

ANNUAL SUMMARY OF OUTBREAKS IN NEW ZEALAND 2017

PREPARED FOR:Ministry of HealthCLIENT REPORT No:FW18037PREPARED BY:Health Intelligence GroupPUBLISHED:3 September 2019

This report is available at <u>www.surv.esr.cri.nz</u>

Published: 3 September 2019

Suggested citation:

Institute of Environmental Science and Research Ltd (ESR). Annual Summary of Outbreaks in New Zealand 2017. ESR; 2018.

ISSN: 1176-3485 Client Report FW18037

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared by the Health Intelligence Group of the Institute of Environmental Science and Research Ltd as part of a Ministry of Health contract for scientific services. The production of this report was led by Shevaun Paine.

This report could not have been produced without the continued support of staff in the public health services who provide data from their regions.

Thanks to the following people for their contributions to this report:

- Joanne Hewitt for the norovirus section;
- Mehnaz Adan and Charlotte Gilkison for producing the map;
- Liza Lopez for data checking;
- Andrea McNeill and Yvonne Galloway for peer review.

DISCLAIMER

This report or document ("the Report") is given by the Institute of Environmental Science and Research Limited ("ESR") solely for the benefit of the Ministry of Health, Public Health Services Providers and other Third Party Beneficiaries as defined in the Contract between ESR and the Ministry of Health, and is strictly subject to the conditions laid out in that Contract.

Neither ESR nor any of its employees makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for use of the Report or its contents by any other person or organisation.



CONTENTS

Summary 1
Introduction
Methods 4
Outbreak definition4
Data sources 4
Norovirus outbreaks
Data analysis5
Data limitations5
Results
Characteristics of outbreaks6
Distribution of outbreaks by public health unit6
Multi-regional gastrointestinal outbreaks and other outbreaks of national significance7
Causal agents
Norovirus outbreaks – genotypes and outbreak setting
Hospitalisations and deaths12
Outbreak settings 14
Modes of transmission15
Foodborne outbreaks
Person-to-person outbreaks
Waterborne outbreaks
Environmental outbreaks21
Zoonotic outbreaks22
sexual contact outbreaks22
Time trends 2008–2017
Glossary
References
Appendix
Outbreak Report Form

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Number and rate of outbreaks per 100,000 population by PHU, 2017	. 7
Figure 2. NRL-confirmed norovirus outbreaks by month and genotype, 2017	10
Figure 3. NRL-confirmed norovirus outbreaks by setting and genotype, 2017	11
Figure 4. Outbreaks and associated cases per 100,000 by year, 2008–2017	23
Figure 5. Percentage of outbreaks by pathogen or condition and year, 2008–2017	24

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Number and rate of outbreaks and associated cases by PHU Office, 20176
Table 2. Outbreaks and associated cases by pathogen, 20179
Table 3. Hospitalised outbreak cases and total outbreak cases by pathogen or condition, 2017
Table 4. Outbreaks and associated cases by setting of exposure/transmission, 2017 14
Table 5. Outbreaks and associated cases by mode of transmission, 2017
Table 6. Foodborne outbreaks and associated cases by pathogen or condition, 2017 16
Table 7. Foodborne outbreaks and associated cases by setting of food preparation, 2017. 17
Table 8. Person-to-person outbreaks and associated cases by pathogen or condition,2017
Table 9. Waterborne outbreaks and associated cases by pathogen, 2017
Table 10. Environmental outbreaks and associated cases by pathogen or condition, 2017 21
Table 11. Zoonotic outbreaks and associated cases by pathogen or condition, 2017 22



ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
DHB	District health board
ESR	Institute of Environmental Science and Research Ltd.
FBVE	Foodborne Viruses in Europe
NRL	Norovirus Reference Laboratory
PHU	Public Health Unit
RSV	Respiratory syncytial virus
STEC	Shiga toxin-producing Escherichia coli



SUMMARY

This report summarises data on outbreaks that were reported to the Institute of Environmental Science and Research Limited (ESR) during 2017.

Key findings were:

Outbreaks and associated case rates increased slightly in 2017

There was a non-significant increase in reported outbreaks (▲5.3%, 644 outbreaks) and cases associated with outbreaks (▲8.6%, 11,963 cases) compared with 2016 (610 outbreaks involving 11,012 cases). A total of 195 (3.2%) outbreak-associated cases were hospitalised (194 in 2016, 2.6%) and 21 cases died (10 cases in 2016).

The number of outbreaks per 100,000 population increased to 13.4 outbreaks per 100,000 population from 13.0 in 2016 and 12.2 in 2015, but was the third lowest rate reported since 2008 (10.5 outbreaks). Hawke's Bay, Otago and Wellington reported the highest outbreak rate per 100,000 population (23.7, 22.8 and 22.6 respectively), almost twice the national rate.

The national rate of outbreak-associated cases was higher in 2017 (249.6 per 100,000 population) than in 2016 (234.6) and 2015 (185.3) but remained lower than the rate reported in 2009 (250.4) and 2014 (328.7).

Enteric agents most common cause of outbreaks

As in previous years, enteric agents were implicated as the cause in the vast majority (88.0%) of outbreaks, with the most common causes reported as norovirus (40.5%), Cryptosporidium (4.2%) and Giardia (3.7%). Over half of the cases associated with all outbreaks in 2017 were caused by norovirus (54.5%).

The most commonly reported non-enteric agents were influenza and influenza-like illness which accounted for 5.3% of outbreaks, 6.4% of associated cases and 10 deaths, followed by Bordetella pertussis which accounted for 3.1% of outbreaks.

The non-enteric agent associated with the highest proportion of outbreak-associated cases in 2017 was mumps (9.9%, 1190/11,963).

Hospitalisations and deaths

In 2017, there were 69 outbreaks where cases were hospitalised. A total of 195 hospitalisations were reported among the 1100 associated cases. The largest number of hospitalisations was due to norovirus (91 hospitalisations, 17.0% of cases). The pathogens or conditions with the highest proportion of hospitalised cases were neurotoxin (100.0%, 3/3 cases) and typhoid fever (76.9%, 20/26 cases), followed by paratyphoid fever (72.7%, 8/11 cases).

Twenty-one deaths were associated with 10 different outbreaks in 2017. The deaths were associated with norovirus (10), influenza A (8), influenza-like illness (2) and typhoid fever (1). A pathogen was not identified in two deaths where an influenza-like illness was reported.



Long-term care facilities the most common outbreak setting

Long-term care facilities (42.8%), childcare centres (18.3%) and private homes (11.3%) continued to be the most common settings for outbreaks. The highest numbers of cases associated with outbreaks were reported from long-term care facilities (49.2%), childcare centres (16.2%) and workplaces (10.2%).

Person-to-person the most common mode of transmission

In 2017, 85.2% of outbreaks recorded person-to-person as a mode of transmission, the majority of these as the primary mode, followed by foodborne (9.5%) and environmental (9.2%) transmission. Multiple modes of transmission were implicated in 12.1% of outbreaks.

Norovirus, campylobacter and salmonella the most implicated pathogens in foodborne outbreaks

Norovirus (27.9%), Campylobacter and Salmonella (6.6% each) were the pathogens most commonly associated with foodborne outbreaks in 2017. Since 2008, norovirus has been the most implicated pathogen in foodborne outbreaks.

Trends remain the same as previous years

The 2017 outbreaks showed continuing trends:

1. an increase in outbreaks in institutional settings and decrease in outbreaks linked to commercial food operators

More than three-quarters of reported outbreaks (75.6%) in 2017 were in institutions, a further increase from previous years. Since 2007, institutional outbreaks have accounted for around half of the outbreaks reported each year. Prior to 2007, commercial food operators and private homes were the most commonly reported settings

The proportion of outbreaks set in childcare centres and schools increased in 2017 compared with 2008-2017.

2. an increase in outbreaks associated with person-to-person transmission.

Over the 2008–2017 period an increase in outbreaks involving person-to-person transmission has been reported. This increase could be partly explained by:

- increasing numbers of people living in long-term care facilities due to the ageing population, and increasing numbers of children attending early childhood education facilities due to the funded 20 hours of early childcare introduced in 2007; and
- the introduction of national guidelines for the management of norovirus outbreaks in hospitals and elderly care institutions [1] in early 2009, which may have led to increased reporting of outbreaks.

Foodborne transmission was the most commonly reported mode of transmission prior to 2007.



INTRODUCTION

This report summarises data on outbreaks that were reported to the Institute of Environmental Science and Research Limited (ESR) during 2017.

