

# Zoonotic endoparasites and <i>Toxoplasma gondii</i> seropositivity in free-roaming cats (<i>Felis catus</i>) from an urban environment

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	PONE-D-26-00846
<b>Article Type:</b>	Research Article
<b>Full Title:</b>	Zoonotic endoparasites and <i>Toxoplasma gondii</i> seropositivity in free-roaming cats (<i>Felis catus</i>) from an urban environment
<b>Short Title:</b>	Zoonotic parasites and Toxoplasma gondii exposure in urban free-roaming cats
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Pratap Kafle, DVM, PhD, DACVM Rowan University Harrison Township, NJ UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
<b>Keywords:</b>	Free-roaming cats, Zoonotic parasites, trap-neuter-return (TNR), Super-shedders, Environmental contamination, Urban ecosystem, Public health.
<b>Abstract:</b>	Free-roaming cats ( <i>Felis catus</i> ) can serve as reservoirs of various zoonotic parasites in urban settings. Despite a large population of free-roaming cats around New York City, studies assessing the prevalence and shedding of various parasites in the New York urban landscape are scarce. This study used the fecal and blood samples collected opportunistically during the Trap–Neuter–Return (TNR) program from 87 free-roaming cats in New York City between May and July 2023. Samples were analyzed using centrifugal fecal flotation, coproantigen immunoassays, serologic assays, and PCR-based assays for gastrointestinal and vector-borne parasites. Fecal flotation (n = 87) results revealed that 57.5% (50/87; 95% CI: 46.9–67.4) of cats were infected with at least one species of parasite. The most prevalent infection was <i>Toxocara</i> spp. (54%; 95% CI: 43.4–64.3), followed by <i>Ancylostoma</i> spp. (13.8%; 95% CI: 8.2–22.6) and coccidia (11.5%; 95% CI: 6.4–19.9). Coproantigen testing (n = 43) identified <i>Giardia</i> spp. in 11.6% (5/43; 95% CI: 5.1–24.5) and <i>Cryptosporidium</i> spp. in 2.3% (1/43; 95% CI: 0.4–12.1) of cats. Antibodies to <i>Toxoplasma gondii</i> were detected in 8.9% (4/45; 95% CI: 3.5–20.7) of serum samples; no <i>Dirofilaria immitis</i> antigen and <i>Cytauxzoon felis</i> DNA was found in the blood samples (n = 45). Male cats were significantly more likely to be infected with <i>Toxocara</i> spp. (OR = 4.36) and, along with juvenile cats (<1 year), shed significantly higher numbers of eggs (p<0.05), identifying young males as high-intensity "super-shedders" driving environmental contamination. The high prevalence of zoonotic helminths, particularly <i>Toxocara</i> spp., underscores the public health risks associated with unmanaged feline populations in densely populated urban centers. These findings highlight the utility of integrating disease surveillance into TNR programs to monitor urban ecosystem health and mitigate zoonotic risks.
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Viet-Linh Nguyen Elizabeth Gurtowski Jiayi Chen Megan Rosen Pratap Kafle, DVM, PhD, DACVM
<b>Opposed Reviewers:</b>	
<b>Additional Information:</b>	
<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Financial Disclosure</b>	Yes
Enter a financial disclosure statement that describes the sources of funding for the work included in this submission. Review the <a href="#">submission guidelines</a> for detailed	

requirements. View published research articles from [PLOS ONE](#) for specific examples.

This statement is required for submission and **will appear in the published article** if the submission is accepted. Please make sure it is accurate.

#### Funded studies

Enter a statement with the following details:

- Initials of the authors who received each award
- Grant numbers awarded to each author
- The full name of each funder
- URL of each funder website
- Did the sponsors or funders play any role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript?

Did you receive funding for this work?

Please add funding details.  
as follow-up to "[Financial Disclosure](#)

Enter a financial disclosure statement that describes the sources of funding for the work included in this submission. Review the [submission guidelines](#) for detailed requirements. View published research articles from [PLOS ONE](#) for specific examples.

This statement is required for submission and **will appear in the published article** if the submission is accepted. Please make sure it is accurate.

