

1 Analysing individual variation in predator hunting mode and the
2 effect of predator and prey behavior on hunting success using an
3 online multiplayer videogame

4

Abstract

6 Predator-prey interactions are important drivers of community and ecosystem dynamics. In this
7 study, we propose a novel system, which is to use an online multiplayer videogame, to explore
8 within-population variation in predator hunting mode, and how predator-prey behavioural interac-
9 tions affect predator hunting success. We examined how predator speed, space coverage, ambush
10 time, and latency to first capture correlate at different hierarchical levels (among environments
11 among individuals, and within individuals) to assess the structure of their hunting mode. We also
12 investigated how these traits interact with prey travel speed and space coverage to affect preda-
13 tor hunting success. We found that individual predators specialized either as cursorial or ambush
14 hunters along a continuum of hunting traits, but also shifted their strategy between encounters.
15 Predators were generally better against slower-moving prey, and both types of hunters achieved
16 similar hunting success over the sampling period. Our study brings additional evidence that con-
17 sidering within-population variation in behavior and success during predator-prey interactions can
18 increase our understanding of community stability. We further discuss how using videogame data
19 for ecological research can help circumvent certain challenges of empirical and simulation studies
20 while providing realistic scientific insight, and develop on their weaknesses and potential biases.

21 **Keywords:** individual variation, hunting success, foraging mode, hunting tactics, predator-prey
22 behavior, online videogames

Introduction

Predator hunting mode plays a crucial role in structuring ecological communities and ecosystems (Huey and Pianka 1981; Preisser et al. 2007; Schmitz 2008; Kersch-Becker et al. 2018) and is usually described as 1) active/cursorial when hunters search, follow, and chase prey for long distances, 2) sit-and-pursue, when hunters remain motionless and pounce on prey that are within chasing distance, and 3) sit-and-wait/ambush, when hunters wait for prey to be within immediate capture distance (McLaughlin 1989). Field studies show that predators with contrasting hunting modes (e.g. cursorial vs ambush) differ in the number of individuals or species, or in the type of prey that they capture (Miller et al. 2014; Donihue 2016; Glaudas et al. 2019). As a result, they can cause opposing trophic cascades and act at different trophic levels (Schmitz 2008; Romero and Koricheva 2011).

Predator species tend to be classified either as active or sit-and-wait hunters based on their average behavior (Lima 2002; Miles et al. 2007; Pettorelli et al. 2015; Schmitz 2017). Despite that categorising predators is still useful to predict community and ecosystem dynamics (Wirsing et al. 2021), it essentially ignores the complexity of predator foraging decision-making. Growing evidence suggest that individual predator behavioral variation can exert important consequences for predator-prey interactions (Pettorelli et al. 2015; Toscano et al. 2016; Schmitz 2017). For instance, individual predator behavioral type can mediate consumptive and non-consumptive effects during trophic interactions (Smith and Blumstein 2010; Griffen et al. 2012; Toscano and Griffen 2014). Yet, the extent to which predators within populations differ in their foraging mode, and how these individual differences affect community and ecosystem processes remains unclear. It is therefore imperative that we account for individual variation in hunting mode during predator-prey interactions if we hope to understand the community consequences of predation.

Stable individual differences in hunting mode within populations can be driven by specialization when individuals experience temporal and/or spatial fluctuations in the distribution, availability, or behavior of their prey (Araújo et al. 2011; Carneiro et al. 2017; Phillips et al. 2017; Courbin et al. 2018). In sea predators, individuals specialize in specific tactics to meet the energy/time demands that are required to successfully capture the type of prey generally encountered (Bowen et al. 2002; Tinker et al. 2008; Arthur et al. 2016). Prey activity/mobility is an important trait

influencing encounter rates with predators (Gerritsen and Strickler 1977; Huey and Pianka 1981; Scharf et al. 2006). Therefore, individual variation in encounter rates with prey activity-types may lead to nonrandom interactions between predator-prey behavioral types (Wolf and Weissing 2012). For example, the locomotor-crossover hypothesis (Huey and Pianka 1981) predicts that ambush predators should be more successful when they hunt fast-moving prey, while cursorial predators should have greater success with sedentary prey (Scharf et al. 2006; Belgrad and Griffen 2016; Donihue 2016). Individual predators with contrasting hunting modes might thus coexist within a population if their tactics allow them to reach similar capture rates (???; Michel and Adams 2009; Chang et al. 2017).

Habitat structure is a second important driver of stable individual differences in predator foraging mode, as it shapes opportunities for prey encounter and prey capture (???; Robinson and Holmes 1982; James and Heck Jr. 1994; Sargeant et al. 2007; Donihue 2016). A growing body of evidence points to predators who hunt in open and homogeneous habitats adopting a cursorial strategy, contrary to those hunting in heterogeneous and closed habitats that typically ambush their prey (???; James and Heck Jr. 1994; Donihue 2016). Hence, the habitat components of a predator's hunting grounds can shape its hunting tactic. Heterogeneous habitats are expected to favor sit-and-wait/sit-and-pursue hunters as they offer perches and cover, which are useful for ambushes (James and Heck Jr. 1994; Laurel and Brown 2006). On the contrary, active hunters should benefit from higher encounter rates in open habitats as prey detection is easier, but, at the expense of being themselves more easily detected (Michel and Adams 2009). This suggests that habitat structure could mediate tradeoffs between hunting strategies.

Trophic interactions are dynamic processes that can also trigger flexible behavioral adjustments by individual predators (Helfman 1990; Heithaus et al. 2018). For instance, predators can respond to changes in prey density (Inoue and Marsura 1983), prey behavioral type (McGhee et al. 2013), prey condition (Wignall and Taylor 2008), seasonality (Miles et al. 2007; Phillips et al. 2017), or habitat structure (???). Unfortunately, most of this research is conducted under controlled laboratory conditions, which can fail to capture the nuances and complexities of a predator specie's behavior in the wild (Carter et al. 2013; Niemelä and Dingemanse 2014). Empirically investigating individual variation in hunting mode requires repeated measures of behavior of numerous individuals under

different environmental settings (Dall and Griffith 2014; Dingemanse and Wright 2020). Such an approach may impose considerable financial, technical, and ethical challenges when studying larger or elusive wildlife, such as apex predators (Hertel et al. 2020). An additional challenge in empirical studies of predator-prey interactions is identifying traits in predators and prey that are easily observable, but also ecologically relevant. For instance, foraging mode is expected to vary along a continuum of morphological, physiological, and behavioral traits (foraging syndrome hypothesis) (Perry et al. 1990; Perry 1999; Butler 2005; Cooper 2005; Miles et al. 2007), but few studies have investigated how habitat- and prey-specific characteristics jointly shape correlated foraging traits at different hierarchical levels.