Outbreak surveillance in New Zealand has been conducted by ESR on behalf of the Ministry of Health since 1996. The outbreak surveillance system collects data on disease outbreaks reported by public health units (PHUs). Since 1997, the outbreak surveillance system has been incorporated as a module within EpiSurv, the national notifiable disease database.

Investigating outbreaks provides information to [2]:

- halt an outbreak and prevent further illness;
- prevent further outbreaks from the immediate source;
- prevent further outbreaks from other similar sources;
- address public concerns;
- involve the public in disease control;
- reduce direct and indirect costs;
- identify new mechanisms of transmission of known illnesses;
- identify new or emerging disease agents;
- satisfy legal and international obligations;
- · improve investigation methods; and
- improve public health training.



METHODS

OUTBREAK DEFINITION

The Guidelines for the Investigation and Control of Disease Outbreaks [2] state that the following types of outbreaks should be reported:

- two or more cases linked to a common source, in particular where the common source is exposure at a common event, food or water dispersed in the community, an environmental source, or a source in an institutional setting;
- a community-wide or person-to-person outbreak (except when the source has become well-established as a national epidemic and reporting it as a discrete event no longer serves a useful purpose);
- any other situation where outbreak investigation or control measures are being used or considered. This situation would include a single detected case of an illness that is exotic to New Zealand or has been eradicated (eg, a locally acquired case of dengue fever, poliomyelitis).

Outbreak reporting is encouraged for:

- a secondary case in an institution;
- household outbreaks—if there is a reasonable possibility that the outbreak resulted from a common source exposure for that household group.

Outbreak reporting is not usually required for:

- most secondary cases— with a few exceptions to this (eg measles, pertussis), and where person-to-person spread of a foodborne illness originating from a common source has occurred; Secondary cases should be identified on the outbreak report form.
- single cases where a specific contaminated source is identified.

DATA SOURCES

Outbreaks are reported to, or identified by, local PHUs. Each PHU records data on outbreaks on a standardised outbreak report form within EpiSurv. PHUs are encouraged to enter data initially as an interim report that can be finalised when further data becomes available. Data is collated and analysed by ESR on behalf of the Ministry of Health. National data is supplemented by data from ESR's Enteric Reference Laboratory, and Virology and Public Health Laboratories. If an outbreak is first identified by these laboratories, the appropriate PHU is asked to complete an outbreak report form.

The outbreak report form has the following sections:

- reporting authority (outbreak report date and interim or final report);
- condition and implicated pathogen, toxin or chemical (name of implicated agent and case definitions);
- outbreak demographics (number of cases, outbreak dates, age/sex of cases, incubation period and duration of illness);

- circumstances of exposure/transmission (means of outbreak recognition, setting, geographic location, mode of transmission and vehicle/source evidence);
- factors contributing to the outbreak (specific factors relating to foodborne, waterborne, person-to-person contact and environmental outbreaks);
- management of the outbreak (control measures undertaken).

The terms used in the outbreak report form are defined in a glossary at the end of this report. The form can be found at: https://surv.esr.cri.nz/episurv/CaseReportForms/Outbreak-Oct2010.pdf and in the appendix of this report.

NOROVIRUS OUTBREAKS

Norovirus genotyping is carried out in the Norovirus Reference Laboratory (NRL) at ESR. Phylogenetic analysis is used for genotyping. The Norovirus Automated Genotyping Tool is used to identify the norovirus genotype using sequences from the GenBank database and the Foodborne viruses in Europe network [3].

The number of outbreaks reported to the NRL differs from the number recorded in EpiSurv (and therefore reported elsewhere in this report), because not all specimens from the norovirus outbreaks reported in EpiSurv are sent to ESR for genotyping and not all gastroenteritis outbreaks caused by norovirus are reported as norovirus outbreaks in EpiSurv.

DATA ANALYSIS

This report contains an analysis of outbreak data reported between 1 January and 31 December 2017, and recorded on the EpiSurv database as at 16 April 2018. Any amendments made to outbreak data after 16 April 2018 are not reflected in this report. Outbreaks reported at the end of the period may not have been finalised by the cut-off date. This means that the number of cases reported here may differ from that reported in the Notifiable Diseases in New Zealand Annual Report 2017 [4].

Rates were calculated using national and PHU population figures based on Statistics New Zealand mid-year population estimates for 2017. Tests for statistical significance were calculated using the two-tailed test for difference in proportions (Fisher's exact).

DATA LIMITATIONS

The data is restricted to outbreaks recorded in EpiSurv. Outbreaks are more likely to be reported if they involve unusual pathogens, notifiable diseases, a large number of cases or a well-defined setting. The differing availability of resources among PHUs may also impact on outbreak investigation and reporting at a regional level. The source of many reported outbreaks remains in the suspected category, as no confirmatory evidence has been found. For these reasons, caution is advised when interpreting the information contained in this report.

This report does not include details about outbreaks of lead absorption (2 outbreaks) reported into EpiSurv in 2017. Responsibility for the collection and reporting of lead absorption, chemical poisoning from the environment and hazardous substance notifications transferred from ESR to the Centre for Public Health Research, Massey University, in January 2013.

CHARACTERISTICS OF OUTBREAKS

There were 644 reported outbreaks (13.4 outbreaks per 100,000 population) in 2017, an increase from the 610 (13.0 outbreaks per 100,000 population) reported in 2016. All but two of the outbreaks were recorded as final reports. A total of 11,963 cases were associated with outbreaks; 36.6% (4377/11,963) of the cases were either clinically or laboratory confirmed and 63.4% (7586/11,963) were probable cases. In 2017, the national rate was 249.6 outbreak-associated cases per 100,000 population, higher than the rate in 2016 (235.1 cases per 100,000 population).

DISTRIBUTION OF OUTBREAKS BY PUBLIC HEALTH UNIT

In 2017, Auckland PHU had the highest proportion of outbreaks (22.7%, 146/644) and cases (22.8%, 2727/11,963) reported followed by Wellington PHU (18.0%, 116/644 and 18.6%, 2230/11,963 respectively) (Table 1). Hawke's Bay PHU reported the highest outbreak rate (23.7 per 100,000 population) and Whanganui reported the highest outbreak-associated case rate (535.4 per 100,000 population) (Table 1, Figure 1).

		Outbreaks			Cases	
PHU Office	Total	% of outbreaks (n=644)	Outbreak rate ¹	Total	% of cases (n=11,963)	Case rate ¹
Northland	17	2.6	9.7	391	3.3	223.1
Auckland ²	146	22.7	8.7	2727	22.8	162.8
Waikato	50	7.8	12.2	1026	8.6	250.6
Bay of Plenty	26	4.0	11.2	308	2.6	133.0
Rotorua	18	2.8	16.4	203	1.7	185.0
Taranaki	17	2.6	14.4	220	1.8	186.3
Hawke's Bay	39	6.1	23.7	833	7.0	506.2
Gisborne	6	0.9	12.4	144	1.2	296.9
Whanganui	8	1.2	12.8	335	2.8	535.4
Manawatu	31	4.8	18.5	677	5.7	403.1
Wellington ³	116	18.0	22.6	2230	18.6	433.9
Nelson Marlborough⁴	26	4.0	17.4	390	3.3	261.7
West Coast	6	0.9	18.5	81	0.7	250.2
Canterbury	73	11.3	14.1	1341	11.2	259.9
South Canterbury	2	0.3	2.1	36	0.3	38.4
Otago	43	6.7	22.8	796	6.7	421.9
Southland	20	3.1	14.8	225	1.9	166.0
Total	644	100	13.4	11963	100	249.6

Table 1. Number and rate of outbreaks and associated cases by PHU Office, 2017

¹ Crude rate of outbreaks per 100,000 population is calculated using Statistics New Zealand population estimates for 2017.

² Auckland PHU covers the Tāmaki Makaurau-Auckland health district.

³ Includes Wellington, Hutt and Wairarapa health districts.

⁴ Includes both Nelson and Blenheim offices.



MULTI-REGIONAL GASTROINTESTINAL OUTBREAKS AND OTHER OUTBREAKS OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

Monitoring of gastrointestinal outbreaks is undertaken at a national and local level. Where a multi-regional outbreak is suspected, ESR conducts epidemiological and microbiological investigations in conjunction with affected PHUs. The Ministry of Health is also involved in the investigation and response and, if the outbreak is likely to be foodborne, the Ministry for Primary Industries is also involved.

In 2017, there were no multi-regional gastrointestinal outbreaks investigated at the national level. However, a national outbreak of pertussis began in October 2017 and an outbreak of mumps involving multiple DHBs which began in September 2016 continued throughout 2017.



