Mus musculus populations in Western Australia lack VKORC1 mutations

conferring resistance to first generation anticoagulant rodenticides:

Implications for conservation and biosecurity

Bridget J.M.L. Duncan[1*], Annette Koenders[1], Quinton Burnham[1], Michael T. Lohr[1]

[1] Centre for Ecosystem Management, School of Science, Edith Cowan University, 270
Joondalup Drive, Joondalup WA 6027, Australia
9
10   * Corresponding author
11   E-mail: duncanbridget95@gmail.com (BJMLD)

12
13   Short title
14   Anticoagulant rodenticide resistance in *Mus musculus* of Western Australia

Abstract

Background

Humans routinely attempt to manage pest rodent populations with anticoagulant rodenticides (ARs). We require information on resistance to ARs within rodent populations to have effective eradication programs that minimise exposure in non-target species. Mutations to the VKORC1 gene have been shown to confer resistance in rodents with high proportions of resistance in mice found in all European populations tested. We screened mutations in *Mus musculus* within Western Australia, by sampling populations from the capital city (Perth) and a remote island (Browse Island). These are the first Australian mouse populations screened for resistance using this method. Additionally, the mitochondrial D-loop of house mice was sequenced to explore population genetic structure, identify the origin of Western Australian mice, and to elucidate whether resistance was linked to certain haplotypes.

Results

No resistance-related VKORC1 mutations were detected in either house mouse population. A genetic introgression in the intronic sequence of the VKORC1 gene of Browse Island house mouse was detected which is thought to have originated through hybridisation with the Algerian mouse (*Mus spretus*). Analysis of the mitochondrial D-loop reported two haplotypes in the house mouse population of Perth, and two haplotypes in the population of Browse Island.

Conclusions

Both house mouse populations exhibited no genetic resistance to ARs, in spite of free use of ARs in Western Australia. Therefore weaker anticoagulant rodenticides can be employed in pest control and eradication attempts, which will result in reduced negative impacts on non-target species. Biosecurity measures must be in place to avoid introduction of resistant house mice, and new house mouse subspecies to Western Australia.

Introduction

Commensal rodents are resident on all land masses (except Antarctica)[1,2] and are expanding their geographical distributions, which is indicative of a high adaptability to challenging environmental conditions and ability to exploit resources provided by humans.[3] These rodents are considered pests, and poisons are the most commonly used method for control and eradication programs.[4] Due to their efficacy, anticoagulant rodenticides (ARs) have been used to carry out eradications on over 300 islands with a 90% success rate.[5,6] Anticoagulant rodenticides can be subdivided into first generation (FGARs) or second generation (SGARs), according to when they were first synthesised and commercialised.[7] In 1958, the first evidence of resistance to ARs was discovered in *Mus musculus* populations, which were resistant to warfarin and diphacinone.[8] Second generation compounds with greater acute toxicities than FGARs were developed in response, resulting in mortality after a single feed at a lower concentration.[7,9,10]

Resistance-linked mutations within rodent species can arise independently and be positively selected in populations that are exposed to ARs, or can be acquired via

introgression with other species, for example, by hybridisation between *M. musculus* and

the Algerian mouse (*Mus spretus*).[11–13] Resistance to ARs in *M. musculus* populations has

been linked to single nucleotide polymorphisms in subunit 1 of the *Vitamin K epOxide*

Reductase Complex (VKORC1*)*, which is involved in the synthesis of vitamin K and is

important in blot clotting[14] and bone formation.[15] However, mutations in the VKORC1

gene should be selected against in the absence of exposure to rodenticides due to negative

pleiotropic effects.[14–17] Extensive testing of resistance to SGARs in *M. musculus* in

Europe, Canada and some in Australia via feeding trials, blood clotting response tests,

and/or genetic screening has uncovered high prevalence of SGAR resistance.[11,18,19] For

example, every European population tested (100 from 6 countries) had levels of VKORC1-

related resistance ranging from 70 to 100%.[11,13,19–21]

It is vital to understand levels of resistance in rodent populations so that appropriate

chemicals can be applied at a suitable rate for management purposes, as chemical residues

of ARs have been detected in a wide variety of non-target species, in both terrestrial and

aquatic environments. The presence of these chemicals outside of their target species can

result directly from the rodenticide, or indirectly via consumption of poisoned rodents as

persistence of rodenticides[22–24] results in liver retention and ultimately biomagnification

and bioaccumulation in food webs.[9]

There is scarce information regarding the presence and distribution of resistance in

rodent populations of Australia, and a complete absence of information for *M. musculus*

populations on the Australian mainland.[25,26] In Western Australia, neither rats nor mice

have been tested to quantify the levels of resistance to ARs despite the pervasive use of

poisons by government agencies and the public, whose use of both FGARs and SGARs is

unmonitored and unregulated.[9]

As ARs are the most commonly used class of chemicals to control both mainland and

island rodent populations in Australia, it is critical to evaluate the levels of resistance in

rodent populations in order to reduce the impact on non-target species.[9] For this reason,

the aim of this study was to investigate whether VKORC1 mutations that have been linked

to AR resistance are present within populations of *M. musculus* in the urban area of Perth

(the largest city in Western Australia). As a comparison, the same investigation was

undertaken for a population of south-east Asian house mouse (*M. musculus castaneus*)

from Browse Island off the coast of Western Australia where ARs have not been used. For

both populations, analyses of the mtDNA D-loop region were conducted to investigate

whether resistance (if present) is correlated with genetic lineages within these species.

Materials and methods

Sample collection and preparation

Western house mice (*Mus musculus domesticus*) from the Perth metropolitan area

(Western Australia) were collected by use of traps or other methods not involving ARs

(n=34); confirmation that death was not due to ARs was derived from the absence of

internal haemorrhaging noted during dissection. Mice were stored at -20°C at Edith Cowan

University until liver extraction, and livers were then stored in 100% ethanol at -8°C until

DNA extraction. Liver samples of south-east Asian house mouse (*Mus musculus castaneus*)

that had been collected using snap traps from Browse Island were donated by the

Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions of Western Australia (n=15). Liver

samples from these mice were preserved in salt saturated dimethyl sulfoxide and stored at -

8°C at Edith Cowan University until DNA extraction.

Sensitivity analysis
109

We carried out a sensitivity analysis to ascertain the likelihood of detecting

mutations in our sample of 34 mice under different proportions of mutation in the Perth

population. Using a binomial distribution, we tested proportions of resistant individuals in

the population ranging from 70%[11] (the lowest percentage of resistance detected in the

literature) down to 10%. The probability of not collecting any mice with resistance in our

sample size of 34 was well below 0.000001 at 70% and 0.028 at 10% in the population

(Table 1). In fact, even at the lowest resistance rate tested, we could have expected to

collect at least 3 resistant mice, and for a population with 70% resistance that number rises

to 24 mice.

