

A mathematical model of H5N1 influenza transmission in US dairy cattle

Thomas Rawson^{1,*}, Christian Morgenstern¹, Edward S. Knock¹, Joseph Hicks¹, Anh Pham¹, Guillaume Morel^{1,2}, Aurelio Cabezas Murillo³, Mike Sanderson⁴, Giovanni Forchini^{1,2}, Richard FitzJohn¹, Katharina Hauck¹, and Neil Ferguson¹

¹MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Jameel Institute, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom

²Umeå School of Business, Economics and Statistics, Umeå Universitet, Umeå, Sweden

³World Animal Health Information and Analysis Department, World Organisation for Animal Health, Paris, France

⁴Center for Outcomes Research and Epidemiology, College of Veterinary Medicine, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS, USA

*Corresponding Author: t.rawson@imperial.ac.uk

January 28, 2025

Abstract

We present a stochastic metapopulation transmission model that simulates the spread of H5N1 avian influenza through individual dairy cows in 35,974 dairy herds in the continental United States. Transmission is enabled through the movement of cattle between herds, as indicated from Interstate Certificates of Veterinary Inspection (ICVI) data. We estimate the rates of under-reporting by state and present the anticipated rates of positivity for cattle tested at the point of exportation over time. We investigate the likely impact of intervention methods to date on the underlying epidemiological dynamics, demonstrating that current interventions have had insufficient impact, preventing only a mean 175.2 reported

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

29 January 2025, concentrated within West Coast states, due to the network of cat-
30 tle movements and distribution of the respective dairy populations. We quantify
31 the extent of uncertainty in the scale of the epidemic, highlighting the most press-
32 ing data streams to capture, and which states are most expected to see outbreaks
33 emerge next, with Arizona and Wisconsin at greatest risk. Our model suggests
34 that dairy herd outbreaks will continue to be a significant public health challenge
35 in 2025, and that more urgent, farm-focused, biosecurity interventions and tar-
36 geted surveillance schemes are sorely needed.

37 **Introduction**

38 In February 2024, dairy farms in Texas, New Mexico, and Kansas began to report an
39 unidentified disease spreading through lactating herds [1, 2]. The disease was charac-
40 terized by decreased rumen activity, diarrhoea, reduced milk production, and thicker
41 milk consistency and discoloration. In March, milk samples from these farms were
42 confirmed via real-time PCR as being infected with highly-pathogenic avian influenza
43 (HPAI) H5N1 [3]. This marked the first time that transmission of Influenza A had been
44 identified in US cattle populations [4].

45
46 Subsequent phylogenetic studies identified this strain circulating in dairy cattle as
47 a clade 2.3.4.4b genotype first isolated from wild bird populations in late 2023 [5].
48 This, and additional most-recent common ancestor studies, suggests that the initial
49 spillover into cattle likely occurred in December of 2023 in Texas [6]. Histological stud-
50 ies demonstrated the virus' capability to bind to epithelial cells in the mammary tissue
51 of dairy cows [7], in accordance with findings of far greater viral shedding within milk
52 compared to nasal swabs or respiratory tissues [3]. These factors indicate that the re-
53 peated use of milking apparatus between individual cows during milking is a primary
54 route of transmission [8, 9]. This additionally explains why outbreaks have yet to be
55 detected in beef cattle or dry heifers. In April, the first human spillover case from
56 dairy cattle was reported [10], with a dairy worker demonstrating conjunctivitis but
57 no respiratory symptoms, likely due to contact with infected milk during the milking
58 process.

59
60 The dairy industry is a substantial contributor to US national economic activity, with
61 over 9 million milk cows [11] contributing to approximately 3% of US GDP [12]. Cattle
62 are frequently moved between premises and across states. As a result of this, export of
63 cattle has been implicated in the proliferation of H5N1 to herds nationwide [3], leading
64 to interventions on exports being introduced. When cattle are shipped interstate, they
65 must be accompanied with an Interstate Certificate of Veterinary Inspection (ICVI) to

66 certify that such animals are fit to travel [13, 14]. As of April 29th 2024, cattle exported
67 interstate have up to 30 cows in the cohort tested for H5N1 influenza [15]. Should
68 the herd test positive, the export cannot proceed, and the origin herd must be quar-
69 antined for 30 days before being tested again. No such requirements were introduced
70 for transfers of cattle within state borders.

71

72 As of December 9th 2024, there have been 720 cattle herd outbreaks reported by the
73 USDA [16], across 15 states, and 35 human spillover cases with cattle as the exposure
74 source [17]. Prolonged outbreaks of H5N1 in a novel animal reservoir presents a con-
75 tinuing threat for further spillover and the potential for viral reassortment. Recent
76 structural analysis by Lin et al. (2024) [18] suggests that a single glutamine to leucine
77 mutation within this 2.3.4.4b variant would be sufficient to allow for human receptor
78 binding. For this reason, ascertaining the true size of the current epidemic, and iden-
79 tifying the areas of greatest circulation, is crucial to inform public health responses for
80 curbing transmission. In previous bovine disease outbreaks, such as bovine spongi-
81 form encephalopathy (BSE) and foot-and-mouth disease in the UK, public health re-
82 sponses have been significantly aided by modeling studies to estimate rates of under-
83 reporting [19], estimating key epidemiological mechanisms [20], and quantifying the
84 impact of control policies [21]. Such efforts have not yet been applied to the current
85 bovine H5N1 epidemic in the US.

86

87 In this study, we estimate the true size of the current epidemic via a stochastic metapop-
88 ulation transmission model capturing 9,308,707 milk cows distributed across 35,974
89 herds across the 48 continental US states, as counted in the 2022 Agricultural cen-
90 sus [11]. Epidemiological parameters are estimated by fitting to outbreak data via a
91 Bayesian evidence synthesis approach [22]. The movement of cattle between herds
92 and states is captured using probabilistic outputs of the US Animal Movement Model
93 (USAMM) [23] and verified using actual 2016 ICVI data [14]. We estimate the rates
94 of under-reporting by state and present the anticipated rates of positivity for cattle
95 tested upon leaving each state over time. We further use this model to interrogate the
96 impact of intervention methods to date on the underlying epidemiological dynamics,
97 and quantify the extent of uncertainty in the scale of the current epidemic, highlighting
98 the most pressing data streams to capture.

