

**PREVALENCE OF SKELETAL AND EYE MALFORMATIONS IN FROGS FROM NORTH-CENTRAL UNITED STATES: ESTIMATIONS BASED ON COLLECTIONS FROM RANDOMLY SELECTED SITES**

Authors: Patrick K. Schoff, Catherine M. Johnson, Anna M. Schotthoefer, Joseph E. Murphy, Camilla Lieske, et. al.

Source: Journal of Wildlife Diseases, 39(3) : 510-521

Published By: Wildlife Disease Association

URL: <https://doi.org/10.7589/0090-3558-39.3.510>

---

BioOne Complete ([complete.BioOne.org](https://complete.BioOne.org)) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at [www.bioone.org/terms-o-use](https://www.bioone.org/terms-o-use).

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

---

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

## PREVALENCE OF SKELETAL AND EYE MALFORMATIONS IN FROGS FROM NORTH-CENTRAL UNITED STATES: ESTIMATIONS BASED ON COLLECTIONS FROM RANDOMLY SELECTED SITES

Patrick K. Schoff,<sup>1,4</sup> Catherine M. Johnson,<sup>1</sup> Anna M. Schotthoefer,<sup>2</sup> Joseph E. Murphy,<sup>2</sup> Camilla Lieske,<sup>2</sup> Rebecca A. Cole,<sup>3</sup> Lucinda B. Johnson,<sup>1</sup> and Val R. Beasley<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Center for Water and the Environment, Natural Resources Research Institute, University of Minnesota—Duluth, 5013 Miller Trunk Hwy, Duluth, Minnesota 55811-1442, USA

<sup>2</sup> Departments of Veterinary Biosciences and Veterinary Pathobiology, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, 2001 South Lincoln Ave., Urbana, Illinois 61802, USA

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Geological Survey, National Wildlife Health Center, 6006 Schroeder Rd., Madison, Wisconsin 53711, USA

<sup>4</sup> Corresponding author (email: pschoff@nrri.umn.edu)

**ABSTRACT:** Skeletal malformation rates for several frog species were determined in a set of randomly selected wetlands in the north-central USA over three consecutive years. In 1998, 62 sites yielded 389 metamorphic frogs, nine (2.3%) of which had skeletal or eye malformations. A subset of the original sites was surveyed in the following 2 yr. In 1999, 1,085 metamorphic frogs were collected from 36 sites and 17 (1.6%) had skeletal or eye malformations, while in 2000, examination of 1,131 metamorphs yielded 16 (1.4%) with skeletal or eye malformations. Hindlimb malformations predominated in all three years, but other abnormalities, involving forelimb, eye, and pelvis were also found. Northern leopard frogs (*Rana pipiens*) constituted the majority of collected metamorphs as well as most of the malformed specimens. However, malformations were also noted in mink frogs (*R. septentrionalis*), wood frogs (*R. sylvatica*), and gray tree frogs (*Hyla* spp.). The malformed specimens were found in clustered sites in all three years but the cluster locations were not the same in any year. The malformation rates reported here are higher than the 0.3% rate determined for metamorphic frogs collected from similar sites in Minnesota in the 1960s, and thus, appear to represent an elevation of an earlier baseline malformation rate.

**Key words:** Amphibian, anuran, broadleaf forest ecoregion, malformation, survey.

### INTRODUCTION

Over the past several years, a number of malformed frogs and toads have been discovered in the USA and Canada; malformations have been reported in specimens of 54 amphibian species in 44 USA states and four Canadian provinces since 1995 (Johnson et al., 2000; and see also North American Reporting Center for Amphibian Malformations, 2002). Normal amphibian populations, like those of other vertebrates (Gilbert, 2000), appear to accommodate a low number of malformed individuals. Reports in the literature support the concept of a baseline malformation rate, which has been documented in several large-scale population studies (Merrill, 1969; Meyer-Rochow and Asashima, 1988; Gray, 2000), as well as in numerous reports detailing spectacular anomalies such as ectopic or supernumerary legs (reviewed by Van Valen, 1974 and Ouellet, 2000). Occasionally, acute malformation

outbreaks occur in which an isolated population has a very high malformation rate (Reynolds and Stephens, 1984; Volpe and Rosenbaum, 2000). These usually involve a single species and last for just one generation (Van Valen, 1974; Ouellet, 2000). Many of the current reports fall within the acute category. However, in contrast to historical reports, the current observations are characterized by malformed animals among multiple species at a single site, multiple sites with high malformation prevalence spread over wide areas, and recurrence of malformed animals in the same site in successive years (Ouellet et al., 1997; Gardiner and Hoppe, 1999; Johnson et al., 1999; Converse et al., 2000; Helgen et al., 2000; Hoppe, 2000). Malformation rates at some sites can be very high. Johnson et al. (1999) reported an average of 12.3% malformed *Hyla regilla* from 13 sites and Helgen et al. (2000) sampled several sites that yielded 40–65% malformed *Rana pipiens*, while matching

reference sites yielded no greater than 1% malformed specimens. Ouellet et al. (1997) matched 14 agricultural sites, in which an average of 12% of the frogs had malformations, with 12 non-agricultural sites, in which they found only 0.7% malformed specimens. Unfortunately, little is known about the causes of the malformations or whether acute malformation outbreaks represent transient elevations of the baseline rate or whether the two have different etiologies.

