for supporting management decisions in the case-study location and could be easily adapted to other scenarios.

Aspects of fox demography such litter size vary substantially between populations (Devenish-Nelson et al., 2013); however, FoxNet outputs for the Mt Clay scenario were robust to most tested parameters. A strength of the modelling and evaluation framework is that it provides clarity about which uncertainties are most important to resolve in order to improve management decisions and design adaptive management strategies (Runge, Converse, & Lyons, 2011). For example the sensitivity of the model to home-range size indicates that this is a key research priority. For the Mt Clay case-study, home-range data were available for 18 foxes in comparable habitat, providing a high degree of confidence in the estimate. Predicted fox densities under the current baiting regime were more sensitive to a decrease in home-range size than an increase, because smaller home ranges resulted in a denser population and less effective bait saturation. Similarly, the population could not persist if fecundity was (unrealistically) low even in the absence of baiting; however, increasing fecundity had less effect as carrying capacity is limited by the number of available territories. Knowledge about the level of parameter precision required to discriminate between management options is crucial when designing monitoring or experiments to address knowledge gaps that impact management (Wintle, 2018).



### 4.3 | Extending the FoxNet framework and its applications

The FoxNet framework provides a substantial advance over previous IBMs of fox population control, as it captures the dynamic nature of fox territories and densities, and the effects of bait layout, home-range size and fox density on the efficacy of control. The case-study models confirm that FoxNet is a useful tool for predicting the structure and density of fox populations under different landscape contexts and management strategies. As the FoxNet framework allows foxes to update their territories in response to changes in habitat productivity, it could also be used to explore the effects of disturbance events such as fire on fox populations (Hradsky, Mildwaters, Ritchie, Christie, & Di Stefano, 2017), facilitating the development of integrated threat management programmes. Future extensions could refine seasonal and density-dependent variations in fecundity, and include competitor or prey species to predict cross-trophic responses to management. FoxNet would require further work to capture daily interactions between individuals and so be applicable to disease-spread scenarios (see Thulke & Eisinger, 2008). With revision of the territory-formation processes, FoxNet could also be adapted to other invasive carnivores such as feral cats.

Individual-based models capture important variation in processes at scales relevant to management and are increasingly used to improve efficiency in on-ground conservation planning (Pacioni, Kennedy, Berry, Stephens, & Schumaker, 2018; Stillman, Railsback, Giske, Berger, & Grimm, 2015). FoxNet's realistic predictions make it immediately applicable to the spatial design and optimisation of predator control programmes. By providing important insights into the effectiveness of management, FoxNet has the potential to be a valuable addition to the conservation practitioners' toolbox.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to Neil Carter for early discussions on IBM structure; Casey Visintin, Jian Yen, Nick Golding and Saras Windecker for help with parallel computing and git; and Volker Grimm, Michael Bode, Marie-Josée Fortin and an anonymous reviewer for constructive feedback. B.A.H. received support from the Australian Government's National Environmental Science programme through the Threatened Species Recovery Hub, the Victorian Government Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning, and Parks Victoria. L.T.K. received support from the Victorian Government and ARC Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions.

### AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors conceived the study. B.A.H. was the main developer of FoxNet and led the writing of the manuscript. All authors contributed to FoxNet's conceptual design and writing the manuscript, and gave final approval for publication.

### DATA ACCESSIBILITY

Data available via Zenodo <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2572045> (Hradsky, Kelly, Robley, & Wintle, 2019). A current version of FoxNet and the User Guide is also maintained at this location.

### ORCID

Bronwyn A. Hradsky  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0141-020X>