99 **Results**

100 The model structure and key output metrics are illustrated in Figure 1. Data on the
101 number of dairy herds in the United States and their respective populations are taken

102 from the 2022 US Agricultural Census [11]. Each herd is modeled via Susceptible-
103 Exposed-Infected-Recovered (SEIR) infection dynamics. Panel 1A illustrates the num-
104 ber of infected cattle per herd over time. Panel 1B depicts the date at which an infected
105 herd probabilistically reports an outbreak. Panel 1C illustrates the aggregated number
106 of herds with any infected cattle per state, and the number of new reported outbreaks.
107 The number of new reported outbreaks is skewed by contact tracing efforts and other
108 time-varying factors - thus are not independent data samples. Therefore, we do not fit
109 to outbreak incidence data, but rather to the date of first detection of an outbreak in
110 each state (panel 1D).

111

112 Figure 2 plots the simulated mean and 95% credible intervals (CrI) of the date of first
113 outbreak detection and the number of reported outbreaks for each US state. After fit-
114 ting the epidemiological parameters of the model via pMCMC [24, 22], we generated
115 20,000 stochastic realizations of the model with parameter estimates drawn from the
116 posterior distributions of the fit parameters (see Table 2). All model results shown are
117 from these stochastic realizations so as to present the full stochastic range of uncer-
118 tainty rather than the optimized realizations from the pMCMC fits.

119

120 The date of first detection in panel 2A is represented as a step function, where the
121 black line in these plots shows the proportion of simulations that have had their first
122 outbreak reported by that date in the respective state. The shaded areas shows the 95%
123 CrI of the modeled date of first outbreak in each state. Note that for many states in
124 panel 2A, the upper 95% CrI bound is the final date of the simulations. Table 1 details
125 the proportion of model simulations that experience their first detected outbreak by
126 the end of the week beginning December 2nd 2024.

127

128 Panel 2B shows the proportion of dairy herds in each state reporting new outbreaks
129 each week from December 18th 2023 to December 2nd 2024. Both panels illustrate that
130 the majority of outbreaks are currently concentrated along the West Coast of the coun-
131 try. The model forecasts that states in the mid-West and Florida are the most probable
132 next states to declare their first outbreak. This trend is due to the epidemic beginning
133 in Texas, which exports primarily to nearby West Coast states. The model is seen to
134 overestimate the number of outbreaks in some states. While our model assumes differ-
135 ences in outbreak detection due to differences in herd sizes by state, we do not assume
136 further intrinsic state-varying differences in outbreak detection. In reality, differences
137 in public health resourcing and messaging will impact outbreak detection rates. 72%
138 of outbreaks reported as of December 9th 2024 have been in California. Due to mak-
139 ing up the majority of the epidemiological data, model fits are mostly tuned to the
140 detection rates observed in California. Therefore, overestimation of the model can be




Figure 1: Schematic overview of model format and outputs. Infection spreads from the initial infected state through export of cattle. A) Cattle exports are stochastically generated using trade data from the United States Animal Movement Model (USAMM)[23]. B) At each time step, a herd has a probability of testing, and notifying of an outbreak. C) We aggregate the number of herds with any infected cattle by state, and the number of newly reported outbreaks, at each date. D) We fit global epidemiological parameters and an ascertainment scaling parameter via particle Markov Chain Monte Carlo simulation (pMCMC). Using the posterior distributions of these parameters, we are able to produce further model simulations herein. Full methodological details are presented in Supplementary Material Section 2.




Figure 2: Model simulations. (A) shows the date at which the first outbreak is detected in a state. (B) shows the proportion of herds in each state which report new outbreaks per state each week, accounting for under-reporting. Red points depict data. The black line depicts the model mean, the shaded grey region depicts the 95% credible interval (95% CrI).

141 interpreted as under-reporting within a state compared broadly to baseline reporting
 142 efforts in California. The simulated number of infected herds, the number of herds
 143 with any infected cows on the premises is shown in Supplementary Material Section
 144 3.1.

145

146 We note that simulated incidence levels have a bimodal distribution. Many simu-
147 lations never see H5N1 emerge in a particular state, which is why the 95% CrIs in
148 Figure 2 often span 0. Thus, this mean value is not the “most probable” outcome, but
149 should be interpreted alongside the proportion of simulations which see no infections
150 in particular states, as provided in Table 1.

151

152 These results demonstrate how the composition of the dairy sector in each state has
153 a significant impact on the overall epidemic dynamics. While panel 2A shows that
154 Florida is increasingly likely to report an outbreak, panel 2B shows that the expected
155 proportion of herds reporting outbreaks in Florida remains low. First, states with
156 larger herd sizes present greater opportunities for infection to spread quickly within
157 the respective holdings. This then poses a greater risk of contaminating neighboring
158 herds through shared workers, equipment, grazing space, or environmental runoff.
159 Secondly, larger population holdings are observed to import larger numbers of cattle,
160 hence increasing the probability of infection, as only up to 30 cows are currently tested
161 during inter-state transfer [15]. Thirdly, our model assumptions of ascertainment trend
162 towards larger holdings being more likely to report outbreaks, as has been observed
163 in real-world reporting to date [3]. We demonstrate this phenomenon in Figure 3. The
164 respective sizes of each state’s dairy industry is provided in Supplementary Material
165 Section 1.

