

Assessing the effects of the first two years of industry-led badger culling in England on the incidence of bovine tuberculosis in cattle in 2013-15

Journal:	<i>Ecology and Evolution</i>
Manuscript ID	ECE-2017-02-00173.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Original Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Brunton, Lucy; Animal and Plant Health Agency, Department of Epidemiological Sciences Donnelly, Christl; MRC Centre for Outbreak Analysis and Modelling, Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Faculty of Medicine, School of Public Health, Imperial College O'Connor, Heather; Animal and Plant Health Agency, Department of Epidemiological Sciences Prosser, Alison; Animal and Plant Health Agency, Department of Epidemiological Sciences Ashfield, Stuart; Animal and Plant Health Agency, Department of Epidemiological Sciences Ashton, Adam; Animal and Plant Health Agency, Department of Epidemiological Sciences Upton, Paul; Animal and Plant Health Agency, Department of Epidemiological Sciences Mitchell, Andrew; Animal and Plant Health Agency, Department of Epidemiological Sciences Goodchild, Anthony; Animal and Plant Health Agency, Department of Epidemiological Sciences Parry, Jessica; Animal and Plant Health Agency, Department of Epidemiological Sciences Downs, Sara; Animal and Plant Health Agency, Department of Epidemiological Sciences
Category:	Population Ecology
Habitat:	Terrestrial
Organism:	Vertebrate
Approach:	Statistical
Abstract:	Culling badgers to control the transmission of bovine tuberculosis (TB) between this wildlife reservoir and cattle has been widely debated. Industry-led culling began in Somerset and Gloucestershire between August and November 2013 to reduce local badger populations. Industry-led culling is not designed to be a randomised and controlled trial of the

	impact of culling on cattle incidence. Nevertheless, it is important to monitor the effects of the culling and, taking the study limitations into account, perform a cautious evaluation of the impacts. A standardised method for selecting areas matched to culling areas in factors found to affect cattle TB risk has been developed to evaluate the impact of badger culling on cattle TB incidence. The association between cattle TB incidence and badger culling in the first two years has been assessed. Descriptive analyses without controlling for confounding showed no association between culling and TB incidence for Somerset, or for either of the buffer areas for the first two years since culling began. A weak association was observed in Gloucestershire for Year 1 only. Multivariable analysis adjusting for confounding factors showed that reductions in TB incidence were associated with culling in the first two years in both the Somerset and Gloucestershire intervention areas when compared to areas with no culling (IRR: 0.79, 95%CI: 0.72-0.87, $p<0.001$ and IRR: 0.42, 95%CI: 0.34-0.51, $p<0.001$ respectively). An increase in incidence was associated with culling in the 2 km buffer surrounding the Somerset intervention area (IRR: 1.38, 95%CI: 1.09-1.75, $p=0.008$), but not in Gloucestershire (IRR: 0.91, 95%CI: 0.77-1.07, $p=0.243$). As only two intervention areas with two years' of data are available for analysis, and the biological cause-effect relationship behind the statistical associations is difficult to determine, it would be unwise to use these findings to develop generalisable inferences about the effectiveness of the policy at present.

Assessing the effects of the first two years of
industry-led badger culling in England on the
incidence of bovine tuberculosis in cattle in
2013-15

Lucy A. Brunton¹ - BSc, PhD

Christl A. Donnelly² - BA, MSc, ScD

Heather O'Connor¹ – BSc, MSc

Alison Prosser¹ - BSc

Stuart Ashfield¹ - BSc, MSc, FRGS

Adam Ashton¹

Paul Upton¹ - BSc

Andrew Mitchell¹ - BSc, BA

Anthony V. Goodchild¹ - BVSc, MRCVS, MPhil, PhD

Jessica E. Parry¹ - BSc, PhD

Sara H. Downs^{1, a} - BSc, MSc, PhD

¹ Department of Epidemiological Sciences, Animal and Plant Health Agency, Woodham Lane,
New Haw, Addlestone, Surrey, KT15 3NB, UK

² MRC Centre for Outbreak Analysis and Modelling, Department of Infectious Disease
Epidemiology, Faculty of Medicine, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, St
Mary's campus, Norfolk Place, London, W2 1PG, UK

^a Corresponding author email: Sara.Downs@apha.gsi.gov.uk

28 **Abstract**

29
30 Culling badgers to control the transmission of bovine tuberculosis (TB) between this wildlife
31 reservoir and cattle has been widely debated. Industry-led culling began in Somerset and
32 Gloucestershire between August and November 2013 to reduce local badger populations.
33 Industry-led culling is not designed to be a randomised and controlled trial of the impact of
34 culling on cattle incidence. Nevertheless, it is important to monitor the effects of the culling
35 and, taking the study limitations into account, perform a cautious evaluation of the impacts.
36 A standardised method for selecting areas matched to culling areas in factors found to affect
37 cattle TB risk has been developed to evaluate the impact of badger culling on cattle TB
38 incidence. The association between cattle TB incidence and badger culling in the first two
39 years has been assessed. Descriptive analyses without controlling for confounding showed
40 no association between culling and TB incidence for Somerset, or for either of the buffer
41 areas for the first two years since culling began. A weak association was observed in
42 Gloucestershire for Year 1 only. Multivariable analysis adjusting for confounding factors
43 showed that reductions in TB incidence were associated with culling in the first two years in
44 both the Somerset and Gloucestershire intervention areas when compared to areas with no
45 culling (IRR: 0.79, 95%CI: 0.72-0.87, $p<0.001$ and IRR: 0.42, 95%CI: 0.34-0.51, $p<0.001$
46 respectively). An increase in incidence was associated with culling in the 2 km buffer
47 surrounding the Somerset intervention area (IRR: 1.38, 95%CI: 1.09-1.75, $p=0.008$), but not
48 in Gloucestershire (IRR: 0.91, 95%CI: 0.77-1.07, $p=0.243$). As only two intervention areas
49 with two years' of data are available for analysis, and the biological cause-effect relationship
50 behind the statistical associations is difficult to determine, it would be unwise to use these
51 findings to develop generalisable inferences about the effectiveness of the policy at present.
52 **Keywords:** bovine tuberculosis, cattle, badgers, culling, wildlife

53 Introduction

54

55 Bovine tuberculosis (TB) caused by the bacterium *Mycobacterium bovis* is an important
56 problem for the British cattle industry. Existing controls include testing and slaughter of test-
57 positive cattle, with herd test frequency determined by local incidence, along with
58 surveillance of all slaughtered cattle in the abattoir. But despite these controls the incidence
59 of TB in cattle in England has shown a generally increasing trend over the last thirty years. In
60 2015, around 5% of cattle herds were under movement restriction due to a TB incident in
61 England, and in the high risk area of England this rose to around 11% (Harris et al 2017).

62

63 European badgers (*Meles meles*) are a host species for *M. bovis* and represent a wildlife
64 reservoir of infection. The use of culling to control the transmission of *M. bovis* between this
65 wildlife reservoir and cattle has been widely debated. There is evidence from the
66 Randomised Badger Culling Trial (RBCT) that proactive (systematic and widespread) culling
67 of badgers for at least four years could reduce the incidence of confirmed TB in cattle by
68 23.2% (95% CI: 12.4% to 32.7%) (Donnelly et al 2006; Donnelly et al 2007). The RBCT was
69 conducted in England between 1998 and 2007. The net effect of proactive culling per year in
70 the RBCT was initially detrimental as a 24.5% increase in incidence (95% CI: 0.6% lower to
71 56.0% higher) was observed in a 2-km-wide buffer around the culled area (Donnelly et al
72 2007). Detrimental effects were attributed to the disruption of badger social structures
73 (perturbation) affecting contact rates between cattle and badgers (Woodroffe et al 2006).
74 However, an overall benefit was observed after the third year of culling and subsequent culls
75 (Donnelly et al 2007).

76

77 The first round of industry-led culling took place in two areas, one in west Somerset and the
78 other in west Gloucestershire between August and November 2013 (hereafter referred to as
79 the Somerset intervention area and Gloucestershire intervention area). Culling licences were
80 issued for the two areas by Natural England (an executive non-departmental public body
81 advising Defra on the natural environment) under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992 to
82 enable groups of farmers and landowners to reduce local badger populations. Licences were
83 subject to a number of criteria. These included the application area to be at least 150 km², at
84 least 70% of the land to be accessible for culling, cattle herds to be subject to annual TB
85 testing and “reasonable biosecurity” to be in place (Defra 2015). It was also a requirement
86 that the culling should plan to reduce the estimated badger population by 70% and be

87 conducted for a minimum of four years (Defra 2015). The aim of the initial culls was to
88 assess the practicalities and impact of the intervention on badger population density. Using
89 a combination of cage trapping and controlled shooting, 1,296 badgers were culled in the
90 Somerset intervention area in Years 1 and 2 combined and 1,198 were culled in the
91 Gloucestershire intervention area in the two years combined. The target minimum number
92 that was estimated to result in a 70% reduction in the badger population was not achieved
93 in either area in Year 1, and was achieved in the Somerset intervention area only in Year 2,
94 although there is uncertainty around the calculation of these minimum numbers due to
95 difficulties in estimating the true badger population size (AHVLA 2014, Defra 2014c, Defra
96 2014d). The third year of culling took place in both areas during autumn 2015. A further area
97 was licensed in Dorset in 2015, and seven new areas were licensed in 2016. Data for
98 analysing cattle TB incidence in the year following the culls in 2015 were not available for
99 this analysis.

100
101 Our aim was to measure and assess any association between the badger culling intervention
102 and the incidence of TB in local cattle, taking account of the methodological constraints
103 resulting from this not being a study based on sound intervention study design principles. TB
104 incidence in cattle herds located within areas where industry-led culling is conducted
105 (“intervention areas”) is compared with TB incidence in herds in uncultured areas matched on
106 characteristics that affect cattle TB risk (“comparison areas”) in a similar, but not identical,
107 approach to that used for analysing the impact of culling during the RBCT (Donnelly et al
108 2003; Donnelly et al 2006; Donnelly et al 2007). The null hypothesis being tested is that TB
109 incidence is the same in the intervention areas and their comparison areas in the years since
110 badger culling began. Cattle TB incidence is also monitored among herds in 2 km “buffer
111 areas” surrounding the intervention areas and compared to incidence among herds in
112 similarly defined areas around uncultured comparison areas to monitor for potentially adverse
113 effects on cattle TB incidence (Donnelly et al 2006). The definition of incidence being used
114 for these analyses is the incidence of OTF-W (Officially Tuberculosis Free status –
115 Withdrawn) incidents. OTF-W incidents are those where evidence of *M. bovis* infection has
116 been identified in at least one bovine animal slaughtered for disease control purposes. They
117 also include other incidents upgraded to OTF-W for epidemiological reasons and
118 slaughterhouse case-disclosed incidents that are confirmed through culture of *M. bovis*.

119

Here we report an unadjusted analysis of OTF-W incidence rate per 100 herd years at risk for the first two years following industry-led culling, alongside more detailed analysis with adjustment for other factors that are likely to be associated with a risk of TB in cattle.

Methods

Selection of comparison areas

Areas were selected from within England which met the following inclusion criteria: within a high risk TB area (Defra 2014a); cattle herds subject to annual TB testing; having no land closer than 2 km to any intervention area boundary (at the time of selection). Boundary information for the intervention areas was used in an automated programming procedure using ArcGIS 10.0 software (ESRI Release 10.0. Redlands, CA, USA) to generate a population of potential comparison areas with centroids shifted 5 km from one another and rotated at 45-degree intervals. Comparison areas were selected in May 2014, around nine months after the start of the culls in late 2013 without any consideration of cattle TB incidence data after the culls began. They were matched to intervention areas on factors known to affect cattle TB incidence in an attempt to control for confounding factors that could explain between-area variation not attributable to culling and therefore bias the analysis. These are described in more detail below.

Ranking of comparison areas for similarity to an intervention area

Each intervention area and potential comparison area was described by six factors or attributes previously associated with TB incidence that had been extracted from the APHA Sam surveillance database (Table 1). The distribution of each factor was summarized using deciles and the absolute difference between the decile to which the intervention area belonged and the decile to which each potential comparison area belonged was calculated. A score based on the sum of the absolute differences for each of the attributes was then used to rank potential comparison areas, with areas having the smallest summed absolute difference ranked highest. No weighting was applied to the ranking attributes.

Selection of matched comparison areas based on rank

154 The highest ranked comparison areas were preferentially selected using a semi-automated
155 process that also sequentially excluded comparison areas that covered part of a higher
156 ranking area or one of the two intervention areas. Ten comparison areas were selected for
157 each intervention area, in order to minimize the consequences of future censoring of
158 comparison areas due to initiation of new intervention areas that cover land in a previously
159 selected comparison area. The process of ranking potential comparison areas and for
160 manually selecting highest-ranking comparison areas was conducted independently by two
161 members of the project team, and any differences in outputs were reconciled. Other
162 attributes likely to be associated with cattle TB incidence were summarized for each
163 intervention and comparison area (Table 2).

164

165 **Statistical analysis**

166

167 The observed OTF-W incidence rate in cattle herds was calculated for each of the two
168 intervention areas, in the 2km-wide uncultured buffer area around each intervention area, and
169 in the 20 comparison areas (10 per intervention area) and their 2km-wide buffers for the
170 first and second years following the baseline date (the date on which the first cull started)
171 and the periods 0-12 months, 12-24 months, and 24-36 months prior to the baseline date. In
172 each case, the herd years-at-risk was calculated using results from whole herd tests as the
173 sum of the time herds in each area were unrestricted and therefore at risk of new infection
174 (a new OTF-W incident) during the period of interest (Downs et al 2013). Crude OTF-W
175 incidence rate ratios (IRRs) were calculated for both the central intervention areas and
176 buffer areas in each reporting period. 95% confidence intervals were calculated and a
177 probability level of $p < 0.05$ was considered to be statistically significant.

178

179 For the adjusted analysis, data for explanatory variables were merged with the OTF-W
180 incidence event data and the herd years-at-risk denominator data. Adjusted IRRs were
181 estimated using Poisson regression models comparing intervention with comparison areas
182 separately for the central areas (i.e. the intervention or comparison areas) and the buffer
183 areas (the 2km buffer areas surrounding intervention and comparison areas), controlling for
184 factors known to be associated with TB incidence. Initial models contained a single
185 intervention status variable which represented the badger culling intervention in both the
186 Somerset and Gloucestershire intervention areas combined and a variable representing the
187 geographical area (coded as Somerset or Gloucestershire) which included both the

188 intervention areas and their matched comparison areas. The inclusion of a variable
189 representing the interaction between the intervention status and area was also explored in
190 these initial models.

191

192 Two models were built, to estimate the effect of intervention on OTF-W incidence in the
193 central areas (Model A) and the buffer areas (Model B) in the first two years of culling. Each
194 model included two separate intervention variables, one for each of the Somerset and
195 Gloucestershire intervention areas in order estimate the independent effects of the
196 intervention in each geographical area. Prior to building the models, bivariable associations
197 between the outcome and explanatory variables were assessed, and pairwise correlations
198 were explored to investigate any collinearity between explanatory variables. Explanatory
199 variables considered to be important potential confounders *a priori* were included in the
200 initial models. These consisted of the variables used to match the comparison areas - area
201 (Somerset or Gloucestershire), historic (3-year) incidence, median herd size, the proportion
202 of herds that were dairy, distance to the matched intervention area and the proportion of
203 the land in the area subjected to proactive culling during the RBCT – to account for imperfect
204 matching, as well as estimated badger sett density (Judge et al. 2014). Additional factors
205 were then added to the models one at a time to assess the effect they had on the estimated
206 impact of the intervention. Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) was used to select models
207 with good fit and parsimonious use of explanatory variables (as recommended by Burnham
208 & Anderson 2002).

209

210 Explanatory variables in the form of counts included historic incidence, herd size, herd years
211 at risk in the first two years of culling and the number of badgers removed as part of
212 historical control operations including the RBCT and earlier government-led culling. These
213 were transformed by adding 0.5 if any values were zero and taking the natural logarithm.
214 Incidence rate ratios were estimated for all variables as the exponent of the estimated
215 Poisson regression coefficient. The herd years-at-risk variable represented the time herds in
216 an area were classified to be free of *M. bovis* infection based on TB testing information. To
217 account for any overdispersion (greater-than-expected variance between areas due to
218 clustering of cattle TB incidents), the "robust" or "sandwich" estimator of variance (Huber
219 1967; White 1982) was used to ensure that confidence intervals were adequately adjusted.
220 Overdispersion in the final models was then assessed using the deviance and Pearson
221 statistics.

222
223 A sensitivity analysis of the influence of individual comparison areas on the estimated
224 associations between industry-led culling and OTF-W incidence was conducted by
225 systematically removing one area at a time from the analysis. A further sensitivity analysis
226 was conducted by systematically removing one explanatory variable at a time from the
227 models. The aim of this was to identify which of the explanatory variables most influenced
228 the estimated associations between industry-led culling and OTF-W incidence.

229
230 As part of our validation of the final models, three further sets of models were developed.
231 The first set examined OTF-W incidence in the first two years since culling began, but using a
232 reduced number of explanatory variables (area, time at risk and historic incidence) in an
233 approach more similar to the analyses of RBCT data (Donnelly et al 2003; Donnelly et al
234 2006). The second set examined OTF-W incidence in the year prior to the culls to explore
235 whether there was any association between the intervention areas and incidence prior to
236 the start of culling; and the third set estimated effects for the individual years since culling
237 began. The results of these validation analyses are presented in the Appendices.

238

239 **Results**

240

241 **Comparison of characteristics in intervention areas and matched comparison areas**

242

243 The characteristics of the intervention areas and buffers and their matched comparison
244 areas are presented in Table 1. There were 6,658 and 6,387 potential comparison areas
245 generated through the 5-km shifts, respectively, for the Somerset and Gloucestershire
246 intervention areas. The ten selected comparison areas were fairly well matched to their
247 respective intervention areas when values for the ranking factors were averaged (Table 1).
248 The proportion of all incidents that were OTF-W was over 80% for all comparison areas. The
249 greatest differences between the intervention and comparison areas were in historic TB
250 incidence and the number of herds. The numbers of OTF-W incidents prior to baseline were
251 slightly lower overall in Somerset comparison areas compared to the Somerset intervention
252 area in the three years prior to baseline with a difference of 10 fewer incidents on average.
253 The mean number of OTF-W incidents in the Gloucestershire comparison areas was higher
254 one year prior to baseline than the intervention area with a difference of 8 more incidents.
255 The mean number of herds in Somerset comparison areas was slightly higher overall than in

the intervention area (32 more herds on average), whilst the mean number of herds in the Gloucestershire comparison areas overall was slightly lower than in the intervention area (44 fewer herds on average).

The geographical locations of the intervention areas and 10 matched comparison areas are shown in Figure 1. Gloucestershire comparison areas were clustered around the Gloucestershire intervention area (mean distance 33.3 km, SD 15.7) whereas some of the 10 comparison areas matched to the Somerset area were further afield (overall mean distance 62.1 km, SD 32.1).

