

1 **Microbiological risk ranking of foodborne pathogens and food products in scarce-data**
2 **settings.**

3 Matteo Crotta^{1,2*}, Bhagyalakshmi Chengat Prakashbabu^{1,2}, Hannah Holt^{1,2}, Ben Swift^{1,2},
4 Paviter Kaur³, Jasbir Singh Bedi⁴, Venkata Chaitanya Pedada⁵, Thahir Basha Shaik⁵,
5 Srinivasa Rao Tumati⁵ and Javier Guitian^{1,2}.

6 ¹ Veterinary Epidemiology, Economics and Public Health Group, The Royal Veterinary College, Hawkshead
7 Lane, North Mymms, AL9 7TA, Hatfield, UK

8 ² OIE Collaborating Centre for Risk Analysis & Modelling

9 ³ Department of Veterinary Microbiology, Guru Angad Dev Veterinary and Animal Sciences University,
10 Ludhiana-141 004, Punjab, India.

11 ⁴ Centre for One Health, College of Veterinary Science, Guru Angad Dev Veterinary and Animal Sciences
12 University, Ludhiana, Punjab, India.

13 ⁵ Department of Veterinary Public Health and Epidemiology, NTR College of Veterinary Science,
14 Gannavaram, Andhra Pradesh, India

15 **Keywords:** Qualitative risk assessment, dairy products, foodborne pathogens, food safety,
16 LMICs, public health, hierarchical clustering.

17 **ABSTRACT**

18 In the absence of epidemiological, microbiological or outbreak data, systematic identification
19 of the hazards and food products posing the higher risk to the consumers is challenging. It is
20 usually in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs), where the burden of foodborne disease
21 is highest that data tend to be particularly scarce. In this study, we propose qualitative risk-
22 ranking methods for pathogens and food products that can be used in settings where scarcity
23 of data on the frequency/concentration of pathogens in foodstuff is a barrier towards the use
24 of classical risk assessment frameworks. The approach integrates the existing knowledge on
25 foodborne pathogens, manufacturing processes and intrinsic/extrinsic properties of food
26 products with key context-specific information regarding the supply chain(s), characteristics
27 of the Food Business Operators (FBOs) and cultural habits to identify: (i) the pathogens that
28 should be considered as a “High” food safety priority and (ii) the food products posing the
29 higher risk of consumer exposure to microbiological hazards via oral (ingestion) route. When
30 applied to the dairy sector of Andhra Pradesh (India) as a case study, *E. coli* O157:H7,
31 *Salmonella* spp., *S. aureus* and *L. monocytogenes* were identified as a “High” food safety
32 priority across all FBOs, *C. sakazakii* a “High” priority for the FBOs producing infant

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

33 formula/milk powder whilst *Shigella* spp. and *Cryptosporidium* spp. a “High” priority when
34 considering the FBOs operating towards the informal end of the formal-informal spectrum.
35 The risk ranking of dairy products was informed by a preliminary cluster analysis for early
36 identification of products that are similar with regards to intrinsic/extrinsic features known
37 to drive the microbiological risk. Products manufactured/retailed by FBOs in the informal
38 market were considered as posing a “High” risk for the consumers due to a widespread lack
39 of compliance to sanitary regulations. For dairy products produced by FBOs operating in the
40 middle and formal end of the formal-informal spectrum, the risk of consumers exposure to
41 microbiological hazards ranged from “Medium” to “Extremely low” depending on the FBO
42 and the intrinsic/extrinsic properties of the products. While providing risk estimates of lower
43 resolution if compared to data-driven risk assessments, the proposed method maximises the
44 value of the information that can be easily gathered in LMICs and provide informative outputs
45 to support food safety decision-making in contexts where resources to be allocated for
46 prevention of foodborne diseases are limited and the food system is complex.

47 **1. INTRODUCTION**

48 Unsafe food is responsible for a vast global burden. In 2010, the World Health Organisation
49 (WHO) estimated that 31 foodborne biological hazards (28 microbial pathogens and 3
50 chemicals) were responsible for 600 million cases of foodborne illness and 33 million years of
51 healthy life lost globally (WHO, 2015). Foodborne illnesses result from a large number of
52 pathogen-food product combinations, making it necessary to prioritize, for purpose of
53 surveillance and controls, those combinations that are likely to pose highest foodborne health
54 risk (Stärk et al., 2006; Van der Fels-Klerx et al., 2018). Different frameworks have been
55 proposed and are widely used in order to assess risk and prioritize hazards in a way that is
56 transparent and supported by best available evidence (FAO/WHO, 2006; OIE, 2010). The risk
57 posed by different pathogen-product combinations can be estimated quantitatively, using
58 deterministic or probabilistic microbial risk assessment models, or qualitatively, using
59 qualitative descriptors such as “Low”, “Medium” or “High” to describe, in non-numerical
60 terms, the degree of belief regarding the occurrence of relevant events (e.g. whether a
61 pathogen present in food survives a processing step) and the final risk estimate. So-called
62 semi-quantitative approaches, in which a scoring system is used to define a logical and explicit
63 hierarchy between the non-numerical descriptions of probability, impact, and severity, are

64 also used for purpose of foodborne risk estimation (FAO/WHO, 2009; Van der Fels-Klerx et
65 al., 2018). Data availability is one of the major considerations for selection of a specific
66 approach (EFSA, 2012) with qualitative risk assessment frameworks being the usual choice
67 when data are inadequate for quantitative assessments and expert knowledge is deemed
68 suitable to allow differentiation between risk categories (CAC, 1999). Several examples of
69 qualitative or semi-quantitative risk ranking of foodborne pathogens and food products are
70 available in the literature (Van der Fels-Klerx et al., 2018). Examples range from ranking of
71 meat-borne pathogens in intensive pork production (de Freitas Costa et al., 2020), to the
72 ranking of chemical hazards (antibiotics) in food (van Asselt et al., 2013) or specific hazard-
73 food combinations (Newsome et al., 2009). Recently, a risk ranking framework for food safety
74 risks posed by emerging dietary practices has been proposed in France (Eygue et al., 2020).

75 Qualitative risk assessment entails a reasoned, referenced and logical discussion of the
76 available evidence pertaining a risk, and as such, it represents a suitable framework for
77 dealing with limited data availability. However, existing frameworks in the context of food
78 safety rely on allocating qualitative probabilities to the frequency of the pathogen in the food
79 or its source based on existing evidence or expert opinion. We argue that in settings such as
80 those often encountered in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs) data on the frequency
81 of pathogens in food are often too scarce to justify assignment of qualitative probabilities.
82 Given that it is in LMICs where such food survey data tend to be particularly scarce or absent,
83 that foodborne illnesses pose the highest burden, there is an urgent need for prioritization
84 tools that do not rely on pre-existing data or knowledge on the frequency of presentation of
85 the pathogen (Jaffee et al., 2019). Here we propose a framework to systematically and
86 transparently assess foodborne risk in the food or its source (e.g. the animal) in the absence
87 of data on pathogen frequency in food products. The approach, which relies on the known
88 characteristics of the pathogen, the intrinsic and extrinsic properties of food products, their
89 processing steps and cultural habits known to facilitate or prevent survival/growth of
90 pathogens, also takes into consideration the socio-economic and regulatory environment
91 within which the different Food Business Operators (FBOs) exist. While still qualitative, an
92 assessment that is independent of pathogen frequency estimates may allow systematic
93 prioritization in those settings where strategic resource allocation is most needed. Such an
94 approach will avoid the need to rely on estimates of pathogen frequency in situations where

95 they are only available from inadequate studies or from uninformed opinions and are
96 therefore highly speculative.

