

Sharing for science: High-resolution trophic interactions revealed rapidly by social media (#47047)

1

First submission

Guidance from your Editor

Please submit by **26 Apr 2020** for the benefit of the authors (and your \$200 publishing discount) .



Structure and Criteria

Please read the 'Structure and Criteria' page for general guidance.



Author notes

Have you read the author notes on the [guidance page](#)?



Raw data check

Review the raw data.



Image check

Check that figures and images have not been inappropriately manipulated.

Privacy reminder: If uploading an annotated PDF, remove identifiable information to remain anonymous.

Files

Download and review all files from the [materials page](#).

5 Figure file(s)

1 Table file(s)



Structure and Criteria

Structure your review

The review form is divided into 5 sections. Please consider these when composing your review:

1. BASIC REPORTING
2. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN
3. VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS
4. General comments
5. Confidential notes to the editor

 You can also annotate this PDF and upload it as part of your review

When ready [submit online](#).

Editorial Criteria

Use these criteria points to structure your review. The full detailed editorial criteria is on your [guidance page](#).

BASIC REPORTING

-  Clear, unambiguous, professional English language used throughout.
-  Intro & background to show context. Literature well referenced & relevant.
-  Structure conforms to [PeerJ standards](#), discipline norm, or improved for clarity.
-  Figures are relevant, high quality, well labelled & described.
-  Raw data supplied (see [PeerJ policy](#)).

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

-  Original primary research within [Scope of the journal](#).
-  Research question well defined, relevant & meaningful. It is stated how the research fills an identified knowledge gap.
-  Rigorous investigation performed to a high technical & ethical standard.
-  Methods described with sufficient detail & information to replicate.

VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS

-  Impact and novelty not assessed. Negative/inconclusive results accepted. *Meaningful* replication encouraged where rationale & benefit to literature is clearly stated.
-  All underlying data have been provided; they are robust, statistically sound, & controlled.
-  Speculation is welcome, but should be identified as such.
-  Conclusions are well stated, linked to original research question & limited to supporting results.

Standout reviewing tips

3



The best reviewers use these techniques

Tip

Support criticisms with evidence from the text or from other sources

Example

Smith et al (J of Methodology, 2005, V3, pp 123) have shown that the analysis you use in Lines 241-250 is not the most appropriate for this situation. Please explain why you used this method.

Give specific suggestions on how to improve the manuscript

Your introduction needs more detail. I suggest that you improve the description at lines 57- 86 to provide more justification for your study (specifically, you should expand upon the knowledge gap being filled).

Comment on language and grammar issues

The English language should be improved to ensure that an international audience can clearly understand your text. Some examples where the language could be improved include lines 23, 77, 121, 128 – the current phrasing makes comprehension difficult.

Organize by importance of the issues, and number your points

1. Your most important issue
2. The next most important item
3. ...
4. The least important points

Please provide constructive criticism, and avoid personal opinions

I thank you for providing the raw data, however your supplemental files need more descriptive metadata identifiers to be useful to future readers. Although your results are compelling, the data analysis should be improved in the following ways: AA, BB, CC

Comment on strengths (as well as weaknesses) of the manuscript

I commend the authors for their extensive data set, compiled over many years of detailed fieldwork. In addition, the manuscript is clearly written in professional, unambiguous language. If there is a weakness, it is in the statistical analysis (as I have noted above) which should be improved upon before Acceptance.

Sharing for science: High-resolution trophic interactions revealed rapidly by social media

Robin A Maritz^{Corresp., 1}, Bryan Maritz¹

¹ Department of Biodiversity and Conservation Biology, University of the Western Cape, Bellville, South Africa

Corresponding Author: Robin A Maritz
Email address: maritzrobin.a@gmail.com

Discrete, ephemeral natural phenomena with low spatial or temporal predictability are incredibly challenging to study systematically. In ecology, species interactions, which constitute the functional backbone of ecological communities, can be notoriously difficult to characterise especially when taxa are inconspicuous and the interactions of interest (e.g., trophic events) occur infrequently, rapidly, or variably in space and time. Overcoming such issues has historically required significant time and resource investment to collect sufficient data, precluding the answering of many ecological and evolutionary questions. Here we show the utility of social media for rapidly collecting ephemeral ecological phenomena with low spatial and temporal predictability by using a Facebook group dedicated to collecting predation events involving reptiles and amphibians in sub-Saharan Africa. We collected over 1 900 independent feeding observations using Facebook from 2015–2019 involving 83 families of predators and 129 families of prey. Feeding events by snakes were particularly well-represented with close to 1 100 feeding observations recorded. Relative to an extensive literature review spanning 226 sources and 138 years, we found that social media has provided snake dietary records faster than ever before in history with prey being identified to a finer taxonomic resolution and showing only modest concordance with the literature due to the number of novel interactions that were detected. Finally, we demonstrate that social media can outperform other citizen science image-based approaches (iNaturalist and Google Images) highlighting the versatility of social media and its ability to function as a citizen science platform.

Sharing for Science: High-resolution trophic interactions revealed rapidly by social media

Robin A. Maritz¹ and Bryan Maritz¹

¹ Department of Biodiversity and Conservation Biology, University of the Western Cape,
Bellville, Western Cape, South Africa

Corresponding Author: Robin A. Maritz¹

Email Address: maritzrobin.a@gmail.com

Abstract

Discrete, ephemeral natural phenomena with low spatial or temporal predictability are incredibly challenging to study systematically. In ecology, species interactions, which constitute the functional backbone of ecological communities, can be notoriously difficult to characterise especially when taxa are inconspicuous and the interactions of interest (e.g., trophic events) occur infrequently, rapidly, or variably in space and time. Overcoming such issues has historically required significant time and resource investment to collect sufficient data, precluding the answering of many ecological and evolutionary questions. Here we show the utility of social media for rapidly collecting ephemeral ecological phenomena with low spatial and temporal predictability by using a Facebook group dedicated to collecting predation events involving reptiles and amphibians in sub-Saharan Africa. We collected over 1900 independent feeding observations using Facebook from 2015–2019 involving 83 families of predators and 129 families of prey. Feeding events by snakes were particularly well-represented with close to 100 feeding observations recorded. Relative to an extensive literature review spanning 226 sources and 138 years, we found that social media has provided snake dietary records faster than ever before in history with prey being identified to a finer taxonomic resolution and showing only modest concordance with the literature due to the number of novel interactions that were detected. Finally, we demonstrate that social media can outperform other citizen science image-based approaches (iNaturalist and Google Images) highlighting the versatility of social media and its ability to function as a citizen science platform.

