

1 **Title**

2 Exposures associated with sporadic *Cryptosporidium* infection in industrialised countries: a systematic review

3 **Short Title**

4 Sporadic *Cryptosporidium* transmission routes: a systematic review

5 **Authors**

6 **Caoimhe McKerr<sup>1,2,5</sup> / [c.mckerr@liv.ac.uk](mailto:c.mckerr@liv.ac.uk) & Wendi Shepherd<sup>4</sup> / [wendi.shepherd@phe.gov.uk](mailto:wendi.shepherd@phe.gov.uk)**

7 Rachel M Chalmers<sup>3,9</sup> / [rachel.chalmers@wales.nhs.uk](mailto:rachel.chalmers@wales.nhs.uk)

8 Roberto Vivancos<sup>1,2,4</sup> / [roberto.vivancos@phe.gov.uk](mailto:roberto.vivancos@phe.gov.uk)

9 Sarah J O'Brien<sup>1</sup> / [sjobrien@liv.ac.uk](mailto:sjobrien@liv.ac.uk)

10 Alison Waldram<sup>7</sup> / [alison.waldram@phe.gov.uk](mailto:alison.waldram@phe.gov.uk)

11 Kevin G Pollock<sup>8</sup> / [kevin.pollock.ic@uhi.ac.uk](mailto:kevin.pollock.ic@uhi.ac.uk)

12 Robert M Christley<sup>2,5</sup> / [robc@liv.ac.uk](mailto:robc@liv.ac.uk)

13

14 1 NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Gastrointestinal Infections, University of Liverpool

15 2 NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections, University of Liverpool

16 3 *Cryptosporidium* Reference Unit, Public Health Wales, Swansea

17 4 Field Epidemiology services, Public Health England, Liverpool

18 5 Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences, University of Liverpool

19 7 Field Epidemiology services, Public Health England, Newcastle

20 8 University of Highlands & Islands, Inverness

21 9 Swansea University Medical School, Swansea, UK

22

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

23 C. McKerr and W. Shepherd contributed equally to this paper.

24 **Corresponding author**

25 Wendi Shepherd

26 Public Health England

27 Field Services Team, Cunard Building, Water Street, Liverpool

28 email: [wendi.shepherd@phe.gov.uk](mailto:wendi.shepherd@phe.gov.uk)

29 **Abstract**

30 Transmission of *Cryptosporidium* can occur via contaminated food or water, contact with animals or other people. Exposures are often identified  
31 from outbreak investigations, but sources for sporadic disease and pathways to infection are still unclear. The aim of this review is to consolidate  
32 the literature to describe exposures associated with human cryptosporidiosis in industrialised countries.

33 Methods followed the recommendations made in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Three steps were used to  
34 identify the literature including electronic database searching using PubMed, Scopus and Web Of Science; reference list trawling; and an  
35 exploration of the grey literature. Quality was assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale. Screening of results was undertaken by two  
36 reviewers and data extracted using a standardised form. A narrative summary presented. Papers were included if they reported on sporadic  
37 cases and were published between 2008 and 2018. Exposures were grouped into pathways.

38 After full-text screening, eight articles (comprising 11 studies) were included, and seven (comprising 10 studies) were suitable for further  
39 synthesis. None of the identified grey literature was included. Four studies described case-control methods, two were case-case studies and  
40 one cross-sectional. Study year ranged from 1999 to 2017 and the studies were conducted in five, large countries in three continents: Europe  
41 (UK and the Netherlands), North America (USA, Canada), and Australia.

42 Included papers investigated water and animal exposures most frequently. Recreational water was not a major source of sporadic illness in this  
43 review. The person-to-person pathway represented the most consistent finding, with all three studies reporting on contact with a symptomatic  
44 individual demonstrating correlations between exposure and disease. This applied particularly to the home environment, which is increasingly  
45 understood to be a significant setting for spread of *Cryptosporidium* infection. Further work on this would help support public health messaging  
46 on preventing spread of disease at home.

47

48 Systematic review registration: PROSPERO number CRD42017056589.

49

50 **Keywords**

51 Cryptosporidium – Systematic review – Meta-analysis – Protozoa - Outbreaks – Sporadic disease – Zoonoses – Gastrointestinal infection –  
52 Risk factors – Epidemiology - Parasite – Foodborne diseases – Waterborne diseases

53

54 **Introduction**

55 *Cryptosporidium* is a protozoan parasite which can infect humans and other animals. The most prevalent species identified in humans are  
56 *Cryptosporidium parvum* and *Cryptosporidium hominis* (1,2). *Cryptosporidium* is distributed world-wide and is suspected to be one of the  
57 greatest contributors to human infectious diarrhoeal illness (3). *Cryptosporidium* infection is reported in 1-3 percent of immunocompetent patients  
58 with diarrhoea in industrialised countries and 7-20 percent in developing countries (4–8). The dissimilarities are believed to be driven by variation  
59 in exposure due to sanitation, availability of clean drinking water, infrastructure, housing, and health factors such as acquired immunity and  
60 nutrition (Putignani and Menichella, 2010). The highest prevalence is observed among children under five years old, in particular the under twos  
61 (3,10). The parasite has a complex life cycle, and characteristics such as structurally tough, resistant oocysts help favour the faecal-oral  
62 transmission route. Outbreaks via animal-to-person (*C. parvum*) contact are commonly reported, as well as those associated with indirect  
63 transmission routes through ingestion of water and food, and, less often, person-to-person (*C. hominis* and *C. parvum*) routes (11).

64 Reported exposures for both *C. parvum* and *C. hominis* often overlap, and include consumption of contaminated drinking water and exposure  
65 to recreational waters, (12–14) and food-related outbreaks (likely contaminated via water or by food handlers) (15–18). *C. parvum* is frequently  
66 associated with exposure to farm animals (19,20) and *C. hominis*, more anthroponotic, with person-to-person spread (21–24), and increased  
67 risks during foreign travel (25). However, the risk factors and associated exposures are often hypothesised/identified from outbreak  
68 investigations, but outbreaks may only represent a small proportion of cases - in the UK, less than 10% of all cases reported to national  
69 surveillance are linked to an identified outbreak (26). Additionally, surveillance systems may not always capture smaller yet significant  
70 outbreaks, and under-ascertainment of true case numbers is common (27–30). As a consequence, pathways may be under-reported and we  
71 cannot be certain that transmission routes for sporadic disease are the same as those which drive outbreaks (31). Despite case control studies  
72 which have investigated differences in risk for endemic and outbreak disease (32,33), sources for sporadic disease and pathways to infection  
73 are still unclear and a proportion of reported cases remain unexplained.

74 Given the absence of any systematic synthesis of reported evidence in the UK, and the low numbers of reviews in other industrialised countries,  
75 the aim of this work was to search the literature to describe exposures associated with sporadic infection with *Cryptosporidium* in industrialised  
76 countries, and to explore differences that may exist in these associations between sporadic and outbreak-related disease.

77

## 78 **Methods**

79 **The full methods and approach have been previously reported.** (34)

80 Where relevant, methods followed recommendations made in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (35) and  
81 reporting followed guidance from “Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses” (PRISMA) (36,37).

## 82 **Eligibility and inclusion**

83 Databases were initially searched with no restriction on year of publication but analysis was later restricted to 2008-2018. There were no  
84 restrictions on language, provided the abstract was available in English for the first round of screening.

85 Studies conducted in industrialised countries (defined using OECD category of countries (38) additional file 1) and reporting on human  
86 subjects were included. All observational studies were included where they reported exposures and relevant quantitative results. Individual  
87 case reports were excluded as in single case descriptions do not give a picture of population epidemiology.

## 88 **Data sources**

89 Three steps were used to identify the literature including: electronic database searching using PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science; reference  
90 list trawling from relevant papers; and an exploration of the grey literature. The last published search date was 15th May 2018, and grey literature  
91 on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2019.

## 92 **Searches**

93 The search terms included the following MeSH terms/ keywords: (Cryptosporidium OR cryptosporidiosis) AND (epidemiolog\* OR risk factors  
94 OR exposure OR transmission OR association) OR (cohort OR case-control OR “case control” OR case-crossover OR “disease outbreaks” OR  
95 meta-analysis OR longitudinal OR ecological). (Additional file 2)

## 96 **Study selection process**

97 Results were managed using the Covidence tool (39). Screening of results and title screening was undertaken in duplicate by two reviewers, to  
98 ensure consistency in the application of the inclusion and exclusion criteria. There was a change in second reviewer during the abstract review  
99 (AW, replaced by WS) – however, the first (CMcK) and third (KP) reviewers did not change which maintained consistency. Discrepancies were  
100 discussed and re-examined, and a third reviewer was available for irreconcilable opinions on inclusion. One paper was sent to the third reviewer  
101 for decision.

## 102 **Data management**

103 Data were extracted in duplicate using a standardised form developed in MS Access. Minimum data fields are available in Additional file 3. Data  
104 items were merged, and discrepancies discussed, prior to the agreement of which data were appropriate for analysis.

## 105 **Quality assessment**

106 Papers were scored using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) (40). This instrument is well piloted and is specific to non-randomised study  
107 types. The NOS was completed independently by both reviewers for all studies. Results were then amalgamated, and areas of discrepancy  
108 discussed prior to agreement on final scores. This instrument provides an overall judgement on quality using a scoring system by evaluating  
109 three parameters (selection, comparability, and outcome) across specific domains. The maximum score for each study is eight: four stars for  
110 selection, one star for comparability and three stars for exposure/outcome domains. The studies were considered of high quality if the NOS  
111 score was 7+ stars (41), moderate quality for a score of 5 or 6 stars, and studies having fewer than five points considered at high risk of bias/poor  
112 quality (42).

## 113 **Data synthesis**

114 Data were summarised presenting the papers' main findings including population under study, outcome(s) measured/case definition, effect  
115 measures and reported statistics, and exposures. Exposures, depending on how they were measured, were grouped into transmission  
116 pathways, following discussion and consensus with authors. Broadly the pathways considered included water, animals, food, and person-to-  
117 person spread. We further sub-categorised exposures following discussions with the study group, in order to better represent specific known  
118 transmission risks for *Cryptosporidium*, with possible differences between species highlighting the anthroponotic versus mostly zoonotic  
119 pathways.

