### University of Nebraska - Lincoln DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

United States Geological Survey: Staff Publications

**US Geological Survey** 

11-5-2021

# Exposure of predatory and scavenging birds to anticoagulant rodenticides in France: Exploration of data from French surveillance programs

Meg-Anne Moriceau

Sébastien Lefebvre

Isabelle Fourel

Etienne Benoit

Florence Buronfosse-Roque

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/usgsstaffpub

Part of the Geology Commons, Oceanography and Atmospheric Sciences and Meteorology Commons, Other Earth Sciences Commons, and the Other Environmental Sciences Commons

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the US Geological Survey at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in United States Geological Survey: Staff Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

### Authors

Meg-Anne Moriceau, Sébastien Lefebvre, Isabelle Fourel, Etienne Benoit, Florence Buronfosse-Roque, Pascal Orabi, Barnett A. Rattner, and Virginie Lattard

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect





## Science of the Total Environment

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/scitotenv

### Exposure of predatory and scavenging birds to anticoagulant rodenticides in France: Exploration of data from French surveillance programs



Meg-Anne Moriceau <sup>a,b</sup>, Sébastien Lefebvre <sup>a</sup>, Isabelle Fourel <sup>a</sup>, Etienne Benoit <sup>a</sup>, Florence Buronfosse-Roque <sup>b</sup>, Pascal Orabi <sup>c</sup>, Barnett A. Rattner <sup>d</sup>, Virginie Lattard <sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> USC1233 RS2GP, INRAe, VetAgro Sup, Univ Lyon, F69 280 Marcy-l'Étoile, France

<sup>b</sup> CNITV, VetAgro Sup, 1 avenue Bourgelat, 69 280 Marcy-l'Étoile, France

<sup>c</sup> French Bird Protection League (LPO France), France

<sup>d</sup> U.S. Geological Survey, Eastern Ecological Science Center, Beltsville, MD 20705, USA

#### HIGHLIGHTS

#### GRAPHICAL ABSTRACT

- Persistent & bioaccumulative anticoagulant rodenticides (AR) are a threat to raptors.
- AR exposure prevalence was 82.5% in predatory birds and 38.8% in scavenger birds.
- Exposure to multiple ARs was common as were differences in exposure among species.
- Public policy mitigation measures did not reduce second-generation AR exposure.
- Diagnosis of AR toxicosis is complex and the 100 ng/g ww threshold was problematic.

#### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 19 July 2021 Received in revised form 23 October 2021 Accepted 24 October 2021 Available online 5 November 2021

Editor: Yolanda Picó

*Keywords:* Raptors Biomonitoring Exposure Anticoagulant rodenticide



#### ABSTRACT

Wild raptors are widely used to assess exposure to different environmental contaminants, including anticoagulant rodenticides (ARs). ARs are used on a global scale for rodent control, and act by disruption of the vitamin K cycle that results in haemorrhage usually accompanied by death within days. Some ARs are highly persistent and bioaccumulative, which can cause significant exposure of non-target species. We characterized AR exposure in a heterogeneous sample of dead raptors collected over 12 years (2008–2019) in south-eastern France. Residue analysis of 156 liver samples through LC-MS/MS revealed that 50% (78/156) were positive for ARs, with 13.5% (21/156) having summed second-generation AR (SGAR) concentrations >100 ng/g ww. While SGARs were commonly detected (97.4% of positive samples), first-generation ARs were rarely found (7.7% of positive samples). ARs were more frequently detected and at greater concentration in predators (prevalence: 82.5%) than in scavengers (38.8%). Exposure to multiple ARs was common (64.1% of positive samples). While chlorophacinone exposure decreased over time, an increasing exposure trend was observed for the SGAR brodifacoum, suggesting that public policies may not be efficient at mitigating risk of exposure for non-target species. Haemorrhage was observed in 88 birds, but AR toxicosis was suspected in only 2 of these individuals, and no difference in frequency of haemorrhage was apparent in birds displaying summed SGAR levels above or below 100 ng/g ww. As for other contaminants, 17.2% of liver samples (11/64) exhibited Pb levels compatible with sub-clinical poisoning

\* Corresponding author at: USC1233 INRAe-Vetagro Sup, 69280 Marcy l'Etoile, France. *E-mail address:* virginie.lattard@vetagro-sup.fr (V. Lattard). (>6 µg/g dw), with 6.3% (4/64) above the threshold for severe/lethal poisoning (>30 µg/g dw). Nine individuals with Pb levels >6 µg/g dw also had AR residues, demonstrating exposure to multiple contaminants. Broad toxicological screening for other contaminants was positive for 18 of 126 individuals, with carbofuran and mevinphos exposure being the suspected cause of death of 17 birds. Our findings demonstrate lower but still substantial AR exposure of scavenging birds compared to predatory birds, and also illustrate the complexity of diagnosing AR toxicosis through forensic investigations.

© 2021 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

#### 1. Introduction

Wild raptors are widely used in Europe for biomonitoring trends in environmental contamination, natural resource management and as sentinels for human health, although harmonization of pan-European monitoring programs has yet to be achieved (Badry et al., 2020; Espín et al., 2016; Gómez-Ramírez et al., 2014). In free-ranging raptors, many studies have assessed exposure to various environmental contaminants, including lead (Pb) (Descalzo et al., 2021; Finkelstein et al., 2012; Krone, 2018; Mateo, 2009; Monclús et al., 2020), veterinary drugs (e.g. diclofenac) (Bean and Rattner, 2018; Cuthbert et al., 2011, 2014; Gómez-Ramírez et al., 2020; Swan et al., 2006), pesticides (e.g., organophosphorus and carbamates) (Allen et al., 1996; Botha et al., 2015), and anticoagulant rodenticides (ARs) (Albert et al., 2010; Murray, 2011, 2017, 2020; Rattner and Harvey, 2021; Thomas et al., 2011). Anticoagulant rodenticides have been widely used since the 1950's for pest control (Wardrop and Keeling, 2008). Widespread resistance of rodents to some first generation ARs (FGARs; e.g., warfarin) became apparent in the 1950's, which eventually resulted in the development of second-generation compounds (e.g., bromadiolone, brodifacoum, difenacoum, difethialone and flocoumafen; Buckle et al., 1994; Goulois et al., 2017; Lefebvre et al., 2016; Marquez et al., 2019). ARs disrupt the vitamin K cycle by inhibiting vitamin K epoxide reductase (VKOR), leading to impaired blood coagulation that can be fatal to both target pest species and non-target species (reviewed in Rached et al., 2020).

Second-generation ARs (SGARs) are persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic compounds, and are currently the most commonly used products to control rodent populations. Non-target exposure to ARs may be primary (e.g., direct consumption of baits) or secondary (e.g., consumption of intoxicated or dead rodents that had been exposed to ARs), and can include transfer through food webs (Hindmarch and Elliott, 2018). Multiple AR residues reflect repeated exposure that could lead to adverse effects (Rattner and Harvey, 2021) and also reflect the complexity of exposure pathways (Hindmarch and Elliott, 2018; Rattner et al., 2014). Contamination of non-target raptors with SGARs is globally widespread (Albert et al., 2010; Murray, 2011, 2017, 2020; Rattner and Harvey, 2021; Thomas et al., 2011; Van den Brink et al., 2018). Prevalence of ARs exposure in wild predatory birds and mammals was recently estimated as 58%, reviewing data from North America (Canada, USA), Europe (UK, Denmark, France and Spain) and New Zealand between 1984 and 2015 (López-Perea and Mateo, 2018). Data are more scarce for scavenging birds.

In France, ARs are authorized as biocides to be used by professionals and the public in urban and suburban settings (European Biocidal Product Regulation N°°528/2012) and are also used as plant protection products (PPP, e.g. for the control of the European water vole *Arvicola amphibius* in crops and meadows up to 2020) (Giraudoux et al., 2012). Chlorophacinone was used as a PPP in France till the end of 2010 (Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche, 2007), and bromadiolone was authorized for this use till its recent withdrawal (21 February 2020 - see https://www.anses.fr/fr/system/files/phyto /decisions/ SUPERCAIDA\_PREX\_2015-1399\_D.pdf) by the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety. Other ARs are only authorized as biocides. Regulatory measures were also implemented in an attempt to reduce SGAR exposure of non-target fauna through biocidal use. Starting in 2013 within the European Union, rodenticide baits to be placed indoors or in and around buildings must be in tamperresistant bait stations. These stations limit primary exposure of nontarget species by physically preventing access to baits (Berny et al., 2014; Nakagawa et al., 2015; Suárez and Cueto, 2018), but regrettably still may permit bait access of non-target species of a similar size as pest rodents. To our knowledge, the success of these public policies has not been thoroughly assessed.

Diagnosis of AR lethal intoxication is complex, generally associating post-mortem lesions suggestive of AR poisoning (i.e., haemorrhages) and quantifiable residues in the liver (Murray, 2018). However, there is no consensus on the toxicity threshold to distinguish between sublethal exposure and poisoning (Rattner and Harvey, 2021). An often cited toxicity threshold for SGAR levels of >100 to 200 ng/g liver wet weight (ww) has been suggested to be potentially lethal (Newton et al., 1999), although both field observations and modeling efforts indicate that SGAR toxicity and lethality can occur at much lower levels (Thomas et al., 2011), and species-specific differences in sensitivity are notable (Rattner and Harvey, 2021). It was also recently suggested that due to large differences in molecular weight and VKOR inhibitory potency, summing of ARs should be limited to second-generation ARs, and it may be appropriate to present exposure data on both a summed mass basis and summed molar basis (Rattner et al., 2020; Rattner and Harvey, 2021).

Herein we present findings characterizing prevalence and factors affecting AR exposure in raptors sampled in France, through analysis of residues in liver of dead predatory and scavenging birds collected over a 12-year period by several bird of prey surveillance programs. The effects of public policies to mitigate risk to non-target fauna were also assessed. We examined diagnosis of AR intoxication using both hepatic AR concentration and molar values that may better represent exposure. As these avian samples were part of broad biomonitoring programs, results of other toxicological analyses (lead, some pesticides and pharmaceuticals) are briefly mentioned to emphasize concomitant exposure to multiple contaminants in wild birds.

#### 2. Material and methods

#### 2.1. Collection of postmortem data: use of a French surveillance database

Raptors (in most instances carcasses) were collected over a 12 year period (2008–2019) from several bird of prey surveillance programs [e.g., LIFE GYPCONNECT that include partnerships with associations such as the Bird Protection League (LPO), and the National Centre for Veterinary Toxicological Information (CNITV); Supplemental Table S1]. Sampling was principally focused on mountainous areas of southeastern France, from the eastern Pyrenees to Alps, in the regions of Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes, Occitanie and Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, especially in the regional natural parks of Baronnies, Grands Causses, Vercors and Verdon, and southern department of Aude, which are the working areas for LIFE GYPCONNECT (see Fig. 1 for the summary of origins of all individuals). Scavenging birds accounted for the majority of samples (see Table 1 for the number of individuals per species collected).

Carcass collections were performed by field agents, usually on the day of the animal death or within a few days thereafter. Carcasses were frozen (-18 °C), and subsequently thawed and necropsied within a variable time frame (several days to a month) by veterinarians of



**Fig. 1.** Number of birds collected per department (n = 245) (gray frame: working area of LIFE GYPCONNECT).

CNITV. While those veterinarians were not pathologists, necropsies were supervised by a senior veterinarian with over 20 years of experience in bird of prey necropsy. For each specimen, history of the carcass (collection location, date of discovery, description of the area) was provided, and information on the species, sex, as well as descriptions of the external aspects and of all organs were compiled during necropsies. Radiographs were performed, and gastric content, liver, kidney, muscle and bone were sampled. Only liver samples were used for this study.

Findings were coded in a database, with details on lesions, results of toxicological analysis and possible cause of death. All necropsy reports in the database were analysed to identify elements for further exploration. Parameters which were not systematically documented (e.g. age of birds and state of decomposition) were not coded for further analysis. Presence/absence of haemorrhages was coded based on keywords in the report ("haemorrhage", "bleeding", "anaemia", "bruising", "haematoma", "blood"), and reports with at least one of these keywords were read to determine whether or not the animal had displayed haemorrhages. Conclusions of reports were analysed, with cause of death classified in six categories [e.g., Electrocution, Trauma, Intoxication, Other (external cause; suspected drowning, poisoning), Other (internal cause; suspicion of a tumoral process, cardiopathy, infectious disease, etc.), and Unknown].

