A systematic review of enteric pathogens and antibiotic resistance genes in outdoor urban aerosols

Olivia Ginn¹, Sarah Lowry², Joe Brown³

¹Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering & Earth Science, University of Notre Dame, 156 Fitzpatrick Hall, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA

²Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, California, United States

³Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 27599, United States

*Correspondence to: (Primary) Dr. Joe Brown, Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, University of North Carolina, 135 Dauer Drive, Chapel Hill, NC, 27599, USA. Tel: 919 360 8752. Email: joebrown@unc.edu. ORCID: 0000-0002-5200-4148. (Secondary) Dr. Olivia Ginn, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering & Earth Science, University of Notre Dame, 156 Fitzpatrick Hall, Notre Dame, IN, 46556, USA. oginn@nd.edu. ORCID: 0000-0002-0109-0699

ABSTRACT

Aerosol transport of enteric microbiota including fecal pathogens and antimicrobial resistance genes (ARGs) has been documented in a range of settings but remains poorly understood outside indoor environments. We conducted a systematic review of the peer-reviewed literature to summarize evidence on specific enteric microbiota including enteric pathogens and ARGs that have been measured in aerosol samples in urban settings where the risks of outdoor exposure and antibiotic resistance (AR) spread may be highest. Following PRISMA guidelines, we conducted a key word search for articles published within the years 1990-2020 using relevant data sources. Two authors independently conducted the keyword searches of databases and conducted primary and secondary screenings before merging results. To be included, studies contained extractable data on enteric microbes and AR in outdoor aerosols regardless of source confirmation and reported on qualitative, quantitative, or viability data on enteric microbes or AR. Qualitative analyses and metric summaries revealed that enteric microbes and AR have been consistently reported in outdoor aerosols, generally via relative abundance measures, though gaps remain preventing full understanding of the role of the aeromicrobiological pathway in the fate and transport of enteric associated outdoor aerosols. We identified remaining gaps in the evidence base including a need for broad characterization of enteric pathogens in bioaerosols beyond bacterial genera, a need for greater sampling in locations of high enteric disease risk, and a need for quantitative estimation of microbial and nucleic acid densities that may be applied to fate and transport models and in quantitative microbial risk assessment.

KEYWORDS

enteric pathogens, antibiotic resistance, bioaerosols, urban air, public health, sanitation

FUNDING

This study was funded by the National Science Foundation under grant number 1653226. This funding source had no role in the design of this study and had no role during its execution, analyses, interpretation of the data, or decision to submit results.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Studies in high-risk outdoor settings in the USA and in other high-income countries have revealed that bioaerosols containing enteric (intestinal) microbes are common where concentrated human or animal fecal waste and one or more mechanisms for aerosolization co-occur. Presence of enteric microbes in aerosols has been best characterized in ambient air surrounding specific point and area sources such as wastewater treatment plants^{1–12} land applied biosolids,^{13–23} composting facilities,^{24,25} meat markets,²⁶ urban areas,^{9,27,28} landfills,^{29,30} and concentrated animal feeding operations.^{31–33} In many of these cases, adequate waste disposal technology exists but bioaerosols containing these targets are consistently detected. A growing body of literature acknowledges the potential risk accompanying enteric microbes and antibiotic resistant (AR) enteric microbes in aerosols where a source is suspected or confirmed. Studies of exposure to these point and area sources typically assess nearby residents^{20,34} or facility workers^{35,36} who might be at greatest risk.

Settings less well characterized in the context of enteric pathogens and associated AR are ambient urban outdoor environments where sources may be diffuse and related to generally inadequate or poorly performing environmental controls or waste management^{37,38}. Establishing and maintaining effective and sustainable infrastructure to improve population health in cities is becoming increasingly difficult due to factors including accelerating urbanization and densification, climate change and its effects on infrastructure, and financing constraints; these and other limiting factors are most acute in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Information on ambient fluxes of enteric pathogens and AR in cities lacking good waste management is needed, targeting settings with potentially elevated exposure risks and

AR spread. Cities in high-income countries (HICs) are not generally considered high risk for exposure to enteric pathogens via sanitary deficits: human excreta is typically directed into covered or underground wastewater infrastructure, creating a separation between humans and their waste to interrupt transmission of enteric infections via well understood pathways.³⁹ However, in LMICs where wastewater and biosolids present greater risks due to the high number of circulating infectious diseases – and poorly controlled antibiotic stewardship⁴⁰ – in the population contributing waste and the presence of unsequestered waste in closer proximity to more people, risk may be higher for exposure through inhalation or ingestion, including indirectly following surface deposition of bioaerosols.^{41–44} Recent studies have described novel detections along with aeromicrobiological transport of enteric pathogens in aerosols, drawing attention to this pathway in the context of disease transmission^{44,45} and AR emergence and dissemination. In order to advance understanding of the current and potential impact of enteric pathogens and AR in bioaerosols in high-risk settings, we seek to describe the rich emerging literature on this topic and identify gaps in evidence. Therefore, we conducted a systematic review of published estimates reporting detections of enteric microbiota and ARs in cities.

2.0 METHODS

We followed PRISMA guidelines for reporting of systematic reviews⁴⁶ as recommended in the WHO Handbook for Guideline Development,⁴⁷ including all meta-data from searches per the recommended PRISMA flow diagram. We pre-specified our methods (<https://osf.io/6Q7E9/>) and provide a full list of preferred reporting items in Supplemental Material. Our outcomes included any report of enteric microbe (bacteria, virus, protozoa) or any ARG from pre-determined lists meeting our site criteria, from either qualitative or quantitative studies assessing their presence. Site criteria were: urban areas with either no known source or a point or area source related to concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs), composting facilities, landfills or other identified source.

2.1 Database sources and search string strategy

A priori, we chose a list of relevant and well-known databases in which to conduct our search for academic peer-reviewed literature including: ISI Web of Science, PubMed, SCOPUS, EBSCOhost, and Science.gov. We conducted additional searches in ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

We compiled the string of keywords for searching the literature databases from our own knowledge of the topic, and from suggestions by experts and existing reviews in related topics.^{48–52} These search terms were refined based on synonyms, abbreviations, and alternate spellings and were expanded and adjusted as initial searches were performed. Searches were in the form of a one line string that included all fields from the scope (e.g., aerosol, extramural, urban...), pathogens (e.g., enteric, fecal indicator, adenovirus...), exposures (e.g., inhalation, ingestion, viable...), mechanisms (e.g., aerosolization, bubbles, aeration...), sampling methods (e.g., impaction, impinger, filter...), AR associated (e.g., *intI1*, *tetA*, *qnrB*...), and antibiotics (e.g., tetracycline, fluoroquinolones, multidrug resistance...). Search strings used “or” and “and” statements to include multiple fields such as “fecal indicator bacteria OR FIB” AND “bioaerosol OR ambient OR air OR aerosol OR airborne”. The full search string is detailed in Supplemental Material.

Two authors independently conducted the keyword searches in each database and compiled findings in Zotero (Version 5.0.96). After deduplication of search results, the authors each conducted an initial screening based on titles and abstracts of papers. Papers passed the initial screening if the title or abstract suggested relevance to the keywords in the search. The full text of papers that passed initial screening were reviewed independently by the two authors if papers were: (1) published in English; (2) published from the 1990-2020; and (3) published or accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal, refereed conference proceedings, government or multilateral document, thesis or dissertation, book, or other document appearing on indexed databases we identified; (4) contained extractable data on enteric microbes including pathogens and AR in outdoor bioaerosols; (5) contained data on targets that could be related to no source, a specific point source, or an area source but must have been from an urban site; and

(6) reported on qualitative (presence/absence), quantitative (culture or PCR-based), or viability (culture) data that was sufficient for interpretation within the three aforementioned groups.

After independent searches, we consulted and compared our findings to achieve consensus on inclusion. For any dissent on inclusion of a paper, a third party was consulted for discussion before again reaching a consensus decision on inclusion. Backward searches examined the references, authors and contributors, and keywords identified in the literature resulting from the initial keyword searches. Forward searches examined articles not initially identified that have referenced literature resulting from the initial keyword searches.