CAUSAL AGENTS

A causal agent or condition^{*} was identified in 70.3% (453/644) of outbreaks, involving 79.6% (9525/11,963) of all outbreak-associated cases. In 16 of these outbreaks, two or more causal agents were identified. No specific pathogen or condition was identified in the remaining 191 outbreaks, all of which were recorded as gastroenteritis.

As with previous years, enteric agents were implicated in the majority of outbreaks (88.0%, 567/644) and accounted for the majority of associated cases (82.1%, 9816/11,963) (Table 2). Norovirus (40.5%, 261/644) was the most common causal agent implicated in outbreaks in 2017. Norovirus outbreaks also had the highest proportion of associated cases (54.5%, 6517/11,963). For the enteric pathogens with more than one outbreak-associated, rotavirus had the highest median number of cases associated with each outbreak (20.5 cases).

Non-enteric agents accounted for 12.0% (77/644) of outbreaks and 17.9% (2147/11,963) of the outbreak-associated cases in 2017 (Table 2). The most frequently reported non-enteric pathogens and conditions were influenza and influenza-like-illness (5.3% of outbreaks, 34/644) followed by *Bordetella pertussis* (3.1% of outbreaks, 20/644). Outbreaks due to influenza and influenza-like illnesses also had the highest median number of cases associated with an outbreak (20 cases). Outbreaks due to the mumps virus had the highest proportion of associated cases (9.9%, 1190/11,963).

^{*} Includes outbreaks of acute respiratory infection and influenza-like-illness where no specific pathogens were identified.



		Outbreaks	Cases ¹		
Pathogen or condition	Total	% of outbreaks (n=644)	Median cases per outbreak	Total	% of cases (n=11,963)
Enteric	567	88.0	12	9,816	82.1
Norovirus	261	40.5	20	6517	54.5
Cryptosporidium spp.	27	4.2	4	184	1.5
<i>Giardia</i> spp.	24	3.7	3.5	170	1.4
Sapovirus	15	2.3	11	233	1.9
Salmonella spp. ²	13	2.0	2	40	0.3
STEC infection ³	11	1.7	3	197	1.6
Shigella spp.	8	1.2	4	32	0.3
Campylobacter spp.	7	1.1	5	31	0.3
Hepatitis A	5	0.8	3	20	0.2
Rotavirus	4	0.6	20.5	96	0.8
Adenovirus	2	0.3	27	54	0.5
Ciguatera fish poisoning	2	0.3	15.5	31	0.3
Histamine (scombroid) fish poisoning	2	0.3	3.5	7	0.1
Paratyphoid fever	2	0.3	7	14	0.1
Staphylococcus aureus	2	0.3	6	12	0.1
Typhoid fever	2	0.3	13	26	0.2
Astrovirus	1	0.2	7	7	0.1
Clostridium difficile	1	0.2	13	13	0.1
Neurotoxin	1	0.2	3	3	0.0
Vibrio fluvialis	1	0.2	27	27	0.2
Yersinia spp.	1	0.2	5	5	0.0
Pathogen not identified ⁴	191	29.7	10	2438	20.4
Non-enteric	77	12.0	9	2147	17.9
Influenza and influenza-like illness⁵	34	5.3	20	765	6.4
Bordetella pertussis	20	3.1	5	160	1.3
Mumps virus	14	2.2	5	1190	9.9
Mycobacterium tuberculosis	3	0.5	2	10	0.1
Measles virus	3	0.5	2	11	0.1
Invasive pneumococcal disease	1	0.2	5	5	0.0
Varicella zoster virus	1	0.2	3	3	0.0
Leptospira spp.	1	0.2	3	3	0.0

Table 2. Outbreaks and associated cases by pathogen, 2017

¹ More than one agent was reported in 16 outbreaks, therefore the numbers don't add up to the group totals.

² Includes non-typhoidal Salmonella species only. Outbreaks of S. Typhi and S. Paratyphi are reported separately.

³ One outbreak involving 157 cases originally reported as STEC infection was later determined to be caused by an atypical enteropathogenic E. coli (EPEC).

⁴ All enteric outbreaks with no identified pathogen were recorded as gastroenteritis.

⁵ Includes outbreaks of influenza A (16 outbreaks with 383 cases), influenza B (6 outbreaks, 67 cases), influenza-like illness (6 outbreaks, 163 cases), acute respiratory infection (4 outbreaks, 98 cases), influenza not otherwise specified (1 outbreak, 24 cases), influenza A and RSV (1 outbreak, 30 cases).

NOROVIRUS OUTBREAKS - GENOTYPES AND OUTBREAK SETTING

In 2017, there were 239 norovirus outbreaks confirmed by the NRL. This is an increase from 2015 and 2016 (184 and 188 outbreaks respectively). The highest number of outbreaks occurred in October (42 outbreaks) and the lowest numbers occurred in March and April (6 and 5 outbreaks respectively) (Figure 2).



Figure 2. NRL-confirmed norovirus outbreaks by month and genotype, 2017

The majority (63.6%, 152/239) of norovirus outbreaks confirmed by the NRL occurred in long-term care facilities. Outbreaks were also associated with childcare centres (12.1%, 29/239), acute-care hospitals (10.9%, 26/239), commercial food operators (5.0%, 12/239), schools (2.5%, 6/239) and private homes (1.7%, 4/239). Other settings were reported in 10 outbreaks (Figure 3).





Figure 3. NRL-confirmed norovirus outbreaks by setting and genotype, 2017

Norovirus genogroup II (GII) was identified in 77.8% (186/239) of outbreaks, and norovirus genogroup I (GI) was identified in 21.3% (51/239) of outbreaks. Both GI and GII were identified in 0.8% (2/239) of outbreaks.

The norovirus genotype was determined for 99.6% (238/239) of NRL-confirmed outbreaks. One norovirus GII was unable to be genotyped. GII.4 was the most common genotype identified and was associated with 55.0% (131/238) of genotyped outbreaks (including two mixed GI and GII outbreaks). In 2017, three GII.4 variants were identified. The variant in one GII.4 outbreak was not determined. The most common GII.4 variant identified was GII.P16/GII.4 (103 outbreaks). This was an increase from 2016 when 19 GII.P16/GII.4 outbreaks associated were identified. The other GII.4 variants identified were New Orleans_2009/Sydney 2012 (14 outbreaks) and the Sydney 2012 variant (13 outbreaks). In total, seven GI genotypes and ten GII genotypes (as defined by typing of the viral capsid) were identified. The second most common genotype identified in 2017 was GI.3 (12.2%, 29/238), followed by GII.P16/GII.2 (7.6%, 18/238), GI.6 (6.3%, 15/238) and GII.6 (5.9%, 14/238). Less commonly identified genotypes included GII.P17/GII.17 (2.1%, 5/238), GII.P7/GII.14 (1.7%, 4/238) and GII.P16/GII.13 (1.3%, 3/238).

Each norovirus outbreak setting was associated with a variety of norovirus genotypes (Figure 3). However, the majority of norovirus outbreaks in acute-care hospitals and longterm care facilities were due to GII.4 (80.8%, 21/26 and 60.3%, 91/151 respectively), compared with a lower proportion (31.1%, 19/61) for other settings.



HOSPITALISATIONS AND DEATHS

Hospitalisation information was recorded for 58.4% (376/644) of outbreaks involving 51.5% (6164/11,963) of associated cases. Of these outbreak-associated cases, 3.2% (195/6164) were hospitalised (Table 3). A higher percentage of cases associated with enteric outbreaks were hospitalised (19.7%, 160/811 cases) compared with non-enteric outbreaks (12.1%, 35/289 cases). The enteric pathogen or condition with the highest proportion of hospitalised cases was neurotoxin (100.0%, 3/3 cases), followed by typhoid fever (76.9%, 20/26) and paratyphoid fever (72.7%, 8/11 cases). Of the non-enteric pathogens and conditions, Mycobacterium tuberculosis (87.5%, 7/8 cases) represented the highest proportion of hospitalised cases, followed by Leptospira spp. (66.7%, 2/3 cases).

Twenty-one deaths were associated with 10 different outbreaks in 2017. The deaths were associated with norovirus (10), influenza A (8) and typhoid fever (1). A pathogen was not identified in two deaths where an influenza-like illness was reported.