166

167 Our model assumes each herd that has not yet reported an outbreak, has a probability
168 of declaring an outbreak at each date. This probability is dependent on the absolute
169 number of infected cattle in the herd, and the proportion of the herd that is currently
170 infected. Panel 3A illustrates the functional dependencies assumed. The functional
171 form shown in panel 3A was designed after discussion with veterinarians based on
172 their experience with on-farm callouts. This baseline probability is then further scaled
173 by an ascertainment rate model parameter, which is estimated in model fitting (Table
174 2). Alternate ascertainment rate assumptions are presented as sensitivity analyses in
175 section 3.2.3 of the Supplementary Material.

176

177 Panels 3B and 3C display the mean probability that a randomly selected herd in each
178 state will report an outbreak, given that 10% of its animals are infected. States with a
179 greater number of large herds, such as California, are more likely to report outbreaks
180 than other states. Table 1 shows that California has reported the vast majority of out-
181 breaks to date.

182

183 Current federal orders require that, when exporting cattle interstate, up to 30 randomly-
184 chosen cows from the exported cohort will be tested for H5N1, and only if all tested

Table 1: Reported outbreaks. For each US state we present the observed number of reported outbreaks, and the number of reported outbreaks predicted by our model. Mean and 95% CrIs are provided from 20,000 stochastic realizations. We also display the proportion of these simulations for which no outbreaks were reported in each state.

US State	Up to and including the week beginning December 2nd 2024		
	Outbreaks reported (Observed)	Simulation outbreaks reported Mean (95% CrI)	Probability of no outbreaks (Proportion of Simulations)
California	520	339 (3 - 809)	0.010
Colorado	64	57 (0 - 139)	0.077
Idaho	35	64 (0 - 256)	0.150
Michigan	29	136 (0 - 710)	0.096
Texas	26	322 (197 - 376)	0.000
Iowa	13	89 (0 - 512)	0.191
Utah	13	25 (0 - 133)	0.306
Minnesota	9	249 (0 - 1305)	0.039
New Mexico	9	86 (74 - 97)	0.000
South Dakota	7	19 (0 - 119)	0.471
Kansas	4	194 (74 - 279)	0.000
Oklahoma	2	70 (0 - 158)	0.041
Nevada	1	2 (0 - 17)	0.686
North Carolina	1	11 (0 - 113)	0.667
Ohio	1	1004 (279 - 1487)	0.000
Wyoming	1	5 (0 - 48)	0.733
Alabama	0	2 (0 - 25)	0.825
Arizona	0	34 (1 - 51)	0.023
Arkansas	0	8 (0 - 34)	0.476
Connecticut	0	2 (0 - 36)	0.870
Delaware	0	0 (0 - 1)	0.974
Florida	0	35 (0 - 78)	0.094
Georgia	0	33 (0 - 155)	0.282
Illinois	0	48 (0 - 316)	0.309
Indiana	0	119 (0 - 598)	0.083
Kentucky	0	69 (0 - 362)	0.171
Louisiana	0	8 (0 - 56)	0.652
Maine	0	3 (0 - 45)	0.879
Maryland	0	9 (0 - 115)	0.698
Massachusetts	0	3 (0 - 40)	0.843
Mississippi	0	5 (0 - 37)	0.716
Missouri	0	125 (0 - 562)	0.112
Montana	0	4 (0 - 48)	0.780
Nebraska	0	7 (0 - 80)	0.759
New Hampshire	0	1 (0 - 5)	0.938
New Jersey	0	1 (0 - 13)	0.914
New York	0	108 (0 - 882)	0.268
North Dakota	0	3 (0 - 37)	0.790
Oregon	0	9 (0 - 104)	0.631
Pennsylvania	0	103 (0 - 888)	0.205
Rhode Island	0	0 (0 - 0)	0.990
South Carolina	0	3 (0 - 33)	0.808
Tennessee	0	34 (0 - 199)	0.343
Vermont	0	24 (0 - 230)	0.516
Virginia	0	16 (0 - 185)	0.664
Washington	0	33 (0 - 193)	0.326
West Virginia	0	2 (0 - 22)	0.881
Wisconsin	0	454 (1 - 2729)	0.019




Figure 3: **Ascertainment rate assumptions.** (A) shows how the modeled baseline probability of reporting an outbreak depends on the number and proportion of infected cattle in a herd. Our model assumes that the probability that an infected herd reports an outbreak depends on the size of the holding, and the number of infected cattle on that date. Panel (B) shows the mean and 95% CrI per-herd probability a herd reports an outbreak by US state, assuming every herd has 10% of its cattle infected. The credible interval captures the variation in herd sizes and the posterior distribution of the ascertainment rate parameter. Panel (C) maps the mean values shown in (B).

185 cattle register negative tests will the export take place [15]. Thus, exports of less than
 186 30 cattle will have all cows tested, and exports of more than 30 cattle will have only
 187 30 randomly selected cows tested. The results of these tests, be it positive or negative,
 188 are not currently reported to health authorities. We output from our model simula-
 189 tions the expected rates of export test positivity per state. This takes into account the
 190 expected number of cattle being exported.


191

192 Figure 4 shows the mean probability by state of such an export testing positive. We use
 193 the 20,000 simulation runs produced in Figure 2 to sample 20,000 national epidemic
 194 trajectories for each herd. For each herd, and for each time point, we assume that it
 195 exports cattle, and sample how many cattle it will be exporting. We then calculate the
 196 probability of these cattle testing positive via the density of a hypergeometric distri-
 197 bution. Figure 4 displays the mean probability over all herds and all 20,000 stochastic
 198 realizations. The 95% CrIs are provided in Supplementary Material Section 3.1.


199

200 Lastly, we use the model to assess the impact that interstate testing has had on the

Mean Per-Herd Probability of H5N1 Positive Test When Exporting From State
Week Beginning 15/04/2024



Mean Per-Herd Probability of H5N1 Positive Test When Exporting From State
Week Beginning 19/08/2024



Mean Per-Herd Probability of H5N1 Positive Test When Exporting From State
Week Beginning 02/12/2024




Figure 4: Probability of positive border testing. When moving cattle inter-state, up to 30 cattle will be tested for H5N1 per export. Panels show the state average per-herd probability that, should a herd export cattle, it would test positive at: **(A)** week beginning April 15th 2024, **(B)** week beginning August 19th 2024, and **(C)** week beginning December 2nd 2024.