While malformation rates at a single site might be estimated using a well designed sampling study, valid baseline malformation rates for populations on local or regional scales can be difficult to glean from studies not specifically designed for that purpose. For instance, abnormalities generated through injury or disease must be distinguished from true developmental errors. Also, since relatively few malformed adults are seen (Helgen et al., 2000), studies that do not distinguish between adults and metamorphs may underestimate the true malformation rate. Despite these limitations, some information on historic malformation rates is available. By close examination of preserved specimens, Hoppe (2000) determined a 0.3% malformation rate for 2,166 northern leopard frog (*Rana pipiens*) metamorphs collected from known sites in central Minnesota, USA in the 1960s. Malformations in this group included ectrodactyly (missing digits), syndactyly (fused digits), polydactyly (multiple digits), and ectromely (missing limbs or limb segments) all of which are common in the current phenomenon. The study reported here addresses the issue of the current background malformation rates using random site selection and a systematic collection protocol in wetlands in the north-central region of the US.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Study area and site selection

The study area is encompassed by the broadleaf forest ecoregion (Bailey, 1983) which spans northeastern Illinois, southern Wisconsin, and

southern Minnesota (USA; Fig. 1). Current land cover within this region ranges from forest to intensive agricultural or urban uses. Site selection was conducted using a stratified random design. We randomly selected fourth order watersheds from the broadleaf forest ecoregion. Wetlands within the selected watersheds were mapped using National Wetland Inventory data. To capture the available gradient of conditions available within each watershed, we selected individual wetlands from regions representing a spectrum of land use intensity (e.g., less disturbed to most disturbed). Field reconnaissance was conducted to select four to eight wetlands in each watershed. Individual sample sites were also subject to the following criteria: 1) classification as a palustrine aquatic bed or emergent wetland (Cowardin et al., 1979), 2) landowner permission, and 3) evidence that the site would remain under a consistent management regime for the duration of the study. We refer to groups of sites within watersheds as wetland clusters (WC), which are identified by wetland cluster and site numbers (e.g., WC 1, site 1=1.1; see Fig. 1 and Table 1). A total of 62 sites in 13 wetland clusters were selected and sampled in 1998. In 1999 and 2000 the objectives of the larger project that encompassed this malformation assessment required the selection of 36 sites within a smaller region. This set was constructed using 18 of the existing sites and 18 additional sites, 10 of which were associated with the existing wetland clusters (WC 9–13), and eight of which were additional sites adjacent to, but not contiguous with the original watersheds. This set of eight additional sites was designated as WC 14.

### Field methods

Each site was visited three times during the spring and summer (March–April, May–June, and late July–August) to gather physical, chemical, and biological data. During the July–August visit, attempts were made to capture metamorphosing frogs at all sites. A minimum effort of two person-hr was expended searching for frogs at each site that was not completely dry. If no frogs were captured during that time, the site was abandoned. At each site where frogs were found, an effort of approximately 16 person-hr was expended for collection and analysis. During 1998, the animals were measured and examined in the field, and representative specimens, including malformed individuals and randomly selected reference specimens, were collected for laboratory analyses. Frogs were euthanized by immersion in 1% MS 222 (3-amino benzoic acid ethyl ester) and stored in 10% neutral buffered formalin. Only meta-




FIGURE 1. Amphibian malformation study area. The study area included 78 wetland sites contained in 14 spatial clusters distributed through southern Minnesota, Wisconsin, and northern Illinois.

morphic animals with emerged forelimbs (Gosner stage 42–46 and beyond; Gosner, 1960) were included in the malformation survey and collection. Adults were not included because of the possibility that they could have migrated from other wetlands.

During the 1999 and 2000 collections, the field researchers endeavored to capture 100 metamorphic frogs; the first 40 frogs collected from each site were distributed between the National Wildlife Health Center (Madison, Wisconsin, USA) and the University of Illinois Col-

lege of Veterinary Medicine (Urbana, Illinois, USA), for malformation assessment, as well as gross and histologic pathology and parasitology studies (to be reported elsewhere). Any additional frogs captured were examined in the field. Malformed frogs were kept for laboratory analysis and the remaining specimens were released.

#### Staining

Specimens were fixed in neutral buffered formalin or 70% ethanol. Cartilage and bone

were stained with alcian blue and alizarin red (Kelly and Bryden, 1983) with enzymatic tissue clearing (Dingerkus and Uhler, 1977). Cleared specimens were stored in glycerin.

## RESULTS

### 1998 collections

A total of 389 metamorphic anurans from seven species were examined in the field (Table 1). The majority were *R. pipiens* and *R. clamitans*, with *R. septentrionalis*, *R. sylvatica*, *R. catesbeiana*, *Hyla* spp. (the gray tree frog, *H. versicolor*, and Cope's gray tree frog, *H. chrysoscelis* are distinguishable in the field only by their call), and *Bufo americanus* represented in much lower numbers (Table 2). Fifty-four frogs, including malformed and reference specimens, were euthanized and returned to the lab for skeletal analysis. After clearing and staining, nine (2.3%) frogs were identified with malformations (Table 2), which included anophthalmia, ectromely, ectrodactyly, taumely (a bony triangle, in which a long bone, such as the femur or tibiafibula, is bent in the middle, such that the heads of the bone are apposed), polymely, and polydactyly (Table 2). Two frogs that were considered normal in the field (i.e., reference specimens) were found by bone staining to have asymmetric pelvises, in which the left ilial shaft was longer than the right, resulting in torsion of the lower trunk. Both of these animals came from the same wetland cluster (WC 4; Table 1), although not from the same site. This subtle malformation was not seen in cleared and necropsied specimens in the 1999 or 2000 collections (Tables 3 and 4).

### 1998 distribution

Metamorphic frogs were collected in 45 of the 62 sites sampled in 1998 (Table 1). Six sites contained only adult or larval forms and 11 sites yielded no frogs during the collection period. The nine malformed specimens were distributed among seven sites, with six sites having one malformed specimen and one site having three mal-

formed specimens. Four of the nine malformed specimens came from one wetland cluster (WC 11), and another wetland cluster contained two malformed specimens (WC 4; Table 1).

### 1999 collections

Metamorphic frogs were collected from 30 of the 36 sites sampled in 1999 (Fig. 1, Table 1). A total of 1,085 metamorphic ranid frogs were examined in the field or lab for skeletal malformations (Table 3). Of these, 267 were examined only in the field, 306 were cleared and stained, and 512 were subjected to necropsy, which involved histopathologic examination of soft tissue (to be reported elsewhere). Skeletal malformations were found in 17 (1.6%) frogs, including abnormalities in the limbs, mandible, pelvis, and spine (Table 3). Bone staining revealed several instances of unique or rarely reported skeletal malformations. One *R. pipiens* had a severely malformed coccyx, which appeared to be in several separate pieces at the articulation with the spine. Several (13) other *R. pipiens* had less severe variations in normal coccygeal form and position, but, since these did not appear to produce torsion or mispositioning of the pelvis or legs, they were considered to be variations in normal growth and not malformations. Several specimens also had asymmetric vertebrae and ribs, which, in one case, was severe enough to produce scoliosis.