97 The objective of this study is therefore to propose a method to qualitatively rank foodborne
98 pathogens and food products in settings where the extremely limited/absence of data on the
99 frequency of the pathogen prevents use of classical qualitative risk assessment frameworks.
100 Considering that the challenge of risk prioritization in absence of pathogen frequency data is
101 heightened for populations consuming a high variety of products, the dairy sector of Andhra
102 Pradesh (India) is used for purpose of illustration. India is the world's largest dairy producer
103 where a high variety of dairy products are consumed, representing an important component
104 of Indian culture and local diets. Within India, the state of Andhra Pradesh is the fourth largest
105 producer of milk (NDDB, 2019).

106 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**


107 **2.1. Overview of the approach.** The risk assessment framework proposed in this study
108 integrates different streams of information that can be gathered with limited resources in
109 data-scarce settings, the general approach consists of three main steps:

110 Step 1. Detailed understanding/description, achieved by means of stakeholder consultation
111 and review of the regulatory framework, of: (i) the **supply chain(s)**, (ii) the food safety
112 **regulatory framework**, and (iii) the **risk profiles of the FBOs**.

113 Step 2. Risk ranking of **foodborne pathogens** to identify those posing the highest food safety
114 risk. This is achieved by: (i) developing, from existing knowledge, an inclusive list of the
115 microbiological hazards potentially posing a risk for consumers and (ii) combining this with
116 known pathogen characteristics that shape the pathogen-specific probability of human
117 exposure through the oral (ingestion) route from different FBOs.

118 Step 3: Risk ranking of **food products** to identify those posing the highest microbiological risk.
119 This is achieved by: (i) describing in detail the manufacturing process of the common food
120 products that are produced and retailed by the different FBOs, (ii) proceeding with a
121 preliminary identification of the group(s) of products that could be considered as similar with
122 regards to a set of variables known to drive the microbiological risk and (iii) revising this
123 preliminary grouping by evaluating the source(s) of heterogeneity within each group.

124 The risk ranking of both pathogens and food products in step 2 and 3 was finalised by
125 integrating information from step 1 to consider the specific role of the FBOs in shaping the
126 final risk of exposure to microbial pathogens. The source and type of knowledge/information
127 used to inform the assessment in the case study of the dairy sector of AP are outlined in figure
128 1.



129

130 *Figure 1. Flowchart outlining the source and the type of knowledge used to inform the qualitative risk ranking of pathogens*
131 *and dairy products (output).*

132 **2.2. Description of the dairy supply chain, regulatory framework and food business** 133 **operators**

134 **2.2.1. Characteristics of the dairy supply chain in Andhra Pradesh.** Most of the milk produced
135 in Andhra Pradesh (AP) is consumed within the household with the remaining being sold
136 through different channels involving a variety of actors operating, as in many other LMICs, at
137 different points along a formal-informal spectrum (Blackmore et al., 2020). To understand the
138 dairy supply chain in AP and the quantity of milk flowing through different routes and actors
139 along the value chain, a stakeholder workshop was held with actors, or representatives of
140 actors, at each stage in the dairy supply chain. The objectives of the workshop were to: (i)
141 map the supply chains of the dairy sector in AP, (ii) identify the actors participating at each
142 step of the chain and any agencies or regulations likely to influence their behaviour and (iii)
143 gather information on key consumer habits. Full details of this exercise are provided in the
144 Supplementary Material #1.

145 **2.2.2. Regulatory framework for dairy products in Andhra Pradesh.** The key reference used
146 to understand the food safety regulatory framework within which FBOs operate in AP was the

147 Food Safety Standards Act, 2006 (FSSAI, 2006) and the accompanying set of Food Safety and
148 Standards Regulations issued by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India (FSSAI) as
149 available on the official FSSAI website: <https://fssai.gov.in/>.

150 **2.2.3. Risk profile of Food Business Operators (FBOs) in the dairy chains of Andhra Pradesh.**

151 For purpose of this risk assessment, FBOs in AP are categorised according to the risks posed
152 by lack of strict adherence to good manufacturing practices (GMP), clean-in-place (CIP) and
153 sanitary regulations resulting in higher chances of microbial contamination of dairy products.
154 Hence, the following ranking of FBOs (from higher risk to lower) is assumed:
155 FBO1>FBO2>FBO3. Where FBO1 are the vendors in the informal end of the spectrum (street
156 vendors characterised by selling or transforming and selling small volumes of milk and mobile
157 vending arrangements); FBO2 are the small-scale manufacturers (permanent or semi-
158 permanent small shops/kiosks) and FBO3 are the producers in the formal end of the spectrum
159 (medium size shops, dairy companies, and cooperatives).

160 **2.3. Risk profiling and ranking of foodborne pathogens.**

161 **2.3.1. Identification of microbiological hazards.** Absence of context-specific food survey
162 data and data on illnesses associated with pathogen-food combinations, which is the
163 motivation of the proposed framework, precludes an *a-priori* identification of the relevant
164 pathogens for the dairy sector of AP. Therefore, the risk ranking exercise considered
165 pathogens known or suspected to be associated with milk and dairy products. Namely:
166 *Aeromonas* spp., *Bacillus cereus*, *Brucella* spp., *Campylobacter* spp., *Clostridium botulinum*,
167 *Corynebacterium* spp., *Coxiella burnetii*, *Cryptosporidium* spp., *Cronobacter (Enterobacter)*
168 *sakazakii*, *Escherichia coli* O157:H7, *Leptospira*, *Listeria monocytogenes*, *Mycobacterium*
169 *bovis*, *Salmonella* spp., *Shigella* spp., *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Streptococcus* spp., *Toxoplasma*
170 *gondii* and *Yersinia enterocolitica*.

171 **2.3.2. Risk profiling and ranking of foodborne pathogens.** The risk ranking of foodborne
172 pathogens aimed at answering the question: “Which foodborne pathogens represent a food
173 safety priority in the dairy sector of Andhra Pradesh when considering specific milk and dairy
174 products marketed by different food business operators?”. This was addressed qualitatively
175 by integrating knowledge regarding the biological characteristics of the pathogens
176 (summarised in the Supplementary Material #2) with the context-specific information (Figure
177 1) gathered during the stakeholder workshop. For each pathogen, a risk profile summarising

178 the key biological factors deemed relevant for the subsequent risk ranking was created using
 179 evidence from scientific literature and/or technical documents issued by public health
 180 agencies describing the hazardous properties of microbial pathogens. These included: optimal
 181 conditions for growth and survival, heat resistance, ability to produce toxins, main source of
 182 milk/dairy product contamination, infectious dose and the severity of illness. In this
 183 qualitative risk assessment, “risk” denotes the combination of the “likelihood of occurrence”
 184 and “severity of consequences” with the “likelihood of occurrence” defined as the likelihood
 185 of ingesting a dose of live bacteria deemed sufficient to result in infection via the oral
 186 (ingestion) route by consumption of dairy products. The output of the assessment is therefore
 187 a risk ranking outlining whether pathogen X should be considered as a food safety priority
 188 according to the qualitative definitions presented in the Table 1.