201 epidemic trajectory. We consider two counterfactual scenarios. Scenario 1) weaker
202 measures - we assume no restrictions are introduced, no testing is required when ex-
203 porting cattle, and thus all interstate exports proceed unabated. Scenario 2) stronger
204 measures - we assume that the federal order was implemented 28 days earlier, on
205 April 1st 2024, and that up to 100 cattle are tested instead of 30. The results of these
206 counterfactuals over 20,000 stochastic model realizations are shown in Figure 5.

207

208 Considerable stochastic variation is seen across all scenarios, though we do see a re-
209 duction in all infection measures for the mean values of scenario 2 - stronger measures,
210 and an increase for the mean values of scenario 1 - weaker measures, compared with
211 the baseline scenario. For the week beginning December 2nd 2024, under baseline
212 model assumptions, the model simulates a national total of mean 120.9 new reported
213 outbreaks (15-518 95% CrI), compared to an increased mean of 150.7 outbreaks (95%
214 range 17-632 under the no interventions scenario 1, and a reduced mean of 93.4 out-
215 breaks (95% range of 11 - 407) under the “stronger” measures scenario 2.

216

217 Figure 5 shows that under each scenario, the epidemic continues to grow - mean-
218 ing border testing measures alone are insufficient to effectively curb the epidemic.
219 Stronger, farm-focused intervention measures would be required to reduce transmis-
220 sion sufficiently to achieve control.

221 **Sensitivity Analyses**

222 All results are also produced under three alternate modeling assumptions. Supple-
223 mentary Material section 3.2.1 considers alternate likelihood assumptions. Supple-
224 mentary Material section 3.2.2 infers cattle exports from exact 2016 ICVI export data.
225 Supplementary Material section 3.2.3 considers simplified ascertainment rate assump-
226 tions - where ascertainment is proportional only to the proportion of the herd infected.
227 Our conclusions are unchanged in all of these sensitivity analyses.

228 **Discussion**

229 Our study presents the first herd-level dynamic model of highly pathogenic avian
230 H5N1 influenza transmission in US dairy cattle across the continental United States.
231 By synthesizing existing data on dairy herd population sizes and cattle trade patterns,
232 we recreate the spread of the virus from an initial seeding in Texas on December 18th
233 2023, through to the week beginning December 2nd 2024.

234

235 The model projects that the majority of the initial national disease burden is focused




Figure 5: **Testing intervention counterfactuals.** (A) The number of new reported outbreaks weekly. (B) The number of herds nationally with any infected cattle. (C) The total number of infected cows nationally over time. Solid lines show simulation mean. Shaded regions show 95% CrI. Blue depicts baseline model assumptions. Red depicts the scenario with no border testing. Green depicts border testing of up to 100 cows, implemented 28 days earlier, on April 1st 2024.

236 within West Coast states, due to their existing trade patterns with Texas, and the size
237 of their respective dairy industries. However, East Coast states are not without risk
238 of currently housing infected herds, as our model suggests that a considerable degree
239 of under-reporting is misrepresenting the true size of the epidemic. A clear result
240 from Figure 2 and Table 1 is that some states are particularly likely to be home to
241 infected herds, but have yet to identify and report infections. Most notable are Ari-
242 zona, Wisconsin, and Florida. Arizona has the largest mean herd size in the country
243 (Supplementary Material Section 1), and extensive trade connections with Texas and
244 California (Supplementary Material Section 2.4) - states particularly burdened with in-
245 fection. Wisconsin, while farther from the epidemic epicenter, has the largest number
246 of dairy herds in the country - 6,216. While Florida has a modestly sized dairy sector,
247 and is located on the east coast, it has one of the highest mean herd sizes in the coun-
248 try, as their industry is predominantly made up of a few very large holdings. It also
249 imports more cattle from Texas than its neighbors. Table 1 shows that, while it is not
250 implausible that no infections have established within these states, the probability of
251 this is low, with Wisconsin in particular only reporting no outbreaks in 1.9% of model
252 simulations. In only 22 of the 48 continental US states did our model predict zero re-
253 ported outbreaks in $> 50\%$ of model simulations (Table 1).

254
255 The model also demonstrates how the distribution of cattle populations in each state
256 mechanistically impacts the rate of reporting. Figure 3 shows that, due to many West
257 Coast states housing large populations of dairy cattle in single herds, they have a
258 higher-than-average likelihood of reporting outbreaks. This is reflected in the out-
259 break data. California has reported over 8 times as many outbreaks as the state with
260 the next highest number of reported outbreaks. Our model suggests that this can be
261 explained by the fact that the average herd size in California is significantly higher,
262 and not necessarily due to more robust epidemiological investigation attempts in the
263 state.

264
265 The only national intervention mandated to date is the testing of cattle exported inter-
266 state. Up to 30 cows in an exported cohort are tested for H5N1, and must test negative
267 for the export to proceed. Figure 4A shows that, early in the epidemic, Texas was one
268 of the only states with a non-negligible probability of cattle testing positive at export,
269 though we note that such interventions were only brought in from April 29th 2024. By
270 August (panel 4B), Texas had a greater than 40% mean probability of an export testing
271 positive. By December of 2024, our model predicts that infections in Texas may have
272 begun to decrease, and a more uniform probability of positivity is observed across the
273 country. According to the USAMM, a mean 29,590 (IQR 922) interstate exports of dairy
274 cattle occur every year [23]. Given that such testing is mandated to occur, it would be

275 prudent to report such testing to verify against our expected positivity rates and better
276 refine model estimates.

