



ENVIRONMENTAL
HEALTH
PERSPECTIVES

ehponline.org

Road Proximity Increases Risk of Skeletal
Abnormalities in Wood Frogs from National
Wildlife Refuges in Alaska

Mari K. Reeves, Christine L. Dolph, Heidi Zimmer,
Ronald S. Tjeerdema, and Kimberly A. Trust

doi:10.1289/ehp.10963 (available at <http://dx.doi.org/>)
Online 21 April 2008



NIEHS
National Institute of
Environmental Health Sciences

National Institutes of Health
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Road Proximity Increases Risk of Skeletal Abnormalities in Wood

Frogs from National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska

**Mari K. Reeves^{1,2}, Christine L. Dolph³, Heidi Zimmer⁴, Ronald S. Tjeerdema², and
Kimberly A. Trust¹**

¹U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage Fisheries and Ecological Services Office, 605 W. 4th Avenue, Room G-61, Anchorage, AK 99501; ² Ecology Graduate Group and Department of Environmental Toxicology, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, University of California, Davis, CA 95616; ³ Water Resources Science Program, University of Minnesota, Saint Paul, MN 55108; ⁴ Western Washington University, Huxley College of the Environment, Bellingham, WA 98225.

Address Correspondence to:

Mari K. Reeves
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Anchorage Fisheries and Ecological Services Office
605 W. 4th Avenue, Room G-61
Anchorage, AK 99501 USA

Phone: 907-271-2785
Fax: 907-271-2786
E-mail: mari_reeves@fws.gov

Acknowledgements: For assistance in the field, we thank C. Berg, F. Broerman, C. Caldes, J. Connor, P. Cotter, V. Davis, M. DeZeeuw, M. Fan, J. Hall, P. Jensen, S. Jensen, B. Johnson, S. Keys, S. Kovach, N. Maxon, B. McCaffrey, E. Moreno, J. Morton, M. Nemeth, D. Payer, M. Perdue, J. Ramos, A. Rappoport, J. Stout, H. Tangermann, and C. Wall. For parasitology, we thank D. Larson and D. Sutherland with the University of Wisconsin, La Crosse. For radiography, we thank D. Green with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), L. Guderyahn with Ball State University, and M. Lannoo with Indiana University. For statistical consulting, we thank J. Bromaghin with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and N. Willits with the University of California at Davis. For review of the manuscript, we thank the editor and three anonymous reviewers, L. Ball with USGS, R. Hinzman with USFWS, and M. Nemeth with LGL Alaska Research. The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Grant Sponsor: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Environmental Quality

Running Title: Frog Abnormalities and Road Proximity

Keywords: Abnormality, Alaska, Amphibian, Malformation, *Rana sylvatica*, *Lithobates sylvaticus*, Wood Frog, National Wildlife Refuge

Abbreviations:

metamorph frog between Gosner stage 42 and 46

OR odds ratio

Refuge National Wildlife Refuge

SVL snout to vent length

UVB ultraviolet-B radiation

Outline:

Abstract

Introduction

Materials and Methods

 Species, Refuge, and Site Selection

 Animal Collection

 Abnormality Classification

 Statistical Analysis

Results

Discussion

Conclusions

References

Tables 1-2

Figure Legends 1-5

Figures 1-5

Abstract

BACKGROUND: Skeletal and eye abnormalities in amphibians are not well understood, and appear to be increasing while global populations decline. Here, we present the first study of amphibian abnormalities in Alaska. OBJECTIVE: To investigate the relationship between anthropogenic influences and the probability of skeletal and eye abnormalities in Alaskan wood frogs (*Rana sylvatica*). METHODS: From 2000 to 2006, we examined 9,269 metamorphic wood frogs from 86 breeding sites on 5 National Wildlife Refuges: Arctic, Innoko, Kenai, Tetlin, and Yukon Delta. Using road proximity as a proxy for human development, we tested relationships between skeletal and eye abnormalities and anthropogenic effects. We also examined a subsample of 458 frogs for the trematode parasite, *Ribeiroia ondatrae*, a known cause of amphibian limb abnormalities. RESULTS: Prevalence of skeletal and eye abnormalities at Alaskan refuges ranged from 1.5% to 7.9%, and were as high as 20% at individual breeding sites. Proximity to roads increased the risk of skeletal abnormalities ($p=0.004$) but not eye abnormalities. The only significant predictor of eye abnormalities was year sampled ($p=0.006$). *Ribeiroia* was not detected in any Alaskan wood frogs. CONCLUSIONS: Abnormality prevalence at road-accessible sites in Kenai and Tetlin Refuges is among the highest reported in the published literature. Proximity to roads is positively correlated with risk of skeletal abnormalities in Alaskan wood frogs.