Table 3. Hospitalised outbreak cases and total outbreak cases by pathogen or condition, 2017

	Outbreaks ¹		Cases ¹			
Pathogen or condition	Total	Total	No. of cases hospitalised ²	% of cases hospitalised		
Enteric	52	811	160	19.7		
Norovirus	21	534	91	17.0		
Typhoid fever	2	26	20	76.9		
Paratyphoid fever	1	11	8	72.7		
Shigella spp.	3	14	7	50.0		
Salmonella spp. ³	4	19	6	31.6		
Cryptosporidium spp.	3	10	3	30.0		
Giardia spp.	3	46	3	6.5		
Hepatitis A	2	13	3	23.1		
Histamine (scombroid) fish poisoning	2	7	3	42.9		
Neurotoxin	1	3	3	100.0		
STEC infection	3	22	3	13.6		
Rotavirus	2	56	2	3.6		
Adenovirus	1	32	1	3.1		
Campylobacter spp,	1	3	1	33.3		
Pathogen not identified ⁴	7	111	10	9.0		
Non-enteric	17	289	35	12.1		
Influenza and influenza-like-illness ⁵	8	218	18	8.3		
Mycobacterium tuberculosis	3	8	7	87.5		
Bordetella pertussis	3	16	4	25.0		
Leptospira spp.	1	3	2	66.7		
Measles virus	1	7	1	14.3		
Chickenpox	1	3	1	33.3		
Total	69	1100	195	17.7		

¹ More than one enteric agent was reported in four outbreaks, therefore the numbers don't add up to the group totals.

² Hospitalisation information was recorded for 58.4% (376/644) of outbreaks, relating to 51.5% (6164/11,963) of cases. Only outbreaks where one or more hospitalisations were recorded were included in the table (69 outbreaks involving 1100 cases).

³ Includes non-typhoidal Salmonella species only. Outbreaks of S. Typhi and S. Paratyphi are reported separately.

⁴ All enteric outbreaks with no identified pathogen were recorded as gastroenteritis.

⁵ Includes outbreaks of influenza A (6 outbreaks with 191 cases), influenza B (2 outbreaks, 27 cases) and influenza-like illness (1 outbreak, 34 cases).



OUTBREAK SETTINGS

The most common outbreak settings recorded were long-term care facilities (40.5%, 261/644) followed by childcare centres (18.3%, 118/644) and private homes (10.7%, 69/644). Outbreaks in long-term care facilities had the highest number of associated cases (5882) (Table 4). Overall, 75.6% (487/644) of all outbreaks and 80.2% (9589/11,963) of cases reported in 2017 were set in institutions. The setting was unknown in 2.6% (17/644) of outbreaks.

	Outb	reaks ¹	Cases ¹	
Outbreak setting	Total	% of outbreaks (n=644)	Total	% of cases (n=11,963)
Institutions	487	75.6	9589	80.2
Long-term care facility	261	40.5	5882	49.2
Childcare centre	118	18.3	1934	16.2
Hospital (acute-care)	40	6.2	548	4.6
School	28	4.3	644	5.4
Hostel/boarding house	8	1.2	133	1.1
Hotel/motel	6	0.9	86	0.7
Camp	4	0.6	99	0.8
Marae	4	0.6	45	0.4
Prison	1	0.2	5	0.0
Other institution	19	3.0	239	2.0
Commercial food operators	41	6.4	304	2.5
Restaurant/café/bakery	25	3.9	194	1.6
Fast food restaurant	4	0.6	12	0.1
Takeaway	4	0.6	8	0.1
Caterer	3	0.5	69	0.6
Supermarket/delicatessen	3	0.5	15	0.1
Temporary or mobile service	1	0.2	3	0.0
Other food outlet	3	0.5	14	0.1
Workplace	16	2.5	1143	9.6
Workplace	14	2.2	1216	10.2
Farm	6	0.9	19	0.2
Other	88	13.7	845	7.1
Private home	69	10.7	246	2.1
Aeroplane / cruise ship	5	0.8	458	3.8
Community/church or sports gathering	3	0.5	35	0.3
Petting zoo	1	0.2	2	0.0
Other setting	17	2.6	161	1.3
Unknown setting	17	2.6	190	1.6

¹ More than one setting was recorded in 20 outbreaks, therefore the numbers don't add up to the group totals.



MODES OF TRANSMISSION

In 2017, the most commonly reported mode of transmission was person-to-person (85.2%, 549/644 outbreaks), followed by foodborne (9.5% 61/644) and environmental (9.2%, 59/644) (Table 5). Person-to-person transmission also accounted for the highest percentage of associated cases (92.0%, 11,000/11,963), followed by environmental transmission (11.3%, 1352/11,963). The mode of transmission was unknown for 3.9% (28 outbreaks).

		Outbre	Cases			
Mode of transmission	Primary mode	Secondary mode	Total	% of outbreaks (n=644) ¹	Total	% of cases (n=11,963) ¹
Person-to-person	478	71	549	85.2	11,000	92.0
Foodborne	54	7	61	9.5	719	6.0
Environmental	7	52	59	9.2	1352	11.3
Zoonotic	11	2	13	2.0	46	0.4
Waterborne	9	2	11	1.7	32	0.3
Sexual contact	1	0	1	0.2	4	0.0
Other	4	1	5	0.8	99	0.8
Unknown	28	-	28	3.9	226	1.9

Table 5. Outbreaks and associated cases by mode of transmission, 2017

¹ More than one mode of transmission was recorded for 78 outbreaks therefore the totals add up to more than 100%. Note: No outbreaks with vectorborne or parenteral transmission were reported in 2017.



FOODBORNE OUTBREAKS

Causal agent

Of the 61 foodborne outbreaks reported in 2017 (with 719 associated cases), 68.9% (42/61 outbreaks) were linked to a pathogen or condition (Table 6). Pathogens most commonly associated with foodborne outbreaks were norovirus (27.9%, 17/61 outbreaks), Campylobacter spp. and Salmonella spp. (6.6%, 4/61 outbreaks each). Enteric viruses (norovirus and hepatitis A) were implicated in 31.1% (19/61) of the foodborne outbreaks while enteric bacteria (Campylobacter spp., Salmonella spp., Shigella spp., STEC infection, S. aureus and V. fluvialis) were implicated in 24.6% (15/61) of the foodborne outbreaks.

	Outb	reaks	Cases		
Pathogen or condition	Total	% of outbreaks (n=61) ¹	Total	% of cases (n=719) ¹	
Norovirus	17	27.9	308	42.8	
Campylobacter spp.	4	6.6	19	2.6	
Salmonella spp.	4	6.6	15	2.1	
Shigella spp.	3	4.9	17	2.4	
Ciguatera fish poisoning	2	3.3	31	4.3	
Typhoid fever	2	3.3	26	3.6	
Staphylococcus aureus	2	3.3	12	1.7	
Hepatitis A	2	3.3	8	1.1	
Histamine (scombroid) fish poisoning	2	3.3	7	1.0	
STEC infection	1	1.6	157	21.8	
Vibrio fluvialis	1	1.6	27	3.8	
Paratyphoid fever	1	1.6	11	1.5	
Giardia spp.	1	1.6	3	0.4	
Neurotoxin	1	1.6	3	0.4	
Pathogen not identified ²	19	31.1	102	14.2	

Table 6. Foodborne outbreaks and associated cases by pathogen or condition, 2017

¹ More than one agent was reported in two foodborne outbreaks, therefore the totals add up to more than 100%.

² All enteric outbreaks with no identified pathogen were recorded as gastroenteritis.



Setting where contaminated foods/beverages were prepared

The setting where foods and beverages were prepared was recorded in 85.2% (52/61) of foodborne outbreaks and 94.3% (678/719) of associated cases in 2017. The preparation settings most commonly associated with foodborne outbreaks included commercial food operators (50.8%, 31/61) and private homes (13.1%, 8/61) (Table 7). Foodborne outbreaks where the food was prepared on a cruise ship had the highest number of cases (21.8%, 157/719) followed by restaurants, cafés, or bakeries (20.9%, 150/719).

