Article (refereed)

Title: Second generation anticoagulant rodenticides in predatory birds: probabilistic characterisation of toxic liver concentrations and implications for predatory bird populations in Canada.

Authors: Philippe J. Thomas[1], Pierre Mineau[1], Richard F. Shore[2], Louise Champoux[3], Pamela A. Martin[4], Laurie K. Wilson[5], Guy Fitzgerald[6], John E. Elliott[7]

[1] National Wildlife Research Centre, Science & Technology Branch, Environment Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0H3, Canada, philippe.thomas@ec.gc.ca (corresponding author), pierre.mineau@ec.gc.ca,
Tel: (613) 998-0511   Fax: (613) 998-0458
[2] Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Lancaster Environment Centre, Library Avenue, Bailrigg, Lancaster LA1 4AP, UK, rfs@ceh.ac.uk
[3] Science & Technology Branch, Environment Canada, Ste-Foy, QC, G1V 4H5, Canada, louise.champoux@ec.gc.ca
[4] Science & Technology Branch, Environment Canada, Burlington, ON, L7R 4A6, Canada, pamela.martin@ec.gc.ca
[5] Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada, Delta, BC, V4K 3N2, Canada, laurie.wilson@ec.gc.ca
[6] Université de Montréal, Saint-Hyacinthe, QC, J2S 7C6, Canada, guy.fitzgerald@umontreal.ca
[7] Science & Technology Branch, Environment Canada, Delta, BC, V4K 3N2, Canada, john.elliott@ec.gc.ca

Abstract:
Second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides (SGARs) are widely used to control rodent pests but exposure and poisonings occur in non-target species, such as birds of prey. Liver residues are often analyzed to detect exposure in birds found dead but their use to assess toxicity of SGARs is problematic. We analyzed published data on hepatic rodenticide residues and associated symptoms of anticoagulant poisoning from 270 birds of prey using logistic regression to estimate the probability of toxicosis associated with different liver SGAR residues. We also evaluated exposure to SGARs on a national level in Canada by analyzing 196 livers from great horned owls (*Bubo virginianus*) and red-tailed hawks (*Buteo jamaicensis*) found dead at locations across the country. Analysis of a broader sample of raptor species from Quebec also helped define the taxonomic breadth of contamination. Calculated probability curves suggest significant species differences in sensitivity to SGARs and significant likelihood of toxicosis below previously suggested concentrations of concern (<0.1 mg/kg). Analysis of birds from Quebec showed that a broad range of raptor species are exposed to SGARs, indicating that generalized terrestrial food chains could be contaminated in the vicinity of the sampled areas. Of the two species for which we had samples from across Canada, great horned owls are exposed to SGARs to a greater extent than red-tailed hawks and liver residue levels were also higher. Using our probability estimates of effect, we estimate that a minimum of 11% of the sampled great horned owl population is at risk of being directly killed by SGARs. This is the first time the potential mortality impact of SGARs on a raptor population has been estimated.

Keywords: rodent, exposure, liver residues, toxicity threshold, anticoagulant rodenticide

SGAR – second generation anticoagulant rodenticide
GHOW – great horned owl
RTHA – red-tailed hawk
BAOW – barred owl
BNOW – barn owl
ALL – all bird species pooled
EIIS – ecological incident information system
EPA – environmental protection agency

1. Introduction

Introduced in the 1970s, second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides (SGARs) were developed to combat the reported development of rodent resistance to first-generation compounds (Buckle et al. 1994). These newer anticoagulant poisons differ from their first-generation counterparts in that they are more acutely toxic at lower doses (often allowing a lethal dose to be obtained in a single feeding), and are more persistent in vertebrate livers (Parmar et al. 1987, Stone et al. 1999, Newton et al. 1999, Erickson and Urban 2004). Greater acute toxicity increases the potential for primary poisoning amongst non-target species while the longer tissue half-lives of SGARs enhance the potential for bioaccumulation in non-target predators in particular, and so may increase the risk of secondary poisoning. Furthermore, rodents survive for several days after consuming a lethal dose of SGARs and often will continue feeding on the bait (Cox and Smith 1992). That increases the likelihood that the body burden in poisoned rodents may significantly exceed the LD50 or even LD100 dose, and poisoned animals may remain active and available for capture by predators for some period after ingestion of the rodenticide. Additionally, poisoned rodents exhibit an altered state of behaviour, such as spending more time in open areas in a lethargic state, and this may further predispose them to predation (Cox and Smith 1992).

SGARs bind and inhibit vitamin K epoxide reductase and persist for at least six months in organs and tissues containing this enzyme such as the liver (Stone et al. 1999, Eason et al. 2002). In an attempt to monitor exposure in non-target wildlife, the presence of detectable SGAR residues as well as the magnitude of concentrations has been measured in the livers of some Canadian, American and European predatory birds and

24 scavengers (Albert et al. 2010, Newton et al. 1990, Shore et al. 1999, Shore et al. 2006).

25 There was a common trend among those studies for most SGARs, namely brodifacoum,

26 bromadiolone, difenacoum and difethialone being detected at an increasing frequency in

27 numerous predators and scavengers. Species most commonly monitored in North

28 America are great horned owls (*Bubo virginianus*) and red-tailed hawks (*Buteo*

29 *jamaicensis*) (Albert et al. 2010, Erickson and Urban 2004).

