

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

Using agent-based modeling to compare corrective actions for *Listeria* contamination in produce
packinghouses

Cecil Barnett-Neefs^{1*}, Genevieve Sullivan^{1,3}, Claire Zoellner², Martin Wiedmann³, Renata Ivanek¹

¹ Department of Population Medicine and Diagnostic Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, United States of America

² iFoodDecisionSciences, Seattle, Washington, United States of America

³ Department of Food Science, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, United States of America

* Corresponding author

E-mail: cwb96@cornell.edu (CBN)

Keywords: decision support tool; simulation; digital twin; computational model; food safety

28 Abstract

29 The complex environment of a produce packinghouse can facilitate the spread of pathogens such as
30 *Listeria monocytogenes* in unexpected ways. This can lead to finished product contamination and
31 potential foodborne disease cases. There is a need for simulation-based decision support tools that
32 can test different corrective actions and are able to account for a facility's interior cross-
33 contamination dynamics. Thus, we developed agent-based models of *Listeria* contamination
34 dynamics for two produce packinghouse facilities; agents in the models represented equipment
35 surfaces and employees, and models were parameterized using observations, values from published
36 literature and expert opinion. Once validated with historical data from *Listeria* environmental
37 sampling, each model's baseline conditions were investigated and used to determine the
38 effectiveness of corrective actions in reducing prevalence of agents contaminated with *Listeria* and
39 concentration of *Listeria* on contaminated agents. Evaluated corrective actions included reducing
40 incoming *Listeria*, modifying cleaning and sanitation strategies, and reducing transmission pathways,
41 and combinations thereof. Analysis of *Listeria* contamination predictions revealed differences
42 between the facilities despite their functional similarities, highlighting that one-size-fits-all
43 approaches may not always be the most effective means for selection of corrective actions in fresh
44 produce packinghouses. Corrective actions targeting *Listeria* introduced in the facility on raw
45 materials, implementing risk-based cleaning and sanitation, and modifying equipment connectivity
46 were shown to be most effective in reducing *Listeria* contamination prevalence. Overall, our results
47 suggest that a well-designed cleaning and sanitation schedule, coupled with good manufacturing
48 practices can be effective in controlling contamination, even if incoming *Listeria* spp. on raw
49 materials cannot be reduced. The presence of water within specific areas was also shown to
50 influence corrective action performance. Our findings support that agent-based models can serve as
51 effective decision support tools in identifying *Listeria*-specific vulnerabilities within individual
52 packinghouses and hence may help reduce risks of food contamination and potential human
53 exposure.

54 Introduction

55 *Listeria monocytogenes* is an environmentally widespread, Gram-positive bacterium known for its
56 ability to grow at refrigeration temperatures (1) and persist in food industry equipment due to the
57 presence of harborage sites and conditions favoring replication of the bacteria (2). Symptoms of *L.*
58 *monocytogenes* infection can either manifest in the form of relatively lesser signs that include
59 nausea, vomiting, fever and diarrhea, and more severe ones including abortion, meningitis,
60 encephalitis, septicemia and death (1). Though only possessing an incidence rate between 0.1 to 10
61 cases per 1 million people per year depending on the specific country (3), listeriosis has a case-
62 fatality rate between 20-30% (4), making it a priority in food safety. Within a produce packinghouse
63 facility, introduction of *L. monocytogenes* on incoming raw produce is only one of the contamination
64 routes that needs to be addressed, as re-contamination is possible further along production lines
65 due to the presence of harborage sites within facilities (5). Alternative introduction routes into a

66 facility can include entries via regular staff or equipment movement, or unexpected occurrences
67 (i.e., random events), such as roof leakage due to extreme weather or during specialized equipment
68 repairs. The interplay between product, equipment surfaces, water and employees presents a
69 complicated web of interactions, allowing pathogens like *L. monocytogenes* to spread beyond its
70 initial introduction site to elsewhere within a facility (6). Challenges associated with control of *L.*
71 *monocytogenes* are further compounded in fresh and ready-to-eat (RTE) foods that do not undergo
72 a kill-step, such as fresh and fresh-cut produce. To combat the risk of contamination, facilities can
73 employ environmental monitoring programs (EMPs) to locate pathogen sources, determine
74 pathogen spread throughout the facility, and verify which control strategies are most effective.
75 EMPs involve the routine collection of sponge and swab samples of strategically selected surfaces
76 within a facility and testing them for *Listeria* spp. as an indicator for conditions that will facilitate *L.*
77 *monocytogenes* contamination. EMP results play an important role in identifying and implementing
78 control strategies such as cleaning and sanitation programs and hygienic zoning (7), which helps
79 restrict pathogen movement.

80 A data scarcity due to limited testing as part of a facility's EMP or low prevalence of *Listeria* spp.
81 positive samples detected as part of the EMP can be supplemented by *in silico* tools for more
82 quantitative analysis. Furthermore, a digital decision support tool can assist when determining which
83 corrective actions to pursue within a facility. Due to the structurally complex nature of these
84 facilities, an agent-based model (ABM) is well-suited to this task thanks to its inherent specialization
85 in modelling the interactions of heterogeneous and autonomous "agents" representing the
86 components of the system under study. Simulating a facility *in silico* can be used for a number of
87 objectives, such as better understanding of pathogen movement, interpreting results of EMPs, and
88 evaluating interventions or capital improvements in the facility. One such tool is "Environmental
89 monitoring with an Agent-Based Model of *Listeria*" (EnABLE) (8), which has already been shown to
90 allow for analysis of *Listeria* spp. transmission in the slicing and packaging room of a smoked seafood
91 facility. EnABLE's flexible systems not only allow for the establishment of a model replica

92 (sometimes referred to as a “digital twin”) of a real food production environment, but the rapid
93 manipulation of any number of model parameters or agent-specific values as well. This inherent
94 modularity can be an incredibly powerful asset in the development and evaluation of different
95 corrective actions. Moreover, the establishment of a model aids in identifying targeted interventions
96 that can be specifically applied to higher risk areas of a facility to mitigate contamination. Thus, the
97 objective of this study was twofold: (i) to construct and validate ABMs for two produce
98 packinghouses using historical sampling data and (ii) use these validated ABMs to quantify the
99 effectiveness of facility-wide and site-specific corrective actions in reducing *Listeria* spp.
100 contamination in wet and dry areas of the packinghouses.

101 **Methods**

102 Data from two produce packinghouse facilities were used to create an ABM for each facility (models
103 “Facility A” and “Facility B”). ABMs were constructed in NetLogo 6.2.0 (9) following the general
104 structure of the EnABLE model developed by Zoellner et al. (8). The models were run with one-hour
105 time steps for a period of two virtual weeks, with the first week allowing *Listeria* to potentially
106 become introduced and spread in a facility and simulated environmental monitoring (EM) being
107 performed in the second week for model validation. For corrective action scenarios, each corrective
108 action was started from the beginning of the simulation and ran for the entire two weeks. For both
109 facilities, an ABM was constructed of the main room where packing operations were performed.
110 While the two packinghouse facilities have variations in layout and size, both facilities can be broken
111 down into similar production steps as briefly summarized: produce is brought into the facility via
112 crates carried by forklifts and loaded into a flume system. Once loaded, raw produce is then
113 transferred to a cleaning area for culling and waxing. Produce is then sorted according to size and
114 appearance and is directed accordingly to either a reject area or the appropriate hand-packing area
115 (trays and bags in Facility A; only trays in Facility B). Production as well as cleaning and sanitation
116 shifts were modeled based on information provided by the facilities, with Facility A performing
117 weekly cleaning and sanitation separately on two separate days, and Facility B performing daily

118 cleaning and sanitation on each workday as well as extended cleaning and sanitation on Saturday.
119 Both facilities operated on a single shift during workdays (Monday-Friday) with a half hour break in
120 the middle of the shift.

121

122 **Model Construction & Specifications**

123 Each model had two types of agents: equipment and employees. Agents' attributes included the
124 following fixed characteristics:

- 125 (i) Position (defined by x and y coordinates to represent position in 2D plane)
- 126 (ii) Distance from floor (i.e., "height" in cm, used to calculate interaction order for agents
127 sharing the same position)
- 128 (iii) Zone category as per proximity to food products (Zone 1: Food-Contact Surfaces (FCS);
129 Zone 2: Non-Food-Contact Surfaces (NFCS) in close proximity to food and FCS; Zone 3:
130 NFCS not in close proximity to food or FCS (10))
- 131 (iv) Cleanability, that classified each agent as either (i) cleanable (i.e., any *Listeria* present on
132 an agent could be removed from the agent during a routine cleaning step) or (ii)
133 uncleanable (i.e., an agent that due to its design cannot be effectively cleaned during
134 routine cleaning and thus remains contaminated once *Listeria* spreads on it)
- 135 (v) Cleaning frequency
- 136 (vi) Surface area (cm²)

137 Additionally, each agent had a number of time-varying attributes to track:

- 138 (i) *Listeria* quantity (both in terms of the absolute number of CFU and concentration per
139 surface area (in CFU/cm²) on an agent)
- 140 (ii) Frequency of contamination from specific sources over the course of the simulation: (a)
141 raw incoming food material, (b) random introduction occurrences that could take place
142 anywhere in the facility, or (c) "Zone 4" (7) introduction (i.e., introduction from areas

143 outside the packing room), which had a more localized effect near actively used
144 doorways

145 (iii) Agent water level (consisting of three levels: 1: no water; 2: damp to the touch; 3: visible
146 water on agent)

147 (iv) Niche formations over the course of the simulation (defined as *Listeria* spreading onto
148 an “uncleanable” agent) or temporary niche formations (defined a contamination of an
149 otherwise “cleanable” agent that remained contaminated after routine cleaning) and
150 how frequently these occur

151 (v) Sampling over the course of the simulation (if the agent has been sampled by the
152 simulated EMP)

153 Table 1 provides a summary of the modeled agents and their characteristics. Agents were grouped
154 based on their location in the production area (Loading, Cleaning, Sorting, Reject, Bag Packing, Tray
155 Packing, and an Other group that included a collection of agents not fitting elsewhere, such as
156 quality control workstations and computer workstations) and by presence of water within the facility
157 area: “wet” (Loading and Cleaning) and “dry” (Sorting, Bag/Tray Packing, Reject and Other).

158 Following the establishment of the agent list, the contact structure among agents was created by
159 assigning (i) directed and (ii) undirected links. The presence of connections allowed for transfer of
160 *Listeria* from one agent to another, depending on link's directionality. Directed links represented
161 one-way connections (termed "contact-links", consisting of "out-directed-links" on the sending
162 agents and "in-directed-links" on the receiving agents). These directed links provided opportunities
163 for *Listeria* transfer in a single direction (with agents sending *Listeria* performing “transfer”, and
164 agents receiving performing “reception”), such as transfer belts and rollers. Undirected links (termed
165 "proximity-links") represented repeated contact between two agents, transferring contamination
166 with a certain frequency and regardless of direction. The models were constructed using
167 observations from in-person visits to the modeled facilities by authors C.W.B.-N. and G.S. to conduct
168 behavioral mapping of number and function of workers (11) and to determine layout, key surfaces,

169 water and traffic patterns, and connection pathways (Fig 1). The specifics of produce commodities
170 packed in the two packinghouses and the locations of packinghouses cannot be provided; this was a
171 condition for gaining access into the facilities and their data.

172

173 Figure_1.tiff

174 **Fig 1. NetLogo views of Facilities A (upper panel) and B (lower panel) illustrating positions of and**
175 **connections among agents and presence of water at a point in time during production.** Circles,
176 triangles and pentagons represent equipment surfaces in zones 1, 2 and 3, respectively; agent water
177 level is denoted by shape color darkness and is independent from floor conditions; employees and
178 forklifts are denoted by specific icons (people and cars respectively); arrows represent the direction
179 of directed agent links and lines without arrows represent undirected links; blue shaded areas
180 represent water presence on the floor (darker colors representing puddles and lighter colors
181 representing damp areas); brown patches denote wall-floor-junctures; grey patches denote doors,
182 with dark grey patches being points of Zone 4 introduction; empty space is denoted by white
183 patches; inactive space not represented by the model is denoted by black.