120 We proceeded with a visual and narrative analysis of results for each exposure in the transmission pathways. Where appropriate, available data  
121 were pooled in a visual analysis combining the exposures across studies using GraphPad Prism 8.3.0 (43). Where a usable effect measure was

122 not reported in the study, but data were available, odds ratios or relative risks were calculated. Where available, the multivariable-level effect  
123 measure was used in preference to the crude to ensure where possible we were using adjusted variables which remained significant predictors  
124 of infection after controlling for covariates. All results, whether statistically significant or not, and those either showing the exposure as increasing  
125 or reducing risk of outcome, were considered in the analysis. For those studies where we used multivariable analysis, all results will have  
126 remained in the final, most parsimonious model.

### 127 **Additional exclusion criteria**

128 Following full text review, additional restrictions on type of cases and time period were applied to refine the selection of papers taken forward  
129 for data extraction.

130 It became apparent to the authors that many of the included papers described (mostly) outbreaks in great detail, with very different, but specific,  
131 settings and widely variable metrics for exposures. This made it difficult to meaningfully synthesise the papers' outcomes within the scope of  
132 this review. Additionally, outbreak-focused papers were often specific to one event, exposure, or setting, and posed the additional problem of  
133 more granular exposures and led to difficulties with quantifying direct exposure. As the main focus of the review was centred on sporadic,  
134 community cases, we applied additional criteria after full-text screening of papers to remove those describing outbreak investigations.

135 Additionally, the older studies were less relevant for describing contemporary risks, and often traversed changes in policy and practice (such as  
136 changes to municipal water supply regulations) which may contribute to changes in reported exposures for disease over time. Therefore, in  
137 order to focus the synthesis on the most relevant and contemporaneous data we restricted inclusion at the data extraction stage to reports  
138 within the last ten years (2008-18).

### 139 **Results**

140 The combined initial database search retrieved 2,115 articles. An additional article was found by screening reference lists, and one pre-print  
141 was included following a routine refresh of the search terms on PubMed. This was reduced to 1,797 after removal of duplicates.

142 Based on title and abstract screening, 338 full-text articles were procured and retained for potential inclusion (**Error! Reference source not  
143 found.**).

144 After full-text screening, 208 peer-reviewed papers were excluded and the remaining 130 taken forward to data extraction. We excluded papers  
145 which were part of wider studies and which reported on the same aspects of the study to prevent inappropriate weighting to one study reported  
146 multiple times.

147 The application of additional selection criteria (as previously described) at this stage were two-fold:

148 1. To restrict the inclusion of papers to the past 10 years (2008-2018) , and

149 2. To restrict the review to studies of sporadic disease

150 These further restrictions resulted in the inclusion of eight articles (comprising 11 studies), of which seven (comprising 10 studies) were suitable  
151 for further synthesis. The single paper excluded from any quantitative analysis did not have enough information for further analysis or  
152 calculations, and no reply was received from authors to our request for additional data.

153 None of the identified grey literature articles were included (searched between May and Sept 2019) as they all described outbreaks and/or were  
154 outside the time period. Six relevant theses were captured but were out of area, or outside the time scope, or were part of published papers we  
155 had already captured.

156 **General characteristics of included studies**

157 A total of eight papers describing 11 individual studies were included for review and potential analysis. The Fournet *et al* paper described three  
158 studies from the UK, Germany and the Netherlands: we excluded the Germany study due to lack of available data and report this paper as two  
159 separate studies from the UK and the Netherlands. Study numbers for the smaller case-case study in the Fournet (2) UK study were not reported.

160 The NicLochlainn *et al* paper includes only results for the overall study period, not individual years, to avoid duplicate counting.

161 The Tollestrup *et al* paper described one large cohort study of 600 participants, but analysed data by residence of participants across three sites:  
162 we report results for the Tollestrup paper as three individual studies.

163 **Risk of bias assessment and quality of the included studies**

164

165 shows the NOS scores allocated to each of the articles and includes stars allocated for each of the individual domains, and reports on general  
166 strengths and weakness of the study designs. For the Tollestrup cohort studies across three sites, (Tollestrup *et al.*, 2014) the overall article score  
167 was taken, as the study designs were the same and thus of identical quality.

168 Almost all studies (n=7) were at least of moderate quality, although some specific biases were observed in the individual domains. Non-response  
169 rate in particular, and the description of and differences in responses in participants, was of some concern in almost all of the studies. A key  
170 quality aspect was risk of bias in the ascertainment of the exposure and its comparability to case exposure. In a couple of the articles it was felt  
171 that case representativeness introduced a likely bias.

172 **Error! Reference source not found.** shows the main characteristics of the included studies.

173 Four of the studies described case-control methods, two were case-case studies and one cross-sectional. Four studies (across 2 papers) reported  
174 outcomes based on serology and thus were classed as serological studies. All but one of the studies had over 100 participants, with three  
175 comprising several thousand participants – these tended to be those that selected cases from large, nationwide surveillance databases.

176 Study year ranged from 1999 to 2017 and the studies were conducted in five, large countries in three continents: Europe (UK and the Netherlands),  
177 North America (USA, Canada), and Australia. The European focus on the UK and the Netherlands might be explained by differences in the  
178 approach to detection and legislation of reporting for *Cryptosporidium* and this awareness within European countries, and not necessarily reflect  
179 a true lack of cases (9).



## 180 **Transmission pathways and exposures investigated**

181 In discussion with the review team, recognising the faecal-oral transmission route for *Cryptosporidium* infection in humans, the following  
182 transmission pathways were established capturing the predominant exposures measured in the included studies:

- 183 • **Animals** – pets and farm animal exposures.
- 184 • **Food** – eating spoiled foods, raw or fresh produce, unpasteurised beverages, and proxy exposures such as eating outside the home,  
185 killing/preparing own meat.
- 186 • **Outdoor activities/environmental exposures** – activities such as gardening and hiking/camping, and environments such as living on a  
187 farm.
- 188 • **Person-to-person spread** – contact with a case (close contact, caring/toileting capacity, and sexual contact) and general social  
189 contact/activities.
- 190 • **Water** – drinking water and recreational water contact/water sports
- 191 • **Travel** - any travel away from usual area of domestic residence.
- 192 • **Season** – season of infection, usually extracted from surveillance data.

193 Main findings can be found in **Error! Reference source not found.** which outlines the main exposures measured (as defined by the studies) and  
194 the main results reported with a relevant transmission pathway added. Where available, multivariable results have been used (OR=odds ratio,  
195 aOR=adjusted odds ratio).

196 The included papers measured over 200 exposures across the 11 studies. Exposures measured were multiple and varied in detail and definition  
197 across each of the studies, and even within studies. Generally, studies were exploratory in nature. The 2015 de Gooyer *et al* study in Australia  
198 (48) was centred on a specific hypothesis about exposure to recreational water, but the rest of the studies tended to look at myriad exposures,  
199 following the main known routes to infection for *Cryptosporidium*. Exposure to animals was a common pathway, with six studies investigating this  
200 and both livestock/farm animal exposure and pets and domestic animal contact were well investigated. Food items were investigated in five  
201 studies, and personal contact (with a case or general social contact) in seven. All bar one study investigated some water exposures, the most  
202 commonly investigated pathway for *Cryptosporidium* cases.

203

204 The Becker (2015) (51), Pintar (2009) (50), and Tollestrup (2014) (45) studies also included risk factors relating to patient/case demographics  
205 and characteristics. We include a short, narrative overview of this content.

## 206 **Clinical variables, case demographics and social factors**

207 Pintar's 2005-7 case-case study of the Canadian Integrated Enteric Disease Surveillance System (C-EnterNet) reported that the odds of a  
208 *Cryptosporidium* case being between six and twelve years old was five times greater than the other enteric pathogens. The non-*Cryptosporidium*  
209 controls had an older profile than the cases (mean: cases=21.7 years, controls=31.8 years,  $p=0.01$ ). Among the serological studies, increased  
210 odds of seropositivity was observed with increasing age: in those over 60 years old compared to a wider baseline of under 40 years at two sites  
211 in the Tollestrup studies, and with increasing age in the Becker study ( $p<0.001$ ). However, it is well known that cases exhibit a bi-modal age  
212 distribution pattern and serological studies can report increased serological positivity with increasing age (52), which may reflect amount and  
213 intensity of exposure over time, or elevated serological responses increasing likelihood of detection (53).

214 In the Tollestrup (b) study, the authors reported a reduced odds of positive serological response to *Cryptosporidium* antigens in people reporting  
215 higher education levels (**Error! Reference source not found.** In the higher income countries, sporadic illness is more often observed among the  
216 less deprived areas and communities (54,55). In these countries, rurality is associated with increasing wealth while more deprived areas tend to  
217 be located in the city. Additionally, associated activities such as swimming and travel are likely to be less prevalent in the more deprived areas  
218 and as such the profile of *Cryptosporidium* in relation to deprivation is converse to that in the less industrialised areas (41,56). Conversely, Becker  
219 *et al* analysed data extracted from the USA National Health and Nutritional Examination Survey (NHANES is series of surveys which examines  
220 about 5,000 persons each year in the USA and is considered to be a nationally representative sample. The NHANES interview includes  
221 demographic, socioeconomic, dietary, and health-related questions as well as medical, dental, and physiological measurements (Centers for  
222 Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 2017) between 1999 and 2000, and found that correlates to *C. parvum* included several poverty and  
223 inequality measures including country of birth other than USA ( $p<0.001$ ) and ethnic groups other than non-Hispanic whites ( $p<0.001$ ). These  
224 results are supported by similar work reporting that Hispanics, African Americans, and women, all had greater odds of reporting *Cryptosporidium*  
225 seropositivity (57). Whilst relative poverty alone is unlikely to directly cause infection with *Cryptosporidium*, it might steer exposure to particular  
226 pathways or risks, or indeed reduce the availability of resources required to avoid exposure, either by personal behaviour/engagement, general  
227 health status or access to a health infrastructure (55,58). However, assessing individual risk alongside population-level characteristics often  
228 introduces fallibility, especially when using surveillance data which may introduce a bias in participants based on their access to healthcare.  
229 Further work on specific population-level characteristics would be useful and may help contextualise some of the individual-level relationships  
230 between these characteristics and exposure to infection.

