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

Olivia Ginn[1-3], Sarah Lowry[1,4], Joe Brown[5]

[1]Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering & Earth Science, University of Notre Dame, 156 Fitzpatrick Hall, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA

[2]Department of Biological Sciences, University of Notre Dame, 100 Galvin Life Science Center, Notre Dame, IN 46556

[3]School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, 30332, United States.

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

[5]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: 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

SUMMARY

Background

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.

Methods

We conducted a PRISMA-adhering systematic review of the peer-reviewed literature to summarize evidence on specific enteric pathogens and ARGs that have been measured in aerosol samples in urban settings where the risks of extramural exposure and antibiotic resistance (AR) spread may be highest. 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 in all aforementioned databases and conducted primary and secondary screenings before merging results. To be included, studies contained extractable data on enteric pathogens and AR in extramural aerosols, identified urban related sources if any and reported on qualitative, quantitative, or viability data that was sufficient for interpretation within the three aforementioned groups.

Findings

Qualitative analyses and metric summaries revealed that enteric microbes and antibiotic resistance have been consistently reported in extramural 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 extramural aerosols.

Interpretation

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.

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.

INTRODUCTION

Studies in high-risk extramural (outdoor) settings in the USA and in other high-income countries have revealed that bioaerosols containing enteric (intestinal) microbes are common where concentrated 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 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] Even in cases where adequate waste disposal technology is used, bioaerosols may persist at elevated levels. 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 have typically included 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]. Information on ambient fluxes of enteric pathogens and AR in cities lacking good waste management is needed, as well as 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 low-and-middle income countries (LMICs) where wastewater and biosolids present greater risks due to the high number of circulating infectious diseases in the population contributing waste and the presence of unsequestered waste in closer proximity to more people, risk may be higher for exposure through bioaerosols.[40–43] We conducted a systematic review of published estimates reporting detections of enteric pathogen and ARGs in cities to current knowledge in this emerging area.

METHODS

We followed PRISMA best practices for reporting of systematic reviews[44] as recommended in the WHO Handbook for Guideline Development,[45] 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.

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.[46–50] 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 all aforementioned databases and compiled their 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 their title or abstract suggested relevance to the keywords in the search. The full text of papers that pass initial screening were reviewed independently by the two authors based on the following inclusion criteria: 1) Published in English 2) Published from the 1990-2020 3) Published in peer-reviewed journal, conference proceedings, government or multilateral document, thesis or dissertation, book or other document appearing on indexed databases we identified. Peer-reviewed publications had priority. 4) Contained extractable data on enteric pathogens and AR in extramural bioaerosols 5) Data on enteric pathogens and AR could be related to no source, a specific point source or an area source but must have been from an urban site. 6) Literature reported on qualitative (presence/absence), quantitative (culture or PCR-based), or viability (culture) data that was sufficient for interpretation within the three aforementioned groups. 7) Articles approved by a peer-reviewed journal, but not yet published (e.g., a copy of the pre-published article) could be used; however, documentation that it was approved for publication was required.

After independent searches, we consulted and compared our findings, ultimately addressing any discrepancies surrounding the inclusion of literature. If there was any disagreement about the inclusion of a paper, a third party was consulted. 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. We recorded whether literature used in the review has been identified through initial, backward or forward searches (Supplemental Material).

Data collection and analysis

For each study, data was extracted and recorded; the full compilation is included in Supplemental Material. Generally, 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 pathogen related. Some publications qualified for both groups. 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. Therefore, we synthesized review data through categorization and narrative summary, as previously done when a quantitative meta-analysis was not applicable,[51] revealing potential gaps requiring further evidence.

Role of the funding source

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

RESULTS

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.

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 found through the systematic review reported on AR related data and 82% reported on enteric pathogen related data. 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.

Table 1: Studies represented by multiple levels of categories, first by antibiotic resistance related or enteric pathogen related, then by data type and analysis method. The intended targets are also categorized.

