1 Quantification of *Legionella pneumophila* in building potable water systems: a

2 meta-analysis comparing qPCR and culture-based detection methods

- 3 Émile Sylvestre^{1,2*}, William J. Rhoads^{1, 3}, Timothy R. Julian^{1, 4, 5}, Frederik Hammes¹
- ⁴ ¹ Eawag, Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, Dübendorf, CH-8600,
- 5 Switzerland
- ⁶ ² Sanitary Engineering, Delft University of Technology, Stevinweg 1, 2628 CN, Delft, the
- 7 Netherlands
- 8 ³ Black & Veatch, 8400 Ward Parkway, Kansas City, MO 64114
- 9⁴ Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, CH-4123 Allschwil, Switzerland
- ⁵ University of Basel, CH-4055 Basel, Switzerland
- 11 *Corresponding author: e.sylvestre@tudelft.nl
- 12

13 Abstract

14 Quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) offers a rapid, automated, and potentially on-site 15 method for quantifying L. pneumophila in building potable water systems, complementing and 16 potentially replacing traditional culture-based techniques. However, the application of qPCR in 17 assessing human health risks is complicated by its tendency to overestimate such risks due to the 18 detection of genomic copies that do not correspond to viable, infectious bacteria. This study 19 examines the relationship between L. pneumophila measurements obtained via qPCR and 20 culture-based methods, aiming to understand and establish qPCR-to-culture concentration ratios 21 needed to inform associated health risks. We developed a Poisson lognormal ratio model and a 22 random-effects meta-analysis to analyze variations in qPCR-to-culture ratios within and across 23 sites. Our findings indicate these ratios typically vary from 1:1 to 100:1, with ratios close to 1:1 24 predicted at all sites. Consequently, adopting a default 1:1 conversion factor appears necessary as 25 a cautious approach to convert qPCR concentrations to culturable concentrations for use in 26 models of associated health risks, for example, through quantitative microbial risk assessment 27 (QMRA) frameworks. Where this approach may be too conservative, targeted sampling and the 28 applications of viability-qPCR could improve the accuracy of qPCR-based QMRA. 29 Standardizing qPCR and culture-based methods and reporting site-specific environmental factors 30 that affect the culturability of *L. pneumophila* would improve the understanding of the 31 relationship between the two methods. The ratio model introduced here shifts us beyond simple 32 correlation analyses, facilitating investigations of temporal and spatial heterogeneities in the 33 relationship. This analysis is a step forward in the integration of QMRA and molecular biology, as the framework demonstrated here for L. pneumphila is applicable to other pathogens 34 35 monitored in the environment.

- 36 Keywords: Legionella pneumophila, quantitative PCR, culture-based method, building potable
- 37 water systems, quantitative microbial risk assessment (QMRA)

38 List of symbols

- *c Legionella pneumophila* concentration
- *k* Individual study
- *n* Sample size
- *Q* Chi-square statistic
- \bar{r} Arithmetic mean qPCR:culture ratio on the raw scale
- *V* Sample volume
- *x Legionella pneumophila* count
- μ Mean parameter of the lognormal distribution
- $\mu_{Culture}$ Mean parameter of the lognormal distribution of culture concentrations
 - μ_{PCR} Mean parameter of the lognormal distribution of qPCR concentrations
- μ_{ratio} Mean parameter of the lognormal distribution of qPCR:culture ratios
- θ_{ratio} True mean log qPCR:culture ratio
 - σ Standard deviation parameter of the lognormal distribution
- $\sigma_{Culture}$ Standard deviation parameter of the lognormal distribution of culture concentrations σ_{PCR} Standard deviation parameter of the lognormal distribution of qPCR concentrations σ_{Ratio} Standard deviation parameter of the lognormal distribution of qPCR:culture ratios
- $\sigma_{PCR,Culture}$ Covariance between qPCR and culture results on the log scale
 - $\sigma_{\mu_{ratio}}$ Standard error of μ_{ratio}
 - $\sigma_{\theta_{ratio}}$ Standard error of θ_{ratio}
 - τ^2 Between-study variance of θ_{ratio}
- e.s. $e(\widehat{\ln(\bar{r})})$ Estimator of the standard error (e.s.e.) of $\ln(\bar{r})$
- e.s. $e(\widehat{\log_{10}(\bar{r})})$ Estimator of the standard error (e.s.e.) of \bar{r} on the \log_{10} scale
- 39

40 **1 Introduction**

41 Legionella pneumophila is widely regarded as the primary causative agent of Legionnaires' 42 disease (Phin et al., 2014), and therefore, accurately quantifying L. pneumophila concentrations 43 in water is central to prevention strategies. Culture-based methods defined by standards like ISO 44 11731:2017, NF T90-431:2017, and ASTM D8429-21 are commonly used to quantify L. 45 pneumophila concentrations in colony-forming units (CFU) or most probable number (MPN). 46 Such cultivation-derived data then serve as inputs for quantitative microbial risk assessment 47 (QMRA), enabling predictions of probabilities of infection upon exposure (Armstrong and Haas, 48 2007; Armstrong and Haas, 2008). However, the widespread application of culture-based 49 methods is hindered by several limitations (National Academies of Sciences and Medicine, 2020), including their time-consuming nature (8–14 days to obtain results), low processing 50 51 throughput, the need for specialized cultivation expertise, and concerns about so-called viable 52 but not culturable (VBNC) bacteria. 53 In some circumstances, molecular techniques like quantitative polymerase chain reaction (qPCR) 54 present a solution to some of these limitations. With their capacity for high-throughput, rapid, 55 and specific L. pneumophila genome copies (GC) quantification, as well as benefits such as 56 automation and on-site implementation, qPCR methods offer a compelling tool to use in 57 conjunction with cultivation (Ahmed et al., 2019; Simard and Doyer, 2022). While standardised 58 aPCR is well established for L. pneumophila detection (AFNOR, 2010; Anonymous, 2012), 59 cultivation will most likely remain the dominant reference method for the foreseeable future. 60 Hence, a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between cultivation and qPCR data is

61 crucial for advancing the use of qPCR for monitoring and risk assessment.

62 Studies comparing L. pneumophila concentrations obtained through qPCR and culture-based 63 methods within building water systems often report correlations (Collins et al., 2017; Joly et al., 64 2006). However, the relationship between qPCR and culture is not expected to be always 65 conserved, both between and within sites, due to various factors, such as environmental 66 conditions affecting the viability and cultivability of the organism (e.g., disinfectant 67 concentration, water temperature, age of pipes/biofilms, water flow conditions) (Delgado-68 Viscogliosi et al., 2009; Donohue, 2021; Grimard-Conea et al., 2022), and method-specific 69 performances related to analytical recovery and detection/quantification limits (Lee et al., 2011). In some instances, qPCR might overestimate human health risks by capturing all DNA, including 70 71 DNA from all cells (culturable, VBNC, and dead) and also free DNA. Emerging techniques, 72 which target DNA within intact cells, often referred to as viability-qPCR, may better align 73 concentration estimates with associated health risks (Nisar et al., 2023) but are still not widely 74 adopted in qPCR-based applications. Additionally, bacterial aggregation in environmental 75 samples (Haas and Heller, 1986; Haas and Heller, 1988) may result in qPCR yielding higher 76 concentrations than cultivation. Thus, employing a ratio as a model could help identify situations 77 with significant discrepancies between the two quantification methods (Lee et al., 2011), 78 improving our understanding of their interplay.

This study presents a systematic review and meta-analysis of the qPCR:culture concentration ratio for *L. pneumophila* in building potable water systems. Our objectives were to (i) develop statistical models to describe the variability in the qPCR:culture relationship both within and across various studies to generate a comprehensive understanding of literature data (ii) to apply these models in interpreting qPCR results within a QMRA framework, and (iii) to evaluate and interpret the factors influencing the qPCR:culture ratio.

85 2 Systematic review

The scientific studies included in this work were identified, screened, and selected following the
guidelines established in the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and MetaAnalysis (PRISMA) framework (Page et al., 2021). A systematic review protocol was initially
developed and amended during the study (Supplementary Material, S1).

90 2.1 Eligibility criteria

91 This review was limited to the results obtained from the analysis of water samples collected in

92 full-scale building potable water systems. Eligible studies necessarily collected quantitative data

93 on the concentrations of *L. pneumophila* in water using both molecular methods (qPCR,

94 viability-qPCR) and culture-based methods (ISO 11731, Legiolert) within paired water samples, as

95 the outcome of interest is the qPCR:culture concentration ratio. Both most probable number

96 (MPN) and colony forming units (CFU) were included for the quantification of cultivable

97 concentrations because both approaches aim to assess viable *L. pneumophila* populations. This

98 inclusion allows for a more comprehensive analysis across a broader range of studies.

99 Only studies including data sets with at least 20% of quantifiable samples were selected to

100 ensure reliable statistical assessments. Studies reporting building-specific data and pooled data

101 from multiple buildings were included in the review, but only building-specific data were used

102 for meta-analysis. Studies using alternative molecular methods, such as digital droplet PCR

103 (ddPCR) and reverse-transcription PCR (RT-qPCR), were excluded. The search was restricted to

104 peer-reviewed journals and governmental reports published in English, French, and German.