231 Whilst it is important to note these findings, these parameters are likely to be risk factors associated with exposures to *Cryptosporidium*: we only  
232 used metrics which could be categorised into *Cryptosporidium* transmission pathways in the further analysis, thus excluding case characteristics.  
233 Three studies looked at travel as a risk for disease (any travel away from usual domestic residence) but most often it was an exclusion criterion  
234 in order to ensure investigation of endemic indigenous cases. *Cryptosporidium* is often observed as a non-viral cause of gastrointestinal illness in  
235 returning travelers (59) and travel might subject people to risk exposures. As such it is not an exposure for disease intrinsically, and susceptibility  
236 may be linked to immunity, or lack thereof, of travelers on short term holidays in endemic areas (60) as well as increased exposures in areas with  
237 lower hygiene or more frequent use of swimming pool in holiday resorts. We excluded travel from any further detailed analysis.  
238 Additionally, there were insufficient papers reporting on season or outdoor activities in enough detail to analyse these any further

### 239 **Transmission pathways**

240 We excluded the entire Ravel *et al* (2013) study from any further analysis as measures reported were proportion exposed rather than odds or  
241 risk, and the data were not available to enable calculation of an effect measure that was comparable with the other studies. Ravel *et al* (2013)  
242 used the C-EnterNet surveillance system to link confirmed cases of sporadic, domestically acquired *Cryptosporidium*, *Giardia* and amoebiasis  
243 with exposures grouped by the main pathways: Water, animal/environment, person-to-person, and exposure to high-risk food, analysing each  
244 infection separately. For cryptosporidiosis cases, travel within Canada (100%), contact with household pets (49%), and swimming (46%) were the  
245 most frequently reported exposures. The animal/environment-to-person transmission pathway remained the most important factor in  
246 *Cryptosporidium* cases' exposure(s) (72%). This was followed by water-based transmission routes (52%) and exposure to risk foods (50%). We  
247 were unable to look at odds of *Cryptosporidium* using the other cases (amoebiasis and giardiasis) as 'controls', given the differences in the system  
248 characteristics and the lack of individual response data.

249 We further sub-categorised the transmission pathways following discussions with the study group, in order to better analyse the underlying  
250 exposures for *Cryptosporidium* (**Error! Reference source not found.**). This level of granularity in exposures helps highlight differences between  
251 anthroponotic and zoonotic pathways, important in recognising differences between infecting species and also when considering targeted public  
252 health messages. Although this made the numbers of studies within each category lower, the team felt that aggregating to top level pathways lost  
253 important detail that is imperative in understanding *Cryptosporidium*.

254 As no exposure included more than four studies, a traditional meta-analysis was considered inappropriate (61). However, a visual analysis allows  
255 us to easily see which studies reported on the main underlying exposures investigated in each pathway and discuss each of the results in light of  
256 the characteristics of the studies.

257 Ten studies (across seven papers) were included in a further analysis allocating the exposures investigated in the studies into the relevant  
258 transmission pathway (where we could allocate a main route).

259 All results whether statistically significant or not, and those either showing the exposure as increasing or reducing risk of outcome, were considered  
260 in the analysis. We used multivariable results where we had them for the comparable exposure. Charts show the study name, study sample size,  
261 measure of association reported, and confidence intervals. Black dots represent statistically significant results, and red insignificant. (Figures 3-  
262 12)

263

## 264 **Results and discussion by transmission pathway**

### 265 **Transmission pathway - Animal contact**

266 Animal contact exposure results were reported from five of the included studies. Animal exposures were categorised as livestock (n=3) and pets  
267 (n=2). **Error! Reference source not found.**

#### 268 **○ Farm animals**

269 One study reported a statistically significant increased odds of disease (Pintar; OR=1.6; 95% CI=1.1-2.5) and another reported reduced odds of  
270 seropositivity (Tollestrup (a), OR=0.53; 95% CI=0.29-0.97). The remaining study reported an insignificant result below 1.0 (Fournet (1), 2013; OR=0.74,  
271 95% CI=0.41–1.32).

272 The metric used in the Pintar study was “visited farm, petting zoo, or fair” which approximates animal contact but there was no detail about physical  
273 contact with animals. In their univariate analysis, they had an environmental exposure variable which was living on a farm. There is plausibility to this  
274 result, as direct contact with animals has been previously identified as an important risk factor for cryptosporidiosis (62–64), but this is often outbreaks  
275 and not sporadic disease.

276 The Tollestrup (a) exposure measured direct handling of livestock and the study reported reduced odds. Although curious, this could be due to repeat  
277 or continuous exposure to the animals producing an elevated serological response in some participants. The use of a long-term marker, such as 27-  
278 kDa, as an outcome for demonstrating *Cryptosporidium* infection, has an impact on the interpretation of results.

#### 279 **○ Pets/Domestic animals**

280 Two studies found significant positive associations with owning or handling pets. (Fournet (2), OR=2.56; 95% CI=2.3-2.84 and Tollestrup (b), OR=2.83;  
281 95% CI=1.24-6.29). The Tollestrup (c) study did also investigate this exposure and it remained in the model; we have not reported it here with the  
282 other studies as it was related to the 15/17-kDa marker, and our results reflect positivity using 27-kDa. **(Error! Reference source not found.)**

283

284 Specifically, the Fournet (2) study considered dog ownership and as most of the cases were *C. hominis*, a more anthroponotic species, this is a  
285 peculiar result. However, we know that in this study exposures for cases were compared between years, and it may be a chance effect that dog  
286 ownership in the population changed, or indeed that it is a proxy exposure for an uncaptured variable.

287 These results are unusual: little epidemiological evidence exists to suggest pets have any role to play in the transmission of disease (52,65,66)  
288 especially for the two main species. The quality and robustness of these two studies do not allow complete confidence in the results: the Fournet  
289 (2) study reported on cases between time periods, and the Tollestrup (b) study used serological responses as a marker for infection and so  
290 must be interpreted differently to current disease. Yet, there is some evidence that oocyst shedding in cats and dogs can occur (26,67) and species-  
291 specific infections have, albeit rarely, been detected in humans (68,69).

292 This theory requires further investigation to be fully understood and described, and the addition of species identification in any study of this exposure  
293 may help better understand the true risks and pattern of infections in both domestic pets and their owners.

#### 294 **Transmission pathway - Food exposures**

295 Results for food exposures were reported in three of the included studies (four variables) and this was the least investigated exposure route when  
296 considering all of the studies' upfront designs. All found significant results. **Error! Reference source not found.** shows results with the specific metric  
297 included: due to the variability of measures and the small number of results reported in the pathway, we did not separate exposures. Two variables  
298 (eating from a farm stand and eating tomatoes) were associated with reduced odds of illness (Valderrama; OR=0.2, 95% CI=0.1-0.9; and Nic Lochlainn;  
299 OR=0.6, 95% CI=0.5-0.8).

300 Two variables (eating BBQ food and eating outside the home) were associated with an increased risk of illness (Nic Lochlainn; OR=1.8, 95% CI=1.4-  
301 2.3; and Fournet (UK); OR=11.32, 95% CI=9.36-13.7). The Pintar study did study several food variables appropriate to eating outside the home, but  
302 none remained in the final models, likely due to the limitations of using surveillance data (50).

303 Previous work in Europe has increasingly demonstrated risks associated with food (15,18,70–72). Our results indicate a range of risks, but exposures  
304 measured were specific to each study and its setting, making comparisons and assessment overall difficult. However, 'eating tomatoes' is consistent  
305 with the literature where raw, salad food item appear to be associated with reduced disease risk, such as carrots (73) and tomatoes (66)

306 Eating outside the home is often a risk factor for any infectious intestinal disease but in the case of *Cryptosporidium* might be confounded by multiple  
307 factors. The profile of food-borne disease is shifting, affected by globalisation and changes in food practices (74). Additionally, advances in diagnostic  
308 methods and surveillance systems have extended the range of protozoa that may be linked to food (70) and this exposure should be further explored  
309 (75,76).

#### 310 **Transmission pathway - Person-to-person**

311 Person-to-person, as a transmission pathway, was well investigated overall (five studies, four included) and represents the most consistent finding so  
312 far.

313 ○ **Contact with a case of diarrhoea**

314 All three studies reporting on person-to-person contact with a symptomatic individual demonstrated correlations between exposure and disease  
315 (Pintar: OR=2.86; 95% CI=1.28-6.38 and OR=2.1, 95% CI=0.64-6.87; Nic Lochlainn: OR=2.2; 95% CI=1.7-3.0; and de Gooyer: OR=12.6; 95%  
316 CI=2.13-75.1).

317 Variables included both home and outside-the-home contact, perhaps demonstrating the importance of differences between case contact in a  
318 household where caring and close contact is more likely and contact in a non-shared space. The de Gooyer and Nic Lochlainn studies, and one Pintar  
319 variable, all related to household transmission. The Pintar non-household contact variable reported lower odds and wider confidence intervals crossing  
320 1.0, suggesting that transmission within the home is more important as a risk factor for sporadic disease. Additionally, this study excluded cases that  
321 initially had reported other illness in the home in order to accurately identify community index cases. This would suggest that any known cases came  
322 after the index illness, indicating that onward spread is more prevalent in *Cryptosporidium* than the other enteric illnesses.

323 Contact with a case is a well-known, and plausible, transmission pathway to disease and exposures underlying this pathway are varied including  
324 childcare, and sexual transmission (Hannah and Riordan, 1988; Hellard *et al.*, 2003; Hunter *et al.*, 2004; Artieda *et al.*, 2012; Johansen *et al.*, 2014).  
325 This makes biological sense given the faecal-oral route of transmission and the high prevalence in younger children who may require help with toileting.  
326 The fairly high odds ratios demonstrate the importance of this pathway to disease, particularly in the home environment. The included studies here  
327 have investigated symptomatic contact, but asymptomatic carriage has also been identified as a possible factor in transmission of sporadic disease  
328 in the home environment (22,23,66).

329 ○ **General contact**

330 Variables which investigated social contact without the prerequisite of contact with a symptomatic individual, were classed under general social contact  
331 and ranged from quite specific, e.g. child-care, to broad, e.g. any social contact. All of the results were statistically significant.

332 Two studies showed a decreased risk of disease associated with general person-to-person contact measured as attendance at 'any social  
333 gathering/event' (Pintar: OR=0.23; 95% CI=0.05-0.99) and (Valderrama: OR=0.4, 95% CI=0.1-0.9).

334

335 Both of these variables were investigating general social contact and might cover a range of activities and undoubtedly have a high exposure in all  
336 groups, thus the result is likely to be spurious.

