**Supplementary tables**

**Supplementary Table 1: List of villages sampled in Sariska Tiger Reserve along with household sampling intensity**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.N.** | **Village** | **Total number of households** | **% Sampled** | **Village location** |
| 1 | Kushalgarh | 27 | 22.22 | In |
| 2 | Kalachara | 23 | 21.74 | In |
| 3 | Kundalkha | 64 | 23.44 | In |
| 4 | Bera | 58 | 20.69 | In |
| 5 | Kankwadi, karat, pilapani | 27 | 22.22 | In |
| 6 | Reika | 24 | 25.00 | In |
| 7 | Panidhal | 5 | 60.00 | In |
| 8 | Nangalhedi | 93 | 20.43 | In |
| 9 | Kanyavas | 27 | 18.52 | In |
| 10 | Mitravat | 52 | 23.08 | In |
| 11 | Dabkan | 50 | 14.00 | In |
| 12 | Berawas | 139 | 15.11 | In |
| 13 | Rajore & Mandalwas | 102 | 20.59 | In |
| 14 | Garh | 47 | 21.28 | In |
| 16 | Deori | 34 | 20.59 | In |
| 17 | Lilunda | 20 | 30.00 | In |
| 18 | Madhogarh | 127 | 17.32 | In |
| 19 | Reikamala | 30 | 26.67 | In |
| 20 | Kiraska | 66 | 19.70 | In |
| 21 | Sukola | 27 | 29.63 | In |
| 22 | Duharmala | 82 | 23.17 | In |
| 24 | Loj | 28 | 25.00 | In |
| 25 | Nathusar | 34 | 29.41 | In |
| 26 | Kasana ki dhaani | 16 | 25.00 | In |
| 27 | Dabli | 25 | 28.00 | In |
| 28 | Indok | 211 | 14.69 | In |
| 32 | Haripura | 20 | 45.00 | In |
| 15 | Nandu | 51 | 19.61 | Out |
| 23 | Manawas | 92 | 16.30 | Out |
| 29 | Meenala | 22 | 27.27 | Out |
| 30 | Sirawas | 42 | 23.81 | Out |
| 31 | Binak, Dehlawas | 180 | 11.11 | Out |

**Supplementary Table 2: List of villages sampled in Panna Tiger Reserve along with household sampling intensity**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.N.** | **Village** | **Total number of households** | **% Sampled** | **Village location/HTC status** |
| 1 | Mainari | 48 | 16.67 | Inside |
| 2 | Dhodan | 144 | 15.28 | Inside |
| 3 | Kharyani | 161 | 14.91 | Inside |
| 4 | Palkohan | 336 | 10.12 | Inside |
| 5 | Bakchur | 9 | 33.33 | On the edge of national park |
| 6 | Rampura | 33 | 21.21 | On the edge of national park |
| 7 | Shivrajpura | 37 | 18.92 | High conflict |
| 8 | Gehdara | 82 | 14.63 | High conflict |
| 9 | Akola | 22 | 13.64 | High conflict |
| 10 | Hinota | 301 | 9.97 | High conflict |
| 11 | Jardhova | 141 | 9.93 | High conflict |
| 12 | Lalar | 136 | 9.56 | High conflict |
| 13 | Kaimasan | 13 | 15.38 | Low conflict |
| 14 | Tapariyan | 70 | 14.29 | Low conflict |
| 15 | Bilhata | 65 | 10.77 | Low conflict |
| 16 | Baharpura | 130 | 10.00 | Low conflict |
| 17 | Patan | 143 | 9.79 | Low conflict |
| 18 | Bhusor | 119 | 9.24 | Low conflict |
| 19 | Bandi Kalan | 245 | 7.35 | Low conflict |
| 20 | Jharkua | 321 | 5.61 | Low conflict |
| 21 | Dwari | 612 | 5.07 | Low conflict |
| 22 | Dupariya | 106 | 10.38 | No conflict |
| 23 | Harsa | 64 | 9.38 | No conflict |
| 24 | Ranguvan | 193 | 5.18 | No conflict |
| 25 | Barbaspura | 14 | 28.57 | Within tiger home range |

**Supplementary Table 3: Table summarizing all the highly correlated variables, among the variables used for modeling attitude of local communities towards tigers in Sariska and Panna Tiger Reserves**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Panna Tiger Reserve: all sampled households** | |
| **Continuous vs continuous: Kendall’s tau ba** | |
| Value of fodder obtained from forest all cattle | Value of fodder obtained from forest all livestock |
| Total livestock lost | Total monetary loss |
| **Categorical vs continuous: binomial logistic regressionc** | |
| Gender | Total livestock lost |
| Loss | Total livestock owned |
| Loss | Value of fodder obtained from forest all cattle |
| **Categorical vs continuous: multinomial logistic regressionc** | |
| Caste/community | Total livestock owned |
| Caste/community | Total Income FP |
| **Panna Tiger Reserve: Households facing livestock loss** | |
| **Continuous vs continuous: Kendall’s tau ba** | |
| Value of fodder obtained from forest all cattle | Value of fodder obtained from forest all livestock |
| Total monetary loss | Cost of last livestock lost |
| **Categorical vs categorical: Cramer’s Vb** | |
| Species of last livestock lost | Loss due to herbivores |
| **Categorical vs continuous: multinomial logistic regressionc** | |
| Compensation satisfied | Age |
| Compensation satisfied | Total livestock owned |
| Caste | Tot Income FP |
|  | |
| **Sariska Tiger Reserve: all sampled households** | |
| **Continuous vs continuous: Kendall’s tau ba** | |
| Value of fodder obtained from forest all cattle | Value of fodder obtained from forest all livestock |
| Total livestock lost | Total monetary loss |
| **Categorical vs continuous: binomial logistic regressionc** | |
| Gender | Total livestock owned |
| Loss | Total livestock owned |
| **Categorical vs continuous: multinomial logistic regressionc** | |
| Caste/community | Total livestock owned |
| Caste/community | Value of fodder obtained from forest all cattle |
| Caste/community | Value of fodder obtained from forest all livestock |
| Caste/community | Total livestock lost |
| Caste/community | Total monetary loss |
| **Sariska Tiger Reserve: Households facing livestock loss** | |
| **Continuous vs continuous: Kendall’s tau ba** | |
| Value of fodder obtained from forest all cattle | Value of fodder obtained from forest all livestock |
| **Categorical vs categorical: Cramer’s Vb** | |
| Caste/community | Species of last livestock lost |
| **Categorical vs continuous: binomial logistic regressionc** | |
| Gender | Total livestock owned |
| Gender | Total monetary loss |
| Age of last livestock lost | Total monetary loss |
| Age of last livestock lost | Cost of last livestock lost |
| **Categorical vs continuous: multinomial logistic regressionc** | |
| Caste/community | Total livestock owned |
| Caste/community | Total livestock lost |
| Species of last livestock lost | Total monetary loss |
| Species of last livestock lost | Cost of last livestock lost |
| Compensation received | Total monetary loss |
| Compensation received | Cost of last livestock lost |
| Compensation received | Compensation satisfied |
| Compensation satisfied | Total monetary loss |

1. For continuous vs continuous: correlation with r>0.7 considered high correlation
2. For categorical vs categorical: correlation with Cramer’s V>0.5 considered high correlation
3. For categorical vs continuous: all variables with Wald’s test of logistic regression significant at α=0.05 and very high log odd values, were considered highly associated