Full title: Targeted genomic sequencing of avian influenza viruses in wetlands sediment from wild bird habitats

Short title: Genomic sequencing of avian influenza viruses in wetlands sediment

Authors: Kevin S. Kuchinski[1], Michelle Coombe[2,3,4], Sarah C. Mansour[1], Gabrielle Angelo P. Cortez[1], Marzieh Kalhor[1], Chelsea G. Himsworth[2,3,4], Natalie A. Prystajecky[1,5]

Affiliations:

1. Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of British Columbia; Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
2. Animal Health Centre, Ministry of Agriculture and Food; Abbotsford, British Columbia, Canada
3. School of Population and Public Health, University of British Columbia; Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
4. Canadian Wildlife Health Cooperative; Abbotsford, British Columbia, Canada
5. British Columbia Centre for Disease Control, Provincial Health Services Authority; Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

Corresponding author: Kevin S. Kuchinski, kevin.kuchinski@bccdc.ca

ABSTRACT

Diverse influenza A viruses (IAVs) circulate in wild birds, including dangerous strains that infect poultry and humans. Consequently, surveillance of IAVs in wild birds is a cornerstone of outbreak prevention and pandemic preparedness. Surveillance is traditionally done by testing birds, but dangerous IAVs are rarely detected before outbreaks begin. Testing environmental specimens from wild bird habitats has been proposed as an alternative. These specimens are thought to contain diverse IAVs deposited by broad range of avian hosts, including species that are not typically sampled by surveillance programs. We developed a targeted genomic sequencing method for recovering IAV genome fragments from these challenging environmental specimens, including purpose-built bioinformatic analysis tools for counting, subtyping, and characterizing each distinct fragment recovered. We demonstrated our method on 90 sediment specimens from wetlands around Vancouver, Canada. We recovered 2,058 IAV genome fragments originating from all 8 IAV genome segments. 11 haemagglutinin subtypes and 9 neuraminidase subtypes were detected, including H5, the current global surveillance priority. Recovered fragments originated predominantly from IAV lineages that circulate in North American resident wild birds. Our results demonstrate that targeted genomic sequencing of environmental specimens from wild bird habitats can be a valuable complement to avian influenza surveillance programs.

INTRODUCTION

Avian-origin influenza A viruses (AIVs) pose a perennial threat to poultry and human health. Outbreaks in poultry flocks incur significant economic losses[1,2]. They also expose agricultural workers to novel influenza infections, threatening epidemics and global influenza pandemics[3–5]. These outbreaks occur when farmlands become contaminated with excreta from infected wild birds. Numerous wild bird species are naturally infected with diverse AIVs, particularly shore birds and waterfowl[6,7]. These birds live in complex communities, resulting in frequent spillovers between species, reassortment of viral genome segments, and emergence of new strains[8–10]. Seasonal migrations along intercontinental flyways allow global dissemination of AIVs[11,12].

Surveillance of AIVs in wild birds is a cornerstone of outbreak prevention and pandemic preparedness[13–16]. Testing is conducted on live-captured birds, hunter-killed birds, and natural deaths recovered from avian habitats. The objective of these surveillance programs is early detection of strains that are pathogenic to poultry and humans. This would allow agricultural producers to increase biosecurity measures and prevent exposure of livestock to infectious excreta. Due to logistical limitations on the number of birds that can be tested, low detection rates, and sampling biases towards certain avian species, these surveillance programs rarely succeed in forewarning the arrival of dangerous AIVs before outbreaks begin in poultry and humans[15].

Alternative AIV surveillance strategies have been proposed wherein environmental specimens from wild bird habitats are tested instead of animals[17,18]. The rationale is that AIVs from diverse members of the wild bird community will accumulate in the environment, including AIVs from avian species that are not commonly tested by surveillance programs. Additionally, environmental specimens are comparatively easy to collect and less disruptive to wildlife. Wetlands sediment is one type of environmental specimen in which AIV genomic material has been successfully detected[18–20].

To facilitate AIV surveillance using wetlands sediment, we developed a targeted genomic sequencing method to characterize fragments of influenza A virus (IAV) genome in sediment specimens. The method encompasses four components: 1) a custom panel of hybridization probes targeting all IAV subtypes circulating in avian, swine, and human hosts; 2) library construction methods that assign unique molecular indices (UMIs) to each genomic fragment in the specimen; 3) a purpose-built bioinformatic tool for resolving UMIs to obtain single-molecule

resolution and discard PCR artefacts; and 4) a purpose-built bioinformatic tool for counting, subtyping, and characterizing each recovered IAV genome fragment.

In this study, we applied our custom method to 90 sediment specimens collected from wetlands around Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada during the autumn and winter of 2021/22. Genome fragments were recovered from varied IAVs, and these fragments were used to assess subtype diversity and the potential host and geographical range of the IAVs in these sediments. Recovered fragments were also used to monitor whether viruses from recognized highly pathogenic AIV (HPAI) clades were present. Further risk assessment was conducted by interrogating recovered fragments for specific genetic markers of virulence.

RESULTS

Screening sediment for IAV genomic material by RT-qPCR: Total RNA was extracted from 435 sediment specimens then screened for IAV genomic material by RT-qPCR. 74 sediment specimens (17.0%) were positive. An additional 64 specimens (14.7%) were deemed to be suspect-positive due to having Ct values above the cut-off threshold (n=4) or amplification curves trending towards the critical threshold in the final cycle (n=60). Sequencing capacity was available for 90 specimens. All 74 positive specimens were assayed. 16 randomly chosen suspect-positive specimens were also assayed to assess whether sequencing specimens with indeterminate RT-qPCR results would be worthwhile during future surveillance efforts.

Detection of IAV genome fragments in sediment by probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing: IAV genome fragments in these specimens were captured and enriched using a custom panel of hybridization probes. The panel was designed for One Health IAV surveillance, targeting all segments of the IAV genome and providing broadly inclusive coverage of all subtypes circulating in avian, swine, and human hosts (Table S1 and Table S2). Captured material was sequenced (Table S3) then analyzed with two purpose-built bioinformatic tools called HopDropper and FindFlu. HopDropper uses UMI-based anaylsis to generate consensus sequences for each distinct fragment of IAV genome recovered[21]. FindFlu characterizes these fragment consensus sequences and determines the IAV genome segments from which they originated.

We detected 2,058 IAV fragments in specimens that were positive by RT-qPCR (Figure 1A). Only 8 IAV fragments were detected in suspect-positive specimens. Low recovery from specimens with indeterminate RT-qPCR results indicated that future surveillance activities should focus on positive specimens only. To reflect surveillance based only on specimens positive by RT-qpCR, the 16 suspect-positive specimens and the 8 IAV genome fragments recovered from them were omitted from the following analyses.



Figure 1: Detection of influenza A virus genome fragments in sediment by probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing. Influenza A virus (IAV) genome fragments were recovered from 74 sediment specimens that tested positive for IAV genomic material by RT-qPCR. **A)** The number of IAV genome fragments recovered from all specimens was counted. In addition to the total count, the number of fragments originating from each of the 8 IAV genome segments (PB2, PB1, PA, HA, NP, NA, M, and NS) was also determined. **B)** The sensitivity of probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing was determined for specimens that tested positive by RT-qPCR. Overall sensitivity was calculated as the percentage of specimens positive by RT-qPCR where probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing detected at least one IAV genome fragment from any genome segment. Sensitivity was also calculated for each of the IAV genome segments separately. **C)** The number of different IAV genome segments detected in each specimen was determined.

IAV genomic material was detected by probe capture-based sequencing in 58 of 74 specimens (78%) that tested positive by RT-qPCR, and fragments from all 8 IAV genome segments were recovered (Figure 1AB). IAV fragments were not evenly distributed across specimens, however. The three specimens with the most IAV fragments contained 809, 207, and 133 IAV fragments respectively. Collectively these three specimens yielded 56% of all IAV fragments detected in this study. The median specimen contained only 5 IAV fragments (Figure 2A). Furthermore, only 16% of specimens contained fragments from all 8 genome segments (Figure 1C), and no individual genome segment was detected in more than 61% of specimens (Figure 1B).



Figure 2: Detection of influenza A virus genome fragments was limited by low abundance of viral genomic material in sediment specimens. 2,058 fragments of influenza A virus (IAV) genome were recovered from 74 sediment specimens that tested positive for IAV genomic material by RT-qPCR. **A)** The number of IAV genome fragments recovered per specimen was counted. This distribution includes specimens where no IAV fragments were recovered. The median and maximum are indicated. **B)** Distribution of screening RT-qPCR Ct values for specimens, including specimens where no IAV fragments were recovered. The minimum, median, and maximum are indicated. **C)** There was a moderate and statistically significant monotonic association between screening RT-qPCR Ct values and the number of IAV genome fragments detected by probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing. Results of Spearman's rank correlation are indicated above the upper-right corner of the scatterplot. Specimens where no IAV fragments were recovered are included. **D)** There was a moderate and statistically significant monotonic association between screening RT-qPCR Ct values and the number of different IAV genome segments detected by probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing. Results of Spearman's rank correlation are indicated above the upper-right corner of the scatterplot. Specimens where no IAV fragments were recovered are included.

These results, together with the high Ct values observed when screening specimens by RT-qPCR (Figure 2B), suggested that low abundance of viral material in these specimens caused stochastic recovery by probe capture. Indeed, there was a statistically significant monotonic association between lower Ct values (*i.e.* greater abundance of viral genomic material) and

127 higher numbers of IAV fragments detected (Figure 2C). Lower Ct values were also significantly
128 associated with the detection of more of the IAV genome segments (Figure 2D).
129
130 **Diversity of IAV subtypes detected:** Subtyping the haemagglutinin (HA) and neuraminidase
131 (NA) genome segments is central to IAV surveillance and diagnosis, so our bioinformatic tool
132 FindFlu automatically reports the subtypes of all HA and NA fragments identified. We observed
133 a high diversity of HA and NA subtypes in the 74 sediment specimens that tested positive for
134 IAV material by RT-qPCR. 11 of the 16 avian-origin HA subtypes were detected, and all 9 of the
135 avian-origin NA subtypes were detected (Figure 3AB). The most widespread HA and NA
136 subtypes were H6 and N2. These were present in 15% and 26% of specimens respectively
137 (Figure 3A). The most abundant HA and NA subtypes in terms of total fragments detected were
138 H5 and N2. The number of fragments detected for these subtypes were 93 and 130 respectively
139 (Figure 3B).
140 One of the proposed advantages of using environmental specimens for surveillance is the
141 possibility that individual specimens might contain diverse viruses deposited by multiple hosts.
142 We assessed this by counting the number of different HA or NA subtypes present in the same
143 specimen (Figure 3C). Up to 5 different HA or NA subtypes were observed in the same
144 specimen. 34% of HA-positive specimens contained more than one HA subtype, and 51% of
145 NA-positive specimens contained more than one NA subtype.



Figure 3: Diverse haemagglutinin and neuraminidase subtypes were detected in wetlands sediment using probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing. Fragments of the haemagglutinin (HA) and neuraminidase (NA) genome segments were recovered from 74 sediment specimens that tested positive for influenza A virus (IAV) genomic material by RT-qPCR. 225 HA fragments were recovered from 35 specimens, and 303 NA fragments were recovered from 35 specimens. **A)** The percentage of specimens containing each HA and NA subtype was determined. **B)** The total number of HA and NA fragments recovered for each HA and NA subtype was counted. **C)** The number of different HA subtypes detected in each HA-positive specimen was determined, and the number of different NA subtypes detected in each NA-positive specimen was determined.

