Quantitative microbial 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 H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b into dairy cattle has raised concerns over the safety of fluid milk. While no foodborne infection has been reported in humans, this strain has infected at least 70 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 warranted. This farm-to-table quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA) uses stochastic models to assess the risk of human infection from consumption of raw and pasteurized fluid cow's milk from the United States supply chains. 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 7.66E-19 (2.39E-20, 4.02E-17), 1.56E-7 (6.67E-10, 1.28E-5), and 1.40E-7 (6.65E-10, 1.13E-05), respectively. Our results confirm 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 numerically 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 mechanistic epidemiologic models for informing public health responses amidst outbreaks with foodborne potential and highlight the need for additional research into raw milk consumption patterns to better understand this exposure pathway.

Keywords: H5N1, quantitative microbial 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 were 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 1,000 herds nationwide as of 26 September 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 live virus (4.0-8.8 $\log_{10}TCID_{50}$/mL (tissue culture infectious dose 50, hereafter referred to as "$\log TCID_{50}$").

As of 26 September 2025, out of 70 total human cases, 41 were attributed to dairy cattle exposure in addition to 1 mortality with "other animal exposure" (Uyeki et al., 2024; CDC, 2025a). 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). No confirmed cases have been definitively attributed to consumption of dairy products, although two raw milk operations issued product recalls after their cattle were determined to be infected. The resultant risk to consumers was acknowledged by public health agencies (LA Public Health, 2024; CDPH, 2024).

While primarily considered respiratory pathogens, evidence exists that avian influenza viruses (AIVs), including H5N1, are infectious via the gastrointestinal (GI) tract, and that human infection via the foodborne route is plausible. Bullock et al. (2025) provide a comprehensive review of this evidence, highlighting successful experimental H5N1 infections in cats, swine, guinea pigs, hamsters, mice, and ferrets after oral, orogastric, or intragastric inoculation. Previous research has also proven the ability of H5N1 to bind to sialic acid receptors in human GI tissue (Shu et al., 2010) and demonstrated viral replication in the intestines of a pediatric patient that died of H5N1 (Uiprasertkul et al., 2005). Milk from cows infected with H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b is known to be infectious by ingestion in mice (Eisfeld et al., 2024; Guan et al., 2024) and by orogastric inoculation of cynomolgus macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*) with a bovine isolate establishing subclinical infection with seroconversion (Rosenke et al., 2025). It is thought that exposure of the pharynx to, and/or absorption via GI lymphatics of, infectious virions contributes to the establishment of infection (Bullock et al., 2025; Rosenke et al., 2025; Shinya et al., 2011). Human cases with known cattle exposure cite contact with raw milk prior to illness (Morse et al., 2024). The epidemiological study by Garg et al. (2024) of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) additionally found that, among 25 dairy workers who contracted avian influenza, “4 (16%) were exposed to cows and 21 (84%) to both cows and raw milk;” in their Table 1 they additionally clarify that “raw milk” refers to raw milk consumption, raw milk exposure, or both.”

Given the plausibility of human infection by ingestion and the demonstration of copious shedding from infected cows, questions remain about the risk of human H5N1 infection from consuming fluid dairy milk. Heat inactivation assays in milk demonstrate efficacy (Guan et al., 2024; Nooruzzaman et al, 2025a); 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 effectiveness 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).

Research into the human H5N1 infection risk associated with fluid milk consumption is critical to inform efforts aimed at reducing said risk in the current and potential future outbreaks, including updates to public health policy or implementation of surveillance strategies. Existing risk assessments report the risk to pasteurized milk consumers as negligible to low, and moderately uncertain, while the risk to raw milk consumers is numerically higher (Chen et al., 2025; Browne et al., 2025). However, these publications are either qualitative in nature and emphasize international rather than domestic populations or fail to represent farm-to-table dynamics that may mechanistically impact risk, such as diversion of infected cows or viral decay during storage. Thus, the objectives of this study were to (i) estimate the risk of human H5N1 infection from consumption of raw or pasteurized fluid milk during the early epidemic (March-October 2024), (ii) assess the impact of multiple potential interventions on baseline risk, and (iii) identify and scrutinize knowledge gaps related to milkborne human infection risk.

2. METHODS

To evaluate the extent of the risk posed to milk consumers by the bovine H5N1 outbreak, we performed a quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA). In accordance with the Codex Alimentarius (FAO, WHO, 2014), a QMRA consists of four systematic steps: (i) hazard identification, (ii) hazard characterization, (iii) exposure assessment, and (iv) risk characterization. These guidelines formed the basis of our analytical approach, with additional

considerations from Boles et al. (2022) and ACMSF (2012). The purpose of this QMRA was to estimate the risk of human H5N1 infection per individual 240 mL (8 fluid ounce) serving of fluid dairy milk of unspecified fat percentage. This involved construction of two bottom-up stochastic QMRA models (Bosch et al., 2018), leveraging the structures of previously described pasteurized (Qian et al., 2023) and raw milk (Latorre et al., 2011) supply chains. The models were built in Microsoft Excel 365 v.2406 (Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA) with @RISK v8.6.1 (Lumivero, Denver, CO). The main outcome of interest was the probability of infection per serving (hereafter "p(infection)"): a function of the probability of serving contamination ("p(serving)") and the quantity of virus in said serving ("Q_{serv}"). We also report the projected annual number of milkborne H5N1 infections, as detailed in *2.4 Risk Characterization*.

