A systematic review of enteric pathogens and antibiotic resistance genes in outdoor urban

aerosols

Olivia Ginn[1], Sarah Lowry[2], Joe Brown[3]

[1]Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering & Earth Science, University of Notre Dame, 156

Fitzpatrick Hall, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA

[2]Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, California, United

States

[3]Deparment of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Gillings School of Global Public Health,

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 27599, United States

*Correspondence to: (Primary) Dr. Joe Brown, Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering,

University of North Carolina, 135 Dauer Drive, Chapel Hill, NC, 27599, USA. Tel: 919 360 8752. Email:

joebrown@unc.edu. ORCID: 0000-0002-5200-4148. (Secondary) Dr. Olivia Ginn, Department of Civil &

Environmental Engineering & Earth Science, University of Notre Dame, 156 Fitzpatrick Hall, Notre

Dame, IN, 46556, USA. oginn@nd.edu. ORCID: 0000-0002-0109-0699

ABSTRACT

Aerosol transport of enteric microbiota including fecal pathogens and antimicrobial resistance genes

(ARGs) has been documented in a range of settings but remains poorly understood outside indoor

environments. We conducted a systematic review of the peer-reviewed literature to summarize evidence

on specific enteric microbiota including enteric pathogens and ARGs that have been measured in aerosol

samples in urban settings where the risks of outdoor exposure and antibiotic resistance (AR) spread may

be highest. Following PRISMA guidelines, we conducted a key word search for articles published within

the years 1990-2020 using relevant data sources. Two authors independently conducted the keyword

searches of databases and conducted primary and secondary screenings before merging results. To be

included, studies contained extractable data on enteric microbes and AR in outdoor aerosols regardless of

source confirmation and reported on qualitative, quantitative, or viability data on enteric microbes or AR.

Qualitative analyses and metric summaries revealed that enteric microbes and AR have been consistently

reported in outdoor aerosols, generally via relative abundance measures, though gaps remain preventing

full understanding of the role of the aeromicrobiological pathway in the fate and transport of enteric

associated outdoor aerosols. We identified remaining gaps in the evidence base including a need for broad

characterization of enteric pathogens in bioaerosols beyond bacterial genera, a need for greater sampling

in locations of high enteric disease risk, and a need for quantitative estimation of microbial and nucleic

acid densities that may be applied to fate and transport models and in quantitative microbial risk

assessment.

KEYWORDS

enteric pathogens, antibiotic resistance, bioaerosols, urban air, public health, sanitation

FUNDING

This study was funded by the National Science Foundation under grant number 1653226. This funding

source had no role in the design of this study and had no role during its execution, analyses, interpretation

of the data, or decision to submit results.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Studies in high-risk outdoor settings in the USA and in other high-income countries have revealed that

bioaerosols containing enteric (intestinal) microbes are common where concentrated human or animal

fecal waste and one or more mechanisms for aerosolization co-occur. Presence of enteric microbes in

aerosols has been best characterized in ambient air surrounding specific point and area sources such as

wastewater treatment plants[1–12] land applied biosolids,[13–23] composting facilities,[24,25] meat markets,[26]

urban areas,[9,27,28] landfills,[29,30] and concentrated animal feeding operations.[31–33] In many of these cases,

adequate waste disposal technology exists but bioaerosols containing these targets are consistently

detected. A growing body of literature acknowledges the potential risk accompanying enteric microbes

and antibiotic resistant (AR) enteric microbes in aerosols where a source is suspected or confirmed.

Studies of exposure to these point and area sources typically assess nearby residents[20,34] or facility

workers[35,36] who might be at greatest risk.

Settings less well characterized in the context of enteric pathogens and associated AR are ambient urban

outdoor environments where sources may be diffuse and related to generally inadequate or poorly

performing environmental controls or waste management[37,38]. Establishing and maintaining effective and

sustainable infrastructure to improve population health in cities is becoming increasingly difficult due to

factors including accelerating urbanization and densification, climate change and its effects on

infrastructure, and financing constraints; these and other limiting factors are most acute in low- and

middle-income countries (LMICs). Information on ambient fluxes of enteric pathogens and AR in cities

lacking good waste management is needed, targeting settings with potentially elevated exposure risks and

AR spread. Cities in high-income countries (HICs) are not generally considered high risk for exposure to

enteric pathogens via sanitary deficits: human excreta is typically directed into covered or underground

wastewater infrastructure, creating a separation between humans and their waste to interrupt transmission

of enteric infections via well understood pathways.[39] However, in LMICs where wastewater and biosolids

present greater risks due to the high number of circulating infectious diseases – and poorly controlled

antibiotic stewardship[40] – in the population contributing waste and the presence of unsequestered waste in

closer proximity to more people, risk may be higher for exposure through inhalation or ingestion,

including indirectly following surface deposition of bioaerosols.[41–44] Recent studies have described novel

detections along with aeromicrobiological transport of enteric pathogens in aerosols, drawing attention to

this pathway in the context of disease transmission[44,45] and AR emergence and dissemination. In order to

advance understanding of the current and potential impact of enteric pathogens and AR in bioaerosols in

high-risk settings, we seek to describe the rich emerging literature on this topic and identify gaps in

evidence. Therefore, we conducted a systematic review of published estimates reporting detections of

enteric microbiota and ARs in cities.

2.0 METHODS

We followed PRISMA guidelines for reporting of systematic reviews[46] as recommended in the WHO

Handbook for Guideline Development,[47] including all meta-data from searches per the recommended

PRISMA flow diagram. We pre-specified our methods (https://osf.io/6Q7E9/) and provide a full list of

preferred reporting items in Supplemental Material. Our outcomes included any report of enteric microbe

(bacteria, virus, protozoa) or any ARG from pre-determined lists meeting our site criteria, from either

qualitative or quantitative studies assessing their presence. Site criteria were: urban areas with either no

known source or a point or area source related to concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs),

wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs), composting facilities, landfills or other identified source.

2.1 Database sources and search string strategy

A priori, we chose a list of relevant and well-known databases in which to conduct our search for

academic peer-reviewed literature including: ISI Web of Science, PubMed, SCOPUS, EBSCOhost, and

Science.gov. We conducted additional searches in ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

We compiled the string of keywords for searching the literature databases from our own knowledge of the

topic, and from suggestions by experts and existing reviews in related topics.[48–52] These search terms were

refined based on synonyms, abbreviations, and alternate spellings and were expanded and adjusted as

initial searches were performed. Searches were in the form of a one line string that included all fields

from the scope (e.g., aerosol, extramural, urban…), pathogens (e.g., enteric, fecal indicator,

adenovirus…), exposures (e.g., inhalation, ingestion, viable…), mechanisms (e.g., aerosolization,

bubbles, aeration…), sampling methods (e.g., impaction, impinger, filter…), AR associated (e.g*., intI1*,

tetA, *qnrB*…), and antibiotics (e.g., tetracycline, fluoroquinolones, multidrug resistance…). Search strings

used "or" and "and" statements to include multiple fields such as "fecal indicator bacteria OR FIB" AND

"bioaerosol OR ambient OR air OR aerosol OR airborne". The full search string is detailed in

Supplemental Material.

Two authors independently conducted the keyword searches in each database and compiled findings in

Zotero (Version 5·0·96). After deduplication of search results, the authors each conducted an initial

screening based on titles and abstracts of papers. Papers passed the initial screening if the title or abstract

suggested relevance to the keywords in the search. The full text of papers that passed initial screening

were reviewed independently by the two authors if papers were: (1) published in English; (2) published

from the 1990-2020; and (3) published or accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, refereed

conference proceedings, government or multilateral document, thesis or dissertation, book, or other

document appearing on indexed databases we identified; (4) contained extractable data on enteric

microbes including pathogens and AR in outdoor bioaerosols; (5) contained data on targets that could be

related to no source, a specific point source, or an area source but must have been from an urban site; and

(6) reported on qualitative (presence/absence), quantitative (culture or PCR-based), or viability (culture)

data that was sufficient for interpretation within the three aforementioned groups.