184

185 A baseline map in the form of text files was first constructed using numerical representation to
186 establish size and grid scale for floor patches, as well as the location of structural components (wall-
187 floor-junctures, open floor, ceiling, and doors). The surface area per patch was 2,500 cm², with
188 Facility A consisting of 109 x 88 patches (9,592) and Facility B consisting of 130 x 56 patches (7,020).
189 Additional maps were then created to represent water level (i.e., none, low, medium, and high) and
190 traffic level (i.e., none, vehicle, low, medium, and high) on the floor for different phases of facility
191 operation. A weekly schedule was also established in the form of a 7x24 csv file for each hour in a
192 week, with each cell detailing the current event for a specific hour (“empty”: no activity; “pre-op”:
193 pre-operations inspection with minimal staff; “production”: standard operations with full staffing
194 and activity; “clean”: “Cleaning Only”/ “Cleaning & Sanitation” operations to remove *Listeria* from
195 equipment) (Tables S1-S5 in S1 File). The schedule was used not only to determine which traffic and
196 water maps to load, but also defined the presence/absence of specific agents (employees and
197 forklifts), as well as *Listeria* introduction processes over time.

198 **Table 1. Agent characteristics by zone of agent-based models (Facilities A and B) representing two**
 199 **modeled packinghouses.**

	Facility A			Facility B				
	Zone 1 ^a	Zone 2	Zone 3	Employees ^b	Zone 1 ^a	Zone 2	Zone 3	Employees ^b
Number of Agents	57	68	63	36	74	122	16	13
Distance from floor (m)	0.90 [0.00, 2.02] ^c	1.00 [0.00, 2.00]	0.00 [0.00, 1.20]	1.20 [0.88, 2.05]	1.0 [0.05, 1.80]	0.71 [0.00, 1.59]	0.0 [0.00, 1.15]	1.20 [1.20, 2.50]
Surface area (cm ²)	340.0 [240.0, 187785.8]	27,500.0 [145.4, 150995.2]	3,178.5 [340.0, 10259.7]	340.0 [340.0, 340.0]	11,250.0 [625.0, 214468.8]	2,500.0 [101.3, 43062.5]	2,725.0 [40.0, 93281.3]	340.0 [340.0, 340.0]
Number of out-directed links	0.0 [0.0, 3.0]	0.0 [0.0, 1.0]	0.0 [0.0, 0.0]	0.0 [0.0, 2.0]	1.0 [0.0, 3.0]	0.0 [0.0, 1.0]	0.0 [0.0, 0.1]	1.0 [1.0, 2.0]
Number of in-directed links	0.0 [0.0, 2.0]	0.5 [0.0, 1.0]	0.0 [0.0, 0.0]	0.0 [0.0, 1.0]	1.0 [0.0, 1.0]	0.0 [0.0, 1.0]	0.0 [0.0, 2.5]	1.0 [1.0, 1.0]
Number of undirected links	1.0 [0.0, 5.0]	1.0 [0.0, 5.0]	1.0 [0.0, 2.0]	3.0 [0.0, 5.0]	0.0 [0.0, 3.0]	0.0 [0.0, 3.0]	1.0 [0.0, 5.2]	1.0 [0.0, 1.0]
Number (%) uncleanable	10 (11%)	20 (29%)	22 (35%)	0 (0%)	6 (8%)	94 (77%)	6 (38%)	0 (0%)
Equipment/Employee Cleaning Schedule	Weekly ^d	Weekly ^d	Weekly ^d	Upon leaving ^e	Weekdays ^f	Weekdays ^f	Weekdays ^f	Upon leaving ^e

200 ^aZone 1 agents and the summary of their attributes do not include employees. ^bValues listed
 201 specifically refer to a pair of human hands. ^cValues are given as median [5th-95th percentile] unless
 202 otherwise stated. ^d“Cleaning Only”: Weekly (Saturday); “Cleaning & Sanitation”: Weekly (Monday).
 203 ^eAll *Listeria* removed when employees leave production floor (Modeled are employees leaving the
 204 production floor for break and at the end of the shift). ^fCleaning & Sanitation: Weekdays (Monday-
 205 Friday).

206

207 Finally, input parameters (as either fixed values or probability distributions) were established from
 208 observations and information in the literature to describe *Listeria* growth, transmission, and
 209 reduction (Table 2; Tables S6-S9 in S1 File). Data not available in literature sources was acquired
 210 from a web-based survey with industry and academic experts that was performed by Sullivan et al.
 211 (12) to specifically collect data needed for development of ABMs for fresh produce facilities. Briefly,
 212 this expert opinion survey was completed by six individuals (four from academia and two from
 213 produce industry backgrounds) with expertise on *Listeria* in food facilities. Each question addressed
 214 a specific parameter; survey results were summarized as a median, minimum, and maximum, which

215 were used to parameterize Pert distributions for each parameter alongside a suitable peakedness
216 parameter (Table 2). For each distribution used, its mean and 5th-95th percentiles were then
217 calculated to provide summary information. Expert elicitation for the purpose of developing a novel
218 modeling framework is considered beneficial because it permits rapid evaluation of the system and
219 parameter uncertainty, and thus it allows prioritization of future data collection based on the results
220 of sensitivity analysis (13). For model parameters represented as probability distributions, the
221 parameter values across iterations were controlled by a global random seed independent from the
222 rest of the model to ensure a repeatable stream of values was chosen from the distribution between
223 simulations of modeled scenarios. Each iteration within a scenario was also controlled with a local
224 random seed to further ensure repeatability during simulations.

225 To determine the degree of reduction in *Listeria* during cleaning for each agent and the timing of
226 these operations, each facility was asked to provide information on the cleaning operations they
227 apply during a regular week. These cleaning activities were modeled as two different levels of
228 reduction: “Cleaning Only” (average of 0.5 log₁₀ *Listeria* reduction) and “Cleaning & Sanitation”
229 (average of 6 log₁₀ *Listeria* reduction) (14) (for details see S1 File).

230 Several assumptions were made in the model for simplicity: firstly, temperature was uniform and
231 constant at 12°C within the facility and external weather conditions were not accounted for.
232 Secondly, *Listeria* on the floor (i.e., patches) was not picked up by agents (i.e., modeled equipment
233 surfaces and employee hands) due to a lack of data regarding frequency of occurrence and amount
234 of *Listeria* transferred, as well as a lack of mechanics within the model to adequately judge if an
235 agent’s surface height is too far from the floor to become directly contaminated from the floor.
236 Additionally, in the model employees were allocated to their working stations, however, their
237 movement around the facility was represented through the traffic map and it was assumed they did
238 not deviate from these patterns. This assumption was not expected to have affected the model
239 prediction. Employees driving forklifts were not accounted for in the model because they do not

240 contact the floor or agents in the model system. The value of the probability of a cleanable agent
 241 being properly cleaned either during “Cleaning & Sanitation” (γ) or “Cleaning Only” (δ) was assumed
 242 due to lack of information. To determine the potential impact of the assumption we tested smaller
 243 values of these probabilities but the impact was negligible (Figure S6) and thus the assumed value
 244 was considered acceptable. Finally, an agent’s cleanability being switched from “uncleanable” to
 245 “cleanable” in scenarios simulating corrective actions was assumed to either represent (i) the
 246 inclusion of equipment that was not previously cleaned on a regular basis into facility’s regular
 247 cleaning and sanitation operations schedule or (ii) modification or replacement of previously difficult
 248 to clean equipment to allow it to be fully cleaned during regular cleaning operations; thereby, in the
 249 model a previously uncleanable agent representing such equipment became cleanable.
 250

251 **Table 2. Baseline model input parameters, description, equation and distribution, summary values**
 252 **and sources for *Listeria* spp. introduction, growth, transmission, and reduction.**

Symbol	Description ^a	Equation/Distribution	Mean	5 th -95 th Percentile	Reference
P_z	Probability that <i>Listeria</i> spp. is introduced into the room via objects from Zone 4 per hour	$10^{\text{Pert}(-2.3,-0.9,-0.6,4.8)}$	0.14	[0.02, 0.36]	(12)
N_z	Amount of <i>Listeria</i> spp. introduced to an agent or patch from Zone 4 (CFU) per occurrence	$10^{\text{Pert}(0.0,1.9,3.3,4.2)}$	156	[6.04, 618.79]	(12)
R_d	Probability of a crate of incoming raw produce containing <i>Listeria</i> -contaminated produce on day d, for d = Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday	$10^{\text{Pert}(-2.3,-0.6,-0.6,5.4)}$	0.161 ^b	[5.82E-2, 0.243]	(12)

N_R	Concentration of <i>Listeria</i> spp. per gram of contaminated raw produce (CFU/g)	Gamma(0.18,0.425)	0.42	[8.90E-8, 2.24]	(15)
α	Proportion of <i>Listeria</i> spp. transferred to a surface upon contact with a contaminated raw produce	$10^{\text{Normal}[-0.44,0.4]}$ for $\alpha < 1$, else $\alpha=1$	0.45	[0.08, 1.00]	(16)
P_r	Rate of random event occurrences that introduce <i>Listeria</i> spp. from outside the room per hour	$10^{\text{Pert}[-4.3,-0.9,-0.6,4.6]}$	0.07	[4.00E-3, 0.203]	(12)
N_r	Amount of <i>Listeria</i> spp. introduced per random event (CFU)	$10^{\text{Pert}(0.2,3.3,3.7,3.3)}$	1233	[42, 3829]	(12)
K	Environmental carrying capacity of <i>Listeria</i> spp. (CFU/ml)	-	1.00E8	-	(14)
GT	Generation time (hr) of <i>Listeria</i> spp. on environment surfaces at 12 °C	Uniform(16,217)	116.48	[26.05, 206.95]	(17)
μ	Maximum specific growth rate (hr^{-1}) of <i>Listeria</i> spp. on environment surfaces (12 °C)	$\text{Ln}(2)/\text{GT}$	0.01	[0.00, 0.03]	<i>calculated</i>
P_t	Probability that contact on floor from foot and equipment traffic is sufficient to spread <i>Listeria</i> spp. to adjacent patch	Pert(0.03,0.25,0.65,4)	0.28	[0.10, 0.48]	(18)
C_i	Contact rate between the contaminated patch and the	$C_{\text{veh}}=120/\text{patch}/\text{hr}$ $C_{\text{high}}=60/\text{patch}/\text{hr}$ $C_{\text{low}}=12/\text{patch}/\text{hr}$ $C_{\text{neg}}=0.2/\text{patch}/\text{hr}$	-	-	<i>observed</i>

	adjacent patch given the traffic level $I = \text{veh}$, <i>high, low, neg^c</i>				
P_w	Probability that environmental <i>Listeria</i> spp. is transported to adjacent patches via (visible) water	Uniform(0.01,0.05)	0.03	[0.01, 0.05]	(8)
β	Probability of <i>Listeria</i> spp. transmission among patches via traffic and water	Uniform(0.0,0.05)	0.03	[3.00E-3, 4.80E-2]	(8)
P_f	Probability that a contaminated produce or organic debris falls to the floor during any given hour of production	Uniform(0.01,0.03)	0.2	[1.10E-2, 2.90E-2]	<i>observed</i>
P_c	Probability of a condensation transfer event given <i>Listeria</i> spp. is present	Uniform(0.0,0.02)	0.01	[1.00E-3, 1.90E-2]	<i>observed</i>
ϑ_d	Log ₁₀ reduction of <i>Listeria</i> spp. from equipment during “Cleaning Only” on day d, for d= <i>Friday</i> within Facility A	Pert(-1.5,-0.5,0,4)	-0.58	[-0.78, -0.37]	(14)
η_d	Log ₁₀ reduction of <i>Listeria</i> spp. from equipment during “Cleaning & Sanitation” on day d, in Facility A d= <i>Saturday</i> ; in Facility B d= <i>Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday</i>	Pert(-8,-6,-1.5,4)	-5.58	[-7.36, -3.47]	(14)
γ	Probability that a cleanable agent was properly cleaned when	-	0.99	-	<i>assumed^d</i>

	“Cleaning & Sanitation” was performed				
δ	Probability that a cleanable agent was properly cleaned when “Cleaning Only” was performed	-	0.99	-	<i>assumed^d</i>
R_i	Number of crates containing raw produce introduced per hour	-	5	-	<i>observed</i>
S_c	Amount of raw produce material in grams introduced per crate	-	362874	-	<i>provided by facility</i>
τ_{ij}	Probability of <i>Listeria</i> spp. transfer from <i>i</i> to <i>j</i> agent given contact, where $i=j=$ Zone1, Zone 2, Zone 3, or Employee agent type ^e	$\tau_{ij}=10^{\text{Normal}(\text{TC},\text{STD})}$	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	(16,19)

253 ^aAll parameters correspond to an hourly time scale. ^b $R_d=0.16$ means that an average of 6.4 crates
254 with contaminated produce are received per shift on an average day. ^cveh=vehicle, neg=negligible.
255 ^dValues were assumed when data was not available from literature or expert opinion. ^eTC=mean
256 transfer coefficient, STD=standard deviation of the transfer coefficient; full data in Supplemental
257 Tables S7 and S8 in S1 File. ^fFull data in Supplemental Table S9 in S1 File.