### 1999 distribution

Malformed frogs were found at 11 sites, with rates ranging from 0.8–8.8% by site (Table 1). Seven sites produced a single malformed specimen; two sites produced two malformed specimens; and two sites produced three malformed specimens. Malformed frogs tended to be grouped in particular sites and wetland clusters. Specifically, sites 64–68, which are all within WC 13, produced 53% of the specimens with skeletal malformations. Only one other site (site 44, WC 10) yielded multiple malformed specimens. These two geo-

TABLE 1. Amphibian metamorph collections and prevalence of malformations by site and year; 1998–2000.

| Site <sup>a</sup><br>number | Identification | 1998              |   | 1999              |   | 2000              |   |
|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---|-------------------|---|-------------------|---|
|                             |                | Prev <sup>b</sup> | (Mal <sup>c</sup> /total <sup>d</sup> ) | Prev <sup>b</sup> | (Mal <sup>c</sup> /total <sup>d</sup> ) | Prev <sup>b</sup> | (Mal <sup>c</sup> /total <sup>d</sup> ) |
| 1                           | 1.1            | 0                 | (0/2)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 2                           | 1.2            | 0                 | (0/3)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 3                           | 1.3            | —                 | (0*)                                    | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 4                           | 1.4            | —                 | (0*)                                    | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 5                           | 1.5            | 0                 | (0/8)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 6                           | 2.1            | —                 | (0*)                                    | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 7                           | 2.2            | 0                 | (0/2)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 8                           | 2.3            | —                 | (0*)                                    | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 9                           | 2.4            | 0                 | (0/1)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 10                          | 3.1            | —                 | (0**)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 11                          | 3.3            | 0                 | (0/3)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 12                          | 3.4            | 0                 | (0/1)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 13                          | 3.5            | 0                 | (0/4)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 14                          | 4.1            | 25                | (1/4)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 15                          | 4.2            | 0                 | (0/1)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 16                          | 4.3            | 13                | (1/8)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 17                          | 4.4            | 0                 | (0/6)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 18                          | 4.5            | 0                 | (0/27)                                  | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 19                          | 4.6            | 0                 | (0/16)                                  | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 20                          | 4.7            | 0                 | (0/12)                                  | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 21                          | 4.8            | 0                 | (0/16)                                  | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 22                          | 5.1            | 17                | (1/6)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 23                          | 5.2            | 0                 | (0/39)                                  | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 24                          | 5.3            | —                 | (0*)                                    | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 25                          | 5.4            | 0                 | (0/14)                                  | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 26                          | 6.1            | —                 | (0*)                                    | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 27                          | 6.2            | 0                 | (0/15)                                  | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 28                          | 6.3            | 0                 | (0/7)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 29                          | 6.4            | —                 | (0**)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 30                          | 7.1            | 0                 | (0/4)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 31                          | 7.2            | —                 | (0*)                                    | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 32                          | 7.3            | —                 | (0*)                                    | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 33                          | 7.4            | 0                 | (0/2)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 34                          | 8.1            | 0                 | (0/1)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 35                          | 8.2            | 9                 | (1/11)                                  | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 36                          | 8.3            | 0                 | (0/8)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 37                          | 8.4            | 0                 | (0/1)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 38                          | 8.5            | —                 | (0**)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 39                          | 9.1            | —                 | (0*)                                    | —                 | (0*)                                    | —                 | (0*)                                    |
| 40                          | 9.2            | 0                 | (0/5)                                   | 0                 | (0/5)                                   | 1.7               | (2/117)                                 |
| 41                          | 9.3            | 0                 | (0/5)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 42                          | 9.4            | —                 | (0*)                                    | 0                 | (0/9)                                   | —                 | (0*)                                    |
| 43                          | 9.5            | 0                 | (0/6)                                   | 4                 | (1/23)                                  | 0                 | (0/7)                                   |
| 44                          | 10.1           | —                 | (0**)                                   | 6                 | (3/47)                                  | 0                 | (0/104)                                 |
| 45                          | 10.2           | 0                 | (0/3)                                   | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 46                          | 10.3           | 0                 | (0/6)                                   | 0                 | (0/8)                                   | —                 | (0*)                                    |
| 47                          | 10.4           | 0                 | (0/13)                                  | 0                 | (0/4)                                   | 0                 | (0/1)                                   |
| 48                          | 11.1           | —                 | (0*)                                    | —                 | —                                       | —                 | —                                       |
| 49                          | 11.2           | 25                | (1/4)                                   | 0                 | (0/1)                                   | 0                 | (0/10)                                  |
| 50                          | 11.3           | 0                 | (0/1)                                   | —                 | (0*)                                    | 0                 | (0/2)                                   |
| 51                          | 11.4           | 27                | (3/11)                                  | 0                 | (0/13)                                  | —                 | (0*)                                    |
| 52                          | 11.5           | 0                 | (0/16)                                  | —                 | (0*)                                    | 0                 | (0/33)                                  |



TABLE 1. Continued.