2.1 Hazard Identification

In a study of n=297 pasteurized retail dairy product samples from 17 states, viral RNA from bovine H5N1 was detected via PCR in approximately 20% of fluid milk samples, but no infectious virus was detected by egg inoculation (Spackman et al., 2024). However, the live virions present in raw milk from infected cows are known to be infectious *in vitro* (Guan et al., 2024) and *in vivo* (Guan et al., 2024; Eisfeld et al., 2024). The strain of H5N1 responsible for the outbreak is infectious in humans (Morse et al., 2024; Uyeki et al., 2024; CDC, 2025a), and exposure to raw milk is a reported risk factor (Garg et al., 2025). Finally, research in both animal models and human cells supports the hypothesis that H5N1 is infectious via GI exposure (Rosenke et al., 2025; Shu et al., 2010; Bullock et al., 2025; Eisfeld et al., 2024; Guan et al., 2024, Shinya et al., 2011; Lipatov et al., 2009). As such, there is sufficient evidence to warrant investigation into the risk of human H5N1 infection via fluid dairy milk products due to the 2024

spillover event. Our position aligns with the current US government's investment in preventing consumer exposure through control strategies, including a Federal Order in April 2024 requiring cattle be tested prior to interstate movement, and (ii) a December 2024 Federal Order that implemented mandatory testing/reporting under the National Milk Testing Strategy (USDA, 2024). The latter Federal Order released by USDA-APHIS (2024) states verbatim that “APHIS has determined that good cause exists to implement these additional requirements without notice and comment, as evidence has shown that raw, unpasteurized milk is a vehicle for the spread of the HPAI H5N1 virus.” They also emphasize that, “while studies have confirmed pasteurized milk and dairy products are safe, raw, unpasteurized milk consumption remains a risk for multiple diseases including HPAI.”

2.2 Exposure Assessment

Two separate models were developed to represent the US pasteurized and raw fluid milk supply chains from farm to table. This was done due to fundamental differences in these 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 complete list of parameters.

2.2.1 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 at the contributing farms, through processing at the facility, distribution through retail, and culminates in its consumption by a consumer as an individual serving.

The lactating cow herds are of average size H_Z 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 laboratory confirmation of 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 K, the hypergeometric distribution parameter for the number of successes (i.e. affected herds) in the population, is represented by:

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

Using APHIS detection data obtained on November 5, 2024 (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 total 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. To assess the impact of assuming clustering of infected herds supplying milk to a modeled plant (**Assumption 2**), we compared predictions with a model that relaxed this assumption, and instead modeled a homogeneous distribution of infected herds (see **Analysis S5.1** in *Supplementary Materials*).

The probability that a processing plant receives milk from at least one infected herd is modeled with **Eq. 1** as Pr($X > 0$) in each iteration. 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 model was fit using empirical data from Nooruzzaman et al. (2025a), which consisted of viral decay rates in replicates run in fluid milk at 4, 20, 30, and 37°C (**Analysis 6** in *Supplementary Information*). **Eq. 4** was applied to all storage/transportation stages in both parameterized and raw models.

The milk is HTST pasteurized, which is estimated to yield >12-log reduction of H5N1 (Spackman et al., 2024a). 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 binomial distribution and gamma function, respectively (Nauta 2005). As we assume that virions do not cluster in fluid milk (**Assumption 3**), and the impact of this assumption is tested in **Analysis S5.2** in *Supplementary Materials*.

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).

2.2.2 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. Specifically, the raw milk 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. The parameter H_W was parameterized as PERT(2,25,80), based on the input from two dairy practitioners with more than 10 years of experience serving farms that sell raw milk in NY, who provided their expert opinions that the vast majority of farms selling raw milk for human consumption in the US are very small operations, ranging between 2 and 80 cows, with an average of 25 cows. 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 raw milk herds do not systematically differ from the national average (**Assumption 4**), which is interrogated in **Analysis S5.3**.

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 pathways, 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 during a given step in the cold chain is adapted from Crotta et al. (2015) and modeled using the general formula:

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

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 ($P_{Disc\text{-}Serv\text{-}W}$).

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 (Q_{serv} ($TCID_{50}$)) are calculated with the aforementioned mathematical partitioning methodology of Nauta (2005).