30 It is still uncertain what SGAR liver concentration is diagnostic of a potentially lethal

31 dose and, indeed Erickson and Urban (2004) have questioned whether such a cause-effect

32 relationship is appropriate. A sometimes cited ‒toxicity threshold‖ is given as ‒greater

33 than 0.1 – 0.2 mg/kg wet weight‖ (Newton et al. 1998, Newton et al. 1999). This was, in

34 fact, described as a ‒potentially lethal range‖ and was derived for a single species, the

35 barn owl (*Tyto alba*); it stems from two sets of observations (Shore et al. 2001). Firstly,

36 barn owls diagnosed post-mortem as having died from rodenticides had liver

37 concentrations > 0.1 mg/kg. Those owls exhibited classical toxicosis signs such as

38 haemorrhaging from organs such as the heart, lungs, liver, brain and/or subcutaneous

39 areas (Newton et al. 1998). Secondly, owls that were experimentally poisoned had liver

40 residues in the range of 0.2 – 1.72 mg/kg (Newton et al. 1999). However, it is uncertain

41 whether these barn owl criteria would apply to other species. Liver residues associated

42 with SGAR poisonings in various species typically range over two orders of magnitude

43 and were reported to be as low as 0.01 mg/kg wet wt in one great horned owl that was

44 examined (Stone et al. 1999). Thus, liver SGAR concentrations associated with toxicity

45 vary markedly among both individuals and species. This suggests a probabilistic

46 approach; which we adopt to review the evidence pertaining to how liver residues are

47   related to toxicity. Our principal objectives are: i) to determine SGAR liver

48   concentrations that may be associated with mortality in birds (ie- to quantify the ―toxicity

49   threshold‖) and ii) using the threshold values, assess the extent and severity of exposure

50   in Canadian birds of prey.

51

52   **2. Methods**

53   **2.1. Toxicity Threshold**

54   2.1.1. Literature Search

55   Recently published (~ last 10 years) peer-reviewed publications as well as the United

56   States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)‘s Ecological Incident Information

57   System (EIIS) were surveyed in order to locate liver residue data sets for birds of prey.

58   The EIIS is the EPA‘s database managing information on incidents linked to the exposure

59   of non target plants and animals to pesticides. It is currently managed by the Office of

60   Pesticide Programs (Mastrota 2007). Data were retained for our assessment if they met a

61   set of pre-determined conditions. These conditions included:

62   i)   SGAR detection limits in liver were under 0.02 mg/kg wet wt;

63   ii)   post-mortem evaluations were conducted prior to liver extraction and analysis;

64   pathophysiological signs of rodenticide poisoning were included.

65   iii)   post-mortem evaluations were conducted by a reputable professional such as a

66   doctor of veterinary medicine (DVM); and

67   iv)   adequate sample sizes were available (n>15) for any given species (in order to

68   have greater statistical power).

69   2.1.2. Data Analysis

70   Raptor necropsies with attending SGAR liver analyses were collected and compiled

71   in database software, and each case was given a binary code as positive (1) or negative

72   (0) for pathophysiological signs of poisoning. A positive coding meant that, after a

73   detailed post-mortem evaluation, an anticoagulant was diagnosed as being the cause of

74   death or a significant contributory factor (ie- when necropsies showed hemorrhage or

75   anemia in the absence of traumatic injury or infectious or parasitic diseases and an

76   anticoagulant residue was detected in the liver). A negative coding represented cases

77   where the cause of death was deemed to be natural or accidental (for example incidental

78   take, hunting, motor vehicle collisions, starvation).

79   The binary dataset was imported into SAS/STAT (version 9.2 TS2M0). Residue

80   concentrations of all SGAR compounds were summed for the logistic regression.

81   Concentrations were log transformed to meet the assumption of normality and re-tested.

82   The PROC LOGISTIC macro was invoked to determine how liver residues affected

83   presence or absence of poisoning symptoms. An effects plot was generated to illustrate

84   the relationship and equations were built for every species with sufficient data (n≥15).

85   Using these equations, liver residue levels (in mg/kg wet weight (ww)) were determined

86   for probabilities of 5%, 10%, 15% and 20% of exhibiting pathologies consistent with

87   rodenticides exposure. Species comparisons were completed using analysis of variance

88   (ANOVA) in conjunction with Tukey's Studentized Range test. Because all birds were

89   found dead or moribund, there was a logical inference that those pathologies

90   (haemorrhaging of the heart, lungs, liver, brain and/or subcutaneous areas) were

91   responsible for, or strongly contributed to, the mortality of the individual.

92   **2.2. Exposure extent in Canada**

93 2.2.1. Sample Collection

94   To obtain a cross-Canada survey of residue levels, liver samples of birds were

95 selected, irrespective of the cause of death, from British Columbia, the prairie provinces,

96 Ontario and Quebec. The birds were collected near agricultural and urban areas of the

97 country where SGAR use was thought to be common. They were typically submitted to

98 rehabilitation or veterinary centres either dead or in a moribund state. Initial diagnosis

99 frequently involved car strike or other obvious ‗mishap‗. They were not chosen because

100 they showed signs of anticoagulant poisoning, but rather reflect the population of

101 reported birds of prey dying from a multitude of causes. The subsequent liver samples

102 were harvested initially as part of previous investigations of exposure to heavy metals or

103 other toxicants, and then rodenticides residues were determined in later years. Three main

104 collections were sampled. These included an Ontario/prairie sample of red-tailed hawks

105 and great-horned owls, two common species known to scavenge; a broader phylogenetic

106 collection from Quebec and a collection of three owl species from British Columbia (barn

107 owl, barred owl [*Strix varia*] and great-horned owl). Those owl species are less mobile

108 than most of the hawk species and were chosen to help identify geographical patterns of

109 contamination and hence, potential sources of rodenticides residues. Results from the

110 latter have already been reported (Albert et al. 2010).

111 2.2.2. Chemical Analysis

112   Chemical analysis was conducted at the National Wildlife Research Center in Ottawa,

113 Ontario, Canada. Methods were similar to those reported by Albert et al. (2010). 50 mg of

114 liver was ground in a mortar with about 5 g anhydrous sodium sulphate (Fisher no. S420-

115 3). The resulting mixture was transferred to an amber glass septum bottle and acetonitrile

116   (EMD Omnisolv, AX0142-1, HPLC grade; 1 x 7 mL and 2 x 5 mL) was used for

117   extraction. The extract was shaken for 2 minutes by hand and 15 minutes mechanically.

118   After centrifuging for 15 minutes at 1000 rpm, the supernatant was removed and

119   transferred into a 40 mL conical tube. The supernatant of the two subsequent extractions

120   were combined with the first supernatant. The total product was evaporated to 10 mL

121   under a stream of nitrogen in a water bath kept at 40°C.