Table 1. Binomial sensitivity analysis.

	Proportion of resistant mice in population (%)			
	10	30	70	95
Probability of finding no resistant mice	0.028	<0.0001	<0.000001	<0.000001
Mode (resistant mice detected)	3	10	24	33

121   Finding a resistant mouse was taken as a success. The analysis was based on the Perth

122   population with a sample size of 34.

DNA extraction and PCR

Prior to DNA extraction, the liver was washed in Milli-Q water for 5 minutes on a

rocking platform at room temperature, then the water was drained and replaced, and the

process repeated under the same conditions for 10 minutes. Genomic DNA was extracted

from the liver using a DNeasy Blood & Tissue kit following the manufacturer's instructions

(Qiagen). Concentration and purity of the DNA were measured using a NanoDrop (Thermo

Fisher Scientific), and then concentration of DNA in all samples was standardised to 10

ng/µL by dilution with Milli-Q water unless it was below 10 ng/µL.

Polymerase chain reaction was used to amplify the three exons of the VKORC1 gene

region[21] and the complete mitochondrial D-loop and flanking regions[32] using primer sets

from the sources indicated. Reactions included 20 ng of DNA template, 12.5 µL of Platinum

II HotStart (VKORC1) or Platinum HotStart (D-loop) master mix (Thermo Fisher Scientific),

0.5 µL of both forward and reverse primers made up to 25 µL with DNA-free H_2O. Cycling

conditions for PCR are shown in Table 2. Successfully amplified PCR products were purified

and sequenced at the Australian Genome Research Facility in Perth, Western Australia.

Table 2. Adapted PCR parameters for VKORC1 and D-loop amplification.[11]

Gene region	Master Mix	Initial denaturation	Denaturation	Annealing	Extension	Final extension
VKORC1	Platinum HotStart	2 min @ 94°C	30 sec @ 94°C	30 sec @ 58°C	110 sec @ 72°C	10 min @ 72°C

	Platinum II HotStart	2 min @ 94°C	30 sec @ 94°C	30 sec @ 60°C	30 sec @ 72°C	10 min @ 72°C
D-loop	Platinum HotStart	2 min @ 94°C	30 sec @ 94°C	30 sec @ 55°C	1 min @ 72°C	10 min @ 72°C

143   All conditions included 40 cycles.

Sequence construction

Sequence chromatograms were manually checked and edited using FinchTV

(Geospiza) and aligned in Geneious Prime 2019.0.4 with multiple reference *Mus musculus*

and *Mus spretus* sequences downloaded from GenBank to confirm (sub)species

identification, identify haplotypes, and detect VKORC1 SNPs. Reference sequences for the

VKORC1 gene included wild type (susceptible to ARs) *M. m. domesticus*, AR resistant *M. m.*

domesticus, the Algerian mouse *M. spretus*, and the hybridised (and resistant to ARs) *M. m.*

domesticus/M.spretus.

Haplotype network construction

The D-loop sequences of Perth metropolitan mice and Browse Island specimens

were aligned in Geneious with 578 *M. m. domesticus* D-loop sequences and 246 *M. m.*

castaneus D-loop sequences, respectively. Non-unique sequences from the same country

were filtered out from both datasets, and sequence length was standardised. Haplotype

networks were created from the aligned datasets using the minimum spanning network

method in PopART (Population Analysis with Reticulate Trees).[27]

Ethical approval

All protocols were approved by the Edith Cowan University Animal Ethics Committee (permit number 21776).

Results

VKORC1 mutations, insertions and deletions

VKORC1 amplification covered three exons. Exons 1 and 2 were amplified using one primer set and resulted in complete sequences for 31 mice and incomplete sequences in 21 mice. Exon 3 resulted in 26 complete sequences and one incomplete. In total, 15 mice from Browse Island and 34 mice from Perth were sequenced, in approximately equal sex ratio.

Sequences from *M. m. castaneus* presented two noteworthy features: all mice carried two silent single nucleotide polymorphisms in exon 1 at amino acid positions 10 and 37, and all mice had a 68 base pair insertion at nucleotide position 1454, located in the intron following exon 2. When compared to published sequences it was found that the insertion (12 mice) was 100% homologous to a section of DNA in *M. spretus* as well as certain *M. m. domesticus* that hybridised with the Algerian mouse. The insertion was not identical in all individuals sequenced from the island: the remaining three individuals differed from the published sequence by a single identical point mutation. None of the mutations linked to the *M. spretus* resistant allele were detected in any of the Browse Island mice, despite all displaying the intragenic sequence. Furthermore, all 15 Browse Island samples reported an eight bp deletion at position 1143 that is shared with the published sequences previously mentioned. One mouse from Browse Island displayed a seven bp and

an 11 bp insertion at nucleotide position 939 and 1266 respectively, which were not

exhibited in any of the published VKORC1 sequences. The VKORC1 insertion discovered on

Browse Island is here defined as an introgression in agreement with previous studies that

have used simulation and statistical methods to reach this conclusion.[28–30]

In contrast, no mutations (associated with AR resistance or not) were detected in the

coding regions of the VKORC1 gene in western house mice (*Mus musculus domesticus*) from

the Perth metropolitan area.

Mus musculus D-loop haplotypes in Western Australia

Mitochondrial D-loop sequences were obtained for all house mice in this study

(n=49), with sequenced PCR products between 900 and 1100 base pairs. The Perth mouse

population had two haplotypes, with the most common being 100% homologous to

published sequences of *M. m. domesticus* from Australia. One mouse from the metropolitan

area displayed a different haplotype, which did not match any published D-loop sequences;

this mouse was most closely related to haplotypes from Australia and The Netherlands, but

differed from them by a single base pair change at position 718. The haplotype network (Fig

1) groups Perth mice with haplotypes from West Europe, New Zealand, and the British Isles,

as well as Southeast Asia, Africa and Oceanic Islands. The western house mouse from Perth

with a unique haplotype was most closely related to *M. m. domesticus* from the Middle

East, Cyprus, and Europe.