189 *Table 1. Rationale of the qualitative terms used within this risk ranking to identify each pathogen as a “Low”, “Moderate”*
 190 *or “High” food safety priority within the dairy sector in Andhra Pradesh.*

LOW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consumers are extremely unlikely to be exposed to a dose of live bacteria/toxins deemed sufficient to result in infection at the point of consumption. - The pathogen is unlikely to pose a risk to human health via the oral route (ingestion) when considering consumption of dairy products in AP. - Consumer exposure to a dose of live bacteria/toxins deemed sufficient to result in infection via oral route at consumption is not negligible but very low and infection in humans is typically mild/self-limiting.
MODERATE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consumer exposure to live bacteria/toxins at consumption is low but not negligible; infection in humans is from mild to severe but non-life threatening. - Infection in humans is from severe to serious but exposure to live bacteria, although not negligible is very unlikely. - Infection in humans is from severe to serious but exposure to a high dose is required to generate infection.
HIGH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consumer exposure to live bacteria or toxins at consumption is not negligible, a low dose is sufficient to generate infection and infection in humans is from severe to serious, possibly life threatening. - Infection in humans is not life threatening but the risk of consumer exposure to bacteria/toxins is high.

191 In the assignment of the likelihoods, full consideration was given to the contribution, in terms
 192 of expected increased risk of contamination and/or conditions favouring growth of the
 193 bacteria in food, arising from noncompliance with food safety standards by the different
 194 FBOs.

195 **2.4. Risk profiling and ranking of dairy products.** The risk ranking of dairy products aimed
196 at answering the question: “Which dairy products pose the higher microbiological risk for
197 consumers in Andhra Pradesh when considering milk and dairy products marketed by different
198 food business operators?”. For purpose of this study, the most common dairy products
199 marketed in AP were considered, namely: *UHT milk, pasteurised milk, toned milk,*
200 *standardised milk, recombined milk, reconstituted milk, flavoured milk, condensed milk, khoa,*
201 *basundi, burfi, peda, gulabjamun, kalajamun, milk cake, paneer, chhana-murki, rasmalai,*
202 *dahi, mishti dahi, lassi, UHT lassi, yogurt, cream, ice cream, kulfi, rasgulla, junnu, kalakand,*
203 *buttermilk, milk powder, junnu powder, ghee (from butter and cream).* The assessment was
204 performed qualitatively and was based on the intrinsic/extrinsic characteristics of dairy
205 products and the level of compliance with food safety and sanitary regulations of the FBOs
206 operating at different levels of the formal-informal spectrum. These aspects were considered
207 because:

- 208 (i) The products are very different from each other but can be characterised by well-
209 established intrinsic and extrinsic factors known to favour/prevent bacterial
210 contamination and growth/survival within a food matrix.
- 211 (ii) Many dairy products are made and can be purchased from different FBOs, such as street
212 vendors, kiosks, small shops or supermarkets. While the manufacturing processes follows
213 the same steps and the biochemical characteristics of the dairy products can assumed to
214 be comparable, the same product made by different FBOs may pose very different risk of
215 microbiological contamination arising from the environment, unhygienic handling or
216 retail form (i.e. loose form, manually or industrially packaged).

217 Intrinsic factors are the inherent (natural or artificially occurring) physical, chemical or
218 biological characteristics of the food matrix such as water activity (a_w), pH, availability of
219 nutrients or antimicrobial components while extrinsic factors are those controlled by the
220 external processing conditions such as thermal treatments, manipulation or preservation
221 methods (Demirci et al., 2020). In this particular assessment (dairy products in AP), given the
222 high variety of products commonly available to consumers, characterisation of dairy products
223 was initially informed by hierarchical cluster analysis aimed at identifying groups of dairy
224 products that can be considered as similar in terms of intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics
225 driving the microbiological risk.

226 The final ranking was then finalised considering the additional risk of contamination arising
227 from the products being manufactured by the different FBOs.

228 **2.4.1. Characterisation of dairy products.** The manufacturing process of each dairy product
229 was first reviewed and summarised into a manufacturing table (Supplementary Material #3);
230 then, for each product, the information related to key intrinsic and extrinsic properties known
231 to favour or prevent microbial presence/growth were described according to the variables:
232 (i) Initial Heat treatment (IHT), (ii) Water activity (a_w), (iii) pH & Starter culture and (iv) Final
233 Heat Treatment (FHT). Detailed justification of why these variables were selected and how
234 they were measured is provided in Supplementary Material #1.

235 **2.4.2. Cluster analysis.** Hierarchical Clustering on Principal Components (HCPC) was used to
236 construct a hierarchical tree showing links between dairy products or groups of dairy products
237 based on the variables mentioned in 2.4.1. As all variables were categorical, hierarchical
238 classification of dairy products was based on the principal components obtained by means of
239 Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA) (Greenacre & Blasius, 2006). Briefly, MCA provides
240 a graphical representation of the data by creating synthetic independent dimensions to
241 describe the relationships between the levels of the variables used to describe the objects
242 (i.e. the products). The dairy products are therefore projected onto these dimensions at a
243 distance where the variability of the projected points (projected inertia) is maximised. As a
244 result, two products will be shown close to each other if they share a relatively large number
245 of characteristics or far apart if they have very different profiles.

246 The MCA was initiated keeping all the dimensions and the ideal partitioning of the hierarchical
247 tree determining the final number of clusters of dairy products was done selecting the
248 number of clusters “ n ” for which the loss of inertia is minimal when passing from “ n ” to “ $n+1$ ”.
249 Results of the cluster analysis provided a visual representation (dendrogram) of the
250 similarities/dissimilarities between groups of dairy products in terms of characteristics
251 favouring or preventing microbial growth/survival. Analyses were done using the
252 “FactoMineR” package (Lê et al., 2008) in R software.

253 **2.4.3. Risk ranking of dairy products.**

254 Objective of the cluster analysis described in 2.4.2. was to group products into relatively
255 homogeneous groups based on a set of variables. However, as some dissimilarities may still
256 exist within the products in each cluster; from the results of the cluster analysis the final risk

257 ranking was finalised evaluating the food safety impact of the features determining
 258 dissimilarities amongst the products within each group (if any). In addition, for each product,
 259 the risk of microbiological contamination arising from noncompliance to food safety
 260 Regulation and hygienic standards was also considered by assuming that if the same product
 261 is manufactured/retailed by different FBOs (i.e. FBO1, FBO2 and FBO3 as specified in 2.2.3)
 262 the higher risk of consumer exposure to microbiological hazards is posed by products
 263 purchased from FBO1 followed to FBO2 and then FBO3.

264 The output of the risk assessment for dairy products is therefore a risk ranking outlining
 265 whether product X should be considered as a dairy product that for its intrinsic/extrinsic
 266 characteristics in combination with the risk profile of the FBO poses a risk of exposure to
 267 foodborne pathogens according to the qualitative definitions presented in the Table 2.

268 *Table 2. Rationale of the qualitative terms used within this risk ranking to identify each dairy product as posing an*
 269 *“Extremely low”, “Very Low”, “Low”, “Moderate” or “High” risk for consumers of dairy products in Andhra Pradesh.*


EXTREMELY LOW	Regardless of whether the intrinsic/extrinsic characteristic of the product are favourable for microbial growth, there is a final heat treatment deemed sufficient to eliminate foodborne pathogens before hermetic packaging; strict adherence to food safety regulations, GMP, CIP are systematically in place to minimise chances of environmental contamination.
VERY LOW	Regardless of whether the intrinsic/extrinsic characteristic of the product are favourable for microbial growth, there is an initial treatment deemed sufficient to eliminate foodborne pathogens present in milk but not a final heat treatment. However, the manufacturing process is highly standardised; strict adherence to food safety regulations, GMP, CIP to minimise chances of environmental contamination.
LOW	The intrinsic/extrinsic characteristic of the product are not favourable for microbial growth; although there is an initial or final heat treatment deemed sufficient to eliminate foodborne pathogens, the product is sold in loose form or manually packaged. Food safety standards are not always met and GMP/CIP not systematically adopted by the FBO; environmental/human cross-contamination is possible but growth is prevented.
MODERATE	The intrinsic/extrinsic characteristic of the product are favourable for microbial growth; although there is an initial or final heat treatment deemed sufficient to eliminate foodborne pathogens, the product is sold in loose form or manually packaged. Food safety standards are not always met and GMP/CIP not systematically adopted by the FBO; environmental/human cross-contamination is possible and growth is not prevented.
HIGH	There is an initial and/or final heat treatment deemed sufficient to eliminate foodborne pathogens but the product is often home-made, sold in loose form or manually packaged. Food safety standards are rarely met, GMP/CIP not adopted by the FBO and microbiological contamination of the product is very likely. The risk

should be considered high regardless of whether the intrinsic/extrinsic characteristic of the product are favourable for microbial growth.
--

