

A One Health Investigation into H5N1 Avian Influenza Virus

Epizootics on Two Dairy Farms

Ismaila Shittu, PhD^{1†}, Diego Silva, MD^{1†}, Judith U. Oguzie, DVM¹, Lyudmyla V. Marushchak, PhD¹, Gene G. Olinger, PhD², John A. Lednicky, PhD³⁻⁴, Claudia M. Trujillo-Vargas, PhD¹, Nicholas E. Schneider, DVM⁵, Haiping Hao, PhD⁶ and Gregory C. Gray, MD^{1,7-9}

¹ Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, University of Texas Medical Branch; Galveston, TX, 77555, USA

² Galveston National Laboratory, University of Texas Medical Branch; Galveston, TX, 77555, USA

³ Department of Environmental and Global Health, College of Public Health and Health Professions, University of Florida; Gainesville, FL 32610, USA.

⁴ Emerging Pathogens Institute, University of Florida; Gainesville, FL 32610, USA

⁵ Schneider Veterinary Services. Milliken, CO.

⁶ Nextgen Sequencing Core, University of Texas Medical Branch; Galveston, TX, 77555, USA.

⁷ Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX, USA.

⁸ Institute for Human Infections and Immunity, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX, USA.

⁹ Department of Global Health, School of Public and Population Health, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX, USA.

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

25 Corresponding author:

26 Gregory C. Gray, MD, MPH, FIDSA

27 Professor in Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Departments of Internal Medicine (Infectious

28 Diseases), Microbiology and Immunology, and Global Health

29 University of Texas Medical Branch

30 301 University Boulevard, Route 0435

31 Galveston, Texas 77555

32 gcgray@utmb.edu

33 Phone: (409) 772-0633

34

35 **Abstract**

36 **Background:** In early April 2024 we studied two Texas dairy farms which had suffered
37 incursions of H5N1 highly pathogenic avian influenza virus (HPAIV) the previous month.

38 **Methods:** We employed molecular assays, cell and egg culture, Sanger and next generation
39 sequencing to isolate and characterize viruses from multiple farm specimens (cow nasal swab,
40 milk specimens, fecal slurry, and a dead bird).

41 **Results:** We detected H5N1 HPAIV in 64% (9/14) of milk specimens, 2.6% (1/39) of cattle nasal
42 swab specimens, and none of 17 cattle worker nasopharyngeal swab specimens. We cultured and
43 characterized virus from eight H5N1-positive specimens. Sanger and next-generation sequencing
44 revealed the viruses were closely related into other recent Texas epizootic H5N1 strains of clade
45 2.3.4.4b. Our isolates had multiple mutations associated with increased spillover potential.

46 Surprisingly, we detected SARS-CoV-2 in a nasal swab from a sick cow. Additionally, 14.3%
47 (2/14) of the farm workers who donated sera were recently symptomatic and had elevated
48 neutralizing antibodies against a related H5N1 strain.

49 **Conclusions:** While our sampling was limited, these data offer additional insight into the large
50 H5N1 HPAIV epizootic which thus far has impacted at least 96 cattle farms in twelve US states.
51 Due to fears that research might damage dairy businesses, studies like this one have been few.
52 We need to find ways to work with dairy farms in collecting more comprehensive
53 epidemiological data that are necessary for the design of future interventions against H5N1
54 HPAIV on cattle farms.

55

56 Highly pathogenic avian influenza A (HPAIV) subtype (H5N1) viruses continue to diversify
57 genetically and have caused millions of wild bird and poultry deaths across multiple
58 continents^{1,2}. Most recently, HPAIV H5N1 strains have infected numerous animal species
59 including bears, bobcats, coyotes, foxes, goats, racoons, sea lions, skunks, and most recently,
60 cattle^{3,4}. Particularly prevalent in these spillovers event have been HPAIV H5N1 HA clade
61 2.3.3.4b^{5,6}.

62 On the 25th of March 2024⁷, the USDA confirmed an outbreak of HPAIV H5N1 in a dairy
63 farm in Texas. As we write this draft (July 25, 2024) the USDA's farm count is currently at 172
64 cattle farms⁸ in 13 states. Four dairy farm and nine poultry farm workers are thought to have
65 been recently infected from these viral strains. While influenza A viruses have been previously
66 detected in cattle⁹, this is the first instance of such widespread infections spreading rapidly across
67 multiple different geographical areas. Upon invitation we used a previously approved One Health
68 research protocol to study two Texas dairy farms for novel respiratory viruses.

69

70 **Methods**

71 **Study Sites and Sampling Protocol.**

72 Knowing that we had a research proposal to study livestock farms for evidence of novel
73 respiratory viruses, we were invited by farm owners to study two dairy farms in Texas as they
74 were recovering from incursions of avian influenza A H5N1 virus in their cattle. The identity and
75 locations of two dairy farms (Farm A and B) are protected through nondisclosure agreements.

76 Our protocol was approved by the University of Texas Medical Branch's (UTMB)
77 Institutional Review Board (23-0085). UTMB's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
78 (IACUC) viewed this study as exempt from formal IACUC ethical review. Our One Health study

79 called for studying livestock farms in United States and Mexico for novel respiratory viruses.¹⁰⁻¹²
80 We planned to prospectively sample sick and healthy farm livestock, the farm environments, and
81 a cohort of healthy animal workers for evidence of novel coronaviruses and other respiratory
82 viruses. At enrollment and every four months for a total of 12 months, we planned to collect
83 questionnaire data about each farm and its animal workers, and an array of samples: 20 nasal
84 swabs from livestock (up to 70% from animals with signs of respiratory illness), NP swabs and
85 sera from up to 10 animal workers, and 4 three-hour bioaerosol samples. In between the four
86 planned farm visits, farm employees would use postage-paid sample kits to collect and ship nasal
87 swabs from livestock with signs of respiratory illness.

88 We employed classical techniques in field sample preparation and preservation. More
89 detailed information can be found in the appendix.

90

91 **Human Samples**

92 Prior to sampling, farm workers of at least 18 years in age were invited to participate in the
93 study through informed consent. Each worker was given a questionnaire to gather demographic
94 and other relevant information related to routine daily activities on the farm. Up to 10 farm
95 workers per farm were asked to permit a serum and a nasopharyngeal (NP) swabs collection.

96

97 **Animals Samples**

98 Farm staff identified as many as 14 sick cattle and 6 healthy cattle at each farm and collected
99 a deep nasal swab sample from each animal. Data regarding the cattle were captured on a
100 sampling form. Additionally, at Farm B we were invited to collect milk samples from a group of

101 previously ill cattle, and orotracheal and cloacal swab samples from the dead grackle found that
102 morning in a cattle barn.

103

104 **Environmental Samples**

105 We used bioaerosol cyclone samplers to study the farms for evidence of novel viruses. We
106 studied areas such as milking parlors, areas where cows queued up to be milked, and hospital
107 pens. In addition, a manager on Farm B collected a fecal slurry sample and asked us to examine
108 it for novel viruses.

109

110 **Laboratory Analyses**

111 We employed classical laboratory techniques for RNA extraction, cell culture, embryonated
112 egg culture, microneutralization (MN). Detailed descriptions of these methods can be found in
113 the Appendix.