47 Introduction

48 Many ecological processes exist as the net product of a large number of discrete, ephemeral
 49 events. At fine spatial and temporal scales, these events are often difficult to predict, making
 50 them challenging to study systematically. This challenge is particularly true for interspecific
 51 biological interactions and is magnified when one or both interacting species are difficult to
 52 detect, with important impacts on our understanding of the ecology of many systems. Such
 53 challenges can be overcome with large investments of time and money, but these costs can be
 54 prohibitive and are likely part of the reason for the remarkable absence of empirical datasets
 55 characterising species interactions in ecosystems (McCann, 2007; Tylianakis et al., 2008;
 56 Hegland et al., 2010; Jordano, 2016).

57
 58 The origin and development of social media and the concurrent advances in access to mobile
 59 cameras together represent a disruptive innovation that has changed the manner and rate at which
 60 modern events are recorded and communicated. With over 3.26 billion people using social media
 61 worldwide (Kemp, 2019) and at least 2.45 billion monthly active users on Facebook alone
 62 (Facebook, 2019), the synergy of social media and readily accessible mobile cameras has
 63 increased the observational effort of researchers by orders of magnitude. Harnessing this power
 64 has far-reaching implications for understanding ecological and evolutionary processes
 65 characterised by difficult to detect, discrete, ephemeral events through the resultant increase in
 66 observation coverage and depth.

67
 68 Trophic interactions, defined as interspecific interactions in which one organism consumes
 69 another, form the basis for understanding processes and system characteristics as diverse as

energy flow, population dynamics, food web dynamics, and the evolution of behavioural, morphological and physiological adaptations by predators and prey (Garvey & Whiles, 2017). Moreover, with a world experiencing climatic changes and worsening environmental conditions, attention to species interactions will be crucial for understanding ecosystem function and integrity rather than biodiversity alone (Valiente-Banuet et al., 2014). Despite their central position in ecological and evolutionary theory, the characterisation of trophic interactions between species and within food webs, particularly those in which such interactions are difficult to study, are often incomplete or absent (Paine, 1988; Chacoff et al., 2012; Miranda, Parrini, & Delerum 2013; Jordano, 2016). Moreover, because certain organismal traits can reduce the detection likelihood of a given trophic interaction, trophic interactions involving terrestrial organisms (particularly non-herbivorous interactions) are underrepresented (Miranda et al., 2013). Additionally, possibly due to their relative abundance and ease of detection, invertebrate organisms tend to be better represented in studies of trophic interactions than vertebrates (Miranda et al., 2013), and among terrestrial vertebrates, endotherms tend to be better represented than ectotherms (Miranda et al., 2013), possibly because of ease of sampling or because endothermy often demands higher food intake rates. Finally, of the interactions detected, organisms involved in lower-trophic-level interactions often suffer from taxonomic aggregation (Polis, 1991), which can mask complex interactions and food web analyses (Greene & Jaksic, 1983; Paine, 1988; Thompson & Townsend, 2000).

Together, reptiles and amphibians (hereafter herpetofauna) include more than 18000 ectothermic, vertebrate species globally and account for more than half of all global tetrapod diversity (Pincheira-Donoso, Bauer, & Uetz, 2013). In many terrestrial ecosystems, these animals can

make up a large proportion of the total abundance of vertebrates and contribute significantly to the total biomass of a region (Western, 1974; Iverson, 1982; Jacobsen, 1982; Petranksa & Murray, 2001). Moreover, herpetofauna (mostly amphibians and squamates) often occupy intermediate trophic levels providing important trophic links between small-bodied invertebrate primary consumers and higher trophic levels occupied primarily by endothermic predators (e.g., Polis, 1991). Interestingly, snakes, a monophyletic lineage of more than 3700 species (approximately 10% of global tetrapod diversity) are exclusively carnivorous and potentially occupy intermediate trophic positions between many other herpetofauna and higher trophic levels (FitzSimons, 1962; Greene, 1997). However, many species of herpetofauna are notoriously difficult to detect and observe in the wild (Steen, 2010; Durso, Willson, & Winne 2011; Durso & Siegel, 2015; Lardner et al., 2015; Rodda et al., 2015), and individuals of many species feed infrequently or discretely (Greene, 1997), making the systematic observation and quantification of trophic interactions incredibly challenging.

In this paper we demonstrate the utility of a method that uses Facebook, specifically a group dedicated to predation events involving reptiles and amphibians in sub-Saharan Africa, to collect images and videos of difficult to detect feeding interactions involving African herpetofauna. We describe how effectively and rapidly information regarding ecological phenomena, specifically trophic interactions, can be collected at large spatial scales and across diverse taxonomic clades using social media as a crowdsourcing platform. First, we highlight the remarkable diversity of predator and prey interactions identified over a five-year period. Next, because snake feeding events are well-represented in our dataset and are notoriously difficult to observe in the wild, we compare our novel snake feeding records to those gathered through an extensive review of snake

diets presented in the literature. Finally, we compare our novel snake dietary data to data collected from other digital media approaches (iNaturalist and Google Images) to demonstrate that it is the sheer number of social media observers that provides the observational power to regularly detect difficult to record trophic interactions. Ultimately, our findings reveal significant gaps in our understanding of feeding interactions involving southern African herpetofauna which our method can greatly reduce. Moreover, our approach highlights a potential application of social media that can act synergistically with traditional approaches to rapidly improve trophic interaction sampling coverage and depth in many ecosystems, and act as a model for using social media for studying difficult to detect ecological events.

Materials & Methods

Facebook data collection. We administrated and curated the Predation Records - Reptiles & Amphibians (Sub-Saharan Africa) group (facebook.com/groups/888525291183325) from its creation in August 2015 until December 2019. When sharing an observation to the group, we asked members to include details such as predator and prey identity, location, date, time, and observer or photographer's name. When information was missing, administrators or group members requested for the details to be added. Predator and prey identities were confirmed to the finest taxonomic-level possible using a combination of locality information and key physical characteristics and with support from taxon expert group members. In challenging cases, persons with taxon-expertise were consulted using Facebook or via email. Observations that appeared on other social media groups were incorporated in an *ad hoc* manner.

Literature data collection. We performed an extensive review of diet records for snake species in southern African snakes (the region where most Facebook observations occurred). We searched primary and grey literature sources (museum bulletins, society newsletters and bulletins, wildlife magazines, and non-indexed journals) for substantiated feeding records. Searches were conducted in English and the main platforms used were Google Scholar and the Biodiversity Heritage Library. Interactions published without supporting details (e.g., field guide descriptions) were categorised as secondary records and were not included in our final analyses. In all instances prey identity was recorded with modification based on updated taxonomy. In instances where only a generic name was provided, the most representative taxonomic name was assigned based on geographic location. Feeding interactions in which multiple prey items of the same type were ingested at once (e.g., ‘three nestling chicks’) were treated as a single record in the database. Captive-fed observations were recorded but excluded from this study. A list of literature sources used (N = 226) and the snake species which they provide data for can be found in the supporting information (Table S1).