Assessing confidence in detections based on limited numbers of recovered genome fragments: Many of the segment/subtype detections in this study were based on the presence of a limited number of fragments (Figure 2A and Figure S1). This suggested the possibility of false detections. First, we considered whether some of these detections were caused by demultiplexing artefacts, *e.g.* mutations or base calling errors in library barcodes that occasionally caused limited numbers of IAV reads to be misassigned to incorrect libraries. To assess this, we determined the number of read pairs that described each IAV fragment (Figure 4A). The median number of read

163 pairs per IAV fragment was 803, and 90% of all IAV fragments were described by at least 158
164 read pairs. Based on these high read pair counts, the actual presence of these IAV fragments in
165 their assigned libraries was strongly supported.

166 Next, we considered cross-contamination of IAV genomic material between specimens
167 during laboratory handling as a source of false detections. When designing this custom targeted
168 genomic sequencing method, we anticipated the potential for cross-contamination between
169 specimens and incorporated strategies to mitigate this risk. First, the positive control target for
170 this method is a synthetic oligomer with an artificial, computer-generated sequence that does not
171 resemble IAV or any other organism. This ensures that positive controls do not contaminate
172 surveillance specimens with exogenous IAV genomic material. Second, negative controls are
173 composed of commercially prepared human reference RNA background material. Unlike typical
174 water blanks, these contain sufficient total RNA mass for successful library construction, thereby
175 providing more sensitive detection of low-level cross-contamination. No IAV fragments were
176 observed in any of the 6 negative controls processed alongside sediment specimens in this study
177 (Table S3). Taken together, this method design and these control specimen results indicated that
178 cross-contamination was not a measurable source of false detections in this study.
179



180
181 **Figure 4: Recovered fragments of influenza A virus genome were sequenced deeply.** Influenza A virus (IAV)
182 genome fragments were recovered from 74 sediment specimens that tested positive for IAV genomic material by
183 RT-qPCR. Multiple copies of each IAV fragment were sequenced, increasing sequencing depth per fragment. The
184 median and 10th percentile of copies sequenced per fragment are indicated overall and for each IAV genome
185 segment.
186

187 Finally, we considered whether index hopping had caused false detections by attributing
188 some IAV genome fragments to libraries from which they had not originated. Index hopping is a
189 form of chimeric PCR artefact where library molecules acquire the barcodes of another library

190 during pooled amplification reactions[22–24]. We anticipated index hopping during the post-capture
191 PCR step of this method for three reasons. First, libraries are pooled for capture so a variety of
192 library barcodes are present on template molecules in the post-capture PCR. Second, the low
193 abundance of viral genomic material in these libraries requires extensive amplification during the
194 post-capture PCR. Third, the post-capture PCR provides favourable conditions for chimera
195 formation because of the numerous amplification cycles, low abundance and complexity of
196 captured material, and fragmented condition of viral genomes.
197 To identify index hops and other chimeric artefacts, we used library construction
198 techniques that associate a UMI with both ends of each genomic fragment, and we performed
199 paired end sequencing on captured material to identify the pair of UMIs associated with each
200 sequenced molecule. A purpose-built bioinformatic tool called HopDropper, which analyzes the
201 frequency and co-occurrences of UMIs, was used to discard sequencing reads originating from
202 potential chimeras and index hops. To confirm the removal of chimeras and index hops by
203 HopDropper, we performed two independent probe captures on the pool of libraries prepared
204 from these specimens, then we separately analyzed each capture with HopDropper. We reasoned
205 that UMIs enriched by both captures should de-multiplex to the same library and be paired with
206 the same other UMI after each capture. 1,934 UMIs were present in both enriched replicates.
207 1,922 of these UMIs (99.4%) were de-multiplexed to same library in both replicates, and 1,904
208 of these UMIs (98.4%) were paired with the same other UMI in both replicates. This indicated
209 that chimeric artefacts formed during post-capture PCR were largely absent following analysis
210 by HopDropper, and that index hopping was not responsible for systematic false IAV detections
211 in this study.
212
213 **Length of IAV fragments recovered by probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing:**
214 FindFlu determines the segment and subtype of IAV fragments by aligning them to IAV
215 reference sequences. It also uses these alignments to estimate the length of each recovered IAV
216 fragment. For these specimens, the median IAV fragment length was 378 nucleotides, but
217 lengths ranged from 113 to 2,113 nucleotides (Figure 5A). FindFlu also uses these estimated
218 fragment lengths to calculate how much each recovered fragment covers of its best-matching
219 reference sequences (Figure 5B). In this study, the median IAV fragment represented only 23%

220 of the segment from which it originated, but some fragments represented up to 99% of their
221 segment of origin.
222



223

224 **Figure 5: Length of influenza A virus genome fragments recovered from sediment specimens by probe**
225 **capture-based targeted genomic sequencing.** Influenza A virus (IAV) genome fragments were recovered from 74
226 sediment specimens that tested positive for IAV genomic material by RT-qPCR. **A)** The length of each IAV genome
227 fragment was estimated by FindFlu, a tool that aligned fragment sequences to a database of 567,893 IAV reference
228 sequences (collected globally from avian, swine, and human hosts). Fragment length estimates were calculated from
229 the start and end coordinates of these alignments. **B)** FindFlu also estimated how much each fragment covered of its
230 segment of origin by dividing the estimated fragment length by the length of the reference sequences to which it
231 aligned.
232

233 **Characterizing potential host range and geographic origin of IAVs in sediment:** When
234 assessing zoonotic risks to agriculture and public health, segment and subtype identification are
235 often insufficient. It is important to know if detected IAVs are similar to those that have
236 previously spilled over into poultry or humans. It is also crucial to identify incursions of viruses
237 from regions where pathogenic strains are known to circulate. For these reasons, the reference
238 sequences used by FindFlu are annotated with the host species from which they were collected

239 and the country where the collection occurred. FindFlu reports these annotations for the best-
240 matching reference sequences of each IAV genome fragment. This provides a qualitative
241 characterization of the potential host range and geographic distribution of the IAVs from which
242 the recovered fragments originated.

243 In this study, strong alignments were obtained between recovered IAV fragments and
244 FindFlu reference sequences (Figure S2). Median alignment identity was 99.0% and median
245 alignment query coverage was 99.8%. This indicated that the IAVs detected in these sediment
246 specimens were very similar to previously described IAVs, so their characteristics could be
247 confidently inferred from the annotations of their best-matching FindFlu reference sequences.
248 Recovered fragments had their closest matches to IAVs that were pre-dominantly isolated from
249 North American resident waterfowl and shorebird species (Figure 6 and Figure 7). We noted
250 some fragments were most similar to IAVs observed in Eurasia, *e.g.* H3s from Japan and
251 Mongolia and H6s from South Korea (Figure 7), demonstrating intercontinental migration of
252 AIV hosts and the potential for incursions of Eurasian viruses into the Americas. We also noted
253 that small minorities of N3, PA, and M fragments had their best alignments to reference
254 sequences collected from chickens and turkeys (Figure 6). Furthermore, 8% of PB1 segment
255 fragments had their best alignments to a reference sequence collected from humans (Figure 6).
256 This PB1 segment reference sequence (GenBank accession CY125726) was collected from a
257 Mexican poultry worker infected with zoonotic H7N3 IAV in 2012[25].



Figure 6: Inferred host species range of influenza A viruses detected in wetlands sediment by probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing. Influenza A virus (IAV) genome fragments were recovered from 74 sediment specimens that tested positive for IAV genomic material by RT-qPCR. Host species range was inferred for each fragment by FindFlu, a tool that aligned IAV fragment sequences to a database of 567,893 IAV reference sequences (collected globally from avian, swine, and human hosts). Each reference sequence was annotated with the host species from which it was collected. Numbers inside cells indicate the percentage of IAV fragments from a particular segment/subtype whose best-matching reference sequences were collected from the corresponding host species. When fragments had multiple best-matching reference sequences with different host species annotations, fractions of those fragments were proportionally allotted to each host species. Percentages less than 1% were not reported.



Figure 7: Inferred geographic range of influenza A viruses detected in wetlands sediment by probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing. Influenza A virus (IAV) genome fragments were recovered from 74 sediment specimens that tested positive for IAV genomic material by RT-qPCR. Geographic range was inferred for each fragment by FindFlu, a tool that aligned IAV fragment sequences to a database of 567,893 IAV reference sequences (collected globally from avian, swine, and human hosts). Each reference sequence was annotated with the country in which it was collected. Numbers inside cells indicate the percentage of IAV fragments from a particular segment/subtype whose best-matching reference sequences were collected in the corresponding country. When fragments had multiple best-matching reference sequences with different country annotations, fractions of those fragments were proportionally allotted to each country. Percentages less than 1% were not reported.

Assessing the presence of highly pathogenic goose/Guangdong/96 lineage H5 viruses: Next, we focused our analysis on H5 fragments due to the global importance of the highly pathogenic goose/Guangdong/96 (gs/Gd) lineage[26]. Viruses in this H5 lineage have caused numerous outbreaks in poultry and humans since it emerged in the mid-1990s. To identify these threats, our custom One Health IAV probe panel was designed to provide extensive coverage of gs/Gd clades (Table S2), and H5 reference sequences used by FindFlu are further annotated with their H5 lineage and clade. None of the H5 fragments we recovered had their best alignments to gs/Gd

reference sequences; all best matches were to viruses belonging to American non-gs/Gd lineages (Figure 8A). When specimen collection for this study began, gs/Gd viruses had not been detected in North America since the end of a previous epizootic in 2015[27], but they were an escalating problem across Eurasia[28–31]. No incursions of Eurasian H5s were detected in this study; all recovered H5 fragments had their best alignments to viruses collected in North America (Figure 8B). Finally, none of the recovered H5 fragments had their best alignments to IAVs that were collected from poultry or humans (Figure 8C). All best alignments were to viruses collected from waterfowl and shorebirds.



Figure 8: Inferred clade, host species range, and geographic range of H5 subtype influenza A viruses detected in wetlands sediment. 93 fragments of H5 subtype haemagglutinin (HA) genome segment were recovered from 74 specimens that tested positive for influenza A virus (IAV) genomic material by RT-qPCR. Clade, host species range, and geographic range were inferred for each H5 fragment by FindFlu, a tool that aligned IAV fragment sequences to a database of 567,893 IAV reference sequences (collected globally from avian, swine, and human hosts). This database included 6,047 H5 subtype HA segment reference sequences. **A)** All H5 fragments had their best matches to reference sequences belonging to American non-goose/Guangdong (gs/Gd) lineages. **B)** All H5 fragments had their best matches to reference sequences collected in the United States of America (USA). **C)** All H5 fragments had their best matches to reference sequences collected from waterfowl and shorebird species.

We also evaluated the phylogenetic relationship of the H5 viruses in these specimens to the gs/Gd lineage. Direct phylogenetic comparison was complicated by the fragmentary and incomplete sequences recovered from the sediment. We deliberately did not attempt to assemble fragments into larger contigs; since there was evidence of multiple viruses in many of these specimens (Figure 3C), we did not want to inadvertently create chimeric H5 segment sequences. Instead, we constructed a proxy phylogenetic tree of H5 reference sequences, then we aligned the recovered H5 fragments to these reference sequences to situate them in their phylogenetic context (Figure 9). All recovered H5 fragments aligned to same leaf of the phylogenetic tree which was populated entirely by American non-gs/Gd reference sequences. This analysis indicated that the H5 IAVs we detected were only distantly related to gs/Gd viruses, diverging from each other before the common ancestor of all gs/Gd lineage IAVs emerged in the mid-1990s.