After independent searches, we consulted and compared our findings to achieve consensus on inclusion.

For any dissent on inclusion of a paper, a third party was consulted for discussion before again reaching a

consensus decision on inclusion. Backward searches examined the references, authors and contributors,

and keywords identified in the literature resulting from the initial keyword searches. Forward searches

examined articles not initially identified that have referenced literature resulting from the initial keyword

searches.

2.2 Data collection and analysis

For each study, data were extracted and recorded; the full compilation is included in Supplemental

Material. We recorded document identifiers such as authors, publication year, document type, and

whether the document was found through initial, backward, or forward searches. We categorized

documents meeting inclusion criteria first by subject, either AR or enteric microbes detection. Some

publications reported both. We then categorized these by analysis method: culture, PCR, or sequencing.

We extracted and recorded general study characteristics such as location, sampling method, sample size,

and intended targets. Depending on the category, we recorded qualitative, quantitative, and semi-

quantitative data, indicating relevant targets and results within the scope of our review. A formal meta-

analysis of the disparate findings was not deemed possible given the limited evidence on this topic and

the wide diversity of methods employed in measurement in this emerging area. Therefore, we synthesized

review data through categorization and descriptive summary, a common approach when quantitative

meta-analysis is not possible,[53] revealing both a broad description of what is known as well as identifying

gaps requiring further evidence.

3.0 RESULTS

3.1 Search results

Searches returned 1226 publications from 6 databases. Upon removal of duplicates, initial screening of

the title and abstract, and full text screening, 52 publications met search criteria. Forward and backward

searches yielded additional publications for a total of 101 to be included in this review.

Figure 1. Modified PRISMA flow diagram applied to our systematic review process.

3.2 Study characteristics

Of the 101 studies we included, ten reported multiple data types or multiple subjects and methodologies,

reflected in Figure 1 and Table 1. Table 1 details the intended targets for each study. The full table listing

each publication by first author and year can be found in Supplemental Material. Overall, 28% of the

studies identified in this systematic review reported on AR related data and 82% reported on enteric

microbe related data (1% reported both). We observed sequencing to be the most frequent analysis

method, accounting for 75% across all studies. A majority of studies took place in upper-middle and high-

income countries (n=89), with only ten studies based in LMICs including India, Mali, Bolivia, and

Vietnam (Figure 2). A few studies collected data from both income categories. China accounted for

almost 50% of all studies. Only 9% of studies were published since 2010.

Bioaerosol sampling can typically be categorized by three different methods: filtration, impaction, and

impingement. In our review, the majority of studies employed filtration to collect bioaerosol samples

(n=60 studies). Filtration was followed by active impaction (n=28), impingement (n=10), and passive

impaction via gravitational settling (n=8). Some studies used multiple methods, often when performing

culture-dependent analyses in addition to culture-independent analyses.

Table 1: Studies included in the review by categories of target type (antibiotic resistance related or
enteric microbe related) and by data type and analysis method. The intended targets are also categorized.

	Data Type	Method	Count	Intended Targets
	Qualitative	PCR	1	ARGs specified *a priori*
AR	Quantitative	Culture	6	AR associated microbes specified *a priori*
		PCR	13	ARGs specified *a priori*
	Semi-quantitative	PCR	1	
		sequencing	7	Any ARGs
	Total AR		28	
Enteric	Qualitative	Culture	2	Enteric microbes specified *a priori*
	Quantitative	Culture	10	
		PCR	2	Enteric microbe specified *a priori*
	Semi-quantitative	PCR	1	
		sequencing	68	All microbial communities

	Total Enteric	83	
	Repeats	10	
	TOTAL	101	

Figure 2. Total number of studies by country of measurement, with circle size proportional to number of studies (n =1 to 44 in China).

3.3 Results from specific studies

Enteric microbes

Overall, studies reporting on enteric microbe detection in bioaerosols in urban settings targeted a limited

range of microbes, focusing on well-established fecal indicators and in the case of detection via culture,

easily culturable bacteria such as *Enterococcus*, *Enterobacter* and *Escherichia* genera.[54] One study

reported detection through culture of *Yersinia enterocolitica*, *Salmonella* spp. and others in Chinese live

poultry markets in urban Tai'an,[55] though in general the city includes extensive sanitation infrastructure

throughout.[56] For quantitative PCR (qPCR), reported enteric microbes included pathogens as well as

possibly commensal enteric bacteria (*Escherichia coli*, *Enterococcus* spp., *Enterobacter* spp., *Yersinia*

enterocolitica, and *Salmonella* spp.)[54,57] and enteric virus (human adenovirus, human enterovirus, and

human rotavirus).[58–60]

A majority of studies assessed overall microbial communities through sequencing, typically employing

16S rRNA. Of these 67 studies, nine classified the population taxonomy to order level,[61–68] eight

classified to family level,[69–74] 37 classified to genus,[51,64,75–109] 12 classified to species[28,54,59,83,98,110–118] and

only one identified a strain-specific[119] species (Figure 3). When classified to order or family,

Enterobacteriales and *Enterobacteriaceae* (respectively) were detected as less than 1% of the bacterial

community. However, one study detected the families *Campylobacteraceae* (*Arcobacter*) and

Helicobacteraceae[70] and another study detected the orders *Clostridiales* and *Campylobacterales*.[65]

Escherichia or *Escherichia-Shigella, Enterococcus* and *Clostridium* were detected most frequently at the

genus level. *Vibrio, Campylobacter, Yersinia, Klebsiella, and Aeromonas* were also detected in a few

studies at the genus level. Enteric microbes detected at the genus or species level through sequencing

included *Aeromonas* spp., *Enterobacter* spp., *Escherichia coli, Enterococcus faecium, Clostridium* spp.,

Vibrio parahaemolyticus, Salmonella enterica, Campylobacter coli, Yersinia enterocolitica, Shigella spp.,

Klebsiella pneumonia, and *Escherichia fergusonii*. One study in a tropical urban setting identified,

through sequencing, the pathogenic strain of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7.[119]

Figure 3: Taxonomic organization of enteric bacterial targets detected in studies included in the review. The number of manuscripts in which bacteria were detected are included in parenthesis where relevant.

The review revealed only three studies assessing enteric viruses in urban outdoor aerosols. Viral

detections include human adenovirus and human adenovirus C; enterovirus A,B and C; and rotavirus A[58–

[60] Generally, the range of enteric microbes identified in bioaerosols in urban settings is small and we see

223 an even smaller range represented among the culturable targets across studies. A complete breakdown by

224 taxonomic classification of enteric microbes detected in the reviewed studies by all methods is in Table 2.

226 *Table 2: Number of studies reporting enteric microbe (commensal and pathogenic) detections broken*
227 *down by taxonomic classification.*

NUMBER OF STUDIES REPORTING VIRAL DETECTIONS						
		Genus		Species		
		Human adenovirus	1	enterovirus A*	1	
				enterovirus B*	1	
				enterovirus C*	1	
				rotavirus A*	1	
				Human adenovirus C	1	
NUMBER OF STUDIES REPORTING BACTERIAL DETECTIONS						
Order		Family		Genus		Species
Enterobacterales	9	Enterobacteriaceae	8	Enterococcus	22	Escherichia coli	13	Escherichia coli O157:H7*	1
Clostridiales	1	Campylobacteraceae	1	Enterobacter	19	Enterobacter aerogenes	1
Campylobacterales	2	Helicobacteraceae	1	Salmonella	5	Enterobacter asburiae	1
				Escherichia	12	Enterococcus faecalis	3
				Clostridium	8	Enterococcus hirae	1
				Vibrio	2	Yersinia pestis*	1
				Campylobacter	3	Enterobacter cloacae	4
				Yersinia*	3	Enterococcus faecium	4
				Aeromonas	2	Aeromonas hydrophila	3
				Shigella	5	Pseudomonas aeruginosa	1
				Escherichia/Shigella	15	Yersinia enterocolitica*	3
						Escherichia fergusonni	2
						Clostridium butyricum	1
						Clostridium perfringens	1
						Vibrio parahaemolyticus	1
						Salmonella enterica*	1
						Campylobacter coli*	1
						Enterobacter coli	1
						Enterobacter hormaechei	1
						Shigella flexneri*	1

