

Systematic review and meta-analysis of the prevalence of coronavirus in the world: One health approach is urgent

Ricardo Faustino^{a,b,#}, Miguel Faria^a, Mónica Teixeira^{a,d}, Filipe Palavra^a, Maria do Céu Costa^c, Paulo Sargento^{a,d}

Affiliations

^a Research Group in Health Sciences and Technologies - NICiTeS, Ribeiro Sanches Higher School of Health, Polytechnic Institute of Lusophony (IPLuso) Lisbon, Portugal

^b Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Lusophone University of Humanities and Technologies of Lisbon, Campo Grande, Lisbon, Portugal

^c CBIOS, School of Health Sciences and Technologies, Lusophone University of Humanities and Technologies, Campo Grande, Lisbon, Portugal

^d Clinic São João De Deus, R. António Patrício 25, 1700-048 Lisbon, Portugal

#Corresponding author

Ricardo Faustino

R. do Telhal aos Olivais 8, 1950-396 | Lisboa, Portugal

E-mail: rjfaustino@fc.ul.pt ; p60571@mso365.ipluso.pt

Phone number: +351 218621060 | Fax number: +351

Keywords

Coronavirus, one health, zoonosis

Abstract

Coronaviruses have been responsible for major epidemic crises in 2003 with SARS-CoV-1, in 2012 with MERS-CoV and in 2019 with SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19), causing serious atypical pneumonia in humans. We intend, with this systematic analysis and meta-analysis, to clarify the prevalence of the various strains of coronavirus in different animal species. For this purpose, we carried out an electronic survey using Pubmed's Veterinary Science search tool to conduct a systematic assessment of published studies reporting the

prevalence of different strains of coronavirus in different animal species between 2015 and 2020. We conducted different analysis to assess sensitivity, publication bias, and heterogeneity, using random and fixed effects. The final meta-analysis included 42 studies for systematic review and 29 in the meta-analysis. For the geographic regions with a prevalence greater than or equal to 0.20 (Forest plot overall; prevalence = 0.20, $p < 0.01$, $Q = 10476.22$ and $I^2 = 100\%$), the most commonly detected viruses were: enteric coronavirus (ECoV), pigeon-dominant coronavirus, (PdCoV), Avian coronavirus M41, Avian coronavirus C46, Avian coronavirus A99, Avian coronavirus JMK, MERS-CoV, Bovine coronavirus, Ro-BatCoV GCCDC1, Alphacoronavirus, Betacoronavirus, Deltacoronavirus, Gamacoronavirus and human coronaviruses (HCoVs). The wide presence of different strains of coronavirus in different animal species on all continents demonstrates the great biodiversity and ubiquity of these viruses.

The most recent epidemiological crises caused by coronavirus demonstrates our unpreparedness to anticipate and mitigate emerging risks, as well as the need to implement new epidemiological surveillance programs for viruses. Combined with the need to create advanced training courses in One Health, this is paramount in order to ensure greater effectiveness in fighting the next pandemics.

Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is the most recent viral pandemic event in recent years associated with the *Coronaviridae* family, with COVID-19 being its seventh member [1]. The *Coronaviridae* comprise two subfamilies, including *Coronavirinae*, whose members are commonly referred to as coronaviruses (CoVs).

The outbreak was thought to have originated in Wuhan, spread rapidly to neighbouring provinces and, within three months, a pandemic was declared. Cases have been reported

in every region of the world, with a high number of infections and deaths. New origin hypotheses, however, have been advanced in more recent studies [2].

Research studies indicate that 72% of events arising from zoonotic diseases originate from wildlife. Many of these diseases pose serious risks to human health, as demonstrated by the 2014 Ebola virus in West Africa, MERS-CoV in the Middle East in 2012 [3], SARS-CoV detected in 2002 in China and H5N1 in 2004. The existence of markets for trade of live animals brings wildlife closer to humans and domestic animals. These places of commerce have a potential role as an interface for the transmission of pathogens. This interface can contribute to the emergence of diseases, and the spread of a range of diseases, including pathogenic avian influenza H5N1, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) [4,5]. According to Leroy [2], since genetic recombination events within human CoVs are well documented, the known high prevalence of dog infections with canine coronaviruses in Europe might foster recombination with SARS-CoV-2 if an animal were infected with both viruses. Such an event, if it happens, could lead to the emergence of a new coronavirus with unpredictable phenotypic characteristics (transmissibility and virulence). Unfortunately, the likelihood of such a scenario is difficult to assess.

The coronavirus is well known in the world of veterinary medicine. A translation of this experience can be very beneficial for human health [6,7]. For this purpose, One Health appears as an important concept. It is a new approach that is based on the relationship between humans, animals and the environment, and recognizes that the health and well-being of human beings is strongly related to the health of animals and their environment [3].

Belonging to the *Coronaviridae* family, in the order Nidovirales, the SARS-CoV-2 genome consists of positive-sense, single-stranded, polyadenylated, nonsegmented RNA [8]. In order to understand the importance and evolution of the coronavirus, a broader point of view is needed to understand the behaviour of *Coronaviridae*. To date, from the seven coronaviruses reported in humans, four of them are ubiquitous with seasonal circulation and mostly causing relatively mild colds (HKU1, NL63, OC43 and 229E). The other three, of more recent zoonotic origin, are associated with severe acute respiratory syndromes, namely SARS-CoV, MERS-CoV and now SARS-CoV-2. Of these seven human coronaviruses, NL63 and 229E belong to the alpha-CoV genus, while the other five are included within the beta-CoV genus. Coronaviruses detected in dogs and cats also belong to these two viral genera [9,10]. Like SARS-CoV-2 and the other respiratory syndrome viruses, the canine respiratory coronavirus (CRCoV), responsible for a respiratory condition in dogs, belongs to the beta-CoV genus. Canine coronavirus (CCoV) and Feline coronavirus (FCoV), both responsible for digestive diseases, belong to *Alphacoronavirus*.

Therefore, the study of the prevalence of different strains of coronaviruses in different animal species in the world provides important information for the implementation of surveillance strategies, as well as epidemiological and preventive public health policies [11, 12].