337 The Valderrama, 2009 study explored ‘contact with a child in diapers’ among community cases of disease and found an almost four-fold risk of disease  
338 (OR=3.8, 95% CI=1.5-9.6). This could be driven by the higher prevalence observed in younger children, as well as the possible contribution of  
339 asymptomatic spread and is probably best considered separately to ‘general social contact’. It has also been demonstrated that young children are  
340 drivers of secondary spread of disease, whether they are symptomatic or not (66).

341 Considering the person-to-person exposures together, it seems reasonable to suggest that the contribution of cases to onward spread warrants further  
342 investigation. This seems to apply particularly to the home environment, where we might identify easy and meaningful public health interventions to  
343 mitigate spread (79). Additionally, when symptoms are used to define a case, we might be losing vital information on asymptomatic disease, and how  
344 much that contributes to spread of infection.

#### 345 **Transmission pathway - Water**

346 Water exposures were investigated in nine of the ten included studies. This pathway was further disaggregated into drinking and recreational water  
347 exposures, with nine and five studies investigating these, respectively.

- 348 • **Drinking water**

349 This was categorised as treated (n=2); untreated (n=5); and bottled (n=3). (Figures 8-10)

- 350 ○ **Treated**

351 One study (Pintar, 2009) found a significant result between consumption of municipal treated drinking water and an increased risk of disease (OR=2.43;  
352 95% CI=1.0-5.7).

353 There had been a sharp increase in cases of *Cryptosporidium* in this area just prior to the study period. It is possible that the association between  
354 municipal water supplies was due to a specific contamination and perhaps represents an outbreak, or was a proxy for another association, such as rural  
355 versus urban residence. The other study (Fournet, (1) 2013 shows an insignificant decreased risk of disease (OR=0.56; 95% CI=0.29-1.05), with a  
356 smaller sample size. The metric was, “drank tap water on daily basis” which is likely a prevalent and difficult to accurately measure metric. This study  
357 was based on an observed increase in cases and comparisons were made between years – it is feasible that drinking treated water may appear to  
358 have a protective effect in comparison to drinking from an untreated or contaminated water source, particularly if the increase was actually an



359 undetected outbreak. Additionally, the odds ratios for the Fournet, (1) study were calculated using presented data and are not those reported in the  
360 manuscript. As such we are unable to comment on any confounders or control for effects.

361 An interesting finding here is that although water exposures were commonly investigated, examinations were not often directed at drinking water, and  
362 more often studies considered variables related specifically to drinking from untreated sources. Although drinking water is often the cause of outbreaks  
363 and is considered to be the main point for public health intervention only two of our studies reported final results allocated to this pathway, and both  
364 studies were following an undetermined increase in cases, which may not truly represent sporadic disease. It may be that following recent water  
365 treatment and regulatory requirements this is now considered a less burdensome transmission pathway for disease (80).

366           ○ **Untreated**

367 Two studies reported significant positive effects between the consumption of untreated drinking water and odds of infection with *Cryptosporidium*,  
368 ranging from almost two-fold (Tollestrup (a): OR=1.98; 95% CI =1.11-3.55) to an increased risk of eight times that of controls (Valderrama: OR=8.0;  
369 95% CI=1.3-48.1).

370 The 2009 Valderrama study had wide confidence intervals, the lower end of which was close to 1.0, despite quite a high odds ratio (8-fold). The data  
371 analysed were based on surveillance data extractions and so there are possible limitations on questions asked and answered. The authors grouped  
372 all and any untreated water consumption. Additionally, although not reported as an outbreak, this study was in response to an increase in cases across  
373 the state of Colorado, USA, and it may be possible that the elevated risks are a result of an outbreak driven by a specific untreated water source  
374 during the study period, although controls were matched by geography which should mitigate this to some extent.

375 The Tollestrup (a) study included 200 of the 600 cohort participants, taking place in a semi-rural area, where there was a significantly higher percentage  
376 of participants using onsite wastewater systems or private wells than participants using municipal systems (p=0.048). It is also important to consider  
377 that the outcome measured in this study was serological response to 27kDa antigen rather than diarrhoeal illness and so our confidence in  
378 comparability may be reduced. Ongoing non-transient exposure to oocysts, perhaps in an untreated system, could result in a positive, and increasingly  
379 high, serological response in residents in this area. This may not, however, necessarily reflect current or prior disease.

380 The remaining non-significant results were all fairly close to 1.0 with narrow confidence intervals. Results from the Becker (2015) study were not  
381 significant and close to no effect (aOR=1.19; 95% CI=0.97 - 1.45), despite being a large study of high quality. As with the Tollestrup studies, the  
382 outcome metric was serological response to a *Cryptosporidium* marker, which might indicate differences in exposure windows and actual infection  
383 cannot be accurately pinpointed.

384 It is interesting to see that this is a well investigated pathway, and it is biologically plausible that exposure to untreated drinking water could represent  
385 a source of *Cryptosporidium* oocysts. Nevertheless, even with the studies' limitations in mind, these results do not seem to indicate that this pathway  
386 is a major contributor to sporadic disease.

387           ○ **Bottled**

388 All of the studies including results for this pathway reported positive associations with disease. Two of the three studies found a significant positive  
389 effect between drinking bottled water and increased odds of *Cryptosporidium* infection, ranging from almost three-fold (Fournet NL (1), 2013: OR=2.72,  
390 95% CI=1.1-6.76) to more than five-fold (De Gooyer, 2017: OR=6.31; 95% CI=1.39-28.7).

391 The odds ratio for the Fournet (1) study in the Netherlands was calculated using their reported data: They reported a 21% vs 11% exposure in cases  
392 and controls respectively. Most cases in the study were infected with *C. hominis* (GP60 subtype IbA10G2) which usually suggests either anthroponotic  
393 spread or perhaps sewage contamination.

394 The de Gooyer study investigated sporadic cases in Australia, where the consumption of bottled water in the general proportion is fairly high (48) and,  
395 in this study, 86% of cases vs 54% of controls exposed was reported. Although exposure prevalence in the control group was lower, it still represents  
396 a reasonable amount of non-diseased participants that cannot be explained by that exposure.

397 The Fournet (2) UK study reported narrow confidence intervals yet did not demonstrated a difference in effect. The controls in this study were cases  
398 from different years: it is reasonable that drinking bottled water may have no effect on disease incidence in comparison to a period of time where  
399 cases were driven by an undetected outbreak with a single other source.

400 If exposure to bottled water was a risk for sporadic disease (and not outbreaks following a specific contamination) we might expect to see exposure  
401 to tap water generally associated with a decreased risk of illness in those exposed, but two case-control studies in areas close to the de Gooyer  
402 investigation in Australia demonstrated no such effects of water associated with *Cryptosporidium* (65). Also, paradoxically, water consumption  
403 consistently free from *Cryptosporidium* oocysts may be associated with reduced immunity over time potentially increasing susceptibility to infection  
404 (81) but this is still poorly understood (32,82). However, *C. hominis* has been detected in finished mineral water samples following an outbreak in the  
405 UK (83) and Australia (84) suggesting some plausibility in these results. In these studies, definitions of 'bottled water' varied and information wasn't  
406 specifically collected on amounts consumed to enable further examination of this association. Additionally, sociodemographic factors associated with  
407 bottled water use have previously been described (85) and so there is a possibility that these results might be open to uncontrolled confounding.

408 On balance, there is some evidence for bottled water as a risk for sporadic illness, but these studies offer insufficient quality and detail to make a  
409 resolute conclusion.

410 • **Recreational water**

411 This was categorised as treated (n=3); and untreated (n=3). (Figures 11 & 12)

412 ○ **Treated**

413 Three studies reported on exposures that were categorised as treated recreational water, and all found significant results. Two studies reported an  
414 increased risk of disease associated with exposure to recreational water (Valderrama, 2009: OR=4.6, 95% CI=1.4-14.6; de Gooyer, 2017: OR=26.4,  
415 95% CI=1.47–472 for general spa use).

416 The de Gooyer study investigated two variables related to recreational water exposure: using a spa and having any recreational water exposure.  
417 These were wide ranging definitions and captured any and all recreational water exposures (except those that might be specifically described as  
418 untreated). As such, we cannot be certain that specific exposures in this group are necessarily treated waters. This could misclassify the exposure  
419 and overestimate the effect. Using a spa was significantly associated with illness ( $p=0.03$ ), although only 13% (4/30) of cases reported this exposure.  
420 We also know that this work was examining an increase in cases that may have been linked to a particular recreational waterpark, although was not  
421 considered an outbreak. If these cases were linked to a particular water source, this could skew the results towards a positive effect.

422 It is worth noting that in Australia, recreational water exposures are a common cause of outbreaks and the prevalence of this recreational activity is  
423 high (86,87). These activities represent a biologically plausible route to infection with *Cryptosporidium*, considering its faecal-oral transmission route  
424 and the likelihood of swallowing water, the chlorine resistant nature of oocysts, and the poorer hygiene habits of younger children (12).

425 One of the studies reported decreased odds of disease (Fournet UK, 2013: OR=0.37, 95% CI=0.33-0.42). This study originally reported proportions  
426 and we used these data to calculate odds ratios – thus these are not adjusted or controlled for any other factors, which may skew the effect measure.  
427 Also, the study is considering cases from one time period versus another, rather than comparing exposures between diseased and non-diseased  
428 participants. It is reasonable that the reported effect could be an artefact if recreational water exposure was the cause of the increase in the prior  
429 years. Whilst we may be able to confidently say that exposure to treated recreational water was not causing the increase in the study time period, we  
430 can be less confident that the results are generalisable and that they represent the true relationship between exposure and sporadic disease.

431 It is likely that treated recreational water represents some risk for cryptosporidiosis, and this would be supported in other literature. However, these  
432 results suggest that it may well be more associated with outbreaks, or specific incidences of increases in disease.

433           ○ **Untreated**

434   One of three studies reporting on untreated recreational water exposures found a significant result, demonstrating a three-fold increased odds (Pintar,  
435   2009; OR=2.91, 95% CI=1.14-7.38). Figure 12

436   After adjusting for age and season in the multivariable model, swimming in an untreated water venue (river or lake) ( $p=0.01$ ) was associated with  
437   increased odds of illness. The proportion of cases exposed was, however, small at 25% (9/36) versus 10% (79/801) for the controls (79/801). This  
438   study used other cases of enteric illness as controls, including *Giardia*, which has similar exposure routes. This could make it more difficult to detect  
439   small differences in risk between case and controls by over-representing exposures and biasing towards the null, so in actual fact this effect measure  
440   could be underestimated (88). The data were however, taken from surveillance records, and cases were only asked about exposures in the seven  
441   days preceding illness which might not accurately capture the exposure window for *Cryptosporidium*.