Note: The Strain column header appears alongside Species. Values in the table:

*Generally pathogenic in immunocompetent hosts

229
3.4 Antibiotic resistance

We identified fewer studies reporting on antibiotic resistant bacteria and antibiotic resistance encoding

genes (ARGs) in bioaerosols (n=28). Using selective culture and often using disk diffusion methods,[120]

studies reported viable bacterial resistance to a broad range of antibiotic groups also highlighted on the

US Food and Drug Administration's, National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System as existent or

emerging threats,[121] Some of these groups include

β--lactams (penicillins, cephalosporins and carbapenems), tetracyclines, quinolones, aminoglycosides,

sulfonamides, and phenicols. Through qPCR, a wide range of AR related genetic targets have been

detected in urban aerosols such as antibiotic resistance genes (ARGs), mobile genetic elements (MGEs)

encoding horizontal gene transfer ability, or mobile integrons (MIs) encoding the ability to undergo

recombination and functional conversion of ARGs (Table 3).[122–124] However, of the studies that detected

ARGs in bioaerosols via PCR, 79% took place in upper-middle and high-income countries.

Table 3: Antibiotic Resistance related categorization with number of studies citing each target (at various levels) in parenthesis.

	Drug Mechanism	Drug Class	Resistance genes	Drug
Antibiotics	β-lactams (2)	Multiple Classes	SHV (2), TEM (5), ampC (1), AMP (1), OXA (1), IMP (1) , OXA-212 (1), OXA-278 (1), OXA-360 (1), VEB (1), GES (1), TEM-193 (1), NDM-1 (2)	---
		penem (1)	CME3 (1), mecA (4), PBP-2x (1)	piperacillin (1) penicillin (2) ampicillin (3) oxacillin (1) carbenicillin (1) cloxacillin (1) amoxicillin (2) amoxicillin/clavulanic acid (1)
		cephalosporin	CTX-1 (1), CTX-M1 (2), CTX-M-32 (1)	cefotaxime (2) ceftazidime (1) cephalorodine (1)
		cephamycin	CMY (1), CMY-2 (4)	---
		carbapenem	---	imipenem (3) meropenem (1)
	Folate Synthesis (1)	sulfonamide	sul1 (10), sul2 (6), sul3 (4)	---
		diaminopyrimidine	dfrA12 (1)	---
		diaminopyrimidine/sulfonamide combination	---	sulfamexoxazole-trimethoprim (1)
	MDR efflux pump (1)	Multiple Classes	qacEdelta1-02 (1), emrD (1)	---

aminoglycoside (2)	aac(6')-lb (3), aph(3")-lb (1), aac(6')-ll (3), aac(6')-I (1), aacA/aphD (1), aad(6) (1), strA (1), str (1), strB (1), aadE (4), apHA1 (1), aph (6)-l (2), aph (3')-ll l (1), aph(3')-lIIa (1), aph(3')-lII (1), aph(3')-l (1), aph(3) (1), aph(3')-lIa (1), aadA (5), ant(3")-Ih-aac(6')-Iid (1), ant(9)-I (1), aadB (1), aacC (1), aadd (3)	gentamicin (4) streptomycin (2) streptomycin (2)
tetracycline (2)	tetK (4), tetM (7), tetC (6), tetG (4), tet32 (2), tet34 (1), tet37 (1), tetL (4), tetO (6), tetQ (4), tetW (8), tetX (5), tetA (3), tetB (3), tetS (2), tetR (1), tetT (1)	tetracycline (5) minocillin (1) doxycycline (1)
phenicol	cmlA1 (1), catA1 (1), cmX(A) (1), catB3 (1), catB8 (1), dfrA1 (1), cat-acetyltransferase (1), cmlB (1), floR (1), catB (1)	chloramphenicol (3)
lincosamide (1)	lnuA (1)	clindamycin (1)
macrolide	mphE (1), mphA (1), mefA (1), macA (1)	
fluoroquinolone (2)	qnrS (6), qnrB (1), qnrD (1), qepA (2)	ciprofloxacin (4)
gylcopeptides (1)	vanA (1), vanB (2), vanRA (1), van HB (1), van-TC (1), vanSA (1)	vancomycin (3)
rifamycin	---	rifampicin (1)
macrolide, lincosamide, streptogramin (MLS) (1)	ermC (6), erm35 (2), erm36 (2), ermA (4), ermB (8), ermF (3), ermT (1), ermX (2), ermQ (1), lnuA (2), ermG (1)	oleandomycin (1) erythromycin (2)
nitrofuran	---	nitrofurentoin (1)
peptide	bacA (4), bcrA (2), MCR (1)	lipopeptide (1)
mupirocin/pseudomonic acid (1)	---	---
cycloheximide (1)	---	---
polymixins	---	polymixinB (1)
Kasugamycin	ksgA (1)	---
Fosmidomycin	rosA (1), rosB (1)	---
nucleoside	SAT (1)	---
multidrug (1)	mexT (1), mdtL (1), mdtH (1), mdtE (1), mexF (3), mexD (1), acrA (1), tolC (1), ceoA (1), acrB (2)	---

Mobile Genetic Elements	intI1 (7), tnpA (2), ICR3 (1), IS613 (1), tnpA-02 (1), tnpA-04 (1)

4.0 DISCUSSION

Results of this systematic review suggest that fecal signatures are present in ambient urban air across the globe, along with evidence suggesting aerosols may play a role in urban AR spread. Notably, studies conducted in cities in LMICs show a broad and diverse range of airborne microbial gene targets of possibly human fecal origin, potentially related to sanitation infrastructure deficits[125] that permit uncontained waste flows in densely populated urban areas[44]. However, the results also reveal large gaps in the characterization and detection of important enteric microbes and AR in bioaerosols in ambient urban air. An especially concerning gap is that LMICs make up a minority of all study locations within the scope of this review, despite the fact that cities in these countries may be characterized by inadequate sanitation infrastructure and high population density, leading to widespread fecal contamination and disproportionately bearing the global burden of diarrheal disease, the cause of 1·8 million deaths worldwide in 2017.[126] Given widespread carriage and shedding of important enteric pathogens, poor containment of sanitary waste near population centers, and the limited evidence that enteric pathogen-associated nucleic acids are widely present in aerosols, these sites should be an explicit focus of future monitoring efforts to understand the extent and implications of fecal microbe transport in aerosols.

Studies that do assess enteric microbes and AR are dominated by quantal (presence/absence) or semi-quantitative data obtained through sequencing. Such estimates target abundance in terms of the microbial community within each sample, as opposed to the environment in which the communities exist. While sequencing is useful in broadly characterizing and understanding infectious diseases and microbial communities in general, it is less useful in the context of transport phenomena and exposure measurements without additional contextual data, typically quantitative measurements that report density of specific genes or microbes per unit volume or mass.[127] In the case of whole-genome sequencing, selection bias may be introduced if the microorganisms chosen for analysis are not representative of the broader population in the sample.[127] When entire communities are sequenced, selection bias is resolved to a degree but additional shortcomings remain or are introduced such as quality control, quantification

limitations, high limits of detection or lack of comparability across other methods and studies.[128]

Furthermore, characterizing specific genes such as those encoding antibiotic resistance requires increased

sequencing depth which is not always possible with low concentration samples like bioaerosols.[129] The

studies that do quantitatively assess gene targets of enteric microbes (n=two) and AR (n=14) in

bioaerosols provide more context, assessing targets in relation to the environmental media in which they

are found as opposed to in relation to other targets present. Importantly, many of the most critical AR

pathogens globally are known to be enriched in fecal wastes, including *E. coli*, *Klebsiella* spp., and