2.2.3 Validation of the exposure assessment and model assumptions

The QMRA predictions must be interpreted in the context of the models' validation and assumptions. Validation of the exposure assessment in the pasteurized milk model was performed using the surveillance data of Spackman et al (2024b). They report the concentration of inactivated viral material in EID_{50}/mL in whole (3.0±1.1), 2% (3.1±1.2), 1% (3.1±1.2), and skim milk (3.3±0.7) after backcalculation via the results of quantitative real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (qrRT-PCR) testing: a molecular diagnostic method based on the presence of viral RNA. Nooruzzaman et al. (2025a) demonstrated that heat treatment does not affect the quantity of viral RNA remaining in the product, providing support for our assumption that viral material (i.e. inactivated virus) in the presence of pasteurization approximates the number of viable viruses in the same milk in the absence of pasteurization (and vice versa). Moreover, paired t-testing of EID_{50} and $TCID_{50}$ titers for H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b in milk by co-authors MN and DD revealed no significant difference between these values ($p=0.15$), supporting that these metrics can be considered approximations of each other (see **Analysis S2** in *Supplementary Materials*). The geographic origin of milk samples analyzed in Spackman et al. (2024b) is unknown. Thus, using the homogeneous herd distribution approach (**Analysis S5.1**) we set K=26, representing the number of H5N1-affected herds in the US 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 viruses during the pasteurization step, allowing us to predict the corresponding concentration of inactivated virus in pasteurized milk (see **Figure S3**). Therefore, the pasteurized milk model output reporting the concentration of inactivated virus ($TCID_{50}$/mL) in milk at retail could be interpreted as the equivalent amount of inactivated virus (i.e., viral genetic material remaining in the product post-pasteurization) in the Spackman et al. (2024b) study, thus approximating their reported metric. The outputs for this value in this simulation were compared graphically against the empirical data (**Figure 2**). Note that as our model does not differentiate between fat percentages in fluid milk and that the results from all fluid milk varieties (e.g. skim, 1%, 2%, and whole) reported in the empirical data were considered together in this comparison.

We identified 4 assumptions, which are detailed in *Supplementary Materials*. The fundamental assumption underlying this work is **Assumption 1**: that milk from H5N1-infected cows is infectious to humans via ingestion, with supporting literature cited in the *Introduction* and further scrutinized in *Discussion*. Additionally, we subjected the previously mentioned **Assumptions 2-4** to additional analyses (**Analyses S5.1-5.3**) to evaluate their impact on our model predictions. The results are given in *Supplementary Materials* and the implications thereof are elaborated upon in *Discussion*.

2.3 Hazard Characterization

In another milkborne H5N1 infection risk assessment, authors adapt an exponential model for the inhalational human influenza A dose-response curve and translate parameter *r* upward to represent viral reduction from acidic conditions in the stomach (Chen et al., 2025). Therein, the authors adapt an existing inhalational exponential dose-response model for H5N1 in

humans and its associated uncertainty range for parameter *r*, and pair this with the results of a literature review examining the impact of gastric conditions (e.g., pH, emptying) on IAV viability. Based on their findings, the authors deemed a 3-log translation appropriate to shift parameter *r* (1.35E-12) and its uncertainty range (2.42E-13 to 1.19E-11) to represent viral inactivation during gastric passage. In the current study, we adopt the Chen et al. approach and use an exponential dose-response model, defined as:

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

where Q_{Serv} is the count of $TCID_{50}$ present in a contaminated serving as predicted in the exposure assessment, *r* is the dose-response parameter, and p_{inf} is the resultant probability of infection from the contaminated serving. To separate uncertainty from variability, we set *r* at 1.35E-12 in the baseline scenario and performed a separate analysis with a simulation in which *r* was allowed to vary within TRIANG(2.42E-13, 1.35E-12, 1.19E-11) alongside all other stochastic model parameters.

2.4 Risk Characterization

The probability of infection (p(infection)) from consuming any serving was calculated as a product of the probability that the consumed serving was contaminated, p(serving), and the probability of developing infection as a result of the virus quantity in said contaminated serving, p_{inf}. Thus, p(infection) may be interpreted as the probability of H5N1 infection from any given serving of fluid cow's milk.

We calculated the projected annual number of milkborne human H5N1 infections by multiplying p(infection) in the pasteurized and raw milk models by the respective number of 240 mL pasteurized and raw fluid milk servings consumed in the US per year. Consumption statistics

were obtained from the QMRA by Chen et al. (2025); the authors report the daily number of "average" (212 mL) pasteurized and raw fluid milk servings consumed in the US. We adapted this number to our QMRA by adjusting for a standardized 240 mL serving size by calculating their total daily volume consumption and dividing this by 240, then multiplying by 365 to obtain the total number of 240 mL pasteurized and raw fluid milk servings consumed annually in the US.

Each simulation consists of 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, tables, and analyses were produced in R v4.3.2 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

To identify model parameters most influential on p(infection) representing knowledge gaps or potential intervention points for public health policy, we conducted a sensitivity analysis and report the partial rank correlation coefficients (ρ) achieving statistical significance ($p < 0.05/$(number of stochastic parameters in model); 16 in the pasteurized milk model and 12 for both purchasing pathways for the raw milk model) for the baseline scenarios for pasteurized and raw milk. Parameters with $|\rho| \leq 0.1$ were considered negligible with low practical significance (Schober et al., 2018) and were omitted from further discussion. Interpretation of the coefficient strength ranges was adapted from this source as well, wherein $0.1 < |\rho| < 0.40$ is weak, $0.40 \leq |\rho| < 0.70$ is moderate, and $0.70 \leq |\rho|$ is strong.