None of the matched comparison areas contained more than 4% of RBCT proactive area land (Figure 1) although some of the comparison area buffer areas contained more RBCT proactive land (maximum of 17 % for one Gloucestershire comparison area buffer). Seven Somerset comparison areas and nine Gloucestershire comparison areas had had badgers removed as part of control operations at some point in the past. The largest number of badgers removed historically in a Somerset comparison area was 1,589 and in a Gloucestershire comparison area was 1,586. Estimated badger sett density was slightly lower in the Somerset intervention area than in the matched comparison areas and similar in the Gloucestershire intervention and comparison areas (Table 2).

Analysis of the impact of the intervention on OTF-W incidence

The observed OTF-W incidence rates per 100 herd years at risk for each of the central intervention and comparison areas, and their respective buffer areas for Year 1, Year 2, and for each of the three years prior to the cull are presented in Table 3. Descriptive analyses without adjustment for confounding factors showed no statistically significant difference between OTF-W incidence rates in the Somerset central intervention area and comparison areas for Year 1 or Year 2. A weak difference in incidence rate between the Gloucestershire central intervention and comparison areas was observed for Year 1 (IRR: 0.64, $p=0.05$), but not for Year 2. No differences in incidence rates were observed between the intervention buffer areas and comparison buffer areas.

In the initial models for the multivariable analysis for the first two years of culling which contained a single intervention variable and an area variable, the inclusion of an interaction

290 between the intervention and area generated a p-value of <0.001 for both the central and
291 buffer areas. This indicated that the effects of the interventions in the two central areas
292 should be examined separately by including area-specific intervention variables. The final
293 models comparing OTF-W incidence in the first two years of culling, adjusted for explanatory
294 variables, for the central areas (Model A) and the buffer areas (Model B) are presented in
295 Table 4.

296

297 For the central areas (Model A), the number of badgers removed historically and the
298 proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area were
299 included in the model alongside the *a priori* explanatory variables as they affected the
300 association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in Somerset, and reduced the
301 AIC (Table 4). A lower IRR for the intervention was observed in the Somerset and
302 Gloucestershire central areas (both $p<0.001$), with a considerably lower IRR in
303 Gloucestershire (IRR: 0.42; 95% CI: 0.34, 0.51) than in Somerset (IRR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.72,
304 0.87). As expected, increases in time at risk and historic incidence were significantly
305 associated with increased OTF-W incidence. Associations with increased OTF-W incidence
306 were also observed for the proportion of herds that were dairy, the total number of badgers
307 removed historically and the proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the
308 intervention area. Increases in the distance to the intervention area and the estimated
309 number of badger setts per 100 km² were both associated with a decrease in OTF-W
310 incidence in the first two years of culling. The Deviance and Pearson goodness-of-fit tests
311 for overdispersion ($p=0.898$ and $p=0.904$, respectively) indicated no evidence of there being
312 significantly more variation in the data than expected.

313

314 The sensitivity analysis of OTF-W incidence in the central areas showed that with the
315 removal of one of the Somerset comparison areas (WS02), there was no longer an
316 association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in Somerset (IRR=1.00; 95% CI:
317 0.80, 1.26; $p=0.976$). Further investigation of this comparison area could not identify any
318 major differences in the data available that might explain this effect, and this area was
319 retained in the central area model.

320

321 The sensitivity analysis of explanatory variables demonstrated that distance to intervention
322 had a strong influence on the association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in
323 the central area of Somerset (Table A1, Appendix 1). When the distance-to-intervention

variable was removed from the model, the IRR for the association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in Somerset increased, and was no longer statistically significant ($p=0.476$). This indicated that after adjusting for the other explanatory variables, inclusion of the distance between the intervention and comparison areas variable had an influential effect on the estimated IRR.

329

330 **Analysis of the impact of the intervention on OTF-W incidence in surrounding areas**

331 For the buffer areas (Model B), the proportion of the area classed as urban and the
332 proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area were
333 included alongside the *a priori* explanatory variables as they affected the association
334 between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in Somerset, and reduced the AIC (Table 4).
335 An increased estimated IRR was observed for the buffer area around the intervention area in
336 Somerset (IRR=1.38; 95% CI: 1.09, 1.75; $p=0.008$) while no significant association between
337 the intervention and OTF-W incidence was observed in the Gloucestershire buffer, having
338 adjusted for explanatory variables (IRR=0.91; 95% CI: 0.77, 1.07; $p=0.243$). Increases in time
339 at risk and historic incidence were associated with an increased OTF-W incidence in the first
340 two years of culling. Associations with an increase in OTF-W incidence in the intervention
341 areas were also observed for the proportion of herds that were dairy, the proportion of land
342 classed as urban and the proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the
343 intervention area. An increase in the proportion of RBCT proactive land was associated with
344 a decreased OTF-W incidence in the first two years of culling. The Deviance and Pearson
345 goodness-of-fit tests for overdispersion ($p=0.762$ and $p=0.774$, respectively) indicated no
346 evidence of there being significantly more variation in the data than expected.

347

348 The sensitivity analysis of OTF-W incidence in the buffer areas showed that removing
349 Somerset comparison buffer areas WS02B or WS07B affected the estimated association
350 between OTF-W incidence in the Somerset buffer and comparison area buffers (when
351 WS02B removed: IRR=1.64, $p=0.181$; when WS07B removed: IRR=1.24, $p=0.125$). The
352 removal of WS07B reduced the estimated IRR for intervention in the Gloucestershire buffer
353 area to 0.81 ($p=0.011$). However, further examination of these areas could not identify any
354 major differences in the data available that might explain these effects and the comparison
355 areas were retained in the final model.

356

The sensitivity analysis of explanatory variables demonstrated that the proportion of the herds that were classed as dairy and the proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area appeared to have a strong influence on the association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in both intervention buffer areas (Table A2, Appendix 1). For both areas, the inclusion of these variables increased the estimated IRR. In the Somerset intervention buffer area this resulted in a significant association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence. In the Gloucestershire intervention buffer area, adjusting for these factors removed the observed association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence. Other factors that had an influential effect on the IRR in the Somerset intervention buffer area were median herd size and the proportion of land that was exposed to proactive culling in the RBCT.

Discussion

Industry-led badger culling in England is a component of the current multi-faceted bovine TB control policy, not a scientific trial, and as such lacks randomisation and other controls. Nonetheless, it is important to monitor the effects of the industry-led culling and evaluate the impacts taking study limitations into account. The external validity (i.e. the generalizability) of the findings will be limited by the way in which the study areas were selected, and the extent to which the circumstances under which the policy is operating are similar to circumstances where culling is proposed in the future.

Suitability of selected comparison areas

In order to assess the impact of the intervention on cattle TB incidence, we first had to develop a method for selecting suitable comparison areas. For the RBCT, areas were prospectively selected in regions similar in terms of location and geographical characteristics and where the incidence of cattle TB in England was highest (Independent Scientific Group on Cattle TB 2007). RBCT areas were randomised to receive proactive or reactive culling or no culling (survey only). Since randomisation was not possible with the current policy, comparison areas were matched to purposively selected intervention areas on factors associated with cattle TB incidence including distance between areas as well as historic OTF-W incidence. Herd size was used as a criterion because it has been consistently and positively associated with TB in cattle herds (Goodchild and Clifton-Hadley 2001, Ramirez-Villaescusa et al 2010, Conlan et al 2013). The proportion of land previously in an RBCT

proactive culling area was also used to match areas, whereas land previously part of an RBCT reactive area was not. This is because no long-term effect from reactive culling on recurrence of cattle TB incidents has been detected (Karolemeas et al 2012). Reductions in cattle TB incidents in proactively culled RBCT trial areas were measurable during culling and after the cessation of culling (Donnelly et al 2007, Jenkins et al 2010). Further exploratory analyses are consistent with an ongoing, but diminishing (test for temporal trend $p=0.008$), benefit of proactive culling at 55 to 60 months post-trial (Donnelly et al 2011). The method used to select comparison areas maximised the probability of identifying areas that were very similar to the intervention areas in terms of risk factors for TB, thereby reducing the impact of confounding factors in descriptive comparisons of rates. Nevertheless, the matching was not perfect and matching variables were incorporated into the regression models as *a priori* confounders in an attempt to account for the imperfect matching.

Impact of the intervention on OTF-W incidence

In annually published surveillance reports describing the cull areas (APHA 2015, APHA 2016), observed OTF-W incidence was reported for the intervention areas combined to maximise the sample size. In the analyses reported here, a difference in effects was observed between the Somerset intervention area and the Gloucestershire intervention area, also demonstrated in a statistically significant area interaction term in the modelling, so results have been reported separately for the individual areas.

When the effect of intervention in each area was analysed with adjustment for potentially confounding factors, significantly lower IRRs for intervention were revealed in the Gloucestershire central area in Year 1 (Table S5), and in each of the central areas in Year 2 (Table S6) and when both Year 1 and Year 2 were analysed together (Table 4). Additional modelling to better understand inter-area comparison indicated that OTF-W incidence was lower in the Gloucestershire intervention area than its comparison areas before culling began (Table S4), as was also observed in the unadjusted analysis. Similar analyses of TB incidence prior to culling were not performed in the RBCT because the randomised selection of areas in that trial was expected to have removed any biases related to differences between areas.

Impact of the intervention on OTF-W incidence in surrounding areas

424 The multivariable analysis revealed an increased IRR for the intervention in the Somerset
425 buffer area (IRR: 1.38, $p=0.008$) and no effect in the Gloucestershire buffer area (IRR: 0.91,
426 $p=0.243$). The observed effect in the Somerset buffer area is consistent with the results of
427 the RBCT, which indicated that an increase in cattle TB incidence could be expected in the
428 buffer areas due to perturbation of the badger population (Donnelly et al 2006; Woodroffe
429 et al 2006). When the individual years were investigated (Appendix 2, Tables A5 and A6), the
430 increased IRR for intervention in the Somerset buffer area was only observed in Year 1, and
431 a lower IRR for intervention in the Gloucestershire buffer area was observed in Year 1 and
432 Year 2 individually. None of the differences in the buffer areas were observed when the year
433 prior to the culls was analysed (Table S4).

434

435 **Reliability of the models**

436 The associations between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in Somerset that were
437 observed in the models including all associated covariates (Table 4) were not observed in the
438 simpler RBCT-like models which included a small number of covariates (Table S3). The
439 modelling performed for the RBCT did not include additional explanatory factors since
440 differences in these potential confounders between areas was assumed to have been
441 accounted for by the randomisation. Indeed, there was no substantial over dispersion
442 despite the limited number of explanatory variables included (Donnelly et al 2003; Donnelly
443 et al 2006). In this study, where randomisation was not possible, simpler models that do not
444 control for potential confounding factors may be less effective in detecting an association
445 between industry-led badger culling and OTF-W incidence.

446

447 The sensitivity analysis performed on the buffer area model identified two Somerset
448 comparison buffer areas as being particularly influential. There was more variation in
449 incidence among the Somerset buffer comparison areas, which might explain why some
450 areas are more influential than others in the models. The greater variation in incidence
451 between buffer areas is not surprising since they are geographically smaller than the central
452 areas and contain fewer herds. The positive influence of the proportion dairy variable and
453 the proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land on the association between
454 culling and OTF-W incidence in both intervention buffer areas is not unexpected as both are
455 factors that have been found to be positively correlated with incidence in previous studies
456 (Goodchild and Clifton-Hadley 2001; Porphyre et al 2008; Broughan et al 2016). The
457 sensitivity analysis demonstrates that there is considerable uncertainty around the

estimates that cannot currently be explained. Our analysis will be subject to confounding in common with all observational studies despite attempts to control for these effects. Further follow-up and inclusion of data from additional culled areas will likely make future analyses more informative (Donnelly et al., 2015).

462

463 **OTF-W incidents versus all TB incidents**

OTF-W incidents were used as the outcome measure rather than all TB incidents because the RBCT only showed an association between OTF-W incidence and culling (Independent Scientific Group on Cattle TB, 2007). This reasoning assumes that the current case definition of OTF-W herds is comparable to the definition of a confirmed incident used during the RBCT. This may not be the case due to operational and policy changes in the management of TB incidents, particularly since the introduction of the TB eradication strategy in 2014 (Defra 2014b). It is not understood why the effects of culling observed in the RBCT were only observed for OTF-W-like incidents. To investigate further, we extended our analysis of industry-led culling to include all TB incidents (Appendix 3, Table A7). Qualitatively similar results were obtained to those obtained when modelling only OTF-W incidents, although the estimated effects were slightly weaker. This might suggest that culling has more influence on OTF-W incidents than those without post-mortem evidence of infection, suggesting that there is a stronger association between badgers and the occurrence of OTF-W incidents compared with all TB incidents. The probability of *M. bovis* infection in a herd will be higher for OTF-W incidents than for TB incidents that have not been confirmed by post-mortem evidence of infection which could possibly increase the power to detect effects (de la Rua-Domenech et al 2006).

481

482 **Difficulties with assessing the impact of industry-led culls**

In Year 1, the target of reducing the estimated pre-cull population by at least 70% was not achieved, nor was spatial coverage of the culling homogeneous (Independent Expert Panel 2014). In Year 2, the minimum number of badgers to be removed was achieved in the Somerset intervention area, but not in the Gloucestershire area (Defra 2014c). This means culling may not have been as effective as that conducted in the RBCT and could potentially have had an adverse effect on cattle TB if it led to greater badger movement and transmission of *M. bovis*. Furthermore, differences in the implementation of the culls between the two intervention areas due to factors such as protestor activity, non-compliant

land holding and heterogeneous coverage of land, may have resulted in differential effects between areas (Independent Expert Panel 2014).

Changes in bovine TB control policy over the duration of the culls, particularly where its application is not equally distributed between the intervention and comparison areas, will impact the quality of comparisons. The “intervention” in Year 1 consisted of culling alone, whereas in Year 2, it comprised culling and the provision of farm-level risk management advice. Because the risk management programme may have a beneficial effect in reducing transmission of infection, any positive or negative effects on cattle TB incidents detected in Year 2 and subsequent years may be attributable to a combination of policies and not to badger culling alone.

It has been estimated that in order to have sufficient power to be confident of observing significant differences in the incidence of OTF-W herd incidents, matched intervention and comparison areas will need to be observed for at least three years after culling begins, and that this increases to four years if only two intervention areas are licenced (Donnelly et al 2015). As such, it was not expected that significant differences would be observed in the first two years of follow-up, particularly since the proportion of badgers removed was estimated to be lower than in the RBCT. While it is possible that the significant differences observed could be true differences, selection bias cannot be ruled out due to the non-randomised selection of the cull areas. It is also possible (though unlikely given the low p-values) that the observed effects are due to chance. Caution should always be applied in the interpretation of models which attempt to fit a relatively large number of parameters (Babiyak 2004, Green 2010), particularly when the dataset is small. However, these findings are coherent with findings from the RBCT.

With the limited data available to date, it is possible that spurious associations could have arisen. For example, the central area model for the first two years since culling began identified estimated badger sett density as being negatively associated with OTF-W incidence in the area. This counterintuitive result at first sight casts doubt on the model, but an increase in estimated badger sett density could increase the likelihood that the transmission of *M. bovis* to cattle is from badgers and thus culling badgers may have more of an impact on cattle TB incidence. The impact of the efficacy of the culls could not be

524 investigated in this analysis because of the uncertainty around the estimates of badger
525 population reduction (AHVLA 2014).

526 A number of potential confounding factors have been included in this analysis. However,
527 even with the inclusion of this additional information, it is unlikely that all sources of bias
528 have been estimated or detected. For example, we do not have all the information that may
529 have been considered by groups of farmers and land owners selecting the culling areas.
530 Factors that affect cattle TB risk may also change with time. Furthermore, farmers and
531 landowners aware of the intervention may change their behaviours in ways that affect cattle
532 TB incidence independent of any changes in Government policy (Gale 2004).

533

534 **Conclusions**

535 We have identified reductions in OTF-W incidence in both the Somerset and Gloucestershire
536 intervention areas, and an increase in OTF-W incidence in the Somerset buffer area in the
537 first two years of industry-led culls. As this analysis has been performed on only two
538 intervention areas with only two years of follow-up data, and the biological cause-effect
539 relationship behind the statistical associations observed is difficult to determine, it would be
540 unwise to use the findings of this analysis to develop generalisable inferences about the
541 effectiveness of the policy at present. These findings are consistent with findings from the
542 RBCT, although a time lag of around four years was observed between culling in the RBCT
543 and measureable significant effects on cattle incidence (Donnelly et al 2007).

544

545 Although a trial randomising culling to different matched areas would be the most rigorous
546 design for the evaluation of the effect of a badger culling policy, this type of design is not
547 possible when the areas where culling is conducted are selected by stakeholders. The long-
548 term value of monitoring information from industry-led culling will depend on the conduct
549 of the culls, the number of areas eventually licensed and the extent to which other bovine
550 TB control policies remain stable. Continued delivery of the intervention in these areas, and
551 further roll out of the intervention to other areas may enable better assessments to be
552 made of the impact of industry-led culling on TB incidence in cattle.

553

554 **Acknowledgements**

555

556 We wish to thank our colleagues at APHA – Adam Brouwer for calculation of the time at risk
557 data, Dr Jenny Broughan and Joanna Lawes for their comments on early drafts of the

558 manuscript, and Dr Jane Gibbens, Prof. Dirk Pfeiffer and Prof. Glyn Hewinson for their review
559 of the final manuscript. We wish to thank the independent auditors – Dr Martine Wahl
560 (Clinical Research and Communication) who reviewed the project protocol, and John
561 Sherington (Jstat Consulting) and Pippa Gibson (Defra) who reviewed the project
562 methodology. Finally we thank Defra for funding this work under Defra research project
563 SE3131. Christl Donnelly would like to thank the MRC for Centre funding.
564

For Review Only

565 **References**

566

567 AHVLA (2014) Monitoring the efficacy of badger population reduction by controlled shooting
568 during the first six weeks of the pilots. Report to Defra 31st January 2014.

569 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300383/a](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300383/hvla-efficacy-report.pdf)
570 [hvla-efficacy-report.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300383/hvla-efficacy-report.pdf) accessed 13/07/2015.

571

572 APHA (2015) Bovine tuberculosis: Infection status in cattle in England. Annual surveillance
573 report for the period January to December 2014.

574 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/467803/e](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/467803/england-surveillance-report14.pdf)
575 [ngland-surveillance-report14.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/467803/england-surveillance-report14.pdf)

576

577 APHA (2016) Report of the incidence of bovine tuberculosis in cattle in 2014 – 2015 in the
578 areas of Somerset and Gloucestershire exposed to two years of industry-led badger control.

579 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/548714/t](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/548714/tb-badger-control-second-year-analysis.pdf)
580 [b-badger-control-second-year-analysis.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/548714/tb-badger-control-second-year-analysis.pdf)

581

582 BABYAK, M. (2004) What you see may not be what you get: a brief nontechnical introduction
583 to overfitting in regression-type models. *Psychosomatic Medicine* 66 (3): 411-421

584

585 BROUGHAN, J. M., MAYE, D., CARMODY, P., BRUNTON, L. A., ASHTON, A., WINT, W.,
586 ALEXANDER, N., NAYLOR, R., WARD, K., GOODCHILD, A. V., HINCHLIFFE, S., EGLIN, R. D.,
587 UPTON, P., NICHOLSON, R. & ENTICOTT, G. (2016) Farm characteristics and farmer
588 perceptions associated with bovine tuberculosis incidents in areas of emerging endemic
589 spread. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* **129**: 88-98.