105 2.2 Search strategy

Backward and forward searches were conducted by the first and second reviewers (hereafter
referred to as WR and ES, respectively), starting with a narrative review paper on methods

108	comparison for Legionella enumeration (Whiley and Taylor, 2014) and the National Academies
109	of Science, Engineering and Medicine (NASEM) report Management of Legionella in Water
110	Systems (National Academies of Sciences and Medicine, 2020). Based on the information
111	gathered from these sources, an electronic search was conducted on PubMed, Scopus, and Web
112	of Science using the following search string:
113	"(Legio* AND qPCR AND culture) OR (Legio* AND viability PCR AND culture) OR (Legio*
114	AND EMA AND culture) OR (Legio* AND PMA AND culture) OR (Legio* AND Methods

115 AND Compare)."

116 Title and abstract screenings were conducted by WR, with verification of excluded articles by

117 ES. WR and ES duplicated the full-text screening, and discrepancies were resolved through

118 discussion. Reasons for excluding studies were recorded. A collaborative spreadsheet software

119 (Google Sheets, Alphabet Inc) was used to retrieve citations, screen citations, and record reasons

120 for study exclusion.

121 **2.3 Data extraction**

122 Water system information, sample processing details, and measurement information, as shown in 123 Table 1, were extracted from the selected studies by WR, ES, and a research intern. Additionally, 124 to evaluate the quality control and assurance of qPCR analyses, we verified whether studies 125 reported methods for generating standard curves for qPCR, control measures for nucleic acid 126 extraction, PCR detection, and inhibition. For cultivation methods, we verified whether 127 standardized protocols were applied. The extracted data were verified by a second reviewer (WR 128 or ES) in all studies to ensure accuracy. For eight studies, concentrations or counts were not 129 provided or reported in tables. For these studies, WebPlotDigitizer, a data extraction program

- 130 with nearly perfect accuracy (Aydin and Yassikaya, 2022), was used in manual mode to extract
- approximated concentrations from relevant figures by magnifying them at 500%. All data
- 132 extracted from studies were stored in the collaborative spreadsheet software, facilitating
- 133 collaborative document editing and ensuring consistency.

134 3 Statistical analyses

135 **3.1** Variability of the qPCR:culture ratio within a building

136 To estimate how much the ratio between the results of the two methods (qPCR and cultivation)

137 varies within each building, we adopted the statistical method previously developed by Sylvestre

138 et al. (2021). This method involves comparing two sets of results that follow a specific

139 probability distribution, known as a Poisson–lognormal distribution. This model assumes that

140 counts *x* (CFU for culture and GC for qPCR) are randomly (Poisson) distributed in each water

141 sample of volume V and concentration c. The probability of finding x organisms in the water

sample is thus:

$$P(x; c, V) = \frac{(cV)^{x} e^{-cV}}{x!}$$
(1)

Organisms have a concentration *c*, and their expected number in a sample volume *V* is *cV*. The concentration *c* is likely to vary in time or space. For MPN methods, Eq. 1 was used as an approximation method because primary studies did not report positive and negative well counts. When such data are reported, the MPN method uncertainty can be modelled more accurately using the binomial and Poisson distributions (Haas et al., 2014).

148 This variation in concentration *c* can be described by a lognormal distribution, which has the149 following probability density function:

$$f(c;\mu,\sigma) = \frac{1}{c\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(ln(c)-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$
(2)

150 where μ and σ are, respectively, the mean and the standard deviation of the underlying normal 151 distribution on the logarithmic scale. If Eq. 2 describes the variation of c in Eq. 1, then the count, 152 x, follows a Poisson–lognormal distribution. The goodness of fit of the Poisson–lognormal 153 distribution was compared to the goodness of fit of an alternative model, the Poisson-gamma 154 distribution, using the marginal deviance information criterion (mDIC) (Quintero and Lesaffre, 155 2018). Results indicated that the lognormal distribution better described concentration variations 156 for qPCR data (Table S1) and cultivation data (Table S2); therefore, the Poisson lognormal 157 distribution was chosen for modelling L. pneumophila concentrations and their ratios. As the mip 158 gene, which is used to quantify L. pneumophila via qPCR, exists in a single copy within the 159 genome of L. pneumophila (Engleberg et al., 1989), methods can be compared by directly taking 160 the ratios of CFUs to gene copies.

161 The distribution of the ratio of two lognormal random variables is also lognormally distributed162 with a mean of:

$$\mu_{ratio} = \mu_{PCR} - \mu_{Culture} \tag{3}$$

and a variance of:

$$\sigma_{ratio}^2 = \sigma_{PCR}^2 + \sigma_{Culture}^2 - 2\sigma_{PCR,Culture}$$
(4)

Here, $\sigma_{PCR,Culture}$ is the covariance between qPCR and cultivation results on the log scale. The empirical covariance was estimated using the logarithm of the concentrations measured by qPCR and culture methods. By considering the covariance between the lognormal variables, Eq. 4

accounts for the dependency between the qPCR and culture results and adjusts the variance ofthe ratio accordingly.

169 Models were implemented using the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method in a Bayesian

170 framework. A uniform prior ranging from -10^2 to 10^2 and an exponential prior with a rate of 1.0

171 were specified for the location parameter μ and the shape parameter σ , respectively, for each

172 lognormal distribution (qPCR and culture).

173 CFU and GC were estimated from reported concentrations, processed sample volumes, limits of

174 quantification (LOQ) and limits of detection (LOD). The impact of analytical recovery rates on

175 estimated concentrations was ignored due to insufficient reporting.

176 Cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) were used to illustrate distributions of *L. pneumophila*

177 concentrations and qPCR:culture ratios, indicating the expected frequency of observing a ratio

178 below a particular level. The best-fit curve was computed from the median values of the

posterior distribution of each parameter. The uncertainty of the fit was represented with a 95%

180 uncertainty interval obtained from the 2.5% and 97.5% percentiles of the posterior distribution of

181 the parameters. The analysis was conducted in R (version 4.3.0). The R code used for data

analysis and visualization can be found in the GitHub repository [NOTE: URL will be provided

in the final paper].

184 **3.2 Meta-analysis models**

185 Statistical meta-analysis models were used to compare mean qPCR:culture ratios across multiple 186 studies and obtain an overall distribution of the mean ratios. The geometric mean and arithmetic 187 mean ratios were chosen as summary estimates, as they provide complementary information for 188 interpreting the data. The mean log₁₀ ratio, equivalent to the geometric mean ratio on the

189 arithmetic scale, was chosen because it represents the median when the ratio is a lognormal

- 190 random variable. Given the high skewness of qPCR:culture ratio distributions, the arithmetic
- 191 mean was also computed for the meta-analysis. The importance of the arithmetic mean lies in its
- 192 sensitivity to high ratios, which contribute to its value. This summary descriptor complements
- 193 the geometric mean, which can suppress the impact of these high ratios. Results were illustrated
- using the *metafor* package version 3.0-2 (Viechtbauer, 2010) in R (version 4.3.0).

195 **3.2.1** Geometric mean ratio

- 196 Here, the meta-analysis is conducted on the mean log ratio on the natural log scale
- 197 $\mu_{ratio,1}, \mu_{ratio,2}, \dots \mu_{ratio,k}$ and known standard errors of these means
- 198 $\sigma_{\mu_{ratio,1}}, \sigma_{\mu_{ratio,2}}, \dots, \sigma_{\mu_{ratio,k}}$. The location parameter of the lognormal distribution of the ratio is
- 199 represented by μ_{ratio} , and the standard error is given by:

$$\sigma_{\mu_{ratio,k}} = \frac{\sigma_{ratio,k}}{\sqrt{n}} \tag{5}$$

where $\sigma_{ratio,k}$ is the scale parameter of the lognormal distribution of the ratio, and *n* is the sample size.

202 **3.2.2** Arithmetic mean ratio

In this case, the meta-analysis is conducted on the ratio \bar{r} , which can be obtained from lognormal parameters as follows:

$$\bar{r} = e^{\mu_{ratio} + \frac{\sigma_{ratio}^2}{2}} \tag{6}$$

An estimator of the standard error (e.s.e.) of $\ln(\bar{r})$ can be derived following the approach presented by Olsson (2005). That is:

e.s.
$$e(\widehat{\ln(\overline{r})}) = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{ratio}^2}{n} + \frac{\sigma_{ratio}^4}{2(n-1)}}$$
 (7)

However, it is more convenient to express the e.s.e. of \bar{r} on the log₁₀-scale, as \bar{r} is commonly presented in this format. Since $y = -\log_{10}(x)$ is a continuous monotonic decreasing function, it follows that the e.s.e for $\log_{10}(\bar{r})$ is:

e.s.
$$e(\widehat{\log_{10}(\overline{r})}) = \log_{10}\left(e^{e.s.e.(\ln(\overline{r}))}\right)$$
 (8)

210 The proof of Eq. 8 is provided in Supplementary Material S2.

211 **3.2.3 Random-effects**

212 A random-effects model assumes that the studies included in the meta-analysis are a random 213 selection drawn from a broader pool of potential studies. These studies are assumed to be 214 representative of a population describable by a single underlying distribution. This approach 215 allowed us to account for both within-study and between-study variability. In the first stage of 216 the model, the log₁₀-transformed mean ratio (either geometric or arithmetic mean) from each 217 study is given a weight based on its variance. These weights reflect the confidence we have in 218 each set of observations of a study; the lower the variance, the higher the weight. Given the 219 central limit theorem, the uncertainty around the estimated log mean ratio of each study is 220 assumed to be normally distributed. For the geometric mean ratio of a study k, that is:

$$\mu_{ratio,k} \sim N(\theta_{ratio,k}, \sigma_{\mu_{ratio,k}}^2) \tag{9}$$

where $\mu_{ratio,k}$ is the inferred parameter of the parametric model of the ratio distribution (Eq. 3), $\theta_{ratio,k}$ is the true mean log ratio, and $\sigma^2_{\mu_{ratio,k}}$ is the within-study variance (Eq. 5), representing the sampling uncertainty within each study.