We performed scenario analyses to determine the impact of, in the pasteurized milk model, (i) pasteurization efficacy, and in the raw milk model, (ii) bulk tank PCR testing and (iii) improved preharvest diversion of infected cows on p(infection). The purpose of this approach

was to evaluate the risk mitigation effects of pasteurization, bulk tank PCR testing, and improved animal-level screening in reducing milkborne H5N1 infection risk.

In the pasteurized milk model, the pasteurization log reduction parameter *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. (2025a), 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.

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. 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., 2025a). 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**. **Analyses S3** and **S4** examine the effect of larger raw milk herd sizes and relative impact of bulk tank PCR testing versus improved cow diversion, respectively.

Issues surrounding dose-response assessment remain leading causes of concern for risk analysts (Hamilton et al., 2024). The dose-response mechanism in our models is similarly a source of uncertainty and, as such, merited further scrutiny. As explained in **2.3 Hazard Characterization**, we subjected the dose-response parameter *r* to an uncertainty analysis.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Validation of Pasteurized Model

Projections for the concentration of inactivated virus (Q_{serv}; (TCID50)) 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 prediction fall well within the Spackman et al. (2024b) 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

The predicted risk metrics in the pasteurized milk model were very low (**Figure 3**). The 5th and 95th percentiles for p(infection) were 2.39E-20 and 4.02E-17, respectively, with a median value of 7.66E-19 (**Table S1**). The mean risk is 1 milkborne infection per 114,800 trillion servings. 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 $logTCID_{50}$ corresponds to 2 $TCID_{50}$ in a serving. Probability of serving contamination took percentiles of 2.43E-8 (5th) and 4.03E-5 (95th) with a median of 7.67E-7 and a mean of 1 contaminated serving per 115,471. Note that this refers to the presence of live, infectious viruses and not viral RNA alone. When these predictions for the risk per any serving were scaled up to predict the number of human infections annually from consumption of pasteurized milk in the US, all iterations predicted zero infections.

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 1.56E-7, with percentiles of 6.67E-10 (5th) to 1.28E-5 (95th). Percentiles for the quantity of virus per contaminated serving ranged from 5.19 (5th) to 8.47 (95th) with a median value of 6.86 $logTCID_{50}$. Median probability of serving contamination was 3.13E-2 (5th percentile: 3.21E-3; 95th percentile: 1.07E-1; mean: 1 contamination per 25 servings). Baseline p(infection) indicated negligible differences in risk between the two raw milk purchasing pathways (**Figure 3** and **Table S1**), likely due to similarities in the duration and temperature of the cold chains that reduce risk through probability of spoilage and subsequent discard. Paired with the increased access to farmstore-sold over retail raw milk in terms of state legality (Rhodes et al., 2019), further discussion of results is limited to the farmstore pathway, except in sensitivity analysis. For farmstore-purchased raw milk, the median predicted risk of infection per serving can be interpreted as 1 milkborne human infection per 6,410,256 servings (with mean of 1 infection per 334,455 servings). Applying this risk to an assumed 583 million annual raw milk servings consumed results in a median of 91 infections per year (IQR: 12-636; mean: 1,743). Note that no literature identified could parameterize the proportion of raw milk

servings arising from farmstore versus retail purchase, and thus, this projection was made under the assumption that all raw milk servings consumed are from the farmstore pathway.

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=0.89; raw, retail: ρ=0.85). 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=0.69; raw, retail: ρ=0.60).

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=0.33; retail: ρ=0.27). For the farmstore purchase pathway, moderate negative correlations were observed for the duration U_F (ρ=-0.63) and temperature T_F (ρ=-0.56) of farmstore storage, and the duration U_{SC} (ρ=-0.50) and temperature T_{SC} (ρ=-0.45) of storage at the consumer residence. Similarly, in the retail purchase pathway, the duration U_{SR} (ρ=-0.55) and temperature T_{SR} (ρ=-0.43) of storage at retail display moderate negative correlation. Infected cow relative milk yield Y_I was negligible in both purchasing pathways and herd size H_W was weak in both (farmstore: ρ=-0.14; retail: ρ=-0.11). Compared against their counterparts in the pasteurized milk model, the strengths and directions of statistically significant parameters were comparable with the exceptions of temperature and storage parameters, which failed to achieve significance in the pasteurized milk model. This is likely due to the increased relative importance

of product spoilage and discard in reducing risk in the raw milk model compared with the pasteurized milk model.

3.4. Scenario Analysis

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 5.01E-14 and 4.70E-20 in the 6-log and 14-log reduction pasteurization scenarios, respectively (**Figure 5** and **Table S2**).