258

259 The models described above, and defined with parameters in Table 2 (and Tables S6-S9 in S1 File),
260 were considered as the “baseline model” for Facilities A and B. All statistical analyses of data
261 generated through model simulations were conducted in R 4.0.5 (20) using the ‘data.table’ package
262 (21) to import large files. To aid interpretation and comparison of results from different sensitivity
263 and scenario analyses, in each model iteration two primary outcomes of interest were recorded at
264 Midday (12:00 pm) on Wednesday of the second simulation week (which in the model was coded as
265 the last action before the mid-shift break). This timing for reporting of the model outcomes was

266 selected to allow for the observation of employee contamination levels just prior to going on break
267 while equipment-related data was collected, mimicking the sampling methods in the historical EM
268 data used for validation. The two outcomes of interest were: (i) the prevalence of contaminated
269 agents (P_W) and (ii) *Listeria* concentration on contaminated agents (C_W , CFU/cm²). The outcome
270 P_W was calculated by first estimating the prevalence of contaminated agents in one iteration
271 (overall or in a specific subset of agents) and then to summarize prevalence across model iterations
272 we used a boxplot; the median was recorded for comparisons. Similarly, the outcome C_W was
273 summarized over agents (overall or in a specific subset of agents) and iterations using a boxplot; the
274 median was recorded for comparisons.

275

276 **Validation and Verification**

277 Both models were validated using historical EM data collected from the respective facility and by
278 recreating analogous *in silico* sampling scenarios that targeted the same equipment surfaces within
279 the model. Historical EM data regarding *Listeria* presence throughout each facility was collected
280 from a complementary study (22), in which Zone 2 and 3 surfaces were sampled using individually
281 packaged sponges hydrated with 10 mL Dey-Engley neutralizing buffer. On a given day, sampling was
282 performed by collecting 3-36 samples in Facility A, and 19-30 samples in Facility B; samples were
283 collected 3-4 hours into a facility's production cycle and tested for the presence of *Listeria* spp. using
284 the Food and Drug Administration Bacteriological Analytical Manual method (23). A simulated
285 sampling routine was performed in each model using the sampling schedule and the number of
286 samples used for collection of the historical data. Simulated sampling was weighted to favor sites
287 that were historically more often sampled; the weight was calculated by dividing the individual
288 agent's sampling probability by the sum of sampling probabilities of all agents in historical data:

$$289 \text{ Weighted } P(x_i) = \frac{P(x_i)}{\sum_i^m P(x_i)} \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

290 where x_i is an individual agent among a total of m agents and P stands for probability.

291 Simulated environmental sampling was interpreted with an assumed false negative rate of 10% if
292 the agent's *Listeria* concentration was ≤ 10 CFU/cm², and 1% if the contamination level was between
293 11-100 CFU/cm². Samples from agents with a *Listeria* concentration over 100 CFU/cm² were
294 assumed to have a zero false negative rate (8). Each model (Facility A and B) was used to run a
295 1,000-iteration BehaviorSpace experiment in NetLogo to determine the contamination status of
296 agents representing historical sampling data and then compare model predictions with historical
297 sampling data for the same sampled surfaces. Validation data were evaluated graphically and using
298 a Chi Square Test, or Fisher's Exact Test (if the number of samples in the group were too small for
299 use of Chi Square test), to determine if prevalence of positive samples in historical data was
300 statistically significantly different from the mean prevalence of positive samples predicted by the
301 model; these comparisons were conducted by shift, zone classification and wet/dry area type. The
302 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) for the historical prevalences were estimated using the Wilson
303 score interval method in the 'Hmisc' R package (24) to describe the level of certainty in the mean
304 estimates while accounting for the sampling effort. Next, we graphically determined whether the
305 95% CI for the historical data fall within the range of prevalences predicted by the model (described
306 by boxplots).

307 Each model was additionally verified to be functioning correctly using NetLogo's own debugging tool
308 for code integrity. Model mechanics were tested using extreme scenarios and simplified models that
309 only ran isolated parts of the original systems. Models for both facilities were also tested on
310 alternate hardware to ensure they remained functional on other computer systems.

311 **Sensitivity Analysis**

312 A 2-sided partial rank correlation coefficient (PRCC) evaluation using the 'epiR' R package (25) was
313 used to perform a sensitivity analysis to identify relationships between the predicted agent
314 contamination prevalence at Midday Week 2 of a randomly selected day from among the days when
315 the facility underwent EM in historical data (Facility A: Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday; Facility B:
316 Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday) and specific input parameters. Coefficients were then filtered

317 against a Bonferroni-corrected significance level ($p=0.05/46=0.0011$ and $p=0.05/45=0.0011$ for
318 Facility A and B, respectively).

319

320 **Scenario Analysis**

321 Scenario analyses evaluated the effect of several corrective actions that were created to simulate
322 targeted control and cleaning strategies (Table 3). In Facility B, regular “Cleaning & Sanitation” of
323 equipment is performed daily and thus these corrective actions were already embedded in the
324 baseline model configuration of Facility B. However, Facility A performs both “Cleaning Only” and
325 “Cleaning & Sanitation” procedures only once a week (Saturdays and Mondays, respectively),
326 therefore scenario analysis for Facility A’s risk-based corrective actions additionally tested both (i)
327 daily “Cleaning Only” of equipment and (ii) daily “Cleaning & Sanitation”. In scenarios involving
328 modification of the Master Sanitization Schedule, agents previously designated as “uncleanable” (if
329 that was because they were never cleaned according to the schedule of cleaning in the baseline
330 model) could now be eligible to undergo cleaning (thus, their cleanability attribute would be
331 changed to “cleanable”), depending on their respective predicted mean contamination probability in
332 the baseline model. Scenario AI_04 (“Transmission Pathways Modification Corrective Action”)
333 involved the modification of connections between specific agents to represent corrective actions
334 that had minimal impact to facility function and a higher likelihood of implementation by a facility in
335 response to a contamination event. This criterion was determined by (i) identifying changes in the
336 model that would involve the smallest number of modifications of agent-to-agent connections and
337 (ii) considering the practical feasibility of making those changes in a packinghouse.

338 **Table 3. Corrective Action Scenarios and their virtual implementation within the Agent-Based**
339 **Models.**

Scenario	Description	Computational implementation ^a	Scenario model-notation
Random Event Occurrence	The time until the next random introduction event to occur was extended by 25%, 50% or 75%	$P_r * 1.25$ $P_r * 1.50$ $P_r * 1.75$	PR_01 PR_02 PR_03

		from baseline	
Random Load Reduction	The amount of <i>Listeria</i> introduced by random contamination events was reduced by 1, 2 or 3 log ₁₀ .	$N_r * 0.1$	LR_01
		$N_r * 0.01$	LR_02
		$N_r * 0.001$	LR_03
Z4 Event Occurrence Reduction	The probability of a Zone 4 introduction event occurring in an hour in the baseline model was reduced by 25%, 50% or 75% or set to zero.	$P_z * 0.75$	PZ_01
		$P_z * 0.50$	PZ_02
		$P_z * 0.25$	PZ_03
		$P_z * 0.00$	PZ_04
Z4 Load Reduction	The amount of <i>Listeria</i> introduced by Zone 4 contamination events was reduced by 1, 2 or 3 log ₁₀ .	$N_z * 0.1$	LZ_01
		$N_z * 0.01$	LZ_02
		$N_z * 0.001$	LZ_03
<i>Listeria</i> Prevalence in Incoming Raw Produce Reduction	The baseline prevalence of product-borne <i>Listeria</i> arriving in the facility was reduced by 25%, 50% or 75% or set to zero. This simulated produce being treated prior to arriving in the packinghouse packing room.	$R_d * 0.75$	EC_01
		$R_d * 0.50$	EC_02
		$R_d * 0.25$	EC_03
		$R_d * 0.00$	EC_04
Cleaning Effectiveness Improvement	The amount of <i>Listeria</i> removed during “Cleaning Only” and “Cleaning & Sanitation” was increased by 3 log ₁₀ . This simulates the usage of more powerful reduction techniques.	$\theta_d * 0.001$ or $\theta_d * 0.001 \& \eta_d * 0.001$	MI_01
Weekend Deep Clean	All <i>Listeria</i> in the facility was removed from all agents regardless of cleanability status every Sunday.	<i>Listeria</i> concentration of affected agents set to zero at the time of the scheduled cleaning	MI_02
Enhanced Flume Water Treatment	The amount of <i>Listeria</i> on the flume agent in each model was reduced by 2 log ₁₀ during each hour of production; this simulates a wash water treatment that effectively delivers a 2 log ₁₀ reduction.	<i>Flume agent load</i> * 0.01	AI_01
Broad Model-based Master Sanitation Schedule Restructuring	Agent cleaning and sanitation schedules were reassigned according to mean contamination probability predicted in the baseline model over the second week. An agent could be assigned one of three options: (i) weekly schedule (when the agent’s predicted contamination probability was ≤32%), (ii) alternating days (33-65%), (iii) daily (≥66%). At the scheduled cleaning and sanitation, <i>Listeria</i> concentration on select agents was reduced by ϑ_d or η_d as appropriate. In the case of Facility A, where a daily schedule did not previously exist, one was implemented using either “Cleaning Only” or “Cleaning &	<i>Listeria</i> concentration of affected agents reduced by ϑ_d at the time of the scheduled “Cleaning Only” (Facility A)	AI_02C1
		<i>Listeria</i> concentration of affected agents reduced by η_d at the time of the scheduled “Cleaning & Sanitation” (Facility A)	AI_02C2
		<i>Listeria</i> concentration of affected agents reduced by η_d at the time of the scheduled “Cleaning & Sanitation” (Facility B)	AI_02