270

271 3. RESULTS

272 **3.1. Milk supply chains in Andhra Pradesh, food business operators and regulatory**
273 **framework.** During the mapping exercise, a description of the milk flows from production to
274 consumption was built with all participants using a consensus-based approach. The resulting
275 Sankey diagram (Figure 2) demonstrates the complexity of the system with a large number of
276 actors involved.



277

278 *Figure 2. Sankey diagram outlining the flow of milk in Andhra Pradesh from production to consumption quantitatively. The*
279 *width of the arrows connecting the different nodes is proportional to the total amount of milk flowing along that route.*
280 *Mk=Milk, HF=Household farm, SSF=Small-scale farm, OF=Organised farm, ScN= Self-consumption and neighbourhood,*
281 *MC=Milk collector, CC=Collection centre, PA=Private agent, DS=Direct sale, INTch=Intermediary (chilling), COOPch*
282 *(Cooperatives (chilling), PVch=Private dairy company (chilling), SSMnch=Small scale manufacturers (NOT chilled),*
283 *COOPpr=Cooperatives (processing), SSMpr=Small scale manufacturer (processing), PVpr=Private dairy company (processing),*
284 *FI=Food industry, FO=Food business operators, COOPmk=marketed by cooperatives, SSMmk=marketed by small scale*
285 *manufacturer, Pvmk=marketed by private dairy companies, SK=Supermarket, SCS=Street corner shops, C=Consumers.*

286 A full description of the milk supply chains in Andhra Pradesh is presented in Supplementary
287 Material #1. The tool used to visually summarize the flow of milk quantitatively has been
288 made available as a web-based application (<https://mcrvc.shinyapps.io/riverflows/>).

289

290 3.2. Risk ranking of foodborne pathogens.

291 Results of the final risk ranking of foodborne pathogens and brief rationale are presented in Table 3. The full risk profile describing each
 292 pathogens' characteristics that was used to rank the pathogens is presented in the Supplementary Material #2.

293

294 *Table 3. Risk ranking of milk-borne pathogens that are judged to be a Low (L), Moderate (M) or High (H) food safety priority in the dairy sector in Andhra Pradesh when considering the oral*
 295 *(ingestion) route of infection and dairy products supplied by different types of Food Business Operators (FBO1, FBO2, FBO3) and rationale.*

Pathogen	Rationale	FBO1	FBO2	FBO3
<i>Aeromonas</i> spp.	The pathogen is not shed in milk, does not survive pasteurisation and infection is typically self-limiting. The infectious dose is high (>10 ⁹ CFU) and the foodborne route is deemed to have marginal contribution to the global burden of disease, compared to exposure via contaminated water. Dairy products do not seem to pose a high risk for the presence of the bacteria compared to other foodstuffs.	L	L	L
<i>Brucella</i> spp.	Infection in humans is severe and prevalence of infection in cattle in India is non-negligible, the pathogen does not survive pasteurisation but can survive for long time in milk and fermented dairy products. While certainly a priority if considering occupational exposure, consumption of raw milk and products made with raw milk is negligible in Andhra Pradesh, hence, infection via the oral route (ingestion) is in principle unlikely. The risk of human exposure to <i>Brucella</i> spp. cannot however be entirely excluded in case of domestic heat-treatments resulting in decimal reductions not sufficient to eliminate the bacteria from the raw milk before consumption should the pathogen be present in high amounts. Thanks to the cultural habits and conditions needed to result in exposure of live bacteria (i.e. high level of contamination that makes the heat-treatment ineffective), chances for infection via oral route are likely to be very low. However, infection is severe and for this reason the risk of <i>Brucella</i> spp. infection via oral route is considered "moderate" for milk and dairy products sold by actors in the informal end of the spectrum.	M	L	L

<i>Campylobacter</i> spp.	The pathogen is part of the intestinal flora of various farm and companion animals and can be present in milk because of faecal contamination or cross contamination with meat of other animals, particularly poultry. <i>Campylobacter</i> infections are rarely life threatening; however, the infectious dose is relatively low. The pathogen is very heat-sensitive and does not survive pasteurisation. Considering consumption of raw milk and products made with raw milk is negligible in AP; infection via the oral route (ingestion) is highly unlikely in settings where the risk of post-processing cross-contamination from other food sources or surrounding environment is minimised.	M	L	L
<i>Corynebacterium</i> spp.	Infections from zoonotic strains of <i>Corynebacterium</i> are not primarily associated with handling of infected dairy products/companion animals or consumption of contaminated raw milk. The pathogen does not survive pasteurisation.	L	L	L
<i>C. botulinum</i>	The pathogen is ubiquitous and has been detected in a variety of food including milk. While infection can be life threatening, this is dependent upon ingestion of pre-formed neurotoxins. Conditions for toxin production are very specific (i.e. temperature abuse of non-acidic anaerobic environment in absence of competitive bacteria) and not met in dairy products commonly produced in AP.	L	L	L
<i>C. burnetii</i>	The pathogen is shed in milk of infected cows as an obligate intracellular microorganism, it does not grow in milk and is eliminated by pasteurisation. The main route of infection seems to be airborne and evidence of the pathogen as a milk-borne hazard capable of causing disease through via oral route (ingestion) is weak. If any, the main risk is represented by consumption of highly contaminated raw milk which is negligible in AP.	L	L	L
<i>Leptospira</i>	Shed in urine of infected animals, leptospirosis is considered an occupational disease for which the main route of infection is percutaneous through contact with contaminated water or damp soil. While contamination of milk cannot be entirely excluded it is restricted to cross-contamination with infected urine. Milk and dairy products are not a suitable medium for growth of this pathogen, if any, the main risk is represented by consumption of highly contaminated raw milk which is negligible in AP.	L	L	L