In the raw milk supply chain, bulk tank PCR testing was more effective than improved animal diversion in numerically reducing p(infection). For all three levels of diversion, the addition of bulk tank PCR testing reduced the median p(infection) 100-fold (**Figures 6** and **S1**). In the farmstore purchase pathway (**Table S3**), without bulk tank PCR, increasing infected cow diversion over a 25% baseline to 50% reduced the median p(infection) from 1.56E-7 to 1.06E-7; with the addition of bulk tank PCR, this value at 25% diversion was 2.49E-9, then 1.69E-9 at 50% diversion. Results for the retail purchase pathway were similar (**Table S4**). An analysis of a hypothetical improvement in the diagnostic (i.e. increase in *Se* from 98.4% to 99.9%) and/or analytical (i.e. decrease in *LoD* from 1.5 to 1.0 $\log TCID_{50}$/0.1mL) sensitivity of this PCR test demonstrated that the higher *Se* results in a 1-log decrease in median farmstore p(infection) to 1.55E-10, while the lower limit of detection confers no appreciable numerical reduction in risk (**Analysis S1**, **Table S6**, and **Figure S2**). **Analysis S4** demonstrated that in the absence of bulk tank PCR testing, even at 99.9% diversion, the median p(infection) of farmstore-purchased milk is still numerically higher than that of baseline diversion with PCR surveillance (**Table S9**).

3.5. Uncertainty Analysis

Accounting for the uncertainty in the dose-response parameter *r* according to the ranges reported by Chen et al. (2025) results in largely negligible (0 to 1-log shifts) increases in p(infection) and a slightly wider distribution of the risk compared with the baseline models (**Table S5** and **Figure 7**). The effect of uncertainty in this parameter was consistent in both raw and pasteurized milk, and across both raw milk purchasing pathways.

4. DISCUSSION

Irrespective of the mode of human exposure, whether foodborne or otherwise, H5N1 viruses remain a public health concern because of their intrinsically high propensity for genetic mutation or reassortment in an infected host, which heightens the risk that the virus could acquire the ability for sustained human to human transmission (Lin et al., 2024). This QMRA predicts the risk of human H5N1 infection from consumption of pasteurized fluid milk to be 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). Still, demonstration of pasteurization efficacy is fundamentally limited by the viral concentration of the initial sample (Nooruzzaman et al., 2025a). To definitively demonstrate the efficacy of pasteurization, assays with supraphysiological concentrations of virus must be conducted. Pasteurization remains the most effective method for reducing risk amidst this H5N1 outbreak. Scenario analysis (**Table S2**) demonstrates how, should pasteurization efficacy be overestimated or a pasteurization failure go undetected, the risk to public health would be increased. However, even if a small quantity of infectious virus survives pasteurization, partitioning of these units during packaging further reduces infection risk. As

seen in sensitivity analysis (**Figure 4a**), 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.

A consequence of the exponential dose-response model utilized in this study is the inherent assumption that a single infectious organism is probabilistically capable of establishing infection in the host (Nilsen and Wyller, 2016). Quantification of the low-range of the exponential dose-response model is inherently uncertain since, at very low doses, the probability of infection is naturally small, and a prohibitively large sample size would be required to quantify it with the necessary level of confidence (Nilsen and Wyller, 2016).

However, with contaminated pasteurized servings containing only 1-2 $TCID_{50}$, and the dose-response parameter *r* of Chen et al. (2025) adjusted to account for a 3-log microbial clearance through gastric passage, the probability of infection is functionally negligible: even with 100-fold uncertainty in parameter *r* in either direction. However, it must be noted that, while the authors derived this equation from an established human influenza A inhalational dose-response curve and exposure route extrapolation was informed by published literature, the lack of a validated orogastric dose-response curve for human H5N1 infection introduces significant uncertainty into the risk projections.

It is also important to note that, to date, none of the reported human H5N1 cases have been positively attributed to consumption of contaminated dairy products. The absence of a reported foodborne H5N1 case may be a result of (i) subclinical infection, (ii) non-reporting of clinical infections, (iii) effectiveness of the implemented control strategies, and/or (iv) inability of H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b to infect humans via ingestion.

As previously discussed, a significant body of literature substantiates the possibility of H5N1 infection by ingestion, demonstrating it definitively in animal models and providing evidence to support the plausibility of this phenomenon in humans. In their 2013 review, Killingley and Nguyen-van-Tam express the role of animal models in the evidence base of influenza research, while still maintaining that the findings of such studies in relation to human pathophysiology is “uncertain and scientifically challengeable.” In the Rosenke et al. (2025) experiment, macaques, noted to be “widely used surrogate models for human infectious diseases,” did not display clinical signs despite undergoing seroconversion and showing histopathological evidence of localized infection. This may be interpreted in the context of 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).