277

278 Our model has also demonstrated that the border-testing intervention alone, while
279 a valuable (if unrealised) opportunity for surveillance, is insufficient to control the
280 spread of H5N1 influenza. We explored the counterfactual scenario of stronger border
281 testing measures, of up to 100 cows, and introduced 28 days earlier, on April 1st 2024.
282 Despite a slight reduction in the mean number of outbreaks under this scenario, the
283 fundamental epidemic dynamics remained unchanged, with infections and outbreaks
284 continuing to increase as the year continued. Rather, more targeted biosecurity inter-
285 ventions at farm level will be required, and better outreach with industrial partners
286 pursued. On May 10th 2024, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) provided a
287 total of \$98 million to support biosecurity measures [25, 26], whereby individual farms
288 could apply for up to \$28,000 to implement protocols such as secure milk plans, dis-
289 posal of infected milk, veterinarian costs, and testing costs. As of January 9th 2025,
290 only 510 premises have applied for this additional funding [27]. On May 30th 2024,
291 the USDA announced a further \$824 million was being allocated to a nationwide vol-
292 untary “Dairy Herd Status Pilot Program”, whereby premises could apply for free
293 routine milk surveillance. The 2022 US Agricultural Census lists 36,024 dairy farms.
294 As of January 9th 2025, only 75 herds have enrolled for the voluntary testing program
295 [28]. Evidently, voluntary measures are currently failing to see sufficient uptake.

296

297 Data availability has been poor throughout the epidemic, the only epidemiological
298 data stream being the number of reported outbreaks. Due to a lack of uniform surveil-
299 lance or testing, uncertainty surrounding state-level infection levels is large, as demon-
300 strated in Figure 2. Uncertainty is further compounded by the probabilistic nature of
301 our modeled export assumptions, necessitated by a lack of precise movement data in
302 this period. Many other countries, including the European Union, enforce mandatory
303 identification of all premises, individual cattle, and movement of animals, often by
304 electronic tagging methods [29]. The US has no such requirement. Additionally, since
305 veterinary and public health responses are governed at the state level, individual states
306 vary greatly in the measures, resources, and interventions they have applied to limit
307 spread. Reported outbreak incidence data are not sufficient to reasonably quantify
308 these state-level differences. The most valuable enhancement to current surveillance
309 would be through stratified and systematic sentinel testing for infection, reporting of
310 both positive and negative test results. This would allow overall assessment of in-
311 fection prevalence within farms, and estimation of the proportion of herds with any
312 level of infections, which in turn would allow better estimation of the risks of onward
313 infection through cattle trade. A further additional valuable source of data would be

314 the publication of the results of pre-export cattle testing currently being undertaken.
315 Figure 4 shows our estimates of the rates of positive tests at export currently, which
316 such data might be compared against, if released.

317

318 While our analysis suggests that some of the earliest infected states may have passed
319 the peak of their epidemics, Figure 2 suggests that many more states will still be in
320 the early stages of their epidemics. Importantly, our model also does not capture the
321 role of either re-infection, or the emergence of new, more adapted, clades of the virus
322 (though studies have shown that initial infection infers strong protection against re-
323 infection [30]). Our analysis suggests that dairy herd outbreaks will continue to be
324 a significant public health challenge in 2025, and that more urgent interventions are
325 sorely needed. Early economic models of the impact of the epidemic on the US dairy
326 sector project economic losses ranging from \$14 billion to \$164 billion [12]. Addition-
327 ally, 35 human spillover cases from cattle [17] have been reported to date. The longer
328 the epidemic persists in a novel mammalian reservoir, the greater the risk of further
329 human spillovers and viral adaptations to human hosts. Recent research suggests only
330 minimal genetic distance separates the currently circulating clade from adaptation to
331 human receptor binding [18], and such adaptation has already occurred to improve
332 virus replication in bovine and primary human airway cells [31].

333

334 Our work is not without limitations. Most importantly is that, due to insufficient
335 epidemiological data, we had to make strong assumptions about the probability of as-
336 certainment - whether or not an infected herd is identified and reported. Fig 3 outlines
337 the implications of these assumptions, but the wide credible interval for our estimate
338 of the ascertainment parameter A^{asc} reflects these data limitations. Additionally, be-
339 cause the US does not employ a mandatory electronic tagging system, there is no way
340 to accurately capture the precise cattle movements for 2024. While we were provided
341 with the 2016 ICVI data utilised in Cabezas et al. (2021) [14], it was considered, upon
342 comparison with USAMM model simulations, that precise inter-state exports might
343 vary greatly year-to-year. Therefore, assuming identical movements to 2016 could
344 induce significant bias into the results. Thus, we instead take the probabilistic ap-
345 proach, whereby the exports of cattle are probabilistically determined through model
346 simulations according to the USAMM model [23]. While this introduces further uncer-
347 tainty into the model, it accurately demonstrates how poor data availability regarding
348 precise 2024 cattle movement hampers epidemic forecasting efforts. We nonetheless
349 present model results fit using this 2016 ICVI data as a sensitivity analysis in Supple-
350 mentary Material Section 3.2.2.

351

352 In conclusion, our model demonstrates that we cannot definitively conclude that the

353 current number of reported outbreaks is a true representation of the scale of the cur-
354 rent H5N1 influenza epidemic in dairy cattle. Significant under-reporting is likely,
355 and the differences in dairy herd population distributions across states have aided in
356 spreading disease across the west coast. Current mandatory interventions are insuf-
357 ficient for controlling the spread of disease, and voluntary testing and interventions
358 are severely under-utilised. Significant increases in testing are urgently required to
359 reduce the uncertainty of model projections and provide decision-makers with a more
360 accurate picture of the true scale of the national epidemic.

361 **Methods**

362 **Infection Seeding**

363 We seeded the epidemic with five infected cows in a mid-size herd in Texas, on the
364 week beginning December 18th 2023, based on phylogenetic analyses [6]. For the
365 stochastic realizations, we also seeded 9 additional herds in accordance with the nine
366 early outbreaks detailed in Caserta et al. (2024) [3]. The herd size, number of infected
367 cattle, and date of seeding is consistent with the data presented in that manuscript.