Materials and Methods

A systematic assessment of published studies reporting coronaviruses prevalence among different animal species and human, was performed. For this purpose, we used the Veterinary Science search tool at PubMed to retrieve published studies, combining different subject search terms, with temporal delimitation in years, between 2015 and 2020.

Search strategy

The search strategy used was: veterinary[*sb*] AND (("coronavirus"[*MeSH Terms*] OR "coronavirus"[*All Fields*]) AND ("one health"[*MeSH Terms*] OR ("one"[*All Fields*] AND "health"[*All Fields*]) OR "one health"[*All Fields*])) AND ("2015/04/18"[*PDat*] : "2020/04/15"[*PDat*]). From the research carried out, 190 studies were found, with the following distribution for years: in 2015 we found 18 studies (2015/18), in 2016/30 studies; 2017/41; 2018/38; 2019/34; and 2020 we identified 29 scientific reports.

Inclusion criteria

The 190 references retrieved in the search process were evaluated based on titles and abstracts, and ordered by publication date. A total of 75 articles were selected because they met the inclusion criteria, and two independent reviewers carried out the selection of the articles. In the first reading step, we started by the titles, followed by the abstracts and full texts. In the selection of the titles, we included all those that presented one or more terms with a coronavirus and one health relationship. From the 75 articles 40 were selected for prevalence analysis, 42 studies for the one health analysis, 31 were used for discussion as references, and 4 articles were excluded after reading the full text.

Data extraction

Quantitative and qualitative data extraction from the included studies was performed into four word table and an Excel spreadsheet, containing the following information: author name, year of publication, PubMed article link, article title, animal species, materials and methods, study location, and important note. During the data extraction process, information was extracted by one author and validated by a second author. Disagreements were resolved by discussion and consultation with a third author, whenever necessary.

Quality assessment

In the evaluation of quality, an instrument adapted from the 22 criteria proposed by the STROBE Statement was used, in compliance with the principles of epidemiological investigation. This assessment aimed to classify the relevance of the articles. The One Health/ERISA evaluation scale, consisting of 15 items to evaluate the articles with regards to the existence of relevant information for the definition of novel One Health recommendations and policies.

Data analysis

For the statistical analysis, data were stored in a predefined spread sheet file, including the authors and year of publication, number of animals and the number of infected animals.

Data were analysed using MetaXL version 5.3 software, an add-in for meta-analysis in Microsoft Excel for Windows (https://www.epigear.com/index_files/metaxl.html). The results calculated were represented in table and graphical formats. The heterogeneity across studies was evaluated by Cochrane's Q test and I² statistics. The calculated value of I² allows measuring the percentage of variability due to heterogeneity, rather than chance difference or sampling error. If the value of I² was greater than 50% and the Q test yields P<0.10, heterogeneity was considered statistically significant. The random effects model, based on DerSimonian-Laird method, which calculates the variability within and between studies, was applied to estimate the pooled prevalence and 95% CIs. The transformed double arcsine method was used for situations where the confidence limits and variance instability could appear due to any single studies with larger or small prevalence rates. The Luis Furuya-Kanamori asymmetry index (LFK index) and the Doi plot were calculated to estimate the publication bias. The presence of symmetry indicates no publication bias. The publication bias was determinate by LFK index, which can take

the following assessments depending on the value obtained: no asymmetry if the LFK index is within ± 1 , minor asymmetry when out of the ± 1 interval, but within ± 2 , and major asymmetry if the LFK index is beyond the ± 2 interval. A sensitivity test was calculated to provide an indication of which study is the prime determinant of the pooled result, and which is the main source of heterogeneity. The test rejects each study, one by one, in the analysis performed, so that it is possible to indicate the combined effect sizes as well as the associated heterogeneity.

Results

Study selection

A total of 190 studies published between 2015 and 2020 were found in our survey, with the following distribution per year: 18 in 2015, 30 in 2016, 41 in 2017, 38 in 2018, 34 in 2019 and 29 in 2020. A total of 115 studies based on the title and abstract were excluded, the remaining 75 studies were selected for the continuation of our study, and 4 studies were subsequently excluded after full reading (2 studies on bibliometrics, 1 study with lack of data and 1 study did not fit the objectives of our study). Of the 71 studies considered eligible, 42 studies were considered for systematic review and 29 studies were included in the meta-analysis (Figure 1).




Figure.1. Flow chart of systematic review process.

Quality assessment

From the one health evaluation scale, we obtained an average score of 9.33 points (62%), the scores of the articles evaluated varied between a minimum of 6 points (40%) and a maximum of 12 points (80%) in a total of 15 points (100%) possible. The following distribution of studies in relation to the average score values, obtained for each of them were: 2 studies had a score of 12 points (80%), 8 studies had a score of 11 points (73.33%), 11 studies had a score of 10 points (66.67%), 8 studies had a score of 9 points (60%), 4 studies had a score of 8 points (50.33%), 7 studies had a score of 7 points (46.67%) and one study had a score of 6 points (40%). Results are shown in Table 1.

The origin of the studies carried out was as follows: three in the USA, five in China, three in Brazil, two in Saudi Arabia, one in Myanmar, one in Iran, one in Japan, one in Rwanda, one in Canada, one in Argentina, one in Qatar, one in Gulf Cooperation Council countries, one in Kenya, one in Netherlands, one in Israel, one in Italy, one in South Korea, one in

Mali, one in Poland, one in Pakistan, one in Lao PDR, one in Cambodia, a joint study in Middle East (KSA, UAE, Africa: Kenya, Somalia, Sudan, Egypt), one in Sweden, one in Australia and 6 global studies (“world”) (see Table 1).

Of the 42 studies selected for the systematic review, thirty-eight (38) contained information on epidemiological data (one study without epidemiological data), twenty-five studies (25) had relevant data for the implementation of One Health policies.

Animal species, coronavirus strains and laboratory tests

The infected animal species described in the studies on the prevalence of different strains of coronavirus in the world were as follows: horses, donkeys, bats (various species), dogs, cats, human, bat, pigeons, camels (more than one species) calves, gull, Magellanic penguins, Dutch pigs, wild boar, alpacas, Llamas, dromedary camel, turkey, quail, chicken, Scandinavian waterfowl and feral camels. The respective identified strains of coronavirus can be found in Table 1 and 2.