<p><i>M. bovis</i></p>	<p>While bovine tuberculosis in humans is uncommon in Europe and other high-income countries, it is still a major public health concern in India. As for <i>Brucella</i> spp., bovine tuberculosis remains a public health priority within the dairy sector in India and AP. Although the pathogen can be shed in the milk of infected animals, it does not survive pasteurisation and considering consumption of raw milk and products made with raw milk is extremely uncommon in AP, infection via oral route (ingestion) is highly unlikely. Existing evidence suggest that infection via the oral route requires thousands or millions of organisms as compared to less than 10 through inhalation, however, as for <i>Brucella</i> spp., because of the cultural habits and conditions needed to result in exposure of live bacteria (i.e. high level of contamination that makes the heat-treatment ineffective), chances for infection via oral route are likely to be very low. However, infection can result in severe illness and for these reasons, the risk of <i>M. bovis</i> infection via oral route is considered as “moderate” for milk and dairy products sold by actors in the informal end of the informality spectrum.</p>	<p>M</p>	<p>L</p>	<p>L</p>
<p><i>Streptococcus</i> spp.</p>	<p>Most streptococcal illnesses in people are caused by species normally maintained in humans (e.g. <i>S. pneumoniae</i>, <i>S. pyogenes</i> or human-adapted strains of <i>S. agalactiae</i>) and originate from opportunistic infection in the host or transmission resulting from close physical contacts. Ingestion of undercooked pork (e.g., <i>S. suis</i>), horsemeat (<i>S. equi</i> subsp. <i>Zooepidemicus</i>), fish (<i>S. agalactiae</i> ST283) and unpasteurised dairy products (<i>S. equi</i> subsp. <i>Zooepidemicus</i>), have however been associated with infection in humans. The genetic profile of <i>S. agalactiae</i>, the major cause of bovine mastitis, seems to be distinct from the strain causing infection in humans; likewise, there is no evidence of milk-borne human infections due to <i>S. uberis</i> or <i>S. dysgalactiae</i> subsp. <i>Dysgalactiae</i>, other strains responsible for mastitis in cattle. With the advent of pasteurisation, the incidence of streptococcal outbreaks has drastically reduced; recent outbreaks have mainly involved <i>S. pyogenes</i> and food products different from milk or dairy products.</p>	<p>L</p>	<p>L</p>	<p>L</p>

<i>T. gondii</i>	While consumption of raw goats' milk is often identified as a risk factor for human toxoplasmosis, the risk of acquiring infection by drinking cow's milk, if any, seems to be minimal. As an obligate intracellular coccidian, <i>T. gondii</i> does not replicate in food, as such, the risk pathway for milk-borne toxoplasmosis requires consumption of raw milk, which is negligible in AP.	L	L	L
<i>Y. enterocolitica</i>	The pathogen is ubiquitous and can grow on a variety of foods, even at refrigeration temperatures, however, it is killed by pasteurisation. Infection is not life threatening and infectious dose is relatively high (10^6 - 10^8). The primary source of human yersiniosis is pigs and while <i>Y. enterocolitica</i> is occasionally detected in heat-treated milk products, contamination is mainly environmental. Dairy products do not seem to pose a high risk for the presence of the bacteria compared to other foods such as pork or beef.	L	L	L
<i>B. cereus</i>	Although this pathogen is frequently detected in various foods including milk, most <i>B. cereus</i> outbreaks have involved food commodities other than milk and dairy products. This is probably because conditions for <i>B. cereus</i> to generate infection are unlikely to be met in dairy products before spoilage. The risk seems to be limited to pasteurised dairy products where the microorganism can multiply (or spores are already present) at high concentration ($>10^5$ CFU/g) without spoiling the product such as extended shelf-life chilled products, desserts or reconstituted powdered milk.	M	M	M
<i>Shigella</i> spp.	The bacteria does not survive pasteurisation and infection from consumption of dairy products is likely to be sporadic, mainly due to poor personal hygiene and handling of processed dairy products. However, the infectious dose is believed to be very low (as few as 10 CFU) therefore shigellosis is a very easily transmitted disease. Clinical signs include diarrhoea that can last from a few days to several weeks. As a pathogen for which the only known reservoirs are humans and large primates, the main transmission route is via food contaminated with human faeces. Considering GMP and CIP are not systematically adopted by processors in the informal sector, <i>Shigella</i> spp. should be considered a high food safety priority in this setting.	H	H	L


<i>C. sakazakii</i>	While the main reservoir for <i>C. sakazakii</i> remains unknown, the pathogen is ubiquitous in food and processing environments. Its ability to form biofilms promoting adherence and environmental stress resistance together with the peculiar ability of surviving on dry substrates for a long time make this pathogen a serious threat for the dairy industry; particularly milk powder, powder infant formula and milk protein-producing facilities.	L	L	H*
<i>Cryptosporidium</i> spp.	<i>Cryptosporidium</i> spp. is considered the main waterborne parasite worldwide due to its ability to survive wastewater treatment and drinking water disinfectants. The parasite is excreted with faeces of infected animals, the main risk for human exposure in the dairy sector is via consumption of raw milk and dairy products made with raw milk but also, and more relevant for AP in settings where CIP is not rigorously applied, is the use of utensils and equipment cleaned with contaminated water.	H	H	L
<i>E. coli</i> O157:H7	The Shiga toxin-producing serotype <i>E. coli</i> O157:H7 is part of the intestinal flora of ruminants and presence in milk is due to faecal contamination. Infectious dose is low, ranging from 10 to 100 CFU and infection in humans can be severe and life threatening. Key risky dairy products are raw milk and in general, any processed dairy product with a risk of post-pasteurisation faecal contamination via human handling.	H	H	H
<i>L. monocytogenes</i>	This ubiquitous pathogen can contaminate milk and dairy products at several stages of the food chain via environmental cross-contamination. <i>L. monocytogenes</i> has been isolated in a variety of dairy products, it does not survive pasteurisation but can grow at refrigeration temperature and adapt to acidic environments. Infection in humans can be life threatening and milk and dairy products are frequently implicated in listeriosis outbreaks.	H	H	H
<i>Salmonella</i> spp.	<i>Salmonella</i> spp. is part of the intestinal flora of ruminants and presence in milk is typically due to faecal contamination. Key risky dairy products are raw milk and in general, any processed dairy product with a risk of post-pasteurisation faecal contamination through human handling. Infectious dose seems to be rather high (10 ⁵ CFU) but <i>Salmonella</i> infections in humans are severe although rarely life threatening.	H	H	H

<i>S. aureus</i>	<i>S. aureus</i> is one of the major causes of bovine clinical and sub-clinical mastitis. Infection in humans is moderate and self-limiting resulting from ingestion of pre-formed and thermo-stable enterotoxins. Methods for detection of subclinical mastitis in milking animals are not routinely used in India and Andhra Pradesh, and the risk of <i>S. aureus</i> being present in milk at high amounts before heat treatment is not negligible. Humans are also known reservoirs and post-pasteurisation contamination via handling is not uncommon.	H	H	H
------------------	--	---	---	---

297 The pathogens identified as a “High” food safety priority across all FBOs were: *E. coli* O157:H7,
298 *Salmonella* spp., *S. aureus* and *L. monocytogenes* whilst *B. cereus* was identified as a
299 “Moderate” food safety priority. *C. sakazakii* was identified as a “High” food safety priority
300 for FBO3, but this is limited to the industrial production of infant formula/milk powder (not
301 produced by FBO1 and FBO2). On the other hand, *Shigella* spp. and *Cryptosporidium* spp.
302 were identified as a “High” food safety priority for FBO1 and FBO2; this is because the risk
303 arising from these pathogens is mainly related to unhygienic handling of food and adoption
304 of GMP and CIP principles by these FBOs is very limited. *M. bovis* and *Brucella* spp. are
305 endemic in cattle in India and AP, therefore herd prevalence is non-negligible, however, the
306 oral (ingestion) route was considered in principle as unlikely to be a relevant exposure
307 pathway for these pathogens. This is because effective pasteurisation is deemed sufficient to
308 eliminate the risk, should these pathogens be already present in the milk of infected animals.
309 However, it was also considered that domestic heat-treatment of raw milk directly purchased
310 from the neighbouring farm, milkman or collection centre might not be sufficient to achieve
311 a log reduction such as to completely eliminate the pathogens should these be present at high
312 concentrations. Although chances of exposure to live bacteria via oral route are very low,
313 considering the severity of the diseases, *M. bovis* and *Brucella* spp. were considered of
314 “Moderate” priority.