Figure 1 Minimum spanning haplotype network from *Mus musculus domesticus* D-loop

data. The numbers in the legend are representative of the number of unique haplotypes

included in the analysis. The size of each circle indicates the frequencies of the haplotype,

and each colour represents the geographical origin of the sequences. The numbered nodes

in the haplotype network correspond to the numbered inset boxes. A black cross in legend

indicates that M. m. domesticus in that area has not been tested for anticoagulant

rodenticide (AR) resistance.[31] A white square indicates that M. m. domesticus has been

tested for Vkorc1 mutations related to AR resistance and was found to be negative (this

study). A red triangle indicates that M. m. domesticus has been tested for resistance

through a lethal feeding period test and was found to be resistant to ARs.[5,8,20,25,26] A

white triangle indicates that M. m. domesticus has displayed Vkorc1 mutations related to

AR resistance.[20] A black triangle indicates that a blood clotting response test has been

performed and M. m. domesticus was found to be resistant to ARs.[26] A blue triangle

indicates that an assay of the VKOR enzyme has been carried out and resistance to ARs was

determined.[5]

The D-loop sequences of 15 mice from Browse Island were identical to published *M.*

m. castaneus D-loop sequences from Asia and Kenya. One mouse differed from the other

haplotype by one base pair at position 101 and was 100% homologous to published *M. m.*

castaneus sequences from Asia, Russia and Kenya. On the haplotype network (Fig 2),

mitochondrial D-loop sequences of *M. m. castaneus* from Browse Island were grouped with

sequences from China, Bangladesh, Japan, Indonesia and Kenya, as well as other Asian

countries.

Fig 2 Minimum spanning haplotype network from mitochondrial D-loop data of *Mus*

***musculus castaneus*.** The numbers in the legend are representative of the number of unique

haplotypes included in the analysis. The size of each circle indicates the frequencies of the

haplotype, and each colour represents the geographical origin of the sequences. The

numbered node in the haplotype network corresponds to the numbered inset box.

Haplotype diversity resulting from deletions and insertions is not represented in PopART

(1.7) networks, therefore all Browse Island samples appear in the same haplotype node.

Discussion

Mus musculus domesticus of Perth lack VKORC1

mutations

Resistance to ARs is usually present in populations of house mice and rats that have

been exposed to toxicants, especially when exposure is repeated and involves intensive use

of FGARs such as warfarin.[32] ARs have been intensively used by the public and

professionals for conservation outcomes, or in agricultural, residential and commercial

settings in Western Australia,[9] and professional pest managers have anecdotally observed

resistance to the ARs warfarin, coumatetralyl (FGARs) and bromadiolone (SGAR) in Perth

house mice (Piggott D, 2019, pers. comm.). Where mouse populations carry resistance,

larger quantities or stronger ARs tend to be used, increasing the likelihood of non-target

animals being affected directly through feeding on baits and indirectly through feeding on

resistant mice that have ingested higher doses of poison (in addition to consuming dead

susceptible mice).

Prior to this study, the resistance to warfarin in Australian *Mus musculus* to ARs had

been recorded only using no-choice feeding tests on animals from Lord Howe Island (700

km off the coast of New South Wales), and Sydney but not in Western Australian

populations.[25,33] In Australia, the *Vkroc1* gene has not previously been sequenced in

mice, and therefore the results of this study are the only available information currently on

genetically-based resistance to ARs of mice in Australia.

No mutations correlated with resistance to ARs were detected in the VKORC1 gene

of *M. m. domesticus* from the Perth metropolitan area in this study. Previous VKORC1

screening in Europe has recorded high frequencies of mutations related to AR resistance

ranging 70-100% (Table 3).[11,19,21,28,34] All published research at the time of preparing

this manuscript reported resistance-related mutations, therefore the absence of VKORC1

sequence variants in the Perth region is a unique result and poses challenges and

opportunities for pest management and biosecurity.

Table 3. Anticoagulant resistance conferred by mutations in the VKORC1 gene in *Mus*

***musculus* populations worldwide.**

Location	Number of mice	Resistance (%)	Reference
France (65 locations)	266	70	[11]
United Kingdom (5 counties)	53	89	[20]
Germany (25 locations)	352	90	[19]
Ireland	50	84	[21]
Switzerland (3 locations)	48	100	[19]
Spain	29	93	[30]

We consider six scenarios as likely explanations for the lack of genetic resistance in

Perth mice (Table 4). The simplest scenario is a founder effect: the mutations in the VKORC1

gene were never present in the Western Australian mice population. As *M. m. domesticus*

was probably introduced in Australia by European settlers in the late 18th Century, the

absence of mutations in the exons of VKORC1 might because they were absent from these

founder animals.[35,36] The mitochondrial D-loop data supports this, as the low haplotype

diversity indicates rapid expansion from a small founding population.[37] ARs were invented

in the 1940s, and the first evidence of resistance in rodents dates to 1958.[18] Therefore,

the highly conserved coding regions of VKORC1 have been maintained free of mutations

because the initial rodent population that colonised Western Australia did not exhibit any.

Table 4. Possible scenarios that could have led to the absence of SNPs in the VKORC1 gene

of *Mus musculus domesticus* of the Perth metropolitan area, Western Australia.

Scenario	Description	Likelihood
Founder effect	Mutations have never been in Western Australia because the founder population did not carry VKORC1 mutations.	Possible
SGARs	The use of strong SGARs removed any warfarin resistance (the most common kind of resistance inferred from VKORC1 mutations) from the Western Australian house mouse population.	Very likely
Pleiotropy	Defective VKOR enzyme activity posed a negative selection pressure on VKORC1 mutations related to rodenticide resistance.	Not likely

Scenario	Description	Likelihood
Other factors	The arid Australian environment selects for natural tolerance to vitamin K depleted conditions; other unidentified genes (such as cytochrome P450) confer resistance to ARs in Western Australian mice.	Possible
Detection failure	As only a subset of the Western Australian house mouse population was tested, the sample could have missed individuals from the population carrying VKORC1 mutations.	Not likely

Alternatively, western house mice of Western Australia may have lost mutations

conferring AR resistance. In this scenario, it may be that heavy use of SGARs has removed

them from the population. In Australia, eight ARs are commercially available for rodent

control, which are intensively used, and readily available to the public without

restrictions.[9] While there is no information available regarding the volume of use of

rodenticides in Australia, evidence of secondary poisoning and AR residues in non-target

species indicates heavy use of rodenticides in Western Australia, both by professionals and

the public.[9] As the most common resistance is exhibited towards the anticoagulant

warfarin, the use of stronger SGARs may have removed any individuals carrying mutations

related to warfarin resistance from Western Australian populations.

Another explanation could be that a large pleiotropic has removed the alleles.

