

1 Characterization of highly pathogenic avian influenza virus in retail dairy products in the US

2

3

4 Erica Spackman^a#, Deana R. Jones^b, Amber M. McCoig^c, Tristan J. Colonius^c, Iryna Goraichuk^a, David

5 L. Suarez^a

6

7

8 a. Exotic and Emerging Avian Viral Disease Research Unit, US National Poultry Research Center, USDA-
9 Agricultural Research Service, Athens, GA

10 b. Egg and Poultry Production Research Unit, US National Poultry Research Center, USDA-Agricultural
11 Research Service, Athens, GA

12 c. Center for Veterinary Medicine, US Food and Drug Administration, Rockville, MD

13

14 Running head: HPAIV RNA detection in milk

15

16

17 # Address correspondence to: Erica Spackman, erica.spackman@usda.gov

18

19

20

21

22

23 **Abstract**

24 In March 2024 Clade 2.3.4.4b H5N1 highly pathogenic avian influenza virus (HPAIV) was detected in
25 dairy cattle in the US and it was discovered that the virus could be detected in raw milk. Although
26 affected cow's milk is diverted from human consumption and current pasteurization requirements are
27 expected to reduce or eliminate HPAIV from the milk supply, a study was conducted to characterize
28 whether the virus could be detected by quantitative real-time RT-PCR (qrRT-PCR) in pasteurized retail
29 dairy products and if detected, to determine whether the virus was viable. From April 18 to 22, 2024 a
30 total of 297 samples of Grade A pasteurized retail milk products (23 product types) were collected from
31 17 US states and represented products from 132 processors in 38 states. Viral RNA was detected in 60
32 samples (20.2%) with titer equivalents of up to $5.4 \log_{10}$ 50% egg infectious doses (EID₅₀) per ml, with a
33 mean and median of $3.0 \log_{10}/\text{ml}$ and $2.9 \log_{10}/\text{ml}$ respectively. Samples that were positive for type A
34 influenza by qrRT-PCR were confirmed to be clade 2.3.4.4 H5 HPAIV by qrRT-PCR. No infectious virus
35 was detected in any of the qrRT-PCR positive samples in embryonating chicken eggs. Further studies are
36 needed to monitor the milk supply but these results provide evidence that infectious virus did not enter the
37 US pasteurized milk supply before control measures for HPAIV were implemented in dairy cattle.

38

39 **Importance**

40 Highly pathogenic avian influenza virus (HPAIV) infections in US dairy cattle were first confirmed in
41 March 2024. Because the virus could be detected in raw milk a study was conducted to determine whether
42 it had entered the retail food supply. Pasteurized dairy products were collected from 17 states in April
43 2024. Viral RNA was detected in 1 in 5 samples but infectious virus was not detected. This provides a
44 snap-shot of HPAIV in milk products early in the event and reinforces that with numerous safety
45 measures, infectious virus in milk is unlikely to enter the food supply.

46

47

48 **Introduction**

49 Cow's milk and milk products are an important source of nutrition for humans. In the US, "Grade A" milk
50 is regulated by a federal-state partnership, the National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments
51 (NCIMS), and is administered through adopted regulations, the Pasteurized Milk Ordinance (PMO)
52 (<https://www.fda.gov/media/140394/download>). The NCIMS helps the industry produce a safe and
53 wholesome product for the consumer. This regulatory system has multiple layers to ensure food safety.
54 Cows with mastitis and other disease conditions that could affect milk quality and safety are milked
55 separately, and the abnormal milk is not included in the supply for human consumption. Milk is also
56 typically picked up from the farm at regular intervals, and the bulk milk (milk pooled from 600-700 cows)
57 is routinely tested for commonly used antibiotics and other substances before pasteurization
58 (<https://www.fda.gov/food/food-compliance-programs/national-drug-residue-milk-monitoring-program>).
59 Samples are also analyzed on a recurring basis for somatic cell and bacterial plate counts to monitor
60 quality management practices.