590

591 BURNHAM, K.P. AND ANDERSON, D.R. (2002) Model selection and Multi-Model Inference: a
592 practical information-theoretic approach. New-York: Springer-Verlag.

593

594 CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S., WILESMITH, J. W., RICHARDS, M. S., UPTON, P. & JOHNSTON, S.
595 (1995) The occurrence of *Mycobacterium bovis* infection in cattle in and around an area
596 subject to extensive badger (*Meles meles*) control. *Epidemiology and Infection* **114**: 179-193.

597

598 CONLAN, A. J., MCKINLEY, T. J., KAROLEMEAS, K., POLLOCK, E. B., GOODCHILD, A. V.,
599 MITCHELL, A. P., BIRCH, C. P., CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S. & WOOD, J. L. (2012) Estimating the
600 hidden burden of bovine tuberculosis in Great Britain. *PLoS Computational Biology* **8**(10):
601 e1002730. Doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002730.
602
603 DEFRA (2014a) Defra response. Pilot badger culls in Somerset and Gloucestershire: Report by
604 the Independent Expert Panel.
605 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300424/p](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300424/pb14158-defra-response-independent-expert-panel.pdf)
606 [b14158-defra-response-independent-expert-panel.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300424/pb14158-defra-response-independent-expert-panel.pdf). Accessed April 8, 2014.
607
608 DEFRA (2014b) The Strategy for achieving Officially Bovine Tuberculosis Free status for
609 England.
610 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300447/p](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300447/pb14088-bovine-tb-strategy-140328.pdf)
611 [b14088-bovine-tb-strategy-140328.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300447/pb14088-bovine-tb-strategy-140328.pdf). Accessed July 12, 2016.
612
613 DEFRA (2014c) Setting the minimum and maximum numbers for Year 2 of the badger culls.
614 Advice to Natural England.
615 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/347536/b](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/347536/badger-cull-setting-min-max-numbers-2014.pdf)
616 [adger-cull-setting-min-max-numbers-2014.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/347536/badger-cull-setting-min-max-numbers-2014.pdf). Accessed December 22, 2016.
617
618 DEFRA (2014d) Bovine TB: summary of badger control monitoring during 2014.
619 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bovine-tb-summary-of-badger-control-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bovine-tb-summary-of-badger-control-monitoring-during-2014)
620 [monitoring-during-2014](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bovine-tb-summary-of-badger-control-monitoring-during-2014). Accessed July 19, 2016.
621
622 DEFRA (2015) Guidance to Natural England Licences to kill or take badgers for the purpose of
623 preventing the spread of bovine TB under section 10(2)(a) of the Protection of Badgers Act
624 1992.
625 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69464/pb](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69464/pb13692-bovinetb-guidance-ne.pdf)
626 [13692-bovinetb-guidance-ne.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69464/pb13692-bovinetb-guidance-ne.pdf), Accessed May 2, 2014.
627
628 DE LA RUA-DOMENECH R., GOODCHILD, A. T., VORDERMEIER, H. M., HEWINSON, R. G.,
629 CHRISTIANSEN, K. H., CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S. (2006) Ante mortem diagnosis of tuberculosis
630 in cattle: a review of the tuberculin tests, gamma-interferon assay and other ancillary
631 diagnostic techniques. *Research in Veterinary Science* **81**(2):190-210.

- 632
- 633 DONNELLY, C. A., WOODROFFE, R., COX, D. R., BOURNE, J., GETTINBY, G., LE FEVRE, A. M.,
 634 MCINERNEY, J. P. & MORRISON, W. I. (2003) Impact of localized badger culling on
 635 tuberculosis incidence in British cattle. *Nature* **426(6968)**: 834-837.
- 636
- 637 DONNELLY, C. A., WOODROFFE, R., COX, D. R., BOURNE, F. J., CHEESEMAN, C. L., CLIFTON-
 638 HADLEY, R. S., WEI G., GETTINBY, G., GILKS, P., JENKINS, H., JOHNSTON, W. T., LE FEVRE, A.
 639 M., MCINERNEY, J. P. & MORRISON, W. I. (2006) Positive and negative effects of widespread
 640 badger culling on tuberculosis in cattle. *Nature* **439**: 843-846.
- 641
- 642 DONNELLY, C. A., WEI, G., JOHNSTON, W. T., COX, D. R., WOODROFFE, R., BOURNE, F. J.,
 643 CHEESEMAN, C. L., CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S., GETTINBY, G., GILKS, P., JENKINS, H. E., LE FEVRE,
 644 A. M., MCINERNEY, J. P. & MORRISON, W. I. (2007) Impacts of widespread badger culling on
 645 cattle tuberculosis: concluding analyses from a large-scale field trial. *International Journal of*
 646 *Infectious Diseases* **11(4)**: 300-308.
- 647
- 648 DONNELLY, C. A., JENKINS, H. & WOODROFFE, R. (2011) Analysis of further data (to 28
 649 August 2011) on the impacts on cattle TB incidence of repeated badger culling.
 650 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0009090>.
- 651
- 652 DONNELLY, C. A., BENTO, A. I., GOODCHILD, A. V. & DOWNS, S. H. (2015) Exploration of the
 653 power or routine surveillance data to assess the impacts of industry-led badger culling on
 654 bovine tuberculosis incidence in cattle herds. *Veterinary Record* **177**: 417.
- 655
- 656 DOWNS, S. H., CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S., UPTON, P. U., MILNE, I., ELY, E., GOPAL, R.,
 657 GOODCHILD, A. V., SAYERS, A. R. (2013) Tuberculin manufacturing source and breakdown
 658 incidence rate of bovine tuberculosis in British cattle, 2005-2009. *Veterinary Record* **172(4)**:
 659 98
- 660
- 661 GALE, E. A. M. (2004) The Hawthorne studies—a fable for our times? *QJM: An International*
 662 *Journal of Medicine* **97(7)**: 439-449.
- 663
- 664 GOODCHILD, A. V. & CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S. (2001) Cattle-to cattle transmission of
 665 *Mycobacterium bovis*. *Tuberculosis* **81(1-2)**: 23-41.

- 666
- 667 GREEN, S. (1991) How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis? *Multivariate*
- 668 *Behavioural Research*. 26 (3): 499-510
- 669
- 670 HARRIS, K. A., BRUNTON, L., BROUWER, A., ROMERO GARCIA, M. P., GIBBENS, J. C., SMITH,
- 671 N. H. & UPTON, P. A. (2017) Bovine TB infection in cattle in Great Britain in 2015. *Veterinary*
- 672 *Record*. 180 (7): 170-175
- 673
- 674 HUBER, P. J. (1967) The behavior of maximum likelihood estimates under nonstandard
- 675 conditions. In *Vol. 1 of Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical*
- 676 *Statistics and Probability*, 221–233. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 677
- 678 INDEPENDENT EXPERT PANEL (2014) Pilot badger culls in Somerset and Gloucestershire.
- 679 Report by the Independent Expert Panel.
- 680 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300382/in](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300382/independent-expert-panel-report.pdf)
- 681 [dependent-expert-panel-report.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300382/independent-expert-panel-report.pdf). Accessed July 22, 2015
- 682
- 683 INDEPENDENT SCIENTIFIC GROUP ON CATTLE TB (2007). Bovine TB: The Scientific Evidence –
- 684 Final Report of the Independent Scientific Group on Cattle TB. Defra Publications, London
- 685 HMSO.
- 686 [http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090330154646/www.defra.gov.uk/animalh/tb](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090330154646/www.defra.gov.uk/animalh/tb/isg/pdf/final_report.pdf)
- 687 [/isg/pdf/final_report.pdf](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090330154646/www.defra.gov.uk/animalh/tb/isg/pdf/final_report.pdf). Accessed July 12, 2016.
- 688
- 689 JENKINS, H. E., WOODROFFE, R. & DONNELLY, C. A. (2010) The duration of the effects of
- 690 repeated widespread badger culling on cattle tuberculosis following the cessation of culling.
- 691 *PLoS One* 5: e9090. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0009090.
- 692
- 693 JUDGE, J., WILSON, G. J., MACARTHUR, R., DELAHAY, R. J. & MCDONALD, R. A. (2014) Density
- 694 and abundance of badger social groups in England and Wales in 2011-2013. *Scientific*
- 695 *Reports* 4: 3809.
- 696
- 697 KAROLEMEAS, K., DONNELLY, C. A., CONLAN, A. J., MITCHELL, A. P., CLIFTON-HADLEY, A. P.,
- 698 CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S., UPTON, P., WOOD, J. L. & MCKINLEY, T. J. (2012) The effect of

- 699 badger culling on breakdown prolongation and recurrence of bovine tuberculosis in cattle
700 herds in Great Britain. *PLoS One* **7(12)**: e51342.
- 701
- 702 PORPHYRE, T., STEVENSON, M. A. & MCKENZIE, J. (2008) Risk factors for bovine tuberculosis
703 in New Zealand cattle farms and their relationship with possum control strategies.
704 *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* **86**: 93-106.
- 705
- 706 RAMIREZ-VILLAESCUSA, A. M., MEDLEY, G. F., MASON, S. & GREEN, L. E. (2010) Risk factors
707 for a herd breakdown with bovine tuberculosis in 148 cattle herds in the southwest of
708 England. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* **95(3-4)**: 224-230.
- 709
- 710 WHITE, H. (1982) Maximum likelihood estimation of misspecified models. *Econometrica* **50**:
711 1-25.
- 712
- 713 WOODROFFE, R., DONNELLY, C. A., COX, D. R., BOURNE, F. J., CHEESEMAM, C. L., DELAHAY, R.
714 J., GETTINBY, G., MCINERNEY, J. P. & MORRISON, W. I. (2006) Effects of culling on badger
715 *Meles meles* spatial organization: implications for the control of bovine tuberculosis. *Journal*
716 *of Applied Ecology* **43**: 1-10.
- 717
- 718 WOODROFFE, R. (2015) Bovine TB in the pilot badger cull zone in Gloucestershire. *Veterinary*
719 *Record* **176**: 258.
- 720

721
722

Table 1 – Distribution of attributes used to rank comparison areas across intervention areas and matched comparison areas (as mean values across 10 comparison areas)

Area	All TB incidents prior to baseline date ^a		OTF-W incidents prior to baseline date		Number of herds	Herd size median	Distance to intervention area km	RBCT proactive area %
	1 year	3 year	1 year	3 year				
Somerset								
Central	30	105	27	84	154	53.5	0	0.5
Central buffer ^b	16	43	13	36	88	39.5	0	3.4
Comparison	31.4	92.1	25.8	74.4	186.3	56.3	62.1	0.03
Comparison buffer	20.1	56.3	16.8	44.7	119.9	61.7	62.1	2.4
Gloucestershire								
Central	17	90	15	69	215	46.0	0	0
Central buffer	22	55	16	41	121	48.0	0	0
Comparison	27.8	83.2	23.3	66.6	171.3	46.2	33.3	0.7
Comparison buffer	18.1	53.8	15.2	43.6	100.8	52.8	33.3	5.5

^a TB incidents includes all incidents. Only OTF-W incidents were used to rank comparison areas. ^b Lower values for some variables because buffer area to the north extends into the sea

723
724
725

726

Table 2 – Distribution of explanatory factors across intervention areas and matched comparison areas (as mean values across 10 comparison areas)

Area	Dairy herds % ^a	Estimated badger main sett density mean/km ^{2a}	Number of badgers removed historically			Flood zone 3 % ^a	Motorway Total length/km ^a	Urban area % ^a	Number of farms ^a	> 1 fragment in central zone % ^a	All land inside central zone % ^d	All land inside central or buffer zones % ^a
			1972-1990	1990-1998	1999-2006							
Somerset												
Central	8.4	0.409	0	375	230	16.2	0	0	153	83.7	65.4	81.0
Central buffer	3.4	0.387	0	87	102	3.4	0	0	87	75.9	37.9	56.3
Comparison	20.3	0.557	154	101	3	9.8	3.5	3.3	185	79.0	58.1	74.2
Comparison buffer	21.5	0.550	64	69	17	7.2	2.4	4.3	119	76.9	31.1	53.3
Gloucestershire												
Central	17.7	0.626	52	366	62	16.2	0	0	214	83.6	67.3	78.5
Central buffer	19.8	0.657	21	97	47	14.0	38.1	8.6	119	71.4	31.1	51.3
Comparison	16.4	0.589	175	88	28	7.3	4.1	5.3	169	77.6	54.9	71.8
Comparison buffer	15.7	0.578	138	80	61	8.7	5.8	4.4	100	74.4	29.0	50.8

^a On baseline date. Baseline dates for Somerset and Gloucestershire were 26/08/13 and 03/09/13, respectively.727
728

729
730

Table 3 – OTF-W incidence rates per 100 herd years at risk and unadjusted incidence rate ratios (IRRs) for central and buffer intervention areas versus the central and buffer comparison areas, respectively, in Somerset and Gloucestershire, for each 12-month reporting period

12-month reporting period	Central intervention	Central comparison	IRR	95% confidence interval		P value	Intervention buffer	Comparison buffer	IRR	95% confidence interval		P value
Somerset												
3 years prior	19.7	15.0	1.32	0.86	1.95	0.173	10.7	13.6	0.79	0.35	1.54	0.503
2 years prior	21.3	13.3	1.60	1.06	2.35	0.022	17.0	13.5	1.26	0.67	2.18	0.407
1 year prior	23.0	15.3	1.50	0.97	2.24	0.054	16.4	15.3	1.07	0.56	1.89	0.778
Year 1	18.9	14.5	1.30	0.83	1.95	0.209	17.1	17.3	0.99	0.53	1.70	0.998
Year 2	14.0	14.4	0.97	0.58	1.53	0.910	11.7	15.6	0.75	0.35	1.42	0.384
Gloucestershire												
3 years prior	14.6	13.5	1.08	0.71	1.59	0.683	13.0	16.2	0.81	0.44	1.38	0.437
2 years prior	11.4	14.8	0.77	0.48	1.19	0.231	9.4	15.0	0.62	0.29	1.18	0.136
1 year prior	7.7	14.9	0.52	0.29	0.86	0.006	14.0	16.9	0.83	0.46	1.39	0.488
Year 1	9.5	14.8	0.64	0.39	1.02	0.049	12.9	14.0	0.93	0.50	1.58	0.802
Year 2	9.2	12.4	0.74	0.44	1.19	0.213	12.1	14.6	0.83	0.44	1.43	0.511

731
732

Table 4 – Multivariable Poisson regression models describing the effect of intervention (badger culling) stratified by area on the number of OTF-W^a incidents **in the first two years since culling began**, adjusted for explanatory variables. Model A describes the effect in the central intervention areas compared with matched central comparison areas, and Model B describes the effect in the 2km buffer area for the intervention areas compared with buffer areas for matched comparison areas.

	IRR ^b	Robust SE	P value	95% confidence Interval	
Model A – Central areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	0.791	0.040	<0.001	0.716	0.874
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.417	0.041	<0.001	0.344	0.507
Area = Somerset	1.103	0.173	0.532	0.811	1.501
Log transformed herd years at risk in first two years of culling	5.251	0.699	<0.001	4.044	6.817
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over three years prior	1.555	0.136	<0.001	1.310	1.847
Log transformed median herd size	0.397	0.308	0.233	0.087	1.815
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.019	0.003	<0.001	1.013	1.024
Distance to intervention (km)	0.996	0.001	<0.001	0.995	0.998
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	0.995	0.003	0.031	0.990	1.000
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	1.003	0.026	0.922	0.953	1.055
Log transformed number of badgers culled historically	1.032	0.010	0.001	1.013	1.052
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.026	0.007	<0.001	1.012	1.040
Model B – Buffer areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	1.379	0.166	0.008	1.090	1.746
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.908	0.075	0.243	0.771	1.068
Area = Somerset	1.106	0.108	0.298	0.914	1.339
Log transformed herd years at risk in first two years of culling	1.955	0.193	<0.001	1.612	2.372
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over three years prior	2.076	0.181	<0.001	1.749	2.464
Log transformed median herd size	1.056	0.145	0.694	0.806	1.382
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.019	0.009	0.031	1.002	1.037
Distance to intervention (km)	0.999	0.001	0.351	0.996	1.002
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	0.840	0.410	0.721	0.323	2.184
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.977	0.005	<0.001	0.967	0.988
Proportion of land classed as urban	1.053	0.013	<0.001	1.027	1.079
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.050	0.008	<0.001	1.034	1.067

^a Officially Tuberculosis Free status Withdrawn

^b Incidence rate ratio

^c Intervention is industry-led badger culling, as described in the Introduction

742 **Appendices**

743

744 Appendix 1 - Sensitivity analysis of individual explanatory factors

745

746 Appendix 2 - Additional model validation

747

748 Appendix 3 - Analysis of all cattle TB incidents

749

For Review Only

Appendix 1. Sensitivity analysis of individual explanatory variables

Table A1 - Model estimates for intervention (industry-led badger culling) in the Somerset and Gloucestershire **central areas in the first two years since culling began** when individual explanatory factors are either added (in yellow) or removed (in blue) from three models: a simple RBCT-like model, the baseline model which was the RBCT-like model plus factors considered important *a priori*, and the final model which was the baseline model plus additional explanatory factors. Where there are notable changes in associations from the starting models, the p values are highlighted in bold font. (Final model reported in Table 4 of main body of paper).