Introduction

Amphibian populations, often considered sentinels of ecological health and indicators of environmental change (Van der Schalie et al. 1999), are declining worldwide (Stuart et al. 2004). Concurrent with this decline is an apparent increase in morphological abnormalities (Hoppe 2000). Whereas the background rate of abnormalities in wild amphibian populations has been described as between 0 and 5% (Converse et al. 2000; Eaton et al. 2004; Gurushankara et al. 2007; Hoppe 2000; Johnson et al. 2002; Ouellet 2000; Schoff et al. 2003; Taylor et al. 2005), recent studies of frogs in some areas have documented rates as high as 6 – 22% (Bacon et al. 2006; Levey 2003; McCallum and Trauth 2003). Established causes of limb abnormalities in amphibians include parasites, chemical contaminants, ultraviolet-B radiation (UVB), and invertebrate predators (Blaustein and Johnson 2003). Causes of eye abnormalities are less well understood, but authors have suggested chemical contaminants and early season temperature extremes (Vershinin 2002) or a recessive genetic mutation (Nishioka 1977). In field studies, high abnormality prevalence has been correlated with human activities such as urbanization and agricultural and industrial land use (Gurushankara et al. 2007; Hopkins et al. 2000; Ouellet 1997; Taylor et al. 2005; Vershinin 2002). In assessing current trends in environmental health, pivotal questions remain about the extent to which human activities are driving amphibian abnormalities in different parts of the world (Johnson et al. 2007; Skelly et al. 2007; Taylor et al. 2005).

The prevalence of abnormalities in Alaskan amphibians had not been examined before this study. The highest latitude studies of this type were in central Canada (55.13° N, Eaton et al. 2004) and Russia (56.85° N, Vershinin 2002). Alaska represents an important place to examine hypotheses about amphibian abnormalities for a number of reasons. In contrast to the contiguous

48 states – where ecological cause and effect relationships are confounded by multiple broad scale land use alterations – Alaska is characterized by vast stretches of wilderness punctuated by local and self-contained disturbances such as roads and small towns. As such, it offers a unique opportunity to isolate the effects of human activities on amphibian populations. Second, the extreme northern latitude of Alaska allows for consideration of the UVB hypothesis for limb abnormalities (Ankley et al. 2004), because long summer days increase the duration of UVB exposure during tadpole development. Finally, because Alaska contains the largest tracts of protected land in the country, it is important from a natural resource management and conservation perspective to develop a baseline understanding of amphibian health in the region.

Here, we present the first study of abnormal amphibians in Alaska: a large, systematic, multi-year sampling effort, which documents the prevalence and types of abnormalities in wood frogs (*Rana sylvatica* or *Lithobates sylvaticus*) from 5 different National Wildlife Refuges. We also analyze the relationship between anthropogenic landscape alterations, approximated by the presence of roads, and abnormality prevalence to assess the effect of human activities on Alaskan amphibians.

Materials and Methods

Species, Refuge, and Site Selection

R. sylvatica (Hillis 2007) is the only amphibian common in most of Alaska, and the only amphibian in the refuges we studied. Wood frogs breed explosively just after snowmelt, laying eggs in late April or early May and metamorphosing in late June or July (Herreid and Kinney 1967). After metamorphosis, young frogs migrate up to 2 km from breeding wetlands to adult habitat in adjacent woods (Berven and Grudzien 1990). This synchronous breeding and

development at each site cause larvae to metamorphose within a 5-7 day window (Herreid and Kinney 1967; Reeves, unpublished data). We examined frogs for abnormalities only during this time.

Five refuges in Alaska were chosen for this study: Arctic, Innoko, Kenai, Tetlin, and Yukon Delta (Figure 1, Table 1). Refuge selection was based on known frog presence and geographic location in the state. We chose sampling sites within each refuge based on proximity to roads and logistics of site access. We calculated distance to the nearest road with geographic information systems and site latitude/longitude data.

All sites in Arctic and Innoko are in remote wilderness areas, accessible only by float plane or river boat. Sites in these refuges are clustered along rivers or lakes, near permanent camps or cabins from which sampling was based.

All sites within the Yukon Delta Refuge were in the town of Bethel (pop. 6,262) and were accessed by road. Bethel is a shipping and transportation hub for western Alaska, but it is not on the main highway system and lacks road access to other Alaskan cities. Potential contaminant sources associated with roads in Bethel include gravel operations, landfills, sewage treatment facilities, and defunct military communications sites.

In the Kenai and Tetlin Refuges we sampled both road-accessible and wilderness sites. The Kenai Refuge has 345 km of roads, including the only major highway bisecting the Kenai Peninsula. Many of these roads were developed to support the two operating oil and gas fields in the refuge, the first of which began drilling in the 1950s. The oil and gas development and other road-associated human activities in the Kenai Refuge have led to the release of contaminants including pentachlorophenol, petroleum products, and polychlorinated biphenyls, mercury from

historic mining, and historic herbicide applications (Parson 2001). The site farthest from any road in the Kenai Refuge is 10 km. In the Tetlin Refuge, approximately half the sites lie along the Alaska-Canada highway (the only highway connecting Alaska to the coterminous United States) and half are near Jathamund Lake, between 35 and 40 km from the nearest road. At Tetlin, former military installations, transportation corridors, and a natural gas pipeline (which parallels the highway) have all led to environmental contamination. Contaminants associated with former military activities include petroleum products and pesticides (Rocque 2007). The pipeline route was sprayed with dioxin-containing herbicides in the 1960s (Rocque 2007).