61 Pasteurization is another pivotal layer of the federal-state milk safety system. The primary
62 method for pasteurization of fluid milk is typically through a continuous flow pasteurizer by high
63 temperature short time; 72°C for 15 seconds is the most used approved method by regulation in the US
64 according to the PMO. Variations in pasteurization time and temperatures are allowed that achieve the
65 same goal of killing pathogenic bacteria and to reduce spoilage bacteria that will in effect increase the
66 shelf life of the milk. The milk is then packaged and sent to retail markets with strict temperature controls
67 that further ensures the safety and quality of the product.

68 Infection of dairy cattle with clade 2.3.4.4b H5N1 highly pathogenic avian influenza virus
69 (HPAIV) was first reported in the US on March 25, 2024 (1). Diagnostic testing of milk from the initial
70 cases detected viral RNA by real-time RT-PCR. The potential for HPAIV to enter the food supply is
71 believed to be mitigated because symptomatic cows have decreased milk quality and production thus
72 preventing the milk from entering the food supply due to milk safety controls. Poor quality milk is

73 normally diverted from the milk supply for human consumption. However, because HPAIV has never
74 been described in dairy cattle, milk has not been monitored for the virus.

75 Historically, documentation of influenza A virus infection in cattle has been sparse with only a
76 few reports of clinical disease (2-4), and there has not been evidence of sustained transmission among
77 cows (5). More recently, serologic studies on respiratory disease or drops in milk production were
78 reported in Northern Ireland that were associated with a rise in convalescent antibody titers to influenza A
79 subtypes that are consistent with human seasonal influenza but no virus was isolated to confirm the
80 lineage present (3). Several experimental studies from the 1950s clearly show that the direct inoculation
81 of the human PR8 influenza A virus strain or Newcastle disease virus into the udder of lactating dairy
82 cows or goats could result in infection with measurable virus shedding, however, the studies did not
83 describe clinical disease or mastitis in the challenged animals (6-9). Until the recent outbreak of clade
84 2.3.4.4b HPAIV in dairy cattle with sustained transmission, infection of bovines with type A influenza
85 was not previously reported and therefore was not considered to be an important pathogen of cattle which
86 delayed initial recognition of the infection.

87 Because the clade 2.3.4.4b H5 HPAIVs belong to the goose/Guangdong/1996 H5 HPAIV lineage,
88 which is known to have zoonotic potential (10), the objective of this study was to screen pasteurized retail
89 dairy products for the presence of viral RNA. Positive samples were subsequently evaluated for the
90 presence of live virus in embryonating chickens eggs. Importantly, human infections with clade 2.3.4.4
91 H5 HPAIV are rare and numerous risk assessments have concluded that the risk to the general public is
92 very low ([https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/infectious-disease-topics/z-disease-list/avian-influenza/threats-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/infectious-disease-topics/z-disease-list/avian-influenza/threats-and-outbreaks/risk-assessment-h5)
93 [and-outbreaks/risk-assessment-h5](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/assessment-of-risk-associated-with-recent-influenza-a%28h5n1%29-clade-2.3.4.4b-viruses), [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/assessment-of-risk-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/assessment-of-risk-associated-with-recent-influenza-a%28h5n1%29-clade-2.3.4.4b-viruses)
94 [associated-with-recent-influenza-a%28h5n1%29-clade-2.3.4.4b-viruses](https://www.fao.org/animal-health/situation-updates/global-aiv-with-zoonotic-potential/en), [https://www.fao.org/animal-](https://www.fao.org/animal-health/situation-updates/global-aiv-with-zoonotic-potential/en)
95 [health/situation-updates/global-aiv-with-zoonotic-potential/en](https://www.fao.org/animal-health/situation-updates/global-aiv-with-zoonotic-potential/en)).

96

97 **Results**

98 **Virus detection.** A total of 297 samples representing 23 pasteurized dairy product types (Supplementary
99 Table) were collected from 17 states which represent products produced at 132 processing locations in 38
100 states. Of these, 20.2% (60/297) were positive for the detection of influenza A RNA by qrRT-PCR (Table
101 1). Virus titer equivalents for positive samples ranged up to $5.4\log_{10}$ 50% egg infectious doses (EID₅₀) per
102 ml, with a mean and median of $3.0\log_{10}/\text{ml}$ and $2.9\log_{10}/\text{ml}$ respectively (Supplementary Table). Fluid
103 milk with different fat contents represented 64.0% (n=190) of the products tested and 75% (n=60) of the
104 samples in which influenza A was detected by qrRT-PCR.