The second stage of the model introduces a random effect to account for differences in \log_{10} transformed mean ratios between studies. When we analyzed geometric mean ratios, we modelled this random effect with an exponential distribution. When we analyzed arithmetic mean ratios, we used a lognormal distribution. For a lognormal distribution with parameters μ and τ^2 , the second stage is:

$$\theta_{ratio,k} \sim LN(\mu, \tau^2) \tag{10}$$

Here, τ^2 represents the between-study variance, capturing the variability in the true mean ratios ($\theta_{ratio,k}$) across studies. The parameters of these distributions were inferred with MCMC methods. We specified uninformative priors for each parameter, as proposed by Higgins et al. (2009). The exponential and the lognormal distributions were illustrated with CDFs.

233 **3.2.4 Subgroup analyses**

Subgroup analyses were conducted to assess potential sources of variability in the mean ratios across various subgroups. The pooled estimates, representing the aggregated outcomes from each subgroup, were obtained using a Bayesian random-effects model. In this model, the within-study mean and the random effect were assumed to be normally distributed. Given the substantial uncertainty associated with subgroup pooled estimates due to small sample sizes, we focused on exploring the overall patterns and trends across the subgroups rather than conducting formal tests of significance between them.

241 4 Results

242 **4.1 Data collection and reporting**

243 Of the 1099 records screened, 189 full-text articles were assessed for eligibility, and 15 were 244 selected for meta-analysis (Fig. 1). Ten of these studies reported the data from the studied 245 locations as pooled, limiting our capacity to assess the influence of distinct water system 246 characteristics and water quality parameters on L. pneumophila qPCR:culture ratios. Two studies 247 (Donohue, 2021; Mapili et al., 2020) and five data sets from Lee et al. (2011) were excluded for 248 having less than 20% quantifiable samples. All but two studies were conducted in European 249 countries. One selected study, Lee et al. (2011), reported site-specific data from multiple potable 250 water systems in different countries. Quality control and assurance elements reported for qPCR 251 analyses varied among the 15 studies: one reported recovery rates for the whole process, four 252 reported recovery rates for nucleic acid extraction, four reported doing positive/negative controls 253 for nucleic acid extraction, 11 reported doing positive/negative controls for PCR detection, nine 254 described methods for generating standard curves, and 12 reported using inhibition controls 255 (Table S4). For cultivation analyses, all studies reported adhering to standardized protocols 256 (Table S5), except two studies using Legiolert[®] test, which were conducted before the 257 publication of the ASTM D8429-21 standard in 2022.

Several chemical disinfection strategies were used across studies, with the predominant approach being chlorine disinfection (Table 2). The water samples tested exhibited a range in average temperature of 22 to 57 °C. Sampling strategies vary significantly across studies. The number of sampling locations per building ranged from as few as one to as many as 21, with most studies monitoring less than five sampling locations. Approximately ten samples were typically collected at each sampling location, and most studies collected flushed samples (i.e., water has

been intentionally run through the outlet being sampled before sampling). The volume analyzed for the quantification of *L. pneumophila* varied considerably, ranging from 27 mL to 1 L, for both culture-based and qPCR methods. The reported lower limit of detection ranged from 1 to 250 CFU L⁻¹ or MPN L⁻¹ for culture-based methods and 80 to 2000 GC L⁻¹ for qPCR methods. Typically, the proportion of samples above the detection limit exceeded 70% when using qPCR. This proportion averaged 60% with culture-based methods, though this was as low as 20% for some sites.

271 **4.2** Temporal variations in qPCR:culture ratios

272 We observed substantial variability in the qPCR:culture ratio, with most sites demonstrating 273 ratios spanning an approximate 3.0-log (Figure 2). For every data set, the lower tail of the 274 lognormal distribution of the ratio began to rise within a qPCR:culture ratio of 0.1 to 1.0. 275 Theoretically, ratios below 1.0 are unexpected since the number of genome copies detected by 276 qPCR should be equal to or higher than the number of culturable cells. However, the model 277 predicts such low ratios when data sets include multiple cultivation and qPCR results that fall 278 below the detection limits. The upper tail of the distribution varied among studies. Most sites 279 exhibited maximum ratios between 1.0 and 2.0-log, while a few presented maximum ratios 280 exceeding 3.0-log. In many studies, a small number of samples with high qPCR:culture ratios 281 considerably influenced the arithmetic mean ratio (e.g., Bonetta et al. (2018), Grimard-Conea et 282 al. (2022), Lee et al. (2011); Table 3).

283 This analysis demonstrates that the distribution of the concentration—either derived from qPCR

or culture-based measurements—can dominate the dispersion of the ratio distribution (Figure 2).

285 When culture-based measurements returned a high number of non-detects, the qPCR

concentration distribution predominantly influenced the distribution of the ratio (Fig 2A, 2B,

2G). In other cases, the culture-based concentration distribution dictated the distribution of the
ratio (Fig 2F, 2J). As shown in Table 3, the correlation coefficient also affects the dispersion of
the ratio distribution. This finding highlights the need to account for the interdependence
between the two methods to characterize the ratio distribution accurately.

291 4.3 Between-study variability in mean qPCR:culture ratios

292 For reviewed studies reporting site-specific data, the geometric mean qPCR:culture ratios display 293 considerable variability, ranging from 0.0 to 2.1-log (Fig. 3). Exponential and lognormal 294 distributions of the random effect illustrate how the geometric or arithmetic mean ratios varies 295 across studies (Fig. 4). The exponential distribution predicts geometric mean qPCR:culture ratios 296 below 10:1 (1.0-log) for approximately 80% of the sites. This suggested that qPCR and 297 cultivation results were similar in most locations. For the remaining 20% of the sites, the 298 geometric mean ratio was predicted to fall between 1.0 and 2.0-log. The distribution of 299 arithmetic mean ratios displayed more skewed, with 50% of the sites presenting mean ratios 300 above 1.0-log and considerable uncertainty surrounding the distribution, indicating that high 301 ratios were expected at these sites.

302 4.4 Impact of viability-qPCR on qPCR:culture ratios

For the three studies employing viability-qPCR, arithmetic and geometric mean qPCR:culture
ratios display lower values than standard qPCR (Fig. 5, Fig. S2, Table S3). Across all studies,
viability-qPCR reduced geometric mean ratios by 0.2-log and arithmetic mean ratios by 0.5-log.
For the studies conducted by Bonetta et al. (2018) and Yáñez et al. (2011), arithmetic mean
ratios were more uncertain for standard qPCR than viability-qPCR, suggesting that viabilityqPCR can reduce the variability in ratios.

309 4.5 Impact of water temperature on qPCR:culture ratios

- 310 The analysis of impacts of temperature on qPCR:culture data was limited to one study (Lee et
- al.), as this was the only study that reported sample-specific temperature data for each study site.
- 312 The influence of hot water temperature on qPCR:culture ratios was examined using data sets
- from sites Switzerland 100, 110 and 120. During the monitoring period, no chemical residuals,
- 314 on-site chemical treatment, or shock disinfection were applied at these three sites (V. Gaia,
- 315 personal communication, April 2023). qPCR:culture ratios increased appreciably across the three
- 316 sites as the temperature became more variable with intermittently lower temperatures, as shown
- in the CDFs (Fig. 6). At site 100, the water temperature from 30–60 sec flush samples
- 318 consistently stayed above 55 °C. Conversely, the other sites recorded lower temperatures, with
- 319 values as low as 47 °C at site 110 and 32 °C at site 120.

320 5 Discussion

321 This review considered the complex interplay between qPCR and culture-based methods by 322 modelling published data sets reporting L. pneumophila concentrations measured in building 323 potable water systems. We found that, predominantly, qPCR yields higher measurements than 324 culture-based methods, a difference influenced by several factors. Higher measurements with 325 qPCR compared to cultivation likely arise from the detection of uncultivable cells and 326 extracellular DNA (Delgado-Viscogliosi et al., 2009). The detection of all genetic material could 327 overestimate health risks, placing an unnecessary burden on building managers. Conversely, 328 conventional culture-based methods may underestimate risks due to cultivation bias, or by not 329 adequately quantifying bacterial aggregates or VBNC cells, even though thermally induced 330 VBNC L. pneumophila can have lower virulence compared to culturable L. pneumophila 331 (Cervero-Aragó et al., 2019). This divergence between qPCR and cultivation results may further 332 be influenced by analytical strategies and environmental variables (Lee et al., 2011), including 333 water temperature, disinfectant levels, and water stagnation, which in turn can be affected by 334 operational parameters like boiler settings as well as flushing and sampling strategies. Given this 335 complexity, caution is necessary when converting qPCR data for use in QMRA.