Animal Collection

Between 50 and 100 metamorphic frogs, stage 42-46 (Gosner 1960), were assessed for abnormalities at each site. Stages 42-44 were mainly aquatic and were captured with dip-nets. Stages 45-46 were primarily terrestrial, and were caught by hand at the pond edge. Frogs were placed in buckets at the capture site until examined for abnormalities using standard protocols (U.S. FWS 1999). Snout-to-vent length (SVL) and tail length were measured, and developmental stage was recorded. Abnormal frogs were euthanized with tricaine methanesulfonate (MS-222, Argent Chemical Laboratories, Redmond, WA), photographed, and sent to the U.S. Geological Survey, National Wildlife Health Center or Ball State University for radiographs to aid in abnormality classification. A subset of normal and abnormal frogs from Kenai (n=448) and Tetlin (n=10) were examined for parasites, including *R. ondatrae*, at the University of Wisconsin, La Crosse. All normal frogs not collected for parasitology were released at the capture site after field examination. Equipment was disinfected with 5% bleach solution between sites to prevent disease spread. All animals were treated humanely with regard to alleviation of

suffering and according to U.S. Government principles for the utilization and care of vertebrate animals used in testing, research, and training.

Abnormality Classification

According to Johnson et al. (2001) *abnormality* is a general term referring to “any gross deviation from the normal range in morphological variation,” and includes both *malformations* (permanent structural defects resulting from abnormal development), and *deformities* (alterations, such as amputation, to an otherwise correctly formed organ or structure).

Abnormalities were categorized for analysis using standard protocols (U.S. FWS 2007) and published guides (Meteyer 2000). Abnormalities were subdivided into the following categories: skeletal abnormalities, eye abnormalities, surface abnormalities (e.g., wounds, skin discolorations, cysts) and diseases. Animals with only surface abnormalities or diseases were considered normal in this analysis. Skeletal abnormalities include 3 subcategories: malformations, injuries, and abnormalities of unknown origin (Table 2). A single researcher classified all frogs in this data set from pictures, radiographs, and field notes.

Statistical Analysis

To examine potential risk factors associated with abnormality prevalence in Alaskan wood frogs, we performed a regression analysis of skeletal and eye abnormalities as a function of breeding site characteristics and covariates. Explanatory variables included frog length, frog developmental stage, year the frogs were found, and refuge in which the frogs were found. Frog length and stage were used as covariates, the refuge parameter represented large-scale geographic patterns, and year represented environmental variables that change annually (e.g., temperature and UVB). We also included distance from breeding sites to the nearest road as a

surrogate for human disturbance (chemical habitat alteration or predator, pathogen, or parasite introduction). Distance to road was log-transformed to make the relationship with abnormalities linear before analysis. In our study areas, distance to road is a better predictor of chemical contamination than is distance to nearest population center (Parson 2001; Rocque 2007).

We first used logistic regression with stepwise selection to identify factors that were significant predictors for each abnormality type (skeletal and eye abnormalities). We then used a generalized linear model (GENMOD in SAS) to perform a repeated measures analysis, which specified that individuals from the same collection event (animals at the same site in the same year) were correlated. This second analysis tended to reduce the significance values of factors in the original model. Variables were dropped if they were significant during the stepwise selection, but not significant once the repeated measures analysis accounted for autocorrelation in the data. After non-significant factors were dropped, the repeated measures analysis was re-run a final time to obtain p-values and odds ratios (OR).

The original sample contained 9,268 metamorphs examined between 2000 and 2006; 272 were excluded from statistical analysis because we lacked information about the site, frog length, or stage, leaving 8,997 for the skeletal abnormality and malformation analyses. Only data from 2003-2006 was used for the eye abnormality analysis (n=7,136) due to a change in eye abnormality protocols in 2003. All analyses were done with SAS software (version 9.1; SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC).

Results

A total of 9,268 metamorphic wood frogs from 86 breeding sites at five Alaskan refuges were examined in this study. Abnormalities were observed at all refuges sampled. Kenai had the highest prevalence of abnormal individuals (7.9%), followed by Tetlin (5.9%), Innoko (3.0%), Arctic (2.0%), and Yukon Delta (1.5%). The overall prevalence of abnormal frogs was 6.2%.