#### 2.2. Sample analysis

AR residue analysis of liver samples was conducted using a previously described liquid chromatography with tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) method (Fourel et al., 2017a). Analytes quantified included

3 first-generation ARs (i.e., warfarin, coumatetralyl, chlorophacinone) and 5 s-generation ARs (SGARs) used in Europe (i.e., bromadiolone, brodifacoum, difenacoum, flocoumafen and difethialone). Limit of quantification (LOQ) was 2 ng/g ww. All analyses (samples collected between 2008 and 2019, stored at -80 °C) were performed between 2016 and 2020 using the same analytical procedures.

As collected birds were part of broad toxicological surveillance programs, it should be noted that some of the samples were also sent to other external laboratories for lead (Pb) analysis (French departmental laboratory of Drôme, LDA 26) by inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) and for a broad toxicological screening with a panel of more than 500 environmental contaminants (mostly pesticides and pharmaceuticals, laboratory Ecoloxie-La Voulte) using LC-MS/MS. Those labs are accredited by a French committee (COFRAC). Results from those other analyses will only be briefly mentioned in this paper.

#### 2.3. Statistical analyses

Descriptive statistics and graphs were generated with R software (version 3.5.1) associated with RStudio (version 1.1.453). Concentrations of ARs in liver were expressed as ng/g ww, and also converted to pmol/g ww (or equivalent nmol/kg ww) using the molecular weight for each AR (PubChem: chlorophacinone = 374.8 g/mol bromadiolone = 527.4 g/mol, brodifacoum = 523.4 g/mol, difenacoum = 444.5 g/mol, difethialone = 539.5 g/mol). As warfarin, coumateralyl and flocoumafen concentrations were consistently below the LOQ, those ARs were excluded from statistical analyses.

#### Table 1

Species, sample size, foraging behaviour and frequency of exposure to ARs of raptors collected between 2008 and 2019<sup>a</sup>.

Feeding habit + A3:K42	Species	n	AR exposed	CHLORO	BROMA	BFC	DFC	DFT	Multiple ARs
			(%)	N exposed					
				(% of tested samples N) (% of AR exposed)					
	Griffon vulture (Gyps fulvus)	90	29/90 (32)	3 (3) (10)	17 (19) (59)	10 (11) (34)	10 (11) (34)	13 (14) (45)	13 (14) (45)
Scavengers	Cinereous vulture (Aegypius monachus)	17	13/17 (76)	2 (12) (15)	10 (59) (77)	5 (29) (38)	6 (35) (46)	6 (35) (46)	7 (41) (54)
	Bearded vulture (Gypaetus barbatus)	9	3/9 (33)	0	2 (22) (67)	1 (11) (33)	2 (22) (67)	2 (22) (67)	2 (22) (66)
	Bonelli's eagle (Aquila fasciata)	7	5/7 (71)	0	4 (57) (80)	4 (57) (80)	5 (71) (100)	4 (57) (80)	4 (57) (80)
	Red kite (Milvus milvus)	16	16/16 (100)	0	14 (87) (87)	15 (94) (94)	9 (56) (56)	7 (44) (44)	14 (87) (87)
	Golden eagle (Aquila chrysateo)	7	7/7 (100)	0	6 (86) (86)	7 (100) (100)	6 (86) (86)	7 (100) (100)	7 (100) (100)
	Common buzzard (Buteo buteo)	3	1/3	0	1	1	1	1	1
Predators	Black kite (Milvus migrans)	1	1/1	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Eurasian eagle-owl (Bubo bubo)	2	2/2	1	2	2	2	2	2
	Hen harrier (Circus cyaneus)	2	0/2	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Eurasian hobby (Falco subbuteo)	1	0/1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Short-toed snake eagle (Circaetus gallicus)	1	1/1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Total		156	78/156 50	6 (4) (8)	57 (37) (73)	46 (29) (59)	41 (26) (53)	42 (27) (54)	50 (32) (64)

Abbreviations: chlorophacinone, CHLORO; bromadiolone, BROMA; brodifacoum, BFC; difenacoum, DFC; difethialone, DFT; not analysed, NA.

<sup>a</sup> % were reported when sample size was greater than 5.

For descriptive results of the levels of ARs (analytes with <50% of samples below the LOQ), the Kaplan-Meier method was used to estimate the extremes of the mean (Helsel, 2005). Lower bound was calculated replacing values below the LOQ by 0.02 ng/g ww, while upper bound was obtained by replacing those values by the LOQ (i.e., 2 ng/g ww). For each species, the range of values, number of animals above LOQ and number of animals with a sum of SGARs above the literature threshold of 100 ng/g ww (Newton et al., 1999) were described.

To assess AR exposure by feeding regimen, a simple classification was implemented. All vultures were categorized as scavengers, while other raptors, including facultative scavengers (e.g., Golden eagle, *Aquila chrysaetos*), were classified as predators. Chi-squared test was used to detect differences in AR exposure between scavengers and predators for prevalence data (e.g., AR detection rate) and *t*-test for continuously distributed variables (e.g. summed SGARs concentration). Other factors, such as presence of multiple ARs, species (retaining only species with sample sizes  $\geq$ 5 individuals), gender and area of discovery (department), were also tested. Parametric tests (t-test) were used for sample size >30 individuals, while non-parametric procedures (Wilcoxon or Kruskal-Wallis, depending on the number of categories) were used for smaller sample size comparison of AR concentration.

To evaluate the effect of change in public policies in France related to AR usage on detection frequency, samples were grouped into 3 different key temporal periods: 2008–2010 (end of chlorophacinone use as a plant protective product in 2010), 2011–2013 (new regulations on SGARs in 2013, brodifacoum, difenacoum and difethialone only to be used in bait boxes starting from 2013) and 2014–2019. Differences in exposure among those 3 key periods were assessed for each AR using Fisher's exact test.

The relation between levels of SGARs found in the liver samples and evidence of AR intoxication (i.e., presence/absence of haemorrhage, for each individual) was examined using non-parametric Wilcoxon test. As trauma and electrocution were considered as possible biases for the presence of haemorrhages, individuals with such mortality classifications were removed for additional analysis. To test the commonly reported threshold of 100 ng/g ww, birds positive for SGARs were then classified into 2 groups, namely those with summed hepatic SGARs <100 ng/g ww or  $\geq$  100 ng /g ww, and compared using Chi-squared test (all individuals) or Fisher's Exact test (birds with "Unknown" cause of death), based on the presence/absence of haemorrhages. As trauma is a common cause for haemorrhage, relationship between AR exposure and presence of haemorrhage in birds that died from trauma was also tested through Fisher's Exact test.

For liver lead (Pb) concentrations, toxicity thresholds reported in literature were used to classify the results [subclinical poisoning (2 to <6  $\mu$ g/g ww, corresponding to 6 to <18  $\mu$ g/g dry weight), clinical poisoning (6–10  $\mu$ g/g ww, i.e., 18–30  $\mu$ g/g dw), and severe poisoning compatible with death (>10  $\mu$ g/g ww or > 30  $\mu$ g/g dw)] (Descalzo et al., 2021; Pain et al., 2019).

#### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Study population, causes of death

In total, 245 birds were necropsied, with the most represented species being Griffon vulture (*Gyps fulvus*; n = 139, 56.7% of samples), Red kite (*Milvus milvus*; n = 32, 13.1%), Cinereous vulture (*Aegypius monachus*; n = 26, 10.6%) and Bearded vultures (*Gypaetus barbatus*; n = 14, 5.7%). Scavengers accounted for the majority of collected samples (73.1%). Excluding cases for which the cause of death could not be determined (i.e., unknown, n = 62, 25.3%), the principal causes of mortality were trauma and electrocution (n = 71, 29% and n = 50, 20.4%, respectively). Two birds (one with trauma, one electrocuted) were found alive but were euthanised due to poor prognosis for survival. Other reported causes were internal disorders (mainly infectious processes, 13.1%), intoxication (lead or other contaminants, i.e., carbofuran, mevinphos or pentobarbital, 9.4%) and other external causes (drowning, envenomation, 2.9%).

#### 3.2. AR exposure

Liver samples were not available for all specimens recorded in the database (absent due to consumption of part of the carcass before collection or advanced decomposition), and thus only 156 samples were analysed for ARs (63.7% of individuals).

#### 3.2.1. Prevalence and concentrations of ARs

Of the 156 liver samples analysed, 78 (50.0%) were found positive for at least one AR at a concentration exceeding the LOQ (Table 1). While the FGAR chlorophacinone was present in only 6 birds (4% of all samples, 7.7% of positive samples), SGARs were found in nearly all positive samples (76/78, 97.4%), with bromadiolone being detected most frequently (n = 57, 73.1% of positive samples).

Concentrations of individual compounds ranged up to 231.4 ng/g ww (442.1 pmol/g ww; brodifacoum, Red kite) (Table 2). Brodifacoum had the highest median concentration, followed in descending order by difenacoum, bromadiolone and difethialone (Fig. 2). However, concentrations for these 4 SGARs were not different (Kruskal-Wallis X<sup>2</sup> = 5.40, df = 3, p = 0.1450). Chlorophacinone levels were lower when compared to each of these SGARs (Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test, p < 0.0001 followed by pairwise Wilcoxon test with Bonferonni correction: chlorophacinone vs brodifacoum or bromadiolone, or difenacoum or difethialone, p < 0.0001 for each comparison).

Only 21 individuals (13.5% of samples) had summed SGAR concentrations in liver exceeding 100 ng/g ww (see Table 2 for the details of prevalence per species). When this 100 ng/g ww threshold of summed SGARs for all samples was examined on a molar basis (i.e., using brodifacoum as a reference, 100 ng brodifacoum/g liver ww = 191 pmol/g liver ww), these same 21 individuals had summed SGAR molar values exceeding 191 pmol/g ww. Only 7 birds had a concentration of an individual SGAR above the commonly used threshold of 100 ng/g ww (i.e., 9% of the positive samples).

#### 3.2.2. Factors affecting AR exposure

3.2.2.1. Foraging behaviour. Anticoagulant rodenticide residues were more frequently detected in predatory birds (33 of 40 samples, 82.5%) than in scavenging birds (45 of 116 samples, 38.8%) (Chi-squared test,  $X^2 = 21.01$ , df = 1, p < 0.001). The summed concentration of SGARs was also greater in predators than in scavengers (*t*-test, t = 5.45, df = 41, p < 0.0001, 95% confidence interval (CI) for difference: 52.9-115.2 ng/g ww), averaging 94.57 ng/g ww in predators vs 10.48 ng/g ww in scavengers (Fig. 3B). Nevertheless, while concentrations of SGARs were low for the majority of scavengers, levels of summed SGARs in 16 of 116 samples (13.8%) were outliers (values above Quartile  $3 + 1.5 \times$  interquartile range), with 12 (10.3%) being extreme points (Quartile 3+3× interquartile range). For these 12 individuals with extreme values (6 Griffon vultures, 4 Cinereous vultures and 2 Bearded vultures), summed SGAR concentrations in liver ranged from 30.2 to 169.6 ng/g ww (57.7-338.1 pmol/g ww), with 4 individuals exceeding 100 ng/g ww (Supplemental Table S2).

3.2.2.2. Number of ARs detected. For liver samples with quantifiable AR residues, 64.1% (n = 50 of 78) contained two or more compounds. Multiple AR residues were more frequently present in predatory birds (28 of 33, 82.5%) than in scavenging birds (22 of 45, 48.9%) (Chi-squared test,  $X^2 = 9.19$ , df = 1, p = 0.0024). Summed SGAR concentrations were higher in birds with multiple ARs (Wilcoxon test, W = 91.5, p < 0.0001), and among the 21 birds (including 4 scavenger birds) with summed SGARs concentration above 100 ng/g ww, all had multiple SGAR residues, with 16 of them exposed to the four SGARs, and 2 of these 16 samples also containing chlorophacinone residues.