105 A subset of the samples positive for type A influenza by qrRT-PCR (n=30) were confirmed to be
106 clade 2.3.4.4 HPAIV by a lineage specific qrRT-PCR test; 100% (30/30) were positive.

107 A total of 60 samples that were positive for type A influenza were tested for infectious virus by
108 standard testing in ECE. Infectious virus was not detected in any samples (Supplementary Table).

109

110 **Discussion**

111 In March 2024 HPAIV was discovered in the milk of infected dairy cattle in the US. Samples were
112 collected from retail markets in April 2024 to assess a variety of products to provide data for an initial
113 safety risk assessment of the national milk supply. Samples were selected to be representative of dairy
114 processors in states that have confirmed HPAIV infected dairy cattle, and states that have not reported
115 infected herds. Of note, due to the complexity of the milk distribution system, the location of where milk
116 was processed may not correlate with the location where the milk was produced. Commercial milk is
117 typically pooled from several dairy farms and routed for bulk processing (i.e., pasteurization) and
118 distribution to multiple states is a common industry practice. For example, a product could have been
119 produced by cows in one state, then processed in a different state, and then sold commercially in a third
120 state. □

121 Most importantly, although viral RNA was detected by qrRT-PCR in 20.2% of the samples, no
122 infectious virus was detected by testing for replication in ECE, which is a highly sensitive bioassay for
123 avian influenza virus detection (11, 12). Positive qrRT-PCR indicates that some viral RNA entered the

124 milk supply, however, it can't be determined at what stage, if any, the virus was infectious. First, cows
125 rapidly develop antibodies after infection which are present in milk and will inactivate the virus. Second,
126 virus is inactivated by pasteurization and possibly the high shear force of homogenization. Work with
127 continuous flow pasteurization is in progress to confirm the conditions for virus inactivation.

128 This study has several limitations that make wider extrapolation of HPAIV RNA levels in
129 pasteurized dairy products difficult. First, the sample size is small. The scope of this study was to obtain
130 an initial snap-shot of whether dairy products had evidence of virus in retail milk samples after the
131 detection of virus in raw milk from dairy cows. Further, some samples were intentionally collected from
132 regions with known HPAIV infected dairy herds, therefore these data likely provide a higher positivity
133 rate than would be expected from a random testing process. Since the recognition of dairy cattle infection
134 with HPAIV, farmers are more aware of the disease, and diagnostic testing can occur in many of the
135 USDA approved laboratories in the National Animal Health Laboratory network. Currently, dairy cattle
136 must be tested before moving across state lines ([https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/dairy-
137 federal-order.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/dairy-federal-order.pdf)) helps mitigate contaminated milk from entering the human food supply. Finally,
138 regardless of the specific detection of HPAIV infection, cows will develop mastitis which will also result
139 in removing their milk from the food supply.

140 In general, numerous measures in the milk production process will greatly reduce, if not
141 eliminate, the risk for infectious influenza A virus entering the retail milk supply. First, approximately
142 99% of the US commercial milk supply ([https://downloads.usda.library.cornell.edu/usda-
143 esmis/files/4b29b5974/hq37xb74r/s1786b07q/mlkpd24.pdf](https://downloads.usda.library.cornell.edu/usda-esmis/files/4b29b5974/hq37xb74r/s1786b07q/mlkpd24.pdf)) that is produced on dairy farms in the US
144 comes from farms that participate in the Grade "A" milk program and follow the PMO
145 (<https://www.fda.gov/media/140394/download>), which includes numerous layers of quality controls that
146 help ensure the safety of dairy products. Second, the US federal-state milk safety system requires that
147 milk from sick cows is diverted for further processing or is destroyed.

148 More studies are needed to characterize the risk of HPAIV entering the milk supply long term but
149 this study provides initial evidence that infectious HPAIV has not reached the US retail milk supply. A

150 combination of the previously implemented sanitary control measures (e.g., PMO) and new HPAIV
151 specific measures are expected to further ensure a safe milk supply.