122   In order to clean up liver extract, a 2 mL portion was transferred into a test tube and

123   heated to dryness. The sample was reconstituted in acetonitrile and cleaned by solid-

124   phase extraction. After the introduction of the sample into the SPE cartridge, the tube

125   containing the sample was rinsed with acetonitrile and added to the SPE cartridge

126   solution. The eluate was then evaporated to dryness and reconstituted in MeOH and

127   filtered through an Acrodisk® syringe filter with a polyvinylidene fluoride (PVDF)

128   membrane. A volume of 10 μL of the diluted filtered extract was analyzed by liquid

129   chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MSMS). Some of the owl samples analysed

130   (mainly from British Columbia) were not cleaned using an SPE cartridge. However,

131   limits of detection were calculated for the procedure with and without an SPE sample

132   cleaning phase and were found to be identical. For this reason, both SPE-cleaned data and

133   non-SPE data were pooled for our analysis.

134   Brodifacoum, bromadiolone and difethialone were detected with a triple quadrupole

135   mass Quatro-Ultima (Waters) with negative electrospray ionization (ESI) in multiple

136   reaction monitoring scanning mode (MRM). LC-MSMS, MRM parameters and triple

137   quadrupole settings were identical as the ones reported in Albert et al. 2010.

138   The method's detection limit was 0.005 mg/kg for difethialone and 0.002 mg/kg for

139   brodifacoum and bromadiolone. The standards were all analytical grade (>98% purity). A

140   calibration curve was built with five levels of concentrations ranging from 2.5 to 80 pg

141   with an r^2>0.99. Samples were diluted in order to fit within the limits of the calibration

142   curve. Recoveries at low and high level were >70% for all compounds. Known amounts

143   of coumatetralyl (5 pg/lL; transition 291.00>140.90) and flocoumafen (1 pg/lL; transition

144   541.40>382.00) were added to each sample prior to the injection allowing ion

145   suppression monitoring. Methanol was injected between each sample to monitor any

146   possible contamination.

147   2.2.3. Statistical Analysis

148   Since great horned owls and red-tailed hawks represented the two species consistently

149   found across Canada (no red-tailed hawk samples were submitted from British Columbia,

150   however) and for which we had a large enough sample size to warrant a meaningful

151   analysis, cumulative frequency distribution graphs were constructed for these species.

152   The graphs were generated through a bootstrapping procedure (501 samples) using

153   BurrliOZ (version 1.0.14, © Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research

154   Organisation, Australia 2000). Using the values identified in our toxicity threshold

155   analysis, it was possible to identify the percentage of the sampled population exposed to

156   SGARs belonging to a certain risk category (5%, 10%, 15% and 20% risk of becoming

157   symptomatic).

158

159   **3. Results**

160   **3.1. Toxicity Threshold**

161   Five sources of data matched our criteria and were used in the analysis. Data

162   published by Newton et al. (1990, 1998, 2000; n=45), Albert et al. (2010; n=164) as well

163   as data from the Ecological Incident Information System (EIIS; n=61). All but four of the

164   EIIS cases were submitted by the State of New York and several of the values were

165   published in Stone et al. (1999, 2003). Barn owl samples were collected from localized

166   areas across Canada and the United Kingdom (UK) with a few individuals from the

167   United States (USA). Barred owl samples were mostly collected in Canada with only one

168   from the USA while red-tailed hawk samples were obtained from the USA only. Great

169   horned owl samples were collected from across both Canada and the USA. Samples were

170   often collected from relatively developed areas or areas where the public was likely to

171   report and submit carcasses.

172   There were significant differences between species in liver SGAR concentrations

173   ($F_{(4,535)}$ =12.68, p<0.0001). Post hoc-tests (Tukey's Studentized Range test, α = 0.05)

174   revealed that, on average, red-tailed hawks (n=32) were the species with the highest liver

175   concentrations of SGARs (Figure 1). All three owl species (great horned owl [n=86],

176   barred owl [n=26] and barn owl [n=126]) had SGAR liver residues that were comparable.

177   Logistic regression plots were calculated to predict the probability of a bird being

178   symptomatic as a function of SGAR liver residues (Figure 2). This was done for each

179   species separately and for all species combined (total of 270 individuals). Only the

180   predicted probability curve for the great horned owl (GHOW) was located inside the 95%

181   confidence limits for the pooled data and the estimated probability of becoming

182   symptomatic differed significantly between species ($F_{(1,4)}$ = 82.9, p<0.0001). The curve

183   for the red-tailed hawk curve differed from those of the three owl species and the curves

184 for the great horned owl and the barn owl also differed from each other (Tukey's

185 Studentized Range post-hoc test, P<0.05).

186   Using the probability curves, we calculated the predicted SGAR liver residue levels

187 for different probability risk thresholds for different species (Table 1), although this was

188 not possible for red-tailed hawks, as the data for this species could not be significantly

189 modeled by a logistic regression. The majority of the calculated values are under the

190 >0.1-0.2 mg/kg threshold suggested by Newton et al. (1999) and all are below 0.2 mg/kg.

191 If the lower range of 0.1 mg/kg and 0.2 mg/kg from the potentially lethal range suggested

192 for barn owls is applied to the barn owl probability curve, they correspond to toxicity

193 probabilities of 11% and 22%, respectively. The higher 0.7 mg/kg level proposed by the

194 Rodenticide Registrants Task Force (Erickson and Urban 2004) corresponds to a 54%

195 probability of effect in barn owls.

196   Although the differences among the species curves indicate that probabilities of

197 toxicity should be considered on a species-by-species basis, that is not possible where

198 data for species are lacking. In such cases, it may be necessary to estimate toxicity

199 probabilities on the basis of pooled data for other species. The probability curve for the

200 pooled data in our study predicts that one in 20 birds with detectable residues would

201 become symptomatic with SGAR liver residues of 0.02 mg/kg and one in five when

202 residue levels reach 0.08mg/kg.

203 **3.2. The extent of SGAR exposure in Canada**

204   Of the two species sampled over a relatively broad area of Canada (great horned owl,

205 red-tailed hawk), great horned owls were most consistently exposed to SGARs (Figure

206 3). Roughly 65% of great horned owls across Canada had detectable levels of SGARs in

207 their liver (detection limit of 0.005 mg/kg ww). Frequency of exposure in red-tailed

208 hawks seemed to increase eastward from the Prairie Provinces to Ontario and Quebec.