		RBCT-like model			Baseline model			Final model		
		IRR ^a	95% CI	P value	IRR ^a	95% CI	P value	IRR ^a	95% CI	P value
RBCT factors: Area, herd years at risk, historic three year incidence	Somerset	1.012	0.879 - 1.165	0.868	0.892	0.716 - 1.112	0.310	0.791	0.716 - 0.874	<0.001
	Gloucestershire	0.685	0.577 - 0.813	<0.001	0.606	0.518 - 0.708	<0.001	0.417	0.344 - 0.507	<0.001
Median herd size	Somerset	1.008	0.868 - 1.170	0.922	0.901	0.734 - 1.106	0.319	0.804	0.732 - 0.884	<0.001
	Gloucestershire	0.677	0.580 - 0.791	<0.001	0.620	0.534 - 0.720	<0.001	0.438	0.358 - 0.537	<0.001
Proportion dairy	Somerset	1.174	0.898 - 1.534	0.241	0.798	0.612 - 1.040	0.095	0.710	0.588 - 0.858	<0.001
	Gloucestershire	0.668	0.588 - 0.760	<0.001	0.592	0.470 - 0.745	<0.001	0.408	0.305 - 0.547	<0.001
Distance to intervention	Somerset	0.824	0.663 - 1.026	0.083	1.053	0.923 - 1.200	0.442	0.957	0.847 - 1.081	0.476
	Gloucestershire	0.616	0.507 - 0.749	<0.001	0.690	0.639 - 0.746	<0.001	0.508	0.417 - 0.619	<0.001
Badger sett density	Somerset	0.976	0.860 - 1.107	0.705	0.933	0.692 - 1.259	0.652	0.791	0.684 - 0.915	0.002
	Gloucestershire	0.688	0.580 - 0.816	<0.001	0.580	0.483 - 0.695	<0.001	0.390	0.324 - 0.470	<0.001
Proportion RBCT	Somerset	1.004	0.865 - 1.165	0.960	0.892	0.714 - 1.114	0.312	0.790	0.714 - 0.875	<0.001
	Gloucestershire	0.693	0.569 - 0.845	<0.001	0.593	0.508 - 0.692	<0.001	0.416	0.347 - 0.498	<0.001
Total badgers removed historically	Somerset	0.977	0.869 - 1.099	0.701	0.840	0.733 - 0.962	0.012	0.848	0.728 - 0.988	0.034
	Gloucestershire	0.622	0.501 - 0.774	<0.001	0.511	0.415 - 0.631	<0.001	0.514	0.442 - 0.598	<0.001
Proportion fragmented	Somerset	0.974	0.845 - 1.121	0.710	0.848	0.727 - 0.988	0.034	0.840	0.733 - 0.962	0.012
	Gloucestershire	0.658	0.530 - 0.816	<0.001	0.514	0.442 - 0.598	<0.001	0.511	0.415 - 0.631	<0.001

^a Incidence rate ratio

Table A2 - Model estimates for intervention (industry-led badger culling) in the Somerset and Gloucestershire **buffer areas in the first two years since culling began** when individual explanatory factors are either added (in yellow) or removed (in blue) from three models: a simple RBCT-like model, the baseline model which was the RBCT-like model plus factors considered important *a priori*, and the final model which was the baseline model plus additional explanatory factors. Where there are notable changes in associations from the starting models, the p values are highlighted in bold font. (Final model reported in Table 4 of main body of paper).

		RBCT-like model			Baseline model			Final model		
		IRR ^a	95% CI	P value	IRR ^a	95% CI	P value	IRR ^a	95% CI	P value
RBCT factors: Area, herd years at risk, historic three year incidence	Somerset	0.818	0.638 - 1.047	0.111	1.177	0.893 - 1.550	0.247	1.379	1.090 - 1.746	0.008
	Gloucestershire	0.998	0.758 - 1.313	0.987	0.992	0.744 - 1.323	0.957	0.908	0.771 - 1.068	0.243
Median herd size	Somerset	0.892	0.689 - 1.154	0.385	1.122	0.799 - 1.575	0.508	1.329	0.989 - 1.785	0.059
	Gloucestershire	0.993	0.755 - 1.307	0.961	0.987	0.748 - 1.302	0.926	0.902	0.768 - 1.059	0.207
Proportion dairy	Somerset	1.326	0.921 - 1.909	0.129	0.843	0.565 - 1.257	0.402	0.962	0.712 - 1.300	0.803
	Gloucestershire	0.939	0.751 - 1.173	0.577	0.919	0.683 - 1.236	0.577	0.782	0.653 - 0.936	0.007
Distance to intervention	Somerset	0.703	0.476 - 1.039	0.077	1.248	0.969 - 1.608	0.086	1.610	1.257 - 2.072	<0.001
	Gloucestershire	0.937	0.701 - 1.252	0.661	1.012	0.786 - 1.303	0.926	0.965	0.849 - 1.096	0.583
Badger sett density	Somerset	0.917	0.646 - 1.304	0.627	1.307	0.929 - 1.838	0.124	1.402	1.060 - 1.855	0.018
	Gloucestershire	0.939	0.715 - 1.234	0.653	0.923	0.706 - 1.206	0.556	0.891	0.765 - 1.038	0.139
Proportion RBCT	Somerset	0.813	0.636 - 1.040	0.099	1.182	0.910 - 1.535	0.211	1.083	0.778 - 1.508	0.637
	Gloucestershire	1.024	0.746 - 1.407	0.882	0.982	0.738 - 1.306	0.899	0.937	0.778 - 1.129	0.495
Proportion urban	Somerset	0.984	0.814 - 1.191	0.872	0.758	0.443 - 1.295	0.310	2.193	1.456 - 3.303	<0.001
	Gloucestershire	0.890	0.788 - 1.005	0.060	0.779	0.585 - 1.036	0.086	1.171	0.905 - 1.515	0.230
Proportion fragmented	Somerset	0.819	0.645 - 1.041	0.103	2.193	1.456 - 3.303	<0.001	0.758	0.443 - 1.295	0.310
	Gloucestershire	1.019	0.719 - 1.444	0.917	1.171	0.905 - 1.515	0.230	0.779	0.585 - 1.036	0.086

^a Incidence rate ratio

Appendix 2. Additional model validation

Replicating the RBCT models

In order to compare the current results with those of the RBCT, we assessed the effect of including just those factors that had been identified as important in the RBCT modelling when analysing the first two years of culling (Table A3). As for the larger models, the inclusion of an interaction between the intervention and area was assessed. The interaction generated a p-value of 0.005 for the central areas and 0.399 for the buffer areas. This indicated that the effects of the interventions in the two central areas should be examined separately. When only time at risk (a measure comparable in effect to the baseline number of herds included in the RBCT analyses), historic incidence, area and intervention (badger culling) were included in the models the AIC was poorer (larger) compared with the larger models. In this model, significantly lower incidence was still observed in the Gloucestershire central area (IRR=0.69; $p<0.001$) but there was no significant effect of culling in the Somerset central area or either of the buffer areas.

Table A3 – Multivariable Poisson regression models describing the effect of intervention separated by area on the number of OTF-W^a incidents **in the first two years since culling began**, adjusted for a reduced set of explanatory variables as applied in analysis of the RBCT (Donnelly et al 2003; Donnelly et al 2006). Model 1 describes the effect in the central intervention areas compared with matched central comparison areas, and Model 2 describes the effect in the 2km buffer area for the intervention areas compared with buffer areas for matched comparison areas.

	IRR ^b	Robust SE	P value	95% confidence interval	
Model 1 - Central areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	1.012	0.073	0.868	0.879	1.165
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.685	0.060	<0.001	0.577	0.813
Area = Somerset	1.008	0.082	0.926	0.859	1.182
Log transformed herd years at risk in the first two years of culling	5.436	1.284	<0.001	3.421	8.635
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over all three years prior	2.075	0.143	<0.001	1.813	2.374
Model 2 - Buffer areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset buffer area ^c	0.818	0.103	0.111	0.638	1.047
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire buffer area ^c	0.998	0.140	0.987	0.758	1.313
Area = Somerset	1.242	0.209	0.199	0.892	1.728
Log transformed herd years at risk in the first two years of culling	2.259	0.567	0.001	1.381	3.696
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over all three years prior	1.588	0.134	<0.001	1.346	1.874

^a Officially Tuberculosis Free status Withdrawn

^b Incidence rate ratio

^c Intervention is industry-led badger culling, as described in the Introduction

797 *Statistical analysis of the year prior to the culls*

798

799 In the initial models for the year prior to the culls which contained a single intervention
800 variable and an area variable, the inclusion of an interaction between the intervention and
801 area generated a p-value of <0.001 for the central areas and p=0.775 for the buffer areas, so
802 the effects were examined separately for each area.

803

804 For the central areas (Table A4, Model 1), the number of badgers removed historically was
805 included in the model alongside the *a priori* explanatory variables as it reduced the AIC.
806 Despite no 'intervention' actually taking place, a significantly lower IRR for intervention in
807 the Gloucestershire central area was observed (IRR=0.59, p=0.002), while no significant
808 association with the intervention was observed in the Somerset central area (IRR=1.05,
809 p=0.521). Increases in time at risk and historic incidence were significantly associated with
810 an increase in OTF-W incidence in the intervention areas. The Deviance and Pearson
811 goodness-of-fit tests for overdispersion generated large p values (p=0.973 for both tests)
812 indicating that there was no evidence of there being significantly more variation in the data
813 than expected.

814

815 For the buffer areas (Table A4, Model 2), the length of motorway through an area was
816 included in the model alongside the *a priori* explanatory variables as it modified the
817 coefficient for the association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in the
818 Gloucestershire buffer area. There appeared to be no effect of intervention on OTF-W
819 incidence in the buffer areas, having adjusted for explanatory variables. Increases in time at
820 risk, historic two-year incidence rate and median herd size were significantly associated with
821 an increase in the numbers of OTF-W incidents in the year prior to the culls. An increase in
822 the estimated number of badger setts per 100km² was associated with a decrease in OTF-W
823 incidence in the year prior to the culls. The Deviance and Pearson goodness-of-fit tests for
824 overdispersion generated large p values (p=0.592 and p=0.593, respectively) indicating that
825 there was no evidence of there being significantly more variation in the data than expected.

826

Table A4 – Multivariable Poisson regression models describing the effect of intervention (badger culling) stratified by area on the number of OTF-W^a incidents **in the year prior to the culls**, adjusted for explanatory variables. Model 1 describes the effect in the central intervention areas compared with matched central comparison areas, and Model 2 describes the effect in the 2km buffer area for the intervention areas compared with buffer areas for matched comparison areas.

	IRR ^b	Robust SE	P value	95% confidence Interval	
Model 1 – Central areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	1.049	0.078	0.521	0.907	1.212
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.588	0.100	0.002	0.422	0.821
Area = Somerset	1.002	0.139	0.986	0.764	1.315
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	1.642	0.337	0.016	1.098	2.454
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	1.917	0.258	<0.001	1.472	2.496
Log transformed median herd size	1.482	0.798	0.465	0.516	4.260
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.004	0.003	0.229	0.997	1.011
Distance to intervention (km)	0.999	0.001	0.635	0.997	1.002
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	1.000	0.005	0.924	0.991	1.010
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.948	0.035	0.145	0.882	1.019
Log transformed number of badgers culled historically	0.990	0.010	0.316	0.971	1.010
Model 2 – Buffer areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	1.036	0.129	0.777	0.811	1.322
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	1.097	0.212	0.632	0.751	1.603
Area = Somerset	0.934	0.083	0.444	0.785	1.112
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	1.989	0.211	<0.001	1.615	2.449
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	1.702	0.185	<0.001	1.376	2.105
Log transformed median herd size	1.626	0.318	0.013	1.108	2.386
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.000	0.005	0.969	0.991	1.010
Distance to intervention (km)	1.003	0.002	0.149	0.999	1.006
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	0.271	0.138	0.011	0.100	0.737
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	1.007	0.005	0.185	0.997	1.018
Length of motorway in the area	1.005	0.006	0.422	0.993	1.017

^a Officially Tuberculosis Free status Withdrawn

^b Incidence rate ratio

^c Intervention is industry-led badger culling, as described in the Introduction

838 *Statistical analysis of each of the first two individual years after culling began*

839

840 In addition to examining the association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in
841 the two years of culling, we also examined the association for each of the individual years
842 after culling took place (Year 1 and Year 2). In Year 1, a significant association between the
843 intervention and OTF-W incidence was only observed for the Gloucestershire central area
844 (IRR=0.56, $p=0.001$), while significant associations between the intervention and OTF-W
845 incidence were observed in both the buffer areas, although the direction of the effect
846 differed (Somerset – IRR=1.89, $p<0.001$; Gloucestershire – 0.75, $p=0.016$) (Table A5). In Year
847 2, a significant association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence was observed for
848 both central areas characterised by a lower incidence in both areas (Somerset – IRR=0.67,
849 $p<0.001$; Gloucestershire – 0.62, $p=0.049$), while a significant association between the
850 intervention and OTF-W incidence was only observed in the Gloucestershire buffer area
851 (IRR=0.72, $p=0.038$).

852

Table A5 – Multivariable Poisson regression models describing the effect of intervention (badger culling) stratified by area on the number of OTF-W^a incidents **in the first year since culling began**, adjusted for explanatory variables. Model 1 describes the effect in the central intervention areas compared with matched central comparison areas, and Model 2 describes the effect in the 2km buffer area for the intervention areas compared with buffer areas for matched comparison areas.

	IRR ^b	SE	P value	95% confidence interval	
Model 1 – Central areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	0.908	0.158	0.580	0.647	1.276
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.563	0.099	0.001	0.399	0.796
Area = Somerset	0.964	0.186	0.851	0.660	1.408
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	3.716	1.251	<0.001	1.920	7.189
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	2.311	0.616	0.002	1.371	3.896
Log transformed median herd size	0.411	0.300	0.223	0.098	1.718
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.021	0.008	0.006	1.006	1.037
Distance to intervention (km)	0.996	0.002	0.060	0.993	1.000
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	0.989	0.007	0.140	0.976	1.004
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.963	0.084	0.667	0.812	1.143
Model 2 – Buffer areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	1.886	0.182	<0.001	1.561	2.279
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.748	0.090	0.016	0.591	0.948
Area = Somerset	0.805	0.052	0.001	0.710	0.914
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	1.688	0.112	<0.001	1.482	1.921
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	2.136	0.132	<0.001	1.893	2.411
Log transformed median herd size	1.547	0.157	<0.001	1.268	1.888
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.041	0.005	<0.001	1.031	1.052
Distance to intervention (km)	1.003	0.001	0.001	1.001	1.004
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	0.071	0.022	<0.001	0.039	0.131
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.973	0.007	<0.001	0.961	0.986
Length of motorway in the area (km)	1.021	0.004	<0.001	1.013	1.029
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.054	0.006	<0.001	1.042	1.066

^a Officially Tuberculosis Free status Withdrawn

^b Incidence rate ratio

^c Intervention is industry-led badger culling, as described in the Introduction

Table A6 – Multivariable Poisson regression models describing the effect of intervention (badger culling) stratified by area on the number of OTF-W ^a incidents **in the second year since culling began**, adjusted for explanatory variables. Model 1 describes the effect in the central intervention areas compared with matched central comparison areas, and Model 2 describes the effect in the 2km buffer area for the intervention areas compared with buffer areas for matched comparison areas.

	IRR ^b	SE	P value	95% confidence interval	
Model 1 – Central areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	0.668	0.042	<0.001	0.591	0.755
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.615	0.152	0.049	0.379	0.999
Area = Somerset	1.291	0.317	0.297	0.798	2.089
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	3.467	0.641	<0.001	2.413	4.981
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	1.126	0.182	0.462	0.820	1.547
Log transformed median herd size	1.844	1.635	0.490	0.324	10.483
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.001	0.005	0.809	0.992	1.010
Distance to intervention (km)	0.995	0.001	<0.001	0.994	0.997
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	1.000	0.003	0.985	0.994	1.006
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.993	0.047	0.889	0.905	1.090
Log transformed number of badgers culled historically	1.052	0.023	0.021	1.008	1.099
Proportion of land classed as urban	1.062	0.019	0.001	1.026	1.099
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.043	0.010	<0.001	1.025	1.063
Model 2 – Buffer areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	1.278	0.443	0.478	0.649	2.520
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.717	0.115	0.038	0.523	0.982
Area = Somerset	1.350	0.411	0.324	0.743	2.452
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	1.753	0.288	0.001	1.270	2.419
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	1.812	0.412	0.009	1.161	2.830
Log transformed median herd size	1.005	0.334	0.987	0.525	1.927
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.008	0.017	0.618	0.976	1.042
Distance to intervention (km)	0.996	0.003	0.155	0.991	1.001
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	6.724	8.506	0.132	0.563	80.248
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.989	0.013	0.408	0.964	1.015
Proportion of land classed as urban	1.075	0.028	0.006	1.021	1.132
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.046	0.021	0.024	1.006	1.087

^a Officially Tuberculosis Free status Withdrawn
^b Incidence rate ratio
^c Intervention is industry-led badger culling, as described in the Introduction

Appendix 3. Analysis of all cattle TB incidents

Table A7 – Multivariable Poisson regression models describing the effect of intervention (badger culling) stratified by area on the number of TB incidents **in the first two years since culling began**, adjusted for explanatory variables. Model 1 describes the effect in the central intervention areas compared with matched central comparison areas, and Model 2 describes the effect in the 2km buffer area for the intervention areas compared with buffer areas for matched comparison areas.

	IRR ^a	Robust SE	P value	95% confidence interval	
Model 1 - Central areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^b	0.886	0.050	0.033	0.793	0.991
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^b	0.586	0.040	<0.001	0.513	0.670
Area = Somerset	1.160	0.102	0.090	0.977	1.377
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	4.038	0.701	<0.001	2.873	5.674
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	1.476	0.138	<0.001	1.229	1.773
Log transformed median herd size	0.218	0.101	0.001	0.088	0.540
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.018	0.004	<0.001	1.011	1.025
Distance to intervention (km)	0.998	0.001	0.092	0.997	1.000
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	0.994	0.003	0.045	0.989	1.000
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	1.016	0.024	0.503	0.970	1.065
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.021	0.006	<0.001	1.010	1.032
Model 2 - Buffer areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^b	1.333	0.199	0.054	0.994	1.788
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^b	0.902	0.094	0.319	0.736	1.105
Area = Somerset	1.118	0.129	0.334	0.892	1.401
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	1.880	0.201	<0.001	1.524	2.319
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	1.821	0.186	<0.001	1.491	2.224
Log transformed median herd size	1.044	0.163	0.783	0.769	1.417
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.023	0.010	0.025	1.003	1.043
Distance to intervention (km)	0.998	0.002	0.283	0.995	1.002
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	1.337	0.770	0.614	0.432	4.136
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.982	0.006	0.003	0.970	0.994
Proportion of land classed as urban	1.043	0.014	0.002	1.016	1.072
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.033	0.010	0.001	1.014	1.052

^a Incidence rate ratio

^b Intervention is industry-led badger culling, as described in the Introduction

Assessing the effects of the first two years of
industry-led badger culling in England on the
incidence of bovine tuberculosis in cattle in
2013-15

Lucy A. Brunton^{1,a} - BSc, PhD
Christl A. Donnelly² - BA, MSc, ScD
Heather O'Connor¹ - BSc, MSc
Alison Prosser¹ - BSc
Stuart Ashfield¹ - BSc, MSc, FRGS
Adam Ashton¹
Paul Upton¹ - BSc
Andrew Mitchell¹ - BSc, BA
Anthony V. Goodchild¹ - BVSc, MRCVS, MPhil, PhD
Jessica E. Parry¹ - BSc, PhD
Sara H. Downs^{1,a} - BSc, MSc, PhD

¹ Department of Epidemiological Sciences, Animal and Plant Health Agency, Woodham Lane,
New Haw, Addlestone, Surrey, KT15 3NB, UK

² MRC Centre for Outbreak Analysis and Modelling, Department of Infectious Disease
Epidemiology, Faculty of Medicine, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, St
Mary's campus, Norfolk Place, London, W2 1PG, UK

^a Corresponding author email: ~~lucy.brunton~~Sara.Downs@apha.gsi.gov.uk

Comment [BLA1]: Corresponding author has been changed as Lucy Brunton has now left the organization.

