Interpretive summary

Influenza A Virus detection in Bulk Tank and Pen Level Milk from Dairies Affected by Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza H5N1

Stenkamp-Strahm et al.

This study characterized daily bulk tank and pen-level milk detections of H5N1 virus on affected dairies. Viral loads in bulk tank samples peaked within three weeks and declined by two months, though some herds showed prolonged detection. Individual cow testing revealed that bulk tank milk testing is more sensitive for H5N1 early outbreak detection, and also identified the likely presence of non-clinically affected cows shedding virus. Pen-level sampling revealed rapid herd-level spread, emphasizing the need for frequent and comprehensive milk sampling to improve detection sensitivity and support effective outbreak management for H5N1 on dairy operations.

12 Running Head: Influenza A virus in bulk tank and pen milk

13 **Influenza A Virus detection in Bulk Tank and Pen Level Milk from Dairies Affected by**

14 **Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza H5N1**

15 C. Stenkamp-Strahm [1,*,†], J. Lombard[1], B. Melody[2], P. Brinson[2], B. McCluskey[1,§]

16 [1] Department of Clinical Sciences, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences,

17 Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523-1678

18 [2] Lander Veterinary Clinic, 4512 S Walnut Rd, Turlock, CA 95380

19 * Current affiliation: Department of Veterinary Clinical and Life Sciences, College of Veterinary

20 Medicine, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322-1600

21 [§] Current affiliation: Lonestar Epidemiology Consulting LLC, 622 Linecamp Dr, Livermore, CO

22 80536

23 [†] Corresponding author: Chloe Stenkamp-Strahm, 950 E 1400 N, Logan, UT 84341, phone: 435-

24 797-2139, email: chloe.stenkamp-strahm@usu.edu

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

ABSRACT

Highly pathogenic avian influenza virus H5N1 has been infecting dairy herds in the U.S. since its initial incursion into cows in early 2024. Although national strategies have aimed to detect affected herds, the best way to surveil herds for the H5N1 virus has not been formally studied and we also do not understand herd-level patterns of infection. To understand infection patterns of H5N1 in dairy herds over time, we conducted early surveillance of non-affected farms in California in the Fall of 2024 in an observational study. Daily bulk tank milk (BTM) samples were submitted from each herd and tested for influenza A (IAV) via rRt-PCR. In a subset of herds, IAV testing of multiple excretion types from cattle of different classes and pen-level daily milk was also completed soon after BTM detection. Daily detections of IAV occurred in BTM for a minimum of 33 days, with some herds continuing to have detection beyond a 75-day window. BTM Ct nadirs were seen between 1-3 weeks of detection. In herds that were tested, virus was detected in the milk from all pens of cattle within a very short time frame after BTM detection, or prior to the initiation of pen level sampling. A very low percentage (2.8%) of individual cow samples tested positive for IAV when collected soon after BTM detection, and although the virus was found in all excretion types, a majority of positive samples were from milk. This suggests that BTM may be the best early indicator of herd infection, and that movement of the virus to all lactating pens of cattle after herd incursion is relatively quick. These results also suggest that surveillance strategies with a long interval between BTM testing days may miss herds with short infection windows. Because most herds experienced test days where some submitted BTM samples had virus detected while others did not, and virus was detected in pen level milk samples when the BTM from the herd had become test negative, this work also highlights the necessity of studying the test sensitivity of IAV rRt-PCR detection in aggregate milk samples.

Key words: influenza A virus, bulk tank milk, H5N1

Abbreviations: CS = clinical signs of H5N1 disease in cows, H5N1 = highly pathogenic avian influenza virus of the H5N1 subtype, IAV = influenza A virus, BTM = bulk tank milk, PLM = pen level milk

INTRODUCTION

Highly pathogenic avian influenza virus of the H5N1 subtype has been infecting dairy cattle and spreading among dairy herds in the U.S since early 2024 (Nguyen et al., 2024). Prior to this outbreak, influenza A viruses (IAV) of the H5N1 subtype (hereafter H5N1) had infected wild birds, poultry, and other mammals and humans, but had not shown evidence of efficient mammal-to-mammal transmission (Gilbertson and Subbarao 2023; Tammiranta et al., 2023; Graziosi et al., 2024). Since the start of this outbreak, H5N1 has infected 1,080 dairy herds in 18 states (USDA, 2024a). Although the main modes of H5N1 transmission among cattle are unknown, the virus appears to move within and among herds proficiently.

Cattle that are exposed to H5N1 can show signs of clinical disease, although these vary in type and severity among individuals. During infection, cattle can shed H5N1 in different excretions, with high viral loads sometimes detected in the milk (Caserta et al., 2024). Bulk tank milk (BTM) has been historically used for surveillance of dairy pathogens, as these samples can represent the pooled milk from all lactating cows on an operation (Nobrega et al., 2023a; 2023b). Although the milk of individual sick cows is diverted from the saleable stream, H5N1 has been detected in BTM samples from herds both before and after the onset of clinical signs of H5N1 disease (NMPF, 2024; Spackman et al. 2024; Stenkamp-Strahm et al., 2025). Ideal surveillance techniques for H5N1 on dairy operations are still being refined, but finding H5N1 in the milk

from infected cattle and the aggregate milk from affected herds has been leveraged in surveillance approaches during the current U.S. outbreak, and good detection sensitivity has been seen when using these methods (USDA, 2025). In the Spring of 2024, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) attempted to reduce interstate spread of the virus by implementing a federal order mandating that lactating cows have milk tested for IAV prior to interstate movement (USDA, 2024b). Testing for virus in BTM or silo milk samples has also been used for initial detection, quarantine, and/or continuous monitoring of H5N1 affected herds at the state (CDA, 2024; CDFA, 2024; UDAF, 2024) and now federal (USDA, 2024c) levels.

During these H5N1 surveillance activities, aggregate milk testing of affected herds has occurred on either a weekly, monthly, or more infrequent basis, with methodology of sample collection varying across states. The best methods for dairy H5N1 surveillance are unknown, in part because the patterns of herd-level H5N1 detections over time are not understood. To determine the patterns and longevity of BTM detections on H5N1 affected dairy operations, daily viral testing of samples taken throughout the outbreak on each farm is necessary. This would include sampling in the period prior to clinical disease detection in cows. Knowledge of these BTM detection patterns may reveal an ideal methodology for continued nation-wide surveillance of H5N1. It also serves to inform farms that have not yet experienced H5N1 infection, regarding the timeframe for disease management and quarantine, should they become infected in the future.