Here, we propose a novel approach to circumvent these challenges by studying individual variation in predator behavior that capitalizes on online multiplayer videogames (Balicer 2007; Lofgren and Fefferman 2007; Oultram 2013; Ahmad et al. 2014; Ross et al. 2015). Online multiplayer videogames could provide numerous opportunities for ecologists to study general ecological phenomena, including the mechanisms driving individual variation in behavior (Barbe et al. 2020). First, online videogames provide abundant repeated measurements on millions of individual players across temporal and environmental gradients. Second, the structure of the virtual environment is known and can be used to evaluate how specific components affect the behavior of interest. Third, videogames can reproduce realistic ecological settings in which complex interactions occur among players. A classic example is the case of the “Corrupted Blood” epidemic in *World of Warcraft*, where transmission modes/vectors and human reactions to the disease were surprisingly similar to what would be expected in a real-world outbreak (Balicer 2007; Lofgren and Fefferman 2007). In this sense, online multiplayer videogames could potentially constitute a complement to traditional field studies. They could permit ecologists (among other scientists) to bridge the gap between real-world ecological studies and large-scale computer simulations (Cere et al., accepted, Ross et al. 2015).

We used the online multiplayer videogame *Dead by Daylight* (DBD) as our study system. This game pits a single player (predator) against a group of four players (prey). The predator’s main objective is to search for and consume prey (figure 1A), whilst the preys’ objective is to exploit resources while escaping the predator. Prey can use a wide range of behaviors such as cooperation or hiding

110 (Cere et al., accepted) to successfully escape (figure 1 B-C), which predators can exploit to lure
 111 them in an ambush. These situations offer the possibility for predators to express different hunting
 112 tactics. Moreover, each match in *DBD* occurs within a specific habitat, including forests, farmlands,
 113 and urban areas. These environments differ in the heterogeneity and complexity of their structures
 114 (McCoy and Bell 1991), such as in the availability of perches and refugia, vegetation density, or
 115 surface area (figure 1D). Hence, predators may encounter prey that express different behaviors, and
 116 are expected to benefit from changing their behavior accordingly to maximize hunting success.



Figure 1: Images of the online videogame Dead by Daylight. (A) The predator player's first person vision. (B) The prey (survivor) player's third person vision. Prey can cooperate to repair generators. Once all generators are repaired, prey may activate one of the two (C) doors in order to escape and win the match. (D) Representative pictures of the different game environments where matches take place. The game environments settings vary between urban, farmland, and forest areas.

117 In this study, we use an extensive and complete dataset on the hunting behavior of predator players
 118 in *DBD* to investigate environmental and individual variation in hunting mode, and how hunting
 119 mode affects prey capture. We use four hunting-related behaviors as proxies of hunting mode: travel
 120 speed, the rate of space covered in the environment, the proportion of time spent in an ambush
 121 position, and the time elapsed before the first prey capture. We use multivariate mixed-modelling

to quantify variation in multiple behaviors and their correlations at different hierarchical levels (i.e. among and within-individuals, Dingemanse and Dochtermann 2013) as a way to describe the variation in hunting mode within a population of predators (Perry et al. 1990; Perry 1999; Butler 2005; Cooper 2005; Miles et al. 2007). Within-population variation includes among-environment differences in average hunting behavior, variation in tactic use arising when some individuals use one tactic more often than others (i.e. individual specialization), and variation arising from individuals adjusting tactic use over time in response to temporal changes in environmental conditions or prey behavior (i.e. individual flexibility). First, we hypothesize that predators use hunting tactics according to habitat-specific characteristics. Therefore, we expect correlated trait values associated with ambush tactics in smaller and heterogeneous environments, and correlated trait values associated with cursorial tactics in open/wider and homogeneous environments (???; James and Heck Jr. 1994; Donihue 2016). Second, we hypothesize that individual predators consistently differ in their hunting mode over time, with some specialising as cursorial hunters, and others as ambush hunters. Thus, we predict that individual predators should differ in their average trait values along a continuum for all combinations of the four hunting traits (among-individual behavioral correlations). Following the locomotor-crossover hypothesis (Huey and Pianka 1981), we predict that ambush and cursorial predator-types will coexist in the population, because both achieve similar hunting success by performing better against prey with the opposite locomotor tendency. Lastly, we hypothesize that individual predators will express flexible hunting behavior, by switching from cursorial to ambush tactics between foraging bouts (i.e. between matches). Thus, we predict that the individuals' residual trait values in contrasting hunting behaviors (ambush vs cursorial) should be negatively correlated (within-individual behavioral correlations).

Materials and methods

Study system

The datasets used to test our hypotheses were provided by Behaviour Interactive Inc., the owner and developer of *DBD*. The company records the behavior of players for every match played online. During our study period, *DBD* offered 15 playable predator avatars. Players who adopt the predator's role choose their avatar before a match. Each predator avatar has unique abilities that

may encourage different playstyles. Some have abilities that make them stealthier, while others can run faster, or have more powerful attacks. We thus controlled for the chosen avatar in our models since it may impact the playstyle of the predator player. In addition, the game environment where players compete is usually randomly assigned from a list of 27 maps differing in their physical components. For example, some maps have large playable surface areas with low vegetation density, which may favor the use of a cursorial strategy. Other maps have a smaller surface area with high vegetation density, which may impair visibility and alter prey detection, favoring the use of an ambush strategy. For additional details on the game settings and map characteristics, refer to <https://deadbydaylight.com/en>, and https://deadbydaylight.gamepedia.com/Dead_by_Daylight_Wiki.

Data collection

The study period ranged from 20 March to 17 June 2019. Our population consisted of 2 171 new anonymous players who initiated their first match between 20 March and 22 March, with a total record of 70 831 matches (average: 177 matches per individual, range: 1 - 972 matches). The average match duration was 11 minutes (range: 5 - 58 minutes). For each match, we recorded the date (date-hour-minutes), the duration, the predator player's anonymous ID, the prey players' anonymous ID's, the predator's avatar, and the game environment where the match took place. We also recorded predator and prey behavior. We retained matches that lasted more than 5 minutes (short matches are usually interrupted because of technical issues). Players also score points during a match by performing different actions. To control for matches where players did not play, or for errors in the data collection, we removed matches where predators earned less than 1 point.

behavioral traits

We selected four out of eight behavioral variables that summarized most of the variation in predator hunting tactics based on a principal component analysis (see Fig. S1 and Table S1 in Supporting information): average travel speed (m/s), the rate of space covered (square/s), the proportion of time spent in an ambush position over the match duration, and the proportion of time predators took to capture their first prey over the match duration. Travel speed and the rate of space covered differ in that speed describes the average distance traveled in meters per second, while space coverage describes the number of 16x16 meters squares (from a grid that covers the whole virtual

environment) entered per second in the environment (similar to the open field test, Montiglio et al. 2010). The proportion of time spent ambushing describes the total amount of time a predator spent monitoring around capture sites to ambush prey that try to rescue a conspecific (see section ‘behavioral traits measurements’ in the Supporting information for details).