152

153 **Materials and Methods**

154 **Retail dairy product sample collection.**

155 The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) collected 297 samples at retail locations in 17 states
156 between April 18 and 22, 2024. Sample sites were selected by local FDA Milk Specialists and field staff,
157 in the Office of Regulatory Affairs. Samples were shipped directly by overnight courier to the US
158 National Poultry Research Center, USDA- Agricultural Research Service where testing was conducted.
159 Sample collection was designed to include both products processed in states where HPAIV infections in
160 dairy herds had been confirmed by the National Veterinary Services Laboratories, APHIS-USDA, at the
161 time of collection, as well as samples from states with no confirmed infections in dairy herds. Within
162 these bounds, sample collection was random and based on retail availability. Samples represented
163 pasteurized retail dairy products produced at 132 processors in 38 states (AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA,
164 IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, MA, ME, MI, MN, MO, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, SC,
165 TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV). Samples included fluid milk (whole, 1%, 2%, skim), cream (heavy
166 cream, light cream, and similar), half & half, cottage cheese (and similar), sour cream, and yogurt
167 (Supplementary Table). All samples were Grade A pasteurized dairy products regulated under the PMO.
168 (<https://www.fda.gov/media/140394/download>, [https://www.fda.gov/food/guidance-documents-](https://www.fda.gov/food/guidance-documents-regulatory-information-topic-food-and-dietary-supplements/milk-guidance-documents-regulatory-information)
169 [regulatory-information-topic-food-and-dietary-supplements/milk-guidance-documents-regulatory-](https://www.fda.gov/food/guidance-documents-regulatory-information-topic-food-and-dietary-supplements/milk-guidance-documents-regulatory-information)
170 [information](https://www.fda.gov/food/guidance-documents-regulatory-information-topic-food-and-dietary-supplements/milk-guidance-documents-regulatory-information)) by FDA and its state milk regulatory partners.

171 **Sample processing.** Samples were immediately processed after receipt. Product with temperatures $>7^{\circ}\text{C}$
172 were discarded and are not included in the sample numbers of this study. Samples were assigned a unique
173 accession number and the original packaging was labeled and stored at 4°C . Product origin (US state) and
174 product type were recorded.

175 Approximately 50ml of each product was portioned into sterile containers. Each sample was
176 processed for RNA extraction and quantitative real-time RT-PCR (qrRT-PCR) as described below.
177 Positive samples with titer equivalents of $\geq 3.9\log_{10}$ 50% egg infectious doses (EID₅₀)/ml based on qrRT-
178 PCR were quantified in embryonating chicken eggs (ECE) and samples with titers $\leq 3.8\log_{10}$ EID₅₀/ml
179 were tested for viable virus in ECE as described below. The cut-off for quantification was selected
180 because it was expected that, if present, the quantity of infectious virus would be lower than the quantity
181 detected by qrRT-PCR and quantification of low levels would not be informative.

182 **RNA extraction.** RNA was extracted from fluid homogenized dairy products using the MagMax
183 magnetic bead extraction kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA) in accordance with manufacturer's
184 instruction. Semi-solid products (e.g., sour cream, yogurt, cottage cheese) were extracted using a hybrid
185 procedure with Trizol LS (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and the MagMax magnetic bead kit. Semi-solid
186 products were portioned by spatula based on weight (approximately 0.25g). Briefly, VetMAX Xeno
187 (Thermo Fisher Scientific) was used as an extraction and internal positive control was added to the Trizol
188 LS for each reaction prior to sample addition. Then 0.25ml or 0.25g of product was added to 0.75ml of
189 Trizol LS and mixed. The mixture was incubated at room temperature for 7-10minutes and 0.2ml of
190 chloroform was added and mixed, incubated at room temperature for an additional 7-10minutes and
191 centrifuged for 10minutes at 15,000xg at 4°C. RNA was recovered from 0.05ml of the aqueous phase by
192 the MagMax magnetic bead kit in accordance with the kit instructions.

