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Table 2. Technical articles that included the keywords “marten”, “density”, “territory”, and “home range”. Of the >75 papers reviewed for North American martens (*Martes americana, M. caurina*), four reported both home range sizes and density. Territories were estimated using either 100% Minimum Convex Polygons (MCP) or time-influenced Local Convex Hulls (t-LoCoH). Reported densities were either minimum known alive (MNKA) or calculated with spatial mark-recapture (SMR). Studies were conducted in Maine, USA (Payer and Harrison 1999), central British Columbia, Canada (Poole et al. 2004), New Hampshire, USA (Siren et al. 2016), and Quebec, Canada (Godbout and Ouellet 2010).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Territory size estimates (km2 ± *SD*, *n*) |   | Density (*n*/km2) |   |
| Study  | Male  | Female  | Range Estimator |   | Density | Density Estimator |   |
| Payer and Harrison 1999a | 3.25 ± 1.42, 41 | 1.65 ± 0.86, 12 | 100% MCP |   | 0.47 | MNKA |   |
| Payer and Harrison 1999b | 4.44 ± 2.07, 25 | 2.38 ± 1.35, 19 | 100% MCP |  | 0.11 | MNKA |  |
| Payer and Harrison 1999c | 4.89 ± 2.23, 39 | 2.88 ± 1.15, 39 | 100% MCP |  | 0.17 | MNKA |  |
| Poole et al. 2004 | 3.30 ± 0.42, 22 | 2.00 ± 0.4, 7 | 100% MCP |  | 0.34 | MNKA |  |
| Siren et al. 2016 | 2.95 ± 0.27, 11 | 1.55 ± 0.2, 4 | 100% MCP |  | 0.51±0.16 | SMR |  |
| Godbout and Ouellet 2010 | 5.50 ± 1.0, 6 | 3.9 ± n/r, 6 | 100% MCP |  | 0.22±0.002 | –d |  |
| This study | 1.80 ± 0.6, 4 | 0.7 ± 0.1, 6 | 99% LoCoH |   | 1.01±0.1 | SMR |   |

aForest reserve

bTrapped industrial

cUntrapped industrial

dEstimator was unreported