5.1 Ecology of Legionella pneumophila in building potable water systems

The temporal analysis of qPCR:culture ratios within building potable water systems shows that while some water samples have comparable concentrations in both qPCR and cultivation, others exhibit much higher concentrations when measured by qPCR compared to cultivation. Typically, the temporal distribution is right-skewed with a long tail towards high ratios, suggesting that a small proportion of samples is characterized by high concentrations of *L. pneumophila* nucleic acids not associated with culturable bacteria. The water temperature is one potential explanation

343 for variability in qPCR:culture ratios, as high water temperatures may reduce culturability while 344 minimally influencing qPCR detection. Sample-specific temperature data from Lee et al. (2011) 345 enabled us to investigate how temperature impacts variations in qPCR:culture ratios in non-346 chlorinated hot water systems from three hospitals in Switzerland. At site Switzerland 110, 347 qPCR concentrations displayed high variations of approximately 3.0-log, while culture 348 concentrations were predominantly at the LOD. These results suggest that L. pneumophila enter 349 the hot-water heater through recirculation lines or potentially grow within the water heater but 350 are then inactivated by the thermal barrier in the water heater, hence a high qPCR:culture ratio. 351 In contrast, site Switzerland 120 demonstrated high variability in qPCR concentrations, but 352 multiple culture-positive results were recorded. This observation points toward potential L. 353 *pneumophila* growth in the hot-water distribution system or a compromised disinfection capacity 354 of the hot-water heater. This hypothesis is supported by water sample temperatures measured at 355 this site, which sporadically fell within the ideal temperature for L. pneumophila growth 356 (25–43°C) (National Academies of Sciences and Medicine, 2020). Notably, a full-scale study by 357 Bédard et al. (2016) demonstrated that implementing corrective measures to maintain a water 358 temperature of 55 °C throughout the hot-water system of a large building resulted in a gradual 359 reduction in concentrations of *L. pneumophila*, as measured by both qPCR and cultivation. 360 Curative control measures, such as thermal and chemical shock treatments, can impact 361 qPCR:culture ratios. In the full-scale study conducted by Grimard-Conea and Prévost (2023), 362 published after our review period, shock chlorination combined with flushing regimes resulted in 363 culturable L. pneumophila concentrations below the LOD, while qPCR still indicated 364 concentrations of approximately 10^3 genome-copies per liter. Additionally, under bench-scale 365 conditions, Delgado-Viscogliosi et al. (2009) demonstrated that exposing L. pneumophila to

366 70°C water for 60 min reduced cultivability by more than 6.0-log. In contrast, nucleic acid
367 integrity was only affected by approximately 0.2-log. Despite clear evidence that such measures
368 impact ratios, there were an insufficient number of studies to provide conclusive quantitative
369 estimates of the impact of remediation strategies on qPCR:culture ratios.

370 5.2 qPCR data integration into L. pneumophila risk assessment

371 A conversion from genome-copies to CFU is necessary for QMRA because available L.

372 pneumophila dose-response models predict health risks for inhaled doses in CFU (Armstrong

and Haas, 2007; Armstrong and Haas, 2008). To integrate qPCR data into QMRA, previous

374 studies converted genome copies to an estimate of viable pathogen counts using a constant

375 qPCR:culture ratio (McBride et al., 2013). This approach can be effective if qPCR:culture ratios

376 remain relatively stable over time. However, a stable ratio may not be likely for *L. pneumophila*

in building potable water systems. These systems provide variable conditions, with possible

378 inactivation of *L. pneumophila* in a point-of-entry treatment system (e.g., hot-water heater) but

also possible (re)growth in the plumbing system before the point of use.

380 Our meta-analysis indicates that qPCR:culture ratios tend to be low and exhibit significant

381 variability. For about 80% of the building potable water systems, predicted geometric mean

382 qPCR:culture ratios were less than 10, with predicted ratios approaching 1:1 at all sites.

383 Therefore, to avoid underestimating the concentration of viable *L. pneumophila*, applying a 1:1

adjustment factor appears necessary when converting a *L. pneumophila* qPCR result into

385 cultivation result to quantify *L. pneumophila* concentrations in building potable water for

- 386 QMRA. Using higher constant qPCR:culture ratios like 10:1, 100:1, or 1000:1 to adjust
- 387 monitoring results could mask *L. pneumophila* growth events, thereby underestimating health
- 388 risks associated with these systems. This recommendation applies exclusively to L. pneumophila;

389 this review did not target other *Legionella* species. While some conservative risk assessments 390 might apply L. pneumophila dose-response models for other Legionella species, the 391 interpretation of health risks associated with *Legionella* species is currently limited due to the 392 absence of dose-response models for species beyond L. pneumophila (Armstrong and Haas, 393 2007; Armstrong and Haas, 2008). 394 The recommended 1:1 factor might significantly overestimate health risks in scenarios where 395 point-of-entry treatment systems, such as thermal disinfection or on-site chemical disinfection, 396 reduce the culturability or viability of L. pneumophilia, with minimal-to-no impact on DNA 397 concentrations. Directly using qPCR concentrations to estimate risks in such systems may result 398 in an excessive number of sites being erroneously classified as hazardous, triggering unnecessary 399 interventions and imposing undue burdens on facility managers. However, determining an 400 adjustment factor that accurately captures the impact of disinfection from point-of-entry 401 treatment systems is challenging. This difficulty arises because L. pneumophila can growth 402 within a hot-water line post-disinfection or at a fixture, potentially leading to lower qPCR:culture 403 ratios compared to those measured directly from the effluent of the hot-water heater. 404 Consequently, relying on a qPCR:culture ratio based solely on the inactivation efficacy of the 405 point-of-entry treatment system to adjust qPCR data for QMRA may mask L. pneumophila 406 growth events. More accurate estimates of potential health risks in such systems could be 407 obtained by pairing measurements from qPCR methods with those from culture-based or 408 viability-qPCR methods. Therefore, qPCR should, at this stage, be viewed as a complementary 409 tool for risk assessment and building investigations, rather than as a replacement for cultivation. 410 Data on L. pneumophila concentrations derived from qPCR can provide useful insights into 411 water safety above and beyond what is possible using culture-data alone. For example, elevated

412 or sudden increases in qPCR-based concentrations can infer L. pneumophila growth within the 413 system. This information can become valuable when considered within the context of the site. 414 For instance, it can highlight areas requiring intervention such as disinfection, elimination of 415 dead ends, improvement in temperature controls, maintenance, or redesign. For population 416 segments more vulnerable to developing severe Legionnaires' disease, including the elderly, 417 immunocompromised individuals, smokers, and those with chronic lung conditions, qPCR 418 results may be valuable for identifying high-risk systems. 419 Viability-qPCR can reduce and stabilize qPCR:culture ratios by excluding non-viable cells

420 (Lizana et al., 2017; Yáñez et al., 2011). The subgroup analysis conducted in this study revealed 421 that, on average, viability-qPCR leads to a reduction of approximately 0.2-log in the geometric 422 mean and 0.5-log in the arithmetic mean when compared to standard qPCR. This reduction 423 appears relatively low, considering the range of mean ratios expected from the meta-analysis. A 424 partial explanation is that the viability-qPCR methods are conservative (i.e. only targeting 425 extensively damaged cells) (Hammes et al., 2011). Nonetheless, targeted uses of viability-qPCR 426 in specific scenarios, such as the effluent of a contaminated hot-water heater with a sufficient 427 thermal barrier, could provide valuable insights. By employing viability-qPCR in these 428 circumstances, it could become possible to determine whether the overwhelming majority of L. 429 pneumophila detected by standard qPCR are non-viable. Further research into the conditions 430 under which VBNC L. pneumophila can regain virulence and the factors influencing their 431 transition back to a culturable state could also be beneficial to improve risk assessment accuracy.

432 **5.3** Improved reporting in qPCR:culture comparison studies

The lack of comprehensive data reporting limited our ability to accurately quantify uncertainties
associated with concentrations of *L. pneumophila* measured by qPCR and culture-based

435 methods. In all studies, only estimated concentrations were reported. However, for modelling 436 temporal variations in pathogen concentrations, it is preferable to use original lab observations 437 (counts and processed volumes). This approach allows for incorporating statistical uncertainties 438 into the analysis (Chik et al., 2018; Schmidt et al., 2023). In our study, we estimated cultivation 439 counts from reported concentrations and sample volumes, but this method can underestimate 440 uncertainties when samples undergo dilution or subsampling. To accurately back-calculate 441 counts from reported cultivation concentrations, it is necessary to have access to dilution factors 442 and volume plated for plating methods, positive and negative well counts for MPN methods, and 443 elution and template volumes for qPCR methods. LODs from qPCR and culture-based methods 444 in reviewed studies sometimes differed by orders of magnitude. Minimizing differences between 445 LODs would be beneficial as it would enhance the accuracy of qPCR:culture ratios at low 446 concentrations. Ideally, when qPCR results are positive, corresponding culturable concentrations 447 should be detectable. More pairing of positive results could increase the covariance between 448 qPCR and cultivation, reducing the variability in the ratio distribution (see Eq. 4). This 449 adjustment might correct for the tendency of the lower tail of the ratio distribution to predict 450 ratios below 1.0, which may facilitate the adoption of less conservative conversion factor than 451 1:1 in some situations.

452 Comparing qPCR and cultivation data can be further complicated by differences in analytical 453 recovery rates between the two methods. However, we were unable to evaluate this impact due 454 to insufficient reporting. Whole process recovery rates for the cultivation of *L. pneumophila* in 455 drinking water samples have been found to range from 30–90% for direct plating (Blanky et al., 456 2015; Boulanger and Edelstein, 1995; Villari et al., 1998) and 12–48% for pre-treated samples 457 (Blanky et al., 2015; Boulanger and Edelstein, 1995). For qPCR, reported recovery rates have

458	ranged from 42–98% for the whole process (Behets et al., 2007; Omiccioli et al., 2015) and 57–
459	123% specifically for DNA extraction (Collins et al., 2015; Collins et al., 2017). Although the
460	direct impact of these variations on the qPCR:culture ratio may be relatively minor compared to
461	certain environmental factors, the effect of this methodological factor remains uncertain and
462	warrants further investigation.
463	On a broader scale, while the study by Lee et al. (2011) adhered to the AFNOR NF-T90-
464	471:2010 standard for qPCR testing, other studies reviewed did not follow an established qPCR
465	standard. Many studies only partially reported specific controls and reporting elements
466	recommended in the Minimum Information for Publication of Quantitative Real-Time PCR
467	Experiments (MIQE) guidelines (Bustin et al., 2009) or the Environmental Microbiology
468	Minimum Information (EMMI) guidelines (Borchardt et al., 2021). Adopting these guidelines in
469	future research would improve the reliability and reproducibility of qPCR results.
470	Without standardized methods for both cultivation and qPCR, consistent correlations between
471	qPCR and cultivation concentrations in building potable water systems remain uncertain (Whiley
472	and Taylor, 2014). However, even with standardized methods, variations in environmental
473	factors such as water temperature can still impact culturability and affect correlations in site-
474	specific temporal analyses. To quantify the influence of these environmental variables on the
475	relationship, mathematical models, such as qPCR:culture ratio distributions and multiple
476	regression models can be applied, provided that site-specific contextual data are reported. The
477	parameters listed in Table 1 offer a preliminary framework for more standardized reporting.