Pseudomonas aeruginosa.[130] All of these studies leverage real-time qPCR which is limited to

interpretation based on standard curves as opposed to absolute quantification which allows for lower

limits of detection[131]. While molecular detections are important in characterizing enteric microbes

including pathogens of concern, detection of microbe-specific nucleic acid sequences do not indicate

viability. Co-culture with fecal indicator bacteria most often detected in these studies (*E. coli*,

Enterobacter sp., or *Enterococcus sp.*) may indirectly indicate potential viability of other microbes;

vegetative bacteria are typically a conservative proxy for pathogen viability since they are readily

inactivated in aerosols[132,133]. The combination of absolute quantification with an expansion of viability

detection methods would contribute to advancing understanding of the potential public health relevance

of this poorly understood pathway of transmission.[131] The need for data characterizing aerosol transport

of enteric pathogens and AR is most critical in settings where the risks of sanitation-related infections and

AR spread are highest, typically LMICs where economic resources and laboratory capacity may be most

limited. Although high-volume sample collection and methodologically sophisticated pathogen assays

may often be unavailable in such settings, affordable and accessible detection of culturable fecal indicator

bacteria and phenotypic resistance testing can provide valuable insight into potential health impacts for

exposed populations.[58,134,135]

Studies included in this review reporting on enteric microbes including pathogens in bioaerosols in urban

settings targeted a limited range of enteric microbes, with many studies (38%) reporting detection of

commonly used fecal indicator bacteria (*Escherichia coli* and *Enteroccocus)*. Only one study in a tropical

urban setting identified, through sequencing, the pathogenic strain of *Escherichia coli*, O157:H7 (EHEC)

yielding a limited data pool that excludes other strains such as ETEC, EPEC and others that were

responsible for over 60,000 deaths across the globe in 2016.[136] Furthermore, though *Campylobacter coli*

was detected in one study through sequencing at the species level, other pathogenic strains of

Campylobacter remain uncharacterized in bioaerosols, even though it was responsible for 75,000

diarrheal deaths worldwide in 2016.[136] Overall, the majority of enteric bacteria and viruses reported in

the studies targeted and detected commensal enteric microbiota or opportunistic pathogens that typically

only cause disease in immunocompromised individuals. Recent evidence reveals the growing relevance of

opportunistic pathogens in clinical settings, particularly in the context of their low susceptibility to

antibiotics and environmental origins[137]. Frank pathogens, which cause disease even in immunocompetent

individuals are less represented in the review, making up less than half (39%) of all unique microbes

reported at the strain and species levels across all studies (Table 2).

Few studies targeted and detected enteric viruses, even though fecal microbes are present and often are

co-occurring with enteric viruses[44,138–140]. Viruses may be highly mobile in aerosols, but would not be

captured in 16S rRNA sequencing that represents the bulk of analytical methods used in bioaerosols

analysis. The available evidence from our review and other emerging evidence[44] suggests that enteric

viruses are important potential targets in urban aerosols, particularly norovirus given its well documented

transport in aerosols[141–144]. Of the studies that employed methods that would be suited to the detection of

enteric viruses (6 out of 101 covered in this review), 33% (n=2) identified them, including detections of

human enterovirus, human rotavirus, and human adenovirus (Table 2).

No study included in our review targeted or reported enteric protozoans in bioaerosols in an urban setting,

so an absence of evidence on detection of this class of enteric microbes should not be interpreted as

evidence that they are not present in aerosols. These microbes tend to be larger in size (5-15 μm) and

therefore experience rapid settling, and so may be of less interest in aerosol transport modeling, however.

Despite this, some evidence suggests they could be widely detected in aerosols and may therefore merit

further study. A study from rural Mexico detection of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in air samples via

microscopy.[45] A study published following our review reported detection of *Giardia duodenalis* and

Cryptosporidium spp. near open sewers in both urban La Paz, Bolivia and Kanpur, India via qPCR, with

G. duodenalis detected in 22% of samples in La Paz and 18% of samples in Kanpur.[44] In this study,

Cryptosporidium spp. was detected in 9% and 3% of samples in La Paz and Kanpur, respectively, at

average densities ranging from 9.3 to 560 gc/m^3.[44]

The results of this review should be considered alongside a number of important limitations. First, though

we used a double-blind search strategy and agreed *a priori* on inclusion criteria and other methods, bias or

human error may have introduced some inconsistency in including literature for the review. Though we

used a consensus-based approach to inclusion of studies, we may have missed or mischaracterized

individual studies given the large number of papers we reviewed. Second, we excluded studies that were

not translatable to English or that had non-extractable data that may have been valuable contributions

within this scope of work. Third, because of the broad range of analysis methods, diagnostic tools, and

variability in interpretation of data, we did not perform a structured meta-analysis and limited our results

and discussion to a broad characterization and categorization of the literature. Future reviews of an

expanded number of papers may be able to quantitatively synthesize and compare study findings

according to methods and metadata using robust statistical methods well suited to meta-analysis.

5.0 CONCLUSION

Based on our interpretation of the results of this review, we can offer the following conclusions. First,

enteric microbes and AR are widely detected in outdoor urban aerosols. A wide range of targets have

been detected, though bacteria are most prominent; most analytical methods in the studies covered in this

review employed methods that limited detection to bacteria only. Further attention on specific pathogens

of interest and especially studies targeting enteric viruses and protozoa are needed. Second, we observe

major gaps in evidence around microbial viability and quantitative estimation of specific enteric

pathogens of global risk relevance. Quantitative data are needed alongside aerosol size data to advance

fate and transport modeling, and viability of pathogens – even if indirect via bacterial indicator co-culture

– is critically important to any assessment of the public health relevance of pathogen detection in

aerosols. Third, we can conclude that important gaps in evidence are apparent specifically in settings

where the risks of enteric pathogen exposure and AR emergence and spread are most acute: cities of

LMICs, which are characterized in part by poor sanitation and high population density in close proximity

to potential sources of bioaerosols containing enteric targets. We propose that future studies should

address these gaps so that we will be able to better understand the potential for enteric microbes and AR

in aerosols to impact global public health and to inform control strategies that can limit exposures when

and where they are most critical.

6.0 CONTRIBUTIONS

Olivia Ginn: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Literature Search, Data Curation and

Verification, Writing- Original Draft, Writing- Review and Editing, Visualization, Supervision, Project

Administration

Sarah Lowry: Methodology, Formal Analysis, Literature Search, Data Curation and Verification,

Writing- Original Draft, Writing- Review and Editing

Joe Brown: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Data Verification, Writing- Review and

Editing, Funding Acquisition

7.0 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

8.0 FUNDING

This study was funded by the National Science Foundation under grant number 1653226. This funding

source had no role in the design of this study and had no role during its execution, analyses, interpretation

of the data, or decision to submit results

9.0 REFERENCES

1   Fannin KF, Vana SC, Jakubowski W. Effect of an Activated Sludge Wastewater Treatment Plant

on Ambient Air Densities of Aerosols Containing Bacteria and Viruses. *Appl Environ Microbiol*

1985; **49**: 1191–6.

2   Benami M, Busgang A, Gillor O, Gross A. Quantification and risks associated with bacterial

aerosols near domestic greywater-treatment systems. *Sci Total Environ* 2016; **562**: 344–52.

3   Sawyer B, Rao KC, O'Brien P, Elenbogen G, Zenz DR, Lue-Hing C. Changes in bacterial aerosols

with height above aeration tanks. J. Environ. Eng. 1996; **122**. DOI:10.1061/(ASCE)0733-

9372(1996)122:5(368).

4   Vermeulen LC, Brandsema PS, Kassteele J Van De, *et al.* Atmospheric dispersion and

transmission of Legionella from wastewater treatment plants : A 6-year case-control study. *Int J*

Hyg Environ Health 2021; **237**. DOI:10.1016/j.ijheh.2021.113811.

5   Lin K, Marr LC. Aerosolization of Ebola Virus Surrogates in Wastewater Systems. *Environ Sci*

Technol 2017; **51**: 2669–75.