Abstract

Culling badgers to control the transmission of bovine tuberculosis (TB) between this wildlife reservoir and cattle has been widely debated. Industry-led culling began in Somerset and Gloucestershire between August and November 2013 to reduce local badger populations. Industry-led culling is not designed to be a randomised and controlled trial of the impact of culling on cattle incidence. Nevertheless, it is important to monitor the effects of the culling and, taking the study limitations into account, perform a cautious evaluation of the impacts. A standardised method for selecting areas matched to culling areas in factors found to affect cattle TB risk has been developed to evaluate the impact of badger culling on cattle TB incidence. The association between cattle TB incidence and badger culling in the first two years has been assessed. Descriptive analyses without controlling for confounding showed no association between culling and TB incidence for Somerset, or for either of the buffer areas for the first two years since culling began. A weak association was observed in Gloucestershire for Year 1 only. Multivariable analysis adjusting for confounding factors showed that reductions in TB incidence were associated with culling in the first two years in both the Somerset and Gloucestershire intervention areas when compared to areas with no culling (IRR: 0.79, 95%CI: 0.72-0.87, $p < 0.001$ and IRR: 0.42, 95%CI: 0.34-0.51, $p < 0.001$ respectively). An increase in incidence was associated with culling in the 2 km buffer surrounding the Somerset intervention area (IRR: 1.38, 95%CI: 1.09-1.75, $p = 0.008$), but not in Gloucestershire (IRR: 0.91, 95%CI: 0.77-1.07, $p = 0.243$). As only two intervention areas with two years' of data are available for analysis, and the biological cause-effect relationship behind the statistical associations is difficult to determine, it would be unwise to use these findings to develop generalisable inferences about the effectiveness of the policy at present.

Keywords: bovine tuberculosis, cattle, badgers, culling, wildlife

Introduction

Bovine tuberculosis (TB) caused by the bacterium *Mycobacterium bovis* is an important problem for the British cattle industry. Existing controls include testing and slaughter of test-positive cattle, with herd test frequency determined by local incidence, along with surveillance of all slaughtered cattle in the abattoir. But despite these controls the incidence of TB in cattle in England has shown a generally increasing trend over the last thirty years. In 2014/2015, around 5% of cattle herds were under movement restriction due to a TB incident in Great Britain as a whole England, and in the high risk area of England this rose to around 10.1% (Lawes-Harris et al 2016/2017).

Comment [BLA2]: Updated as more recent data is now available.

European badgers (*Meles meles*) are a host species for *M. bovis* and represent a wildlife reservoir of infection. The use of culling to control the transmission of *M. bovis* between this wildlife reservoir and cattle has been widely debated. There is evidence from the Randomised Badger Culling Trial (RBCT) that proactive (systematic and widespread) culling of badgers for at least four years could reduce the incidence of confirmed TB in cattle by 23.2% (95% CI: 12.4% to 32.7%) (Donnelly et al 2006; Donnelly et al 2007). The RBCT was conducted in England between 1998 and 2007. The net effect of proactive culling per year in the RBCT was initially detrimental as a 24.5% increase in incidence (95% CI: 0.6% lower to 56.0% higher) was observed in a 2-km-wide buffer around the culled area (Donnelly et al 2007). Detrimental effects were attributed to the disruption of badger social structures (perturbation) affecting contact rates between cattle and badgers (Woodroffe et al 2006). However, an overall benefit was observed after the third year of culling and subsequent culls (Donnelly et al 2007).

The first round of industry-led culling took place in two areas, one in west Somerset and the other in west Gloucestershire between August and November 2013 (hereafter referred to as the Somerset intervention area and Gloucestershire intervention area). Culling licences were issued for the two areas by Natural England (an executive non-departmental public body advising Defra on the natural environment) under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992 to enable groups of farmers and landowners to reduce local badger populations. Licences were subject to a number of criteria. These included the application area to be at least 150 km², at least 70% of the land to be accessible for culling, cattle herds to be subject to annual TB testing and “reasonable biosecurity” to be in place (Defra 2015). It was also a requirement

Comment [BLA3]: Revised in response to the second comment from Reviewer 1.

that the culling should plan to reduce the estimated badger population by 70% and be conducted for a minimum of four years (Defra 2015). The aim of the initial culls was to assess the practicalities and impact of the intervention on badger population density. Using a combination of cage trapping and controlled shooting, 1,296 badgers were culled in the Somerset intervention area in Years 1 and 2 combined and 1,198 were culled in the Gloucestershire intervention area in the two years combined. The target minimum number that was estimated to result in a 70% reduction in the badger population was not achieved in either area in Year 1, and was achieved in the Somerset intervention area only in Year 2, although there is uncertainty around the calculation of these minimum numbers due to difficulties in estimating the true badger population size (AHVLA 2014, Defra 2014c, Defra 2014d). The third year of culling took place in both areas during autumn 2015. A further area was licensed in Dorset in 2015, and seven new areas were licensed in 2016. Data for analysing cattle TB incidence in the year following the culls in 2015 were not available for this analysis.

Our aim was to measure and assess any association between the badger culling intervention and the level incidence of TB in local cattle, taking account of the methodological constraints resulting from this not being a study based on sound intervention study design principles. TB incidence in cattle herds located within areas where industry-led culling is conducted ("intervention areas") is compared with TB incidence in herds in uncultured areas matched on characteristics that affect cattle TB risk ("comparison areas") in a similar, but not identical, approach to that used for analysing the impact of culling during the RBCT (Donnelly et al 2003; Donnelly et al 2006; Donnelly et al 2007). The null hypothesis being tested is that TB incidence is the same in the intervention areas and their comparison areas in the years since badger culling began. Cattle TB incidence is also monitored among herds in 2 km "buffer areas" surrounding the intervention areas and compared to incidence among herds in similarly defined areas around uncultured comparison areas to monitor for potentially adverse effects on cattle TB incidence (Donnelly et al 2006). The outcome-measure definition of incidence being used for these analyses is the incidence of OTF-W (Officially Tuberculosis Free status – Withdrawn) incidents. OTF-W incidents are those where evidence of *M. bovis* infection has been identified in at least one bovine animal slaughtered for disease control purposes. They also include other incidents upgraded to OTF-W for epidemiological reasons and slaughterhouse case-disclosed incidents that are confirmed through culture of *M. bovis*.

~~The rationale for confining the analyses primarily to OTF-W incidents is that the RBCT~~

~~demonstrated an association between badger culling and incidence of OTF-W like incidents only rather than all incidents (OTF-W like incidents were then called “confirmed” incidents, Independent Scientific Group on Cattle TB, 2007).~~

Comment [BLA4]: Deleted as this is covered in more detail in the discussion.

Here we report an unadjusted analysis of OTF-W incidence rate per 100 herd years at risk for the first two years following industry-led culling, alongside more detailed analysis with adjustment for other factors that are likely to be associated with a risk of TB in cattle.

Methods

Selection of comparison areas

Areas were selected from within England which met the following inclusion criteria: within a high risk TB area (Defra 2014a); cattle herds subject to annual TB testing; having no land closer than 2 km to any intervention area boundary (at the time of selection). Boundary information for the intervention areas was used in an automated programming procedure using ArcGIS 10.0 software (ESRI Release 10.0. Redlands, CA, USA) to generate a population of potential comparison areas with centroids shifted 5 km from one another and rotated at 45-degree intervals. Comparison areas were selected in May 2014, around nine months after the start of the culls in late 2013 without any consideration of cattle TB incidence data after the culls began. They were matched to intervention areas on factors known to affect cattle TB incidence in an attempt to control for confounding factors that could explain between-area variation not attributable to culling and therefore bias the analysis. These are described in more detail below.

Ranking of comparison areas for similarity to an intervention area

Each intervention area and potential comparison area was described by six factors or attributes previously associated with TB incidence that had been extracted from the APHA Sam surveillance database (Table 1). The distribution of each factor was summarized using deciles and the absolute difference between the decile to which the intervention area belonged and the decile to which each potential comparison area belonged was calculated. A score based on the sum of the absolute differences for each of the attributes was then

used to rank potential comparison areas, with areas having the smallest summed absolute difference ranked highest. No weighting was applied to the ranking attributes.

Selection of matched comparison areas based on rank

The highest ranked comparison areas were preferentially selected using a semi-automated process that also sequentially excluded comparison areas that covered part of a higher ranking area or ~~a previously identified~~ one of the two intervention areas. Ten comparison areas were selected for each intervention area, in order to minimize the consequences of future censoring of comparison areas due to initiation of new intervention areas that cover land in a previously selected comparison area. The process of ranking potential comparison areas and for manually selecting highest-ranking comparison areas was conducted independently by two members of the project team, and any differences in outputs were reconciled. Other attributes likely to be associated with cattle TB incidence were summarized for each intervention and comparison area (Table 2).

Statistical analysis

The observed ~~TB-OTF-W~~ incidence rate in cattle herds was calculated for each of the two intervention areas, in the 2km-wide unculler buffer area around each intervention area, and in the 20 comparison areas (10 per intervention area) and their 2km-wide buffers for the first and second years following the baseline date (the date on which the first cull started) and the periods 0-12 months, 12-24 months, and 24-36 months prior to the baseline date. In each case, the herd years-at-risk was calculated using results from whole herd tests as the sum of the time herds in each area were unrestricted and therefore at risk of new infection (a new ~~TB-OTF-W~~ incident) during the period of interest (Downs et al 2013). Crude OTF-W incidence rate ratios (IRRs) were calculated for both the central intervention areas and buffer areas in each reporting period. 95% confidence intervals were calculated and a probability level of $p < 0.05$ was considered to be statistically significant.

For the adjusted analysis, data for explanatory variables were merged with the OTF-W incidence event data and the herd years-at-risk denominator data. Adjusted IRRs were estimated using Poisson regression models comparing intervention with comparison areas separately for the central areas (i.e. the intervention or comparison areas) and the buffer

areas [\(the 2km buffer areas surrounding intervention and comparison areas\)](#), controlling for factors known to be associated with TB incidence. Initial models contained a single intervention status variable which represented the badger culling intervention in both the Somerset and Gloucestershire [intervention](#) areas combined and a variable representing the geographical area (coded as Somerset or Gloucestershire) which included both the intervention areas and their matched comparison areas. The inclusion of a variable representing the interaction between the intervention status and area was also explored in these initial models.

Two models were built, to estimate the effect of intervention on OTF-W incidence in the central areas (Model A) and the buffer areas (Model B) in the first two years of culling. Each model included two separate intervention variables, one for each of the Somerset and Gloucestershire intervention areas in order estimate the independent effects of the intervention in each geographical area. Prior to building the models, bivariable associations between the outcome and explanatory variables were assessed, and pairwise correlations were explored to investigate any collinearity between explanatory variables. Explanatory variables considered to be important potential confounders *a priori* were included in the initial models. These consisted of the variables used to match the comparison areas - area (Somerset or Gloucestershire), historic (3-year) incidence, median herd size, the proportion of herds that were dairy, distance to the matched intervention area and the proportion of the land in the area subjected to proactive culling during the RBCT – to account for imperfect matching, as well as estimated badger sett density (Judge et al. 2014). Additional factors were then added to the models one at a time to assess the effect they had on the estimated impact of the intervention. Akaike’s Information Criterion (AIC) was used to select models with good fit and parsimonious use of explanatory variables (as recommended by Burnham & Anderson 2002).

Explanatory variables in the form of counts included historic incidence, herd size, herd years at risk in the first two years of culling and the number of badgers removed as part of historical control operations including the RBCT and earlier government-led culling. These were transformed by adding 0.5 if any values were zero and taking the natural logarithm. Incidence rate ratios were estimated for all variables as the exponent of the estimated Poisson regression coefficient. The herd years-at-risk variable represented the time herds in an area were classified to be free of *M. bovis* infection based on TB testing information. To

account for any overdispersion (greater-than-expected variance between areas due to clustering of cattle TB incidents), the “robust” or “sandwich” estimator of variance (Huber 1967; White 1982) was used to ensure that confidence intervals were adequately adjusted. Overdispersion in the final models was then assessed using the deviance and Pearson statistics.

A sensitivity analysis of the influence of individual comparison areas on the estimated associations between industry-led culling and OTF-W incidence was conducted by systematically removing one area at a time from the analysis. A further sensitivity analysis was conducted by systematically removing one explanatory variable at a time from the models. The aim of this was to identify which of the explanatory variables most influenced the estimated associations between industry-led culling and OTF-W incidence.

As part of our validation of the final models, three further sets of models were developed. The first set examined OTF-W incidence in the first two years since culling began, but using a reduced number of explanatory variables (area, time at risk and historic incidence) in an approach more similar to the analyses of RBCT data (Donnelly et al 2003; Donnelly et al 2006). The second set examined OTF-W incidence in the year prior to the culls to explore whether there was any association between the intervention areas and incidence prior to the start of culling; and the third set estimated effects for the individual years since culling began. The results of these validation analyses are presented in the Appendices.

Results

Comparison of characteristics in intervention areas and matched comparison areas

The characteristics of the intervention areas and buffers and their matched comparison areas are presented in Table 1. There were 6,658 and 6,387 potential comparison areas generated through the 5-km shifts, respectively, for the Somerset and Gloucestershire intervention areas. The ten selected comparison areas were fairly well matched to their respective intervention areas when values for the ranking factors were averaged (Table 1). The proportion of all incidents that were OTF-W was over 80% for all comparison areas. The greatest differences between the intervention and comparison areas were in historic TB incidence and the number of herds. The numbers of OTF-W incidents prior to baseline were

slightly lower overall in Somerset comparison areas compared to the Somerset intervention area in the three years prior to baseline with a difference of 10 fewer incidents on average. The mean number of OTF-W incidents in the Gloucestershire comparison areas was higher one year prior to baseline than the intervention area with a difference of 8 more incidents. The mean number of herds in Somerset comparison areas was slightly higher overall than in the intervention area (32 more herds on average), whilst the mean number of herds in the Gloucestershire comparison areas overall was slightly lower than in the intervention area (44 fewer herds on average).

The geographical locations of the intervention areas and 10 matched comparison areas are shown in Figure 1. Gloucestershire comparison areas were clustered around the Gloucestershire intervention area (mean distance 33.3 km, SD 15.7) whereas some of the 10 comparison areas matched to the Somerset area were further afield (overall mean distance 62.1 km, SD 32.1).

None of the matched comparison areas contained more than 4% of RBCT proactive area land (Figure 1) although some of the comparison area buffer areas contained more RBCT proactive land (maximum of 17 % for one Gloucestershire comparison area buffer). Seven Somerset comparison areas and nine Gloucestershire comparison areas had had badgers removed as part of control operations at some point in the past. The largest number of badgers removed historically in a Somerset comparison area was 1,589 and in a Gloucestershire comparison area was 1,586. Estimated badger sett density was slightly lower in the Somerset intervention area than in the matched comparison areas and similar in the Gloucestershire intervention and comparison areas (Table 2).

~~Statistical analysis of the first two years since culling began~~ **Analysis of the impact of the intervention on OTF-W incidence**

The observed OTF-W incidence rates per 100 herd years at risk for each of the central **intervention** and comparison areas, and their respective buffer areas for Year 1, Year 2, and for each of the three years prior to the cull are presented in Table 3. Descriptive analyses without adjustment for confounding factors showed no statistically significant difference between **OTF-W** incidence rates in the Somerset central intervention area and comparison areas for Year 1 or Year 2. A weak difference in incidence rate between the Gloucestershire

Comment [BLA5]: The subsection titles have been revised to make the questions more explicit, in response to comments from the Associate Editor.

central intervention and comparison areas was observed for Year 1 (IRR: 0.64, $p=0.05$), but not for Year 2. No differences in incidence rates were observed between the intervention [buffer areas](#) and comparison buffer areas.

In the initial models for the multivariable analysis for the first two years of culling which contained a single intervention variable and an area variable, the inclusion of an interaction between the intervention and area generated a p -value of <0.001 for both the central and buffer areas. This indicated that the effects of the interventions in the two central areas should be examined separately by including area-specific intervention variables. The final models comparing OTF-W incidence in the first two years of culling, adjusted for explanatory variables, for the central areas (Model A) and the buffer areas (Model B) are presented in Table 4.

For the central areas (Model A), the number of badgers removed historically and the proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area were included in the model alongside the *a priori* explanatory variables as they affected the association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in Somerset, and reduced the AIC (Table 4). A lower IRR for the intervention was observed in the Somerset and Gloucestershire central areas (both $p<0.001$), with a considerably lower IRR in Gloucestershire (IRR: 0.42; 95% CI: 0.34, 0.51) than in Somerset (IRR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.72, 0.87). As expected, increases in time at risk and historic incidence were significantly associated with increased OTF-W incidence. Associations with increased OTF-W incidence were also observed for the proportion of herds that were dairy, the total number of badgers removed historically and the proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area. Increases in the distance to the intervention area and the estimated number of badger setts per 100 km² were both associated with a decrease in OTF-W incidence in the first two years of culling. The Deviance and Pearson goodness-of-fit tests for overdispersion ($p=0.898$ and $p=0.904$, respectively) indicated no evidence of there being significantly more variation in the data than expected.

The sensitivity analysis of OTF-W incidence in the central areas showed that with the removal of one of the Somerset comparison areas (WS02), there was no longer an association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in Somerset (IRR=1.00; 95% CI: 0.80, 1.26; $p=0.976$). Further investigation of this comparison area ~~with the other~~

~~comparison areas~~ could not identify any major differences in the data available that might explain this effect, and this area was retained in the central area model.

The sensitivity analysis of explanatory variables demonstrated that distance to intervention had a strong influence on the association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in the central area of Somerset (Table A1, Appendix 1). When the distance-to-intervention variable was removed from the model, the IRR for the association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in Somerset increased, and was no longer statistically significant ($p=0.476$). This indicated that after adjusting for the other explanatory variables, inclusion of the distance between the intervention and comparison areas variable had an influential effect on the estimated IRR.

Analysis of the impact of the intervention on OTF-W incidence in surrounding areas

For the buffer areas (Model B), the proportion of the area classed as urban and the proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area were included alongside the *a priori* explanatory variables as they affected the association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in Somerset, and reduced the AIC (Table 4). An increased estimated IRR was observed for the buffer area around the ~~culled central~~ intervention area in Somerset (IRR=1.38; 95% CI: 1.09, 1.75; $p=0.008$) while no significant association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence was observed in the Gloucestershire buffer, having adjusted for explanatory variables (IRR=0.91; 95% CI: 0.77, 1.07; $p=0.243$). Increases in time at risk and historic incidence were associated with an increased OTF-W incidence in the first two years of culling. Associations with an increase in OTF-W incidence in the intervention areas were also observed for the proportion of herds that were dairy, the proportion of land classed as urban and the proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area. An increase in the proportion of RBCT proactive land was associated with a decreased OTF-W incidence in the first two years of culling. The Deviance and Pearson goodness-of-fit tests for overdispersion ($p=0.762$ and $p=0.774$, respectively) indicated no evidence of there being significantly more variation in the data than expected.