368 **Epidemiological dynamics**

369 We construct a stochastic metapopulation SEIR model [32] with 35,974 individual
370 herds of varying population size, informed by the 2022 US Agricultural Census [11].
371 Each herd's infection dynamics are the stochastic equivalent of the following set of
372 ordinary differential equations (ODEs):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dS_i}{dt} &= -\beta \frac{S_i I_i}{N_i} - \beta S_i \alpha \left(\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N_{\text{herds}}^i} \frac{I_j}{N - N_i} \right), \\ \frac{dE_i}{dt} &= \beta \frac{S_i I_i}{N_i} + \beta S_i \alpha \left(\sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N_{\text{herds}}^i} \frac{I_j}{N - N_i} \right) - \sigma E_i, \\ \frac{dI_i}{dt} &= \sigma E_i - \gamma I_i, \\ \frac{dR_i}{dt} &= \gamma I_i.\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

373 Here, S_i , E_i , I_i , and R_i are the number of susceptible, exposed, infected and recovered
374 cows in herd i . N_i is the total population of herd i . β , σ , and γ are the transmission,
375 incubation, and recovery rates respectively. α is a model parameter between 0 and
376 1 controlling the rate of transmission between herds in the same state. N_{herds}^i is the

377 total number of herds in the US state herd i resides in. Early epidemiological surveys
 378 of farms reporting outbreaks found that transmission routes existed between neigh-
 379 boring herds through the shared use of equipment, staff, grazing space, or wild birds
 380 [33], which we capture here in the model. We assume no such transmission can occur
 381 between herds in different US states.

382

383 The stochastic analogue of the above ODEs, is that we calculate the number of cat-
 384 tle progressing between epidemiological compartments via binomial distributions, for
 385 each time step dt as:

$$\begin{aligned} n_{SE}^i &\sim \text{Binomial} \left(S_i, 1 - \exp \left(- \left(\beta \frac{S_i I_i}{N_i} + \beta S_i \alpha \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N_{\text{herds}}^i} \frac{I_j}{N - N_i} \right) dt \right) \right), \\ n_{EI}^i &\sim \text{Binomial} (E_i, 1 - \exp(-\sigma dt)), \\ n_{IR}^i &\sim \text{Binomial} (I_i, 1 - \exp(-\gamma dt)). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

386 Here n_{XY}^i is the number of cattle moved from compartment X to Y (for general X and
 387 Y), in herd i , in a time step of size dt .

388

389 After all cattle movements between epidemiological compartments is concluded, we
 390 calculate for each herd that has yet to report an outbreak, whether or not it will re-
 391 port an outbreak in that time step. It reports an outbreak with probability $P_i^{\text{outbreak}} =$
 392 $1 - e^{-\phi_i}$, where ϕ_i is

$$\phi_i = \left(\frac{I_i}{(0.7N_i)^{0.95}} + \frac{I_i}{150} \right) A^{\text{asc}} dt, \quad (3)$$

393 and A^{asc} is a model parameter that we fit. The bracketed term to the left of A^{asc} in
 394 Equation 3 is shown in the heatmap of Figure 3A. This functional form was devel-
 395 oped in consultation with veterinarians based on their experiences of at what stage of
 396 pathogen spread they are typically consulted.

397 Movement of cattle between herds

398 After calculating the movement between epidemiological compartments and any re-
 399 porting of outbreaks, we then calculate the movement of cattle between herds. As
 400 detailed in Supplementary Material Section 2.4, we infer from the USAMM the prob-
 401 ability, P_i^{export} , for each US state that a herd within that state will export cattle each
 402 week. We assume the same probability for every herd in the state. We also calculate
 403 the proportion of cows in the origin herd that will be exported - $P_i^{\text{export size}}$ from the
 404 USAMM export simulations, which include cohort size and size of origin herd. We
 405 also calculate the probabilities of, should an export of cattle occur, which US state they

406 will be exported to. This is parameterized by a movement matrix M , where element
407 $M_{i,j}$ denotes the probability that an export from state i will go to state j . This matrix
408 describes the patterns of interstate movement, and the diagonal represents the prob-
409 ability of an export remaining within the same state. Once the destination state is
410 determined, we randomly allocate which herd in the destination state the cattle will
411 be exported to, scaled by the population size of the respective herds, to preserve herd
412 sizes. Once an origin and destination herd are assigned, we draw the number of cattle
413 to be exported as

$$\begin{aligned}n_{S_i S_j} &\sim \text{Binomial} \left(S_i, P_i^{\text{export size}} dt \right), \\n_{E_i E_j} &\sim \text{Binomial} \left(E_i, P_i^{\text{export size}} dt \right), \\n_{I_i I_j} &\sim \text{Binomial} \left(I_i, P_i^{\text{export size}} dt \right), \\n_{R_i R_j} &\sim \text{Binomial} \left(R_i, P_i^{\text{export size}} dt \right).\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

414 Lastly, before moving cattle between the respective compartments of herds i and j , we
415 simulate the border testing mandate. If the model date is after April 29th 2024, we
416 draw a random variable, X from a hypergeometric distribution:

$$X \sim \text{Hypergeometric} \left(n_{I_i I_j}, n_{S_i S_j} + n_{E_i E_j} + n_{R_i R_j}, \min(30, n_{N_i N_j}) \right).\tag{5}$$

417 Here the three parameters of the above hypergeometric are, the number of "success"
418 items in the population, the number of "failure" items in the population, and the num-
419 ber of samples taken without replacement from the population. X is the number of in-
420 fected cattle drawn. If $X = 0$, then no infected cattle are detected, and the export takes
421 place. All probabilities and a full logic flow diagram are presented in Supplementary
422 Material Section 2.