Transmission of the H5N1 virus among dairy farms and between individual dairy cows is still not understood. Routes of dairy cow H5N1 exposure may include oral, respiratory or teat end exposure via milking equipment. Once a farm is affected, individual pens of cattle may be exposed to virus at different rates, and/or by different routes. To the author's knowledge

aggregate milk testing for H5N1 done at the pen level (pen level milk; hereafter denoted as PLM) has not been previously performed in dairy herds affected during this outbreak. PLM testing done after H5N1 detections are made in BTM may inform patterns of intra-herd H5N1 movement and viral transmission within a dairy farm. Sampling of individual cattle after H5N1 detections are made in BTM, and prior to the onset of clinical signs in the herd, would also be advantageous to understand potential transmission routes of the virus into the herd.

To describe detections at the herd level and also inform intra-herd movement of dairy H5N1, this observational study included testing of daily BTM and PLM samples submitted from multiple California dairy herds (n = 19 and 5, respectively) both prior to and during H5N1 infection. A subset of these farms (n = 6) also allowed sampling of individual cows from multiple cattle classes soon after BTM detection. BTM, PLM, and individual cow samples were tested for influenza A virus (IAV). Results from BTM, PLM and individual cow sampling are used to describe patterns of dairy H5N1 detections seen at the herd level throughout each outbreak period. These results are then used to guide a discussion of both intra-herd viral transmission, and the best methods for future dairy H5N1 surveillance.

121 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

122 *Study Design*

123 In the central valley region of California, a convenience sample of dairy operations (n =
124 19) that had not experienced H5N1 infection were recruited for enrollment in this observational
125 study. This investigation was conducted by Lander Veterinary Clinic (LVC) personnel and
126 included three overlapping studies focusing on IAV detection: a BTM detection study, a PLM
127 detection study, and an individual cow detection study. All herds were enrolled between
128 9/10/2024 and 11/14/2024 and had from 600 to 3,050 lactating cows. Demographic
129 characteristics of enrolled herds by study participation are described in Table 1. Farm size, parlor
130 type, breeds and classes of cattle represented on each enrolled operation are described in
131 Supplemental Table 1.

132 For the BTM detection study, each operation submitted daily BTM samples starting at
133 enrollment and continuing until 2/11/25. A single farm stopped daily submissions after 1/10/25,
134 given their earlier outbreak timeframe, and lack of detection in submitted samples for the prior
135 three weeks. Farms were instructed to submit one aggregate milk sample from each tank of
136 shipped milk. Farms submitted between one and eight unique BTM samples per day depending
137 on operation size and daily milk production. For the PLM detection study, a subset of farms (n =
138 5) submitted pooled saleable milk from each pen of lactating cows daily, beginning six to 18
139 days after initial BTM detection of IAV. For the individual cow detection study, six operations
140 allowed sampling of cattle within nine days of BTM detection. Samples were collected from
141 lactating cows that had clinical signs of either H5N1 or other diseases (sick cows), non-clinically
142 affected lactating cows (healthy cows), dry cows (non-lactating cows), fresh cows (those less
143 than 21 days post-calving) pre-weaned and weaned heifers. Samples collected included serum,

144 nasal swabs, urine, and a composite milk sample from all functional quarters if lactating. Milk
145 from individual quarters was collected from a subset of 20 sick cows on a single operation.

146 Individual cow records were collected from on-farm record management systems. Dates
147 that each farm first experienced clinical signs were determined using herd level records, and
148 discussions with veterinarians and herd management personnel.

149 *Sample Collection and Processing*

150 On each farm, milk haulers and dairy staff were trained by LVC personnel to collect
151 BTM and PLM samples, respectively, and these were kept at 0°C until courier pick-up. Farms
152 were instructed to collect one sample from each filled bulk tank. For PLM collection, standard
153 operating procedures were followed using a QualiTru Sampling Systems peristaltic pump (Part
154 No. 500200) with a sanitary fitting, a sterile seven channel septum, and sterile collection bags.
155 Between each milking pen, a new sterile septa channel and fluid line were fitted and residual
156 milk was flushed from the receiver jar(s) several times to allow it to clear prior to subsequent
157 collection. Farms enrolled in this portion of the project submitted once daily PLM samples from
158 all lactating pens of cattle on the operation (n = 6 – 13) that contributed saleable milk to the farm
159 bulk tank(s). Couriers collected BTM and PLM samples from each farm daily. Samples were
160 driven to LVC on ice and refrigerated on arrival.

161 BTM and PLM samples were characterized for IAV via rRT-PCR assays at LVC within
162 24 hours of collection. The following protocol was used for RNA isolation and subsequent PCR:
163 RNA extraction was completed using 50ul of sample diluted in 150ul phosphate buffered saline
164 with a MagMax CORE Nucleic Acid Purification Kit (Applied Biosystems, Cat. A32700) paired
165 with the Swine Influenza Virus RNA Test Kit (Applied Biosystems, Cat. 4415200) on a

166 KingFisher Flex 96 system (ThermoFisher). A QuantStudio 6 or QuantStudio 5 Pro Real-Time
167 PCR System (ThermoFisher, Cat. A43168, A28569) was used according to manufacturer's
168 instructions to perform rRT-PCR for IAV. Reactions were performed using 8ul of extracted RNA
169 from each sample. A cycle threshold (Ct) cut-off value of 40 was used. Samples were stored at
170 4°C after testing.

171 For the six operations enrolled to sample individual cattle, attempts were made on each
172 farm to collect samples from >= 20 sick lactating cows, 10-15 healthy lactating cows,
173 nonlactating cows, cows that had recently calved (fresh cows), and preweaned and/or weaned
174 calves. Collection of samples was dependent on which cattle classes were present on each
175 operation. Cattle classified as sick were selected by farm personnel or were cattle present in a
176 hospital pen due to various clinical diseases (e.g., lameness, lethargy, gastrointestinal disease,
177 pneumonia, and suspected H5N1). Milk from individual cows was collected in the parlor after
178 teats had been prepped and prior to the placement of milking units, or when cows were restrained
179 in housing areas, and placed in 50ml conical vials. A single operation had milk samples collected
180 from individual quarters on a subset of cattle (n = 20), otherwise milk was collected as a
181 composite of milk from all four quarters. When cows were restrained in housing areas, urine was
182 collected in 50ml conical tubes, blood was collected from the coccygeal vein into serum
183 separator tubes, and nasal swab samples were collected from both nostrils using sterile swabs.
184 Swabs were placed in 3-5ml transport media (brain heart infusion (BHI) or molecular transport
185 media (MTM)) provided by USDA's National Veterinary Services Laboratories (NVSL, Ames,
186 IA). All samples from individual cattle were kept on ice after collection.