442   The remaining two studies were statistically insignificant, and both reported no effect of this exposure on risk of disease in their study population  
443   (Fournet (1) NL (OR=1.15, 95% CI=0.63-2.1) and de Gooyer (OR=1.0, 95% CI=0.31-3.25).

444   Overall, the contribution of this exposure to disease in this review is not considerable. This is interesting in light of the more positive effects we report  
445   for treated recreational water. This may be due to untreated activities being associated with other unmeasurable factors, such as adult, rather than  
446   child, populations (89).

447   **Publication Bias**

448   Due to the small number of studies against each exposure category ( $n<5$ ), we did not consider it appropriate to proceed with statistical analysis into  
449   heterogeneity and publication bias.

450   **Conclusions**

451   The case-characteristics collected from our included studies reflected the bimodal age-related pattern that *Cryptosporidium* follows in the US and the  
452   UK; a peak in young children, and a peak in adulthood (21,90,91).

453

454   The animal transmission pathway was commonly investigated, although was not considered a main hypothesis for sporadic disease in any of the  
455   papers. We report a couple of unusual associations with disease and pet contact, specifically cats and dogs, although these should be considered in  
456   light of some of the methodological weaknesses of the studies concerned. Evidence for this route is conflicted and more research is needed to support  
457   or refute this pathway as a contributor to sporadic infection.

458 Food exposures were not so frequently investigated, and metrics used were specific to the niche study population or hypothesis. Given that food items  
459 are increasingly identified in outbreak investigations (Casemore, 2001; Ethelberg *et al.*, 2005; McKerr *et al.*, 2015). this exposure, and protozoa that  
460 may be linked to food, should be further explored (70,75,76).

461 Person-to-person transmission was well investigated overall and represents the most consistent finding so far. Considering the person-to-person  
462 exposures, it seems reasonable to suggest that the contribution of cases to onward spread warrants further investigation. This seems to apply  
463 particularly to the home environment which is increasingly understood to be a significant setting for spread of *Cryptosporidium* infection (22,23,79,92)  
464 and would support public health messaging on preventing spread of disease at home (93).

465 Our included papers investigated water exposures most frequently despite evidence that in industrialised countries in recent years, drinking treated  
466 mains water is unlikely to cause a significant amount of sporadic cryptosporidiosis (94,95). However, despite improved legislation for drinking water  
467 quality (80) deficiencies can persist and it is important to keep monitoring this pathway (96,97). We present some risks associated with bottled water,  
468 although this is likely to be a high prevalence exposure and may be confounded by socio-economic variables.

469 Recreational water is more frequently associated with outbreaks and was not a major source of sporadic illness in this review, perhaps reflecting the  
470 episodic nature of pool water contamination events. Nonetheless, we know that standard treatment practices for recreational water, such as  
471 chlorination, are unsuccessful in eliminating *Cryptosporidium* oocysts (98). This does seem a well understood pathway (2,99).

472

473 When considering exposures for sporadic disease, it may be more pertinent for future studies to focus on food exposures, and research in this area  
474 is on the increase (100).

475 Secondly, our results demonstrate that further detail is required on the case-to-person transmission pathway: although well investigated, exposures  
476 were variable, and no study hypothesised this as a risk for infection, with most results incidental to the study. We should seek to quantify and ascertain  
477 spread of infection in the home environment and build a profile of asymptomatic infections, through better observational studies and more routine sub-  
478 typing of isolates (101,102).

479

## 480 **Limitations**

481 As with any work which seeks to combine various different studies, significant limitations exist which should be considered in any synthesis.

482 The main limitations to this work were the low number of papers included, which meant meta-analysis was not possible. Although we didn't quantify  
483 heterogeneity, anecdotally, there were differences between the studies included in terms of study design, populations studied, data collected and  
484 variables measured, and outcomes, which may have made meta-analyses difficult regardless.

485 In the studies, often several variables were measured which represented the same exposure, and participants may have been counted in either as  
486 they were not necessarily mutually exclusive. This is common to epidemiological studies, which are often undertaken in response to outbreaks, and  
487 defined by particular settings and putative exposures (29). The breadth of this makes the extrapolation of our results less robust, and context must be  
488 considered in assessing results. This might dilute any differences between exposures driving sporadic disease and outbreaks. A suggestion for further  
489 work would be to extend the time period to look specifically at the magnitude of changes in exposures and to review outbreaks in that context.  
490 Unfortunately, this was beyond the scope of this work.

491 Additionally, there could be bias associated with the personal subjectivity of categorising exposures into pathways, especially without the granular  
492 detail of raw data or knowing the specifics of questions asked of participants. However, our robust methodological approach and commitment to  
493 duplicating all tasks in this review hopefully mitigates this as far as possible.

494 Two included papers (45,51) measured their outcome using serological response to the 15/17kDa and 27kDa antigen groups, which can identify  
495 previous, as well as recent infection and cannot distinguish between species or genotypes (103). Because we had two papers with this outcome,  
496 which judged it differently, we used response to the 27kDa to indicate a strong serological response and therefore count as infection. However, this  
497 has a longer positivity than the 15/17kDa, and could represent infection as long as nine months prior (53). This might have meant we were correlating  
498 current or recent exposures to old infection and making inferences when in fact there was no link. However, as we were looking at sporadic infection  
499 as opposed to outbreak disease, it may be appropriate to consider more static exposures, in any case. Additionally, diarrhoeal disease from  
500 *Cryptosporidium* infection may well recur and has comparative longevity, that might well underpin some health seeking behaviour, so the other studies  
501 are also at some small risk of correlating exposures with disease in a different time frame. Furthermore, even those studies that do have accurate and  
502 recent onsets are often a) vulnerable to recall biases and b) have different windows of exposure for cases and controls (27).

503 Often crucial detail was absent from the manuscript, and so allocation of measured variables to our exposures was occasionally arbitrary. However,  
504 we moderated this as far as possible by following a systematic approach and utilising our third reviewer for any discord. We would recommend that  
505 future research includes large-scale observational studies with enough resource to achieve high study quality whilst maintaining resolution in  
506 exposures measured.

507 In assessing study quality, we recognised that the NOS has significant limitations for use in this type of systematic review (104). A number of  
508 studies we reviewed used surveillance data rather than more traditional study designs which meant that the NOS was not always directly applicable.  
509 Where this was the case, we have had to apply the tool as appropriately as possible and in discussion with reviewers. At present, there is no risk of  
510 bias tool which encompasses both case-control studies and surveillance data.

511 Despite the limitations considered, this is the first systematic review considering routes of transmission in industrialised countries for sporadic  
512 *Cryptosporidium* and highlights that food routes are under investigated, and that person-person transmission, although recognised, is not thoroughly  
513 investigated.

#### 514 **Abbreviations**

515	AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
516	GRADE	Grading of Recommendations, Assessments, Development and Evaluation
517	HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
518	NOS	Newcastle-Ottawa Scale
519	NIHR	National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit
520	OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
521	OR	Odds Ratio
522	PHE	Public Health England
523	PHW	Public Health Wales
524	PRISMA–P	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses for Protocols
525	ROBINS-I	Risk of Bias In Non-randomized Studies - of Interventions
526	RR	Relative Risk/Risk Ratio
527	UK	United Kingdom

#### 528 **Declarations**

529 Nothing to declare.

530 **Ethical approval**

531 As this is a literature review, ethical approval is not indicated or required. Research ethics approval is not required for research involving information  
532 freely available in the public domain.

533 **Competing interests**

534 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

535 **Funding**

536 This research is jointly funded by the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Emerging and Zoonotic  
537 Infections (HPRU EZI) and the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Gastrointestinal Infections  
538 (HPRU GI) at the University of Liverpool in partnership with Public Health England (PHE), University of East Anglia, University of Oxford and the  
539 Institute of Food Research. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, the Department of Health,  
540 PHE, or Public Health Wales.

541 **Authors' contributions**

542 **CMCK, RChr, RCha, RV, and SOB** conceived the initial idea for the study.

543 **CMCK:** Paper sourcing, Extraction & Analysis, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Data curation

544 **WS:** Data extraction tools, Extraction & Analysis, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

545 **AW:** Title screening and first round inclusion of manuscripts, protocol review

546 **KGP:** Third reviewer, manuscript writing, critical revision

547 All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

548 **Acknowledgements**

549 Thanks to Ken Linkman at the University of Liverpool Harold Cohen library for his specialist aid with medical databases and search terms, Dan Pope  
550 at University of Liverpool Public Health Department for technical guidance for data synthesis, and to Peter Burrell at Public Health England for  
551 assistance with data extraction tools.



552 Erica Kintz at University of East Anglia and Ruaraidh Hill at Liverpool Reviews and Implementation Group (LRiG), University of Liverpool for advice  
553 on design and data collection.