2.2 Data collection and analysis

For each study, data were extracted and recorded; the full compilation is included in Supplemental Material. We recorded document identifiers such as authors, publication year, document type, and whether the document was found through initial, backward, or forward searches. We categorized documents meeting inclusion criteria first by subject, either AR or enteric microbes detection. Some publications reported both. We then categorized these by analysis method: culture, PCR, or sequencing.

We extracted and recorded general study characteristics such as location, sampling method, sample size, and intended targets. Depending on the category, we recorded qualitative, quantitative, and semi-quantitative data, indicating relevant targets and results within the scope of our review. A formal meta-analysis of the disparate findings was not deemed possible given the limited evidence on this topic and the wide diversity of methods employed in measurement in this emerging area. Therefore, we synthesized review data through categorization and descriptive summary, a common approach when quantitative meta-analysis is not possible,⁵³ revealing both a broad description of what is known as well as identifying gaps requiring further evidence.

156 **3.0 RESULTS**

157 **3.1 Search results**

158 Searches returned 1226 publications from 6 databases. Upon removal of duplicates, initial screening of
159 the title and abstract, and full text screening, 52 publications met search criteria. Forward and backward
160 searches yielded additional publications for a total of 101 to be included in this review.

161

Figure 1. Modified PRISMA flow diagram applied to our systematic review process.

3.2 Study characteristics

Of the 101 studies we included, ten reported multiple data types or multiple subjects and methodologies, reflected in Figure 1 and Table 1. Table 1 details the intended targets for each study. The full table listing each publication by first author and year can be found in Supplemental Material. Overall, 28% of the studies identified in this systematic review reported on AR related data and 82% reported on enteric microbe related data (1% reported both). We observed sequencing to be the most frequent analysis method, accounting for 75% across all studies. A majority of studies took place in upper-middle and high-income countries (n=89), with only ten studies based in LMICs including India, Mali, Bolivia, and Vietnam (Figure 2). A few studies collected data from both income categories. China accounted for almost 50% of all studies. Only 9% of studies were published since 2010.

Bioaerosol sampling can typically be categorized by three different methods: filtration, impaction, and impingement. In our review, the majority of studies employed filtration to collect bioaerosol samples (n=60 studies). Filtration was followed by active impaction (n=28), impingement (n=10), and passive impaction via gravitational settling (n=8). Some studies used multiple methods, often when performing culture-dependent analyses in addition to culture-independent analyses.

Table 1: Studies included in the review by categories of target type (antibiotic resistance related or enteric microbe related) and by data type and analysis method. The intended targets are also categorized.

	Data Type	Method	Count	Intended Targets
AR	Qualitative	PCR	1	ARGs specified <i>a priori</i>
	Quantitative	Culture	6	AR associated microbes specified <i>a priori</i>
		PCR	13	ARGs specified <i>a priori</i>
	Semi-quantitative	PCR	1	Any ARGs
		sequencing	7	
	Total AR		28	
Enteric	Qualitative	Culture	2	Enteric microbes specified <i>a priori</i>
	Quantitative	Culture	10	Enteric microbe specified <i>a priori</i>
		PCR	2	
	Semi-quantitative	PCR	1	All microbial communities
		sequencing	68	

Total Enteric	83
Repeats	10
TOTAL	101

Figure 2. Total number of studies by country of measurement, with circle size proportional to number of studies (n=1 to 44 in China).

3.3 Results from specific studies

Enteric microbes

Overall, studies reporting on enteric microbe detection in bioaerosols in urban settings targeted a limited range of microbes, focusing on well-established fecal indicators and in the case of detection via culture, easily culturable bacteria such as *Enterococcus*, *Enterobacter* and *Escherichia* genera.⁵⁴ One study reported detection through culture of *Yersinia enterocolitica*, *Salmonella* spp. and others in Chinese live poultry markets in urban Tai'an,⁵⁵ though in general the city includes extensive sanitation infrastructure throughout.⁵⁶ For quantitative PCR (qPCR), reported enteric microbes included pathogens as well as possibly commensal enteric bacteria (*Escherichia coli*, *Enterococcus* spp., *Enterobacter* spp., *Yersinia*

enterocolitica, and *Salmonella* spp.)^{54,57} and enteric virus (human adenovirus, human enterovirus, and human rotavirus).^{58–60}

A majority of studies assessed overall microbial communities through sequencing, typically employing 16S rRNA. Of these 67 studies, nine classified the population taxonomy to order level,^{61–68} eight classified to family level,^{69–74} 37 classified to genus,^{51,64,75–109} 12 classified to species^{28,54,59,83,98,110–118} and only one identified a strain-specific¹¹⁹ species (Figure 3). When classified to order or family, *Enterobacteriales* and *Enterobacteriaceae* (respectively) were detected as less than 1% of the bacterial community. However, one study detected the families *Campylobacteraceae* (*Arcobacter*) and *Helicobacteraceae*⁷⁰ and another study detected the orders *Clostridiales* and *Campylobacterales*.⁶⁵ *Escherichia* or *Escherichia-Shigella*, *Enterococcus* and *Clostridium* were detected most frequently at the genus level. *Vibrio*, *Campylobacter*, *Yersinia*, *Klebsiella*, and *Aeromonas* were also detected in a few studies at the genus level. Enteric microbes detected at the genus or species level through sequencing included *Aeromonas* spp., *Enterobacter* spp., *Escherichia coli*, *Enterococcus faecium*, *Clostridium* spp., *Vibrio parahaemolyticus*, *Salmonella enterica*, *Campylobacter coli*, *Yersinia enterocolitica*, *Shigella* spp., *Klebsiella pneumonia*, and *Escherichia fergusonii*. One study in a tropical urban setting identified, through sequencing, the pathogenic strain of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7.¹¹⁹

216

217 *Figure 3: Taxonomic organization of enteric bacterial targets detected in studies included in the review.*
 218 *The number of manuscripts in which bacteria were detected are included in parenthesis where relevant.*

219

220 The review revealed only three studies assessing enteric viruses in urban outdoor aerosols. Viral
 221 detections include human adenovirus and human adenovirus C; enterovirus A,B and C; and rotavirus A⁵⁸⁻
 222 ⁶⁰ Generally, the range of enteric microbes identified in bioaerosols in urban settings is small and we see

an even smaller range represented among the culturable targets across studies. A complete breakdown by taxonomic classification of enteric microbes detected in the reviewed studies by all methods is in Table 2.

Table 2: Number of studies reporting enteric microbe (commensal and pathogenic) detections broken down by taxonomic classification.

NUMBER OF STUDIES REPORTING VIRAL DETECTIONS						
		Genus		Species		
		Human adenovirus	1	enterovirus A*	1	
				enterovirus B*	1	
				enterovirus C*	1	
				rotavirus A*	1	
				Human adenovirus C	1	
NUMBER OF STUDIES REPORTING BACTERIAL DETECTIONS						
Order		Family		Genus		Species
Enterobacterales	9	Enterobacteriaceae	8	Enterococcus	22	Escherichia coli
Clostridiales	1	Campylobacteraceae	1	Enterobacter	19	Enterobacter aerogenes
Campylobacterales	2	Helicobacteraceae	1	Salmonella	5	Enterobacter asburiae
				Escherichia	12	Enterococcus faecalis
				Clostridium	8	Enterococcus hirae
				Vibrio	2	Yersinia pestis*
				Campylobacter	3	Enterobacter cloacae
				Yersinia*	3	Enterococcus faecium
				Aeromonas	2	Aeromonas hydrophila
				Shigella	5	Pseudomonas aeruginosa
				Escherichia/Shigella	15	Yersinia enterocolitica*
						Escherichia fergusonii
						Clostridium butyricum
						Clostridium perfringens
						Vibrio parahaemolyticus
						Salmonella enterica*
						Campylobacter coli*
						Enterobacter coli
						Enterobacter hormaechei
						Shigella flexneri*

*Generally pathogenic in immunocompetent hosts

3.4 Antibiotic resistance

We identified fewer studies reporting on antibiotic resistant bacteria and antibiotic resistance encoding genes (ARGs) in bioaerosols (n=28). Using selective culture and often using disk diffusion methods,¹²⁰ studies reported viable bacterial resistance to a broad range of antibiotic groups also highlighted on the US Food and Drug Administration's, National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System as existent or emerging threats,¹²¹ Some of these groups include

236 β -lactams (penicillins, cephalosporins and carbapenems), tetracyclines, quinolones, aminoglycosides,
 237 sulfonamides, and phenicols. Through qPCR, a wide range of AR related genetic targets have been
 238 detected in urban aerosols such as antibiotic resistance genes (ARGs), mobile genetic elements (MGEs)
 239 encoding horizontal gene transfer ability, or mobile integrons (MIs) encoding the ability to undergo
 240 recombination and functional conversion of ARGs (Table 3).^{122–124} However, of the studies that detected
 241 ARGs in bioaerosols via PCR, 79% took place in upper-middle and high-income countries.