187 BTM, PLM and all individual cow samples were shipped to a National Animal Health
188 Laboratory Network (NAHLN) lab; Iowa State University (ISU) Veterinary Diagnostic

189 Laboratory, in Ames, IA. Sample RNA was isolated and rRT-PCR assays for IAV were
190 performed per NAHLN standard operating procedures and protocols, using a cycle threshold (Ct)
191 cut-off value of 40. Ct values <40 were considered positive. Annually, each NAHLN laboratory
192 is required to successfully complete NVSL-administered proficiency tests and quality control
193 procedures for identification of IAV. Serum samples from cattle were additionally tested using an
194 IDEXX AI MultiS-Screen ELISA (IDEXX, Cat. 99-12119; Westbrook, ME) per NAHLN
195 standard operating procedures and protocols. Samples were determined as ELISA positive if the
196 signal to noise (S/N) ratio was ≤ 0.4. Samples were considered suspect positive at S/N ratios >
197 0.4 and < 0.5, and negative if ratios were ≥ 0.5.

198 After initial detection of IAV in the BTM from each operation, each herd was confirmed
199 to be infected with IAV H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b genotype B3.13 via testing at NVSL.

200 *Analysis*

201 BTM samples on some farms were not collected every day. Dates with missing IAV
202 results from enrolled farms (Supplementary Table 2) represented weekend or holiday dates
203 where sample collection was not possible, or dates where shipments of samples were either
204 misplaced or lost in transit. A majority of rRT-PCR results used in subsequent analyses were
205 from testing at the ISU NAHLN laboratory. Supplementary Table 2 describes dates where
206 sample Ct values were supplied from rRT-PCR assays done at LVC due to shipments of samples
207 having been misplaced, or changes in study funding source. To ensure comparable test results, a
208 correlation of Ct values from LVC and ISU was completed by selecting dates from 5 farms with
209 low (< 25), medium (25 – 35) and high (> 35) Ct values measured at each testing lab, for
210 comparison. Pearson correlation and Wilcoxon signed rank for paired sample tests were

211 performed using these values, and a correlation regression plot was created (Supplemental Figure
212 1).

213 For each farm, the number of days from BTM detection to the onset of clinical signs in
214 cows, the number of days from BTM detection or onset of clinical signs to the lowest achieved
215 BTM Ct value, and the number of days from BTM detection to the first day all samples
216 submitted were non-detected, were calculated. The lowest BTM and PLM Ct value measured for
217 each farm over the course of the study was determined, and the lowest daily Ct values measured
218 for BTM and PLM was graphically depicted over time. The lowest Ct value from each pen was
219 described by the time from initial BTM detection and the onset of clinical signs in cows. The
220 number of days that each farm submitted milk samples with both a detected and non-detected
221 delineation was also calculated. For individual cows, the number of samples with IAV detected
222 was described by cattle class and sample type on each operation. Statistical tests were performed
223 using R version 2024.12.1+563 or later.

224 **RESULTS**

225 Of operations enrolled, a majority had more than 1,000 lactating cows (73.6% for the
226 BTM study, 100% for the PLM study, and 83.3% for the individual cow study) (Table 1). About
227 half of operations milked their lactating cows three times per day (57.8% for the BTM study,
228 40% for the PLM study, and 50% for the individual cow study). For the BTM study, 68.4% of
229 the operations were comprised of primarily Holstein cows, while 10.5% had primarily Jersey
230 cows and the other 21.1% of farms were composed of multiple or mixed breeds. For the PLM
231 and individual cow detection studies, most operations were comprised of Holsteins (60.0% and
232 83.3% for PLM and individual cow detection, respectively), while the rest were comprised of
233 Jersey cows (40.0% and 16.7%, for PLM and individual cow, respectively). Operations enrolled

234 across studies had several different parlor types, including herringbone, parallel, rotary, robotic
235 and flat barn (Table 1). The single highest percentage of herds enrolled in the BTM study had
236 herringbone parlors (42.1% compared to 21.1%, 26.3%, 5.3%, 5.3% for parallel, robotic, rotary
237 and flat barn parlors, respectively) while an equal number of PLM herds had herringbone and
238 rotary parlors (40% for herringbone and rotary, compared to 20% parallel, respectively). Half of
239 the farms (50%) in the individual cow detection study had rotary parlors compared to 16.7%
240 each for herringbone, parallel, and robotic parlor types.

241 During the study period, a total of 7,671 aggregate milk samples were submitted from
242 enrolled operations; 4,749 were BTM and 2,922 were PLM. The total number of BTM and PLM
243 samples submitted by each farm can be found in Supplemental Table 1. A total of 16 farms
244 submitted BTM samples consistently throughout the study period with the remaining 3 farms
245 being omitted from subsequent analyses due to lack of, or inconsistencies with, daily sample
246 submission. All other farms submitted samples daily, with some exceptions (see missing
247 submissions, Supplemental Table 2). Although samples were characterized for IAV at both
248 NAHLN and LVC laboratories (Supplemental Table 2; percentage LVC results), a correlation
249 using sample results from five study farms showed a high correlation (Pearson = 0.954;
250 Supplemental Figure 1) and lack of significant difference (Shapiro-wilk $p<0.001$; Wilcoxon
251 signed-rank = 0.796) between values. Of note, most study farms experienced days where some
252 BTM samples submitted had IAV detected, while other BTM samples submitted had IAV non-
253 detected (range in number of days with detection and non-detection = 0 – 19; Supplemental
254 Table 2).

255 *Bulk Tank Milk Detection*

256 Each enrolled farm had initial BTM IAV detection between 10/24/24 and 12/11/24. A
257 timeline showing initial BTM detection, first clinical signs of H5N1 disease in cows, the first
258 date that all samples submitted from each farm after detection were negative, and/or the end date
259 of sampling can be seen in Figure 1. The number of days from initial IAV detection to the first
260 negative BTM sample on each farm ranged from 33 to 77 days, with three farms having
261 continuous daily detections until the end of the study period (Table 2, Figure 1). Of note, three
262 farms were missing BTM sample submissions in the days leading up to first detection; these
263 were not included in the Figure 1 timeline or the BTM detection length calculations in Table 2.

264 The lowest BTM Ct value achieved during the outbreak period on each enrolled farm was
265 between 18.7 and 21.6 and occurred from eight to 23 days after initial BTM detection (Table 2).
266 Each farm experienced clinical signs of H5N1 disease in cows between three and 14 days of
267 initial BTM detection, and clinical signs occurred one to 14 days prior to each farm's lowest
268 achieved BTM Ct (Table 2). Curves of the lowest daily BTM Ct values over time for six
269 representative farms can be seen in Figure 2, with curves from the additional ten study farms
270 found in Supplemental Figure 2.