554

555

## 556 **Tables and Figures**

557 Table 1: Newcastle-Ottawa Scale scores with individual domains and general strengths and weakness of the study design

558 Table 2: General characteristics of included studies

559 Table 3: Characteristics and main exposures or factors measured, and main results.

560 Figure 1: PRISMA diagram showing manuscript capture and inclusion

561 Figure 2: Transmission pathways and underlying exposures used to categorise variables measured in the included studies

562 Figure 3: Exposure measured and results: Animal contact – Farm animals

563 Figure 4: Exposure measured and results: Animal contact – Pets

564 Figure 5: Exposure measured and results: Food

565 Figure 6: Exposure measured and results: Person-to-Person - Contact with a case of diarrhoea

566 Figure 7: Exposure measured and results: Person-to-person – General contact

567 Figure 8: Exposure measured and results: Drinking Water - Treated

568 Figure 9: Exposure measured and results: Drinking Water – Untreated

569 Figure 10: Exposure measured and results: Drinking Water - Bottled

570 Figure 11: Exposure measured and results: Recreational water – Treated

571 Figure 12: Exposure measured and results: Recreational water – Untreated

572

## 573 **Additional/Supplementary files**

574 Additional file 1: OECD membership

575 Additional file 2: Search terms

576 Additional file 3: Minimum data set for collection

## 577 **References**

578 1. Chalmers RM, Smith R, Elwin K, Clifton-Hadley FA, Giles M. Epidemiology of anthroponotic and zoonotic human cryptosporidiosis in England  
579 and Wales, 2004 to 2006. *Epidemiol Infect* [Internet]. 2011;139(5):700–12. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27975646>

580 2. Cacciò SM, Putignani L. Epidemiology of Human Cryptosporidiosis. In: *Cryptosporidium: parasite and disease* [Internet]. Vienna: Springer  
581 Vienna; 2014 [cited 2017 Oct 23]. p. 43–79. Available from: [http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-7091-1562-6\\_2](http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-7091-1562-6_2)

582 3. Kotloff KL, Nataro JP, Blackwelder WC, Nasrin D, Farag TH, Panchalingam S, et al. Burden and aetiology of diarrhoeal disease in infants and  
583 young children in developing countries (the Global Enteric Multicenter Study, GEMS): a prospective, case-control study. *Lancet* [Internet].  
584 2013 Jul 20 [cited 2017 Apr 28];382(9888):209–22. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23680352>

585 4. Current WL, Garcia LS. Cryptosporidiosis. *Clin Microbiol Rev* [Internet]. 1991;4(3):325–58. Available from:

- 586 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1889046>
- 587 5. Casemore DP. Epidemiological aspects of human cryptosporidiosis. *Epidemiol Infect* [Internet]. 1990;104(1):1–28. Available from:  
588 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2407541>
- 589 6. Jelinek T, Lotze M, Eichenlaub S, Löscher T, Nothdurft HD. Prevalence of infection with *Cryptosporidium parvum* and *Cyclospora*  
590 *cayetanensis* among international travellers. *Gut* [Internet]. 1997 Dec [cited 2017 Oct 23];41(6):801–4. Available from:  
591 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9462213>
- 592 7. Leder K, Weller PF. Epidemiology, clinical manifestations, and diagnosis of cryptosporidiosis - UpToDate [Internet]. [cited 2017 Oct 23].  
593 Available from: <https://www.uptodate.com/contents/epidemiology-clinical-manifestations-and-diagnosis-of-cryptosporidiosis>
- 594 8. Muliylil J, Ward H, Menon VK, Sarkar R, Kannan A, Sankaran P, et al. Symptomatic and Asymptomatic *Cryptosporidium* Infections in Children  
595 in a Semi-Urban Slum Community in Southern India. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* [Internet]. 2010 Nov 5 [cited 2017 Dec 19];83(5):1110–5. Available  
596 from: <http://www.ajtmh.org/content/journals/10.4269/ajtmh.2010.09-0644>
- 597 9. Putignani L, Menichella D. Global distribution, public health and clinical impact of the protozoan pathogen *cryptosporidium*. *Interdiscip*  
598 *Perspect Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2010 [cited 2017 May 5];2010. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20706669>
- 599 10. Ajjampur SSR, Liakath FB, Kannan A, Rajendran P, Sarkar R, Moses PD, et al. Multisite study of cryptosporidiosis in children with diarrhea in  
600 India. *J Clin Microbiol* [Internet]. 2010 Jun 1 [cited 2017 Dec 19];48(6):2075–81. Available from:  
601 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20392919>
- 602 11. Cacciò SM, Thompson RCCA, McLauchlin J, Smith H V. Unravelling *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* epidemiology [Internet]. Vol. 21, *Trends in*  
603 *Parasitology*. 2005 [cited 2017 Oct 23]. p. 430–7. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16046184>
- 604 12. Stafford R, Neville G, Towner C, McCall B. A community outbreak of *Cryptosporidium* infection associated with a swimming pool complex.  
605 *Commun Dis Intell* [Internet]. 2000 Aug [cited 2018 Jul 19];24(8):236–9. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11022390>
- 606 13. Louie K, Gustafson L, Fyfe M, Gill I, MacDougall L, Tom L, et al. An outbreak of *Cryptosporidium parvum* in a Surrey pool with detection in  
607 pool water sampling. *Can Commun Dis Rep* [Internet]. 2004 Apr 1 [cited 2018 Jul 20];30(7):61–6. Available from:  
608 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15109091>
- 609 14. McCann R, Jones R, Snow J, Cleary P, Burgess S, Bothra V, et al. An outbreak of cryptosporidiosis at a swimming club – can rapid field  
610 epidemiology limit the spread of illness? *Epidemiol Infect* [Internet]. 2014 May 14 [cited 2017 May 15];142(1):51–5. Available from:  
611 [http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0950268813001143](http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0950268813001143)
- 612 15. Ethelberg S, Lisby M, Vestergaard LS, Enemark HL, Olsen KE, Stensvold CR, et al. A foodborne outbreak of *Cryptosporidium hominis*  
613 infection. *Epidemiol Infect* [Internet]. 2009;137(3):348–56. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19134228>
- 614 16. Robertson LJ, Chalmers RM. Foodborne cryptosporidiosis: is there really more in Nordic countries? *Trends Parasitol* [Internet]. 2013;29(1):3–  
615 9. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23146217>
- 616 17. Åberg R, Sjöman M, Hemminki K, Pirnes A, Räsänen S, Kalanti A, et al. *Cryptosporidium parvum* Caused a Large Outbreak Linked to Frisée  
617 Salad in Finland, 2012. *Zoonoses Public Health* [Internet]. 2015 Dec [cited 2017 May 15];62(8):618–24. Available from:  
618 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/zph.12190>
- 619 18. McKerr C, Adak G, Nichols G, Gorton R, Chalmers R, Kafatos G, et al. An Outbreak of *Cryptosporidium parvum* across England &  
620 Scotland Associated with Consumption of Fresh Pre-Cut Salad Leaves, May 2012. Kirk M, editor. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 2015 May 27 [cited  
621 2017 May 15];10(5):e0125955. Available from: <http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0125955>
- 622 19. Hoek MR, Oliver I, Barlow M, Heard L, Chalmers R, Paynter S. Outbreak of *Cryptosporidium parvum* among children after a school excursion  
623 to an adventure farm, south west England. *J Water Heal* [Internet]. 2008;6(3):333–8. Available from:  
624 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19108553>
- 625 20. Utsi L, Smith SJ, Chalmers RM, Padfield S. *Cryptosporidium* outbreak in visitors of a UK industry-compliant petting farm caused by a rare  
626 *Cryptosporidium parvum* subtype: a case-control study. *Epidemiol Infect* [Internet]. 2016 Apr 1 [cited 2017 May 15];144(5 PG-1000–9):1000–  
627 9. Available from: [http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0950268815002319](http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0950268815002319)
- 628 21. Nichols G, Chalmers R, Lake I, Sopwith W, Regan M, Hunter P, et al. *Cryptosporidium*: A report on the surveillance and epidemiology of  
629 *Cryptosporidium* infection in England and Wales [Internet]. (DWI) DWI, editor. DWI; 2006. Available from:

- 630 [http://www.dwi.gov.uk/research/completed-research/reports/DWI70\\_2\\_201.pdf](http://www.dwi.gov.uk/research/completed-research/reports/DWI70_2_201.pdf)
- 631 22. Johansen O, Hanevik K, Thrana F, Carlson A, Stachurska-Hagen T, Skaare D, et al. Symptomatic and asymptomatic secondary transmission  
632 of *Cryptosporidium parvum* following two related outbreaks in schoolchildren. *Epidemiol Infect* [Internet]. 2014 Jun [cited 2017 Apr  
633 25];143(8):1–8. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25268811>
- 634 23. Newman RD, Zu SX, Wuhib T, Lima AAM, Guerrant RL, Sears CL. Household epidemiology of *Cryptosporidium parvum* infection in an urban  
635 community in Northeast Brazil. *Ann Intern Med* [Internet]. 1994 Mar 15 [cited 2017 Apr 27];120(6 PG-500–5):500–5. Available from:  
636 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8311373>
- 637 24. Hannah J, Riordan T. Case to case spread of cryptosporidiosis; evidence from a day nursery outbreak. *Public Health* [Internet].  
638 1988;102(6):539–44. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3231695>
- 639 25. Hellard M, Hocking J, Willis J, Dore G, Fairley C. Risk factors leading to *Cryptosporidium* infection in men who have sex with men. *Sex*  
640 *Transm Infect* [Internet]. 2003 Oct [cited 2018 Jul 20];79(5):412–4. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14573839>
- 641 26. Chalmers RM, Giles M. Zoonotic cryptosporidiosis in the UK – challenges for control. *J Appl Microbiol* [Internet]. 2010;109(5):1487–97.  
642 Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2010.04764.x>
- 643 27. Food Standards Agency. A report of infectious intestinal disease in England. London; 2000.
- 644 28. Adak GK, Long SM, O'Brien SJ. Trends in indigenous foodborne disease and deaths, England and Wales: 1992 to 2000. *Gut* [Internet]. 2002  
645 Dec [cited 2017 Jun 12];51(6):832–41. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12427786>
- 646 29. Briggs ADM, Boxall NS, Van Santen D, Chalmers RM, McCarthy ND. Approaches to the detection of very small, common, and easily missed  
647 outbreaks that together contribute substantially to human *Cryptosporidium* infection. *Epidemiol Infect* [Internet]. 2014;142(9 PG-1869–  
648 76):1869–76. Available from: NS -
- 649 30. Chalmers RM, McCarthy N, Barlow KL, Stiff R. An evaluation of health protection practices for the investigation and management of  
650 *Cryptosporidium* in England and Wales. *J Public Health (Bangkok)* [Internet]. 2016 Dec 29 [cited 2017 Jun 20];388(24):1291–301. Available  
651 from: <https://academic.oup.com/jpubhealth/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/pubmed/fdw143>
- 652 31. Bouzid M, Hunter PR, Chalmers RM, Tyler KM. *Cryptosporidium* pathogenicity and virulence. *Clin Microbiol Rev* [Internet]. 2013;26(1):115–  
653 34. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23297262>
- 654 32. Hunter P, Thompson R. The zoonotic transmission of *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium*. *Int J Parasitol* [Internet]. 2005;35(11-12 PG-1181–  
655 90):1181–90. Available from: NS -
- 656 33. Yoder JS, Harral C, Beach MJ. *Cryptosporidiosis* surveillance - United States, 2006-2008. *MMWR Surveill Summ*. 2010 Jun;59(6):1–14.
- 657 34. McKerr C, O'Brien SJ, Chalmers RM, Vivancos R, Christley RM. Exposures associated with infection with *Cryptosporidium* in industrialised  
658 countries: A systematic review protocol. *Syst Rev*. 2018;7(1).
- 659 35. Higgins JPT GS (editors)., Collaboration TC. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0* [updated March  
660 2011]. [Internet]. The Cochrane Collaboration; 2011. Available from: <http://www.handbook.cochrane.org>
- 661 36. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Altman D. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA  
662 Statement. *PLoS Med* [Internet]. 2009 Jul 21 [cited 2017 Sep 5];6(7):e1000097. Available from:  
663 <http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>
- 664 37. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis  
665 protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2017 Sep 5];349. Available from:  
666 <http://www.bmj.com/content/349/bmj.g7647>
- 667 38. UNICEF National Committees [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2017 Oct 24]. Available from: [https://www.unicef.org/about/structure/index\\_natcoms.html](https://www.unicef.org/about/structure/index_natcoms.html)
- 668 39. Veritas Health Innovation. *Covidence* systematic review software [Internet]. Melbourne: Cohcrane; 2018. Available from: [www.covidence.org](http://www.covidence.org)
- 669 40. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of  
670 nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses [Internet]. The Ottawa Hospital Research Institute. 2000 [cited 2019 Mar 28]. Available from: .
- 671 41. Bouzid M, Kintz E, Hunter PR. Risk factors for *Cryptosporidium* infection in low and middle income countries: A systematic review and meta-