The highest abnormality prevalence at any single breeding site was 20%, at a Kenai site in 2005 (Table 2). In Innoko, the highest single-site abnormality prevalence was 19%, and in Tetlin it was 14%. These were lower at Arctic (6%) and Yukon Delta (5%). Each refuge had sites at which no abnormal frogs were found, but this was not the norm; 88% of the 161 sampling events yielded at least one abnormal frog.

Over 20 different types of abnormalities were documented (Table 2). Ectromelia (partial limb), micromelia (shrunken limb or limb element), amelia (limb totally missing), and unpigmented iris (eye totally black) were the four most common, collectively accounting for 73% of the abnormalities across all refuges (Figure 2; Table 2). These abnormalities were also the most common at each individual refuge, with some exceptions. Black-eyed frogs were common at Innoko, Kenai, and Tetlin, making up 20% or more of the abnormalities at each refuge, but only one black-eyed frog was found in Yukon Delta, and none were found in Arctic. Shrunken and partial limbs were among the most common abnormality types at all refuges except Innoko, which had a high proportion of partial limbs (27% of the abnormalities were of this type), but fewer shrunken limbs (only 7% of the abnormalities at this refuge). Several abnormality types occurred only in Kenai, including anteversion (twisted long bones), microcephaly (shrunken head), scoliosis (curved spine), cutaneous fusion (skin webbing), and

kinked tail (Table 2). The rarest abnormality type was polymelia (extra limb); only one specimen had an extra limb, and this frog was also found in Kenai. Injuries comprised 12-36% of the skeletal abnormalities at each refuge with the lowest proportion at Innoko, the highest at Yukon Delta, and more intermediate values at Arctic (17%), Kenai (17%), and Tetlin (20%).

The trematode parasite, *R. ondatrae*, is known to induce skeletal malformations in amphibians (Johnson and Sutherland 2003). To investigate whether *R. ondatrae* could be implicated in the abnormalities we identified, a subset of normal and abnormal frogs collected in the field were kept for parasite analysis. We examined a total of 448 specimens from Kenai and 10 from Tetlin for parasites. None of these frogs were infected with *R. ondatrae*, nor were planorbid snail hosts seen at any sampling site.

In the regression analysis, prevalence of skeletal abnormalities increased with site proximity to the nearest road ($p=0.004$, $OR=0.8809$; Figure 3). With one exception, all sites with abnormality prevalence above 6% were within 10 km of a road. One remote site in Innoko deviated from this trend, and can be seen as an outlier in Figure 3 (with an abnormality prevalence of 19%). This site, though located >100 km from any road, is adjacent to an historic mining and trapping cabin, now used as the base of Innoko Refuge field operations. This outlier did not affect our result interpretation, so was retained during statistical analysis. Frogs in our study were also more likely to have skeletal abnormalities if they were smaller ($p=0.002$, $OR=0.8831$, Figure 4) and at a later developmental stage ($p<0.0001$, $OR=1.2812$, Figure 5). The preliminary logistic regression analysis identified significant differences in skeletal abnormalities among refuges; however, once we accounted for autocorrelation in our data with the repeated measures analysis, refuge was no longer a significant predictor of any abnormality type. We

found no relationship between skeletal abnormalities and year sampled. Eye abnormalities varied with year ($p=0.006$), though they were not correlated with refuge, frog size, Gosner stage, or distance to the nearest road. Significantly fewer eye abnormalities were found in 2003 than in 2004 (OR=0.1969) or 2005 (OR=0.2078).

In our data, frogs closer to roads were smaller. In a simple linear regression of frog size against distance to the nearest road, the equation is $SVL \text{ (mm)} = 19.2 + 0.02 * \text{distance to road (km)}$ ($p < 0.0001$, $R^2 = 0.20$). By this equation, the average frog in a site adjacent to the road is 19 mm snout to vent, whereas the average frog at 150 km is 22 mm. Despite this colinearity between size and distance to roads, we included both in our final regression model because both were significant during stepwise model selection, suggesting this colinearity was overcome. Additionally, both factors could independently influence abnormality prevalence, so we avoided choosing one or the other to represent both.

Discussion

The average abnormality prevalence in this study (6.2%) is higher than background levels of 0-5% reported for other areas (Ouellet 2000). The average in this study is high, however, because of hotspots in some areas. Specifically, the abnormality prevalence at road-accessible sites in the Kenai and Tetlin Refuges is among the highest reported to date. Remote areas in Alaskan refuges exhibited abnormality prevalence closer to 2%, and within the published range for background levels in other places in North America (Converse et al. 2000; Eaton et al. 2004; Hoppe 2000; Schoff et al. 2003; Taylor et al. 2005).