This work was funded by institutional startup funds by Long Island University, College of Veterinary Medicine and Rowan university, Shreiber School of Veterinary Medicine

<p><b>Funded studies</b></p> <p>Enter a statement with the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initials of the authors who received each award</li> <li>• Grant numbers awarded to each author</li> <li>• The full name of each funder</li> <li>• URL of each funder website</li> <li>• Did the sponsors or funders play any role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript?</li> </ul>	
<p>Did you receive funding for this work?"</p>	
<p>Please select the country of your main research funder (please select carefully as in some cases this is used in fee calculation).</p> <p>as follow-up to "<b>Financial Disclosure</b>"</p> <p>Enter a financial disclosure statement that describes the sources of funding for the work included in this submission. Review the <a href="#">submission guidelines</a> for detailed requirements. View published research articles from <a href="#">PLOS ONE</a> for specific examples.</p>	<p>UNITED STATES - US</p>
<p>This statement is required for submission and <b>will appear in the published article</b> if the submission is accepted. Please make sure it is accurate.</p>	
<p><b>Funded studies</b></p> <p>Enter a statement with the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initials of the authors who received each award</li> <li>• Grant numbers awarded to each author</li> <li>• The full name of each funder</li> <li>• URL of each funder website</li> <li>• Did the sponsors or funders play any role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript?</li> </ul>	
<p>Did you receive funding for this work?"</p>	
<p><b>Competing Interests</b></p>	<p>The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.</p>

Use the instructions below to enter a competing interest statement for this submission. On behalf of all authors, disclose any [competing interests](#) that could be perceived to bias this work—acknowledging all financial support and any other relevant financial or non-financial competing interests.

This statement is **required** for submission and **will appear in the published article** if the submission is accepted. Please make sure it is accurate and that any funding sources listed in your Funding Information later in the submission form are also declared in your Financial Disclosure statement.

View published research articles from [PLOS ONE](#) for specific examples.

#### NO authors have competing interests

Enter: *The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.*

#### Authors with competing interests

Enter competing interest details beginning with this statement:

*I have read the journal's policy and the authors of this manuscript have the following competing interests: [insert competing interests here]*

\* typeset

#### Ethics Statement

Enter an ethics statement for this submission. This statement is required if the study involved:

- Human participants
- Human specimens or tissue
- Vertebrate animals or cephalopods
- Vertebrate embryos or tissues

The study procedures complied with institutional guidelines for animal handling and welfare and were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of the Long Island University (protocol # 2023-021)

- Field research

Write "N/A" if the submission does not require an ethics statement.

General guidance is provided below.

Consult the [submission guidelines](#) for detailed instructions. **Make sure that all information entered here is included in the Methods section of the manuscript.**

## **Format for specific study types**

### **Human Subject Research (involving human participants and/or tissue)**

- Give the name of the institutional review board or ethics committee that approved the study
- Include the approval number and/or a statement indicating approval of this research
- Indicate the form of consent obtained (written/oral) or the reason that consent was not obtained (e.g. the data were analyzed anonymously)

### **Animal Research (involving vertebrate animals, embryos or tissues)**

- Provide the name of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) or other relevant ethics board that reviewed the study protocol, and indicate whether they approved this research or granted a formal waiver of ethical approval
- Include an approval number if one was obtained
- If the study involved *non-human primates*, add *additional details* about animal welfare and steps taken to ameliorate suffering
- If anesthesia, euthanasia, or any kind of animal sacrifice is part of the study, include briefly which substances and/or methods were applied

### **Field Research**

Include the following details if this study involves the collection of plant, animal, or other materials from a natural setting:

- Field permit number
- Name of the institution or relevant body that granted permission

### **Data Availability**

Authors are required to make all data underlying the findings described fully available, without restriction, and from the time of publication. PLOS allows rare exceptions to address legal and ethical concerns. See the [PLOS Data Policy](#) and [FAQ](#) for detailed information.

Yes - all data are fully available without restriction

<p>A Data Availability Statement describing where the data can be found is required at submission. Your answers to this question constitute the Data Availability Statement and <b>will be published in the article</b>, if accepted.</p> <p><b>Important:</b> Stating 'data available on request from the author' is not sufficient. If your data are only available upon request, select 'No' for the first question and explain your exceptional situation in the text box.</p> <p>Do the authors confirm that all data underlying the findings described in their manuscript are fully available without restriction?</p>	
<p><b>Describe where the data may be found in full sentences. If you are copying our sample text, replace any instances of XXX with the appropriate details.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the data are <b>held or will be held in a public repository</b>, include URLs, accession numbers or DOIs. If this information will only be available after acceptance, indicate this by ticking the box below. For example: <i>All XXX files are available from the XXX database (accession number(s) XXX, XXX.).</i></li> <li>• If the data are all contained <b>within the manuscript and/or Supporting Information files</b>, enter the following: <i>All relevant data are within the manuscript and its Supporting Information files.</i></li> <li>• If neither of these applies but you are able to provide <b>details of access elsewhere</b>, with or without limitations, please do so. For example:</li> </ul> <p><i>Data cannot be shared publicly because of [XXX]. Data are available from the XXX Institutional Data Access / Ethics Committee (contact via XXX) for researchers who meet the criteria for access to confidential data.</i></p> <p><i>The data underlying the results presented in the study are available from (include the name of the third party</i></p>	<p>All relevant data are within the manuscript and its Supporting Information files.</p>

*(and contact information or URL).*

- This text is appropriate if the data are owned by a third party and authors do not have permission to share the data.