Data management and curation. Data were recorded manually and kept in local storage with monthly back-ups to a personal cloud storage service. Images and videos from all Facebook posts were downloaded in the event that posts are deleted. For each feeding interaction, we recorded predator/prey identity, predator/prey life stage, direction of ingestion (for snake predators), interaction specifics (date, time, location), and any noteworthy details. Taxonomic hierarchies were automatically updated for each predator and prey item by referencing a local hierarchy database with information obtained from biodiversity databases (reptile-database.org; sabap2.adu.org.za; amphibiaweb.org; gbif.org).

For Facebook records, additional information included microhabitat (e.g., tree/shrub, artificial surface), type of interaction (true predation or scavenging), type of event (e.g., *in situ*, roadkill, captured–regurgitated), share date, person who shared the record, person(s) who observed the record, and post permalink. Duplicates were excluded in a semi-automated manner using a photo comparison program (Duplicate Photo Cleaner, v4.7, WebMinds, Inc.). Additionally, records were flagged and verified whenever an identical combination of predator, prey, and observer arose.

For literature records, additional information included predator and prey snout-vent-length, predator and prey mass, type of study (e.g., incidental, museum), museum voucher numbers (when available), and reference. We treated any record in which a given author had published the same interaction previously and did not provide any information on locality or date along with the most recent account as a duplicate.

Data collection from other digital media sources. We retrieved relevant observations from the iNaturalist citizen science platform (iNaturalist.org) in December 2019. These included all records shared on the iSpot platform (ispot.org.za) for southern Africa that were migrated to the iNaturalist platform during 2017. Currently, there is no centralised method for reporting species interactions on iNaturalist, but a pre-existing iNaturalist project, ‘Interactions (s Afr)’ (inaturalist.org/projects/interactions-s-afr), gathers feeding interaction data using the observation field “Eating: (Interaction)” which we used to query (“&field:Eating: (Interaction)=”) and retrieve all snake feeding records in southern Africa logged onto the platform (N = 77).

Uncatalogued observations were located using the following independent queries: ‘feeding’, ‘eating’, ‘meal’, ‘predation’, ‘swallow’, and ‘prey’; species was set to “Serpentes” and location used was “southern Africa” (N = 25). Records were exported using the download observations function. Duplicate interactions were identified based on iNaturalist observation number. The crowd-sourced identification was used when available. We manually inspected images of the target species (the four most observed species in the Facebook dataset) including brown-house snake (*Boaedon capensis*), southern African python (*Python natalensis*), boomslang (*Dispholidus typus*), and cape cobra (*Naja nivea*) for additional instances of feeding that had been missed.

Google Images results were retrieved in October 2019. Searches were performed for each of the four target study species using the following query: “(“*scientific name*” | “*common name*”) (eating | prey | predation | swallow | meal | feeding)”, and all resulting images were inspected for evidence of feeding. Only images of wild feeding observations were recorded. Photos documenting the same encounter were excluded manually. Observations derived from Google Images were more coarsely identified as the geographic location was frequently missing, but prey were identified to the finest taxonomic-level whenever possible.

Analytical approaches and comparisons. All data manipulations, graphical outputs, and statistical analyses were conducted in R version 3.6.1. In all analyses, non-southern African snake species were excluded. To assess interaction novelty, duplicate interactions within the dataset for each approach were removed. Then, for interactions in which the prey was identified to the species-level (repeated at each taxonomic level) the presence of a given predator-prey

interaction was assigned to either literature, each digital media source, or both (shared). For the comparison of prey-ratios derived from digital media sources, prey items categorised as ‘large mammals’ are species that typically exceed five kilograms.

Results

Between 2015 and 2019, we gathered a total of 1917 trophic interactions involving reptiles or amphibians via Facebook from the Predation Records - Reptiles & Amphibians (Sub-Saharan Africa) group (Fig. 1). We detected trophic interactions between 83 families of predators (across 30 orders and 9 classes) and 129 families of prey (across 51 orders and 14 classes). Our observations span 18 African countries. However, most feeding interactions were reported from South Africa (75.5%; N = 1446) which is reflective of a geographic bias in Facebook group participation. Observations of trophic interactions were dominated by predation by non-avian reptiles which accounted for 66.0% (N = 1266) of all trophic interactions in our dataset. Remarkably, snakes accounted for the majority of these observations (85.8%; N = 1086). We detected feeding events by 85 species of snakes including five of the eight families that occur in Africa.

In our study, there were at least 1369 unique observers who uploaded media documenting a predation event ($\mu = 1.44$, $SD = 1.88$, range = 32). Across all observations (i.e., any class of predator), 82.0% of observers have reported only a single record. Whereas, 18.0% have reported at least two predation events, and 0.95% of observers have reported more than 10 predation events. There were 891 unique observers who had documented a predation event in which the predator was a snake ($\mu = 1.24$, $SD = 1.23$, range = 19). For instances of snakes as predators,

89.5% of observers had only one observation, and only 0.45% of observers have reported more than 10 snake predation events. Notably, the records posted by the top four observers were dominated by observations of prey in road-killed specimens or from snakes that regurgitated prey items during a requested snake removal.

Our extensive literature review of southern African snake diets revealed a total of 2884 feeding records covering 109 of southern Africa's 168 species, collected over a period of more than 130 years (Fig. 2). Contrastingly, in five years, we were able to collect 1066 feeding records, which equates to 27.0% of all documented observation. When unsubstantiated records are included as a conservative measure, our observations from Facebook account for 24.3% of all feeding records.

Overall, feeding observations accrued at a significantly faster rate (Welch's t-test: $t = -3.94$, $p = 0.0163$) by utilising Facebook ($\mu = 213 \text{ records} \cdot \text{yr}^{-1}$) compared to historical collection and reporting approaches ($\mu = 20.9 \text{ records} \cdot \text{yr}^{-1}$). To account for gaps in reporting, we conducted a sliding-window analysis to test if there were any time periods that produced comparable rates of data accumulation. There were no five-year periods that approached or exceeded the accumulation rate observed using Facebook. The most comparable period was between 2006–2010 ($\mu = 139 \text{ records} \cdot \text{yr}^{-1}$) which produced 696 records. Only after expanding the sliding-window to a 10-year frame did the number of accumulated records from the literature ($N = 1187$) exceed the number of records that were collected using Facebook in half of the time. This period of high reporting rate can be attributed to the publication of several multi-taxa museum studies from 1998–2007 (Shine et al., 1998; Keogh et al., 2000; Webb et al., 2000; Webb et al., 2001; Shine et al., 2006a; Shine et al., 2006b; Shine et al., 2007). Importantly, the periods of

comparable reporting rates are the result of decades of work that ultimately culminated in the publication of the literature during those periods, rather than actual rates of record accrual as represented by our Facebook dataset.