242 Table 3: Antibiotic Resistance related categorization with number of studies citing each target (at various levels) in parenthesis.

	Drug Mechanism	Drug Class	Resistance genes	Drug
Antibiotics	β -lactams (2)	Multiple Classes	SHV (2), TEM (5), ampC (1), AMP (1), OXA (1), IMP (1) , OXA-212 (1), OXA-278 (1), OXA-360 (1), VEB (1), GES (1), TEM-193 (1), NDM-1 (2)	---
		penem (1)	CME3 (1), mecA (4), PBP-2x (1)	piperacillin (1) penicillin (2) ampicillin (3) oxacillin (1) carbenicillin (1) cloxacillin (1) amoxicillin (2) amoxicillin/clavulanic acid (1)
		cephalosporin	CTX-1 (1), CTX-M1 (2), CTX-M-32 (1)	cefotaxime (2) ceftazidime (1) cephalorodine (1)
		cephamycin	CMY (1), CMY-2 (4)	---
		carbapenem	---	imipenem (3) meropenem (1)
	Folate Synthesis (1)	sulfonamide	sul1 (10), sul2 (6), sul3 (4)	---
		diaminopyrimidine	dfrA12 (1)	---
		diaminopyrimidine/sulfonamide combination	---	sulfamexoxazole-trimethoprim (1)
	MDR efflux pump (1)	Multiple Classes	qacEdelta1-02 (1), emrD (1)	---

	aminoglycoside (2)	aac(6')-Ib (3), aph(3'')-Ib (1), aac(6')-II (3), aac(6')-I (1), aacA/aphD (1), aad(6) (1), strA (1), str (1), strB (1), aadE (4), apHA1 (1), aph (6)-I (2), aph (3')-II I (1), aph(3')-IIIa (1), aph(3')-III (1), aph(3')-I (1), aph(3) (1), aph(3')-IIa (1), aadA (5), ant(3'')-Ih-aac(6')-Iid (1), ant(9)-I (1), aadB (1), aacC (1), aadd (3)	gentamicin (4) streptomycin (2) streptomycin (2)
	tetracycline (2)	tetK (4), tetM (7), tetC (6), tetG (4), tet32 (2), tet34 (1), tet37 (1), tetL (4), tetO (6), tetQ (4), tetW (8), tetX (5), tetA (3), tetB (3), tetS (2), tetR (1), tetT (1)	tetracycline (5) minocyclin (1) doxycycline (1)
	phenicol	cmlA1 (1), catA1 (1), cmX(A) (1), catB3 (1), catB8 (1), dfrA1 (1), cat-acetyltransferase (1), cmlB (1), floR (1), catB (1)	chloramphenicol (3)
	lincosamide (1)	lnuA (1)	clindamycin (1)
	macrolide	mphE (1), mphA (1), mefA (1), macA (1)	
	fluoroquinolone (2)	qnrS (6), qnrB (1), qnrD (1), qepA (2)	ciprofloxacin (4)
	glycopeptides (1)	vanA (1), vanB (2), vanRA (1), van HB (1), van-TC (1), vanSA (1)	vancomycin (3)
	rifamycin	---	rifampicin (1)
	macrolide, lincosamide, streptogramin (MLS) (1)	ermC (6), erm35 (2), erm36 (2), ermA (4), ermB (8), ermF (3), ermT (1), ermX (2), ermQ (1), lnuA (2), ermG (1)	oleandomycin (1) erythromycin (2)
	nitrofurantoin	---	nitrofurantoin (1)
	peptide	bacA (4), bcrA (2), MCR (1)	lipopeptide (1)
	mupirocin/pseudomonic acid (1)	---	---
	cycloheximide (1)	---	---
	polymixins	---	polymixinB (1)
	Kasugamycin	ksgA (1)	---
	Fosmidomycin	rosA (1), rosB (1)	---
	nucleoside	SAT (1)	---
	multidrug (1)	mexT (1), mdtL (1), mdtH (1), mdtE (1), mexF (3), mexD (1), acrA (1), tolC (1), ceoA (1), acrB (2)	---

243

Mobile Genetic Elements	intI1 (7), tnpA (2), ICR3 (1), IS613 (1), tnpA-02 (1), tnpA-04 (1)
-------------------------	--

4.0 DISCUSSION

Results of this systematic review suggest that fecal signatures are present in ambient urban air across the globe, along with evidence suggesting aerosols may play a role in urban AR spread. Notably, studies conducted in cities in LMICs show a broad and diverse range of airborne microbial gene targets of possibly human fecal origin, potentially related to sanitation infrastructure deficits¹²⁵ that permit uncontained waste flows in densely populated urban areas⁴⁴. However, the results also reveal large gaps in the characterization and detection of important enteric microbes and AR in bioaerosols in ambient urban air. An especially concerning gap is that LMICs make up a minority of all study locations within the scope of this review, despite the fact that cities in these countries may be characterized by inadequate sanitation infrastructure and high population density, leading to widespread fecal contamination and disproportionately bearing the global burden of diarrheal disease, the cause of 1·8 million deaths worldwide in 2017.¹²⁶ Given widespread carriage and shedding of important enteric pathogens, poor containment of sanitary waste near population centers, and the limited evidence that enteric pathogen-associated nucleic acids are widely present in aerosols, these sites should be an explicit focus of future monitoring efforts to understand the extent and implications of fecal microbe transport in aerosols.

Studies that do assess enteric microbes and AR are dominated by quantal (presence/absence) or semi-quantitative data obtained through sequencing. Such estimates target abundance in terms of the microbial community within each sample, as opposed to the environment in which the communities exist. While sequencing is useful in broadly characterizing and understanding infectious diseases and microbial communities in general, it is less useful in the context of transport phenomena and exposure measurements without additional contextual data, typically quantitative measurements that report density of specific genes or microbes per unit volume or mass.¹²⁷ In the case of whole-genome sequencing, selection bias may be introduced if the microorganisms chosen for analysis are not representative of the broader population in the sample.¹²⁷ When entire communities are sequenced, selection bias is resolved to a degree but additional shortcomings remain or are introduced such as quality control, quantification

limitations, high limits of detection or lack of comparability across other methods and studies.¹²⁸