We quantified prey average travel speed (m/s) and rate of space covered (square/s). These two traits were measured using the same method described for predators (refer to Supporting information). For both traits, we averaged the four individual prey values within each match since we were interested in the average effect of prey behavior on the predator’s hunting behavior. Thus, we used one average value per prey trait, for each match played.

Statistical analyses: Software and computer setup

We performed all statistical analyses using the R software (version 4.0.2, R Core Team, 2020) on a remote computer cluster (Cedar, Compute Canada, <https://docs.computeCanada.ca/wiki/Cedar>) running on CentOS Linux 7. All models were fitted using the R package “brms” version 2.14.4 (Bürkner 2017). We provide the R code and outputs on this GitHub repository (https://github.com/quantitative-ecologist/videogame_hunting_tactics-Rscripts) with the R sessions information to ensure reproducibility.

Statistical analyses: Variation in hunting mode

We first parametrized a multivariate Bayesian mixed model to quantify unadjusted repeatability of hunting behavior, and evaluate among-environment, among-individual (specialization), and within-individual (flexibility) behavioral correlations. We included the predator’s population-response to prey behavior by adding prey travel speed (x_1) and rate of space covered (x_2) as linear fixed effects. We square-root transformed the four hunting behaviors ($y1$ = speed, $y2$ = space, $y3$ = time in ambush, $y4$ = time 1st capture) to achieve normality and then defined each as having a Gaussian distribution. All traits were then standardised to mean and unit variance (z-scores). The model is described by the following equations:

$$y1_{ij} = (\beta_{0y1} + id_{0y1,i} + env_{0y1,i} + avatar_{0y1,i}) + \beta_{1y1}x_1 + \beta_{2y1}x_2 + \varepsilon_{0y1,ij} \quad (1)$$

$$y2_{ij} = (\beta_{0y2} + id_{0y2,i} + env_{0y2,i} + avatar_{0y2,i}) + \beta_{1y2}x_1 + \beta_{2y2}x_2 + \varepsilon_{0y2,ij} \quad (2)$$

$$y3_{ij} = (\beta_{0y3} + id_{0y3,i} + env_{0y3,i} + avatar_{0y3,i}) + \beta_{1y3}x_1 + \beta_{2y3}x_2 + \varepsilon_{0y3,ij} \quad (3)$$

$$y4_{ij} = (\beta_{0y4} + id_{0y4,i} + env_{0y4,i} + avatar_{0y4,i}) + \beta_{1y4}x_1 + \beta_{2y4}x_2 + \varepsilon_{0y4,ij} \quad (4)$$

where i indexes individual players and j the recorded match. Player ID ($id_{0y,i}$), the game environment ($env_{0y,i}$), the predator avatar ($avatar_{0y,i}$), and the residuals ($\varepsilon_{0y,ij}$) are, respectively, random intercepts (among- individual, environment, and avatar variance) and residuals (within-individual variance). Random intercepts (BLUPs) and residuals were assumed to follow a multivariate Gaussian distribution, with their associated variance-covariance matrixes (Ω_{id} , Ω_{env} , Ω_{avatar} , Ω_{ε}) (equations S1-S4 in Supporting information). For each combination of behaviors, we extracted the behavioral correlations among- individuals, environments, and avatars, as well as within-individual (residual) behavioral correlations (Dingemanse and Dochtermann 2013). The sample size of each parameter's posterior distribution is 4000 (see section 'Parametrization of the bayesian multivariate mixed model' in the Supporting information for details).

Following Nakagawa and Schielzeth (2010), we calculated each hunting trait's adjusted repeatability estimate (intra-class correlation coefficient, ICC) for the player ID, the game environment, and the predator avatar by dividing the variance associated with the random effect by the total phenotypic variance (ex. $ICC_{id0,y1} = V_{id0,y1} / (V_{id0,y1} + V_{env0,y1} + V_{avatar0,y1} + V_{\varepsilon0,y1})$). We computed the 95% credible intervals for each repeatability estimate using the highest posterior density intervals.

Statistical analyses: Effect of hunting behavior and prey behavior on prey capture

Since predators can capture a maximum of four prey, we used the number of prey captured per total number of prey in a match (four) as a binomial response variable ($\omega_{ij} \sim Binom(max_{ij}, P_{ij})$). We first quantified the linear relationship between hunting success and predator behavior by fitting a binomial Bayesian generalized linear mixed model (glmm) with a logit link function. The model

223 fits a linear function ($\beta_{n,pred}x_i$) where we could estimate if hunting success increased or decreased
 224 with increasing hunting behavior scores. We fitted the mean probability of capturing four prey (P_{ij})
 225 for individual i on its j match as a function of its travel speed, rate of space covered, proportion of
 226 time spent ambushing, and proportion of time before the first capture (equation S5 in Supporting
 227 information). We computed a second model to account for variation in hunting success explained
 228 by prey behavior ($\beta_{n,prey}x'_i$). We thus added prey travel speed and their rate of space covered in
 229 the model equation (equation S6 in Supporting information). Both models had random intercepts
 230 for the predator player's ID ($id_{0,i}$) and the game environment ($env_{0,i}$) to partition the variance
 231 in hunting success explained by differences among players and the environments where matches
 232 occurred. Player ID and the game environment were assumed to follow a normal distribution with
 233 estimated variance ($id_{0,i} \sim N(0, V_{id})$, $env_{0,i} \sim N(0, V_{env})$). We included an observation-level random
 234 effect to account for overdispersion and compared the models to a beta-binomial model to ensure
 235 that the estimates were robust (Harrison 2015). Trait values were standardised to mean and unit
 236 variance (z-scores). The sample size of each parameter's posterior distribution is 4000 for the first
 237 model and 6000 for the second model.

238 We built a third model with the same structure as the first model and included quadratic terms
 239 ($\frac{1}{2}\gamma_{n,pred}x_i$) to determine whether the relationships between hunting success and predator behavior
 240 are concave or convex (equation S7 in Supporting information). Concave gradients suggest that
 241 individuals at the extremes of the trait distribution perform poorly while the opposite is true when
 242 the gradient is convex (Brodie et al. 1995). We also added interaction terms for each combination
 243 of predator traits ($\gamma_{n,pred}$) to estimate correlated effects on hunting success. Lastly, we computed
 244 a fourth model with the same structure as the third and included quadratic terms for prey
 245 behavior ($\frac{1}{2}\gamma_{n,prey}x'_i$), and interaction terms between predator and prey behaviors ($\gamma_{n,pred \text{ prey}}$) to
 246 test if predators perform better against prey with the opposite locomotor tendency (locomotor
 247 crossover) (equation S8 in Supporting information). All trait values were standardised to mean of
 248 0 and unit variance (z-scores). The sample size of each parameter's posterior distribution is 4000
 249 for both models.

250 We calculated the models' ICCs following Nakagawa et al. (2017). For each model parameter, we
 251 computed the 95% credibility intervals using the highest posterior density intervals. We assumed

the fixed effects and the ICCs reached statistical significance when the 95% credible intervals did not overlap zero (Nakagawa and Cuthill 2007).