Statistics, heterogeneity and publication bias

The prevalence values of the different strains of coronavirus identified in the infected animals and described in the studies selected for the meta-analysis were projected on a world map, where the red colour indicates the maximum prevalence value and the pink signifies the lowest value, see the figure 2.

Prevalence of coronavirus around the world




Figure 2. Maximum prevalence of the different coronavirus strains for each country considered in this systematic review and metanalysis.

The studies considered were assessed for heterogeneity through the Cochran Q test, and the results ($Q = 10476.22$, $p = <0.001$) showed that the true treatment effect is not the same across studies and variations are not caused by chance. This was confirmed by the value of the I² test (99.2%), suggesting a statistically significant heterogeneity. The value of $\tau^2(0.473)$, which measures the estimated variation (heterogeneity) between the effects observed in different studies also supports the fact that effect sizes vary across studies.

Sensitivity analysis

A sensitivity analysis of the fifty-one studies was performed to evaluate the effect of each individual study on the pooled result. This was done by excluding each study step by step, one at a time (based on nine studies). The results showed that the studies of Falzarano and Müller [13,14], were the prime determinants of the pooled result.

Table 1. Description and quality assessment of studies with information for the definition of new One Health (OH) measures and policies:

Studies	Local	Tipology	Recommended measures		Species	OH Score
			Epidemiology	Health policies		
Goodrich EL, et al., 2020	USA	Case report	yes	No	Horse/Donkeys	12
Yadav PD et al., 2020	India	Original	no	No	Bat	10
Leroy EM et al., 2020	n.a	Editorial commentary	yes	No	Dogs/cats	11
Sun J et al., 2020	China	Review	yes	No	Human	11
Foddai A et al., 2020	world	Editorial Commentary	Yes	Yes	Human/animal	10
Foddai A et al 2020	world	methodology	Yes	Yes	Human/animal	7
Valituttol et al., 2020	Myanmar	original	Yes	No	Bat	9
Qingye Zhuang et al., 2020	China	Original	Yes	No	Pigeons	6
Roya Mohammadpour et al., 2020	Iran	Review	Yes	Yes	Camels	8
Masashi YAMADA et al., 2020	Japan	Original	Yes	Yes	Calves	7
Nziza J, Goldstein T, Cranfield M, et al., 2020	Rwanda	Original	Yes	Yes	Bat	11
Canuti M et al., 2019	Canada	Original	Yes	No	Gull	7
Markotter W et al., 2019	Rwanda	Original	Yes	Yes	Bat	9
Uhart M et al., 2019	Argentina	Original	Yes	No	Magellanic Penguins	9
Maboni G et al., 2019	USA	Research	Yes	Yes	Dog	10
Farag E et al., 2019	Quatar	-	Yes	Yes	Human and camels	11
Skariyachan S et al., 2019	World	Review	Yes	Yes	More than one species	10

Farag EAB et al., 2019	Gulf Cooperation Council countries	Online report	Yes	Yes	Human and camels	7
Ommeh S et al., 2018	Kenya	Research	Yes	No	Camels Human	11
Dortmans JCFM et al., 2018	Netherlands	Original	Yes	Yes	Dutch pigs Wild boar	12
David D et al., 2018	Israel	Original	Yes	No	Alpacas Llamas	10
de Mira Fernandes A et al., 2018	Brazil	Original	Yes	No	Calves	9
Bailey ES et al 2018	World	Review	Yes	No	More than one species	7
Obameso JO et al., 2017	China	Research	Yes	No	Bat	9
Rizzo F et al., 2017	Italy	Research	Yes	Yes	Bat	10
Lee S et al., 2017	South Korea	Research	Yes	Yes	Bat	7
Hemida MG et al., 2017	Saudi Arabia	Original	Yes	Yes	dromedary camel	11
Reperant LA et al., 2017	World	Review	Yes	Yes	Human	8
Falzarano D et al., 2017	Mali	Original	Yes	No	Dromedary camels	8
Lu S et al., 2017	China	Original	Yes	No	Dog	7
Fish EJ et al., 2017	USA	Original	Yes	No	Cat	8
Domańska-Blicharz K et al., 2017	Poland	Research	Yes	No	Turkey	9
Saqib M et al., 2017	Pakistan	Research letters	Yes	Yes	Dromedary Camels	11
Lacroix A et al., 2017	Lao PDR Cambodia	Research	Yes	Yes	Bat	10
Torres CA et al., 2016	Brasil	Original	Yes	Yes	Quail Chicken	9
Corman VM et al., 2016	Middle East:	Original	Yes	Yes	dromedary camels	10

KSA, UAE

Africa :
Kenya,
Somalia,
Sudan,Egypt

Asano KM et al., 2016	Brazil	Short report	Yes	Yes	Bat	10
Wille M et al., 2016	Sweden	Research	Yes	Yes	Scandinavian Waterfowl	10
Liu L et al., 2016	World	Perspective	Yes	Yes	Human	11
Ge XY et al., 2016	China	Research	Yes	Yes	Bat	10
Crameri G et al., 2015	Australia	Original	Yes	Yes	feral camels	11
Müller MA et al 2015	Saudi Arabia	Research	Yes	Yes	Human	9

Table 4. Characterization of studies according to the infected animal species and coronavirus:

Studies	Species	Coronavirus	Population		Lab Technique	Prevalence
			n	n positive		
Yadav PD et al., 2020	Bat (Pteropus)	BtCoV	508	21	RT-PCR	4.13
	Bat (Rousettus)	BtCoV	78	4	RT-PCR	5.13
Goodrich EL, et al., 2020	AMH* and donkeys	BCoV/ECov	30	25		
Valituttol et al., 2020	Bat**	PREDICT_CoV-35,47,82,92,93,96	464	7	PCR	1.5
Qingye Zhuang et al., 2020	Pigeons***	CdCoV	687	19	RT-PCR	2.77
		DdCoV	687	6	RT-PCR	0.87
		PdCoV	687	159	RT-PCR	23.14
Roya Mohammadpour et al., 2020	Camels	MERS-CoV*4	18	3	Serology	16.66
			186	8	Serology	4.30
			98	7	RT-PCR	7.14
Masashi YAMADA et al., 2020	Calves	BCV	88	1	RT-PCR	1.14
Nziza J, Goldstein T, Cranfield M, et al., 2020	Bat	CoV*5	503	27	c-PCR	5.4
Canuti M et al., 2019	great black-backed American herring gulls	GuCoV B29*6	26	3	PCR	11.5
			24	2	PCR	8.3
Markotter W et al., 2019	Bat	Rh-BtCoV/441/Rwanda/08 Rh- BtCoV/445/Rwanda/08 (Betacoronavirus)	101	2	RT-PCR	1.9

Uhart M et al., 2019	Magellanic Penguins	Avian coronavirus M41	393	171	serological test (hemagglutination inhibition)	43.5
		Avian coronavirus C46		235		59.8
		Avian coronavirus A99		147		37.4
		Avian coronavirus JMK		158		40.2
Maboni G et al., 2019	Dog	CoV	559	26	PCR	4.6
Pusterla N et al., 2019	Horse	ECoV	277	20	qPCR	7.2
Ommeh S et al., 2018	Turkana Rendille/Gabbra Somali (1) Improved/Pakistani Somali (2) Human	MERS-CoV	156	76	ELISA	48.72
			293	234		79.86
			611	460		75.29
			84	14		16.67
			19	8		42.11
	486	20	4.12			
Dortmans JCFM et al., 2018	Dutch Pigs Wild boar	Porcine epidemic diarrhea virus (PEDV)	838	9		1.07
			101	0		0
David D et al., 2018	Alpacas Llamas	MERS-CoV	102	35	ELISA	34.3
			19	7		36.8
de Mira Fernandes A et al., 2018	Calves	BCoV (Bovine coronaviru)	44	10		22.72
			70	7		10
Obameso JO et al., 2017	Bat	Ro-BatCoV GCCDC1	118	47	PCR	39.8
			270	70		38.8
			180	64		35.6
Rizzo F et al., 2017	Bat	CoV	302	36	PCR	12
Lee S et al., 2017	Bat	Bat-CoV-JTMC15	672	18	RT-PCR	2.7
		Bat-CoV-HKU5				
		Bat-CoV-SC2013				
Falzarano D et al., 2017	Dromedary camels	MERS-CoV	570	502	ELISA	88
Lu S et al., 2017	Dog	CRCoV-BJ232*7	246	16	RT-PCR	6.5
Fish EJ et al., 2017	Cat	feline coronavirus (FCoV)	205	9	qRT-PCR	4.4
Domarńska-Blicharz K et al., 2017	Turkey	TCoV	207	20	RT-PCR	9.8
Domarńska-Blicharz K et al., 2017	Dromedary Camels	MERS-CoV	565	315	ELISA	55.8
Lacroix A et al., 2017	Bat	alpha-coronavirus (αCoV) strain HKU10, PREDICT-CoV-53 strains BatCoV Ratcha-67 BatCoV-25 PA201 beta-CoV(βCoV) PREDICT-CoV-22 strains PREDICT-CoV22, R91, R77, R74, R58 PREDICT-CoV-24 strains, R96, R75, R72, R65, R59, R71 PREDICT-CoV-34 strain, MERS-CoV JPDB144 BatCoV512_SL2-9_Pisp	1965	93	RT-PCR	4.7
Torres CA et al., 2016	Quail Chicken	Gammacoronavirus	60	28	RT-PCR	46.6
		Deltacoronavirus	30	6		20
Corman VM et al., 2016	dromedary camels	HCoV-229F	364	150	IFA	41.2
Asano KM et al., 2016	Bat	Alphacoronavirus	29	9	RT-PCR	31

Wille M et al., 2016	Scandinavian Waterfowl	Gammacoronavirus	764	143	QRT-PCR	18.7
Ge XY et al., 2016	China	Alphacoronavirus Betacoronavirus	276	138	RT-PCR	50
Müller MA et al 2015	Saudi Arabia	MERS-CoV	10009	15	ELISA	0.15

Note: *American Miniature Horse (AMH) of one farm in upstate New York. ECoV – enteric coronavirus.** 11 species across eight genera from six families. PREDICT_CoV: unclassified Coronavirinae (Three novel alphacoronaviruses, three novel betacoronaviruses, and one known alphacoronavirus previously identified in the southeast Asian, were detected for the first time in bats in Myanmar).*** Viruses were organized into lineages based on phylogenetic analysis, and the CoVs dominant in chickens, ducks pigeons, and geese were named as pigeon-dominant coronavirus (PdCoV), chicken-dominant coronavirus (CdCoV), duck-dominant coronavirus (DdCoV) and geese-dominant coronavirus (GdCoV), respectively.*4: Khalaj, 2014a; Khalaj, 2014b and Khalili Bagaloy et al., 2017, respectively.*5 Known Coronaviruses Detected in Bats: 1) Strain of Kenya bat coronavirus/BtKY56/BtKY55, 2) Strain of Chaerephon bat/coronavirus/Kenya/KY22/2006, 3) Strain of Eidolon bat coronavirus/Kenya/KY24/2006, 4) Strain of Bat coronavirus HKU9; Novel Coronaviruses Detected in Bats: 1) PREDICT_CoV-42, 2) PREDICT_CoV-43, 3) PREDICT_CoV-44, 4) PREDICT_CoV-66.*6 The phylogenetic analyses of GuCoV B29 performed suggest that this virus could represent a novel species within the genus Gammacoronavirus.*7 the isolation of CRCoV-BJ232 failed on cell culture.




Figure 3. Results of metanalysis, Fixed effects, heterogeneity, $Q = 10476.22$, $p=0.00$ and $I^2=100\%$.