| Site <sup>a</sup><br>number | Identification | 1998              |  | 1999              |  | 2000              |  |
|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------------|--|-------------------|--|-------------------|--|
|                             |                | Prev <sup>b</sup> | (MalF <sup>c</sup> /total <sup>d</sup> ) | Prev <sup>b</sup> | (MalF <sup>c</sup> /total <sup>d</sup> ) | Prev <sup>b</sup> | (MalF <sup>c</sup> /total <sup>d</sup> ) |
| 53                          | 11.6           | —                 | (0**)                                    | —                 | (0*)                                     | —                 | (0*)                                     |
| 54                          | 11.7           | 0                 | (0/16)                                   | 0                 | (0/2)                                    | 0                 | (0/4)                                    |
| 55                          | 11.8           | —                 | —  | 0                 | (0/9)                                    | —                 | (0*)                                     |
| 56                          | 11.9           | —                 | —  | 0                 | (0/41)                                   | 2                 | (2/92)                                   |
| 57                          | 12.2           | 0                 | (0/11)                                   | —                 | —  | —                 | —  |
| 58                          | 12.3           | 0                 | (0/27)                                   | 0                 | (0/51)                                   | 0                 | (0/142)                                  |
| 59                          | 12.4           | —                 | (0**)                                    | 0                 | (0/1)                                    | —                 | (0*)                                     |
| 60                          | 12.5           | —                 | —  | 0                 | (0/54)                                   | 1.8               | (2/113)                                  |
| 61                          | 12.6           | —                 | —  | 0                 | (0/48)                                   | 3.3               | (7/210)                                  |
| 62                          | 12.7           | —                 | —  | 0                 | (0/45)                                   | 0                 | (0/39)                                   |
| 63                          | 12.8           | —                 | —  | —                 | (0*)                                     | —                 | (0*)                                     |
| 64                          | 13.1           | 0                 | (0/1)                                    | 7                 | (1/14)                                   | 100               | (1/1)                                    |
| 65                          | 13.2           | 0                 | (0/6)                                    | 2                 | (2/86)                                   | 0                 | (0/1)                                    |
| 66                          | 13.3           | 0                 | (0/4)                                    | 1.7               | (2/118)                                  | 0                 | (0/1)                                    |
| 67                          | 13.4           | 0                 | (0/12)                                   | 0.8               | (1/123)                                  | —                 | (0*)                                     |
| 68                          | 13.5           | 5                 | (1/20)                                   | 9                 | (3/34)                                   | 2                 | (1/42)                                   |
| 69                          | 13.6           | —                 | —  | —                 | (0*)                                     | —                 | (0*)                                     |
| 79                          | 13.7           | —                 | —  | 0                 | (0/2)                                    | —                 | (0*)                                     |
| 71                          | 13.8           | —                 | —  | 0                 | (0/29)                                   | 0                 | (0/2)                                    |
| 72                          | 14.1           | —                 | —  | 2                 | (1/65)                                   | 0                 | (0/1)                                    |
| 73                          | 14.2           | —                 | —  | 0                 | (0/18)                                   | 0                 | (0/14)                                   |
| 74                          | 14.4           | —                 | —  | 2                 | (1/42)                                   | —                 | (0*)                                     |
| 75                          | 14.5           | —                 | —  | 2                 | (1/47)                                   | 0.9               | (1/111)                                  |
| 76                          | 14.6           | —                 | —  | 1                 | (1/86)                                   | 0                 | (0/15)                                   |
| 77                          | 14.7           | —                 | —  | 0                 | (0/48)                                   | 0                 | (0/60)                                   |
| 78                          | 14.8           | —                 | —  | 0                 | (0/12)                                   | 0                 | (0/9)                                    |
| Totals                      |                | 2.3               | (9/389)                                  | 1.6               | (17/1,085)                               | 1.4               | (16/1,131)                               |

<sup>a</sup> Site identification refers to wetland cluster (WC 1–14), followed by the individual site within that cluster. A total of 78 sites in 14 wetland clusters were sampled during the 3 yr of the study. 1998: 62 sites (1.1–13.5); 1999 and 2000: 36 sites (9.1–14.8).

<sup>b</sup> Prevalence; percent of collected individuals with skeletal malformations.

<sup>c</sup> Number of malformed metamorphic frogs collected/total number collected; 0\* = collection attempted but no frogs captured; 0\*\* = only larvae and adults collected; — = no collection attempted.

<sup>d</sup> Skeletal and eye malformations only.

graphically separated clusters accounted for 70% of the malformed frogs.

#### 2000 collections

The 36 sites that were sampled in 1999 were sampled again in 2000. A total of 1,131 metamorphic frogs were collected from 24 sites (Table 1). Of these, 478 were examined for malformations in the field and returned and 653 were subjected to necropsy. Sixteen (1.4%) were determined to be malformed. As observed in previous years, the majority of malformations occurred in the hindlimbs (Table 4), however, five specimens with eye malformations were also collected.

#### 2000 distribution

Seven of the 24 sites that yielded frogs had at least one malformed frog (Table 1). As observed in previous years, the malformations were clustered, with two sites (60 and 61, WC 12) contributing nine of the 16 malformed specimens.

#### Annual variation

Frog captures were highly variable among sites within the same year. Of the 62 sites sampled in 1998, 11 yielded no frogs and 35 yielded fewer than 10 metamorphic frogs during the collection period. In 1999, 15 of the 36 sites yielded zero to nine metamorphic frogs, and in 2000,

TABLE 2. Summary of malformations in anurans collected in 1998.

| Species                   | n <sup>a</sup> | Malf <sup>b</sup> | Prev <sup>c</sup> (%) | Malformation type <sup>d</sup> and (number) <sup>e</sup>  |
|---------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---|
| <i>Rana pipiens</i>       | 232            | 6                 | 2.6                   | pelvic asymmetry (2), polydactyly (2), anophthalmia (1)<br>ectromely (1), polymely (1), taumely (1)<br>brachydactyly and brachymely |
| <i>R. clamitans</i>       | 95             | 1                 | 1                     |   |
| <i>R. septentrionalis</i> | 22             | 0                 | 0                     |   |
| <i>R. sylvatica</i>       | 10             | 0                 | 0                     |   |
| <i>R. catesbeiana</i>     | 1              | 0                 | 0                     |   |
| <i>Hyla</i> spp.          | 13             | 2                 | 10                    | bilateral amely (1), brachydactyly and brachymely (1)   |
| <i>Bufo americanus</i>    | 4              | 0                 | 0                     |   |
| unknown                   | 12             | 0                 | 0                     |   |
| Total                     | 389            | 9                 | 2.3                   |   |

<sup>a</sup> Number of metamorphic frogs collected.

<sup>b</sup> Skeletal and eye malformations.

<sup>c</sup> Prevalence; percentage of specimens malformed in sample.