Results

Variation in hunting mode: Repeatability of hunting behavior

As predicted, we found moderate among-individual differences in average travel speed (ICC_{id} , average speed [95% CI] = 0.280 [0.254, 0.304]) and average proportion of time spent in ambush position (ICC_{id} , time in ambush [95% CI] = 0.322 [0.301, 0.342]), while individuals differed weakly in their time before the first capture (ICC_{id} , time 1st capture [95% CI] = 0.102 [0.091, 0.114]) (figure 2A, diagonal). Individual predators differed weakly in their average rate of space covered (ICC_{id} , space covered [95% CI] = 0.051 [0.044, 0.057]) (figure 2A, diagonal).

Contrary to our predictions, predators did not differ in their average travel speed (ICC_{env} , average speed [95% CI] = 0.002 [0.001, 0.003]), nor in their proportion of time spent in ambushing (ICC_{env} , time in ambush [95% CI] = 0.002 [0.001, 0.003]) in different game environments (figure 2B, diagonal). However, we detected small differences among the game environments in the average rate of space covered and time before the first capture (ICC_{env} , space covered [95% CI] = 0.065 [0.036, 0.097]) (ICC_{env} , time 1st capture [95% CI] = 0.055 [0.029, 0.082]) (figure 2B, diagonal). Finally, predators displayed weak among-avatar differences for the four hunting behaviors (ICC_{avatar} , average speed [95% CI] = 0.091 [0.042, 0.153], ICC_{avatar} , space covered [95% CI] = 0.025 [0.010, 0.046], ICC_{avatar} , time in ambush [95% CI] = 0.034 [0.012, 0.064], ICC_{avatar} , time 1st capture [95% CI] = 0.021 [0.008, 0.039]).

Variation in hunting mode: Correlations between hunting behaviors

As we expected, the predators' average travel speed and proportion of time spent ambushing were negatively correlated ($r_{id_{0,y1}id_{0,y3}}$ [95% CI] = -0.635 [-0.671, -0.597]). Thus, faster predators spent less time ambushing prey (figure 2A, lower off-diagonal). Faster individuals covered space at a faster rate ($r_{id_{0,y1}id_{0,y2}}$ [95% CI] = 0.363 [0.297, 0.434]), and individuals who were faster or covered space at a faster rate also took less time to capture their first prey ($r_{id_{0,y1}id_{0,y4}}$ [95% CI] = -0.412 [-0.470, -0.350], $r_{id_{0,y2}id_{0,y4}}$ [95% CI] = -0.249 [-0.331, -0.163]) (figure 2A, lower off-diagonal). There




Figure 2: Correlations between combinations of hunting behaviors and their ICCs. For each panel, the ICC of the trait is displayed on the diagonal. Black and gray circles are negative and positive correlations respectively. (A) Among-individual behavioral correlations on the lower off-diagonal, and residual within-individual behavioral correlations on the upper off-diagonal. (B) Among-environment behavioral correlations on the lower off-diagonal. behavior names were shortened to simplify the plot.

was no relationship between space covered and time spent ambushing ($r_{id_{0,y2}id_{0,y3}}$ [95% CI] = 0.001 [-0.075, 0.079]), but ambush hunters required more time to capture their first prey ($r_{id_{0,y3}id_{0,y4}}$ [95% CI] = 0.244 [0.177, 0.310]) (figure 2A, lower off-diagonal).

At the residual within-individual level, we detected a weak positive correlation between travel speed and the rate of space covered ($r_{e_{0,y1}e_{0,y2}}$ [95% CI] = 0.191 [0.184, 0.198]) and a negative correlation between travel speed and the proportion of time spent ambushing prey ($r_{e_{0,y1}e_{0,y3}}$ [95% CI] = -0.289 [-0.296, -0.282]) (figure 2A, upper off-diagonal). Hence, matches in which a predator was faster (relative to its average) were also matches in which it covered space at a faster rate, while spending less time ambushing prey. Predators that covered space at a faster rate also took more time before capturing their first prey ($r_{e_{0,y2}e_{0,y4}}$ [95% CI] = 0.135 [0.127, 0.142]). We did not detect large correlations between travel speed or time ambushing and the time before the first capture ($r_{e_{0,y1}e_{0,y4}}$ [95% CI] = -0.080 [-0.088, -0.073], $r_{e_{0,y3}e_{0,y4}}$ [95% CI] = -0.097 [-0.105, -0.090]).

Environments where predators were on average faster were also those where they spent on

average less time ambushing their prey ($r_{env0,y1env0,y3}$ [95% CI] = -0.465 [-0.767, -0.143]) (figure 2B, lower off-diagonal). We detected a similar relationship between space coverage and time ambushing, although it was not statistically significant as the credible intervals overlapped zero ($r_{env0,y2env0,y3}$ [95% CI] = -0.246 [-0.582, 0.071]). Predators took on average less time to capture their first prey in environments where they covered space at a faster rate ($r_{env0,y2env0,y4}$ [95% CI] = -0.830 [-0.937, -0.702]), while taking more time on average in environments where they used ambushes ($r_{env0,y3env0,y4}$ [95% CI] = 0.354 [0.025, 0.650]) (figure 2B, lower off-diagonal). Lastly, we did not detect among-environment correlations between travel speed and space coverage, or between travel speed and the time before capturing a first prey ($r_{env0,y1env0,y2}$ [95% CI] = -0.045 [-0.404, 0.291], $r_{env0,y1env0,y4}$ [95% CI] = 0.079 [-0.273, 0.419]) (figure 2B, lower off-diagonal).

Effect of predator and prey behavior on hunting success: Linear relationships

Predator behavior alone (equation S5) explained 12.7% of the variation in hunting success ($R^2_{marginal} = 0.127$). Travel speed and time spent ambushing were positively related to hunting success (table I), suggesting that faster predators and ambush predators captured more prey (figure 3A, C). Predators who covered space at a faster rate captured fewer prey (table I) (figure 3B). Predators that required more time to capture their first prey had lower hunting success (table I) (figure 4D). Hunting success barely varied among game environments (ICC_{env0} [95% CI] = 0.005 [0.002, 0.008]). Differences among individuals in hunting success were low (ICC_{id0} [95% CI] = 0.067 [0.060, 0.074]).

Adding prey behavior (equation S6) increased the explained variance in hunting success to 18% ($R^2_{marginal} = 0.181$). Predators that competed against cursorial prey had significantly lower hunting success (table I). Prey that were faster at covering space in the environment significantly reduced the predators' hunting success (table I).

Effect of predator and prey behavior on hunting success: Quadratic relationships

Relative to the first model, the model that included quadratic and interaction terms for predator behavior (equation S7) barely increased the explained variance in hunting success ($R^2_{marginal} = 0.149$). However, we observed significant concave relationships for travel speed and time spent ambushing (table I), suggesting that hunting success was low at extreme behavioral values (figure

Table I: Estimates of the models relating predator hunting success to predator hunting behavior, prey behavior, and their interactions.