315 **3.3. Risk ranking of dairy products.**

316 3.3.1. **Cluster analysis.** Altogether, the first four dimensions of the MCA explained 93.1% of
317 the variance; based on inertia criterion the increase in between-cluster inertia when moving
318 from 5 to 6 clusters (figure 3) was minimal, compared to from 4 to 5, it was hence decided to
319 partition the hierarchical tree in 4 clusters.



320

321 Figure 3. dendrogram showing the hierarchical clustering of dairy products and the bar chart of the amount of inertia gained
322 when moving from n clusters to $n+1$.

323 Products in the first cluster: UHT lassi, mishit dahi, lassi, dahi, yogurt and buttermilk are all
324 fermented products of high a_w that are not heat-treated before packaging (exception made
325 for UHT lassi). In fact, all these products are characterised by the addition of a starter culture
326 after an initial heat treatment, the risk arising from the possible microbial contamination is
327 mitigated by presence of Lactic Acid Bacteria (LABs) that proliferate during fermentation
328 creating an unfavourable and competitive environment for most of the pathogenic bacteria.

329 Products in the second cluster: powder milk/junnu, condensed milk, peda, burfi and basundi
330 all have low a_w and undergo an initial heat treatment as part of the manufacturing process.
331 While powdered products and the condensed milk also undergo a final heat treatment before
332 packaging this is not the case for the Indian sweets basundi, burfi and peda.

333 The third cluster was the most heterogeneous and included: kulfi, milk cake, ice cream,
334 gulabjamun, kalajamun and ghee (butter and cream methods). All these products are
335 characterised by medium a_w values suboptimal for growth of some pathogens such *Shigella*,
336 *E. coli* O157:H7 or *Salmonella* spp. but still optimal for other such as *L. monocytogenes* or *S.*
337 *aureus*. Gulabjamun and kalajamun are khoa-based sweets not undergoing any initial heat

338 treatment but are heat treated at $T > 100^{\circ}\text{C}$ before packaging. Similarly, ghee is made from
 339 either pasteurised cream or butter treated since the beginning at T between 100 and 110°C
 340 before packaging.

341 Products in the fourth cluster included: cream, reconstituted milk, pasteurised milk, UHT milk,
 342 standardised milk, flavoured milk, toned milk and recombined milk. Products in this group are
 343 manufactured through a processing circuit that is completely closed with minimal risk of
 344 cross-contamination from the environment, have high a_w but are at least pasteurised before
 345 packaging.

346 Finally, products in the fifth cluster: khoa, rasgulla, junnu, paneer, kalakand, Rasmalai and
 347 channa-murki are characterised by having an initial heat-treatment as part of the processing
 348 and high a_w . Junnu, rasgulla and khoa are subjected to a prolonged heat treatment at high
 349 temperatures before packaging.

350 **3.3.2. Risk ranking of dairy products.** The risk ranking of dairy products was performed
 351 integrating: (i) the results of the clustering, (ii) the characteristics of the individual products
 352 resulting in within-cluster dissimilarities where needed, and (iii) the risk profile of the FBOs
 353 where products can be purchased. Results of the final risk ranking are summarised in Table 4.

354 *Table 4. Risk ranking of dairy products. Dairy products are classified as “Extremely low”, “Very low”, “Low”, “Moderate” or*
 355 *“High” risk of consumer exposure to microbiological hazard; classification is informed by integrating the intrinsic/extrinsic*
 356 *characteristics of the products with the additional risk of microbiological contamination arising from the FBO. n.a.=product*
 357 *not normally produced/retailed by the FBO*

PRODUCT	FBO1	FBO2	FBO3
Buttermilk	HIGH	MEDIUM	VERY LOW
Chhana-murki	HIGH	MEDIUM	VERY LOW
Kalakand	HIGH	MEDIUM	VERY LOW
Paneer	HIGH	MEDIUM	VERY LOW
Flavoured milk	HIGH	MEDIUM	EXTREMELY LOW
Junnu	HIGH	MEDIUM	EXTREMELY LOW
Khoa	HIGH	MEDIUM	EXTREMELY LOW
Burfi	HIGH	LOW	VERY LOW
Dahi	HIGH	LOW	VERY LOW
Ice cream	HIGH	LOW	VERY LOW
Kulfi	HIGH	LOW	VERY LOW
Lassi	HIGH	LOW	VERY LOW
Mishti dahi	HIGH	LOW	VERY LOW
Peda	HIGH	LOW	VERY LOW
Gulabjamun	HIGH	LOW	EXTREMELY LOW
Ghee (butter)	HIGH	n.a.	n.a.

Milk cake	n.a.	MEDIUM	VERY LOW
Rasmalai	n.a.	MEDIUM	VERY LOW
Yogurt	n.a.	MEDIUM	VERY LOW
Cream	n.a.	MEDIUM	EXTREMELY LOW
Rasgulla	n.a.	MEDIUM	EXTREMELY LOW
Junnu powder	n.a.	LOW	EXTREMELY LOW
Kalajamun	n.a.	LOW	EXTREMELY LOW
Milk powder	n.a.	LOW	EXTREMELY LOW
Ghee (cream)	n.a.	LOW	EXTREMELY LOW
Basundi	n.a.	LOW	VERY LOW
Condensed milk	n.a.	n.a.	EXTREMELY LOW
Pasteurised milk	n.a.	n.a.	EXTREMELY LOW
Recombined milk	n.a.	n.a.	EXTREMELY LOW
Reconstituted milk	n.a.	n.a.	EXTREMELY LOW
Standardised milk	n.a.	n.a.	EXTREMELY LOW
Toned milk	n.a.	n.a.	EXTREMELY LOW
UHT lassi	n.a.	n.a.	EXTREMELY LOW
UHT milk	n.a.	n.a.	EXTREMELY LOW

358

359 From definitions given in Table 2, in principle, all products manufactured by FBO1 represent
360 an “extremely low” to “very low” risk of exposure to the microbiological hazards for the
361 consumers. However, when the same products are manufactured/distributed by FBO2 the
362 risk increases to “low” or “medium”; chances for microbial contamination are assumed to be
363 higher for products manufactured by FBO2 and the difference between “low” and
364 “moderate” is mainly linked to the intrinsic characteristics of the product favouring microbial
365 growth.

366 A further increase in the risk is assumed for the same products manufactured by FBO3, where
367 chances for environmental/human contamination drive the risk estimate in such a way that
368 the intrinsic characteristics favouring/preventing microbial growth become irrelevant.

369 **4. DISCUSSION**

370 The intent of this study was to propose a method for systematic risk ranking of foodborne
371 pathogens and food products in settings where data on the frequency/concentration of
372 pathogens in foods are largely absent. In these settings, even the assignment of qualitative
373 probabilities to the minimum set of events along the risk pathways until consumption (i.e.
374 probability of the food product being contaminated or the probability of the pathogen
375 surviving processing) would be highly speculative and unjustified.

376 The main advantage of the approach presented here is that it is entirely based on existing
377 knowledge and information that can be easily gathered in any setting. However, a limitation
378 is that the prioritization may be obtained at a low level of resolution leading to the
379 identification of a *group* of pathogens or *group* of products posing the highest risk for the
380 consumers. The choice of the probability scales from “Low” to “High” for pathogens and
381 “Extremely low” to “High” for products were a compromise between a desired practically
382 informative level or resolution of the final outputs and the level of discrimination that could
383 be realistically achieved from the available information. However, if supported by rigorous,
384 comprehensive and logical reasoning, this qualitative prioritization of groups of pathogens
385 and products can be highly informative to support decision-making; particularly if resources
386 to be allocated for the prevention of foodborne diseases are limited, the food system is
387 complex and food-safety decisions need to be made. The potential of this risk ranking
388 approach has been demonstrated by applying it to the complex dairy sector of AP, where milk
389 flows through a network of formal and informal actors resulting in very diverse dairy products
390 being available to consumers. Risk ranking of pathogens was performed through a logical
391 discussion of the exposure pathways as opposed to survey data. This is because (i) there are
392 very limited data on the presence or absence of pathogens in milk and dairy products in India
393 in general and AP specifically, (ii) results from other parts of India/countries are not
394 necessarily representative of AP and (iii) some potentially relevant pathogens are not
395 targeted by microbiological surveys.