Furthermore, characterizing specific genes such as those encoding antibiotic resistance requires increased sequencing depth which is not always possible with low concentration samples like bioaerosols.¹²⁹ The studies that do quantitatively assess gene targets of enteric microbes (n=two) and AR (n=14) in bioaerosols provide more context, assessing targets in relation to the environmental media in which they are found as opposed to in relation to other targets present. Importantly, many of the most critical AR pathogens globally are known to be enriched in fecal wastes, including *E. coli*, *Klebsiella* spp., and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.¹³⁰ All of these studies leverage real-time qPCR which is limited to interpretation based on standard curves as opposed to absolute quantification which allows for lower limits of detection¹³¹. While molecular detections are important in characterizing enteric microbes including pathogens of concern, detection of microbe-specific nucleic acid sequences do not indicate viability. Co-culture with fecal indicator bacteria most often detected in these studies (*E. coli*, *Enterobacter* sp., or *Enterococcus* sp.) may indirectly indicate potential viability of other microbes; vegetative bacteria are typically a conservative proxy for pathogen viability since they are readily inactivated in aerosols^{132,133}. The combination of absolute quantification with an expansion of viability detection methods would contribute to advancing understanding of the potential public health relevance of this poorly understood pathway of transmission.¹³¹ The need for data characterizing aerosol transport of enteric pathogens and AR is most critical in settings where the risks of sanitation-related infections and AR spread are highest, typically LMICs where economic resources and laboratory capacity may be most limited. Although high-volume sample collection and methodologically sophisticated pathogen assays may often be unavailable in such settings, affordable and accessible detection of culturable fecal indicator bacteria and phenotypic resistance testing can provide valuable insight into potential health impacts for exposed populations.^{58,134,135}

Studies included in this review reporting on enteric microbes including pathogens in bioaerosols in urban settings targeted a limited range of enteric microbes, with many studies (38%) reporting detection of

commonly used fecal indicator bacteria (*Escherichia coli* and *Enterococcus*). Only one study in a tropical urban setting identified, through sequencing, the pathogenic strain of *Escherichia coli*, O157:H7 (EHEC) yielding a limited data pool that excludes other strains such as ETEC, EPEC and others that were responsible for over 60,000 deaths across the globe in 2016.¹³⁶ Furthermore, though *Campylobacter coli* was detected in one study through sequencing at the species level, other pathogenic strains of *Campylobacter* remain uncharacterized in bioaerosols, even though it was responsible for 75,000 diarrheal deaths worldwide in 2016.¹³⁶ Overall, the majority of enteric bacteria and viruses reported in the studies targeted and detected commensal enteric microbiota or opportunistic pathogens that typically only cause disease in immunocompromised individuals. Recent evidence reveals the growing relevance of opportunistic pathogens in clinical settings, particularly in the context of their low susceptibility to antibiotics and environmental origins¹³⁷. Frank pathogens, which cause disease even in immunocompetent individuals are less represented in the review, making up less than half (39%) of all unique microbes reported at the strain and species levels across all studies (Table 2).

Few studies targeted and detected enteric viruses, even though fecal microbes are present and often are co-occurring with enteric viruses^{44,138–140}. Viruses may be highly mobile in aerosols, but would not be captured in 16S rRNA sequencing that represents the bulk of analytical methods used in bioaerosols analysis. The available evidence from our review and other emerging evidence⁴⁴ suggests that enteric viruses are important potential targets in urban aerosols, particularly norovirus given its well documented transport in aerosols^{141–144}. Of the studies that employed methods that would be suited to the detection of enteric viruses (6 out of 101 covered in this review), 33% (n=2) identified them, including detections of human enterovirus, human rotavirus, and human adenovirus (Table 2).

No study included in our review targeted or reported enteric protozoans in bioaerosols in an urban setting, so an absence of evidence on detection of this class of enteric microbes should not be interpreted as

evidence that they are not present in aerosols. These microbes tend to be larger in size (5-15 μm) and therefore experience rapid settling, and so may be of less interest in aerosol transport modeling, however. Despite this, some evidence suggests they could be widely detected in aerosols and may therefore merit further study. A study from rural Mexico detection of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in air samples via microscopy.⁴⁵ A study published following our review reported detection of *Giardia duodenalis* and *Cryptosporidium* spp. near open sewers in both urban La Paz, Bolivia and Kanpur, India via qPCR, with *G. duodenalis* detected in 22% of samples in La Paz and 18% of samples in Kanpur.⁴⁴ In this study, *Cryptosporidium* spp. was detected in 9% and 3% of samples in La Paz and Kanpur, respectively, at average densities ranging from 9.3 to 560 gc/m³.⁴⁴

The results of this review should be considered alongside a number of important limitations. First, though we used a double-blind search strategy and agreed *a priori* on inclusion criteria and other methods, bias or human error may have introduced some inconsistency in including literature for the review. Though we used a consensus-based approach to inclusion of studies, we may have missed or mischaracterized individual studies given the large number of papers we reviewed. Second, we excluded studies that were not translatable to English or that had non-extractable data that may have been valuable contributions within this scope of work. Third, because of the broad range of analysis methods, diagnostic tools, and variability in interpretation of data, we did not perform a structured meta-analysis and limited our results and discussion to a broad characterization and categorization of the literature. Future reviews of an expanded number of papers may be able to quantitatively synthesize and compare study findings according to methods and metadata using robust statistical methods well suited to meta-analysis.

5.0 CONCLUSION

Based on our interpretation of the results of this review, we can offer the following conclusions. First, enteric microbes and AR are widely detected in outdoor urban aerosols. A wide range of targets have been detected, though bacteria are most prominent; most analytical methods in the studies covered in this

review employed methods that limited detection to bacteria only. Further attention on specific pathogens of interest and especially studies targeting enteric viruses and protozoa are needed. Second, we observe major gaps in evidence around microbial viability and quantitative estimation of specific enteric pathogens of global risk relevance. Quantitative data are needed alongside aerosol size data to advance fate and transport modeling, and viability of pathogens – even if indirect via bacterial indicator co-culture – is critically important to any assessment of the public health relevance of pathogen detection in aerosols. Third, we can conclude that important gaps in evidence are apparent specifically in settings where the risks of enteric pathogen exposure and AR emergence and spread are most acute: cities of LMICs, which are characterized in part by poor sanitation and high population density in close proximity to potential sources of bioaerosols containing enteric targets. We propose that future studies should address these gaps so that we will be able to better understand the potential for enteric microbes and AR in aerosols to impact global public health and to inform control strategies that can limit exposures when and where they are most critical.

6.0 CONTRIBUTIONS

Olivia Ginn: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Literature Search, Data Curation and Verification, Writing- Original Draft, Writing- Review and Editing, Visualization, Supervision, Project Administration

Sarah Lowry: Methodology, Formal Analysis, Literature Search, Data Curation and Verification, Writing- Original Draft, Writing- Review and Editing

Joe Brown: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Data Verification, Writing- Review and Editing, Funding Acquisition

7.0 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

8.0 FUNDING

This study was funded by the National Science Foundation under grant number 1653226. This funding source had no role in the design of this study and had no role during its execution, analyses, interpretation of the data, or decision to submit results

9.0 REFERENCES

- 1 Fannin KF, Vana SC, Jakubowski W. Effect of an Activated Sludge Wastewater Treatment Plant on Ambient Air Densities of Aerosols Containing Bacteria and Viruses. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 1985; **49**: 1191–6.
- 2 Benami M, Busgang A, Gillor O, Gross A. Quantification and risks associated with bacterial aerosols near domestic greywater-treatment systems. *Sci Total Environ* 2016; **562**: 344–52.
- 3 Sawyer B, Rao KC, O'Brien P, Elenbogen G, Zenz DR, Lue-Hing C. Changes in bacterial aerosols with height above aeration tanks. *J. Environ. Eng.* 1996; **122**. DOI:10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9372(1996)122:5(368).
- 4 Vermeulen LC, Brandsema PS, Kasstele J Van De, *et al.* Atmospheric dispersion and transmission of Legionella from wastewater treatment plants : A 6-year case-control study. *Int J Hyg Environ Health* 2021; **237**. DOI:10.1016/j.ijheh.2021.113811.
- 5 Lin K, Marr LC. Aerosolization of Ebola Virus Surrogates in Wastewater Systems. *Environ Sci Technol* 2017; **51**: 2669–75.
- 6 Sánchez-Monedero MA, Aguilar MI, Fenoll R, Roig A. Effect of the aeration system on the levels of airborne microorganisms generated at wastewater treatment plants. *Water Res* 2008; **42**: 3739–44.
- 7 Gangamma S, Patil RS, Mukherji S. Characterization and proinflammatory response of airborne biological particles from wastewater treatment plants. *Environ Sci Technol* 2011; **45**: 3282–7.
- 8 Lue-Hing C, Zenz DR, Sedita SJ. Environmental Impact of the Microbial Aerosol Emissions From Wastewater Treatment Plants. *Water Sci Technol* 1982; **14**: 289–309.