209 The frequency of exposed birds was the lowest (~20%) in the Prairie and Northern

210 provinces (and territories), increased to ~70% in Ontario and reached the highest in

211 Quebec (~90% of red-tailed hawks found with detectable SGAR liver residues), although

212 the sample size in Quebec was smaller than in the other regions. However, as sampling

213 was fortuitous and sampling effort was not uniform, these spatial comparisons must be

214 considered preliminary.

215   Great horned owls and red-tailed hawks were exposed to a number of SGARs (Figure

216 4). The majority of great-horned owls had multiple compounds in the liver; it was the

217 only species with detectable levels of all three registered compounds. Sixty percent of

218 red-tailed hawks had detectable liver residues of one or two compounds (Figure 4).

219 Although the proportion of great horned owls with detectable residues was greater than

220 for red-tailed hawks, this difference was not significant when data were compared for

221 those provinces from which carcasses of both species were collected (Prairie Provinces,

222 Ontario and Quebec; (paired t-test, $t_{(2)}$= - 0.78, p = 0.26; Figure 4). Brodifacoum and

223 bromadiolone were both detected in great horned owls and red-tailed hawks.

224 Difethialone was only ever detected in great horned owls (Table 2) but has only been

225 registered in Canada relatively recently.

226   When the liver SGAR concentrations in great horned owls measured in the present

227 study were plotted as a cumulative frequency graph (Figure 5; birds with detectable

228 residues only), it was apparent that approximately 25% had liver SGARs that exceeded

229 the 20% probability level for effect (0.07mg/kg; Table 1). The lack of a probability curve

230   for red-tailed hawks precludes making a similar calculation for that species, but it is

231   evident that liver residue levels were much lower than for great-horned owls (Figure 5

232   and 6). For-example, 50% of great horned owls with detectable residues had liver

233   concentrations greater than 0.05 mg/kg ww compared with only 10% of red-tailed hawks.

234   Comparison of liver concentrations in the two species in which birds were matched by

235   province confirmed that liver residues were significantly higher in the owls than in the

236   hawks (paired t-test; $t_{(2)} = -4.0$, p=0.03). This finding is in contrast to the previously

237   published literature (Figure 1) where liver residues were higher in red-tailed hawks than

238   in great-horned owls.

239   Of the small number of individuals from 13 other species analyzed from Quebec,

240   eight of those had at least one individual with detectable liver SGAR residues (Figure 7).

241   That indicates that a wide breadth of species is probably also exposed to these

242   compounds elsewhere in Canada.

243

244   **4. Discussion**

245   **4.1. Toxicity Threshold**

246   Critical SGAR liver concentrations associated with adverse effects and/or mortality

247   have not been defined for most raptor species (Walker et al. 2008a), and establishing liver

248   ‒toxicity thresholds‖ for SGARs is problematic (Stone et al. 2003). This is partly

249   because there are a number of factors that contribute uncertainty. For instance, the limit

250   of quantification used to measure the liver SGAR residues can vary widely with the

251   analytical method. That can lead to underestimates of the extent of contamination but,

252   conversely, inflation of residue magnitude if residues which were detected but were

253 below the level of quantification using older analytical methodology were assigned an

254 inflated limit value (Taylor et al. 2009). Species also vary markedly in their sensitivity to

255 SGARs. This is known for laboratory mammals (World Health Organisation 1995) but

256 almost nothing is known about the relative sensitivity of different avian species (Walker

257 et al. 2008a). Our risk probability curves strongly suggest significant differences exist

258 among raptor species.

259   To date, the only residue toxicity threshold for SGARs in raptors that has been

260 suggested is the >0.1-0.2 mg/kg –potentially lethal range‖ for barn owls (Newton et al.

261 1998, 1999). At best, that provides a range of concern for potential toxicity, and gives no

262 indication of likelihood of effects. The approach described in the current study offers a

263 major advance in our ability to assess risk from SGAR residues in that it proposes

264 quantitative toxicity thresholds for different probability levels of dying from SGAR

265 intoxication for three species, including the barn owl. If sufficient data were available, it

266 should be possible to extend this approach to other species. That, in turn, would help to

267 identify raptor species that may be more sensitive to SGAR toxicity. Overall, on the basis

268 of the probability curves defined so far, it would seem that the >0.1-0.2 mg/kg level for

269 barn owls already carries considerable risk of acute intoxication (> 10-20% of barn owls

270 with this residue being likely to suffer mortality). Clearly, the probability of acute

271 poisoning associated with the 0.7 mg/kg residue level proposed by the Rodenticide

272 Registrants Task Force (Erickson and Urban 2004) is worse still.

273   The probabilistic methods described here are, as with all predictive methods, subject

274 to biases and uncertainties. Of these, perhaps two of the most important are likely to be

275 underestimation of non-lethal residues, because birds characterised as ‒zeros‖ in the

276 probabilistic plot may have metabolised some of their non-lethal SGAR residues before

277 dying [from non-SGAR related causes], and over-estimation of residues associated with

278 mortality because birds ingest more than a lethal dose before they die; animals typically

279 die some 5-7 days after ingestion of a lethal dose (Meehan 1984). Both biases would

280 have the effect of flattening the probability curve.

281 **4.2. Exposure extent in Canada**

282 4.2.1. Spatial extent

283 Stone et al. (2003) stated that, at the time, SGARs appeared to be present in the

284 majority of great horned owls and in roughly half of the red-tailed hawks from the

285 sampled areas of the State of New York. That conclusion can be directly applied to our

286 situation in Canada. Furthermore, a substantial fraction of a number of other raptors in

287 Quebec (from the western half of the province including areas surrounding Gatineau,

288 Montreal, Sherbrooke, Quebec and as far north as Obedjiwan) were also exposed to

289 SGARs (43% – or 13 of 30 birds tested), supporting the notion that other avian species

290 are also being impacted by SGAR use. This wider exposure in Quebec suggests a broad

291 contamination of terrestrial food chains as Accipiters, such as the Cooper's hawk, as well

292 as other species such as the merlin and the American kestrel, feed predominantly on small

293 birds and occasionally on insects (Ehrlich et al. 1988). Small birds, if the source of

294 rodenticides, are most likely being exposed to SGARs from insects or other invertebrates,

295 and possibly through direct uptake of grain-based baits.