271 *Pen Level Milk Detection*

272 PLM samples were collected on five enrolled farms starting six to 18 days after each
273 farm had initial IAV detection in their BTM. IAV was detected in the milk from all pens on these
274 operations seven to 18 days of initial BTM detection, although three of five farms had detection
275 in all pens on their first pen-level sample collection date (at 7-, 10-, and 18-days post BTM
276 detection, respectively; Table 2, Figure 1). The number of days from clinical signs to IAV
277 detection in all PLM samples ranged from one to 12 days for these farms (Table 2, Figure 1),
278 although these estimates could be erroneously long given the delay in starting PLM sample

collection. Curves showing daily PLM Ct values with daily BTM Ct values from each of the five represented farms are seen in Figure 3. PLM samples collected near the time of the BTM Ct nadir on each farm tended to have Ct values similar to those of the main bulk tank (Figure 3). Of note, there were days when PLM IAV detections were made when BTM from the same herd were test-negative for IAV (Figure 3B, 3D). A single farm that submitted PLM samples continued to have BTM detections until the end of the study period (Figure 3C). In the final days of sampling, only two pens appeared to be contributing to continued detections on this farm. Cattle in these pens included cows and heifers that had recently calved (i.e., fresh cows), and high producing cows in their first to fourth lactations.

Individual Cow Sampling

A total of 1,309 samples of milk, nasal swabs, serum and urine were collected from individual cows on six enrolled farms (Farms BC, BD, BI, BL, BM, and BN) four to nine days after BTM detection (Table 3). Of these samples, 419 came from sick cows, 198 came from healthy cows, 223 from nonlactating cows, 245 from fresh cows, 152 from preweaned calves and 72 from weaned calves (Table 3). Of all individual cow samples collected, just 2.8% (37) had IAV detected, representing 33 cows. The highest percentage of positive samples were taken from sicks cows (8%) followed by healthy cows (1%) and fresh cows (0.4%) (Table 3). No samples from non-lactating cows, preweaned or weaned calves had IAV detected. All cattle had detection in a single excretion, except for two sick cows on Farm BN that had detections in both milk and urine, and one sick cow on Farm BD that had detections in milk, urine, and serum. At the farm level, Farm BN had the highest percentage of samples with detection (11%) followed by Farm BD and Farm BM (4% for each Table 3). Farm BC, Farm BI and Farm BL each had less than 1% of samples with detection. For specific sample types, milk samples had the highest percent with

302 detection (12.7%), followed by urine (2%) (Table 4). Nasal swab and serum samples had one
303 detection each (0.3% for each; Table 4). Of note, quarter samples collected from 20 sick cows on
304 Farm BC were all negative; the single PCR-positive milk sample from this operation was a
305 composite sample.

306 Serum samples collected from enrolled cattle were tested for IAV antibodies via IDEXX
307 ELISA. The number of days from BTM detection to when these serum samples were collected
308 can be seen in Table 3. Serum samples from two sick cows on Farm BM were ELISA positive. In
309 addition, serum samples from two fresh cows on Farm BI and one sick cow on Farm BD were
310 suspect ELISA positive. All other serum samples from tested cattle were ELISA negative. Viral
311 RNA was found in milk samples from the cows with positive ELISA results on Farm BM. The
312 single cow on Farm BD with suspect positive ELISA results had viral RNA found in multiple
313 excretions (milk, urine and serum). The two fresh cows with suspect positive ELISA results on
314 Farm BI did not have IAV detected in any excretion.

315

316

317 **DISCUSSION**

318 This study details daily BTM and PLM IAV detections on dairy farms affected by the
319 H5N1 virus. Because farms were enrolled prior to initial detection of IAV, trends in viral load (Ct
320 values) measured from the beginning to the end of the outbreak period on each farm could be
321 analyzed and visualized over time, giving estimates to the timeframe for dairy H5N1 outbreak
322 management. Trends could be seen in the detection timelines on a majority of study farms; a Ct
323 nadir was reached one to three weeks from first detection, and the time to the first test-negative
324 day was typically between four and seven weeks.

325 Some farms (4/16; 25%) did not fit this trend, however, and had consistent daily
326 detections of IAV for >75 days. BTM detections with a similarly prolonged time course have
327 been seen in prior work looking at affected Colorado farms (USDA, 2025). Reasons for
328 prolonged IAV BTM detection on any farm may be related to maintenance of the virus in certain
329 farm environments (Stenkamp-Strahm et al., 2025), movement of naïve cows onto the operation,
330 exposure of naïve cattle on the farm, or various approaches to the management/quarantine of sick
331 cattle that may continue to shed infectious virus. A single herd with prolonged detection (Farm
332 BF) also participated in the PLM study and had detections in just two pens of cattle at the end of
333 the study period. This operation sends 5 to 6-month-old heifers offsite to be bred and raised until
334 just prior to calving. One of the pens with prolonged detection was composed of cows that had
335 recently calved, suggesting that potentially naïve cattle coming back to this operation may play a
336 role in prolonged BTM detection.

337 The previous finding that IAV was present in BTM prior to the identification of sick
338 cattle (NMPF, 2024) was confirmed in this study. Farms enrolled were made aware of their BTM
339 detection status and likely anticipated that they would have clinically ill cattle in the days after

340 detection. Regardless, clinical signs of H5N1 were seen anywhere from three to 14 days after
341 initial detection on participating operations. *This information helps to validate BTM testing as an*
342 *ideal method for early detection of this virus on dairy farms.* The work also supports the notion
343 that sampling individual cattle is not a good early detection method of infected herds. A cross
344 section of cattle from multiple cattle classes were tested for IAV early in the outbreak (within
345 four to nine days of BTM detection) on six operations, and a very low percentage (< 3%) of
346 H5N1 detections were made when looking across multiple collected sample types. On the day of
347 individual cow sample collection, BTM Ct values for sampled farms ranged from 21 – 27.2 (data
348 not shown). *In addition to supporting the notion that BTM testing is more sensitive than*
349 *individual animal testing for virus early in an outbreak, this corroborates the likely presence of*
350 *subclinical or nonclinical cows shedding viral RNA into their milk.*

351 For farms that submitted PLM samples, the H5N1 virus was detected in all pens within a
352 relatively short time window (1-12 days) of clinical signs being detected in the herd. This
353 timeframe is likely an overestimation; more than half of the farms in the PLM study started pen-
354 level sampling when virus was already detected in all pens. When PLM was collected and tested
355 near the peak of the outbreak (lowest achieved BTM Ct), Ct values from pens were often similar
356 to those of the BTM measured on the same day, and measured nadirs were similar between
357 samples from PLM and BTM. *Taken together, this information suggests that the virus, once on a*
358 *farm, quickly spreads to all lactating pens of cattle.* A single farm in the study (Farm BC)
359 submitted PLM samples prior to the date of herd clinical signs. On this farm, virus was detected
360 in >30% of pens on the day clinical signs were first reported. *From a management perspective,*
361 *this suggests that by the time clinical observations and segregation of sick cows is possible, the*
362 *virus may have already spread considerably within a herd.*

