It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1	Quantitative risk assessment of human H5N1 infection from consumption of fluid cow's				
2	milk				
3					
4	Katherine J. Koebel, DVM ^{1#} , Ece Bulut, MS, PhD ¹ , Samuel D. Alcaine, MS, PhD ² , Aljoša				
5	Trmčić, PhD ² , Mohammed Nooruzzaman, DVM, MS, PhD ¹ , Lina M. Covaleda, PhD ¹ , Diego G.				
6	Diel, DVM, MS, PhD ¹ , & Renata Ivanek, DVM, MSc, PhD ¹				
7					
8	¹ Department of Population Medicine & Diagnostic Sciences, College of Veterinary Medicine,				
9	Cornell University, Ithaca, NY				
10	² Department of Food Science, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences, Cornell University,				
11	Ithaca, NY				
12					
13	[#] Correspondence to: kjk239@cornell.edu S1-020 Schurman Hall, 602 Tower Rd, Ithaca NY				

14 14850 | ORCiD: 0000-0003-4910-2131

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- 15 Word counts: Abstract: 146 | Main text (Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion): 3,401
- 16 Running head: H5N1 fluid milk QRA
- 17 Keywords: H5N1, dairy cattle, quantitative risk assessment, dairy foods, raw milk
- 18
- 19 Summary: In this epidemiologic study, the public health risk of human H5N1 infection from
- 20 drinking raw and pasteurized milk is investigated by use of quantitative risk assessment models.

- 22 Biosketch: Katherine J. Koebel earned her Bachelor's in Animal Science from Michigan State
- 23 University and her Doctor of Veterinary Medicine from Cornell University. Her research draws
- from skills and experience in quantitative analysis, epidemiologic modeling, and dairy science.
- 25 She is currently a PhD student in Epidemiology at Cornell University, researching One Health in
- 26 the context of dairy cattle population medicine.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

27 Abstract

The emergence of H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b in dairy cattle raised concerns over the safety of fluid 28 milk. We developed two stochastic quantitative risk assessment models to represent the United 29 30 States raw and pasteurized fluid milk supply chains and employed these models in baseline, sensitivity, and scenario analysis. Median (5th, 95th percentiles) probabilities of infection per 240-31 32 mL pasteurized and farmstore-purchased raw milk serving were 5.68E-15 (1.766E-16, 2.98E-13) and 1.13E-03 (5.16E-06, 3.82E-02), respectively. This metric was highly sensitive to the viral 33 titers in infected cows' milk. Pasteurization is highly effective at reducing this risk. Bulk tank 34 35 milk PCR testing is more effective at reducing the probability of infection per raw milk serving than improving the identification and diversion of infected cows' milk at harvest. These findings 36 37 emphasize the importance of pasteurization and dairy cow disease surveillance in reducing the 38 risk of H5N1 infection associated with fluid milk consumption.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

39 Introduction

40	Avian influenza (AI) threatens both avian and mammalian species. AI is an illness caused
41	by multiple strains of the influenza A virus (IAV). $(1,2)$ Of particular interest are the viruses of
42	the H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b. This clade emerged in 2020 and was subsequently detected in North
43	America in late 2021.(3,4) Epidemiologic data highlight the predominance of this clade in
44	reports of influenza A(H5) samples from both humans and animals.(5,6).
45	In March 2024, a spillover event resulted in the infection of dairy cattle in Texas with
46	H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b.(7,8) The initial infections have since spread to more than 800 herds
47	nationwide as of 19 December 2024.(9) Infected cows present predominantly with clinical
48	mastitis, usually in mid- to late-lactation, with additional signs such as anorexia, rumen
49	hypomotility, and nasal discharge. Milk from these animals contains extremely high
50	concentrations of virus (4.0-8.8 log ₁₀ TCID ₅₀ /mL (note: hereafter "logTCID ₅₀ ")) and is infectious
51	in a murine oral inoculation model.(7,10,11)
52	As of 19 December 2024, 37 human H5N1 cases with cattle exposure have been
53	confirmed.(12,13) These cases were attributed to workplace exposure and no mortalities nor
54	documented cases of foodborne transmission have been reported. Human cases are generally
55	mild, including conjunctivitis and upper respiratory symptoms, and no human-to-human
56	transmission has been proven.(14) Exposure in 2 cases is unknown (13). Additionally, on 24
57	November 2024, a voluntary recall was issued after a lot of retail raw milk from a California
58	dairy herd tested positive for H5N1.(15) No resultant illnesses have been reported, but the
59	California Department of Public Health acknowledges the potential risk of human infection from
60	contact with or ingestion of the product.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

61	Many questions remain about the risk of human infection with H5N1 from fluid dairy				
62	milk. Recent studies demonstrate high efficacy of heat inactivation of the virus in milk (10,16);				
63	for example, high-temperature short-time (HTST) pasteurization is posited to yield a minimum				
64	12-log reduction in viral loads.(17) Despite the importance of pasteurization in reducing the risk				
65	of foodborne illness, consumption of raw milk remains popular in the U.S.; 4.4% of U.S. adults				
66	consume raw milk at least once per year.(18-20)				
67	Timely research into the human infection risk associated with fluid milk consumption is				
68	essential to inform actions aimed at reducing said risk. The objectives of this study were to (i)				
69	estimate the public health risk of human H5N1 infection from consumption of raw or pasteurized				
70	fluid milk via quantitative risk assessment (QRA), (ii) assess intervention strategies, and (iii)				
71	identify key knowledge gaps.				
72					
73	Methods				
74	Due to differences in the pasteurized and raw milk supply chains, two separate QRA				
75	models were developed in @RISK v.8.6.1 (Lumivero, Denver, CO), an add-on to Microsoft				
76	Excel 365 v.2406 (Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA). Additionally, two raw milk purchasing				
77	pathways (farmstore and retail) were differentiated. Both models consisted of three main, and				
78	several additional, components (Figure 1); parameters are defined in Table 1.				
79	We assume uniform spatial dispersion of the virus in fluid milk; ignorance of cumulative				
80	risk from consumption of multiple servings over time; a fixed number of herds shipping to a				
81	given processing plant; and unspecified fluid milk fat percentage (i.e. skim, 2%, 1%, or whole).				
82	The implications thereof are elaborated upon in Discussion.				

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

84 Pasteurized Milk Model

85	This model represents a given fluid milk processing plant receiving, processing,				
86	packaging, and distributing milk from a fixed number of herds. Fluid milk is followed from the				
87	plant through retail until its consumption by a consumer. The plant receives milk from 100 herds				
88	(<i>n</i>), where the number of affected herds (<i>k</i>) shipping to that plant is calculated with Eqs. S1-3 .				
89	The herds are of average size H_Z , with a healthy cow producing Y_H gal/d.(21,22) Infected				
90	cows comprise p_{herd} proportion of the herd and give Y_I relative yield with milk titers $V_M.(7,23)$ A				
91	proportion D of these animals is identified and their milk is discarded at the time of harvest (i.e.				
92	does not enter the bulk tank). Diversion of this milk means identification of the animal as unfit to				
93	contribute to the milk supply, including but not limited to recognition of clinical illness or a				
94	laboratory-confirmed H5N1 infection.				
95	Milk is pooled at the plant and held at 4°C for 24 hours, during which the viral titers				
96	experience log decay V_D of 0.1 logTCID ₅₀ /d.(16) Temperature-dependent log decay is calculated				
97	with Eq. S4. This method was applied to all storage/transportation stages in both models.				
98	The milk is HTST pasteurized, which is estimated to yield >12-log reduction of				
99	H5N1.(17) Pasteurization log reduction (L) is therefore set at a baseline of 12 with additional				
100	evaluation during scenario analysis. Milk is packaged into gallon (3,785 mL) containers and the				
101	partitioning of virions modeled according to Nauta.(24) Gallons proceed through the cold chain:				
102	storage at the plant (U_{P-Z} , T_{P-Z}), transport to retail (U_{TR-Z} , T_{TR-Z}), storage at retail (U_{SR-Z} , T_{SR-Z}),				
103	transport to the consumer residence (U_{TC-Z} , T_{TC-Z}), and storage at the residence (U_{SC-Z} , and T_{SC-Z})				
104	z).(25) Food waste of gallons ($P_{Disc-Gal-Z}$) and servings ($P_{Disc-Serv-Z}$) is accounted for.(26) The				
105	model culminates in the consumption of an 8-ounce (240 mL) serving. An exponential dose-				
106	response curve with parameter r is employed. Parameter r was calibrated using a mustelid model				

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

of ingestion of H5N1-contaminated meat (Eq. S5).(27) To predict the number of H5N1 cases
 nationally from drinking pasteurized fluid dairy milk, per annum U.S. consumption statistics

109 were obtained from an FDA QRA.(28)

Validation of the pasteurized milk model (its exposure assessment) was performed using
 nationwide dairy food surveillance data which reported the logEID₅₀/mL (50% egg infectious
 doses; considered synonymous with logTCID₅₀ for our purposes) in pasteurized fluid milk at

retail calculated via quantitative real-time RT-PCR (qrRT-PCR).(29) We reproduced this data by

setting K=26 (see Eqs. 2-3), running the model with L=0, and recording the concentration of

115 virus (logTCID₅₀/mL) in fluid milk at retail. The output (logTCID₅₀/mL) can be interpreted as

the equivalent amount of viral genetic material remaining in the product post-pasteurization,

117 approximating the approach in Spackman et al (compared to their results, we combined all fluid

118 milk types as our model does not differentiate between product fat percentages). We compared

119 our predicted logTCID₅₀/mL with Spackman *et al*'s logEID₅₀/mL graphically.

120

121 Raw Milk Model

This model represents a herd of size H_W selling raw milk through either farmstore or 122 123 retail pathways. No pooling of milk from multiple herds nor pasteurization occurs. Parameters 124 $p_{nat'l}$, p_{herd} , Y_H , Y_L , V_M , V_D , D, and r are shared with the pasteurized milk model. In the farmstore 125 pathway, gallon packages are sold directly to consumers after storage at the farmstore (U_F , T_F). 126 In the retail pathway, on-farm storage lag (U_{P-W}, T_{P-W}) , retail transport (U_{TR-W}, T_{TR-W}) , and retail storage (U_{SR} , T_{TR}) are modeled.(30) In both models packages are transported to (U_{TC-W} , T_{TC-W} , 127 128 $T_{H_{i}}$) and stored at ($U_{SC-W_{i}}$ and T_{SC-W}) the consumer residence. The milk temperature during 129 transport to the residence (T_{TC-W}) is calculated with Eq. S6. Accounting for raw milk

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

perishability, the probability of spoilage and discard of the product is adapted from Crotta *et al*(Eq. S7).(*31*)

132

133 Analysis

The primary risk output reported is the "probability of infection per serving" (hereafter "p(infection)") for both models. Sensitivity analysis was conducted with partial rank correlation coefficients (ρ) achieving statistical significance after Bonferroni correction at α =0.05/(number of stochastic parameters in model). Parameters with $|\rho| \le 0.1$ were considered negligible (and of low practical significance) and were omitted from further discussion.(*32*) Coefficient strength ranges were adapted from this paper as well, where $0.1 < |\rho| < 0.40$ is weak, $0.40 \le |\rho| < 0.70$ is moderate, and $0.70 \le |\rho|$ is strong.

Scenario analyses investigated the effects of four parameters on p(infection) (Table 1): in 141 142 the pasteurized milk model, (i) pasteurization (L); in both models, (ii) dose-response parameter r; and in the raw milk model, (iii) improved infected animal diversion (D) and (iv) bulk tank PCR 143 144 testing. In the pasteurized milk model, L was tested at levels 6-, 8-, 10-, 12- (baseline), and 14-145 log reduction. Similarly, in both models, the dose-response parameter r was tested at levels 1E-6, 1E-8 (baseline), and 1E-10. Lastly, full factorial analysis was performed to examine two 146 interventions aimed at reducing risk from consumption of raw milk. Parameters sensitivity (Se), 147 specificity (Sp), and limit of detection (LoD) are employed regarding PCR testing; (33,34) all 148 149 positive tanks (true or false) are discarded. All negatives (true or false) proceed to distribution. 150 Simulations are comprised of 50,000 iterations generated with Latin hypercube sampling and Mersenne twister pseudorandom number generation. Convergence testing with 5% tolerance 151

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

and 95% confidence confirmed the sufficiency of the iteration number. Figures were produced in
R v4.3.2 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

- 154
- 155 Results

ORA models were developed for the raw and pasteurized milk supply chains (Figure 1). 156 157 Projections for the concentration of viral material in retail gallon packages conform well to the 158 results of previously conducted surveillance testing, (29) supporting the validity of the QRA models' exposure assessment (Figure 2). Baseline p(infection) per serving indicated similarity 159 between the two raw milk purchasing pathways (Figure 3 and Table S1). Paired with the 160 increased access to farmstore-sold over retail raw milk in terms of state legality,(35) further 161 162 description of results is limited to the farmstore pathway, except in sensitivity analysis. 163 Baseline scenario 164 Risk metrics in the pasteurized milk model were very low (Figure 3). 5th and 95th 165 percentiles for p(infection) were 1.77E-16 and 2.98E-13, respectively, with a median value of 166 5.68E-15 (**Table S1**). The quantity of virus per contaminated serving was similarly low, ranging 167 from 0 to 0.30 logTCID₅₀ with a mean value of 0.019 logTCID₅₀. A value of 0 logTCID₅₀ 168

169 corresponds to a single TCID₅₀ in a serving and 0.30 logTCID₅₀ corresponds to 2 TCID₅₀ in a

serving. Prevalence of serving contamination took percentiles of 2.43E-08 (5th) and 4.03E-05

171 (95th) with a median of 7.67E-07. Note that this refers to the presence of live infectious virus

and not viral material alone. Out of 50,000 iterations, n=290 (0.58%) projected milk-borne

173 human H5N1 infections with 1 (n=281), 2 (n=8), or 3 (n=1) infections projected in these

174 iterations. An iteration represents a full calendar year of average U.S. fluid milk consumption

175 under the simulated conditions.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

176	In the raw milk model, risk metrics were considerably higher (12-log difference in
177	medians) than in the pasteurized milk model (Figure 3 and Table S1). Median p(infection) was
178	1.13E-03, with percentiles of 5.16E-06 (5th) to 3.82E-02 (95th). Percentiles for the quantity of
179	virus per contaminated serving ranged from 5.22 (5th) to 8.49 (95th) with a median value of 6.88
180	logTCID ₅₀ . Median prevalence of serving contamination was 3.13E-02 (5th percentile: 3.21E-03;
181	95th percentile: 1.07E-01).

182

183 Sensitivity analysis

184 Tornado plots are given in **Figures 4a-c**. Parameter notation is available in **Table 1**. In 185 both models, V_M was very strongly correlated with the p(infection) (pasteurized: $\rho=0.94$; raw, 186 farmstore: $\rho=0.88$, raw, retail: $\rho=0.83$). This metric was also sensitive to $p_{nat'l}$ in both models 187 (pasteurized: $\rho=0.80$; raw, farmstore: $\rho=0.72$; raw, retail: $\rho=0.63$).

In the pasteurized milk model, parameter p_{herd} demonstrated moderate positive 188 correlation ($\rho=0.52$). Y_I was weakly correlated ($\rho=0.15$). H_Z ($\rho=-0.10$) yielded negligible 189 correlation. In the raw milk model, weak positive correlation was observed in *p_{herd}* (farmstore: 190 191 $\rho=0.29$; retail: $\rho=0.24$). For the farmstore purchase pathway, moderate negative correlations 192 were observed in U_F (ρ =-0.62), T_F (ρ =-0.54), U_{SC} (ρ =-0.48), and T_{SC} (ρ =-0.43). Similarly, in the 193 retail purchase pathway, U_{SR} (p=-0.54) and T_{SR} (p=-0.42) display moderate negative correlation. 194 Y_l (farmtore: $\rho=0.09$; retail: $\rho=0.08$) was negligible in both purchasing pathways. Compared 195 against their counterparts in the pasteurized milk model, the strengths and directions of statistically significant parameters were comparable with the exceptions of H_W (farmstore: ρ =-196 197 0.12; retail: ρ =-0.10), which was considered weak in the farmstore pathway and negligible in

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

retail, and parameters T_H (farmstore: ρ =-0.01) and U_{TC} (farmstore: ρ =-0.01), which failed to achieve significance in the retail pathway.

200

201 Scenario analysis

202	The median p(infection) was equal to 3.71E-10 and 3.49E-16 in the 6- and 14-log					
203	pasteurization scenarios, respectively (Figure 5 and Table S2). Increases in the pasteurization					
204	efficacy parameter <i>L</i> produced a progressively lower median p(infection) at each level tested.					
205	A 100-fold increase in the dose-response parameter r (i.e. from a baseline of 1E-8 to 1E					
206	6), meaning a decrease in the quantity of virus necessary to result in infection, proportionately					
207	increases (by 1-2 logs) p(infection), and vice versa (Figure 6 and Table S3). For example, for					
208	pasteurized milk, median p(infection) increases from 5.68E-15 to 5.68E-13 when r increases by					
209	2-log. This effect was consistent in both raw milk purchasing pathways (Figure S1).					
210	In the raw milk supply chain, bulk tank PCR testing was more effective than improved					
211	animal diversion in reducing p(infection); for all three levels of diversion, the addition of bulk					
212	tank PCR testing reduced median p(infection) by 1-2 log (Figures 7 and S2). In the farmstore					
213	purchase pathway (Table S4), without bulk tank PCR, increasing infected cow diversion over a					
214	25% baseline to 50% reduced the median p(infection) from 1.13E-03 to 7.90E-04; with the					
215	addition of bulk tank PCR, this value at 25% diversion was 1.81E-05, then 1.26E-05 at 50%					
216	diversion. Results for the retail purchase pathway were similar (Table S5).					

217

218 **Discussion**

Our model predicts the risk of human H5N1 infection from consumption of pasteurized fluid milk is extremely low (**Figure 3** and **Table S1**), supporting claims about the safety of the domestic pasteurized fluid milk supply chain. According to research surrounding H5N1 and

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

222 HTST pasteurization, 12-log reduction is highly efficacious at reducing the public health risk.(17) Even if a small quantity of infectious virions survive pasteurization, partitioning of 223 these units during packaging further reduces infection risk. In iterations producing a non-zero 224 amount of live virus in a serving, the dose-response parameter r is a significant driver of 225 226 infection risk, as even 1-2 TCID₅₀ can cause infection under the exponential dose-response 227 model, albeit with a very low probability. With the importance of r demonstrated in scenario 228 analysis (Figure 6 and Table S3), further research into H5N1 ingestion dose-response is needed. 229 As seen in sensitivity analysis (Figure 4), the predicted low infection risk is also due in small 230 part to the dilution effect of pooling from multiple herds and the reduced milk yield of infected cows that are not diverted from the supply chain. Also in sensitivity analysis, the decreased 231 232 H5N1 infection risk in raw milk associated with increased storage temperatures/times is a 233 function of viral decay; excessive or inappropriate storage of dairy products is not advisable due 234 to the risk of illness from spoilage pathogens.

The human public health burden from pasteurized milk is predicted to be low, in that 235 <1% of iterations predicted a maximum of 3 cases attributable to its consumption. Note that this 236 output is calculated with per annum consumption data and thus represents the projected annual 237 238 number of infections extrapolating from epidemiologic data collected between March and 239 November of this EID situation; the implications behind this must be considered. Expansion of 240 the virus into California has caused rapid increases in herd infections; as H5N1 continues to 241 spread, by a means still not well understood, it is unknown where in the epidemic curve the U.S. 242 national herd is currently. The model addresses this with stochasticity in the monthly national 243 herd-level prevalence parameter $p_{nat'l}$, but projections of risk may be over- or underestimated.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

While a >12-log reduction is posited (*17*), demonstration of pasteurization efficacy is fundamentally limited by the viral concentration of the initial sample.(*16*) In order to definitively demonstrate efficacy, assays with supraphysiological concentrations of the virus must be conducted. Pasteurization remains the most effective method for reducing risk amidst this H5N1 outbreak, and per scenario analysis (**Table S2**), should its efficacy be overestimated or a pasteurization failure go undetected, the risk to public health would be substantial.

250 Unknowns surrounding the clinical manifestations of human H5N1 infection by ingestion must be considered. The two cases of Michigan dairy workers cite potential exposure from 251 252 splashing milk and direct contact with oronasal secretions during animal care procedures. (36) It is unknown what symptoms an infection from ingestion would produce in a human. In laboratory 253 254 animal studies, clinical signs after H5N1 ingestion ranged from none to weight loss and lethargy, 255 up to and including mortality.(27, 10, 11, 37) It is thought that viral contact with the oropharynx during deglutition is the route of entry sufficient to establish infection in these models. Perhaps 256 257 presentation with conjunctivitis in humans is a function of the route of exposure, including the splash of contaminated material into the mucous membranes of the face. Other routes of 258 exposure may produce a different array of symptoms. Therefore, the absence of a documented 259 260 case attributable to milk consumption may be a result of asymptomaticity or non-reporting. Exposure in two H5N1 cases remains unattributed.(13) 261

Wastewater surveillance has proven applications in the context of this outbreak. Detection of H5N1 in Texas wastewater coincided with the emergence of the disease syndrome in dairy cattle and predates the official announcement of the causative agent.(*38*) While genetic analysis of wastewater samples indicates primarily bovine contribution (likely milk effluent from farms or processing plants), viral shedding in human sewage cannot be ruled out.(*39*) As such,

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

wastewater surveillance in areas without cattle could be used to identify human cases even if saidcases are asymptomatic.

Ingestion of raw milk carries inherent risk of foodborne illness, primarily bacterial.(18-269 20) Our model demonstrates that, without pasteurization, the p(infection) is dramatically higher. 270 271 Given the popularity of raw milk amongst U.S. consumers, in light of this EID there is an urgent 272 need for new technological, educational, and policy solutions to protect public health. Here we have demonstrated the efficacy of two interventions. PCR testing of raw milk herd bulk tanks is 273 highly efficacious in reducing p(infection), more so than improving the ability to identify and 274 275 divert milk from infected cows. However, despite its comparatively weaker effect, diverting infected cows is still important, as this relates to sensitivity in both models to viral titers in 276 277 infected cow milk (V_M) . The U.S.D.A. is currently implementing a bulk tank milk testing 278 surveillance plan at the state and locoregional levels.(40)

The assumptions and limitations of any QRA must be acknowledged for appropriate 279 interpretation of its results. We assume uniform spatial dispersion of virus in milk; if this is 280 281 incorrect and clustering is present, the resultant distribution for the quantity of virus per serving, and therefore the predicted p(infection), is incorrect as a smaller proportion of packages will 282 283 contain more virions paired with a lower prevalence of serving contamination. This may also be 284 true for different milkfat levels, if virions distribute differently in fat globules versus the liquid 285 fraction. As Spackman et al report slight differences in the concentration of viral material 286 amongst different milkfat levels, (29) continued surveillance is required to determine if this is a function of processing or sample size. Our model does not differentiate between milkfat levels; if 287 288 sufficient data become available to allow for inclusion of milkfat as a parameter, projections of 289 risk may shift in either direction. Next, a fixed number of herds contribute to the modeled plant.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

290 Due to the dilution effect demonstrated previously, deviation from a fixed n in real life may increase or decrease risk. Lastly, note that we report risk p(infection) as the probability of 291 infection per single, 8-ounce (240 mL) serving. We assume that p(infection) of a given serving is 292 independent of the "next" consumed serving. In reality, there may be a cumulative risk from 293 294 consumption of multiple subinfectious doses over time, therefore underestimating true risk. 295 Additional information is needed to make a QRA accounting for all dairy products. As research characterizing H5N1 in other dairy foods becomes available, the framework of our 296 297 model may be adapted. As of 6 December 2024, a new Federal Order has been mandated 298 requiring processor-level raw milk H5N1 surveillance. Implementation of this initiative is supported by the projections of our models, and results from this heightened surveillance will 299 300 prove useful in future model developments.(41) For example, academics and industry 301 stakeholders have expressed interest in studying H5N1 in raw milk cheese. The expansion of our models to fill this knowledge gap is being pursued by the authors. 302 303 In conclusion, based on the results of this QRA and the most up-to-date scientific 304 literature, the risk of human H5N1 infection from consumption of pasteurized fluid milk is extremely low. Consumption of raw milk has historically been discouraged due to the risk of 305 306 foodborne illness; in the context of this EID, the emergence of a novel potential milkborne 307 pathogen emphasizes both the risk of this practice and the need for solutions to effectively 308 protect public health. This risk may be reduced with implementation of risk mitigation 309 interventions, including thermal treatment and bulk tank PCR testing. As new information 310 becomes available, the models will be refined and new applications considered. 311

312 Acknowledgements

313	Research reported in this publication was supported by the Office of the Director, National					
314	Institutes of Health of the National Institutions of Health (NIH) under Award Number					
315	T32ODO011000. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily					
316	represent the official views of the National Center for Research Resources or the NIH.					
317	Additionally, this research was partially supported by grants to RI from the National Institute of					
318	Food a	and Agriculture, USDA, Hatch under Accession Number 7000433, as well as Multistate				
319	Resear	rch Funds Accession Number 1016738.				
320						
321	Refer	ences				
322	1.	Alexander DJ. An overview of the epidemiology of avian influenza. Vaccine. 2007 Jul				
323		26;25(30):5637-44. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2006.10.051				
324						
325	2.	Swayne DE. Avian Influenza. 2023 Jun. In: Merck Veterinary Manual. Available from:				
326		https://www.merckvetmanual.com/poultry/avian-influenza/avian-influenza. Accessed				
327		2024 May 17.				
328						
329	3.	Bevins SN, Shriner SA, Cumbee JC, Dilione KE, Douglass KE, Ellis JW, et al.				
330		Intercontinental Movement of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza A(H5N1) Clade				
331		2.3.4.4 Virus to the United States, 2021. Emerg Infect Dis. 2022;28(5):1006-1011. doi:				
332		10.3201/eid2805.220318				
333						
334	4.	Kandeil A, Patton C, Jones JC, Jeevan T, Harrington WN, Trifkovic S, et al. Rapid				
335		evolution of A(H5N1) influenza viruses after intercontinental spread to North America.				
336		Nat Commun. 2023 May 29;14(3082). doi: 10.1038/s41467-023-38415-7				
337						
338	5.	World Organisation for Animal Health World Animal Health Information System. United				
339		States of America - Influenza A viruses of high pathogenicity (Inf. with) (non-poultry				
340		including wild birds) (2017-). Available from: https://wahis.woah.org/#/in-				
341		event/4451/dashboard				
342						
343	6.	World Health Organization. Genetic and antigenic characteristics of zoonotic influenza A				
344		viruses and development of candidate vaccine viruses for pandemic preparedness. 2023				
345		Feb 24.				
346						

347 348	7.	7. Caserta LC, Frye EA, Butt SL, Laverack M, Nooruzzaman M, Covaleda LM <i>et al.</i> Spillover of highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 virus to dairy cattle. Nature.				
349		2024;634:669-676. doi: 10.1038/s41586-024-07849-4				
350						
351	8.	Burrough ER, Magstadt DR, Petersen B, Timmermans SJ, Gauger PC, Zhang J, et al.				
352 353		Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza A(H5N1) Clade 2.3.4.4b Virus Infection in Domestic				
354		10.3201/eid3007.240508				
355						
356 357	9.	U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. HPAI				
358		poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/hpai-confirmed-cases-livestock				
359						
360	10	. Guan L, Eisfeld AJ, Pattinson D, Gu C, Biswas A, Maemura T, <i>et al.</i> Cow's Milk				
361		Containing Avian Influenza A(H5N1) Virus - Heat Inactivation and Infectivity in Mice.				
362		N Engl J Med. 2024 Jul 4;391(1):87-90. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2405495				
363						
364	11	. Eisfeld, AJ, Biswas A, Guan L, Gu C, Maemura T, Trifkovic S, et al. Pathogenicity and				
365		transmissibility of bovine H5N1 influenza virus. Nature. 2024 July 8;633:426-432. doi:				
366		10.1038/s41586-024-07766-6				
367						
368	12	2. Uyeki TM, Milton S, Hamid CA, Webb CR, Presley SM, Shetty V et al. Highly				
369		pathogenic avian influenza A(H5N1) virus infection in a dairy farm worker. N Engl J				
370		Med. 2024 May 3;390:2028-2029. doi: 10.1056/nejmc2405371				
371						
372	13	. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Centers for Disease Control and				
373		Prevention. H5 Bird Flu: Current Situation. 2024 Nov 13. Available from:				
374		https://www.cdc.gov/bird-flu/situation-summary/index.html				
375						
376	14	. Neumann G, Kawaoka Y. Highly pathogenic H5N1 avian influenza virus outbreak in				
377		cattle: the knowns and unknowns. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2024 Jul 25;22:525-526. doi:				
378		/10.1038/s41579-024-01087-1				
379						
380	15	California Department of Public Health. California acts to protect public health: CDPH				
381		warns against drinking single lot of raw milk following bird flu detection; secures				
382		voluntary recall. 2024 Nov 24. Available from:				
383		https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/OPA/Pages/NR24-039.aspx				
384						
385	16	Nooruzzaman M. Covaleda LM. Martin, NH. Koebel K. Ivanek R. Alcaine SD. Diel DG				
386	10	Thermal inactivation spectrum of influenza A H5N1 virus in raw milk. 2024 Sep 24.				

387	[Preprint] Available from:
388	https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.09.21.614205v1
389	
390	17. Spackman E, Anderson N, Walker S, Suarez DL, Jones DR, McCoig et al. Inactivation of
391	highly pathogenic avian influenza virus with high-temperature short time continuous flow
392	pasteurization and virus detection in bulk milk tanks. J Food Protect. October
393	2024;87(10). doi: 10.1016/j.jfp.2024.100349
394	
395	18. Lando AM, Bazaco MC, Parker CC, Ferguson M. Characteristics of U.S. consumers
396	reporting past year intake of raw (unpasteurized) milk: Results from the 2016 Food
397	Safety Survey and 2019 Food Safety and Nutrition Survey. J Food Protect. 2022 Mar
398	25;85(7):1036-1043.
399	
400	19. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Centers for Disease Control and
401	Prevention. Raw Milk. 2024 Apr 29. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/food-
402	safety/foods/raw-milk.html
403	
404	20. United States Food and Drug Administration. Food Safety and Raw Milk. 2024 Mar 5.
405	Available from: https://www.fda.gov/food/buy-store-serve-safe-food/food-safety-and-
406	raw-milk. Accessed 2024 May 16.
407	
408	21. U.S. Department of Agriculture National Agricultural Statistics Service. 2022 Census of
409	Agriculture. Complete data available at: www.nass.usda.gov/AgCensus
410	
411	22. U.S. Department of Agriculture National Agricultural Statistics Service. Quick Stats
412	database query. Available at: https://www.nass.usda.gov/Quick_Stats/
413	
414	23. Durst, P. HPAI dairy herd infection report. Michigan State University Extension. 2024
415	May 24. Available from: https://www.canr.msu.edu/news/hpai-dairy-herd-infection-case-
416	report
417	
418	24. Nauta MJ. Microbiological risk assessment models for partitioning and mixing during
419	food handling. Int J Food Microbiol. 2005 Apr 15;100:311-322. doi:
420	10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2004.10.027
421	
422	25. Qian C, Murphy SI, Lott TT, Martin NH, Wiedmann M. Development and deployment of
423	a supply-chain digital tool to predict fluid-milk spoilage due to psychrotolerant
424	sporeformers. J Dairy Sci. 2023 Aug 23;106(12):8415-33. doi: 10.3168/jds.2023-23673
425	

426	26. Buzby JC, Wells HF, and Hyman J. The Estimated Amount, Value, and Calories of
427	Postharvest Food Losses at the Retail and Consumer Levels in the United States, EIB-
428	121, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, February 2014.
429	
430	27. Lipatov AS, Kwon YK, Pantin-Jackwood MJ, Swayne DE. Pathogenesis of H5N1
431	influenza virus infections in mice and ferret models differs according to respiratory tract
432	or digestive system exposure. J Infect Dis. 2009 Mar 01;199(5):717-725. doi:
433	10.1086/596740
434	
435	28. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration, Center
436	for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition. Quantitative assessment of relative risk to public
437	health from foodborne Listeria monocytogenes among selected ready-to-eat foods.
438	September 2003.
439	
440	29. Spackman E, Jones DR, McCoig AM, Colonius TJ, Goraichuk IV, Suarez DL.
441	Characterization of highly pathogenic avian influenza virus in retail dairy products in the
442	US. J Virol. 2024 Jul 23;98(7). doi: 10.1128/jvi.00881-24
443	
444	30. Latorre, AA, Pradhan AK, van Kessel JAS, Karns JS, Boor KJ, Rice DH <i>et al.</i>
445	Quantitative risk assessment of listeriosis due to consumption of raw milk. J. Food
446	Protect. 2011 Aug;74(8):1268-81. doi: 10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-10-554
447	
448	31. Crotta M, Paterlini F, Rizzi R, Guitian, J. Consumers' behavior in quantitative microbial
449	risk assessment for pathogens in raw milk: incorporation of the likelihood of
450	consumption as a function of storage time and temperature. J Dairy Sci. 2015 Oct
451	14;99(2):1029-58. doi: 10.3108/Jds.2013-10175
452	32 Schober P. Boer C. Schwarte I.A. Correlation coefficients: Appropriate use and
454	interpretation Anesth Analg 2018 May: 126(5): 1763-1768 doi:
455	10 1213/ANE 0000000002864
456	10.1213/11112.000000000000000000000000000000000
457	33. Thermo Fisher Scientific, VetMAX-Gold SIV solutions, 2017. Available from:
458	https://assets.thermofisher.com/TFS-
459	Assets/GSD/Flyers/animalhealth flyer vetmaxgold siv CO121090.pdf
460	
461	34. Laconi A. Fortin A. Bedendo G. Shibata A. Sakoda Y. Awuni JA et al. Detection of
462	avian influenza virus: a comparative study of the <i>in silico</i> and <i>in vitro</i> performances of
463	current RT-qPCR assays. Sci Rep. 2020 May 21:10:8441. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-
464	64003-6
465	

466 467	35. Rhodes MT, Kuchler F, McClelland K, Hamrick KS. Consumer food safety practices: raw milk consumption and food thermometer use, EIB-205, U.S. Department of
468 469	Agriculture, Economic Research Service, January 2019.
470	36. Morse J, Coyle J, Mikesell L, Stoddard B, Eckel S, Weinberg M, et al. Influenza
471	A(H5N1) virus infection in two dairy farm workers in Michigan. New Engl J Med. 2024
472	Aug 7;391:963-4. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2407264
473	
474	37. Gu C, Maemura T, Guan L, Eisfeld AJ, Biswas A, Kiso M, et al. A human isolate of
475	bovine H5N1 is transmissible and lethal in animal models. Nature. 2024 Oct 28. doi:
476	10.1038/s41586-024-08254-7
477	
478	38. Tisza MJ, Hanson BM, Clark JR, Wang L, Payne K, Ross MC, et al. Virome sequencing
479	identifies H5N1 influenza in wastewater from nine cities. 2024 May 10. [Preprint]
480	Available from:
481	https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.05.10.24307179v1.full.pdf
482	
483	39. Honein MA, Olsen SJ, Jernigan DB, Daskalakis DC. Challenges and opportunities for
484	wastewater monitoring of influenza viruses during the multistate outbreak of highly
485	pathogenic avian influenza A(H5N1) virus in dairy cattle and poultry. 2024 Nov 6. Am J
486	Public Health. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2024.307860
487	
488	40. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. USDA
489	builds on actions to protect livestock and public health from H5N1 avian influenza. 2024
490	Oct 30. Available from: https://www.aphis.usda.gov/news/agency-announcements/usda-
491	builds-actions-protect-livestock-public-health-h5n1-avian-influenza
492	
493	41. U.S. Department of Agriculture. USDA announces new federal order, begins national
494	milk testing strategy to address H5N1 in dairy herds. 2024 Dec 6. Available from:
495	https://www.usda.gov/article/usda-announces-new-federal-order-begins-national-milk-
496	testing-strategy-address-h5n1-dairy-herds

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

497 **Tables and Figures**

498

499 Table 1: Parameters used in a quantitative risk assessment of human H5N1 infection from

500 consumption of pasteurized and raw fluid dairy milk.

	Pasteurized Milk	x Model (Z)	Raw Milk Model (W)	
Parameter	Value	Source	Value	Source
Number of herds per plant (<i>n</i>)	100	Assumption	NA	NA
U.S. Herd-Level H5N1 Prevalence (<i>p_{nat'l}</i>)	PERT(0.000803 21, 0.00080321, 0.2363)	9,21,22	PERT(0.000803 21, 0.00080321, 0.2363)	9,21,22
Number of affected herds in U.S. (<i>K</i>)	See Eqs. S2-3.	9,21,22	NA	9,21,22
Number of herds in U.S. (<i>N</i>)	23,153	21	23,153	21
Number of affected herds shipping to plant (k)	See Eqs. S1-3.	21	NA	NA
Average herd size (head) (<i>H</i>)	TRIANG(20, 350, 5000)	21	TRIANG(2, 20, 50)	Expert elicitation
Within-Herd H5N1 Prevalence (%, x100) (<i>p</i> _{herd})	UNIF(0.0342, 0.2349)	7	UNIF(0.0342, 0.2349)	7
Healthy cow milk yield (gal/day) (Y _H)	PERT(8, 9, 10)	22	PERT(8, 9, 10)	22
Infected cow relative milk yield (% of healthy, x100) (<i>Y_I</i>)	PERT(0.5, 0.6, 1.0)	23	PERT(0.5, 0.6, 1.0)	23
Viral titer in	PERT(4.0, 6.5,	7	PERT(4.0, 6.5,	7

infected cow milk (logTCID ₅₀ /mL) (V_M)	8.8)		8.8)	
Viral decay rate (log/day) (V _D)	At 4°C: 0.1 See Eq. S4 .	16	At 4°C: 0.1 See Eq. S4 .	16
Duration of finished product storage at plant/farm pre- shipping ¹ (days) (U_P)	UNIF(1, 2)	25	UNIF(0.167,0.5)	30
Temperature of storage at plant/farm pre- shipping ¹ (°C) (T_P)	UNIF(3.5, 4.5)	25	UNIF(2.2,4.4)	30
Duration of transport to retail (days) (<i>U</i> _{TR})	UNIF(1, 5, 10)	25	TRIANG(0.0716 , 0.0889, 0.247)	30
Temperature of transport to retail (°C) (<i>T_{TR}</i>)	TRIANG(1.7, 4.4, 10)	25	TRIANG(3.6,6.5 ,10.9)	30
Duration of storage at retail (days) (<i>U</i> _{SR})	TruncN(1.82, 3.3, (0.042, 10.0))	25	UNIF(1,7)	30
Duration of storage at farmstore (days) (<i>U_F</i>)	NA	NA	UNIF(1,7)	30
Temperature of storage at retail (°C) (T_{SR})	TruncN(2.3, 1.8, (-1.4, 5.4))	25	TRIANG(- 6.1787, 4.4444, 14.471,Trunc(0,))	30
Temperature of storage at farmstore (°C) (T_F)	NA	NA	TRIANG(- 6.1787, 4.4444, 14.471,Trunc(0,))	30

Duration of transport to consumer residence (days) (U_{TC})	TruncN(0.042, 0.02, (0.01, 0.24))	25	TRIANG(0.012, 0.0271,0.1731)	30
Temperature of transport to consumer residence (°C) (T_{TC})	TruncN(2.3,1.8,(0,10))	25	See Eq. S6 .	30
Home-arrival temperature (°C) (T_H)	NA	NA	TRIANG(- 3.3804,8.8889,2 1.156,Trunc(0,))	30
Duration of storage at consumer residence (days) (U _{SC})	UNIF(1,35)	25	PERT(0.5,2.5,8. 5)	30
Temperature of storage at consumer residence (°C) (T_{SC})	TruncLaplace(4. 06, 2.31, (-1, 15))	25	TRIANG(- 5.0221, 2.7778, 17.238)	30
Probability of gallon discard (%, x100) (<i>P</i> _{Disc-} <i>Gal</i>)	0.12	26	See Eq. S7 .	31
Probability of serving discard (%, x100) (<i>P</i> _{Disc} - <i>serv</i>)	0.20	26	See Eq. S7 .	31
Dose-response parameter r (<i>r</i>)	Baseline: 1.0E-08 Scenario: 1.0E-06, 1.0E-10	27	Baseline: 1.0E-08 Scenario: 1.0E-06, 1.0E-10	27
PCR sensitivity (%, x100) (<i>Se</i>)	NA	NA	0.984	8,33

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

PCR specificity (%, x100) (Sp)	NA	NA	0.991	8,33
PCR limit of detection (logEID ₅₀ /100 ul) (<i>LoD</i>)	NA	NA	1.5	34
Pasteurization log reduction (log) (<i>L</i>)	Baseline: 12 Scenario: 6, 8, 10, 14	17	NA	NA
Infected cow's milk diversion (%, x100) (D)	0.25	Assumption	Baseline: 0.25 Scenario: 0.50, 0.75	Assumption

¹The duration/temperature of storage at the processing plant for the pasteurized milk supply chain, or the

502 duration/temperature of holding at the farm before shipping to retail in the retail purchasing pathway for

503 the raw supply chain.

504 Note: "log" denotes log₁₀

Figure 1: Conceptual model for a quantitative risk assessment of human H5N1 infection from consumption of pasteurized and raw fluid dairy milk.



It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- 509 Figure 2: Probability density histogram of the predicted concentration (log10TCID50/mL)
- 510 of viral material in gallon pasteurized milk containers at retail. Overlaid are the mean (solid)
- 511 $\pm 2\sigma$ (dashed) log₁₀EID₅₀/mL reported for retail dairy milk in Spackman *et al.*



It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

513 Figure 3: Violin plots for the baseline probability of H5N1 infection per serving of

- 514 **pasteurized or raw milk.** Two purchasing pathways (via farmstore and via retail) for raw milk
- 515 are differentiated. For the purposes of visualization, a logarithmic (base-10) Y-axis is employed.



- 517 Figures 4a-c: Sensitivity of the probability of infection per serving of pasteurized (a) or raw
- 518 serving obtained through farmstore (b) or retail (c) sale to model parameters achieving
- 519 statistical (Bonferroni-corrected $p \le 0.05$) and practical ($\rho > 0.1$) significance.



It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- 523 Figure 5: Violin plots for the scenario analysis of varying pasteurization log reductions on
- 524 **the probability of H5N1 infection per pasteurized milk serving**. For the purposes of
- 525 visualization, a logarithmic (base-10) Y-axis is employed.



It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- 527 Figure 6: Violin plots for the scenario analysis of varying dose-response parameter *r* on the
- 528 **probability of infection per pasteurized or raw milk serving**. For the purposes of
- 529 visualization, a logarithmic (base-10) Y-axis is employed. The raw milk farmstore purchase
- 530 pathway is represented here.



It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

532 Figure 7: Violin plots for the scenario analysis of bulk tank PCR testing and improved

533 **infected cow diversion on the probability of infection per raw milk serving.** For the purposes

of visualization, a logarithmic (base-10) Y-axis is employed. The farmstore purchase pathway is

535 represented here.