296 In our study, great horned owls were consistently exposed to SGARs across the

297 country. In apparent contrast, their daytime ecological counterpart, the red-tailed hawk,

298 showed an increasing frequency of exposure eastward from the Prairie Provinces. This

299 difference could be explained by the lower dietary diversity of owls than hawks. Marti

300 and Kochert (1995) showed that, on a finer scale, food-niche breadth became narrower

301 along an eastward transect from the west coast of North America. This may reflect

302 greater diversity of available prey in the west that could permit local populations of those

303 two raptors to increase their diet segregation in western regions (Marti and Kochert

304 1995). Houston et al. (1998) lists the main prey of great horned owls as including rabbits

305 and hares, coots and other waterfowl and mice. While snowshoe hares (*Lepus*

306 *americanus*), black-tailed jackrabbits (*Lepus californicus*), and ground squirrels

307 (*Spermophilus spp.*) dominate the hawkʻs diet in western and northern parts of North

308 America (Preston and Beane 2009). The bulk of their diet in eastern and midwestern

309 North America includes voles (*Microtus*), mice (*Peromyscus spp., Reithrodontomys spp.,*

310 *Mus musculus*), rats (*Sigmodon hispidus, Oryzomys palustris*), and cottontails (*Sylvilagus*

311 *spp*.) (Preston and Beane, 2009). Thus, it may be that in eastern areas that are more

312 agricultural and urban (and subject to a higher degree of SGAR use), red-tailed hawks are

313 exposed more frequently to SGARs through their increased feeding on rodents and

314 reduced predation on other prey.

315   To obtain a more reliable estimate on actual exposure in Canada, we examined the

316 livers of birds found dead from all causes. Our data indicate that, despite a smaller human

317 population and the harsher climate in Canada (albeit some south-western regions of the

318 country are characterised by milder weather), both of which should limit the need for

319 rodenticides, the scale of exposure reported in our study are comparable to those in

320 Europe. In the French Department of Loire Atlantique, 73% of a sample consisting of

321 common kestrels (*Falco tinnunculus*), common buzzards (*Buteo buteo*), barn owls and

322 tawny owls (*Strix aluco*) had detectable SGAR liver residues (Lambert et al. 2007). In the

323 UK, between 40% and 74% of barn owls, kestrels, and avian scavengers such as buzzards

324 and red kites (*Milvus milvus*) found dead from various causes had detectable liver SGAR

325 residues (Newton et al. 1999; Shore et al., 1999, 2006; Walker 2008b). However, it

326 should be noted that the sampled areas of Canada were those with higher population

327 densities and where landscape features are not greatly dissimilar from Europe. That may

328 at least in part account for the apparent similarity in the frequency of contamination.

329   The widespread exposure in Canada in part most likely reflects the increase in sales

330 and use of SGARs in the last few decades (Albert et al. 2010), and the use of persistent

331 compounds that remain detectable in the liver long after the exposure event (Laas et al.

332 1985). However, it is also clear from our data that multiple exposures, as detected by the

333 presence of multiple compounds in the liver, are common. Although SGARs cannot be

334 used legally on crops or orchards in Canada and are labelled for ‗indoor uses‘ only,

335 ‗indoor‘ is defined to include use of baits outside farms and food establishments. This is

336 likely to increase the exposure of non-target organisms. SGARs in Canada are currently

337 labelled for domestic use although this is likely to change soon. Proposed regulatory

338 actions relating to exposure risks for wildlife includes (amongst others), prohibiting use

339 of SGAR compounds in residential settings or outdoor areas where wildlife may be

340 exposed. In the case of commercial applications, bait stations would be required where

341 wildlife could be exposed. Furthermore, labels of commercial class products would be

342 amended to state that those products could be used only by certified operators, farmers

343 and persons authorized in government-approved pest control programs (Pest Management

344   Regulatory Agency 2009). Those risk mitigation measures should have an overall

345   positive impact on reducing unnecessary exposure risks to wildlife.

346   Regarding the impact of SGARs, we must be cautious in extrapolating from our data

347   to predict likely mortality. However, if the probability of mortality is applied to each

348   residue value in our dataset for great horned owls, this equates to an estimated predicted

349   mortality of 11% (calculated by multiplying the probability of being exposed to SGARs

350   [65% in GHOW] by the mean probability of exhibiting signs of intoxication [17% in

351   GHOW]). This is the first time that the scale of potential mortality from SGARs has been

352   estimated for any wild raptor population. That estimate may well be too low, as some

353   proportion of poisoned birds likely die out of sight (Shore et al. 2005) and so be under-

354   represented in our sample. Furthermore, our estimates of the scale of mortality do not

355   account for any indirect effects that SGARs may have. Sub-lethal exposures may

356   indirectly increase mortality associated with natural or accidental events. For instance,

357   SGARs may hinder the recovery of birds from non-fatal collisions or accidents. They

358   may also impair hunting ability through behavioural changes such as lethargy, thus

359   increasing the probability of starvation. Intoxication with rodenticides has been shown to

360   alter behaviour in rodents (Cox and Smith 1992) but there is no evidence to date of

361   indirect effects in free-ranging raptors (Shore et al. 2005).

362   The lack of a probability plot for red-tailed hawks means that a comparable estimate

363   for SGAR-induced mortality in Canada cannot be made for this species. The available

364   data suggest that red-tailed hawks may be more sensitive to SGARs than great horned

365   owls (Figure 2) but red-tailed hawks generally had lower liver SGAR concentrations in

366   Canada, and, it is notable that in New York, great horned owls are poisoned more

367 frequently than red-tailed hawks (Stone et al. 1999, 2003). Additional studies and

368 monitoring of red-tailed hawk SGAR residues would strengthen our ability to estimate

369 the risk of toxicosis following exposure to SGARs.

370 4.2.2. Future directions

371 Most studies that investigate exposure of non-target species to SGARs have focused

372 on the uptake of poisoned rodents by various predators (Newton et al.1990, 1999; Berny

373 et al.1997; McDonald et al.1998; Howald et al. 1999; Shore et al. 1999, 2003). The

374 finding that falcons and accipiters were also exposed in Quebec suggests that terrestrial

375 food chains are broadly contaminated by SGARs despite their very restricted use.