423 **cowflu package**

424 To efficiently simulate the above probabilistic model, we produced a custom R pack-
425 age, `cowflu`, which allows simulating and fitting the model via the `dust2` package [22]
426 in R, while the model itself is written in C++. Documentation on the use of the pack-
427 age and worked vignettes can be found on our github repo: <https://github.com/mrc-ide/cowflu>. The package is flexible to being applied to any SEIR metapopula-
428 tion model with custom probabilities of movement between sub-populations, subject
429 to user-defined movement matrices.
430

431 **Model fitting**

432 Five of the above model parameters - β , α , σ , γ , and A^{asc} , are fit via particle Markov
 433 Chain Monte Carlo [24] methods. We assign weakly-informative prior distributions,
 434 informed by early studies associated with the current outbreak [34]. We fit the model
 435 simulated values of “date of first outbreak detection” (as seen in Figure 2A) to the real
 436 world data equivalent, via a likelihood function detailed in Supplementary Material
 437 section 2.5. We ran the pMCMC simulations across 16 chains of 40,000 iterations each.
 438 Model convergence statistics are presented in Supplementary Material section 2.5.

439
 440 Table 2 shows the priors and posteriors for all model parameters. Note that we fit
 441 $\frac{\beta}{\gamma}$ instead of β due to observed correlation between β and γ , so as to improve chain
 mixing.

Table 2: The Prior distributions and posterior intervals for all fit model parameters.

Parameter	Description	Prior distribution	Posterior - Median (95% CrI)
$\frac{\beta}{\gamma}$	transmission rate recovery rate	Uniform(0.05, 3)	1.864 (0.929-2.932)
α	Inter-state transmission proportion	Uniform(0, 0.1)	0.063 (0.009-0.098)
σ	Incubation rate	Uniform(0.05, 2)	1.050 (0.199-1.956)
γ	Recovery rate	Uniform(0.05, 2)	1.084 (0.384-1.942)
A^{asc}	Ascertainment rate scaling	Beta(1, 1)	0.648 (0.091-0.986)

442

443 References

- 444 [1] Klein, B., Kraemer, M. U. G. & Scarpino, S. V. Timeline for H5N1 in the USA
445 during the 2024 Outbreak. 10.5281/zenodo.11977338 . [https://github.com/
446 Emergent-Epidemics/H5N1_US2024_timeline](https://github.com/Emergent-Epidemics/H5N1_US2024_timeline) (2024).
- 447 [2] Burrough, E. R. *et al.* Highly pathogenic avian influenza A (H5N1) clade 2.3. 4.4
448 b virus infection in domestic dairy cattle and cats, United States, 2024. *Emerging
449 infectious diseases* **30**, 1335—1343 (2024).
- 450 [3] Caserta, L. C. *et al.* Spillover of highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 virus to
451 dairy cattle. *Nature* **634**, 669–676 (2024).
- 452 [4] Sreenivasan, C. C., Thomas, M., Kaushik, R. S., Wang, D. & Li, F. Influenza A in
453 bovine species: a narrative literature review. *Viruses* **11**, 561 (2019).
- 454 [5] Mostafa, A. *et al.* Avian influenza A (H5N1) virus in dairy cattle: origin, evolution,
455 and cross-species transmission. *mBio* **15**, e02542–24 (2024).
- 456 [6] Nguyen, T.-Q. *et al.* Emergence and interstate spread of highly pathogenic avian
457 influenza A (H5N1) in dairy cattle. *bioRxiv* (2024).
- 458 [7] Ríos Carrasco, M., Gröne, A., van den Brand, J. M. & de Vries, R. P. The mammary
459 glands of cows abundantly display receptors for circulating avian H5 viruses.
460 *Journal of Virology* **98**, e01052–24 (2024).
- 461 [8] Halwe, N. J. *et al.* H5N1 clade 2.3. 4.4 b dynamics in experimentally infected
462 calves and cows. *Nature* **637**, 903–912 (2025).
- 463 [9] Le Sage, V., Campbell, A., Reed, D. S., Duprex, W. P. & Lakdawala, S. S. Per-
464 sistence of influenza H5N1 and H1N1 viruses in unpasteurized milk on milking
465 unit surfaces. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* **30**, 1721 (2024).
- 466 [10] Uyeki, T. M. *et al.* Highly pathogenic avian influenza A (H5N1) virus infection in
467 a dairy farm worker. *New England Journal of Medicine* **390**, 2028–2029 (2024).
- 468 [11] United States 2022 Census of Agriculture. Table 11. Cattle and Calves - Inven-
469 tory and Sales: 2022 and 2017. [https://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/
470 AgCensus/2022/Full_Report/Volume_1,_Chapter_2_US_State_Level/st99_2_
471 011_011.pdf](https://www.nass.usda.gov/Publications/AgCensus/2022/Full_Report/Volume_1,_Chapter_2_US_State_Level/st99_2_011_011.pdf). Accessed: 2024-12-09.
- 472 [12] Morel, G. *et al.* The impact of H5N1 on US domestic and international dairy mar-
473 kets (pre-print). SSRN (2025). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5101058>.