We observed higher abnormality prevalence in sites closer to roads. Ostensibly, road proximity could increase the prevalence of frog abnormalities by 1) contributing to chemical

contamination of the habitat (Parson 2001; Rocque 2007), or 2) facilitating introduction of predators, parasites, or pathogens (Reeves 2008; Urban 2006). If contaminants caused abnormal development in Alaskan amphibians, then proximity to roads should result in malformations, but not injuries in the absence of other stressors (Loeffler et al. 2003 and references within). If predators caused the limb abnormalities, we should see fresh and healed injuries and possibly developmental malformations if limbs were amputated early enough in tadpole development to partially regenerate (Forsyth 1946; Fry 1966). The prevalence of both malformations and injuries in our data suggests that predators were almost certainly responsible for some proportion of the skeletal abnormalities. Either early limb amputation by predators (Forsyth 1946; Fry 1966) or exposure to chemical contaminants (Gardiner et al. 2003) may have caused the developmental malformations. Road-associated contaminants may also reduce tadpole size or fitness, increasing the risk of predation injury (Boone and James 2003). Nevertheless, both chemical contaminants (Relyea 2005) and invertebrate predators (Relyea 2001) can decrease frog size at metamorphosis. Thus, we cannot discern whether road effects on skeletal abnormalities are mediated through chemical contaminants, shifts in predator community composition, or a combination of these two stressors.

Our data do not support the parasite or UVB hypotheses for skeletal abnormalities in Alaskan wood frogs. The malformation-inducing parasite *R. ondatrae* was not detected in any of the frogs in this study, and the lack of bilateral malformations is atypical of UVB exposure (Ankley et al. 2002). It is possible that UVB induced the eye abnormalities in our study, based on the correlation with year sampled, yet we cannot find any report that associates UVB with amphibian eye abnormalities. Causes of eye abnormalities in amphibians are not well

understood, but others have proposed chemical contaminants, temperature extremes, and genetic mutations as causes (Nishioka 1977; Vershinin 2002). We cannot rule out temperature extremes or genetic mutations as causes of the eye abnormalities in this study, but chemical contaminants are unlikely candidates, based on the lack of correlation with roads and associated environmental contamination.

A number of limitations are associated with using road proximity as the only means by which to quantify the effects of human disturbance on Alaskan wood frogs. For example, not all roads in this study represent the same kind of landscape disturbance. Whereas all of the Yukon Delta sites were closest to roads in the town of Bethel, a small village accessible only by air or barge, in Kenai the nearest road may have been either a major highway or a restricted-access gravel road on the oil and gas fields. Moreover, roads are not necessarily the only or even the most significant source of human disturbance to a breeding site. The high abnormality prevalence at one remote Innoko site may be an example of anthropogenic effects unrelated to roads, because this site was subject to stressors related to current refuge operations and historic land use. Clearly, further study is needed to discern whether and how human activities are related to abnormalities in Alaskan frogs.

In addition to the correlation between road proximity and abnormality prevalence, we identified other significant covariates including frog size, frog developmental stage, and year sampled. Several mechanisms could explain the increased probability of skeletal abnormalities with smaller size. Small frogs might be more likely to suffer insults such as failed predation attempts. Size at metamorphosis has been related to adult fitness (Werner 1986) and small tadpoles and metamorphs are more vulnerable to gape-limited predation (Brodie and

Formanowicz 1983). Alternatively, abnormal frogs may compete poorly for resources, leaving them smaller at metamorphosis than their normal counterparts. Finally, the stressor causing abnormalities could also reduce size at metamorphosis. Wood frogs exposed to caged predators (Relyea 2001) and chemical contaminants (Relyea 2005) were smaller at metamorphosis than unexposed controls. Size and developmental stage were not correlated in our data.

The increased prevalence of skeletal abnormalities at later developmental stages is probably sampling bias created by different capture techniques. Whereas dip-netting for earlier stage metamorphs (Gosner 42-44) samples abnormal and normal individuals with comparable efficiency, capturing later stage metamorphs on land may result in the disproportionate collection of the less-mobile abnormal animals. Moreover, normal metamorphs leave the breeding area quickly, but frogs with skeletal abnormalities may stay closer to water, where they can dive from predators instead of relying on missing or misshapen limbs to escape. Care was taken to examine each limb during sampling, because the primary goal of this study was detection of morphological abnormalities. Therefore, we do not think limb abnormalities were obscured by the longer tails of earlier stage metamorphs (another potential source of sampling bias).

Correlative models provide results valuable for focusing future data collection. Our model identified contaminants and predators, or a synergistic interaction between them, as important areas of future research into the causes of limb abnormalities in Alaskan wood frogs. Our data also suggest that *R. ondatrae* and UVB are probably not responsible for the skeletal abnormalities we observed, but UVB or climate may cause the eye abnormalities.