6   Sánchez-Monedero MA, Aguilar MI, Fenoll R, Roig A. Effect of the aeration system on the levels

of airborne microorganisms generated at wastewater treatment plants. *Water Res* 2008; **42**: 3739–

44.

7   Gangamma S, Patil RS, Mukherji S. Characterization and proinflammatory response of airborne

biological particles from wastewater treatment plants. *Environ Sci Technol* 2011; **45**: 3282–7.

8   Lue-Hing C, Zenz DR, Sedita SJ. Environmental Impact of the Microbial Aerosol Emissions From

Wastewater Treatment Plants. *Water Sci Technol* 1982; **14**: 289–309.

Cronholm LS. Potential Health Hazards from Microbial Aerosols in Densely Populated Urban Regions Potential Health Hazards from Microbial Aerosols in Densely Populated Urban Regions. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 1980; **39**: 6–12.

Heinonen-Tanski H, Reponen T, Koivunen J. Airborne enteric coliphages and bacteria in sewage treatment plants. *Water Res* 2009; **43**: 2558–66.

Paez-Rubio T, Viau E, Romero-Hernandez S, Peccia J. Source bioaerosol concentration and rRNA gene-based identification of microorganisms aerosolized at a flood irrigation wastewater reuse site. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2005; **71**: 804–10.

Sawyer B, Elenbogen G, Rao KC, O'Brien P, Zenz DR, Lue-Hing C. Bacterial aerosol emission rates from municipal wastewater aeration tanks. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 1993; **59**: 3183–6.

Dungan RS. Estimation of infectious risks in residential populations exposed to airborne pathogens during center pivot irrigation of dairy wastewaters. *Environ Sci Technol* 2014; **48**: 5033–42.

Tanner BD, Brooks JP, Gerba CP, Haas CN, Josephson KL, Pepper IL. Estimated Occupational Risk from Bioaerosols Generated during Land Application of Class B Biosolids. *J Environ Qual* 2008; **37**: 2311.

Viau E, Bibby K, Paez-Rubio T, Peccia J. Toward a consensus view on the infectious risks associated with land application of sewage sludge. *Environ Sci Technol* 2011; **45**: 5459–69.

Paez-Rubio T, Ramarui A, Sommer J, Xin H, Anderson J, Peccia J. Emission rates and characterization of aerosols produced during the spreading of dewatered class B biosolids. *Environ Sci Technol* 2007; **41**: 3537–44.

Pillai SD. Bioaerosols from Land-Applied Biosolids: Issues and Needs. *Water Environ Res* 2007; **79**: 270–8.

Brooks JP, Tanner BD, Josephson KL, Gerba CP, Haas CN, Pepper IL. A national study on the residential impact of biological aerosols from the land application of biosolids. *J Appl Microbiol* 2005; **99**: 310–22.

19 Brooks JP, Gerba CP, Pepper IL. Diversity of aerosolized bacteria during land application of

biosolids. *J Appl Microbiol* 2007; **103**: 1779–90.

20 Brooks JP, Tanner BD, Gerba CP, Haas CN, Pepper IL. Estimation of bioaerosol risk of infection

to residents adjacent to a land applied biosolids site using an empirically derived transport model.

J Appl Microbiol 2005; **98**: 397–405.

21 Baertsch C, Paez-Rubio T, Viau E, Peccia J. Source tracking aerosols released from land-applied

class B biosolids during high-wind events. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2007; **73**: 4522–31.

22 Shuval HI, Guttman-Bass N, Applebaum J, Fattal B. Aerosolized enteric bacteria and viruses

generated by spray irrigation of wastewater. *Water Sci Technol* 1989; **21**: 131–5.

23 Teltsch B, Katzenelson E. Airborne enteric bacteria and viruses from spray irrigation with

wastewater. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 1978; **35**: 290–6.

24 Pankhurst LJ, Akeel U, Hewson C, *et al.* Understanding and mitigating the challenge of bioaerosol

emissions from urban community composting. *Atmos Environ* 2011; **45**: 85–93.

25 Pahari AK, Dasgupta D, Patil RS, Mukherji S. Emission of bacterial bioaerosols from a

composting facility in Maharashtra, India. *Waste Manag* 2016; **53**: 22–31.

26 Gao X, Shao M, Luo Y, *et al.* Airborne bacterial contaminations in typical Chinese wet market

with live poultry trade. *Sci Total Environ* 2016; **572**: 681–7.

27 Fang Z, Wang X, Hu L, Ouyang Z, Zheng H. Culturable Airborne Bacteria in Outdoor

Environments in Beijing, China [electronic resource]. *Microb Ecol* 2007; **54**: 487–96.

28 Gangamma S. Characteristics of airborne bacteria in Mumbai urban environment. *Sci Total

Environ* 2014; **488**–**489**: 70–4.

29 Frączek K, Rózycki H, Ropek D. Statistical analyses of bioaerosol concentration at municipal

landfill site. *Ecol Chem Eng S* 2014; **21**: 229–43.

30 Huang CY, Lee CC, Li FC, Ma YP, Su HJJ. The seasonal distribution of bioaerosols in municipal

landfill sites: A 3-yr study. *Atmos Environ* 2002; **36**: 4385–95.

31 Green CF, Gibbs SG, Tarwater PM, Mota LC, Scarpino P V. Bacterial plume emanating from the

air surrounding swine confinement operations. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 2006; **3**: 9–15.

32   Ko G, Simmons III OD, Likirdopulos CA, Worley-Davis L, Williams M, Sobsey MD.

Investigation of Bioaerosols Released from Swine Farms using Conventional and Alternative

Waste Treatment and Management Technologies. *Environ Sci Technol* 2008; **42**: 8849–57.

33   Pillai SD, Ricke SC. Bioaerosols from municipal and animal wastes: background and

contemporary issues. *Can J Microbiol* 2002; **48**: 681–96.

34   Jahne MA, Rogers SW, Holsen TM, Grimberg SJ. Quantitative microbial risk assessment of

bioaerosols from a manure application site. *Aerobiologia (Bologna)* 2015; **31**: 73–87.

35   Rendon RVC, Garcia BCB, Vital PG. Assessment of airborne bacteria in selected occupational

environments in Quezon City, Philippines. *Arch Environ Occup Heal* 2017; **72**: 178–83.

36   Yang K, Li L, Wang Y, Xue S, Han Y, Liu J. Airborne bacteria in a wastewater treatment plant:

emission characterization, source analysis and health risk assessment. *Water Res* 2019; **149**: 596–

606.

37   Mukherjee A, Duttagupta S, Chattopadhyay S, *et al.* Impact of sanitation and socio-economy on

groundwater fecal pollution and human health towards achieving sustainable development

goals across India from ground-observations and satellite-derived nightlight. *Sci Rep* 2019; **9**: 1–

11.

38   Berendes DM, Kirby AE, Clennon JA, *et al.* Urban sanitation coverage and environmental fecal

contamination: Links between the household and public environments of Accra, Ghana. *PLoS One*

2018; **13**: 1–19.

39   Wagner EG, Lanoix JN. Excreta Disposal for Rural Areas and Small Communities. World Health

Organization, 1958.

40   Torres NF, Chibi B, Kuupiel D, Solomon VP, Mashamba-Thompson TP, Middleton LE. The use

of non-prescribed antibiotics; prevalence estimates in low-and-middle-income countries. A

systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Public Heal* 2021; **79**: 1–15.

41   Johnson A, Ginn O, Bivins A, Rocha-Melogno L, Tripathi SN, Brown J. Extended-spectrum beta-

478   lactamase (ESBL)-positive Escherichia coli presence in urban aquatic environments in Kanpur,

479   India. *J Water Health* 2020; **18**: 849–54.

480   42   Salazar D, Ginn O, Brown J, Soria F, Garvizu C. Assessment of antibiotic resistant coliforms from

481   bioaerosol samples collected above a sewage-polluted river in La Paz, Bolivia. *Int J Hyg Environ*

482   *Health* 2020; **228**: 113494.