Figure 9: Phylogenetic context of H5 subtype influenza A viruses detected in wetlands sediment by probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing. A proxy phylogenetic tree was constructed from 147 recent haemagglutinin (HA) segment nucleotide reference sequences belonging to the H5 subtype. Reference sequences were collected globally since 2018 (the past 5 years, inclusive). The HA segment sequence from the prototypical goose/Guangdong/96 lineage (GenBank accession NC_007362) was also included to represent Clade 0 of this lineage. Monophyletic groups of highly similar sequences (all leaves within 0.025 substitutions/site of their common ancestor) were collapsed into single leaves for visual clarity. Leaves were coloured according to their H5 lineage and clade. Background shading was applied to Gs/Gd lineage clades. 93 fragments of H5 subtype HA segments were recovered from sediment specimens. These H5 fragments were aligned to the reference sequences composing the proxy tree. For each tree leaf, the percentage of recovered H5 fragments whose best-matching reference sequences belonged to the leaf was calculated. These percentages were indicated beside each leaf and used to scale leaf sizes.

334

335 Finally, we assessed the virulence of the H5 IAVs in the sediment by characterizing HA
336 cleavage sites on recovered fragments. A common feature of HPAI is the presence of polybasic
337 amino acid insertions in this cleavage site[30,32]. We identified 9 H5 fragments on which the HA
338 cleavage site had been sequenced (Table 1). All 9 of these fragments contained the same
339 canonical low-pathogenicity H5 cleavage site motif: PQRETRGLF.

340

341 **Table 1: Haemagglutinin cleavage site on H5 subtype fragments recovered from sediment specimens had**
342 **canonical low-pathogenicity motifs.** 93 fragments of influenza A virus (IAV) genome were recovered that
343 originated from H5 subtype haemagglutinin (HA) genome segments. Fragments were translated and aligned to the
344 HA segment of the prototypical goose/Guangdong/96 lineage strain (GenBank accession NC_007362). HA cleavage
345 site motifs were extracted from translated, aligned sequences on fragments that spanned the cleavage site.

H5 cleavage site motif	H5 fragments containing motif	Total H5 cleavage site-spanning fragments	Percent of total (%)
PQRETRGLF	9	9	100

346

347 **DISCUSSION**

348 In this study, we demonstrated that our custom targeted genomic sequencing method can be used
349 to effectively characterize IAV genomic material in wetlands sediment. All segments of the IAV
350 genome were detected (Figure 1), and diverse HA and NA subtypes were observed (Figure 3).
351 Multiple HA and NA subtypes were frequently detected in the same specimen (Figure 3),
352 highlighting the advantages of environmental surveillance. The diversity of subtypes we
353 observed showed that the custom probe panel designed for this study is broadly inclusive of
354 diverse IAVs. It also revealed high HA and NA subtype richness among wild bird communities
355 in the wetlands visited during the study period.

356 This method succeeded in recovering IAV genome fragments from specimens with low
357 abundance of viral genomic material (Figure 2). Significant relationships were observed between
358 screening RT-qPCR Ct values, the number of IAV genomic fragments recovered, and the
359 number of IAV genome segments detected in a specimen (Figure 2). The practical implication of
360 these results is that specimens with lower screening RT-qPCR Ct values (*i.e.* higher abundance
361 of viral genomic material) should be prioritized when sequencing capacity is limited.

362 This method's ability to recover IAV genome fragments from specimens with low
363 abundance of viral genomic materials means that detections of particular segments or subtypes
364 might rely on the recovery of limited numbers of genome fragments. This study demonstrated
365 that confidence can be had in these detections. Even when the number of fragments detected in a

366 specimen were limited, those fragments were described by hundreds-to-thousands of read pairs
367 (Figure 4A). Furthermore, there was no evidence of cross-contamination in the 6 independent
368 negative controls (Table S3), and there was limited evidence of chimeric artefacts after data was
369 processed by HopDropper. The lack of evidence for false detections in this study reflects several
370 method design choices that were made to increase confidence in results. IAV material is not used
371 as positive control material so it cannot contaminate specimens. Negative controls contain
372 sufficient background material to provide sensitive detection of low-level cross-contamination.
373 UMIs are used during library construction to enable removal of PCR artefacts.
374 This study also highlighted a major constraint of using wetlands sediment for genomics-
375 based surveillance of AIVs: IAV genomic material recovered from these specimens is
376 fragmentary and incomplete. Only 16% of specimens had fragments from all 8 IAV genome
377 segments recovered by probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing (Figure 1C). Most
378 fragments were short and only covered small regions of the IAV genome segment from which
379 they originated (Figure 5). Some longer fragments were recovered, but only up to 300
380 nucleotides were sequenced from each end of these fragments. This is an important trade-off for
381 this method: Illumina short read platforms may leave the middles of longer fragments
382 undescribed, but their high single-read accuracy and paired-end chemistry are instrumental for
383 UMI-based single-fragment resolution and artefact removal. This trade-off seems prudent when
384 enrichment and amplification are necessary to sequence fragmentary genomic material
385 originating from multiple viruses in complex, challenging environmental specimens. If
386 sequencing further along fragments is desired, paired-end sequencing runs could be performed
387 with asymmetrical read lengths, *e.g.* 25 cycles for one read (to capture the UMI on that end of
388 the molecule) followed by 575 cycles for the other read (to sequence further along the fragment).
389 Alternatively, data generated by this method could be used to identify libraries containing long
390 fragments of particularly high interest; these libraries could then be individually reflexed to a
391 long-read platform.
392 In many applications, it is routine and appropriate to assemble fragmentary sequences
393 into larger contigs. Full genomes might be instrumental for comparing genetic similarity between
394 strains or constructing trees for phylodynamic analyses. The results from this study suggest that
395 assembling the fragments recovered from sediment is not prudent. Genomic material from
396 multiple viruses was often present in a single specimen (Figure 3C). Thus, assembling fragments

397 may combine sequences originating from different viruses and create fictitious genomes. Each
398 distinct fragment should be analyzed independently, and these fragments must be the unit of
399 analysis for surveillance.

400 Fortunately, these distinct IAV genome fragments recovered from sediment provide
401 useful information that can address practical surveillance questions. High quality alignments to
402 well-characterized reference sequences were obtained (Figure S2). This allowed qualitative
403 characterization of the potential host range and geographic origin of the IAVs in these specimens
404 with the FindFlu tool (Figure 6, Figure 7, and Figure 8). This would allow the detection of
405 viruses resembling those that have already spilled over into poultry and/or humans. It would also
406 allow the detection of viral incursions from regions where pathogenic strains are known to
407 circulate.

408 We also used FindFlu to identify the lineage and clade of recovered H5 fragments (Figure
409 8). This would allow the direct identification of HPAI gs/Gd lineage viruses, especially with the
410 broad coverage of gs/Gd viruses provided by our custom probe panel (Table S2). Unfortunately,
411 this study was unable to explicitly demonstrate detection of gs/Gd H5 viruses in sediment. No
412 HPAI outbreaks occurred in the study region during the study period. A portion of specimen
413 collection coincided with the arrival of a clade 2.3.4.4 gs/Gd lineage H5N1 virus in North
414 America, but this strain did not arrive in the region where the study was conducted until April
415 2022[33,34], three months after specimen collected had ended. Consequently, all H5 fragments
416 detected originated from low pathogenicity, American H5 lineages that commonly circulate in
417 waterfowl and shorebirds (Figure 6, Figure 7, Figure 8, and Figure 9).

418 While recovered H5 fragments could not be directly analyzed phylogenetically, we were
419 able to infer their phylogenetic context by alignment to a proxy tree. Based on the positions in
420 this tree of: 1) the prototypical gs/Gd sequence from 1996; 2) contemporary gs/Gd clades; and 3)
421 the leaf to which the recovered H5 fragments aligned, we surmised that the H5 viruses detected
422 in these specimens were separated from gs/Gd viruses by several decades of evolution. A more
423 precise estimate could be reached with phylodynamic modeling and a molecular clock, but this
424 was beyond the scope of this study. Nonetheless, this demonstrates how fragmentary, incomplete
425 sequences recovered from sediment could be effectively incorporated into future phylodynamic
426 analyses.

427 The results from this study highlight some interpretation challenges that might arise when
428 using genomic data for surveillance. Notably, small minorities of fragments had their best
429 matches to IAVs that have previously infected poultry and humans (Figure 6), but the level of
430 risk implied by these detections was not clear. HPAI and spillover phenotypes are typically
431 associated with specific HA subtypes due to the role of the HA surface protein in viral
432 attachment and entry. None of these fragments originated from HA segments. Instead, they
433 originated from NA and internal segments. These fragments may have belonged to low-risk
434 strains that had acquired NA or internal segments from high-risk strains through re-assortment.
435 In these re-assortment scenarios, the segments acquired from HPAI/spillover strains may not
436 have been those that encoded the HPAI/spillover phenotype. Another possibility is that these
437 fragments merely originated from regions of IAV genome segments that are well-conserved
438 between low-pathogenicity and HPAI lineages circulating among diverse hosts. Another
439 possibility to consider is that these viruses where not truly the closest matches for these genome
440 fragments; better matching viruses from wild birds may have been absent from the bioinformatic
441 database because viral diversity in wild birds is undersampled and incompletely characterized.
442 These interpretation challenges are not unique to probe capture methodology or
443 environmental sampling, however. All genomic surveillance must contend with inferring viral
444 phenotype and spillover risk from genotype, sequence similarity, and phylogenetic context, all
445 using biased and incomplete reference sequence databases. That is why this study also assessed
446 pathogenicity more directly by interrogating genetic markers of virulence on recovered
447 fragments. We focused on H5 cleavage sites and corroborated the presence of low-pathogenicity
448 H5 strains by detecting only canonical monobasic cleavage site motifs (Table 1). This same
449 concept could be applied to other phenotypic markers of virulence and host range, however[35–38].
450 The laboratory methods presented in this study are flexible, and they could accommodate
451 RNA extracted from various types of specimens. This expands their use to animal-based AIV
452 surveillance as a culture-free method for direct sequencing of IAVs in bird swabs. This would
453 avoid the extensive biocontainment infrastructure required for culturing suspected HPAIs, and it
454 would be useful for sequencing swabs with low viral loads that fail conventional whole genome
455 sequencing methods. Sequencing of wetlands sediment and bird swabs with this method would
456 be easily scaled and parallelized; sediment and swab specimens could be processed

457 simultaneously on the same library construction plates, captured in the same reaction, and
458 sequenced on the same run, thereby increasing throughput and decreasing cost per specimen.
459 The One Health design of our custom probe panel further expands the types of specimens
460 that could be assayed to include clinical specimens from other animals (*e.g.* swine and humans)
461 as well as diverse environmental specimens (*e.g.* material from swine barns and agricultural
462 fairs, filtered air from building HVAC systems, and municipal wastewater)[39–43]. Additionally,
463 these specimens often contain other pathogens of importance to agriculture and public health,
464 and probe panels could be expanded for simultaneous multi-pathogen detection[44–47]. In this way,
465 the probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing platform demonstrated here could provide
466 a powerful general-purpose tool for pathogen surveillance.
467