Conclusion

The elevated abnormality prevalence in some areas of Alaska's National Wildlife Refuges is a striking indication that we cannot assume the size and relative remoteness of these protected areas renders them immune to the influence of humans. On the other hand, while preliminary evidence points to a possible effect of anthropogenic disturbance on Alaskan wood frogs, we lack sufficient evidence to identify a specific causal agent. The results of our analyses suggest that predation injuries and some effect of roads, such as chemical contamination or shifts in predator community composition, may contribute to the skeletal abnormalities we observed. The cause of eye abnormalities is unknown, yet the lack of association with human disturbance and the significance of year sampled in our statistical model suggest eye abnormalities in Alaskan wood frogs are more likely to be associated with something that occurs statewide and changes annually, such as UVB or climate. More study is needed to elucidate risk factors for amphibian abnormalities in Alaska, and such research is ongoing.

References

- Ankley GT, Degitz SJ, Diamond SA, Tietge JE. 2004. Assessment of environmental stressors potentially responsible for malformations in North American anuran amphibians. *Ecotoxicol Environ Saf* 58:7-16.
- Ankley GT, Diamond SE, Tietge JE, Holcombe GW, Jensen KM, Defoe DL, et al. 2002. Assessment of the Risk of Solar Ultraviolet Radiation to Amphibians. I. Dose-dependent induction of Hindlimb Malformations in the Northern Leopard Frog (*Rana pipiens*). *Environ Sci Technol* 36:2853-2858.
- Bacon JP, Gray JA, Kitson L. 2006. Status and conservation of the reptiles and amphibians of the Bermuda islands. *Applied Herpetology* 3:323-344.
- Berven KA, Grudzien TA. 1990. Dispersal in the wood frog (*Rana sylvatica*): Implications for genetic population structure. *Evolution* 44:2047-2056.
- Blaustein AR, Johnson PTJ. 2003. The complexity of deformed amphibians. *Front Ecol Environ* 1:87-94.
- Boone MD, James SM. 2003. Interactions of an insecticide, herbicide, and natural stressors in amphibian community mesocosms. *Ecol Appl* 13:829-841.
- Brodie ED Jr., Formanowicz DR Jr. 1983. Prey size preference of predators: Differential vulnerability of larval anurans. *Herpetologica* 39:67-75.
- Converse KA, Mattsson J, Eaton-Poole L. 2000. Field surveys of Midwestern and Northeastern

- Fish and Wildlife Service lands for the presence of abnormal frogs and toads. *J Iowa Acad Sci* 107:160-167.
- Eaton BR, Eaves S, Stevens C, Puchniak A, Paszkowski CA. 2004. Deformity levels in wild populations of the wood frog *Rana sylvatica* in three ecoregions of Western Canada. *J Herpetol* 38:283-287.
- Forsyth JW. 1946. The histology of anuran limb regeneration. *J Morph* 79:287-321.
- Fry AE. 1966. Hind limb regeneration in *Rana pipiens* larvae. *Copeia* 1966:530-534.
- Gardiner D, Ndayibagira A, Grün F, Blumberg B. 2003. Deformed frogs and environmental retinoids. *Pure and Applied Chemistry* 75:2263-2273.
- Gosner KL. 1960. A Simplified Table for Staging Anuran Embryos and Larvae with Notes on Identification. *Herpetologica* 16:183-190.
- Gurushankara HP, Krishnamurthy SV, Vasudev, V. 2007. Morphological abnormalities in natural populations of common frogs inhabiting agroecosystems of the central Western Ghats. *Applied Herpetology* 4:39-45.
- Herreid CF, Kinney S. 1967. Temperature and Development of the Wood Frog, *Rana sylvatica*, in Alaska. *Ecology* 48:579-590.
- Hillis DM. 2007. Constraints in naming parts of the Tree of Life. *Mol Phylogen Evol* 42:331-338.
- Hopkins WA, Congdon J, Ray JK. 2000. Incidence and impact of axial malformations in larval

- bullfrogs *Rana catesbeiana* developing in sites polluted by a coal-burning power plant. Environ Toxicol Chem 19:862-868.
- Hoppe DM. 2000. History of Minnesota frog abnormalities: Do recent findings represent a new phenomenon? J Iowa Acad Sci 107:86-89.
- Johnson PTJ, Chase JM, Dosch KL, Hartson RB, Gross JA, Larson DJ, et al. 2007. Aquatic eutrophication promotes pathogenic infection in amphibians. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 104:15781-15786.
- Johnson PTJ, Lunde KB, Ritchie EG, Reaser JK, Launer AE. 2001. Morphological abnormality patterns in a California amphibian community. Herpetologica 57:336-352.
- Johnson PTJ, Lunde KB, Thurman EM, Ritchier EG, Wray SN, Sutherland DR. 2002. Parasite *Ribeiroia ondatrae* infection linked to amphibian malformations in the western United States. Ecol Monogr 72:151-168.
- Johnson PTJ, Sutherland DR. 2003. Amphibian deformities and *Ribeiroia* infection: An emerging helminthiasis. Trends Parasitol 19:322-335.
- Levey R. Investigations into the causes of amphibian malformations in the Lake Champlain basin of New England. 2003. Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation. Waterbury, Vermont, USA.
- Loeffler K, Stocum DL, Fallon JF, Meteyer CU. 2001. Leaping lopsided: A review of the current hypotheses regarding etiologies of limb malformations in frogs. Anat Rec 265:228-245.