483   43   Farling S, Rogers T, Knee JS, Tilley EA, Brown J, Deshusses MA. Bioaerosol emissions

484   associated with pit latrine emptying operations. *Sci Total Environ* 2019; **648**: 1082–6.

485   44   Ginn O, Rocha-Melogno L, Bivins A, *et al.* Detection and Quantification of Enteric Pathogens in

486   Aerosols Near Open Wastewater Canals in Cities with Poor Sanitation. *Environ Sci Technol* 2021.

487   DOI:10.1021/acs.est.1c05060.

488   45   Balderrama-Carmona AP, Gortáres-Moroyoqui P, Álvarez-Valencia LH, *et al.* Occurrence and

489   quantitative microbial risk assessment of Cryptosporidium and Giardia in soil and air samples. *Int*

490   *J Infect Dis* 2014; **26**: 123–7.

491   46   Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and

492   meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 2009; **339**: 332–6.

493   47   Organization WH. WHO handbook for guideline development, 2nd edn. World Health

494   Organization, 2014.

495   48   Ahmed SM, Hall AJ, Robinson AE, *et al.* Global Prevalence of Norovirus in Cases of

496   Gastroenteritis: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2014; **14**: 725–30.

497   49   Penakalapati G, Swarthout J, Delahoy MJ, *et al.* Exposure to Animal Feces and Human Health: A

498   Systematic Review and Proposed Research Priorities. *Environ Sci Technol* 2017; **51**: 11537–52.

499   50   WHO, UNICEF. Progress on household drinking water, sanitation and hygiene 2000-2017.

500   Special focus on inequalities. 2019.

501   51   Li J, Cao J, Zhu YG, *et al.* Global Survey of Antibiotic Resistance Genes in Air. *Environ Sci*

502   *Technol* 2018; **52**: 10975–84.

52   Gao M, Qiu T, Sun Y, Wang X. The abundance and diversity of antibiotic resistance genes in the

atmospheric environment of composting plants. *Environ Int* 2018; **116**: 229–38.

53   Yasin YM, Kerr MS, Wong CA, Bélanger CH. Factors affecting nurses' job satisfaction in rural

and urban acute care settings: A PRISMA systematic review. *J Adv Nurs* 2020; **76**: 963–79.

54   Gao J-F, Fan X-Y, Li H-Y, Pan K-L. Airborne Bacterial Communities of PM2.5 in Beijing-

Tianjin-HebeiMegalopolis, China as Revealed By Illumina MiSeq Sequencing: A CaseStudy.

AEROSOL AIR Qual Res 2017; **17**: 788–98.

55   Wu B, Meng K, Wei L, Cai Y, Chai T. Seasonal Fluctuations of Microbial Aerosol in Live Poultry

Markets andthe Detection of Endotoxin. *Front Microbiol* 2017; **8**.

DOI:10.3389/fmicb.2017.00551.

56   Jia W, Li C, Qin K, Liu L. Testing and Analysis of Drinking Water Quality in the Rural Areas of

High-tech District in Tai'an City. *J Agric Sci* 2010; **2**: 2008–10.

57   Santos RA, Sau NJ, Certucha T, Almendariz FJ. Rapid detection of bacteria, Enterococcus

faecalis, in airborne particles of Hermosillo, Sonora, México. *J Environ Biol* 2019; **40**: 619–25.

58   Rocha-Melogno L, Ginn O, Bailey ES, *et al.* Bioaerosol sampling optimization for community

exposure assessment in cities with poor sanitation: A one health cross-sectional study. *Sci Total*

Environ 2020; **738**. DOI:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139495.

59   Gonzalez-Martin C, Coronado-Alvarez NM, Teigell-Perez N, *et al.* Analysis of the Impact of

African Dust Storms on the Presence of EntericViruses in the Atmosphere in Tenerife, Spain.

AEROSOL AIR Qual Res 2018; **18**: 1863–73.

60   Cao C, Jiang W, Wang B, *et al.* Inhalable microorganisms in Beijing's PM2.5 and PM10

pollutants during a severe smog event. *Environ Sci Technol* 2014; **48**: 1499–507.

61   Bertolini V, Innocente E, Rampazzo G, *et al.* Temporal variability and effect of environmental

variables on airborne bacterial communities in an urban area of Northern Italy [electronic

resource]. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 2013; **97**: 6561–70.

62   Bowers RM, McLetchie S, Knight R, Fierer N. Spatial variability in airborne bacterial

communities across land-use types and their relationship to the bacterial communities of potential

source environments. *ISME J* 2011; **5**: 601–12.

63   Fang Z, Guo W, Zhang J, Lou X. Influence of heat events on the composition of airborne bacterial

communities in urban ecosystems. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2018; **15**.

DOI:10.3390/ijerph15102295.

64   Gandolfi I, Bertolini V, Bestetti G, *et al.* Spatio-temporal variability of airborne bacterial

communities and their correlation with particulate matter chemical composition across two urban

areas. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 2015; **99**: 4867–77.

65   Jang G Il, Hwang CY, Cho BC. Effects of heavy rainfall on the composition of airborne bacterial

communities. *Front Environ Sci Eng* 2018; **12**: 1–10.

66   Ouyang W, Gao B, Cheng H, *et al.* Airborne bacterial communities and antibiotic resistance gene

dynamicsin PM2.5 during rainfall. *Environ Int* 2020; **134**. DOI:10.1016/j.envint.2019.105318.

67   Pan Y, Pan X, Xiao H, Xiao H. Structural Characteristics and Functional Implications of PM2.5

Bacterial Communities During Fall in Beijing and Shanghai, China. *Front Microbiol* 2019; **10**: 1–

11.

68   Zhen Q, Deng Y, Wang Y, *et al.* Meteorological factors had more impact on airborne bacterial

communities than air pollutants. *Sci Total Environ* 2017; **601–602**: 703–12.

69   Bowers RM, Clements N, Emerson JB, Wiedinmyer C, Hannigan MP, Fierer N. Seasonal

Variability in Bacterial and Fungal Diversity of the Near-Surface Atmosphere. *Environ Sci*

Technol 2013; **47**: 12097–106.

70   Brodie EL, DeSantis TZ, Parker JPM, Zubietta IX, Piceno YM, Andersen GL. Urban aerosols

harbor diverse and dynamic bacterial populations. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2007; **104**: 299–304.

71   Mhuireach G, Betancourt-Román CM, Green JL, Johnson BR. Spatiotemporal controls on the

urban aerobiome. *Front Ecol Evol* 2019; **7**. DOI:10.3389/fevo.2019.00043.

72   Serrano-Silva N, Calderon-Ezquerro MC. Metagenomic survey of bacterial diversity in the

atmosphere of Mexico City using different sampling methods. *Environ Pollut* 2018; **235**: 20–9.

73   Franzetti A, Gandolfi I, Gaspari E, Ambrosini R, Bestetti G. Seasonal variability of bacteria in fine

and coarse urban air particulate matter. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 2011; **90**: 745–53.

74   Fierer N, Liu Z, Rodríguez-Hernández M, Knight R, Henn M, Hernandez MT. Short-term

temporal variability in airborne bacterial and fungal populations. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2008;

74: 200–7.

75   Fan C, Li Y, Liu P, *et al.* Characteristics of airborne opportunistic pathogenic bacteria during

autumn and winter in Xi'an, China. *Sci Total Environ* 2019; **672**: 834–45.

76   Fykse EM, Tjärnhage T, Humppi T, *et al.* Identification of airborne bacteria by 16S rDNA

sequencing, MALDI-TOF MS and the MIDI microbial identification system. *Aerobiologia*

(Bologna) 2015; **31**: 271–81.

77   Gat D, Mazar Y, Cytryn E, Rudich Y. Origin-Dependent Variations in the Atmospheric

Microbiome Community in Eastern Mediterranean Dust Storms. *Environ Sci Technol* 2017; **51**:

6709–18.

