Using machine learning with wild bird reporting data to produce risk maps of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza in Britain and determine possible biases in the wild bird reporting

Aeron Sanchez¹, Alex Mastin³, Stephen Vickers⁴, Rowland R. Kao^{1,2}









Animal & Plant Health Agency











PROSLIN



UNITED KINGDOM · CHINA · MALAYSIA

Funders





Department for Environment

Food and Rural Affairs

More than 50,000 wild birds in UK killed by avian flu - double previous estimates

H5N1 bird flu may lead to extinction of species as data revealed by Guardian shows worst losses in decades



□ National Trust rangers clear dead birds from one of the Farne Islands off Northumberland, where at least 6,000 birds have died from avian influenza. Photograph: Owen Humphreys/PA

Alarm as HPAI kills almost 9,000 sea creatures in Chile

Mark Clements: Over 8,887 sea creatures have been recorded dead on the Chilean coast so far this year due to infection with the highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) virus.

Mark Clements May 30, 2023

Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza – A Global Animal Pandemic



Bird flu: H5N1 virus in Brazil wild birds prompts animal health emergency

Health declaration to last 180 days, as world's biggest exporter of chicken meat detects virus for first time ever

Transatlantic spread of highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 by wild birds from Europe to North America in 2021



BBB Record avian flu outbreak sees 48m NEWS birds culled in UK and EU



2022 has seen a deadly and highly pathogenic new strain of H5N1 bird flu make a cataclysmic impact on captive and wild bird populations. Conservationists and scientists are counting the cost.

More than 50,000 wild birds in UK killed by avian flu - double previous eritering

H5N1 hird flu may lead to extinction of species as data revea Guardian shows worst losses in decades



Deadly H5N1 avian influenza str mainland Antarctica for the first

By environment reporter Peter de Kruijff

ABC Science Science and Technology

Mon 26 Feb

lab**animal**Explore content < About the journal < Publish with us <

nature > lab animal > news & views > article

News & Views | Published: 14 August 2024

Infectious disease

The highly pathogenic H5N1 virus found in U.S. dairy cattle has some characteristics that could enhance infection and transmission among mammals

Alarm as HPAI kills almost 9,000 sea

Fabien Filaire & Sander Herfst 🖾

Lab Animal (2024) | Cite this article

745 Accesses | 88 Altmetric | Metrics

A highly pathogenic H5N1 influenza virus is spreading in U.S. dairy cattle and has been transmitted to other species, including humans, probably through contaminated milk. Understanding how the virus spreads among cattle and its potential for mammalian adaptation and airborne transmission is crucial for effective outbreak control and public health safety.



The detection of avian influenza in a pair of deceased brown skua presents a risk to Antarctica's unique wildlife which could be devastated by the disease. (Liam Quinn, Gentoo Penguin defends against a Brown Skua, CC BYSA 20 DEED)

https://www.abc.net.au/news/science/2024-02-27/deadly-h5n1avian-influenza-strain-detected-on-antarctica/103473276





HPAI in Great Britain (H5N1)





Source 1: October 2021 to September 2022: Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza H5N1 outbreaks in Great Britain. The Animal and Plant Health Agency. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/repo rts-relating-to-recent-cases-of-avian-influenzabird-flu

Source 2: October 2022 to September 2023: Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza H5N1 outbreaks in Great Britain. The Animal and Plant Health Agency. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/repo rts-relating-to-recent-cases-of-avian-influenzabird-flu

National impact on seabird populations





Pierce-Higgins et al. British Trust for Ornithology report 2023

UK Government commissioned report

advised on four specific issues:

- 1. the host range of the current virus and the potential roles of non-avian hosts
- 2. the possibility of interventions to reduce the impact of HPAI on wild birds
- 3. the potential to supplement current approaches to control with vaccination
- 4. the potential to model the expected future trajectory of the outbreak



30 March 2023 — Independent report Highly pathogenic avian influenza in Great Britain: evaluation and future actions

An independent scientific evaluation of evidence around highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) in Great Britain. UK Government commissioned report advised on four specific issues:

2.

3.

1. the host range of the current virus and the potential roles of non-avian hosts



the possik reduce th

the poten future risks

approaches to control with vaccination

4. the potential to model the expected future trajectory of the outbreak

An independent scientific evaluation of evidence around highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) in Great Britain.

report

and

fluenza

Wild bird infection reporting

Passive surveillance syster

Previously via phone, now online

Species recorded as Goose Gull, Swan, Duck, Bird of Prey and Other. In this study, grouped into

- Landbirds
- Waterbirds
- Seabirds



🎄 GOV.UK

Home > Environment > Wildlife, animals, biodiversity and ecosystems > Wildlife and habitat conservation > Birds

Guidance

Report dead wild birds

How to report dead wild birds.

Use this service to report dead wild birds. Your report will help us understand how diseases are spreading.

We'll ask you:

- where you found the dead birds
- what type of dead birds you found
- how many dead birds you found
- your contact details (find out how your personal information is used)

If you're under 18, ask a parent or guardian to fill in this form.

It should take about 5 minutes.

Start now >

https://www.gov.uk/guidance/report-dead-wild-birds

Wild bird infection reporting



Defining wild bird and poultry contact networks (Roslin/Aeron Sanchez)

 Implementation of ML model to 'correct' for ascertainment bias



0.6

0.5



Estimates of wild bird densities







General public observe and count birds Data submitted to eBird eBird combine observations with measures of habitat, weather, effort, etc. eBird run sophisticated predicted relative abundance modelling

Used by S. Vickers (RVC but now Edinburgh) to estimate wild bird population densities in GB

Machine Learning tools to identify epidemiological risks

• Binary Decision Trees



https://amueller.github.io/aml/02-supervisedlearning/08-decision-trees.html What set of questions allow me to most efficiently identify the right suspect?