- 672 analysis. Ajampur SS, editor. PLoS Negl Trop Dis [Internet]. 2018 Jun 7 [cited 2018 Aug 13];12(6):e0006553. Available from:  
673 <http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0006553>
- 674 42. Luchini C, Stubbs B, Solmi M, Veronese N. Assessing the quality of studies in meta-analyses: Advantages and limitations of the Newcastle  
675 Ottawa Scale. World J Meta-Analysis [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2019 Nov 11];5(4):80. Available from: <http://www.wjgnet.com/2308-3840/full/v5/i4/80.htm>  
676
- 677 43. GraphPad Software. GraphPad Prism [Internet]. La Jolla California USA: GraphPad Software; 2019. Available from: [www.graphpad.com](http://www.graphpad.com)
- 678 44. Fournet N, Deege MP, Urbanus AT, Nichols G, Rosner BM, Chalmers RM, et al. Simultaneous increase of Cryptosporidium infections in the  
679 Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Germany in late summer season, 2012. Euro Surveill [Internet]. 2013;18(2 PG-). Available from: NS -
- 680 45. Tollestrup K, Frost FJ, Kunde TR, Yates M V, Jackson S. Cryptosporidium infection, onsite wastewater systems and private wells in the arid  
681 Southwest. J Water Health. 2014;12(1):161–72.
- 682 46. Ravel A, Nesbitt A, Pintar K, Macarthur A, Wang H-L, Marshall B, et al. Epidemiological and clinical description of the top three reportable  
683 parasitic diseases in a Canadian community. Epidemiol Infect. 2013 Feb;141(2):431–42.
- 684 47. Nic Lochlainn LM, Sane J, Schimmer B, Mooij S, Roelfsema J, van Pelt W, et al. Risk Factors for Sporadic Cryptosporidiosis in the  
685 Netherlands: Analysis of a 3-Year Population Based Case-Control Study Coupled With Genotyping, 2013-2016. J Infect Dis [Internet]. 2019  
686 [cited 2019 Feb 18];219(7):1121–9. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/jid/article/219/7/1121/5160029>
- 687 48. de Gooyer TE, Gregory J, Easton M, Stephens N, Fearnley E, Kirk M. Waterparks are high risk for cryptosporidiosis: a case-control study in  
688 Victoria. Commun Dis Intell [Internet]. 2017 Jun;41(2):E142–9. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28899309>
- 689 49. Valderrama AL, Hlavsa MC, Cronquist A, Cosgrove S, Johnston SP, Roberts JM, et al. Multiple risk factors associated with a large statewide  
690 increase in cryptosporidiosis. Epidemiol Infect. 2009 Dec;137(12):1781–8.
- 691 50. Pintar KDM, Pollari F, Waltner-Toews D, Charron DF, McEwen SA, Fazil A, et al. A modified case-control study of cryptosporidiosis (using  
692 non-Cryptosporidium-infected enteric cases as controls) in a community setting. Epidemiol Infect. 2009 Dec;137(12):1789–99.
- 693 51. Becker DJ, Oloya J, Ezeamama AE. Household Socioeconomic and Demographic Correlates of Cryptosporidium Seropositivity in the United  
694 States. PLoS Negl Trop Dis [Internet]. 2015 Sep 14;9(9):e0004080. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4569081/>
- 695 52. Pollock KGJ, Ramsey C. A study of variation in serological markers for Cryptosporidium exposure over time associated with the introduction of  
696 enhanced filtration treatment of drinking water from Loch Katrine [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2020 Mar 7]. Available from: [moz-extension://3c6979e9-747c-4255-9d8f-e5e06edc6791/enhanced-  
697 reader.html?openApp&pdf=https%3A%2F%2Fdwqr.scot.nhs.uk/media%2F14169%2Fresearch-prev-serological-markers-for-cryptosporidium-  
698 exposure-over-time-associated-with-the-introduction-of-enhanced-filtratio](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336979e9-747c-4255-9d8f-e5e06edc6791/enhanced-extension://3c6979e9-747c-4255-9d8f-e5e06edc6791/enhanced-reader.html?openApp&pdf=https%3A%2F%2Fdwqr.scot.nhs.uk/media%2F14169%2Fresearch-prev-serological-markers-for-cryptosporidium-exposure-over-time-associated-with-the-introduction-of-enhanced-filtration)  
699
- 700 53. Chalmers RM, Elwin K, Cheesbrough J, Hadfield SJ, Beeching NJ. Detection of IgG antibodies in sera from patients with Cryptosporidium  
701 parvum and Cryptosporidium hominis. J Infect [Internet]. 2013 Sep [cited 2017 May 15];67(3 PG-231–7):231–7. Available from: NS -
- 702 54. Reeve N. A spatial analysis of Giardiasis and Cryptosporidiosis in relation to public water supply distribution in North West England [Internet].  
703 Unpublished. Available from: [eprints.lancs.ac.uk › eprint › ReeveManuscriptSSTERevisions3](https://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/eprint/ReeveManuscriptSSTERevisions3)
- 704 55. Snel SJ, Baker MG, Venugopal K. The epidemiology of cryptosporidiosis in New Zealand, 1997-2006. N Z Med J [Internet]. 2009  
705 Feb;122(1290):47–61. Available from: NS -
- 706 56. Lake IR, Nichols G, Harrison FCD, Bentham G, Sari Kovats R, Grundy C, et al. Using infectious intestinal disease surveillance data to explore  
707 illness aetiology; a cryptosporidiosis case study. Health Place. 2009 Mar;15(1):333–9.
- 708 57. Frost FJ, Muller TB, Calderon RL, Craun GF. Analysis of serological responses to Cryptosporidium antigen among NHANES III participants.  
709 Ann Epidemiol [Internet]. 2004 Aug;14(7):473–8. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15310525>
- 710 58. Ellis DA, McQueenie R, McConnachie A, Wilson P, Williamson AE. Demographic and practice factors predicting repeated non-attendance in  
711 primary care: a national retrospective cohort analysis. Lancet Public Heal. 2017 Dec 1;2(12):e551–9.
- 712 59. Okhuysen PC. Traveler's Diarrhea Due to Intestinal Protozoa. Clin Infect Dis. 2001;33(1 July):110–4.
- 713 60. Shlim DR, Hoge CW, Rajah R, Scott RM, Pandey P, Echeverria P. Persistent High Risk of Diarrhea among Foreigners in Nepal during the First  
714 2 Years of Residence. Clin Infect Dis. 1999 Sep;29(3):613–6.