468 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

469 **Specimen collection:** Twenty samples of superficial wetland sediment were collected from 22
470 wetlands (n = 440) across the lower mainland of British Columbia, Canada. Specimen collection
471 occurred between October 6, 2021, and January 17, 2022. All 20 sites in a wetland were sampled
472 on the same day. Wetland locations were selected in consultation with local biologists to
473 determine areas that were likely to have high abundance of wild waterfowl. Within a wetland,
474 sampling locations were selected to maximize potential of use by waterfowl (*e.g.* evidence on
475 shoreline of recent waterfowl usage), ease of access to submerged sediment (*e.g.* water depth of
476 less than 0.5 m), and to represent as much of the spatial extent of the wetland as possible.
477 Sampling locations within a wetland were separated by 2 m or more. At each sampling location,
478 biologists walked 1 to 2 m into the water and scooped the superficial layers of sediment into a
479 120 mL sterile urine collection container while wearing sterile nitrile gloves. Environmental data
480 was then collected at each sampling location, including the geographic coordinates, an estimated
481 water depth, water pH, water salinity, water temperature, and the presence or absence of fresh
482 waterfowl feces at the shoreline.
483 Containers of sediment were brought back to the lab and kept at 4 °C until pre-
484 processing could occur. During pre-processing, excess water was decanted, and large chunks of
485 organic debris (*e.g.* leaves, plant roots, and rocks) were removed. The remaining material was
486 manually stirred with a sterile metal scoopula to homogenize it, then 10 to 12 mL of the
487 remaining material was placed into a 15 mL conical tube. The outsides of the tubes were wiped

488 clean, disinfected with a 10% bleach solution, and then placed into a -80 °C freezer until RNA
489 extraction.
490
491 **Total RNA extraction from sediment specimens and RT-qPCR screening for IAV genomic**
492 **material:** Total RNA was extracted from 435 of 440 total sediment specimens collected for this
493 study (5 specimens had insufficient sediment for extraction). Total RNA was extracted from 2 g
494 of sediment using the Qiagen RNeasy PowerSoil Total RNA kit (#12866). A chloroform
495 extraction was added to the manufacturer's protocol to remove additional PCR inhibitors. After
496 the phenol:chloroform:isoamyl alcohol (pH 6.5-8.0) extraction step in the manufacturer's
497 protocol, the aqueous phase was transferred to a new container then mixed with an equal volume
498 of chloroform. Phases were separated by centrifugation, then this chloroform extraction was
499 repeated on the aqueous phase. The manufacturer's protocol was resumed after the second
500 chloroform extraction. RNA was eluted in 30 µL of nuclease-free water and stored at -80 °C.
501 IAV genomic material was detected by RT-qPCR targeting the matrix (M) segment
502 (Table 2)[48]. 25 µL reactions were prepared with Applied Biosystems AgPath-ID One-Step RT
503 PCR reagents (#4387391), 400 nM each of primers M52C and M253R (Table 2), 120 nM of the
504 FAM-labeled probe M96C (Table 2), 3 µg of New England BioLabs T4 Gene 32 Protein
505 (#M0300), and 2 µL of RNA extracted from sediment specimens. Reactions were incubated with
506 the following cycling conditions: 1 cycle of 45 °C for 10 minutes; 1 cycle of 95 °C for 10
507 minutes; 45 cycles of 95 °C for 15 seconds followed by 60 °C for 60 seconds. Reactions were
508 run on an Applied Biosystems 7500 Fast Real-Time PCR System using a fixed critical threshold
509 of 0.05 for all reactions. Following common clinical practice, a Ct value of 40 was selected as
510 the cut-off for specimen positivity. Screening RT-qPCR reactions were allowed to proceed for an
511 additional 5 cycles, however, to identify suspect-positive specimens and assess their value for
512 surveillance. Specimens were called suspect-positive if they had Ct values greater than 40 or if
513 their amplification curves trended towards the critical threshold in the final PCR cycle.
514

515 **Table 2: Sequences of oligonucleotides used in this study.**

Oligo name	Oligo purpose	Oligo sequence (5' to 3')	Reference
M52C	Forward primer for IAV M segment detection	CTTCTAACCGAGGTCGAAACG	Fouchier *et al*., 2000
M253R	Reverse primer for IAV M segment detection	AGGGCATTTTGGACAAAKCGTCTA	Fouchier *et al*., 2000
M96C	Taqman probe for IAV M segment detection	CCGTCAGGCCCCCTCAAAGCCGA	Fouchier *et al*., 2000
control_oligo	Positive control target for probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing	GTTCTTAGCTATTGCGCTTCCGCAATNNNBANNNDCNNNHGGCCAATACAGTTGGAGAGCGTGTTGGCGAATATAAGCCACTCGCGAATGGTCCGCCAGGCTAGCTTCATTCGTCGATGCACCGTATATGGTCATCTATATATCTAACTCGACACAACACHNNNGDNNNTBNNNATTGCGTGATACAGCAAGAGACAACG	This study
control_oligo_f	Forward primer for amplifying and detecting control oligo	CGTTGTCTCTTGCTGTATCACGC	This study
control_oligo_r	Reverse primer for amplifying and detecting control oligo	GTTCTTAGCTATTGCGCTTCCGC	This study
control_oligo_p	Taqman probe for detecting control oligo	TGAAGCTAGCCTGGCGGACC	This study

516

517 **cDNA synthesis and library construction:** Double-stranded cDNA was prepared from 11 µL of
518 undiluted RNA using the Invitrogen SuperScript IV First-Strand Synthesis System (#18091200)
519 and the Invitrogen Second Strand cDNA Synthesis Kit (#A48571). First and second strand
520 synthesis were both performed according to the manufacturer's protocols, then purified using
521 1.8X Agencourt AMPure XP-PCR Purification Beads (#A63881). Sequencing libraries were
522 prepared from the total volume of purified cDNA using the Integrated DNA Technologies xGen
523 cfDNA & FFPE DNA Library Preparation Kit (#10006202) according to the manufacturer's
524 protocol. Libraries were barcoded using the xGen UDI Primers Plate 1 (#10005922) with 15
525 cycles of PCR. Following barcoding PCRs, libraries were purified with 1.3X Agencourt AMPure
526 XP-PCR Purification Beads (#A63881) then eluted in 30 µL of nuclease-free water.

527 Libraries were prepared in batches of 15 sediment specimens and 1 batch control
528 specimen. Sediment specimens were randomly assigned to 6 batches. All specimens in the same
529 batch were prepared on the same reaction plates and from the same reagent master mixes. Batch
530 controls were composed of 500 ng of Invitrogen Universal Human Reference RNA (#QS0639)
531 spiked with 40,000 copies of double-stranded control oligo. The sequence of the control oligo
532 was generated randomly (Table 2), then it was synthesized as an ssDNA Ultramer DNA Oligo by

533 Integrated DNA Technologies (Coralville, Iowa, United States of America). Single-stranded
534 control oligo was amplified by PCR as follows. 50 µL reactions were prepared with New
535 England BioLabs NEBNext Ultra II Q5 Master Mix (#M0544), 1 µM of each control oligo
536 amplification primer (Table 2), and 20 million copies of single-stranded control oligo Ultramer
537 as template. Reactions were incubated with the following cycling conditions: 1 cycle of 98 °C
538 for 30 seconds; 10 cycles of 98 °C for 15 seconds followed by 65 °C for 75 seconds; 1 cycle of
539 65 °C for 10 minutes. After amplification, double-stranded control oligo PCR products were
540 purified using 1.2X Agencourt AMPure XP-PCR Purification Beads (#A63881) then eluted in 25
541 µL of nuclease-free water.
542 To spike batch controls with the specified copies of double-stranded control oligo, the
543 molarity of the purified double-stranded control oligo PCR product was determined by qPCR. 20
544 µL reactions were prepared with New England BioLabs Luna Universal Probe qPCR Master Mix
545 (#M3004), 250 nM of each control oligo amplification primer (Table 2), 250 nM of FAM-
546 labeled control oligo detection probe (Table 2), and 2 µL of purified double-stranded control
547 oligo PCR product. Reactions were run on an Applied Biosystems 7500 Fast Real-Time PCR
548 System with the following cycling conditions: 1 cycle of 95 °C for 60 seconds; 40 cycles of 95
549 °C for 15 seconds followed by 60 °C for 45 seconds. A dilution series of the single-stranded
550 control oligo Ultramer stock was used as a standard curve for quantification.
551 Enrichment of control oligos in batch control specimens functioned as a positive control
552 for library construction and probe capture. Absence of control oligos in sediment specimens
553 following index hop removal (described below) functioned as a negative control for reagent
554 contamination and cross-contamination between specimens. Absence of IAV fragments in batch
555 control specimens also functioned as a negative control in the same way.
556
557 **One Health IAV probe panel design:** IAV genome segment sequences were downloaded from
558 the Influenza Research Database (www.fludb.org)[49] on December 9, 2021. Sequences were
559 limited to those marked as complete from avian, swine, and human hosts. In total 531,526 IAV
560 genome segment nucleotide sequences were obtained. Separate sub-panels were designed for
561 each IAV genome segment as follows. First, all reference sequences representing a segment were
562 clustered at 99% nucleotide identity using VSEARCH cluster_fast (v2.21.0) without masking (-
563 qmask none)[50]. Cluster centroids were used as the input design space for ProbeTools makeprobes

564 (v0.1.9) using batch sizes of 10 probes (-b 10), probe length of 120 nucleotides (-k 120), and a
565 coverage endpoint of 95% (-c 95)[44]. Sub-panels for each IAV genome segment were combined
566 to create the final panel. 10 probes with randomly generated sequences were added for capturing
567 synthetic spike-in control oligos, although only one was used in this study (described above).
568 The final panel contained 9,380 probes (sequences provided in Supplemental Material 1).
569 ProbeTools capture and stats (v0.1.9) were used to confirm extensive coverage by the final panel
570 of reference sequences in the design space (Table S1 and Table S2). The final panel was
571 synthesized by Twist Biosciences (San Francisco, California, United States of America) with
572 0.02 fmol of each probe per reaction.
573
574 **Library pooling, hybridization probe capture, and genomic sequencing:** dsDNA
575 concentration was measure for each library using the Invitrogen Qubit dsDNA Broad Range kit
576 (#Q32851) on the Invitrogen Qubit 4 Fluorometer. 300 ng of each library was pooled together,
577 then two independent capture replicates were performed on aliquots of the pool. For each capture
578 replicate, 2 aliquots of 4 μg of the pool were captured separately. After this first capture, they
579 were combined and subjected to an additional capture for further enrichment of IAV genomic
580 material. This means that 8 μg of library pool was enriched for each independent capture
581 replicate and 16 μg of library pool was enriched in total for the whole study.
582 Pooled library material was completely evaporated in a vacuum oven at 50 °C and -20
583 mm Hg, then hybridization reactions were prepared with our custom One Health IAV panel
584 (described above), Twist Universal Blockers (#100578), and Twist Hybridization Reagents
585 (#104178) according to the manufacturer's protocol. Hybridization reactions were incubated at
586 70 °C for 16 hours then washed with Twist Wash Buffers (#104178). Washing was performed
587 according to the manufacturer's protocol except the streptavidin bead slurry was resuspended in
588 22.5 μL of nuclease-free water instead of 45 μL prior to post-capture PCR. Post-capture PCR
589 was performed on the total volume of bead slurry using Twist Equinox Library Amp Mix
590 (#104178). Reactions were prepared and incubated according to the manufacturer's protocol with
591 15 cycles of amplification. Following post-capture PCR, reactions were purified with the
592 included DNA Purification Beads according to the manufacturer's protocol. Purified captured
593 library pools were eluted in 30 μL of nuclease-free water.