396 When considering the case study of the AP dairy sector, the risk ranking of pathogens
397 identified *E. coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella* spp., *S. aureus* and *L. monocytogenes* as the pathogens
398 that should be regarded as high food safety priority and *B. cereus* as a moderate priority for
399 all FBOs. *Shigella* spp. was identified as high priority for FBO1 because the risk is restricted to
400 cross-contamination with human faeces and hence unhygienic handling or production in
401 highly unregulated settings but the infectious dose is extremely low (Zaidi & Estrada-García,
402 2014). Similarly, *Campylobacter* spp. and *Cryptosporidium* were considered as moderate food
403 safety priority for FBO1 and FBO2 due to the risk mainly arising from unhygienic handling of
404 food and very limited adoption of sanitary measures by these FBOs. On the other hand, *C.*
405 *sakazakii* was identified as a high food safety priority for FBO3 due to the risk posed by this
406 pathogen when present in milk powder and powdered infant formula (not produced by FBO1

407 and FBO2). The fact that important zoonotic diseases such as bovine tuberculosis and
408 brucellosis are still prevalent in the country (Mangtani et al., 2020; Refaya et al., 2020) might
409 initially cause alarm in terms of consumer exposure to these important zoonotic pathogens.
410 Our assessment based on the integration of different streams of information, has identified
411 these pathogens as of “moderate” priority but only for a specific segment of the population
412 (i.e. those purchasing raw milk for self-consumption directly from neighbouring farms,
413 milkman or collection centre) and under a specific set of circumstances (i.e. inadequate
414 domestic treatment of highly contaminated raw milk). Consumers in AP reportedly always
415 boil milk before consumption, and dairy products are made from pasteurised (or equivalently
416 heat-treated milk) in both the formal and informal supply chain. These are key behaviours,
417 which minimise the risk arising from pathogens that would be considered as a high food safety
418 priority otherwise.

419 Context-specific qualitative information played a major role in the risk ranking of foodborne
420 pathogens and repeating this exercise in other settings characterised by different consumer’
421 habits (Chengat Prakashbabu et al., 2020), will probably result in a very different set of priority
422 pathogens. Of note that the method proposed here should not be considered as relevant only
423 for LMICs. In fact, the same approach can be used for early identification of potential hazards
424 at which consumers (or group of consumers) can be exposed to because of specific habits,
425 believes or changes in consumption trends (FSA, 2018; Golden et al., 2022; Tomasevic et al.,
426 2018). For this reason, integration of different streams of information as proposed in this
427 study is essential to minimise biases in the qualitative characterisation of the risk.

428 The risk ranking of food products was based on methods for classification and evaluation of
429 similarities/dissimilarities between products or group of products based on the intrinsic and
430 extrinsic factors known to favour or prevent microbial contamination and/or growth
431 integrated with the expected risk of microbiological contamination that characterises the
432 different FBOs. Consideration of the two elements is particularly relevant in settings such as
433 AP or any other LMICs where very diverse FBOs coexist and the same products might pose a
434 very different food safety risk depending of the manufacturer/distributor.

435 The concise nature of the preliminary cluster analysis inevitably required a further within-
436 cluster evaluation of dissimilarities between products within and across clusters for the scope

437 of the final risk ranking. However, the visual representation of the hierarchies together with
438 the inspection of features characterising each cluster facilitates identification of groups of
439 products that could be quickly considered of low (or high) risk. This preliminary step can in
440 fact be very useful if a long list of food products is to be evaluated, as is the case in the Indian
441 dairy sector. If epidemiological data are available, other evidence-based approaches can
442 certainly be used (Sumner et al., 2005; Xavier et al., 2014); the method proposed here finds
443 its value precisely in contexts where data are scarce/absent and a high variety of food
444 products are marketed. In such case, a risk ranking simply based on few but well-established
445 intrinsic and extrinsic properties can serve to narrow down the spectrum of food products
446 and consequently, support a more efficient allocation of resources towards those that are
447 more likely to pose the higher risk for the consumers.

448 The factors included in the analysis were those relevant for the common dairy products
449 marketed in AP. Should this exercise be repeated for other food commodities where
450 manufacturing processes includes other important intrinsic or extrinsic factors (e.g. ageing,
451 inclusion of chemical preservatives as part of the product formulation or packaging under
452 modified atmosphere), these should of course be considered for either the classification by
453 means of cluster analysis and the final ranking.

454 It should be noted that the final ranking of food products was intentionally made pathogen
455 non-specific as this was judged impractical. Combining the ranking of pathogens with the
456 ranking of products would in fact require a higher level of resolution of the output allowing
457 to distinguish for example the risk arising from a product judged to pose a “high” risk for
458 pathogens considered as “high” food safety priority and pathogens considered as “moderate”
459 or “low” priority. Considering the limited set of information on which this framework is based,
460 attempting such specific product-pathogen ranking would have led to an output surrounded
461 by high uncertainty. Considering the main objective of the proposed methods is to inform
462 decision-making in data-scarce settings, the most practical option is to accept the
463 compromise of an output that is of low resolution but informative. Hence, the more practical
464 option for an early pathogen-product interpretation of the risk is to consider the ranking of
465 products to identify the FBO-product combinations that should be given priority if food safety
466 risk-based monitoring/surveillance plans are to be implemented.

467 Qualitative risk assessments based on logical appraisal of the available evidence provide
468 conclusions that are inevitably more subjective than those obtained by quantitative models
469 based on numerical estimates. However, they represent a well-established and recognised
470 framework to evaluate risk. In fact, the value of this method is precisely to allow a first and
471 early identification of the relevant context-specific microbiological hazards and food products
472 in the absence of food survey data but still based upon a systematic and logical reasoning of
473 the evidence.

474 **5. CONCLUSIONS**

475 Good quality microbiological data on the presence of bacteria in food or epidemiological data
476 on the frequency and the likely source of foodborne disease in the population is often lacking,
477 particularly in LMICs. Even in the absence of such data, it is possible to systematically rank
478 pathogens and food products according to the risk they pose, based on pathogen/products
479 characteristics and context specific information including food regulations and risk profiles of
480 food business operators. The approach applied to the dairy sector of Andhra Pradesh shown
481 how the risk estimates that are generated, although of lower resolution if compared to data-
482 driven risk assessments, can inform decision-making by identifying the pathogens and food
483 products posing the higher risk for public health and the role of food business operators in
484 shaping the risk.

485 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

486 This work was supported, by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Foreign,
487 Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO) [Grant number: OPP1195676]. Under the
488 grant conditions of the Foundation, a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Generic License has
489 already been assigned to the Author Accepted Manuscript version that might arise from this
490 submission. The research team would like to thank the individuals and organizations who
491 generously shared their time, experience, and materials for the purposes of this project
492 during the stakeholder meeting held in Andhra Pradesh. We are extremely grateful to dr.
493 Francesco Tranquillo for the technical support in the development of the Shiny app.