363 Although our results suggest that intra-herd transmission of H5N1 is rapid, we still have
364 much to learn regarding the transmission of this virus among dairy cattle. Results from
365 intramammary infection experiments initially suggested contaminated milking equipment as a
366 primary mode of transmission (Baker et al., 2024; Halwe et al., 2024), but infection using these
367 methods has not been successfully reproduced in a lab setting (Lee et al., 2025). Although other
368 dairy pathogens can be spread via contaminated milking equipment, history suggests that cow-
369 to-cow transmission via this route in conventional milking systems may be relatively inefficient
370 (Baxter et al., 1992; Deng et al., 2021), and unlikely to result in the proficient movement of virus
371 observed. In addition to parlor surfaces and milking equipment, work by our group and others
372 has shown H5N1 viral detection in dairy bioaerosols, wastewater, and the personal protective
373 equipment of dairy personnel (Campbell et al., 2025; Stenkamp-Strahm et al., 2025). Individual
374 cattle shed virus in excretions other than milk including whole blood, urine and nasal discharge
375 (Lombard et al., 2025). Moreover, herds that had a relatively low incidence of disease during
376 their H5N1 outbreak have shown high levels (>80%) of seroconversion (Pena Mosca et al., 2025;
377 J. Lombard, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, personal communication). Of the 33
378 early sampled cattle with IAV detection in this study, 7 (21%) had detection in urine, and 1 (3%)
379 had detection in serum. *Findings from earlier studies, along with these results from individual*
380 *cow and PLM sampling, leads to a specific hypothesis: some cows infected with H5N1*
381 *experience systemic infection or viremia, and there are likely multiple routes that cattle within a*
382 *herd can be exposed to the virus.*

383 Results from a study that looked at the seroprevalence of influenza A in cattle across the
384 US suggest that exposure to IAV may be more widespread in cattle than originally thought (Lang
385 et al., 2025). Although all enrolled cattle were tested for the presence of serum IAV antibodies,

386 only two tested cows on a single farm were ELISA positive, and these cows also had IAV
387 detection in their milk samples. Compared to the other tested farms, this farm was sampled the
388 greatest number of days (nine) after initial BTM detection. This fits with previous experimental
389 studies that have shown the development of antibodies in serum and milk between seven and
390 nine days after intramammary exposure (Baker et al., 2024; Halwe et al., 2024). Two fresh cows
391 had serum antibody detection that was deemed to be 'suspect' when sampled seven days after
392 BTM detection, and these individuals did not have IAV detected in any excretion. When heifer
393 calves were experimentally aerosol inoculated with virus, they developed serum antibodies
394 between seven and 13 days of exposure, and had sporadic IAV detections in nasal,
395 oropharyngeal, ocular and saliva samples (Baker et al., 2024). For the operations enrolled in this
396 study (and many others across the U.S) there had been no movement of infected cows prior to
397 BTM detection, and we do not know how the H5N1 virus entered these herds. *It therefore*
398 *remains unknown in a natural infection setting how many days after herd incursion that H5N1*
399 *may be detected in BTM samples, and how long after this incursion cattle may develop*
400 *antibodies.* This timeframe would likely depend on a cow's H5N1 exposure route, dose, and
401 immune status.

402 One may consider the modification of BTM surveillance approaches, given the results
403 from BTM and PLM detections in this study. For example, some herds may have outbreak
404 windows that are less than or very close to one month in duration. *Monthly or more infrequent*
405 *antigen-only testing may therefore miss herds that experience such short outbreak windows*.
406 Also, when samples representing all milk produced by a herd on a single day were tested, some
407 samples from a given herd would have IAV detected and others not. Herds in this work without
408 these 'simultaneous' test result days were those that frequently submitted single daily samples

409 (data not shown). *If using BTM for herd level detection surveillance or for quarantine release,*
410 *there is a need to collect samples that represent all milking cows on an operation (i.e., samples*
411 *representing all milk shipped on a given day) for best detection sensitivity.* Further, in this study
412 there were days when pen-level samples from a herd had IAV detection, while BTM samples
413 from the same day were determined to be test-negative. This was observed toward the end of
414 farm outbreak periods when results were trending toward non-detection, *supporting a notion that*
415 *the sensitivity of BTM IAV testing decreases as viral load decreases*. At the time of this writing,
416 very little has been published regarding the detection sensitivity of IAV in BTM or PLM
417 samples. Future work should focus on measuring IAV detection sensitivity in milk, especially in
418 cases where only a few animals may be contributing low levels of viral RNA to an aggregated
419 sample.

420 *Limitations*

421 Farms enrolled in the current work were instructed to submit a single milk sample from
422 each bulk tank that was shipped daily. This was in an attempt to represent all lactating cows on
423 an operation, since cows may be milked multiple times and milk from multiple bulk tanks may
424 be shipped each day, depending on farm size. The number of samples submitted compared to the
425 number of bulk tanks shipped was not monitored, however, so the authors are limited in knowing
426 if all cows on each operation were truly represented in Ct measures, or whether duplicate
427 samples from shipped tanks were submitted. We also cannot extrapolate viral loads in the milk
428 from a given tank or pen of animals to how many individual cows may be shedding virus. This
429 limits our understanding as to the exact speed of intra-herd viral spread; although virus was
430 detected in pens relatively quickly, it's possible that only a few individuals were contributing
431 viral RNA to collected samples. Comparing the magnitude of each individual farms' outbreak is

also not possible given BTM Ct values alone. Standard curves are not routinely completed by NAHLN labs on samples submitted for outbreak testing, but a Ct nadir value of 18 (the lower end of the range seen in this work) would likely equate to ~1,900,000 viral copies of RNA, while a Ct value of 21 (the upper end of the range seen in this work) would equate to ~228,000 copies (S. Robbe-Austerman, NVSL, Ames, IA, personal communication).

We currently lack a case definition for H5N1 disease in dairy cattle. What may deem a cow 'clinical' for H5N1 is therefore variable across farms that have been affected by this virus to date, including farms enrolled in the current work. For the individual cow study, the way sick cattle were presented to LVC personnel was not uniform across operations and may represent a study bias in the percentages of individual cow IAV detected by operation. As an example, two of the six farms (Farm BN and Farm BD) used biometric data systems, so may have had an increased sensitivity for detecting cows potentially infected with H5N1 compared to the other operations studied. All farms were sampled from 2 days prior to 6 days after personnel-deemed detection of clinical signs, with most sampling occurring within 1-3 days of clinical signs and a low number of purported H5N1 cases having been identified on each farm when sampling took place.