	Linear (95% CI)	Quadratic (95% CI)	Pred Interaction (95% CI)	Pred-prey Interaction (95% CI)
speed	0.07 (0.05, 0.08)	-0.11 (-0.10, -0.12)	-	-
space	-0.40 (-0.38, -0.42)	0.09 (0.08, 0.10)	-	-
ambush	0.38 (0.37, 0.40)	-0.12 (-0.12, -0.13)	-	-
time	-0.66 (-0.64, -0.67)	0.13 (0.12, 0.14)	-	-
prey speed	-0.20 (-0.19, -0.22)	-0.07 (-0.07, -0.08)	-	-
prey space	-0.63 (-0.60, -0.65)	-0.10 (-0.08, -0.11)	-	-
speed:space	-	-	-0.06 (-0.04, -0.07)	-
speed:ambush	-	-	-0.11 (-0.09, -0.12)	-
speed:time	-	-	-0.06 (-0.04, -0.07)	-
space:ambush	-	-	0.04 (0.03, 0.06)	-
space:time	-	-	-0.03 (-0.02, -0.05)	-
ambush:time	-	-	-0.02 (-0.01, -0.04)	-
speed:prey speed	-	-	-	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.00)
speed:prey space	-	-	-	-0.09 (-0.07, -0.12)
space:prey space	-	-	-	-0.05 (-0.03, -0.06)
space:prey speed	-	-	-	0.10 (0.07, 0.12)
ambush:prey speed	-	-	-	-0.06 (-0.04, -0.07)
ambush:prey space	-	-	-	-0.01 (-0.03, 0.01)
time:prey speed	-	-	-	0.00 (-0.02, 0.01)
time:prey space	-	-	-	0.05 (0.03, 0.07)

320 3E, G). There was a significant convex relationship between hunting success and space coverage
321 (table I) (figure 3F), and the shape of the quadratic function relating hunting success to time before
322 the first prey is captured was almost the same as the linear function (figure 3H). Hunting success
323 was still similar among game environments (ICC_{env0} [95% CI] = 0.010 [0.005, 0.016]), and varied
324 slightly among individual players (ICC_{id0} [95% CI] = 0.072 [0.064, 0.079]).

325 The model that included quadratic and interaction terms for predator and prey behavior (equation
326 S8) had the highest explanatory power in hunting success ($R^2_{marginal} = 0.212$). We detected concave
327 relationships between hunting success and prey speed/prey rate of space covered (Table I), thus,
328 predators had a higher probability of capturing all prey during a match when they competed against
329 prey that expressed average population values of these traits.




Figure 3: Effect of predator hunting behavior on prey capture. Hunting success (i.e. the probability of capturing four prey) is on the y axis for all panels, and the standardised hunting behavior is on the x axis. The black dashed lines represent the 95% credibility intervals for the predicted values, and the gray band represents the 95% prediction intervals (variance in fixed effects + variance in random effects). (A), (B), (C), (D) Linear functions. (E), (F), (G), (H) Quadratic functions.

330 *Effect of predator and prey behavior on hunting success: predator and prey behavioral interaction*

331 According to our predictions, faster predators were more successful when they competed against
332 sedentary prey (figure 4A). Predators had higher hunting success for the whole range of values

333 of space covered when they competed against slower-moving prey (figure 4C). Contrary to our
 334 expectations, the most successful predators were those who covered space at a slow rate when
 335 they competed against prey that were slower at covering space in the environment (figure 4D).
 336 However, those who covered space at the fastest rate were more successful against prey that
 337 were the slowest at covering space (figure 4D). There were no significant interactions between
 338 predator and prey travel speed (figure 4B). Lastly, for the whole range of time spent ambushing
 339 prey, predators had generally higher success against slower moving prey and prey that covered less
 340 space in the environment (figure 4E-F), although the interaction with prey space covered was not
 341 significant (table I).




Figure 4: Influence of the predator and prey behavioral interactions on predator hunting success. The plots' 3D surfaces show the relationship between different combinations of predator-prey behaviors and predator hunting success. We fitted the surfaces by predicting the mean probability of capturing four prey based on the best quadratic approximation of the predator and prey interaction terms. Here, we show interactions that enable us to determine if there are predator-prey locomotor crossovers. (A) Predator travel speed and prey space coverage. (B) Predator and prey travel speed. (C) Predator space coverage and prey travel speed. (D) Predator and prey space coverage. (E) Predator time spent ambushing and prey space coverage. (F) Predator time spent ambushing and prey travel speed.

Discussion

Our study is the first to use an online multiplayer videogame to investigate individual variation in predator foraging mode, and how predator and prey behavior affect hunting success. We provide evidence that individuals who adopt the predator role display individual specialization and flexibility in their foraging modes, varying along a continuum from cursorial to sit-and-wait. The expression of these foraging modes was consistent with shifts in the expression of other behaviors such as space use and the latency to first prey capture, matching the predictions of the foraging syndrome hypothesis at the individual level. Contrary to our expectations, neither hunting behavior nor prey capture varied among game environments. Even if we found the presence of competing foraging modes in the population, the most successful predators were those who hunted at average population values of travel speed, and those who spent an above population-average of their time ambushing prey. Lastly, we found evidence for the locomotor-crossover hypothesis for some predator-prey trait combinations. However, predators were generally less successful when they competed against fast traveling prey and those who covered space faster in the environment.

Our analyses revealed that predators differed in their average travel speed and in their proportion of time spent ambushing prey. These behaviors were negatively correlated at the among-individual level, suggesting that individuals may specialize as either cursorial or ambush predators. Cursorial predators displayed a shorter latency to first prey capture compared to ambush predators. These results are similar to those of McGhee et al. (2013), who found that fast moving northern pike (*Esox lucius*) were quicker to launch their initial attack. Interestingly, we found that hunting success decreased significantly with increasing latency to first capture, but did not strongly interact with time spent ambushing to affect hunting success. Thus, although ambush predators displayed a longer latency to capture their first prey, they were as successful as cursorial predators.

Since individuals achieved similar hunting success across the study period, our observations suggest that ecological mechanisms such as locomotor-crossovers may favor the coexistence of both foraging strategies within the *DBD* predator population. Indeed, we found that cursorial predators had greater hunting success when they competed against more sedentary prey, which agrees with empirical studies that tested the locomotor crossover hypothesis (Belgrad and Griffen 2016; Donihue 2016; Chang et al. 2017). However, locomotor-crossovers did not seem to explain the

371 success of ambush predators, as they also displayed higher success against sedentary prey, or prey
372 travelling at speeds close to the population average. In addition, predators reached similar hunting
373 success across the observed range of space coverage and time spent ambushing (figure 4. C-F).
374 A potential explanation is that by focusing solely on prey speed and space coverage, we failed to
375 capture other important prey strategies involved in the predator-prey interaction. For instance,
376 unpublished results by Santostefano et al. found four prey behavioral profiles in *DBD*, where faster
377 and exploratory individuals seemed distinct from bolder individuals that performed more coopera-
378 tive/altruistic actions, and that were involved in longer chases with the predator. Hence, we can
379 hypothesize that the success of ambush predators might be explained, to a degree, by a higher
380 capture of bold prey.

