

**Should I stay or should I go: Escape behaviour of Russell's vipers,
Daboia russelii (Shaw & Nodder, 1797) in India's agricultural
landscapes**

Vivek P. Cyriac^{1,2,*}, Kiran B. Srinivasa³, Lohith Kumar² and Gerard Martin²

¹ Centre for Ecological Sciences, Indian Institute of Science, CV Raman Rd, Bengaluru, Karnataka – 560012,
India

² The Liana Trust, Sy. No. 1418/1419, Rathnapuri, Hunsur, Karnataka – 1571189, India

³ Humane Society International (India), Hunsur, Karnataka – 1571189, India

*Corresponding author; e-mail: vivek.cyriac@gmail.com

ORCID iDs: Cyriac: 0000-0002-0465-0452; Srinivasa: 0000-0002-8031-9366; Martin: 0000-0002-1409-2984

Supplementary material

Table S1.

Definitions used to categorise behaviour and microhabitat usage in Russell's vipers *Daboia russelii*.

	Definition
Behaviours	
Ambush	Body bunched up, ready to spring, lower jaw usually touching the ground and often in front of the body
Basking	The snake is exposed to sun in a location where it is clearly gaining heat from the sun. Body not in tight coils
Courtship	When the snake is with an individual of the opposite sex during mating season(October, November, December)
Resting	Coiled up, usually not exposed to the sun, head placed within the coils
Unknown	Behaviour of the snake cannot be determined
Microhabitat	
Burrow	Hole with tunnel, dug by other animals or termite mounds
Large fallen leaves	Banana leaves, coconut fronds or other palm fronds fallen on the ground or artificially piled up with no sign of decomposition
Low vegetation	Wild or cultivated vegetation up to 0.5 m in height
High vegetation	Wild or cultivated vegetation above 0.5 m in height
Material piles	Rocks, building material, roofing sheets, etc. piled up. Does not include natural rock formations
Fire wood	Branches or wood that has been cut into pieces and piled

Table S2.

Summary and comparison of different models from the generalised linear model (GLM) and generalised linear mixed-effects model (GLMM) analyses evaluating escape response and flight initiation distance (FID) in Russell's vipers. Models in bold indicate the best-fit model with the lowest Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) values.

Model			AIC	AICc	Δ AICc	Akaike weights
Dependent variable	Fixed effects	Random effects				
Russell's viper escape response (binomial with logit link function)						
Moved away	Behaviour*	Individual	208.15	208.22	0	0.5494
		ID + date	88	86		
Moved away	Behaviour* + snake's visibility + relative humidity	Individual ID + date	210.17 26	210.24 32	2.0146	0.2006
Moved away	Behaviour* + snake's visibility + tracker distance + relative humidity	Individual ID + date	211.46 59	211.53 65	3.3079	0.1050
Moved away	Behaviour* + snake's visibility	Individual ID + date	212.23 44	212.30 42	4.0756	0.0715
Moved away	Behaviour* + snake's visibility + tracker distance + relative humidity + distance to cover	Individual ID + date	213.10 94	213.18 00	4.9514	0.0462
Moved away	Behaviour* + snake's visibility + tracker distance + relative humidity + distance to cover + sex	Individual ID + date	214.89 86	214.96 92	6.7406	0.0188

Moved away	Behaviour* + snake's visibility + tracker distance + relative humidity + distance to cover + sex + ambient temperature	Individual ID + date	216.85 65	216.85 65	8.6985	0.0070
Moved away	Behaviour* + snake's visibility + tracker distance + relative humidity + distance to cover + sex + ambient temperature + microhabitat	Individual ID + date	221.39 16	221.39 16	13.233 6	0.0007
Moved away	null	Individual ID + date	223.07 79	223.14 77	14.919 1	0.0003
Effect of body temperature on escape response (binomial with logit link function)						
Moved away	Body temperature	Individual ID + date	182.25 46	182.34 35	0	0.8126
Moved away	Null	Individual ID + Date	185.18 94	185.27 83	2.9348	0.1873
Russell's viper flight initiation distance (FID) (gamma with log link function)						
FID	Snake's visibility + distance to cover*	Individual ID + date	188.48 27	188.66 18	0	0.4489
FID	Snake's visibility + sex + distance to cover* +	Individual ID + date	189.48 46	189.66 37	1.001	0.2720
FID	Snake's visibility + sex + distance to cover* + body temperature	Individual ID + date	191.20 61	191.38 52	2.7234	0.1150

FID	Snake's visibility* + sex + behaviour + distance to cover* + body temperature	Individual ID + date	191.28 28	191.46 19	2.8001	0.1106
FID	Distance to cover*	Individual ID + date	193.19 08	193.37 00	4.7082	0.0426
FID	Null	Individual ID + date	196.95 59	197.13 50	8.4732	0.0064
FID	Snake's visibility + sex + behaviour + microhabitat + distance to cover* + body temperature	Individual ID + date	197.80 37	197.98 28	9.3210	0.0042

Table S3.

Results of the pairwise comparison evaluating escape response across behaviours (A, Ambush; B, basking; C, courtship; R, resting) and flight initiation distance (FID) across snake's visibility (NV, not visible; SC, small coils visible; under half visible; UH, MH, more than half visible; CP, completely visible) using Tukey's *post-hoc* test. Models in bold indicate the significant pair-wise combinations.

Pair of groups	Estimate	Std. error	z value	P value
Escape response across behaviours				
B–A	1.6851	0.7375	2.285	0.0903
C–A	2.9369	1.4034	2.093	0.1403
R–A	0.1886	0.8013	0.235	0.9949
C–B	1.2518	1.2664	0.989	0.7378
R–B	–1.4965	0.4930	–3.035	0.0112
R–C	–2.7484	1.3336	–2.061	0.1503
FID across different levels of the snake's visibility				
MH–CP	0.47350	0.29022	1.632	0.4708
NV–CP	–0.37074	0.26544	–1.397	0.6238
SC–CP	–0.02365	0.27019	–0.088	1.0000
UH–CP	0.28868	0.28244	1.022	0.8417
NV–MH	–0.84424	0.26090	–3.236	0.0104
SC–MH	–0.49715	0.23374	–2.127	0.2047
UH–MH	–0.18482	0.23001	–0.804	0.9278
SC–NV	0.34709	0.20483	1.695	0.4310
UH–NV	0.65942	0.21570	3.057	0.0184
UH–SC	0.31233	0.21131	1.478	0.5705