Discussion

Ubiquity of coronavirus

The results obtained in this systematic review and meta-analysis demonstrate a wide variety of coronaviruses capable of infecting a very wide range of animal species, namely

vertebrates. It is possible over the last few decades to see coronavirus infections in several countries on all continents, with a globally endemic virus: Sweden, Italy, Holland, Poland, USA, Canada, Argentina, Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Myanmar, Iran, Rwanda, Middle East (KSA, United Arab Emirates, Africa: Kenya, Somalia, Sudan), Egypt, Qatar, Gulf Cooperation Council countries, Kenya, Israel, Mali, Pakistan, Japan, China, South Korea Lao PDR, Cambodia and Australia (see Tables 1 and 4).

Virological diversity

If we consider the geographic regions with a prevalence greater than or equal to 0.20 (Forest plot overall; prevalence = 0.20, $p = 0.00$, $Q = 10476.22$ and $I^2 = 100\%$), we can highlight the following strains of coronavirus with the highest prevalence in this study: enteric coronavirus, ECoV (American Miniature Horse / USA) [15]; pigeon-dominant coronavirus, PdCoV (pigeons / China) [16]; Avian coronavirus M41, Avian coronavirus C46, Avian coronavirus A99, Avian coronavirus JMK (Magellanic Penguins / Argentina) [17]; MERS-CoV (camels; alpacas, llamas; dromedary camels / Kenya; Israel; Mali) [18,19]; bovine coronavirus (Calves / Brazil) [20]; Ro-BatCoV GCCDC1 (Bat / China) [21]; Gamacoronavirus, Deltacoronavirus (Quail, Chicken / Brazil) [22]; Alphacoronavirus (Bat / Brazil) [23]; Alphacoronavirus and Betacoronavirus (Bat / China) [24]. These data can be interesting in evolutionary terms, if we consider that the four human coronaviruses (HCoVs) are endemic and global respiratory pathogens.

The study by Corman [25] on HCoV-229E (dromedary camels / MiddleEast: KSA and UAE; Africa: Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Egypt) present in dromedaries infected with MERS-CoV shows that 5.6% of these animals ($n = 1033$) tested positive for HCoV-229E. This study was important, because MERS-CoV is an emerging strain with a zoonotic reservoir in dromedary camels and allowed us to define a hypothesis about the origin of human coronaviruses (HCoVs). The study allowed to advance that both viruses are

monophyletics, with possible ecological isolation, being a descendant of camelid-associated viruses. Although HCoV-229E does not currently prove to be a risk for a global epidemic, its evolutionary history appears as a hypothesis for MERS-CoV emergence [25].

Since the appearance of the first global SARS-CoV crisis in 2003, which occurred in Guangdong province, China, with 305 cases of atypical pneumonia, the 2012 MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19), the search for different species of animals that can be considered as a reservoir of the disease has been constant and in the case of SARS-CoV-2 inconclusive, although new evidence points to the bat [11].

Comparative pathology studies

Three female equines of the genus *Equus* (two mares and a donkey), after returning from a show in Texas, showed signs of fever. The adult mare and the donkey showed colic and acute neurological deficits. Microscopic examination of the small intestine showed signs of severe necrotizing enteritis, with loss of epithelial lining. The lamina propria and the submucosa of the intestine of the youngest mare had multiple foci of histiocytes, lymphocytes, neutrophils and eosinophils. There was a strong diffuse, multifocal, granular to globular intracytoplasmic immunoreactivity in glandular and crypt enterocytes. In the youngest mare, lesions of severe bilateral multifocal hemorrhagic nature of the adrenal glands (Waterhouse-Friderichsen syndrome), diffuse pulmonary congestion and marked edema, generalized petechial hemorrhages in the thymus and minimal focal lymphocytic myocarditis also stood out [26].

In dromedary camels, after experimental MERSCoV infection, MERS-CoV receptors – dipeptidyl peptidase 4 (DPP4) were detected in the hair epithelial cells of the upper respiratory tract, trachea and bronchi. At the level of the pulmonary parenchyma, these receptors were detected mainly in endothelial cells and only in alveolar epithelial cells.

Contrary to that observed in dromedary camels, the MERS-CoV receptor is expressed mainly in the human lower respiratory tract (it is not expressed in a stable manner on the cell surface), with the limited expression of DPP4 in the epithelium of the human upper respiratory tract, observed in localized glands, in the submucosa of the upper respiratory tract, confirming that it is an infection of the lower respiratory tract (Widagdo W, et al., 2016) [27].

In rhesus monkeys and marmosets experimentally infected with MERS-CoV, DPP4 receptors were identified in pneumocytes type I and II, bronchial epithelial cells and alveolar macrophages. Changes in the pulmonary parenchyma led to lesions of varying degrees, including pneumonia, pulmonary edema, hemorrhage, degeneration and necrosis of pneumocytes and bronchial epithelial cells. The most prominent pathological effect observed in the lungs of rhesus monkeys was diffuse and focal eosinophilic infiltration into the thickened alveolar septum and edematous alveolar cavities, around the bronchus and between necrotic bronchial epithelial cells. In sago monkeys, diffuse and focal neutrophilic infiltration was found in edematous alveolar cavities. In both species, diffuse infiltration of numerous macrophages was observed [28].

In summary, among the general components of inflammation, fever was the predominant sign identified in mares, donkeys, rhesus and marmosets [26,28]. In the inflammatory response, there is a cellular predominance of eosinophils (chronic inflammation) and neutrophils (acute inflammation) [26,28], and lymphocytes with pyknotic and carioretic morphology [26], with areas of necrosis both at the level of intestine, as well as at the level of the lung parenchyma [26,28]. At the level of the lung parenchyma, DPP4 expression was identified in endothelial cells, in the alveolar lining epithelium [27] and in the bronchi, as well as in alveolar macrophages [28].

Beyond the systematic revision – Where are we with regards to the One Health Approach?

Emerging risks in agricultural and animal breeding should be addressed by specific preventive interventions. That implies a close cooperation and interaction between veterinarians, occupational health physicians and public health operators, so as to establish a worldwide strategy to expand interdisciplinary projects and better emerging risk communication policies in all aspects of health care for humans and animals, within a healthy environment. This is what the One Health Approach intends to be.