- 9 Cronholm LS. Potential Health Hazards from Microbial Aerosols in Densely Populated Urban Regions Potential Health Hazards from Microbial Aerosols in Densely Populated Urban Regions. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 1980; **39**: 6–12.
- 10 Heinonen-Tanski H, Reponen T, Koivunen J. Airborne enteric coliphages and bacteria in sewage treatment plants. *Water Res* 2009; **43**: 2558–66.
- 11 Paez-Rubio T, Viau E, Romero-Hernandez S, Peccia J. Source bioaerosol concentration and rRNA gene-based identification of microorganisms aerosolized at a flood irrigation wastewater reuse site. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2005; **71**: 804–10.
- 12 Sawyer B, Elenbogen G, Rao KC, O’Brien P, Zenz DR, Lue-Hing C. Bacterial aerosol emission rates from municipal wastewater aeration tanks. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 1993; **59**: 3183–6.
- 13 Dungan RS. Estimation of infectious risks in residential populations exposed to airborne pathogens during center pivot irrigation of dairy wastewaters. *Environ Sci Technol* 2014; **48**: 5033–42.
- 14 Tanner BD, Brooks JP, Gerba CP, Haas CN, Josephson KL, Pepper IL. Estimated Occupational Risk from Bioaerosols Generated during Land Application of Class B Biosolids. *J Environ Qual* 2008; **37**: 2311.
- 15 Viau E, Bibby K, Paez-Rubio T, Peccia J. Toward a consensus view on the infectious risks associated with land application of sewage sludge. *Environ Sci Technol* 2011; **45**: 5459–69.
- 16 Paez-Rubio T, Ramarui A, Sommer J, Xin H, Anderson J, Peccia J. Emission rates and characterization of aerosols produced during the spreading of dewatered class B biosolids. *Environ Sci Technol* 2007; **41**: 3537–44.
- 17 Pillai SD. Bioaerosols from Land-Applied Biosolids: Issues and Needs. *Water Environ Res* 2007; **79**: 270–8.
- 18 Brooks JP, Tanner BD, Josephson KL, Gerba CP, Haas CN, Pepper IL. A national study on the residential impact of biological aerosols from the land application of biosolids. *J Appl Microbiol* 2005; **99**: 310–22.

- 426 19 Brooks JP, Gerba CP, Pepper IL. Diversity of aerosolized bacteria during land application of
427 biosolids. *J Appl Microbiol* 2007; **103**: 1779–90.
- 428 20 Brooks JP, Tanner BD, Gerba CP, Haas CN, Pepper IL. Estimation of bioaerosol risk of infection
429 to residents adjacent to a land applied biosolids site using an empirically derived transport model.
430 *J Appl Microbiol* 2005; **98**: 397–405.
- 431 21 Baertsch C, Paez-Rubio T, Viau E, Peccia J. Source tracking aerosols released from land-applied
432 class B biosolids during high-wind events. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2007; **73**: 4522–31.
- 433 22 Shuval HI, Guttman-Bass N, Applebaum J, Fattal B. Aerosolized enteric bacteria and viruses
434 generated by spray irrigation of wastewater. *Water Sci Technol* 1989; **21**: 131–5.
- 435 23 Teltsch B, Katzenelson E. Airborne enteric bacteria and viruses from spray irrigation with
436 wastewater. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 1978; **35**: 290–6.
- 437 24 Pankhurst LJ, Akeel U, Hewson C, *et al.* Understanding and mitigating the challenge of bioaerosol
438 emissions from urban community composting. *Atmos Environ* 2011; **45**: 85–93.
- 439 25 Pahari AK, Dasgupta D, Patil RS, Mukherji S. Emission of bacterial bioaerosols from a
440 composting facility in Maharashtra, India. *Waste Manag* 2016; **53**: 22–31.
- 441 26 Gao X, Shao M, Luo Y, *et al.* Airborne bacterial contaminations in typical Chinese wet market
442 with live poultry trade. *Sci Total Environ* 2016; **572**: 681–7.
- 443 27 Fang Z, Wang X, Hu L, Ouyang Z, Zheng H. Culturable Airborne Bacteria in Outdoor
444 Environments in Beijing, China [electronic resource]. *Microb Ecol* 2007; **54**: 487–96.
- 445 28 Gangamma S. Characteristics of airborne bacteria in Mumbai urban environment. *Sci Total*
446 *Environ* 2014; **488–489**: 70–4.
- 447 29 Frączek K, Rózycki H, Ropek D. Statistical analyses of bioaerosol concentration at municipal
448 landfill site. *Ecol Chem Eng S* 2014; **21**: 229–43.
- 449 30 Huang CY, Lee CC, Li FC, Ma YP, Su HJJ. The seasonal distribution of bioaerosols in municipal
450 landfill sites: A 3-yr study. *Atmos Environ* 2002; **36**: 4385–95.
- 451 31 Green CF, Gibbs SG, Tarwater PM, Mota LC, Scarpino P V. Bacterial plume emanating from the

air surrounding swine confinement operations. *J Occup Environ Hyg* 2006; **3**: 9–15.

32 Ko G, Simmons III OD, Likirdopulos CA, Worley-Davis L, Williams M, Sobsey MD. Investigation of Bioaerosols Released from Swine Farms using Conventional and Alternative Waste Treatment and Management Technologies. *Environ Sci Technol* 2008; **42**: 8849–57.

33 Pillai SD, Ricke SC. Bioaerosols from municipal and animal wastes: background and contemporary issues. *Can J Microbiol* 2002; **48**: 681–96.

34 Jahne MA, Rogers SW, Holsen TM, Grimberg SJ. Quantitative microbial risk assessment of bioaerosols from a manure application site. *Aerobiologia (Bologna)* 2015; **31**: 73–87.

35 Rendon RVC, Garcia BCB, Vital PG. Assessment of airborne bacteria in selected occupational environments in Quezon City, Philippines. *Arch Environ Occup Heal* 2017; **72**: 178–83.

36 Yang K, Li L, Wang Y, Xue S, Han Y, Liu J. Airborne bacteria in a wastewater treatment plant: emission characterization, source analysis and health risk assessment. *Water Res* 2019; **149**: 596–606.

37 Mukherjee A, Duttagupta S, Chattopadhyay S, *et al.* Impact of sanitation and socio-economy on groundwater fecal pollution and human health towards achieving sustainable development goals across India from ground-observations and satellite-derived nightlight. *Sci Rep* 2019; **9**: 1–11.

38 Berendes DM, Kirby AE, Clennon JA, *et al.* Urban sanitation coverage and environmental fecal contamination: Links between the household and public environments of Accra, Ghana. *PLoS One* 2018; **13**: 1–19.

39 Wagner EG, Lanoix JN. Excreta Disposal for Rural Areas and Small Communities. World Health Organization, 1958.

40 Torres NF, Chibi B, Kuupiel D, Solomon VP, Mashamba-Thompson TP, Middleton LE. The use of non-prescribed antibiotics; prevalence estimates in low-and-middle-income countries. A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Public Heal* 2021; **79**: 1–15.

41 Johnson A, Ginn O, Bivins A, Rocha-Melogno L, Tripathi SN, Brown J. Extended-spectrum beta-

478 lactamase (ESBL)-positive *Escherichia coli* presence in urban aquatic environments in Kanpur,
479 India. *J Water Health* 2020; **18**: 849–54.

480 42 Salazar D, Ginn O, Brown J, Soria F, Garvizu C. Assessment of antibiotic resistant coliforms from
481 bioaerosol samples collected above a sewage-polluted river in La Paz, Bolivia. *Int J Hyg Environ*
482 *Health* 2020; **228**: 113494.

483 43 Farling S, Rogers T, Knee JS, Tilley EA, Brown J, Deshusses MA. Bioaerosol emissions
484 associated with pit latrine emptying operations. *Sci Total Environ* 2019; **648**: 1082–6.