	Sanitation". This simulates a "risk-based reorganization of the cleaning and sanitation schedule".		
Directed Model-based Master Sanitation Schedule Restructuring	Only agents predicted to have a mean contamination probability $\geq 66\%$ in the baseline model were scheduled for daily cleaning and sanitation, meaning that <i>Listeria</i> concentration on these agents was reduced by ϑ_d or η_d as appropriate on agents scheduled to be cleaned at that frequency; other agents were left with their original cleaning and sanitation scheduling. In the case of Facility, A where a daily schedule did not previously exist, one was implemented using either "Cleaning Only" or "Cleaning & Sanitation". This simulates a "partial reorganization of the cleaning and sanitation schedule of surfaces determined to be most at risk of contamination".	<i>Listeria</i> concentration of affected agents reduced by ϑ_d at the time of the scheduled "Cleaning Only" (Facility A)	AI_03C1
		<i>Listeria</i> concentration of affected agents reduced by η_d at the time of the scheduled "Cleaning & Sanitation" (Facility A)	AI_03C2
		<i>Listeria</i> concentration of affected agents reduced by η_d at the time of the scheduled "Cleaning & Sanitation" (Facility B)	AI_03
Transmission Pathways Modification Corrective Action	Links between specific agents were severed to represent physical isolation between them. In Facility A the interconnected drain system was compartmentalized so that agents could only receive <i>Listeria</i> (but not spread it further) while in Facility B each forklift was assigned to a single separate area.	Modified links defined at beginning of scenario	AI_04
Combined Corrective Action 01	Facility A ran scenarios EC_02 and AI_02C2 simultaneously, while Facility B ran scenarios EC_02 and AI_03. This simulated the simultaneous application of (i) reduced <i>Listeria</i> prevalence in incoming produce and (ii) the most effective schedule-based corrective action for each facility.	$R_d * 0.50$; <i>Listeria</i> concentration of affected agents reduced by η_d at the time of the scheduled cleaning	CI_01
Combined Corrective Action 02	EC_02 and AI_04 were applied in the model simultaneously, this simulated the simultaneous application of (i) reduced <i>Listeria</i> prevalence in incoming produce and (ii) agent compartmentalization.	$R_d * 0.50$; Modified links defined at beginning of scenario	CI_02
Combined Corrective Action 03	Facility A ran scenarios AI_02C2 and AI_04 simultaneously, while Facility B ran scenarios AI_03 and AI_04. This simulated the simultaneous application of (i) each model's most effective	<i>Listeria</i> concentration of affected agents reduced by η_d at the time of the scheduled cleaning; Modified links defined at beginning of scenario	CI_03

schedule-based corrective action
and (ii) agent
compartmentalization.

340 ^aParameter notations are defined in Table 2.

341

342 Each corrective action scenario (54 in total: Facility A: 28, Facility B: 26) was evaluated by running
343 1,000 iterations. Scenario analyses simulations used the same fixed seed as in the baseline model to
344 assure a fair (counterfactual) comparison among scenarios and between each scenario and the
345 baseline model. Efficacy of a corrective action was evaluated by comparing the prevalence of
346 contaminated agents, separately for wet and dry area, in counterfactual iterations of the baseline
347 model and the model with a corrective action implemented using Eq. 2. The efficacy for each
348 iteration was defined as:

$$349 \quad Efficacy = \left(1 - \frac{P_{ca+c}}{P_{b+c}}\right) \times 100 \quad (Eq. 2)$$

350 where P_b stands for prevalence in the baseline model iteration and P_{ca} stands for prevalence in the
351 corresponding iteration of the model with a corrective action. Constant c is a correction factor
352 corresponding to $0.5/m$ (where m is the total number of agents of the area type in the model, i.e.,
353 Facility A: dry agents=171, wet agents=53; Facility B: dry agents=176 and wet agents=49); this
354 correction factor was applied to be able to calculate the efficacy in iterations where prevalence in
355 the baseline model was zero. Efficacy over all iterations was summarized with the median and
356 interquartile range (IQR) statistics. The IQR was specifically used due to it being a robust measure of
357 dispersion as it represents the middle 50% of the sample and is thus not influenced by outliers (26).

358 The estimate of efficacy of a corrective action provides useful information about the relative change
359 in prevalence of contamination between the compared scenario and the baseline but it does not
360 assess the magnitude of contamination for each scenario. Thus, the distribution of both predicted
361 prevalence of contamination and concentration of *Listeria* on contaminated agents over all
362 iterations were compared between the baseline and promising corrective action scenarios

363 (identified based on sensitivity and efficacy analysis). The comparisons were presented graphically as
364 boxplots for each scenario by wet and dry areas. For ease of interpretation, we estimated the
365 difference between the median prevalence (expressed as percentage point (pp) difference) and
366 between median concentration (expressed as \log_{10} CFU/cm²) for the corrective action scenario and
367 the baseline. Data files and code used to build the two agent-based models using NetLogo, as well as
368 data files and R code relevant to the scenario analysis and sensitivity analysis, are available on the
369 GitHub repository: https://github.com/lvanekLab/CPS_ABM. No statistical tests were performed to
370 compare simulation predictions to other simulation predictions (e.g., corrective actions versus the
371 baseline) as the modeler controls the number of replications produced (effectively “sample size”) by
372 selecting the number of iterations and thus with sufficient computer time, there is no limit to how
373 small a p-value value can be obtained (27). Furthermore, no comparisons were made in corrective
374 action performance between the two Facilities (e.g., EC_04 in Facility A versus Facility B) due to key
375 differences in their layout, schedules and specific equipment used, because of which the facility
376 specific models were developed as opposed to a generic model; thus, statistical comparisons
377 between the two models may lead to misleading conclusions.

378 **Results**

379 **Validation**

380 The baseline models were validated with historical data for Facilities A and B at both whole-model
381 and area-specific levels (Fig 2; Table S10 in S1 File). All comparisons indicated lack of statistically
382 significant differences (either with Chi Squared Test or Fisher’s Exact Test as appropriate) between
383 agent contamination prevalence observed in historical data and mean prevalence obtained with
384 simulated environmental sampling.

385

386

Figure_2.tiff

387 **Fig 1. Graphical comparison of baseline Facilities A and B using historical data at midday against**
388 **simulated sampling results.** Results for Facility A and depicted in panels A, C and E, while results for
389 Facility B are in panels B, D and F. Validation groupings investigated included (i) all agents (panels A
390 and B), (ii) Zone category (panels C and D), and (iii) presence of water in the area (panels E and F).
391 Lack of differences between historical (black, covering the mean (denoted with \bar{x}) and 95%
392 confidence intervals for contamination prevalence) and simulated sampling (colored boxplots,
393 describing the mean (denoted with \bar{x}), median, interquartile range, 5th and 95th percentiles and any
394 outliers for contamination prevalence) groups indicated the model's behavior could be considered
395 representative of its respective facility.

396

397 **Predicted *Listeria* prevalence and concentration in wet** 398 **versus dry areas**

399 The Facility A wet areas had median agent contamination prevalence of 25.9% and 23.1% within the
400 Loading area and Cleaning area (i.e., the model's "wet" area), respectively (Fig 3.A), while the Facility
401 B Loading area and Cleaning area had respective median prevalence of 42.9% and 17.9% (Fig 3.B).
402 "Dry" areas (i.e., combination of remaining facility areas not in proximity to water) had a lower
403 prevalence of *Listeria* positive agents, with Facility A having medians of 6.3%, 4.1%, 1.7%, 11.1% and
404 7.7% for the Sorting, Tray Packing, Bag Packing, Reject and Other areas, respectively (Fig 3.A). Facility
405 B did not feature an active Bag Packing area, but all its remaining dry areas except the Reject area
406 had medians of 0%; the Reject area median prevalence was 21.7% (Fig 3.B). Within each area, the
407 concentration of *Listeria* on contaminated agents was recorded and analyzed. Figs 3.C and 3.D show
408 the low concentrations (in \log_{10} CFU/cm²) for Facilities A and B respectively, across all wet and dry
409 areas in the modeled facilities. Each area group contained a combination of agents belonging to
410 Zone 1-3. Visual evaluation of agents grouped by hygienic Zone revealed an overall higher
411 prevalence and concentration in Zone 3 agents compared to Zones 1 and 2 (Fig S2 in S1 file).

412

413 Figure_3.tiff

414 **Fig 3. Boxplots describing *Listeria* contamination prevalence and concentration on contaminated**
415 **agents on Wednesday at Midday for Facility A and B baseline conditions.** Prevalence of *Listeria*
416 contamination within each area of Facility A (panel A) and Facility B (panel B). Both facilities show
417 higher prevalence in wet areas (blue) than dry areas (yellow), except for the Reject area. \log_{10}

418 concentrations (CFU/cm²) of *Listeria* on contaminated agents within each area of Facility A (panel C)
419 and Facility B (panel D) with median concentrations listed showing low level of contamination.

420

421 Sensitivity Analysis

422 The effects of model input parameters on P_W , analyzed using PRCC, are depicted in Fig 4. The most
423 influential parameters were the concentration of *Listeria* spp. per gram of contaminated raw
424 produce (N_R) and the probability of contact between Zone 1 agents (P_{11}). In Facility A the probability
425 of *Listeria* transfer between Zone 3 agents given contact (τ_{33}) was negatively correlated with
426 prevalence of contaminated agents, while the transfer probability between Zone 1 agents and Zone
427 3 agents (τ_{13}) was negatively correlated in Facility B (Fig 4). In both facilities the negatively correlated
428 parameters involved equipment that was connected to drainage systems within the facilities (as well
429 as interconnected drains in Facility A, which are designated Zone 3); *Listeria* in the drainage system
430 could not re-contaminate other agents and instead would show die off, which led to the negative
431 correlation.

432

433

Figure_4.tiff

434 **Fig 4. Sensitivity plots of significant model input parameters against prevalence of *Listeria***
435 **contaminated agents at midday Wednesday of the second week of simulation for each facility.**
436 Significant partial rank correlation coefficient (PRCC) values were determined using Bonferroni
437 correction according to the number of parameters evaluated in Facilities A and B, respectively. (N_R :
438 Concentration of *Listeria* spp. per gram of contaminated raw produce (CFU/g); P_{ij} : Probability of
439 contact from contaminated surface in Zone i to another surface in Zone j , where $i=j=$ Zone1, Zone 2,
440 Zone 3 or Employee agent type; P_o : Rate of random event occurrences that introduces *Listeria* spp.
441 from outside the room per hour; P_z : Probability that *Listeria* spp. is introduced into the room via
442 objects from Zone 4 per hour; R_d : Prevalence of *Listeria* spp. in produce on day d , for $d =$ Monday,
443 Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday; α : Proportion of *Listeria* spp. transferred to a surface upon
444 contact with a contaminated raw produce; τ_{ij} : Probability of *Listeria* spp. transfer from i to j agent
445 given contact, where $i=j=$ Zone1, Zone 2, Zone 3, or Employee agent type.; N_z : Amount of *Listeria* spp.
446 introduced to an agent or patch from Zone 4 (CFU) per occurrence)

447

448 Scenario Analysis

449 Comparison of modeled corrective actions with the baseline model allowed for evaluation of the
450 efficacy of each corrective action and provided data for prioritizing strategies for virtual

451 implementation to evaluate the magnitude of contamination for each scenario (Fig 5-6; Table S11 in
452 S1 File). Based on efficacies that did not produce a positive result in both wet and dry areas of
453 respective facility and sensitivity analysis results, Random Event Occurrence Reduction (PR), Random
454 Load Reduction (LR), Z4 Event Occurrence Reduction (PZ) and Z4 Load Reduction (LZ) corrective
455 actions were deemed ineffective (Fig S3-S6 in S1 File) and were excluded from further analysis of the
456 magnitude of contamination.