381 Predators also displayed flexibility in their foraging mode, where individuals switched between a
382 cursorial or ambush strategy from one match to the other. These foraging mode switches were
383 accompanied by shifts in space coverage and in latency before a first capture, suggesting that
384 predators may adjust their behavior according to the type of prey encountered. Thus, the outcome
385 of the predator-prey interaction might not only be determined by the individual predator's preferred
386 hunting mode, but also by its flexibility from one encounter to the next (McGhee et al. 2013).
387 Although this falls outside the scope of this study, further analyses will need to investigate the
388 dynamics of the predator behavior within a match to determine if predators switch between sit-
389 and-wait to cursorial strategies as prey density is reduced (Inoue and Marsura 1983). Short-term
390 switches in hunting mode are also expected to occur as predators make behavioral adjustments in
391 response to prey antipredator behavior (Helfman 1990), and should be favored when prey encounters
392 are unpredictable (Woo et al. 2008; Carneiro et al. 2017; Phillips et al. 2017). Comparing prey
393 selection and capture rates between specialist and flexible hunters could provide important insight
394 into the community-consequences of behavioral decisions made by predators.

395 An unexpected result in our study was that predator hunting mode did not change across different
396 environments. This contrasts with studies showing that predators exploit habitat characteristics
397 such as vegetation density to choose their hunting strategies (???; James and Heck Jr. 1994; Warfe
398 and Barmuta 2004). A potential explanation is that habitat structure may have instead affected
399 prey behavior, for instance, by altering their perception of predation risk or fear (Heithaus et

al. 2009; Gaynor et al. 2019). Features of heterogeneous habitats can sometimes exert stronger predator cues, leading prey to avoid these habitats, or alter their activity to reduce predation risks (Preisser et al. 2007). Prey individuals in *DBD* might differ in the way they respond to habitat changes, as some could have increased activity in heterogeneous habitats by exploiting refuges, thus, negating the effect of the environment on the predator’s hunting strategy (Warfe and Barmuta 2004). This could also explain why hunting success was similar among game environments. Predators can also alter their hunting behavior at larger scales according to prey behavior (as we have found), but seek prey accessibility at finer scales by killing them in specific areas in a given habitat (Hopcraft et al. 2005). We will need to investigate capture sites in the environment to see if these habitat scale-dependent effects on hunting behavior occur in *DBD*. Taken together, our observations emphasize the importance of quantifying the interactions between environmental and individual-level factors of predators and prey to better understand trophic interactions. Nevertheless, we cannot exclude the possibility that the game’s design might not properly simulate real ecological habitats to affect the predator’s behavior. For instance, predators have visual cues on the different patches where prey forage. This offers them the opportunity to approximate the distance/time required to travel among patches, while possibly relaxing the energy/concentration allocated to managing movement across the habitat’s features.

We are among the first ecologists (Cere et al. accepted; Barbe et al. 2020) to propose the use of online multiplayer videogames to investigate how ecological mechanisms shape the dynamics of trophic interactions. Although we are persuaded that videogames are poised to play a central role in testing ecological hypotheses, as they reduce financial, statistical or logistical hurdles associated with empirical research while providing complex and ecologically-relevant datasets, they are not a panacea and they come with their own biases. For instance, player behavior may not properly reflect behavioral decisions made by real-life organisms in the wild, as the player cannot “die” (Oultram 2013). Hence, individuals may take greater risks in a videogame compared to real predators (Lofgren and Fefferman 2007; Oultram 2013). Moreover, while *DBD* provides an interesting system to investigate predator-prey interactions, prey density is fixed at four players, which prevents the modelling of predator functional responses. Lastly, similar to mesocosm experiments with single predators, the game may not reflect natural systems where multiple predator species compete for

the same prey. In light of these potential biases, researchers should interpret results from online videogames with care, and aim to test specific ecological hypotheses when using virtual systems.

To conclude, individual variation in predator (and prey) behavior is increasingly recognized as a critical factor influencing the outcome of trophic interactions (Pettorelli et al. 2015; Toscano et al. 2016; Moran et al. 2017). Albeit our study being essentially descriptive, as it is the first to investigate individual variation in foraging behavior using an online videogame, we showed that individuals differed in contrasting hunting strategies that align with those used by wild predators. These hunting modes varied among- and within- individuals along correlated behaviors (foraging syndrome hypothesis), and our results suggest that predator-prey locomotor-crossovers may promote the coexistence of different predator and prey behavioral types. We are confident that further studies using online videogames will provide valuable ecological insight for behavioral and community ecologists.

Acknowledgements:

We thank behavior Interactive for generous access to their data, and members of the Rover Team (Julien Céré, Guillaume Bergerot, Jean-Baptiste Le Meur, Nicholas Robitaille) in the company for inputs on the preliminary results. We would also like to thank members of the GRECA at UQAM for their insightful comments and suggestions on the whole research process. Lastly, we thank two anonymous reviewers whose comments helped us improve this manuscript.

Author contributions:

MFF and POM conceived the study. MFF collected the data, conducted the analyses, and led the writing of the manuscript. All authors contributed to revisions and gave their final approval for the present manuscript.

Competing interests:

The authors declare no competing interests

Grant information:

This project was funded by the Mitacs Accelerate Grant (#IT12054) through a partnership with behavior Interactive and Université du Québec à Montréal.

Data availability statement:

We could not openly share the data on open science/data web platforms due to ownership and privacy restrictions. However, upon reasonable request, we can provide the data used to conduct our analyses. In addition, the project’s R scripts and results are freely available on this GitHub repository: https://github.com/quantitative-ecologist/videogame_hunting_tactics-Rscripts.

Literature Cited

- Ahmad, M. A., C. Shen, J. Srivastava, and N. Contractor. 2014. On the Problem of Predicting Real World Characteristics from Virtual Worlds. Pages 1–18 *in* M. A. Ahmad, C. Shen, J. Srivastava, and N. Contractor, eds. Predicting Real World Behaviors from Virtual World Data, Springer Proceedings in Complexity. Springer International Publishing, Cham.
- Araújo, M. S., D. I. Bolnick, and C. A. Layman. 2011. The ecological causes of individual specialisation. *Ecology Letters* 14:948–958.
- Arthur, B., M. Hindell, M. N. Bester, W. C. Oosthuizen, M. Wege, and M.-A. Lea. 2016. South for the winter? Within-dive foraging effort reveals the trade-offs between divergent foraging strategies in a free-ranging predator. *Functional Ecology* 30:1623–1637.
- Balicer, R. D. 2007. Modeling Infectious Diseases Dissemination Through Online Role-Playing Games. *Epidemiology* 18:260–261.
- Barbe, L., C. Mony, and B. W. Abbott. 2020. Artificial Intelligence Accidentally Learned Ecology through Video Games. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 35:557–560.
- Belgrad, B. A., and B. D. Griffen. 2016. Predator–prey interactions mediated by prey personality and predator hunting mode. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 283:20160408.
- Bowen, W. D., D. Tully, D. J. Boness, B. M. Bulheier, and G. J. Marshall. 2002. Prey-dependent

foraging tactics and prey profitability in a marine mammal. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 244:235–245.