We found important differences in the taxonomic resolution to which prey species were identified when comparing the two datasets. Prey were identified to the species level in 76.6% of Facebook records compared to only 50.4% of literature records ($X^2 = 216.9$, $p < 0.0001$) (Fig. 3)—probably because digestion of prey items in the gut of museum specimens often eliminates diagnostic characteristics. Similarly, a significantly larger proportion of the Facebook records were identifiable to at least the level of genus, family, and order than records in the literature dataset ($X^2 = 49.13$ – 250.6 , all $p < 0.0001$).

Broadly speaking, the number of feeding observations for each snake species was moderately correlated across the two approaches (Spearman's correlation: $\rho = 0.490$, $p < 0.0001$). However, this relationship obscures some dramatic differences in the overlap in trophic interactions detected via each approach. For interactions with species-level identification of prey items, we identified 441 and 781 distinct interactions within the Facebook and literature datasets, respectively (Fig. 4). Surprisingly, only 114 of these interactions were shared between the two datasets, and, notably, 327 interactions (of the 441 interactions detected; 74.1%) were unique to the Facebook dataset. Cohen's Kappa coefficient ($\kappa = -0.813$) confirmed that the approaches were largely discordant. Given the bias toward higher-level taxonomic resolution for prey in the literature dataset (Fig. 3), we recalculated Cohen's Kappa with interactions aggregated at the level of genus, family, and order and found low concordance across all taxonomic levels of prey

identification (Cohen's Kappa $\kappa = -0.813 - -0.465$) with order-level taxonomic assignment showing the greatest, but still poor, level of concordance. Depending on level of prey identification, our analyses revealed that 28.4–74.1% of interactions detected via Facebook were previously undocumented (Fig. 4). Remarkably, even at the coarse taxonomic aggregation level of order, 28.4% of interactions detected using Facebook were novel.

On iNaturalist, we found 92 snake feeding observations by querying the database. The earliest upload date of a feeding observations was in 2011 with an average of 11.3 observations added per year since then—a rate that is significantly slower (Welch's t-test: $t = 4.15$, $p = 0.0139$) than Facebook ($\mu = 213 \text{ records} \cdot \text{yr}^{-1}$). The greatest number of feeding observations reported on iNaturalist occurred in 2019 ($N = 39$) and represents fewer observations than the number of uploads to the Facebook group during its first year of infancy ($N = 54$). Nine of the top-ten snake species recorded feeding using iNaturalist were also in the top-ten in the Facebook dataset. Notably, the brown house snake (*Boaedon capensis*) had the most observations on both platforms. Interestingly, of the 61 distinct interactions with prey identified to the species-level that were reported on iNaturalist, 20 were not detected using Facebook and 13 interactions were not present in either the Facebook or the literature dataset.

We gathered an additional seven feeding observations for four target species (*B. capensis*, *Python natalensis*, *Dispholidus typus*, and *Naja nivea*) by visually searching through species records for uncatalogued records. Across all four target species, Facebook outperformed iNaturalist (Fig. 5a). However, the number of records obtained for each of the target species was

proportionally similar between the two platforms. The maximum difference in proportions equated to 4.4% (*D. typus*, Facebook: 7.32% vs. iNaturalist: 11.8%).

Targeted Google Images searches for the four target species returned 13–25 records per species which exceeds the number of records posted to iNaturalist for each the target species but still underperforms relative to Facebook (Fig. 5a). Additionally, the ratio of prey types for several of the target species were heavily skewed depending on the source of the observation (Fig. 5b). In particular, 84.2% of records for *N. nivea* depicted ophiophagy (i.e. snake-eating), particularly involving puff adders (*Bitis arietans*) and mole snakes (*Pseudaspis cana*) (Fig. 5b). Additionally, 84.6% of *P. natalensis* observations involved animals feeding on large mammals (e.g., antelope) and our search failed to produce any instances of bird-eating (Fig. 5b). Notably, this method did not produce any novel species interactions.

Discussion

Our study demonstrates the power of crowdsourcing via social media to gather a geographically and taxonomically diverse dataset of difficult to observe trophic interactions between southern African herpetofauna, their predators, and their prey. Despite these types of interactions being difficult to observe, our approach has yielded observations faster, at finer taxonomic resolution, and that differ significantly from what is currently known within 138 years of herpetological literature. Taken together, these findings provide a powerful example of the potential application of social media to gather discrete, ephemeral ecological interactions.

Importantly, our work is part of a growing recognition of the remarkable power of social media and citizen science to gather biological information (reviewed by Toivonen et al., 2019). Although a number of studies have made use of digital media platforms (i.e., not specifically designed for citizen science) to better understand the geographic and temporal distribution of biological traits or organisms (Leighton et al., 2016; Jimenez-Valverde et al., 2019; Marshal & Strine, 2019), other studies have started to detail ecological and evolutionary processes explicitly. Google Images has been used to quantify insect-pollinator relationships (Bahlai & Landis, 2016), commensalism-like relationships between birds and large mammals (Mikula et al., 2018), to assess the diets of predatory birds (Mikula et al., 2016; Naude et al., 2019), and the diets of predatory insects (Hernandez et al., 2019). Similarly, Facebook has been used to quantify co-grazing patterns between two deer species (Mori, Bari, & Coraglia, 2018) and *ad hoc* observations have revealed a fascinating foraging strategy in skunks (Pesendorfer, Dickerson, & Dragoo, 2018). Importantly, many of these taxa are often conspicuous due to their size, colouration, microhabitat usage, or duration spent in one location, and the resources in several of the studies are conspicuous (for the same reasons) or spatially restricted. Ultimately, these characteristics improve detection probability and reporting rates. Conversely, our study has demonstrated that social media (specifically Facebook) draws observational power from such a large network that even elusive ecological interactions with low temporal and spatial predictability can be gathered rapidly.