	Data Type	Method	Count	Percent of total (%)	Intended Targets
AR	Qualitative	PCR	1	0·99	ARGs specified *a priori*
	Quantitative	Culture	6	5·9	AR associated microbes specified *a priori*
		PCR	13	13	ARGs specified *a priori*
	Semi-quantitative	PCR	1	0·99	
		sequencing	7	6·9	Any ARGs
	Total AR		28	28	
Enteric	Qualitative	Culture	2	2·0	Enteric pathogens specified *a priori*
	Quantitative	Culture	10	10	
		PCR	2	2	Enteric pathogens specified *a priori*
	Semi-quantitative	PCR	1	0·99	
		sequencing	68	67	All microbial communities
	Total Enteric		83	82	
	Repeats		10		
	TOTAL		101		



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

Results from specific studies

Enteric Pathogens

Overall, studies reporting on enteric pathogens in bioaerosols in urban settings targeted a limited range of enteric 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.[52] One study reported detection through culture of *Yersinia enterocolitica*, *Salmonella* spp. and others in Chinese live poultry markets in urban Tai'an,[53] though in general the city includes extensive sanitation infrastructure throughout,[54] For quantitative PCR (qPCR), reported enteric pathogens also included enteric bacteria (*Escherichia coli*, *Enterococcus* spp., *Enterobacter* spp., *Yersinia enterocolitica*, and *Salmonella* spp.)[52,55] and enteric virus (human adenovirus, human enterovirus, and human rotavirus),[56] A majority of studies assessed overall microbial communities through sequencing, typically 16S. Of these 67 studies, nine classified the population taxonomy to order level,[57–64] eight classified to family level,[65–70] 37 classified to genus,[49,60,71–105] 12 classified to species[28,52,79,94,106–115] and only one identified a strain-specific[116] 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*[66] and another study detected the orders *Clostridiales* and *Campylobacterales.*[61] *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 pathogens detected at the genus or species level through sequencing include *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.[116] The review revealed only three studies assessing enteric viruses in urban outdoor aerosols. Viral detections include human adenoviruses, enteroviruses, rotaviruses and noroviruses.[56,112,117] Generally, the range of enteric pathogens identified in bioaerosols in urban settings is small and we see an even smaller range represented among the culturable targets across studies.



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.

Antibiotic Resistance

We identified fewer studies reporting on antibiotic resistant bacteria and antibiotic resistance encoding genes in bioaerosols (n=28). Through culture and often using disk diffusion methods,[118] 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,[119] Some of these groups include beta-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 2).[120–122] However, of the studies that detected ARGs in bioaerosols via PCR, 79% took place in upper-middle and high-income countries.

Table 2: Antibiotic Resistance related categorization with number of studies citing each target (at various levels) in parenthesis.

	Drug Mechanism	Drug Class	Resistance genes	Drug
Antibiotics	Beta-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')-llla (1), aph(3')-lll (1), aph(3')-l (1), aph(3) (1), aph(3')-lla (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)

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[123] that permit uncontained waste flows in densely populated urban areas[43]. However, the results also reveal large gaps in the characterization and detection of important enteric and AR-associated pathogens 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.[124] 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.

Second, the studies that do assess enteric or AR-associated pathogens 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.[125] 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.[125] 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.[126] 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.[127] The studies that do quantitatively assess gene targets of enteric pathogens (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. 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 and a deeper understanding of the potential public health relevance of this poorly understood pathway of transmission.[128]

Third, studies reporting on enteric pathogens in bioaerosols in urban settings targeted a limited range of enteric microbes, focusing on well-established fecal indicators. 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.[129] 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.[129] Based on our review, no enteric protozoans have been targeted or detected in bioaerosols in an urban setting. Though these microbes tend to be larger in size (5-15 μm) and therefore experience faster settling times, a study in rural Mexico revealed through microscopy the presence of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in air samples.[130] This evidence suggests that these may be important targets in urban settings as well, especially when fecal contamination is widespread. Furthermore, few studies targeted and detected enteric viruses, even though fecal microbes are present and often are co-occurring with enteric viruses[43].