193 **Quantitative real-time RT-PCR.** A qrRT-PCR test targeting the influenza A M gene was run on a
194 QuantStudio5 (Thermo Fisher Scientific) as described (13). The primers and probe for the internal control
195 were used as directed by the kit instructions. Titer equivalents were determined by including a standard
196 curve derived from RNA extracted from a 10-fold dilutions series of quantified avian influenza virus
197 stocks (14). A subset of the influenza A qrRT-PCR positive samples were tested with an additional qrRT-
198 PCR test that is specific for the 2.3.4.4b H5 lineage with a highly pathogenic cleavage site (15).

199 **Virus detection and quantification in embryonating chickens eggs.** All samples (1ml) were treated for
200 1hr at ambient temperature (approximately 21°C) with antibiotics (final concentration: penicillin G 1000

201 IU/ml, streptomycin 200 µg/ml, gentamicin 100 µg/ml, kanamycin 65 µg/ml, amphotericin B 2 µg/ml).
202 Then dilutions were made in brain heart infusion (BHI) broth with antibiotics for samples that were
203 quantified. Semisolid samples were mixed 1:1 (0.5g:0.5ml) with brain heart infusion broth prior to
204 inoculation into ECE or dilution. Samples were inoculated for virus detection (undiluted for 2 passages)
205 or quantified using standard methods (16, 17). Hemagglutination assay was used to confirm the presence
206 of avian influenza virus (18).

207

208 **Acknowledgements**

209 The authors gratefully thank Nathan Anderson, Frankie Beacorn, Tarrah Bigler, Nick Chaplinski, Suzanne
210 DeBlois, Edna Espinoza, Jesse Gallagher, Javier Garcia, Jessica Gladney, David Haley, Anne Hurley-
211 Bacon, Lindsay Killmaster, Scott Lee, Stephen Norris, David Pearce, Timothy Roddy, Melinda
212 Vonkunghong, Stephen Walker, Robin Woodruff, and Ricky Zoller for technical assistance with this
213 work.

214 Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply
215 endorsement by the US Government. This research was supported by US Department of Agriculture
216 (USDA)-Agricultural Research Service Project No. 6040-32000-081-00D and the US Food and Drug
217 Administration by IAA contract number pending. All opinions expressed in this paper are the authors' and
218 do not necessarily reflect the policies and views of the USDA or FDA. The USDA is an equal opportunity
219 provider and employer.

220

221 **References**

- 222 1. Burrough E, Magstadt D, Petersen B, Timmermans S, Gauger P, Zhang J, Siepker C, Mainenti M,
223 Li G, Thompson A, Gorden P, Plummer P, Main R. 2024. Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza
224 A(H5N1) Clade 2.3.4.4b Virus Infection in Domestic Dairy Cattle and Cats, United States, 2024.
225 *Emerging Infectious Disease journal* 30.
- 226 2. Brown IH, Crawshaw TR, Harris PA, Alexander DJ. 1998. Detection of antibodies to influenza A
227 virus in cattle in association with respiratory disease and reduced milk yield. *Vet Rec* 143:637-8.