114

115 *Molecular Analysis*

116 Extracted RNA specimens were screened with RT-qPCR for the influenza A virus (matrix
117 gene) and for H5 influenza virus using WHO-recommended assays¹³. We also studied specimens
118 by a conventional RT-PCR for coronaviruses^{10,14}. Specimens with evidence of influenza A virus
119 RNA were further characterized using conventional RT-PCR for the HA cleavage site according
120 to Slomka *et. al*, 2007¹⁵. The 300-bp amplicons were visualized on a 1% agarose gel by
121 electrophoresis. Amplicons of the size expected for the HA cleavage site protocol were sent for
122 Sanger sequencing.

123

124 *Next Generation Sequencing and Phylogenetic Analysis*

125 RNA-seq library for samples selected for NGS was prepared using NEBNext Ultra II
126 RNA Library Prep kit for Illumina (New England Biolabs, Ipswich, MA) following the
127 manufacturer's recommended procedure. The libraries were sequenced on the Illumina NextSeq
128 550 platform (Illumina Inc., San Diego, CA) for paired end 75 bp sequencing. Raw sequence
129 reads were analyzed on the openly available CZ ID platform at (<https://czid.org/>)¹⁶, where host
130 backgrounds were depleted, and taxon classification identified hits for influenza A viruses and
131 reference-based consensus genomes were generated. The reads were also de novo assembled
132 using SPADEs¹⁷ and abyss v2.3.7¹⁸ and contigs were blasted using NCBI blast against a custom
133 made virus protein database and using NCBI blastn against NCBI nt database. Furthermore,
134 reference-based reads assembly was carried out via Bowtie v1.1.2¹⁹. Multiple sequencing
135 alignment of nucleotides was done using MAFFT²⁰. IQ-tree v1.6.12²⁰ was used to construct a
136 maximum likelihood tree.

137

138 *Microneutralization Assays (MN)*

139 To determine if the farm workers had been exposed to the influenza A (H5N1) virus, we
140 measured the neutralizing antibody to a recombinant H5N1 (rg-A/bald eagle/Florida/W22-134-
141 OP/2022 of clade 2.3.4.4b) kindly provided by Dr Richard Webby of St. Jude Children Hospital,
142 Memphis, TN using MN.

143

144

145 **Results**

146 **Farm Information**

147 We visited Farm A on April 3rd and Farm B on April 4th, 2024. While we previously studied
148 specimens from Farm A²¹, this was our first visit to the farm site. Farm A had 7,200 dairy cattle,
149 was located on 4,900 acres of land, and employed 180 cattle workers. Farm B had 8,200 dairy
150 cattle, was located on 98 acres of land, and employed 45 cattle workers. Farm A was solely
151 engaged in dairy farming. Farm B raised both dairy and beef cattle, but dairy and beef cattle
152 were kept in separate areas. No other livestock were raised on these farms. Additional
153 information can be found in the appendix.

154 During the 30 days prior to our visit, both farms reported that their livestock had shown or
155 were currently showing signs of respiratory disease including coughing, nasal discharges,
156 difficulty breathing and fever. In addition, farm B reported receiving new stocks of animals each
157 week but was unaware of any cattle illnesses reported from the sending farm. As recorded in our
158 earlier report²¹ Farm A first noticed illnesses among cattle on March 6th. An estimate 4.75% of
159 the herd was affected with illnesses largely waned by April 1st. Farm B first noted dairy cattle
160 illnesses on March 20th with the illnesses increasing over the next 13 days, eventually affecting
161 an estimated 14% of the milking herd. On March 22, illnesses were first noted in the Farm B's
162 feral cats with cats showing lethargy, paralysis, and increased respiratory rate. Farm B estimated
163 that 15-20 of their ~40 feral cats died during the next 14 days (**Video**). Farm B thought they
164 might have observed signs of illness in a beef cow which had recently calved during their dairy
165 cattle epizootic but discounted same when a molecular test of the cow's sera was negative for
166 influenza A RNA. As measured by milk production the epizootic quickly abated and Farm B
167 stopped segregating sick cows on April 6th.

168

169 **Farm Worker Demographics**

170 By our previously IRB-approved protocol we were permitted to enroll up to 10 animal
171 workers on each farm. In total, we enrolled via informed consent 17 farm workers (10 on Farm A
172 and 7 on Farm B). Twelve farm workers were male (70.6%, **Table 1**). In Farm A, a 100%
173 permitted both nasopharyngeal (NP) swab and serum collection. On farm B, all permitted NP
174 swab collections but only 4 agreed to serum collection. A majority of the farm workers (88.2%)
175 were of Latino ethnicity (**Table 1**). Five (29.4%) of the 17 farm workers reported having
176 experienced recent respiratory illnesses and using different medications including antibiotics,
177 ibuprofen, multivitamin, and cough syrup in the last 30 days (**Table 1**).

178

179 **Laboratory Studies**

180 *Human Samples*

181 All 17 NP swabs collected from farm workers were negative by molecular assays for
182 influenza A viruses and coronaviruses. Microneutralization assays (MN) conducted on the
183 fourteen farm workers' sera samples indicated a prevalence of 14.3% (2/14) of neutralizing
184 antibodies to a recombinant influenza A H5N1 virus. All the MN positive samples (20%, 2/10)
185 were from Farm A (**Table 2**).

186

187 *Animal Samples*

188 In all, 39 deep nasal swabs were collected from cattle on the farms. Among these only nasal
189 swab specimen (USL_042 collected from Farm B) had molecular evidence of influenza A virus
190 by the RT-qPCR assay (**Table 3**). This specimen was obtained from a recuperating cow and had a

191 relatively high Ct value of 38.76. The virus was successfully isolated and propagated in
192 embryonated eggs (but not in MDCK or MDBK cells). It was characterized as HPAIV H5N1. In
193 addition, multiple other specimens collected at Farm B were positive by RT-qPCR for influenza
194 A virus and successfully grown in embryonated eggs or two different cell lines (**Table 3**). These
195 included 9 (64%) of 14 milk samples (Ct value from 22.26 to 29.88). Most had molecular
196 evidence of HPAIV H5N1 virus. In addition, one cattle swab specimen (USL_022) had evidence
197 of a coronavirus by conventional RT-PCR having bands of correct molecular weight. Sanger
198 sequencing revealed the cow had evidence of SAR-CoV-2 infection.

199 Oropharyngeal and cloacal swab specimens were obtained from a dead female great-tailed
200 grackle (*Quiscalus mexicanus*) (**Fig. 1**) found in an open-air dairy cattle barn. Both swabs had
201 molecular evidence of influenza A virus (matrix gene) and that were characterized as HPAIV
202 H5N1 (**Table 3**).

203

204 *Environmental Samples*

205 Due to the TE-BC251 NIOSH bioaerosol cyclone samplers (Tisch Environmental Inc.,
206 Cleves, OH) having three collection chambers, the four bioaerosol samplers we employed on
207 each farm yielded 12 samples each. None of these 24 samples had molecular evidence of
208 influenza A virus or coronaviruses. A single cattle fecal slurry sample was collected on Farm B
209 and it had molecular evidence of influenza A virus by qRT-PCR with a high Ct value (38.89)
210 (**Table 3**).

211

212

213

214 **Sanger Sequencing of Influenza A HA cleavage site.**

215 In studying the specimens with evidence of influenza A virus, conventional RT-PCR studies
216 of HA and NA genes yielded good quality Sanger sequencing results from the dead bird's oral-
217 tracheal swab sample and from six milk samples (all from Farm B). For phylogenetic analysis,
218 we used sequences from these seven samples. The phylogenetic analyses showed all seven
219 sequences were within the same clusters implying they were closely related and from the same
220 location. Furthermore, our sequences were in the same HA clade as those of other Texas
221 sequences deposited in GenBank that were obtained during the current epizootic. Sanger
222 sequencing results for the six milk (and the dead bird) samples demonstrated the presence of
223 multiple basic amino acids (PLREKRRKRGLF) at the HA cleavage site indicating that bovine
224 strains were highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) H5N1 viruses belonging to clade 2.3.4.4b.
225 **(Fig. S1 in Appendix)**

226

227 **Next Generation Sequencing Results**

228 We submitted five samples for NGS: the cattle nasal swab with molecular evidence of
229 SARS-CoV-2, one cow nasal swab specimen, two milk specimens, and the oral-tracheal swab
230 specimen from the dead grackle. The cattle nasal swab specimens with SARS-Cov-2 did not
231 pass library prep quality control. Maximum likelihood phylogenetic analysis of HA (**Fig. 2**) and
232 NA genes (**Fig. 3**) from the other four specimens revealed that their genomes clustered with
233 H5N1 influenza A virus HA clade 2.3.4.4b in GenBank. The nucleotide sequences from the dairy
234 cow and milk samples shared 100% identity scores with the genome from the dead grackle. The
235 milk and swab samples shared 99.94% identity, while the dead bird and milk samples shared
236 pairwise identity ranging 99.94 to 100%.

237 **Mutation Analysis**

238 Several common mutations were identified across the four viral genomes reported in this
239 study (**Table S1 in Appendix**). We identified several mutations that alter host cell specificity,
240 target drug binding sites and known to cause antigenic shifts or cause mild drug resistance. These
241 types of mutation are assigned with a level 2 warning/significance or orange mutations according
242 to FluSurver (<http://flusurver.bii.a-star.edu.sg/>). Across the various segments of the four
243 genomes, we found several mutations associated with viral virulence and host specificity shifts.
244 Virulence-based mutations were detected in *PB2* (V495I and M676A) and *PBI* (N375S) gene
245 segments. Mutations associated with host specificity shift included two in the *HA* gene (N110S
246 and V226A). A rather infrequent mutation was found in the *PB2* gene (M631L) of all four
247 viruses. This mutation increases H5N1 HPAIV propagation in human cells by enhancing
248 polymerase activity and virus replication.

249

250 **Discussion**

251 The US H5N1 epizootic is unprecedented for its rapid spread in the United States and impact
252 upon numerous wild and livestock animal species. While our field sampling was limited, this
253 report is important in adding new observations. It seems likely that H5N1 HPAIV detections in
254 the nasal passage of cattle occur early in infection and are brief in duration. Workers in Farm A
255 first noticed cattle illness on March 6th and by April 1st cattle illnesses had largely waned. We
256 found H5N1 HPAIV virus in 6 (42%) of 14 sick cattle nasal swabs on March 21st, 1 (10%) of 10
257 sick cattle nasal swabs on April 1st, and none of 14 sick cattle nasal swabs on April 3rd. On Farm
258 B, cattle illnesses were first observed on March 20th. When we visited the farm on April 4th, we
259 found only 1 (7%) of 14 ill cows to have evidence of H5N1 HPAIV in their nasal swabs. While

260 the virus seems to rapidly clear from cattle nasal tissues, infected cows may shed H5N1 for
261 longer periods in their milk. Further research will be required to establish the duration of H5N1
262 shedding in infected cow's milk. On Farm B, while nasal swabs had little evidence of H5N1
263 HPAIV when we visited on April 4th, 9 (64%) of 14 cattle milk samples from convalescing cows
264 had evidence of virus with relatively low Ct values (high titers of virus). While our sampling
265 were not likely representative of the many cows on the farms, the available data seems consistent
266 with reports from US Department of Agriculture^{22,23} and cattle associations²⁴ that HPAIV H5N1
267 affects only a subset of cattle and the generally moderate illnesses quickly resolve.

268 Additionally, in one of the only serological studies of dairy workers during this epizootic,
269 two (20%) of 10 dairy workers from Farm A who donated sera had evidence of elevated titers
270 against a recombinant H5N1 virus of clade 2.3.4.4b virus by a MN assay. The first of these dairy
271 workers had a moderately elevated MN titer of 1:40. He often worked inside cattle corrals close
272 to dairy cattle. He reported no respiratory illnesses during the last 12 months but reported having
273 a cough and taking cough medication at the time we enrolled him. The second worker had a MN
274 of 1:80. She worked in the Farm A's cafeteria. She reported experiencing fever, cough or sore
275 throat during that last 12 months as well as being around others at work with similar respiratory
276 signs and symptoms. She had just recovered from a respiratory illness when we enrolled her.
277 While we cannot rule out cross-reacting antibodies from previous influenza A virus infections or
278 vaccines as a cause for the MN titer elevations, neutralizing assays are often considered the best
279 assay for the virus-specific serological assessments. We observe that workers in Farm A had
280 more time (~4 weeks) to develop antibodies to the H5N1 virus as compared to workers on Farm
281 B (~2 weeks) as Farm A experienced the H5N1 epizootic 14 days earlier than Farm B.

282 The study is also unique in documenting a likely SARS-CoV-2 infection in the nasal
283 secretions of a sick cow. SARS-CoV-2 infections in cattle is known but thought to be rare^{25,26}. A
284 cross-sectional study of plasma from 1000 cattle from 83 farms in Germany²⁷ during 2021-22
285 suggested that 11 cattle from 9 farms or ~1% of cows tested had evidence of previous infection.
286 Experimental data also suggest that the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in cattle is low²⁸. Our
287 report is important in that the observation by Farm B's manager that they thought they had
288 detected H5N1 HPAI in a beef cow that had just delivered is concerning. Farm B discounted
289 their hunch when a molecular assay from the cow's blood was negative for influenza A. This
290 hunch may have been correct in that the time period of cattle viremia may be relatively short. We
291 now know that a better choice would have been a molecular assay of the cow's milk.

292 In addition, this report is valuable in corroborating reports of both dead cats and birds that
293 were observed associated with disease cattle in Farm B. Observing feral cat and bird die-offs is
294 likely a tell-tale sign of HPAI incursions on farms. Our study is further valuable for the
295 identification of numerous mutations associated with viral spillover potential. Finally, it seems
296 important to note the H5N1 HPAIV isolates from cattle, cattle milk, and the dead bird in this
297 study cluster closely with other H5N1 HPAIV associated with this now national epizootic.

298 Continued surveillance and reporting of results from deidentified farms/workers is important
299 in understanding outbreak trends. Genome analyses of future H5N1 strains is also extremely
300 important, not only for determining which viral strains are circulating, but also in assessing
301 genetic markers associated increased virulence and resistance to antivirals. Finally, information
302 from this type of surveillance work is helpful in directing vaccine production and in considering
303 employment of vaccines to prevent human disease, livestock disease or both.

304 It now seems especially prudent that we find ways to prospectively and more intensely study
305 dairy farms to better quantify serological evidence of infections in both livestock and dairy
306 workers. Before we can perform such important research, we need to find ways to fully protect
307 the dairy businesses from any economic harm that might arise through such intensive study.

308

309 **References**

- 310 1. Antigua KJC, Choi WS, Baek YH, Song MS. The Emergence and Decennary
311 Distribution of Clade 2.3.4.4 HPAI H5Nx. *Microorganisms* 2019;7(6). DOI:
312 10.3390/microorganisms7060156.
- 313 2. World Health Organization/World Organisation for Animal HF, Agriculture Organization
314 HNEWG. Revised and updated nomenclature for highly pathogenic avian influenza A
315 (H5N1) viruses. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* 2014;8(3):384-8. DOI:
316 10.1111/irv.12230.
- 317 3. Plaza PI, Gamarra-Toledo V, Eugui JR, Lambertucci SA. Recent Changes in Patterns of
318 Mammal Infection with Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza A(H5N1) Virus Worldwide.
319 *Emerg Infect Dis* 2024;30(3):444-452. DOI: 10.3201/eid3003.231098.
- 320 4. Burrough ER, Magstadt DR, Petersen B, et al. Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza
321 A(H5N1) Clade 2.3.4.4b Virus Infection in Domestic Dairy Cattle and Cats, United
322 States, 2024. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2024;30(7). DOI: 10.3201/eid3007.240508.
- 323 5. Youk S, Torchetti MK, Lantz K, et al. H5N1 highly pathogenic avian influenza clade
324 2.3.4.4b in wild and domestic birds: Introductions into the United States and
325 reassortments, December 2021-April 2022. *Virology* 2023;587:109860. DOI:
326 10.1016/j.virol.2023.109860.
- 327 6. Pantin-Jackwood MJ, Spackman E, Leyson C, et al. Pathogenicity in Chickens and
328 Turkeys of a 2021 United States H5N1 Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza Clade 2.3.4.4b
329 Wild Bird Virus Compared to Two Previous H5N8 Clade 2.3.4.4 Viruses. *Viruses*
330 2023;15(11). DOI: 10.3390/v15112273.

- 331 7. APHIS. U. Federal and State Veterinary, Public Health Agencies Share Update on HPAI
332 Detection in Kansas, Texas Dairy Herds. 2024.
- 333 8. USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza
334 (HPAI) Detections in Livestock. June 13, 2024 ([https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/livestock)
335 [poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/livestock](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/livestock)).
- 336 9. Sreenivasan CC, Thomas M, Kaushik RS, Wang D, Li F. Influenza A in Bovine Species:
337 A Narrative Literature Review. *Viruses* 2019;11(6). DOI: 10.3390/v11060561.
- 338 10. Xiu L, Binder RA, Alarja NA, et al. A RT-PCR assay for the detection of coronaviruses
339 from four genera. *J Clin Virol* 2020;128:104391. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104391.
- 340 11. Fieldhouse JK, Bailey ES, Toh TH, et al. Panspecies molecular assays detect viral
341 pathogens missed by real-time PCR/reverse-transcriptase PCR among pneumonia
342 patients, Sarawak, Malaysia. *Trop Dis Travel Med Vaccines* 2020;6:13. DOI:
343 10.1186/s40794-020-00114-2.
- 344 12. Wang X, Xiu L, Binder RA, et al. A pan-coronavirus RT-PCR assay for rapid viral
345 screening of animal, human, and environmental specimens. *One Health* 2021;13:100274.
346 DOI: 10.1016/j.onehlt.2021.100274.
- 347 13. World Health Organization. Manual for the laboratory diagnosis and virological
348 surveillance of influenza. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2011.
- 349 14. Gray GC, Robie ER, Studstill CJ, Nunn CL. Mitigating Future Respiratory Virus
350 Pandemics: New Threats and Approaches to Consider. *Viruses* 2021;13(4). DOI:
351 10.3390/v13040637.

- 352 15. Slomka MJ, Coward VJ, Banks J, et al. Identification of sensitive and specific avian
353 influenza polymerase chain reaction methods through blind ring trials organized in the
354 European Union. *Avian Dis* 2007;51(1 Suppl):227-34. DOI: 10.1637/7674-063006R1.1.
- 355 16. Kalantar KL, Carvalho T, de Bourcy CFA, et al. IDseq-An open source cloud-based
356 pipeline and analysis service for metagenomic pathogen detection and monitoring.
357 *Gigascience* 2020;9(10). DOI: 10.1093/gigascience/giaa111.
- 358 17. Bankevich A, Nurk S, Antipov D, et al. SPAdes: a new genome assembly algorithm and
359 its applications to single-cell sequencing. *J Comput Biol* 2012;19(5):455-77. DOI:
360 10.1089/cmb.2012.0021.
- 361 18. Jackman SD, Vandervalk BP, Mohamadi H, et al. ABySS 2.0: resource-efficient assembly
362 of large genomes using a Bloom filter. *Genome Res* 2017;27(5):768-777. DOI:
363 10.1101/gr.214346.116.
- 364 19. Katoh K, Standley DM. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:
365 improvements in performance and usability. *Mol Biol Evol* 2013;30(4):772-80. DOI:
366 10.1093/molbev/mst010.
- 367 20. Trifinopoulos J, Nguyen LT, von Haeseler A, Minh BQ. W-IQ-TREE: a fast online
368 phylogenetic tool for maximum likelihood analysis. *Nucleic Acids Res*
369 2016;44(W1):W232-5. DOI: 10.1093/nar/gkw256.
- 370 21. Oguzie JU, Marushchak LV, Shittu I, et al. Avian Influenza A(H5N1) Virus among Dairy
371 Cattle, Texas, USA. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2024;30(7). DOI: 10.3201/eid3007.240717.
- 372 22. USDA APHIS. Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza H5N1 Genotype B3.13 in Dairy
373 Cattle: National Epidemiologic Brief. 2024.
374 (<https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/hpai-dairy-national-epi-brief.pdf>).

- 375 23. US Department of Agriculture. 2024 Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (H5N1) -
376 Michigan Dairy Herd and Poultry Flock Summary. US Department of Agriculture, June 9
377 , 2024 2024. ([https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/hpai-h5n1-dairy-cattle-mi-
378 epi-invest.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/hpai-h5n1-dairy-cattle-mi-
378 epi-invest.pdf)).
- 379 24. Practitioners AAoB. AABP Statement on Texas Cattle Outbreak. AABP web site:
380 American Association of Bovine Practitioners March 18, 2024 2024.
381 ([https://agpartners.net/2024/03/18/AABP-STATEMENT-ON-TEXAS-CATTLE-
382 OUTBREAK/](https://agpartners.net/2024/03/18/AABP-STATEMENT-ON-TEXAS-CATTLE-
382 OUTBREAK/)).
- 383 25. Vienna. CSH. SARS-ANI VIS. A Global Open Access Dataset of Reported SARS-CoV-2
384 Events in Animals. 2022.
- 385 26. Nerpel A, Yang L, Sorger J, Kasbohrer A, Walzer C, Desvars-Larrive A. SARS-ANI: a
386 global open access dataset of reported SARS-CoV-2 events in animals. *Sci Data*
387 2022;9(1):438. DOI: 10.1038/s41597-022-01543-8.
- 388 27. Wernike K, Bottcher J, Amelung S, et al. Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 Suggestive of
389 Single Events of Spillover to Cattle, Germany. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2022;28(9):1916-1918.
390 DOI: 10.3201/eid2809.220125.
- 391 28. Ulrich L, Wernike K, Hoffmann D, Mettenleiter TC, Beer M. Experimental Infection of
392 Cattle with SARS-CoV-2. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2020;26(12):2979-2981. DOI:
393 10.3201/eid2612.203799.

394

395

396 **Acknowledgments:**

397 This project was supported in part by the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative
398 Competitive Grant from the American Rescue Plan Act (award number 2023-70432-39558)
399 through USDA APHIS and Professor Gregory C. Gray's startup funding from the University of
400 Texas Medical Branch. The findings and conclusions in this presentation are those of the authors
401 and should not be construed to represent any official USDA or US Government determination or
402 policy. We thank Dr. Richard Webby of St. Jude Children Hospital, Memphis, TN for sharing the
403 recombinant H5N1 (rg-A/bald eagle/Florida/W22-134-OP/2022) virus used in the MN assays.
404 We thank Barbara Petersen, DVM of Sunrise Veterinary Service for her education regarding
405 livestock farming. We thank the dairy farm owners and managers for engaging us in research
406 collaboration. We gratefully acknowledge all data contributors, i.e., the authors and their
407 originating laboratories responsible for obtaining the specimens, and their submitting
408 laboratories for generating the genetic sequence and metadata and sharing via NCBI the, on
409 which this research is based.

410 **Author Contributions**

411 Conceptualization: GCG
412 Methodology: IS, LVM, JUO, LVM, JAL, CMTV, ALM, HH, GCG
413 Investigation: IS, DS, JUO, LVM, GGO, JAL, NES, HH, GCG
414 Data analysis: IS, JUO, LVM, HH
415 Visualization: JUO, LVM
416 Funding acquisition: GCG
417 Project administration: GCG, DS, LVM
418 Supervision: GCG, LVM

419 Writing – original draft: IS, GCG

420 Writing – review & editing: IS, DS, JUO, LVM, JAL, CMJV, GCG

421

422 **Conflicts of Interest**

423 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

424

425 **Data Availability**

426 Data needed to evaluate the conclusions in the paper are present in the paper and/or the
427 supplementary materials. All viral sequences have been deposited on NCBI with accession
428 numbers: PP914075-PP914106. Researchers with BSL3Ag-approved laboratories may request
429 the live viruses A/cattle/Texas/81518/2024(H5N1) and A/cattle/Texas/29074/2024(H5N1)
430 isolated from milk and A/grackle/Texas/2/2024(H5N1) isolated from dead female great- tailed
431 grackle (*Quiscalus mexicanus*) described in this paper by contacting Dr. Kenneth Plante, PhD
432 (ksplante@utmb.edu) of UTMB’s World Reference Center for Emerging Viruses and
433 Arboviruses (<https://www.utmb.edu/wrceva/>). Additional data, study instruments, or specimens
434 may be requested from the corresponding author. Farm location, farm identification and personal
435 identifying data for human are protected by nondisclosure agreement and will not be shared. The
436 sharing of specimens or data will require the signing of material transfer agreement (MTA).

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of participants from the two dairy farms

Participants characteristics	Farm B		
	Farm A (n=10)	(n=7)	Combined
Age in years, median (range)	38 (26 – 59)	27 (16 – 39)	33 (16-59)
Male/female number	7/3	5/2	
Ethnicity			
Latino	10 (100%)	5 (71.4%)	15 (88.2%)
American-Indian or Alaska native	-	2 (28.6%)	2 (11.8%)
Highest level of education			
Primary (grades 1-5)	1 (10%)	2 (28.6%)	3 (17.65%)
Secondary	1 (10%)	3 (42.9%)	4 (23.53%)
Tertiary	2 (20%)	1 (14.3%)	3 (17.65%)
College (2 years)	1 (10%)	1 (14.3%)	2 (5.88%)
College (4 years)	5 (50%)	-	5 (35.29%)
History of chronic breathing problems?			
Yes	-	-	
No	9 (90%)	7 (100%)	16 (94.1%)
Unknown	1	-	1 (5.9%)
Have you ever used inhaled tobacco products?			
Yes	1	2	3 (17.7%)
Previously	1	-	1 (5.9%)
No	8	5	13 (76.4%)
Any medications in the last 30 days?			
Yes (antibiotics, ibuprofen, multivitamin, cough syrup, diarrhea pills, dewormer and hear problem)	4 (40%)	1 (14.3%)	5 (29.4%)
No	6 (60%)	6 (85.7%)	12 (70.6%)

Recent respiratory illness? Yes	4 (40%)	1 (14.3%)	5 (29.4%)
Past respiratory illness (last 12 months)? Yes	5 (50%)	4 (57.1%)	9 (52.9%)
Recent respiratory illness noticed among household? Yes	6 (60%)	-	6 (35.3%)
Recent respiratory illness noticed among co-workers? Yes	4 (40%)	2 (28.5%)	6 (35.3%)
Have you received vaccination for human influenza? Yes	8 (80%)	1 (14.2%)	9 (52.9%)
Have you received vaccination for human SARS-CoV-2? Yes	10 (100%)	1 (14.2%)	11 (64.7%)
Job type on the farm?			
Calf caretaker	1 (10%)	-	1 (5.8%)
Veterinarian	-	1 (14.2%)	1 (5.8%)
Inseminator	-	1 (14.2%)	1 (5.8%)
Feeders	1 (14.2%)	1 (14.2%)	2 (11.7%)
Milkers	1 (10%)	4 (57.1%)	5 (29.4%)
Tractor driver/maintenance	4 (40%)	-	4 (23.5%)
Maternity	1 (10%)	-	1 (5.8%)
Maintenance	1 (10%)	-	1 (5.8%)
Mechanic shop	2 (20%)	-	2 (11.7%)
Cleaning services	2 (20%)	-	2 (11.7%)
Hospital	1 (10%)	-	1 (5.8%)
Breeder	-	1 (14.2%)	1 (5.8%)
Others			3 (17.6%)

Table 2. Farm workers clinical history and laboratory assay results.

Sample ID		Respiratory symptoms	Nasopharyngeal swab		MN*	
number	Farm	during the last 12 months?	influenza A qRT-PCR (Ct)	MN* titer	interpretation	
USH_01	Farm A	No	Negative	1:20	Negative	
USH_02	Farm A	Yes	Negative	1:10	Negative	
USH_03	Farm A	Yes	Negative	1:10	Negative	
USH_04	Farm A	Yes	Negative	<1:10	Negative	
USH_05	Farm A	No	Negative	1:40	Positive	
USH_06	Farm A	Yes	Negative	1:20	Negative	
USH_07	Farm A	No	Negative	1:20	Negative	
USH_08	Farm A	Yes	Negative	1:20	Negative	
USH_09	Farm A	Yes	Negative	1:20	Negative	
USH_10	Farm A	Yes	Negative	1:80	Positive	
USH_11	Farm B	No	Negative	1:20	Negative	
USH_12	Farm B	No	Negative	1:20	Negative	
USH_13	Farm B	Yes	Negative	NA	NA	
USH_14	Farm B	Yes	Negative	NA	NA	
USH_15	Farm B	No	Negative	1:20	Negative	
USH_16	Farm B	Yes	Negative	1:20	Negative	
USH_17	Farm B	Yes	Negative	NA	NA	

*Serologic microneutralization (MN) assays were run against recombinant H5N1 (rg-A/bald eagle/Florida/W22-134-OP/2022 of clade 2.3.4.4b), NA = Not applicable

Table 3. Comparison of the threshold cycle (Ct) of the different sample types before and after inoculation of cell lines and embryonated eggs.

Sample ID	Farm	Sample type	Specimen	Specimen Ct values for Influenza A matrix gene							
			Ct values	in different substrates							
			before inoculation	Cell lines						Embryonated eggs	Influenza subtype
			into the substrates	MDCK 1 st harvest	MDCK 2 nd harvest	MDBK 1 st harvest	MDBK 2 nd harvest	MDBK 2 nd harvest			
MP01	B	Milk	29.88	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	HPAI H5N1	
MP02	B	Milk	28.98	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	HPAI H5N1	
MP03	B	Milk	>45	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	Negative	
MP04	B	Milk	>45	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	Negative	
MP05	B	Milk	22.76	29.24	35.31	27.78	28.33	31.88		HPAI H5N1	
MP06	B	Milk	>45	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	Negative	
MP07	B	Milk	24.70	32.55	32.77	31.66	36.34	-		HPAI H5N1	
MP08	B	Milk	>45	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	Negative	
MP09	B	Milk	25.87	37.82	33.26	30.43	32.07	30.36		HPAI H5N1	
MP10	B	Milk	22.26	19.24	15.00	29.94	35.92	-		HPAI H5N1	
MP11	B	Milk	28.57	36.16	36.39	38.39	35.71	-		HPAI H5N1	
MP12	B	Milk	27.00	33.23	32.03	35.28	36.66	-		HPAI H5N1	

MP13	B	Milk	28.14	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	HPAI H5N1
MP14	B	Milk	>45	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	Negative
USL_042	B	Cattle (nasal swab)	38.78	>45	>45	>45	>45	31.17	HPAI H5N1
USL_047A	B	Bird (oral-tracheal swab)	22.72	25.00	30.61	30.22	34.65	13.57	HPAI H5N1
USL_047B	B	Bird (cloacal swab)	34.63	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	HPAI H5N1
WST_01	B	Fecal slurry	38.89	NT	NT	NT	NT	NT	HPAI H5N1

MDCK = Mardin-Darby canine kidney; MDBK = Mardin-Darby bovine kidney, NT = Not tested




Fig. 1. Images from various farm visits demonstrating sample collections. Nasal swabs were taken from sick and healthy cattle, oral-tracheal and cloacal swabs were taken from a dead bird, and aerosol samples were taken from cattle environments.




Fig. 2. Phylogenetic Tree of the HA gene. Maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree inferred for four viruses isolated in this study (two from milk-colored blue, one from a nasal swab of cow-colored red, and one from a dead grackle colored orange), to other related HPAI H5N1 viruses submitted to GenBank during the current epizootic, downloaded from NCBI. Bootstrap values are displayed at key nodes.



Fig. 3. Phylogenetic Tree of the NA gene. Maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree inferred for four viruses isolated in this study (two from milk-colored blue, one from a nasal swab of cow-colored red, and one from a dead grackle colored orange), to other related HPAI H5N1 viruses submitted to GenBank during the current epizootic, downloaded from NCBI. Bootstrap values are displayed at key nodes.

Video. Video of sick feral cat taken on Farm B during the HPAI H5N1 incursion (download from link). https://liveutmb-my.sharepoint.com/:v:/g/personal/gcgray_utmb_edu/EXe2BTggZo9HhE84hi-G0sUBdpRGQDqFVim-pWHSAbSHsA?nav=eyJyZWZlcjJhbnEluZm8iOncmVmZXJyYWxBcHAIoiJPbmVEcm12ZUZvcjJlc2luZXNzIiwicmVmZXJyYWxBcHBQbGF0Zm9ybSI6Ild1YiIsInJlZmVycmFsTW9kZSI6InZpZXciLCJyZWZlcjJhbnFZpZXciOiJNeUZpbGVzTGlua0NvcHkiX0&e=fJxEdR

Figure 2

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.27.24310982>; this version posted July 31, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/).




Figure 3

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.27.24310982>; this version posted July 31, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/).



0.002

Supplemental Appendix

A One Health Investigation into H5N1 Avian Influenza Virus Detections on Dairy Farms

Table of Contents:

Subject	Pages
Additional Text	2-6
Figures	7
Tables	8-10
References	11

Ismaila Shittu^{1†}, Diego Silva^{1†}, Judith U. Oguzie¹, Lyudmyla V. Marushchak¹, Gene G. Olinger²,
Claudia M. Trujillo-Vargas¹, Anabel Rodriguez³, Nicholas E. Schneider, Haiping Hao, and
Gregory C. Gray^{1,7-9*}

¹ Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, University of Texas Medical Branch;
Galveston, TX, 77555, USA

² Galveston National Laboratory, University of Texas Medical Branch; Galveston, TX, 77555, USA

³ Department of Environmental and Global Health, College of Public Health and Health Professions,
University of Florida; Gainesville, FL 32610, USA.

⁴ Emerging Pathogens Institute, University of Florida; Gainesville, FL 32610, USA

⁵ Schneider Veterinary Services. Milliken, CO.

⁶ Nextgen Sequencing Core, University of Texas Medical Branch; Galveston, TX, 77555, USA.

⁷ Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX,
USA.

⁸ Institute for Human Infections and Immunity, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX,
USA.

⁹ Department of Global Health, School of Public and Population Health, University of Texas Medical
Branch, Galveston, TX, USA.

Additional Text

Methods

Sample Preparation

Nasopharyngeal (NP) swabs were collected using human volunteers a 6-inch polyester-tipped applicator swab (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Pittsburgh, PA). After collection, swabs were broken off into a 15mL tube containing 2mL of viral transport medium (VTM; rmbio, Missoula, MT) containing Hank's basal salt solution, fetal bovine serum, gentamicin and amphotericin B and kept in an insulated portable cooler before being transported to the One Health Laboratory at UTMB, Galveston. At the laboratory, the VTM samples were vortexed and aliquoted before being stored at -80°C. In addition, approximately 10mL of whole blood was collected from consenting farm workers. The blood was allowed to clot and kept in an insulated portable cooler. Thereafter, the blood was centrifuged at 1300 rpm for 15 minutes. Aliquots of the serum specimens were made and stored at -80°C until studied with the microneutralization assay.

Animal samples were collected by farm staff. They selected 14 sick animals and six healthy animals per farm. Samples were placed in 2ml of VTM and kept cool before being transported to UTMB and preserved at -80°C until tested.

To examine the hypothesis that novel viruses might be detected in aerosol on the farms, we used National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) bioaerosol cyclone samplers (Tisch Environmental Inc., Cleves, OH) as previously reported¹. Prior to set up, each NIOSH sampler was calibrated to a flow rate of 3.5 L/min¹, this flow rate was obtained using an Air Check Touch (part number: 220-5000TC) pump from SKC INC. In each farm, research staff placed four bioaerosol samplers were set up in different farm locations where cattle and farm staff mixed. The bioaerosol samplers were run for ~3 hours, then removed and kept in a refrigerated cooler. The locations and times the samplers were started and stopped were

documented. Each tube and the filter attached to the samplers were hydrated with 1 mL of 0.5% protease-free bovine serum albumin (w/v) (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA cat no. BP9703100) in phosphate buffered saline, vortexed and aliquoted. The aliquots were stored at -80°C until analyzed.

RNA Extraction

On the QIAcube Connect automated extraction system (Qiagen) using the QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA), RNA was extracted from 140µl aliquots of specimens (nasal swabs, milk and bioaerosol including waste from the tank) collected from humans, animals and the environment following the manufacturer's instructions. RNA was eluted with 60µl of buffer AVE and stored at -80°C until tested.

Cell Culture

To isolate virus, Madin-Darby canine kidney (MDCK) (ATCC, cat no. CRL-CCL34) and Madin-Darby bovine kidney (MDBK) (ATCC, cat no. CCL-22) cell lines were grown in Minimal Essential Medium (MEM) containing Earles salt and L-glutamine (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA cat no. 11095080) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA cat no. 26140-079) and 1X penicillin-streptomycin. The cells were cultured as monolayers in 6-well plates at 37°C in 5% CO₂ environment.

Prior to infecting the cells, all specimens were filtered using sterile 0.45µm pore-size filters (Millipore Sigma™, Ireland cat no. SLGVR33RS). At confluency, the cells were washed with PBS (Corning, Manassas, VA) and infected with 0.2ml of the filtered specimens with an addition

of 0.8 ml of serum-free maintenance medium (MEM, 1X penicillin-streptomycin and 2 µg/mL TPCK-Trypsin).

Embryonated Egg Culture

Ten-day-old specific-pathogen-free (SPF) chicken eggs (AVS Bio, Norwich, CT) were used for growing AIV isolates from RT-qPCR influenza virus RNA-positive specimens (1 nasal swab from cattle, 6 samples of milk and fecal and oral swab from dead bird) according to a standard protocol². Briefly, SPF eggs were incubated for 10 days at 37°C and 45% humidity. The eggs were monitored daily using an egg candling lamp. All specimens were filtered using 0.45µm pore-size filters (Millipore Sigma) before inoculation with 0.2ml of the filtrate into the allantoic cavity of the eggs.

The inoculated eggs were candled daily to check for embryo death. After the incubation period, eggs were chilled at 4°C overnight. Allantoic fluid from the dead eggs were then harvested and frozen at -80°C until tested. The virus work was conducted in our BSL3Ag laboratory. For molecular analyses the harvested allantoic fluid was treated with TRizol LS Reagent (Invitrogen, Waltham, MA) under BSL3Ag conditions before being moved into BSL2 where they underwent RNA extraction following the manufacturer's recommendations. RNA was then stored at -80°C for further molecular testing.

Microneutralization Assays (MN)

We measured the neutralizing antibody to a recombinant H5N1 (rg-A/bald eagle/Florida/W22-134-OP/2022 of clade 2.3.4.4b) kindly provided by Dr Richard Webby of St. Jude Children Hospital, Memphis, TN using previously described MN procedures³. Prior to

testing, sera were treated overnight (18-24 hours) with receptor destroying enzyme (RDE, Denka Seiken, Japan) according to the manufacturer's instructions to cleave sialic acid from glycoproteins and glycolipids in the serum, destroying these potential inhibitors from interfering with the HAI assay, and subsequently heat inactivated at 56°C for 30 min. The RDE-treated sera were then diluted with PBS to a final dilution of 1:10 as described by Cuevas et al³. Two-fold dilutions of the serum starting with the 1:10 dilution were performed. We considered a titer \geq 1:40 as positive.

The recombinant H5N1 virus was propagated and titrated to determine the 50% tissue culture infectious dose (TCID₅₀) in MDCK cells⁴. The end point titer of the recombinant H5N1 was calculated according to the Spearman-Kärber formula⁵. The MN was performed in 96-well microtiter plates with the inactivated sera and the recombinant H5N1 according to a published protocol³. Each of the samples were tested in duplicate and the lowest serum dilution without CPE was recorded as the neutralizing titer.

Results

Farm Information

Neither farm had provisions for preventing wild birds from accessing cattle areas. The cattle feed or water troughs were open to birds. Both farms reported periodically vaccinating dairy cattle with vaccines against common cattle respiratory pathogens. Each farm reported using numerous biosecurity measures including cleaning and disinfection of clothing and equipment as well as segregation of sick animals. The workers in Farm A reported always being provided with personal protective equipment (PPE) including aprons, face shield, disposable gloves, washable boots or disposable booties and sometimes mask and frequent handwashing. Workers on Farm B

reported always being provided with coveralls, aprons, disposable latex gloves, washable boots and frequently washing their hands. They reported only occasionally using eye protection glasses and rarely using masks.




Fig. S1. Phylogenetic Tree of the HA cleavage site. Neighbor-joining phylogenetic tree of the HA cleavage sites from six cattle milk sample (colored blue) sequences and one dead grackle (colored orange) amplified from this study compared to other related viruses in GenBank from NCBI.

Phylogenetic analyses were performed using the Geneious Prime software v2024.0.5.

Table S1. Summary of identified mutations. As shown in FluSurver (<http://flusurver.bii.a-star.edu.sg>). Mutations that alter host-cell specificity or occur at drug-binding sites are labelled orange mutations and assigned a level 2 significance warning. This category also includes mutations that cause antigenic shifts or moderate drug resistance.


Sample ID	Mutation Region	All mutations	Orange Mutations	Reference
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /29074/2024(H5N1) HA	HA	K3N;G16S;N110S;L120M;L131Q;T139P;T156A;Q185R;V194I;A201E;T211I;V226A;N252D;E284G;M285V;I298V;K492E;I526V;V538A;I547M;V548M	N110S;L131Q;T139P;V226A	HA A/Sichuan/26221/2014(H5N6)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /29074/2024(H5N1) MP	M1	N82S;N85S;N87T;T140A;F144L;M165I;V166A;A200V;A227T;K230R;M248L		M1 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /29074/2024(H5N1) MP	M2	R12K;K18N;I51V;R61G;D88N		M2 A/Mallard/Astrakhan/263/1982(H14N5)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /29074/2024(H5N1) NA	NA	I8T;V17I;I20V;H44Y;A46P;V67I;N71S;T76A;K78Q;A81T;V99I;H100Y;H155Y;T188I;M258I;L269M;E287D;T289M;V321I;G336S;V338M;S339P;P340S;N366S;G382E;A395E;I418M;S434N;D460S		NA A/Goose/Guangdong/1/1996(H5N1)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /29074/2024(H5N1) NS	NS1	S7L;R21Q;S87P;C116S;D139N;A223E;V226I	A223E;V226I	NS1 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /29074/2024(H5N1) NS	NS2	R61K;E67G	E67G	NS2 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /29074/2024(H5N1) NP	NP	Y52H;S482N		NP A/Chicken/BCFAV8 //2014(H5N2)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /29074/2024(H5N1) PA	PA	I61M;T85A;K113R;L219I;S277P;M441V;K497R;Y535H;I543L;S558L;T608S		PA A/Netherlands/219/2003(H7N7)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /29074/2024(H5N1) PB1	PB1	T59S;E75D;M171V;V179I;N375S;R430E;A587P	N375S	PB1 A/Mallard/Astrakhan/263/1982(H14N5)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /29074/2024(H5N1) PB2	PB2	T58A;V109I;V139I;E362G;K389R;D441N;V478I;V495I;M631L;V649I;M676A	V495I;M676A	
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /81518/2024(H5N1) HA	HA	K3N;G16S;N110S;L120M;L131Q;T139P;T156A;Q185R;V194I;A201E;T211I;V226A;N252D;E284G;M285V;I298V;K492E;I526V;V538A;I547M;V548M	N110S;L131Q;T139P;V226A	HA A/Sichuan/26221/2014(H5N6)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /81518/2024(H5N1) M2	M1	N82S;N85S;N87T;T140A;F144L;M165I;V166A;A200V;A227T;K230R;M248L		M1 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)

A/CATTLE/TEXAS /81518/2024(H5N1) M2	M2	R12K;K18N;I51V;R61G;D88N		M2 A/Mallard/Astrakha n/263/1982(H14N5)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /81518/2024(H5N1) NA	NA	I8T;V17I;I20V;H44Y;A46P;V67I;N71S;T76A;K78Q;A81T;V99I;H100Y;H155Y;T188I;M258I;L269M;E287D;T289M;V321I;G336S;V338M;S339P;P340S;N366S;G382E;A395E;I418M;S434N;D460G		NA A/Goose/Guangdon g/1/1996(H5N1)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /81518/2024(H5N1) NEP	NS1	S7L;R21Q;S87P;C116S;D139N;A223E;V226I	A223E;V226I	NS1 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /81518/2024(H5N1) NEP	NS2	R61K;E67G	E67G	NS2 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /81518/2024(H5N1) NP	NP	Y52H;S482N		NP A/Chicken/BCFAV8 //2014(H5N2)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /81518/2024(H5N1) PA	PA	I61M;T85A;K113R;L219I;S277P;M441V;K497R;Y535H;I543L;S558L;T608S		PA A/Netherlands/219/ 2003(H7N7)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /81518/2024(H5N1) PB1	PB1	T59S;E75D;M171V;V179I;N375S;R430E;A587P	N375S	PB1 A/Mallard/Astrakha n/263/1982(H14N5)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /81518/2024(H5N1) PB2	PB2	T58A;V109I;V139I;E362G;K389R;D441N;V478I;V495I;M631L;V649I;M676A	V495I;M676A	PB2 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /31156/2024(H5N1) HA	HA	K3N;G16S;N110S;L120M;L131Q;T139P;T156A;Q185R;V194I;A201E;T211I;V226A;N252D;E284G;M285V;I298V;K492E;I526V;V538A;I547M;V548M	N110S;L131Q; T139P;V226A	HA A/Sichuan/26221/20 14(H5N6)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /31156/2024(H5N1) M2	M1	N82S;N85S;N87T;T140A;F144L;M165I;V166A;A200V;A227T;K230R;M248L		M1 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /31156/2024(H5N1) M2	M2	R12K;K18N;I51V;R61G;D88N		M2 A/Mallard/Astrakha n/263/1982(H14N5)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /31156/2024(H5N1) NA	NA	I8T;V17I;I20V;H44Y;A46P;V67I;N71S;T76A;K78Q;A81T;V99I;H100Y;H155Y;T188I;M258I;L269M;E287D;T289M;V321I;G336S;V338M;S339P;P340S;N366S;G382E;A395E;I418M;S434N;D460S		NA A/Goose/Guangdon g/1/1996(H5N1)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /31156/2024(H5N1) NEP	NS1	S7L;R21Q;S87P;C116S;D139N;A223E;V226I	A223E;V226I	NS1 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /31156/2024(H5N1) NEP	NS2	R61K;E67G	E67G	NS2 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)

A/CATTLE/TEXAS /31156/2024(H5N1) NP	NP	Y52H;S482N		NP A/Chicken/BCFAV8 //2014(H5N2)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /31156/2024(H5N1) PA	PA	I61M;T85A;K113R;L219I;S277P;M441V;K497R;Y535H;I543L;S558L;T608S		PA A/Netherlands/219/ 2003(H7N7)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /31156/2024(H5N1) PB1	PB1	T59S;E75D;M171V;V179I;N375S;R430E;A587P	N375S	PB1 A/Mallard/Astrakha n/263/1982(H14N5)
A/CATTLE/TEXAS /31156/2024(H5N1) PB2	PB2	T58A;V109I;V139I;E362G;K389R;D441N;V478I;V495I;M631L;V649I;M676A	V495I;M676A	PB2 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)
A/GRACKLE/TEX AS/2/2024(H5N1) HA	HA	K3N;G16S;N110S;L120M;L131Q;T139P;T156A;Q185R;V194I;A201E;T211I;V226A;N252D;E284G;M285V;I298V;K492E;I526V;V538A;I547M;V548M	N110S;L131Q; T139P;V226A	HA A/Sichuan/26221/20 14(H5N6)
A/GRACKLE/TEX AS/2/2024(H5N1) M2	M1	N82S;N85S;N87T;T140A;F144L;M165I;V166A;A200V;A227T;K230R;M248L		M1 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)
A/GRACKLE/TEX AS/2/2024(H5N1) M2	M2	R12K;K18N;I51V;R61G;D88N		M2 A/Mallard/Astrakha n/263/1982(H14N5)
A/GRACKLE/TEX AS/2/2024(H5N1) NA	NA	I8T;V17I;I20V;H44Y;A46P;V67I;N71S;T76A;K78Q;A81T;V99I;H100Y;H155Y;T188I;M258I;L269M;E287D;T289M;V321I;G336S;V338M;S339P;P340S;N366S;G382E;A395E;I418M;S434N;D460S		NA A/Goose/Guangdon g/1/1996(H5N1)
A/GRACKLE/TEX AS/2/2024(H5N1) NEP	NS1	S7L;R21Q;S87P;C116S;D139N;A223E;V226I	A223E;V226I	NS1 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)
A/GRACKLE/TEX AS/2/2024(H5N1) NEP	NS2	R61K;E67G	E67G	NS2 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)
A/GRACKLE/TEX AS/2/2024(H5N1) NP	NP	Y52H;S482N		NP A/Chicken/BCFAV8 //2014(H5N2)
A/GRACKLE/TEX AS/2/2024(H5N1) PA	PA	I61M;T85A;K113R;L219I;S277P;M441V;K497R;Y535H;I543L;S558L;T608S		PA A/Netherlands/219/ 2003(H7N7)
A/GRACKLE/TEX AS/2/2024(H5N1) PB1	PB1	T59S;E75D;M171V;V179I;N375S;R430E;A587P	N375S	PB1 A/Mallard/Astrakha n/263/1982(H14N5)
A/GRACKLE/TEX AS/2/2024(H5N1) PB2	PB2	T58A;V109I;V139I;E362G;K389R;D441N;V478I;V495I;M631L;V649I;M676A	V495I;M676A	PB2 A/Duck/Guangdong /E1/2012(H10N8)

References

1. Cao G, Noti JD, Blachere FM, Lindsley WG, Beezhold DH. Development of an improved methodology to detect infectious airborne influenza virus using the NIOSH bioaerosol sampler. *J Environ Monit* 2011;13(12):3321-8. DOI: 10.1039/c1em10607d.
2. World Health Organization. Manual for the laboratory diagnosis and virological surveillance of influenza. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2011.
3. Cuevas F, Kawabata H, Krammer F, Carreno JM. An In Vitro Microneutralization Assay for Influenza Virus Serology. *Curr Protoc* 2022;2(7):e465. DOI: 10.1002/cpz1.465.
4. Karakus U, Cramer M, Lanz C, Yángüez E. Propagation and Titration of Influenza Viruses. In: Yamauchi Y, ed. *Influenza Virus. Methods in Molecular Biology*. New York, NY.: Humana Press; 2018.
5. Vieyres G, Pietschmann T. Entry and replication of recombinant hepatitis C viruses in cell culture. *Methods* 2013;59(2):233-48. DOI: 10.1016/j.ymeth.2012.09.005.



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.27.24310982>; this version posted July 31, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure S1