478 6 Conclusions

479	This meta-analysis examined the qPCR-to-culture concentration ratio for L. pneumophila in
480	building potable water systems, aiming to guide the interpretation of qPCR data for QMRA. The
481	key conclusions drawn from this study are as follows:
482	• Our analysis confirms that Poisson lognormal distributions effectively describe system-
483	specific variations in concentrations of L. pneumophila using both qPCR and culture-
484	based methods.
485	• The relationship between qPCR and culture methods, modeled as the ratio of two
486	correlated lognormal random variables, showed substantial variability within systems,
487	with ratios typically ranging from 1:1 to 100:1. This variability can be attributed to
488	environmental factors such as water temperature and methodological considerations,
489	including detection limits.
490	• Across the literature, the random-effects meta-analysis model indicated that for
491	approximately 80% of systems, the geometric mean of the qPCR-to-culture ratios is less
492	than 10:1. However, due to occasional high ratios, the arithmetic mean ratios exceed
493	100:1 in about 20% of the systems.
494	• Given the observed variability and frequent occurrences of ratios close to 1:1,
495	implementing a default 1:1 conversion factor for converting qPCR data to culturable
496	concentrations in QMRA is recommended. This strategy avoids underestimating
497	culturable concentrations due to regrowth of L. pneumophila downstream of point-of-
498	entry treatment systems like hot water heaters.
499	• In cases of heavy <i>L. pneumophila</i> contamination before point-of-entry treatment systems,
500	directly incorporating qPCR data into QMRA might overestimate health risks by

501	detecting large amounts of DNA from non-infectious bacteria. Emerging techniques like
502	viability-qPCR, which targets DNA within intact cells, could provide a more accurate
503	alignment of concentration estimates with actual health risks associated with L.
504	pneumophila. However, these techniques are not yet widely adopted in qPCR-based
505	applications.
506 •	More standardized, site-specific reporting can facilitate detailed analysis of
507	environmental and methodological variables influencing qPCR-to-culture ratios. This
508	includes studying conditions that are likely to yield high proportions of non-viable and
509	viable but non-culturable (VBNC) L. pneumophila.
510	

511 7 Acknowledgments

- 512 ES was funded by postdoctoral fellowships from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research
- 513 Council of Canada (558161-2021) and the Fonds de Recherche du Québec Nature et
- 514 technologies (303866). Additional funding was provided by the Swiss Federal Food Safety and
- 515 Veterinary Office (FSVO), the Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH) and the Federal Office of
- 516 Energy (FOE), through the project LeCo (Legionella Control in Buildings; Aramis nr.: 4.20.01),
- 517 as well as Eawag discretionary funding. We gratefully acknowledge Nadine Graf for her
- 518 assistance with data extraction and compilation, Brittany Halverson-Duncan and Prof. Peter
- 519 Vanrolleghem for their guidance on statistical analyses, and Dr. Valeria Gaia and Dr. John V.
- 520 Lee for providing data and sharing their insights for interpreting the findings.

522 **Table 1.** Reporting elements necessary for evaluating the relationship between concentrations of

523 *Legionella pneumophila* measured by qPCR and culture-based methods in building potable water

524 systems.

Water system information Building type Water system (e.g., hot/cold) Outlet Draw (e.g., first draw, flushed) Water treatment Preventive control measure(s) Curative control measure(s) Water quality parameter Total chlorine Free chlorine Monochloramine Water temperature Sample processing Sampling location and date sample type Sample volume for qPCR Sample volume for qPCR Sample volume for cultivation Sample dilution/concentration factor for qPCR Sample dilution/concentration factor for cultivation Volume processed for qPCR Volume processed for qPCR Number of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCR ^b Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCR ^b Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation	Category	Parameter
Water system (e.g., hot/cold)OutletDraw (e.g., first draw, flushed)Water treatmentPreventive control measure(s)Water quality parameterTotal chlorineFree chlorineMonochloramineWater temperatureSample processingSample processingSample volume for qPCRSample volume for cultivationSample dilution/concentration factor for qPCRSample dilution/concentration factor for cultivationVolume processed for qPCRMeasurement informationqPCR methodGene target for qPCRNumber of gene copies within the genomeSpecificity of the qPCR assayCulture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN)Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCR ^b Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for cultivationLimits of detection (LOD) for qPCRLimits of detection (LOD) for qPCR	Water system information	Building type
Outlet Draw (e.g., first draw, flushed)Water treatmentPreventive control measure(s) Curative control measure(s)Water quality parameterTotal chlorine Free chlorine Monochloramine Water temperatureSample processingSampling location and dateinformationSample volume for qPCR Sample volume for cultivation Sample dilution/concentration factor for qPCR Sample dilution/concentration factor for cultivation Volume processed for qPCR Volume processed for cultureMeasurement informationqPCR method Gene target for qPCR Sumber of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for cultivation binit of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR	-	Water system (e.g., hot/cold)
Draw (e.g., first draw, flushed)Water treatmentPreventive control measure(s) Curative control measure(s)Water quality parameterTotal chlorine Free chlorine Monochloramine Water temperatureSample processingSampling location and dateinformationSample type Sample volume for qPCR Sample dilution/concentration factor for cultivation Volume processed for qPCR Volume processed for cultureMeasurement informationqPCR method Gene target for qPCR Number of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) 		Outlet
Water treatmentPreventive control measure(s)Water quality parameterTotal chlorine Free chlorine Monochloramine Water temperatureSample processingSampling location and dateinformationSample type Sample volume for qPCR Sample dilution/concentration factor for qPCR Sample dilution/concentration factor for qPCR Sample dilution/concentration factor for cultivation Volume processed for qPCR Volume processed for cultureMeasurement information*// qPCR method Gene target for qPCR Sumber of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for cultivation bilimits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR		Draw (e.g., first draw, flushed)
Water quality parameterCurative control measure(s)Water quality parameterTotal chlorine Free chlorine Monochloramine Water temperatureSample processingSampling location and dateinformationSample type Sample volume for qPCR Sample volume for cultivation Sample dilution/concentration factor for qPCR Sample dilution/concentration factor for cultivationMeasurement informationqPCR method Gene target for qPCR Number of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCR ^b Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for cultivation b Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR	Water treatment	Preventive control measure(s)
Water quality parameterTotal chlorine Free chlorine Monochloramine Water temperatureSample processingSampling location and dateinformationSample type Sample volume for qPCR Sample volume for cultivation Sample dilution/concentration factor for qPCR Sample dilution/concentration factor for cultivation Volume processed for qPCR Volume processed for qPCR Number of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation		Curative control measure(s)
Free chlorineMonochloramineWater temperatureSample processinginformationSample typeSample volume for qPCRSample volume for cultivationSample dilution/concentration factor for qPCRSample dilution/concentration factor for cultivationVolume processed for qPCRVolume processed for cultureMeasurement information ^a qPCR methodGene target for qPCRNumber of gene copies within the genomeSpecificity of the qPCR assayCulture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN)Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for cultivation ^b Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivationLimits of detection (LOD) for cultivation	Water quality parameter	Total chlorine
Monochloramine Water temperatureSample processing informationSampling location and dateSample volume for qPCR Sample volume for qPCR Sample dilution/concentration factor for qPCR Sample dilution/concentration factor for cultivation Volume processed for qPCR Volume processed for cultureMeasurement informationaqPCR method Gene target for qPCR Number of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR		Free chlorine
Sample processingWater temperatureSample processingSampling location and dateinformationSample typeSample volume for qPCRSample volume for cultivationSample dilution/concentration factor for qPCRSample dilution/concentration factor for cultivationVolume processed for qPCRVolume processed for qPCRVolume processed for cultureMeasurement information"qPCR methodGene target for qPCRNumber of gene copies within the genomeSpecificity of the qPCR assayCulture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN)Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCRbCiount of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for cultivationLimits of detection (LOD) for qPCRLimits of detection (LOD) for cultivationLimits of detection (LOD) for aPCR		Monochloramine
Sample processingSampling location and dateinformationSample typeSample volume for qPCRSample volume for cultivationSample dilution/concentration factor for qPCRSample dilution/concentration factor for cultivationVolume processed for qPCRVolume processed for cultureMeasurement information ^a qPCR methodGene target for qPCRNumber of gene copies within the genomeSpecificity of the qPCR assayCulture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN)Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCR ^b Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for cultivationLimits of detection (LOD) for qPCRLimits of detection (LOD) for cultivation		Water temperature
 information Sample type Sample volume for qPCR Sample volume for cultivation Sample dilution/concentration factor for qPCR Sample dilution/concentration factor for cultivation Volume processed for qPCR Volume processed for culture Measurement information^a qPCR method Gene target for qPCR Number of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for qPCR^b Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for cultivation^b Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR 	Sample processing	Sampling location and date
Sample volume for qPCR Sample volume for cultivation Sample dilution/concentration factor for qPCR Sample dilution/concentration factor for cultivation Volume processed for qPCR Volume processed for culture qPCR method Gene target for qPCR Number of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for qPCR ^b Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for cultivation ^b Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation	information	Sample type
Sample volume for cultivationSample dilution/concentration factor for qPCRSample dilution/concentration factor for cultivationVolume processed for qPCRVolume processed for cultureMeasurement informationaqPCR methodGene target for qPCRNumber of gene copies within the genomeSpecificity of the qPCR assayCulture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN)Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCR ^b Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for cultivationLimits of detection (LOD) for qPCRLimits of detection (LOD) for qPCRLimits of detection (LOD) for qPCR		Sample volume for qPCR
Sample dilution/concentration factor for qPCRSample dilution/concentration factor for cultivationVolume processed for qPCRVolume processed for cultureMeasurement informationaqPCR methodGene target for qPCRNumber of gene copies within the genomeSpecificity of the qPCR assayCulture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN)Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCRbCiount of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for cultivationbLimits of detection (LOD) for qPCRLimits of detection (LOD) for cultivationLimit of quantification (LOO) for qPCR		Sample volume for cultivation
Sample dilution/concentration factor for cultivationVolume processed for qPCR Volume processed for cultureMeasurement informationaqPCR method Gene target for qPCR Number of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCRb Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for cultivation Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR		Sample dilution/concentration factor for qPCR
Volume processed for qPCR Volume processed for cultureMeasurement informationaqPCR method Gene target for qPCR Number of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCRb Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for cultivationb Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR		Sample dilution/concentration factor for cultivation
Measurement informationalVolume processed for cultureMeasurement informationalqPCR methodGene target for qPCRNumber of gene copies within the genomeSpecificity of the qPCR assayCulture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN)Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCRbCount of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for cultivationbLimits of detection (LOD) for qPCRLimits of detection (LOD) for cultivationLimit of quantification (LOO) for qPCR		Volume processed for qPCR
Measurement information ^a qPCR method Gene target for qPCR Number of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for qPCR ^b Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for cultivation ^b Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation		Volume processed for culture
Gene target for qPCR Number of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for qPCR ^b Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for cultivation ^b Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation Limit of quantification (LOO) for aPCR	Measurement information ^a	qPCR method
Number of gene copies within the genome Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for qPCR ^b Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for cultivation ^b Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation		Gene target for qPCR
Specificity of the qPCR assay Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for qPCR ^b Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for cultivation ^b Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation		Number of gene copies within the genome
Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN) Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for qPCR ^b Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for cultivation ^b Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation Limit of quantification (LOQ) for qPCR		Specificity of the qPCR assay
Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for qPCR ^b Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for cultivation ^b Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation Limit of quantification (LOO) for aPCR		Culture-based method (e.g., CFU, MPN)
Count of <i>Legionella pneumophila</i> per processed volume for cultivation ^b Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation Limit of quantification (LOQ) for qPCR		Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for qPCR ^b
Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation Limit of quantification (LOQ) for qPCR		Count of Legionella pneumophila per processed volume for cultivation ^b
Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation Limit of quantification (LOQ) for aPCR		Limits of detection (LOD) for qPCR
Limit of quantification (LOO) for aPCR		Limits of detection (LOD) for cultivation
Emilit of quantification (EOQ) for quark		Limit of quantification (LOQ) for qPCR
Limit of quantification (LOQ) for cultivation		Limit of quantification (LOQ) for cultivation
Recovery rates for qPCR (whole process, nucleic acid extraction, PCR detection		Recovery rates for qPCR (whole process, nucleic acid extraction, PCR detection
Recovery rates for cultivation		Recovery rates for cultivation