3.2.2.3. Species. The concentration of summed SGARs differed among species with sample sizes ≥5 individuals (Kruskal-Wallis rank sum

test,  $X^2 = 63.45$ , df = 5, p < 0.001). Levels were greater in Golden eagles and Red kites compared to Bearded, Cinereous and Griffon vultures, respectively (pairwise Wilcoxon test with Bonferonni correction: Golden eagle vs vulture species p = 0.0241, 0.0223 and < 0.001, and for Red kite vs vulture species p = 0.0100, 0.0440 and < 0.001) (Fig. 3A), further supporting the aforementioned difference in exposure between predatory and scavenger birds.

3.2.2.4. Other factors. Concentrations of summed SGARs did not differ between sexes (t-test, t = -1.014, df = 102.96, p = 0.3132). Birds were categorized by the geographic region (i.e., department) where they were found, but there was no difference among departments (sample size  $\geq 5$  individuals) in summed SGAR concentrations for either scavenging (5 departments, Kruskal-Wallis X<sup>2</sup> = 4.0515, df = 4, p = 0.3991) or predatory birds (2 departments, Wilcoxon test, W = 32, p = 0.3690).

#### 3.3. Temporal trends of AR exposure

A decreasing trend in the proportion of individuals exposed to chlorophacinone was observed (Fisher's exact test, p = 0.0041, df = 2) when birds were grouped according to three key periods of changing patterns of AR use (n = 3 of 17 for 2008–2010, n = 2 of 24 for 2011–2013, and n = 1 of 115 for 2014–2019), with a significant difference between 2008 and 2010 and 2014–2019 (pairwise comparison of proportions using Fisher's test with Bonferroni correction, p = 0.0213, df = 1, Odds Ratio = 0.043 [0.0008–0.5747]) (Fig. 4). In contrast, an increasing trend for brodifacoum was observed among these 3 key periods (Fisher's exact test, p = 0.0398, df = 2; but no difference for pairwise comparisons). For the other ARs, hepatic residue concentrations were similar among these 3 periods (Fisher's exact test for bromadiolone, p = 0.5389; for difenacoum, p = 0.378; for difethialone, p = 0.2743; for summed SGAR, p = 0.2609).

#### 3.4. Evidence of AR intoxication

Of 156 birds tested for ARs, only 130 were examined for the presence of haemorrhage at necropsy because of carcass decomposition of the 26 other specimens. Eighty-eight (88) of those 130 birds displayed signs of haemorrhage (67.7%). None were initially diagnosed with AR toxicosis, but for 9 birds, cause of death was undetermined. Six (6) of those 9 birds were positive for ARs: 2 had low levels of summed SGARs (2.1 and 2.2 ng/g ww) and were not further considered, but the remaining 4 birds (all Red kites) had summed SGAR levels ranging from 27.3 to 191.9 ng/g ww. Levels of ARs and the clinical picture for those 4 individuals are described in Table 3 and Fig. 5, respectively. While the clinical picture does not favour coagulopathy in birds 1 and 2, lesions reported in birds 3 (Fig. 5) and 4, combined with high levels of summed SGARs, are suggestive of AR toxicosis in those birds (2/156, i.e., 1.3% of tested birds actually died of AR toxicosis).

There was no difference in summed SGAR concentrations between birds with or without haemorrhage (non-parametric Wilcoxon rank Test, W = 1681, p = 0.3814). For the remaining subset of birds excluding those with trauma and electrocution, summed SGAR concentrations did not differ between those with or without apparent haemorrhage for all birds (Wilcoxon rank Test, W = 365.5, p = 0.2584) and for the subset of species with  $\geq 5$  individuals (i.e., Griffon vulture, Cinereous vulture and Red kite - Wilcoxon rank test, W = 103, 6 and 10, respectively, and p-values = 0.4523, 1 and 1, respectively). When examining data for only those birds with cause of death classified as "Unknown" (n = 20; avoiding bias), summed SGAR concentrations did not differ between those with or without apparent haemorrhage (Wilcoxon test, W =49, p = 1).

No difference was found between summed SGARs >100 ng/g and presence of haemorrhages, for samples involving all individuals (Chi-squared test,  $X^2 = 0.057$ , df = 1, p-value = 0.8117) or when excluding

#### Table 2

Hepatic residues of anticoagulant rodenticides (in ng/g ww or *pmol/g ww*) in raptors collected in France between 2008 and 2019.