Table 7. Foodborne outbreaks and associated	I cases by setting of food preparation,
2017	

	Ou	tbreaks	C	ases ¹
Preparation setting	Total	% of outbreaks (n=61)	Total	% of cases (n=719)
Commercial food operators	31	50.8	241	33.5
Restaurant/café/bakery	19	31.1	150	20.9
Takeaway	3	4.9	8	1.1
Caterers	2	3.3	35	4.9
Supermarket/delicatessen	2	3.3	9	1.3
Fast food restaurant	2	3.3	5	0.7
Other food outlet	3	4.9	34	4.7
Institutions	10	16.4	246	34.2
School	2	3.3	104	14.5
Long-term care facility	2	3.3	77	10.7
Marae	2	3.3	16	2.2
Hotel/motel	1	1.6	23	3.2
Childcare centre	1	1.6	7	1.0
Acute care hospital	1	1.6	5	0.7
Other institutions	1	1.6	14	1.9
Other	13	21.3	249	34.6
Private home	8	13.1	55	7.6
Overseas manufacturer	2	3.3	31	4.3
Cruise ship	1	1.6	157	21.8
Community/church gathering	1	1.6	5	0.7
Other setting*	1	1.6	1	0.1
Unknown preparation setting	9	14.8	41	5.7

¹ Two preparation settings were recorded in two foodborne outbreaks, therefore the numbers don't add up to the group totals.

² Case was linked to an international outbreak set at a Rainbow festival in Italy. See: https://ecdc.europa.eu/en/news-events/typhoid-fever-outbreak-linked-rainbow-gathering-northern-italy

Additional information on foodborne outbreaks can be found in the Foodborne disease in New Zealand 2017 report [5].



PERSON-TO-PERSON OUTBREAKS

Causal agents

In 2017, there were 549 person-to-person outbreaks (primary and secondary mode of transmission) with 11,000 associated cases. A causal agent was identified in 73.8% (405/549) of these outbreaks. As in 2016, the most common causal agent was norovirus, which was recorded in 44.1% (242/549) of person-to-person outbreaks and involved 56.5% (6219/11,000) of outbreak-associated cases (Table 8). Other common pathogens and conditions included Giardia spp. (3.8%, 21/549) and B. pertussis (3.6%, 20/549). Influenza or influenza-like illness accounted for 34 (6.2%) outbreaks and 765 (7.0%) associated cases. There was also a high number of cases associated with mumps (10.8%, 1190/11,000) in 2017.



Table 8. Person-to-person outbreaks and associated cases by pathogen or condition, 2017

		Outbrea	breaks ¹ Cases				
Pathogen or condition	Primary mode	Secondary mode	Total	% of outbreak s (n=549) ²	Total	% of cases (n=11,000) ²	
Norovirus	211	31	242	44.1	6219	56.5	
Influenza and influenza-like- illness ³	31	3	34	6.2	765	7.0	
Giardia spp.	17	4	21	3.8	160	1.5	
Bordetella pertussis	20	0	20	3.6	160	1.5	
Cryptosporidium spp.	13	5	18	3.3	115	1.0	
Sapovirus	9	6	15	2.7	233	2.1	
Mumps virus	14	0	14	2.6	1190	10.8	
Salmonella spp. ⁴	4	5	9	1.6	31	0.3	
STEC infection	7	1	8	1.5	35	0.3	
Rotavirus	4	0	4	0.7	96	0.9	
Hepatitis A	2	1	3	0.5	12	0.1	
Shigella spp.	1	2	3	0.5	11	0.1	
Measles virus	3	0	3	0.5	11	0.1	
Mycobacterium tuberculosis	3	0	3	0.5	10	0.1	
Adenovirus	2	0	2	0.4	54	0.5	
Campylobacter spp.	1	1	2	0.4	12	0.1	
Clostridium difficile	1	0	1	0.2	13	0.1	
Astrovirus	0	1	1	0.2	7	0.1	
Staphylococcus aureus	0	1	1	0.2	7	0.1	
Invasive pneumococcal disease	1	0	1	0.2	5	0.0	
Yersinia spp.	1	0	1	0.2	5	0.0	
Chicken Pox	1	0	1	0.2	3	0.0	
Pathogen not identified ⁵	144	13	157	28.6	2160	19.6	

¹ Includes outbreaks where person-to-person transmission was either the primary or secondary mode of transmission reported. ² Multiple agents were reported in 15 person-to-person outbreaks, therefore the totals add up to more than 100%.

³ Includes outbreaks of influenza A (16 outbreaks with 383 cases), influenza B (6 outbreaks, 67 cases), influenza-like illness (5 outbreaks, 129 cases), acute respiratory infection (4 outbreaks, 98 cases), influenza not otherwise specified (1 outbreak, 24 cases), influenza A and RSV (1 outbreak, 30 cases).

⁴ Includes non-typhoidal Salmonella species only.

⁵ All enteric outbreaks with no identified pathogen were recorded as gastroenteritis.



WATERBORNE OUTBREAKS

Causal agents

There were 11 waterborne outbreaks with 32 associated cases in 2017. A causal agent was identified in most (90.9%, 10/11) of the outbreaks (Table 9). The most commonly reported waterborne pathogens and conditions were Giardia spp. (27.3%, 3/11 outbreaks), Cryptosporidium spp., Salmonella spp. and Shigella spp. (18.2%, 2/11 outbreaks each).

		Outbr	Cases			
Pathogen or condition	Primary mode	Secondary mode	Total	% of outbreaks (n=11)	Total	% of cases (n=32)
<i>Giardia</i> spp.	2	1	3	27.3	9	28.1
Cryptosporidium spp.	2	0	2	18.2	6	18.8
Salmonella spp. ²	2	0	2	18.2	4	12.5
Shigella spp.	1	1	2	18.2	6	18.8
STEC infection	1	0	1	9.1	3	9.4
Pathogen not identified ²	1	0	1	9.1	4	12.5

Table 9. Waterborne outbreaks and associated cases by pathogen, 2017

¹ Includes outbreaks where waterborne transmission was either the primary or secondary mode of transmission reported.

² Includes non-typhoidal Salmonella species only.

³ All enteric outbreaks with no identified pathogen were recorded as gastroenteritis.

ENVIRONMENTAL OUTBREAKS

Causal agents

There were 59 environmental outbreaks with 1352 associated cases reported in 2017. Of these outbreaks, 79.7% (47/59) were linked to a specific causal agent (Table 10). The most common causal agent identified in environmental outbreaks was norovirus (47.5%, 28/59), followed by Cryptosporidium spp. (10.2%, 6/59). Environmental transmission was the secondary mode reported in all of the norovirus outbreaks. Norovirus also accounted for the highest proportion of associated cases (69.7%, 942/1352) followed by influenza A (7.5%, 101/1352).

Table 10. Environmental outbreaks and associated cases by pathogen or condition,
2017

		Outbi	Cases			
Pathogen or condition	Primary mode	Secondary mode	Total	% of outbreaks (n=59)²	Total	% of cases (n=1352) ²
Norovirus	0	28	28	47.5	942	69.7
Cryptosporidium spp.	2	4	6	10.2	79	5.8
Giardia spp.	3	1	4	6.8	40	3
Influenza A	0	3	3	5.1	101	7.5
Sapovirus	0	2	2	3.4	35	2.6
Campylobacter spp.	0	2	2	3.4	9	0.7
Hepatitis A	1	1	2	3.4	9	0.7
Shigella spp.	0	1	1	1.7	2	0.1
Salmonella spp.	0	1	1	1.7	2	0.1
Pathogen not identified ³	1	11	12	20.3	193	14.3

¹ Includes outbreaks where environmental transmission was either the primary or secondary mode of transmission reported.

² Three pathogens were reported in one environmental outbreak, therefore the totals add up to more than 100%.

³ All enteric outbreaks with no identified pathogen were recorded as gastroenteritis.



ZOONOTIC OUTBREAKS

Causal agents

There were 13 zoonotic outbreaks, with 46 associated cases in 2017. All were linked to a specific pathogen (Table 11). Cryptosporidium spp. was the most commonly identified pathogen and was linked to 53.8% (7/13) of zoonotic outbreaks and 60.9% (28/46) of the associated cases.

Table 11. Zoonotic outbreaks and associated cases by pathogen or condition, 2017

		Outbreaks ¹				Cases	
Pathogen or condition	Primary mode	Secondary mode	Total	% of outbreaks (n=13)	Total	% of cases (n=46)	
Cryptosporidium spp.	7	0	7	53.8	28	60.9	
Campylobacter spp.	1	1	2	15.4	9	19.6	
STEC infection	1	1	2	15.4	4	8.7	
Leptospira spp.	1	0	1	7.7	3	6.5	
Salmonella spp.	1	0	1	7.7	2	4.3	

¹ Includes outbreaks where zoonotic transmission was either the primary or secondary mode of transmission reported.

SEXUAL CONTACT OUTBREAKS

There was one sexual contact outbreak involving four cases in 2017. The outbreak of shigellosis involved contact between men who have sex with men (MSM).