\* typeset

Additional data availability information:

6 January 2026

Dear Editors of PLOS ONE,

Please find enclosed our manuscript entitled "**Zoonotic endoparasites and *Toxoplasma gondii* seropositivity in free-roaming cats (*Felis catus*) from an urban environment**" by Viet-Linh Nguyen, Elizabeth Gurtowski, Jiayi Chen, Megan Rosen, and myself, submitted for consideration as a Research Article in PLOS ONE.

Free-roaming cats represent an important interface between wildlife, domestic animals, and humans in urban ecosystems and can serve as reservoirs for a range of zoonotic and veterinary parasites. Despite the large population of free-roaming cats in New York City, data describing parasite prevalence, shedding intensity, and associated public health risks remain limited. In this study, fecal and blood samples collected through a Trap–Neuter–Return (TNR) program were analyzed using parasitological, immunological, and molecular diagnostic approaches to assess gastrointestinal and selected vector-borne parasites.

Our results reveal a high prevalence of zoonotic gastrointestinal parasites, particularly *Toxocara* spp. (54%), and demonstrate that juvenile and male cats contribute disproportionately to environmental contamination through higher parasite shedding intensity. Evidence of exposure to *Toxoplasma gondii* was also identified (8.9%), while selected vector-borne pathogens were not detected. These findings highlight the public health relevance of unmanaged feline populations in densely populated urban environments and support the integration of disease surveillance into TNR programs as a tool for monitoring urban ecosystem health.

This manuscript has not been published previously and is not under consideration by another journal. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript and have contributed substantially to the work.

Thank you for your consideration of this submission. We appreciate your time and look forward to your evaluation of our manuscript.

Yours faithfully,



**Pratap Kafle DVM, PhD, DACVM (Parasit.)**

Assistant Professor, Veterinary Parasitology

Shreiber School of Veterinary Medicine of Rowan University

1000 Gilbreth Parkway

Harrison Township, New Jersey, USA

1   **Zoonotic endoparasites and *Toxoplasma gondii* seropositivity in free-roaming cats (*Felis*  
2   *catus*) from an urban environment**

3   Viet-Linh Nguyen<sup>1</sup>, Elizabeth Gurtowski<sup>2</sup>, Jiayi Chen<sup>2</sup>, Megan Rosen<sup>2</sup>, Pratap Kafle<sup>1, 2\*</sup>

4   <sup>1</sup> Shreiber School of Veterinary Medicine, Rowan University, Harrison Township, New Jersey,  
5   United States of America

6   <sup>2</sup> Lewyt College of Veterinary Medicine, Long Island University, Brookville, New York, United  
7   States of America

8   \* Corresponding author

9   Email: kafle@rowan.edu

10

11

## 12 Abstract

13 Free-roaming cats (*Felis catus*) can serve as reservoirs of various zoonotic parasites in urban  
14 settings. Despite a large population of free-roaming cats around New York City, studies assessing  
15 the prevalence and shedding of various parasites in the New York urban landscape are scarce.  
16 This study used the fecal and blood samples collected opportunistically during the Trap–Neuter–  
17 Return (TNR) program from 87 free-roaming cats in New York City between May and July  
18 2023. Samples were analyzed using centrifugal fecal flotation, coproantigen immunoassays,  
19 serologic assays, and PCR-based assays for gastrointestinal and vector-borne parasites. Fecal  
20 flotation (n = 87) results revealed that 57.5% (50/87; 95% CI: 46.9–67.4) of cats were infected  
21 with at least one species of parasite. The most prevalent infection was *Toxocara* spp. (54%; 95%  
22 CI: 43.4–64.3), followed by *Ancylostoma* spp. (13.8%; 95% CI: 8.2–22.6) and coccidia (11.5%;  
23 95% CI: 6.4–19.9). Coproantigen testing (n = 43) identified *Giardia* spp. in 11.6% (5/43; 95%  
24 CI: 5.1–24.5) and *Cryptosporidium* spp. in 2.3% (1/43; 95% CI: 0.4–12.1) of cats. Antibodies to  
25 *Toxoplasma gondii* were detected in 8.9% (4/45; 95% CI: 3.5–20.7) of serum samples; no  
26 *Dirofilaria immitis* antigen and *Cytauxzoon felis* DNA was found in the blood samples (n = 45).  
27 Male cats were significantly more likely to be infected with *Toxocara* spp. (OR = 4.36) and,  
28 along with juvenile cats (<1 year), shed significantly higher numbers of eggs (p<0.05),  
29 identifying young males as high-intensity "super-shedders" driving environmental  
30 contamination. The high prevalence of zoonotic helminths, particularly *Toxocara* spp.,  
31 underscores the public health risks associated with unmanaged feline populations in densely  
32 populated urban centers. These findings highlight the utility of integrating disease surveillance  
33 into TNR programs to monitor urban ecosystem health and mitigate zoonotic risks.