habit         Kaplan-Meler mean (in pp.) ww)           Scavengers         Griffon vulture (Gyp. fultur)         90         0.4-2.3         2.92-4.50         -         >100 ng1/dec           Scavengers         Griffon vulture (Gyp. fultur)         90         0.4-2.3         2.92-4.50         2.6-4.3         0.7-2.4         0.7-2.4         0.5-13.6           Ope-16.0         5.5-8.5         4.9-9.2         1.5-5.5         0.02-10.02         1.03.04.2         2.9.6           Ope-16.0         5.5-8.5         4.9-9.2         1.5-5.5         0.02-10.01.128.0246.2         2.9.6           Ope-16.0         5.8-8.5         4.9-9.2         5.4-6.7         8.4-9.7         1.03.9.63           (Applin Multur)         10         0.7-2.5         1.19.4-126.4         5.0-6.2         5.4-6.7         8.4-9.7         3.03-53.3           (Applin Multur)         10         2.0-6.6         2.26-24.0         9.5-11.9         1.22-15.1         1.5-6.18.0         3.09-53.3           (Applin Multur)         10         2.0-6.6         2.26-24.0         9.3-7.5.1         1.00-2.1.17.22         1.00-2.7.7.1.3         1.00-2.1.17.7.2         3.8-5.4         10.1-1.65           (Applin Multur)         9         /         2.4-3.9         2.2-4.0         1.7.3.2	Feeding	Species	Ν	CHLORO	BROMA	BFC	DFC	DFT	∑SGARs				
$ \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	habit			Kaplan-Meier mean (in ng/g ww)									
Range (ng and pmolig ww)           Deterts > LOQ           Deterts > LOQ           Scarenigers         Cilifon vulture (Copr,fulves)         90         04-23         229-450         26-43         07-24         6-100         ng non-24         5-100 ngg-1/detect           Scarenigers         0         0-23-24         26-64         0-7-24         000-103/02         LoOp-108/02/2           Cilifon vulture (Copr,fulves)         0         0-100-2302         20-00-1280/2428           0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0.000-1182/246         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0					Kaplan-Meier mean (in pmol/g ww)								
Detects > L0Q						Range (r	ng and pmol/g ww)						
					Detects > LOQ								
Scivenges (opp fulvus)         60         0.4-2.3 0.95-00         2.29-4.50 5.5.85         2.4-4.3 0.9-6.0         0.7-2.4 0.5-5.5         0.7-2.4 0.00         0.00         0.19.25-55         1.13.455         1.13.455         1.13.455         1.13.455         1.13.455         1.13.455         1.20-0.00         2.290         2.290         2.290         2.290         2.290         2.290         2.290         2.290         2.290         2.22-51         1.55-55         1.19.4-12.64         5.0-62         5.4-6.7         8.4-9.7         3.08-353         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-0.91.07.37         2.00-2.10.07.37         2.00-2.10.07.37         2.00-2.10.07.37         2.00-2.10.07.37         2.00-2.10.07.37         2.00-2.10.07.37         2.00-2.10.07.37         2.00-2.27						-			>100 ng.g-1/detects				
	Scavengers	Griffon vulture	90	0.4-2.3	2.92-4.50	2.6-4.3	0.7-2.4	0.7-2.4	6.9-13.6				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		(Gyps fulvus)		0.9-6.0	5.5-8.5 100-86 0/163 1	4.9-8.2 100-635/1213	1.5-5.5 100-11 1/25 0	13.1-44.5 100-10 9/20 2	13.3-26.67 100-128 0/246 2				
$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{Constraint} & 17 & 0.7-2.5 & 11.94-12.64 & 5.0-6.2 & 5.4-6.7 & 8.4-9.7 & 30.8-33.3 \\ (Agyptias monachas) & L0Q=9.1/24.3 & L0Q=610/115.7 & L0Q=39.3/75.1 & L0Q=54.6/17.28 & L0Q=71.4/132.3 & L0Q=10.968.0/38.1 \\ L0Q=9.1/24.3 & L0Q=610/115.7 & 5.07 & 6.17 & 6.17 & 2.13 \\ 2/17 & 10.17 & 5.17 & 6.17 & 6.17 & 2.13 \\ 2/17 & 10.17 & 5.17 & 6.17 & 6.17 & 2.13 \\ (Cypactus barbons) & 1 & 1 & 4.5-7.4 & 4.3-7.6 & 3.8-7.3 & 7.1-10.0 & 19.7-23.3 \\ barbons & 1 & 1 & 0 & 10.9(-119/22.56 & L0Q=19.9/38.0 & L0Q=112/25.2 & L0Q=27.7/51.3 & L0Q=42.281.4 \\ (Cypactus barbons) & 1 & L0Q & 10.9(-119/22.56 & L0Q=19.9/38.0 & L0Q=112/25.2 & 10.9(-27.7/51.3 & 20.9-42.36 & 0.9 & 0.9 \\ 0.9 & 2/9 & 1.9 & 2/9 & 2/9 & 0.9 \\ 0.9 & 2/9 & 1.9 & 2/9 & 2/9 & 0.9 \\ 0.9 & 0.9 & 2/9 & 1.9 & 2/9 & 2/9 & 0.9 \\ 0.9 & 0.9 & 2/9 & 1.9 & 2/9 & 2/9 & 0.9 \\ 0.0 & 0.0 & -12.9/21.1 & L0Q=2.31.4 \\ (Milvas milvus) & 1 & 52.55.7 & 71.6-71.9 & 45.5-47.1 & 37.1-38.9 & 20.94-21.36 \\ (Milvas milvus) & 1 & 52.55.7 & 71.6-71.9 & 45.5-47.1 & 37.1-38.9 & 20.94-21.6 & 0.106 & 10.06 \\ 0.10 & 10.0 & -10.271.271.1 & 0.0 & -11.7 & 54.9-57.7 & 10.9-11.7 & 54.9-57.7 & 10.9-11.7 & 54.9-57.7 & 10.9-11.7 & 54.9-57.7 & 10.9 & 11.7 & 10.9-11.7 & 154.9-57.7 & 10.9-11.7 & 154.9-57.7 & 10.9-11.7 & 154.9-57.7 & 10.9-11.7 & 154.9-57.7 & 10.9-11.7 & 154.9-57.7 & 10.9-11.7 & 154.9-57.7 & 10.9-11.4 & 154.9-57.7 & 47.7 & 57.7 & 17.6 & 17.$				3/90	17/90	10/90	10/90	13/90	29/90				
$ \left  \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Cinereous vulture	17	07-25	11 94-12 64	50-62	54-67	84-97	2/29 30.8–35.3				
$ \begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		(Aegypius	17	2.0-6.6	22.6-24.0	9.5–11.9	12.2–15.1	15.6–18.0	59.9-69.0				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		monachus)		100-91/243	100-610/1157	100-39 3/75 1	100-546/1228	100-714/1323	100-1696/33812				
Predators         Bearded vulture         9         /         24-3.9         22-4.0         1.7-3.2         3.8-5.4         101-165           (Cyppertus barbanus)         /         4.5-7.4         4.3-7.6         3.8-7.3         7.1-10.0         197-32.3           barbanus)         0.9         0.9         2.9         1.0         0.002-11.2/25.2         1002-71.7/51.3         100-42.2/81.4           (Milvus milvus)         16         /         29.1-92.4         375-376         20.2-21.0         20.0-21.0         106.8-108.9           (Milvus milvus)         16         /         29.1-92.4         375-376         20.2-21.0         20.0-21.0         106.8-108.9           100         10.016         14.116         15016         916         7/1.6         16.16           1016         14.116         1516         916         7/1.6         17.49-57         10.02-12.17.7         10.99-11.7         15.49-57.7         10.9-11.7         15.49-57.7         10.9-11.7         10.9-11.7         10.9-11.7         10.9-11.7         10.9-11.7         10.9-11.7         10.9-11.7         10.9-11.7         10.9-11.5         10.00         10.02-11.0         10.3         10.3         10.3         10.3         10.3         10.3         10.3				2/17	10/17	5/17	6/17	6/17	13/17				
International Constraints          Constraint		Poordod vulturo	0	/	24.20	22.40	1720	29 54	2/13				
$ \begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		(Gypaetus	9	/	2.4-3.9 4.5-7.4	4.3-7.6	3.8–7.3	7.1–10.0	19.7–32.3				
DOQ         DOQ 100E113/J2250         DOQ 12/9         1/9         2/9         2/9         2/9         3/9           Predators         Red kite         16         /         29.1-29.4         37.5-37.6         202-21.0         20.0-21.0         106.8-108.9           (Milvus milvus)         /         552-55.7         7.16-71.9         45.5-47.1         37.1-38.9         209.4-213.6           100         L00-121.9/231.1         L00-253/05.1         L00-214.4/42.1         L00-953/214.4         L00-122.3/226.7         2.4/4.2-653.7/05.           100         L00-213.9/231.1         L00-235.4/67.1         10.9-11.7         54.9-57.7         10.9-11.7         54.9-57.7           (Aquila fasciata)         /         266.8-28.40         24.5-25.6         38.5-39.8         201-21.7         10.99-115.4           (Aquila fasciata)         /         266.8-28.40         24.5-25.5         38.5-39.8         201-21.7         10.99-35.4/62.1         10.9-35.4/62.1         10.9-35.4/62.1         10.9-35.4/62.1         10.9-35.4/62.1         10.9-35.4/63.1         12.9-4/31.0           (Aquila fasciata)         /         32.7-22.9         53.1-53.1         24.2-24.5         19.5-19.5         12.94.430.5         12.94.430.5         12.94.430.5         12.9.4-30.0         10.1.4-101.4		barbatus)		100	100 11 0/22 50	100 100/280	100 11 2/25 2	100 27 7/51 2	100 42 2/81 4				
Predators         Red kite (Milvus milvus)         16         /         525-55.7         71.6-71.9         45.5-47.1         37.1-38.9         209.4-213.6           LOQ         LOQ-121.9/231.1         LOQ-231.4/42.1         LOQ-95.3/214.4         LOQ-122.3/226.7         2.4/42-365.3/705.           Milvus milvus)         0/6         14/16         15/16         9/16         7/16         16/16           Bonelli's eagle         7         /         141-15.0         12.8-13.4         171.1-17.7         10.9-11.7         549-57.7           (Aquila fasciata)         /         26.8-28.40         24.5-25.6         38.5-39.8         20.1-21.7         109.9-115.4           LOQ         LOQ         10.02-35.4/67.1         10.02-71.0/135.6         LOQ e8.0/18.0         LOQ-252./65.2         LOQ 2240/455.5           Golden eagle         7         /         32.7-32.9         53.1-53.1         242-24.5         19.5-19.5         129.4-30.0           (Aquila chrysateo)         /         61.9-62.5         101.4-101.4         545-55.1         36.1-36.1         253.9-255.1           LOQ         LOQ         LOQ-17.0/13.6         LOQ-24.0/14.7         5.3/8-33.0/61.2         21.3/36.3-204.4/41           (Aquila chrysateo)         /         4.9-7.4         39.7-42				0/9	2/9	1/9	2/9	2/9	2/9 LUQ-42.2/81.4				
Predators       Red Kite       1b       /       29.1–29.4       37.5–37.0       20.2–21.0       20.0–21.0       20.0–21.0       20.0–21.0         (Milvus milvus)       /       552–55.7       71.6–71.9       455–47.1       37.1–38.9       20.9–21.36       20.9–21.0       20.9–21.36       20.9–21.36       20.9–21.36       20.9–21.36       20.9–21.16       10.9–11.7       54.9–57.7       10.9–11.7       54.9–57.7       10.9–11.7       54.9–57.7       10.9–11.7	Decidence	D - 11/6-	10		20.1.20.4	275.276	20.2.21.0	20.0.21.0	0/3				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Predators	(Milvus milvus)	16	/	29.1-29.4 55.2-55.7	37.5-37.6 71.6-71.9	20.2-21.0 45.5-47.1	20.0-21.0 37.1-38.9	209.4-213.6				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		(		LOQ	LOQ-121.9/231.1	LOQ-231.4/442.1	LOQ-95.3/214.4	LOQ-122.3/226.7	2.4/4.2-365.3/705.4				
Bonelli's eagle         7         //         14.1-15.0         12.8-13.4         17.1-17.7         10.9-11.7         54.9-57.7           (Aquila fasciata)         /         268-28.40         24.5-25.6         38.5-39.8         20.1-21.7         109.9-115.4           LOQ         LOQ-35.4/67.1         LOQ-71.0/135.6         LOQ-88.0/198.0         LOQ-352.4/65.2         LOQ-224.0/455.5           0/7         4/7         4/7         5/7         4/7         5/7           Golden eagle         7         /         32.7-32.9         53.1-53.1         242-24.5         19.5-19.5         129.4-130.0           (Aquila chrysateo)         //         61.9-62.5         101.4-101.4         545-55.1         36.1-36.1         253.9-255.1           LOQ         LOQ-112.0/212.4         3.1/59-98.0/187.2         LOQ-63.0/141.7         5.3/9.8-33.0/61.2         21.3/86.3-204.4/41           0/7         6/7         7/7         6/7         7/7         6/7         7/7           Common buzzard         3         /         2.66-3.9         20.8-22.1         5.9-7.2         49.8-51.1         79.1-84.3           (Buteo buteo)         /         4.9-7.4         3.97-42.2         13.2-162         92.3-94.8         1502.2-160.6           LOQ<				0/16	14/16	15/16	9/16	7/16	16/16				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Bonelli's eagle	7	/	14.1-15.0	12.8-13.4	17.1–17.7	10.9-11.7	54.9-57.7				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		(Aquila fasciata)		/	26.8-28.40	24.5-25.6	38.5-39.8	20.1-21.7	109.9-115.4				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				LOQ	LOQ-35.4/67.1	LOQ-71.0/135.6	LOQ-88.0/198.0	LOQ-35.2/65.2	LOQ-224.0/455.5				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				0/7	4/7	4/7	5/7	4/7	1/5				
(Aquila chrysateo)       /       61.9-62.5       101.4-101.4       54.5-55.1       3.61-36.1       225.39-255.1         LOQ       LOQ-112.0/212.4       3.1/5.9-98.0/187.2       LOQ-63.0/141.7       5.3/9.8-33.0/61.2       21.3/36.3-204.4/410         0/7       6/7       7/7       6/7       7/7       6/7       7/7       6/7         Common buzzard       3       /       2.6-3.9       20.8-22.1       5.9-7.2       49.8-51.1       79.1-84.3         (Buteo buteo)       /       4.9-7.4       39.7-42.2       13.2-16.2       59.2-3.4.8       1502-160.6         LOQ       LOQ-7.7/14.6       LOQ-62.3/119.0       LOQ-17.6/39.6       LOQ-149.4/276.9       LOQ-237.0/450.1         0/3       1/3       1/3       1/3       1/3       1/3       1/3         Hen harrier       2       /       /       /       /       /         LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       0/2       0/2       0/2         UC       //       //       //       //       //       //       //       //       //       ////////////////////////////////////		Golden eagle	7	/	32.7-32.9	53.1-53.1	24.2-24.5	19.5-19.5	129.4-130.0				
Loc       L		(Aquila chrysateo)		/	61.9-62.5 LOO-112 0/212 4	101.4–101.4 3 1/5 9–98 0/187 2	54.5-55.1 100-63.0/141.7	36.1-36.1 5 3/9 8-33 0/61 2	253.9-255.1 21 3/36 3-204 4/410 0				
Common buzzard         3         /         2.6-3.9         20.8-22.1         5.9-7.2         49.8-51.1         79.1-84.3           (Buteo buteo)         /         4.9-7.4         39.7-42.2         13.2-16.2         92.3-94.8         150.2-237.0/450.1           LOQ         LOQ-7.7/14.6         LOQ-62.3/119.0         LOQ-17.6/39.6         LOQ-149.4/276.9         LOQ-237.0/450.1           0/3         1/3         1/3         1/3         1/3         1/3         1/3           Hen harrier         2         /         /         /         /         /         /           LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         1/3           Hen harrier         2         /         /         /         /         /         /           LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         O/2         0/2         0/2           Back bibo)         4.7-7.3         167.6-167.6         84.7-84.7         104.5-104.5         136.8-136.8         493.6-493.6           LOQ-3.5/9.3         71.6/135.8-105.2/199.5         13.9/26.6-74.8/142.9         30.7/69.1-62.2/139.9         30.2/56.0-117.4/217.6         180.0/351.1-326.0/63				0/7	6/7	7/7	6/7	7/7	7/7				
(Bute obteo)       /       4.9-7.4       39.7-42.2       13.2-16.2       92.3-94.8       150.2-160.6         (Bute obteo)       IOQ       LOQ-7.7/14.6       LOQ-62.3/119.0       LOQ-17.6/39.6       LOQ-149.4/276.9       LOQ-237.0/450.1         0/3       1/3       1/3       1/3       1/3       1/3       1/3       1/3         Hen harrier       2       /       /       /       /       /       /         LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       1/1         Hen harrier       2       /       /       /       /       /       /       /         LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       LOQ       O/0         0/2       0/2       0/2       0/2       0/2       0/2       0/2       0/2         Eurasian       2       1.8-2.8       88.4-88.4       44.4-44.4       46.5-46.5       73.8-73.8       253.0-253.0         eagle-owl       (Bubo bubo)       4.7-7.3       167.6-167.6       84.7-84.7       104.5-104.5       136.8-136.8       493.6-493.6         LOQ-3.5/9.3       71.6/135.8-105.2/199.5       13.9/26.6-74.8/142.9       30.7		Common buzzard	з	/	26-39	20.8-22.1	59_72	498-511	6/7 79 1–84 3				
LOQ         LOQ-7.7/14.6         LOQ-62.3/119.0         LOQ-17.6/39.6         LOQ-149.4/276.9         LOQ-237.0/450.1           0/3         1/3         1/3         1/3         1/3         1/3         1/3         1/3           Hen harrier         2         /         /         /         /         /         1/1           (Circus cyaneus)         /         /         /         /         /         /         /           LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         1/1           Hen harrier         2         /         /         /         /         /         /         /         /           LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         O/0         O/0           LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         LOQ         O/2         0/2		(Buteo buteo)	5	1	4.9-7.4	39.7-42.2	13.2–16.2	92.3–94. 8	150.2–160.6				
Understand         U/3         1/3 <th <="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>LOQ</td><td>LOQ-7.7/14.6</td><td>LOQ-62.3/119.0</td><td>LOQ-17.6/39.6</td><td>LOQ-149.4/276.9</td><td>LOQ-237.0/450.1</td></th>	<td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>LOQ</td> <td>LOQ-7.7/14.6</td> <td>LOQ-62.3/119.0</td> <td>LOQ-17.6/39.6</td> <td>LOQ-149.4/276.9</td> <td>LOQ-237.0/450.1</td>				LOQ	LOQ-7.7/14.6	LOQ-62.3/119.0	LOQ-17.6/39.6	LOQ-149.4/276.9	LOQ-237.0/450.1			
Hen harrier (Circus cyaneus)       2       / <th <="" th="">       /       <th< td=""><td rowspan="6"></td><td></td><td></td><td>0/3</td><td>1/3</td><td>1/3</td><td>1/3</td><td>1/3</td><td>1/3 1/1</td></th<></th>	/ <th< td=""><td rowspan="6"></td><td></td><td></td><td>0/3</td><td>1/3</td><td>1/3</td><td>1/3</td><td>1/3</td><td>1/3 1/1</td></th<>				0/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	1/3 1/1			
(Circus cyaneus)       /	Hen harrier		2	/	/	/	/	/	/				
LOQ       L	(Circus cyaneus)			/	/	/	/	/	/				
Eurasian eagle-owl (Bubo bubo)         2         1.8–2.8         88.4–88.4         44.4–44.4         46.5–46.5         73.8–73.8         253.0–253.0           (Bubo bubo)         4.7–7.3         167.6–167.6         84.7–84.7         104.5–104.5         136.8–136.8         493.6–493.6           LOQ-3.5/9.3         71.6/135.8–105.2/199.5         13.9/26.6–74.8/142.9         30.7/69.1–62.2/139.9         30.2/56.0–117.4/217.6         180.0/351.1–326.0/63           1/2         2/2				0/2	0/2	0/2	0/2	0/2	0/2				
Eurasian 2 1.8–2.8 88.4–88.4 44.4–44.4 46.5–46.5 /3.8–/3.8 253.0–253.0 eagle-owl (Bubo bubo) 4.7–7.3 167.6–167.6 84.7–84.7 104.5–104.5 136.8–136.8 493.6–493.6 LOQ-3.5/9.3 71.6/135.8–105.2/199.5 13.9/26.6–74.8/142.9 30.7/69.1–62.2/139.9 30.2/56.0–117.4/217.6 180.0/351.1–326.0/63 1/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 Black kite 1 / / / / / / / 2/2 Black kite 1 / / / / / / / / / / / / (Milvus migrans) / / / / / / / / / / /	_ ·								0/0				
(Bubo bubo)       4.7-7.3       167.6-167.6       84.7-84.7       104.5-104.5       136.8-136.8       493.6-493.6         LOQ-3.5/9.3       71.6/135.8-105.2/199.5       13.9/26.6-74.8/142.9       30.7/69.1-62.2/139.9       30.2/56.0-117.4/217.6       180.0/351.1-326.0/62         1/2       2/2       2/2       2/2       2/2       2/2       2/2         Black kite       1       /       /       /       /       /       /         (Milvus migrans)       /       /       /       /       /       /       /       /         LOQ       LOQ       3.0/5.7       LOQ       LOQ       3.0/5.7       LOQ       3.0/5.7	Eurasian eagle-owl		2	1.8–2.8	88.4-88.4	44.4-44.4	46.5-46.5	73.8-73.8	253.0-253.0				
LOQ-3.5/9.3 71.6/135.8-105.2/199.5 13.9/26.6-74.8/142.9 30.7/69.1-62.2/139.9 30.2/56.0-117.4/217.6 180.0/351.1-326.0/6: 1/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 2/2 Black kite 1 / / / / / / / 2/2 Black kite 1 / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /		(Bubo bubo)		4.7–7.3	167.6–167.6	84.7-84.7	104.5-104.5	136.8–136.8	493.6-493.6				
Black kite         1         /         //         //         //         //         2/2           Black kite         1         /         /         ///         ///         ///         ///         ///         ///         ///         ///         ////         ////         ////         ////         ////         ////         ////         /////         ////         ////         /////         /////         /////         /////				LOQ-3.5/9.3 1/2	71.6/135.8-105.2/199.5	13.9/26.6-74.8/142.9	30.7/69.1-62.2/139.9	30.2/56.0-117.4/217.6	180.0/351.1-326.0/636.2				
Black kite         1         / <th <="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1/2</td><td>2/2</td><td>2/2</td><td>2/2</td><td>2/2</td><td>2/2</td></th>	<td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1/2</td> <td>2/2</td> <td>2/2</td> <td>2/2</td> <td>2/2</td> <td>2/2</td>				1/2	2/2	2/2	2/2	2/2	2/2			
LOQ LOQ 3.0/5.7 LOQ LOQ 3.0/5.7		Black kite	1	/	/	/	/	/	/				
		(minvus migruns)		LOQ	LOQ	3.0/5.7	LOQ	LOQ	3.0/5.7				
0/1 $0/1$ $1/1$ $0/1$ $0/1$ $1/1$				0/1	0/1	1/1	0/1	0/1	1/1				
O/I         O/I           Short-toed snake         1         /         44.0         /         /         /         /		Short-toed snake	1	/	44.0	/	/	/	0/1				
eagle		eagle		*		,	,		,				
(Circaetus / 83.4 / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /		(Circaetus		/	83.4 44.0/83.4	/	/	/	/				
0/1 $1/1$ $0/1$ $0/1$ $0/1$ $1/1$		Бишсиз)		0/1	1/1	0/1	0/1	0/1	1/1				
0/1		Europies holds	1	1	,	1	1	1	0/1				
Eurasian noody I // // // // // // // // // // // // /		Eurasian hobby (Falco subbuteo)	I	/	/	/	/	/	/ /				
LOQ LOQ LOQ LOQ LOQ LOQ		,		LÓQ	LÓQ	LÓQ	LÓQ	LÓQ	LÓQ				
0/1 0/1 0/1 0/1 0/1 0/1 0/1 0/1				0/1	0/1	0/1	0/1	0/1	0/1				