TIME TRENDS 2008–2017

Between 2008 and 2014, both the number of outbreaks per 100,000 population and the number of cases per 100,000 increased overall, although there was variability during that time period. The annual outbreak rate peaked in 2014 (19.1 outbreaks per 100,000 population) and then decreased significantly (p<0.05) in 2015 to 12.2 outbreaks per 100,000. The rate in 2016 (13.0 outbreaks per 100,000) and 2017 (13.4 outbreaks per 100,000) has remained similar to that reported in 2015 (Figure 4). Similarly, the number of outbreak-associated cases per 100,000 peaked in 2014 with 328.8 cases per 100,000 and then decreased to 185.3 per 100,000 in 2015. However, the rate increased significantly in 2016 to 234.6 cases per 100,000 population, which was largely due to the Havelock North campylobacteriosis outbreak (involving 964 cases) reported in August 2016. The case rate in 2017 (249.6 per 100,000) was slightly higher than reported in 2016. A large mumps outbreak involving 1076 cases in Auckland contributed to the elevated rate in 2017.





In 2017, a causal agent was identified in 70.3% of outbreaks which is similar to the previous 10 years (range: 64.8–79.1% per year 2007 to 2016). The causal agent associated with the highest number of outbreaks and associated cases during 2008–2016 was norovirus. In 2017, 261 norovirus outbreaks were reported with 6517 associated cases. The highest number of norovirus outbreaks recorded since reporting began in 1997 occurred in 2014 (326 outbreaks and 9390 cases). Since 2008, norovirus outbreaks have accounted for around a third of outbreaks reported each year, with the exception of 2009 when the proportion was almost half (45.4%, 290/639 outbreaks) (Figure 5).





Figure 5. Percentage of outbreaks by pathogen or condition and year, 2008–2017

The number of rotavirus outbreaks reported each year has significantly decreased since a peak in 2014 (47 outbreaks, 854 cases). In 2017 there were four outbreaks involving 96 cases all set in childcare centres. The decrease follows the introduction of a rotavirus vaccine to the national immunisation schedule in July 2014 [6].

There was a decrease in the number of outbreaks due to STEC infection in 2017 compared to recent years (2017: 11, 2016:16, 2015: 17, 2014:10, 2013: 16 outbreaks). However, the number of outbreaks and associated cases reported annually since 2012 has increased significantly. Between 2006 and 2012 there was an average of four outbreaks and 16 associated cases reported each year. The most commonly reported mode of transmission for STEC outbreaks in 2017 was person-to-person (8 outbreaks, 35 cases).

The number of outbreaks and associated cases due to *Cryptosporidium* spp. was lower in 2017 (27 outbreaks, 184 cases) than in 2016 (34 outbreaks, 191 cases) and was significantly lower than reported in 2013 (99 outbreaks, 550 cases) when outbreaks of *Cryptosporidium* spp. peaked. As with previous years the most commonly reported mode of transmission for *Cryptosporidium* spp. outbreaks in 2017 was person-to-person (18 outbreaks, 115 cases).

The number of outbreaks and associated cases due to *Giardia* spp. was also lower in 2017 (24 outbreaks, 170 cases) than in 2016 (45 outbreaks, 238 cases). The number of outbreaks and associated cases steadily increased between 2007 (21 outbreaks, 111 cases) and 2010 (97 outbreaks, 378 cases) when outbreaks of *Giardia* spp. peaked. The number of outbreaks reported each year from 2015 to 2017 (range: 24–46) is significantly lower than the number of outbreaks reported between 2010 and 2014 (range: 71–97). Similar to *Cryptosporidium* spp. the most commonly reported mode of transmission for *Giardia* spp. outbreaks in 2017 was person-to-person (21 outbreaks, 160 cases).

There were seven outbreaks of *Campylobacter* spp. reported in 2017, the lowest recorded since a peak in 2006 (47 outbreaks). There was a large reduction in the number of outbreaks

of Campylobacter spp. reported in 2007, when numbers reduced by more than half from 2006 (47 outbreaks, 221 cases) to 2007 (21 outbreaks, 60 cases). This decrease was most likely due to interventions put in place in New Zealand in 2006 to reduce the incidence of poultry-associated foodborne campylobacteriosis [7]. The number of outbreaks and associated cases of Campylobacter spp. increased steadily between 2009 (13 outbreaks, 69 cases) and 2014 (35 outbreaks, 241 cases). In 2016, the number of outbreaks reported (16 outbreaks) was the lowest since 2009, while the number of associated cases was the largest since recording began (1014 cases). The Havelock North waterborne outbreak in August 2016 accounted for 967 notified cases. In 2017, more than half (57.1%, 4/7) of the reported *Campylobacter* spp. outbreaks were due to foodborne transmission.

The introduction of more sensitive testing methods in diagnostic laboratories since mid-2015 may have contributed to the increased detection of outbreaks for some enteric diseases. Concurrently, some laboratories have reduced or stopped culturing for some organisms, meaning that outbreak detection through monitoring trends in pathogen subtypes is affected at local and national levels. This means there is greater potential to miss outbreaks or detect them later than would have occurred if all notifiable organisms were available for subtyping.

Outbreaks of other pathogens and conditions that have been reported in recent years include varicella zoster virus (chicken pox) (2014: 2 outbreaks, 45 cases; 2015: 1 outbreak, 22 cases, 2016: 2 outbreaks, 18 cases, 2017: 1 outbreak, 3 cases) and adenovirus (2017: 2 outbreaks; 54 cases). Both outbreaks involving adenovirus also had another enteric pathogen identified (norovirus and Giardia spp.), and were set in institutions.

In 2017, there were three outbreaks of measles reported involving 11 cases, compared to three outbreaks involving 98 cases in 2016. The number of measles outbreaks and associated cases has significantly decreased since 2014 (19 outbreaks, 243 cases) when the largest number of outbreaks was reported. The highest number of cases linked to outbreaks was reported in 2011 when 582 cases were linked to six outbreaks.

The most common outbreak settings in 2017 were long-term care facilities, childcare centres and private homes, similar to 2016. Approximately one fifth (18.3%, 118 outbreaks) of outbreaks were set in childcare centres, which is the highest proportion since recording began (range: 2.4–18.0%). Since 2006, outbreaks in institutions have accounted for around one-half to two-thirds of all outbreaks reported annually, and those in private homes for around one-fifth to one-third. Before 2006, commercial food operators and private homes were the most commonly reported settings.

Since 2006, the most frequently reported mode of transmission for outbreaks has been person-to-person transmission. Prior to this, foodborne transmission was the most frequently reported mode (range: 1998 to 2006 28.3-52.9% of outbreaks per year). Between 2007 and 2016, the proportion of foodborne outbreaks reported each year ranged from 13.3 to 23.1%. In 2017, 9.5% (61 outbreaks) of outbreaks were reported to have foodborne transmission, the lowest proportion since recording began. In 2017, the number of outbreaks with personto-person transmission (85.2%, 549/644) was more than eight times higher than any other mode of transmission. Foodborne transmission was the second most common mode of transmission in 2017 (9.5%, 61 outbreaks) and 2016 (15.6%, 95/610) surpassing environmental transmission which was the second most common mode of transmission reported from 2013 to 2015.



GLOSSARY

Common event outbreak

An outbreak due to the exposure of a group of persons to a noxious influence that is common to the individuals in the group, where the exposure is brief and essentially simultaneous and all resultant cases develop within one incubation period of the disease. Cases therefore have exposures that are grouped in place and time (synonymous with point source outbreak).

Common site outbreak

An outbreak due to the exposure of a group of persons to a noxious influence that is common to the individuals in the group, where exposures have occurred at the same place (or site) but over a longer time period than those of common event outbreaks (ie, grouped in place but not in time).

Common source outbreak

An outbreak due to the exposure of a group of persons in the community to a noxious influence that is common to the individuals in the group. These outbreaks are subcategorised into common event (where exposures are grouped in time and place), dispersed common source (grouped in time but not in place) and common site (grouped in place but not in time).

Community-wide outbreak

An outbreak among individuals in a community where transmission is predominantly by direct exposure of susceptible people to infectious people (synonymous with person-to-person outbreak).

Contamination

The presence of a disease-causing agent on a body surface, in clothes, bedding, toys or other inanimate articles, or substances such as water and food.

Dispersed common source outbreak

Outbreak due to the exposure of a group of persons in the community to a noxious influence that is common to the individuals in the group, where the exposures are not grouped in place (and may or may not be grouped in time). These outbreaks are often due to a distributed vehicle of infection transmission, such as a commercially prepared food item or a water supply.

Environment

All factors that are external to the individual human host.