Furthermore, it is unknown what disease syndrome a foodborne H5N1 infection would produce in a symptomatic human. Case reports and epidemiological data from the outbreak thus far suggest a predominantly mild conjunctival or upper respiratory illness, likely not severe or concerning enough to merit seeking treatment. 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. While such a route of transmission is previously undescribed, as in the review by Killingley and Nguyen-van-Tam

(2013), it is mechanistically possible given its similarity to droplet transmission. 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. Additionally, Garg et al. (2025) report that only 38% of the H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b human cases in their study sought medical care. Therefore, the absence of a documented case attributable to milk consumption may be a result of asymptomaticity or under-detection. Using the baseline model in Morris et al. (2024), which assumes that the severity of H5N1 infections is similar to seasonal influenza and uses parameters for urgent care settings, the median probability of detecting an influenza infection through this system is 1.28% (5-95%ile: 0.66% - 2.36%). Then, adopting the top-down approach by Chen et al. (2025), and after adjusting for differences in serving size between our and their QMRAs, the median predicted minimal incidence risk (i.e., at least one illness case detected) in a year detectable with a probability of 95% is 0.70 (5-95%ile: 0.38-1.36) cases per million in the US population, corresponding to an outbreak of 233 (median, 5-95%ile: 127-455) illness cases. For comparison, our median predicted risk of infection per million farmstore raw milk servings was 1.56e-7 (5-95%ile: 6.67e-10 - 1.28e-05), corresponding to a median of 91 (5-95%ile: 0-7,464) infections per year. Assuming the baseline settings in Morris et al. (2024), the median expected number of detected illness cases for the predicted number of infections from farmstore-purchased raw milk is 1.2 (5-95%ile: 0-99.3), and the probability of zero detected illnesses from such an outbreak is 31% (5-95%ile: 7.38e-42% - >99%). Given the small expected number of detected illnesses corresponding to the QMRA-predicted number of infections from raw milk, under the model's assumptions, it is plausible that the human H5N1 infection via ingestion of raw milk goes undetected.

A third potential contributing factor to the absence of reported foodborne H5N1 infections in people could be the efficacy of the aforementioned Federal Order control strategies, including mandatory animal and milk testing (USDA, 2024). Results of this milk monitoring have demonstrated markedly decreased recovery rates of IAV (Tarbuck et al., 2025). As of 8 February 2026, the USDA-APHIS dashboard reports that no new detections of H5N1 have been reported in cattle in the past 30 days.

Evidence against the possibility of H5N1 infection by ingestion must also be considered. The affinity of bovine H5N1 viruses for human-type α2,6 sialic acid receptors relative to avian α2,3 conformations was questioned early in the outbreak (Eisfeld et al., 2024). *In vitro* studies examining preferential binding of bovine isolates to these two varieties of receptors have yielded conflicting results (Chopra et al., 2025; Santos et al., 2025). The dubious affinity for bovine isolates to bind human-type receptors is implicated in the ability (or inability) of H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b to infect people via ingestion. For consideration, in our raw milk model, under the assumptions of human foodborne infectivity, at least 1 foodborne infection was projected in >99.9% of iterations for the farmstore and retail pathways: values that make the absence of detection probabilistically unlikely if infection is possible and symptomatic. As the outbreak continues towards resolution, the absence of definitive foodborne human cases should be acknowledged with due consideration given to the quality and quantity of scientific evidence supporting the presence of this hazard.

We also encourage careful scrutiny of the limitations and assumptions of our models (*Supplementary Materials*), and acknowledge the inherent interspecies and inter-route extrapolation of our supporting evidence and dose-response model, respectively. Cumulatively, the assumptions of clustered distributions of infected herds, uniform spatial dispersion of viruses

in fluid suspension, and equal probability of herd infection for conventional versus raw milk operations introduce negligible-to-low levels of uncertainty into our model (**Analyses S5.1-5.3**). Also, our model does not account for cumulative risk from consumption of multiple subinfectious doses over time nor does it differentiate between milkfat levels. Repeated exposure over time may alter susceptibility or result in sensitization, violating the assumption of inter-dose independence. No empirical data from repeated human exposure are available to support dose response modeling; however, in Nooruzzaman et al. (2025b), repeated ingestion of contaminated milk led to H5N1 infection in ferrets, supporting the need for further research in this phenomenon. Furthermore, if virions distribute differently in fat globules versus the liquid fraction, the true risk may be shifted in either direction. 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.

Nevertheless, the public health burden from pasteurized milk predicted by this QMRA is extremely low, in that no iterations produced projected foodborne infections. Note that this output is calculated with per annum consumption data and thus represents the projected *annual* number of infections utilizing epidemiologic data collected between March and November of 2024; seeing as initiatives to mitigate the outbreak have resulted in a reduced monthly incidence of herd infection over time, extrapolating data from the early phases of the outbreak to an entire year means our projections likely capture the upper limit of true risk.

Ingestion of raw milk carries an inherent danger of foodborne illness (Lando et al., 2022; CDC, 2024b; FDA, 2024b, Koski et al., 2022). 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 efficacious in numerically 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). The practical ability to achieve an appreciable or significant reduction in p(infection) from diversion of infected cows alone will be determined by labor, diagnostic, economic, and logistic constraints on any given operation; we show in **Analysis S4** that the necessary level of detection cannot be feasibly attained on most farms, exceeding the upper limit of 75% set by the authors as a realistic maximum. 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). This will likely be more important for smaller herds, as the brief **Analysis S3** demonstrates that p(infection) is numerically, but not practically, lower when the maximum of herd size parameter H_W is raised to account for larger commercial raw milk operations. 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 QMRA accounting for all dairy products. As research characterizing H5N1 in other dairy foods becomes available, the framework of our model may be adapted. 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 an area of active investigation for the authors.