78   Gou H, Lu J, Li S, Tong Y, Xie C, Zheng X. Assessment of microbial communities in PM1 and

PM10 of Urumqi during winter. *Environ Pollut* 2016; **214**: 202–10.

79   Hai VD, Hoang SMT, Hung NTQ, *et al.* Characteristics of airborne bacteria and fungi in the

atmosphere in Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam - A case study over three years. *Int Biodeterior*

Biodegrad 2019; **145**: 104819.

80   Hurtado L, Rodriguez G, Lopez J, *et al.* Characterization of atmospheric bioaerosols at 9 sites in

Tijuana, Mexico. *Atmos Environ* 2014; **96**: 430–6.

81   Innocente E, Franzetti A, Facca C, *et al.* Influence of seasonality, air mass origin and particulate

matter chemical composition on airborne bacterial community structure in the Po Valley, Italy. *Sci*

Total Environ 2017; **593**–**594**: 677–87.

82   García-Mena J, Murugesan S, Pérez-Muñoz AA, *et al.* Airborne Bacterial Diversity from the Low

Atmosphere of Greater Mexico City. *Microb Ecol* 2016; **72**: 70–84.

83   Li H, Zhou X-Y, Yang X-R, Zhu Y-G, Hong Y-W, Su J-Q. Spatial and seasonal variation of the

airborne microbiome in a rapidly developing city of China. *Sci Total Environ* 2019; **665**: 61–8.

84   Liang Z, Yu Y, Ye Z, Li G, Wang W, An T. Pollution profiles of antibiotic resistance genes

associated with airborne opportunistic pathogens from typical area, Pearl River Estuary and their

exposure risk to human. *Environ Int* 2020; **143**: 105934.

85   Abd Aziz A, Lee K, Park B, *et al.* Comparative study of the airborne microbial communities and

their functional composition in fine particulate matter (PM2.5) under non-extreme and extreme

PM2.5 conditions. *Atmos Environ* 2018; **194**: 82–92.

86   Lu Z, Liu Q, Xiong Y, Huang F, Zhou J, Schauer JJ. A hybrid source apportionment strategy using

positive matrix factorization (PMF) and molecular marker chemical mass balance (MM-CMB)

models. *Environ Pollut* 2018; **238**: 39–51.

87   Mu F, Bai W, Li Y, Lu R, Qi Y, Xie W. Source identification of airborne bacteria in the

mountainous area and the urban areas. *Atmos Res* 2020; **231**.

https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2019.104676.

88   Nanclares Castañeda DA, Zapata Sánchez CH, Silva-Bedoya LM, Montontoya Campuzáno OI,

Moreno Herrera CX. Assessment of culturable bacteria associated with fine particulate matter

collected in antioquia colombia-South America. *Rev Int Contam Ambient* 2020; **36**: 287–302.

89   Núñez A, Alcamí A, Amo de Paz G, *et al.* Temporal patterns of variability for prokaryotic and

eukaryotic diversity in the urban air of Madrid (Spain). *Atmos Environ* 2019; published online

Sept 8. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.116972.

90   Romano S, Becagli S, Lucarelli F, Rispoli G, Perrone MR. Airborne bacteria structure and

chemical composition relationships in winter and spring PM10 samples over southeastern Italy.

Sci Total Environ 2020; **730**: 138899.

91   Shen F, Zheng Y, Niu M, *et al.* Characteristics of biological particulate matters at urban and rural

sites in the North China Plain. *Environ Pollut* 2019; **253**: 569–77.

92   Soleimani Z, Sorooshian A, Goudarzi G, Maleki H, Marzouni MB. Impact of Middle Eastern dust

storms on indoor and outdoor composition of bioaerosol. *Atmos Environ* 2016; **138**: 135–43.

93   Stewart JD, Shakya KM, Bilinski T, Wilson JW, Ravi S, Choi CS. Variation of near surface

608  atmosphere microbial communities at an urban and a suburban site in Philadelphia, PA, USA. *Sci*

609  *Total Environ* 2020; **724**: 138353.

610 94 Sun Y, Xu S, Zheng D, Li J, Tian H, Wang Y. Effects of haze pollution on microbial community

611  changes and correlation with chemical components in atmospheric particulate matter. *Sci Total*

612  *Environ* 2018; **637**–**638**: 507–16.

613 95 Wei M, Liu H, Chen J, *et al.* Effects of aerosol pollution on PM2.5-associated bacteria in typical

614  inland and coastal cities of northern China during the winter heating season. *Environ Pollut* 2020;

615  **262**: 114188.

616 96 Agarwal S, Mandal P, Srivastava A. Quantification and Characterization of Size-segregated

617  Bioaerosols at Municipal Solid Waste Dumping Site in Delhi. *Procedia Environ Sci* 2016; **35**:

618  400–7.

619 97 Núñez A, Moreno DA. The Differential Vertical Distribution of the Airborne Biological Particles

620  Reveals an Atmospheric Reservoir of Microbial Pathogens and Aeroallergens. *Microb Ecol* 2020;

621  **80**: 322–33.

622 98 Xu A, Chen X, Lang X, Xia Y, Song Z. Seasonal variability in bacterial and fungal diversity and

623  community composition of the near-surface atmosphere in coastal megacity. *Aerobiologia*

624  *(Bologna)* 2017; **33**: 555–75.

625 99 Yan D, Tao Z, Yu L-Y, Su; J, Yu L-Y. Structural Variation in the Bacterial Community

626  Associated with Particulate Matter in Beijing, China During Hazy and Nonhazy Days. *Appl*

627  *Environ Microbiol* 2018; **84**: 1–13.

628 100 Yang Y, Zhou R, Chen B, Zhang T, Hu L, Zou S. Characterization of airborne antibiotic resistance

629  genes from typical bioaerosol emission sources in the urban environment using metagenomic

630  approach. *Chemosphere* 2018; **213**: 463–71.

631 101 Yooseph S, Andrews-Pfannkoch C, Tenney A, *et al.* A metagenomic framework for the study of

632  airborne microbial communities. *PLoS One* 2013; **8**. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0081862.

633 102 Zhao Y, Chen Z, Hou J, *et al.* Monitoring antibiotic resistomes and bacterial microbiomes in the

aerosols from fine, hazy, and dusty weather in Tianjin, China using a developed high-volume

tandem liquid impinging sampler. *Sci Total Environ* 2020; **731**: 139242.

103   Soto T, Lozano M, Vicente-Soler J, Cansado Vizoso J, Gacto Fernández MJ. Microbiological

survey of the aerial contamination in urban areas of the city of Murcia, Spain. *An Biol* 2009; **31**:

7–13.

104   Amarloei A, Fazlzadeh M, Jafari AJ, Zarei A, Mazloomi S. Particulate matters and bioaerosols

during Middle East dust storms events in Ilam, Iran. *Microchem J* 2020; **152**.

DOI:10.1016/j.microc.2019.104280.

105   Cha Y, Park M-H, Lee S-H, Kim JH, Cho KH. Modeling spatiotemporal bacterial variability with

meteorological and watershed land-use characteristics. *Water Res* 2016; **100**: 306–15.

106   Cuthbertson L, Amores-Arrocha H, Malard LA, Els N, Sattler B, Pearce DA. Characterisation of

arctic bacterial communities in the air above svalbard. *Biology (Basel)* 2017; **6**.

DOI:10.3390/biology6020029.

107   Du P, Du R, Ren W, Lu Z, Fu P. Seasonal variation characteristic of inhalable microbial

communities in PM2.5 in Beijing city, China. *Sci Total Environ* 2018; **610**–**611**: 308–15.

108   Du P, Du R, Lu Z, Ren W, Fu P. Variation of bacterial and fungal community structures in

PM2.5collected during the 2014 APEC summit periods. *Aerosol Air Qual Res* 2018; **18**: 444–55.

109   Fan XY, Gao JF, Pan KL, Li DC, Dai HH, Li X. More obvious air pollution impacts on variations

in bacteria than fungi and their co-occurrences with ammonia-oxidizing microorganisms in PM2.5.

