SUPPORTING INFORMATION

AUTHORS: Jennie R. Christensen, Misty MacDuffee, Robie W. Macdonald, Michael Whiticar & Peter S. Ross

TITLE: Persistent Organic Pollutants in British Columbia Grizzly Bears: The Consequence of Divergent Diets

Number of Pages: 1

Number of Tables: 1

Table S1. Supporting Information. Example of how we estimated the proportion of a contaminant concentration in a grizzly bear that is attributed to salmon consumption. Σ DDT and stable isotope data from bear #6 (5 year old, maritime, male grizzly bear) are used as a model. Bear #6 contained 11,100 ng/kg Σ DDT ([Σ DDT]_{TOTAL}), while our baseline herbivore bear (#1) contained 31.727 ng/kg ([Σ DDT]_{BASELINE}). See text for equations.

Equation (Eq.#) and variable	Solving	Calculated Values	Meaning of value obtained
(3) $\Delta \delta^{\prime 5} N_{SEG}$	(11.6-3.5), (14.1-3.5), (14.4-3.5), (14.0-3.5), (13.2-3.5), (13.2-3.5), (9.3-3.5)	=8.1, 10.6, 10.9, 10.5, 9.7 and 5.8 ‰	Deviation from an herbivorous (100% plant) diet for the bear, using $\delta^{15}N$ values in each segment of hair
(4) $\Sigma \Delta \delta^{I5} N_{SEG}$	8.1+10.6+10.9+ 10.5+9.7+5.8	=55.6 ‰	Cumulative deviation from an herbivorous diet over a four month period
(7) P_{MEAT}	55.6/91.8	=0.61	Proportion of diet consisting of salmon (based on Chinook Equivalency index)
(8) <i>P</i> _{VEG}	1.0-0.61	=0.39	Proportion of diet consisting of vegetation
(9) [<i>2</i> DDT] _{VEG}	0.39(31.727)	=12 ng/kg	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Concentration} & \text{of} \\ \Sigma \text{DDT attributed to} \\ \text{vegetation} \end{array}$
(10) [<i>2</i> DDT] _{MEAT}	11,100–12.374	=11,088 ng/kg	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Concentration} & \text{of} \\ \Sigma \text{DDT attributed} & \text{to} \\ \text{salmon} \end{array}$
(11) $P_{[\Sigma DDT]}$	11,088/11,100	=0.99	Proportion of Σ DDT attributed to salmon