Dysfunctional VKORC1 activity has a cost, as blood clotting requires the enzyme to perform

well.[14] Furthermore, vitamin K is essential during foetal bone formation and therefore

females with normal VKOR activity are better breeders.[15] VKORC1 mutations are

therefore selected against in conditions where rodenticides are not used and rodent

populations are not exposed to the poisons;[14–17] however, continuous exposure of house

mice to ARs in the Perth Metropolitan area poses a selection pressure to maintain resistant

mutations, and therefore it is unlikely that mutations in the VKORC1 gene are absent due to

negative pleiotropic effects, and resistant rodents might be consuming exogenous vitamin K

to overcome the defective enzyme activity.[17]

It is also possible that Perth mice have AR resistance through other mechanisms (i.e.

through mutations in other genes conferring resistance), which would result in there being

no selection in favour of VKORC1 mutations (and they may be actively selected against as

per the pleiotropy scenario). The absence of resistance-related alleles in the VKORC1 gene

does not rule out the presence of resistance in Western Australia as this gene is not the only

known mechanism of resistance to anticoagulant rodenticides. Cytochrome P450 2C9

(CYP2C9) metabolises anticoagulant rodenticides, and genetic variants are associated with

the need for higher dosages.[26,38] As Cytochrome P450 also detoxifies other pollutants,

such as pesticides, the presence of environmental pollutants in general could lead to an

increase of cytochrome P450 activity and render rodents pre-adapted to rodenticides.[39]

Other unidentified genes could be involved in rodenticide resistance as well, and resistance

to certain ARs, such as difenacoum, has been shown to be polygenic.[40,41]

Rodents adapted to living in arid environments are tolerant to anticoagulant

rodenticides, an adaptation to a scarcity of available vitamin K. This could be an alternative

cause of AR resistance in western house mice of Western Australia, where the climate

ranges from Mediterranean in the south (where Perth is located) and transitions through

semi-arid to desert further inland.[38,42,43] Until resistance to anticoagulant rodenticides

is tested in *M. m. domesticus* of Western Australia through laboratory tests such as feeding

trials and blood clot response tests, it cannot be said whether the mice of this region are

resistant to ARs even though this study has shown that they do not carry resistance-linked

alleles in the VKORC1 gene. Pest managers have anecdotally reported resistance in the

Perth region, and therefore it is possible that house mice of Western Australia are resistant.

A final possibility is that mutations in the VKORC1 gene of Perth house mice are

present but were not detected. Sample size (34 mice) was adequate to detect resistant mice

at levels of resistance in the population to as low as 10% (Table 1). Measures were taken to

avoid sample collection bias according to sex (equal number of male and female samples

were used), location (a geographical range spanning through the entire Perth metropolitan

area was preferred), and sample collection was designed not to underestimate the

frequency of VKORC1 mutations (i.e. no mice killed with rodenticides were collected).

Furthermore, western house mouse populations in Europe reported high percentages of

resistance (between 70% to 100%) with much smaller sample sizes than our study (as few as

four mice per location)[11] while all other tests performed on house mouse populations

worldwide detected alleles associated with resistance.[11,19–21,30] We therefore hold the

possibility of a false negative not to be a concern.

Combinations of the scenarios discussed could be active (potentially in different

places and at different times); for example, if the initial colonising population did not have

mutations in the VKORC1 gene (scenario founder effect), any mutations arising

independently could have been quickly removed from the population by the intensive use of

strong anticoagulant rodenticides that killed those individuals (scenario SGARs).

VKORC1 introgression between *Mus* species

M. m. castaneus inhabiting Browse Island had an intragenic insertion in the VKORC1

gene, which was 100% homologous with the GenBank *Mus spretus* reference sequence, as

well as some *M. m. domesticus* that have hybridised with *M. spretus*.[30] There is evidence

of an ongoing process of hybridisation between the *M. musculus* subspecies, which,

combined with the retention of ancestral polymorphism and introgression in the wild,

renders it difficult to distinguish between subspecies.[44]

The most researched *M. musculus* subspecies, *M. m. musculus* and *M. m.*

domesticus[45] present evidence for introgression in at least 10% of their nuclear genomes,

as well as multiple mitochondrial restriction sites.[46,47] When compared to *M. m.*

musculus and *M. m. domesticus*, *M. m. castaneus* is more polymorphic, and its retention of

ancestral polymorphisms might be the reason behind the complexity of defining its lineage

and identifying introgression,[45] making it difficult to interpret the history of the Browse

Island mice.

The intragenic insertion detected in this study in the VKORC1 gene has been

previously found to have transferred from *M. spretus* to *M. m. domesticus* in areas of

sympatry in Spain and allopatry in Germany, where hybridisation and introgression between

allopatric species might have been caused by human interaction that increased the

geographic distribution of the *Mus* species.[30] Although there is a selective disadvantage

from hybridisation between *M. musculus* and *M. spretus*, including sterile male offspring

and the possibility of sterile female offspring depending on the direction of the

backcross,[48] the introgression of the *M. spretus* haplotype between distant populations

has been possible because it involved an adaptive gene such as VKORC1 and its spread has

been driven by the selection pressure posed by the common use of ARs.[29]

Previous studies identified three distinct introgression events between *M. m.*

domesticus and *M. spretus*, including an ancient event that occurred more than 2000 years

ago prior to the colonisation of Europe by *M. musculus*.[28] The other more recent

introgression events are dated around 50 to 60 years ago, since the introduction of ARs.[30]

Introgression in the VKORC1 gene was present but in low frequencies and it was therefore

considered far from becoming fixed and the details were not reported.[29] The 68 bp

insertion detected in the present study was present in all Browse Island mice so it can be

concluded that the introgression event was likely to be fixed in this small population due to

founder effect and genetic bottlenecks. Therefore the region of the VKORC1 gene from *M.*

spretus that has been detected in the *M. m. castaneus* sample from Browse Island is

considered a comet allele[47] that has migrated from one evolutionary lineage to another

and its frequency has increased to reach fixation.

The D-loop places the mice on Browse Island most closely to mice from China,

Indonesia, and other Asian countries, but as no other studies have sequenced the VKORC1

gene region in this subspecies or attempted to identify introgression in different *Mus*

species from Asian countries, we cannot make inferences on the process and location of the

hybridisation between the two *Mus* species. Less is known about hybridisation involving *M.*

m. castaneus than the European subspecies;[49] additionally, introgression in the VKORC1

gene between *M. spretus* and *M. m. castaneus* has not been described previously, possibly

because the two taxa are allopatric.