Abbreviations: chlorophacinone, CHLORO; bromadiolone, BROMA; brodifacoum, BFC; difenacoum, DFC; difethialone, DFT; limit of quantification, LOQ.



**Fig. 2.** Distribution (boxplot: minimum, first quartile, median, third quartile, and maximum) of detected quantities of each AR in birds; compounds not sharing common letters are different (*p* < 0.001).

bias and keeping only birds with "Unknown" cause of death (n = 13; Fisher's Exact test, OR = 0.527, p = 1).

Thirty-nine (39) of the 130 birds examined for the presence of haemorrhages died from trauma, and 35/39 displayed signs of haemorrhage (i.e., 89.7% of birds with trauma). AR exposure was detected in 15/35 birds, with 7 birds having summed SGARs concentrations  $\geq$ 100 ng/g ww. No relationship was apparent between AR exposure and presence of haemorrhage in birds that died from trauma (Fisher's Exact test, OR = 0.756, p = 1).

#### 3.5. Other contaminants

Lead concentration was determined in 64 liver samples representing 8 species. Evidence of elevated Pb exposure (>6 µg/g dw) was apparent in 11 individuals (17.2%) and levels exceeding the threshold of severe/ lethal poisoning (>30 µg/g dw) occurred in 4 individuals (6.3%). In the necropsy reports, lead intoxication was described as the suspected cause of death for these 4 individuals. Of the liver samples with elevated Pb exposure (>6 µg/g dw, n = 11/64), 9 (81.2%) were also positive for ARs. All ARs detected were SGARs, with summed concentrations ranging from 2.5 to 224 ng/g ww. Seven (7) individuals had multiple SGARs, and 3 of them displayed summed SGAR levels >100 ng/g. Pb intoxication was suspected in 3 of those birds with multiple SGAR exposure, and the 4 others died from electrocution (n = 3) or from trauma (n = 1).

Broad toxicological screening was performed on 126 birds, of which 18 exhibited positive results. For those birds, it was concluded that cause of death was consistent with pesticide or pharmaceutical intoxication (18/126, 14.3%). Carbofuran was detected in 13 samples (13/18, i.e., 72.2% of intoxicated birds – 10.3% of screened birds) and mevinphos in 4 samples (4/18, 22.2% of intoxicated birds – 3.2% of screened birds). One bird was positive for pentobarbital that had not been euthanised, potentially from consumption of tissue from euthanized livestock that had been mistakenly dropped off at a feeding station. Of these 18 positive samples, 12 had been analysed for AR residues and 9 (75.0%) of these were positive (SGARs present in 7, 58.3%). Summed SGAR concentrations ranged from 3.0 to 213.5 ng/g ww. Multiple SGARs were found in 5 samples.

#### 4. Discussion

#### 4.1. Causes of death of the study population

Scavengers, and especially Griffon vultures, were the most frequently represented samples. This is likely due to a sampling bias, as vultures are widely monitored in France, and Griffon vultures were the first to be reintroduced starting in the 1980s through several programs and National Action Plans (Ministère de l'environnement, de l'énergie et de la mer, 2017) resulting in a large population (n = 1544reproductive pairs in 2014, with census in the Pyrenees counting 1254 reproductive pairs in 2019). Another likely source of bias was apparent when comparing numbers of samples collected over the years (more samples from 2016 to 2019) as the LIFE GYPCONNECT program was most active doing carcass collection, necropsy and toxicological analyses during that period.

The principal causes of death reported for all birds were trauma (28.6% of all samples) and electrocution (20%). Trauma was often related to the collision of the bird with a wind turbine, vehicle or power line. Collision with wind turbines is a well-known threat to wild birds (Barrios and Rodríguez, 2004; Hunt et al., 2017), and was reported to account for up to 41% of casualties in areas directly surrounding wind farms. Collision with power lines results either in trauma or electrocution, and represents another major threat for wild birds (Barrientos et al., 2012; Jenkins et al., 2010).

#### 4.2. Characterizing exposure to ARs in wild birds

#### 4.2.1. Prevalence of AR exposure in raptors from France

All available liver samples collected from dead raptors were systematically analysed, without any prejudgment of potential AR exposure. This systematic monitoring may allow less bias in the estimation of the prevalence of AR exposure than incident-based surveillance that is



**Fig. 3.** A/ Summed SGAR concentrations per bird species (boxplot) and B/ summed SGAR concentration by foraging behaviour (boxplot); individual SGARs<LOQ were assigned a value of zero. Species or foraging behaviour groups not sharing a common lower case are different (*p* < 0.05). SGAR, second-generation anticoagulant rodenticide; LOQ, limit of quantification.

sometimes performed and certainly overestimates this prevalence (Millot et al., 2017; Murray, 2011, 2017, 2020; Sánchez-Barbudo et al., 2012). Yet, half of the samples (78/156) were positive for ARs. This is consistent with the mean exposure rate calculated in the review from López-Perea and Mateo (2018), who estimated a prevalence of ARs in raptors of 58% (López-Perea and Mateo, 2018). More recent data from the UK indicates a higher prevalence of 66.8% in common Kestrels (Roos et al., 2021). However, both those rates are based on results obtained from predatory birds. In our study, prevalence of AR exposure in predatory birds (82.5%) was higher than previously reported rates, but was calculated based on a small sample size (n = 40). Prevalence in scavenger birds (38.8% - n = 116)

was lower, but still quite substantial. To our knowledge, this is the first report of prevalence of AR exposure in scavenging birds calculated on a large sample size. Future work focusing on the prevalence of AR exposure in scavenging birds could add clarity this observation.

Detected ARs were mainly SGARs, which is consistent with their greater environmental persistence when compared to FGARs (Buckle et al., 1994; Giraudoux et al., 2006). Warfarin and flocoumafen were not detected in any of the samples, and they were not sold in France during the study period (https://simmbad.fr/public/servlet/accueilGrandPublic. html). While coumatetralyl is authorized for use in France, it was not detected.

M.-A. Moriceau, S. Lefebvre, I. Fourel et al.



**Fig. 4.** Detection frequency of each AR per time period; chlorophacinone detection frequency differed (p < 0.05) between 2008 and 2010 and 2014–2019 as indicated by different letters superscripts.

Levels of SGARS were mostly low, with only 13.5% of samples above the commonly used threshold of 100 ng/g ww. This suggests a relatively prevalent exposure of wild birds in the zone of the study (i.e. southeastern France), but mainly at low levels.

#### 4.2.2. Factors affecting AR exposure

4.2.2.1. Exposure of predatory vs scavenging birds: different pathways?. As expected, the proportion of AR-positive samples was greater in predators than scavengers. Predatory birds are likely to be directly exposed to ARs through consumption of intoxicated rodents, which may be weakened and motionless, lose their nocturnal disposition and positive thigmotactic behaviour, and are therefore easy prey (Cox and Smith, 1992; Frankova et al., 2017; Littin et al., 2000). Exposure of predatory birds could also occur through the consumption of AR-contaminated non-target mammals, reptiles, and birds (e.g., passerines, waterbirds) (Hindmarch and Elliott, 2018; Nakayama et al., 2019; Rattner et al., 2014). It should however be noted that one limit of this study was that the opportunistic nature of some predator species (e.g., Golden eagle is a facultative scavenger obtaining much of its diet through predation) was not taken into account, as well as some species-specific feeding habits (e.g., Short-toed snake eagle whose diet is mainly reptiles, not rodents).

Even if prevalence of AR exposure was lower in scavengers, some of them (10%) displayed high levels of summed SGARs. The AR exposure pathway for scavengers is not obvious. In the areas of carcass collection, reintroduced scavengers forage at feeding stations stocked with dead livestock by local farmers and with butchery remains (including bones for Bearded vultures) by field agents. While accidental primary AR exposure of domestic ruminants can occur (e.g., recently described poisoning event in ewes) (Moriceau et al., 2020) based on the sources of food and vigilance, substantial AR exposure at such supplemental feeding "vulture restaurants" seems unlikely. As vulture populations are growing in the area studied, feeding stations may not provide adequate food resources, resulting in some birds feeding on wild carrion. Presence of numerous illegal hunting "dumps" have been reported in the study area (Florence Buronfosse, National Centre for Veterinary Toxicological Information [CNITV], oral communication, 2021), and scavenging of the remains of large wild hunted mammals (e.g., boars) that may have consumed AR baits (Alabau et al., 2020) could be a source of exposure. This could especially be the case for Griffon vultures that are keen on viscera. Rodents might occasionally be part of the diet of Cinereous vultures (Xiao-Ti, 1991), and of young Bearded vultures, when food resources are scarce (Florence Buronfosse, National Centre for Veterinary Toxicological Information [CNITV], oral communication, 2021). Further investigation of feeding habits of vultures in the study area are needed to better understand AR exposure pathways.

4.2.2.2. Acute vs chronic multiple exposure. Less than 10% of positive samples displayed a concentration of an individual SGAR above the commonly used threshold of 100 ng/g ww, and none of the sampled birds presented evidence of AR toxicosis, suggesting that massive acute exposure was uncommon in raptors in our study (López-Perea and Mateo, 2018). The fact that high concentrations of a single ARs are rarely found could also suggest that much of the ingested AR is quickly eliminated, with only a small fraction persisting (Rached et al., 2020). This deserves further investigation through toxicokinetic studies.

In contrast, all birds with summed SGARs above 100 ng/g ww had multiple AR residues (i.e. up to 4 SGARs) and more than half of positive samples had residues of 2 or more ARs. This is consistent with other publications (Albert et al., 2010; Stone et al., 1999; Thomas et al., 2011), and suggests that chronic repeated exposure is a more prevalent pathway of exposure in wild birds, which can lead to sublethal adverse effects (Rattner and Harvey, 2021).

4.2.2.3. Other factors affecting AR exposure. Sex ratio of adult bird populations, including raptors, has received limited attention, but there is some evidence that in free-ranging populations males outnumber females (Donald, 2007). Notably, for the Andean condor (*Vulture* gryphus), an age-dependent skewed sex ratio favoring mature males has been described, with a proposed explanation that immature females forage in plains which might enhance exposure to human threats such as environmental contaminants (Lambertucci et al., 2012). However, in the present study, involving many different species of raptors, no such sex-based pattern of AR exposure was apparent, which is generally similar to observations in another AR exposure study (Murray, 2011).

While human population density, urbanization, density of livestock and acreage of crops have been observed to influence the magnitude

#### Table 3

Levels of ARs, haemorrhagic lesions and presence of blood clots in individuals suspected of AR toxicosis.

Bird	Species	Year	CHLORO	BROMA	BFC	DFC	DFT	$\sum$ SGARs	Macroscopic haemorrhagic lesions at necropsy	Blood clots in cardiac cavity
					(ng/g v	ww)				(Y/N/NA)
1	Red kite	2013	0	31.6	2.1	0	0	33.7	Subcutaneous hematoma of the thoracic area Serohaemorrhagic pericardial effusion	Υ
2	Red kite	2018	0	2.1	25.2	0	0	27.3	Haemorrhage of the right eye Slight bleeding of lung surface	Y
3	Red kite	2018	0	52.5	8	63.2	68.2	191.9	Hematoma of right pectoral muscle and neck Blood in abdominal cavity Lung haemorrhage Haemorrhage of digestive tract Several haematoma on the surface of the skull bone	Ν
4	Red kite	2019	0	4.4	86	0	5.8	96.2	Subcutaneous hematoma of the thoracic area Lung haemorrhage Haemorrhage of pericardium	Ν

Abbreviations: chlorophacinone, CHLORO; bromadiolone, BROMA; brodifacoum, BFC; difenacoum, DFC; difethialone, DFT; second-generation anticoagulant rodenticide, SGAR.



Fig. 5. Haemorrhagic lesions in bird n°3. A: Cervical haematoma, surrounding the trachea - B: Blood in coelomic cavity - C: Haemorrhage of digestive tract- D: Haematoma on the surface of the skull.

of SGAR exposure (Coeurdassier et al., 2019; López-Perea et al., 2019), no geographic trend for scavenging or predatory birds was apparent in the present study. This is likely a deficiency of recordkeeping for habitat type where carcasses were discovered (e.g., urban, suburban, agriculture, rural, natural area) could be addressed in this monitoring scheme, using available public data on land use.

#### 4.3. Effect of public policies on AR exposure

Following the restriction of chlorophacinone use as a PPP in agricultural settings at the end of 2010, the frequency of detection in liver of raptors decreased. However, this trend should be viewed with caution as it is based on few detections. Furthermore, chlorophacinone is seemingly less persistent than several SGARs in liver (Vandenbroucke et al., 2008) which may limit its probability of detection. Bromadiolone was the most frequently detected SGAR in this study, and it may partly be explained by the fact that between 2010 and 2020 it was the only AR authorized in France as a PPP. Continued monitoring of bromadiolone since its 2020 withdrawal as a PPP would reveal how frequency of detection and residue concentrations change over time in non-target raptors.

While from 2013, use of bait stations was made mandatory for ARs used as biocides (Berny et al., 2014; Nakagawa et al., 2015; Suárez and Cueto, 2018), the trend observed in the present study seemed to be an increase in the frequency of detection of SGARs (Fig. 2), with this being significant for brodifacoum. These findings suggest that further measures may need to be considered to mitigate the risk of exposure in non-target fauna to SGARs used as biocides. It also suggests that exposure of wild birds, especially considering that their use is currently banned in the EU (EU Pesticides database, https://ec.europa.eu/food/plants/pesticides/eu-pesticides-database\_en, access on 14 October 2021); use of AR biocides in urban areas and cattle farms could even be the principal exposure route for wildlife (López-Perea et al., 2019).

Such an increase in the use of SGARs might be related to the occurrence of resistance to ARs in rodents pest species (Blažić et al., 2018; Boitet et al., 2018; Buckle et al., 1994; Lefebvre et al., 2016; Marquez et al., 2019; McGee et al., 2020), and to the absence of efficient alternatives for pest control. Differences in potency and toxicity between stereoisomers of SGARs could be a promising direction for investigation to develop effective and more "eco-friendly" rodenticides (Damin-Pernik et al., 2016; Fourel et al., 2017b, 2021; Lefebvre et al., 2020).

#### 4.4. Diagnosis of AR toxicosis

While many birds were exposed to ARs, toxicosis was suspected in only 2 of 156 individuals evaluated for rodenticide residues (i.e., 1.3% of sampled birds, 2.6% of birds with detectable AR residues). Suspicion of AR toxicosis in those 2 birds was established as they displayed macroscopic haemorrhage and clearly elevated AR residues (i.e., 96.2 and 191.9 ng summed SGARs/g ww) (Murray, 2018), and no other obvious cause of death was described in necropsy records. Using these criteria, 2 other birds might be suspected of succumbing from AR toxicosis (Table 3), yet residue concentrations were low and signs of haemorrhage were less apparent, and clotted blood was observed in the cardiac cavities of both individuals. This rate of toxicosis is consistent with prevalence reported in a recent study in Bald and Golden eagles (4% of eagles tested actually dying from AR toxicosis, Niedringhaus et al., 2021), suggesting that mortality directly related to AR consumption is rather low in non-target birds of prey. However, other studies in the northeastern United States involving several species of raptors indicate a greater frequency of AR toxicosis, with incidence of exposure increasing in recent years (Murray, 2011, 2017, 2020).

In contrast to these few suspected cases of AR toxicosis, the presence of haemorrhage was observed in a high proportion of birds (88/130, 67.7%), but most (71/88) were diagnosed with causes of death that result in haemorrhage (e.g., trauma, electrocution, infectious processes). No excessive bleeding from minor wounds was documented in any of

the cases, that might be suggestive of impaired coagulation (Murray, 2018). While some publications may suggest increased susceptibility to trauma in AR-intoxicated animals (Elmeros et al., 2011; Fournier-Chambrillon et al., 2004) no relationship was apparent between levels of AR exposure and presence of haemorrhage in birds that were classified as dying from trauma.

Our observations illustrate the difficulty of diagnosing AR toxicosis during post-mortem examination, especially for heterogeneous samples of wildlife with a high prevalence of other causes of death involving haemorrhage. No histopathological examination was performed on the samples to detect microscopic evidence of haemorrhage or hypoxic damage to tissues, as suggested by several previous studies (Murray, 2011, 2018; Niedringhaus et al., 2021; Rattner et al., 2011). However, this type of examination is not appropriate if carcasses are not fresh. Moreover, the codification of the presence/absence of haemorrhage was based on the personal interpretation of the senior author's review of descriptive data in each necropsy report based on keywords (i.e., "haemorrhage", "bleeding", "anaemia","bruising", "haematoma","blood"). Efforts are underway to improve the coding of necropsy observations in our internal wildlife mortality database.

To assist with diagnosis of AR toxicosis, many diagnosticians were led to the implementation of a toxicity threshold for summed SGARs, with a commonly reported threshold of 100 ng/g ww (Newton et al., 1990). However, in the present dataset this threshold concentration did not seem to reveal many individuals that died from AR toxicosis. In addition, no significant difference could be found when excluding potentially confounding factors (e.g., trauma and electrocution as cause of death) or by the grouping of samples by species to account for potential species-specific differences in AR sensitivity that limit the utility of this threshold (Rattner and Harvey, 2021). Drawbacks of the present study and dataset that limit our availability to examine the AR toxicity threshold for wild birds include small sample size for many of the species, and unlike other studies (e.g., Thomas et al., 2011; Murray, 2020), few individuals which seemingly died from AR toxicosis sequelae including coagulopathy. Moreover, carcasses could be more or less decomposed, possibly affecting AR concentration estimates in sampled livers (Valverde et al., 2020). It is noteworthy that some have suggested that such a residue threshold may not be a relevant diagnostic tool for AR toxicosis, as it does not address sublethal effects and the potential consequences of bioaccumulation from repeated exposures (Erickson and Urban, 2004; Rattner and Harvey, 2021). Development of additional biomarkers for AR effects could be useful in monitoring the effect of rodenticides on non-target fauna (Rached et al., 2020).

#### 4.5. Concomitant exposure to other contaminants

In our study, most of the samples displaying elevated Pb exposure (>6  $\mu$ g/g dw) were also positive for SGARs. The majority of those birds with exposure to both AR and Pb died from either trauma or electrocution. Combined sequential exposure to both lead and AR could have increased the risk of mortality in those birds, as these contaminants may impair flight coordination and/or spatial recognition (Herring and Eagles-Smith, 2017; Murray, 2011; Rattner et al., 2011). Furthermore, through different mechanisms of action, both lead and ARs can cause anaemia (Rattner and Mastrota, 2018). Further investigations are needed to characterise such potential "cocktail effects" of environmental contaminants commonly encountered by wild birds.

#### 5. Conclusion

This study aimed at characterizing exposure to ARs in a large yet heterogeneous sample of birds of prey from southeastern France collected over a 12 year period. Results were generally consistent with other reports, documenting a rather high prevalence of AR exposure (mainly SGARs), usually low levels of individual ARs and summed of SGARs, and occasionally with a few birds seemingly succumbing to AR toxicosis. Multiple exposure was quite frequent, raising the issue of sub-lethal chronic effects related to repeated exposure. As expected, levels of ARs were higher in predators, but some scavengers also displayed high levels for which a pathway of exposure could not be fully elucidated. It was also noted that current public policies had a limited effect on mitigating AR exposure; the development of more eco-friendly ARs could be an approach to limit AR contamination of non-target fauna. The study also confirmed that diagnosis of AR toxicosis is a complex issue, and establishing a threshold like the widely used value of 100 ng/g ww may not be ideal. Future research exploring biomarkers of effect rather than just exposure, could permit discrimination of AR exposure and toxicosis. The presence of both ARs and Pb in some samples demonstrates multiple contaminant exposures that could have the potential to result in additive or synergistic effects.

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi. org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.151291.