- 228 3. Graham DA, Calvert V, McLaren E. 2002. Retrospective analysis of serum and nasal mucus from
229 cattle in Northern Ireland for evidence of infection with influenza A virus. *Vet Rec* 150:201-4.
- 230 4. Gunning RF, Brown IH, Crawshaw TR. 1999. Evidence of influenza A virus infection in dairy
231 cows with sporadic milk drop syndrome. *Vet Rec* 145:556-7.
- 232 5. Sreenivasan CC, Thomas M, Kaushik RS, Wang D, Li F. 2019. Influenza A in Bovine Species: A
233 Narrative Literature Review. *Viruses* 11.
- 234 6. Mitchell CA, Walker RV, Bannister GL. 1953. Further Experiments Relating to the Propagation of
235 Virus in the Bovine Mammary Gland. *Can J Comp Med Vet Sci* 17:218-22.
- 236 7. Mitchell CA, Walker RV, Bannister GL. 1953. Preliminary Experiments Relating to the
237 Propagation of Viruses in the Bovine Mammary Gland. *Can J Comp Med Vet Sci* 17:97-104.
- 238 8. Mitchell CA, Walker RV, Bannister GL. 1954. Persistence Of Neutralizing Antibody In Milk And
239 Blood Of Cows And Goats Following The Instillation Of Virus Into The Mammary Gland. *Can J*
240 *Comp Med Vet Sci* 18:426-30.
- 241 9. Mitchell CA, Walker RV, Bannister GL. 1956. Studies relating to the formation of neutralizing
242 antibody following the propagation of influenza and Newcastle disease virus in the bovine
243 mammary gland. *Can J Microbiol* 2:322-8.
- 244 10. Yamaji R, Saad MD, Davis CT, Swayne DE, Wang D, Wong FYK, McCauley JW, Peiris JSM,
245 Webby RJ, Fouchier RAM, Kawaoka Y, Zhang W. 2020. Pandemic potential of highly pathogenic
246 avian influenza clade 2.3.4.4 A(H5) viruses. *Rev Med Virol* 30:e2099.
- 247 11. Moresco KA, Stallknecht DE, Swayne DE. 2010. Evaluation and attempted optimization of avian
248 embryos and cell culture methods for efficient isolation and propagation of low pathogenicity
249 avian influenza viruses. *Avian Dis* 54:622-6.
- 250 12. Moresco KA, Stallknecht DE, Swayne DE. 2012. Evaluation of different embryonating bird eggs
251 and cell cultures for isolation efficiency of avian influenza A virus and avian paramyxovirus
252 serotype 1 from real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction-positive wild bird
253 surveillance samples. *J Vet Diagn Invest* 24:563-7.
- 254 13. Spackman E, Senne DA, Myers TJ, Bulaga LL, Garber LP, Perdue ML, Lohman K, Daum LT,
255 Suarez DL. 2002. Development of a real-time reverse transcriptase PCR assay for type A
256 influenza virus and the avian H5 and H7 hemagglutinin subtypes. *Journal of Clinical*
257 *Microbiology* 40:3256-60.
- 258 14. Spackman E. 2020. Avian Influenza Virus Detection and Quantitation by Real-Time RT-PCR.
259 *Methods Mol Biol* 2123:137-148.

- 260 15. James J, Seekings AH, Skinner P, Purchase K, Mahmood S, Brown IH, Hansen RDE, Banyard
261 AC, Reid SM. 2022. Rapid and sensitive detection of high pathogenicity Eurasian clade 2.3.4.4b
262 avian influenza viruses in wild birds and poultry. *J Virol Methods* 301:114454.
- 263 16. Spackman E, Killian ML. 2020. Avian Influenza Virus Isolation, Propagation, and Titration in
264 Embryonated Chicken Eggs. *Methods Mol Biol* 2123:149-164.
- 265 17. Reed LJ, Muench H. 1938. A simple method for estimating fifty percent endpoints. *American*
266 *Journal of Hygiene* 27:493-497.
- 267 18. Killian ML. 2020. Hemagglutination Assay for Influenza Virus. *Methods Mol Biol* 2123:3-10.
268

Table 1. Detection of influenza A in pasteurized retail dairy products by quantitative real-time RT-PCR.

Titer values are expressed as \log_{10} 50% egg infectious doses determined by a standard curve using quantified virus. No infectious virus was detected in any of the qrRT-PCR positive samples.

Product	# positive / total tested (% positive)	Mean titer equivalents (\pm standard deviation)
Whole milk	16/68 (23.5)	3.0 \pm 1.1
2% reduced fat milk	16/58 (27.6)	3.1 \pm 1.2
1% low fat milk	9/28 (32.1)	3.1 \pm 1.2
Skim milk	4/36 (11.1)	3.3 \pm 0.7
Half and half	6/25 (24.0)	2.3 \pm 1.0
Yogurt	0/14 (0)	Not applicable
Cream	3/17 (17.6)	2.3 \pm 0.9
Cottage cheese	1/21 (4.8)	2.6 \pm 0.0
Sour cream	5/30 (16.7)	3.4 \pm 1.2
Total	60/297 (20.2)	3.1 \pm 1.1