Our approach has several strengths that make its application in ecological and evolutionary studies appealing. Firstly, the ease of reporting means that observers are more likely to share their observations. A dedicated, actively managed, public group allows for photos to be funnelled

from across Facebook, and many of our observers had already shared their observations to Facebook in some other context before those posts were shared to our dedicated predation records group. Importantly, the group acts as an outlet for observations that would never otherwise have been documented formally; now, those records can be incorporated into a growing database. Secondly, while citizen science projects like iNaturalist and iSpot attract many users, citizen science platforms are mainly populated by a few very active users (Sauermann & Franzoni, 2015). Facebook does not require an inherent interest in a particular topic which allows for a diverse range of media to be posted and shared publicly. Together with the low probability of encountering feeding events—as indicated by the number of single observations in our dataset—dedicated flora and fauna platforms do not attract enough observers to gather sizeable datasets, especially outside of major populated areas. Thirdly, the interactive nature of Facebook facilitates direct communication with observers which can result in more photos or details, if needed. Information such as locality data can be requested directly from observers thus reducing the reliance on geo-tagging functions of social media platforms, which can be incorrect or missing from posts altogether (Di Minin, Tenkanen, & Toivonen, 2015). Fourth, the Facebook group format provides an ideal platform to discuss identification of species with interested experts, thereby facilitating expert-crowdsourcing of species identifications. Austen et al. (2018) proposed that the identification of species in digital natural history observations should be based on more than one photo and verified by more than one expert. Thus, Facebook groups offer effective mechanisms to meet these criteria. Finally, the community of observers receive informed feedback from researchers regarding their observation. Unlike passive data collection methods (e.g., Google Images), active engagement with observers and other members acts as an

opportunity to educate the public about the importance of an observation and active engagement and feedback has the potential to incentivise continued participation.

The data gathered via our approach is not without its context-specific challenges. Primarily, our approach does not offer an obvious mechanism for quantifying sampling effort, prohibiting rate- or density-dependent analyses of these processes. Secondly, our approach, as with nearly all sampling approaches, may over-represent certain interactions in important ways (Glaudas, Kearney, & Alexander, 2017). For one, our approach is likely to include events that happen (1) frequently, (2) near humans (either urban areas or well-trafficked nature reserves), and (3) over longer periods of time. Third, the permanence of posts and their associated media, which appear on social media platforms like Facebook, are not guaranteed, and images may be removed, or their visibility settings may be changed by the owner at any time. As a result, there is a need to store images and data outside of the platform in a timely manner. Finally, we have adopted to manually curate and log observations into a database rather than seek automated approaches in part due to the loss of API function in April 2018 associated with a change in Facebook's terms of service (Freelon, 2018). This manual approach has worked well at the scale of our analysis but will become problematic at the scale of some of the data that social media has the potential to gather. Advances in machine learning for identification of species in images are progressing rapidly (reviewed by Wäldchen & Mäder, 2018) and are starting to be utilised for scientific assessment of social media images (Di Minin et al., 2018). However, in our context, we continue to be limited by the fact that the observations being reported are inherently difficult to observe, thus limiting the availability of sufficient amounts of training data. Nonetheless, automation of

image identification, or even social media group administration, will be required to scale our approach to truly global ecological or evolutionary questions.

The relatively low measures of concordance between the data gathered via Facebook, and that reported in the literature (Fig. 4), or via other digital media platforms (Fig. 5b) raises an important question of which more closely reflects reality. Some approaches to studying diet such as fixed videography (Glaudas et al., 2017) and **DNA barcoding of prey remains** (reviewed by Alberdi et al., 2019) offer promising future prospects for relatively unbiased dietary analysis for many organisms, including snakes. However, these approaches are incredibly effort- and cost-intensive, limiting their widespread application. Currently, it is unclear to what degree our data might bias for or against detection of certain interactions. However, we are encouraged by the detection in our Facebook dataset of several apparently difficult to detect interactions (e.g., puff adders (*Bitis arietans*) consuming amphibians, the first reported diet record for Swazi rock snakes (*Inyoka swazicus*)), and interactions with both incredibly short handling times (e.g., a vine snake (*Thelotornis capensis*) catching and swallowing a rain frog (*Breviceps* sp.) in under 20 seconds). It is apparent from our analysis that Google Images may be the least effective means for collecting representative diet data, at least for our study system. This is likely to be the case because not all webpages are indexed by Google, (including Facebook) and blogs or media outlets are dominated by eye-catching photos and particularly notable or lengthy encounters. On the other hand, iNaturalist may provide more representative data that can be used in corroboration with Facebook data, which can be promising for regions with more involvement (e.g., United States of America: 483000+; United Kingdom: 28000+; South Africa: 7300+ observers).

411

412 Our approach has several implications for our understanding of snake biology. It is well
 413 established that diet has played a major role in the evolution of snakes (Greene, 1983; Colston et
 414 al., 2010) and their venoms (Daltry et al., 1996; Barlow et al., 2009; Casewell et al., 2013).
 415 Additionally, snake feeding, either through demographic effects on prey populations, risk of
 416 predation and ‘landscape of fear’ dynamics, or the selective agents for prey anti-predatory
 417 adaptations, are likely to represent the major impacts that snakes have within ecosystems and
 418 food webs. Understanding these processes is inextricably linked with high-quality natural history
 419 data regarding variation in snake diets. However, our understanding of the details of snake diets
 420 remains surprisingly superficial, especially in places like Africa where snake bite is a major
 421 health concern (Harrison et al., 2009; Chippaux, 2011). In this context, we think that our novel
 422 approach to gathering natural history data can provide a powerful tool to supplement existing
 423 datasets and ultimately improve our understanding of snake feeding, thereby contextualising
 424 studies of snakes, their ecological functions, and their venoms.

425

426 **The approach** that we describe here has enormous potential beyond our usage of it, and we look
 427 forward to seeing its application in multiple ecological and evolutionary contexts. Even within
 428 our own dataset, we have only begun to explore the full potential of our data by addressing
 429 species-specific questions (Layloo, Smith, & Maritz, 2017; Maritz, Alexander, & Maritz, 2019;
 430 Maritz et al., 2019; Smith et al., 2019). However, the data lends itself to addressing other
 431 questions such as seasonality in feeding and prey preference, intraguild predation, and the
 432 evolution of diet. We, additionally, see its value in documenting other ephemeral, discrete, event-
 433 driven processes similar to predation, particularly if they can be captured as photographs of the

types of subjects already shared to social media. For example, photographs of pollinators visiting flowers could be crowd-sourced and curated to better understand pollination dynamics, images of identifiable animals (e.g., distinct markings) could be used to assess seasonal body condition, home range size, and lifespan, and photographs of urban biodiversity could elucidate novel urban ecology interactions between species, or even human-wildlife conflict. Importantly, images of many of these types of events are being shared on social media platforms already, and all that is required is for interested researchers to start engaging with those data.