525 ^{*a*}This list does not include all quality control and assurance elements necessary for qPCR and cultivation analyses of

526 environmental samples. ^bWhen counts were unavailable, reported concentrations were extracted.



Fig. 1. Systematic review flow diagram.

Table 2. Characteristics of building potable water systems, sampling strategy and *Legionella pneumophila* enumeration methods for evaluating
 site-specific qPCR:culture ratio.

				Sampling str	ategy	Volume	analyzed	Detection limit		
	ī	Chemical		Sample per		Culture	qPCR	Culture	qPCR	
Reference , site	(°C)	treatment	Location	location	Method	(L)	(L)	(CFU L-1)	(GC L ⁻¹)	
Building-specific										
Bonetta et al. (2018)	22.1	None	14	5	Flushed	1.000	1.000	1^a	80	
Bonetta et al. (2018)	38.0	NEOW	14	5	Flushed	1.000	1.000	1^a	80	
Grimard-C. et al. (2022)	31.1	Chlorine	21	6	First-draw/flushed	0.100	0.700	10 MPN/L	10	
Joly et al. (2006), Grenoble	-	N/S	N/S	N/S	N/S	0.800	0.200	50	30	
Lee et al. (2011), France DW1	42.7	None	5	3-10	Flushed	0.027	0.027	190	190	
Lee et al. (2011), France DW2	47.9	None	4	3-10	Flushed	0.027	0.027	190	190	
Lee et al. (2011), HPA SH	50.9	Chlorine diox.	4	4-13	Flushed	0.027	0.027	190	190	
Lee et al. (2011), Italy Scre	38.7	N/S	1	11	Flushed	0.027	0.027	190	190	
Lee et al. (2011), Italy Ed 1	34.7	N/S	2	15	Flushed	0.027	0.027	190	190	
Lee et al. (2011), Italy Pad 5	37.9	N/S	3	11-12	Flushed	0.027	0.027	190	190	
Lee et al. (2011), Spain DW1	50.2	Copper/silver	5	8-9	Flushed	0.027	0.027	190	190	
Lee et al. (2011), Spain DW2	44.8	Chlorine	5	9	Flushed	0.027	0.027	190	190	
Lee et al. (2011), Spain DW3	51.3	Chlorine	5	9	Flushed	0.027	0.027	190	190	
Lee et al. (2011), Switz. 100	57.5	None	3	9-10	Flushed (30–60 s)	0.027	0.027	190	190	
Lee et al. (2011), Switz. 110	57.3	None	3	9-10	Flushed (30–60 s)	0.027	0.027	190	190	
Lee et al. (2011), Switz. 120	53.9	None	3	9-10	Flushed (30–60 s)	0.027	0.027	190	190	
Morio et al. (2008)	50.1	Chlorine	N/S	N/S	N/S	0.020	0.200	250	100	
Pooled data from multiple b	ouildings	1								
Behets et al. (2007)	N/A	N/S	N/A	N/A	N/S	1.000	1.000	50	60	
Bonetta et al. (2010)	N/A	Chlorine	N/A	N/A	Flushed (3 min)	1.000	1.000	100	80	
Boss et al. (2018)	N/A	None	N/A	N/A	Flushed (1L)	1.000	1.000	N/S	100	
Collins et al. (2015)	N/A	N/S	N/A	N/A	N/S	0.100	0.700	N/S	128	
Collins et al. (2017)	N/A	N/S	N/A	N/A	N/S	0.050	0.600	20	150	
Delgado-Viscogliosi et al. (2009)	N/A	N/S	N/A	N/A	N/S	0.630	0.100	50	250	
Fittipaldi et al. (2010)	N/A	N/S	N/A	N/A	N/S	N/S	1.000	N/S	N/S	
Joly et al. (2006), Lyon	N/A	N/S	N/A	N/A	N/S	0.200	0.200	50	250	
Mapili et al. (2020)	N/A	N/S	N/A	N/A	First draw/flushed	0.100	1.000	100	100	
Toplitsch et al. (2018)	N/A	N/S	N/A	N/A	N/S	0.100	0.100	10	2000	
Yanez et al. (2011)	N/A	N/S	N/A	N/A	N/S	0.333	0.333	30	977	

⁵³² ^aThis detection limit is self-reported in the study. It may have been developed assuming 100% recovery from filtration, but recoveries were not reported.

Table 3. Statistical analysis of site-specific qPCR:culture ratios, qPCR concentrations and culture concentrations for *Legionella pneumophila* in
 water samples collected in building potable water systems.

	<u> </u>			Lognormal parameters						_	qPCR:cı	ilture ratio	
		% of	% of	qPCR		Culture			Ratio)	Pearson	Geometric	Arithmetic
Reference, site	Total	+ve qPCR	+ve culture	Â	$\widehat{\sigma}$	ĥ	$\widehat{\sigma}$	ĥ	$\widehat{\sigma}$	$\widehat{\sigma}_{ ho}$	corr. (ρ)	mean	mean
Building-specific													
Bonetta et al. (2018) Pre-inter.	9	100	100	10.3	1.3	8.5	1.2	1.8	1.9	1.4	0.47	6	17
Bonetta et al. (2018) Post-inter.	20	60	60	4.9	0.8	0.8	2.5	4.0	2.6	2.6	0.01	59	2100
Grimard-C. et al. (2022) First draw	62	100	69	7.7	2.2	4.2	3.4	3.4	4.1	3.1	0.45	30	3700
Joly et al. (2006), Grenoble	31	100	87	8.4	1.3	6.6	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.5	0.69	6	19
Lee et al. (2011), France DW1	36	67	47	6.5	1.9	6.0	0.7	0.5	2.0	1.8	0.30	1	8
Lee et al. (2011), France DW2	33	91	79	7.0	1.8	6.4	1.1	0.5	2.1	1.5	0.53	1	5
Lee et al. (2011), HPA SH2	12	83	50	6.5	1.0	6.4	1.5	0.1	1.8	1.4	0.53	1	2
Lee et al. (2011), Italy Scre	11	100	64	7.7	0.9	6.9	1.7	0.8	1.8	1.8	0.24	2	12
Lee et al. (2011), Italy Ed 1	30	100	67	6.7	0.4	6.3	0.7	0.4	0.8	0.6	0.35	1	1
Lee et al. (2011), Italy Pad 5	35	89	69	7.3	1.8	7.2	1.6	0.1	2.4	1.5	0.57	1	3
Lee et al. (2011), Spain DW1	44	89	80	7.6	1.5	7.0	1.2	0.5	1.9	1.4	0.45	1	4
Lee et al. (2011), Spain DW2	45	100	58	7.0	0.6	6.2	0.9	0.7	1.1	0.9	0.27	2	3
Lee et al. (2011), Spain DW3	45	100	76	9.5	1.2	7.7	1.8	1.7	2.2	1.8	0.33	5	28
Lee et al. (2011), Switz. 100	30	43	20	6.1	1.4	5.5	0.6	0.6	1.3	1.3	0.49	1	4
Lee et al. (2011), Switz. 110	27	93	30	8.3	1.7	5.6	0.7	2.6	1.8	2.1	-0.47	13	150
Lee et al. (2011), Switz. 120	29	97	38	11.3	2.5	6.5	1.5	4.8	3.9	2.2	0.42	120	2200
Morio et al. (2008)	98	55	31	6.1	1.5	4.5	1.5	1.6	2.1	1.6	0.36	5	18
Pooled data from multiple build	lings												
Behets et al. (2007)	28	50	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bonetta et al. (2010)	29	100	66	7.8	1.7	6.4	1.9	1.3	2.5	2.0	0.46	4	27
Boss et al. (2018)	38	100	47	7.3	1.5	6.0	2.0	1.2	2.5	2.0	0.46	3	25
Collins et al. (2015)	31	90	77	8.3	1.8	6.6	3.3	2.1	3.8	3.3	0.31	8	1900
Collins et al. (2017)	140	100	96	9.7	1.8	7.3	2.3	2.3	2.9	2.4	0.34	10	180
Delgado-V. et al. (2009)	64	100	95	9.3	1.5	7.0	1.9	2.2	2.4	1.9	0.42	9	55
Fittipaldi et al. (2010)	13	100	100	9.9	1.4	6.9	2.8	3.0	2.9	3.6	-0.43	21	13 000
Joly et al. (2006)	45	93	69	10.1	1.7	6.6	1.6	3.5	2.3	1.9	0.33	33	220
Toplitsch et al. (2018)	19	95	100	8.8	1.2	6.3	1.2	2.4	1.7	1.2	0.59	11	23
Yanez et al. (2011)	10	100	80	9.4	1.8	5.7	1.6	3.7	2.5	1.9	0.41	40	250



