

1 **Perceptions of responsibility and capability for treating wildlife casualties in UK**  
2 **veterinary practices**

3 **E. Barnes\*, M. J. Farnworth**

4 **School of Biological Sciences, Plymouth University, Drake Circus, Plymouth, Devon**  
5 **PL4 8AA, UK**

6 **\*E-mail for correspondence: [barnes.mle@gmail.com](mailto:barnes.mle@gmail.com)**

7 Attribution of responsibility for, and management of, wildlife patients can be problematic.  
8 National annual caseload estimates range from 30-40,000 (Molony and others 2007) to 71,000  
9 (Grogan and Kelly 2013). Veterinary attitudes towards provision of wildlife care in primary  
10 practice, and any benefits or disadvantages associated with it, remain largely unexplored in the  
11 peer-reviewed literature.

12 Educating care providers and treating wildlife are considered important in an international  
13 context (Vogelnest 2008, Miller 2012). However, no government department or NGO accepts  
14 sole responsibility for wildlife health in the UK meaning interested organisations may have  
15 different or competing core concerns (e.g. population health vs. individual health). Therefore,  
16 issues surrounding wildlife casualties are often unclear (Duff and others 2010).

17 Veterinary professionals must consider multiple laws pertaining to wildlife casualty  
18 management (e.g. Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981) including species-specific legislation,  
19 and the regulatory requirement to provide veterinary first aid and analgesia (RCVS 2012:1.4).  
20 The treatment of wildlife casualties also raises ethical dilemmas (Kirkwood 2000, McCallum  
21 and Hocking 2005, Cooper and Cooper 2006), such as whether to treat or to euthanase given  
22 the stress associated with treatment (Stocker 2005) and likelihood of successful release.

23 The public's perception is that all veterinary practices can treat injured wildlife (Cooper and  
24 Cooper 2006). Charities may advise that such cases be directed to veterinarians (e.g. Royal  
25 Society for the Protection of Birds, 2013) in the absence of an organisational ability to provide  
26 individualised treatment.

27 Treatment of wildlife casualties requires suitably trained staff (Mullineaux and others 2003),  
28 specialist facilities and equipment, time and money. Understanding how the ability and  
29 willingness to provide these resources varies between and within practices will help in  
30 improving wildlife casualty management. We aimed to evaluate practice caseload, their  
31 willingness and capacity to meet this caseload and any impact of practice-based variables.

32 We adopted a cross-sectional design involving a semi-quantitative online questionnaire (see  
33 Appendix 1), relying on self-report, with the attendant caveats related to such report. The  
34 questions included the practice's type, size (number of staff), location, ownership and  
35 experience in relation to wildlife casualties (i.e. demand, caseload, protocols, knowledge,  
36 facilities and limitations). Ethical approval was granted by Plymouth University's Research  
37 Ethics Committee.

38 Data were collected over 12 weeks (October 2015-January 2016). Participation from veterinary  
39 surgeons and veterinary nurses was requested by emailing a web link to 1,706 practices  
40 registered with the RCVS.

41 Return rate was 169/1706 (10%). Of these, 85% (143/169) experienced wildlife admissions for  
42 treatment and an estimated 8,081 (range 6,267-9,895) animals were treated per annum (Fig. 1).

43 The data were highly skewed: the median 'total treated' per annum was 33, while the maximum  
44 was 355; it appeared that those practices treating a total number exceeding 40 ( $n = 20$ ) might  
45 have answered for multiple branches, or were specialists treating high numbers of a particular  
46 species. Excluding these for the purposes of extrapolation resulted in a mean number treated

47 of 30.2 which could suggest a UK annual wildlife workload of 131,609 (range 90,044-  
48 173,173), significantly higher than previous estimates.

49 **Figure 1.** Estimated numbers of animals treated per species, per annum. Other species  
50 identified (with no numbers) included stoats and weasels.

51 Most cases were garden birds (31.9%) and hedgehogs (23.9%), with the most frequent  
52 suspected cause being injuries from predators (55.1%) and collisions (47.1%).

53 The majority of respondents (84%) were often or sometimes willing to perform treatment  
54 beyond first aid/stabilisation before transferring the patient to a wildlife organisation. The most  
55 frequent treatments offered were prescription medication, rehabilitation (<72hrs) and release.

56 Good or excellent knowledge was most often reported in relation to mammals and birds  
57 (broadly consistent with the caseload), but knowledge/skills were also the most frequently cited  
58 restriction in treating wildlife (Fig. 2). The second most frequently reported restriction was  
59 'Facilities/equipment'. Kruskal-Wallis/Jonckheere tests showed a significant relationship  
60 between numbers of wildlife treated and the facilities for holding wildlife temporarily ( $H(4) =$   
61  $20.395, p < 0.001, J = 4,461, z = 3.924, p < 0.001, r = 0.330$ ).

62 **Figure 2.** Percentage of restrictions experienced by veterinary practices treating wildlife. Other  
63 (in summary): prognosis always poor, lack of good post-treatment rehabilitation centres  
64 available. Total responses = 138.

65 Cost and time were also identified as major restrictions. Most respondents (85.6%) agreed that  
66 the public expected veterinary practices to treat injured wildlife for free. Some costs can be  
67 reimbursed by the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals under  
68 a Memorandum of Understanding with the British Veterinary Association, but this offers  
69 reimbursement for initial emergency treatment for large animals (over 1kg), which, by size  
70 alone, excludes the majority of the reported caseload. 46.2% of practices were willing to accept

71 these costs, but a minority (22.7%) agreed that ‘It is asking too much of the profession to invest  
72 time and/or funds in treating wildlife’. There was no significant relationship between the level  
73 of agreement with that proposition and the total numbers treated (Kendall’s  $\tau = -0.022$ ,  $p =$   
74  $0.741$ , bootstrapping to establish confidence intervals showed 95% BCa CI  $[-0.155, 0.112]$ ),  
75 suggesting this difference in opinion does not significantly affect readiness to treat wildlife.

76 Respondents were equivocal on whether treating wildlife casualties benefitted the practice  
77 overall (‘yes’ 43.2%, ‘no’ 40.2%). Benefits identified included experience, knowledge,  
78 personal satisfaction, team morale, public relations. Disadvantages included diversion of  
79 resources (e.g. staff, time and finances) and animal welfare concerns (e.g. disease transmission  
80 and inability to provide sufficient care).

81 Most respondents (71%) agreed that ‘All veterinary practices should have a role in wild animal  
82 welfare’. Half (49.2%) agreed, whilst 10.6% disagreed, that practices should share their  
83 experience of wildlife patients within the veterinary community. However, fewer than 10%  
84 ‘often’ or ‘sometimes’ reported wildlife cases to an appropriate organisation and there was no  
85 significant correlation between the two ( $\tau = -0.035$ ,  $p = 0.674$ , 95% BCa CI  $[-0.205,$   
86  $0.141]$ ). Information on likely outcomes is important to any decision to treat, but 59% agreed  
87 (9.8% disagreed) that not much information is available on the outcomes of wildlife  
88 rehabilitation cases.

89 Based on the responses given, the majority of veterinary practices recognise and accept their  
90 responsibility to treat wildlife casualties, but face a larger caseload than previously estimated  
91 and identified knowledge, facilities, cost and time as significant restrictions. Additional  
92 financial support and dissemination of information on wildlife rehabilitation and outcomes  
93 within the veterinary community may be beneficial. However, this was an exploratory study,  
94 based on a limited sample and further research is required to validate the findings. Future

95 research could assess how concerns identified affect practice capability, treatment offered and  
96 animal welfare.

97 **Word count = 1,021**

## 98 **Acknowledgements**

99 The authors acknowledge the assistance of the RCVS in the recruitment of respondents and  
100 sincere thanks go to the respondents, for giving freely of their time and thoughts in relation to  
101 the survey.

## 102 **References**

103 COOPER, J. & COOPER, M. E. (2006) Ethical and legal implications of treating casualty wild  
104 animals. In Practice 28, 2-6

105 DUFF, J. P., HOLMES J. P. & BARLOW, A. M. (2010) Surveillance turns to wildlife.  
106 Veterinary Record 167, 154-156

107 GROGAN, A. & KELLY, A. (2013) A review of RSPCA research into wildlife rehabilitation.  
108 Veterinary Record 172, 211-215

109 KIRKWOOD, J. K. (2000) Interventions for the conservation or welfare of wild animals. In  
110 Veterinary Ethics. An Introduction. Ed G. Legood. Continuum. pp 121-138

111 MCCALLUM, H. & HOCKING, B. A. (2005) Reflecting on ethical and legal issues in wildlife  
112 disease. Bioethics 19, 336-347

113 MILLER, E. A. (2012) Minimum standards for wildlife rehabilitation. 4th ed. National Wildlife  
114 Rehabilitators Association and International Wildlife Rehabilitation Council.

115 MOLONY, S. E., BAKER, P. J., GARLAND, L. I., CUTHILL, C. & HARRIS, S. (2007)

116 Factors that can be used to predict release rates for wildlife casualties. *Animal Welfare*  
117 16, 361-367

118 MULLINEAUX, E., BEST, R. & COOPER, J. E. eds. (2003) *BSAVA Manual of wildlife*  
119 *casualties*. British Small Animal Veterinary Association.

120 Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (2012) *Codes of Professional Conduct*.  
121 [www.rcvs.org.uk/advice-and-guidance](http://www.rcvs.org.uk/advice-and-guidance). Accessed October 2, 2015

122 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (2013) *Make a home for wildlife: advice. Injured*  
123 *and baby birds*. [www.rspb.org.uk/makeahomeforwildlife/advice/helpingbirds/health](http://www.rspb.org.uk/makeahomeforwildlife/advice/helpingbirds/health/injuredbirds.aspx)  
124 [/injuredbirds.aspx](http://www.rspb.org.uk/makeahomeforwildlife/advice/helpingbirds/health/injuredbirds.aspx). Accessed October 2, 2015.

125 STOCKER, L. (2005) *Practical wildlife care*. 2nd ed. Wiley-Blackwell.

126 VOGELNEST, L. (2008) *Veterinary considerations for the rescue, treatment, rehabilitation and*  
127 *release of wildlife*. In *Medicine of Australian mammals*. Eds L. Vogelnest & R. Woods. CSIRO  
128 Publishing. pp 1-12