Conclusions

Employing social media as a citizen science platform allowed for the collection of trophic data across a remarkable diversity of interactions involving African reptiles and amphibians. Particularly, the results of the dietary analysis of snakes demonstrate how rapidly and precisely information can be collected to characterise an ecological process compared to traditional approaches. Additionally, the results show a large discordance between sampling via social media and traditional approaches including the detection of many novel interactions, which emphasises the magnitude of the knowledge gap regarding snake diets. Finally, the results highlight how social media can outperform traditional citizen science and crowdsourcing approaches when observations involve elusive animals or unpredictable events, which is likely due differences in the number of active members and thus overall sampling intensity. Beyond herpetological studies, the observational power and approach showcased here has enormous potential for the documentation and investigation of other rare events that underlie important ecological processes.

457

458 **Acknowledgements**

459 We acknowledge Andre Coetzer, Tyrone Ping, and Luke Verburgt for their roles in conceiving
 460 the idea for the Predation Records - Reptiles & Amphibians (Sub-Saharan Africa) Facebook
 461 group. Additionally, we thank them and Gary Nicolau for assisting in the management of the
 462 group's membership and discussions as admins. We are indebted to the members of the group
 463 (and other members of the Facebook community) who have shared observations to and
 464 participated in our research project. We thank the Facebook users who encourage members on
 465 other groups and pages to share their observations with us. Specifically, we acknowledge A.
 466 Myburgh, G. Brown, F. Theart, N. Barrett, L. Kemp, and A. Kemp for their notable efforts. We
 467 are grateful for the identifications provided by experts in the community. Particularly, we thank
 468 Tyrone Ping, Gary Nicolau, Luke Kemp, Luke Verburgt, Werner Conradie, Johan Marais, James
 469 Harvey, Stephen Spawls, and Dan Parker for their continued input. We recognise the 2017
 470 University of the Western Cape Biodiversity and Conservation Biology Herpetology honours
 471 students for assisting in the early phase of the literature search.

472

473 **References**

- 474 Alberdi, A, Aizpurua, O, Bohmann, K, Gopalakrishnan, S, Lynggaard, C, Nielsen, M, Gilbert,
 475 MT. 2019. Promises and pitfalls of using high-throughput sequencing for diet analysis.
 476 *Molecular Ecology Resources* 19:327–348 DOI: 10.1111/1755-0998.12960
- 477 Austen, GE, Bindemann, M, Griffiths, RA, Roberts, DL. 2018. Species identification by
 478 conservation practitioners using online images: Accuracy and agreement between experts.
 479 *PeerJ*, 6:e4157 DOI: 10.7717/peerj.4157

480 Bahlai, CA, Landis, DA. 2016. Predicting plant attractiveness to pollinators with passive
481 crowdsourcing. *Royal Society Open Science* 3:150677 DOI: 10.1098/rsos.150677

482 Barlow, A, Pook, CE, Harrison, RA, Wüster, W. 2009. Coevolution of diet and prey-specific
483 venom activity supports the role of selection in snake venom evolution. *Proceedings of the*
484 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 276:2443–2449 DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2009.0048

485 Casewell, NR, Wüster, W, Vonk, FJ, Harrison, RA, Fry, BG. 2013. Complex cocktails: the
486 evolutionary novelty of venoms. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 28:219–229 DOI:
487 10.1016/j.tree.2012.10.020

488 Chacoff, NP, Vázquez, DP, Lomáscolo, SB, Stevani, EL, Dorado, J, Padrón, B. 2011. Evaluating
489 sampling completeness in a desert plant-pollinator network. *Journal of Animal Ecology*
490 81:190–200 DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01883.x

491 Chippaux, J. 2011. Estimate of the burden of snakebites in sub-Saharan Africa: a meta-analytic
492 approach. *Toxicon* 57:586–599 DOI: 10.1016/j.toxicon.2010.12.022

493 Colston, TJ, Costa, GC, Vitt, LJ. 2010. Snake diets and the deep history hypothesis. *Biological*
494 *Journal of the Linnean Society* 101:476–486 DOI: 10.1111/j.1095-8312.2010.01502.x

495 Daltry, JC, Wüster, W, Thorpe, RS. 1996. Diet and snake venom evolution. *Nature* 379:537–554
496 DOI: 10.1038/379537a0

497 Di Minin, E, Fink, C, Tenkanen, H, Hiippala, T. 2018. Machine learning for tracking illegal
498 wildlife trade on social media. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 2:406–407 DOI:
499 10.1038/s41559-018-0466-x

500 Di Minin, E, Tenkanen, H, Toivonen, T. 2015. Prospects and challenges for social media data in
501 conservation science. *Frontiers in Environmental Science* 3:63 DOI:
502 10.3389/fenvs.2015.00063

503 Durso, AM, Willson, JD, Winne, CT. 2011. Needles in haystacks: Estimating detection
504 probability and occupancy of rare and cryptic snakes. *Biological Conservation* 144:1508–
505 1515 DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2011.01.020

506 Durso, AM, Seigel, RA. 2015. A snake in the hand is worth 10,000 in the bush. *Journal of*
507 *Herpetology* 49:503–506 DOI: 10.1670/15-49-04.1

508 Facebook. 2019, October 30. Facebook Reports Third Quarter 2019 Results [Press Release].
509 Available at [https://investor.fb.com/investor-news/press-release-details/2019/Facebook-](https://investor.fb.com/investor-news/press-release-details/2019/Facebook-Reports-Third-Quarter-2019-Results/default.aspx)
510 [Reports-Third-Quarter-2019-Results/default.aspx](https://investor.fb.com/investor-news/press-release-details/2019/Facebook-Reports-Third-Quarter-2019-Results/default.aspx) (accessed 20 January 2020)

511 FitzSimons, VFM. 1962. *Snakes of Southern Africa*. Cape Town, South Africa: Purnell and Sons.

512 Freelon, D. 2018. Computational research in the post-API age. *Political Communication* 35:665–
513 668 DOI: 10.1080/10584609.2018.1477506

514 Garvey, JE, Whiles, M. 2017. *Trophic Ecology*. London, England: CRC Press.

515 Glaudas, X, Kearney, TC, Alexander, GJ. 2017. Museum specimens bias measures of snake diet:
516 a case study using the ambush-foraging puff adder (*Bitis arietans*). *Herpetologica* 73:121–
517 128 DOI: 10.1655/herpetologica-d-16-00055

518 Greene, HW. 1983. Dietary correlates of the origin and radiation of snakes. *American Zoologist*
519 23:431–441 DOI: 10.1093/icb/23.2.431

520 Greene, HW, Jaksic, FM. 1983. Food-niche relationships among sympatric predators: effects of
521 level of prey identification. *Oikos* 40:151–154 DOI: 10.2307/3544212

522 Greene, HW. 1997. *Snakes: The Evolution of Mystery in Nature*. Berkeley, California:
523 University of California Press.