### REFERENCES

- Augusiak, J., Van den Brink, P. J., & Grimm, V. (2014). Merging validation and evaluation of ecological models to 'evaluation': A review of terminology and a practical approach. *Ecological Modelling*, 280, 117–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2013.11.009>
- Baker, P. J., Boitani, L., Harris, S., Saunders, G., & White, P. C. L. (2008). Terrestrial carnivores and human food production: Impact and management. *Mammal Review*, 38, 123–166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2907.2008.00122.x>
- Baker, P. J., Robertson, C. P. J., Funk, S. M., & Harris, S. (1998). Potential fitness benefits of group living in the red fox, *Vulpes vulpes*. *Animal Behaviour*, 56, 1411–1424. <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.1998.0950>
- Bellard, C., Genovesi, P., & Jeschke, J. M. (2016). Global patterns in threats to vertebrates by biological invasions. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 283, 20152454. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.2454>
- Bengsen, A. (2014). Effects of coordinated poison-baiting programs on survival and abundance in two red fox populations. *Wildlife Research*, 41, 194–202. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WR13202>
- Bennett, N. D., Croke, B. F. W., Guariso, G., Guillaume, J. H. A., Hamilton, S. H., Jakeman, A. J., & Andreassian, V. (2013). Characterising performance of environmental models. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 40, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2012.09.011>
- Berry, O., Tatler, J., Hamilton, N., Hilmer, S., Hitchen, Y., & Algar, D. (2014). Slow recruitment in a red-fox population following poison baiting: A non-invasive mark-recapture analysis. *Wildlife Research*, 40, 615–623.
- Bino, G., Dolev, A., Yosha, D., Guter, A., King, R., Saltz, D., & Kark, S. (2010). Abrupt spatial and numerical responses of overabundant foxes to a reduction in anthropogenic resources. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 47, 1262–1271. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01882.x>
- Bonnell, M. A., & Breck, S. W. (2017). Using resident-based hazing programs to reduce human-coyote conflicts in urban environments. *Human-Wildlife Interactions*, 11, 146–155.
- Budgey, R., Learmount, J., & Smith, G. C. (2017). Simulating control of a focal wildlife outbreak of *Echinococcus multilocularis*. *Veterinary Parasitology*, 237, 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2017.02.022>
- Carter, N., Levin, S., Barlow, A., & Grimm, V. (2015). Modeling tiger population and territory dynamics using an agent-based approach. *Ecological Modelling*, 312, 347–362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2015.06.008>
- Carter, A., & Luck, G. W. (2013). Fox baiting in agricultural landscapes: Preliminary findings on the importance of bait-site selection. *Wildlife Research*, 40, 184–195. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WR12169>
- Coman, B., Robinson, J., & Beaumont, C. (1991). Home range, dispersal and density of red foxes (*Vulpes vulpes* L.) in central Victoria. *Wildlife Research*, 18, 215–223. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WR9910215>
- Devenish-Nelson, E. S., Harris, S., Soulsbury, C. D., Richards, S. A., & Stephens, P. A. (2013). Demography of a carnivore, the red fox, *Vulpes vulpes*: What have we learnt from 70 years of published studies? *Oikos*, 122, 705–716. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2012.20706.x>