Brodie, E. D., A. J. Moore, and F. J. Janzen. 1995. Visualizing and quantifying natural selection. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 10:313–318.

Butler, M. A. 2005. Foraging mode of the chameleon, *Bradypodion pumilum*: A challenge to the sit-and-wait versus active forager paradigm? *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 84:797–808.

Bürkner, P.-C. 2017. Brms: An R Package for Bayesian Multilevel Models Using Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software* 80:1–28.

Carneiro, A. P. B., A.-S. Bonnet-Lebrun, A. Manica, I. J. Staniland, and R. A. Phillips. 2017. Methods for detecting and quantifying individual specialisation in movement and foraging strategies of marine predators. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 578:151–166.

Carter, A. J., W. E. Feeney, H. H. Marshall, G. Cowlshaw, and R. Heinsohn. 2013. Animal personality: What are behavioural ecologists measuring? *Biological Reviews* 88:465–475.

Chang, C.-c., H. Y. Teo, Y. Norma-Rashid, and D. Li. 2017. Predator personality and prey behavioural predictability jointly determine foraging performance. *Scientific Reports* 7:40734.

Cooper, W. E. 2005. The foraging mode controversy: Both continuous variation and clustering of foraging movements occur. *Journal of Zoology* 267:179–190.

Courbin, N., A. Besnard, C. Péron, C. Saraux, J. Fort, S. Perret, J. Tornos, et al. 2018. Short-term prey field lability constrains individual specialisation in resource selection and foraging site fidelity in a marine predator. *Ecology Letters* 21:1043–1054.

Dall, S. R. X., and S. C. Griffith. 2014. An empiricist guide to animal personality variation in ecology and evolution. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* 2:3.

Dingemanse, N. J., and N. A. Dochtermann. 2013. Quantifying individual variation in behaviour: Mixed-effect modelling approaches. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 82:39–54.

Dingemanse, N. J., and J. Wright. 2020. Criteria for acceptable studies of animal personality and behavioural syndromes. *Ethology* 126:865–869.

504 Donihue, C. M. 2016. Aegean wall lizards switch foraging modes, diet, and morphology in a human-
505 built environment. *Ecology and Evolution* 6:7433–7442.

506 Gaynor, K. M., J. S. Brown, A. D. Middleton, M. E. Power, and J. S. Brashares. 2019. Landscapes
507 of Fear: Spatial Patterns of Risk Perception and Response. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 34:355–
508 368.

509 Gerritsen, J., and J. Strickler. 1977. Encounter probabilities and community structure in zooplank-
510 ton: A mathematical model. *Journal of the Fisheries Board of Canada* 34.

511 Glaudas, X., K. L. Glennon, M. Martins, L. Luiselli, S. Fearn, D. F. Trembath, D. Jelić, et al. 2019.
512 Foraging mode, relative prey size and diet breadth: A phylogenetically explicit analysis of snake
513 feeding ecology. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 88:757–767.

514 Griffen, B. D., B. J. Toscano, and J. Gatto. 2012. The role of individual behavior type in mediating
515 indirect interactions. *Ecology* 93:1935–1943.

516 Harrison, X. A. 2015. A comparison of observation-level random effect and Beta-Binomial models
517 for modelling overdispersion in Binomial data in ecology & evolution. *PeerJ* 3:e1114.

518 Heithaus, M. R., L. M. Dill, and J. J. Kiszka. 2018. Feeding strategies and tactics. Pages 354–363
519 *in* B. Würsig, J. G. M. Thewissen, and K. M. Kovacs, eds. *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals*
520 (Third Edition). Academic Press.

521 Heithaus, M. R., A. J. Wirsing, D. Burkholder, J. Thomson, and L. M. Dill. 2009. Towards
522 a predictive framework for predator risk effects: The interaction of landscape features and prey
523 escape tactics. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 78:556–562.

524 Helfman, G. S. 1990. Mode selection and mode switching in foraging animals. Pages 249–298 *in*
525 P. J. B. Slater, J. S. Rosenblatt, and C. Beer, eds. *Advances in the Study of Behavior* (Vol. 19).
526 Academic Press.

527 Hertel, A. G., P. T. Niemelä, N. J. Dingemanse, and T. Mueller. 2020. A guide for studying
528 among-individual behavioral variation from movement data in the wild. *Movement Ecology* 8.

529 Hopcraft, J. G. C., A. R. E. Sinclair, and C. Packer. 2005. Planning for success: Serengeti lions

530 seek prey accessibility rather than abundance. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 74:559–566.

531 Huey, R. B., and E. R. Pianka. 1981. Ecological consequences of foraging mode. *Ecology* 62:991–
532 999.

533 Inoue, T., and T. Marsura. 1983. Foraging strategy of a mantid, *Paratenodera angustipennis* S.:
534 Mechanisms of switching tactics between ambush and active search. *Oecologia* 56:264–271.

535 James, P. L., and K. L. Heck Jr. 1994. The effects of habitat complexity and light intensity on
536 ambush predation within a simulated seagrass habitat. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology*
537 *and Ecology* 176:187–200.

538 Kersch-Becker, M. F., B. B. Grisolia, M. J. O. Campos, and G. Q. Romero. 2018. Community-
539 wide responses to predation risk: Effects of predator hunting mode on herbivores, pollinators, and
540 parasitoids. *Ecological Entomology* 43:846–849.

541 Laurel, B. J., and J. A. Brown. 2006. Influence of cruising and ambush predators on 3-dimensional
542 habitat use in age 0 juvenile Atlantic cod *Gadus morhua*. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology*
543 *and Ecology* 329:34–46.

544 Lima, S. L. 2002. Putting predators back into behavioral predator–prey interactions. *Trends in*
545 *Ecology & Evolution* 17:70–75.

546 Lofgren, E. T., and N. H. Fefferman. 2007. The untapped potential of virtual game worlds to shed
547 light on real world epidemics. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 7:625–629.

548 McCoy, E. D., and S. S. Bell. 1991. Habitat structure: The evolution and diversification of a
549 complex topic. Pages 3–27 *in* S. S. Bell, E. D. McCoy, and H. R. Mushinsky, eds. *Habitat Structure:*
550 *The physical arrangement of objects in space, Population and Community Biology Series.* Springer
551 Netherlands, Dordrecht.