Based on our interpretation of the results of this review, we conclude that the literature is lacking in several key aspects as it pertains to enteric pathogens and AR in urban aerosols, including quantitative estimation of specific enteric pathogens of global risk relevance. A first step in assessing the role that the aeromicrobiological pathway may play in enteric pathogen and AR dissemination in the environment is to address these gaps through additional research. We propose that priorities should include broad, quantitative characterization of enteric pathogens that may exist as bioaerosols and increasing the geographical scope of sampling to include locations where risk of enteric disease is highest. Certain limitations must be considered in the context of our process and interpretation of the review. First, though we used a double-blind search strategy and agreed a priori on inclusion criteria, bias or human error may have introduced some inconsistency in including literature for the review, especially with such a large sample size to start off with. 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.

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

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

DATA SHARING

All data extracted from the included studies and used in qualitative analyses is included in the supplementary information.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

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.

9 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.

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

11 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.

12 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.

13 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.

14 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.

15 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.

16 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.

17 Pillai SD. Bioaerosols from Land-Applied Biosolids: Issues and Needs. *Water Environ Res* 2007;

79: 270–8.

18 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 Johnson A, Ginn O, Bivins A, Rocha-Melogno L, Tripathi SN, Brown J. Extended-spectrum beta-lactamase (ESBL)-positive Escherichia coli presence in urban aquatic environments in Kanpur, India. *J Water Health* 2020; **18**: 849–54.

41 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.

42 Farling S, Rogers T, Knee JS, Tilley EA, Brown J, Deshusses MA. Bioaerosol emissions associated with pit latrine emptying operations. *Sci Total Environ* 2019; **648**: 1082–6.

43 Ginn O, Rocha-Melogno L, Bivins A, *et al.* Detection and Quantification of Enteric Pathogens in Aerosols Near Open Wastewater Canals in Cities with Poor Sanitation. *Environ Sci Technol* 2021. DOI:10.1021/acs.est.1c05060.

44 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 2009; **339**: 332–6.

45 Organization WH. WHO handbook for guideline development, 2nd edn. World Health Organization, 2014.

46 Ahmed SM, Hall AJ, Robinson AE, *et al.* Global Prevalence of Norovirus in Cases of Gastroenteritis: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2014; **14**: 725–30.

47 Penakalapati G, Swarthout J, Delahoy MJ, *et al.* Exposure to Animal Feces and Human Health: A Systematic Review and Proposed Research Priorities. *Environ Sci Technol* 2017; **51**: 11537–52.

48 WHO, UNICEF. Progress on household drinking water, sanitation and hygiene 2000-2017. Special focus on inequalities. 2019.

49 Li J, Cao J, Zhu YG, *et al.* Global Survey of Antibiotic Resistance Genes in Air. *Environ Sci Technol* 2018; **52**: 10975–84.

50 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.

51 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.

52 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.

53 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.

54 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.

55 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.

56 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.

57 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.

58 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.

59 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.

60 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.

61 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.

62 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.

63 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.

64 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.

65 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.

66 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.

67 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.

68 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.

69 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.

70 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.

71 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.

72 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.

73 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.

74 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.

75 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.

76 Hurtado L, Rodriguez G, Lopez J, *et al.* Characterization of atmospheric bioaerosols at 9 sites in Tijuana, Mexico. *Atmos Environ* 2014; **96**: 430–6.

77 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.

78 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.

79 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.

80 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.

81 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.

82 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.

83 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.

84 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.

85 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.

86 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.

87 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.

88 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.

89 Stewart JD, Shakya KM, Bilinski T, Wilson JW, Ravi S, Choi CS. Variation of near surface atmosphere microbial communities at an urban and a suburban site in Philadelphia, PA, USA. *Sci Total Environ* 2020; **724**: 138353.

90 Sun Y, Xu S, Zheng D, Li J, Tian H, Wang Y. Effects of haze pollution on microbial community changes and correlation with chemical components in atmospheric particulate matter. *Sci Total Environ* 2018; **637**–**638**: 507–16.

91 Wei M, Liu H, Chen J, *et al.* Effects of aerosol pollution on PM2.5-associated bacteria in typical inland and coastal cities of northern China during the winter heating season. *Environ Pollut* 2020;

262: 114188.