485 44 Ginn O, Rocha-Melogno L, Bivins A, *et al.* Detection and Quantification of Enteric Pathogens in
486 Aerosols Near Open Wastewater Canals in Cities with Poor Sanitation. *Environ Sci Technol* 2021.
487 DOI:10.1021/acs.est.1c05060.

488 45 Balderrama-Carmona AP, Gortáres-Moroyoqui P, Álvarez-Valencia LH, *et al.* Occurrence and
489 quantitative microbial risk assessment of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in soil and air samples. *Int*
490 *J Infect Dis* 2014; **26**: 123–7.

491 46 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and
492 meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 2009; **339**: 332–6.

493 47 Organization WH. WHO handbook for guideline development, 2nd edn. World Health
494 Organization, 2014.

495 48 Ahmed SM, Hall AJ, Robinson AE, *et al.* Global Prevalence of Norovirus in Cases of
496 Gastroenteritis: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2014; **14**: 725–30.

497 49 Penakalapati G, Swarthout J, Delahoy MJ, *et al.* Exposure to Animal Feces and Human Health: A
498 Systematic Review and Proposed Research Priorities. *Environ Sci Technol* 2017; **51**: 11537–52.

499 50 WHO, UNICEF. Progress on household drinking water, sanitation and hygiene 2000-2017.
500 Special focus on inequalities. 2019.

501 51 Li J, Cao J, Zhu YG, *et al.* Global Survey of Antibiotic Resistance Genes in Air. *Environ Sci*
502 *Technol* 2018; **52**: 10975–84.

503 52 Gao M, Qiu T, Sun Y, Wang X. The abundance and diversity of antibiotic resistance genes in the

atmospheric environment of composting plants. *Environ Int* 2018; **116**: 229–38.

53 Yasin YM, Kerr MS, Wong CA, Bélanger CH. Factors affecting nurses’ job satisfaction in rural and urban acute care settings: A PRISMA systematic review. *J Adv Nurs* 2020; **76**: 963–79.

54 Gao J-F, Fan X-Y, Li H-Y, Pan K-L. Airborne Bacterial Communities of PM2.5 in Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei Megalopolis, China as Revealed By Illumina MiSeq Sequencing: A Case Study. *AEROSOL AIR Qual Res* 2017; **17**: 788–98.

55 Wu B, Meng K, Wei L, Cai Y, Chai T. Seasonal Fluctuations of Microbial Aerosol in Live Poultry Markets and the Detection of Endotoxin. *Front Microbiol* 2017; **8**. DOI:10.3389/fmicb.2017.00551.

56 Jia W, Li C, Qin K, Liu L. Testing and Analysis of Drinking Water Quality in the Rural Areas of High-tech District in Tai’an City. *J Agric Sci* 2010; **2**: 2008–10.

57 Santos RA, Sau NJ, Certucha T, Almendariz FJ. Rapid detection of bacteria, *Enterococcus faecalis*, in airborne particles of Hermosillo, Sonora, México. *J Environ Biol* 2019; **40**: 619–25.

58 Rocha-Melagno L, Ginn O, Bailey ES, *et al.* Bioaerosol sampling optimization for community exposure assessment in cities with poor sanitation: A one health cross-sectional study. *Sci Total Environ* 2020; **738**. DOI:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139495.

59 Gonzalez-Martin C, Coronado-Alvarez NM, Teigell-Perez N, *et al.* Analysis of the Impact of African Dust Storms on the Presence of Enteric Viruses in the Atmosphere in Tenerife, Spain. *AEROSOL AIR Qual Res* 2018; **18**: 1863–73.

60 Cao C, Jiang W, Wang B, *et al.* Inhalable microorganisms in Beijing’s PM2.5 and PM10 pollutants during a severe smog event. *Environ Sci Technol* 2014; **48**: 1499–507.

61 Bertolini V, Innocente E, Rampazzo G, *et al.* Temporal variability and effect of environmental variables on airborne bacterial communities in an urban area of Northern Italy [electronic resource]. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 2013; **97**: 6561–70.

62 Bowers RM, McLetchie S, Knight R, Fierer N. Spatial variability in airborne bacterial communities across land-use types and their relationship to the bacterial communities of potential

source environments. *ISME J* 2011; **5**: 601–12.

63 Fang Z, Guo W, Zhang J, Lou X. Influence of heat events on the composition of airborne bacterial communities in urban ecosystems. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2018; **15**.

DOI:10.3390/ijerph15102295.

64 Gandolfi I, Bertolini V, Bestetti G, *et al.* Spatio-temporal variability of airborne bacterial communities and their correlation with particulate matter chemical composition across two urban areas. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 2015; **99**: 4867–77.

65 Jang G Il, Hwang CY, Cho BC. Effects of heavy rainfall on the composition of airborne bacterial communities. *Front Environ Sci Eng* 2018; **12**: 1–10.

66 Ouyang W, Gao B, Cheng H, *et al.* Airborne bacterial communities and antibiotic resistance gene dynamics in PM_{2.5} during rainfall. *Environ Int* 2020; **134**. DOI:10.1016/j.envint.2019.105318.

67 Pan Y, Pan X, Xiao H, Xiao H. Structural Characteristics and Functional Implications of PM_{2.5} Bacterial Communities During Fall in Beijing and Shanghai, China. *Front Microbiol* 2019; **10**: 1–11.

68 Zhen Q, Deng Y, Wang Y, *et al.* Meteorological factors had more impact on airborne bacterial communities than air pollutants. *Sci Total Environ* 2017; **601–602**: 703–12.

69 Bowers RM, Clements N, Emerson JB, Wiedinmyer C, Hannigan MP, Fierer N. Seasonal Variability in Bacterial and Fungal Diversity of the Near-Surface Atmosphere. *Environ Sci Technol* 2013; **47**: 12097–106.

70 Brodie EL, DeSantis TZ, Parker JPM, Zubietta IX, Piceno YM, Andersen GL. Urban aerosols harbor diverse and dynamic bacterial populations. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2007; **104**: 299–304.

71 Mhuireach G, Betancourt-Román CM, Green JL, Johnson BR. Spatiotemporal controls on the urban aerobiome. *Front Ecol Evol* 2019; **7**. DOI:10.3389/fevo.2019.00043.

72 Serrano-Silva N, Calderon-Ezquerro MC. Metagenomic survey of bacterial diversity in the atmosphere of Mexico City using different sampling methods. *Environ Pollut* 2018; **235**: 20–9.

73 Franzetti A, Gandolfi I, Gaspari E, Ambrosini R, Bestetti G. Seasonal variability of bacteria in fine

556 and coarse urban air particulate matter. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 2011; **90**: 745–53.

557 74 Fierer N, Liu Z, Rodríguez-Hernández M, Knight R, Henn M, Hernandez MT. Short-term
558 temporal variability in airborne bacterial and fungal populations. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2008;
559 **74**: 200–7.

560 75 Fan C, Li Y, Liu P, *et al.* Characteristics of airborne opportunistic pathogenic bacteria during
561 autumn and winter in Xi'an, China. *Sci Total Environ* 2019; **672**: 834–45.

562 76 Fykse EM, Tjærnhage T, Humppi T, *et al.* Identification of airborne bacteria by 16S rDNA
563 sequencing, MALDI-TOF MS and the MIDI microbial identification system. *Aerobiologia*
564 (*Bologna*) 2015; **31**: 271–81.

565 77 Gat D, Mazar Y, Cytryn E, Rudich Y. Origin-Dependent Variations in the Atmospheric
566 Microbiome Community in Eastern Mediterranean Dust Storms. *Environ Sci Technol* 2017; **51**:
567 6709–18.

568 78 Gou H, Lu J, Li S, Tong Y, Xie C, Zheng X. Assessment of microbial communities in PM₁ and
569 PM₁₀ of Urumqi during winter. *Environ Pollut* 2016; **214**: 202–10.