- McCallum ML, Trauth SE. 2003. A forty-three year museum study of northern cricket frog *Acris crepitans* abnormalities in Arkansas: Upward trends and distributions. *J Wildl Dis* 39:522-528.
- Meteyer CU. 2000. Field guide to malformations of frogs and toads with radiographic interpretations. Biological Science Report USGS/BRD/BSR-2000-0005. Madison, WI. U.S. Geological Survey.
- Nishioka M. 1977. Color variants induced by radiation and their inheritance in *Rana nigromaculata*. *Sci Rep Lab Amphibian Biol, Hiroshima Univ* 2:25-89.
- Ouellet M. 2000. Amphibian Deformities: Current State of Knowledge. In: *Ecotoxicology of Amphibians and Reptiles* (Sparling DW, Linder G, Bishop CA, eds). Pensacola, FL: Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC), 617–646.
- Ouellet M, Bonin J, Rodrigue J, DesGranges J, Lair S. 1997. Hindlimb deformities ectromelia, ectrodactyly in free-living anurans from agricultural habitats. *J Wildl Dis* 33:95-104.
- Parson TAS. 2001. *Kenai National Wildlife Refuge Contaminant Assessment*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage, AK.
- Reeves MK. 2008. *Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis* in Wood Frogs (*Rana Sylvatica*) from three National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska, USA. *Herpetol Rev* 39:68-70.
- Relyea RA. 2001. The lasting effects of adaptive plasticity: Predator-induced tadpoles become long-legged frogs. *Ecology* 82:1947-1955.

Relyea RA. 2005. The lethal impacts of roundup and predatory stress on six species of North American tadpoles. *Arch Environ Contam Toxicol* 48:351-357.

Rocque DA. 2007. *Tetlin National Wildlife Refuge Contaminant Assessment*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Regional Office, Anchorage, AK.

Schoff PK, Johnson CM, Schotthoefer AM, Murphy JE, Lieske C, Cole RA, et al. 2003.

Prevalence of skeletal and eye malformations in frogs from North-Central United States: Estimations based on collections from randomly selected sites. *J Wildl Dis* 39:510-521.

Skelly DK, Bolden SR, Freidenburg LK, Freidenfelds NA, Levey R. 2007. Ribeiroia infection is not responsible for Vermont amphibian deformities. *Ecohealth* 4:156-163.

Stuart SN, Chanson JS, Cox NA, Young BE, Rodrigues ASL, Fischman DL, et al. 2004. Status and trends of amphibian declines and extinctions worldwide. *Science* 306:1783-1786.

Taylor B, Skelly D, Demarchis LK, Slade MD, Galusha D, Rabinowitz PM. 2005. Proximity to pollution sources and risk of amphibian limb malformation. *Environ Health Perspect* 113:1497-1501.

Urban MC. 2006. Road facilitation of trematode infections in snails of northern Alaska. *Conserv Biol* 20:1143-1149.

U.S. FWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 1999. Standard Operating Procedures for Abnormal Amphibian Surveys. Available:

<http://www.fws.gov/contaminants/amphibian/SOPs.html> [accessed 21 February

2008].

U.S. FWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2007. Standard Operating Procedures for Abnormal Amphibian Classification. Available:

<http://www.fws.gov/contaminants/amphibian/AbnormalSOPs.html> [accessed 21 February 2008].

Van der Schalie WH, Gardner HS, Bantle JA, De Rosa CT, Finch RA, Reif JF, et al.1999.

Animals as sentinels of human health hazards of environmental chemicals. Environ Health Perspect 107:309-315.

Vershinin VL. 2002. Ecological specificity and microevolution in amphibian populations in urbanized areas. Advances in Amphibian Research in the Former Soviet Union 7:1-161.

Werner EE. 1986. Amphibian metamorphosis: Growth prevalence, predation risk, and the optimal size at transformation. Am Nat 128:319-341.

Table 1. Skeletal and Eye Abnormality and Breeding Site Information by Refuge

Refuge	Years Sampled	No. Sites ^a	Abnormalities			Latitude ^e	Longitude ^f	Elevation ^g	Distance to Road ^h
			Mean ^b	Median ^c	Range ^d				
Arctic (7,932,000 ha)	2001-2002	9	2.0%	1.4%	0-6%	67.18-67.22 N	142.13-142.20 W	195-200	151-155
Innoko (1,558,000 ha)	2002-2006	13	3.0%	1.5%	0-19%	63.60-63.64 N	158.03-158.14 W	25-30	14-139
Kenai (797,200 ha)	2000-2006	38	7.9%	7.6%	0-20%	60.145-60.78 N	150.06 - 151.09 W	60-520	0-10
Tetlin (95,426 ha)	2003-2006	19	5.9%	4.0%	0-14%	62.64-62.97 N	141.03-141.86 W	500-700	0-40
Yukon Delta (6,555,850 ha)	2002-2004	7	1.5%	0.0%	0-5%	60.78-60.79 N	161.81-161.88 W	15-30	0-5