524 Harrison, RA, Hargreaves, A, Wagstaff, SC, Faragher, B, Lalloo, DG. 2009. Snake envenoming:
525 a disease of poverty. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 3:e569 DOI:

10.1371/journal.pntd.0000569

Hegland, SJ, Dunne, J, Nielsen, A, Memmott, J. 2010. How to monitor ecological communities cost-efficiently: the example of plant–pollinator networks. *Biological Conservation* 143:2092–2101 DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2010.05.018

Hernandez, M, Masonick, P, Weirauch, C. 2019. Crowdsourced online images provide insights into predator-prey interactions of putative natural enemies. *Food Webs* 21:e00126 DOI: 10.1016/j.fooweb.2019.e00126

Iverson, JB. 1982. Biomass in turtle populations: a neglected subject. *Oecologia* 55:69–76 DOI: 10.1007/bf00386720

Jacobsen, NHG. 1982. The ecology of the reptiles and amphibians in the *Burkea africana*-*Eragrostis pallens* savanna of the Nylsvley Nature Reserve. M. Sci. Thesis, University of Pretoria, South Africa.

Jiménez-Valverde, A, Peña-Aguilera, P, Barve, V, Burguillo-Madrid, L. 2019. Photo-sharing platforms key for characterising niche and distribution in poorly studied taxa. *Insect Conservation and Diversity* 12: 389–403 DOI: 10.1111/icad.12351

Jordano, P. 2016. Sampling networks of ecological interactions. *Functional Ecology* 30:1883–1893 DOI: 10.1111/025734

Kemp, S. 2019, January 30. Digital 2019: Global Internet Use Accelerates. Available at <https://wearesocial.com/blog/2019/01/digital-2019-global-internet-use-accelerates> (accessed 23 January 2020)

Keogh, J, Branch, WR, Shine, R. 2000. Feeding ecology, reproduction and sexual dimorphism in the colubrid snake *Crotaphopeltis hotamboeia* in southern Africa. *African Journal of Herpetology* 49:129–137 DOI: 10.1080/21564574.2000.9635439

549 Lardner, B, Rodda, GH, Adams, AA, Savidge, JA, Reed, RN. 2015. Detection rates of geckos in
550 visual surveys: turning confounding variables into useful knowledge. *Journal of*
551 *Herpetology* 49: 522–532 DOI: 10.1670/14-048

552 Layloo, I, Smith, C, Maritz, B. 2017. Diet and feeding in the cape cobra, *Naja nivea*. *African*
553 *Journal of Herpetology* 66:147–153 DOI: 10.1080/21564574.2017.1388297

554 Leighton, GR, Hugo, PS, Roulin, A, Amar, A. 2016. Just Google it: assessing the use of Google
555 Images to describe geographical variation in visible traits of organisms. *Methods in*
556 *Ecology and Evolution* 7:1060–1070 DOI: 10.1111/2041-210x.12562

557 Maritz, B, Alexander, GJ, Maritz, RA. 2019. The underappreciated extent of cannibalism and
558 ophiophagy in African cobras. *Ecology* 100:e02522 DOI: 10.1002/ecy.2522

559 Maritz, R, Conradie, W, Sardinha, CI, Peto, A, Chechene, AHC, Maritz, B. 2019. Ophiophagy
560 and cannibalism in African vine snakes (Colubridae: *Thelotornis*). *African Journal of*
561 *Ecology* [early view] DOI: 10.1111/aje.12702

562 Marshall, BM, Strine, CT. 2019. Exploring snake occurrence records: spatial biases and marginal
563 gains from accessible social media. *PeerJ* 7:e8059 DOI: 10.7717/peerj.8059

564 McCann, K. 2007. Protecting biostructure. *Nature* 446:29 DOI: 10.1038/446029a

565 Mikula, P, Morelli, F, Lučan, RK, Jones, DN, Tryjanowski, P. 2016. Bats as prey of diurnal
566 birds: a global perspective. *Mammal Review* 46:160–174 DOI: 10.1111/mam.12060

567 Mikula, P, Hadrava, J, Albrecht, T, Tryjanowski, P. 2018. Large-scale assessment of
568 commensalistic–mutualistic associations between African birds and herbivorous mammals
569 using internet photos. *PeerJ* 6:e4520 DOI: 10.7717/peerj.4520

570 Miranda, M, Parrini, F, Dalerum, F. 2013. A categorization of recent network approaches to
571 analyse trophic interactions. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 4:897–905 DOI:

10.1111/2041-210x.12092

Mori, E, Bari, PD, Coraglia, M. 2018. Interference between roe deer and Northern chamois in the Italian Alps: are Facebook groups effective data sources? *Ethology Ecology & Evolution* 30:277–284 DOI: 10.1080/03949370.2017.1354922

Naude, VN, Smyth, LK, Weideman, EA, Krochuk, BA, Amar, A. 2019. Using web-sourced photography to explore the diet of a declining African raptor, the Martial Eagle (*Polemaetus bellicosus*). *Condor*:121, 1–9 DOI: 10.1093/condor/duy015

Paine, RT. 1988. Road maps of interactions or grist for theoretical development? *Ecology* 69:1648–1654 DOI: 10.2307/1941141

Pesendorfer, MB, Dickerson, S, Dragoo, JW. 2018. Observation of tool use in striped skunks: how community science and social media help document rare natural phenomena. *Ecosphere* 9:e02484 DOI: 10.1002/ecs2.2484

Petranka, JW, Murray, SS. 2001. Effectiveness of removal sampling for determining salamander density and biomass: a case study in an Appalachian streamside community. *Journal of Herpetology* 35:36–44 DOI: 10.2307/1566020

Pincheira-Donoso, D, Bauer, AM, Meiri, S, Uetz, P. 2013. Global taxonomic diversity of living reptiles. *PLoS One* 8:e59741 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0059741

Polis, GA. 1991. Complex trophic interactions in deserts: an empirical critique of food-web theory. *American Naturalist* 138:123–155 DOI: 10.1086/285208