In conclusion, based on the results of this QMRA and in accordance with the ACMSF qualitative criteria (2012), we find the risk of human H5N1 infection from consumption of pasteurized fluid cow's milk to be **negligible**: characterized by **moderate uncertainty**. Due to the absence of pasteurization, the risk for raw milk is demonstrably higher but remains **low** with **moderate uncertainty**. Additionally, the absence of reported clinical cases indicates **low severity** for both supply chains. 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 the health of raw milk consumers. 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 are subject to refinement.

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.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The models are available at https://github.com/IvanekLab/H5N1-Dairy-QRA.

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

ACMSF. 2012. ACMSF Approaches to microbiological risk assessment: Discussion paper— risk assessment outputs. UK Food Standards Agency.

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

Boles C, et al. Semi-quantitative microbial risk assessment: a narrative review and proposed framework for health and safety practitioners. J Public Health Emerg. 2022;6. doi: 10.21037/jphe-22-1

Bosch A, et al. Foodborne viruses: Detection, risk assessment, and control options in food processing. Int J Food Microbiol. 2018;285:110-128. doi: 10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2018.06.001

Browne L, Jackson J, Adams L, and Wilson A. Updated risk assessment: Risk to UK consumers from highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) H5N1 B3.13 in US dairy and beef products. Food Standards Agency. 06 February 2025. doi: 10.46756/001c.128394

Bullock TA, et al. The (digestive) path less traveled: influenza A virus and the gastrointestinal tract. September 2025. mBio 16(9). doi: 10.1128/mbio.01017-25

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

Chen Y, Dean KJ, Fenske GJ, Murphy SI, Gavelek A, Pouillot R, Van Doren JM, and Dennis S. Rapid risk assessment to address emerging concerns of HPAI in raw and pasteurized milk. PLOS One. 2025 June 4. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0322948

Chopra P, Ray SD, Page CK, Shepard JD, et al. Receptor-binding specificity of a bovine influenza A virus. Nature. 2025 April 16;640. doi: 10.1038/s41586-024-07766-6

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

Garg S, et al. Highly pathogenic avian influenza A(H5N1) virus infections in humans. N Engl J Med. 2025 February 27;392(9). doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2414610

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

Hamilton KA, et al. Research gaps and priorities for quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA). Risk Analysis. 2024;44(11):2521-2536. doi: 10.1111/risa.14318

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

Killingley B, and Nguyen-Van-Tam J. Routes of influenza transmission. *Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses*. 7:42-51.

Koski L, et al. Foodborne illness outbreaks linked to unpasteurized milk and relationship to changes in state laws – United States, 1998-2018. 2022 Oct 25;150:e183. doi: 10.1017/S0950268822001649

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

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

Lin TH, Zhu X, Wang S, Zhang D, McBride R, Yu W, Barbarinde S, Paulson JC, Wilson IA. Science. 2024 Dec 5;386(6726):1128-1134. doi: 10.1126/science.adt0180

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

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

Morris SE, Gilmer M, Threlkel R, Brammer L, Budd AP, Iuliano AD, et al. Detection of novel influenza viruses through community and healthcare testing: implications for surveillance efforts in the United States. Influenza Other Respir Viruses. 2024;18(5):e13315. doi: 10.1111/irv.13315

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

Nilsen V, Wyller J. QMRA for drinking water: revisiting the mathematical structure of single-hit dose-response models. Risk Anal. 2016 Jan;36(1):145-62. doi: 10.1111/risa.12389

a. Nooruzzaman M, Covaleda LM, Martin, NH, Koebel KJ, Ivanek R, Alcaine SD, Diel DG. Thermal inactivation spectrum of influenza A H5N1 virus in raw milk. Nature Commun. 2025 April 07. doi: 10.1038/s41467-025-58219-1

b. Nooruzzaman M, de Oliveira P.S.B, Butt SL, Martin NH, Alcaine SD, Walker SP, Diel DG. H5N1 influenza virus stability and transmission risk in raw milk and cheese. Nature Med. 2025 October. doi: 10.1038/s41591-025-04010-0

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

Shinya K, et al. Systemic dissemination of H5N1 influenza A viruses in ferrets and hamsters after direct intragastric inoculation. J Virol. 2011 May;85(10). doi: 10.1128/JVI.00148-11

Shu Y, Li CK, Li Z, Gao R, Liang Q et al. Avian influenza A(H5N1) viruses can directly infect and replicate in human gut tissues. J Infect Dis. April 2010;201. doi: 10.1086/651457

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.