^a Number breeding sites sampled

^b Refuge overall abnormality prevalence = Number abnormal frogs/ Total frogs sampled at all sites over all years

^c Median breeding site abnormality prevalence. Prevalence of skeletal and eye abnormalities was not calculated for ponds at which fewer than 50 individuals were examined

^d Range of abnormality prevalence at breeding sites. Prevalence of skeletal and eye abnormalities was not calculated for ponds at which fewer than 50 individuals were examined

^e Range in site latitude (WGS 84)

^f Range in site longitude (WGS84)

^g Range in site elevation (meters)

^h Range in distance from a breeding site to the nearest road (kilometers)

Table 2. Summary of Abnormalities in Wood Frog Populations at Five National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska
 Values are number of abnormalities in each category

Abnormality Type	Arctic	Innoko Kenai	Tetlin	Yukon Delta	Total		
Eye Abnormality	Anophthalmia (missing eye)	0	2	12	6	0	20
	Unpigmented iris (black eye)	0	15	118	20	1	154
	Microphthalmia (small eye)	0	0	1	1	0	2
	Other ^a	0	2	6	2	0	10
Skeletal Injury ^b	Brachydactyly (short digits)	2	0	7	0	2	11
	Ectrodactyly (missing digits)	1	1	4	3	0	9
	Ectromelia (partial limb)	0	0	44	6	0	50
	Limb crushed	0	0	14	1	2	17
Skeletal Malformation	Other ^c	0	2	2	0	0	4
	Amelia (missing limb)	0	1	31	3	0	35
	Anteversion (twisted longbones)	0	0	9	0	0	9
	Brachygnathia (short jaw)	1	4	6	0	0	11
	Microcephaly (shrunken head or blunt snout)	0	0	4	0	0	4
	Micromelia (shrunken limb or limb element)	5	3	126	17	3	154
	Polymelia (extra limb)	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Polydactyly (extra digits)	2	0	2	0	0	4
	Scoliosis or Lordosis (curved spine)	0	0	2	0	0	2
	Cutaneous fusion (skin webbing)	0	0	3	0	0	3
Skeletal Unknown Origin	Syndactyly (digits fused)	0	0	11	2	0	13
	Taumelia (bone bridge or triangle)	0	0	4	0	0	4
	Kinked tail	0	0	3	0	0	3
	Brachydactyly (short digits)	0	1	27	1	2	31
	Ectrodactyly (missing digits)	0	0	26	3	0	29
Overall	Ectromelia (partial limb)	7	12	90	14	2	125
	Other ^d	0	2	5	0	0	7
Overall	Eye Total	0	19	137	29	1	186

Injury Total	3	3	71	10	4	91
Malformation Total	8	8	199	22	3	240
Unknown Origin Total	7	15	151	18	4	195
Total no. abnormalities	18	45	558	79	12	712
Total no. abnormal individuals	12	39	450	68	7	576
Total no. individuals examined	615	1309	5716	1146	482	9268
% Individuals Abnormal	2.0%	3.0%	7.9%	5.9%	1.5%	6.2%

^aIncludes oversized eyes, abnormally shaped pupils, and cataracts

^bEither fresh blood or exposed bone must be noted for the injury category

^cIncludes dissociated and dangling limb

^dIncludes apparent dislocations

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Map of Alaska with refuges sampled for abnormal wood frogs.

Figure 2. Pictures of the four most common abnormalities in Alaskan wood frogs. A. Micromelia, B. Ectromelia, C. Amelia, and D. Unpigmented Iris.

Figure 3. Skeletal abnormalities and malformations versus distance to the nearest road.

Symbols are prevalence of frogs with skeletal abnormalities during single collection events at different refuges: Arctic (\square) Innoko (\circ) Kenai (Δ) Tetlin (∇) and Yukon Delta (\diamond).

Figure 4. Skeletal abnormalities and malformations versus size. Values are proportion of frogs abnormal in each category. Error bars are calculated based on the underlying

binomial distribution: $s(\hat{p}) = \frac{\sqrt{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}}{n}$ where $s(\hat{p})$ is the standard error estimate, \hat{p} is

the proportion abnormal in that category, and n is the number sampled in each category.

Figure 5. Skeletal abnormalities and malformations versus developmental stage. Values are proportion of frogs abnormal in each category. Error bars are calculated based on the

underlying binomial distribution: $s(\hat{p}) = \frac{\sqrt{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}}{n}$ where $s(\hat{p})$ is the standard error

estimate, \hat{p} is the proportion abnormal in that category, and n is the number sampled in each category.