457

458

Figure_5.tiff

459 **Fig 5. Comparison of corrective action efficacy against baseline conditions in Facility A.** Efficacy was
460 calculated using eq. 2 for each area (i.e., “wet” and “dry”) within a model for each applicable
461 corrective action and displayed by median efficacy (red line marker) and interquartile range (black
462 dot crossed by line marker). Positive efficacy indicated a lower *Listeria* prevalence in the model with
463 a corrective action compared to the baseline model and thus effectiveness of the corrective action,
464 while zero or negative efficacy indicated that the corrective action is predicted to not be able to
465 reduce the agent contamination prevalence. Panel A: Facility A Wet area. Panel B: Facility A Dry area.
466 PR_01-PR_03: Random Event Occurrence Reduction (125%; 150%; 175% event delay from baseline
467 respectively). LR_01-LR_03: Random Load Reduction (1-3 Log₁₀, respectively). PZ_01-PZ_04: Z4 Event
468 Occurrence Reduction (25%; 50%; 75%; 100% reduction from baseline respectively). LZ_01-LZ_03: Z4
469 Load Reduction (1-3 Log₁₀, respectively). EC_01-EC_04: Reduction of *Listeria* Prevalence in incoming
470 produce (25%; 50%; 75%; 100% reduction from baseline, respectively). MI_01: Cleaning
471 Effectiveness Improvement (increased *Listeria* removed during reduction events increased by 3
472 log₁₀). MI_02: Weekend Deep Clean (Removal of *Listeria* from all agents regardless of cleanability
473 status every Sunday). AI_01: Enhanced Flume Water Treatment (2 log₁₀ removal of *Listeria* in flume
474 agent per hour of production). AI_02/AI_02C1/AI_02C2: Broad Model-based Master Sanitization
475 Restructuring (Agent cleaning and sanitation schedules were fully reassigned according to a mean
476 contamination probability; Facility A was given a daily schedule for both “Cleaning Only” and
477 “Cleaning & Sanitation” respectively). AI_03/AI_03C1/AI_03C2: Directed Model-based Master
478 Sanitization Schedule Restructuring (Sanitization of agents with a mean contamination probability
479 ≥66% was set to a daily frequency; Facility A was given a daily schedule for both “Cleaning Only” and
480 “Cleaning & Sanitation” respectively). AI_04: Transmission Pathways Modification Corrective Action
481 (Drain compartmentalization). CI_01: EC_02 and AI_02C2 were applied simultaneously. CI_02: EC_02
482 and AI_04 were applied simultaneously. CI_03: AI_02C2 and AI_04 were applied simultaneously.

483

484

485

Figure_6.tiff

486 **Fig 6. Comparison of corrective action efficacy against baseline conditions in Facility B.** Efficacy was
487 calculated using eq. 2 for each area (i.e., “wet” and “dry”) within a model for each applicable

488 corrective action and displayed by median efficacy and interquartile range. Positive efficacy
489 indicated a lower *Listeria* prevalence in the model with a corrective action compared to the baseline
490 model and thus effectiveness of the corrective action, while zero or negative efficacy indicated that
491 the corrective action is predicted to not be able to reduce the agent contamination prevalence.
492 Panel A: Facility B Wet area. Panel B: Facility B Dry area. PR_01-PR_03: Random Event Occurrence
493 Reduction (125%; 150%; 175% event delay from baseline respectively). LR_01-LR_03: Random Load
494 Reduction (1-3 Log₁₀, respectively). PZ_01-PZ_04: Z4 Event Occurrence Reduction (25%; 50%; 75%;
495 100% reduction from baseline respectively). LZ_01-LZ_03: Z4 Load Reduction (1-3 Log₁₀,
496 respectively). EC_01-EC_04: Reduction of *Listeria* Prevalence in incoming produce (25%; 50%; 75%;
497 100% reduction from baseline, respectively). MI_01: Cleaning Effectiveness Improvement (increased
498 *Listeria* removed during reduction events increased by 3 log₁₀). MI_02: Weekend Deep Clean
499 (Removal of *Listeria* from all agents regardless of cleanability status every Sunday). AI_01: Enhanced
500 Flume Water Treatment (2 log₁₀ removal of *Listeria* in flume agent per hour of production).
501 AI_02/AI_02C1/AI_02C2: Broad Model-based Master Sanitization Restructuring (Agent cleaning and
502 sanitation schedules were fully reassigned according to a mean contamination probability).
503 AI_03/AI_03C1/AI_03C2: Directed Model-based Master Sanitization Schedule Restructuring
504 (Sanitization of agents with a mean contamination probability ≥66% was set to a daily frequency).
505 AI_04: Transmission Pathways Modification Corrective Action (Separation of forklift area
506 assignment). CI_01: EC_02 and AI_03 were applied simultaneously. CI_02: EC_02 and AI_04 were
507 applied simultaneously. CI_03: AI_03 and AI_04 were applied simultaneously.

508

509 **Modifying Prevalence of *Listeria* Contamination in** 510 **Incoming Produce**

511 Reducing the prevalence of *Listeria* on incoming raw produce (scenarios EC_01, EC_02, EC_03 and
512 EC_04) showed a corresponding drop in median prevalence of contamination on agents in both wet
513 and dry areas. Facility A showed a maximum reduction (at EC_04) of 32.07 pp and 2.34 pp (Fig S7.A)
514 for wet and dry area, respectively. Median *Listeria* concentrations on positive agents per area
515 decreased by 0.57 log₁₀ CFU/cm² and 0.52 log₁₀ CFU/cm², respectively (Fig S7.C).

516 The maximum impact of reducing contamination prevalence on incoming raw produce in Facility B
517 led to a reduction of 20.41 pp in median contamination prevalence for the wet area, and a median
518 prevalence reduction of 1.70 pp in the dry area (Fig S7.B). Wet area *Listeria* concentrations on
519 positive agents also showed a substantial decrease in predicted median (1.05 log₁₀ CFU/cm²; Fig
520 S7.D), while predicted median *Listeria* concentrations in dry areas only were reduced by 0.20 log₁₀
521 CFU/cm².

522

523 **Enhanced Cleaning and Sanitation Strategies**

524 Improving the effectiveness of *Listeria* removal actions (“Cleaning Only” and “Cleaning & Sanitation”;
525 scenario MI_01) by 3 log₁₀ showed no meaningful changes in Facility A or Facility B's median *Listeria*
526 prevalence or concentration for either wet or dry areas. Weekend deep cleaning (scenario MI_02)
527 however, led to considerable reduction of median prevalence in both models. Facility A wet area
528 prevalence decreased by 24.53 pp (Fig S8.A) and Facility B wet area prevalence decreased by 16.33
529 pp (Fig S8.B).

530

531 **Agent-Targeted Corrective Actions**

532 In Facility A the enhanced flume water treatment (scenario AI_01) and risk-based (scenarios AI_02C1
533 and AI_02C2) “Cleaning Only”/ “Cleaning & Sanitation” corrective actions showed the best
534 performance in reducing both facility-wide median prevalence of contaminated agents; risk-based
535 corrective actions are activities that target agents with higher probabilities of becoming
536 contaminated according to the baseline model. Of the risk-based corrective actions applied, AI_02C2
537 had the largest impact in the wet areas (Fig S9.A), producing a median decrease in prevalence of
538 contaminated agents against the baseline of 28.30 pp and a median decrease in concentration of
539 0.36 log₁₀ CFU/cm². In contrast, AI_01 was the most effective in Facility B's wet area, but AI_03 was
540 more effective in the dry area, producing a median prevalence decrease of 12.24 pp and 0.57 pp for
541 each area respectively in AI_01, and 10.20 pp and 2.27 pp in AI_03 (Fig S9.B). Median concentration
542 on positive agents decreased by 0.40 log₁₀ CFU/cm² and 0.05 log₁₀ CFU/cm² of each respective area
543 in AI_01, and decreased by 0.25 log₁₀ CFU/cm² and 0.12 log₁₀ CFU/cm² for each respective area in
544 AI_03 (Fig S9.D).

545 The “Transmission Pathways Modification Corrective Action” (AI_04) was applied to each model by
546 eliminating connection links chosen to have minimal impact to facility function and a higher
547 likelihood of implementation by a facility in response to a contamination event. This
548 compartmentalization seeks to limit the spread of *Listeria* moving between zones (i.e., non-FCS-to-

549 FCS transmission) by reducing the number of connections for strategically chosen agents. For
550 example, in Facility A, the network of indoor square and trench drains was remodeled as isolated
551 agents to simulate the introduction of anti-backflow valves within the system. This intervention
552 reduced the Facility A wet area *Listeria* prevalence by 15.09 pp, concentration by 0.13 CFU/cm², dry
553 area prevalence by 2.92 pp and the concentration by 0.70 log₁₀ CFU/cm². In Facility B, the AI_04
554 corrective action involved assigning a single forklift to the Loading area operations, and one to its
555 Reject area, rather than allowing both forklifts to interact with both areas. While this change in
556 traffic patterns (i.e., connections) was effective for reducing the likelihood of *Listeria* contamination
557 in the Facility B dry area, producing a median prevalence reduction of 3.41 pp, the amount of
558 contamination on contaminated agents slightly increased by 0.20 log₁₀ CFU/cm². As the corrective
559 action was tailored to facility, it is unsurprising that the results of AI_04 differed between models.
560 Compartmentalizing Facility A's drains prevented spread between wet and dry areas of the model,
561 thus producing a facility-wide reduction in prevalence and concentration (Fig S9.A), while isolating
562 Facility B's forklifts only impacted prevalence in dry areas.

563

564 **Combined Corrective Actions**

565 Of the three combined corrective actions, combinations CI_01 and CI_03 were most effective in
566 reducing *Listeria* prevalence in Facility A wet areas (Fig S10.A; reduction of 24.53 pp for both);
567 combination CI_01 decreased median concentration in the wet area by 0.44 log₁₀ CFU/cm². For the
568 dry areas, Scenario CI_03 showed the greatest reduction and efficacy with a median concentration
569 decrease of 0.59 log₁₀ CFU/cm² in the dry area (Fig S10.C).

570 In Facility B wet areas, CI_01 was the most effective correction action with a prevalence reduction of
571 14.29 pp (Fig S10.B). Median concentration among contaminated wet areas dropped by 0.39 log₁₀
572 CFU/cm² (Fig S10.D). CI_02 and CI_03 were more effective in the dry areas with a decrease in
573 prevalence of 3.41 pp for both; median concentration among contaminated dry areas increased by
574 0.08 and 0.20 log₁₀ CFU/cm², respectively (Fig S10.D).

575

576 **Discussion**

577 This study described the development of two ABMs of *Listeria* contamination dynamics in produce
578 packinghouses, demonstrating their successful validation and characterization of baseline behaviors.
579 Both facilities were functionally similar, receiving raw produce that is subsequently washed, sorted,
580 and packed. However, the facilities differed in layout and specific food safety practices (e.g.,
581 frequency of “Cleaning Only” and “Cleaning & Sanitation” cleaning operations), which are important
582 to consider when evaluating the risk of environmental *Listeria* contamination and mitigation
583 strategies. Using the developed models, a range of corrective actions were tested, further
584 demonstrating strengths of such ABMs as a decision support tool for industries. The most effective
585 corrective actions in both models were: (i) reducing incoming *Listeria* on contaminated produce, (ii)
586 simulation-informed modification of cleaning and sanitation strategies and (iii) eliminating specific
587 agent-to-agent transmission pathways. While most of these corrective actions were more effective
588 in the wet area of the respective facility than dry, eliminating specific transmission pathways (i.e.,
589 AI_04) was more effective in reducing the prevalence of Facility B’s dry area.

590 ***Listeria* Dynamics in Modelled Produce Packinghouses**

591 Both models predicted elevated *Listeria* contamination within areas characterized as often
592 containing a high level of water, such as those areas involved in raw produce loading or cleaning
593 operations. This predicted pattern of increased prevalence in areas containing high levels of water
594 agrees with findings regarding the water activity required for *L. monocytogenes* growth by Pietrysiak
595 et al. and Farber et al. (28,29). However, the Reject area (which was classified as “dry”) was also
596 predicted to show elevated *Listeria* contamination prevalence compared to other Dry areas. While
597 there may not have been water directly involved in this Reject area, wet or damaged produce was
598 stored in large crates in this area for extended periods. This area contains “sink” sites that receive
599 *Listeria*, but do not transfer it to another agent (sink sites were also described by Malley et al. (30)).
600 Importantly, increased *Listeria* prevalence does not always rely on growth, it can simply reflect

601 increased introduction without actual growth. The predicted concentration of *Listeria* on positive
602 agents was highly variable within all production areas in the two facilities though concentrations
603 appeared lower in the dry areas in facility B and some of the production areas in facility A. The
604 median predicted concentrations were relatively low in both models. It is possible that the low
605 concentration of *Listeria* within both models reduced the probability of cross-contamination
606 occurring, and subsequently reducing how far *Listeria* can be transmitted throughout a facility. The
607 low concentrations on positive agents would in reality also be more difficult to detect (31).

608 Dry areas showed lower contamination prevalence, but their closer proximity to the end of the
609 product line presents a risk of contaminating finished produce. These areas are less likely to be
610 contaminated by *Listeria* on incoming raw produce due to their distance from the loading area and
611 lack of water in the area. This does not prevent them from being contaminated through alternative
612 means (i.e., Zone 4 introduction) based on the facility's design. In this case, it is possible for other
613 *Listeria* contamination routes to bypass other stages of a product line and reach finished produce
614 more quickly. However, in these two models no Zone 2 or 3 surfaces were close enough to a Zone 4
615 introduction site to cause a large amount of *Listeria* contamination from it. Ultimately this is a
616 facility-specific issue dependent on local layout and not mutually exclusive from introduction on
617 contaminated raw produce.

618 Sensitivity analysis identified the concentration of *Listeria* spp. per gram of contaminated raw
619 produce (N_R) and probability of contact from a contaminated surface in Zone 1 to another surface in
620 Zone 1 (P_{11}) as the two most influential factors in prevalence of *Listeria* contaminated agents in both
621 facilities. Similar to previous reports (32,33), this suggests that if incoming produce is a primary
622 source of *Listeria* introduced to the facilities, it would be able to rapidly spread among FCSs as
623 mediated by P_{11} and subsequently contaminate finished product. In reality, it is difficult to trace the
624 movement of *Listeria* spp. through a facility to such a fine degree. However, it is possible that even
625 with a low contamination prevalence a sufficiently high volume of incoming raw produce may lead

626 to introduction of an amount of *Listeria* that is likely to spread into the rest of the facility from the
627 initial introduction site. Berrang et al., (34) suggest a mechanism of *Listeria spp.* introduction like this
628 may also occur in poultry processing plants. These results, combined with the lack of zone 1 data for
629 model validation, emphasize the need for further research into postharvest *Listeria* levels on raw
630 produce. This is both to better understand *Listeria* introduction behavior via a potentially major
631 introduction route, and to produce more accurate models that act on *Listeria* introduced on raw
632 contaminated produce.

633 **Limiting *Listeria* Introduction into Produce Packinghouses**

634 Corrective actions applied to the models were initially designed around targeting the three routes of
635 *Listeria* introduction into a facility (i.e., contaminated raw produce, Zone 4, or random occurrences)
636 to assess the effectiveness of preventing “exterior” *Listeria* entering the facility. Factors to consider
637 in these corrective actions include: facility layout (especially agent proximity to potential Zone 4
638 introduction sites (34,35)), postharvest contamination status of raw produce, and employee
639 movement patterns. Incoming raw produce (the primary route in both models) has also been
640 identified as a key vehicle of introduction in other studies involving *L. monocytogenes* (34,36–38),
641 reinforcing the findings of both the sensitivity analysis and route-based corrective action
642 comparisons. Although controlling the prevalence of *Listeria* on incoming raw produce can be
643 difficult given the abundance and randomness of external sources that can contaminate produce
644 before reaching a packinghouse (39,40), stringent implementation and verification of Good
645 Agricultural Practices (GAP) and other supply chain programs could represent one strategy to reduce
646 *Listeria* prevalence on incoming raw produce.

647 Corrective actions involving remaining introduction routes (Zone 4 or random occurrences) were
648 eliminated early on due to poor performance in both models. In the case of Zone 4-based corrective
649 actions some improved performance was seen in each model’s Dry area contamination prevalence
650 (i.e., those closer to Zone 4 introduction sites), but was not effective across both areas. However,
651 this reinforces importance of considering the facility specific layout in designing corrective actions

652 because this type of corrective action would be more effective in facilities that have Zone 4
653 occurrences affecting a larger number of surfaces.

654

655 **Modifying Surface Cleanability and *Listeria* Harborage** 656 **Capabilities**

657 A second series of corrective actions were formed under the assumption that introduction could not
658 be reduced, effectively targeting *Listeria* that has successfully entered the virtual facility. These
659 measures involved enhancing or reorganizing existing measures used to reduce *Listeria*, such as
660 increasing the effectiveness and frequency of sanitation events or changing in plant transmission
661 routes (e.g., by restricting equipment such as forklifts to a specific room). While the exact
662 implementation differed between modeled facilities, similar corrective actions have been historically
663 implemented to control *Listeria* spread within food facilities, specifically in the forms of increased
664 cleaning and sanitation frequency or replacing equipment with easier to clean versions (increasing
665 cleanability), or by modifying equipment to eliminate niches (reducing harborage) (6) (both of which
666 were implicitly and simplistically represented in the developed ABMs in corrective action scenarios
667 that altered an agent's cleanability, from uncleanable to cleanable).

668 The two types of cleaning and sanitation schedule restructuring evaluated were: (i) broad, where
669 surfaces are eligible for cleaning and sanitation, with the mean contamination probability
670 determining specific schedule frequency, and (ii) directed, where surfaces with a mean
671 contamination probability $\geq 66\%$ are cleaned and sanitized every day of the work week. A key
672 difference in the *Listeria* contamination prevalence outcomes following restructuring of the cleaning
673 and sanitation schedule between both facilities is due to differences in their initial schedules; with
674 Facility A only performing a weekly cleaning and sanitation operation, and Facility B cleaning and
675 sanitation at a daily frequency. As a result, introducing a higher frequency of cleaning and sanitation
676 operations for more surfaces showed an improvement for Facility A regardless of whether the
677 cleaning and sanitation scenario implemented is more (AI_02C2: "Cleaning & Sanitation") or less

678 (AI_02C1: “Cleaning Only”) comprehensive. This improvement was less effective in directed
679 restructuring (AI_03C1/AI_03C2), as fewer surfaces were scheduled to undergo daily cleaning or
680 cleaning and sanitation regardless of the method used. Conversely, in Facility B’s wet areas the
681 corrective actions AI_02 and AI_03 were effective to similar degrees (having the same median
682 prevalence in wet areas). Similarly, in Facility B’s dry areas, broad (AI_02) and directed (AI_03)
683 rescheduling also produced similar reductions in median *Listeria* contamination prevalence (though
684 differed from each other by a near negligible amount). These reductions in contamination
685 prevalence in both areas of Facility B are likely due to the new cleaning and sanitization schedule in
686 corrective actions AI_02 and AI_03 now targeting key agents in Facility B that were previously not
687 cleaned and sanitized at a sufficient frequency in the baseline scenario. These specific agents were
688 targeted in both corrective actions (AI_02 and AI_03) of Facility B due to their mean contamination
689 probability being $\geq 66\%$. However, while both forms of rescheduling were effective across both areas
690 in Facility B, it is important to reiterate that directed rescheduling (AI_03C1/AI_03C2) was not as
691 effective as broad rescheduling (AI_02C1/AI_02C2) in Facility A. This highlights an important point
692 that while the predicted contamination probability of an agent (i.e., a surface that the agent
693 represents) can be a useful decision support component, it should not necessarily be the sole
694 defining factor for determining the frequency of its cleaning and sanitation. Instead, creating
695 cleaning and sanitation schedules should consider prior conditions and surface-specific information
696 (such as Zone, proximity to water and connectivity) to avoid deprioritizing key equipment surfaces.
697 Tompkin (6) showed that the exact response to detecting contamination by industry can differ by
698 the facility, the food being handled, and equipment in question, but corrective actions typically will
699 take into account various factors (such as existing cleaning and sanitation frequency, material
700 composition for cleanability and harborage risks and other relevant practices). In both models some
701 of the most effective corrective actions similarly required situation-specific interpretation and
702 analysis to be implemented; this methodology is reinforced by the number of corrective actions built
703 with site-specific considerations detailed by Tompkin (6).

704 Several corrective action scenarios evaluated here (i.e., AI_02/AI_02C1/ AI_02C2 and
705 AI_03/AI_03C1/AI_03C2) required information on the agent-specific contamination probability. This
706 demonstrates a distinct advantage in ABM usage in providing supplementary *in silico* data to an
707 EMP, as the data, such as a surface's predicted risk of being contaminated, can allow a facility to
708 investigate and focus efforts on locations of higher predicted contamination risk. This may be of
709 particular use in the event of a data scarcity in an EMP, which may be caused by insufficient
710 coverage that cannot reliably detect *Listeria spp.* presence throughout a facility (41). Though a lack
711 of data can be alleviated with intensive validation sampling (42), an ABM may be a highly practical
712 tool in directing efforts more quickly and efficiently, ultimately saving time and money (12).
713 Furthermore, given the practical impossibility of a facility to assess multiple corrective actions in
714 reality, an ABM can evaluate various corrective action scenarios and advise which are more likely to
715 be useful.

716

717 **Limiting *Listeria* Transmission Across Equipment Surfaces**

718 Lastly, the third corrective action strategy, modifying existing surface transmission pathways, was
719 functionally the most unique, as it wholly depended on the facility's preexisting layout and
720 equipment structure. While it is relatively straightforward to take a single piece of equipment in
721 isolation and determine potential risks during production, the interaction effects between multiple
722 surfaces may be more difficult to assess. Good Manufacturing Practices (GMPs) (43) generally
723 require compartmentalization within a facility to limit pathogen transmission (typically referred to as
724 hygienic zoning) but employing an ABM can allow for a more extensive review of such control
725 strategies in a relatively rapid timeframe. Though some transmission pathways cannot be removed
726 or modified due to their critical functions (i.e., major belts or the flume system), there are several
727 auxiliary equipment surfaces that may present a greater risk than initially considered due to elevated
728 connectivity between them. These transmission pathways may allow for cross-contamination
729 outside of typical FCS-to-FCS routes.

730 Transmission pathways were identified in both models, that were not critical to packinghouse
731 operations but still allowed for *Listeria* movement between areas; subsequently they were modified
732 to restrict transmission. The layout of Facility A's production line was predominantly designed as a
733 one-way flow, but it featured a highly interconnected drainage system spanning multiple areas. In
734 corrective action AI_04, the drain system in Facility A was modified to restrict drain cross-
735 contamination, which was particularly effective in areas needing more drainage (i.e., wet areas). In
736 practice, redesigning a facility's entire drainage system with anti-backflow valves would take time
737 and effort to complete, and may be more practical when constructing a new packinghouse facility.
738 Implementing AI_04 in Facility B was more straightforward, as the activity of two forklift agents
739 operating between two interior areas allowed for frequent *Listeria* cross-contamination between the
740 Reject and Loading areas. Limiting a single forklift to each area severed any direct contamination
741 routes, leaving *Listeria* only able to follow the production line to reach the Reject area. This
742 compartmentalization directly limited the spread of *Listeria* into other areas and demonstrates that
743 a relatively simple corrective action can have widespread impact. In practice, reducing surface
744 interconnectivity, may also be implemented through employee training or redesign of equipment to
745 reduce or prevent cross-contamination (44).