Fig. 2. Complementary cumulative distribution function of the lognormal distribution (with 95%

uncertainty interval) for building-specific qPCR and culture concentrations of *Legionella pneumophila*and their ratio in water samples from selected building potable water systems. Only 12 of the 17 sites are

⁵³⁹ shown to illustrate main trends.

Author(s) and Year	Site	n	μ	σ	Geometric mean Arithmetic mean
Bonetta et al., 2018 (a)	-	9	1.8	1.4	┝→▤─▋──┥
Bonetta et al., 2018 (b)	-	20	4	2.6	
Grimard-C. et al., 2022	-	121	3.4	3.1	
Joly et al., 2006	Grenoble	31	1.8	1.5	┝╾╋┿╌╋╌┥
Lee et al., 2011	France DW1	36	0.5	1.8	∲ -8 •
Lee et al., 2011	France DW2	41	0.5	1.5	シ┲┉
Lee et al., 2011	HPA SH2	12	0.1	1.4	
Lee et al., 2011	Italy Ed 1	30	0.4	0.6	
Lee et al., 2011	Italy Pad 5	35	0.1	1.5	· ⊢∰₩─■
Lee et al., 2011	Italy Scre	11	0.8	1.8	┝┊───⋛────┥
Lee et al., 2011	Spain DW1	44	0.5	1.4	┆ ⊢ <u></u> <u></u> - , · <u>-</u>
Lee et al., 2011	Spain DW2	45	0.7	0.9	HE H
Lee et al., 2011	Spain DW3	45	1.7	1.8	⊢∎→⊢-∎
Lee et al., 2011	Switz. 100	30	0.1	1.7	
Lee et al., 2011	Switz. 110	27	2.6	2.2	
Lee et al., 2011	Switz. 120	29	4.8	2.4	┝╌┫╌┙┝───┫──╼
Morio et al., 2008	-	98	1.6	1.6	⊢∎+ ⊢∎→
				Г	
				-1	0 1 2 3 4
					Log ₁₀ mean qPCR:culture ratio

540 (a) No water treatment, (b) On-site water treatment with a Neutral electrolyzed oxidizing water (NEOW) device

- 541 **Fig. 3.** Forest plots of site-specific qPCR:culture ratios for *Legionella pneumophila* in building potable
- 542 water systems for arithmetic mean ratios and geometric mean ratios. μ and σ are the parameters of the
- 543 lognormal distribution of the ratio, and *n* is the sample size. Horizontal lines represent 95% confidence
- 544 intervals on mean values. Arrows indicate that confidence intervals exceed a log-ratio value of 4.0.



Log₁₀ mean qPCR : culture ratio

- 545 **Fig. 4.** Cumulative distribution function of the random-effects distribution (with 95% uncertainty
- interval) predicted using an exponential random-effects model for geometric mean qPCR:culture ratios
 (green) and a lognormal random-effects model for arithmetic mean qPCR:culture ratios (blue) for
- 548 *Legionella pneumophila* in building potable water systems.
- 549



(a) No water treatment, (b) On-site water treatment with a neutral electrolyzed oxidizing water (NEOW) device

551 **Fig. 5.** Forest plots of qPCR:culture ratio and viability-qPCR:culture ratio for *Legionella pneumophila* in

water samples from building potable water systems. Subgroup analyses were carried out for arithmetic

553 mean ratios. μ and σ are the parameters of the lognormal distribution of the ratio, and *n* is the sample

size. Horizontal lines represent 95% confidence intervals on mean values. Pooled estimates were obtained

555 using the random-effect model.

556





557 **Fig. 6. A.** Cumulative distribution function of the lognormal distribution (with 95% uncertainty interval)

558 for qPCR:culture ratios of *Legionella pneumophila* in flushed water samples from non-chlorinated

building potable water systems. Samples were collected weekly for ten weeks at three different sampling

560 locations for each water system. **B.** Violin plots of the water temperature based on sample-specific

561 temperature measurements.

563 8 References

564	AFNOR 2010 NF T90-471: Water quality. Detection and quantification of Legionella and/or
565	Legionella pneumophila by concentration and genic amplification by polymerase chain
566	reaction (PCR).
567	Ahmed, S., Liwak-Muir, U., Walker, D., Zoldowski, A., Mears, A., Golovan, S., Mohr, S., Lem,
568	P. and Harder, C. 2019. Validation and in-field testing of a new on-site qPCR system for
569	quantification of Legionella pneumophila according to ISO/TS 12869: 2012 in HVAC
570	cooling towers. Journal of Water and Health 17(2), 237-253.
571	Anonymous 2012 ISO/TS 12869:2012: Water quality—Detection and Quantification of
572	Legionella spp. and/or Legionella pneumophila by Concentration and Genic
573	Amplification by Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction (qPCR), International
574	Organisation for Standardisation Geneva.
575	Armstrong, T.W. and Haas, C.N. 2007. A quantitative microbial risk assessment model for
576	legionnaires' disease: Animal model selection and dose-response modeling. Risk Anal
577	27(6), 1581-1596.
578	Armstrong, T.W. and Haas, C.N. 2008. Legionnaires' disease: evaluation of a quantitative
579	microbial risk assessment model. Journal of Water and Health 6(2), 149-166.
580	Aydin, O. and Yassikaya, M.Y. 2022. Validity and reliability analysis of the PlotDigitizer
581	software program for data extraction from single-case graphs. Perspectives on Behavior
582	Science 45(1), 239-257.
583	Bédard, E., Boppe, I., Kouamé, S., Martin, P., Pinsonneault, L., Valiquette, L., Racine, J. and
584	Prévost, M. 2016. Combination of Heat Shock and Enhanced Thermal Regime to
585	Control the Growth of a Persistent Legionella pneumophila Strain. Pathogens 5(2).

586	Behets, J., Declerck, P., Delaedt, Y., Creemers, B. and Ollevier, F. 2007. Development and
587	evaluation of a Taqman duplex real-time PCR quantification method for reliable
588	enumeration of Legionella pneumophila in water samples. Journal of microbiological
589	methods 68(1), 137-144.
590	Blanky, M., Rodríguez-Martínez, S., Halpern, M. and Friedler, E. 2015. Legionella
591	pneumophila: From potable water to treated greywater; quantification and removal during
592	treatment. Science of the Total Environment 533, 557-565.
593	Bonetta, S., Bonetta, S., Ferretti, E., Balocco, F. and Carraro, E. 2010. Evaluation of Legionella
594	pneumophila contamination in Italian hotel water systems by quantitative real-time PCR
595	and culture methods. Journal of Applied Microbiology 108(5), 1576-1583.
596	Bonetta, S., Pignata, C., Bonetta, S., Meucci, L., Giacosa, D., Marino, E., Gorrasi, I., Gilli, G.
597	and Carraro, E. 2018. Effectiveness of a neutral electrolysed oxidising water (NEOW)
598	device in reducing Legionella pneumophila in a water distribution system: A comparison
599	between culture, qPCR and PMA-qPCR detection methods. Chemosphere 210, 550-556.
600	Borchardt, M.A., Boehm, A.B., Salit, M., Spencer, S.K., Wigginton, K.R. and Noble, R.T. 2021.
601	The environmental microbiology minimum information (EMMI) guidelines: qPCR and
602	dPCR quality and reporting for environmental microbiology. Environmental Science &
603	Technology 55(15), 10210-10223.
604	Boss, R., Baumgartner, A., Kroos, S., Blattner, M., Fretz, R. and Moor, D. 2018. Rapid
605	detection of viable Legionella pneumophila in tap water by a qPCR and RT-PCR-based

606 method. Journal of applied microbiology 125(4), 1216-1225.