376 Invertebrates represent another route of exposure, especially in insectivorous avian

377 species (Dowding et al. 2006). Some potential routes of exposure to aerial insectivores

378 include the consumption of invertebrates that previously fed on rodent faeces or carcasses

379 and even the consumption of ground-dwelling earthworms and beetles that ingested

380 residues or actual rodent bait (Spurr and Drew 1999; Dunlevy et al. 2000). Clearly, given

381 the fact that many ecosystems contain a larger proportion of insectivorous vertebrates

382 relative to higher trophic predators, exposure could even be greater in those taxa

383 (Dowding et al. 2010). Developing probability curves or even metabolism studies for a

384 wider range of species would provide us with insight into the relative sensitivities and

385 risks to other species (Watanabe et al 2010). Finally, researching further indirect effects

386 of SGARs on survival would refine current risk assessments of direct and indirect

387 mortalities in wildlife.

388 **4.3. Conclusion**

389   Our results continue to support recommendations that persistent SGARs such as

390   brodifacoum, bromadiolone and difethialone should be used with caution (or not at all in

391   some circumstances) given that it appears difficult to eliminate the risk of exposure to

392   non-target wildlife. The results presented will hopefully aid policy-makers in refining

393   risk-assessments of SGARs on non-target wildlife.

394   Our results can also help regulatory agencies worldwide provide guidance on both

395   commercial and residential use of SGARs and enforce appropriate risk mitigation as

396   needed. In this context, the extent of non-target exposure to SGARs may not always

397   depend on the amount of bait used, but also on the way it is used (Shore et al. 2006).

398   Focusing on improving application methods, such as baiting in areas of high rat activity

399   only, conducting periodic and frequent searches for dead or dying rodents, enclosing the

400   bait in a fashion that reduces invertebrate uptake may help reduce exposure of SGARs to

401   predatory birds and other non-target species. Whether or not rodenticide resistance is

402   common, an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approach, that seeks to combine

403   mechanical, biological and chemical controls, should be favoured as opposed to relying

404   on a purely chemical mode of control.

405

406

407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416

428   **References:**
429
430   Albert, C.A., Wilson, L.K., Mineau, P., Trudeau, S. and Elliott, J.E. 2010. Anticoagulant
431   rodenticides in three owl species from western Canada, 1998-2003. Arch. Environ.
432   Contam. Toxicol. 163,451-459.
433
434   Berny, P.J., Buronfosse, T., Buronfosse, F., Lamarque, F. and Lorgue, G. 1997. Field
435   evidence of secondary poisoning of foxes (Vulpes vulpes) and buzzards (Buteo buteo) by
436   bromadiolone, a 4-year survey. Chemosphere. 35,1817–1829.
437
438   Buckle, A.P., Prescott, C.V. and Ward, K.J. 1994. Resistance to the first and second
439   generation anticoagulant rodenticides – a new perspective. In: Halverson, W.S., Marsh,
440   R.E. (eds) Proc. 16th Vert. Pest Conf. pp 138-144.
441
442   Cox, P. and Smith, R.H. 1992. Rodenticide ecotoxicology: pre-lethal effects of
443   anticoagulants on rat behaviour. In: Borreco JE, Marsh RE (eds) Proc. 15th Vert. Pest
444   Conf. University of California, Davis, California, USA. pp 165-170.
445
446   Dowding, J.E., Lovegrove, T.G., Ritchie, J., Kast, S.N. and Puckett, M. 2006. Mortality
447   of northern New Zealand dotterels (*Charadrius obscurus aquilonius*) following an aerial
448   poisoning operation. Notornis. 53,235–239.
449
450   Dowding, C.V., Shore, R.F., Worgan, A., Baker, P.J. and Harris, S. 2010. Accumulation
451   of anticoagulant rodenticides in a non-target insectivore, the European hedgehog
452   (*Erinaceus europaeus*). Environ. Pollut. 158,161-66.
453
454   Dunlevy, P.A., Campbell, E.W. and Lindsey, G.D. 2000. Broadcast application of a
455   placebo rodenticide bait in a native Hawaiian forest. Int. Biodeterior. Biodegradation.
456   45,199–208.
457
458   Eason, C.T., Murphy, E.C., Wright, G.R.G., Spurr, E.B. 2002. Assessment of risks of
459   brodifacoum to non-target birds and mammals in New Zealand. Ecotoxicology. 11,35-48.
460

461 Ehrlich, P.R., Dobkin, D.S. and Wheye, D. 1988. The birder's handbook – a field guide
462 to the natural history of North American birds. Simon & Schuster Inc. New York, New
463 York.
464
465 Erickson, W. and Urban, D. 2004. Potential risks of nine rodenticides to birds and
466 nontarget mammals: a comparative approach. United States Environmental Protection
467 Agency, Washington, DC, USA.
468
469 Hedgal, P.L. and Colvin, B.A. 1988. Potential hazard to eastern screech-owls and other
470 raptors of brodifacoum bait used for vole control in orchards. Environ. Toxicol. Chem.
471 7,245-260.
472
473 Houston, C.S., Dwight, G.S. and Christoph, R. 1998. Great Horned Owl (*Bubo
474 virginianus*), The Birds of North America Online (A. Poole, Ed.). Ithaca: Cornell Lab of
475 Ornithology; Retrieved from the Birds of North America Online:
476 http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/bna/species/372
477
478 Howald, G.R., Mineau, P., Elliott, J.E., and Cheng, K.M. 1999. Brodifacoum poisoning
479 of avian scavengers during rat control on a seabird colony. Ecotoxicology 8,429-446.
480
481 Laas, F.Y., Forss, D.A., Godfrey, M.E.R. 1985. Retention of brodifacoum in sheep
482 tissues and excretion in faeces. N.Z. J. Agric. Res. 28,357–359.
483
484 Lambert, O., Pouliquen, H., Larhantec, M., Thorin, C. and L'Hostis, M. 2007. Exposure
485 of raptors and waterbirds to anticoagulant rodenticides (difenacoum, bromadiolone,
486 coumatetralyl, coumafen, brodifacoum): epidemiological survey in Loire Atlantique
487 (France). Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 79,91-94.
488
489 McDonald, R.A., Harris, S., Turnbull, G., Brown, P. and Fletcher, M. 1998.
490 Anticoagulant rodenticides in stoats (Mustela erminea) and weasels (Mustela nivalis) in
491 England. Environ. Pollut. 103,17–23.
492
493 Marti, C.D. and Kochert, M.N. 1995. Are Red-tailed Hawks and Great Horned Owls
494 diurnal-nocturnal dietary counterparts? Wilson Bull. 107,615-628.
495
496 Mastrota, N.F. 2007. EIIS Version 2.0 – User Manual. EFED Information and Support
497 Branch, Environmental Fate and Effects Division, Office of Pesticide Programs, USA.
498
499 Meehan, A.P. 1984. Rats and Mice: their Biology and Control. Rentokil Limited, East
500 Grinstead, Sussex, UK.
501
502 Newton, I., Wyllie, I. and Freestone, P. 1990. Rodenticides in British barn owls. Environ.
503 Pollut. 68,101-117.
504
505 Newton, I., Dale, L., Finnie, J.K., Freestone, P., Wright, J., Wyatt, C. and Wyllie, I. 1998.
506 Wildlife and Pollution: 1997/98 Annual Report. JNCC Report No. 285