(similar methods for continuous variables)

Correlation between variables

- Simple Decision Trees are highly susceptible to OVERFITTING
 - Very precise description of training dataset
 - Very poor prediction on any new data
 - Increasingly problematic with small datasets
 - Highly correlated variables
 - Noisy data

Randomly selected features (until pre-set minimum points per leaf)

Features Features Features Features Randomly Data used chosen training Data used Data used Data used data subsets (66%) Tree #1 Tree #2 Tree #3 Tree #4 "VOTE" Controls for Take aggregate of answers, rather overfitting and than the answer of the aggregate variable correlations

Assessing univariate roles

- Assess contribution of individual variables to model fit
- "permutation importance" assess reduction in model fit after randomizing each variable in turn
- Partial dependence/Accumulated local effects assess univariate impact on outcomes
- Shapley values/Shapley importance ensures 'fair' distribution of contribution to all contributors (efficient, symmetric, additive and with only contributors benefiting)

Risk factors included in the model

- Date
- Location
- Species Group
- Wild bird populations for species grouping and date
- Human populations
- Distance to rivers and lakes
- Distance to roads and walking paths
- Distance to towns
- Driving distance and times to towns
- Land usage
- Park or green Space
- Reported on a bank holiday
- Distance to eBird hotspot and eBird hotspots within a set radius
- Number of poultry farms and animals within set distances.

Data sources:

Density estimates based on e-Bird (Vickers, RVC)

UK Census data

Training and testing ML models

- Consider multiple approaches: random forest models, GLMs, SVMs and gradient boosted trees
- Models trained to predict binary outcome: will a tested wild bird that result as positive/negative for H5N1 (w/o specifying lab test sensitivity/specificity).
- For testing and analysing our models we used 5-Fold cross validation (run 4 times).
- Area under the ROC curve or AUC as a measure of the model performance.
- Random forest models and gradient boosted decision trees were the best performing (GBT .
- For the rest of the investigation, we will use boosted decision tree models
 - Decision threshold at 0.5 this gave an accuracy of 0.879 [0.858,0.894], sensitivity of 0.678[0.584,0.726] and specificity of 0.938 [0.905,0.957].

Assessing model fit



Prediction depends on the chosen decision threshold used on the probability of the output prediction.

(L) Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) plot of true positive rate (sensitivity) vs. false positive rate (1-specificity)

(R) Detection error tradeoff (DET)curve Shows false negative rate(1-sensitivity) against falsepositive rate(1-specificity).

Model tested for overfitting using 5 fold cross-validation



Highly correlated variables can "mask" the importance of individual variables.



Shapley Feature Importance

Permutation feature importance shows many "unimportant" variables

BUT model has high accuracy (R2 ~ 0.xx).

likely due to the correlations between a number of the input features

Shapely contributions or SHAP plots we see a higher number of features contributing to the model predictions.



mean(|SHAP value|) (average impact on model output magnitude)

Shapley Feature Importance

Permutation feature importance shows many "unimportant" variables

BUT model has high accuracy (R2 ~ 0.xx).

likely due to the correlations between a number of the input features

Shapely contributions or SHAP plots we see a higher number of features contributing to the model predictions.



mean(|SHAP value|) (average impact on model output magnitude)

Generating risk maps

- models trained on the entire data set without a test set
- 50,000 mock data points generated with a random location date and species.
- Each mock data point passed through the final model; probability of testing positive calculated for each point.



Scatter plot of all the mock points where the colour scale represents the model prediction probability of an that bird testing positive.

Ascertainment corrected risk map







Areas in red represented areas with at least one reported dead bird where ascertainment is particularly low

Comparison of real test locations to predicted



Removal of ascertainment biased variables suggests there may be a much broader circulation of virus than observed but most have lower test fraction than observed

Ongoing work by collaborators uses/tests this model

- Pilot: 7 main sites plus 5 one-off sample sites from the Highlands and <u>also collections from Bass Rock and</u> <u>Fedra</u>
 - (may increase –Loch Fleet, Wigton Bay)
 - Pond/lake sediments (5 sites/4 samples per site)
 - Faecal/environmental samples (mainly geese/gannets)
- Repeat sampling 3 times (summer, start of winter arrivals later winter) – <u>currently on 2nd round</u>
- rt-PCR for M-gene <u>RNA extractions underway</u> (delayed by procurement issues at Edinburgh) (n>200)
- MinION seq of any +'ves
 - Does this approach work?
 - Can we detect AIV in different seasons?

From work of Lina Gonzalez Gordon & Mark Bronsvoort, Roslin Institute





Ongoing work by collaborators uses/tests this model



Isle of May

Conclusions

- 1. ML models describe surveillance data to high accuracy
- 2. Removal of human observation factors creates a "prediction landscape" based solely on natural factors
- 3. Ascertainment corrected map shows evidence of much wider spread dissemination but **no evidence of areas of high infection** (BUT may be beyond limits of ML models if strong unobserved nonlinearities
- 4. e-bird data coarse grained (seagulls in particular)
- 5. Does not account for pattern vs. process issues
- 6. Currently being used to guide field work/active surveillance



UNITED KINGDOM · CHINA · MALAYSIA

Funders





Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs