Quantitative risk assessment of human H5N1 infection from consumption of fluid cow's milk

Katherine J. Koebel, DVM[1#], Ece Bulut, MS, PhD[1], Samuel D. Alcaine, MS, PhD[2], Aljoša Trmčić, PhD[2], Mohammed Nooruzzaman, DVM, MS, PhD[1], Lina M. Covaleda, PhD[1], Diego G. Diel, DVM, MS, PhD[1], & Renata Ivanek, DVM, MSc, PhD[1]

[1]Department of Population Medicine & Diagnostic Sciences, College of Veterinary Medicine, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY

[2]Department of Food Science, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY

[#]Correspondence to: kjk239@cornell.edu | S1-020 Schurman Hall, 602 Tower Rd, Ithaca NY 14850 | ORCiD: 0000-0003-4910-2131

ABSTRACT

The spillover of highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 into dairy cattle has raised concerns over the safety of fluid milk. While no human foodborne infection has been reported, this strain has infected dozens of people and milk from infected cows is known to be infectious by ingestion in multiple other species. Investigation into the public health threat of this outbreak is critical. This study uses quantitative risk assessment (QRA) models to represent the United States raw and pasteurized fluid milk supply chains to estimate the risk of human infection from consumption of fluid cow's milk. These models were parameterized with literature emerging from this outbreak, then employed to estimate the H5N1 infection risk and evaluate multiple potential interventions aimed at reducing this risk. The median (5th, 95th percentiles) probabilities of infection per 240-mL serving of pasteurized, farmstore-purchased raw, or retail-purchased raw milk were 5.68E-15 (1.77E-16, 2.98E-13), 1.13E-03 (5.16E-06, 3.82E-02), and 1.02E-03 (5.20E-06, 3.64E-02), respectively. Our results demonstrate that pasteurization is highly effective at reducing H5N1 infection risk. Scenario analysis revealed quantitative real-time reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction (qrRT-PCR) testing of bulk tank milk to be an effective method for reducing risk from raw milk. Additionally, we identify knowledge gaps related to human H5N1 dose-response by ingestion and raw milk consumption patterns. These findings emphasize the importance of pasteurization in protecting public health and will inform the implementation of control strategies to reduce the risk of human H5N1 infection from raw milk.

Keywords: H5N1, quantitative risk assessment, dairy cattle, milk, public health, foodborne illness

1. INTRODUCTION

Avian influenza (AI) represents a serious risk to both avian and mammalian species. AI is an illness caused by multiple strains of the influenza A virus (IAV) (Alexandar, 2007; Swayne, 2023). Of particular interest are the viruses of the H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b, which emerged in 2020 and was subsequently detected in North America in late 2021 (Bevins et al., 2021; Kaneil et al., 2023). Epidemiologic data highlight the predominance of this clade in reports of influenza A(H5) samples from both humans and animals (WHO, 2024; WHO, 2023).

In March 2024, a spillover event resulted in the infection of dairy cattle in Texas with H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b (Caserta et al., 2024; Burrough et al., 2024). The initial infections have since spread to more than 900 herds nationwide as of 28 January 2025 (USDA-APHIS, 2025b). Infected cows present predominantly with clinical mastitis, usually in mid- to late-lactation, with additional signs such as anorexia, rumen hypomotility, and nasal discharge (Caserta et al., 2024; Burrough et al., 2024). Milk from these animals contains extremely high concentrations of virus (4.0-8.8 $\log_{10}TCID_{50}$/mL (tissue culture infectious dose 50) (note: hereafter "$\log TCID_{50}$")) and is known to be infectious by ingestion in mice, cats, and cynomolgus macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*) (Caserta et al., 2024; Guan et al., 2024; Eisfeld et al., 2024; Rosenke et al., 2025).

As of 28 January 2025, out of 67 total human cases, 40 were attributed to cattle exposure in addition to 1 mortality with "other animal exposure" (Uyeki et al., 2024; CDC, 2025a). Cases with cattle exposure were attributed to workplace contact with infected animals and no documented cases of foodborne transmission have been reported. Human cases are generally mild, including conjunctivitis and upper respiratory symptoms, and no human-to-human transmission has been reported (Neumann et al., 2024). Exposure in 2 cases is unknown (CDC, 2025a). Additionally, on 24 November 2024, a voluntary recall was issued after a lot of retail

raw milk from a California dairy herd tested positive for H5N1 (CDPH, 2024). No resultant human illnesses have been reported, but several cats fed the recalled raw milk experienced laboratory-confirmed infection and the California Department of Public Health acknowledges the potential risk of human infection from contact with or ingestion of the product (LA Public Health, 2024; CDPH, 2024).

Many questions remain about the risk of human infection with H5N1 from fluid dairy milk. Recent studies demonstrate high efficacy of heat inactivation of the virus in milk (Guan et al., 2024; Nooruzzaman et al, 2024); for example, high-temperature short-time (HTST) pasteurization is posited to yield a minimum 12-log reduction in viral loads (Spackman et al., 2024a). Despite the importance of pasteurization in reducing the risk of foodborne illness, consumption of raw milk remains popular in the United States (US); 4.4% of US adults consume raw milk at least once per year (Lando et al., 2022; CDC, 2024b; FDA, 2024b).

Timely research into the human infection risk associated with fluid milk consumption is essential to inform efforts aimed at reducing said risk, including updates to public health policy or implementation of surveillance strategies. The objectives of this study were to (i) estimate the risk of human H5N1 infection from consumption of raw or pasteurized fluid milk, (ii) assess the impact of multiple potential interventions on baseline risk, and (iii) identify and scrutinize knowledge gaps related to human infection risk.

2. METHODS

The approach used in addressing the objectives of this study was a quantitative risk assessment (QRA). This was done in @RISK v.8.6.1 (Lumivero, Denver, CO), an add-on to Microsoft Excel 365 v.2406 (Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA). Two separate QRA models were

developed: one to represent the US pasteurized fluid milk supply chain, and another to represent that of raw milk. These models were developed separately due to fundamental differences in the supply chains, including variations in processing (i.e. pooling of milk from multiple farms), differences in the constituent steps of the cold chain, and distinct distributions for multiple parameters (e.g. herd size). In the raw milk model, two purchasing pathways (farmstore and retail) were differentiated to represent the two available avenues for obtaining raw milk in the US as these pathways also differ in their cold chain parameters (Latorre et al., 2011). However, both models function similarly with 3 main components: Herd Dynamics, Processing & Packaging, and Consumption & Infection. See **Figure 1** for a conceptual model and **Table 1** for a comprehensive list of parameters.

We assume uniform spatial dispersion of the virus in fluid milk; a fixed number of herds supplying milk to a given processing plant; and unspecified fluid milk fat percentage (i.e. skim, 2%, 1%, or whole). Additionally, we ignore the cumulative risk from consumption of multiple servings over time and assume an equitable risk of herd infection for both raw milk and conventional dairies. The implications thereof are elaborated upon in **Section 4**.

2.1. Pasteurized Milk Model

This model represents a given fluid milk processing plant receiving, processing, packaging, and distributing milk from a fixed number of herds. Fluid milk is followed from its harvest from the contributing herds, through processing at the facility, distribution through retail, and culminates in its consumption by a consumer as a 240 mL (approximately 8 ounce) serving.

The herds are of average size H_Z (lactating cows), with a healthy cow producing Y_H gal/d (USDA-NASS, 2022, 2024). Infected cows comprise p_{herd} proportion of the herd and give Y_I

relative yield (%) with milk titers V_M (logTCID$_{50}$/mL) (Caserta et al., 2024; Durst, 2024). A proportion *D* (%) of these animals is identified and their milk is discarded at the time of harvest (i.e. does not enter the bulk tank). Diversion of this milk is understood to mean identification of the animal as unfit to contribute to the milk supply, including but not limited to recognition of clinical illness or a laboratory-confirmed H5N1 infection.

The plant receives milk from 100 herds (*n*), where the number of affected herds (*k*) shipping to that plant is calculated with a hypergeometric distribution such that:

$$\textbf{Eq. 1}: Pr(X = k) = \frac{\binom{K}{k}\binom{N-K}{n-k}}{\binom{N}{n}}$$

where *N* is the number of dairy herds in the US (23,153) (USDA-NASS, 2022) and *n*=100. *K*, the hypergeometric distribution parameter for the number of successes (i.e. affected herds) in the population, was calculated using two distinct approaches to represent the geographic distribution of affected herds in the US as (i) clustered and (ii) homogeneous.

In the (i) clustered approach, *K* is represented by:

$$\textbf{Eq. 2}: K = p_{nat'l} * N$$

Using APHIS detection data obtained 2024 November 5 (USDA-APHIS, 2024b) and the USDA 2022 Census of Agriculture (USDA-NASS), the US herd-level H5N1 prevalence parameter $p_{nat'l}$ was calculated from values of the monthly period prevalences for states (*p(state.month)*) with confirmed H5N1 infections in dairy herds such that:

$$\textbf{Eq. 3}: p(state.month) = \frac{\#\ of\ new\ H5N1\ herd\ detections\ within\ month\ in\ state}{\#\ of\ dairy\ herds\ in\ state}$$

by obtaining the number of herds detected positive in a state from the aforementioned APHIS detection data (USDA-APHIS, 2024b), and the number of herds in that state from the USDA 2022 Census of Agriculture (USDA-NASS). Next, a PERT distribution was fitted with the minimum, most likely and maximum values of *p(state.month)* to form $p_{nat'l}$. In this approach, the

state-month prevalence values used in parameterization of K (and the US herd-level H5N1 prevalence, $p_{nat'l}$) indirectly account for the clustering phenomenon of localized outbreaks amongst herds in geographic proximity supplying milk to the same processing plant.

In the (ii) homogeneous approach, we calculated the number of affected herds in the US in a given month (*#US.month*) by adding the state-month numbers of affected herds (i.e. # of new H5N1 herd detections within month in state) over all affected US states in each month. The *#US.month* values were obtained using the same USDA APHIS dataset as above and represented with a PERT distribution with minimum, most likely, and maximum values of 10, 56, and 192, respectively. Unlike with the use of the clustered approach, this method assumes homogeneous geographic distribution of infected herds, which is a necessary simplifying assumption when the geographic origin of milk is unknown. The clustered approach was used in the baseline pasteurization model, which was also subsequently subjected to the sensitivity and scenario analysis. The impact of the homogenous approaches was assessed in the scenario analysis.

Milk is pooled at the plant and held 24 hours, during which the viral titers undergo logarithmic decay V_D. Temperature-dependent daily log decay (logTCID$_{50}$/d) is calculated such that:

$$\textbf{Eq. 4}: V_D = 0.0596 * e^{0.0993*T}$$

where T is the temperature parameter (°C) and V_D is the log (base-10) decay rate (logTCID$_{50}$/d) during the corresponding cold chain step. This regression model was fit using empirical data from Nooruzzaman et al. (2024). **Eq. 4** was applied to all storage/transportation stages in both models.

The milk is HTST pasteurized, which is estimated to yield >12-log reduction of H5N1 (Spackman et al., 2024a). Pasteurization log reduction (L) is therefore set at a baseline of 12-log,

but was further investigated in scenario analysis (see **Section 2.3**). Milk is packaged into gallon (3,785 mL) containers and the partitioning of viruses, including the resultant quantity in contaminated containers and the probability of container contamination, is modeled according to the Multinomial and Betabinomial functions described in Nauta (2005). Gallons proceed through the cold chain: storage at the plant ($U_{P\text{-}Z}$, $T_{P\text{-}Z}$), transport to retail ($U_{TR\text{-}Z}$, $T_{TR\text{-}Z}$), storage at retail ($U_{SR\text{-}Z}$, $T_{SR\text{-}Z}$), transport to the consumer residence ($U_{TC\text{-}Z}$, $T_{TC\text{-}Z}$), and storage at the residence ($U_{SC\text{-}Z}$, and $T_{SC\text{-}Z}$) (Qian et al., 2023). Duration parameters are expressed in days (d) and temperature parameters in °C (**Table 1**). Food waste of gallons ($P_{Disc\text{-}Gal\text{-}Z}$) and servings ($P_{Disc\text{-}Serv\text{-}Z}$) is accounted for (Buzby et al, 2014).

A 240 mL serving is partitioned from the package and immediately drank by a consumer. The probability that a consumed serving was contaminated (p(serving)) and the quantity of virus in a contaminated serving are calculated with the aforementioned mathematical partitioning methodology of Nauta (2005). An exponential dose-response curve with parameter *r* is employed. Parameter *r* was calibrated using a mustelid model of ingestion of H5N1-contaminated meat (Lipatov et al., 2009), resulting in the following equation:

$$\textbf{Eq. 5}: p_{inf} = 1 - e^{-x*r}$$

where *x* is the count of $TCID_{50}$ present in a contaminated serving, *r* is the dose-response parameter, and p_{inf} is the resultant probability of infection from the contaminated serving. Parameter *r* was further evaluated in scenario analysis (see **Section 2.3**). Finally, the probability of infection (p(infection)) from consuming any serving was calculated as a product of p(serving) and p_{inf}, representing the probability that the serving consumed was contaminated *and* developing infection as a result of the virus quantity in said serving. Thus, p(infection) may be interpreted as the probability of H5N1 infection from any given serving of fluid cow's milk. To

predict the number of H5N1 cases nationally from drinking pasteurized fluid cow's milk, p(infection) was multiplied by the annual number of pasteurized fluid milk servings consumed in the US as reported by an FDA QRA (CDC-FSAN, 2003).

Validation of the pasteurized milk model (i.e. its exposure assessment) was performed using nationwide dairy food surveillance data which reported the $\log EID_{50}$/mL (50% egg infectious doses; considered synonymous with $\log TCID_{50}$ for our purposes) in pasteurized fluid milk at retail. This concentration was backcalculated via the results of quantitative real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (qrRT-PCR) testing (Spackman et al., 2024b). The geographic origin of milk samples analyzed in Spackman et al. (2024b) is unknown. Thus, using the homogeneous approach we estimated K=26, representing the number of H5N1affected herds during the month (i.e. April 2024) in which their surveillance was conducted. Parameter L was set at 0 so that the model would not "remove" any material during the pasteurization step; therefore, the model output reporting the concentration of virus ($\log TCID_{50}$/mL) in pasteurized fluid milk at retail could be interpreted as the equivalent amount of viral genetic material remaining in the product post-pasteurization. This most closely approximates the analytical approach in Spackman et al. (2024b). The results of this simulation were compared graphically against the empirical data in Spackman et al. (2024b) (**Figure 2**). Note that as our model does not differentiate between fat percentages in fluid milk that the results from all fluid milk varieties (e.g. skim, 1%, 2%, and whole) were considered together in this comparison.

2.2. Raw Milk Model

As aforementioned, all 3 model components (Herd Dynamics, Processing & Packaging, and Consumption & Infection) are shared with the pasteurized milk model, with several

adaptations. This model represents a single given herd of size H_W (lactating cows) selling raw fluid milk through either farmstore or retail pathways modeled in parallel. No pooling of milk from multiple herds nor pasteurization occurs. The probability that the herd is infected is given by parameter $p_{nat'l}$ (**Eq. 3**). Sharing parameter $p_{nat'l}$ between the pasteurized and raw milk models is driven by the assumption that no proclivity for H5N1 exists in raw milk herds as opposed to the national average.

Parameters p_{herd}, Y_H, Y_I, V_M, V_D, D, and r are shared with the pasteurized milk model. In the farmstore pathway, gallon packages are sold directly to consumers after storage at the farmstore (U_F, T_F). In the retail pathway, on-farm storage lag ($U_{P\text{-}W}$, $T_{P\text{-}w}$), retail transport ($U_{TR\text{-}W}$, $T_{TR\text{-}W}$), and retail storage (U_{SR}, T_{TR}) are modeled (Latorre et al., 2011). In both models, packages are transported to ($U_{TC\text{-}W}$, $T_{TC\text{-}W}$, T_H,) and stored at ($U_{SC\text{-}W}$, *and* $T_{SC\text{-}W}$) the consumer residence. Temperature parameters remain expressed in °C and duration parameters in days (d) as in the pasteurized milk model. The milk temperature during transport to the residence ($T_{TC\text{-}W}$) is calculated with:

$$\textbf{Eq. 6}: T_{TC-W} = ((T_F \ or \ T_{SR-W}) + T_H)/2$$

where T_F and $T_{SR\text{-}W}$ are the temperatures of storage at the farmstore or retail, respectively, T_H is the temperature of home arrival, and $T_{TC\text{-}W}$ is the temperature during transport to the consumer residence (°C) (Latorre et al., 2011).

Accounting for raw milk perishability, the probability of spoilage and discard of the product is adapted from Crotta et al. (2015) as:

$$\textbf{Eq. 7}: p_i = \frac{e^{-12.6385+0.5022*T+0.06895*h}}{1-e^{-12.6385+0.5022*T+0.06895*h}}$$

where T is the temperature parameter (°C), h is the duration parameter (d), and p_i is the probability of spoilage and subsequent discard of a gallon ($P_{Disc\text{-}Gal\text{-}W}$) or serving ($P_{Disc\text{-}Serv\text{-}W}$).

As with the pasteurized milk model, a 240 mL serving of raw milk is poured and consumed. Calculation of the probability of serving contamination (p(serving)), the quantity of virus in contaminated servings ($\log TCID_{50}$), and the probability of developing infection from the quantity of virus in a contaminated serving (p_{inf}) (**Eq. 5**) is performed with identical methodology to the pasteurized milk model. Similarly, p(infection) was calculated as product of p_{inf} and p(serving). For both the farmstore and retail purchasing pathways, p(infection) is differentiated and reported separately. Unlike in the pasteurized model, the lack of annual national-level per capita raw milk consumption data limits our ability to project the number of H5N1 cases attributable to consumption of this product. Therefore, this metric was not considered in analysis, and its omission is elaborated upon in **Section 4**.

2.3. Analysis

As previously described, the primary risk output reported and used in analysis is the "probability of infection per serving" (p(infection)) for both models. This metric is a function of the probability of developing illness from the quantity of virus in a contaminated serving (p_{inf}), in addition to the probability of consuming a contaminated serving (p(serving)), which is in turn a function of obtaining a contaminated gallon package. Additionally, in the pasteurized milk model, the projected annual number of H5N1 infections nationally attributable to pasteurized milk consumption was considered by multiplying the number of pasteurized fluid milk servings consumed annually in the US by p(infection). As a corresponding consumption metric is not available for raw milk, this projection could not be calculated for that model.

Sensitivity analysis was conducted with partial rank correlation coefficients (□) achieving statistical significance after Bonferroni correction at $p < 0.05$/(number of stochastic parameters

in model); the numbers of parameters was 16 in the pasteurized milk model and 12 in both purchasing pathways for the raw milk model. Parameters with $|\rho| \leq 0.1$ were considered negligible (and of low practical significance) (Schober et al., 2018) and were omitted from further discussion. Coefficient strength ranges were adapted from Schober et al. (2018) as well, where $0.1 < |\rho| < 0.40$ is weak, $0.40 \leq |\rho| < 0.70$ is moderate, and $0.70 \leq |\rho|$ is strong.

Scenario analyses investigated the effects of multiple parameter and model manipulations on p(infection). The purpose of this approach was twofold: to identify and scrutinize parameters that represent knowledge gaps with undue influence on risk projections in this QRA, and to evaluate the risk mitigation effects of several interventions aimed at reducing foodborne H5N1 infection risk. In the pasteurized milk model, we tested the clustered versus homogeneous approach to estimation of the number of H5N1 affected herds in the US as well as 5 levels of the pasteurization log reduction parameter *L* to examine the protective effects of this practice. In the raw milk model, we evaluated infected animal diversion (*D*) and bulk tank PCR testing (parameters *Se*, *Sp* and *LoD*). Finally, in both models, we varied levels of dose-response parameter *r*.

In the pasteurized milk model, *L* was tested at levels 6-, 8-, 10-, 12- (baseline), and 14-log reduction. A minimum level of 6 was chosen based on the thermal inactivation assays of Nooruzzaman et al. (2024), in which HTST pasteurization conditions were concretely demonstrated to completely inactive H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b in raw clinical milk samples of approximately 6 $\log TCID_{50}$/mL starting concentration.

Similarly, in both models, the dose-response parameter *r* was tested at levels 1E-6, 1E-8 (baseline), and 1E-10. This was done to capture uncertainty surrounding the theoretical median infectious dose for human H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b infection by ingestion, as this remains unknown.

This range of values contains infectious doses used in multiple successful laboratory animal inoculation studies: 7 $\log TCID_{50}$ orogastrically in nonhuman primates (Rosenke et al., 2025), $3X10^6$ plaque-forming units (PFU) orogastrically in mice (Guan et al., 2024), 6 $\log TCID_{50}$ oronasally in Holstein calves (Halwe et al., 2024), and 10^6 PFU intranasally in ferrets (Gu et al., 2024).

Lastly, a full factorial scenario analysis was performed to examine two interventions aimed at reducing risk from consumption of raw milk. Diversion parameter *D* was evaluated at baseline 25%, and levels 50% and 75%, reflecting an unspecified "improved ability" to remove the milk of infected cows from the supply chain before harvest and pooling. These levels were tested in combination with implementation of once-daily PCR testing of bulk tank milk. Parameters sensitivity (*Se*), specificity (*Sp*), and limit of detection (*LoD*) are employed regarding PCR testing (Thermo-Fisher Scientific, 2017; Laconi et al., 2020). The model simulates the once-daily collection of a single 0.10 mL aliquot directly from the bulk tank for laboratory testing. Partitioning of spatially uniformly-distributed viruses into this quantity utilizes the same methodology for partitioning bulk tank milk into gallon containers and from gallon containers into an individual serving. The bulk tank milk is held for 24h while the aliquot is transported to the laboratory and tested, with viral decay V_D during this lag time as previously mentioned (Nooruzzaman et al., 2024). Bulk tanks testing true (at a probability *Se*) or false (at a probability 1-*Sp*) positive by PCR are dumped and contribute no risk. Tanks testing negative either by false negative (at a probability 1-*Se*) or falling under the *LoD* proceed through the remainder of the model. An additional, truncated analysis into the impact of a test with improved analytic and/or diagnostic sensitivity is provided in **Analysis S1**.

Each model is simulated at 50,000 iterations generated with Latin hypercube sampling and Mersenne twister pseudorandom number generation. Convergence testing with 5% tolerance and 95% confidence confirmed the sufficiency of the iteration number. Figures were produced and partial rank correlation analysis conducted in R v4.3.2 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

3. RESULTS

3.1. Validation of Pasteurized Model

Projections for the concentration of viral material in gallon packages of pasteurized fluid milk at retail are shown to align with the empirical data from previously conducted surveillance testing (Spackman et al., 2024b). By examination of **Figure 2**, it is evident that the distribution for the pasteurized milk model's estimates fall well within the reported range for titers as given by the mean ± 2 standard deviations. As such, the pasteurized fluid milk model (its exposure assessment component) was considered validated to the extent possible given available data.

3.2. Baseline Scenario

Risk metrics in the pasteurized milk model were very low (**Figure 3**). The 5th and 95th percentiles for p(infection) were 1.77E-16 and 2.98E-13, respectively, with a median value of 5.68E-15 (**Table S1**). The quantity of virus per contaminated serving was similarly low, ranging from 0.00 to 0.30 $\log TCID_{50}$ with a mean value of 0.02 $\log TCID_{50}$. A value of 0.00 $\log TCID_{50}$ corresponds to 1 $TCID_{50}$ in a serving and 0.30 $\log TCID_{50}$ corresponds to 2 $TCID_{50}$ in a serving. Probability of serving contamination took percentiles of 2.43E-08 (5th) and 4.03E-05 (95th) with a median of 7.67E-07. Note that this refers to the presence of live, infectious viruses and not viral

material alone. Out of 50,000 iterations, *n*=290 (0.58%) projected nonzero annual milk-borne human H5N1 infections with 1 (*n*=281), 2 (*n*=8), or 3 (*n*=1) infections projected in these iterations. An iteration represents a full calendar year of average US fluid milk consumption under the simulated conditions.

In the raw milk model, risk metrics were considerably higher (12-log difference in medians) than in the pasteurized milk model (**Figure 3** and **Table S1**). Median p(infection) for the farmstore purchase pathway was 1.13E-03, with percentiles of 5.16E-06 (5th) to 3.82E-02 (95th). Percentiles for the quantity of virus per contaminated serving ranged from 5.22 (5th) to 8.49 (95th) with a median value of 6.88 $\log TCID_{50}$. Median probability of serving contamination was 3.13E-02 (5th percentile: 3.21E-03; 95th percentile: 1.07E-01). Baseline p(infection) indicated negligible differences in risk between the two raw milk purchasing pathways (**Figure 3** and **Table S1**). Paired with the increased access to farmstore-sold over retail raw milk in terms of state legality (Rhodes et al., 2019), further description of results is limited to the farmstore pathway, except in sensitivity analysis (**Section 3.3.**).

3.3. Sensitivity Analysis

Tornado plots are given in **Figures 4a-c**. In both models, the viral titer in infected cow milk V_M was very strongly correlated with the p(infection) (pasteurized: ρ=0.94; raw, farmstore: ρ=0.88; raw, retail: ρ=0.83). This metric was also sensitive to the US herd-level H5N1 prevalence $p_{nat'l}$ in both models (pasteurized: ρ=0.80; raw, farmstore: ρ=0.72; raw, retail: ρ=0.63).

In the pasteurized milk model, parameter p_{herd} (within-herd H5N1 prevalence) demonstrated moderate positive correlation (ρ=0.52). Other parameters (Y_I and H_Z) yielded weak

or negligible correlation. In the raw milk model, weak positive correlation was observed in p_{herd} (farmstore: ρ=0.29; retail: ρ=0.24). For the farmstore purchase pathway, moderate negative correlations were observed for the duration U_F (ρ=-0.62) and temperature T_F (ρ=-0.54) of farmstore storage, and the duration U_{SC} (ρ=-0.48) and temperature T_{SC} (ρ=-0.43) of storage at the consumer residence. Similarly, in the retail purchase pathway, the duration U_{SR} (ρ=-0.54) and temperature T_{SR} (ρ=-0.42) of storage at retail display moderate negative correlation. Infected cow relative milk yield Y_I (farmstore: ρ=0.09; retail: ρ=0.08) was negligible in both purchasing pathways. Compared against their counterparts in the pasteurized milk model, the strengths and directions of statistically significant parameters were comparable with the exceptions of raw milk herd size H_W (farmstore: ρ=-0.12; retail: ρ=-0.10), which was considered weak in the farmstore pathway and negligible in retail, and parameters temperature of home arrival T_H (farmstore: ρ=-0.01) and duration of transport to consumer residence U_{TC} (farmstore: ρ=-0.01), which failed to achieve significance in the retail pathway.

3.4. Scenario Analysis

In the pasteurized model, using the homogeneous rather than clustered approach to the parameterization of the distribution of H5N1 affected herds in the US decreased the median p(infection) by one order of magnitude to 6.30E-16 with percentiles 4.32E-17 (5th) and 2.39E-14 (95th) (**Table S2** and **Figure S1**).

Increases in the pasteurization efficacy parameter L produced a progressively lower median p(infection) at each level tested. The median p(infection) was equal to 3.71E-10 and 3.49E-16 in the 6-log and 14-log reduction pasteurization scenarios, respectively (**Figure 5** and **Table S3**).

A 100-fold increase in the dose-response parameter *r* (i.e. from a baseline of 1E-8 to 1E-6), meaning a decrease in the quantity of virus necessary to result in infection, proportionately increases (by 1-2 logs) p(infection), and vice versa (**Figure 6** and **Table S4**). For example, for pasteurized milk, median p(infection) increases from 5.68E-15 to 5.68E-13 when *r* increases by 2-log. This effect was consistent in both raw milk purchasing pathways (**Figure S2**).

In the raw milk supply chain, bulk tank PCR testing was more effective than improved animal diversion in reducing p(infection). For all three levels of diversion, the addition of bulk tank PCR testing reduced the median p(infection) by 1-2 log (**Figures 7** and **S2**). In the farmstore purchase pathway (**Table S5**), without bulk tank PCR, increasing infected cow diversion over a 25% baseline to 50% reduced the median p(infection) from 1.13E-03 to 7.90E-04; with the addition of bulk tank PCR, this value at 25% diversion was 1.81E-05, then 1.26E-05 at 50% diversion. Results for the retail purchase pathway were similar (**Table S6**). An analysis of a hypothetical improvement in the PCR test *Se* (from 98.4% to 99.9%) demonstrates a 1-2-log decrease in infection risk (**Analysis S1**, **Table S7**, and **Figure S4**).

4. DISCUSSION

This QRA predicts the risk of human H5N1 infection from consumption of pasteurized fluid milk is extremely low (**Figure 3** and **Table S1**). According to research surrounding H5N1 and HTST pasteurization, 12-log reduction is highly efficacious at reducing the public health risk (Spackman et al., 2024a). Even if a small quantity of infectious virus survives pasteurization, partitioning of these units during packaging further reduces infection risk.

It is for this reason that the dose-response parameter *r* is a significant driver of risk and why it was chosen for further investigation in scenario analysis. Under an exponential dose-response model, even 1-2 $TCID_{50}$ can cause infection, albeit with a very low probability.

Therefore, in iterations producing a nonzero amount of live infectious virus in a serving, the human infection risk is similarly nonzero. With the importance of *r* demonstrated in scenario analysis (**Figure 6** and **Table S4**), the need for further research into H5N1 ingestion dose-response is emphasized.

It is important to note that, to date, none of the reported human H5N1 cases have been definitively attributed to consumption of contaminated dairy products. As such, this QRA relies upon the assumption that such a route is indeed possible. A study in nonhuman primates succeeded in establishing subclinical infection with seroconversion after orogastric inoculation (Rosenke et al., 2025). The authors emphasize the validity of macaques as "widely used surrogate models for human infectious diseases." The results of their experiment provide support for the possibility of human infection by ingestion of contaminated dairy products.

Unknowns surrounding the clinical manifestations of human H5N1 infection by ingestion must be considered. The two cases of Michigan dairy workers cite potential exposure from splashing milk and direct contact with oronasal secretions during animal care procedures (Morse et al., 2024). It is unknown what symptoms an infection from ingestion would produce in a human. In laboratory animal studies, clinical signs after H5N1 ingestion ranged from none to weight loss and lethargy, up to and including mortality (Halwe et al., 2024; Rosenke et al., 2025; Lipatov et al., 2009; Guan et al., 2024; Eisfeld et al., 2024; Gu et al., 2024). It is thought that viral contact with the oropharynx during deglutition is the route of entry sufficient to establish infection in these models. Perhaps presentation with conjunctivitis in humans is a function of the route of exposure, including the splash of contaminated material into the mucous membranes of the face. Other routes of exposure may produce a different array of symptoms. Therefore, the absence of a documented case attributable to milk consumption may be a result of

asymptomaticity or under-detection. Exposure in three H5N1 cases remains unattributed as of 28 January 2025 (CDC, 2025).

The aforementioned nonhuman primates study also determined that animals inoculated orogastrically were capable of shedding. This may be interpreted in the context of recent wastewater surveillance of H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b (Tisza et al., 2024). Detection of H5N1 in Texas wastewater coincided with the emergence of the disease syndrome in dairy cattle and predates the official announcement of the causative agent. While genetic analysis of wastewater samples indicates primarily bovine contribution (likely milk effluent from farms or processing plants), viral shedding in human sewage cannot be ruled out (Honein et al., 2024). Synthesizing the available information leaves plausible the conclusion that human infection in the manner described by this QRA is possible and, furthermore, may go undetected: thus, also potentially contributing to the lack of cases identified attributed to fluid milk consumption. Continuation of wastewater surveillance in light of this outbreak is of paramount importance to protect public health and hasten response efforts with detections in previously unaffected areas.

While a >12-log reduction is posited, demonstration of pasteurization efficacy is fundamentally limited by the viral concentration of the initial sample (Nooruzzaman et al., 2024). To definitively demonstrate efficacy, assays with supraphysiological concentrations of virus must be conducted. Pasteurization remains the most effective method for reducing risk amidst this H5N1 outbreak, and per scenario analysis (**Table S3**), should its efficacy be overestimated or a pasteurization failure go undetected, the risk to public health would be substantial.

Nevertheless, the public health burden from pasteurized milk predicted by this QRA is extremely low, in that <1% of iterations predicted a maximum of 3 cases attributable to its

consumption. Note that this output is calculated with per annum consumption data and thus represents the projected *annual* number of infections extrapolating from epidemiologic data collected between March and November of 2024; the implications behind this must be considered. Expansion of the virus into California has caused rapid increases in herd infections; as H5N1 continues to spread, by a means still not well understood, it is unknown where in the epidemic curve the US national herd is currently. The model addresses this with stochasticity in the monthly national herd-level prevalence parameter $p_{nat'l}$, but projections of risk may be over- or underestimated. Related to $p_{nat'l}$, use of the same herd-level infection risk parameter, generated from national detection data, assumes that raw milk herds are not more nor less likely to experience H5N1 infection than conventional herds. While there is no biological reason to suspect this, it is possible that differences in herd management associated with sale of raw milk from an operation could exist that increase or decrease the likelihood of an infection, therefore causing our raw milk risk projections to be under- or overestimates, respectively.

This QRA makes additional assumptions that must be acknowledged for appropriate interpretation of its results. We assume uniform spatial dispersion of virus in milk; if this is incorrect and clustering in milk is present, the resultant distribution for the quantity of virus per serving, and therefore the predicted p(infection), is incorrect as a smaller proportion of packages will contain more viruses paired with a lower probability of serving contamination. This may also be true for different milkfat levels, if viruses distribute differently in fat globules versus the liquid fraction. As Spackman et al. report slight differences in the concentration of viral material amongst different milkfat levels (2024b), continued surveillance is required to determine if this is a function of processing or sample size. Our model does not differentiate between milkfat levels; if sufficient data become available to allow for inclusion of milkfat as a parameter, projections of

risk may shift in either direction. Next, a fixed number (*n*) of herds contribute milk to the modeled plant. Due to the dilution effect demonstrated previously, deviation from a fixed *n* in real life may increase or decrease risk. While our PERT distribution for $p_{nat'l}$, used in both the pasteurized and raw milk models, was fitted to the data for the period between the outbreak start and early November 2024, the parameter distribution encompasses the state-month period prevalences calculated for November and December 2024, and January 2025 (reported by APHIS on 2025 February 12), supporting that the distribution for $p_{nat'l}$ is representative of the outbreak thus far. Our approach to estimation of $p_{nat'l}$ accounted for the spatial clustering of H5N1 affected herds in the US, which is reasonable considering the contagious nature of the infection. However, when the calculated risk is extrapolated at the national level, it may result in overestimation since infection has not yet been reported in many areas of the US. Taking the alternative approach, the assumption of a homogeneous geographic distribution of affected herds may have underestimated the risk experienced locally. While neither approach is perfect, together they provide a range of plausible risk predictions (**Table S2**). Lastly, note that we report p(infection) as the probability of infection per single 8-ounce (240 mL) serving. We assume that p(infection) of a given serving is independent of the "next" consumed serving. In reality, there may be a cumulative risk from consumption of multiple subinfectious doses over time, therefore underestimating true risk.

Ingestion of raw milk carries an inherent risk of foodborne illness (Lando et al., 2022; CDC, 2024b; FDA, 2024b). Our model demonstrates that, without pasteurization, the p(infection) is dramatically higher. Given the popularity of raw milk amongst US consumers, in light of this outbreak there is an urgent need for new technological, educational, and policy solutions to protect the health of raw milk consumers. Here we have demonstrated the efficacy of

two interventions. PCR testing of raw milk herd bulk tanks is highly efficacious in reducing p(infection), more so than our representation of improved identification and diversion of milk from infected cows. However, despite its comparatively weaker effect, diverting infected cows is still important, as this relates to sensitivity in both models to viral titers in infected cow milk (V_M). It is possible that our maximum estimate of 75% diversion is too low, and that higher diversions (>90%) will result in more substantial risk reductions. The ability to achieve this will be determined by labor, diagnostic, economic, and practical constraints on any given operation. It is also possible that the development of improved molecular diagnostics will lead to better sensitivity, specificity, and limits of detection that will increase the risk mitigation value of these technologies in bulk tank milk testing. The potential impact of such a diagnostic test is briefly examined in **Analysis S1**. The USDA is currently implementing a bulk tank milk testing surveillance plan at the state and locoregional levels (USDA-APHIS, 2024a).

As seen in sensitivity analysis (**Figure 4**), the predicted low infection risk for pasteurized milk is also due in small part to the dilution effect of pooling from multiple herds and the reduced milk yield of infected cows that are not diverted from the supply chain. Also in sensitivity analysis, the decreased H5N1 infection risk in raw milk associated with increased storage temperatures/times is a function of viral decay and milk spoilage; excessive or inappropriate storage of dairy products is not advisable due to the risk of illness from other foodborne pathogens that may be present in raw milk.

Additional information is needed to make a QRA accounting for all dairy products. As research characterizing H5N1 in other dairy foods becomes available, the framework of our model may be adapted. As of 6 December 2024, a new Federal Order has been mandated requiring processor-level raw milk H5N1 surveillance (USDA-APHIS, 2024a). Implementation

of this initiative is supported by the projections of our models, and results from this heightened surveillance will prove useful in future model developments. For example, academics and industry stakeholders have expressed interest in studying H5N1 in raw milk cheese. The expansion of our models to fill this knowledge gap is being pursued by the authors.

In conclusion, based on the results of this QRA and the most up-to-date scientific literature, the risk of human H5N1 infection from consumption of pasteurized fluid milk is extremely low. Consumption of raw milk has historically been discouraged due to the risk of foodborne illness; in the context of this outbreak, the emergence of a novel potential milkborne pathogen emphasizes both the risk of this practice and the need for solutions to effectively protect public health. This risk may be reduced with implementation of risk mitigation interventions, including thermal treatment and bulk tank PCR testing. As new information becomes available, the models will be refined and new applications considered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Research reported in this publication was supported by the Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health of the National Institutions of Health (NIH) under Award Number T32ODO011000 to KK. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Center for Research Resources or the NIH. Additionally, this research was partially supported by grants to RI from the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, USDA, Hatch under Accession Number 7000433, as well as Multistate Research Funds Accession Number 1016738.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Alexander DJ. An overview of the epidemiology of avian influenza. Vaccine. 2007 Jul 26;25(30):5637-44. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2006.10.051

Bevins SN, Shriner SA, Cumbee JC, Dilione KE, Douglass KE, Ellis JW, *et al*. Intercontinental Movement of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza A(H5N1) Clade 2.3.4.4 Virus to the United States, 2021. Emerg Infect Dis. 2022;28(5):1006-1011. doi: 10.3201/eid2805.220318

Burrough ER, Magstadt DR, Petersen B, Timmermans SJ, Gauger PC, Zhang J, *et al*. Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza A(H5N1) Clade 2.3.4.4b Virus Infection in Domestic Dairy Cattle and Cats, United States, 2024. Emerg Infect Dis. 2024;30(7):1335-1343. doi: 10.3201/eid3007.240508

Buzby JC, Wells HF, and Hyman J. The Estimated Amount, Value, and Calories of Postharvest Food Losses at the Retail and Consumer Levels in the United States, EIB-121, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, February 2014.

California Department of Public Health. California acts to protect public health: CDPH warns against drinking single lot of raw milk following bird flu detection; secures voluntary recall. 2024 Nov 24. Available from: https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/OPA/Pages/NR24-039.aspx

Caserta LC, Frye EA, Butt SL, Laverack M, Nooruzzaman M, Covaleda LM *et al*. Spillover of highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 virus to dairy cattle. Nature. 2024;634:669-676. doi: 10.1038/s41586-024-07849-4

Crotta M, Paterlini F, Rizzi R, Guitian, J. Consumers' behavior in quantitative microbial risk assessment for pathogens in raw milk: Incorporation of the likelihood of consumption as a function of storage time and temperature. J Dairy Sci. 2015 Oct 14;99(2):1029-38. doi: 10.3168/jds.2015-10175

Durst, P. HPAI dairy herd infection report. Michigan State University Extension. 2024 May 24. Available from: https://www.canr.msu.edu/news/hpai-dairy-herd-infection-case-report

Eisfeld, AJ, Biswas A, Guan L, Gu C, Maemura T, Trifkovic S, *et al*. Pathogenicity and transmissibility of bovine H5N1 influenza virus. Nature. 2024 July 8;633:426-432. doi: 10.1038/s41586-024-07766-6

Gu C, Maemura T, Guan L, Eisfeld AJ, Biswas A, Kiso M, *et al*. A human isolate of bovine H5N1 is transmissible and lethal in animal models. Nature. 2024 Oct 28. doi: 10.1038/s41586-024-08254-7

Guan L, Eisfeld AJ, Pattinson D, Gu C, Biswas A, Maemura T, *et al*. Cow's Milk Containing Avian Influenza A(H5N1) Virus - Heat Inactivation and Infectivity in Mice. N Engl J Med. 2024 Jul 4;391(1):87-90. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2405495

Halwe NJ., et al. H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b dynamics in experimentally infected calves and cows. Nature. 2024 Sep 25;637:903-912. doi: 10.1038/s41586-024-08063-y

Honein MA, Olsen SJ, Jernigan DB, Daskalakis DC. Challenges and opportunities for wastewater monitoring of influenza viruses during the multistate outbreak of highly pathogenic avian influenza A(H5N1) virus in dairy cattle and poultry. 2024 Nov 6. Am J Public Health. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2024.307860

Kandeil A, Patton C, Jones JC, Jeevan T, Harrington WN, Trifkovic S, *et al*. Rapid evolution of A(H5N1) influenza viruses after intercontinental spread to North America. Nat Commun. 2023 May 29;14(3082). doi: 10.1038/s41467-023-38415-7

Laconi A, Fortin A, Bedendo G, Shibata A, Sakoda Y, Awuni JA *et al*. Detection of avian influenza virus: a comparative study of the *in silico* and *in vitro* performances of current RT-qPCR assays. Sci Rep. 2020 May 21;10:8441. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-64003-6

Los Angeles County Department of Public Health. UPDATED: Confirmed H5 bird flu detected in Los Angeles County cats that consumed recalled raw milk – Public health investigating additional possible cases in cats. 2024 Dec 18. Available from: http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/phcommon/public/media/mediapubhpdetail.cfm?prid=4908

Lando AM, Bazaco MC, Parker CC, Ferguson M. Characteristics of U.S. consumers reporting past year intake of raw (unpasteurized) milk: Results from the 2016 Food Safety Survey and 2019 Food Safety and Nutrition Survey. J Food Protect. 2022 Mar 25;85(7):1036-1043.

Latorre, AA, Pradhan AK, van Kessel JAS, Karns JS, Boor KJ, Rice DH *et al*. Quantitative risk assessment of listeriosis due to consumption of raw milk. J. Food Protect. 2011 Aug;74(8):1268-81. doi: 10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-10-554

Lipatov AS, Kwon YK, Pantin-Jackwood MJ, Swayne DE. Pathogenesis of H5N1 influenza virus infections in mice and ferret models differs according to respiratory tract or digestive system exposure. J Infect Dis. 2009 Mar 01;199(5):717-725. doi: 10.1086/596740

Morse J, Coyle J, Mikesell L, Stoddard B, Eckel S, Weinberg M, *et al*. Influenza A(H5N1) virus infection in two dairy farm workers in Michigan. New Engl J Med. 2024 Aug 7;391:963-4. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2407264

Nauta MJ. Microbiological risk assessment models for partitioning and mixing during food handling. Int J Food Microbiol. 2005 Apr 15;100:311-322. doi: 10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2004.10.027

Neumann G, Kawaoka Y. Highly pathogenic H5N1 avian influenza virus outbreak in cattle: the knowns and unknowns. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2024 Jul 25;22:525-526. doi: /10.1038/s41579-024-01087-1

Nooruzzaman M, Covaleda LM, Martin, NH, Koebel K, Ivanek R, Alcaine SD, Diel DG. Thermal inactivation spectrum of influenza A H5N1 virus in raw milk. 2024 Sep 24. [Preprint] Available from: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.09.21.614205v1

Qian C, Murphy SI, Lott TT, Martin NH, Wiedmann M. Development and deployment of a supply-chain digital tool to predict fluid-milk spoilage due to psychrotolerant sporeformers. J Dairy Sci. 2023 Aug 23;106(12):8415-33. doi: 10.3168/jds.2023-23673

Rhodes MT, Kuchler F, McClelland K, Hamrick KS. Consumer food safety practices: raw milk consumption and food thermometer use, EIB-205, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, January 2019.

Rosenke K., et al. Pathogenesis of bovine H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b infection in Macaques. Nature. 2025 Jan 15. doi: 10.1038/s41586-025-08609-8

Schober P, Boer C, Schwarte LA. Correlation coefficients: Appropriate use and interpretation. Anesth Analg. 2018 May;126(5):1763-1768. doi: 10.1213/ANE.0000000000002864

Spackman E, Anderson N, Walker S, Suarez DL, Jones DR, McCoig *et al*. Inactivation of highly pathogenic avian influenza virus with high-temperature short time continuous flow pasteurization and virus detection in bulk milk tanks. J Food Protect. October 2024a;87(10). doi: 10.1016/j.jfp.2024.100349

Spackman E, Jones DR, McCoig AM, Colonius TJ, Goraichuk IV, Suarez DL. Characterization of highly pathogenic avian influenza virus in retail dairy products in the US. J Virol. 2024b Jul 23;98(7). doi: 10.1128/jvi.00881-24

Swayne DE. Avian Influenza. 2023 Jun. In: Merck Veterinary Manual. Available from: https://www.merckvetmanual.com/poultry/avian-influenza/avian-influenza. Accessed 2024 May 17.

Thermo Fisher Scientific. VetMAX-Gold SIV solutions. 2017. Available from: https://assets.thermofisher.com/TFS-Assets/GSD/Flyers/animalhealth_flyer_vetmaxgold_siv_CO121090.pdf

Tisza MJ, Hanson BM, Clark JR, Wang L, Payne K, Ross MC, *et al*. Virome sequencing identifies H5N1 influenza in wastewater from nine cities. 2024 May 10. [Preprint] Available from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.05.10.24307179v1.full.pdf

U.S. Department of Agriculture. USDA announces new federal order, begins national milk testing strategy to address H5N1 in dairy herds. 2024 Dec 6. Available from: https://www.usda.gov/article/usda-announces-new-federal-order-begins-national-milk-testing-strategy-address-h5n1-dairy-herds

a. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. USDA builds on actions to protect livestock and public health from H5N1 avian influenza. 2024 Oct 30. Available from: https://www.aphis.usda.gov/news/agency-announcements/usda-builds-actions-protect-livestock-public-health-h5n1-avian-influenza

b. U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. HPAI confirmed cases in livestock. Available from: https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian-influenza/hpai-detections/hpai-confirmed-cases-livestock

U.S. Department of Agriculture National Agricultural Statistics Service. 2022 Census of Agriculture. Complete data available at: www.nass.usda.gov/AgCensus

U.S. Department of Agriculture National Agricultural Statistics Service. Quick Stats database query. Available at: https://www.nass.usda.gov/Quick_Stats/

a. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. H5 Bird Flu: Current Situation. 2024-2025. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/bird-flu/situation-summary/index.html

b. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Raw Milk. 2024 Apr 29. Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/food-safety/foods/raw-milk.html

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition. Quantitative assessment of relative risk to public health from foodborne *Listeria monocytogenes* among selected ready-to-eat foods. September 2003.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration. Food Safety and Raw Milk. 2024 Mar 5. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/food/buy-store-serve-safe-food/food-safety-and-raw-milk. Accessed 2024 May 16.

Uyeki TM, Milton S, Hamid CA, Webb CR, Presley SM, Shetty V *et al*. Highly pathogenic avian influenza A(H5N1) virus infection in a dairy farm worker. N Engl J Med. 2024 May 3;390:2028-2029. doi: 10.1056/nejmc2405371

World Health Organization. Genetic and antigenic characteristics of zoonotic influenza A viruses and development of candidate vaccine viruses for pandemic preparedness. 2023 Feb 24.

World Organisation for Animal Health World Animal Health Information System. United States of America - Influenza A viruses of high pathogenicity (Inf. with) (non-poultry including wild birds) (2017-). Available from: https://wahis.woah.org/#/in-event/4451/dashboard

TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE 1 | Parameters used in a quantitative risk assessment of human H5N1 infection from consumption of pasteurized or raw fluid cow's milk.

	Pasteurized Milk Model (*Z*)		**Raw Milk Model (*W*)**	
Parameter (notation)	**Value**	**Source**	**Value**	**Source**
Number of herds per plant (*n*)	100	Assumption	NA	NA
US Herd-Level H5N1 Prevalence (unitless) ($p_{nat'l}$)	PERT(0.00080321, 0.00080321, 0.2363)	USDA-APHIS, 2024b; USDA-NASS, 2022; USDA-NASS, 2024	PERT(0.00080321, 0.00080321, 0.2363)	USDA-APHIS, 2024b; USDA-NASS, 2022; USDA-NASS, 2024
Number of affected herds in US (*K*)	See **Eqs. 2-3**.	USDA-APHIS, 2024b; USDA-NASS, 2022; USDA-NASS, 2024	NA	USDA-APHIS, 2024b; USDA-NASS, 2022; USDA-NASS, 2024
Number of herds in US (*N*)	23,153	USDA-NASS, 2022	NA	NA
Number of affected herds shipping to plant (*k*)	See **Eqs. 1-3**.	USDA-NASS, 2022	NA	NA
Average herd size (lactating cows) (*H*)	TRIANG(20, 350, 5000)	USDA-NASS, 2022	TRIANG(2, 20, 50)	Expert elicitation
Within-Herd H5N1 Prevalence (unitless) (p_{herd})	UNIF(0.0342, 0.2349)	Caserta et al., 2024	UNIF(0.0342, 0.2349)	Caserta et al., 2024
Healthy cow milk yield (gal/d) (Y_H)	PERT(8, 9, 10)	USDA-NASS, 2024	PERT(8, 9, 10)	USDA-NASS, 2024
Infected cow relative milk	PERT(0.5, 0.6, 1.0)	Durst, 2024	PERT(0.5, 0.6, 1.0)	Durst, 2024

yield (unitless) (Y_I)				
Viral titer in infected cow milk (logTCID$_{50}$/mL) (V_M)	PERT(4.0, 6.5, 8.8)	Caserta et al., 2024	PERT(4.0, 6.5, 8.8)	Caserta et al., 2024
Viral decay rate (log/d) (V_D)	See **Eq. 4**.	Nooruzzaman et al., 2024	See **Eq. 4**.	Nooruzzaman et al., 2024
Duration of finished product storage at plant/farm pre-shipping[1] (d) (U_P)	UNIF(1, 2)	Qian et al., 2023	UNIF(0.167, 0.5)	Latorre et al., 2011
Temperature of storage at plant/farm pre-shipping[1] (°C) (T_P)	UNIF(3.5, 4.5)	Qian et al., 2023	UNIF(2.2, 4.4)	Latorre et al., 2011
Duration of transport to retail (d) (U_{TR})	UNIF(1, 5, 10)	Qian et al., 2023	TRIANG(0.0716, 0.0889, 0.247)	Latorre et al., 2011
Temperature of transport to retail (°C) (T_{TR})	TRIANG(1.7, 4.4, 10)	Qian et al., 2023	TRIANG(3.6, 6.5, 10.9)	Latorre et al., 2011
Duration of storage at retail (d) (U_{SR})	TruncN(1.82, 3.3, (0.042, 10.0))	Qian et al., 2023	UNIF(1, 7)	Latorre et al., 2011
Duration of storage at farmstore (d) (U_F)	NA	NA	UNIF(1, 7)	Latorre et al., 2011
Temperature of storage at retail (°C) (T_{SR})	TruncN(2.3, 1.8, (-1.4, 5.4))	Qian et al., 2023	TRIANG(-6.1787, 4.4444, 14.471, Trunc(0,))	Latorre et al., 2011
Temperature of	NA	NA	TRIANG(-	Latorre et al.,

storage at farmstore (°C) (T_F)			6.1787, 4.4444, 14.471,Trunc(0,))	2011
Duration of transport to consumer residence (d) (U_{TC})	TruncN(0.042, 0.02, (0.01, 0.24))	Qian et al., 2023	TRIANG(0.012, 0.0271, 0.1731)	Latorre et al., 2011
Temperature of transport to consumer residence (°C) (T_{TC})	TruncN(2.3, 1.8, (0,10))	Qian et al., 2023	See **Eq. 6**.	Latorre et al., 2011
Home-arrival temperature (°C) (T_H)	NA	NA	TRIANG(-3.3804, 8.8889, 21.156, Trunc(0,))	Latorre et al., 2011
Duration of storage at consumer residence (d) (U_{SC})	UNIF(1, 35)	Qian et al., 2023	PERT(0.5, 2.5, 8.5)	Latorre et al., 2011
Temperature of storage at consumer residence (°C) (T_{SC})	TruncLaplace(4.06, 2.31, (-1, 15))	Qian et al., 2023	TRIANG(-5.0221, 2.7778, 17.238)	Latorre et al., 2011
Probability of gallon discard (unitless) ($P_{Disc\text{-}Gal}$)	0.12	Buzby et al., 2014	See **Eq. 7**.	Crotta et al., 2015
Probability of serving discard (unitless) ($P_{Disc\text{-}Serv}$)	0.20	Buzby et al., 2014	See **Eq. 7**.	Crotta et al., 2015
Dose-response parameter r (r)	Baseline: 1.0E-08 Scenarios: 1.0E-06,	Lipatov et al., 2009	Baseline: 1.0E-08 Scenarios: 1.0E-06,	Lipatov et al., 2009

	1.0E-10		1.0E-10	
Bulk tank PCR test sensitivity (unitless) (*Se*)	NA	NA	0.984 See **Analysis S1**.	Burrough et al., 2024; Thermo-Fisher Scientific, 2017
Bulk tank PCR test specificity (unitless) (*Sp*)	NA	NA	0.991	Burrough et al., 2024; Thermo-Fisher Scientific, 2017
PCR test limit of detection ($logEID_{50}$/100 ul) (*LoD*)	NA	NA	1.5 See **Analysis S1**.	Laconi et al., 2020
Pasteurization log reduction (log) (*L*)	Baseline: 12 Scenarios: 6, 8, 10, 14	Spackman et al., 2024a; Nooruzzaman et al., 2024	NA	NA
Infected cows' milk diversion (unitless) (*D*)	0.25	Assumption	Baseline: 0.25 Scenarios: 0.50, 0.75	Assumption

[1]The duration/temperature of storage at the processing plant for the pasteurized milk supply chain, or the duration/temperature of holding at the farm before shipping to retail in the retail purchasing pathway for the raw supply chain.

Note: "log" denotes log_{10}

FIGURE 1 | Conceptual model for a quantitative risk assessment of human H5N1 infection from consumption of pasteurized or raw fluid cow's milk.



FIGURE 2 | Probability density histogram of the predicted concentration (log_{10}TCID50/mL) of viral material in pasteurized milk gallon containers at retail. Overlaid vertical lines are the mean (solid) ± 2 standard deviations (dashed) $log_{10}EID_{50}$/mL reported for retail fluid milk in Spackman et al. (2024b).



FIGURE 3 | Violin plots for the baseline probability of H5N1 infection per serving (p(infection)) of pasteurized or farmstore- or retail-purchased raw milk. For the purposes of visualization, a logarithmic (base-10) Y-axis is employed.



FIGURES 4A-C | Sensitivity of the probability of infection per serving (p(infection)) of (a) pasteurized or raw milk obtained through (b) farmstore or (c) retail sale to model parameters achieving statistical (Bonferroni-corrected p ≤ 0.05/number of evaluated parameters in the model) and practical (correlation coefficient |⍰| > 0.1) significance.



(**a**)



(**b**)



(**c**)

FIGURE 5 | Violin plots for the scenario analysis of the impact of varying pasteurization log reduction parameter *L* on the probability of H5N1 infection per pasteurized milk serving (p(infection)). For the purposes of visualization, a logarithmic (base-10) Y-axis is employed.



FIGURE 6 | Violin plots for the scenario analysis of the impact of varying dose-response parameter *r* on the probability of infection per pasteurized or farmstore-purchased raw milk serving (p(infection)). For the purposes of visualization, a logarithmic (base-10) Y-axis is employed.



FIGURE 7 | Violin plots for the scenario analysis of bulk tank milk PCR testing (defined by parameters *Se*, *Sp* and *LoD*) and improved infected cow diversion (parameter *D*) on the probability of infection per farmstore-purchased raw milk serving (p(infection)). For the purposes of visualization, a logarithmic (base-10) Y-axis is employed.




Probability density
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
0
2
4
logTCID50 /mL


Probability of infection per serving, log10
0
-3
-6
-9
-12
-15
-18
Pasteurized
Raw Farmstore
Raw Retail


Pasteurized
Viral Titer in Infected Cow Milk
U.S. Herd-Level H5N1 Prevalence
Within-Herd H5N1 Prevalence
Infected Cow Relative Milk Yield
0.94
0.80
0.52
0.15
Parameter
-0.25
0.00
0.25
0.50
0.75
1.00
Partial Rank Correlation Coefficient


Raw - Farmstore
Viral Titer in Infected Cow Milk
U.S. Herd-Level H5N1 Prevalence
Within-Herd H5N1 Prevalence
Average Herd Size
Temperature of Storage at Consumer Residence
Duration of Storage at Consumer Residence
Temperature of Storage at Farmstore
Duration of Storage at Farmstore
0.88
0.72
0.29
-0.12
-0.43
-0.48
-0.54
-0.62
Parameter
-0.75
-0.50
-0.25
0.00
0.25
0.50
0.75
1.00
Partial rank correlation coefficient


Raw - Retail
Viral Titer in Infected Cow Milk
U.S. Herd-Level H5N1 Prevalence
Within-Herd H5N1 Prevalence
Temperature of Storage at Retail
Duration of Storage at Retail
Parameter
0.83
0.63
0.24
-0.42
-0.54
-0.75
-0.50
-0.25
0.00
0.25
0.50
0.75
1.00
Partial rank correlation coefficient


Probability of infection per serving, log10
-6
-7
-8
-9
-10
-11
-12
-13
-14
-15
-16
-17
6-log reduction
8-log reduction
10-log reduction
12-log reduction
14-log reduction
Baseline


Probability of infection per serving, log10
0
-1
-2
-3
-4
-5
-6
-7
-8
-9
-10
-11
-12
-13
-14
-15
-16
-17
-18
-19
-20
1E-6 Pasteurized
1E-8 Pasteurized Baseline
1E-10 Pasteurized
1E-6 Raw
1E-8 Raw Baseline
1E-10 Raw


Probability of infection per serving, log10
0
-1
-2
-3
-4
-5
-6
-7
-8
-9
-10
-11
-12
-13
-14
25% diversion No PCR
50% diversion No PCR
75% diversion No PCR
25% diversion PCR
50% diversion PCR
75% diversion PCR


Probability of infection per serving, log_{10}
-11
-12
-13
-14
-15
-16
-17
Clustered
Homogeneous


Probability of infection per serving, log10
0
-1
-2
-3
-4
-5
-6
-7
-8
-9
-10
-11
-12
-13
-14
1E-6 Farmstore
1E-8 Farmstore Baseline
1E-10 Farmstore
1E-6 Retail
1E-8 Retail Baseline
1E-10 Retail


Probability of infection per serving, log_{10}
0
-1
-2
-3
-4
-5
-6
-7
-8
-9
-10
-11
-12
-13
25% diversion No PCR
50% diversion No PCR
75% diversion No PCR
25% diversion PCR
50% diversion PCR
75% diversion PCR


Probability of infection per serving, log_{10}
-3
-6
-9
-12
-15
LoD 1.5
Se 98.4%
Baseline
LoD 1.5
Se 99.9%
LoD 1.0
Se 98.4%
LoD 1.0
Se 99.9%


PASTEURIZED MILK MODEL
1 Herd Dynamics
Initial Population of Cows
# of affected herds
Average herd size
H5N1 within-herd prevalence
Quantity of Virus in Raw Bulk Tank
Milk production
Shedding
2 Processing & Packaging
Quantity of Virus in Pasteurized Bulk Tank
1 Pasteurization
Quantity of Virus in Pasteurized Milk Gallon
Partitioning
Distribution (retail) & viral decay
3 Consumption & Infection
Quantity of Virus in Pasteurized Milk Serving
Partitioning
Food waste
Storage (residence) & viral decay
Consumption of Pasteurized Milk Containing H5N1
National consumption data
Probability of Infection per Serving
Probability of serving contamination
Probability of infection from contaminated serving (exponential dose-response)
RAW MILK MODEL
1 Herd Dynamics
Initial Population of Cows
Herd size
H5N1 within-herd prevalence
Probability of purchase from affected herd
1 Improved diversion of infected cows
Quantity of Virus in Raw Bulk Tank
Milk production
Shedding
2 PCR testing of bulk tank
2 Processing & Packaging
Quantity of Virus in Raw Milk Gallon
Partitioning
Distribution (retail and farmstore), bacterial spoilage & viral decay
3 Consumption & Infection
Quantity of Virus in Raw Milk Serving
Partitioning
Storage (residence), bacterial spoilage & viral decay
Consumption of Raw Milk Containing H5N1
Probability of Infection per Serving
Probability of serving contamination
Probability of infection from contaminated serving (exponential dose-response)
Key
Main model component
Risk intervention