- Doherty, T. S., Glen, A. S., Nimmo, D. G., Ritchie, E. G., & Dickman, C. R. (2016). Invasive predators and global biodiversity loss. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 113, 11261–11265. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1602480113>
- Eisinger, D., & Thulke, H. H. (2008). Spatial pattern formation facilitates eradication of infectious diseases. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 45, 415–423. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2007.01439.x>
- Grimm, V., Berger, U., DeAngelis, D. L., Polhill, J. G., Giske, J., & Railsback, S. F. (2010). The ODD protocol: A review and first update. *Ecological Modelling*, 221, 2760–2768. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2010.08.019>
- Grimm, V., Revilla, E., Berger, U., Jeltsch, F., Mooij, W. M., Railsback, S. F., & DeAngelis, D. L. (2005). Pattern-oriented modeling of agent-based complex systems: Lessons from ecology. *Science*, 310, 987–991. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1116681>
- Harding, E. K., Doak, D. F., & Albertson, J. D. (2001). Evaluating the effectiveness of predator control: The non-native red fox as a case study. *Conservation Biology*, 15, 1114–1122. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2001.0150041114.x>
- Harris, S., & Smith, G. C. (1987). Demography of two urban fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) populations. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 24, 75–86. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2403788>
- Hradsky, B. A., Kelly, L., Robley, A., & Wintle, B. A. (2019). Data from: FoxNet: An individual-based model framework to support management of an invasive predator, the red fox. *Zenodo*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2572045>
- Hradsky, B. A., Mildwaters, C. A., Ritchie, E. G., Christie, F., & Di Stefano, J. (2017). Responses of invasive predators and native prey to a prescribed forest fire. *Journal of Mammalogy*, 98, 835–847. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmammal/gyx010>
- Hradsky, B. A., Robley, A., Alexander, R., Ritchie, E. G., York, A., & Di Stefano, J. (2017). Human-modified habitats facilitate forest-dwelling populations of an invasive predator, *Vulpes vulpes*. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 12291. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-12464-7>
- Kamler, J. F., & Ballard, W. B. (2002). A review of native and nonnative red foxes in North America. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 1973–2006(30), 370–379.
- Kubicek, A., Jopp, F., Breckling, B., Lange, C., & Reuter, H. (2015). Context-oriented model validation of individual-based models in ecology: A hierarchically structured approach to validate qualitative, compositional and quantitative characteristics. *Ecological Complexity*, 22, 178–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecocom.2015.03.005>
- Larivière, S., & Pasitschniak-Arts, M. (1996). *Vulpes vulpes*. *Mammalian Species*, 537, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3504236>
- Lieury, N., Ruetten, S., Devillard, S., Albaret, M., Drouyer, F., Baudoux, B., & Millon, A. (2015). Compensatory immigration challenges predator control: An experimental evidence-based approach improves management. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 79, 425–434. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jwmg.850>
- Lockie, J. D. (1959). The estimation of the food of foxes. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 23, 224–227. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3797647>
- Marlow, N. J., Thomson, P. C., Algar, D., Rose, K., Kok, N. E., & Sinagra, J. A. (2000). Demographic characteristics and social organisation of a population of red foxes in a rangeland area in Western Australia. *Wildlife Research*, 27, 457–464. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WR99035>
- Marlow, N. J., Thomson, P. C., Rose, K., & Kok, N. E. (2016). Compensatory responses by a fox population to artificial density reduction in a rangeland area in Western Australia. *Conservation Science Western Australia*, 10, 3.
- McIlroy, J., Saunders, G., & Hinds, L. A. (2001). The reproductive performance of female red foxes, *Vulpes vulpes*, in central-western New South Wales during and after a drought. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 79, 545–553. <https://doi.org/10.1139/z01-003>
- McLeod, R. (2004). *Counting the cost: Impact of invasive animals in Australia*. Canberra, ACT: Cooperative Research Centre for Pest Animal Control.
- McLeod, S. R., & Saunders, G. R. (2001). Improving management strategies for the red fox by using projection matrix analysis. *Wildlife Research*, 28, 333–340. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WR00104>
- Muller, T., Freuling, C. M., Wysocki, P., Roumiantzeff, M., Freney, J., Mettenleiter, T. C., & Vos, A. (2015). Terrestrial rabies control in the European Union: Historical achievements and challenges ahead. *Veterinary Journal*, 203, 10–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tvjl.2014.10.026>
- Newsome, T. M., Crowther, M. S., & Dickman, C. R. (2014). Rapid recolonisation by the European red fox: How effective are uncoordinated and isolated control programs? *European Journal of Wildlife Research*, 60, 749–757. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-014-0844-x>
- O'Donnell, C. F. J., Pryde, M. A., van Dam-Bates, P., & Elliott, G. P. (2017). Controlling invasive predators enhances the long-term survival of endangered New Zealand long-tailed bats (*Chalinolobus tuberculatus*): Implications for conservation of bats on oceanic islands. *Biological Conservation*, 214, 156–167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2017.08.015>
- Pacioni, C., Kennedy, M. S., Berry, O., Stephens, D., & Schumaker, N. H. (2018). Spatially-explicit model for assessing wild dog control strategies in Western Australia. *Ecological Modelling*, 368, 246–256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2017.12.001>
- R Core Team. (2018). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: The R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Robley, A., Gormley, A. M., Forsyth, D. M., & Triggs, B. (2014). Long-term and large-scale control of the introduced red fox increases native mammal occupancy in Australian forests. *Biological Conservation*, 180, 262–269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.10.017>
- Robley, A., Moloney, P. D., Neave, G., & Pitts, D. (2017). Glenelg Ark: Benefits to biodiversity from long-term fox control, 2005 to 2016. Arthur Rylah Institute for Environmental Research Technical Report Series 275. Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning. Heidelberg, Vic.
- Runge, M. C., Converse, S. J., & Lyons, J. E. (2011). Which uncertainty? Using expert elicitation and expected value of information to design an adaptive program. *Biological Conservation*, 144, 1214–1223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2010.12.020>
- Rushton, S. P., Shirley, M. D. F., Macdonald, D. W., & Reynolds, J. C. (2006). Effects of culling fox populations at the landscape scale: A spatially explicit population modeling approach. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 70, 1102–1110. [https://doi.org/10.2193/0022-541X\(2006\)70\[1102:EOCFPA\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.2193/0022-541X(2006)70[1102:EOCFPA]2.0.CO;2)
- Sargeant, A. B. (1972). Red fox spatial characteristics in relation to waterfowl predation. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 36, 225. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3799055>
- Saunders, G. R., Gentle, M. N., & Dickman, C. R. (2010). The impacts and management of foxes *Vulpes vulpes* in Australia. *Mammal Review*, 40, 181–211. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2907.2010.00159.x>
- Saunders, G., McLeod, S., & Kay, B. (2000). Degradation of sodium monofluoroacetate (1080) in buried fox baits. *Wildlife Research*, 27, 129–135. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WR99031>
- Shwiff, S., Nunan, C., Kirkpatrick, K. N., & Shwiff, S. (2011). A retrospective economic analysis of the Ontario red fox oral rabies vaccination programme. *Zoonoses and Public Health*, 58, 169–177. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1863-2378.2010.01335.x>
- Smith, G. C., & Wilkinson, D. (2003). Modeling control of rabies outbreaks in red fox populations to evaluate culling, vaccination, and vaccination combined with fertility control. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases*, 39, 278–286. <https://doi.org/10.7589/0090-3558-39.2.278>
- Soulsbury, C. D., Iossa, G., Baker, P. J., White, P. C., & Harris, S. (2011). Behavioral and spatial analysis of extraterritorial movements in red foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*). *Journal of Mammalogy*, 92, 190–199. <https://doi.org/10.1644/09-MAMM-A-187.1>