Conclusion

This work has described daily detections of IAV in BTM and PLM samples from multiple dairies affected by H5N1. Our findings describe both trends and variabilities in aggregate milk detections over time, showing the highest aggregate milk viral loads occurring within three weeks of initial detection and overall detections of IAV waning by two months. This work also confirms a need to study farm-level factors that play a role in prolonged detection of the virus, as a subset of herds did not fit these trends. Although this work has not clarified transmission routes

455 of the virus between cows, PLM detections suggest that intra-herd spread of the virus is
456 relatively quick, especially considering the clinical disease onset in each herd and the overall low
457 number of detections made from individual cow excretions. The authors recommend completing
458 analyses that focus on IAV rRT-PCR detection sensitivities in aggregate milk, given the detection
459 of virus in PLM samples when BTM from the same farms had become test-negative.

460 Our results support the current use of BTM testing for early detection of dairy H5N1
461 outbreaks. The patterns of herd viral detection seen here should be used to guide future
462 surveillance approaches. Specific recommendations to improve the effectiveness of current
463 monitoring include testing BTM at intervals of less than one month, so as not to 'miss'
464 identifying infected farms. Additionally, testing aggregate milk samples that represent all cows
465 currently lactating on an operation should be pursued, given that study farms had BTM samples
466 with detection and non-detection on a single day.

467 **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL**

468 The data supplement can be found at the following DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/TFJ87

469

NOTES

Funding

This project was completed using Federal funds provided through the United States Department of Agriculture, Cooperative Agreement 25-9419-0731 and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, under Contract No. 75N93021C00016.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the following personnel of Lander Veterinary Clinic for their work collecting and characterizing samples: Yvette Guzman, Ernesto Padilla, Alondra Ramirez, Carina Montañez, Jessica Pacheco, and Giselle Leon. The authors would like to additionally thank the Iowa State University Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory team for their testing of aggregate milk and individual cow samples. We lastly would like to thank the California Department of Food and Agriculture for their collaboration and cooperation during this work.

Ethics statement

The Colorado State University Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) determined this study to be exempt from IACUC approval. CSU IACUC #5980.

Artificial intelligence disclosure

Artificial intelligence (AI) was not used in the writing of any section of the manuscript body. During the preparation of this work, the authors used ChatGPT to generate the interpretive summary, reviewed and edited the content, and take full responsibility for that section of the manuscript.

491 **REFERENCES**

492 Baker, A. L., B. Arruda, M. V. Palmer, P. Boggiatto, K. Sarlo Davila, A. Buckley, G. Ciacci
493 Zanella, C. A. Snyder, T. K. Anderson, C. Hutter, T. Q. Nguyen, A. Markin, K. Lantz, E. A.
494 Posey, M. K. Tor- chetti, S. Robbe-Austerman, D. R. Magstadt, and P. J. Gorden. 2024.
495 Experimental reproduction of viral replication and disease in dairy calves and lactating cows
496 inoculated with highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b. Nature.
497 https://doi.org/10.1101/2024 .07.12.603337.

498 Baxter, J. D., G. W. Rogers, S. B. Spencer, and R. J. Eberhart. 1992. The effect of milking
499 machine liner slip on new intramammary infec- tions. J. Dairy Sci. 75:1015–1018.
500 https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022 -0302(92)77844-8.

501 CDFA (California Department of Food and Agriculture). 2024. Healthy Dairy Cattle H5N1 Bird
502 Flu Testing Protocols for Monitored Herd, Pre-Movement, and Non-Monitored Herd
503 Surveillance for Producers. Accessed Jul. 2025.
504 https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/AHFSS/Animal_Health/docs/surveillance_testing_of_dairy_cattle_prot
505 ocol-for_producers.pdf.

506 Campbell AJ, M. Shephard, A.P. Paulos, M. Pauly, M. Vu, C. Stenkamp-Strahm, K. Bushfield,
507 B. Hunter-Binns, O. Sablon, E.E. Bendall, W.J. Fitzimmons, K. Brizuela, G. Quirk, N. Kumar,
508 B. McCluskey, N. Shetty, L.C. Marr, J.J. Guthmiller, K. Abernathy, A.S. Lauring, B.T. Melody,
509 M. Wolfe, J. Lombard, S.S. Lakdawala. 2025. Surveillance on California dairy farms reveals
510 multiple sources of H5N1 transmission. bioRxiv. 2025.07.31.666798.
511 https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.07.31.666798

512 Caserta, L. C., E. A. Frye, S. L. Butt, M. A. Laverack, M. Nooruzzaman, L. M. Covalenda, A.
513 Thompson, M. Prarat Koscielny, B. Cronk, A. Johnson, K. Kleinhenz, E. E. Edwards, G. Gomez,
514 G. R. Hitchener, M. Martins, D. R. Kapczynski, D. L. Suarez, E. R. Alexander Morris, T.
515 Hensley, J. S. Beeby, M. Lejeune, A. Swinford, F. Elvinger, K. M. Dimitrov, and D. G. Diel.
516 From birds to mammals: Spillover of highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 virus to dairy
517 cattle led to efficient intra- and interspecies transmission. Nature. https://doi.org/
518 10.1101/2024.05.22.595317.

519 CDA (Colorado Department of Agriculture). 2024. Order of the com- missioner of agriculture –
520 statewide mandatory bulk tank HPAI testing. Accessed Dec. 20, 2024.
521 https://drive.google.com/file/d/ 17KS5LLEG-Dir1s9fpGVL8Mnp62ACCz2a/view.

522 Deng Z, G. Koop, H. Hogeveen, E.A.J. Fischer, B.H.P Van den Borne, R. van der Tol, T.J.G.M.
523 Lam. 2021. Transmission dynamics of Staphylococcus aureus and Streptococcus agalactiae in a
524 Dutch dairy herd using an automatic milking system. Prev. Vet. Med. 192:105384.
525 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2021.105384

526 Gilbertson, B., and K. Subbarao. 2023. Mammalian infections with high- ly pathogenic avian
527 influenza viruses renew concerns of pandemic potential. J. Exp. Med. 220:e20230447.
528 https://doi.org/10.1084/jem .20230447.

529 Graziosi, G., C. Lupini, E. Catelli, and S. Carnaccini. 2024. Highly pathogenic avian influenza
530 (HPAI) H5 clade 2.3.4.4b virus infection in birds and mammals. Animals (Basel) 14:1372.
531 https://doi.org/10 .3390/ani14091372.