397   The length of the insertion in the VKORC1 gene (68bp), could indicate an ancient

introgression event (>2000 years ago) characterised by continued backcrossing, drift and

recombination;[28] however the insertion is not fragmented, and is identical across most

individuals from Browse Island and the reference sequences from GenBank. The fact that

the region is highly conserved is evidence of its adaptive value as selection would maintain it

over time, but this affects the length-based method used to determine the age of the

hybridisation. The location of the insertion on the gene could influence the way it is

conserved. Noncoding intron regions are usually conserved when the exons are alternatively

spliced.[50] In humans, the VKORC1 gene is alternatively spliced, and three isoforms have

been described, while the VKORC1 of *M. musculus* has a single described isoform and two

potential isoforms that have been computationally mapped.[51] If the VKORC1 gene of *Mus*

musculus is indeed alternatively spliced, the possibility of the intron being conserved is

much higher, as this phenomenon is observed in 77% of the conserved exons.[50]

411   The VKORC1 gene is highly conserved across organisms and no south-east Asian

412   house mouse from Browse Island carried mutations in the coding sequence that are linked

413   to the *M. spretus* allele. The absence of these adaptive mutations is consistent with the

414   absence of exposure to ARs.[13]

Low genetic diversity of *Mus musculus* in Western Australia

Mus musculus domesticus of the Perth metropolitan area belongs to two closely related haplotypes that differ from each other by a single base pair change, and are most closely related to mice from European countries, such as The Netherlands and United Kingdom. A phylogeographic study of mice in Australia detected 12 haplotypes, with Western Australian house mice belonging to two major clades.[36] The clade occurring geographically closest to Perth is the most widespread clade in Australia, and this haplotype group is also the most common in the United Kingdom, which suggests Western Australian *M. m. domesticus* likely originated from the British Isles.[36]

Apart from mice from Madeira, which were grouped closely in the haplotype network, no countries were characterised by pockets of diversity. The resulting network was highly reticulate, indicating western house mice are closely related worldwide (Fig 1). The genotypic analysis of the mitochondrial D-loop of house mice from the Perth metropolitan area indicated the presence of a single, large panmictic population. Our network places Iranian mice in a central position (Fig 1), indicating Iran is an old (or ancestral) population[52] and potentially a centre of origin for the subspecies. This concurs with the assumed origin of the commensal relationship between mice and humans that was established in the Middle East around 10,000 BC when humans first formed large settlements in the Fertile Crescent.[53] The expansion of *M. m. domesticus* would have been aided by human transport and trade into the Mediterranean Sea during the Iron Age, and then to colonies like Australia by European settlers.[54–56]

A previous phylogeographic study of *M. musculus* in Australia documented the

presence of *domesticus* as the predominant and only subspecies of house mouse in

Australia[36], however mitochondrial D-loop data from mice of Browse Island from our

study confirm previous records based on morphology suggesting that the *castaneus*

subspecies of house mouse is present in Australia. However, unlike the European origins of

the house mouse in Australia, the haplotype network of *M. m. castaneus* suggests that the

origin of these Browse Island mice is China and Indonesia. Previous studies have also

identified the Indonesian islands of Rote and Timor as the source of Australian *M. m.*

castaneus.[57]

Implications for pest management

When planning pest eradications or population control, it is vital to gather

information on the resistance of the population in order to choose a control method that

can successfully eliminate most of the population,[70] ideally 99% of the population.[31]

However, eradication attempts and rodent control programs in Western Australia have

been carried out with no knowledge of the level of resistance in rodent populations.

As resistance-conferring VKORC1 mutations were not detected in the Perth

metropolitan area, nor on Browse Island, house mouse populations in these areas can be

managed with the use of a) FGARs with fewer negative impacts on non-target species or b)

weaker SGARs when the natural tolerance exhibited by mice poses restrictions on the use of

first generation compounds. Even so, regular testing should be used to detect developing

resistance which can then be eliminated by a temporary switch to a SGAR,[33] or methods

with low risk of bioaccumulation and secondary toxicity such as lethal trapping or a non-

anticoagulant rodenticide containing actives such as cholecalciferol or corn gluten

meal.[9,58]

As Perth is close to a major commercial port,[59] the risk of resistant mice invading

the area through international shipping is high. Despite a reported genetic resilience of

established mouse populations to new migrants,[60] in the event that resistant mice reach

Perth these new individuals would be at a highly advantageous position due to the intense

use of ARs.[14] Although our data indicate that, so far this has not occurred, it is an ongoing

risk. A biosecurity and quarantine system has been developed to defend Western Australia

and all other States and Territories on the Australia continent against incursions of pests,

and checkpoints are in place at the State borders and all airports[61,62] and stringent

biosecurity protocols need to be established for all ports also.[63] Vessels should be

certified free of rodents and provide evidence that no re-infestation occurred since the

certificate was issued.[63] Furthermore, resistance to ARs is not always concomitant in rat

and mouse species, and if rats and mice of Perth exhibit different levels of resistance, more

complex control programs are needed.[33]

The presence of a different mouse subspecies on Browse Island poses a biosecurity

risk to mainland Australia.[64] Fortunately, the introgression between Browse Island mice

and M. spretus was limited to intronic sequences in the VKORC1 gene, and resistance-

related mutations were not carried by any individual from Browse Island that has been

sequenced. Since the south-east Asian house mouse population on Browse Island carries

silent VKORC1 mutations that do not impair rodenticide activity, the use of ARs to achieve

pest eradication is possible, reducing the biosecurity risk of invasion of mainland Australia

and will promote breeding of indigenous species by removing the risk of egg predation of

both seabirds and green turtles (*Chelonia midas*) that nest on the island[1]'[57]. The use of

anticoagulant rodenticides on all islands should be carefully planned to reduce the impact of

toxicants to endemic fauna of the island and coastal waters, since broadcast applications of

rodenticides on islands are linked to exposure of non-target wildlife in coastal

environments.[65] The waters around Browse Island are part of the Australian Fishing Zone,

and are often visited by Indonesian fishermen who harvest marine organisms for

consumption; as this biota might be exposed to ARs, the use of toxicants threatens human

health through possible secondary exposure.[65,66]

Conclusion

The order Rodentia is characterised by a high number of successful invaders, which

humans have attempted to manage with the use of anticoagulant rodenticides (ARs) since

the 1940s.[4,7] However, this has selected for resistance in the rodents and negatively

impacted non-target species.[7,9,22,24] VKORC1 screening in multiple European countries

has detected high frequencies of mutations that confer resistance to ARs.[11,18,19,39] In

Australia, strong ARs can be purchased from supermarket and retail outlets and are

routinely and intensively used in residential and commercial settings.[9] These factors led to

the hypothesis that *Mus musculus* of Perth have a high probability of carrying resistance-

related mutations in the VKORC1 gene. The aim of this study was to provide the first genetic

data on AR resistance levels in two contrasting house mouse populations, and to make

suggestions for conservation and biosecurity based on the evidence gathered.