594 Molarity of double-captured library pools was determined using the New England
595 BioLabs NEBNext Library Quant Kit for Illumina (#E7630). Double-captured library pools were
596 also run on the Agilent TapeStation 2200 device using Agilent D1000 ScreenTape (#5067-5582)
597 and D1000 reagents (#5067-5583) to obtain the peak fragment size, which was used to adjust
598 molarity. 15 pmol of double-captured library pool was sequenced on an Illumina MiSeq
599 instrument using MiSeq v3 600 cycle reagent kits (#MS-102-3003) to generate 2 x 300 cycle
600 paired end reads. Each independent capture replicate was sequenced on its own run. The
601 following adapter sequences were provided in the MiSeq sample sheet for on-instrument
602 trimming: AGATCGGAAGAGCACACGTCTGAACTCCAGTCA and
603 AGATCGGAAGAGCGTCGTGTAGGGAAAGAGTGT.
604
605 **Chimera and index hop removal and generation of consensus sequences for distinct**
606 **fragments:** Each MiSeq run was separately analyzed with HopDropper (v1.0.0)
607 (https://github.com/KevinKuchinski/HopDropper). All FASTQ files generated in the run were
608 analyzed, including sediment specimen libraries, control specimen libraries, and Undetermined
609 libraries. 14-nucleotide intrinsic UMIs and 8-nucleotide extrinsic UMIs were assigned to each
610 read, and extrinsic UMIs were limited to the 32 indices provided with the Integrated DNA
611 Technologies xGen cfDNA & FFPE DNA Library Preparation Kit (#10006202). Fragments and
612 their read pairs were only outputted if their UMI pair was observed at least 30 times. Fragment
613 end consensus sequences were generated by sub-sampling up to 200 read pairs from each
614 fragment. HopDropper defaults were used for other parameters.
615
616 **Identification and characterization of influenza A virus genome fragments:** Fragment end
617 consensus sequences generated by HopDropper were analyzed by FindFlu (v0.0.8)
618 (https://github.com/KevinKuchinski/FindFlu). The FindFlu database used for this study was
619 comprised of all complete segment nucleotide sequences in the Influenza Research Database
620 (www.fludb.org) from avian, swine, and human hosts on October 11, 2022. It contained 172,009
621 avian-origin sequences, 72,203 swine-origin sequences, and 323,681 human-origin sequences
622 (567,893 total sequences). IAV fragments from both probe capture replicates were combined for
623 analyses in this study, except for analyses where probe capture replicates were explicitly

624 considered separately. All fragment counts were based on UMI pair to ensure that IAV
625 fragments were not double-counted if they were enriched in both probe capture replicates.
626 The FindFlu fragment report provided the following for each IAV fragment: segment,
627 subtype, number of copies sequenced, fragment length, segment coverage, alignment identity,
628 and alignment query coverage. The FindFlu host, country, and H5 clade reports were used to
629 calculate the percentage of IAV fragments having their best matches to reference sequences from
630 various host species, collection countries, and H5 clades. In cases where IAV fragments had
631 multiple best-matching reference sequences with multiple host/country/H5 clade annotations,
632 each different host/country/H5 clade value observed was proportionally allocated a fraction of a
633 fragment ($1/n$ where n was the number of best-matching reference sequences the fragment had).
634
635 **Phylogenetic analysis of H5 fragments:** Recent H5 segment reference sequences were
636 downloaded from the Influenza Research Database (www.fludb.org)[49]. All available complete
637 H5 segment nucleotide sequences collected from 2018 onwards were downloaded on November
638 6, 2022. The prototypical goose/Guangdong/96 lineage HA sequence (GenBank accession
639 NC_007362) was also included to represent Clade 0. A multiple sequence alignment was
640 performed on the resulting collection of 147 H5 reference sequences using CLUSTAL W
641 (v2.1)[51]. A maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree was constructed from the multiple sequence
642 alignment and bootstrapped 100 times using PHYML (v3.3.20211231)[52]. The resulting tree was
643 analyzed and visualized with the ETE3 package (v3.1.2) in Python (v3.9.12)[53]. Outlying
644 branches were trimmed if their length exceeded 3 standard deviations of the mean branch length.
645 For visual clarity, monophyletic groups of similar leaves were collapsed into a single leaf if all
646 leaves were less than 0.025 substitutions/site from their common ancestral node. The length of
647 the replacement leaf's branch was set to the mean branch length of the collapsed leaves.
648 The best-matching reference sequences for each H5 fragment were determined as
649 follows. The H5 fragment end consensus sequences generated by HopDropper were aligned to
650 the H5 reference sequences composing the tree using blastn (v2.13.0)[54]. A combined bitscore
651 was generated for each fragment-reference sequence combination by adding together the
652 bitscores from both fragment end consensus sequence alignments against that reference
653 sequence. Each fragment's best-matching reference sequences were those with which it had its
654 maximum combined bitscore.

655 The percentage of H5 fragments having their best match to each reference sequence
656 composing the tree was calculated as follows. The number of H5 fragments having their best
657 match to a reference sequence was divided by the total number of H5 fragments then multiplied
658 by 100. In cases where an H5 fragment had multiple best matches, that fragment was counted as
659 1/*n* of a fragment for each of their best matches, where *n* was that fragment's number of best
660 matches. When similar tree leaves were collapsed into a single leaf for visual clarity, the
661 replacement leaf's percentage of H5 fragments having their best match to it was determined by
662 summing the percentages of its constituent leaves.
663
664 **H5 cleavage site characterization:** H5 fragment end consensus sequences generated by
665 HopDropper were translated and aligned to the prototypical goose/Guangdong/96 lineage HA
666 amino acid sequence (GenBank accession NC_007362) using blastx (v2.13.0)[54]. Only the best
667 alignments (by bitscore) were retained for each fragment end consensus sequence. The position
668 of each fragment end consensus sequence in the goose/Guangdong H5 amino acid sequence was
669 determined from the alignment subject start and subject end coordinates. Fragment end
670 consensus sequences containing the HA cleavage site were identified by finding fragments that
671 spanned the coordinates 336 and 348. HA cleavage site motifs were then extracted from the
672 aligned, translated sequences.
673
674 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**
675 We would like to thank all the laboratories worldwide who have submitted genomic sequences to
676 the Influenza Research Database. We would also like to thank the Public Health Laboratory at
677 the British Columbia Centre for Disease Control for maintaining laboratory space, RT-qPCR
678 instruments, and the Illumina MiSeq sequencing platform used in this study. Ciara O'Higgins
679 and Kristen Moffit at the BC Ministry of Agriculture and Food's Animal Health Centre provided
680 invaluable assistance with specimen processing. The EBE Environmental Consulting Inc. team's
681 dedication to collecting specimens in exceptionally challenging weather conditions was greatly
682 appreciated.
683

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

KK conceived the study, designed the custom panel of hybridization probes, developed laboratory methods and bioinformatic tools used to generate genomic data, analyzed and interpreted genomic data, and wrote the manuscript. MC conceived the study, developed the wetlands sampling strategy and sediment specimen collection protocol, oversaw specimen collection, and reviewed the manuscript. SM oversaw RNA extraction and RT-qPCR screening of sediment specimens and reviewed the manuscript. GC and MK performed RNA extraction, RT-qPCR screening, library construction, and hybridization probe capture, and they reviewed the manuscript. CH conceived the study, secured funding, provided graduate-level supervision of MC, and reviewed the manuscript. NP conceived the study, secured funding, provided graduate-level supervision of KK, and reviewed the manuscript.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Source code for HopDropper and FindFlu are available at https://github.com/KevinKuchinski/. Raw sequencing reads generated during this study are available from the NCBI Short Read Archive as part of BioProject PRJNA926989. The custom One Health IAV probe panel has been included as a supplemental FASTA file (Supplemental Material 1). Influenza A virus genome fragments recovered in this study (following HopDropper and FindFlu analysis, as described above) have been included as a supplemental FASTA file (Supplemental Material 2).

REFERENCES

1. Ramos S. Impacts of the 2014-2015 Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza Outbreak on the U.S. Poultry Sector. *United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service*. 2017;LDPM-282-02:22.

2. Swayne DE, Hill RE, Clifford J. Safe application of regionalization for trade in poultry and poultry products during highly pathogenic avian influenza outbreaks in the USA. *Avian Pathol*. 2017;46(2):125-130. doi:10.1080/03079457.2016.1257775

3. Watanabe T, Watanabe S, Maher EA, Neumann G, Kawaoka Y. Pandemic potential of H7N9 influenza viruses. *Trends Microbiol*. 2014;22(11):623-631. doi:10.1016/j.tim.2014.08.008

4. Mostafa A, Abdelwhab EM, Mettenleiter TC, Pleschka S. Zoonotic Potential of Influenza A Viruses: A Comprehensive Overview. *Viruses*. 2018;10(9):497. doi:10.3390/v10090497

5. Sutton TC. The Pandemic Threat of Emerging H5 and H7 Avian Influenza Viruses. *Viruses*. 2018;10(9):461. doi:10.3390/v10090461

6. Olsen B, Munster VJ, Wallensten A, Waldenström J, Osterhaus ADME, Fouchier RAM. Global patterns of influenza a virus in wild birds. *Science*. 2006;312(5772):384-388. doi:10.1126/science.1122438

7. Krauss S, Walker D, Pryor SP, et al. Influenza A viruses of migrating wild aquatic birds in North America. *Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis*. 2004;4(3):177-189. doi:10.1089/vbz.2004.4.177

8. Wille M, Holmes EC. The Ecology and Evolution of Influenza Viruses. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med*. 2020;10(7):a038489. doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a038489

9. Dugan VG, Chen R, Spiro DJ, et al. The evolutionary genetics and emergence of avian influenza viruses in wild birds. *PLoS Pathog*. 2008;4(5):e1000076. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1000076

10. Chen R, Holmes EC. Avian influenza virus exhibits rapid evolutionary dynamics. *Mol Biol Evol*. 2006;23(12):2336-2341. doi:10.1093/molbev/msl102

11. Hill NJ, Bishop MA, Trovão NS, et al. Ecological divergence of wild birds drives avian influenza spillover and global spread. *PLoS Pathog*. 2022;18(5):e1010062. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1010062

12. Keawcharoen J, van Riel D, van Amerongen G, et al. Wild ducks as long-distance vectors of highly pathogenic avian influenza virus (H5N1). *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2008;14(4):600-607. doi:10.3201/eid1404.071016

13. Hoye BJ, Munster VJ, Nishiura H, Klaassen M, Fouchier RAM. Surveillance of Wild Birds for Avian Influenza Virus. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2010;16(12):1827-1834. doi:10.3201/eid1612.100589

14. Machalaba CC, Elwood SE, Forcella S, et al. Global Avian Influenza Surveillance in Wild Birds: A Strategy to Capture Viral Diversity. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2015;21(4):e141415. doi:10.3201/eid2104.141415

15. Ramey AM, DeLiberto TJ, Berhane Y, Swayne DE, Stallknecht DE. Lessons learned from research and surveillance directed at highly pathogenic influenza A viruses in wild birds inhabiting North America. *Virology*. 2018;518:55-63. doi:10.1016/j.virol.2018.02.002

16. Bevins SN, Pedersen K, Lutman MW, et al. Large-Scale Avian Influenza Surveillance in Wild Birds throughout the United States. *PLOS ONE*. 2014;9(8):e104360. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0104360

17. Hood G, Roche X, Brioudes A, et al. A literature review of the use of environmental sampling in the surveillance of avian influenza viruses. *Transbound Emerg Dis*. 2021;68(1):110-126. doi:10.1111/tbed.13633

18. Coombe M, Iwasawa S, Byers KA, et al. A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND NARRATIVE SYNTHESIS OF THE USE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLES FOR THE SURVEILLANCE OF AVIAN INFLUENZA VIRUSES IN WILD WATERBIRDS. *jwdi*. 2021;57(1):1-18. doi:10.7589/JWD-D-20-00082

19. Tindale LC, Baticados W, Duan J, et al. Extraction and Detection of Avian Influenza Virus From Wetland Sediment Using Enrichment-Based Targeted Resequencing. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science*. 2020;7. Accessed August 26, 2022. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fvets.2020.00301

20. Densmore CL, Iwanowicz DD, Ottinger CA, et al. Molecular Detection of Avian Influenza Virus from Sediment Samples in Waterfowl Habitats on the Delmarva Peninsula, United States. *Avian Dis*. 2017;61(4):520-525. doi:10.1637/11687-060917-ResNote.1

21. Kivioja T, Vähärautio A, Karlsson K, et al. Counting absolute numbers of molecules using unique molecular identifiers. *Nat Methods*. 2012;9(1):72-74. doi:10.1038/nmeth.1778

22. Costello M, Fleharty M, Abreu J, et al. Characterization and remediation of sample index swaps by non-redundant dual indexing on massively parallel sequencing platforms. *BMC Genomics*. 2018;19(1):332. doi:10.1186/s12864-018-4703-0

23. MacConaill LE, Burns RT, Nag A, et al. Unique, dual-indexed sequencing adapters with UMIs effectively eliminate index cross-talk and significantly improve sensitivity of massively parallel sequencing. *BMC Genomics*. 2018;19(1):30. doi:10.1186/s12864-017-4428-5

24. Meyerhans A, Vartanian JP, Wain-Hobson S. DNA recombination during PCR. *Nucleic Acids Research*. 1990;18(7):1687-1691. doi:10.1093/nar/18.7.1687

25. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Notes from the field: Highly pathogenic avian influenza A (H7N3) virus infection in two poultry workers--Jalisco, Mexico, July 2012. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2012;61(36):726-727.