746 **Combined Corrective Actions Have Facility-Wide Impact on** 747 ***Listeria* Harborage**

748 As stated previously, a major advantage of an ABM is the ability to generate predictions specific to
749 individual equipment surfaces and for specific simulated corrective actions, or their combinations,
750 and subsequently direct efforts in more focused course. For both models, a useful metric of
751 measuring the performance of a corrective action was investigating its efficacy and comparing
752 change in the *Listeria* contamination prevalence in wet and dry areas. The three combined corrective
753 action scenarios (CI_01-CI_03) were selected from individual corrective action types that showed the
754 highest *Listeria* contamination prevalence reductions in either area: reducing the *Listeria* prevalence
755 on incoming raw produce, cleaning and sanitation schedule restructuring and transmission pathway

756 modification. Of these options, a 50% reduction in *Listeria* prevalence on raw produce was chosen as
757 a more plausible outcome than complete elimination of contamination on incoming raw produce,
758 and each facility had its own best-performing respective cleaning and sanitation restructuring option
759 chosen. These combined corrective actions could then be simulated and further analyzed
760 themselves to determine the performance of using multiple corrective actions simultaneously. While
761 this is largely similar to previous scenarios, combining corrective actions is an already suggested
762 general strategy (45) and has the benefit of relying on multiple layers of defense. The selection and
763 evaluation of which specific corrective actions to combine however, can be more systematically
764 done with the additional performance data provided by an ABM's simulations.

765

766 **Limitations and Future Directions**

767 It should be noted that a fundamental limitation facing both models was the relatively small amount
768 of historical data available (including complete absence of historical data for Zone 1 agents), limiting
769 the extent of validation. It is also possible that low historical prevalence in certain areas in the facility
770 may make it more difficult to detect meaningful levels of improvement, given an already low
771 baseline to begin with. Additionally, both models were simulated on a virtual timescale of two
772 weeks, making for relatively short-term observations (though at the same time addressing the
773 industry needs for decision support tools for short-term planning). Various interventions may have
774 far more noticeable consequences to their facilities if observed for a longer period, which should be
775 subject of a future investigation. Furthermore, there was insufficient data available on individual
776 agent attributes with respect to their composition or materials and how this may affect cleaning and
777 sanitation operations, requiring agents to be treated uniformly in this regard. Currently the model
778 can support this to a limited degree by setting agents to be cleanable or uncleanable. However, this
779 model system can support the addition of information such as composition/materials and its impact
780 on cleaning and sanitation once acquired during future modeling applications. A related cleaning
781 limitation involved a lack of information on how likely agents were to undergo successful cleaning or

782 cleaning & sanitization; both of which were set at the assumed value of 0.99. Sensitivity analysis and
783 testing lower values (i.e., $\gamma=0.95$ and $\delta=0.85$) resulted in no meaningful change in prevalence of
784 contaminated agents or concentration on contaminated agents. It should be noted however, that
785 the two-week duration of this model may be too short for these values to be particularly impactful.
786 Thus, testing the effect of the probability of successful cleaning over longer simulation runs should
787 be a subject of a future investigation to determine whether this knowledge gap should be prioritized
788 for research. An additional limitation due to insufficient data was that incoming crates in both
789 facilities were treated as independent from each other, rather than simulate the arrival of clusters of
790 crates containing contaminated produce. Again, this issue may be overcome in future models with
791 collection of more extensive data to integrate. Due to a lack of postharvest contamination data on
792 produce, the amount of *Listeria* introduced to the model on contaminated produce was calculated
793 using data from Chen et al., 2016 (15) which evaluated stone fruits involved in an outbreak of
794 listeriosis. We acknowledge that values from outbreaks may be higher than what would be expected
795 outside of outbreak situations. Lastly, both models use a non-specific virtual strain of *Listeria* spp.,
796 but we acknowledge that different strains of *L. monocytogenes* may have differences in properties,
797 which could be included in future modelling efforts as well.

798 Future models should also include economic factors to assess the most appropriate interventions or
799 combinations of interventions that should be implemented in a given facility. While the first reaction
800 may be to implement as many separate corrections as possible for overlapping protection, each
801 extra layer will incur additional costs (46). Instead, being able to identify potentially more cost-
802 effective actions, such as employee training to reduce cross contamination (47) instead of
803 equipment replacement, would allow for better decision-making that optimizes resource allocation.
804 Furthermore, incorporating economic factors could allow for the model to estimate the overall cost
805 to a facility of having to operate with more systemic issues, such as layout and drainage methods
806 (48). A key takeaway that is applicable to any type of packinghouse or food processing facility
807 attempting to combat ongoing *Listeria* contamination is that each facility should be treated uniquely

808 and addressed with specifically designed corrective actions that have highest potential effectiveness
809 (49). Models such as those developed here could aid design of the facility specific corrective actions.
810 An additional direction for future development may include the use of ABMs in testing measures
811 already implemented within a facility under hypothetical situations of an increased contamination
812 risk. While the scenarios demonstrated here were to trial corrective actions, similar techniques could
813 be used to test the impact of increased *Listeria* contamination (e.g., in incoming material) on facility
814 and finished product contamination under the currently implemented procedures in a facility. This
815 would expand the scope that these models can be applied to, allowing them to be used in both a
816 diagnostic capacity for solving existing contamination issues, and to assist in pre-emptively assessing
817 how well a facility would be able to reduce *Listeria* contamination risks in the event of a system
818 failure.

819

820 **Conclusions**

821 Once established within a packinghouse, *Listeria* spp. has proven to be difficult to control, and
822 decision support tools such as the ABM reported may be valuable in not only quantifying how
823 contamination may move through a facility, but in finding effective options for combating it. With
824 Facilities A and B, we have illustrated that ABMs can serve as highly adaptable tools in the field of
825 food safety through their ability to replicate the unique components of individual produce
826 packinghouses. From our ABM scenarios, targeting *Listeria* that is introduced through the primary
827 contamination route (in this case contaminated incoming raw produce) was the most effective
828 method in prevalence reduction, and may be generalizable to different facilities as its
829 implementation does not depend on a facility's specific layout. However, assessing the effectiveness
830 of this strategy relies on contamination data that currently are rarely available. Therefore, it may be
831 more practical to focus on designing in-house corrective actions, such as increasing the frequency at
832 which select surfaces are sanitized and employing measures to limit contamination spread between

833 equipment surfaces, that account for facility-wide conditions and patterns. An element of particular
834 note in this regard is the local presence of water within an area, as it has shown to affect *Listeria*
835 growth and the performance of corrective actions within the specific area. The *in silico* data
836 generated by ABMs has also shown to be useful for designing and evaluating additional corrective
837 action scenarios. Combining contamination and corrective action results from an ABM with relevant
838 economics data would further aid in determining the overall feasibility of implementing corrective
839 actions specifically to individual facilities.

840

841 **Acknowledgments**

842 We would like to thank the personnel representing two packinghouses for their time and providing access to
843 their facilities.

844

845 **References**

- 846 1. Chen Y. *Listeria monocytogenes*. In: Lampel KA, Al-Khaldi S, Cahill SM, editors. *Bad Bug Book*
847 *Handbook of Foodborne Pathogenic Microorganisms and Natural Toxins* [Internet]. 2nd ed.
848 FDA; 2017 [cited 2021 Jan 26]. p. 1–5. Available from:
849 <https://www.fda.gov/media/83271/download>
- 850 2. Carpentier B, Cerf O. Review — Persistence of *Listeria monocytogenes* in food industry
851 equipment and premises. *Int J Food Microbiol* [Internet]. 2011;145(1):1–8. Available from:
852 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168160511000122>
- 853 3. WHO. *Listeriosis* [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2021 Jan 26]. p. 1–5. Available from:
854 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/listeriosis>
- 855 4. FDA. Get the Facts about *Listeria* | FDA [Internet]. Food and Drug Administration. 2020 [cited
856 2021 Jan 26]. p. 1–5. Available from: [https://www.fda.gov/animal-veterinary/animal-health-](https://www.fda.gov/animal-veterinary/animal-health-literacy/get-facts-about-listeria)
857 [literacy/get-facts-about-listeria](https://www.fda.gov/animal-veterinary/animal-health-literacy/get-facts-about-listeria)
- 858 5. Ferreira V, Wiedmann M, Teixeira P, Stasiewicz MJ. *Listeria monocytogenes* Persistence in
859 Food-Associated Environments: Epidemiology, Strain Characteristics, and Implications for
860 Public Health. *J Food Prot* [Internet]. 2014 Jan 1;77(1):150–70. Available from:
861 <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-13-150>
- 862 6. Tompkin RB. Control of *Listeria monocytogenes* in the Food-Processing Environment
863 [Internet]. Vol. 65, *Journal of Food Protection*. 2002. p. 709–25. Available from:
864 <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-65.4.709>
- 865 7. Marriott NG, Schilling MW, Gravani RB. Food Contamination Sources. In: *Principles of Food*
866 *Sanitation* [Internet]. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2018. p. 83–91. Available from:
867 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67166-6_5
- 868 8. Zoellner C, Jennings R, Wiedmann M, Ivanek R. EnABLE: An agent-based model to understand
869 *Listeria* dynamics in food processing facilities. *Sci Rep* [Internet]. 2019;9(1):495. Available
870 from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-36654-z>
- 871 9. Wilensky U. *Netlogo* [Internet]. Evanston, IL: Center for Connected Learning and Computer-
872 Based Modeling, Northwestern University; 1999. Available from:
873 <https://ccl.northwestern.edu/netlogo/>
- 874 10. Food and Drug Administration. Control of *Listeria monocytogenes* in Ready-To-Eat Foods:
875 Guidance for Industry Draft Guidance [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2020 Mar 10]. Available from:
876 [https://www.fda.gov/files/food/published/Draft-Guidance-for-Industry--Control-of-Listeria-](https://www.fda.gov/files/food/published/Draft-Guidance-for-Industry--Control-of-Listeria-monocytogenes-in-Ready-To-Eat-Foods-%28PDF%29.pdf)
877 [monocytogenes-in-Ready-To-Eat-Foods-%28PDF%29.pdf](https://www.fda.gov/files/food/published/Draft-Guidance-for-Industry--Control-of-Listeria-monocytogenes-in-Ready-To-Eat-Foods-%28PDF%29.pdf)
- 878 11. Yan W, Forsyth DA. Learning the Behavior of Users in a Public Space through Video Tracking.
879 In: 2005 Seventh IEEE Workshops on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV/MOTION'05) -
880 Volume 1. 2005. p. 370–7.
- 881 12. Sullivan GB, Zoellner C, Wiedmann M, Ivanek R. In Silico Models for Design and Optimization
882 of Science-Based *Listeria* Environmental Monitoring Programs in Fresh-Cut Produce Facilities.
883 *Appl Environ Microbiol* [Internet]. 2021 Sep 14;87(21):e00799-21. Available from:
884 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00799-21>
- 885 13. Russell RE, Katz RA, Richgels KLD, Walsh DP, Grant EHC. A Framework for Modeling Emerging
886 Diseases to Inform Management. *Emerg Infect Dis* [Internet]. 2017 Jan;23(1):1–6. Available
887 from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27983501>