The sensitivity analysis of OTF-W incidence in the buffer areas ~~models~~ showed that removing Somerset comparison buffer areas WS02B or WS07B affected the estimated association between OTF-W incidence in the Somerset buffer and comparison area buffers (when

WS02B removed: IRR=1.64, $p=0.181$; when WS07B removed: IRR=1.24, $p=0.125$). The removal of W07B reduced the estimated IRR for intervention in the Gloucestershire buffer area to 0.81 ($p=0.011$). However, further examination of these areas could not identify any major differences in the data available that might explain these effects and the comparison areas were retained in the final model.

The sensitivity analysis of explanatory variables demonstrated that the proportion of the herds that were classed as dairy and the proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area appeared to have a strong influence on the association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in both [intervention](#) buffer areas (Table A2, Appendix 1). For both areas, the inclusion of these variables increased the estimated IRR. In the Somerset [intervention](#) buffer area this resulted in a significant association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence. In the Gloucestershire [intervention](#) buffer area, adjusting for these factors removed the observed association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence. Other factors that had an influential effect on the IRR in the Somerset [intervention](#) buffer [area](#) were median herd size and the proportion of land that was exposed to proactive culling in the RBCT.

Discussion

Industry-led badger culling in England is a component of the current multi-faceted bovine TB control policy, not a scientific trial, and as such lacks randomisation and other controls. ~~Results will be less robust than those from a randomised controlled trial because of possible unknown bias due to uncontrolled or inadequately controlled confounding by factors associated with cattle TB incidence and the areas selected for culling. Furthermore, estimates of the proportion of badgers removed through industry-led culling suggest a considerably smaller proportion of badgers were removed than was achieved in proactive culling in the RBCT (AHVLA 2014; Defra 2014c). It is not clear how similar the final population density after culling was to that achieved by the RBCT, which is likely to be an important factor in the success of culling in reducing cattle exposure to TB infection from badgers directly or indirectly from environmental contamination. Despite these constraints~~ Nonetheless, it is important to monitor the effects of the industry-led culling and evaluate the impacts taking study limitations into account. The external validity (i.e. the generalizability) of the findings will be limited by the way in which the study areas were

Comment [BLA6]: Sections of text which are repeated elsewhere, or superfluous, have been deleted in response to comments from both reviewers regarding the length of the discussion.

selected, and the extent to which the circumstances under which the policy is operating are similar to circumstances where culling is proposed in the future. ~~A standardised method for selecting comparison areas for analyses has been developed and we report the results from the follow-up of cattle TB incidence in the first two years since culling was introduced in two areas. This initial analysis shows a decrease in OTF-W incidence in both intervention areas and an increase in the 2km-wide buffer surrounding the Somerset intervention area over the first 2 years since culling began, when compared to matched comparison areas. These findings must be interpreted with caution for the reasons described above.~~

Area selection**Suitability of selected comparison areas**

~~In order to assess the impact of the intervention on cattle TB incidence, we first had to develop a method for selecting suitable comparison areas.~~ For the RBCT, areas were prospectively selected in regions similar in terms of location and geographical characteristics and where the incidence of cattle TB in England was highest (Independent Scientific Group on Cattle TB 2007). ~~The specific criterion for identifying the locations of each area for the RBCT was the incidence of OTF-W incidents over the three years prior to selection with additional evidence of continuing cattle TB incidents in the most recent year (Independent Scientific Group on Cattle TB 2007).~~ RBCT areas were randomised to receive ~~the two types of~~ proactive or reactive culling or no culling (survey only). Since randomisation was not possible with the current policy, comparison areas were matched to purposively selected intervention areas on factors associated with cattle TB incidence including distance between areas as well as historic OTF-W incidence ~~sets one and three years prior to the date the culling started~~. Herd size was ~~another used as a~~ used in this study because it has been consistently and positively associated with TB in cattle herds (Goodchild and Clifton-Hadley 2001, Ramirez-Villaescusa et al 2010, Conlan et al 2013). The proportion of land previously in an RBCT proactive culling area was also used to match areas, whereas land previously part of an RBCT reactive area was not. This is because no long-term effect from reactive culling on recurrence of cattle TB incidents has been detected (Karolemeas et al 2012). ~~Reactive culling in the RBCT was suspended prematurely in November 2003 because it was associated with an overall increase in TB incidents in cattle in reactive trial areas, thought to be due to perturbation (Donnelly et al 2003, Woodroffe et al 2009). Proactive (widespread) culling in the RBCT continued until 2005 and r~~Reductions in cattle TB incidents in proactively culled RBCT trial areas were measurable during culling and after the cessation of culling (Donnelly et al 2007, Jenkins et al 2010). Further exploratory analyses are consistent with an ongoing,

but diminishing (test for temporal trend $p=0.008$), benefit of proactive culling at 55 to 60 months post-trial (Donnelly et al 2011).

The method used to select comparison areas maximised the probability of identifying areas that were very similar to the intervention areas in terms of risk factors for TB, thereby reducing the impact of confounding factors in descriptive comparisons of rates. Nevertheless, the matching was not perfect and matching variables were incorporated into the regression models as *a priori* confounders in an attempt to account for the imperfect matching.

Effectiveness of culls at reducing badger density

~~In the initial culls in Somerset and Gloucestershire in 2013 (Year 1), the target of reducing the estimated pre-cull population by at least 70% was not achieved, nor was spatial coverage of the culling homogeneous (Independent Expert Panel 2014). In Year 2, the minimum number of badgers to be removed was achieved in the Somerset intervention area, but not in the Gloucestershire area (Defra 2014c). This means culling may not have been as effective as that conducted in the RBCT and could potentially have had an adverse effect on cattle TB if it led to greater badger movement and transmission of *M. bovis*. Furthermore, differences in the implementation of the culls between Gloucestershire and Somerset due to factors such as protestor activity, non-compliant land holding and heterogeneous coverage of land, may have resulted in differences in effects from the intervention between areas (Independent Expert Panel 2014).~~

Comment [BLA7]: Moved to the general discussion of limitations.

Associations between the intervention and OTF-W incidence **Impact of the intervention on OTF-W incidence**

~~In annually published surveillance reports describing the incidence of cattle TB in the cull areas (APHA 2015, APHA 2016), observed OTF-W incidence was reported for the intervention and comparison areas combined to maximise the sample size. In the analyses reported here, a difference in effects was observed between the Somerset intervention area and the Gloucestershire intervention area, also demonstrated in a statistically significant area interaction term in the modelling, so results have been reported separately for the individual areas. The analysis of the combined observed OTF-W incidence rates for the first and second years since culling began found no association between the intervention and cattle TB in the central or buffer areas across all time periods (APHA 2016). When Somerset and Gloucestershire were analysed separately here, a weak association between the~~

~~intervention and cattle TB incidence was observed in Gloucestershire for Year 1 (IRR: 0.64, 95%CI: 0.39-1.02, p=0.05) but not for Year 2. No association was observed for Somerset, or for any of the buffer areas (Table 3). This~~

When the effect of intervention in each area was analysed with adjustment for potentially confounding factors, significantly lower IRRs for intervention were revealed in the Gloucestershire central area in Year 1 (Table S5), and in each of the central areas in Year 2 (Table S6) and when both Year 1 and Year 2 were analysed together (Table 4). Additional modelling to better understand inter-area comparison indicated that OTF-W incidence was lower in the Gloucestershire intervention area than its comparison areas before culling began (Table S4), as was also observed in the unadjusted analysis. Similar analyses of TB incidence prior to culling were not performed in the RBCT because the randomised selection of areas in that trial was expected to have removed any biases related to differences between areas.

Impact of the intervention on OTF-W incidence in surrounding areas

The multivariable analysis ~~also~~ revealed an increased IRR for the intervention in the Somerset buffer area (IRR: 1.38, p=0.008) and no effect in the Gloucestershire buffer area (IRR: 0.91, p=0.243). The observed effect in the Somerset buffer area is consistent with the results of the RBCT, which indicated that an increase in cattle TB incidence could be expected in the buffer areas due to perturbation of the badger population (Donnelly et al 2006; Woodroffe et al 2006). When the individual years were investigated (Appendix 2, Tables A5 and A6), the increased IRR for intervention in the Somerset buffer area was only observed in Year 1, and a lower IRR for intervention in the Gloucestershire buffer area was observed in Year 1 and Year 2 individually. None of the differences in the buffer areas were observed when the year prior to the culls was analysed (Table S4).

Reliability of the models

~~As well as not being observed in the unadjusted incidence analysis (Table 3), t~~The associations between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in Somerset that were observed in the models including all associated covariates (Table 4) were not observed in the simpler RBCT-like models which included a small number of covariates (Table S3). The modelling performed for the RBCT did not include additional explanatory factors since differences in these potential confounders between areas was assumed to have been accounted for by the randomisation. Indeed, there was no substantial over dispersion despite the limited number

of explanatory variables included (Donnelly et al 2003; Donnelly et al 2006). In this study, where randomisation was not possible, simpler models that do not control for potential confounding factors may be less effective in detecting an association between industry-led badger culling and OTF-W incidence.

~~Sensitivity analyses were performed to investigate the robustness of the models and to help understand the influence of individual areas and explanatory factors. The analysis revealed that distance to intervention was an influential factor in explaining the observed association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in the central Somerset area.~~ The sensitivity analysis performed on the buffer area model identified two Somerset comparison buffer areas as being particularly influential. There was more variation in incidence among the Somerset buffer comparison areas, which might explain why some areas are more influential than others in the models. ~~It could be expected that there would be more~~ The greater variation in incidence between buffer areas is not surprising since they are geographically smaller than the central areas and contain fewer herds. ~~So the greater fluctuations in incidence may be a result of the smaller populations in these areas.~~ The positive influence of the proportion dairy variable and the proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land on the association between culling and OTF-W incidence in both intervention buffer areas is not unexpected. ~~Both led to an increase in the IRR for the intervention in each buffer area when added to the model, and as~~ both are factors that have been found to be positively correlated with incidence in previous studies (Goodchild and Clifton-Hadley 2001; Porphyre et al 2008; Broughan et al 2016). The sensitivity analysis demonstrates that there is considerable uncertainty around the estimates that cannot currently be explained. Our analysis will be subject to confounding in common with all observational studies despite attempts to control for these effects. Further follow-up and inclusion of data from additional culled areas will likely make future analyses more informative (Donnelly et al., 2015).

~~Cattle herd incidence—~~OTF-W only and total incidents versus all TB incidents

OTF-W incidents were used as the outcome measure rather than all TB incidents because the RBCT only showed an association between OTF-W incidence and culling (Independent Scientific Group on Cattle TB, 2007). This reasoning assumes that the current case definition of OTF-W herds is comparable to the definition of a confirmed incident used during the RBCT. This may not be the case due to operational and policy changes in the management of TB incidents, particularly since the introduction of the TB eradication strategy in 2014 (Defra

2014b). It is not understood why the effects of culling observed in the RBCT were only observed for OTF-W-like incidents. To investigate further, we extended our analysis of industry-led culling to include all TB incidents (Appendix 3, Table A7). Qualitatively similar results were obtained to those obtained when modelling only OTF-W incidents, although the estimated effects were slightly weaker. This might suggest that culling has more influence on OTF-W incidents than those without post-mortem evidence of infection, suggesting that there is a stronger association between badgers and the occurrence of OTF-W incidents compared with all TB incidents, ~~and that this is somewhat “diluted” when all incidents are considered~~. The probability of *M. bovis* infection in a herd will be higher for OTF-W incidents than for TB incidents that have not been confirmed by post-mortem evidence of infection which could possibly increase the power to detect effects (de la Rua-Domenech et al 2006).

Difficulties with assessing the impact of industry-led culls

~~In Year 1, the target of reducing the estimated pre-cull population by at least 70% was not achieved, nor was spatial coverage of the culling homogeneous (Independent Expert Panel 2014). In Year 2, the minimum number of badgers to be removed was achieved in the Somerset intervention area, but not in the Gloucestershire area (Defra 2014c). This means culling may not have been as effective as that conducted in the RBCT and could potentially have had an adverse effect on cattle TB if it led to greater badger movement and transmission of *M. bovis*. Furthermore, differences in the implementation of the culls between the two intervention areas due to factors such as protestor activity, non-compliant land holding and heterogeneous coverage of land, may have resulted in differential effects between areas (Independent Expert Panel 2014).~~

Changes in bovine TB control policy over the duration of the culls, particularly where its application is not equally distributed between the intervention and comparison areas, will impact the quality of comparisons. ~~In 2013, biosecurity advice was provided to farmers in and around the Somerset and Gloucestershire intervention areas that was not provided to farmers in and around comparison areas. Subsequently, the Government announced a commitment to provide farm-level risk management information to farms throughout the cull areas (Paterson 2014). The timing of the introduction of this meant that t~~he “intervention” in Year 1 consisted of culling alone, whereas in Year 2, it comprised culling and the provision of farm-level risk management advice. Because the risk management programme may have a beneficial effect in reducing transmission of infection, ~~the~~

~~independent effects from the badger culls in Somerset and Gloucestershire intervention areas cannot be easily evaluated. In other words,~~ any positive or negative effects on cattle TB incidents detected in Year 2 and subsequent years may be attributable to a combination of policies and not to badger culling alone.

It has been estimated that in order to have sufficient power to be confident of observing significant differences in the incidence of OTF-W herd incidents, matched intervention and comparison areas will need to be observed for at least three years after culling begins, and that this increases to four years if only two intervention areas are licenced (Donnelly et al 2015). As such, it was not expected that significant differences would be observed in the first two years of follow-up, particularly since the proportion of badgers removed was estimated to be lower than in the RBCT. While it is possible that the significant differences observed could be true differences, selection bias cannot be ruled out due to the non-randomised selection of the cull areas ~~and the method by which comparison areas were selected~~. It is also possible (though unlikely given the low p-values) that the observed effects are due to chance. Caution should always be applied in the interpretation of models which attempt to fit a relatively large number of parameters (Babyak 2004, Green 2010), particularly when the dataset is small. However, these findings are coherent with findings from the RBCT. ~~The analysis reported here will become more robust with the expansion of the dataset and the power afforded over time.~~

With the limited data available to date, it is possible that spurious associations could have arisen. For example, the central area model for the first two years since culling began identified estimated badger sett density as being negatively associated with OTF-W incidence in the area. This counterintuitive result at first sight casts doubt on the model, but ~~further investigation might find a negative association between estimated badger sett density and the efficacy of the culls which may in turn have a positive impact on herd incidence. Alternatively,~~ an increase in estimated badger sett density could increase the likelihood that the transmission of *M. bovis* to cattle is from badgers and thus culling badgers may have more of an impact on cattle TB incidence. The impact of the efficacy of the culls could not be investigated in this analysis because of the uncertainty around the estimates of badger population reduction, ~~but should be considered in future analyses if possible. The ability to investigate this is dependent on having reliable information about the underlying badger population, and this is difficult to estimate~~ (AHVLA 2014). An additional

~~counterintuitive result is the positive association between the total number of badgers removed historically and an increase in OTF-W incidence. This could be explained by the historical badger removal operations reflecting the ongoing burden of infection in these areas, with more badgers being removed historically to tackle the disease in high incidence areas.~~

A number of potential confounding factors have been included in this analysis. However, even with the inclusion of this additional information, it is unlikely that all sources of bias have been estimated or detected. For example, we do not have all the information that may have been considered by groups of farmers and land owners selecting the culling areas. Factors that affect cattle TB risk may also change with time. Furthermore, farmers and landowners aware of the intervention may change their behaviours in ways that affect cattle TB incidence independent of any changes in Government policy (Gale 2004).

Conclusions

~~Extended analyses of the data available for the first two years since culling began has~~We
have identified reductions in OTF-W incidence in both the Somerset and Gloucestershire ~~central intervention~~ areas, and an increase in OTF-W incidence in the Somerset buffer area ~~in the first two years of industry-led culls statistically associated with the intervention.~~ As this analysis has been performed on only two intervention areas with only two years of follow-up data, and the biological cause-effect relationship behind the statistical associations observed is difficult to determine, it would be unwise to use the findings of this analysis to develop generalisable inferences about the effectiveness of the policy at present. ~~However, these~~ findings are consistent with findings from the ~~Randomised Badger Culling Trial~~RBCT, although a time lag of around four years was observed between culling in the RBCT and measureable significant effects on cattle incidence (Donnelly et al 2007).

Although a trial randomising culling to different matched areas would be the most rigorous design for the evaluation of the effect of a badger culling policy, this type of design is not possible when the areas where culling is conducted are selected by stakeholders ~~in advance of matching.~~ The long-term value of monitoring information from industry-led culling will depend on the conduct of the culls, the number of areas eventually licensed and the extent to which other bovine TB control policies remain stable. Continued delivery of the intervention in these areas, and further roll out of the intervention to other areas may

enable better assessments to be made of the impact of industry-led culling on TB incidence in cattle.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank our colleagues at APHA – Adam Brouwer for calculation of the time at risk data, Dr Jenny Broughan and Joanna Lawes for their comments on early drafts of the manuscript, and Dr Jane Gibbens, Prof. Dirk Pfeiffer and Prof. Glyn Hewinson for their review of the final manuscript. We wish to thank the independent auditors – Dr Martine Wahl (Clinical Research and Communication) who reviewed the project protocol, and John Sherington (Jstat Consulting) and Pippa Gibson (Defra) who reviewed the project methodology. Finally we thank Defra for funding this work under Defra research project SE3131. Christl Donnelly would like to thank the MRC for Centre funding.

References

AHVLA (2014) Monitoring the efficacy of badger population reduction by controlled shooting during the first six weeks of the pilots. Report to Defra 31st January 2014.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300383/hvla-efficacy-report.pdf accessed 13/07/2015.

APHA (2015) Bovine tuberculosis: Infection status in cattle in England. Annual surveillance report for the period January to December 2014.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/467803/england-surveillance-report14.pdf

APHA (2016) Report of the incidence of bovine tuberculosis in cattle in 2014 – 2015 in the areas of Somerset and Gloucestershire exposed to two years of industry-led badger control.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/548714/tb-badger-control-second-year-analysis.pdf

BABYAK, M. (2004) What you see may not be what you get: a brief nontechnical introduction to overfitting in regression-type models. *Psychosomatic Medicine* 66 (3): 411-421

~~BLOWEY, R., GRAY, C., GRIFFITHS, J. & ROWE, J. (2015a) Bovine TB in the pilot badger cull zone in Gloucestershire. *Veterinary Record* 176: 260.~~

~~BLOWEY, R., GRAY, C., GRIFFITHS, J. & ROWE, J. (2015b) Bovine TB in the pilot badger cull zone in Gloucestershire. *Veterinary Record* 176: 527-528.~~

BROUGHAN, J. M., MAYE, D., CARMODY, P., BRUNTON, L. A., ASHTON, A., WINT, W., ALEXANDER, N., NAYLOR, R., WARD, K., GOODCHILD, A. V., HINCHLIFFE, S., EGLIN, R. D., UPTON, P., NICHOLSON, R. & ENTICOTT, G. (2016) Farm characteristics and farmer perceptions associated with bovine tuberculosis incidents in areas of emerging endemic spread. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 129: 88-98.

BURNHAM, K.P. AND ANDERSON, D.R. (2002) Model selection and Multi-Model Inference: a practical information-theoretic approach. New-York: Springer-Verlag.