607	Boulanger, C.A. and Edelstein, P.H. 1995. Precision and accuracy of recovery of Legionella
608	pneumophila from seeded tap water by filtration and centrifugation. Applied and
609	Environmental Microbiology 61(5), 1805-1809.
610	Bustin, S.A., Benes, V., Garson, J.A., Hellemans, J., Huggett, J., Kubista, M., Mueller, R.,
611	Nolan, T., Pfaffl, M.W., Shipley, G.L., Vandesompele, J. and Wittwer, C.T. 2009. The
612	MIQE guidelines: Minimum information for publication of quantitative real-time PCR
613	experiments. Clinical Chemistry 55(4), 611-622.
614	Cervero-Aragó, S., Schrammel, B., Dietersdorfer, E., Sommer, R., Lück, C., Walochnik, J. and
615	Kirschner, A. 2019. Viability and infectivity of viable but nonculturable Legionella
616	pneumophila strains induced at high temperatures. Water research 158, 268-279.
617	Chik, A.H.S., Schmidt, P.J. and Emelko, M.B. 2018. Learning something from nothing: the
618	critical importance of rethinking microbial non-detects. Frontiers in Microbiology 9,
619	2304.
620	Collins, S., Jorgensen, F., Willis, C. and Walker, J. 2015. Real-time PCR to supplement gold-
621	standard culture-based detection of Legionella in environmental samples. Journal of
622	Applied Microbiology 119(4), 1158-1169.
623	Collins, S., Stevenson, D., Walker, J. and Bennett, A. 2017. Evaluation of Legionella real-time
624	PCR against traditional culture for routine and public health testing of water samples.
625	Journal of applied microbiology 122(6), 1692-1703.
626	Delgado-Viscogliosi, P., Solignac, L. and Delattre, JM. 2009. Viability PCR, a culture-
627	independent method for rapid and selective quantification of viable Legionella
628	pneumophila cells in environmental water samples. Applied and Environmental
629	Microbiology 75(11), 3502-3512.

- 630 Donohue, M.J. 2021. Quantification of Legionella pneumophila by qPCR and culture in tap
- 631 water with different concentrations of residual disinfectants and heterotrophic bacteria.
- 632 Science of the Total Environment 774, 145142.
- 633 Engleberg, N., Carter, C., Weber, D., Cianciotto, N. and Eisenstein, B. 1989. DNA sequence of
- mip, a Legionella pneumophila gene associated with macrophage infectivity. Infection
 and immunity 57(4), 1263-1270.
- 636 Fittipaldi, M., Codony, F. and Morato, J. 2010. Comparison of conventional culture and real-
- time quantitative PCR using SYBR Green for detection of Llegionella pneumophila in
 water samples. Water Sa 36(4).
- 639 Grimard-Conea, M., Deshommes, E., Doré, E. and Prévost, M. 2022. Impact of
- 640 recommissioning flushing on Legionella pneumophila in a large building during the
- 641 COVID-19 pandemic. Frontiers in Water 4, 959689.
- 642 Grimard-Conea, M. and Prévost, M. 2023. Controlling Legionella pneumophila in
- 643 Showerheads: Combination of Remedial Intervention and Preventative Flushing.
- 644 Microorganisms 11(6), 1361.
- Haas, C.N. and Heller, B. 1986. Statistics of enumerating total coliforms in water samples by
 membrane filter procedures. Water Research 20(4), 525-530.
- Haas, C.N. and Heller, B. 1988. Test of the validity of the Poisson assumption for analysis of
 most-probable-number results. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 54(12), 29963002.
- Haas, C.N., Rose, J.B. and Gerba, C.P. (2014) Quantitative microbial risk assessment, John
 Wiley & Sons.

652	Hammes, F., Berney, M. and Egli, T. 2011. Cultivation-independent assessment of bacterial
653	viability. High resolution microbial single cell analytics, 123-150.

- Higgins, J.P., Thompson, S.G. and Spiegelhalter, D.J. 2009. A re-evaluation of random-effects
- 655 meta-analysis. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)
- 656 172(1), 137-159.
- Joly, P., Falconnet, P.-A., André, J., Weill, N., Reyrolle, M., Vandenesch, F., Maurin, M.,
- Etienne, J. and Jarraud, S. 2006. Quantitative real-time Legionella PCR for
- 659 environmental water samples: data interpretation. Applied and environmental
- 660 microbiology 72(4), 2801-2808.
- Lee, J.V., Lai, S., Exner, M., Lenz, J., Gaia, V., Casati, S., Hartemann, P., Lück, C., Pangon, B.,
- 662 Ricci, M.L., Scaturro, M., Fontana, S., Sabria, M., Sánchez, I., Assaf, S. and Surman-Lee,
- S. 2011. An international trial of quantitative PCR for monitoring Legionella in artificial
 water systems. J Appl Microbiol 110(4), 1032-1044.
- Lizana, X., López, A., Benito, S., Agustí, G., Ríos, M., Piqué, N., Marqués, A. and Codony, F.
- 666 2017. Viability qPCR, a new tool for Legionella risk management. International Journal
 667 of Hygiene and Environmental Health 220(8), 1318-1324.
- Mapili, K., Pieper, K., Dai, D., Pruden, A., Edwards, M., Tang, M. and Rhoads, W. 2020.
- Legionella pneumophila occurrence in drinking water supplied by private wells. Lettersin applied microbiology 70(4), 232-240.
- 671 McBride, G.B., Stott, R., Miller, W., Bambic, D. and Wuertz, S. 2013. Discharge-based QMRA
- 672 for estimation of public health risks from exposure to stormwater-borne pathogens in
- 673 recreational waters in the United States. Water research.

674	Morio E	Corvec S	Caroff N	Le Gallou E	Drugeon F	I and Revnaud	A 2008	Real_time
0/4	МОПО. Г.	. Corvec. S	Calon. N.	Le Ganou. Г	Diugeon. r	1. and Keynauu. I	1 . 2000.	Real-unie

- 675 PCR assay for the detection and quantification of Legionella pneumophila in
- 676 environmental water samples: utility for daily practice. International Journal of Hygiene
- 677 and Environmental Health 211(3-4), 403-411.
- National Academies of Sciences, E. and Medicine (2020) Management of Legionella in water
- 679 systems, National Academies Press.
- 680 Nisar, M.A., Ross, K.E., Brown, M.H., Bentham, R., Best, G. and Whiley, H. 2023. Detection
- and quantification of viable but non-culturable Legionella pneumophila from water
- samples using flow cytometry-cell sorting and quantitative PCR. Frontiers in
- 683 Microbiology 14, 32.
- Olsson, U. 2005. Confidence intervals for the mean of a log-normal distribution. Journal of
 Statistics Education 13(1).
- 686 Omiccioli, E., Schiavano, G.F., Ceppetelli, V., Amagliani, G., Magnani, M. and Brandi, G.
- 687 2015. Validation according to ISO/TS 12869: 2012 of a molecular method for the
- isolation and quantification of Legionella spp. in water. Molecular and cellular probes29(2), 86-91.
- 690 Page, M.J., McKenzie, J.E., Bossuyt, P.M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T.C., Mulrow, C.D.,
- 691 Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J.M., Akl, E.A. and Brennan, S.E. 2021. The PRISMA 2020
- statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. International journal ofsurgery 88, 105906.
- 694 Phin, N., Parry-Ford, F., Harrison, T., Stagg, H.R., Zhang, N., Kumar, K., Lortholary, O., Zumla,
- A. and Abubakar, I. 2014. Epidemiology and clinical management of Legionnaires'
- disease. The Lancet infectious diseases 14(10), 1011-1021.

- 697 Quintero, A. and Lesaffre, E. 2018. Comparing hierarchical models via the marginalized
 698 deviance information criterion. Stat Med 37(16), 2440-2454.
- 699 Schmidt, P.J., Acosta, N., Chik, A.H., D'Aoust, P.M., Delatolla, R., Dhiyebi, H.A., Glier, M.B.,
- 700 Hubert, C.R., Kopetzky, J. and Mangat, C.S. 2023. Realizing the value in "non-
- standard" parts of the qPCR standard curve by integrating fundamentals of quantitative
- microbiology. Frontiers in microbiology 14, 1048661.
- Simard, M.-C. and Doyer, G. (2022) REWAS 2022: Developing Tomorrow's Technical Cycles
 (Volume I), pp. 427-434, Springer.
- 705 Sylvestre, É., Dorner, S., Burnet, J.-B., Smeets, P., Medema, G., Cantin, P., Villion, M., Robert,
- C., Ellis, D. and Servais, P. 2021. Changes in Escherichia coli to enteric protozoa ratios
 in rivers: Implications for risk-based assessment of drinking water treatment
- requirements. Water research 205, 117707.
- 709 Toplitsch, D., Platzer, S., Pfeifer, B., Hautz, J., Mascher, F. and Kittinger, C. 2018. Legionella
- 710 detection in environmental samples as an example for successful implementation of
- 711 qPCR. Water 10(8), 1012.
- Viechtbauer, W. 2010. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. Journal of
 statistical software 36(3), 1-48.
- Villari, P., Motti, E., Farullo, C. and Torre, I. 1998. Comparison of conventional culture and
 PCR methods for the detection of Legionella pneumophila in water. Letters in applied
- 716 microbiology 27(2), 106-110.
- Whiley, H. and Taylor, M. 2014. *Legionella* detection by culture and qPCR: Comparing apples
 and oranges. Critical Reviews in Microbiology, 1-10.

- 719 Yáñez, M.A., Nocker, A., Soria-Soria, E., Múrtula, R., Martínez, L. and Catalán, V. 2011.
- 720 Quantification of viable Legionella pneumophila cells using propidium monoazide
- 721 combined with quantitative PCR. Journal of Microbiological Methods 85(2), 124-130.