- 474 [13] Buhnerkempe, M. G. *et al.* A national-scale picture of us cattle movements ob-
475 tained from interstate certificate of veterinary inspection data. *Preventive veteri-*
476 *nary medicine* **112**, 318–329 (2013).
- 477 [14] Cabezas, A., Sanderson, M., Lockhart, C., Riley, K. & Hanthorn, C. Spatial and
478 network analysis of us livestock movements based on interstate certificates of
479 veterinary inspection. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* **193**, 105391 (2021).
- 480 [15] Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. Technical Notes: Clarification to
481 Inquiries Received on April 24 Federal Order. [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/tech-notes-clarification-inquiries-rcvd-fo.pdf)
482 [sites/default/files/tech-notes-clarification-inquiries-rcvd-fo.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/tech-notes-clarification-inquiries-rcvd-fo.pdf).
483 Accessed: 2024-12-09.
- 484 [16] Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. HPAI Confirmed Cases in Live-
485 stock . [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/hpai-confirmed-cases-livestock)
486 [avian-influenza/hpai-detections/hpai-confirmed-cases-livestock](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/hpai-confirmed-cases-livestock). Ac-
487 cessed: 2024-12-09.
- 488 [17] Centre for Disease Control. H5 Bird Flu: Current Situation . [https://www.cdc.](https://www.cdc.gov/bird-flu/situation-summary/index.html)
489 [gov/bird-flu/situation-summary/index.html](https://www.cdc.gov/bird-flu/situation-summary/index.html). Accessed: 2024-12-09.
- 490 [18] Lin, T.-H. *et al.* A single mutation in bovine influenza H5N1 hemagglutinin
491 switches specificity to human receptors. *Science* **386**, 1128–1134 (2024).
- 492 [19] Donnelly, C. A., Ferguson, N. M., Ghani, A. C. & Anderson, R. M. Implications
493 of bse infection screening data for the scale of the british bse epidemic and cur-
494 rent european infection levels. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B:*
495 *Biological Sciences* **269**, 2179–2190 (2002).
- 496 [20] Chis Ster, I. & Ferguson, N. M. Transmission parameters of the 2001 foot and
497 mouth epidemic in Great Britain. *PloS one* **2**, e502 (2007).
- 498 [21] Ferguson, N. M., Donnelly, C. A. & Anderson, R. M. Transmission intensity and
499 impact of control policies on the foot and mouth epidemic in great britain. *Nature*
500 **413**, 542–548 (2001).
- 501 [22] FitzJohn, R. G. *et al.* Reproducible parallel inference and simulation of stochastic
502 state space models using odin, dust, and mcstate. *Wellcome Open Research* **5**, 288
503 (2021).
- 504 [23] Sellman, S. *et al.* Modeling us cattle movements until the cows come home: Who
505 ships to whom and how many? *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* **203**,
506 107483 (2022).

- 507 [24] Andrieu, C., Doucet, A. & Holenstein, R. Particle markov chain monte carlo meth-
508 ods. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* **72**, 269–
509 342 (2010).
- 510 [25] US Department of Agriculture. Fact Sheet: USDA, HHS Announce New Ac-
511 tions to Reduce Impact and Spread of H5N1 . [https://www.usda.gov/article/
512 usda-hhs-announce-new-actions-reduce-impact-and-spread-h5n1](https://www.usda.gov/article/usda-hhs-announce-new-actions-reduce-impact-and-spread-h5n1). Accessed:
513 2024-12-16.
- 514 [26] Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. USDA Support Options for
515 Dairy Herd Producers . [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/
516 usda-support-dairy-herd-508.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/usda-support-dairy-herd-508.pdf). Accessed: 2024-12-09.
- 517 [27] US Department of Agriculture. Financial Assistance. . [https://www.aphis.usda.
518 gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/
519 livestock/financial-assistance](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/livestock/financial-assistance). Accessed: 2025-01-09.
- 520 [28] US Department of Agriculture. Dairy Herd Status Program . [https://
521 www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/
522 hpai-detections/livestock/dairy-herd-status-program](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/livestock/dairy-herd-status-program). Accessed: 2024-12-
523 16.
- 524 [29] Bowling, M. *et al.* Identification and traceability of cattle in selected countries
525 outside of North America. *The Professional Animal Scientist* **24**, 287–294 (2008).
- 526 [30] Zhou, Y. *et al.* Highly pathogenic avian influenza virus H5N1 infection in dairy
527 cows confers protective immunity against reinfection. *ResearchSquare* (2024). URL
528 <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-5613077/v1>.
- 529 [31] Dholakia, V. *et al.* Polymerase mutations underlie adaptation of H5N1 influenza
530 virus to dairy cattle and other mammals. *bioRxiv* (2025).
- 531 [32] Keeling, M. J., Bjørnstad, O. N. & Grenfell, B. T. Metapopulation dynamics of
532 infectious diseases. In *Ecology, genetics and evolution of metapopulations*, 415–445
533 (Elsevier, 2004).
- 534 [33] US Department of Agriculture. Fact Sheet: Highly Pathogenic Avian
535 Influenza H5N1 Genotype B3.13 in Dairy Cattle: National Epidemi-
536 ologic Brief . [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/
537 hpai-dairy-national-epi-brief.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/hpai-dairy-national-epi-brief.pdf). Accessed: 2024-12-16.
- 538 [34] Ward, J. *et al.* Estimates of epidemiological parameters for H5N1 influenza in
539 humans: a rapid review. *medRxiv* (2024).

540 **Author Contributions**

541 **TR:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Analysis, Writing. **CM:** Writing, Re-
542 view and Editing. **ESK; RF:** Software, Analysis. **JH; AP; GM; GF:** Review and Editing.
543 **ACM; MS:** Data Provision. **KH; NF:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Review and
544 Editing.

545 **Funder Statement**

546 TR, CM, JTH, AP, and KH acknowledge funding from the Medical Research Council
547 (MRC) Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis (MR/X020258/1) funded by the
548 UK MRC and carried out in the frame of the Global Health EDCTP3 Joint Undertaking
549 supported by the EU; the NIHR for support for the Health Research Protection Unit
550 (HRPU) in Modelling and Health Economics, a partnership between the UK Health Se-
551 curity Agency (UKHSA), Imperial College London, and London School of Hygiene &
552 Tropical Medicine (grant code NIHR200908); EK is funded exclusively via the HRPU;
553 TR, AP, GM, GF, and KH acknowledge funding from Community Jameel and Kenneth
554 C Griffin supporting the work of the “Jameel Institute-Kenneth C Griffin Initiative
555 for the Economics of Pandemic Preparedness” at the Jameel Institute, Imperial. CM
556 acknowledges support from The Eric and Wendy Schmidt Fund for Strategic Innova-
557 tion via the Schmidt Polymath Award (G-22-63345). AP also acknowledges funding
558 by a joint investigator award to Prof Azra Ghani and KH from the Wellcome Trust
559 (220900/Z/20/Z). The funders of the study had no role in the study design, data col-
560 lection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report. For the purpose
561 of open access, the authors have applied a ‘Creative Commons Attribution’ (CC BY)
562 licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.