- Stillman, R. A., Railsback, S. F., Giske, J., Berger, U., & Grimm, V. (2015). Making predictions in a changing world: The benefits of individual-based ecology. *BioScience*, 65, 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biu192>
- Storm, G. L., Andrews, R. D., Phillips, R. L., Bishop, R. A., Siniff, D. B., & Tester, J. R. (1976). Morphology, reproduction, dispersal, and mortality of midwestern red fox populations. *Wildlife Monographs*, 49, 3–82.
- Thiele, J. C. (2014). R Marries NetLogo: Introduction to the RNetLogo Package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 58, 1–41.
- Thomson, P. C., Marlow, N. J., Rose, K., & Kok, N. E. (2000). The effectiveness of a large-scale baiting campaign and an evaluation of a buffer zone strategy for fox control. *Wildlife Research*, 27, 465–472. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WR99036>
- Thulke, H., & Eisinger, D. (2008). The strength of 70%: Revision of a standard threshold of rabies control. *Developments in Biologicals*, 131, 291–298.
- Thulke, H. H., Grimm, V., Müller, M. S., Staubach, C., Tischendorf, L., Wissel, C., & Jeltsch, F. (1999). From pattern to practice: A scaling-down strategy for spatially explicit modelling illustrated by the spread and control of rabies. *Ecological Modelling*, 117, 179–202. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800\(98\)00198-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800(98)00198-7)
- Towerton, A. L., Dickman, C. R., Kavanagh, R. P., & Penman, T. D. (2016). Control of the red fox in remnant forest habitats. *Wildlife Research*, 43, 169–177. <https://doi.org/10.1071/WR15133>
- Trewhella, W. J., Harris, S., & McAllister, F. E. (1988). Dispersal distance, home-range size and population density in the red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) – a quantitative analysis. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 25, 423–434. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2403834>
- Walsh, J., Wilson, K., Benshemesh, J., & Possingham, H. (2012). Unexpected outcomes of invasive predator control: The importance of evaluating conservation management actions. *Animal Conservation*, 15, 319–328. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-1795.2012.00537.x>
- Wilensky, U. (1999). Netlogo. Center for Connected Learning and Computer-Based Modeling, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.
- Winstanley, R. K., Buttemer, W. A., & Saunders, G. (2003). Field metabolic rate and body water turnover of the red fox *Vulpes vulpes* in Australia. *Mammal Review*, 33, 295–301. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2907.2003.00015.x>
- Wintle, B. A. (2018). Why, what, how much, and is it worth it? Questions to answer before spending a penny on monitoring. In S. Legge, D. Lindenmayer, N. Robinson, B. Scheele, D. Southwell, & B. Wintle (Eds.), *Monitoring threatened species and ecological communities*. CSIRO Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1071/9781486307722>
- Zakharov, E. S., Safronov, V. M., Koryakina, L. P., & Smetanin, N. N. (2016). The ecology of the red fox (*Vulpes vulpes* L.) in the middle Lena River basin. *Russian Journal of Ecology*, 47, 392–398. <https://doi.org/10.1134/S1067413616040160>

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

**How to cite this article:** Hradsky BA, Kelly LT, Robley A, Wintle BA. FoxNet: An individual-based model framework to support management of an invasive predator, the red fox. *J Appl Ecol*. 2019;56:1460–1470. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13374>