532 Halwe, N. J., K. Cool, A. Breithaupt, J. Schön, J. D. Trujillo, M. Nooru- zzaman, T. Kwon, A. K.
533 Ahrens, T. Britzke, C. D. McDowell, R. Piesche, G. Singh, V. Pinho Dos Reis, S. Kafle, A.
534 Pohlmann, N. N. Gaudreault, B. Corleis, F. M. Ferreyra, M. Carossino, U. B. R. Balasuriya, L.
535 Hensley, I. Morozov, L. M. Covaleda, D. Diel, L. Ulrich, D. Hoffmann, M. Beer, and J. A. Richt.
536 2025. H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4b dynamics in experimentally infected calves and cows. Na- ture
537 637:903–912. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-08063-y.

538 Lang Y., L. Shi, D. Gupta, C. Dai, M. A. Khalid, M.Z. Zhang, X. Wan, R. Webby, W. Ma. 2025.
539 Detection of antibodies against influenza A viruses in cattle. J. Virol. e0213824.
540 https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.02138-24

541 Lee C., N.N. Tarbuck, H.J. Cochran, B.M. Foreman, P. boley, S. Khatiwada, A. Dhakal, K.O.
542 Adefaye, J. Schrock, M.J. Jahid, T. Laocharoensuk, R. Suresh, O. Shekoni, E. Stevens, S.
543 Dolatyabi, C. Sanders, E. Ohl, D. Huey, J. Hanson, R. Gourapura, R.J. Webby, C.J. Warren, S.P.
544 Kenney, A.S. Bowman. 2025. Dairy cows infected with influenza A(H5N1) reveals low
545 infectious dose and transmission barriers. Res. Gate. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-6900680/v1

546 Lombard J., C. Stenkamp-Strahm, B. McCluskey, B. Melody. 2025. Evidence of viremia in dairy
547 cows naturally infected with influenza A virus, California, USA. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 31:1425–
548 1427. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid3107.250134

549 NMPF (National Milk Producers Federation). 2024. HPAI H5N1 Virus Spillover into Dairy
550 Cattle. Accessed Jun. 10, 2024. https://www.nmpf.org/wp-
551 content/uploads/2024/11/NMPF_H5N1-virus-early-detection-bulk-tank-milk.pdf.

552 Nobrega D.B., J.E. French, D.F. Kelton. 2023a. A scoping review of the testing of bulk milk to
553 detect infectious diseases of dairy cattle: diseases caused by bacteria. J. Dairy Sci. 106:1986–
554 2006. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2022-22395.

555 Nobrega D.B., J.E. French, D.F. Kelton. 2023a. A scoping review of the testing of bulk tank milk
556 to detect nonbacterial pathogens or herd exposure to nonbacterial pathogens in dairy cattle. J.
557 Dairy Sci. 106:5636–5658. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2022-22586.

558 Peña-Mosca, F., E.A. Frye, M.J. MacLachlan, A.R. Rebelo, P.S.B. de Oliveira, M.
559 Nooruzzaman, M.P. Koscielny, M. Zurakowski, Z.R. Lieberman, W.M. Leone, F. Elvinger, D.V.
560 Nydam, D.G. Diel. 2025. The impact of highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 virus infection
561 on dairy cows. Nat. Commun. 16:6520. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-025-46520-4.

562 Spackman, E., D. R. Jones, A. M. McCoig, T. J. Colonius, I. V. Gorai- chuk, and D. L. Suarez.
563 2024a. Characterization of highly pathogenic avian influenza virus in retail dairy products in the
564 US. J. Virol. 98:e00881-24. https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.00881-24.

565 Stenkamp-Strahm, C., B. MucCluskey, B. Melody, B. Christiansen, N. Urie, N. Amey, R.
566 Lomkin, A.J. Campbell, S.S Lakdawala, J. Lombard. 2025. Dairy environments with milk
567 exposure are most likely to have detection of influenza A virus. medRxiv. 2025.09.03.25335023.
568 https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.09.03.25335023.

569 Tammiranta, N., M. Isomursu, A. Fusaro, M. Nylund, T. Nokireki, E. Gi- ussani, B. Zecchin, C.
570 Terregino, and T. Gadd. 2023. Highly patho- genic avian influenza A (H5N1) virus infections in
571 wild carnivores connected to mass mortalities of pheasants in Finland. Infect. Genet. Evol.
572 111:105423. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meegid.2023.105423.

USDA. 2024a. HPAI confirmed cases in livestock. USDA-Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). Accessed Dec. 6, 2024. https://www.aphis.usda.gov/livestock-poultry-disease/avian/avian -influenza/hpai-detections/hpai-confirmed-cases-livestock.

USDA. 2024b. Federal order requiring testing for and reporting of highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) in livestock. Accessed Jun. 10, 2024. https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/dairy-federal-order.pdf.

USDA. 2024c. USDA announces new federal order, begins national milk testing strategy to address H5N1 in dairy herds. Accessed Dec. 20, 2024. https://www.usda.gov/article/usda-announces-new-federal -order-begins-national-milk-testing-strategy-address-h5n1-dairy -herds.

USDA. 2025. Technical Brief: Estimating the Probability of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza Detection in Bulk Tank Milk at Various Sampling Times Using Disease Event Surveillance Data. Accessed Aug. 8, 2025. https://www.aphis.usda.gov/sites/default/files/tech-brief-hpai-btm-surveillance.pdf

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food (UDAF). 2024. UDAF enacts mandatory surveillance of HPAI in Cache County dairies. Oct. 24, 2024. Accessed Aug. 15, 2025. https://ag.utah.gov/2024/10/23/udaf-enacts-mandatory-surveillance-of-hpai-in-cache-county-dairies/.