92 Agarwal S, Mandal P, Srivastava A. Quantification and Characterization of Size-segregated Bioaerosols at Municipal Solid Waste Dumping Site in Delhi. *Procedia Environ Sci* 2016; **35**: 400–7.

93 Núñez A, Moreno DA. The Differential Vertical Distribution of the Airborne Biological Particles Reveals an Atmospheric Reservoir of Microbial Pathogens and Aeroallergens. *Microb Ecol* 2020; **80**: 322–33.

94 Xu A, Chen X, Lang X, Xia Y, Song Z. Seasonal variability in bacterial and fungal diversity and community composition of the near-surface atmosphere in coastal megacity. *Aerobiologia (Bologna)* 2017; **33**: 555–75.

95 Yan D, Tao Z, Yu L-Y, Su; J, Yu L-Y. Structural Variation in the Bacterial Community Associated with Particulate Matter in Beijing, China During Hazy and Nonhazy Days. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2018; **84**: 1–13.

96 Yang Y, Zhou R, Chen B, Zhang T, Hu L, Zou S. Characterization of airborne antibiotic resistance genes from typical bioaerosol emission sources in the urban environment using metagenomic approach. *Chemosphere* 2018; **213**: 463–71.

97 Yooseph S, Andrews-Pfannkoch C, Tenney A, *et al.* A metagenomic framework for the study of airborne microbial communities. *PLoS One* 2013; **8**. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0081862.

98 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.

99 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.

100 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.

101 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.

102 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.

103 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.

104 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.

105 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.

106 Rodriguez-Gomez C, Ramirez-Romero C, Cordoba F, *et al.* Characterization of culturable airborne microorganisms in the Yucatan Peninsula. *Atmos Environ* 2020; **223**: 117183.

107 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.

108 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/1438179215?accountid=11107.

109 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.

110 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.

111 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.

112 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.

113 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.

114 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.

115 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.

116 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.

117 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.

118 Hudzicki J. Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion susceptibility test protocol. *Am Soc Microbiol* 2009; : 1–14.

119 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.

120 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.

121 Ma L, Li AD, Yin X Le, Zhang T. The Prevalence of Integrons as the Carrier of Antibiotic Resistance Genes in Natural and Man-Made Environments. *Environ Sci Technol* 2017; **51**: 5721–

8.

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

123 Jones ER, Van Vliet MTH, Qadir M, Bierkens MFP. Country-level and gridded estimates of wastewater production, collection, treatment and reuse. *Earth Syst Sci Data* 2021; **13**: 237–54.

124 GBD 2017 Causes of Death Collaborators. Global, regional, and national age-sex-specific mortality for 282 causes of death in 195 countries and territories, 1980–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *Lancet* 2018; **392**: 1736–88.

125 Van Goethem N, Descamps T, Devleesschauwer B, *et al.* Status and potential of bacterial genomics for public health practice: A scoping review. *Implement Sci* 2019; **14**: 1–16.

126 Tan BF, Ng C, Nshimyimana JP, Loh LL, Gin KYH, Thompson JR. Next-generation sequencing (NGS) for assessment of microbial water quality: Current progress, challenges, and future opportunities. *Front Microbiol* 2015; **6**. DOI:10.3389/fmicb.2015.01027.

127 Zaheer R, Noyes N, Ortega Polo R, *et al.* Impact of sequencing depth on the characterization of the microbiome and resistome. *Sci Rep* 2018; **8**: 1–11.

128 Taylor SC, Laperriere G, Germain H. Droplet Digital PCR versus qPCR for gene expression analysis with low abundant targets: From variable nonsense to publication quality data. *Sci Rep* 2017; **7**: 1–8.

129 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.

130 Balderrama-Carmona AP, Gortáres-Moroyoqui P, Álvarez-Valencia LH, *et al.* Occurrence and quantitative microbial risk assessment of Cryptosporidium and Giardia in soil and air samples. *Int J Infect Dis* 2014; **26**: 123–7.