Concomitantly this is the first genetic data available for resistance in mice on the Australian

continent. The absence of resistance-conferring VKORC1 mutations in both Perth

metropolitan area and Browse Island house mouse populations contrasts starkly with all

other mouse populations screened thus far. Our results indicate that FGARs can be

employed to control and/or eradicate mice effectively, minimising potential harm to non-

target species, promoting biodiversity on the island[57] and reducing the biosecurity threat

to mainland Australia posed by *Mus musculus castaneus*.

A general lack of data regarding the levels of AR resistance in commensal rodents in

Australia and the impact of rodenticides on non-target biota should motivate future

research to investigate resistance in mouse and rat populations throughout Australia.

Investigation of genetic resistance should also include native rodents targeted for control in

agricultural settings like *Rattus sordidus* and *Melomys burtoni*.[67] Anticoagulant

rodenticides are likely to continue to be effective in controlling house mouse populations (at

least in the short-term) and there should be a focus on: preventing the introduction of

potentially resistant house mice to Western Australia through the port of Fremantle and

other routes; genetic screening of other mainland Australian mouse and also rat

populations; screening populations prior to eradication programs on islands to minimise the

risk of coastal water contamination; and, generally reducing the threat of secondary

poisoning to non-target species in both environments by careful planning and application of

ARs underpinned by a thorough understanding of resistance in the target populations.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr J Lo and Ms K Patak for statistical advice. The authors thank the staff of the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions for donating house mouse samples and for their useful insights into the history of human movements on Browse Island. We also thank the many volunteers across the Perth metropolitan area who donated house mouse samples to this project.

References

1. Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research. Rats, mice and people: rodent biology and management. In: Singleton GR, Hinds LA, Krebs CJ, Spratt DM, editors. Rats, mice and people: rodent biology and management. Canberra; 2003. Available: www.aciar.gov.au

2. Pocock MJO, Hauffe HC, Searle JB. Dispersal in house mice. Biol J Linnaean Soc. 2005;84: 565–583.

3. Brouat C, Tollenaere C, Estoup A, Loiseau A, Sommer S, Soanandrasana R, et al. Invasion genetics of a human commensal rodent: the black rat *Rattus rattus* in Madagascar. Mol Ecol. 2014;23: 4153–4167. doi:10.1111/mec.12848

4. Capizzi D, Bertolino S, Mortelliti A. Rating the rat: Global patterns and research priorities in impacts and management of rodent pests. Mamm Rev. 2014;44: 148–162. doi:10.1111/mam.12019

5. Goulois J, Hascoët C, Dorani K, Besse S, Legros L, Benoit E, et al. Study of the efficiency of anticoagulant rodenticides to control *Mus musculus domesticus* introgressed with *Mus spretus* VKORC1. Pest Manag Sci. 2017;73: 325–331.

doi:10.1002/ps.4319

6.   Howald G, Donlan CJ, Galván JP, Russell JC, Parkes J, Samaniego A, et al. Invasive

rodent eradication on islands. Conserv Biol. 2007;21: 1258–1268. doi:10.1111/j.1523-

1739.2007.00755.x

7.   Ruiz-Suárez N, Henríquez-Hernández LA, Valerón PF, Boada LD, Zumbado M,

Camacho M, et al. Assessment of anticoagulant rodenticide exposure in six raptor

species from the Canary Islands (Spain). Sci Total Environ. 2014;485–486: 371–376.

doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.03.094

8.   Pelz HJ, Rost S, Hünerberg M, Fregin A, Heiberg AC, Baert K, et al. The genetic basis of

resistance to anticoagulants in rodents. Genetics. 2005;170.

doi:10.1534/genetics.104.040360

9.   Lohr MT, Davis RA. Anticoagulant rodenticide use, non-target impacts and regulation:

a case study from Australia. Sci Total Environ. 2018;634.

doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.04.069

10.   Horak KE, Fisher PM, Hopkins B. Pharmacokinetics of anticoagulant rodenticides in

target and non-target organisms. In: van den Brink NW, editor. Anticoagulant

rodenticides and wildlife. 2018. pp. 87–108. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-64377-9_4

11.   Goulois J, Lambert V, Legros L, Benoit E, Lattard V. Adaptative evolution of the

VKORC1 gene in *Mus musculus domesticus* is influenced by the selective pressure of

anticoagulant rodenticides. Ecol Evol. 2016;7. doi:10.1002/ece3.2829

12.   Hedrick PW. Adaptive introgression in animals: examples and comparison to new

mutation and standing variation as sources of adaptive variation. Mol Ecol. 2013;22:

4606–4618. doi:10.1111/mec.12415

13.   Song Y, Endepols S, Klemann N, Richter D, Matuschka FR, Shih CH, et al. Adaptive

introgressive hybridization with the Algerian mouse (*Mus spretus*) promoted the

evolution of anticoagulant rodenticide resistance in European house mice (*M.*

musculus domesticus). European Vertebrate Pest Management conference. 2011. pp.

67–69. doi:10.5073/jka.2011.432.034

14.   Ishizuka M, T. T, Tanaka KD, Heewon M, Okajima F, Sakamoto KQ, et al. Pesticide

resistance in wild mammals: mechanisms of anticoagulant resistance in wild rodents.

J Toxicol Sci. 2008;33.

15.   Heiberg AC, Leirs H, Siegismund HR. Reproductive success of bromadiolone-resistant

rats in absence of anticoagulant pressure. Pest Manag Sci. 2006;62.

doi:10.1002/ps.1249

16.   Jacob J, Endepols S, Pelz HJ, Kampling E, Cooper TG, Yeung GH, et al. Vitamin K

requirement and reproduction in bromadiolone resistant Norway rats. Pest Manag

Sci. 2012;68.

17.   Markussen MDK, Heiberg AC, Nielsen R, Leirs H. Vitamin K requirement in Danish

anticoagulant-resistant Norway rats (*Rattus norvegicus*). Pest Manag Sci. 2003;59.

doi:10.1002/ps.703

18.   Grandemange A, Lasseur R, Longin-Sauvageon C, Benoit E, Berny P. Distribution of

VKORC1 single nucleotide polymorphism in wild *Rattus norvegicus* in France. Pest

Manag Sci. 2010;66. doi:10.1002/ps.1869

19.   Pelz HJ, Rost S, Müller E, Esther A, Ulrich RG, Müller CR. Distribution and frequency of

VKORC1 sequence variants conferring resistance to anticoagulants in *Mus musculus*.