552 McGhee, K. E., L. M. Pintor, and A. M. Bell. 2013. Reciprocal behavioral plasticity and behavioral
553 types during predator-prey interactions. *The American Naturalist* 182:704–717.

554 McLaughlin, R. L. 1989. Search modes of birds and lizards: Evidence for alternative movement
555 patterns. *The American Naturalist* 133:654–670.

556 Michel, M. J., and M. M. Adams. 2009. Differential effects of structural complexity on predator
557 foraging behavior. *Behavioral Ecology* 20:313–317.

558 Miles, D. B., J. B. Losos, and D. J. Irschick. 2007. Morphology, performance, and foraging mode.
559 Pages 49–93 *in* D. B. Miles, L. B. McBrayer, and S. M. Reilly, eds. *Lizard Ecology*. Cambridge
560 University Press, Cambridge.

561 Miller, J. R. B., J. M. Ament, and O. J. Schmitz. 2014. Fear on the move: Predator hunting mode
562 predicts variation in prey mortality and plasticity in prey spatial response. *Journal of Animal*
563 *Ecology* 83:214–222.

564 Montiglio, P.-O., D. Garant, D. Thomas, and D. Réale. 2010. Individual variation in temporal
565 activity patterns in open-field tests. *Animal Behaviour* 80:905–912.

566 Moran, N. P., B. B. M. Wong, and R. M. Thompson. 2017. Weaving animal temperament into
567 food webs: Implications for biodiversity. *Oikos* 126:917–930.

568 Nakagawa, S., and I. C. Cuthill. 2007. Effect size, confidence interval and statistical significance:
569 A practical guide for biologists. *Biological Reviews* 82:591–605.

570 Nakagawa, S., P. C. D. Johnson, and H. Schielzeth. 2017. The coefficient of determination R^2
571 and intra-class correlation coefficient from generalized linear mixed-effects models revisited and
572 expanded. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* 14:20170213.

573 Nakagawa, S., and H. Schielzeth. 2010. Repeatability for Gaussian and non-Gaussian data: A
574 practical guide for biologists. *Biological Reviews* 85:935–956.

575 Niemelä, P. T., and N. J. Dingemanse. 2014. Artificial environments and the study of “adaptive”
576 personalities. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 29:245–247.

577 Oultram, S. 2013. Virtual plagues and real-world pandemics: Reflecting on the potential for online
578 computer role-playing games to inform real world epidemic research. *Medical Humanities* 39:115–
579 118.

580 Perry, G. 1999. The evolution of search modes: Ecological versus phylogenetic perspectives. *The*
581 *American Naturalist* 153:98–109.

582 Perry, G., Y. L. Werner, I. Lampl, D. Rothenstein, N. Sivan, A. Lerner, and E. Shani. 1990.
 583 Foraging mode in lacertid lizards: Variation and correlates. *Amphibia-Reptilia* 11:373–384.

584 Pettorelli, N., A. Hilborn, C. Duncan, and S. M. Durant. 2015. Chapter Two - Individual variability:
 585 The missing component to our understanding of predator–prey interactions. Pages 19–44 *in* S.
 586 Pawar, G. Woodward, and A. I. Dell, eds. *Advances in Ecological Research, Trait-Based Ecology -*
 587 *From Structure to Function* (Vol. 52). Academic Press.

588 Phillips, R. A., S. Lewis, J. González-Solís, and F. Daunt. 2017. Causes and consequences of
 589 individual variability and specialization in foraging and migration strategies of seabirds. *Marine*
 590 *Ecology Progress Series* 578:117–150.

591 Preisser, E. L., J. L. Orrock, and O. J. Schmitz. 2007. Predator hunting mode and habitat domain
 592 alter nonconsumptive effects in predator–prey interactions. *Ecology* 88:2744–2751.

593 Robinson, S. K., and R. T. Holmes. 1982. Foraging behavior of forest birds: The relationships
 594 among search tactics, diet, and habitat structure. *Ecology* 63:1918–1931.

595 Romero, G. Q., and J. Koricheva. 2011. Contrasting cascade effects of carnivores on plant fitness:
 596 A meta-analysis. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 80:696–704.

597 Ross, T. L., E. Castronova, and I. Knowles. 2015. Virtual Worlds as Laboratories. Pages 1–15
 598 *in* *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. American Cancer Society.

599 Sargeant, B. L., A. J. Wirsing, M. R. Heithaus, and J. Mann. 2007. Can environmental heterogene-
 600 ity explain individual foraging variation in wild bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops* sp.)? *Behav Ecol*
 601 *Sociobiol* 61:679–688.

602 Scharf, I., E. Nulman, O. Ovadia, and A. Bouskila. 2006. Efficiency evaluation of two competing
 603 foraging modes under different conditions. *The American Naturalist* 168:350–357.

604 Schmitz, O. 2017. Predator and prey functional traits: Understanding the adaptive machinery
 605 driving predator–prey interactions. *F1000Res* 6:1767.

606 Schmitz, O. J. 2008. Effects of predator hunting mode on grassland ecosystem function. *Science*
 607 319:952–954.

608 Smith, B. R., and D. T. Blumstein. 2010. Behavioral types as predictors of survival in Trinidadian
609 guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*). *Behavioral Ecology* 21:919–926.

610 Tinker, M. T., G. Bental, and J. A. Estes. 2008. Food limitation leads to behavioral diversification
611 and dietary specialization in sea otters. *PNAS* 105:560–565.

612 Toscano, B. J., N. J. Gownaris, S. M. Heerhartz, and C. J. Monaco. 2016. Personality, foraging
613 behavior and specialization: Integrating behavioral and food web ecology at the individual level.
614 *Oecologia* 182:55–69.

615 Toscano, B. J., and B. D. Griffen. 2014. Trait-mediated functional responses: Predator behavioural
616 type mediates prey consumption. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 83:1469–1477.

617 Warfe, D. M., and L. A. Barmuta. 2004. Habitat structural complexity mediates the foraging
618 success of multiple predator species. *Oecologia* 141:171–178.

619 Wignall, A. E., and P. W. Taylor. 2008. Alternative predatory tactics of an araneophagic assassin
620 bug (*Stenolemus bituberosus*). *acta ethol* 12:23.

621 Wirsing, A. J., M. R. Heithaus, J. S. Brown, B. P. Kotler, and O. J. Schmitz. 2021. The context
622 dependence of non-consumptive predator effects. *Ecology Letters* 24:113–129.

623 Wolf, M., and F. J. Weissing. 2012. Animal personalities: Consequences for ecology and evolution.
624 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 27:452–461.

625 Woo, K. J., K. H. Elliott, M. Davidson, A. J. Gaston, and G. K. Davoren. 2008. Individual
626 specialization in diet by a generalist marine predator reflects specialization in foraging behaviour.
627 *Journal of Animal Ecology* 77:1082–1091.