EpiSurv

The national notifiable disease surveillance system that ESR manages to record data about notifiable diseases and outbreaks reported by public health units.

Exposure

Proximity and/or contact with a potential source of a disease agent in such a manner that effective transmission of the agent and harmful or protective effects of the agent may occur.

Household outbreak

An outbreak confined to members of a single household.

Institutional outbreak

An outbreak confined to the population of a specific residential or other institutional setting, such as a hospital, long-term care facility, prison, childcare centre or school.

Outbreak

Two or more cases of a specific disease or health-related condition linked to a common source, in particular, where the common source is exposure at a common event, or food or water dispersed in a community, an environmental source or a source in an institutional setting; OR a community-wide or person-to-person outbreak; OR any other situation where the outbreak investigation or control measures are being used or considered.

Source (of illness)

The person, animal, object or substance from which a disease agent passes to a host.

Transmission of illness

Any mechanism by which a disease agent is spread through the environment or to another person. Mechanisms are defined as either direct or indirect.

Vehicle

An inanimate intermediate in the indirect transmission of a pathogen from a reservoir or infected host to a susceptible host; vehicles include foods, clothing and instruments.



REFERENCES

- 1. Ministry of Health. 2009. Guidelines for the Management of Norovirus Outbreaks in Hospitals and Elderly Care Institutions. Wellington. https://www.health.govt.nz/system/files/documents/publications/guidelines-managementnorovirus 0.pdf
- 2. ESR. 2012. Guidelines for the Investigation and Control of Disease Outbreaks. Porirua, New Zealand: Institute of Environmental Science & Research Limited. https://surv.esr.cri.nz/episurv/Manuals/GuidelinesForInvestigatingCommDiseaseOBs.pdf
- 3. Kroneman A, Vennema H, Deforche K, et al. 2011. An automated genotyping tool for enteroviruses and noroviruses. J Clin Virol 51(2): 121-5.
- 4. ESR. 2019. Notifiable Diseases in New Zealand Annual Report 2017. Porirua, New Zealand: Institute of Environmental Science and Research Limited. https://surv.esr.cri.nz/PDF surveillance/AnnualRpt/AnnualSurv/2017/2017AnnualNDRep ort_FINAL.pdf
- 5. Pattis I, Lopez L, Cressey P, et al. 2018. Annual Report Concerning Foodborne Disease in New Zealand 2017. Christchurch, New Zealand: Institute of Environmental Science and Research Ltd. https://www.mpi.govt.nz/food-safety/food-safety-and-suitabilityresearch/human-health-surveillance/foodborne-disease-annual-reports/
- 6. Ministry of Health. 2014. Immunisation Handbook 2014. Wellington: Ministry of Health. http://www.moh.govt.nz/notebook/nbbooks.nsf/0/5B75258BCFDED7CACC257CF4007C E5B8/\$file/immunisation-handbook-may14-v2.pdf
- 7. Sears A, Baker M, Wilson N, et al. 2011. Marked Campylobacteriosis Decline after Interventions Aimed at Poultry, New Zealand. Emerg Infect Dis 17(6): 1007-15.



OUTBREAK REPORT FORM

OUTBREAK REPORT FORM

Outbreak Summar	Ŷ		Outbreak N	lo
Reporting Auth	ority			
Officer responsible	for investigation		Date outbreak repo	orted
Interim report	Final report -	date finalised		🔘 Not an outbreak
Name of outbreak	(optional)			
Condition and 1	Implicated Contaminan	it		
Implicated contam	ninant (pathogen)	-		Unknown
	subtype			
Condition (disease)		Other, specify	
Other known cond	ition/implicated pathogen	Yes	🔘 No	
Implicated contam	ninant (pathogen)			Unknown
	subtype			
Condition (disease)		Other, specify	
CASE DEFINITION	(5)			
Laboratory confirm	ned case			
Clinically confirme	d case			
Probable case				
Outbreak Demo	ographics			
Number of people	exposed		🔾 Actual	🔾 Approx 📃 Unknown
Number of cases (a	as per case defn above)			
	Lab confirmed		Number Ho	spitalised
	Clinically confirmed		Number Die	ed
	Probable			
	Total			
Outbreak dates	Onset of illness in first case			
	Onset of illness in last case		or	Outbreak ongoing
Age of cases	Number for which age recorde	d	-	
	Median age (years)		Range (years)	
Sex of cases	Number of males		- Number of females	
Incubation period	Median 🤇	days 🔘 hr	s Range	🔵 days 🔵 hrs
Duration of illness	Median 🦳	days 🔵 hr	s Range	🔵 days 🔵 hrs



Outbreak Summary		Outbreak No.
Circumstances of Exposure/	/Transmission	
How was the outbreak first recog	nised?	
 Increase in disease incidence 	Cases had person to per	erson contact with other cases(s)
Cases attended common event	🔘 Common organism typ	e/strain characteristics between cases
Cases linked to common source (eg food, water, environmental site)	
Other means (specify)		
Were these cases part of a well-de (eg Common event, institutional, If yes, date of exposure	efined exposed group Ores environmental, household) If exposure >1 day, dat	No Unknown
Description of exposure event		
First setting where exposure occu	rred	Setting unknown
Food premises	Institution	Workplace/Community/Other
Restaurant/café/bakery	Hostel/boarding house	 Workplace
Takeaway	Hotel/motel	Farm
Supermarket/delicatessen	Long term care facility	Petting zoo
 Temporary or mobile service 	 Hospital (acute care) 	Home
Fast food restaurant	Prison	 Community, church, sports gathering
Caterers	Camp	Cruise ship, airline, tour bus, train
Other food outlet	School Childcare centre	Other setting
	Marae	
	Other institution	
Setting name		
Setting Address Number	Street	Suburb
Town/City		Post Code GeoCode
Second setting where exposure or	curred	Setting unknown
Food premises	Institution	Workplace/Community/Other
Restaurant/café/bakery	Hostel/boarding house	Workplace
Takeaway	Hotel/motel	Farm
Supermarket/delicatessen	Long term care facility	Petting zoo
Temporary or Mobile Service	 Hospital (acute care) 	Home
 Fast food restaurant 	Prison	 Community, church, sports gathering
Caterers	Camp	Cruise ship, airline, tour bus, train
 Other food outlet 	School Ochildcare centre	Other setting
	🔘 Marae	
	Other institution	
Setting name		
Setting Address Number	Street	Suburb
Town/City		Post Code GeoCode

Outbreak Summary		Outbreak No.
Circumstances of Exp	osure/Transmission contd	
First setting where contam	inated food/beverage was prepared	Setting unknown 📃
Overseas manufacture	r, specify	
Food premises	Institution	Workplace/Community/Other
Restaurant/café/bakery	 Hostel/boarding house 	Workplace
Takeaway	Hotel/motel	🔘 Farm
Supermarket/delicatessen	Long term care facility	Petting zoo
Temporary or Mobile Serv	ice 📃 Hospital (acute care)	Home
Fast food restaurant	Prison	Community, church, sports gathering
Caterers	🔘 Camp	🔵 Cruise ship, airline, tour bus, train
Other food outlet	School O Childcare centre	Commercial food manufacturer
	Marae	Other setting
	 Other institution 	
Setting name		
Setting Address Number	Street	Suburb
Town/City		Post Code GeoCode
Second setting where cont	aminated food/beverage was prepared	Setting unknown
Overseas manufacture	r, specify	
Food premises		Workplace/Community/Other
Restaurant/café/bakery	O Hostel/boarding house	Workplace
Takeaway	Hotel/motel	Farm
Supermarket/delicatessen	Long term care facility	Petting zoo
Temporary or Mobile Serv	ice 🔍 Hospital (acute care)	O Home
Fast food restaurant	Prison	Community, church, sports gathering
Caterers	Camp	Cruise ship, airline, tour bus, train
Other food outlet	School Childcare centre	Commercial food manufacturer
	Marae	Other setting
	Other institution	
Setting name		
Setting Address Number	Street	Suburb
Town/City		Post Code GeoCode
Geographic location where	exposure occurred (tick one)	
◯ New Zealand	Overseas, specify	Unknown
If exposure occurred in New	Zealand, specify	
Primary TA		
Und(s)		
Haalth District(s)		
Health District(s)		