678
 679 CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S., WILESMITH, J. W., RICHARDS, M. S., UPTON, P. & JOHNSTON, S.
 680 (1995) The occurrence of *Mycobacterium bovis* infection in cattle in and around an area
 681 subject to extensive badger (*Meles meles*) control. *Epidemiology and Infection* **114**: 179-193.
 682
 683 CONLAN, A. J., MCKINLEY, T. J., KAROLEMEAS, K., POLLOCK, E. B., GOODCHILD, A. V.,
 684 MITCHELL, A. P., BIRCH, C. P., CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S. & WOOD, J. L. (2012) Estimating the
 685 hidden burden of bovine tuberculosis in Great Britain. *PLoS Computational Biology* **8(10)**:
 686 e1002730. Doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002730.
 687
 688 DEFRA (2014a) Defra response. Pilot badger culls in Somerset and Gloucestershire: Report by
 689 the Independent Expert Panel.
 690 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300424/p](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300424/pb14158-defra-response-independent-expert-panel.pdf)
 691 [b14158-defra-response-independent-expert-panel.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300424/pb14158-defra-response-independent-expert-panel.pdf). Accessed April 8, 2014.
 692
 693 DEFRA (2014b) The Strategy for achieving Officially Bovine Tuberculosis Free status for
 694 England.
 695 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300447/p](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300447/pb14088-bovine-tb-strategy-140328.pdf)
 696 [b14088-bovine-tb-strategy-140328.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300447/pb14088-bovine-tb-strategy-140328.pdf). Accessed July 12, 2016.
 697
 698 DEFRA (2014c) Setting the minimum and maximum numbers for Year 2 of the badger culls.
 699 Advice to Natural England.
 700 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/347536/b](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/347536/badger-cull-setting-min-max-numbers-2014.pdf)
 701 [adger-cull-setting-min-max-numbers-2014.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/347536/badger-cull-setting-min-max-numbers-2014.pdf). Accessed December 22, 2016.
 702
 703 DEFRA (2014d) Bovine TB: summary of badger control monitoring during 2014.
 704 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bovine-tb-summary-of-badger-control-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bovine-tb-summary-of-badger-control-monitoring-during-2014)
 705 [monitoring-during-2014](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/bovine-tb-summary-of-badger-control-monitoring-during-2014). Accessed July 19, 2016.
 706
 707 DEFRA (2015) Guidance to Natural England Licences to kill or take badgers for the purpose of
 708 preventing the spread of bovine TB under section 10(2)(a) of the Protection of Badgers Act
 709 1992.
 710 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69464/pb](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69464/pb13692-bovinetb-guidance-ne.pdf)
 711 [13692-bovinetb-guidance-ne.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69464/pb13692-bovinetb-guidance-ne.pdf), Accessed May 2, 2014.

712
713 DE LA RUA-DOMENECH R., GOODCHILD, A. T., VORDERMEIER, H. M., HEWINSON, R. G.,
714 CHRISTIANSEN, K. H., CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S. (2006) Ante mortem diagnosis of tuberculosis
715 in cattle: a review of the tuberculin tests, gamma-interferon assay and other ancillary
716 diagnostic techniques. *Research in Veterinary Science* **81(2)**:190-210.
717
718 DONNELLY, C. A., WOODROFFE, R., COX, D. R., BOURNE, J., GETTINBY, G., LE FEVRE, A. M.,
719 MCINERNEY, J. P. & MORRISON, W. I. (2003) Impact of localized badger culling on
720 tuberculosis incidence in British cattle. *Nature* **426(6968)**: 834-837.
721
722 DONNELLY, C. A., WOODROFFE, R., COX, D. R., BOURNE, F. J., CHEESEMAN, C. L., CLIFTON-
723 HADLEY, R. S., WEI G., GETTINBY, G., GILKS, P., JENKINS, H., JOHNSTON, W. T., LE FEVRE, A.
724 M., MCINERNEY, J. P. & MORRISON, W. I. (2006) Positive and negative effects of widespread
725 badger culling on tuberculosis in cattle. *Nature* **439**: 843-846.
726
727 DONNELLY, C. A., WEI, G., JOHNSTON, W. T., COX, D. R., WOODROFFE, R., BOURNE, F. J.,
728 CHEESEMAN, C. L., CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S., GETTINBY, G., GILKS, P., JENKINS, H. E., LE FEVRE,
729 A. M., MCINERNEY, J. P. & MORRISON, W. I. (2007) Impacts of widespread badger culling on
730 cattle tuberculosis: concluding analyses from a large-scale field trial. *International Journal of*
731 *Infectious Diseases* **11(4)**: 300-308.
732
733 DONNELLY, C. A., JENKINS, H. & WOODROFFE, R. (2011) Analysis of further data (to 28
734 August 2011) on the impacts on cattle TB incidence of repeated badger culling.
735 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0009090>.
736
737 DONNELLY, C. A., BENTO, A. I., GOODCHILD, A. V. & DOWNS, S. H. (2015) Exploration of the
738 power of routine surveillance data to assess the impacts of industry-led badger culling on
739 bovine tuberculosis incidence in cattle herds. *Veterinary Record* **177**: 417.
740
741 DOWNS, S. H., CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S., UPTON, P. U., MILNE, I., ELY, E., GOPAL, R.,
742 GOODCHILD, A. V., SAYERS, A. R. (2013) Tuberculin manufacturing source and breakdown
743 incidence rate of bovine tuberculosis in British cattle, 2005-2009. *Veterinary Record* **172(4)**:
744 98
745

- 746 GALE, E. A. M. (2004) The Hawthorne studies—a fable for our times? *QJM: An International*
 747 *Journal of Medicine* **97**(7): 439-449.
- 748
- 749 GOODCHILD, A. V. & CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S. (2001) Cattle-to cattle transmission of
 750 *Mycobacterium bovis*. *Tuberculosis* **81**(1-2): 23-41.
- 751
- 752 GREEN, S. (1991) How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis? *Multivariate*
 753 *Behavioural Research*. 26 (3): 499-510
- 754
- 755 [HARRIS, K. A., BRUNTON, L., BROUWER, A., ROMERO GARCIA, M. P., GIBBENS, J. C., SMITH,](#)
 756 [N. H. & UPTON, P. A. \(2017\) Bovine TB infection in cattle in Great Britain in 2015. *Veterinary*](#)
 757 [Record](#). 180 (7): 170-175
- 758
- 759 HUBER, P. J. (1967) The behavior of maximum likelihood estimates under nonstandard
 760 conditions. In *Vol. 1 of Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical*
 761 *Statistics and Probability*, 221–233. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 762
- 763 INDEPENDENT EXPERT PANEL (2014) Pilot badger culls in Somerset and Gloucestershire.
 764 Report by the Independent Expert Panel.
 765 [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300382/in](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300382/independent-expert-panel-report.pdf)
 766 [dependent-expert-panel-report.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300382/independent-expert-panel-report.pdf). Accessed July 22, 2015
- 767
- 768 INDEPENDENT SCIENTIFIC GROUP ON CATTLE TB (2007). Bovine TB: The Scientific Evidence –
 769 Final Report of the Independent Scientific Group on Cattle TB. Defra Publications, London
 770 HMSO.
 771 [http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090330154646/www.defra.gov.uk/animalh/tb](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090330154646/www.defra.gov.uk/animalh/tb/isg/pdf/final_report.pdf)
 772 [/isg/pdf/final_report.pdf](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090330154646/www.defra.gov.uk/animalh/tb/isg/pdf/final_report.pdf). Accessed July 12, 2016.
- 773
- 774 JENKINS, H. E., WOODROFFE, R. & DONNELLY, C. A. (2010) The duration of the effects of
 775 repeated widespread badger culling on cattle tuberculosis following the cessation of culling.
 776 *PLoS One* **5**: e9090. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0009090.
- 777

JUDGE, J., WILSON, G. J., MACARTHUR, R., DELAHAY, R. J. & MCDONALD, R. A. (2014) Density and abundance of badger social groups in England and Wales in 2011-2013. *Scientific Reports* **4**: 3809.

KAROLEMEAS, K., DONNELLY, C. A., CONLAN, A. J., MITCHELL, A. P., CLIFTON-HADLEY, A. P., CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S., UPTON, P., WOOD, J. L. & MCKINLEY, T. J. (2012) The effect of badger culling on breakdown prolongation and recurrence of bovine tuberculosis in cattle herds in Great Britain. *PLoS One* **7**(12): e51342.

~~KREBS, J. R., ANDERSON, R., CLUTTON-BROCK, T., MORRISON, I., YOUNG, D., DONNELLY, C., FROST, S. & WOODROFFE, R. (1997) Bovine tuberculosis in cattle and badgers. London, MAFF Publications, PB3423.~~

~~LAWES, J. R., HARRIS, K. A., BROUWER, A., BROUGHAN, J. M., SMITH, N. H. & UPTON, P. A. (2016) Bovine TB surveillance in Great Britain in 2014. *Veterinary Record* **178**: 310-315.~~

~~PATERSON, O. (2014) House of Commons, Statement on strategy for eradication of bovine TB: Hansard: 3 April 2014: Column 1034. <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmhansrd/cm140403/debtext/140403-0002.htm#14040348000003>. Accessed July 21, 2015.~~

PORPHYRE, T., STEVENSON, M. A. & MCKENZIE, J. (2008) Risk factors for bovine tuberculosis in New Zealand cattle farms and their relationship with possum control strategies. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* **86**: 93-106.

RAMIREZ-VILLAESCUSA, A. M., MEDLEY, G. F., MASON, S. & GREEN, L. E. (2010) Risk factors for a herd breakdown with bovine tuberculosis in 148 cattle herds in the southwest of England. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* **95**(3-4): 224-230.

WHITE, H. (1982) Maximum likelihood estimation of misspecified models. *Econometrica* **50**: 1-25.

WOODROFFE, R., DONNELLY, C. A., COX, D. R., BOURNE, F. J., CHEESEMAN, C. L., DELAHAY, R. J., GETTINBY, G., MCINERNEY, J. P. & MORRISON, W. I. (2006) Effects of culling on badger

812 *Meles meles* spatial organization: implications for the control of bovine tuberculosis. *Journal*
813 *of Applied Ecology* **43**: 1-10.
814
815 ~~WOODROFFE, R., DONNELLY, C. A., COX, D. R., GILKS, P., JENKINS, H. E., JOHNSTON, W. T., LE~~
816 ~~FEVRE, A. M., BOURNE, F. J., CHEESEMAN, C. L., CLIFTON-HADLEY, R. S., GETTINBY, G.,~~
817 ~~HEWINSON, R. G., MCINERNEY, J. P., MITCHELL, A. P., MORRISON, W. I. & WATKINS, G. H.~~
818 ~~(2009) Bovine tuberculosis in cattle and badgers in localized culling areas. *Journal of Wildlife*~~
819 ~~*Diseases* **45**(1): 128-143.~~
820
821 WOODROFFE, R. (2015) Bovine TB in the pilot badger cull zone in Gloucestershire. *Veterinary*
822 *Record* **176**: 258.
823

Table 1 – Distribution of attributes used to rank comparison areas across intervention areas and matched comparison areas (as mean values across 10 comparison areas)

Area	All TB incidents prior to baseline date ^a		OTF-W incidents prior to baseline date		Number of herds	Herd size median	Distance to intervention area km	RBCT proactive area %
	1 year	3 year	1 year	3 year				
Somerset								
Central	30	105	27	84	154	53.5	0	0.5
Central buffer ^b	16	43	13	36	88	39.5	0	3.4
Comparison	31.4	92.1	25.8	74.4	186.3	56.3	62.1	0.03
Comparison buffer	20.1	56.3	16.8	44.7	119.9	61.7	62.1	2.4
Gloucestershire								
Central	17	90	15	69	215	46.0	0	0
Central buffer	22	55	16	41	121	48.0	0	0
Comparison	27.8	83.2	23.3	66.6	171.3	46.2	33.3	0.7
Comparison buffer	18.1	53.8	15.2	43.6	100.8	52.8	33.3	5.5

^a TB incidents includes all incidents. Only OTF-W incidents were used to rank comparison areas. ^b Lower values for some variables because buffer area to the north extends into the sea

829

Table 2 – Distribution of explanatory factors across intervention areas and matched comparison areas (as mean values across 10 comparison areas)

Area	Dairy herds % ^a	Estimated badger main sett density mean/km ^{2 a}	Number of badgers removed historically			Flood zone 3 % ^a	Motorway Total length/km ^a	Urban area % ^a	Number of farms ^a	> 1 fragment in central zone % ^a	All land inside central zone % ^d	All land inside central or buffer zones % ^a
			1972-1990	1990-1998	1999-2006							
Somerset												
Central	8.4	0.409	0	375	230	16.2	0	0	153	83.7	65.4	81.0
Central buffer	3.4	0.387	0	87	102	3.4	0	0	87	75.9	37.9	56.3
Comparison	20.3	0.557	154	101	3	9.8	3.5	3.3	185	79.0	58.1	74.2
Comparison buffer	21.5	0.550	64	69	17	7.2	2.4	4.3	119	76.9	31.1	53.3
Gloucestershire												
Central	17.7	0.626	52	366	62	16.2	0	0	214	83.6	67.3	78.5
Central buffer	19.8	0.657	21	97	47	14.0	38.1	8.6	119	71.4	31.1	51.3
Comparison	16.4	0.589	175	88	28	7.3	4.1	5.3	169	77.6	54.9	71.8
Comparison buffer	15.7	0.578	138	80	61	8.7	5.8	4.4	100	74.4	29.0	50.8

^a On baseline date. Baseline dates for Somerset and Gloucestershire were 26/08/13 and 03/09/13, respectively.830
831

832
833

Table 3 – OTF-W incidence rates per 100 herd years at risk and unadjusted incidence rate ratios (IRRs) for central and buffer intervention areas versus the central and buffer comparison areas, respectively, in Somerset and Gloucestershire, for each 12-month reporting period

12-month reporting period	Central intervention	Central comparison	IRR	95% confidence interval		P value	Intervention buffer	Comparison buffer	IRR	95% confidence interval		P value
Somerset												
3 years prior	19.7	15.0	1.32	0.86	1.95	0.173	10.7	13.6	0.79	0.35	1.54	0.503
2 years prior	21.3	13.3	1.60	1.06	2.35	0.022	17.0	13.5	1.26	0.67	2.18	0.407
1 year prior	23.0	15.3	1.50	0.97	2.24	0.054	16.4	15.3	1.07	0.56	1.89	0.778
Year 1	18.9	14.5	1.30	0.83	1.95	0.209	17.1	17.3	0.99	0.53	1.70	0.998
Year 2	14.0	14.4	0.97	0.58	1.53	0.910	11.7	15.6	0.75	0.35	1.42	0.384
Gloucestershire												
3 years prior	14.6	13.5	1.08	0.71	1.59	0.683	13.0	16.2	0.81	0.44	1.38	0.437
2 years prior	11.4	14.8	0.77	0.48	1.19	0.231	9.4	15.0	0.62	0.29	1.18	0.136
1 year prior	7.7	14.9	0.52	0.29	0.86	0.006	14.0	16.9	0.83	0.46	1.39	0.488
Year 1	9.5	14.8	0.64	0.39	1.02	0.049	12.9	14.0	0.93	0.50	1.58	0.802
Year 2	9.2	12.4	0.74	0.44	1.19	0.213	12.1	14.6	0.83	0.44	1.43	0.511

834
835

Table 4 – Multivariable Poisson regression models describing the effect of intervention (badger culling) stratified by area on the number of OTF-W^a incidents **in the first two years since culling began**, adjusted for explanatory variables. Model A describes the effect in the central intervention areas compared with matched central comparison areas, and Model B describes the effect in the 2km buffer area for the intervention areas compared with buffer areas for matched comparison areas.

	IRR ^b	Robust SE	P value	95% confidence Interval	
Model A – Central areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	0.791	0.040	<0.001	0.716	0.874
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.417	0.041	<0.001	0.344	0.507
Area = Somerset	1.103	0.173	0.532	0.811	1.501
Log transformed herd years at risk in first two years of culling	5.251	0.699	<0.001	4.044	6.817
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over three years prior	1.555	0.136	<0.001	1.310	1.847
Log transformed median herd size	0.397	0.308	0.233	0.087	1.815
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.019	0.003	<0.001	1.013	1.024
Distance to intervention (km)	0.996	0.001	<0.001	0.995	0.998
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	0.995	0.003	0.031	0.990	1.000
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	1.003	0.026	0.922	0.953	1.055
Log transformed number of badgers culled historically	1.032	0.010	0.001	1.013	1.052
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.026	0.007	<0.001	1.012	1.040
Model B – Buffer areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	1.379	0.166	0.008	1.090	1.746
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.908	0.075	0.243	0.771	1.068
Area = Somerset	1.106	0.108	0.298	0.914	1.339
Log transformed herd years at risk in first two years of culling	1.955	0.193	<0.001	1.612	2.372
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over three years prior	2.076	0.181	<0.001	1.749	2.464
Log transformed median herd size	1.056	0.145	0.694	0.806	1.382
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.019	0.009	0.031	1.002	1.037
Distance to intervention (km)	0.999	0.001	0.351	0.996	1.002
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	0.840	0.410	0.721	0.323	2.184
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.977	0.005	<0.001	0.967	0.988
Proportion of land classed as urban	1.053	0.013	<0.001	1.027	1.079
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.050	0.008	<0.001	1.034	1.067

^a Officially Tuberculosis Free status Withdrawn

^b Incidence rate ratio

^c Intervention is industry-led badger culling, as described in the Introduction

845 **Appendices**

846

847 Appendix 1 - Sensitivity analysis of individual explanatory factors

848

849 Appendix 2 - Additional model validation

850

851 Appendix 3 - Analysis of all cattle TB incidents

852

For Review Only

Appendix 1. Sensitivity analysis of individual explanatory variables

Table A1 - Model estimates for intervention (industry-led badger culling) in the Somerset and Gloucestershire **central areas in the first two years since culling began** when individual explanatory factors are either added (in yellow) or removed (in blue) from three models: a simple RBCT-like model, the baseline model which was the RBCT-like model plus factors considered important *a priori*, and the final model which was the baseline model plus additional explanatory factors. Where there are notable changes in associations from the starting models, the p values are highlighted in bold font. (Final model reported in Table 4 of main body of paper).