#### **CRediT authorship contribution statement**

Conceptualization: SL, IF, EB, FB, BAR, VL Formal analysis: MAM, IF, SL, VL Funding acquisition: FB, PO, EB, VL Investigation: MAM, IF, FB, PO, VL Methodology: MAM, SL, IF, FB, BAR, VL Project administration: PO, FB, VL Resources: PO, FB, VL Supervision and Validation: VL BAR; Writing original draft: MAM, BAR, VL Review&Editing: MAM, SL, IF, EB, FB, PO, BAR, VL

#### **Declaration of competing interest**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

#### Acknowledgments

This work was partially funded by a European LIFE funding programme (LIFE GYPCONNECT LIFE14 NAT/FR/000050 - Restoration of connections between the Alpine and Pyrenean populations of bearded vulture (*Gypaetus barbatus*). We would like to thank all the field agents who took part to the carcass collection for this study, especially the agents from the LIFE GYPCONNECT. We thank Jhon López-Perea for reviewing a draft of this manuscript. Any use of trade, firm or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. The contribution of Barnett Rattner to this study was supported by the Contaminant Biology Program of the U.S. Geological Survey.

#### References

- Alabau, E., Mentaberre, G., Camarero, P.R., Castillo-Contreras, R., Sánchez-Barbudo, I.S., Conejero, C., Fernández-Bocharán, M.S., López-Olvera, J.R., Mateo, R., 2020. Accumulation of diastereomers of anticoagulant rodenticides in wild boar from suburban areas: implications for human consumers. Sci. Total Environ. 738, 139828. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139828.
- Albert, C.A., Wilson, L.K., Mineau, P., Trudeau, S., Elliott, J.E., 2010. Anticoagulant rodenticides in three owl species from Western Canada, 1988–2003. Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol. 58, 451–459. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-009-9402-z.
- Allen, G.T., Veatch, J.K., Stroud, R.K., Vendel, C.G., Poppenga, R.H., Thompson, L., Shafer, J.A., Braselton, W.E., 1996. Winter poisoning of coyotes and raptors with furadan-laced carcass baits. J. Wildl. Dis. 32, 385–389. https://doi.org/10.7589/0090-3558-32.2.385.
- Badry, A., Krone, O., Jaspers, V.L.B., Mateo, R., García-Fernández, A., Leivits, M., Shore, R.F., 2020. Towards harmonisation of chemical monitoring using avian apex predators: identification of key species for pan-european biomonitoring. Sci. Total Environ. 731, 139198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139198.
- Barrientos, R., Ponce, C., Palacín, C., Martín, C.A., Martín, B., Alonso, J.C., 2012. Wire marking results in a small but significant reduction in avian mortality at power lines: a

BACI designed study. PLoS ONE 7, e32569. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone. 0032569.

- Barrios, L., Rodríguez, A., 2004. Behavioural and environmental correlates of soaring-bird mortality at on-shore wind turbines: bird mortality at wind power plants. J. Appl. Ecol. 41, 72–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2004.00876.x.
- Bean, T.G., Rattner, B.A., 2018. Environmental contaminants of healthcare origin: exposure and potential effects in wildlife. Health Care and Environmental Contaminants. Elsevier, pp. 87–122.
- Berny, P., Esther, A., Jacob, J., Prescott, C., European Commission, Directorate-General for the Environment, 2014. Publications Office, Luxembourg.
- Blažić, T., Jokić, G., Götz, M., Esther, A., Vukša, M., Đedović, S., 2018. Brodifacoum as a first choice rodenticide for controlling bromadiolone-resistant mus musculus. J. Stored Prod. Res. 79, 29–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jspr.2018.08.006.
- Boitet, M., Hammed, A., Chatron, N., Debaux, J.V., Benoit, E., Lattard, V., 2018. Elevated difenacoum metabolism is involved in the difenacoum-resistant phenotype observed in Berkshire rats homozygous for the L120Q mutation in the vitamin K epoxide reductase complex subunit 1 (Vkorc1) gene: resistance to difenacoum of Berkshire rats. Pest Manag. Sci. 74, 1328–1334. https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.4797.
- Botha, C.J., Coetser, H., Labuschagne, L., Basson, A., 2015. Confirmed organophosphorus and carbamate pesticide poisonings in South African wildlife (2009–2014). J. S. Afr. Vet. Assoc. 86, 1329. https://doi.org/10.4102/jsava.v86i1.1329.
- Buckle, A.P., Prescott, C.V., Ward, K.J., 1994. Resistance to the first and second generation anticoagulant rodenticides-a new perspective. Vertebr. Pest Conf. 16, 138–144.
- Coeurdassier, M., Villers, A., Augiron, S., Sage, M., Couzi, F.-X., Lattard, V., Fourel, I., 2019. Pesticides threaten an endemic raptor in an overseas French territory. Biol. Conserv. 234, 37–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.03.022.
- Cox, P., Smith, R.H., 1992. Rodenticide ecotoxicology: pre-lethal effects of anticoagulants on rat behaviour. Vertebr. Pest Conf. 15, 165–170.
- Cuthbert, R., Taggart, M.A., Prakash, V., Saini, M., Swarup, D., Upreti, S., Mateo, R., Chakraborty, S.S., Deori, P., Green, R.E., 2011. Effectiveness of action in India to reduce exposure of gyps vultures to the toxic veterinary drug diclofenac. PLoS ONE 6. https:// doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0019069.
- Cuthbert, R.J., Taggart, M.A., Prakash, V., Chakraborty, S.S., Deori, P., Galligan, T., Kulkarni, M., Ranade, S., Saini, M., Sharma, A.K., Shringarpure, R., Green, R.E., 2014. Avian scavengers and the threat from veterinary pharmaceuticals. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 369. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0574.
- Damin-Pernik, M., Espana, B., Besse, S., Fourel, I., Caruel, H., Popowycz, F., Benoit, E., Lattard, V., 2016. Development of an ecofriendly anticoagulant rodenticide based on the stereochemistry of difenacoum. Drug Metab. Dispos. 44, 1872–1880. https:// doi.org/10.1124/dmd.116.071688.
- Descalzo, E., Camarero, P.R., Sánchez-Barbudo, I.S., Martinez-Haro, M., Ortiz-Santaliestra, M.E., Moreno-Opo, R., Mateo, R., 2021. Integrating active and passive monitoring to assess sublethal effects and mortality from lead poisoning in birds of prey. Sci. Total Environ. 750, 142260. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142260.
- Donald, P.F., 2007. Adult sex ratios in wild bird populations: adult sex ratios in birds. Ibis 149, 671–692. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2007.00724.x.
- Elmeros, M., Christensen, T.K., Lassen, P., 2011. Concentrations of anticoagulant rodenticides in stoats Mustela erminea and weasels Mustela nivalis from Denmark. Sci. Total Environ. 409, 2373–2378. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.03.006.
- Erickson, W., Urban, D., 2004. Potential risks of nine rodenticides to birds and nontarget mammals: A comparative approach. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Pesticides Programs Environmental Fate and Effects Division.
- Espín, S., García-Fernández, A.J., Herzke, D., Shore, R.F., van Hattum, B., Martínez-López, E., Coeurdassier, M., Eulaers, I., Fritsch, C., Gómez-Ramírez, P., Jaspers, V.L.B., Krone, O., Duke, G., Helander, B., Mateo, R., Movalli, P., Sonne, C., van den Brink, N.W., 2016. Tracking pan-continental trends in environmental contamination using sentinel raptors—what types of samples should we use? Ecotoxicology 25, 777–801. https://doi. org/10.1007/s10646-016-1636-8.
- European Regulation No 528/2012, 2012. European Regulation No 528/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May. ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2012/528/oj.
- Finkelstein, M.E., Doak, D.F., George, D., Burnett, J., Brandt, J., Church, M., Grantham, J., Smith, D.R., 2012. Lead poisoning and the deceptive recovery of the critically endangered California condor. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 109, 11449–11454. https://doi. org/10.1073/pnas.1203141109.
- Fourel, I., Damin-Pernik, M., Benoit, E., Lattard, V., 2017a. Core-shell LC–MS/MS method for quantification of second generation anticoagulant rodenticides diastereoisomers in rat liver in relationship with exposure of wild rats. J. Chromatogr. B 1041–1042, 120–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchromb.2016.12.028.
- Fourel, I., Damin-Pernik, M., Benoit, E., Lattard, V., 2017b. Cis-bromadiolone diastereoisomer is not involved in bromadiolone red kite (Milvus milvus) poisoning. Sci. Total Environ. 601–602, 1412–1417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.06.011.
- Fourel, I., Couzi, F.-X., Lattard, V., 2021. Monitoring the hepatic residues of cis- and transdiastereoisomers of second generation anticoagulant rodenticides reveals a different bioaccumulation of diastereoisomers in the food chain of the Réunion harrier (Circus maillardi). Sci. Total Environ. 146287. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021. 146287.
- Fournier-Chambrillon, C., Berny, P.J., Coiffier, O., Barbedienne, P., Dassé, B., Delas, G., Galineau, H., Mazet, A., Pouzenc, P., Rosoux, R., Fournier, P., 2004. Evidence of secondary poisoning of free-ranging riparian mustelids by anticoagulant rodenticides in France: implications for conservation of European mink (Mustela lutreola). J. Wildl. Dis. 40, 688–695. https://doi.org/10.7589/0090-3558-40.4.688.
- Frankova, M., Stejskal, V., Aulicky, R., 2017. Suppression of food intake by house mouse (Mus musculus) following ingestion of brodifacoum-based rodenticide bait. Crop Prot. 100, 134–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2017.06.017.