- 888 14. FDA/FSIS. Interagency Risk Assessment: *Listeria monocytogenes* in Retail Delicatessens
889 [Internet]. 2013. Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/media/87042/download>
- 890 15. Chen Y, Burall LS, Luo Y, Timme R, Melka D, Muruvanda T, et al. *Listeria monocytogenes* in
891 stone fruits linked to a multistate outbreak: Enumeration of cells and whole-genome
892 sequencing. *Appl Environ Microbiol*. 2016;82(24):7030–40.
- 893 16. Hoelzer K, Pouillot R, Gallagher D, Silverman MB, Kause J, Dennis S. Estimation of *Listeria*
894 *monocytogenes* transfer coefficients and efficacy of bacterial removal through cleaning and
895 sanitation. *Int J Food Microbiol* [Internet]. 2012 Jul 2 [cited 2020 Mar 23];157(2):267–77.
896 Available from:
897 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S016816051200267X?via%3Dihub>
- 898 17. Ziegler M, Rüegg S, Stephan R, Guldimann C. Growth potential of *Listeria monocytogenes* in
899 six different RTE fruit products: impact of food matrix, storage temperature and shelf life. *Ital*
900 *J food Saf* [Internet]. 2018 Oct 8;7(3):7581. Available from:
901 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30538961>
- 902 18. Chambers MK, Ford MR, White DM, Barnes DL, Schiewer S. Transport of fecal bacteria by
903 boots and vehicle tires in a rural Alaskan community. *J Environ Manage* [Internet]. 2009 Feb 1
904 [cited 2020 Mar 23];90(2):961–6. Available from:
905 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479708000728?via%3Dihub>
- 906 19. BERRANG ME, FRANK JF. Generation of Airborne *Listeria innocua* from Model Floor Drains†. *J*
907 *Food Prot* [Internet]. 2012 Jul 1;75(7):1328–31. Available from:
908 <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-12-021>
- 909 20. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing [Internet]. R
910 Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021. Available from: <https://www.r-project.org/>
- 911 21. Dowle M, Srinivasan A, Gorecki J, Chirico M, Stetsenko P, Short T, et al. Package “data.table”:
912 Extension of “data.frame” [Internet]. CRAN. 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 5]. p. 1–126. Available
913 from: <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/data.table/data.table.pdf>
- 914 22. Sullivan G, Wiedmann M. Detection and Prevalence of *Listeria* in U.S. Produce Packinghouses
915 and Fresh-Cut Facilities. *J Food Prot* [Internet]. 2020 Sep 22;83(10):1656–66. Available from:
916 <https://doi.org/10.4315/JFP-20-094>
- 917 23. Hitchins AD, Jinneman K, Chen Y. BAM Chapter 10: Detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* in
918 Foods and Environmental Samples, and Enumeration of *Listeria monocytogenes* in Foods |
919 FDA. In: *Bacteriological Analytical Manual* [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2021 Jan 25]. p. 99–103.
920 Available from: [https://www.fda.gov/food/laboratory-methods-food/bam-chapter-10-](https://www.fda.gov/food/laboratory-methods-food/bam-chapter-10-detection-listeria-monocytogenes-foods-and-environmental-samples-and-enumeration)
921 [detection-listeria-monocytogenes-foods-and-environmental-samples-and-enumeration](https://www.fda.gov/food/laboratory-methods-food/bam-chapter-10-detection-listeria-monocytogenes-foods-and-environmental-samples-and-enumeration)
- 922 24. Harrell Jr FE, Dupont C, Horvath V, Levine JG, Cortens E, Xie Y, et al. Package “Hmisc”: Harrell
923 Miscellaneous [Internet]. CRAN. 2020 [cited 2021 Feb 5]. p. 1–441. Available from:
924 <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/Hmisc/Hmisc.pdf>
- 925 25. Stevenson M, Sergeant E, Nunes T, Heuer C, Marshall J, Sanchez J, et al. Package “epiR”: Tools
926 for the Analysis of Epidemiological Data [Internet]. CRAN. 2020 [cited 2021 Jan 11]. p. 1–194.
927 Available from: <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/epiR/epiR.pdf>
- 928 26. Kassambara A, Mundt F. Package “factoextra”: Extract and Visualize the Results of
929 Multivariate Data Analyses [Internet]. CRAN. 2020 [cited 2021 Jan 11]. p. 1–84. Available
930 from: <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/factoextra/factoextra.pdf>
- 931 27. Husson F, Josse J, Le S, Mazet J. Package “FactoMineR”: Multivariate Exploratory Data

- 932 Analysis and Data Mining [Internet]. CRAN. 2020 [cited 2021 Jan 11]. p. 1–100. Available
933 from: <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/FactoMineR/FactoMineR.pdf>
- 934 28. Wei T, Simko V, Levy M, Xie Y, Jin Y, Zemla J. Package “corrplot” [Internet]. CRAN. 2017 [cited
935 2021 Apr 27]. p. 1–18. Available from: [https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/corrplot/corrplot.pdf)
936 [project.org/web/packages/corrplot/corrplot.pdf](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/corrplot/corrplot.pdf)
- 937 29. MALLEY TJ V, STASIEWICZ MJ, GRÖHN YT, ROOF S, WARCHOCKI S, NIGHTINGALE K, et al.
938 Implementation of Statistical Tools To Support Identification and Management of Persistent
939 *Listeria monocytogenes* Contamination in Smoked Fish Processing Plants. *J Food Prot*
940 [Internet]. 2013 May 1;76(5):796–811. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-](https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-12-236)
941 [028X.JFP-12-236](https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-12-236)
- 942 30. Pietrysiak E, Smith S, Ganjyal GM. Food Safety Interventions to Control *Listeria*
943 *monocytogenes* in the Fresh Apple Packing Industry: A Review. *Compr Rev Food Sci Food Saf*
944 [Internet]. 2019 Nov 1;18(6):1705–26. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-](https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12496)
945 [4337.12496](https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12496)
- 946 31. Farber JM, Coates F, Daley E. Minimum water activity requirements for the growth of *Listeria*
947 *monocytogenes*. *Lett Appl Microbiol* [Internet]. 1992 Sep 1;15(3):103–5. Available from:
948 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-765X.1992.tb00737.x>
- 949 32. Spanu C, Jordan K. *Listeria monocytogenes* environmental sampling program in ready-to-eat
950 processing facilities: A practical approach. *Compr Rev Food Sci Food Saf* [Internet]. 2020 Nov
951 1;19(6):2843–61. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12619>
- 952 33. Angelo KM, Conrad AR, Saupe A, Dragoo H, West N, Sorenson A, et al. Multistate outbreak of
953 *Listeria monocytogenes* infections linked to whole apples used in commercially produced,
954 prepackaged caramel apples: United States, 2014–2015. *Epidemiol Infect* [Internet]. 2017 Apr
955 9 [cited 2021 Jan 23];145(5):848–56. Available from:
956 [https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0950268816003083/type/journal_](https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0950268816003083/type/journal_article)
957 [article](https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0950268816003083/type/journal_article)
- 958 34. CDC. Multistate Outbreak of Listeriosis Associated with Jensen Farms Cantaloupe --- United
959 States, August--September 2011 [Internet]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2011
960 [cited 2021 Jan 22]. p. 1–3. Available from:
961 <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm6039a5.htm>
- 962 35. Berrang ME, Meinersmann RJ, Frank JF, Ladely SR. Colonization of a Newly Constructed
963 Commercial Chicken Further Processing Plant with *Listeria monocytogenes*†. *J Food Prot*
964 [Internet]. 2010 Feb 1;73(2):286–91. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-](https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-73.2.286)
965 [73.2.286](https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-73.2.286)
- 966 36. Rørvik LM. *Listeria monocytogenes* in the smoked salmon industry. *Int J Food Microbiol*
967 [Internet]. 2000;62(3):183–90. Available from:
968 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168160500003342>
- 969 37. Estrada EM, Hamilton AM, Sullivan GB, Wiedmann M, Critzer FJ, Strawn LK. Prevalence,
970 Persistence, and Diversity of *Listeria monocytogenes* and *Listeria* Species in Produce
971 Packinghouses in Three U.S. States. *J Food Prot* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 21;83(2):277–86.
972 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-19-411>
- 973 38. Fox EM, Wall PG, Fanning S. Control of *Listeria* species food safety at a poultry food
974 production facility. *Food Microbiol* [Internet]. 2015;51:81–6. Available from:
975 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S074000201500088X>



- 976 39. Esteban JI, Oporto B, Aduriz G, Juste RA, Hurtado A. A survey of food-borne pathogens in
977 free-range poultry farms. *Int J Food Microbiol* [Internet]. 2008;123(1):177–82. Available from:
978 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0168160507007210>
- 979 40. Allende A, Monaghan J. Irrigation Water Quality for Leafy Crops: A Perspective of Risks and
980 Potential Solutions. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* [Internet]. 2015 Jul 3;12(7):7457–77.
981 Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26151764>
- 982 41. Strawn LK, Gröhn YT, Warchocki S, Worobo RW, Bihn EA, Wiedmann M. Risk Factors
983 Associated with Salmonella and Listeria monocytogenes Contamination of Produce Fields.
984 *Appl Environ Microbiol* [Internet]. 2013 Dec 15;79(24):7618 LP – 7627. Available from:
985 <http://aem.asm.org/content/79/24/7618.abstract>
- 986 42. Muhterem-Uyar M, Dalmasso M, Bolocan AS, Hernandez M, Kapetanakou AE, Kuchta T, et al.
987 Environmental sampling for Listeria monocytogenes control in food processing facilities
988 reveals three contamination scenarios. *Food Control* [Internet]. 2015;51:94–107. Available
989 from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0956713514006240>
- 990 43. Beno SM, Stasiewicz MJ, Andrus AD, Ralyea RD, Kent DJ, Martin NH, et al. Development and
991 Validation of Pathogen Environmental Monitoring Programs for Small Cheese Processing
992 Facilities. *J Food Prot* [Internet]. 2016 Dec 1;79(12):2095–106. Available from:
993 <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-16-241>
- 994 44. FDA. Good Manufacturing Practices for the 21st Century for Food Processing (2004 Study)
995 Section 1: Current Food Good Manufacturing Practices | FDA [Internet]. Food and Drug
996 Administration. 2017 [cited 2021 Apr 27]. Available from: [https://www.fda.gov/food/current-](https://www.fda.gov/food/current-good-manufacturing-practices-cgmps-food-and-dietary-supplements/good-manufacturing-practices-21st-century-food-processing-2004-study-section-1-current-food-good)
997 [good-manufacturing-practices-21st-century-food-processing-2004-study-section-1-current-food-good](https://www.fda.gov/food/current-good-manufacturing-practices-cgmps-food-and-dietary-supplements/good-manufacturing-practices-21st-century-food-processing-2004-study-section-1-current-food-good)
998
- 999 45. Bolocan AS, Oniciuc EA, Alvarez-Ordóñez A, Wagner M, Rychli K, Jordan K, et al. Putative
1000 Cross-Contamination Routes of Listeria monocytogenes in a Meat Processing Facility in
1001 Romania. *J Food Prot* [Internet]. 2015 Sep 1;78(9):1664–74. Available from:
1002 <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-14-539>
- 1003 46. ILSI RESEARCH FOUNDATION/RISK SCIENCE INSTITUTE EPONLMINF. Achieving Continuous
1004 Improvement in Reductions in Foodborne Listeriosis—A Risk-Based Approach. *J Food Prot*
1005 [Internet]. 2005 Sep 1;68(9):1932–94. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-](https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-68.9.1932)
1006 [68.9.1932](https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-68.9.1932)
- 1007 47. Meireles A, Giaouris E, Simões M. Alternative disinfection methods to chlorine for use in the
1008 fresh-cut industry. *Food Res Int* [Internet]. 2016;82:71–85. Available from:
1009 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0963996916300126>
- 1010 48. Lappi VR, Thimothe J, Walker J, Bell J, Gall K, Moody MW, et al. Impact of Intervention
1011 Strategies on Listeria Contamination Patterns in Crawfish Processing Plants: A Longitudinal
1012 Study†. *J Food Prot* [Internet]. 2004 Jun 1;67(6):1163–9. Available from:
1013 <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-67.6.1163>
- 1014 49. Nyarko E, Kniel KE, Zhou B, Millner PD, Luo Y, Handy ET, et al. Listeria monocytogenes
1015 persistence and transfer to cantaloupes in the packing environment is affected by surface
1016 type and cleanliness. *Food Control* [Internet]. 2018;85:177–85. Available from:
1017 <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S095671351730467X>
- 1018 50. Lappi VR, Thimothe J, Nightingale KK, Gall K, Scott VN, Wiedmann M. Longitudinal Studies on
1019 Listeria in Smoked Fish Plants: Impact of Intervention Strategies on Contamination Patterns. *J*
1020 *Food Prot* [Internet]. 2004 Nov 1;67(11):2500–14. Available from:







1021 <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-67.11.2500>





1022

1023 **Supporting information**



1024 **S1 File. Supporting Information File – S1.docx.**










Area Water Group ■ Dry ■ Wet

A**B**

A**B**

A**B**