The risk of biological contamination in general is increased by a complex agricultural production process, which may persist in the “meadow to plate” chain, which favors exposure to workers in the food sector and environments. Regarding food, the first incident occurred on June 12, 2020 at the Xinfadi agricultural products market in Beijing, where SARS-CoV-2 was detected on a cutting board used to process imported salmon (Han et al., 2020). Although subsequent investigations have not been conclusive as to its origin, this particular incident raised, before authorities and consumers, some questions about frozen foods as possible carriers of SARS-CoV-2. Since the beginning of July 2020, at least nine food contamination incidents have been reported in China, where SARS-CoV-2 has been detected in imported foods, mainly packaging materials, from shrimp imported from Ecuador, and in Shenzhen, in Guangdong province on August 12, 2020, on the surface of frozen chicken originating in Brazil, which became the first known case in which the new coronavirus was detected in real samples of imported foods [29].

. It is worth considering the possibility that the food cold chain may promote contamination, because laboratory studies [30] have shown that SARS-CoV-2 remained highly stable under refrigeration, at 4° C, and in freezing conditions, from -10 to -80 °C in fish, meat, poultry, and pig skin for 14–21 days. In a controlled laboratory study [31],

the persistence of SARS-CoV-2 in chilled salmon, frozen chicken and pork for 21 days was examined. The study showed that SARS-CoV-2 titers remained virtually constant, and the inoculated viruses maintained their infectivity both in the refrigerated product (4 °C) and in the frozen samples (-20 °C and -80 °C). In a previous study, researchers presented evidence that SARS-CoV-2 can remain quite stable in pig skin for 14 days, at 4 °C [32].

The most recent investigation, in an experimental context, points to the new coronavirus remaining up to 72 hours in plastic and stainless steel with temperatures of around 20° and humidity of 40% [33, 34]. Other multiple investigations have already reported that SARS-CoV-2 and other coronaviruses are able to remain on surfaces such as metal, glass, PVC, Teflon, and other materials, for several days [35,36,37,38].

At the interface between the health of humans, animals and the ecosystem, host receptor recognition is a determinant for virus infection. Recently (2020) Li [39] conducted sequence and structural analyses of angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) from different species, which sheds some light on cross-species receptor usage of SARS-CoV-2. Citing the authors, all these analyses raise an alert on a potential interspecies transmission of the virus and propose further surveillance in the diverse animal populations.

Conclusions

A true One Health approach is urgent

This systematic review and meta-analysis of the prevalence of the coronaviruses worldwide highlights the great biological diversity of these agents, as well as their ability to infect a wide variety of species. The latest most important epidemiological crises, which occurred in 2003 (SARS-CoV-1), 2012 (MERS-CoV) and 2019 (SARS-CoV-2,

COVID-19) alert to the potential epidemic risk of this infection, which causes severe atypical pneumonia and several other systemic dysfunctions.

The wide variety of infected animal species or natural sources of the coronaviruses require a crosscutting and multidisciplinary approach. It is essential to put in place a One Health approach to this public health problem and to take advantage of the experience from the collaboration between Human and Veterinary Medicine. The concept of One Health has become increasingly important. However, there is much to do. It is essential to enhance the structuring of new One Health policies that allow the creation of epidemiological surveillance programs and the creation of advanced training courses in this new area of intervention that brings together human, animal and environment health, in order to prepare human resources to fight the next pandemic. The SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) pandemic only showed our lack of preparedness and responsiveness at the global level. Will we be better prepared for the next one?

Authorship contribution

Ricardo Faustino: conceptualization, data management, metanalysis, investigation, methodology, validation, writing - original draft, review, editing, supervision. Paulo Sargento: investigation, methodology, validation, review and editing. Maria do Céu Costa: conceptualization, investigation, methodology, validation, Writing and Review. Mónica Teixeira: conceptualization, investigation, methodology, validation, writing and review. Miguel Faria: Investigation, methodology, validation, review metanalysis, writing and editing. Filipe Palavra: conceptualization, investigation, methodology, validation and review.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest concerning this article.

Acknowledgements

The present study was supported by the Research Group in Health Sciences and Technologies - NICiTeS, Ribeiro Sanches Higher School of Health, Polytechnic Institute of Lusophony (IPLuso) Lisbon, Portugal

References

- [1] Sun, J., He, W. T., Wang, L., Lai, A., Ji, X., Zhai, X., Li, G., Suchard, M. A., Tian, J., Zhou, J., Veit, M., & Su, S. (2020). COVID-19: Epidemiology, Evolution, and Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives. *Trends in molecular medicine*, 26(5), 483–495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molmed.2020.02.008>
- [2] Leroy, E. M., Ar Gouilh, M., & Brugère-Picoux, J. (2020). The risk of SARS-CoV-2 transmission to pets and other wild and domestic animals strongly mandates a one-health strategy to control the COVID-19 pandemic. *One health (Amsterdam, Netherlands)*, 10, 100133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onehlt.2020.100133>
- [3] Daly J. M. (2017). Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS) coronavirus: Putting one health principles into practice?. *Veterinary journal (London, England : 1997)*, 222, 52–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tvjl.2017.02.002>
- [4] Greatorex, Z. F., Olson, S. H., Singhalath, S., Silithammavong, S., Khammavong, K., Fine, A. E., Weisman, W., Douangngeun, B., Theppangna, W., Keatts, L., Gilbert, M., Karesh, W. B., Hansel, T., Zimicki, S., O'Rourke, K., Joly, D. O., & Mazet, J. A. (2016). Wildlife Trade and Human Health in Lao PDR: An Assessment of the Zoonotic Disease Risk in Markets. *PloS one*, 11(3), e0150666. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0150666>
- [5] Zumla, A., Dar, O., Kock, R., Muturi, M., Ntoumi, F., Kaleebu, P., Eusebio, M., Mfinanga, S., Bates, M., Mwaba, P., Ansumana, R., Khan, M., Alagaili, A. N., Cotten, M., Azhar, E. I., Maeurer, M., Ippolito, G., & Petersen, E. (2016). Taking forward a 'One Health' approach for turning the tide against the Middle East

