

## *Supplementary Material*

### 1 Supplementary Figures and Tables

#### 1.1 Supplementary Figure



**Supplementary Figure 1.** Models and their placement in each experimental station. (A) artificial and genuine quail eggs within an artificial nest and attached 1m off the ground; (B) artificial and real cempedak seeds on a petri dish on the ground; (C) artificial caterpillar stuck 3 cm from the tip of a wooden stick and attached to at 1 m elevation from the ground; and (D) artificial frog on 6 cm × 6 cm cardboard.

## 1.2 Supplementary Tables

**Supplementary Table 1.** Correlation coefficients (rs) between vegetational structure variables, based on non-parametric Spearman's Rank multivariate correlation. Relatively strong correlations marked in bold ( $rs \geq 0.70$ ). Canopy denotes canopy cover; shrub, shrub cover; ground, ground cover; litter, leaf litter; flower, flower availability; fruit, fruit availability; sapling, trees with DBH >2 cm; dead, dead trees; understorey, understorey volume; and AGB, aboveground biomass.

	Canopy	Shrub	Ground	Litter	Sapling	Dead	Understorey
<b>Shrub</b>	0.56						
<b>Ground</b>	-0.45	0.06					
<b>Litter</b>	<b>0.78</b>	0.63	-0.17				
<b>Sapling</b>	<b>0.70</b>	0.60	-0.23	<b>0.75</b>			
<b>Dead</b>	0.30	0.19	-0.15	0.23	0.41		
<b>Understorey</b>	0.53	0.42	-0.14	0.54	0.56	0.23	
<b>AGB</b>	0.66	0.44	-0.15	0.68	0.64	0.22	0.41

**Supplementary Table 2.** Bayesian probability outputs comparing likelihood of predation between different primary forest sites for each artificial prey item type.

	Reference site	Probability that rate is lower at reference	
		Fraser primary	Cameron primary
Nests	Lojing primary	78%	33%
	Fraser primary		11%
Seeds	Lojing primary	98%	78%
	Fraser primary		8%
Caterpillars	Lojing primary	82%	100%
	Fraser primary		3%
Frogs	Lojing primary	85%	66%
	Fraser primary		3%

**Supplementary Table 3.** Bayesian probability outputs comparing likelihood of predation between Cameron Highlands and Fraser’s Hill rural sites for different artificial prey item types.

<b>Prey type</b>	<b>Probability that predation at reference (Fraser rural) is lower than Cameron rural</b>
Nests	0%
Seeds	40%
Caterpillars	5%
Frogs	70%

**Supplementary Table 4.** Bayesian probability outputs comparing likelihood of artificial nest predation across degradation gradients in Cameron Highlands and Fraser’s Hill.

	Reference site (primary forest)	Probability that predation is lower at reference		
<b>Cameron Highlands</b>	Cameron primary	Cameron secondary	Cameron rural	Cameron tea
		30%	30%	91%
<b>Fraser's Hill</b>	Fraser primary	Fraser edge	Fraser rural	
		79%	98%	

**Supplementary Table 5.** Bayesian probability outputs comparing likelihood of artificial seed predation across degradation gradients in Cameron Highlands and Fraser’s Hill.

	Reference site (primary forest)	Probability that predation is lower at reference		
<b>Cameron Highlands</b>	Cameron primary	Cameron secondary	Cameron rural	Cameron tea
		15%	10%	5%
<b>Fraser's Hill</b>	Fraser primary	Fraser edge	Fraser rural	
		68%	1%	

**Supplementary Table 6.** Bayesian probability outputs comparing likelihood of artificial caterpillar predation across degradation gradients in Cameron Highlands and Fraser’s Hill.

	Reference site (primary forest)	Probability that predation is lower at reference		
<b>Cameron Highlands</b>	Cameron primary	Cameron secondary	Cameron rural	Cameron tea
		98%	97%	89%
<b>Fraser's Hill</b>	Fraser primary	Fraser edge	Fraser rural	
		29%	40%	

**Supplementary Table 7.** Bayesian probability outputs comparing likelihood of artificial frog predation across degradation gradients in Cameron Highlands and Fraser's Hill.

	Reference site (primary forest)	Probability that predation is lower at reference		
<b>Cameron Highlands</b>	Cameron primary	Cameron secondary	Cameron rural	Cameron tea
		2%	20%	2%
<b>Fraser's Hill</b>	Fraser Primary	Fraser edge	Fraser rural	
		30%	3%	