		RBCT-like model			Baseline model			Final model		
		IRR ^a	95% CI	P value	IRR ^a	95% CI	P value	IRR ^a	95% CI	P value
RBCT factors: Area, herd years at risk, historic three year incidence	Somerset	1.012	0.879 - 1.165	0.868	0.892	0.716 - 1.112	0.310	0.791	0.716 - 0.874	<0.001
	Gloucestershire	0.685	0.577 - 0.813	<0.001	0.606	0.518 - 0.708	<0.001	0.417	0.344 - 0.507	<0.001
Median herd size	Somerset	1.008	0.868 - 1.170	0.922	0.901	0.734 - 1.106	0.319	0.804	0.732 - 0.884	<0.001
	Gloucestershire	0.677	0.580 - 0.791	<0.001	0.620	0.534 - 0.720	<0.001	0.438	0.358 - 0.537	<0.001
Proportion dairy	Somerset	1.174	0.898 - 1.534	0.241	0.798	0.612 - 1.040	0.095	0.710	0.588 - 0.858	<0.001
	Gloucestershire	0.668	0.588 - 0.760	<0.001	0.592	0.470 - 0.745	<0.001	0.408	0.305 - 0.547	<0.001
Distance to intervention	Somerset	0.824	0.663 - 1.026	0.083	1.053	0.923 - 1.200	0.442	0.957	0.847 - 1.081	0.476
	Gloucestershire	0.616	0.507 - 0.749	<0.001	0.690	0.639 - 0.746	<0.001	0.508	0.417 - 0.619	<0.001
Badger sett density	Somerset	0.976	0.860 - 1.107	0.705	0.933	0.692 - 1.259	0.652	0.791	0.684 - 0.915	0.002
	Gloucestershire	0.688	0.580 - 0.816	<0.001	0.580	0.483 - 0.695	<0.001	0.390	0.324 - 0.470	<0.001
Proportion RBCT	Somerset	1.004	0.865 - 1.165	0.960	0.892	0.714 - 1.114	0.312	0.790	0.714 - 0.875	<0.001
	Gloucestershire	0.693	0.569 - 0.845	<0.001	0.593	0.508 - 0.692	<0.001	0.416	0.347 - 0.498	<0.001
Total badgers removed historically	Somerset	0.977	0.869 - 1.099	0.701	0.840	0.733 - 0.962	0.012	0.848	0.728 - 0.988	0.034
	Gloucestershire	0.622	0.501 - 0.774	<0.001	0.511	0.415 - 0.631	<0.001	0.514	0.442 - 0.598	<0.001
Proportion fragmented	Somerset	0.974	0.845 - 1.121	0.710	0.848	0.727 - 0.988	0.034	0.840	0.733 - 0.962	0.012
	Gloucestershire	0.658	0.530 - 0.816	<0.001	0.514	0.442 - 0.598	<0.001	0.511	0.415 - 0.631	<0.001

^a Incidence rate ratio

863
864
865
866
867
868
869

Table A2 - Model estimates for intervention (industry-led badger culling) in the Somerset and Gloucestershire **buffer areas in the first two years since culling began** when individual explanatory factors are either added (in yellow) or removed (in blue) from three models: a simple RBCT-like model, the baseline model which was the RBCT-like model plus factors considered important *a priori*, and the final model which was the baseline model plus additional explanatory factors. Where there are notable changes in associations from the starting models, the p values are highlighted in bold font. (Final model reported in Table 4 of main body of paper).

		RBCT-like model			Baseline model			Final model		
		IRR ^a	95% CI	P value	IRR ^a	95% CI	P value	IRR ^a	95% CI	P value
RBCT factors: Area, herd years at risk, historic three year incidence	Somerset	0.818	0.638 - 1.047	0.111	1.177	0.893 - 1.550	0.247	1.379	1.090 - 1.746	0.008
	Gloucestershire	0.998	0.758 - 1.313	0.987	0.992	0.744 - 1.323	0.957	0.908	0.771 - 1.068	0.243
Median herd size	Somerset	0.892	0.689 - 1.154	0.385	1.122	0.799 - 1.575	0.508	1.329	0.989 - 1.785	0.059
	Gloucestershire	0.993	0.755 - 1.307	0.961	0.987	0.748 - 1.302	0.926	0.902	0.768 - 1.059	0.207
Proportion dairy	Somerset	1.326	0.921 - 1.909	0.129	0.843	0.565 - 1.257	0.402	0.962	0.712 - 1.300	0.803
	Gloucestershire	0.939	0.751 - 1.173	0.577	0.919	0.683 - 1.236	0.577	0.782	0.653 - 0.936	0.007
Distance to intervention	Somerset	0.703	0.476 - 1.039	0.077	1.248	0.969 - 1.608	0.086	1.610	1.257 - 2.072	<0.001
	Gloucestershire	0.937	0.701 - 1.252	0.661	1.012	0.786 - 1.303	0.926	0.965	0.849 - 1.096	0.583
Badger sett density	Somerset	0.917	0.646 - 1.304	0.627	1.307	0.929 - 1.838	0.124	1.402	1.060 - 1.855	0.018
	Gloucestershire	0.939	0.715 - 1.234	0.653	0.923	0.706 - 1.206	0.556	0.891	0.765 - 1.038	0.139
Proportion RBCT	Somerset	0.813	0.636 - 1.040	0.099	1.182	0.910 - 1.535	0.211	1.083	0.778 - 1.508	0.637
	Gloucestershire	1.024	0.746 - 1.407	0.882	0.982	0.738 - 1.306	0.899	0.937	0.778 - 1.129	0.495
Proportion urban	Somerset	0.984	0.814 - 1.191	0.872	0.758	0.443 - 1.295	0.310	2.193	1.456 - 3.303	<0.001
	Gloucestershire	0.890	0.788 - 1.005	0.060	0.779	0.585 - 1.036	0.086	1.171	0.905 - 1.515	0.230
Proportion fragmented	Somerset	0.819	0.645 - 1.041	0.103	2.193	1.456 - 3.303	<0.001	0.758	0.443 - 1.295	0.310
	Gloucestershire	1.019	0.719 - 1.444	0.917	1.171	0.905 - 1.515	0.230	0.779	0.585 - 1.036	0.086

^a Incidence rate ratio

870
871

Appendix 2. Additional model validation

Replicating the RBCT models

In order to compare the current results with those of the RBCT, we assessed the effect of including just those factors that had been identified as important in the RBCT modelling when analysing the first two years of culling (Table A3). As for the larger models, the inclusion of an interaction between the intervention and area was assessed. The interaction generated a p-value of 0.005 for the central areas and 0.399 for the buffer areas. This indicated that the effects of the interventions in the two central areas should be examined separately. When only time at risk (a measure comparable in effect to the baseline number of herds included in the RBCT analyses), historic incidence, area and intervention (badger culling) were included in the models the AIC was poorer (larger) compared with the larger models. In this model, significantly lower incidence was still observed in the Gloucestershire central area (IRR=0.69; $p<0.001$) but there was no significant effect of culling in the Somerset central area or either of the buffer areas.

Table A3 – Multivariable Poisson regression models describing the effect of intervention separated by area on the number of OTF-W^a incidents in the first two years since culling began, adjusted for a reduced set of explanatory variables as applied in analysis of the RBCT (Donnelly et al 2003; Donnelly et al 2006). Model 1 describes the effect in the central intervention areas compared with matched central comparison areas, and Model 2 describes the effect in the 2km buffer area for the intervention areas compared with buffer areas for matched comparison areas.

	IRR ^b	Robust SE	P value	95% confidence interval	
Model 1 - Central areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	1.012	0.073	0.868	0.879	1.165
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.685	0.060	<0.001	0.577	0.813
Area = Somerset	1.008	0.082	0.926	0.859	1.182
Log transformed herd years at risk in the first two years of culling	5.436	1.284	<0.001	3.421	8.635
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over all three years prior	2.075	0.143	<0.001	1.813	2.374
Model 2 - Buffer areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset buffer area ^c	0.818	0.103	0.111	0.638	1.047
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire buffer area ^c	0.998	0.140	0.987	0.758	1.313
Area = Somerset	1.242	0.209	0.199	0.892	1.728
Log transformed herd years at risk in the first two years of culling	2.259	0.567	0.001	1.381	3.696
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over all three years prior	1.588	0.134	<0.001	1.346	1.874

^a Officially Tuberculosis Free status Withdrawn

^b Incidence rate ratio

^c Intervention is industry-led badger culling, as described in the Introduction

Statistical analysis of the year prior to the culls

In the initial models for the year prior to the culls which contained a single intervention variable and an area variable, the inclusion of an interaction between the intervention and area generated a p-value of <0.001 for the central areas and $p=0.775$ for the buffer areas, so the effects were examined separately for each area.

For the central areas (Table A4, Model 1), the number of badgers removed historically was included in the model alongside the *a priori* explanatory variables as it reduced the AIC. Despite no 'intervention' actually taking place, a significantly lower IRR for intervention in the Gloucestershire central area was observed ($IRR=0.59$, $p=0.002$), while no significant association with the intervention was observed in the Somerset central area ($IRR=1.05$, $p=0.521$). Increases in time at risk and historic incidence were significantly associated with an increase in OTF-W incidence in the intervention areas. The Deviance and Pearson goodness-of-fit tests for overdispersion generated large p values ($p=0.973$ for both tests) indicating that there was no evidence of there being significantly more variation in the data than expected.

For the buffer areas (Table A4, Model 2), the length of motorway through an area was included in the model alongside the *a priori* explanatory variables as it modified the coefficient for the association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in the Gloucestershire buffer area. There appeared to be no effect of intervention on OTF-W incidence in the buffer areas, having adjusted for explanatory variables. Increases in time at risk, historic two-year incidence rate and median herd size were significantly associated with an increase in the numbers of OTF-W incidents in the year prior to the culls. An increase in the estimated number of badger setts per 100km^2 was associated with a decrease in OTF-W incidence in the year prior to the culls. The Deviance and Pearson goodness-of-fit tests for overdispersion generated large p values ($p=0.592$ and $p=0.593$, respectively) indicating that there was no evidence of there being significantly more variation in the data than expected.

Table A4 – Multivariable Poisson regression models describing the effect of intervention (badger culling) stratified by area on the number of OTF-W^a incidents **in the year prior to the culls**, adjusted for explanatory variables. Model 1 describes the effect in the central intervention areas compared with matched central comparison areas, and Model 2 describes the effect in the 2km buffer area for the intervention areas compared with buffer areas for matched comparison areas.

	IRR ^b	Robust SE	P value	95% confidence Interval	
Model 1 – Central areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	1.049	0.078	0.521	0.907	1.212
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.588	0.100	0.002	0.422	0.821
Area = Somerset	1.002	0.139	0.986	0.764	1.315
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	1.642	0.337	0.016	1.098	2.454
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	1.917	0.258	<0.001	1.472	2.496
Log transformed median herd size	1.482	0.798	0.465	0.516	4.260
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.004	0.003	0.229	0.997	1.011
Distance to intervention (km)	0.999	0.001	0.635	0.997	1.002
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	1.000	0.005	0.924	0.991	1.010
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.948	0.035	0.145	0.882	1.019
Log transformed number of badgers culled historically	0.990	0.010	0.316	0.971	1.010
Model 2 – Buffer areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	1.036	0.129	0.777	0.811	1.322
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	1.097	0.212	0.632	0.751	1.603
Area = Somerset	0.934	0.083	0.444	0.785	1.112
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	1.989	0.211	<0.001	1.615	2.449
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	1.702	0.185	<0.001	1.376	2.105
Log transformed median herd size	1.626	0.318	0.013	1.108	2.386
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.000	0.005	0.969	0.991	1.010
Distance to intervention (km)	1.003	0.002	0.149	0.999	1.006
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	0.271	0.138	0.011	0.100	0.737
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	1.007	0.005	0.185	0.997	1.018
Length of motorway in the area	1.005	0.006	0.422	0.993	1.017

^a Officially Tuberculosis Free status Withdrawn

^b Incidence rate ratio

^c Intervention is industry-led badger culling, as described in the Introduction

Statistical analysis of each of the first two individual years after culling began

In addition to examining the association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence in the two years of culling, we also examined the association for each of the individual years after culling took place (Year 1 and Year 2). In Year 1, a significant association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence was only observed for the Gloucestershire central area (IRR=0.56, $p=0.001$), while significant associations between the intervention and OTF-W incidence were observed in both the buffer areas, although the direction of the effect differed (Somerset – IRR=1.89, $p<0.001$; Gloucestershire – 0.75, $p=0.016$) (Table A5). In Year 2, a significant association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence was observed for both central areas characterised by a lower incidence in both areas (Somerset – IRR=0.67, $p<0.001$; Gloucestershire – 0.62, $p=0.049$), while a significant association between the intervention and OTF-W incidence was only observed in the Gloucestershire buffer area (IRR=0.72, $p=0.038$).

Table A5 – Multivariable Poisson regression models describing the effect of intervention (badger culling) stratified by area on the number of OTF-W^a incidents **in the first year since culling began**, adjusted for explanatory variables. Model 1 describes the effect in the central intervention areas compared with matched central comparison areas, and Model 2 describes the effect in the 2km buffer area for the intervention areas compared with buffer areas for matched comparison areas.

	IRR ^b	SE	P value	95% confidence interval	
Model 1 – Central areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	0.908	0.158	0.580	0.647	1.276
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.563	0.099	0.001	0.399	0.796
Area = Somerset	0.964	0.186	0.851	0.660	1.408
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	3.716	1.251	<0.001	1.920	7.189
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	2.311	0.616	0.002	1.371	3.896
Log transformed median herd size	0.411	0.300	0.223	0.098	1.718
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.021	0.008	0.006	1.006	1.037
Distance to intervention (km)	0.996	0.002	0.060	0.993	1.000
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	0.989	0.007	0.140	0.976	1.004
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.963	0.084	0.667	0.812	1.143
Model 2 – Buffer areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	1.886	0.182	<0.001	1.561	2.279
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.748	0.090	0.016	0.591	0.948
Area = Somerset	0.805	0.052	0.001	0.710	0.914
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	1.688	0.112	<0.001	1.482	1.921
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	2.136	0.132	<0.001	1.893	2.411
Log transformed median herd size	1.547	0.157	<0.001	1.268	1.888
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.041	0.005	<0.001	1.031	1.052
Distance to intervention (km)	1.003	0.001	0.001	1.001	1.004
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	0.071	0.022	<0.001	0.039	0.131
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.973	0.007	<0.001	0.961	0.986
Length of motorway in the area (km)	1.021	0.004	<0.001	1.013	1.029
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.054	0.006	<0.001	1.042	1.066

^a Officially Tuberculosis Free status Withdrawn

^b Incidence rate ratio

^c Intervention is industry-led badger culling, as described in the Introduction

Table A6 – Multivariable Poisson regression models describing the effect of intervention (badger culling) stratified by area on the number of OTF-W ^a incidents **in the second year since culling began**, adjusted for explanatory variables. Model 1 describes the effect in the central intervention areas compared with matched central comparison areas, and Model 2 describes the effect in the 2km buffer area for the intervention areas compared with buffer areas for matched comparison areas.

	IRR ^b	SE	P value	95% confidence interval	
Model 1 – Central areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	0.668	0.042	<0.001	0.591	0.755
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.615	0.152	0.049	0.379	0.999
Area = Somerset	1.291	0.317	0.297	0.798	2.089
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	3.467	0.641	<0.001	2.413	4.981
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	1.126	0.182	0.462	0.820	1.547
Log transformed median herd size	1.844	1.635	0.490	0.324	10.483
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.001	0.005	0.809	0.992	1.010
Distance to intervention (km)	0.995	0.001	<0.001	0.994	0.997
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	1.000	0.003	0.985	0.994	1.006
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.993	0.047	0.889	0.905	1.090
Log transformed number of badgers culled historically	1.052	0.023	0.021	1.008	1.099
Proportion of land classed as urban	1.062	0.019	0.001	1.026	1.099
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.043	0.010	<0.001	1.025	1.063
Model 2 – Buffer areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^c	1.278	0.443	0.478	0.649	2.520
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^c	0.717	0.115	0.038	0.523	0.982
Area = Somerset	1.350	0.411	0.324	0.743	2.452
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	1.753	0.288	0.001	1.270	2.419
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	1.812	0.412	0.009	1.161	2.830
Log transformed median herd size	1.005	0.334	0.987	0.525	1.927
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.008	0.017	0.618	0.976	1.042
Distance to intervention (km)	0.996	0.003	0.155	0.991	1.001
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	6.724	8.506	0.132	0.563	80.248
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.989	0.013	0.408	0.964	1.015
Proportion of land classed as urban	1.075	0.028	0.006	1.021	1.132
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.046	0.021	0.024	1.006	1.087

^a Officially Tuberculosis Free status Withdrawn
^b Incidence rate ratio
^c Intervention is industry-led badger culling, as described in the Introduction


Appendix 3. Analysis of all cattle TB incidents

Table A7 – Multivariable Poisson regression models describing the effect of intervention (badger culling) stratified by area on the number of TB incidents **in the first two years since culling began**, adjusted for explanatory variables. Model 1 describes the effect in the central intervention areas compared with matched central comparison areas, and Model 2 describes the effect in the 2km buffer area for the intervention areas compared with buffer areas for matched comparison areas.

	IRR ^a	Robust SE	P value	95% confidence interval	
Model 1 - Central areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^b	0.886	0.050	0.033	0.793	0.991
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^b	0.586	0.040	<0.001	0.513	0.670
Area = Somerset	1.160	0.102	0.090	0.977	1.377
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	4.038	0.701	<0.001	2.873	5.674
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	1.476	0.138	<0.001	1.229	1.773
Log transformed median herd size	0.218	0.101	0.001	0.088	0.540
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.018	0.004	<0.001	1.011	1.025
Distance to intervention (km)	0.998	0.001	0.092	0.997	1.000
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	0.994	0.003	0.045	0.989	1.000
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	1.016	0.024	0.503	0.970	1.065
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.021	0.006	<0.001	1.010	1.032
Model 2 - Buffer areas					
Intervention effect in Somerset area ^b	1.333	0.199	0.054	0.994	1.788
Intervention effect in Gloucestershire area ^b	0.902	0.094	0.319	0.736	1.105
Area = Somerset	1.118	0.129	0.334	0.892	1.401
Log transformed herd years at risk in year prior to culls	1.880	0.201	<0.001	1.524	2.319
Log transformed OTF-W incidence rate over two years prior	1.821	0.186	<0.001	1.491	2.224
Log transformed median herd size	1.044	0.163	0.783	0.769	1.417
Proportion of herds that are dairy	1.023	0.010	0.025	1.003	1.043
Distance to intervention (km)	0.998	0.002	0.283	0.995	1.002
Estimated badger sett density per 100 km ²	1.337	0.770	0.614	0.432	4.136
Proportion of land involved in proactive culling in the RBCT	0.982	0.006	0.003	0.970	0.994
Proportion of land classed as urban	1.043	0.014	0.002	1.016	1.072
Proportion of farms with more than one fragment of land in the intervention area	1.033	0.010	0.001	1.014	1.052


^a Incidence rate ratio

^b Intervention is industry-led badger culling, as described in the Introduction



Locations of Gloucestershire Intervention Areas and ten matched comparison areas across map of smoothed cattle TB herd incidence in the high incidence area of England, 2013. Culling and comparison areas are symbolised by a solid circle that approximates actual size. OTF-W incident density was created using the spatial analyst kernel density tool within ArcGIS 10.0.

84x99mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Locations of Somerset Intervention Areas and ten matched comparison areas across map of smoothed cattle TB herd incidence in the high incidence area of England, 2013. Culling and comparison areas are symbolised by a solid circle that approximates actual size. OTF-W incident density was created using the spatial analyst kernel density tool within ArcGIS 10.0.

84x99mm (300 x 300 DPI)