¹**Leveraging regulatory monitoring data for quantitative microbial risk**

²**assessment of** *Legionella pneumophila* **in cooling towers**

- 3 Émile Sylvestre^{1,2*}, Dominique Charron², Xavier Lefebvre³, Emilie Bedard⁴, Michèle Prévost²
- ¹ Sanitary Engineering, Delft University of Technology, Stevinweg 1, 2628 CN, Delft, the

5 Netherlands

- ² NSERC Industrial Chair on Drinking Water, Department of Civil, Geological, and Mining
- ⁷Engineering, Polytechnique Montreal, Montreal, Quebec, H3C 3A7, Canada
- ³ Department of Mechanical Engineering, Polytechnique Montreal, Montreal, Quebec, H3C 3A7,
- ⁹Canada
- ⁴ Department of Civil, Geological, and Mining Engineering, Polytechnique Montreal, Montreal,
- 11 Quebec, H3C 3A7, Canada
- ¹²*Corresponding author: E. Sylvestre@tudelft.nl

¹⁴**Abstract**

¹⁵Cooling towers are critical engineered water systems for air conditioning and refrigeration but ¹⁶can create favorable conditions for *Legionella pneumophila* growth and aerosolization. Human ¹⁷exposure to *L. pneumophila*-contaminated aerosols can cause Legionnaire's disease. Routine 18 monitoring of *L. pneumophila* in cooling towers offers possibilities to develop quantitative 19 microbial risk assessment (QMRA) to guide system design, operation, control, and maintenance. 20 Here, we used the regulatory monitoring database from Quebec, Canada, to develop statistical ²¹models for predicting *L. pneumophila* concentration variability in cooling towers and integrate 22 these models into a screening-level QMRA to predict human health risks. Analysis of 105,463 23 monthly *L. pneumophila* test results revealed that the exceedance rate of the 10^4 colony forming 24 unit (CFU) per liter threshold was constant at 10% from 2016 to 2020, emphasizing the need to 25 better validate the efficacy of corrective measures following the threshold exceedances. Among 26 2,852 cooling towers, 51.2% reported no detections, 38.5% had up to nine positives, and 10.2% 27 over ten. The gamma or the lognormal distributions adequately described site-specific variations 28 in *L. pneumophila* concentrations, but parametric uncertainty was very high for the lognormal 29 distribution. We showed that rigorous model comparison is essential to predict peak 30 concentrations accurately. Using QMRA, we found that, to meet a health-based target of 10^{-6} ³¹DALY/pers.-year for clinical severity infections, an average *L. pneumophila* concentration below 32 1.4 \times 10⁴ CFU L⁻¹ should be maintained in cooling towers. We identified 137 cooling towers at 33 risk of exceeding this limit, primarily due to the observation or prediction of rare peak concentrations above 10^5 CFU L⁻¹. Effective mitigation of those peaks is critical to controlling 35 public health risks associated with *L. pneumophila*.

- **Keywords**: *Legionella pneumophila*, cooling towers, quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA), aerosol transmission, water treatment
- (QMRA), aerosol transmission, water treatment

⁴⁰**¹ Introduction**

⁴¹Exposure to *Legionella pneumophila* through inhalation of aerosols produced by engineered ⁴²water systems, such as cooling towers, is a common cause of Legionnaire's disease. This disease 43 can result in a severe form of pneumonia, particularly threatening individuals who are older, ⁴⁴have weakened immune systems, or suffer from chronic lung diseases (National Academies of 45 Sciences and Medicine, 2020).

⁴⁶Cooling towers, engineered water systems designed to remove excess heat from buildings by 47 cooling water, are critical for air conditioning and refrigeration but can provide ideal conditions ⁴⁸for the growth and aerosolization of *L. pneumophila*. These systems operate using evaporative 49 cooling. Warm water from cooling systems — usually between 29 and 35 \degree C, a temperature 50 range favorable for *L. pneumophila* growth — is sprayed as fine droplets onto packing or 51 honeycomb material. As ambient air is drawn into the cooling tower, either by natural or 52 mechanical ventilation, a small portion of the water evaporates, reducing its temperature but also 53 generating aerosol droplets that may carry *L. pneumophila*. While cooling towers should be 54 equipped with drift eliminators designed to minimize aerosol droplets released into the 55 atmosphere, the efficiency of these devices is not absolute (ASHRAE, 2008). The release of 56 contaminated droplets into the atmosphere can pose public health risks for neighboring 57 communities.

58 The growth of *L. pneumophila* colonies in cooling towers is influenced by various factors, such 59 as the presence of protozoa (which serve as hosts), biofilms, nutrient availability, water ⁶⁰temperature, and manufacturing materials (Kusnetsov et al., 1993; Paniagua et al., 2020; ⁶¹Türetgen and Cotuk, 2007). To minimize growth, the primary strategy involves chemical water ⁶²disinfection (Kim et al., 2002). However, predicting the presence and survival of *L. pneumophila*

84 Within the QMRA framework proposed by Hamilton et al. (2018), the health risk is directly 85 proportional to the concentrations of *L. pneumophila* in the bulk water of the cooling tower.

⁸⁶Extensive routine *L. pneumophila* monitoring data from programs designed to validate treatment 87 efficiency offer a significant opportunity to develop statistical models to investigate temporal 88 variations in these concentrations. Parametric models, such as mixed Poisson distributions, have 89 been widely used to model temporal variations in microbial concentrations in surface water ⁹⁰sources (Haas et al., 1999; Masago et al., 2004; Teunis et al., 1997). These distributions have 91 also been used in ecology to describe variations in the abundance of populations governed by an 92 environmental carrying capacity (Dennis and Patil, 1988; Dennis and Patil, 1984). Despite the ⁹³apparent potential of such models, their application to model routine monitoring *L. pneumophila* 94 data remains unexplored. Bridging this gap could facilitate the development of more transparent, 95 risk-based strategies for *L. pneumophila* risk assessment and management. 96 The objectives of our study are to i) develop candidate statistical models to predict the variability 97 and uncertainty in *L. pneumophila* concentrations obtained from routine monitoring of bulk 98 water in cooling towers, ii) establish a framework for model comparison and selection and 99 implement it for an extensive database, and iii) incorporate selected models within a screening-100 level QMRA model to predict human health risks associated with exposure to droplet aerosols 101 generated by a representative cooling tower.

¹⁰³**² Methodology**

¹⁰⁴**2.1 Database**

¹⁰⁵In Quebec, *L. pneumophila* monitoring is required by the regulation for the maintenance of

- 106 cooling towers (Gouvernement du Québec, 2014). We obtained the Quebec regulatory database,
- 107 which includes *L. pneumophila* monitoring results for 2852 cooling towers (1960 buildings) in

108 Ouebec, Canada. For each cooling tower, the database consists of results from monthly

¹⁰⁹monitoring of *L. pneumophila* concentrations in bulk water obtained yearly or on a seasonal

110 basis from 2016 to 2020. It also includes general system information, including the building

111 type, usage type, service period, and location. Specific information on water treatment (types of

112 biocides used, application frequencies, dosages, etc.) was unavailable. The regulation defines an

113 action level of 10^4 colony-forming units (CFU) L^{-1} and a human health risk level of 10^6 CFU L^{-1} .

¹¹⁴Upon exceedance of the action level, the regulation requires immediate corrective intervention.

¹¹⁵A strict decontamination procedure must be applied when the concentration of *L. pneumophila* is

116 equal to or greater than 10^6 CFU L⁻¹. Additional *L. pneumophila* results following a

¹¹⁷decontamination procedure were included in the database for some cooling towers, following

118 testing requirements. However, these results could not be differentiated from routine monitoring 119 results.

¹²⁰**2.2 Sample collection and** *L. pneumophila* **enumeration**

¹²¹Each sample was collected and stored following Standard DR-09-11 (Centre d'expertise en

122 analyse environnementale du Québec, 2022). *L. pneumophila* enumeration was performed using

- 123 culture-based methods adapted from AFNOR NF T90-431 or ISO 11731:2017, depending on the
- ¹²⁴laboratory conducting the analyses. Diluted samples were spread on glycine vancomycin
- 125 polymyxin cycloheximide agar medium (GVPC) or BMPA, with or without acid (pH 2; 5
- 126 minutes) or heat $(50 °C; 30$ minutes) pre-treatment or a combination of acid and heat. Samples

127 were then incubated at 36
$$
^{\circ}
$$
C for 8-11 days, and presumptive colonies of *Legionella* spp. were

- 128 grown with buffered charcoal yeast extract (BCYE) supplemented or not with cysteine at $36 \pm$
- 129 1.5 °C for 3-5 days. *L. pneumophila* species were identified, in most cases, by a latex
- 130 agglutination test, and all results were expressed as CFU. Results at the detection limit were
- 131 reported in CFU L^{-1} calculated as 1 CFU per volume of sample tested.

¹³²**2.3 Estimation of** *L. pneumophila* **counts from reported concentrations**

- 133 Statistical inference was not made directly from reported concentrations since treating detection
- ¹³⁴limits as actual microbial concentrations or as censored data can significantly bias statistical
- 135 analyses (Chik et al., 2018).
- ¹³⁶We developed an approximation method to estimate the colony numbers and assayed water
- 137 volumes for each reported concentration. Initially, for concentrations reported at the detection
- 138 limit, we calculated the tested volume (V_i) for each instance (i) using the formula:

$$
V_i = \frac{1}{c_{\text{LD},i}} \quad \text{for } i = 1, ..., j \tag{1}
$$

where $C_{LD,i}$ represents the detection limit and *j* is the count of these instances in the database.

- 140 Subsequently, for each detected concentration $(C_{\text{detected},m})$, we computed the corresponding
- number of colonies $(k_{i,m})$ by applying the previously determined volume (V_i) in the equation:

$$
k_{i,m} = \frac{v_i}{c_{\text{detected},i,m}} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, j \text{ and for } m = 1, \dots, n \tag{2}
$$

142 Here, *n* is the total number of distinct detected concentrations. This calculation resulted in *j* pairs $\frac{1}{2}$ of colors number and volumes, each associated with a gracific detected concentration 143 of colony numbers and volumes, each associated with a specific detected concentration.

- ¹⁴⁴To approach the statistical analysis conservatively and avoid underestimating the sampling
- 145 uncertainty, we selected the minimum integer of colonies (k_{min}) along with its corresponding
146 vectors (V). This corresponding the select contrate answer the breadest results
- 146 volume (V). This approach minimizes the colony count to ensure the broadest possible
147 confidence intervels for the evening number of colonies per semple.
- 147 confidence intervals for the average number of colonies per sample.

¹⁴⁸**2.4 Estimation of** *L. pneumophila* **concentration from counts**

- 149 A discrete random variable can characterize the distribution of organisms within a specific
- 150 volume of water. Assuming that these organisms are randomly distributed in the water sample,
- 151 the probability of finding a specific count of organisms (k) within a sample of known
152 concentration (c) and volume (V) is given by the Deisson distribution.
- 152 concentration (*c*) and volume (*V*) is given by the Poisson distribution:

$$
P(k; c, V) = \frac{cV^k}{k!} \exp(-cV)
$$
 (3)

- $\frac{1}{2}$ ibution the m ¹⁵³For a sample adhering to a Poisson distribution, the maximum likelihood estimate for the
- 154 concentration (c) is the sample arithmetic mean given by:

$$
\bar{c} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} V_i}
$$
\n⁽⁴⁾

 $\mu = 1$ 155 This estimator is only valid if organisms are distributed "randomly," i.e., the bulk solution is well 156 mixed, and organisms are not aggregated.

¹⁵⁷**2.5 Temporal stability of the** *L. pneumophila* **concentration**

¹⁵⁸When a series of samples is collected at a regular interval, obtained results may indicate that the

- 159 concentration is stable or variable over time. To assess whether the concentration of *L*.
- 160 pneumophila is stable over time in the cooling tower, we used a likelihood ratio test to evaluate
- 161 the fit of a Poisson distribution to observed data (Haas et al., 1999). The null hypothesis of the
- 162 test posits that the data set is adequately described by a single Poisson distribution with a
- 163 constant concentration, \bar{c} . The likelihood of the null hypothesis is given by:

$$
L^{0} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\bar{c} V_{i}^{k}}{k_{i}!} \exp(-\bar{c} V_{i})
$$
\n⁽⁵⁾

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 164 Conversely, the alternative hypothesis suggests that each sample has its concentration \bar{c} at the 165 time of sampling. Therefore, the likelihood for the elternative hypothesis is: 165 time of sampling. Therefore, the likelihood for the alternative hypothesis is:

$$
L^{A} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{k_i^{k_i}}{k_i!} \exp(-k_i)
$$
\n⁽⁶⁾

166 The test statistic (Λ) can be simplified to:

$$
-\ln(\Lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[(\bar{c} V_i - k_i) - k_i \ln \left(\frac{\bar{c} V_i}{k_i} \right) \right]
$$
(7)

167 The null hypothesis is rejected when the value of $-2 \ln(\Lambda)$ exceed the upper $1 - \alpha$ percentile of
168 a αv^2 distribution with $r = 1$ decrees of freedom. The decrees of freedom represent the difference 168 a χ^2 distribution with $n - 1$ degrees of freedom. The degrees of freedom represent the difference 169 in the number of parameters between the alternative hand null hypotheses. The error risk α was
170 and at 5% 170 set at 5%.

¹⁷¹**2.6 Temporal variability in** *L. pneumophila* **concentrations**

172 Distributions of microorganisms in water are often more dispersed than what a Poisson 173 distribution would predict; that is, the variance of the number of organisms exceeds the mean. ¹⁷⁴This overdispersion relative to the Poisson distribution can result from spatial or temporal 175 heterogeneities. This heterogeneity can be accounted for by a continuous random variable 176 representing the concentration of each sample. The marginal distribution of the number of 177 organisms is then obtained by the following integral:

$$
P(k; c, V, \delta) = \int_{0}^{\infty} P_p(k; cV) h(c; \delta) dc
$$
\n(8)

- 178 where h is a continuous distribution with parameters δ representing the temporal variations in
179 concentrations. General discreme left in the base of the model temporal
- 179 concentrations. Gamma and lognormal distributions have been selected to model temporal
- 180 variations. The general properties of these distributions are presented in Table 1.

181 Table 1. Density functions describing the variation of a concentration c, mean, and standard deviation for the gamma and lognormal distributions. the gamma and lognormal distributions.

183

¹⁸⁴**2.7 Bayesian inference**

185 Parameters for Poisson and mixed Poisson distributions were inferred using Bayesian models.

186 The hierarchical model structure is outlined as follows: At the first level, the observed number of

187 colonies per volume is distributed according to a Poisson distribution. At the second level,

188 concentration c is modeled as a latent variable (i.e., not directly observable) following a
189 continuous distribution (either comme or log normal for this study), making the first low

189 continuous distribution (either gamma or log-normal for this study), making the first level

190 conditional on c . The hierarchical structures for Poisson-gamma and Poisson-log-normal models
191 cro:

191 are:

Poisson gamma: $x_i|c_i, V_i \sim \text{Poisson}(c_i V_i)$, $c_i \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha, \beta)$

 P^2 . Poisson les nemets $u \mid e_i U$. Defines $(e_i, b) \mid e_i$. Les nemets • Poisson log-normal: $x_i|c_i, V_i$ \sim Poisson $1 - \frac{1}{2}$. The contract $\frac{1}{2}$ of $\frac{1}{2}$ is the contract $\frac{1}{2}$ of $\frac{1}{2}$ is the contract of $\frac{1}{2}$ of $\frac{1}{2}$

¹⁹⁴Prior distributions were chosen to ensure Markov chain stationarity while minimizing the prior

195 influence on the posterior distribution. A conjugate Gamma (α, β) prior was assigned to 1960. Consumers a with a sub- β act to 0.01. Uniform (min. mora) wisco were used to infer a sum

- 196 parameter c, with α and β set to 0.01. Uniform (min, max) priors were used to infer gamma
197 distribution permeters α and β with bounds set at 0 and 10 for α and 10^{-12} and 10^{-1} for β
- distribution parameters α and β , with bounds set at 0 and 10 for α, and 10⁻¹² and 10⁻¹ for β. A
108 for minimum parameters and all the bounds st at 0 and 10 for a sup (3) prior was
- 198 uniform (min, max) prior was selected for μ, with bounds at -10 and 10. An exp(λ) prior was

199 allocated to σ as suggested by McElreath (2018), with λ set at 0.1, assuming the logarithm of the
200 standard deviation was significantly below 50 for all cooling towers 200 standard deviation was significantly below 50 for all cooling towers.

201 Models were fitted using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulations with rjags (v4-10) in 202 R (v4.1.0). For each parameter, three Markov chains were run for 10^5 iterations following a 203 burn-in of $10³$ iterations. The Brooks-Gelman-Rubin scale reduction factor was applied to assess ²⁰⁴chain convergence, and the effective sample size (the ratio of sample size to autocorrelation in 205 Markov chains) was evaluated to ensure comprehensive exploration of the posterior distribution, 206 deemed well-estimated at an effective size over 10,000. Brooks-Gelman-Rubin reduction factors 207 and effective sample sizes were calculated using the diagMCMC function (Kruschke, 2014).

²⁰⁸**2.8 Model comparison and selection**

²⁰⁹The fit quality of Poisson and mixed Poisson distributions was compared using the deviance

210 information criterion (DIC) (Spiegelhalter et al., 2002). The DIC is computed as follows:

$$
DIC = \overline{D} - (\overline{D} - \widehat{D}) = \overline{D} + p_D
$$
\n
$$
(9)
$$

211 where D is the mean deviance across the sampled parameter values from the posterior 212 distribution and \hat{D} is a non-line term unlated to the side of use del constitution. A model is 212 distribution, and \hat{D} is a penalty term related to the risk of model overfitting. A model with a DIC at least three points lower DIC value is considered superior. Generally, a model with a DIC at least three point lower DIC value is considered superior. Generally, a model with a DIC at least three points 214 lower than that of other models is significantly better (Spiegelhalter et al., 2002). For hierarchical 215 models with a latent variable (e.g., mixed Poisson distributions), different DICs can be calculated 216 for the model's hierarchical levels. The fit of a Poisson distribution should be assessed with a 217 conditional DIC (cDIC), while that of a mixed Poisson distribution should be evaluated with a 218 marginal DIC (mDIC) (Millar, 2009). The cDIC can be directly calculated using the current 219 version of rjags in R. However, computing the mDIC is more complex as it requires integrating 220 the likelihood function of the distribution, which cannot be done directly in rjags. Thus, mDICs

- 221 for mixed Poisson distributions were computed through numerical integration following the
- 222 approach proposed by Quintero and Lesaffre (2018).
- 223 The cooling towers were classified using a decision-making algorithm identifying the best model lel
'
lk
- 224 describing *L. pneumophila* concentrations (Fig. 1). For cooling towers where the statistical
- 225 distribution of data could be validated, we computed the median value and the 95% uncertainty
- 226 interval of the average *L. pneumophila* concentration predicted by the best-fit model. The
- 227 analysis was conducted in R (version 4.3.0). The R code used for data analysis and visualization
- 228 can be found in the GitHub repository [NOTE: URL will be provided in the final paper].

Fig 1. Decision algorithm to determine the best fit model to assess *L. pneumophila* concentrations in bulk water from a cooling tower. water from a cooling tower.

²³²**2.9 Screening-level quantitative microbial risk assessment**

- ²³³To determine the dose of *L. pneumophila* that can deposit in the respiratory tract of the exposed
- 234 subject, it is necessary to develop and integrate a series of sub-models that account for various
- ²³⁵stages of the process. These stages include the emission of contaminated droplets by the cooling
- 236 tower, the transport and atmospheric dispersion of the droplets, the inactivation of *L*.

²³⁷*pneumophila* during atmospheric transport, and its inhalation and deposition in the human 238 respiratory tract (Table S1). For our screening-level QMRA, a hypothetical cooling tower was 239 considered, characterized by an effective head of 10 m and an average recirculation flow rate of 240 10^3 L s⁻¹. The analysis also assumes that a drift eliminator reduces evaporative water loss to 241 0.003% of the recirculation flow rate (ASHRAE, 2008).

²⁴²**2.9.1 Emission, fate, and transport of aerosol droplets discharged by the cooling tower**

243 We focused our analysis only on aerosol droplets with diameters $\leq 150 \mu$ m, as they quickly 244 evaporate once airborne and can be transported over long distances. To estimate the mass-245 weighted fraction of these aerosols, we applied the lognormal distribution of aerosol mass 246 modelled by Peterson and Lighthart (1977) from measurements obtained at the cooling tower 247 outlet by Shofner and Thomas (1971). For the specific fractions of *L. pneumophila* bacteria transferred from water to aerosols with a diameter of $1\n-10 \mu$ m, we relied on estimates from
249 Hamilton at al. (2018) oxtracted from the ampirical aumulative distribution function obtains 249 Hamilton et al. (2018) extracted from the empirical cumulative distribution function obtained by 250 Allegra et al. (2016). These fractions are conservative for QMRA, given that the enumeration of ²⁵¹*L. pneumophila* bacteria for each droplet diameter was determined using a qPCR method, which 252 measures both viable and dead cells.

²⁵³We employed a Gaussian model to model the transport and dispersion of these aerosols. Based 254 on results obtained at 66 meteorological stations in Quebec by Ilinca et al. (2003), we considered 255 an arithmetic mean annual wind speed of 4.5 m s^{-1} . For environmental conditions, the Gaussian 256 model predicts that the highest concentration of the pollutant emitted at an effective height of 10 257 m would be observed at a distance of 110 m from the point of emission.

²⁵⁸Droplets were considered as evaporated immediately upon emission from the cooling tower. To 259 evaluate the survival of *L. pneumophila* within these evaporated aerosol droplets, we used a first-

260 order two-phase inactivation model developed from the data of Katz and Hammel (1987). This 261 model predicts a high inactivation rate in the first 30 seconds $(\lambda_{E1} = 0.12 \text{ s}^{-1})$, which then
262 decreases $(1 - 7)(10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1})$. Inactivation rates for a guarantee area also are arrested to be very decreases $(\lambda_{E2} = 7 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1})$. Inactivation rates for aqueous aerosols are expected to be very low
262. (a) $1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$ compared to the rates for expected agreeals (first phase) (Hamilton at al. $(\lambda_A \sim 1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1})$ compared to the rates for evaporated aerosols (first phase) (Hamilton et al.,
264 2018) ²⁶⁴2018).

²⁶⁵*2.9.2* **Inhalation, deposition of aerosols, and health effects**

266 We used deposition efficiencies for aerosols with diameters ranging from 1 to10 μ m obtained by
267 Hovder et al. (1086) for an aral inhelation rate of 15 L sir min⁻¹ a requirementary avale duration of 8 267 Heyder et al. (1986) for an oral inhalation rate of 15 L air min⁻¹, a respiratory cycle duration of 8 268 s, and an average respiratory volume of 1 L. Our model assumed an exposure duration of one 269 hour per day at a frequency of 365 days per year, as proposed by Hamilton et al. (2018) to assess 270 the risks associated with residential exposure. The dose–response models developed by
271 Armstrong and Haas (2007) based on animal data from Muller at al. (1983) and Fitzgeor 271 Armstrong and Haas (2007) based on animal data from Muller et al. (1983) and Fitzgeorge et al. ²⁷²(1983) were used to predict infection with subclinical severity and infection with clinical 273 severity. Clinical severity was defined as an infection requiring medical attention or seeking 274 health services. The health impact of a clinically severe infection was assessed using the 275 disability-adjusted life years (DALY) factor calculated by van Lier et al. (2016) based on 276 surveillance data for Legionnaires' disease in the Netherlands (Dijkstra et al., 2010; Dijkstra et ²⁷⁷al., 2008).

²⁷⁸*2.9.3* **Risk characterization**

279 The health outcome target corresponds to the tolerable risk associated with exposure to *L*. ²⁸⁰*pneumophila* in contaminated aerosols a cooling tower produces. Infection risks and DALYs 281 specific to each cooling tower in the database were assessed based on the arithmetic mean ²⁸²concentration of *L. pneumophila* in the water, estimated by parametric modeling. Risk estimates

²⁸⁶**³ Results**

- ²⁸⁷The database aggregated 105,463 monitoring results documenting *L. pneumophila*
- 288 concentrations in 2,852 cooling towers from 1,960 buildings in Quebec, Canada. Empirical
- 289 complementary cumulative distribution functions (CCDFs) of monitoring results grouped by
- 290 year offer insights into exceedances of *L. pneumophila* concentration thresholds (Fig. 2). The $10⁴$
- 291 CFU L⁻¹ threshold has a steady exceedance probability of 10% over the 2016-2020 period. The
- 292 exceedance probability of the 10^6 CFU L⁻¹ threshold also remains constant at around 0.5% for
- 293 the whole period. Notably, the 10^7 CFU L⁻¹ threshold is exceeded more often in 2018 than in the 294 other years.
- 295 The 5-year arithmetic mean concentration and the maximum concentration for each cooling
- 296 tower were computed to assess their relationship. The log-log relationship between the maximum
- 297 and the arithmetic mean concentrations demonstrates that peak concentrations can substantially
- 298 impact the 5-year arithmetic mean (Fig. 3). The arithmetic mean is typically about 1.0 log lower

299 than the sample maximum.

- ³⁰¹**Fig. 2**. Empirical complementary cumulative distribution function of *L. pneumophila* concentrations in
- 302 bulk water from 2852 cooling towers in Quebec, Canada, from 2016 to 2020. The dotted and solid lines indicate concentrations of 10^4 and 10^6 CFU L⁻¹, respectively. 303 indicate concentrations of 10^4 and 10^6 CFU L⁻¹, respectively.

Arithmetic mean concentration (CFU/L)

Fig. 3. Relationship between the sample arithmetic mean concentration and the maximum concentration of *L. pneumophila* in bulk water from 2852 cooling towers in Quebec, Canada.

305 For 1461 cooling towers (about half of the total), all monitoring results are non-detects (Table 2). 306 For 1,099 cooling towers, 1 to 9 positive results are obtained. Results from the Poisson test 307 reveal that *L. pneumophila* concentrations are statistically stable for roughly 50% of these 308 cooling towers, equivalent to around 20% of the total. For the remaining 50%, the limited 309 number of positive results hinders accurate parameter estimation of the Poisson Gamma and 310 Poisson lognormal distributions. Temporal variations could be assessed for the 292 cooling 311 towers where the positive results count is ten or more (about 10% of the total). Within this 312 subset, the marginal deviance information criterion (mDIC) suggests the Poisson distribution as 313 the most suitable model for ten cooling towers, indicating stable concentrations despite 314 consistent positive findings. For the remaining 282 cooling towers, the mDIC can discriminate 315 between the Poisson gamma and Poisson lognormal for 145 cooling towers, often favoring the 316 Poisson lognormal. For the remainder, the mDIC indicates a similar quality of fits. 317 When results are Poisson distributed, arithmetic mean concentrations are consistently below $10⁴$ 318 CFU L^{-1} (Table 3). Predictions from the Poisson gamma generally indicate arithmetic mean 319 concentrations below 10^5 CFU L⁻¹. Arithmetic mean concentrations surpass 10^6 CFU L⁻¹ in 30 of 320 the 90 cooling towers with optimal Poisson lognormal fits. This discrepancy underscores the ³²¹significant impact of distribution selection on average concentration estimates. Moreover, the 322 span of the 95% uncertainty interval of the arithmetic mean predicted by the Poisson lognormal 323 generally extends 1.0- to 2.0-log more than that of the Poisson gamma (Table S2, Figure 4). The ³²⁴CCDFs show that the predictions of the lognormal distribution can extrapolate beyond the 325 maximum observation, unlike the gamma distribution. The uncertainty interval of the CCDF 326 remains stable for the gamma distribution but not for the lognormal distribution, expanding as ³²⁷exceedance probabilities diminish. For certain cooling towers, like Cooling tower D, the CCDF

328 exhibits distinct tail behaviors at exceedance probabilities below 1% (Figure 4). In such cases,

329 the limited data size fails to adequately capture the upper tail's behavior, explaining the often-

330 similar mDICs for Poisson gamma and Poisson lognormal fits.

Table 2. Classification of cooling towers based on the decision algorithm to determine the best-fit model
332 to assess *L. pneumophila* concentrations in bulk water, as shown in Fig. 1. Models are the Poisson

332 to assess *L. pneumophila* concentrations in bulk water, as shown in Fig. 1. Models are the Poisson distribution (Pois.), the Poisson gamma distribution (PGA), and the Poisson lognormal distribution

333 distribution (Pois.), the Poisson gamma distribution (PGA), and the Poisson lognormal distribution (PLN).

 (PLN) .

⁴ Discrimination between the fit of the PGA and PLN is not possible because the difference in DIC between the two
336 models is less than three points 336 models is less than three points.

337
338

³³⁸**Table 3.** Classification of 844 cooling towers based on their arithmetic mean *L. pneumophila* 339 concentration in bulk water. The average concentration was predicted using the best-fit model determined
340 using the decision algorithm shown in Fig. 1. The models are the Poisson distribution, the Poisson gamma

340 using the decision algorithm shown in Fig. 1. The models are the Poisson distribution, the Poisson gamma
341 distribution (PGA), and the Poisson lognormal distribution (PLN).

distribution (PGA), and the Poisson lognormal distribution (PLN).

⁴ Discrimination between the fit of the PGA and PLN is not possible because the difference in DIC between the two
343 models is less than three points

343 models is less than three points.

Fig. 4. Complementary cumulative distribution function of the Poisson-gamma (PGA) and Poisson
346 Iognormal (PLN) distributions fitted to *L. pneumophila* data from four cooling towers from the Que

346 lognormal (PLN) distributions fitted to *L. pneumophila* data from four cooling towers from the Quebec database. The dark blue and red lines represent the best fits of the gamma and lognormal distributions,

347 database. The dark blue and red lines represent the best fits of the gamma and lognormal distributions,
348 respectively. The blue and red areas represent the 95% uncertainty intervals of the gamma and lognorm

348 respectively. The blue and red areas represent the 95% uncertainty intervals of the gamma and lognormal
349 distributions, respectively. The values of the marginal deviance information criterion (mDIC) and the

349 distributions, respectively. The values of the marginal deviance information criterion (mDIC) and the arithmetic mean concentration (with 95% uncertainty interval) in the bulk water of the cooling tower

350 arithmetic mean concentration (with 95% uncertainty interval) in the bulk water of the cooling tower
351 (CFU/L) predicted by each model are listed. mDICs in bold indicate the best-fit models. ³⁵¹(CFU/L) predicted by each model are listed. mDICs in bold indicate the best-fit models.

Table 4. Critical arithmetic mean *L. pneumophila* dose deposited at the alveoli and critical arithmetic 371 mean *L. pneumophila* concentration in water of the cooling water to achieve three different annual
372 health-based targets. Parameter values of the OMRA model used to calculate the doses and 372 health-based targets. Parameter values of the QMRA model used to calculate the doses and concentrations are presented in Table S1. concentrations are presented in Table S1.

Table 5. Classification of 844 cooling towers (CTs) based on their arithmetic mean infection risk and their upper uncertainty bound (97.5%) of the arithmetic mean infection risk. Risks have been calculated using a screen 376 the arithmetic mean infection risk. Risks have been calculated using a screening-level quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA). Risks are compared to three different annual health-based targets. Models are the Po 377 are compared to three different annual health-based targets. Models are the Poisson distribution, the Poisson gamma distribution (PGA), and the Poisson lognormal distribution (PLN).

the Poisson lognormal distribution (PLN).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.or/g/10.112024.05.19.24307585; this version posted May 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint
(which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRx The copyright holder for this preprint this version posted May 20, 2024. [;](https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.19.24307585) <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.19.24307585> doi: medRxiv preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

³⁸⁰**⁴ Discussion**

³⁸¹**4.1 Evolution of** *L. pneumophila* **concentration exceedance rates in Quebec**

382 In Quebec, the period from July 2014 to June 2017 saw a documented decrease in

- 383 exceedance rates of 10^4 CFU L⁻¹ for approximately 300 cooling towers (Racine et al.,
- 384 2019), coinciding with the introduction of the new regulation (Gouvernement du Québec,

³⁸⁵2014). The average annual exceedance rate decreased from 15% in 2014-2015 to 9% in

³⁸⁶2016-2017. For the 2016-2020 period, our results indicate similar exceedance rates of

387 about 10% for concentrations of 10^4 CFU L⁻¹ for the combined results of the 2852 cooling

388 towers included in the database. The exceedance rates for concentrations of 10^5 CFU L⁻¹

389 and 10^6 CFU L⁻¹ also remained stable during this period, except for a notable increase in

the exceedance rate of 10^7 CFU L⁻¹ in 2018. This increase may have been influenced by

391 the extreme heat waves of summer 2018, potentially leading to increased cooling tower

³⁹²usage and operating conditions favorable to *L. pneumophila* growth. That summer was

393 recorded as the hottest in 146 years of meteorological observations in southern Quebec

³⁹⁴(Lebel et al., 2019). Analyzing risk factors, such as air temperature, humidity level, and

395 precipitation, could provide insights into the conditions that resulted in these extreme

396 concentrations. Overall, the introduction of Quebec's regulation appears to have initially

397 reduced the high concentrations of *L. pneumophila* in Quebec's cooling towers but did

398 not reduce the exceedance rates of 10^4 CFU L⁻¹ to the lower values of around 1% found in

399 the Canadian federal cooling tower databases (data not shown). Gathering specific

400 information on the water treatment strategies used in these cooling towers, including the

401 types of biocides, application frequencies, and dosages, could shed light on the causes of

402 the differences observed between these datasets.

⁴⁰³**4.2 Variations in** *L. pneumophila* **concentrations in cooling towers over five years** ⁴⁰⁴To assess temporal variations in *L. pneumophila* concentrations in cooling towers, three 405 discrete parametric distributions — Poisson, Poisson gamma, and Poisson lognormal — 406 were proposed. We chose these discrete distributions to avoid replacing non-detects with ⁴⁰⁷a specific concentration (e.g., one organism per analyzed volume). Instead, we treated the ⁴⁰⁸sample concentration as a random variable that can be estimated using a Poisson 409 distribution. This approach requires knowledge of the number of CFUs and the water 410 volume analyzed per sample. However, laboratories do not typically report this critical ⁴¹¹information. We introduced a method to estimate the number of CFUs and the analyzed 412 volume of each sample from reported concentrations, although the potential bias in these 413 estimates could not be assessed. A direct comparison between the fit of these 414 distributions to actual and estimated results would provide insights into the limitations of 415 our approach. Ideally, laboratories should report raw data (i.e., the number of CFUs and 416 the analyzed volume) to facilitate modelling of temporal variations for risk assessment. ⁴¹⁷We developed an algorithm to identify the best modelling approach based on monitoring ⁴¹⁸results. Using a goodness-of-fit test for the Poisson distribution, we determined whether 419 the concentration was statistically stable or variable in cooling towers when at least one 420 positive result was recorded. The distribution of microorganisms in water typically ⁴²¹exhibits more dispersion than the Poisson distribution predicts, meaning that the variance 422 of organism counts exceeds their average number. Our analysis attributed overdispersion ⁴²³relative to the Poisson distribution solely to temporal variations in concentrations. Yet, 424 other heterogeneity sources — such as organism aggregation in samples or variable 425 recovery rates from enumeration methods — can also contribute to overdispersion (Haas

426 and Heller, 1986). Although these other heterogeneity sources have not been analyzed for ⁴²⁷*L. pneumophila*, they are well-documented for other bacteria (El-Shaarawi et al., 1981; ⁴²⁸Haas and Heller, 1986; Pipes et al., 1977). Examining subsamples from individual water 429 samples from cooling towers could elucidate the impact of *L. pneumophila* aggregation 430 on concentration variation.

431 Gamma et lognormal distributions were chosen as mixture distributions to characterize 432 temporal variations in *L. pneumophila* concentrations. The theoretical foundation for 433 selecting these distributions lies in their ability to approximate random variations in 434 population size, constrained by an environmental carrying capacity. The gamma 435 distribution can be derived from population growth following the logistic function 436 (Dennis and Patil, 1984), while the lognormal distribution emerges from the Gompertz 437 function (Dennis and Patil, 1988). Both logistic and Gompertz models yield sigmoid 438 functions representing population growth in three stages: initial slow growth, followed by 439 optimal growth, which eventually slows down as the population approaches its carrying 440 capacity. However, the Gompertz curve tapers off more gradually than the logistic curve. ⁴⁴¹Thus, the lognormal distribution may indicate that *L. pneumophila* has not reached its 442 carrying capacity, whereas the gamma distribution suggests that the carrying capacity has 443 been reached. This carrying capacity might be affected by operational factors, including 444 water treatment practices and the efficacy of interventions following regulatory threshold 445 exceedances. Our analysis reveals that neither the gamma nor the lognormal distribution ⁴⁴⁶consistently outperforms the other in predicting variations. Identifying the most accurate ⁴⁴⁷model was not possible for many cooling towers, likely due to limited sample sizes.

⁴⁴⁸When discrimination between the gamma and lognormal is not feasible, we recommend 449 selecting the lognormal to conservatively predict peak concentrations.

⁴⁵⁰**4.3 Challenges in monitoring** *L. pneumophila* **concentrations in cooling towers** 451 Using static parametric distributions for modelling *L. pneumophila* concentrations 452 assumes the stochastic process is stationary (i.e., the process's structure is constant over 453 time) and ergodic (i.e., the sample size is sufficiently large to reflect the process's 454 structure). However, fulfilling these conditions in cooling towers presents challenges. A ⁴⁵⁵shift in the average concentration due to changes in water treatment may render the 456 process non-stationary, potentially requiring different analyses for pre- and post-457 intervention data. Additionally, our findings reveal that monthly monitoring over five 458 years may not adequately represent the process. This is evidenced by the considerable ⁴⁵⁹parametric uncertainty in the *L. pneumophila* concentration distribution of some cooling 460 towers. This result highlights the importance of accounting for short-term variations to ⁴⁶¹predict public health risks. The causes of these fluctuations, such as *L. pneumophila* ⁴⁶²growth events or biofilm detachment, remain uncertain, limiting precise 463 recommendations for monitoring. Nevertheless, our analysis suggests that the monitoring ⁴⁶⁴guidelines and regulations require revision for the risk management of high-risk cooling 465 towers (e.g., those exceeding the 10^4 CFU L⁻¹ threshold). A more frequent monitoring 466 interval, potentially bi-weekly or weekly, notably during periods of higher risk like 467 warmer months, could be key to managing public health risks associated with these 468 cooling towers.

4.4 Advancing QMRA for systems with high variability

489 statistically valid, ensuring concentrations consistently remain below the set threshold 490 with a defined confidence level. This approach demands detailed statistical analyses to

491 determine the necessary monitoring frequency to capture *Legionella* growth, bloom, and

⁵⁰¹**4.5 Proactive strategies to reduce** *L. pneumophila* **exceedance thresholds**

502 Under Quebec's regulations, exceeding the 10^4 CFU L⁻¹ threshold requires identifying the 503 causes of the increase, implementing corrective measures, and assessing the efficacy of 504 these measures. However, the effectiveness of these interventions appears limited, given 505 the recurring exceedances of the 10^4 CFU L⁻¹ and 10^6 CFU L⁻¹ thresholds since 2016. To 506 address this issue, adopting high-frequency *L. pneumophila* monitoring following 507 exceedances could enable early detection of peak concentrations, allowing for a better 508 evaluation of the corrective measures. The implementation of comprehensive water 509 management plans could shift focus from reactive to preventive measures, potentially 510 reducing costs and resources associated with frequent monitoring following threshold 511 exceedances.

⁵ Conclusions

⁶ Acknowledgments

⁵⁶¹**⁷ References**

- 696 World Health Organization (WHO) 2008 Guidelines for drinking water-quality. Third
697 Edition incorporating the First and Second addenda Edition (Volume 1).
- 697 Edition incorporating the First and Second addenda Edition (Volume 1).
698 Recommendations, p. 668, Geneva, Switzerland.
- 698 Recommendations, p. 668, Geneva, Switzerland.
699 World Health Organization (WHO) (2011) Water safety
- World Health Organization (WHO) (2011) Water safety in buildings.