<sup>d</sup> All limb malformations occurred in the hindlimbs, unless otherwise noted; pelvic asymmetry-ilial shaft longer on one side; polydactyly-multiple digit; anophthalmia-missing eye; ectromely-missing limb or segment; polymely-multiple limbs; taumely-bony triangle, where long bones are bent such that the proximal and distal ends are apposed and the middle forms the apex of a triangle; brachydactyly-reduced metatarsal or phalanges; brachymely-reduced limb segment; amely-absence of hindlimb and acetabulum.

<sup>e</sup> Some specimens had multiple anomalies.

22 of 36 sites yielded zero to nine frogs (Table 1). Also, there appeared to be little consistency in the number of metamorphic frogs captured in the same site from year to year, even though the collecting team was similar in all years. Although some sites produced relatively high numbers of frogs in 1999 and 2000 (e.g., WC 12), most others showed no pattern. In addition, the distribution of malformed frogs was not consistent in the three collection years. Of the 36 sites that were surveyed in both

1999 and 2000, 15 contained malformed specimens (Table 1). However, only three sites contained malformed frogs in both years, and of these, only one had multiple malformed frogs in a single year (site 13.5, 1999). Twenty sites were sampled in all 3 yr. Two of these sites yielded no frogs and three sites yielded fewer than 10 total frogs across all 3 yr. Even though the 22 malformations from these sites represented over half of the total malformations observed during the 3 yr, only one site (13.5)

TABLE 3. Summary of malformations in anurans collected in 1999.

| Species                   | n <sup>a</sup> | Malf <sup>b</sup> | Prev <sup>c</sup> (%) | Malformation type <sup>d</sup> and (number) <sup>e</sup>  |
|---------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---|
| <i>Rana pipiens</i>       | 931            | 13                | 1.4                   | brachydactyly (3), forelimb brachydactyly (1), brachygnathia (2), brachymely (1), craniofacial (1), ectrodactyly (1), ectromely (1), polymely (1) pelvic (1), polydactyly (1) |
| <i>R. septentrionalis</i> | 119            | 3                 | 2.5                   | brachydactyly (1), ectromely (1), spinal (1)  |
| <i>R. clamitans</i>       | 23             | 1                 | 4                     | brachymely with cutaneous fusion  |
| <i>R. sylvatica</i>       | 12             | 0                 | 0                     |   |
| Total                     | 1,085          | 17                | 1.6                   |   |

<sup>a</sup> Number of metamorphic frogs collected.

<sup>b</sup> Skeletal and eye malformations.

<sup>c</sup> Prevalence; percentage of specimens malformed in sample.

<sup>d</sup> All limb malformations occurred in the hindlimbs, unless otherwise noted; brachydactyly-reduced metatarsal or phalanges; brachygnathia-reduced mandible; brachymely-shortened limb; craniofacial-anomalous zygomatic arch; ectrodactyly-missing digit, including metatarsal; ectromely-missing limb or segment; polymely-multiple limbs; pelvic anomalous pelvic development; polydactyly-multiple toes; spinal-abnormality causing scoliosis; cutaneous fusion-skin joined over two limb segments.

<sup>e</sup> Some specimens had multiple anomalies.



TABLE 4. Summary of malformations in anurans collected in 2000.

| Species                   | n <sup>a</sup> | Malf <sup>b</sup> | Prev <sup>c</sup> (%) | Type <sup>d</sup> and (number) <sup>e</sup>  |
|---------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--|
| <i>Rana pipiens</i>       | 1,107          | 15                | 1.4                   | anophthalmia (5), brachymely (2), ectromely (2), forelimb ectromely (1), bony projection (1), brachydactyly (1), ectrodactyly (1), lateral asymmetry (1), pelvic (1), polymely (1) |
| <i>R. clamitans</i>       | 21             | 0                 | 0                     |  |
| <i>R. septentrionalis</i> | 3              | 1                 | 33                    | brachydactyly (1)  |
| Total                     | 1,131          | 16                | 1.4                   |  |

<sup>a</sup> Number of metamorphic frogs collected.

<sup>b</sup> Skeletal and eye malformations.

<sup>c</sup> Prevalence; percentage of specimens malformed in sample.

<sup>d</sup> All limb malformations occurred in the hindlimbs, unless otherwise noted; anophthalmia-missing eye; brachymely-reduced limb; ectromely-missing limb or segment; bony projection-anomalous appendage, in this case originating in the pelvic area; brachydactyly-reduced metatarsal or phalanges; ectrodactyly-missing digit, including metatarsal; lateral asymmetry-one half of body smaller than the other; pelvic-anomalous pelvic development; polymely, multiple limbs.

<sup>e</sup> Some specimens had multiple anomalies.

produced malformed specimens in each of the 3 yr.

#### Severity

Malformations were categorized as “severe” (Table 5) if they were estimated to cause a major reduction in fitness. On this basis, minor skeletal malformations, such as missing or reduced phalanges, were not considered severe. Similarly, abnormal coloration noted on the hindlimb skin would probably not impair fitness, although it is recognized that skin color pattern could, under certain circumstances, be relevant to mate selection and susceptibility to predation.

TABLE 5. Summary of severe malformations found in anurans collected in 1998–2000.

| Year  | Number of frogs | Malformations           |                       |                     | Prev <sup>b</sup> (%) |
|-------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|       |                 | Total malf <sup>a</sup> | Prev (%) <sup>b</sup> | Severe <sup>c</sup> |                       |
| 1998  | 389             | 9                       | 2.3                   | 6                   | 1.5                   |
| 1999  | 1,085           | 17                      | 1.6                   | 11                  | 1.0                   |
| 2000  | 1,131           | 16                      | 1.1                   | 13                  | 1.1                   |
| Total | 2,605           | 42                      | 1.6                   | 30                  | 1.2                   |

<sup>a</sup> Skeletal and eye malformations.

<sup>b</sup> Prevalence; percentage of specimens malformed in sample.

<sup>c</sup> Severity was based on an estimation of the effect of the malformation on fitness.

