**Table S3**. Comparison of full models assessing responses of avian assemblages to the presence of supplementary feeders, with and without taking spatial autocorrelation into account, for which the response variables exhibit statistically significant Moran’s I values (*P* < 0.05; Moran’s I <0.045 in all cases). Taking spatial autocorrelation into account (using an autocovariate model constructed in the spdep package; R v. 2.15.1, 2012) has little influence on parameter estimates (mean ± s.e.) and explanatory capacity (in parentheses).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Model R2 | Canopy cover | Mean tree height | Green space | Supplementary feeding stations |
| Breeding spp. rich of supplementary-feeding species: non-spatial model | 0.249 | 0.030 ± 0.011 (0.045) | -0.049 ± 0.052 (0.005) | 0.020 ± 0.008 (0.038) | 1.182 ± 0.349 (0.064) |
| Breeding spp. rich of supplementary-feeding species: spatial model | 0.283 | 0.032 ± 0.010 (0.049) | -0.044 ± 0.051 (0.004) | 0.013 ± 0.008 (0.013) | 1.139 ± 0.342 (0.059) |
| Breeding density of supplementary-feeding species: non-spatial model | 0.211 | 0.076 ± 0.050 (0.014) | -0.302 ± 0.243 (0.009) | 0.087 ± 0.036 (0.035) | 6.647 ± 1.640 (0.096) |
| Breeding density of supplementary-feeding species: spatial model | 0.247 | 0.089 ± 0.049 (0.018) | -0.310 ± 0.239 (0.010) | 0.051 ± 0.038 (0.010) | 6.221 ± 1.617 (0.083) |