Outbreak Summary Outbreak No.	
Circumstances of Exposure/Transmission contd	
Mode of transmission (indicate the primary mode and all secondary modes)	
Foodborne, from consumption of contaminated food or drink (excluding water)	
Mode 🔵 primary 🔘 secondary Level of evidence 🔵 1 💮 2a 💿 2b 💿 3a 💿 3b 💿	3c 🔘 4
Waterborne, from consumption of contaminated drinking water	
Mode 🔵 primary 🔘 secondary Level of evidence 🔵 1 💮 2a 💿 2b 💿 3a 💿 3b 💿	3c 🔘 4
Person to person spread, from (non-sexual) contact with an infected person (including droplets)	
Mode 🔵 primary 🔘 secondary Level of evidence 🔵 1 💮 2a 💿 2b 💿 3a 💿 3b 💿	3c 🔘 4
Sexual, from sexual contact with an infected person	
Mode 🔵 primary 🔘 secondary Level of evidence 🔵 1 💮 2a 💿 2b 💿 3a 💿 3b 💿	3c 🔘 4
Parenteral, from needle stick injury or reuse of contaminated injection equipment	
Mode 🔵 primary 🔘 secondary Level of evidence 🔵 1 💮 2a 💿 2b 💿 3a 💿 3b 💿	3c 🔵 4
Environmental, from contact with an environmental source (eg swimming)	
Mode 🔵 primary 🔘 secondary Level of evidence 🔵 1 💮 2a 💿 2b 💿 3a 💿 3b 💿	3c 🔵 4
Zoonotic, from contact with an infected animal	
Mode 🔵 primary 🔘 secondary Level of evidence 🔵 1 💮 2a 💿 2b 💿 3a 💿 3b 💿	3c 🔵 4
Vectorborne, from contact with an insect vector	
Mode 🔵 primary 🔘 secondary Level of evidence 🔵 1 💮 2a 💿 2b 💿 3a 💿 3b 💿	3c 🔵 4
Other mode of transmission (specify)	
Mode O primary O secondary Level of evidence O 1 O 2a O 2b O 3a O 3b O	3c 🔘 4
Mode of transmission unknown	
Vehicle/source of common source outbreak	
Was a specific contaminated food, water or environmental vehicle/source identified?	nown
If yes,	
former f	
Source 1	
Level of evidence 🔵 1 💭 2a 💭 2b 💭 3a 💭 3b 💭 3c 💭 4	
Food category ESR Updated Date	
Source 2	
Level of evidence 1 2a 2b 3a 3b 3c 4	
Food category ESR Updated Date	
Source 3	
Level of evidence 🔵 1 💭 2a 💭 2b 💭 3a 💭 3b 💭 3c 💭 4	
Food category ESR Updated Date	

Outbreak Summary	Outbre	ak No.
Factors Contributing to Outbreak		
Foodborne outbreak (tick all that apply)		
Inadequate reheating of previously cooked food	Confirmed	Suspected
Improper storage prior to presentation	Confirmed	Suspected
Inadequate thawing	Confirmed	Suspected
Preparation too far in advance	Confirmed	Suspected
Undercooking	Confirmed	Suspected
Improper hot holding	Confirmed	Suspected
Inadequate or slow cooling or refrigeration	Confirmed	Suspected
Cross contamination due to improper handing or storage	Confirmed	Suspected
Cross contamination from an infected food handler	Confirmed	Suspected
Chemical contamination	Confirmed	 Suspected
Use of ingredient from an unsafe source	Confirmed	 Suspected
Use of untreated water in food preparation	Confirmed	Suspected
Consumption of unpasteurised milk	Confirmed	Suspected
Consumption of raw food	Confirmed	Suspected
Other factors, specify	Confirmed	Suspected
Waterborne outbreak (tick all that apply)	(Pre latest form revi	sion: 📃 Untreated water supply)
Surface water with no treatment	Confirmed	Suspected
Roof collected rainwater with no treatment	Confirmed	Suspected
Groundwater not assessed as secure and with no treatment	Confirmed	Suspected
Source water quality inferior to normal,	Confirmed	Suspected
If source water quality inferior to normal, specify		
Inadequately treated water supply	Confirmed	Suspected
Recent or ongoing treatment process failure	Confirmed	Suspected
Contamination of post treatment water storage	 Confirmed 	Suspected
Post treatment contamination (other)	Confirmed	Suspected
If post treatment contamination (other), specify		
Specify the WINZ supply code of the implicated water supply		
Person to person outbreak (tick all that apply)		0
Inadequate vaccination cover	Confirmed	
Inadequate vaccination effectiveness	Confirmed	Suspected
Exposure to infected person	Confirmed	Suspected
Poor hygiene of cases	Confirmed	Suspected
Excessively crowded living conditions	Confirmed	Suspected
Unprotected sexual activity	Confirmed	Suspected
Compromised immune system	Confirmed	Suspected

Outbreak Summary	Outb	reak No.	
Factors Contributing to Outbreak			
Environmental outbreak (tick all that apply)			
Exposure to contaminated land	Confirmed	Suspected	
Exposure to contaminated air (including ventilation)	Confirmed	Suspected	
 Exposure to contaminated built environments (inc dwellings) 	Confirmed		
Exposure to infected animals or animal products	Confirmed	Suspected	
Exposure to contaminated swimming/spa pools	Confirmed	Suspected	
Exposure to contaminated other recreational water	Confirmed	Suspected	
Other outbreaks			
Other risk factor, specify	Confirmed	Suspected	
	_		
Management of the Outbreak			
Was there any specific action taken to control the outbreak?	Yes	🔘 No	🔵 Unknown
If yes, list the control measures undertaken (tick all that apply)			
Source Specify			
Closure			
Modification of procedures			
Cleaning, disinfection			
Removal			
Treatment			
Exclusion			
Isolation			
Health education and advice			
Health warning			
Vehicles and vectors			
Removal			
Treatment			
Contacts and potential contacts			
Chemoprophylaxis			
Vaccination			
Other control measures (specify)			



Management of the Outbreak Was insufficient information supplied to complete the form? Yes No Unknown Other comments on outbreak Ves No Unknown Other comments on outbreak Ves No Unknown Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Ves No Unknown Evel of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence 3a Compelling evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances	Outbreak Summary			Outbreak No.		
Was insufficient information supplied to complete the form? Yes No Unknown Other comments on outbreak No Unknown Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 10 Laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 12 Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, same organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profile 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 3c No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances	Mana	gement of the Outbreak				
Other comments on outbreak Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Everel of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances	Was ii	sufficient information supplied to complete the form?	Ves	O No	🔘 Unknown	
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Evecl of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances	Other comments on outbreak					
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, same organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, same organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Evel of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Please attach a copy of written report if prepared. Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances	Blace attack a convict unitten report if pressured					
 Level of Evidence Codes Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances 						
Level of Evidence Codes 1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances						
 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances 	Level of Evidence Codes					
 2a Elevated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances 	1 Elevated risk ratio or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1 AND laboratory evidence					
 2b Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in both cases and vehicle (to the highest level of identification) 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances 	2a	levated relative risk or odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals not including 1				
 3a Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific organism e.g. scrombrotoxin, ciguatoxin etc 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances 	2b	Laboratory evidence, same organism and sub type detected in identification)	both cases and	l vehicle (to the hig	ghest level of	
 3b Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not linked directly to the vehicle or indistinguishable DNA or PFGE profiles 3c Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances 	3a	Compelling evidence, symptomatology attributable to specific	organism e.g. s	crombrotoxin, cigu	atoxin etc	
 ^{3c} Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio 4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances 	3b	Other association i.e. organism detected at source but not link profiles	ed directly to th	ne vehicle or indisti	nguishable DNA or PFGE	
4 No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances	3c	Raised but not statistically significant relative risk or odds ratio	0			
	4	No evidence found but logical deduction given circumstances				
Version: 2 October 2010						





INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH LIMITED

- Kenepuru Science Centre

 34 Kenepuru Drive, Kenepuru, Porirua 5022

 P0 Box 50348, Porirua 5240

 New Zealand

 T: +64 4 914 0700

 F: +64 4 914 0770
- Mt Albert Science Centre 120 Mt Albert Road, Sandringham, Auckland 1025 Private Bag 92021, Auckland 1142 New Zealand T: +64 9 815 3670 F: +64 9 849 6046
- NCBID Wallaceville

 66 Ward Street, Wallaceville, Upper Hutt 5018

 P0 Box 40158, Upper Hutt 5140

 New Zealand

 T: +64 4 529 0600

 F: +64 4 529 0601
- Christchurch Science Centre 27 Creyke Road, Ilam, Christchurch 8041 P0 Box 29181, Christchurch 8540 New Zealand T: +64 3 351 6019 F: +64 3 351 0010

www.esr.cri.nz