Pest Manag Sci. 2012;68. doi:10.1002/ps.2254

20.   Prescott C, Coan E, Jones C, Baxter M, Rymer D, Buckle A. Anticoagulant resistance in

rats and mice in the UK: current status in 2018. Campaign Responsible Rodentic Use

UK. Reading; 2018. Available:

http://www.pestmagazine.co.uk/_attachments/Resources/624_S4.pdf

21. Mooney J, Lynch MR, Prescott C V., Clegg T, Loughlin M, Hannon B, et al. VKORC1

sequence variants associated with resistance to anticoagulant rodenticides in Irish

populations of *Rattus norvegicus* and *Mus musculus domesticus*. Sci Rep. 2018;8.

doi:10.1038/s41598-018-22815-7

22. Kotthoff M, Rüdel H, Jürling H, Severin K, Hennecke S, Friesen A, et al. First evidence

of anticoagulant rodenticides in fish and suspended particulate matter: spatial and

temporal distribution in German freshwater aquatic systems. Environ Sci Pollut Res.

2018; 1–11. doi:10.1007/s11356-018-1385-8

23. López-Perea JJ, Camarero PR, Sánchez-Barbudo IS, Mateo R. Urbanization and cattle

density are determinants in the exposure to anticoagulant rodenticides of non-target

wildlife. Environ Pollut. 2019;244: 801–808. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2018.10.101

24. Rattner BA, Lazarus RS, Elliott JE, Shore RF, Van Den Brink N. Adverse outcome

pathway and risks of anticoagulant rodenticides to predatory wildlife. Environ Sci

Technol. 2014;48: 8433–8445. doi:10.1021/es501740n

25. Wheeler R, Priddel D, Dwyer TO, Carlile N, Portelli D, Wilkinson I, et al. Evaluating the

susceptibility of invasive black rats (*Rattus rattus*) and house mice (*Mus musculus*) to

brodifacoum as a prelude to rodent eradication on Lord Howe Island. Biol Invasions.

2018;4. doi:10.1007/s10530-018-1863-4

26. Zhelev GG, Koev KP, Dimitrov VD, Petrov VS. Anticoagulant resistance in synanthropic

rodents in the Stara Zagora region, Bulgaria. Maced Vet Rev. 2019;42.

doi:10.2478/macvetrev-2019-0010

27. Bandelt H-J, Forster P, Rohl A. Median-joining networks for inferring intraspecic

phylogenies. Mol Biol. 1994;16: 37–48. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.a026036

28.   Liu KJ, Steinberg E, Yozzo A, Song Y, Kohn MH, Nakhleh L. Interspecific introgressive

origin of genomic diversity in the house mouse. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2015;112.

doi:10.1073/pnas.1406298111

29.   Ullrich KK, Linnenbrink M, Tautz D. Introgression patterns between house mouse

subspecies and species reveal genomic windows of frequent exchange. DoiOrg.

2017;1: 168328. doi:10.1101/168328

30.   Song Y, Endepols S, Klemann N, Richter D, Matuschka FR, Shih CH, et al. Adaptive

introgression of anticoagulant rodent poison resistance by hybridization between old

world mice. Curr Biol. 2011;21: 1296–1301. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2011.06.043

31.   Fisher P. Review of house mouse (*Mus musculus*) susceptibility to anticoagulant

poisons. Doc Sci Intern Ser. 2005;198: 1–18.

32.   Cuthbert RJ, Visser P, Louw H, Ryan PG. Palatability and efficacy of rodent baits for

eradicating house mice (*Mus musculus*) from Gough Island, Tristan da Cunha. Wildl

Res. 2011;38: 196. doi:10.1071/wr11016

33.   Billing J. The control of introduced *Rattus rattus* L. on Lord Howe Island. II. The status

of warfarin resistance in rats and mice. Wildl Res. 2000;27. doi:10.1071/WR99013

34.   Song Y, Lan Z, Kohn MH. Mitochondrial DNA phylogeography of the Norway rat. PLoS

One. 2014;9: 1–13. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0088425

35.   Cory F, Wilson A, Priddel D, Carlile N, Klomp N. Eradication of the house mouse (*Mus*

musculus) from Montague Island, New South Wales, Australia. Ecol Manag Restor.

2011;12. doi:10.1111/j.1442-8903.2011.00583.x

36.   Gabriel SI, Stevens MI, da Luz Mathias M, Searle JB. Of mice and "convicts": origin of

the Australian house mouse, *Mus musculus*. PLoS One. 2011;6.

651 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0028622

652 37. Tang Q, Low GW, Lim JY, Gwee CY, Rheindt FE. Human activities and landscape

653 features interact to closely define the distribution and dispersal of an urban

654 commensal. Evol Appl. 2018;11: 1598–1608. doi:10.1111/eva.12650

655 38. Gryseels S, Leirs H, Makundi R, Gouy De Bellocq J. Polymorphism in VKORC1 gene of

656 natal multimammate mice, *Mastomys natalensis*, in Tanzania. J Hered. 2015;106.

657 doi:10.1093/jhered/esv054

658 39. Ishizuka M, Okajima F, Tanikawa T, Min H, Tanaka KD, Sakamoto KQ, et al. Elevated

659 warfarin metabolism in warfarin-resistant roof rats (*Rattus rattus*) in Tokyo. Drug

660 Metab Dispos. 2007;35. doi:10.1124/dmd.106.011775

661 40. Cowan PE, Gleeson DM, Howitt RLJ, Ramón-Laca A, Esther A, Pelz HJ. VKORC1

662 sequencing suggests anticoagulant resistance in rats in New Zealand. Pest Manag Sci.

663 2017;73. doi:10.1002/ps.4304

664 41. Limdi NA, Veenstra DL. Warfarin pharmacogenetics. Pharmacotherapy. 2008;28:

665 1084–1097. doi:10.1016/j.tcm.2014.09.001

666 42. Bradfield AAG, Gill JE. Laboratory trials of five rodenticides for the control of

667 *Mesocricetus auratus* Waterhouse. J Hyg (Lond). 1984;93: 389–394.

668 doi:10.1017/S0022172400064950

669 43. Mahmoud W, Redfern R. The response of the Egyptian spiny mouse (*Acomys*

670 *cahirinus*) and two other species of commensal rodents to anticoagulant rodenticides.

671 J Hyg (Lond). 1981;86: 329–334. doi:10.1017/S0022172400069072

672 44. Yang H, Wang JR, Didion JP, Buus RJ, Bell TA, Welsh CE, et al. Subspecific origin and

673 haplotype diversity in the laboratory mouse. Nat Genet. 2011;43: 648–655.

674 doi:10.1038/ng.847

45.   Rajabi-Maham H, Orth A, Boursot P, Siahsarvi R, Bonhomme F. The south-eastern

house mouse *Mus musculus castaneus* (Rodentia: Muridae) is a polytypic subspecies.

Biol J Linn Soc. 2012;107: 295–306.

46.   Bozikova E, Munclinger P, Teeter KC, Tucker PK, Macholan M, J P. Mitochondrial DNA

in the hybrid zone between *Mus musculus musculus* and *Mus musculus domesticus*: a

comparison of two transects. Biol J Linn Soc. 2005;84: 363–378.