Tarbuck NN *et al*. Retail milk monitoring of influenza A(H5N1) in dairy cattle, United States, 2024-2025. 2026 February. *Emerg Infect Dis* 32(2). doi: 10.3201/eid3202.251332

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

Uiprasertkul M, Puthavathana P, Sangsiriwut K, et al. Influenza A H5N1 replication sites in humans. 2005 July. Emerg Infect Dis; 11(7). doi: 10.3201/eid1107.041313

U.S. Department of Agriculture. Federal Order requiring additional testing for and reporting of highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) in livestock and milk. 2024 Dec 6. Available from: https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/20241205-federal-order-final.pdf

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) **Analysis S5.3:** PERT(0.0004016, 0.004016, 0.11815) PERT(0.001204815, 0.0.001204815, 0.35445)	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	PERT(2, 25, 80) **Analysis S3**: BetaSubj(2, 25, 144, 1000)	Expert opinion
Within-Herd H5N1 Prevalence	UNIF(0.0342, 0.2349)	Caserta et al., 2024	UNIF(0.0342, 0.2349)	Caserta et al., 2024

(unitless) (p_{herd})				
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 yield (unitless) (Y_I)	PERT(0.5, 0.6, 1.0)	Durst, 2024	PERT(0.5, 0.6, 1.0)	Durst, 2024
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)	NA	NA	UNIF(1, 7)	Latorre et al., 2011

(U_F)				
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 storage at farmstore (°C) (T_F)	NA	NA	TRIANG(-6.1787, 4.4444, 14.471,Trunc(0,))	Latorre et al., 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	0.20	Buzby et al.,	See **Eq. 7**.	Crotta et al.,

serving discard (unitless) ($P_{Disc\text{-}Serv}$)		2014		2015
Dose-response parameter r (*r*)	Baseline: 1.35E-12 Uncertainty: TRIANG(2.42E-13, 1.35E-12, 1.19E-11)	Chen et al., 2025	Baseline: 1.35E-12 Uncertainty: TRIANG(2.42E-13, 1.35E-12, 1.19E-11)	Chen et al., 2025
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 ($\log EID_{50}$/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 **Analysis S4:** 0.999	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 | Estimated concentration of inactivated H5N1 virus in milk gallon containers at retail in the pasteurized supply chain. The probability density histogram shows the model prediction in $\log_{10}TCID_{50}$/mL. Overlaid vertically are the mean (solid line) concentration of H5N1 virus ± 2 standard deviations (dashed lines) reported in $\log EID_{50}$/mL by Spackman et al. (2024b), which were arrived at after backcalculation from PCR testing. As pasteurization does not remove viral RNA, qrRT-PCR performed on pasteurized products serves as a proxy for the concentration of virus in the product, albeit inactivated. We approximated this metric by running our model with pasteurization parameter L=0, allowing us to predict the concentration of (inactivated) virus in milk gallons, thus mimicking the backcalculation approach in Spackman et al. This approach assumes $\log_{10}TCID_{50}$/mL and $\log EID_{50}$/mL approximate each other as supported by **Analysis S2**.



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 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.



FIGURE 7 | Violin plots for the analysis of the impact of uncertainty in dose-response parameter *r* on the probability of infection per serving of pasteurized or farmstore- or retail-purchased raw milk. 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
-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
Parameter
0.94
0.80
0.52
0.15
-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
Parameter
0.89
0.69
0.33
-0.14
-0.45
-0.50
-0.56
-0.63
-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
Average Herd Size
Temperature of Storage at Retail
Duration of Storage at Retail
Parameter
0.85
0.60
0.27
-0.11
-0.43
-0.55
-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
-10
-11
-12
-13
-14
-15
-16
-17
-18
-19
-20
-21
6-log reduction
8-log reduction
10-log reduction
12-log reduction
14-log reduction
Baseline


Probability of infection per serving, log_{10}
-3
-4
-5
-6
-7
-8
-9
-10
-11
-12
-13
-14
-15
-16
-17
-18
25% diversion No PCR
50% diversion No PCR
75% diversion No PCR
25% diversion PCR
50% diversion PCR
75% diversion PCR


Log10 p(infection) per Serving
-2
-3
-4
-5
-6
-7
-8
-9
-10
-11
-12
-13
-14
-15
-16
-17
-18
-19
-20
-21
-22
Baseline r Pasteurized
Uncertain r Pasteurized
Baseline r Raw - Farmstore
Uncertain r Raw - Farmstore
Baseline r Raw - Retail
Uncertain r Raw - Retail


Probability of infection per serving, log10
-3
-4
-5
-6
-7
-8
-9
-10
-11
-12
-13
-14
-15
-16
-17
-18
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, log10
-6
-9
-12
-15
-18
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%


QMRA for the pasteurized milk supply chain
Spackman et al. (2024b)
Baseline model
L=12
Remove the inactivated virus as a result of pasteurization
Validation scenario
L=0
Keep the inactivated virus as a result of pasteurization
PCR detected viral material; no viable (infectious) virus detected
Predicted in a milk gallon at retail
Back calculation
Compared in Figure 2
Concentration of viable virus remaining in milk post-pasteurization
Concentration of inactivated virus and remaining viable virus in milk post-pasteurization
Concentration of inactivated virus in milk post-pasteurization


Probability of infection per serving, log_{10}
-3
-6
-9
-12
-15
25% Diversion
No PCR
Baseline
50% Diversion
No PCR
75% Diversion
No PCR
99.9% Diversion
No PCR
25% Diversion
PCR


Probability of infection per serving, log_{10}
-15
-16
-17
-18
-19
-20
-21
Clustered
Homogeneous


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