26. Nuñez IA, Ross TM. A review of H5Nx avian influenza viruses. *Ther Adv Vaccines Immunother*. 2019;7:2515135518821625. doi:10.1177/2515135518821625

27. Krauss S, Stallknecht DE, Slemons RD, et al. The enigma of the apparent disappearance of Eurasian highly pathogenic H5 clade 2.3.4.4 influenza A viruses in North American waterfowl. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2016;113(32):9033-9038. doi:10.1073/pnas.1608853113

28. Pohlmann A, King J, Fusaro A, et al. Has Epizootic Become Enzootic? Evidence for a Fundamental Change in the Infection Dynamics of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza in Europe, 2021. *mBio*. 2022;0(0):e00609-22. doi:10.1128/mbio.00609-22

29. Verhagen JH, Fouchier RAM, Lewis N. Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza Viruses at the Wild-Domestic Bird Interface in Europe: Future Directions for Research and Surveillance. *Viruses*. 2021;13(2):212. doi:10.3390/v13020212

30. James J, Seekings AH, Skinner P, et al. Rapid and sensitive detection of high pathogenicity Eurasian clade 2.3.4.4b avian influenza viruses in wild birds and poultry. *Journal of Virological Methods*. 2022;301:114454. doi:10.1016/j.jviromet.2022.114454

31. Lewis NS, Banyard AC, Whittard E, et al. Emergence and spread of novel H5N8, H5N5 and H5N1 clade 2.3.4.4 highly pathogenic avian influenza in 2020. *Emerging Microbes & Infections*. 2021;10(1):148-151. doi:10.1080/22221751.2021.1872355

32. Luczo JM, Stambas J, Durr PA, Michalski WP, Bingham J. Molecular pathogenesis of H5 highly pathogenic avian influenza: the role of the haemagglutinin cleavage site motif. *Rev Med Virol*. 2015;25(6):406-430. doi:10.1002/rmv.1846

33. Food A and. Minister's statement on positive case of avian influenza in B.C. | BC Gov News. Published April 14, 2022. Accessed November 14, 2022. https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2022AF0014-000580

34. Alkie TN, Lopes S, Hisanaga T, et al. A threat from both sides: Multiple introductions of genetically distinct H5 HPAI viruses into Canada via both East Asia-Australasia/Pacific and Atlantic flyways. *Virus Evolution*. 2022;8(2):veac077. doi:10.1093/ve/veac077

35. Long JS, Mistry B, Haslam SM, Barclay WS. Host and viral determinants of influenza A virus species specificity. *Nat Rev Microbiol*. 2019;17(2):67-81. doi:10.1038/s41579-018-0115-z

36. Zhang M, Liu M, Bai S, et al. Influenza A Virus–Host Specificity: An Ongoing Cross-Talk Between Viral and Host Factors. *Frontiers in Microbiology*. 2021;12. Accessed December 8, 2022. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmicb.2021.777885

37. Cauldwell AV, Long JS, Moncorgé O, Barclay WSY 2014. Viral determinants of influenza A virus host range. *Journal of General Virology*. 95(6):1193-1210. doi:10.1099/vir.0.062836-0

38. Lipsitch M, Barclay W, Raman R, et al. Viral factors in influenza pandemic risk assessment. *eLife*. 5:e18491. doi:10.7554/eLife.18491

39. Prost K, Kloeze H, Mukhi S, Bozek K, Poljak Z, Mubareka S. Bioaerosol and surface sampling for the surveillance of influenza A virus in swine. *Transboundary and Emerging Diseases*. 2019;66(3):1210-1217. doi:10.1111/tbed.13139

40. Corzo CA, Culhane M, Dee S, Morrison RB, Torremorell M. Airborne Detection and Quantification of Swine Influenza A Virus in Air Samples Collected Inside, Outside and Downwind from Swine Barns. *PLOS ONE*. 2013;8(8):e71444. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0071444

41. Goyal SM, Anantharaman S, Ramakrishnan MA, et al. Detection of viruses in used ventilation filters from two large public buildings. *Am J Infect Control*. 2011;39(7):e30-38. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2010.10.036

42. Mercier E, D'Aoust PM, Thakali O, et al. Municipal and neighbourhood level wastewater surveillance and subtyping of an influenza virus outbreak. *Sci Rep*. 2022;12(1):15777. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-20076-z

43. Wolfe MK, Duong D, Bakker KM, et al. Wastewater-Based Detection of Two Influenza Outbreaks. *Environ Sci Technol Lett*. 2022;9(8):687-692. doi:10.1021/acs.estlett.2c00350

44. Kuchinski KS, Duan J, Himsworth C, Hsiao W, Prystajecky NA. ProbeTools: designing hybridization probes for targeted genomic sequencing of diverse and hypervariable viral taxa. *BMC Genomics*. 2022;23(1):579. doi:10.1186/s12864-022-08790-4

45. Wylie TN, Wylie KM, Herter BN, Storch GA. Enhanced virome sequencing using targeted sequence capture. *Genome Res*. 2015;25(12):1910-1920. doi:10.1101/gr.191049.115

46. O'Flaherty BM, Li Y, Tao Y, et al. Comprehensive viral enrichment enables sensitive respiratory virus genomic identification and analysis by next generation sequencing. *Genome Res*. 2018;28(6):869-877. doi:10.1101/gr.226316.117

47. Briese T, Kapoor A, Mishra N, et al. Virome Capture Sequencing Enables Sensitive Viral Diagnosis and Comprehensive Virome Analysis. *mBio*. 2015;6(5):e01491-15. doi:10.1128/mBio.01491-15

48. Fouchier RAM, Bestebroer TM, Herfst S, Van Der Kemp L, Rimmelzwaan GF, Osterhaus ADME. Detection of Influenza A Viruses from Different Species by PCR Amplification of Conserved Sequences in the Matrix Gene. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2000;38(11):4096-4101.

49. Zhang Y, Aevermann BD, Anderson TK, et al. Influenza Research Database: An integrated bioinformatics resource for influenza virus research. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2017;45(Database issue):D466-D474. doi:10.1093/nar/gkw857

50. Rognes T, Flouri T, Nichols B, Quince C, Mahé F. VSEARCH: a versatile open source tool for metagenomics. *PeerJ*. 2016;4:e2584. doi:10.7717/peerj.2584

51. Thompson JD, Higgins DG, Gibson TJ. CLUSTAL W: improving the sensitivity of progressive multiple sequence alignment through sequence weighting, position-specific gap penalties and weight matrix choice. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 1994;22(22):4673-4680.

52. Guindon S, Lethiec F, Duroux P, Gascuel O. PHYML Online—a web server for fast maximum likelihood-based phylogenetic inference. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2005;33(Web Server issue):W557-W559. doi:10.1093/nar/gki352

53. Huerta-Cepas J, Serra F, Bork P. ETE 3: Reconstruction, Analysis, and Visualization of Phylogenomic Data. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*. 2016;33(6):1635-1638. doi:10.1093/molbev/msw046

54. Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, et al. BLAST+: architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2009;10:421. doi:10.1186/1471-2105-10-421



Figure S1: Number of influenza A virus genome fragments detected in wetlands sediment by probe capture-based targeted genomic sequencing. 2,058 fragments of influenza A virus (IAV) genome were recovered from 74 sediment specimens that tested positive for IAV genomic material by RT-qPCR. Numbers inside cells indicate the number of IAV fragments originating from a particular segment/subtype that were recovered from the corresponding specimen. Only specimens that contained IAV fragments were plotted.



Figure S2: Influenza A virus genome fragments recovered from wetlands sediment were highly similar to reference sequences used by FindFlu to characterize viruses. FindFlu aligned recovered influenza A virus (IAV) genome fragments to a database of 567,893 IAV reference sequences (collected globally from avian, swine, and human hosts). **A)** Nucleotide sequence identities were calculated by dividing the number of identical bases by the alignment length. **B)** Query sequence coverage values were calculated by dividing alignment lengths by query sequence lengths. The minimum, median, and maximum values in both distributions are indicated on the plots.

Table S1: Custom probe panel provides broadly inclusive coverage of influenza A virus reference sequences. The ProbeTools capture and stats modules were used to predict *in silico* how well this study's custom panel of 9,370 probes covered 531,526 influenza A virus (IAV) reference sequences (collected globally from avian, swine, and human hosts). For each reference sequence, probe coverage was calculated as the number of nucleotide positions covered by at least one probe in the panel. The minimum, 5th percentile, median, and maximum probe coverage values were reported for each segment, subtype, and host category.

Segment	Subtype	Host	Reference sequences (#)	Minimum coverage (%)	Fifth percentile of coverage (%)	Median coverage (%)	Maximum coverage (%)
PB2	n/a	avian	19109	71.4	100.0	99.3	100.0
PB2	n/a	human	34153	86.4	100.0	97.8	100.0
PB2	n/a	swine	6767	73.0	100.0	99.1	100.0
PB1	n/a	avian	18173	70.9	100.0	99.7	100.0
PB1	n/a	human	28158	82.9	100.0	99.8	100.0
PB1	n/a	swine	5939	78.7	100.0	99.7	100.0
PA	n/a	avian	19990	62.6	100.0	99.9	100.0
PA	n/a	human	34391	80.7	100.0	98.1	100.0
PA	n/a	swine	6919	78.0	100.0	99.7	100.0
HA	all	avian	26173	62.1	100.0	99.9	100.0
HA	all	human	49011	82.3	100.0	99.8	100.0
HA	all	swine	11342	67.9	100.0	99.9	100.0
HA	H1	avian	916	73.3	100.0	98.1	100.0
HA	H1	human	21844	82.3	100.0	100.0	100.0
HA	H1	swine	7899	72.2	100.0	99.8	100.0
HA	H2	avian	530	81.7	100.0	99.4	100.0
HA	H2	human	95	93.6	100.0	99.6	100.0
HA	H2	swine	2	97.5	98.6	98.1	98.7
HA	H3	avian	2269	66.6	100.0	99.1	100.0
HA	H3	human	26651	89.6	100.0	99.0	100.0
HA	H3	swine	3374	67.9	100.0	99.9	100.0
HA	H4	avian	1928	72.8	100.0	99.4	100.0
HA	H4	human	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
HA	H4	swine	5	97.3	99.9	99.4	100.0
HA	H5	avian	5555	75.4	100.0	100.0	100.0
HA	H5	human	246	94.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
HA	H5	swine	33	98.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
HA	H6	avian	1902	77.4	100.0	99.8	100.0
HA	H6	swine	2	96.6	99.8	98.3	100.0
HA	H7	avian	2367	70.6	100.0	100.0	100.0
HA	H7	human	152	93.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
HA	H7	swine	3	85.7	98.0	98.0	98.0
HA	H8	avian	160	79.6	100.0	98.7	100.0
HA	H9	avian	7364	73.1	100.0	100.0	100.0
HA	H9	human	18	87.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
HA	H9	swine	22	87.5	100.0	97.6	100.0
HA	H10	avian	1231	81.8	100.0	99.9	100.0
HA	H10	human	4	98.5	98.5	98.5	98.5
HA	H10	swine	1	99.4	99.4	99.4	99.4
HA	H11	avian	736	77.5	100.0	99.9	100.0
HA	H11	swine	1	82.7	82.7	82.7	82.7
HA	H12	avian	344	78.5	100.0	98.1	100.0
HA	H13	avian	546	75.4	99.6	97.0	100.0
HA	H14	avian	39	79.3	100.0	100.0	100.0