47.   Staubach F, Lorenc A, Messer PW, Tang K, Petrov DA, Tautz D. Genome patterns of

selection and introgression of haplotypes in natural populations of the house mouse

(*Mus musculus*). PLoS Genet. 2012;8. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1002891

48.   Dejager L, Libert C, Montagutelli X. Thirty years of *Mus spretus*: a promising future.

Trends Genet. 2009;25: 234–241. doi:10.1016/j.tig.2009.03.007

49.   Jing M, Yu HT, Bi X, Lai YC, Jiang W, Huang L. Phylogeography of Chinese house mice

(*Mus musculus musculus/castaneus*): distribution, routes of colonization and

geographic regions of hybridization. Mol Ecol. 2014;23: 4387–4405.

doi:10.1111/mec.12873

50.   Sorek R, Ast G. Intronic sequences flanking alternatively spliced exons are conserved

between human and mouse. Genome Res. 2003;13: 1631–1637.

doi:10.1101/gr.1208803

51.   The UniProt Consortium. UniProt: a worldwide hub of protein knowledge. Nucleic

Acids Res. 2018;47: D506–D515. doi:10.1093/nar/gky1049

52.   Kho W-G, Kano S, Iwagami M, Tanabe K, Hayakawa T, Kim S-H, et al. Geographical

origin of *Plasmodium vivax* in the Republic of Korea: haplotype network analysis

based on the parasite's mitochondrial genome. Malar J. 2010;9: 184.

doi:10.1186/1475-2875-9-184

53.   Lippens C, Estoup A, Hima MK, Loiseau A, Tatard C, Dalecky A, et al. Genetic structure

and invasion history of the house mouse (*Mus musculus domesticus*) in Senegal, West

Africa: a legacy of colonial and contemporary times. Heredity (Edinb). 2017; 1–12.

doi:10.1038/hdy.2017.18

54.   Cucchi T, Auffray J-C, Vigne J-D. On the origin of the house mouse synanthropy and

dispersal in the Near East and Europe: zooarcheological review and perspectives. In:

Macholan M, Baird SJE, Muclinger P, Pialek J, editors. Evolution in our

neighbourhood: the house mouse as a model in evolutionary research. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press; 2012. pp. 65–93. doi:10.1017/cbo9781139044547.005

55.   Jones EP, Jóhannesdóttir F, Gündüz I, Richards MB, Searle JB. The expansion of the

house mouse into north-western Europe. J Zool. 2011;283: 257–268.

doi:10.1111/j.1469-7998.2010.00767.x

56.   Searle JB, Jones CS, Scascitelli M, Jones EP, Herman JS, Rambau RV, et al. Of mice and

(Viking?) men: phylogeography of British and Irish house mice. 2009; 201–207.

doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.0958

57.   Moro D, Palmer R, Greatwich B, Dickinson R, Anderson H. Browse Island. A journey to

Western Australia's most remote nature reserve. Landscope. 2018: 22–27.

58.   Baldwin RA, Meinerz R, Witmer GW. Cholecalciferol plus diphacinone baits for vole

control: a novel approach to a historic problem. J Pest Sci (2004). 2016;89: 129–135.

doi:10.1007/s10340-015-0653-3

59.   Department of Treasury and Finance. An economic history of Western Australia since

colonial settlement. 2004.

60.   Mora MS, Cutrera AP, Lessa EP, Vassallo AI, D'Anatro A, Mapelli FJ. Phylogeography

and population genetic structure of the Talas tuco-tuco (*Ctenomys talarum*):

integrating demographic and habitat histories. J Mammal. 2013;94: 459–476.

doi:10.1644/11-mamm-a-242.1

61.   Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development. WA State barrier

animal inspections. 2015 [cited 24 May 2019]. Available:

https://www.agric.wa.gov.au/quarantine/wa-state-barrier-animal-inspections

62.   Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development. Quarantine WA border

checkpoints. 2017 [cited 24 May 2019]. Available:

https://www.agric.wa.gov.au/importing-animals/quarantine-wa-border-checkpoints

63.   Tasmania Parks and Wildlife Service. Macquarie Island pest eradication plan. 2009.

64.   Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development. Biosecurity &

quarantine. [cited 24 May 2019]. Available: https://www.agric.wa.gov.au/biosecurity-

quarantine

65.   Masuda BM, Fisher P, Beaven B. Residue profiles of brodifacoum in coastal marine

species following an island rodent eradication. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf. 2015;113: 1–8.

doi:10.1016/j.ecoenv.2014.11.013

66.   Stacey N. Boats to burn: Bajo fishing activity in the Australian zone. Canberra: The

Australian National University E Press; 2007.

67.   Smith M, Dyer B, Brodie A, Hunt W, Staples L. Overcoming rat infestation in Australian

sugarcane crops using an integrated approach that includes new rodenticide

technology. ACIAR Monogr Ser. 2003;96: 238–241.

Legend
- 🟢 Afghanistan (2)
- Bangladesh (3)
- 🔴 Browse Island, WA (2)
- 🔵 China (33)
- 🟠 India (34)
- 🔵 Indonesia (2)
- Iran (60)
- 🔴 Japan (6)
- ⚪ Kenya (11)
- Myanmar (3)
- 🟡 New Zealand (3)
- 🟢 Pakistan (9)
- Philippines (2)
- 🟣 Russia (3)
- Sri Lanka (1)
- Taiwan (2)
- 🔵 Thailand (2)
- 🔵 Vietnam (2)

Legend

🔵 Atlantic Ocean Islands (Falkland 10, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands 1) ✳
🔴 Australia West (4) ▢ ✳
🟠 Australia East (6) ▲ ✳
🩷 British Isles (19) ▲ △
🔴 Canada (1) ▲
🔵 China (1) ✳
🔵 Cyprus (23) ✳
🔵 Indian Ocean Islands (Amsterdam Island 1, Kerguelen Archipelago 5) ✳
🟢 Madeira (13) ✳
🟩 Middle East (Georgia 1, Iran 30, Israel 4, Turkey 37) ✳
🟡 New Zealand (5) ✳
🩷 Peru (1) ⬠
🟣 Russia (3) ✳
🟤 Senegal (8) ✳
⚪ Somalia (1) ✳
🔵 Southeast Asia (Indonesia 2, Philippines 1) ✳
🟢 Southeast Europe (Greece 5, Bulgaria 9, Slovenia 1) ▲ ▲
🟤 Tunisia (1) ✳
🟢 West Europe (France 4, Italy 17, The Netherlands 5, Portugal 14) ▲ △ 🔺