- respiratory syndrome coronavirus and other zoonotic pathogens with epidemic potential. *International journal of infectious diseases : IJID : official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases*, 47, 5–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2016.06.012>
- [6] Foddai, A., Lubroth, J., & Ellis-Iversen, J. (2020a). Base protocol for real time active random surveillance of coronavirus disease (COVID-19) - Adapting veterinary methodology to public health. *One health (Amsterdam, Netherlands)*, 9, 100129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onehlt.2020.100129>
- [7] Foddai, A., Lindberg, A., Lubroth, J., & Ellis-Iversen, J. (2020b). Surveillance to improve evidence for community control decisions during the COVID-19 pandemic - Opening the animal epidemic toolbox for Public Health. *One health (Amsterdam, Netherlands)*, 9, 100130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onehlt.2020.100130>
- [8] Su, S., Wong, G., Shi, W., Liu, J., Lai, A., Zhou, J., Liu, W., Bi, Y., & Gao, G. F. (2016). Epidemiology, Genetic Recombination, and Pathogenesis of Coronaviruses. *Trends in microbiology*, 24(6), 490–502. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2016.03.003>
- [9] Erles, K., Toomey, C., Brooks, H. W., & Brownlie, J. (2003). Detection of a group 2 coronavirus in dogs with canine infectious respiratory disease. *Virology*, 310(2), 216–223. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0042-6822\(03\)00160-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0042-6822(03)00160-0)
- [10] Terada, Y., Matsui, N., Noguchi, K., Kuwata, R., Shimoda, H., Soma, T., Mochizuki, M., & Maeda, K. (2014). Emergence of pathogenic coronaviruses in cats by homologous recombination between feline and canine coronaviruses. *PloS one*, 9(9), e106534. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0106534>
- [11] Bailey, E. S., Fieldhouse, J. K., Choi, J. Y., & Gray, G. C. (2018). A Mini Review of the Zoonotic Threat Potential of Influenza Viruses, Coronaviruses, Adenoviruses, and Enteroviruses. *Frontiers in public health*, 6, 104. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00104>
- [12] Farag, E., Nour, M., El Idrissi, A., Berrada, J., Moustafa, A., Mehmood, M., Mahmoud, M. H., El-Sayed, A. M., Alhajri, F., Al-Hajri, M., Hassan, O. A., Al-Romaihi, H., Al-Thani, M., Al-Marri, S. A., Koopmans, M., & Ismail, M. H. (2019). Survey on Implementation of One Health Approach for MERS-CoV Preparedness and Control in Gulf Cooperation Council and Middle East Countries. *Emerging infectious diseases*, 25(3), e171702. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2503.171702>
- [13] Falzarano, D., Kamissoko, B., de Wit, E., Maïga, O., Cronin, J., Samaké, K., Traoré, A., Milne-Price, S., Munster, V. J., Sogoba, N., Niang, M., Safronetz, D., &

- Feldmann, H. (2017). Dromedary camels in northern Mali have high seropositivity to MERS-CoV. *One health* (Amsterdam, Netherlands), 3, 41–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onehlt.2017.03.003>
- [14] Müller, M. A., Meyer, B., Corman, V. M., Al-Masri, M., Turkestani, A., Ritz, D., Sieberg, A., Aldabbagh, S., Bosch, B. J., Lattwein, E., Alhakeem, R. F., Assiri, A. M., Albarrak, A. M., Al-Shangiti, A. M., Al-Tawfiq, J. A., Wikramaratna, P., Alrabeeah, A. A., Drosten, C., & Memish, Z. A. (2015). Presence of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus antibodies in Saudi Arabia: a nationwide, cross-sectional, serological study. *The Lancet. Infectious diseases*, 15(5), 559–564. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(15\)70090-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(15)70090-3)
- [15] Goodrich, E. L., Mittel, L. D., Glaser, A., Ness, S. L., Radcliffe, R. M., & Divers, T. J. (2020). Novel findings from a beta coronavirus outbreak on an American Miniature Horse breeding farm in upstate New York. *Equine veterinary education*, 32(3), 150–154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eve.12938>
- [16] Zhuang, Q., Liu, S., Zhang, X., Jiang, W., Wang, K., Wang, S., Peng, C., Hou, G., Li, J., Yu, X., Yuan, L., Wang, J., Li, Y., Liu, H., & Chen, J. (2020). Surveillance and taxonomic analysis of the coronavirus dominant in pigeons in China. *Transboundary and emerging diseases*, 10.1111/tbed.13541. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tbed.13541>
- [17] Uhart, M., Thijl Vanstreels, R. E., Gallo, L., Cook, R. A., & Karesh, W. B. (2020). serological survey for select infectious agents in wild Magellanic penguins (*Spheniscus magellanicus*) in argentina, 1994-2008. *Journal of wildlife diseases*, 56(1), 66–81.
- [18] David, D., Rotenberg, D., Khinich, E., Erster, O., Bardenstein, S., van Straten, M., Okba, N., Raj, S. V., Haagmans, B. L., Miculitzki, M., & Davidson, I. (2018). Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus specific antibodies in naturally exposed Israeli llamas, alpacas and camels. *One health* (Amsterdam, Netherlands), 5, 65–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onehlt.2018.05.002>
- [19] Ommeh, S., Zhang, W., Zohaib, A., Chen, J., Zhang, H., Hu, B., Ge, X. Y., Yang, X. L., Masika, M., Obanda, V., Luo, Y., Li, S., Waruhiu, C., Li, B., Zhu, Y., Ouma, D., Odendo, V., Wang, L. F., Anderson, D. E., Lichoti, J., ... Shi, Z. L. (2018). Genetic Evidence of Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-Cov) and Widespread Seroprevalence among Camels in Kenya. *Virologica Sinica*, 33(6), 484–492. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12250-018-0076-4>

- [20] de Mira Fernandes, A., Brandão, P. E., Dos Santos Lima, M., de Souza Nunes Martins, M., da Silva, T. G., da Silva Cardoso Pinto, V., de Paula, L. T., Vicente, M., Okuda, L. H., & Pituco, E. M. (2018). Genetic diversity of BCoV in Brazilian cattle herds. *Veterinary medicine and science*, 4(3), 183–189. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1002/vms3.102>
- [21] Obameso, J. O., Li, H., Jia, H., Han, M., Zhu, S., Huang, C., Zhao, Y., Zhao, M., Bai, Y., Yuan, F., Zhao, H., Peng, X., Xu, W., Tan, W., Zhao, Y., Yuen, K. Y., Liu, W. J., Lu, L., & Gao, G. F. (2017). The persistent prevalence and evolution of cross-family recombinant coronavirus GCCDC1 among a bat population: a two-year follow-up. *Science China. Life sciences*, 60(12), 1357–1363. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11427-017-9263-6>
- [22] Torres, C. A., Hora, A. S., Toniatti, P. O., Taniwaki, S. A., Cecchinato, M., Villarreal, L. Y., & Brandão, P. E. (2016). Gammacoronavirus and Deltacoronavirus in Quail. *Avian diseases*, 60(3), 656–661. <https://doi.org/10.1637/11412-032316-Reg.1>
- [23] Asano, K. M., Hora, A. S., Scheffer, K. C., Fahl, W. O., Iamamoto, K., Mori, E., & Brandão, P. E. (2016). Alphacoronavirus in urban Molossidae and Phyllostomidae bats, Brazil. *Virology journal*, 13, 110. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12985-016-0569-4>
- [24] Ge, X. Y., Wang, N., Zhang, W., Hu, B., Li, B., Zhang, Y. Z., Zhou, J. H., Luo, C. M., Yang, X. L., Wu, L. J., Wang, B., Zhang, Y., Li, Z. X., & Shi, Z. L. (2016). Coexistence of multiple coronaviruses in several bat colonies in an abandoned mineshaft. *Virologica Sinica*, 31(1), 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12250-016-3713-9>
- [25] Corman, V. M., Eckerle, I., Memish, Z. A., Liljander, A. M., Dijkman, R., Jonsdottir, H., Juma Ngeiywa, K. J., Kamau, E., Younan, M., Al Masri, M., Assiri, A., Gluecks, I., Musa, B. E., Meyer, B., Müller, M. A., Hilali, M., Bornstein, S., Wernery, U., Thiel, V., Jores, J., ... Drosten, C. (2016). Link of a ubiquitous human coronavirus to dromedary camels. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 113(35), 9864–9869. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1604472113>
- [26] Giannitti, F., Diab, S., Mete, A., Stanton, J. B., Fielding, L., Crossley, B., Sverlow, K., Fish, S., Mapes, S., Scott, L., & Pusterla, N. (2015). Necrotizing Enteritis and Hyperammonemic Encephalopathy Associated With Equine Coronavirus Infection

- in Equids. *Veterinary pathology*, 52(6), 1148–1156.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0300985814568683>
- [27] Widagdo, W., Raj, V. S., Schipper, D., Koliijn, K., van Leenders, G., Bosch, B. J., Bensaid, A., Segalés, J., Baumgärtner, W., Osterhaus, A., Koopmans, M. P., van den Brand, J., & Haagmans, B. L. (2016). Differential Expression of the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus Receptor in the Upper Respiratory Tracts of Humans and Dromedary Camels. *Journal of virology*, 90(9), 4838–4842.
<https://doi.org/10.1128/JVI.02994-15>
- [28] Yu, P., Xu, Y., Deng, W., Bao, L., Huang, L., Xu, Y., Yao, Y., & Qin, C. (2017). Comparative pathology of rhesus macaque and common marmoset animal models with Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus. *PloS one*, 12(2), e0172093.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0172093>
- [29] Han, J., Zhang, X., He, S. et al. Can the coronavirus disease be transmitted from food? A review of evidence, risks, policies and knowledge gaps. *Environ Chem Lett* 19, 5–16 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10311-020-01101-x>
- [30] Fisher D, Reilly A, Zheng AKE, Cook AR, Anderson DE (2020) Seeding of outbreaks of COVID-19 by contaminated fresh and frozen food. *BioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.17.255166>
- [31] Harbourt D, Haddow A, Piper A, Bloomfield H, Kearney B, Gibson K, Minogue T (2020) Modeling the stability of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) on skin, currency, and clothing. *medRxiv* <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.01.20144253>.
- [32] Chin, A.W.H., Chu, J.T.S., Perera, M.R.A., Hui, K.P.Y., Yen, H., Chan, M.C..W, Peiris, M., Poon, L.L.M. (2020) Stability of SARS-CoV-2 in different environmental conditions. *Lancet Microbe* 1(1):e10. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247\(20\)30003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(20)30003-3).
- [33] Warnes SL, Little ZR, Keevil CW. Human coronavirus 229E remains infectious on common touch surface materials. *MBio*. (2015) 6:e01691-15. doi: 10.1128/mBio.01697-15
- [34] Kampf G, Todt D, Pfaender S, Steinmann E. Persistence of coronaviruses on inanimate surfaces and their inactivation with biocidal agents. *J Hosp Infect*. (2020) 104:246–51. doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2020.01.022

- [35] Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (2020) Food safety and the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). <https://www.fda.gov/food/food-safety-during-emergencies/food-safety-and-coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19>. Accessed 2 Sept 2020.
- [36] Anderson EL, Turnham P, Griffin JR, Clarke CC (2020) Consideration of the aerosol transmission for COVID-19 and public health. *Risk Anal* 40(5):902–907. <https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13500>.
- [37] Morawska L, Milton DK (2020) It is time to address airborne transmission of COVID-19. *Clin Infect Dis* ciaa939. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa939>.
- [38] Anelich, L., Lues, R., Farber, J., Parreira, V. (2020) SARS-CoV-2 and Risk for Food Safety. *Frontiers in Nutrition*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnut.2020.580551>
- [39] Li, R., Qiao, S., & Zhang, G. (2020). Analysis of angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) from different species sheds some light on cross-species receptor usage of a novel coronavirus 2019-nCoV. *The Journal of infection*, 80(4), 469–496.