Segment	Subtype	Host	Reference sequences (#)	Minimum coverage (%)	Fifth percentile of coverage (%)	Median coverage (%)	Maximum coverage (%)
HA	H15	avian	20	62.1	99.5	79.4	100.0
HA	H16	avian	266	69.2	100.0	98.4	100.0
NP	n/a	avian	19897	67.9	100.0	99.5	100.0
NP	n/a	human	36140	71.8	99.9	96.7	100.0
NP	n/a	swine	7168	68.8	99.7	98.3	100.0
NA	all	avian	20401	63.5	100.0	99.7	100.0
NA	all	human	43304	74.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
NA	all	swine	12126	69.4	100.0	100.0	100.0
NA	N1	avian	4446	78.8	100.0	98.8	100.0
NA	N1	human	19974	74.7	100.0	99.9	100.0
NA	N1	swine	4936	76.7	100.0	99.6	100.0
NA	N2	avian	5341	79.9	100.0	99.8	100.0
NA	N2	human	23200	86.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
NA	N2	swine	7171	69.4	100.0	100.0	100.0
NA	N3	avian	1681	74.8	99.9	98.5	100.0
NA	N3	human	2	95.7	96.9	96.4	97.0
NA	N3	swine	4	98.1	99.9	99.0	99.9
NA	N4	avian	378	81.1	100.0	99.8	100.0
NA	N4	human	1	96.3	96.3	96.3	96.3
NA	N5	avian	567	77.7	100.0	99.2	100.0
NA	N5	swine	1	94.3	94.3	94.3	94.3
NA	N6	avian	2930	78.3	100.0	99.9	100.0
NA	N6	human	4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
NA	N6	swine	8	93.6	100.0	99.9	100.0
NA	N7	avian	1078	63.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
NA	N7	human	4	97.5	98.8	98.2	98.8
NA	N7	swine	1	74.1	74.1	74.1	74.1
NA	N8	avian	2528	74.9	100.0	99.8	100.0
NA	N8	human	5	99.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
NA	N8	swine	3	89.2	96.2	89.2	97.0
NA	N9	avian	1452	72.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
NA	N9	human	114	95.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
NA	N9	swine	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
M	n/a	avian	20263	77.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
M	n/a	human	40456	78.2	100.0	99.8	100.0
M	n/a	swine	9860	73.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
NS	n/a	avian	20810	66.5	100.0	99.8	100.0
NS	n/a	human	34027	76.1	100.0	100.0	100.0
NS	n/a	swine	6949	64.4	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table S2: Custom probe panel provides broadly inclusive coverage of H5 subtype haemagglutinin segment reference sequences from diverse clades of the goose/Guangdong/96 lineage. The ProbeTools captures and stats modules were used to predict *in silico* how well this study's custom panel of 9,370 probes covered 5,834 H5 subtype haemagglutinin (HA) segment reference sequences (collected globally from avian, swine, and human hosts). For each reference sequence, probe coverage was calculated as the number of nucleotide positions covered by at least one probe in the panel. The minimum, 5th percentile, median, and maximum probe coverage values were reported for each segment, subtype, and host category.

H5 clade	Host	Reference sequences (#)	Minimum coverage (%)	Fifth percentile of coverage (%)	Median coverage (%)	Maximum coverage (%)
0	avian	61	94.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
0	human	6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
0	swine	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1	avian	219	98.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1	human	49	98.5	100.0	99.9	100.0
1,2,3,5,6,8,9-like	avian	2	96.5	99.8	98.2	100.0
1,2,5,6,8,9-like	avian	4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1,2,8-like	avian	3	99.6	100.0	100.0	100.0
1.1	avian	29	99.6	100.0	100.0	100.0
1.1.1	avian	9	95.7	100.0	99.9	100.0
1.1.1	human	3	95.3	99.7	97.0	100.0
1.1.2	avian	89	90.7	100.0	99.9	100.0
1.1.2	human	25	94.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
2-like	avian	4	99.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.1-like	avian	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.1.1	avian	23	95.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.1.1	swine	4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.1.2	avian	9	99.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.1.2	human	6	99.4	99.6	99.6	99.6
2.1.3	avian	28	99.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.1.3	swine	5	99.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.1.3.1	avian	16	95.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.1.3.2	avian	134	94.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.1.3.2	human	33	95.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.1.3.2a	avian	21	99.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.1.3.2b	avian	4	99.3	100.0	99.8	100.0
2.1.3.3	avian	10	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.1.3.3	swine	4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.2	avian	330	94.4	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.2	human	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.2-like	avian	15	99.8	100.0	99.9	100.0
2.2.1	avian	227	99.2	100.0	99.9	100.0
2.2.1	human	50	95.4	100.0	99.9	100.0
2.2.1.1	avian	76	95.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.2.1.1a	avian	58	95.4	99.9	99.9	100.0
2.2.1.2	avian	279	93.0	100.0	99.8	100.0
2.2.1.2	human	8	99.8	100.0	99.8	100.0
2.2.2	avian	31	99.3	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.2.2-like	avian	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.2.2.1	avian	22	99.5	99.8	99.8	99.8
2.2.2.1	human	2	99.8	99.8	99.8	99.8
2.3-like	avian	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.1	avian	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.2	avian	19	99.6	100.0	100.0	100.0

H5 clade	Host	Reference sequences (#)	Minimum coverage (%)	Fifth percentile of coverage (%)	Median coverage (%)	Maximum coverage (%)
2.3.2.1	avian	45	98.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.2.1	human	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.2.1-like	avian	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.2.1a	avian	328	91.5	100.0	99.9	100.0
2.3.2.1a	human	2	98.9	99.9	99.4	99.9
2.3.2.1b	avian	31	95.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.2.1b	swine	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.2.1c	avian	802	92.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.2.1c	human	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.2.1c	swine	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.3,4-like	avian	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.4	avian	142	94.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.4	human	31	99.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.4	swine	1	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
2.3.4-like	avian	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.4.1	avian	26	95.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.4.1	human	6	99.4	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.4.2	avian	26	94.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.4.2	human	3	99.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.4.3	avian	50	99.6	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.4.3	human	13	96.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.4.4	avian	1069	88.3	100.0	99.8	100.0
2.3.4.4	human	4	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.3.4.4	swine	2	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
2.4	avian	17	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
2.5	avian	13	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
3	avian	17	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
3	human	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
4	avian	6	98.4	100.0	100.0	100.0
5	avian	4	98.4	100.0	99.9	100.0
5	swine	5	99.3	100.0	100.0	100.0
5,6-like	avian	1	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
6	avian	7	94.8	100.0	99.9	100.0
6	swine	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
7	avian	24	95.7	100.0	99.9	100.0
7	human	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
7.1	avian	12	98.9	99.5	99.4	99.5
7.2	avian	37	87.2	99.9	98.3	99.9
7.2	swine	1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
9	avian	20	99.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
9	swine	3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
American non-gs/Gd	avian	768	75.4	100.0	99.5	100.0
American non-gs/Gd	swine	2	98.8	99.5	99.2	99.5
Eurasian non-gs/Gd	avian	331	82.7	100.0	100.0	100.0
Eurasian non-gs/Gd	swine	2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
none	avian	48	88.6	100.0	99.7	100.0

Table S3: Probe capture and sequencing metrics. Sequencing libraries were prepared from 90 specimens that were positive (n=74) or suspect-positive (n=16) for influenza A virus (IAV) genomic material by RT-qPCR. After pooling libraries together, two independent probe captures were performed and sequenced separately (capture_1 and capture_2). FASTQ data was analyzed with HopDropper to identify distinct fragments of genomic material and remove chimeric artefacts (invalid reads). The number of total read pairs and valid read pairs was reported for each library by HopDropper. Fragment consensus sequences generated by HopDropper were analyzed by FindFlu to identify fragments of IAV genome. The number of IAV read pairs in each library was determined by summing the number of copies for each IAV fragment identified by FindFlu. For each library, the number of IAV read pairs was divided by the total number of read pairs to calculate total on-target rates. Valid on-target rates were calculated by dividing the number of IAV read pairs in a library by the number of valid read pairs in that library.

Capture replicate	Specimen ID	Screening RT-qPCR result	Screening RT-qPCR Ct value	Total read pairs (#)	Valid read pairs (#)	IAV read pairs (#)	Total on-target (%)	Valid on-target (%)
capture-1	sediment-1	Positive	29.74	172839	123424	54496	31.5	44.2
capture-2	sediment-1	Positive	29.74	184143	125720	67185	36.5	53.4
capture-1	sediment-2	Positive	37.8	9816	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-2	Positive	37.8	13078	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-3	Positive	34.64	362356	239693	196805	54.3	82.1
capture-2	sediment-3	Positive	34.64	317087	212259	173528	54.7	81.8
capture-1	sediment-4	Positive	37.14	617838	415482	415482	67.2	100.0
capture-2	sediment-4	Positive	37.14	657293	454675	454675	69.2	100.0
capture-1	sediment-5	Positive	34.39	28854	16351	12951	44.9	79.2
capture-2	sediment-5	Positive	34.39	35749	21026	9650	27.0	45.9
capture-1	sediment-6	Positive	35.81	61294	35924	33763	55.1	94.0
capture-2	sediment-6	Positive	35.81	73277	42115	33868	46.2	80.4
capture-1	sediment-7	Positive	37.17	13249	5330	2047	15.5	38.4
capture-2	sediment-7	Positive	37.17	15571	3476	292	1.9	8.4
capture-1	sediment-8	Positive	37.66	7102	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-8	Positive	37.66	9909	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-9	Positive	31.39	220956	150388	106019	48.0	70.5
capture-2	sediment-9	Positive	31.39	187552	129177	90870	48.5	70.3
capture-1	sediment-10	Positive	33.79	59842	37111	10247	17.1	27.6
capture-2	sediment-10	Positive	33.79	76291	46956	11629	15.2	24.8
capture-1	sediment-11	Positive	34.94	40338	21756	6100	15.1	28.0
capture-2	sediment-11	Positive	34.94	71886	43453	17584	24.5	40.5
capture-1	sediment-12	Positive	37.25	30905	16288	5486	17.8	33.7
capture-2	sediment-12	Positive	37.25	40646	21804	5100	12.5	23.4
capture-1	sediment-13	Positive	37.53	530	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-13	Positive	37.53	642	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-14	Positive	37.74	6038	1321	781	12.9	59.1
capture-2	sediment-14	Positive	37.74	11660	4015	2628	22.5	65.5
capture-1	sediment-15	Positive	36.97	33403	14578	2144	6.4	14.7
capture-2	sediment-15	Positive	36.97	40416	13794	2337	5.8	16.9
capture-1	sediment-16	Positive	39.9	18514	3857	1853	10.0	48.0
capture-2	sediment-16	Positive	39.9	28731	9055	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-17	Positive	36.04	99126	61623	29347	29.6	47.6
capture-2	sediment-17	Positive	36.04	124105	81015	38849	31.3	48.0
capture-1	sediment-18	Positive	36.91	16335	759	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-18	Positive	36.91	21078	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-19	Positive	38.27	24676	8550	8397	34.0	98.2
capture-2	sediment-19	Positive	38.27	24111	6567	6567	27.2	100.0
capture-1	sediment-20	Positive	39.54	7927	652	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-20	Positive	39.54	11547	1809	1809	15.7	100.0
capture-1	sediment-21	Positive	38.93	16819	3886	1191	7.1	30.6

Capture replicate	Specimen ID	Screening RT-qPCR result	Screening RT-qPCR Ct value	Total read pairs (#)	Valid read pairs (#)	IAV read pairs (#)	Total on-target (%)	Valid on-target (%)
capture-2	sediment-21	Positive	38.93	21911	4759	3585	16.4	75.3
capture-1	sediment-22	Positive	38.16	10044	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-22	Positive	38.16	13722	148	148	1.1	100.0
capture-1	sediment-23	Positive	37.49	28942	15618	9076	31.4	58.1
capture-2	sediment-23	Positive	37.49	34369	18373	7740	22.5	42.1
capture-1	sediment-24	Positive	39.23	192	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-24	Positive	39.23	205	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-25	Positive	38.26	18810	9709	2416	12.8	24.9
capture-2	sediment-25	Positive	38.26	11653	3375	33	0.3	1.0
capture-1	sediment-26	Positive	37.92	17050	4401	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-26	Positive	37.92	20050	3748	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-27	Positive	35.76	48138	25237	9404	19.5	37.3
capture-2	sediment-27	Positive	35.76	51918	25737	6616	12.7	25.7
capture-1	sediment-28	Positive	37.75	42399	20550	2716	6.4	13.2
capture-2	sediment-28	Positive	37.75	45617	19371	9055	19.9	46.7
capture-1	sediment-29	Positive	38.79	19025	4609	4047	21.3	87.8
capture-2	sediment-29	Positive	38.79	23342	3603	529	2.3	14.7
capture-1	sediment-30	Positive	33.48	296600	200680	87749	29.6	43.7
capture-2	sediment-30	Positive	33.48	303294	208434	95289	31.4	45.7
capture-1	sediment-31	Positive	36.04	51796	30680	7575	14.6	24.7
capture-2	sediment-31	Positive	36.04	53945	31069	9530	17.7	30.7
capture-1	sediment-32	Positive	34.38	118096	76146	37944	32.1	49.8
capture-2	sediment-32	Positive	34.38	107319	69349	35090	32.7	50.6
capture-1	sediment-33	Positive	37.0	12889	2179	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-33	Positive	37.0	18721	4587	4203	22.5	91.6
capture-1	sediment-34	Positive	38.66	7925	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-34	Positive	38.66	10580	146	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-35	Positive	35.24	96018	57214	35142	36.6	61.4
capture-2	sediment-35	Positive	35.24	99988	49410	29437	29.4	59.6
capture-1	sediment-36	Positive	34.21	318299	207819	92563	29.1	44.5
capture-2	sediment-36	Positive	34.21	297011	189799	70544	23.8	37.2
capture-1	sediment-37	Positive	35.14	59164	30848	8210	13.9	26.6
capture-2	sediment-37	Positive	35.14	59973	31689	12549	20.9	39.6
capture-1	sediment-38	Positive	39.48	57390	23454	12613	22.0	53.8
capture-2	sediment-38	Positive	39.48	56215	20925	7968	14.2	38.1
capture-1	sediment-39	Positive	37.53	14108	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-39	Positive	37.53	19305	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-40	Positive	35.43	52572	29150	11618	22.1	39.9
capture-2	sediment-40	Positive	35.43	53874	22204	7509	13.9	33.8
capture-1	sediment-41	Positive	36.85	49970	29206	15213	30.4	52.1
capture-2	sediment-41	Positive	36.85	49103	26999	9652	19.7	35.7
capture-1	sediment-42	Positive	34.88	123004	80528	51949	42.2	64.5
capture-2	sediment-42	Positive	34.88	125657	81782	38682	30.8	47.3
capture-1	sediment-43	Positive	36.67	26365	8973	7365	27.9	82.1
capture-2	sediment-43	Positive	36.67	24860	6651	3996	16.1	60.1
capture-1	sediment-44	Positive	37.97	64481	39264	20760	32.2	52.9
capture-2	sediment-44	Positive	37.97	62189	35994	30638	49.3	85.1
capture-1	sediment-45	Positive	34.01	327306	212395	85313	26.1	40.2
capture-2	sediment-45	Positive	34.01	322004	215898	74621	23.2	34.6
capture-1	sediment-46	Positive	33.75	281204	178445	73024	26.0	40.9
capture-2	sediment-46	Positive	33.75	318599	209473	109718	34.4	52.4
capture-1	sediment-47	Positive	31.0	293899	178571	59178	20.1	33.1

Capture replicate	Specimen ID	Screening RT-qPCR result	Screening RT-qPCR Ct value	Total read pairs (#)	Valid read pairs (#)	IAV read pairs (#)	Total on-target (%)	Valid on-target (%)
capture-2	sediment-47	Positive	31.0	335264	205977	50764	15.1	24.6
capture-1	sediment-48	Positive	37.37	12068	1220	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-48	Positive	37.37	15492	1243	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-49	Positive	35.74	20204	6623	750	3.7	11.3
capture-2	sediment-49	Positive	35.74	25349	6566	3635	14.3	55.4
capture-1	sediment-50	Positive	30.51	434665	265394	96164	22.1	36.2
capture-2	sediment-50	Positive	30.51	399178	263511	79846	20.0	30.3
capture-1	sediment-51	Positive	38.78	32628	14046	10786	33.1	76.8
capture-2	sediment-51	Positive	38.78	45528	21216	17323	38.0	81.7
capture-1	sediment-52	Positive	27.86	2845588	1869576	1030244	36.2	55.1
capture-2	sediment-52	Positive	27.86	2879923	1924536	1043441	36.2	54.2
capture-1	sediment-53	Positive	37.85	12915	3572	1569	12.1	43.9
capture-2	sediment-53	Positive	37.85	17538	3878	1405	8.0	36.2
capture-1	sediment-54	Positive	38.26	70353	47014	32312	45.9	68.7
capture-2	sediment-54	Positive	38.26	101699	67246	43665	42.9	64.9
capture-1	sediment-55	Positive	37.32	24	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-55	Positive	37.32	20	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-56	Positive	39.89	8834	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-56	Positive	39.89	11661	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-57	Positive	36.32	21516	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-57	Positive	36.32	31734	7919	7919	25.0	100.0
capture-1	sediment-58	Positive	36.83	35728	15287	2272	6.4	14.9
capture-2	sediment-58	Positive	36.83	32223	12298	4398	13.6	35.8
capture-1	sediment-59	Positive	33.37	9519	999	493	5.2	49.3
capture-2	sediment-59	Positive	33.37	11220	161	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-60	Positive	37.16	3027	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-60	Positive	37.16	4094	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-61	Positive	38.36	6825	2150	2150	31.5	100.0
capture-2	sediment-61	Positive	38.36	9139	2801	2801	30.6	100.0
capture-1	sediment-62	Positive	32.11	290124	187124	134991	46.5	72.1
capture-2	sediment-62	Positive	32.11	304333	208477	126413	41.5	60.6
capture-1	sediment-63	Positive	32.18	202819	124051	59232	29.2	47.7
capture-2	sediment-63	Positive	32.18	196436	126576	68569	34.9	54.2
capture-1	sediment-64	Positive	35.26	1325	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-64	Positive	35.26	1700	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-65	Positive	35.4	50031	25932	18793	37.6	72.5
capture-2	sediment-65	Positive	35.4	43528	17321	10821	24.9	62.5
capture-1	sediment-66	Positive	36.38	4304	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-66	Positive	36.38	5579	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-67	Positive	38.45	70801	46010	18791	26.5	40.8
capture-2	sediment-67	Positive	38.45	78229	52760	10334	13.2	19.6
capture-1	sediment-68	Positive	38.62	31988	13962	6169	19.3	44.2
capture-2	sediment-68	Positive	38.62	28440	10387	3771	13.3	36.3
capture-1	sediment-69	Positive	34.14	327166	198942	102946	31.5	51.7
capture-2	sediment-69	Positive	34.14	366586	233981	118945	32.4	50.8
capture-1	sediment-70	Positive	36.99	3377	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-70	Positive	36.99	4653	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-71	Positive	33.89	132503	86232	54365	41.0	63.0
capture-2	sediment-71	Positive	33.89	136011	87949	62912	46.3	71.5
capture-1	sediment-72	Positive	36.3	84741	57300	57300	67.6	100.0
capture-2	sediment-72	Positive	36.3	84098	54494	36013	42.8	66.1
capture-1	sediment-73	Positive	37.02	32700	20535	4581	14.0	22.3

Capture replicate	Specimen ID	Screening RT-qPCR result	Screening RT-qPCR Ct value	Total read pairs (#)	Valid read pairs (#)	IAV read pairs (#)	Total on-target (%)	Valid on-target (%)
capture-2	sediment-73	Positive	37.02	32030	19401	7514	23.5	38.7
capture-1	sediment-74	Positive	36.36	3011	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-74	Positive	36.36	3948	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-75	Suspect		42	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-75	Suspect		30	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-76	Suspect		110	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-76	Suspect		83	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-77	Suspect		5154	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-77	Suspect		6996	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-78	Suspect		4327	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-78	Suspect		6691	681	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-79	Suspect		22	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-79	Suspect		23	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-80	Suspect		24	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-80	Suspect		11	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-81	Suspect		8203	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-81	Suspect		11354	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-82	Suspect	41.08	3450	248	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-82	Suspect	41.08	5799	1158	295	5.1	25.5
capture-1	sediment-83	Suspect		9056	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-83	Suspect		12411	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-84	Suspect	40.83	6461	705	705	10.9	100.0
capture-2	sediment-84	Suspect	40.83	7461	634	634	8.5	100.0
capture-1	sediment-85	Suspect		12275	4537	4537	37.0	100.0
capture-2	sediment-85	Suspect		15046	5034	5034	33.5	100.0
capture-1	sediment-86	Suspect		19177	7919	2106	11.0	26.6
capture-2	sediment-86	Suspect		17940	5936	661	3.7	11.1
capture-1	sediment-87	Suspect		3038	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	sediment-87	Suspect		4335	0	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	sediment-88	Suspect		22078	8490	8490	38.5	100.0
capture-2	sediment-88	Suspect		20958	4620	4620	22.0	100.0
capture-1	sediment-89	Suspect		18321	7915	4114	22.5	52.0
capture-2	sediment-89	Suspect		22887	8962	3379	14.8	37.7
capture-1	sediment-90	Suspect		8826	201	201	2.3	100.0
capture-2	sediment-90	Suspect		12281	403	403	3.3	100.0
capture-1	Undetermined			987909	30901	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	Undetermined			989527	40473	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	control-1			1727947	25754	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	control-1			1697915	21957	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	control-2			1251991	21795	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	control-2			1219539	9900	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	control-3			862722	2003	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	control-3			877188	2514	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	control-4			2156783	4287	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	control-4			2115832	6104	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	control-5			1277530	18481	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	control-5			1302672	19157	0	0.0	0.0
capture-1	control-6			1596828	1234	0	0.0	0.0
capture-2	control-6			1577998	0	0	0.0	0.0