- Giraudoux, P., Tremollières, C., Barbier, B., Defaut, R., Rieffel, D., Bernard, N., Lucot, É., Berny, P., 2006. Persistence of bromadiolone anticoagulant rodenticide in Arvicola terrestris populations after field control. Environ. Res. 102, 291–298. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.envres.2006.02.008.
- Giraudoux, P., Coeurdassier, M., Couval, G., Jacquot, M., Renaude, R., Truchetet, D., Raoul, F., 2012. Sustainable control of grassland small mammals. Presented at the 6th SETAC World Congress and 22nd Europe annual meeting, Berlin.
- Gómez-Ramírez, P., Shore, R.F., van den Brink, N.W., van Hattum, B., Bustnes, J.O., Duke, G., Fritsch, C., García-Fernández, A.J., Helander, B.O., Jaspers, V., Krone, O., Martínez-López, E., Mateo, R., Movalli, P., Sonne, C., 2014. An overview of existing raptor contaminant monitoring activities in Europe. Environ. Int. 67, 12–21. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.envint.2014.02.004.
- Gómez-Ramírez, P., Blanco, G., García-Fernández, A.J., 2020. Validation of multi-residue method for quantification of antibiotics and NSAIDs in avian scavengers by using small amounts of plasma in HPLC-MS-TOF. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 17, 4058. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17114058.
- Goulois, J., Lambert, V., Legros, L., Benoit, E., Lattard, V., 2017. Adaptative evolution of the Vkorc1 gene in mus musculus domesticus is influenced by the selective pressure of anticoagulant rodenticides. Ecol. Evol. 7, 2767–2776. https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3. 2829.
- Helsel, D.R., 2005. Nondetects and data analysis statistics for censored environmental data. John Wiley & Sons Inc, Hoboken. NJ, USA.
- Herring, G., Eagles-Smith, C.A., 2017. Characterizing golden eagle risk to lead and anticoagulant rodenticide exposure: a review. J. Raptor Res. 51, 273–292. https://doi.org/10. 3356/JRR-16-19.1.
- Hindmarch, S., Elliott, J.E., 2018. Ecological factors driving uptake of anticoagulant rodenticides in predators. In: van den Brink, N.W., Elliott, J.E., Shore, R.F., Rattner, B.A. (Eds.), Anticoagulant Rodenticides and Wildlife, Emerging Topics in Ecotoxicology. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 229–258 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64377-9\_9.
- Hunt, W.G., Wiens, J.D., Law, P.R., Fuller, M.R., Hunt, T.L., Driscoll, D.E., Jackman, R.E., 2017. Quantifying the demographic cost of human-related mortality to a raptor population. PLoS ONE 12, e0172232. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0172232.
- Jenkins, A.R., Smallie, J.J., Diamond, M., 2010. Avian collisions with power lines: a global review of causes and mitigation with a South African perspective. Bird Conserv. Int. 20, 263–278. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959270910000122.
- Krone, O., 2018. Lead poisoning in birds of prey. In: Sarasola, J.H., Grande, J.M., Negro, J.J. (Eds.), Birds of Prey: Biology and Conservation in the XXI Century. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 251–272 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-73745-4\_ 11.
- Lambertucci, S.A., Carrete, M., Donázar, J.A., Hiraldo, F., 2012. Large-scale age-dependent skewed sex ratio in a sexually dimorphic avian scavenger. PLoS ONE 7, e46347. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0046347.
- Lefebvre, S., Benoit, E., Lattard, V., 2016. Comparative biology of the resistance to vitamin k antagonists: an overview of the resistance mechanisms. In: Basaran, O., Biteker, M. (Eds.), Anticoagulation Therapy https://doi.org/10.5772/64204.
- Lefebvre, S., Fourel, I., Chatron, N., Caruel, H., Benoit, E., Lattard, V., 2020. Comparative biological properties of the four stereoisomers of difethialone, a second-generation anticoagulant rodenticide, in rats: development of a model allowing to choose the appropriate stereoisomeric ratio. Arch. Toxicol. 94, 795–801. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00204-020-02662-0.
- Littin, K.E., O'Connor, C.E., Eason, C.T., 2000. Comparative effects of brodifacoum on rats and possums. N. Z. Plant Prot. 53, 310–315. https://doi.org/10.30843/nzpp.2000.53. 3701.
- López-Perea, J.J., Mateo, R., 2018. Secondary exposure to anticoagulant rodenticides and effects on predators. In: van den Brink, N.W., Elliott, J.E., Shore, R.F., Rattner, B.A. (Eds.), Anticoagulant Rodenticides and Wildlife, Emerging Topics in Ecotoxicology. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 159–193 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64377-9\_7.
- López-Perea, J.J., Camarero, P.R., Sánchez-Barbudo, I.S., Mateo, R., 2019. Urbanization and cattle density are determinants in the exposure to anticoagulant rodenticides of nontarget wildlife. Environ. Pollut. 244, 801–808. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018. 10.101.
- Marquez, A., Khalil, R.A., Fourel, I., Ovarbury, T., Pinot, A., Rosine, A., Thalmensi, G., Jaffory, G., Kodjo, A., Benoit, E., Lattard, V., 2019. Resistance to anticoagulant rodenticides in Martinique could lead to inefficient rodent control in a context of endemic leptospirosis. Sci. Rep. 9, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-49661-5.
- Mateo, R., 2009. Lead poisoning in wild birds in Europe and the regulations adopted by different countries. Ingestion of Lead from Spent Ammunition: Implications for Wildlife and Humans. Presented at the Ingestion of Spent Lead Ammunition: Implications for Wildlife and Humans. The Peregrine Fund https://doi.org/10.4080/ilsa.2009.0107.
- McGee, C.F., McGilloway, D.A., Buckle, A.P., 2020. Anticoagulant rodenticides and resistance development in rodent pest species – a comprehensive review. J. Stored Prod. Res. 88, 101688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jspr.2020.101688.
- Millot, F., Decors, A., Mastain, O., Quintaine, T., Berny, P., Vey, D., Lasseur, R., Bro, E., 2017. Field evidence of bird poisonings by imidacloprid-treated seeds: a review of incidents reported by the french SAGIR network from 1995 to 2014. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 24, 5469–5485. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-016-8272-y.
- Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche, 2007. Avis aux fabricants, distributeurs et utilisateurs de produits phytopharmaceutiques concernant la non-inscription de certaines substances actives à l'annexe I de la directive 91/414/CEE du Conseil et le retrait des autorisations de produits phytopharmaceutiques contenant ces substances. J. Off. de la Repub. Franç. n°253 du 31 octobre 2007, Texte n°170.
- Ministère de l'environnement, de l.énergie et de la mercollab, 2017. Plan National d'Action Vautour fauve 2017-2026.

- Monclús, L., Shore, R.F., Krone, O., 2020. Lead contamination in raptors in Europe: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Sci. Total Environ. 748, 141437. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.141437.
- Moriceau, M.-A., Lefebvre, S., Fourel, I., Benoit, E., Rattner, B.A., Lattard, V., 2020. Accidental chlorophacinone exposure of lactating ewes: clinical follow-up and human health dietary implications. Food Chem. Toxicol. 143, 111518. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct. 2020.111518.
- Murray, M., 2011. Anticoagulant rodenticide exposure and toxicosis in four species of birds of prey presented to a wildlife clinic in Massachusetts, 2006–2010. J. Zoo Wildl. Med. 42, 88–97. https://doi.org/10.1638/2010-0188.1.
- Murray, M., 2017. Anticoagulant rodenticide exposure and toxicosis in four species of birds of prey in Massachusetts, USA, 2012–2016, in relation to use of rodenticides by pest management professionals. Ecotoxicology 26, 1041–1050. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s10646-017-1832-1.
- Murray, M., 2018. Ante-mortem and post-mortem signs of anticoagulant rodenticide toxicosis in birds of prey. In: van den Brink, N.W., Elliott, J.E., Shore, R.F., Rattner, B.A. (Eds.), Anticoagulant Rodenticides and Wildlife. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 109–134 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64377-9\_5.
- Murray, M., 2020. Continued anticoagulant rodenticide exposure of red-tailed hawks (Buteo jamaicensis) in the northeastern United States with an evaluation of serum for biomonitoring. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 39, 2325–2335. https://doi.org/10.1002/ etc.4853.
- Nakagawa, L., de Masi, E., Narciso, E., Neto, H.M., Papini, S., 2015. Palatability and efficacy of bromadiolone rodenticide block bait previously exposed to environmental conditions. Pest Manag. Sci. 71, 1414–1418. https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.3944.
- Nakayama, S.M.M., Morita, A., Ikenaka, Y., Mizukawa, H., Ishizuka, M., 2019. A review: poisoning by anticoagulant rodenticides in non-target animals globally. J. Vet. Med. Sci. 81, 298–313. https://doi.org/10.1292/jvms.17-0717.
- Newton, I., Wyllie, I., Freestone, P., 1990. Rodenticides in British barn owls. Environ. Pollut. 68, 101–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/0269-7491(90)90015-5.
- Newton, I., Shore, R.F., Wyllie, I., Birks, J.D.S., Dale, L., 1999. Empirical evidence of sideeffects of rodenticides on some predatory birds and mammals. In: Cowan, D.P., Feare, C.J. (Eds.), Advances in Vertebrate Pest Management. Filander Verlag, Furth, Germany, pp. 347–367.
- Niedringhaus, K.D., Nemeth, N.M., Gibbs, S., Zimmerman, J., Shender, L., Slankard, K., Fenton, H., Charlie, B., Dalton, M.F., Elsmo, E.J., Poppenga, R., Millsap, B., Ruder, M.G., 2021. Anticoagulant rodenticide exposure and toxicosis in bald eagles (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) and golden eagles (Aquila chrysaetos) in the United States. PLoS ONE 16, e0246134. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0246134.
- Pain, D.J., Mateo, R., Green, R.E., 2019. Effects of lead from ammunition on birds and other wildlife: a review and update. Ambio 48, 935–953. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-019-01159-0.
- Rached, A., Moriceau, M.-A., Serfaty, X., Lefebvre, S., Lattard, V., 2020. Biomarkers potency to monitor non-target fauna poisoning by anticoagulant rodenticides. Front. Vet. Sci. 7. https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2020.616276.
- Rattner, B.A., Harvey, J.J., 2021. Challenges in the interpretation of anticoagulant rodenticide residues and toxicity in predatory and scavenging birds. Pest Manag. Sci. 77, 604–610. https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.6137.
- Rattner, B.A., Mastrota, F.N., 2018. Anticoagulant rodenticide toxicity to non-target wildlife under controlled exposure conditions. In: van den Brink, N.W., Elliott, J.E., Shore, R.F., Rattner, B.A. (Eds.), Anticoagulant Rodenticides and Wildlife, Emerging

Topics in Ecotoxicology. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 45–86 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64377-9\_3.

- Rattner, B.A., Horak, K.E., Warner, S.E., Day, D.D., Meteyer, C.U., Volker, S.F., Eisemann, J.D., Johnston, J.J., 2011. Acute toxicity, histopathology, and coagulopathy in American kestrels (Falco sparverius) following administration of the rodenticide diphacinone. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 30, 1213–1222. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.490.
- Rattner, B.A., Lazarus, R.S., Elliott, J.E., Shore, R.F., van den Brink, N., 2014. Adverse outcome pathway and risks of anticoagulant rodenticides to predatory wildlife. Environ. Sci. Technol. 48, 8433–8445. https://doi.org/10.1021/es501740n.
- Rattner, B.A., Volker, S.F., Lankton, J.S., Bean, T.G., Lazarus, R.S., Horak, K.E., 2020. Brodifacoum toxicity in American kestrels (Falco sparverius) with evidence of increased hazard on subsequent anticoagulant rodenticide exposure. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 39, 468–481. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.4629.
- Roos, S., Campbell, S.T., Hartley, G., Shore, R.F., Walker, L.A., Wilson, J.D., 2021. Annual abundance of common kestrels (Falco tinnunculus) is negatively associated with second generation anticoagulant rodenticides. Ecotoxicology https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10646-021-02374-w.
- Sánchez-Barbudo, I.S., Camarero, P.R., Mateo, R., 2012. Primary and secondary poisoning by anticoagulant rodenticides of non-target animals in Spain. Sci. Total Environ. 420, 280–288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2012.01.028.
- Stone, W.B., Okoniewski, J.C., Stedelin, J.R., 1999. Poisoning of wildlife with anticoagulant rodenticides in New York. J. Wildl. Dis. 35, 187–193. https://doi.org/10.7589/0090-3558-35.2.187.
- Suárez, O.V., Cueto, G.R., 2018. Comparison of efficacy of second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides: effect of active ingredients, type of formulation and commercial suppliers. Cogent Food Agric. 4, 1525147. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311932.2018. 1525147.
- Swan, G.E., Cuthbert, R., Quevedo, M., Green, R.E., Pain, D.J., Bartels, P., Cunningham, A.A., Duncan, N., Meharg, A.A., Lindsay Oaks, J., Parry-Jones, J., Shultz, S., Taggart, M.A., Verdoorn, G., Wolter, K., 2006. Toxicity of diclofenac to gyps vultures. Biol. Lett. 2, 279–282. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2005.0425.
- Thomas, P.J., Mineau, P., Shore, R.F., Champoux, L., Martin, P.A., Wilson, L.K., Fitzgerald, G., Elliott, J.E., 2011. Second generation anticoagulant rodenticides in predatory birds: probabilistic characterisation of toxic liver concentrations and implications for predatory bird populations in Canada. Environ. Int. 37, 914–920. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. envint.2011.03.010.
- Valverde, I., Espín, S., Gómez-Ramírez, P., Navas, I., Sánchez-Virosta, P., Torres-Chaparro, M.Y., Jiménez, P., María-Mojica, P., García-Fernández, A.J., 2020. Temporal persistence of bromadiolone in decomposing bodies of common kestrel (Falco tinnunculus). Toxics 8, 98. https://doi.org/10.3390/toxics8040098.
- Van den Brink, N.W., Elliott, J.E., Shore, R.F., Rattner, B.A. (Eds.), 2018. Anticoagulant Rodenticides and Wildlife, Emerging Topics in Ecotoxicology. Springer International Publishing, Cham https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64377-9.
- Vandenbroucke, V., Bousquet-Melou, A., De Backer, P., Croubels, S., 2008. Pharmacokinetics of eight anticoagulant rodenticides in mice after single oral administration. J. Vet. Pharmacol. Ther. 31, 437–445. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365- 2885.2008.00979.x.
- Wardrop, D., Keeling, D., 2008. The story of the discovery of heparin and warfarin. Br. J. Haematol. 141, 757–763. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2141.2008.07119.x.
- Xiao-Ti, Y., 1991. Distribution and status of the cinereous vulture Aegypius monachus in China. Birds Prey 4, 51–56.