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of 19 California dairy herds enrolled in H5N1 detection studies, by study participation

		BTM Detection Study		PLM Detection Study		Individual Cow Detection Study	
	Level	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Characteristic	Total	19	100.0	5	100.0	6	100.0
Herd Size	<1,000	5	26.3	0	0.0	1	16.7
	1,000 - ≤2,000	7	36.8	3	60.0	3	50.0
	>2,000	7	36.8	2	40.0	2	33.3
Times milked per day	<= 2	4	21.1	1	20.0	1	16.7
	2 – 3[1]	4	21.1	2	40.0	2	33.3
	>= 3	11	57.8	2	40.0	3	50.0
Breed	Holstein >=95%	13	68.4	3	60.0	5	83.3
	Jersey >=95%	2	10.5	2	40.0	1	16.7
	Mixed	4	21.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Parlor Type	Herringbone	8	42.1	2	40.0	1	16.7
	Parallel	4	21.1	1	20.0	1	16.7
	Rotary	5	26.3	2	40.0	3	50.0
	Robotic	1	5.3	0	0.0	1	16.7
	Flat Barn	1	5.3	0	0.0	0.0	0.0

[1]Farm will milk cattle either 2 or 3 times per day, depending on production

Table 2: Bulk tank milk and pen level milk longitudinal detection results by herd

Farm Acronym	No. Days BTM IAV detection to first day with all negative tanks	No. Days from Detection to Lowest BTM Ct Value	Lowest BTM Ct Value	No. Days from BTM detection to CS	No. Days from CS to Lowest BTM Ct Value	No. Days from BTM detection to detection in all Pens	No. Days from CS to Detection in all Pens
BB	33	11	19.6	5	6		
BC	37	13	19.6	8	5	11	3
BD	37	8	18.7	4	4	7[2]	3[2]
BE	41	13	19.2	3	10		
BF[1]	77	13	20.3	9	4	10[2]	1[2]
BG	35	15	19.6	14	1		
BH	46	23	19.9	9	14	15	6
BI[3]	*[3]	*[3]	20.9	*[3]	8		
BL[1]	*NA*	18	21.5	5	13		
BM	51	15	18.7	6	9	18[2]	12[2]
BN[3]	*[3]	*[3]	19.5	*[3]	4		
BP	41	15	20.3	10	5		
BQ[1]	*NA*	21	21.6	9	12		
BR	42	19	19.5	10	9		
BS[3]	*[3]	*[3]	19.3	*[3]	3		
BT[1]	*NA*	17	19.4	11	6		
All Farms Range	33 - ≥77	8 - 23	18.7 – 21.6	3 – 14	1 - 14	7-18	1-12

[1]Continued to have BTM detections to the end of study period.
[2]Detections were made in all pens on the first day of pen-level sampling
[3]Sample submissions in days prior to initial detection were missing, making accurate calculation of days from detection to the first negative sampling day impossible or lowest Ct value impossible



Figure 1: Timeline showing the number of days from BTM influenza A virus (IAV) detection to clinical signs in 13 California dairy herds, IAV detection in PLM from all pens (for farms enrolled in the PLM study), and date of either the first day with all negative tanks or end date of sampling. Study herds shown had consistent daily submissions of BTM throughout the study period.



Figure 2: Panels A-F: Lowest daily influenza A (IAV) Ct values from bulk tank milk (BTM) samples submitted from six (6) California dairy farms over time. These farms had a different number of days from BTM IAV detection to when cows experienced clinical signs (CS), and different periods of time (37 – 77 days) between initial IAV detection to when all tank samples submitted on a day were negative. Two of the farms represented (Panel E, Panel F) continued to have BTM IAV detections to the end of the study period.



Figure 3: Panels A-E: Lowest daily influenza A (IAV) Ct values from bulk tank milk or pen-level milk samples submitted from five California dairy farms enrolled in the pen-level detection study, over time. Some farms (Panels B, C, E) had detection in all pens on the first day pen-level samples were submitted. One farm (Panel C) had detections in BTM and some pen-level samples to the end of the study period. One farm (Panel B) had several days where detections were made in pen-level milk samples even though BTM had become test-negative.

1 **Table 3:** Summary of individual cow sample Influenza A virus PCR-positive test results for 6 California dairy herds/farms, by cattle class and farm of
2 collection.

	Number of PCR Positive Samples by Cattle Class							
	Sick Cows	Healthy Cows	Non-lactating Cows	Fresh Cows	Preweaned Heifers	Weaned Heifers	Total	
Sample type							Number	Percent
Farm BC (5-6[1])								
Milk[2]	1/25	0/11		0/15			1/53	1.9%
Nasal Swab	0/24	0/13	0/15	0/15	0/11	0/9	0/89	0%
Serum	0/23	0/11	0/15	0/15	0/6	0/9	0/79	0%
Urine	1/24	0/11	0/14	0/12		0/9	1/70	1.4%
Total	2/96	0/46	0/44	0/57	0/17	0/27	2/287	0.7%
Farm BD (5[1])								
Milk	9/24	0/10		0/13			9/47	19%
Nasal Swab	0/24	0/10	0/15	0/14		0/15	0/78	0%
Serum	1/24	0/10	0/15	0/13		0/15	1/77	1.3%
Urine	1/20	0/10	0/15	0/13		0/15	1/73	1.4%
Total	11/92	0/40	0/45	0/53		0/45	11/275	4.0%
Farm BI (4-7[1])								
Milk				0/9			0/9	0%
Nasal Swab			0/15	0/9	0/15		0/39	0%
Serum			0/14	0/9	0/15		0/38	0%
Urine			0/15	1/9	0/15		1/39	2.6%
Total			0/44	1/36	0/45		1/125	0.8%
Farm BL (7[1])								
Milk	1/20	0/10		0/15			1/45	2.2%
Nasal Swab	0/20	0/10	0/15	0/15	0/15		0/75	0%
Serum	0/20	0/10	0/15	0/15	0/15		0/75	0%
Urine	0/13	0/10	0/15	0/15	0/15		0/68	0%
Total	1/73	0/40	0/45	0/60	0/45		1/263	0.4%
Farm BM (9[1])								
Milk	9/21	0/9		0/10			9/40	23%
Nasal Swab	1/21	0/9	0/15	0/10	0/15		1/70	1.4%
Serum	0/21	0/9	0/15	0/10	0/15		0/70	0%
Urine	0/21	0/9	0/15	0/9	0/15		0/69	0%
Total	10/84	0/36	0/45	0/39	0/45		10/249	4.0%
Farm BN (7[1])								
Milk	6/19	2/9					8/28	29%

Nasal Swab	0/19	0/9					0/28	0%
Serum	0/19	0/9					0/28	0%
Urine	4/17	0/9					4/26	15%
Total	10/74	2/36					12/110	11%
All Farms Total	34/419	2/198	0/223	1/245	0/152	0/72	37/1,309	2.8%

[1]Number of days from BTM detection to individual cow sampling

[2]Quarter samples were taken from 20 individual sick cows and no individual quarters had IAV detected. Each individual was counted once as a non-detection;
[1]Number of days from farm bulk tank milk detection to sampling of cattle

22 **Table 4:** Summary of individual cow sample Influenza A virus PCR-positive test results for 6 California dairy herds, by sample type

Sample Type	Total Samples Collected	No. Positive (%)
Milk	220	28 (12.7%)
Nasal Swab	377	1 (0.3%)
Serum	367	1 (0.3%)
Urine	345	7 (2.0%)

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37