Environ Pollut 2019; **251**: 668–80.

110   Rodriguez-Gomez C, Ramirez-Romero C, Cordoba F, *et al.* Characterization of culturable

airborne microorganisms in the Yucatan Peninsula. *Atmos Environ* 2020; **223**: 117183.

111   Sun X, Li D, Li B, *et al.* Exploring the disparity of inhalable bacterial communities and antibiotic

resistance genes between hazy days and non-hazy days in a cold megacity in Northeast China. *J*

Hazard Mater 2020; **398**. DOI:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.122984.

112   Velez-Quinones MA. Study of Airborne Bacterial Populations in Urban Areas Using Phenotypic

and Phylogenetic Characterization. ProQuest Diss. Theses. 2013.

https://go.openathens.net/redirector/gatech.edu?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/1438179

215?accountid=11107.

113 Zhou Y-W, Lv Y, Chen X, *et al.* Characteristics of bacterial communities in fine particulate matter

of severe cold region, China. *Zhongguo Huanjing Kexue/China Environ Sci* 2019; **39**: 3616–23.

114 Cao Y, Raith MR, Griffith JF. Droplet digital PCR for simultaneous quantification of general and

human-associated fecal indicators for water quality assessment. *Water Res* 2015; **70**: 337–49.

115 Chen B, Yang Y, Liang X, Yu K, Zhang T, Li X. Metagenomic profiles of antibiotic resistance

genes (ARGs) between human impacted estuary and deep ocean sediments. *Environ Sci Technol*

2013; **47**: 12753–60.

116 Hu Z, Liu H, Zhang H, *et al.* Temporal discrepancy of airborne total bacteria and pathogenic

bacteria between day and night. *Environ Res* 2020; **186**: 109540.

117 Ji L, Zhang Q, Fu X, *et al.* Feedback of airborne bacterial consortia to haze pollution with different

PM2.5 levels in typical mountainous terrain of Jinan, China. *Sci Total Environ* 2019; **695**: 133912.

118 Najafi MS, Khoshakhllagh F, Zamanzadeh SM, Shirazi MH, Samadi M, Hajikhani S.

Characteristics of TSP Loads during the Middle East Springtime Dust Storm (MESDS) in Western

Iran. *Arab J Geosci* 2014; **7**: 5367–81.

119 Woo AC, Brar MS, Chan Y, *et al.* Temporal variation in airborne microbial populations and

microbially-derived allergens in a tropical urban landscape. *Atmos Environ* 2013; **74**: 291–300.

120 Hudzicki J. Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion susceptibility test protocol. *Am Soc Microbiol* 2009; : 1–

14.

121 Karp BE, Tate H, Plumblee JR, *et al.* National antimicrobial resistance monitoring system: Two

decades of advancing public health through integrated surveillance of antimicrobial resistance.

Foodborne Pathog Dis 2017; **14**: 545–57.

122 Barraud O, Baclet MC, Denis F, Ploy MC. Quantitative multiplex real-time PCR for detecting

class 1, 2 and 3 integrons. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2010; **65**: 1642–5.

123   Ma L, Li AD, Yin X Le, Zhang T. The Prevalence of Integrons as the Carrier of Antibiotic

687   Resistance Genes in Natural and Man-Made Environments. *Environ Sci Technol* 2017; **51**: 5721–

688   8.

689   124   Mazel D. Integrons: Agents of bacterial evolution. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2006; **4**: 608–20.

690   125   Jones ER, Van Vliet MTH, Qadir M, Bierkens MFP. Country-level and gridded estimates of

691   wastewater production, collection, treatment and reuse. *Earth Syst Sci Data* 2021; **13**: 237–54.

692   126   GBD 2017 Causes of Death Collaborators. Global, regional, and national age-sex-specific

693   mortality for 282 causes of death in 195 countries and territories, 1980–2017: a systematic analysis

694   for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *Lancet* 2018; **392**: 1736–88.

695   127   Van Goethem N, Descamps T, Devleesschauwer B, *et al.* Status and potential of bacterial

696   genomics for public health practice: A scoping review. *Implement Sci* 2019; **14**: 1–16.

697   128   Tan BF, Ng C, Nshimyimana JP, Loh LL, Gin KYH, Thompson JR. Next-generation sequencing

698   (NGS) for assessment of microbial water quality: Current progress, challenges, and future

699   opportunities. *Front Microbiol* 2015; **6**. DOI:10.3389/fmicb.2015.01027.

700   129   Zaheer R, Noyes N, Ortega Polo R, *et al.* Impact of sequencing depth on the characterization of

701   the microbiome and resistome. *Sci Rep* 2018; **8**: 1–11.

702   130   Murray CJ, Ikuta KS, Sharara F, *et al.* Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019:

703   a systematic analysis. *Lancet* 2022; **6736**. DOI:10.1016/s0140-6736(21)02724-0.

704   131   Taylor SC, Laperriere G, Germain H. Droplet Digital PCR versus qPCR for gene expression

705   analysis with low abundant targets: From variable nonsense to publication quality data. *Sci Rep*

706   2017; **7**: 1–8.

707   132   Bagley ST, Auer MT, Stern DA, Babiera MJ. Sources and fate of giardia cysts and

708   cryptosporidium oocysts in surface waters. *Lake Reserv Manag* 1998; **14**: 379–92.

709   133   Kouimtzi M, Pinney RJ, Newton JM. Survival of bacteria during extrusion-spheronization. *Pharm*

710   *Sci* 1997; **3**: 347–51.

134   Medina C, Ginn O, Brown J, *et al.* Detection and assessment of the antibiotic resistance of

Enterobacteriaceae recovered from bioaerosols in the Choqueyapu River area, La Paz – Bolivia.

Sci Total Environ 2020; : 143340.

135   Salazar D, Ginn O, Brown J, Soria F, Garvizu C. Assessment of antibiotic resistant coliforms from

bioaerosol samples collected above a sewage-polluted river in La Paz, Bolivia. *Int J Hyg Environ*

Health 2020; **228**: 113494.

136   Collaborators G 2016 DD. Estimates of the global, regional, and national morbidity, mortality, and

aetiologies of diarrhoea in 195 countries: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease

Study 2016. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2018; **18**: 1211–28.

137   Sanz-García F, Gil-Gil T, Laborda P, Ochoa-Sánchez LE, Martínez JL, Hernando-Amado S.

Coming from the wild: Multidrug resistant opportunistic pathogens presenting a primary, not

human-linked, environmental habitat. *Int J Mol Sci* 2021; **22**. DOI:10.3390/ijms22158080.

138   Gerba CP, Betancourt WQ, Kitajima M. How much reduction of virus is needed for recycled

water: A continuous changing need for assessment? *Water Res* 2017; **108**: 25–31.

139   Symonds EM, Griffin DW, Breitbart M. Eukaryotic viruses in wastewater samples from the

United States. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2009; **75**: 1402–9.

140   Hellmér M, Paxéus N, Magnius L, *et al.* Detection of pathogenic viruses in sewage provided early

warnings of hepatitis A virus and norovirus outbreaks. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2014; **80**: 6771–

81.

141   Marks PJ, Vipond IB, Regan FM, Wedgwood K, Fey RE, Caul EO. A school outbreak of

Norwalk-like virus: Evidence for airborne transmission. *Epidemiol Infect* 2003; **131**: 727–36.

142   Marks PJ, Vipond IB, Carlisle D, Deakin D, Fey RE, Caul EO. Evidence for airborne transmission

of Norwalk-like virus (NLV) in a hotel restaurant. *Epidemiol Infect* 2000; **124**: 481–7.

143   O'Neill PD, Marks PJ. Bayesian model choice and infection route modelling in an outbreak of

Norovirus. *Stat Med* 2005; **24**: 2011–24.

144   Alsved M, Widell A, Dahlin H, Karlson S, Medstrand P, Löndahl J. Aerosolization and recovery

of viable murine norovirus in an experimental setup. *Sci Rep* 2020; **10**: 1–10.