494 **REFERENCES**

495 Blackmore, E., Guarín, A., Alonso, S., Grace, D., & Vorley, B. (2020). *Informal milk markets in*
496 *Kenya, Tanzania and Assam (India): An overview of their status, policy context, and*

- 497 *opportunities for policy innovation to improve health and safety*. ILRI Research
498 Report 62. Nairobi, Kenya: ILRI.
- 499 CAC. (1999). Principles and guidelines for the conduct of microbiological risk assessment.
500 *CAC/GL-30*.
- 501 Chengat Prakashbabu, B., Cardwell, J. M., Craighead, L., Ndour, A. P. N., Yempabou, D., Ba,
502 E., Bada-Alambedji, R., Akakpo, A. J., & Guitian, J. (2020). "We never boil our milk, it
503 will cause sore udders and mastitis in our cows"-consumption practices, knowledge
504 and milk safety awareness in Senegal. *BMC Public Health*, 20, 1-12.
505 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08877->
- 506 de Freitas Costa, E., Cardoso, M., Kich, J. D., & Corbellini, L. G. (2020). A qualitative risk
507 assessment approach to microbial foodborne hazards in Brazilian intensive pork
508 production: A step towards risk prioritization. *Microbial Risk Analysis*, 15, 100105.
509 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mran.2020.100105>
- 510 Demirci, A., Feng, H., & Krishnamurthy, K. (2020). *Food Safety Engineering*. Springer Nature
511 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-42660-6>
- 512 EFSA. (2012). Scientific Opinion on the development of a risk ranking framework on
513 biological hazards. *EFSA Journal*, 10(6), 2724.
- 514 Eygue, M., Richard-Forget, F., Cappelier, J.-M., Pinson-Gadais, L., & Membré, J.-M. (2020).
515 Development of a risk-ranking framework to evaluate simultaneously biological and
516 chemical hazards related to food safety: Application to emerging dietary practices in
517 France. *Food Control*, 115, 107279.
518 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2020.107279>
- 519 FAO/WHO. (2006). *Food safety risk analysis: A guide for national food safety authorities*.
520 FAO & WHO, Rome.
- 521 FAO/WHO. (2009). *Risk characterization of microbiological hazards in food: guidelines*. FAO
522 & WHO, Rome.
- 523 FSA. (2018). *Raw Drinking Milk Consumer Research*. Retrieved February 2022 from
524 [https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/Raw%20Drinking%20](https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/Raw%20Drinking%20Milk%20Consumer%20Insight%20Report%202018.pdf)
525 [Milk%20Consumer%20Insight%20Report%202018.pdf](https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/Raw%20Drinking%20Milk%20Consumer%20Insight%20Report%202018.pdf)
- 526 FSSAI. (2006). *Food Safety Standards (FSS) Act, 2006* Retrieved March 2022 from
527 <https://www.fssai.gov.in/cms/food-safety-and-standards-act-2006.php>
- 528 Golden, O., Caldeira, A. J. R., & Santos, M. J. (2022). Raw fish consumption in Portugal: A
529 survey on trends in consumption and consumer characteristics. *Food Control*, 135,
530 108810. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2022.108810>
- 531 Greenacre, M., & Blasius, J. (2006). *Multiple correspondence analysis and related methods*.
532 Chapman and Hall/CRC, London.
- 533 Jaffee, S., Henson, S., Unnevehr, L., Grace, D., & Cassou, E. (2019). *The Safe Food Imperative:
534 Accelerating Progress in Low- and Middle-Income Countries*. World Bank,
535 Washington, DC.
- 536 Lê, S., Josse, J., & Husson, F. (2008). FactoMineR: an R package for multivariate analysis.
537 *Journal of Statistical Software*, 25(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v025.i01>
- 538 Mangtani, P., Berry, I., Beauvais, W., Holt, H. R., Kulashri, A., Bharti, S., Sagar, V., Nguipdop-
539 Djomo, P., Bedi, J., & Kaur, M. (2020). The prevalence and risk factors for human
540 Brucella species infection in a cross-sectional survey of a rural population in Punjab,
541 India. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine & Hygiene*, 114(4), 255-
542 263. <https://doi.org/10.1093/trstmh/trz133>.

- 543 NDDDB. (2019). *National Dairy Development Board: Milk Production by States*. Retrieved
544 December 2021 from <https://www.nddb.coop/information/stats/milkprodstate>
- 545 Newsome, R., Tran, N., Paoli, G., Jaykus, L., Tompkin, B., Miliotis, M., Ruthman, T., Hartnett,
546 E., Busta, F., & Petersen, B. (2009). Development of a risk-ranking framework to
547 evaluate potential high-threat microorganisms, toxins, and chemicals in food. *Journal*
548 *of food science*, 74(2), R39-R45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-3841.2008.01042.x>
- 549 OIE. (2010). *Handbook on import risk analysis for animals and animal products*. (2nd ed.,
550 Vol. 1). OIE, Paris.
- 551 Refaya, A. K., Bhargavi, G., Mathew, N. C., Rajendran, A., Krishnamoorthy, R., Swaminathan,
552 S., & Palaniyandi, K. (2020). A review on bovine tuberculosis in India. *Tuberculosis*,
553 122, 101923. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tube.2020.101923>
- 554 Stärk, K. D., Regula, G., Hernandez, J., Knopf, L., Fuchs, K., Morris, R. S., & Davies, P. (2006).
555 Concepts for risk-based surveillance in the field of veterinary medicine and
556 veterinary public health: review of current approaches. *BMC health services*
557 *research*, 6(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-6-20>
- 558 Sumner, J., Ross, T., Jenson, I., & Pointon, A. (2005). A risk microbiological profile of the
559 Australian red meat industry: Risk ratings of hazard–product pairings. *International*
560 *Journal of Food Microbiology*, 105(2), 221-232.
561 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2005.03.016>
- 562 Tomasevic, I., Novakovic, S., Solowiej, B., Zdolec, N., Skunca, D., Krocko, M., Nedomova, S.,
563 Kolaj, R., Aleksiev, G., & Djekic, I. (2018). Consumers' perceptions, attitudes and
564 perceived quality of game meat in ten European countries. *Meat Science*, 142, 5-13.
565 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2018.03.016>
- 566 van Asselt, E. D., van der Spiegel, M., Noordam, M. Y., Pikkemaat, M. G., & van der Fels-
567 Klerx, H. J. (2013). Risk ranking of chemical hazards in food—A case study on
568 antibiotics in the Netherlands. *Food Research International*, 54(2), 1636-1642.
569 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2013.08.042>
- 570 Van der Fels-Klerx, H. J., Van Asselt, E. D., Raley, M., Poulsen, M., Korsgaard, H., Bredsdorff,
571 L., Nauta, M., D'Agostino, M., Coles, D., Marvin, H. J. P., & Frewer, L. J. (2018). Critical
572 review of methods for risk ranking of food-related hazards, based on risks for human
573 health. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 58(2), 178-193.
574 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2016.1141165>
- 575 WHO. (2015). *WHO estimates of the global burden of foodborne diseases: foodborne disease*
576 *burden epidemiology reference group 2007-2015*. WHO, Geneva.
- 577 Xavier, C., Gonzales-Barron, U., Paula, V., Estevinho, L., & Cadavez, V. (2014). Meta-analysis
578 of the incidence of foodborne pathogens in Portuguese meats and their products.
579 *Food Research International*, 55, 311-323.
580 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodres.2013.11.024>
- 581 Zaidi, M. B., & Estrada-García, T. (2014). Shigella: a highly virulent and elusive pathogen.
582 *Current tropical medicine reports*, 1(2), 81-87. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s40475-014-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40475-014-0019-6)
583 [0019-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40475-014-0019-6).

584

585