507
508 Newton, I., Shore, R.F., Wyllie, I., Birks, J.D.S., Dale, L. 1999. Empirical evidence of
509 side-effects of rodenticides on some predatory birds and mammals. In: Cowan DP, Feare
510 CJ (eds) Advances in vertebrate pest management. Filander Verlag, Furth, pp 347–367.
511
512 Newton, I., Afsar, A., Dale, L., Finnie, J., Shore, R.F., Wright, J., Wyatt, C. and Wyllie, I.
513 2000. Wildlife and Pollution: 1998/99 Annual Report. JNCC Report No.305
514
515 Parmar, G., Bratt, H., Moore, R. and Batten, P.L. 1987. Evidence for a common binding-
516 site in vivo for the retention of anticoagulants in rat liver. Hum. Toxicol. 6,431–432.
517
518 Pest Management Regulatory Agency. 2009. Proposed Risk Mitigation Measures for
519 Eight Rodenticides. Re-evaluation Note REV2009-05. Health Canada. Ottawa, Ontario.
520 22 June 2009. 23 pages.
521
522 Preston, C.R. and Beane, R.D. 2009. Red-tailed Hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), The Birds of
523 North America Online (A. Poole, Ed.). Ithaca: Cornell Lab of Ornithology; Retrieved
524 from the Birds of North America Online: http://bna.birds.cornell.edu/bna/species/052
525
526 Shore, R.F., Birks, J.D.S. and Freestone, P. 1999. Exposure of non-target vertebrates to
527 second-generation rodenticides in Britain, with particular reference to the polecat *Mustela*
528 *putorius*. N.Z. J. Ecol. 23,199-206.
529
530 Shore, R.F., Malcolm, H.M., Wienburg, C.L., Turk, A., Horne, J.A., Dale, L., Wyllie, I.
531 and Newton, I. 2001. Wildlife and pollution: 1999/2000 Annual report. JNCC Report No.
532 321
533
534 Shore, R.F., Birks, J.D.S., Afsar, A., Wienburg, C.L. and Kitchener, A.C. 2003. Spatial
535 and temporal analysis of second-generation anticoagulant rodenticide residues in polecats
536 (*Mustela putorius*) from throughout their range in Britain, 1992–1999. Environ. Pollut.
537 122,183–193.
538
539 Shore, R.F., Malcolm, H.M., Wienburg, C.L., Walker, L.A., Turk, A. and Horne, J.A.
540 2005. Wildlife and Pollution: 2001/02 Annual Report. JNCC Report No. 352
541
542 Shore, R.F., Malcolm, H.M., McLennan, D., Turk, A., Walker, L.A., Wienburg, C.L. and
543 Burn, A.J. 2006. Did foot-and-mouth disease-control operations affect rodenticide
544 exposure in raptors? J. Wildl. Manage. 70,588-593.
545
546 Spurr, E.B. and Drew, K.W. 1999. Invertebrates feeding on baits used for vertebrate pest
547 control in New Zealand. N.Z. J. Ecol. 23,167–173.
548
549 Stone, W.B., Okoniewski, J.C. and Stedelin, J.R. 1999. Poisoning of wildlife with
550 anticoagulant rodenticides in New York. J. Wildl. Dis. 35,187-193.
551

552   Stone, W.B., Okoniewski, J.C. and Stedelin, J.R. 2003. Anticoagulant rodenticides and
553   raptors: recent findings from New York, 1998-2001. Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.
554   70,34-40.
555
556   Taylor, M.J., Sharp, E.A., Melton, L.M., Giela, A. and Watson, J.E. 2009. Walk on the
557   wild side: an investigation into secondary poisoning of wild birds using LC-MS. British
558   Mass Spectrometry Society. 60,12-14.
559
560   Walker, L.A., Turk, A., Long, S.M., Wienburg, C.L., Best, J. and Shore, R.F. 2008a.
561   Second generation anticoagulant rodenticides in tawny owls (*Strix aluco*) from Great
562   Britain. Sci. Total Environ. 392,93-98.
563
564   Walker, L.A., Shore, R.F., Turk, A., Pereira, M.G., and Best, J. 2008b. The Predatory
565   Bird Monitoring Scheme (PBMS) — identifying chemical risks to top predators in
566   Britain. Ambio. 37,466-471.
567
568   Walker, L.A., Lawlor, A.J., Llewellyn, N., Peréira, M.G., Potter, E., Townsend, J., Turk,
569   A., and Shore, R.F. 2010. The Predatory Bird Monitoring Scheme (PBMS) Report 2006-
570   7. A contract report from the Centre for Ecology & Hydrology to Natural England, 65
571   pages. Retrieved from the website at
572   http://pbms.ceh.ac.uk/docs/AnnualReports/PBMSreport2006_2007_FINAL.pdf
573
574   Watanabe, K.P., Saengtienchai, A., Tanaka, K.D., Ikenaka, Y. and Ishizuka, M. 2010.
575   Comparison of warfarin sensitivity between rat and bird species. Comp. Biochem. Phys.
576   C. 152,114-119.
577
578   World Health Organisation. 1995. Environmental Health Criteria 175: Anticoagulant
579   Rodenticides. World Health Organisation (WHO), Geneva.
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597

Figure captions:

Figure 1: Published liver SGAR residues (combined concentrations of bromadiolone, brodifacoum and difethialone) in barred owl (BAOW), barn owl (BNOW), great horned owl (GHOW) and red-tailed hawk (RTHA). Total number of birds = 270 and do not include birds with non-detected residues. Diamond in the center of the box represents average, line is the median, box is the upper and lower quartiles and the whiskers are the standard deviation. Sources of the data are: Newton et al. 1990, 1998, 2000; Stone et al. 1999, 2003; Albert et al. 2010; EIIS 2010 download.

Figure 2: Effect plot of the probability of becoming symptomatic (0,1) as a function of $\log_{10}$ [mg/kg]. ALL represents pooled data (n=270), BAOW represents barred owls (n=26), BNOW represents barn owls (n=126), GHOW represents great horned owls (n=86) and RTHA represents red-tailed hawks (n=32). Shading represents 95% confidence limits for ALL birds. Curves were drawn using the formula y(probability)= $1/(1+\exp(-(int + b*x))$ where int is the intercept and b is the parameter estimate for X (concentration).

Figure 3: Percentage of great horned owls (GHOW) and red-tailed hawks (RTHA) across Canada sampled in our study that had detectable ($\geq$ 0.005 mg/kg ww) liver SGAR residues. No RTHA samples were collected from PYR. PYR stands for the Pacific and Yukon region of Canada and PNR is the Prairie and Northern Region.

Figure 4: Percentage of great horned owls (GHOW) and red-tailed hawks (RTHA) with 0, 1, 2 and 3 different SGARs detected in the liver. Tested compounds were brodifacoum, bromadiolone and difethialone.

Figure 5: Cumulative frequency graph for liver SGAR residues in 79 great horned owls. Red line represents the 20% probability level for effect (0.07 mg/kg; Table 1).

Figure 6: Cumulative frequency graph for liver SGAR residues in 42 red-tailed hawks.

Figure 7: Numbers of birds of prey from Québec that contained detectable and non-detectable liver SGAR residues (13/30 samples tested positive or 43%).

| 633 | **Table 1:** Toxicity threshold values (mg/kg ww) for 5%, 10%, 15% and 20% probability |

Table 1: Toxicity threshold values (mg/kg ww) for 5%, 10%, 15% and 20% probability risk levels. For-example, in barred owls (BAOW), an owl with 0.06mg/kg SGAR residues in the liver would have a 5% chance of showing signs of toxicosis. Sample sizes (n) as well as the number of positive (1) and negative (0) cases are presented. P value representing binary logit model fit is also showed. BNOW stands for barn owl, GHOW is the great horned owl, RTHA the red-tailed hawk and ALL represents the pooled data for all birds.

Probability	BAOW	BNOW	GHOW	RTHA	ALL
	n=26	n=126	n=86	n=32	n=270
	0=22	0=114	0=62	0=3	0=201
	1=4	1=12	1=24	1=29	1=69
	p=0.008	p=<0.0001	p=<0.0001	p=0.37	p=<0.0001
0.05	0.06	0.05	0.02	---	0.02
0.10	0.09	0.09	0.03	---	0.04
0.15	0.13	0.13	0.05	---	0.06
0.20	0.16	0.18	0.07	---	0.08

--- - values not presented if binary logit model fit was not statistically significant

670 **Table 2:** Geometric mean (range) liver SGAR concentrations [mg/kg ww] for great
671 horned owls (GHOW) and red-tailed hawks (RTHA) from the Pacific and Yukon region
672 of Canada (PYR), the prairie and northern region (PNR), Ontario and Quebec.
673

|	PYR		PNR		Ontario		Quebec		Pooled – all provinces	
	GHOW	**RTHA**	**GHOW**	**RTHA**	**GHOW**	**RTHA**	**GHOW**	**RTHA**	**GHOW**	**RTHA**
Brodifacoum	0.04 (0.003-0.61) n=28	N/A	0.008 (0.001-0.016) n=6	0.004 (0.001-0.02) n=3	0.007 (0.001-0.05) n=17	0.006 (0.001-0.17) n=18	0.013 (0.003-0.08) n=7	0.01 (0.008-0.04) n=5	0.017 (0.001-0.61) n=58	0.006 (0.001-0.17) n=26
Bromadiolone	0.03 (0.005-0.57) n=33	N/A	0.007 (0.001-0.07) n=7	0.004 (0.001-0.008) n=3	0.01 (0.001-0.07) n=15	0.004 (0.001-0.06) n=25	0.01 (0.003-0.14) n=6	0.003 (0.002-0.006) n=4	0.018 (0.001-0.57) n=61	0.004 (0.001-0.064) n=32
Difethialone	0.02 (0.013-0.03) n=3	N/A	ND	ND	0.003 (0.003-0.003) n=1	ND	ND	ND	0.013 (0.003-0.03) n=4	0
Pooled - all compounds	0.03 (0.003-0.609) n=64	N/A	0.007 (0.001-0.07) n=13	0.004 (0.001-0.017) n=6	0.008 (0.001-0.07) n=33	0.005 (0.001-0.17) n=43	0.012 (0.003-0.14) n=13	0.006 (0.002-0.04) n=9	0.016 (0.001 - 0.61) n=123	0.005 (0.001 - 0.064) n=58

674 N/A = no samples obtained; ND = no detectable residue in any livers; n= number of birds with detectable
675 residues.

676

677

678

679

680
681
682

Figure 1

683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696

697
698
699 **Figure 2**
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711

712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734

Figure 3

735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757

758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803

Figure 4

804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828 **Figure 5**
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849

850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890

Figure 6

891
892
893
894
895
896 **Figure 7**
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915

916
917
918
919
920