## DISCUSSION

### Comparisons of current and historical malformation rates

Gray (2000) reported that in a set of over 10,000 cricket frogs (*Acris crepitans*) collected in Illinois between 1968 and 1971, 0.4% were abnormal. The majority of these were missing limbs or limb segments which could have resulted from either developmental malformations or traumatic amputations. A survey of Illinois cricket frogs in the early 1990s also identified only one skeletal malformation in 341 animals (Reeder et al., 1998). These studies suggest that, either *A. crepitans* is resistant to etiologic agents causing malformations among other anurans or that the causative factor(s) were not widely distributed during that time. Hoppe (2000) conducted a retrospective analysis of preserved *R. pipiens* metamorphs collected in central Minnesota between 1958 and 1963 in which malformations were distinguished from traumatic deformations on the basis of scar tissue formation. Six of 2,166 frogs (0.3%) had malformations, including hindlimb ectrodactyly, syndactyly, and ectromely, as well as three cases of forelimb ectromely, syndactyly, and polydactyly. Notably absent from these studies were cutaneous fusions and eye and jaw

malformations which were common malformations in more recent observations of metamorphic *R. pipiens* from the same area (this study; Hoppe, 2000), as well as the bony triangles and ectopic bones found in this and other recent studies (Gardiner and Hoppe, 1999). Thus, if these 1960s collections were unbiased, the available data suggest that baseline malformation rates for *R. pipiens* and *A. crepitans* in the north-central region of the USA was 0.3 to 0.4% 30 yr ago and that there may be both qualitative and quantitative differences in the malformation types currently observed. Of 2,605 metamorphic frogs collected over 3 yr in the current study, 42 (1.6%) had skeletal or eye malformations, representing a four-to five-fold increase over the historic background prevalence reported for this region.

#### Causes of malformation

Although no single cause has been found to explain all amphibian malformations, three major hypotheses, each with limited theoretical and empirical support, have emerged. These are: trematode parasites, chemical mimics of retinoic acid, and ultraviolet-B radiation (UV-B). Ankley et al. (1998, 2000) showed that *R. pipiens* embryos and larvae exposed to artificial or natural UV-B developed extensive limb malformations, consisting almost exclusively of hindlimb deletions or reductions. Militating against the UV hypothesis is the fact that only limb deletions and truncations were produced which does not reflect the current situation in the field where *R. pipiens* and other ranids are found with a wide variety of malformations in limb and other tissue.

A second hypothetical cause of malformations is exposure to natural or anthropogenic chemicals that act as retinoids which are potent regulators of development in the vertebrate brain, eye, mandible, and limbs. Although essential for proper development, retinoids can be teratogenic if applied at inappropriate times

or in abnormal concentrations. For example, retinoic acid produced duplicate limbs when applied directly to developing frog limb buds (Bryant and Gardiner, 1992), or regenerating tails (Maden, 1993), and produced deletions when applied to regenerating axolotl limbs (Scadding and Maden, 1986a). Few studies have been performed with native frogs, but Degitz et al. (2000) established that retinoic acid caused hindlimb malformations in *R. sylvatica* that were similar to those seen in field specimens of *R. septentrionalis* (Gardiner and Hoppe, 1999). Significantly, these malformations included bony triangle malformations of the long bones of the leg which have also been observed in retinoic acid-treated *Xenopus* (Scadding and Maden, 1986b) and other vertebrates (Summerbell, 1983; Tickle et al., 1985). Although Ouellet et al. (1997) observed a correlation between malformed amphibians, agricultural land use, and implied exposure to chemical pesticides, no direct evidence for the presence of active retinoids has been established in the current malformation phenomenon.

The remaining hypothesis is that trematode parasites cause malformations when they physically or chemically disrupt the developing limb, jaw, or eye fields (Sessions et al., 1999). Experimental infections of *Hyla regilla* (Johnson et al., 1999) and *Bufo boreas* (Johnson et al., 2001) with cercariae from the trematode parasite *Ribeiroia* sp. produced multiple types of hindlimb malformations, including missing or shortened limbs as well as multiple digits and limbs. In addition, these infections caused the bony triangle formation in hindlimbs that has been noted as a retinoid effect (Gardiner and Hoppe, 1999) suggesting that the parasites may produce retinoids or stimulate retinoid-regulated pathways. Malformation induction was dependent on the parasite species because infection with *Alaria mustelae* cercariae did not result in abnormal limb development (Johnson et al., 1999). These experimental infections produced only hindlimb

and forelimb malformations and not the other forms that have been consistently found in wild populations. Also, even though *Ribeiroia* sp. has been found in some of our Minnesota study sites, none of the malformed frogs identified in our study harbored these metacercariae (Schotthoefer, data not shown). The apparent lack of *Ribeiroia* sp. in malformed individuals indicates that either trematode parasites other than *Ribeiroia* sp. can cause malformations, that *Ribeiroia* cercariae are cleared from the frogs, or that other mechanisms are at work.

#### Malformation and declining amphibian populations

A recent analysis documented the decline in amphibian populations over the last several decades and also showed that the phenomenon exists on a global scale (Houlahan et al., 2000). Despite the fact that malformations appear to occur at scales that would not contribute significantly to population declines (Carey, 2000) the increased malformation prevalence and declining populations are occurring in the same time frame, which may be more than coincidental. Many population reductions can be associated with habitat destruction, degradation, fragmentation, and contamination (Reeder et al., 1998; Beasley et al., 2002) but others appear to be occurring in areas less affected by human influences (Berger et al., 1998). Infectious diseases have been implicated as the proximate cause of declines or extinctions in some areas (for review, see Dzasak et al., 1999). Diseases caused by a chytrid fungus (Berger et al., 1998) and by *Saprolegnia ferax* (Kiesecker et al., 2001) have contributed to widespread amphibian deaths in areas described as ecologically pristine. Other diseases implicated in recent decimation of amphibian populations include *Aeromonas hydrophila*, the bacterium responsible for red leg disease (Cunningham et al., 1996) and iridoviruses (Bollinger et al., 1999). Additional stressors include introduced predators or competitors (Corn,

2000), increased temperatures and other deleterious aspects of climate change (Pounds et al., 1999), and increased exposure to UV-B, which has been suggested to reduce reproductive success and survival of amphibians at high altitudes (Blaustein et al., 1994).

Biotic stressors may cause amphibian malformations and declining populations directly (Blaustein et al., 1994; Ankley et al., 2000), or they may contribute indirectly by suppressing immune competence (Carey et al., 1999), or by increasing susceptibility to pathogens. Thus, the apparent concurrence of amphibian population declines and elevated malformation rates in the preceding 40 yr may be coincidental or the two phenomena may have responded to changing environmental conditions. Anthropogenic factors, such as elevated temperature and pH, widespread exposure to chemical toxicants, and increased exposure to ambient UV radiation, may combine to reduce reproductive success, increase susceptibility to disease, and suppress behavioral and immunologic defenses against pathogens. Long-term studies of amphibian population dynamics and the occurrence and causes of malformations will be necessary to determine whether the factors that contribute to high malformation rates also contribute significantly to health problems of amphibians that, in turn, influence population sustainability on local, regional, and global scales.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the private landowners, as well as the Departments of Natural Resources of Wisconsin and Minnesota for granting permission for this study to be conducted on their property. We also thank T. Trembl, University of Minnesota—Duluth, J. Ashamalla, W. Baumgartner, M. Bhuthimethee, J. Creasey, A. Fronczke, L. Morgan, L. Schmoldt, J. Steele, Z. Steinberg, and S. Tufedal, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, for assistance in collections, A. Koehler, National Wildlife Health Center, for skeletal staining, and T. Hollenhorst, Natural Resources Research Institute, for assistance in site selection, collections, and graphics. Although the re-

search described in this article has been funded wholly or in part by the United States Environmental Protection Agency through grant GAD R82558667 to VRB, it has not been subjected to the Agency's required peer and policy review and therefore does not necessarily reflect the views of the Agency and no official endorsement should be inferred.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- ANKLEY, G. T., J. E. TIETGE, D. L. DEFOE, K. M. JENSEN, G. W. HOLCOMBE, E. H. DURHAN, AND S. A. DIAMOND. 1998. Effects of ultraviolet light and methoprene on survival and development of *Rana pipiens*. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 17: 2530–2542.
- , ———, G. W. HOLCOMBE, D. L. DEFOE, S. A. DIAMOND, K. M. JENSEN, AND S. J. DEGITZ. 2000. Effects of laboratory ultraviolet radiation and natural sunlight on survival and development of *Rana pipiens*. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 78: 1092–1100.
- BAILEY, R. G. 1983. Delineation of ecosystem regions. *Environmental Management* 7: 365–373.
- BEASLEY, V. R., S. A. FAEH, B. WIKOFF, J. EISOLD, D. NICHOLS, R. COLE, A. M. SCHOTTHOEFER, C. STAEHLE, M. GREENWELL, AND L. E. BROWN. 2003. Risk factors and the decline of the northern cricket frog, *Acris crepitans*: Evidence for the involvement of herbicides, parasitism, and habitat modifications. *In* The status and conservation of United States amphibians, M. Lannoo (ed.). University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, Iowa, in press.
- BERGER, L., R. SPEARE, P. DASZAK, D. E. GREEN, A. A. CUNNINGHAM, C. L. GOGGIN, R. SLOCOMBE, M. A. RAGAN, A. D. HYATT, K. R. McDONALD, H. B. HINES, K. R. LIPS, G. MARANTELLI, AND H. PARKES. 1998. Chytridiomycosis causes amphibian mortality associated with population declines in the rain forests of Australia and Central America. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 95: 9031–9036.
- BLAUSTEIN, A. R., P. D. HOFFMAN, D. G. HOKIT, J. M. KIESECKER, S. C. WALLS, AND J. B. HAYS. 1994. UV repair and resistance to solar UV-B in amphibian eggs: A link to population declines. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 91: 1791–1795.
- BOLLINGER, T. K., J. MAO, D. SCHOCK, R. M. BRIGHAM, AND V. G. CHINCHAR. 1999. Pathology, isolation, and preliminary molecular characterization of a novel iridovirus from tiger salamanders in Saskatchewan. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* 35: 413–429.
- BRYANT, S. V., AND D. M. GARDINER. 1992. Retinoic acid, local cell-cell interactions, and pattern formation in vertebrate limbs. *Developmental Biology* 152: 1–25.
- CAREY, C. 2000. Infectious disease and worldwide declines of amphibian populations, with comments on emerging diseases in coral reef organisms and in humans. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 108 (Supplement 1): 143–150.
- , N. COHEN, AND L. ROLLINS-SMITH. 1999. Amphibian declines: An immunological perspective. *Developmental and Comparative Immunology* 23: 459–472.
- CONVERSE, K. A., J. MATTSSON, AND L. EATON-POOLE. 2000. Field surveys of midwestern and north-eastern Fish and Wildlife Service lands for the presence of abnormal frogs and toads. *Journal of the Iowa Academy of Science* 107: 160–167.
- CORN, P. S. 2000. Amphibian declines: Review of some current hypotheses. *In* *Ecotoxicology of amphibians and reptiles*, D. W. Sparling, G. Linder and C. A. Bishop (eds.). SETAC Press, Pensacola, Florida, pp. 663–696.
- COWARDIN, L. M., V. CARTER, F. GOLET, AND E. LAROE. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deep-water habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish Wildlife Service FWS/OBS-79/31, 131 pp.
- CUNNINGHAM, A. A., T. E. LANGTON, P. M. BENNETT, J. F. LEWIN, S. E. DRURY, R. E. GOUGH, AND S. K. MACGREGOR. 1996. Pathological and microbiological findings from incidents of unusual mortality of the common frog (*Rana temporaria*). *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society: Biological Sciences* 351: 1539–1557.
- DASZAK, P., L. BERGER, A. A. CUNNINGHAM, A. D. HYATT, D. E. GREEN, AND R. SPEARE. 1999. Emerging infectious diseases and amphibian population declines. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 5: 735–748.
- DEGITZ, S. J., P. A. KOSIAN, E. A. MAKYNYN, K. M. JENSEN, AND G. T. ANKLEY. 2000. Stage- and species-specific developmental toxicity of all-trans retinoic acid in four native North American ranids and *Xenopus laevis*. *Toxicological Sciences* 57: 264–274.
- DINGERKUS, G., AND L. D. UHLER. 1977. Enzyme clearing of alcian blue-stained whole small vertebrates for demonstration of cartilage. *Stain Technology* 52: 229–232.
- GARDINER, D. M., AND D. M. HOPPE. 1999. Environmentally induced limb malformations in mink frogs (*Rana septentrionalis*). *Journal of Experimental Zoology* 248: 207–216.
- GILBERT, S. F. 2000. *Developmental biology*. Sinauer Associates, Inc., Sunderland, Massachusetts, pp. 3–24.
- GOSNER, K. L. 1960. A simplified table for staging anuran embryos and larvae with notes on identification. *Herpetologica* 16: 183–190.
- GRAY, R. H. 2000. Morphological abnormalities in Illinois cricket frogs, *Acris crepitans*, 1968–71. *Journal of the Iowa Academy of Science* 107: 92–95.
- HELGEN, J. C., M. C. GERNES, S. M. KERTEN, J. W.

- CHIRHART, J. T. CANFIELD, D. BOWERS, J. HAFERMAN, R. G. MCKINNEL, AND D. M. HOPPE. 2000. Field investigations of malformed frogs in Minnesota 1993–97. *Journal of the Iowa Academy of Science* 107: 96–112.
- HOPPE, D. M. 2000. History of Minnesota frog abnormalities: Do recent findings represent a new phenomenon? *Journal of the Iowa Academy of Science* 107: 86–89.
- HOULAHAN, J. E., C. S. FINDLAY, B. R. SCHMIDT, H. MEYER, AND S. L. KUZMIN. 2000. Quantitative evidence for global amphibian population declines. *Nature* 404: 752–755.
- JOHNSON, D. H., S. C. FOWLE, AND J. A. JUNDT. 2000. The North American reporting center for amphibian malformations. *Journal of the Iowa Academy of Science* 107: 123–127.
- JOHNSON, P. T. J., K. B. LUNDE, E. G. RITCHIE, AND A. E. LAUNER. 1999. The effect of trematode infection on amphibian limb development and survivorship. *Science* 284: 802–804.
- , ———, R. W. HAIGHT, J. BOWERMAN, AND A. R. BLAUSTEIN. 2001. *Ribeiroia ondatrae* (Trematoda: Digenea) infection induces severe limb malformations in western toads (*Bufo boreas*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 79: 370–379.
- KELLY, W. L., AND M. M. BRYDEN. 1983. A modified differential stain for cartilage and bone in whole mount preparations of mammalian fetuses and small vertebrates. *Stain Technology* 58: 131–134.
- KIESECKER, J. M., A. R. BLAUSTEIN, AND L. K. BELDEN. 2001. Complex causes of amphibian population declines. *Nature* 410: 681–684.
- MADEN, M. 1993. The homeotic transformation of tails into limbs in *Rana temporaria* by retinoids. *Developmental Biology* 159: 379–391.
- MERRELL, D. J. 1969. Natural selection in a leopard frog population. *Journal of the Minnesota Academy of Science* 35: 86–89.
- MEYER-ROCHOW, V. B., AND M. ASASHIMA. 1988. Naturally occurring morphological abnormalities in wild populations of the Japanese newt *Cynops pyrrhogaster* (Salamandridae; Urodela; Amphibia). *Zoologischer Anzeiger* 221: 70–80.
- NORTH AMERICAN REPORTING CENTER FOR AMPHIBIAN MALFORMATIONS. 2002. Jamestown, North Dakota, Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center Home Page, <http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/narcam> (Version 30 Sept., 2002).
- OUELLET, M. 2000. Amphibian deformities: Current state of knowledge. In *Ecotoxicology of amphibians and reptiles*, D. W. Sparling, G. Linder and C. A. Bishop (eds.). SETAC Press, Pensacola, Florida, pp. 617–661.
- , J. BONIN, J. RODRIGUE, J.-L. DESGRANGES, AND S. LAIR. 1997. Hindlimb deformities (ectromelia, ectrodactyly) in free-living anurans from agricultural habitats. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* 33: 95–104.
- POUNDS, J. A., M. P. L. FOGDEN, AND J. H. CAMPBELL. 1999. Biological response to climate change on a tropical mountain. *Nature* 398: 611–615.
- REEDER, A. L., G. L. FOLEY, D. K. NICHOLS, L. G. HANSEN, B. WIKOFF, S. FAEH, J. EISOLD, M. B. WHEELER, R. WARNER, J. E. MURPHY, AND V. R. BEASLEY. 1998. Forms and prevalence of intersexuality, and effects of environmental contaminants on sexuality in cricket frogs (*Acris crepitans*). *Environmental Health Perspectives* 106: 261–266.
- REYNOLDS, T. D., AND T. D. STEPHENS. 1984. Multiple ectopic limbs in a wild population of *Hyla regilla*. *Great Basin Naturalist* 44: 166–169.
- SCADDING, S. R., AND M. MADEN. 1986a. Comparison of the effects of vitamin A on limb development and regeneration in the axolotl, *Ambystoma mexicanum*. *Journal of Embryology and Experimental Morphology* 91: 19–34.
- , AND ———. 1986b. Comparison of the effects of vitamin A on limb development and regeneration in *Xenopus laevis* tadpoles. *Journal of Embryology and Experimental Morphology* 91: 35–53.
- SESSIONS, S. K., R. A. FRANSSSEN, AND V. L. HORNER. 1999. Morphological clues from multilegged frogs: Are retinoids to blame? *Science* 284: 800–802.
- SUMMERBELL, D. 1983. The effect of local application of retinoic acid to the anterior margin of the developing chick limb. *Journal of Embryology and Experimental Morphology* 78: 269–289.
- TICKLE, C., J. LEE, AND G. EICHELE. 1985. A quantitative analysis of the effect of all-trans-retinoic acid on the pattern of chick wing development. *Developmental Biology* 109: 82–95.
- VAN VALEN, L. 1974. A natural model for the origin of some higher taxa. *Journal of Herpetology* 8: 109–121.
- VOLPE, E. P., AND P. A. ROSENBAUM. 2000. *Understanding evolution*, 6th Edition, McGraw Hill, Boston, Massachusetts, 281 pp.

Received for publication 14 March 2002.