

Supplementary Material

Immobilisation efficacy of conducted electrical weapons on captive white-tailed deer

Patrick J. Grunwald^A, Mark G. Ruder^B, David A. Osborn^A, Lisa I. Muller^C, Kaitlin O. Goode^D, and Gino J. D'Angelo^{A,}*

^AWarnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources, University of Georgia, 180 East Green Street, Athens, GA 30602, USA.

^BSoutheastern Cooperative Wildlife Disease Study, College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Georgia, 589 D.W. Brooks Drive, Athens, GA 30602, USA.

^CSchool of Natural Resources, University of Tennessee, 2505 E.J. Chapman Drive, Knoxville, TN 37996, USA.

^DWildlife Resources Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources, 2067 US-278, Social Circle, GA 30025, USA.

*Correspondence to: Gino J. D'Angelo Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources, University of Georgia, 180 East Green Street, Athens, GA 30602, USA Email: gdangelo@uga.edu

Supplementary Table S1

Feed consumption rates (kg/day/deer) of white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) chemically immobilised plus exposed to a conducted electrical weapon (CEW) for 5 seconds (Chem5; n =5), chemically immobilised plus exposed to a CEW for 15 seconds (Chem 15; n =5), only exposed to a CEW for 5 seconds (CEW5; n =10), only exposed to a CEW for 15 seconds (CEW15; n =10), and a control (n=10) while group-housed in outdoor paddocks (0.4–0.8 ha) or housed in individual barn stalls (3 x 6 m) before and after treatment.

Treatment	Location	Before Treatment (SE)	After Treatment (SE)	P Value
Chem5	Paddock	0.83 (0.10)	0.76 (0.09)	0.63
Chem5	Stall	0.73 (0.10)	0.82 (0.17)	0.67
Chem15	Paddock	0.68 (0.12)	0.64 (0.08)	0.76
Chem15	Stall	0.74 (0.09)	0.82 (0.14)	0.63
CEW5	Paddock	1.25 (0.10)	1.24 (0.09)	0.96
CEW5	Stall	0.68 (0.08)	0.76 (0.07)	0.45
CEW15	Paddock	1.10 (0.14)	0.83 (0.06)	0.06
CEW15	Stall	0.71 (0.11)	1.07 (0.08)	0.01
Control	Paddock	1.33 (0.16)	1.63 (0.10)	0.12
Control	Stall	1.20 (0.07)	1.31 (0.08)	0.30