- 715 61. Bruce N, Pope D, Stanistreet D. Quantitative methods for health research : a practical interactive guide to epidemiology and statistics  
716 [Internet]. 2008 [cited 2020 Jan 19]. 538 p. Available from:  
717 <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,uid&db=cat03962a&AN=liv.191732328&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- 718 62. Lange H, Johansen O, Vold L, Robertson L, Anthonisen I, Nygard K. Second outbreak of infection with a rare *Cryptosporidium parvum*  
719 genotype in schoolchildren associated with contact with lambs/goat kids at a holiday farm in Norway. *Epidemiol Infect* [Internet]. 2014;142(10  
720 PG-2105–13):2105–13. Available from: NS -
- 721 63. Grinberg A, Pomroy WE, Squires RA, Scuffham A, Pita A, Kwan E. Retrospective cohort study of an outbreak of cryptosporidiosis caused by  
722 a rare *Cryptosporidium parvum* subgenotype. *Epidemiol Infect* [Internet]. 2011;139(10):1542–50. Available from:  
723 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21087535>
- 724 64. Kiang KM, Scheftel JM, Leano FT, Taylor CM, Belle-Isle PA, Cebelinski EA, et al. Recurrent outbreaks of cryptosporidiosis associated with  
725 calves among students at an educational farm programme, Minnesota, 2003. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2006 Aug;134(4):878–86.
- 726 65. Robertson B, Sinclair, Forbes A, Veitch M, Kirk M, Cunliffe D, et al. Case-control studies of sporadic cryptosporidiosis in Melbourne and  
727 Adelaide, Australia. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2002;128(3):419–31.
- 728 66. Hunter PR, Hughes S, Woodhouse S, Syed Q, Verlander NQ, Chalmers RM, et al. Sporadic cryptosporidiosis case-control study with  
729 genotyping. *Emerg Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2004 Jul [cited 2018 Jul 20];10(7):1241–9. Available from: [http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/10/7/03-0582\\_article.htm](http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/10/7/03-0582_article.htm)  
730
- 731 67. Smith RP, Chalmers RM, Elwin K, Clifton-Hadley FA, Mueller-Doblies D, Watkins J, et al. Investigation of the role of companion animals in the  
732 zoonotic transmission of cryptosporidiosis. *Zoonoses Public Health*. 2009 Feb;56(1):24–33.
- 733 68. Chalmers RM, Hughes S, Thomas AL, Woodhouse S, Thomas PD, Hunter P. Laboratory ascertainment of *Cryptosporidium* and local  
734 authority policies for investigating sporadic cases of cryptosporidiosis in two regions of the United Kingdom. *Commun Dis Public Health*.  
735 2002;5(2).
- 736 69. Chalmers RM, Elwin K, Thomas AL, Guy EC, Mason B. Long-term *Cryptosporidium* typing reveals the aetiology and species-specific  
737 epidemiology of human cryptosporidiosis in England and Wales, 2000 to 2003. *Eurosurveillance* [Internet]. 2009;14(2 PG-). Available from:  
738 NS -
- 739 70. EFSA. Public health risks associated with food-borne parasites [Internet]. *EFSA journal*. 2018 [cited 2020 Mar 7]. Available from:  
740 <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5495>
- 741 71. Casemore DP. *Cryptosporidium* and cryptosporidiosis. *CPD Infect*. 2001;2(2):53–7.
- 742 72. Ethelberg S, Lisby M, Vestergaard LS, Enemark HL, Molbak K. Cryptosporidiosis outbreak associated with eating in a canteen, Denmark,  
743 August 2005. *Euro Surveill* [Internet]. 2005 Oct 27 [cited 2017 May 15];10(10):E051027.4. Available from:  
744 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16790895>
- 745 73. Robertson B, Sinclair, Forbes A, Veitch M, Kirk M, Cunliffe D, et al. Case-control studies of sporadic cryptosporidiosis in Melbourne and  
746 Adelaide, Australia. *Epidemiol Infect* [Internet]. 2002 Jun [cited 2018 Jul 19];128(3):419–31. Available from:  
747 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12113486>
- 748 74. Waltner-Toews D. Responding to globalised food-borne disease: risk assessment as post-normal science. *EFSA J* [Internet]. 2019 Jul 1 [cited  
749 2020 Mar 9];17(S1). Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.2903/j.efsa.2019.e170718>
- 750 75. Nichols GL. Food-borne protozoa. *Br Med Bull*. 2000;56(1):209–35.
- 751 76. Robertson LJ, Gjerde B. Occurrence of parasites on fruits and vegetables in Norway. *J Food Prot* [Internet]. 2001 Nov [cited 2017 May  
752 15];64(11):1793–8. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11726161>
- 753 77. Artieda J, Basterrechea M, Arriola L, Yagüe M, Albisua E, Arostegui N, et al. Outbreak of cryptosporidiosis in a child day-care centre in  
754 Gipuzkoa, Spain, October to December 2011. *Eurosurveillance*. 2012;17(5).
- 755 78. Hannah J, Riordan T. Case to case spread of cryptosporidiosis; Evidence from a day nursery outbreak. *Public Health* [Internet]. 1988 Nov 1  
756 [cited 2018 Dec 6];102(6):539–44. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0033350688800234?via%3Dihub>
- 757 79. Bloomfield SPF, Martin Exner P, Carlo Signorelli P, Kumar Jyoti Nath P, Scott EA, Signorelli CC. The chain of infection transmission in the

- 758 home and everyday life settings, and the role of hygiene in reducing the risk of infection. 2012 [cited 2017 May 2]; Available from:  
759 [http://www.ifh-homehygiene.org/IntegratedCRD.nsf/IFH\\_Topic\\_Infection\\_Transmission?OpenForm](http://www.ifh-homehygiene.org/IntegratedCRD.nsf/IFH_Topic_Infection_Transmission?OpenForm)
- 760 80. Lake IR, Nichols G, Bentham G, Harrison FCD, Hunter PR, Kovats RS. Cryptosporidiosis decline after regulation, England and Wales, 1989-  
761 2005. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2007;13(4):623–5.
- 762 81. Ramsay CN, Wagner AP, Robertson C, Smith H V, Pollock KGJ. Effects of Drinking-Water Filtration on Cryptosporidium Seroepidemiology,  
763 Scotland. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2014 Jan;20(1):70–6.
- 764 82. Frost FJ, Roberts M, Kunde TR, Craun G, Tollestrup K, Harter L, et al. How Clean Must Our Drinking Water Be: The Importance of Protective  
765 Immunity. *J Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2005 Mar 1 [cited 2019 Jan 28];191(5):809–14. Available from:  
766 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15688300>
- 767 83. Nichols RAB, Campbell BM, Smith H V. Identification of Cryptosporidium spp. oocysts in United Kingdom noncarbonated natural mineral  
768 waters and drinking waters by using a modified nested PCR-restriction fragment length polymorphism assay. *Appl Environ Microbiol*. 2003 Jul  
769 1;69(7):4183–9.
- 770 84. Weinstein P, Macaitis M, Walker C, Cameron S. Cryptosporidial diarrhoea in South Australia: An exploratory case-control study of risk factors  
771 for transmission. *Med J Aust*. 1993;158(2):117–9.
- 772 85. Hu Z, Morton LW, Mahler RL. Bottled water: United States consumers and their perceptions of water quality. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.  
773 2011 Feb;8(2):565–78.
- 774 86. Hellard ME, Sinclair MI, Fairley CK, Andrews RM, Bailey M, Black J, et al. An outbreak of cryptosporidiosis in an urban swimming pool: why  
775 are such outbreaks difficult to detect? *Aust N Z J Public Health* [Internet]. 2000 Jun [cited 2018 Jul 19];24(3):272–5. Available from:  
776 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10937403>
- 777 87. Puech MC, McAnulty JM, Lesjak M, Shaw N, Heron L, Watson JM. A statewide outbreak of cryptosporidiosis in New South Wales associated  
778 with swimming at public pools. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2001 Jun;126(3):389–96.
- 779 88. Voetsch AC, Poole C, Hedberg CW, Hoekstra RM, Ryder RW, Weber DJ, et al. Analysis of the FoodNet case-control study of sporadic  
780 Salmonella serotype Enteritidis infections using persons infected with other Salmonella serotypes as the comparison group. *Epidemiol Infect*.  
781 2009;137(3):408–16.
- 782 89. Dufour AP, Behymer TD, Cantú R, Magnuson M, Wymer LJ. Ingestion of swimming pool water by recreational swimmers. *J Water Health*.  
783 2017 Jun 1;15(3):429–37.
- 784 90. Yoder JS, Beach MJ. Cryptosporidiosis surveillance--United States, 2003-2005. *MMWR Surveill Summ*. 2007 Sep;56(7):1–10.
- 785 91. Dietz VJ, Roberts JM. National surveillance for infection with Cryptosporidium parvum, 1995-1948: What have we learned? *Public Health*  
786 *Rep*. 2000;115(4):358–63.
- 787 92. Perry S, De La Luz Sanchez M, Hurst PK, Parsonnet J. Household transmission of gastroenteritis. *Emerg Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2005 Jul [cited  
788 2017 Apr 27];11(7):1093–6. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16022787>
- 789 93. Public Health England. Management of Gastrointestinal Infections 2019 [Internet]. Recommendations for the Public Health Management of  
790 Gastrointestinal Infections. 2019 [cited 2020 Mar 5]. Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/gastrointestinal-infections-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/gastrointestinal-infections-guidance-for-public-health-management)  
791 [guidance-for-public-health-management](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/gastrointestinal-infections-guidance-for-public-health-management)
- 792 94. Sopwith W, Osborn K, Chalmers R, Regan M. The changing epidemiology of cryptosporidiosis in North West England. *Epidemiol Infect*  
793 [Internet]. 2005;133(5):785–93. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16181496>
- 794 95. Pollock KGJG, Young D, Robertson C, Ahmed S, Ramsay CNN. Reduction in cryptosporidiosis associated with introduction of enhanced  
795 filtration of drinking water at Loch Katrine, Scotland. *Epidemiol Infect* [Internet]. 2014;142(1):56–62. Available from:  
796 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23591075>
- 797 96. Griffiths J. Waterborne Diseases - an overview | ScienceDirect Topics [Internet]. International Encyclopedia of Public Health (Second Edition).  
798 2017 [cited 2020 Jan 22]. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/medicine-and-dentistry/waterborne-diseases>
- 799 97. Nichols G, Lake IR, Chalmers RM, Bentham G, Harrison FCD, Hunter PR, et al. Intervention in Waterborne Disease. In: OrtegaPierres, G and  
800 Caccio, SM and Fayer, R and Mank, TG and Smith, HV and Thompson, RCA, editor. GIARDIA AND CRYPTOSPORIDIUM: FROM

- 801 MOLECULES TO DISEASE. CABI PUBLISHING, WALLINGFORD OX10 8DE, OXON, ENGLAND: CABI PUBLISHING-C A B INT; 2009. p.  
802 227–37.
- 803 98. World Health Organization: Risk assessment of Cryptosporidium in drinking water [Internet]. 2009. Available from:  
804 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/70117>
- 805 99. Chalmers RM. Waterborne outbreaks of cryptosporidiosis. Ann Ist Super Sanita [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2020 Mar 9];48(4):429–46. Available  
806 from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23247139>
- 807 100. Redmond E, Curnin A. Systematic review of the relative proportion of foodborne disease associated with food preparation or handling  
808 practices in the home [Internet]. UK; 2018 May [cited 2020 Mar 9]. Available from: [moz-extension://3c6979e9-747c-4255-9d8f-  
809 e5e06edc6791/enhanced-  
810 reader.html?openApp&pdf=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.food.gov.uk%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2Fmedia%2Fdocument%2Ffs101098fbdinthe  
811 hometechnicalrep.pdf](moz-extension://3c6979e9-747c-4255-9d8f-e5e06edc6791/enhanced-reader.html?openApp&pdf=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.food.gov.uk%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2Fmedia%2Fdocument%2Ffs101098fbdinthe%2Fhometechnicalrep.pdf)
- 812 101. Davies A, Campbell B, Evans MR, Bone A, Roche A, Chalmers R. Asymptomatic carriage of protozoan parasites in children in day care  
813 centers in the United Kingdom. Pediatr Infect Dis J [Internet]. 2009;28(9):838–40. Available from:  
814 <https://insights.ovid.com/pubmed?pmid=19684527>
- 815 102. Chalmers RM, Katzer F. Looking for Cryptosporidium: the application of advances in detection and diagnosis. Trends Parasitol. 2013  
816 May;29(5):237–51.
- 817 103. Leav BA, Mackay M, Ward HD. Cryptosporidium Species: New Insights and Old Challenges . Clin Infect Dis. 2003 Apr;36(7):903–8.
- 818 104. Ioannidis JPA. Commentary: Adjusting for bias: a user’s guide to performing plastic surgery on meta-analyses of observational studies. Int J  
819 Epidemiol [Internet]. 2011 Jun [cited 2020 Mar 3];40(3):777–9. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21233141>
- 820