570 79 Hai VD, Hoang SMT, Hung NTQ, *et al.* Characteristics of airborne bacteria and fungi in the
571 atmosphere in Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam - A case study over three years. *Int Biodeterior*
572 *Biodegrad* 2019; **145**: 104819.

573 80 Hurtado L, Rodriguez G, Lopez J, *et al.* Characterization of atmospheric bioaerosols at 9 sites in
574 Tijuana, Mexico. *Atmos Environ* 2014; **96**: 430–6.

575 81 Innocente E, Franzetti A, Facca C, *et al.* Influence of seasonality, air mass origin and particulate
576 matter chemical composition on airborne bacterial community structure in the Po Valley, Italy. *Sci*
577 *Total Environ* 2017; **593–594**: 677–87.

578 82 García-Mena J, Murugesan S, Pérez-Muñoz AA, *et al.* Airborne Bacterial Diversity from the Low
579 Atmosphere of Greater Mexico City. *Microb Ecol* 2016; **72**: 70–84.

580 83 Li H, Zhou X-Y, Yang X-R, Zhu Y-G, Hong Y-W, Su J-Q. Spatial and seasonal variation of the
581 airborne microbiome in a rapidly developing city of China. *Sci Total Environ* 2019; **665**: 61–8.

- 84 Liang Z, Yu Y, Ye Z, Li G, Wang W, An T. Pollution profiles of antibiotic resistance genes associated with airborne opportunistic pathogens from typical area, Pearl River Estuary and their exposure risk to human. *Environ Int* 2020; **143**: 105934.
- 85 Abd Aziz A, Lee K, Park B, *et al.* Comparative study of the airborne microbial communities and their functional composition in fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) under non-extreme and extreme PM_{2.5} conditions. *Atmos Environ* 2018; **194**: 82–92.
- 86 Lu Z, Liu Q, Xiong Y, Huang F, Zhou J, Schauer JJ. A hybrid source apportionment strategy using positive matrix factorization (PMF) and molecular marker chemical mass balance (MM-CMB) models. *Environ Pollut* 2018; **238**: 39–51.
- 87 Mu F, Bai W, Li Y, Lu R, Qi Y, Xie W. Source identification of airborne bacteria in the mountainous area and the urban areas. *Atmos Res* 2020; **231**.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2019.104676>.
- 88 Nanclares Castañeda DA, Zapata Sánchez CH, Silva-Bedoya LM, Montontoya Campuzáno OI, Moreno Herrera CX. Assessment of culturable bacteria associated with fine particulate matter collected in antioquia colombia-South America. *Rev Int Contam Ambient* 2020; **36**: 287–302.
- 89 Núñez A, Alcamí A, Amo de Paz G, *et al.* Temporal patterns of variability for prokaryotic and eukaryotic diversity in the urban air of Madrid (Spain). *Atmos Environ* 2019; published online Sept 8. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.116972>.
- 90 Romano S, Becagli S, Lucarelli F, Rispoli G, Perrone MR. Airborne bacteria structure and chemical composition relationships in winter and spring PM₁₀ samples over southeastern Italy. *Sci Total Environ* 2020; **730**: 138899.
- 91 Shen F, Zheng Y, Niu M, *et al.* Characteristics of biological particulate matters at urban and rural sites in the North China Plain. *Environ Pollut* 2019; **253**: 569–77.
- 92 Soleimani Z, Sorooshian A, Goudarzi G, Maleki H, Marzouni MB. Impact of Middle Eastern dust storms on indoor and outdoor composition of bioaerosol. *Atmos Environ* 2016; **138**: 135–43.
- 93 Stewart JD, Shakya KM, Bilinski T, Wilson JW, Ravi S, Choi CS. Variation of near surface

608 atmosphere microbial communities at an urban and a suburban site in Philadelphia, PA, USA. *Sci*
609 *Total Environ* 2020; **724**: 138353.

610 94 Sun Y, Xu S, Zheng D, Li J, Tian H, Wang Y. Effects of haze pollution on microbial community
611 changes and correlation with chemical components in atmospheric particulate matter. *Sci Total*
612 *Environ* 2018; **637–638**: 507–16.

613 95 Wei M, Liu H, Chen J, *et al.* Effects of aerosol pollution on PM_{2.5}-associated bacteria in typical
614 inland and coastal cities of northern China during the winter heating season. *Environ Pollut* 2020;
615 **262**: 114188.

616 96 Agarwal S, Mandal P, Srivastava A. Quantification and Characterization of Size-segregated
617 Bioaerosols at Municipal Solid Waste Dumping Site in Delhi. *Procedia Environ Sci* 2016; **35**:
618 400–7.

619 97 Núñez A, Moreno DA. The Differential Vertical Distribution of the Airborne Biological Particles
620 Reveals an Atmospheric Reservoir of Microbial Pathogens and Aeroallergens. *Microb Ecol* 2020;
621 **80**: 322–33.

622 98 Xu A, Chen X, Lang X, Xia Y, Song Z. Seasonal variability in bacterial and fungal diversity and
623 community composition of the near-surface atmosphere in coastal megacity. *Aerobiologia*
624 *(Bologna)* 2017; **33**: 555–75.

625 99 Yan D, Tao Z, Yu L-Y, Su, J, Yu L-Y. Structural Variation in the Bacterial Community
626 Associated with Particulate Matter in Beijing, China During Hazy and Nonhazy Days. *Appl*
627 *Environ Microbiol* 2018; **84**: 1–13.

628 100 Yang Y, Zhou R, Chen B, Zhang T, Hu L, Zou S. Characterization of airborne antibiotic resistance
629 genes from typical bioaerosol emission sources in the urban environment using metagenomic
630 approach. *Chemosphere* 2018; **213**: 463–71.

631 101 Yooseph S, Andrews-Pfannkoch C, Tenney A, *et al.* A metagenomic framework for the study of
632 airborne microbial communities. *PLoS One* 2013; **8**. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0081862.

633 102 Zhao Y, Chen Z, Hou J, *et al.* Monitoring antibiotic resistomes and bacterial microbiomes in the

634 aerosols from fine, hazy, and dusty weather in Tianjin, China using a developed high-volume
635 tandem liquid impinging sampler. *Sci Total Environ* 2020; **731**: 139242.

636 103 Soto T, Lozano M, Vicente-Soler J, Cansado Vizoso J, Gacto Fernández MJ. Microbiological
637 survey of the aerial contamination in urban areas of the city of Murcia, Spain. *An Biol* 2009; **31**:
638 7–13.

639 104 Amarloei A, Fazlzadeh M, Jafari AJ, Zarei A, Mazloomi S. Particulate matters and bioaerosols
640 during Middle East dust storms events in Ilam, Iran. *Microchem J* 2020; **152**.
641 DOI:10.1016/j.microc.2019.104280.

642 105 Cha Y, Park M-H, Lee S-H, Kim JH, Cho KH. Modeling spatiotemporal bacterial variability with
643 meteorological and watershed land-use characteristics. *Water Res* 2016; **100**: 306–15.

644 106 Cuthbertson L, Amores-Arrocha H, Malard LA, Els N, Sattler B, Pearce DA. Characterisation of
645 arctic bacterial communities in the air above svalbard. *Biology (Basel)* 2017; **6**.
646 DOI:10.3390/biology6020029.

647 107 Du P, Du R, Ren W, Lu Z, Fu P. Seasonal variation characteristic of inhalable microbial
648 communities in PM_{2.5} in Beijing city, China. *Sci Total Environ* 2018; **610–611**: 308–15.

649 108 Du P, Du R, Lu Z, Ren W, Fu P. Variation of bacterial and fungal community structures in
650 PM_{2.5} collected during the 2014 APEC summit periods. *Aerosol Air Qual Res* 2018; **18**: 444–55.

651 109 Fan XY, Gao JF, Pan KL, Li DC, Dai HH, Li X. More obvious air pollution impacts on variations
652 in bacteria than fungi and their co-occurrences with ammonia-oxidizing microorganisms in PM_{2.5}.
653 *Environ Pollut* 2019; **251**: 668–80.

654 110 Rodriguez-Gomez C, Ramirez-Romero C, Cordoba F, *et al.* Characterization of culturable
655 airborne microorganisms in the Yucatan Peninsula. *Atmos Environ* 2020; **223**: 117183.

656 111 Sun X, Li D, Li B, *et al.* Exploring the disparity of inhalable bacterial communities and antibiotic
657 resistance genes between hazy days and non-hazy days in a cold megacity in Northeast China. *J*
658 *Hazard Mater* 2020; **398**. DOI:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.122984.

659 112 Velez-Quinones MA. Study of Airborne Bacterial Populations in Urban Areas Using Phenotypic

660 and Phylogenetic Characterization. ProQuest Diss. Theses. 2013.

661 <https://go.openathens.net/redirector/gatech.edu?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/1438179>

662 215?accountid=11107.

663 113 Zhou Y-W, Lv Y, Chen X, *et al.* Characteristics of bacterial communities in fine particulate matter

664 of severe cold region, China. *Zhongguo Huanjing Kexue/China Environ Sci* 2019; **39**: 3616–23.

665 114 Cao Y, Raith MR, Griffith JF. Droplet digital PCR for simultaneous quantification of general and

666 human-associated fecal indicators for water quality assessment. *Water Res* 2015; **70**: 337–49.

667 115 Chen B, Yang Y, Liang X, Yu K, Zhang T, Li X. Metagenomic profiles of antibiotic resistance

668 genes (ARGs) between human impacted estuary and deep ocean sediments. *Environ Sci Technol*

669 2013; **47**: 12753–60.

670 116 Hu Z, Liu H, Zhang H, *et al.* Temporal discrepancy of airborne total bacteria and pathogenic

671 bacteria between day and night. *Environ Res* 2020; **186**: 109540.

672 117 Ji L, Zhang Q, Fu X, *et al.* Feedback of airborne bacterial consortia to haze pollution with different

673 PM2.5 levels in typical mountainous terrain of Jinan, China. *Sci Total Environ* 2019; **695**: 133912.

674 118 Najafi MS, Khoshakhllagh F, Zamanzadeh SM, Shirazi MH, Samadi M, Hajikhani S.

675 Characteristics of TSP Loads during the Middle East Springtime Dust Storm (MESDS) in Western

676 Iran. *Arab J Geosci* 2014; **7**: 5367–81.

677 119 Woo AC, Brar MS, Chan Y, *et al.* Temporal variation in airborne microbial populations and

678 microbially-derived allergens in a tropical urban landscape. *Atmos Environ* 2013; **74**: 291–300.

679 120 Hudzicki J. Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion susceptibility test protocol. *Am Soc Microbiol* 2009; : 1–

680 14.

681 121 Karp BE, Tate H, Plumblee JR, *et al.* National antimicrobial resistance monitoring system: Two

682 decades of advancing public health through integrated surveillance of antimicrobial resistance.

683 *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 2017; **14**: 545–57.

684 122 Barraud O, Baclet MC, Denis F, Ploy MC. Quantitative multiplex real-time PCR for detecting

685 class 1, 2 and 3 integrons. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2010; **65**: 1642–5.

686 123 Ma L, Li AD, Yin X Le, Zhang T. The Prevalence of Integrons as the Carrier of Antibiotic
687 Resistance Genes in Natural and Man-Made Environments. *Environ Sci Technol* 2017; **51**: 5721–
688 8.

689 124 Mazel D. Integrons: Agents of bacterial evolution. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2006; **4**: 608–20.

690 125 Jones ER, Van Vliet MTH, Qadir M, Bierkens MFP. Country-level and gridded estimates of
691 wastewater production, collection, treatment and reuse. *Earth Syst Sci Data* 2021; **13**: 237–54.

692 126 GBD 2017 Causes of Death Collaborators. Global, regional, and national age-sex-specific
693 mortality for 282 causes of death in 195 countries and territories, 1980–2017: a systematic analysis
694 for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *Lancet* 2018; **392**: 1736–88.

695 127 Van Goethem N, Descamps T, Devleesschauwer B, *et al.* Status and potential of bacterial
696 genomics for public health practice: A scoping review. *Implement Sci* 2019; **14**: 1–16.

697 128 Tan BF, Ng C, Nshimiyimana JP, Loh LL, Gin KYH, Thompson JR. Next-generation sequencing
698 (NGS) for assessment of microbial water quality: Current progress, challenges, and future
699 opportunities. *Front Microbiol* 2015; **6**. DOI:10.3389/fmicb.2015.01027.

700 129 Zaheer R, Noyes N, Ortega Polo R, *et al.* Impact of sequencing depth on the characterization of
701 the microbiome and resistome. *Sci Rep* 2018; **8**: 1–11.

702 130 Murray CJ, Ikuta KS, Sharara F, *et al.* Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019:
703 a systematic analysis. *Lancet* 2022; **6736**. DOI:10.1016/s0140-6736(21)02724-0.

704 131 Taylor SC, Laperriere G, Germain H. Droplet Digital PCR versus qPCR for gene expression
705 analysis with low abundant targets: From variable nonsense to publication quality data. *Sci Rep*
706 2017; **7**: 1–8.

707 132 Bagley ST, Auer MT, Stern DA, Babiera MJ. Sources and fate of giardia cysts and
708 cryptosporidium oocysts in surface waters. *Lake Reserv Manag* 1998; **14**: 379–92.

709 133 Kouimtzi M, Pinney RJ, Newton JM. Survival of bacteria during extrusion-spheronization. *Pharm*
710 *Sci* 1997; **3**: 347–51.

711 134 Medina C, Ginn O, Brown J, *et al.* Detection and assessment of the antibiotic resistance of

- Enterobacteriaceae recovered from bioaerosols in the Choqueyapu River area, La Paz – Bolivia. *Sci Total Environ* 2020; : 143340.
- Salazar D, Ginn O, Brown J, Soria F, Garvizu C. Assessment of antibiotic resistant coliforms from bioaerosol samples collected above a sewage-polluted river in La Paz, Bolivia. *Int J Hyg Environ Health* 2020; **228**: 113494.
- Collaborators G 2016 DD. Estimates of the global, regional, and national morbidity, mortality, and aetiologies of diarrhoea in 195 countries: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2018; **18**: 1211–28.
- Sanz-García F, Gil-Gil T, Laborda P, Ochoa-Sánchez LE, Martínez JL, Hernando-Amado S. Coming from the wild: Multidrug resistant opportunistic pathogens presenting a primary, not human-linked, environmental habitat. *Int J Mol Sci* 2021; **22**. DOI:10.3390/ijms22158080.
- Gerba CP, Betancourt WQ, Kitajima M. How much reduction of virus is needed for recycled water: A continuous changing need for assessment? *Water Res* 2017; **108**: 25–31.
- Symonds EM, Griffin DW, Breitbart M. Eukaryotic viruses in wastewater samples from the United States. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2009; **75**: 1402–9.
- Hellmér M, Paxéus N, Magnus L, *et al*. Detection of pathogenic viruses in sewage provided early warnings of hepatitis A virus and norovirus outbreaks. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2014; **80**: 6771–81.
- Marks PJ, Vipond IB, Regan FM, Wedgwood K, Fey RE, Caul EO. A school outbreak of Norwalk-like virus: Evidence for airborne transmission. *Epidemiol Infect* 2003; **131**: 727–36.
- Marks PJ, Vipond IB, Carlisle D, Deakin D, Fey RE, Caul EO. Evidence for airborne transmission of Norwalk-like virus (NLV) in a hotel restaurant. *Epidemiol Infect* 2000; **124**: 481–7.
- O’Neill PD, Marks PJ. Bayesian model choice and infection route modelling in an outbreak of Norovirus. *Stat Med* 2005; **24**: 2011–24.
- Alsved M, Widell A, Dahlin H, Karlson S, Medstrand P, Löndahl J. Aerosolization and recovery of viable murine norovirus in an experimental setup. *Sci Rep* 2020; **10**: 1–10.

738