Rodda, GH, Dean-Bradley, K, Campbell, EW, Fritts, TH, Lardner, B, Adams, AA, Reed, RN. 2015. Stability of detectability over 17 years at a single site and other lizard detection comparisons from Guam. *Journal of Herpetology* 49:513–521 DOI: 10.1670/14-085

Sauermann, H, Franzoni, C. 2015. Crowd science user contribution patterns and their

implications. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112:679–684 DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1408907112

Shine, R, Branch, WR, Webb, JK, Harlow, PS, Shine, T, Keogh, JS. 2007. Ecology of cobras from southern Africa. *Journal of Zoology* 272:183–193 DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7998.2006.00252.x

Shine, R, Branch, WR, Harlow, PS, Webb, JK. 1998. Reproductive biology and food habits of horned adders, *Bitis caudalis* (Viperidae), from southern Africa. *Copeia* 1998(2):391–401 DOI: 10.2307/1447433

Shine, R, Branch, WR, Harlow, PS, Webb, JK, Shine, T. 2006a. Biology of burrowing asps (Atractaspididae) from southern Africa. *Copeia* 2006(1):103–115 DOI: 10.1643/0045-8511(2006)006[0103:bobaaf]2.0.co;2

Shine, R, Branch, WR, Webb, JK, Harlow, PS, Shine, T. 2006b. Sexual dimorphism, reproductive biology, and dietary habits of psammophiine snakes (Colubridae) from southern Africa. *Copeia* 2006(4):650–664 DOI: 10.1643/0045-8511(2006)6[650:sdrbad]2.0.co;2

Smith, CCD, Layloo, I, Maritz, RA, Maritz, B. 2019. Sexual dichromatism does not translate into sex-based difference in morphology or diet for the African boomslang. *Journal of Zoology* 308:253–258 DOI: 10.1111/jzo.12670

Steen, DA. 2010. Snakes in the grass: secretive natural histories defy both conventional and progressive statistics. *Herpetological Conservation and Biology* 5:183–188.

Thompson, RM, Townsend, CR. 2000. Is resolution the solution?: The effect of taxonomic resolution on the calculated properties of three stream food webs. *Freshwater Biology* 44:413–422 DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2427.2000.00579.x

- Toivonen, T, Heikinheimo, V, Fink, C, Hausmann, A, Hiippala, T, Järvi, O, Tenkanen, H, Di Minin, E. 2019. Social media data for conservation science: a methodological overview. *Biological Conservation* 233:298–315 DOI: 10.1016/j.biocon.2019.01.023
- Tylianakis, JM, Didham, RK, Bascompte, J, Wardle, DA. 2008. Global change and species interactions in terrestrial ecosystems. *Ecology Letters* 11:1351–1363 DOI: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01250.x
- Valiente-Banuet, A, Aizen, MA, Alcántara, JM, Arroyo, J, Cocucci, A, Galetti, M, García, MB, García, D, Gómez, JM, Jordano, P, Medel, R, Navarro, L, Obeso, JR, Oviedo, R, Ramírez, N, Rey, PJ, Traveset, A, Verdú, M, Zamora, R. 2014. Beyond species loss: the extinction of ecological interactions in a changing world. *Functional Ecology* 29:299–307 DOI: 10.1111/1365-2435.12356
- Webb, JK, Branch, WR, Shine, R. 2001. Dietary habits and reproductive biology of typhlopoid snakes from southern Africa. *Journal of Herpetology* 35:558–567 DOI: 10.2307/1565893
- Webb, JK, Shine, R, Branch, WR, Harlow, PS. 2000. Life-history strategies in basal snakes: reproduction and dietary habits of the African thread snake *Leptotyphlops scutifrons* (Serpentes: Leptotyphlopidae). *Journal of Zoology* 250:321–327 DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7998.2000.tb00776.x
- Western, D. 1974. The distribution, density and biomass density of lizards in a semi-arid environment of northern Kenya. *African Journal of Ecology* 12:49–62 DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2028.1974.tb00106.x
- Wäldchen, J, Mäder, P. 2018. Machine learning for image based species identification. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 9:2216–2225 DOI: 10.1111/2041-210x.13075

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Arc diagram depicting family-level interactions detected using Facebook. Arcs

represent the connection between predator and prey families and the colour of the arc indicates

which taxonomic group the predator belongs to. Colour opacity corresponds to the frequency that

an interaction was detected (i.e., darker shading = more observations). Interactions on the top of

the plot represent herpetofauna as predators while interactions on the bottom of the plot represent

herpetofauna as prey. Abbreviations: Actinopterygii (Ac), Malacostraca (M), Chilopoda (C),

Gastropoda (G), and Plantae (P).

Figure 2: Accumulation of snake feeding records identified by literature sources and

Facebook.

Figure 3: Taxonomic resolution of snake prey items identified by literature sources and

Facebook. * p-value < 0.0001**

Figure 4: Proportion of unique snake feeding interactions identified by literature sources

and Facebook. An interaction is defined as any instance of a specific snake species consuming a

specific prey item. Interactions were included only if the prey were identified to the taxonomic

level under analysis. Duplicate interactions within an approach were removed.

Figure 5: Comparison of feeding observations for four target snake species collected from

Facebook, iNaturalist, and Google Images. (A) The number of observations collected across

663 the three digital platforms, and (B) the proportion of records with prey belonging to a given prey
 664 category across the three platforms.

Figure 1

Arc diagram depicting family-level interactions detected using Facebook.

Arcs represent the connection between predator and prey families and the colour of the arc indicates which taxonomic group the predator belongs to. Colour opacity corresponds to the frequency that an interaction was detected (i.e., darker shading = more observations). Interactions on the top of the plot represent herpetofauna as predators while interactions on the bottom of the plot represent herpetofauna as prey. Abbreviations: Actinopterygii (Ac), Malacostraca (M), Chilopoda (C), Gastropoda (G), and Plantae (P).

Figure 1




Figure 2

Accumulation of snake feeding records identified by literature sources and Facebook.

Figure 2




Figure 3

Taxonomic resolution of snake prey items identified by literature sources and Facebook.

*** p-value < 0.0001

Figure 3




Figure 4

Proportion of unique snake feeding interactions identified by literature sources and Facebook.

An interaction is defined as any instance of a specific snake species consuming a specific prey item. Interactions were included only if the prey were identified to the taxonomic level under analysis. Duplicate interactions within an approach were removed.

Figure 4




Figure 5

Comparison of feeding observations for four target snake species collected from Facebook, iNaturalist, and Google Images.

(A) The number of observations collected across the three digital platforms, and (B) the proportion of records with prey belonging to a given prey category across the three platforms.

Figure 5