35   **Keywords:** Free-roaming cats, Zoonotic parasites, trap-neuter-return (TNR), Super-shedders,  
36   Environmental contamination, Urban ecosystem, Public health.

37   

## Introduction

38   Free-roaming cats (*Felis catus*), including stray, feral, and outdoor-access owned cats, are  
39   abundant in many densely populated urban environments, where they occupy shared spaces with  
40   people, pets, and synanthropic wildlife, increasing the likelihood of environmental exposure to  
41   various parasites and pathogens through contaminated soil and public areas. These cats can serve  
42   as significant reservoirs for a range of helminths and protozoal parasites, such as *Toxocara* spp.,  
43   *Ancylostoma* spp., *Giardia* spp., *Cryptosporidium* spp., and *Toxoplasma gondii*, that can cause  
44   diseases in companion animals and humans, with children and immunocompromised individuals  
45   at particular risk [1-5]. From a One Health perspective, unmanaged free-roaming cat populations  
46   occupy a critical interface between animal health, human health, and environmental hygiene.  
47   Therefore, surveillance of parasitic infections in urban free-roaming cat populations represents  
48   an important component of One Health approaches aimed at understanding and mitigating  
49   zoonotic risks at the human–animal–environment interface.

50   Environmental persistence of parasite stages shed by cats further amplifies their public health  
51   significance. For instance, eggs of *Toxocara* spp. are highly resistant to environmental  
52   degradation and can remain infective in soil for prolonged periods, leading to widespread  
53   contamination of public spaces, indicating potential exposure for people and other animals [6].  
54   Similarly, *T. gondii* oocysts shed by infected cats can persist in soil and water, contaminate  
55   produce, and infect terrestrial and aquatic wildlife, illustrating the cross-ecosystem nature of this  
56   parasite [7-9]. *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium* infections in cats involve a mixture of host-adapted  
57   and potentially zoonotic assemblages and species, and while the overall zoonotic risk from cats

58 is considered low to moderate, their role as sources and sentinels remains relevant in densely  
59 populated settings [3].

60 In many cities, Trap–Neuter–Return (TNR) programs are used to manage feral cat colonies, and  
61 they offer an efficient opportunity to integrate disease surveillance into ongoing population  
62 control and welfare interventions. Leveraging TNR programs for systematic parasitological  
63 monitoring can generate data that are directly relevant to One Health, including estimates of  
64 infection prevalence, intensity of environmental shedding, and demographic risk factors within  
65 urban cat populations.

66 The objectives of this study were to estimate the prevalence of key gastrointestinal and zoonotic  
67 parasites in free-roaming cats enrolled in a TNR program in NYC and to identify demographic  
68 risk factors associated with infection and shedding intensity. This data provides an important  
69 baseline for understanding the role of free-roaming cats in environmental contamination and  
70 informs One Health strategies to mitigate zoonotic risks in densely populated urban  
71 environments.

## 72 Materials and methods

### 73 Study population and sampling

74 This cross-sectional study was conducted between May and July 2023 using free-roaming cats  
75 (defined here as cats not confined indoors and including feral, stray, and colony-associated  
76 individuals) captured through the Long Island University College of Veterinary Medicine TNR  
77 program from various locations around NYC (Figure 1). Cats were humanely trapped at multiple  
78 sites and trapping location was recorded. For each individual cat, the attending veterinarians  
79 recorded sex, reproductive status, including pregnancy and lactation. Age estimation was based  
80 on physical examination, dentition, and body size.

81 **Figure 1. Geographic origin of free-roaming cats trapped and sampled at the Long Island**  
82 **University College of Veterinary Medicine Trap-Neuter-Return program, New York City,**  
83 **May–July 2023. Points represent approximate trap locations**

84

85 Following physical examination, each cat received a unique microchip identifier and was  
86 surgically sterilized as part of the TNR program. The animals were then released at the site of  
87 capture. The study procedures complied with institutional guidelines for animal handling and  
88 welfare and were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of the Long  
89 Island University (protocol # 2023-021).

90 **Laboratory analyses**

91 Fresh fecal samples were collected rectally and processed within 24 hours. Fecal flotation was  
92 performed using Sheather's sugar solution (Jorgensen Laboratories, CO; specific gravity 1.27)  
93 following a standard centrifugation protocol. Briefly, approximately 2 g of feces was mixed in 10  
94 mL of flotation solution, strained, and centrifuged at  $400 \times g$  for 10 minutes. Samples were  
95 systematically examined at  $100\times$  and  $400\times$  magnification for helminth eggs and protozoal  
96 oocysts, which were identified based on morphological characteristics [10]. Total counts were  
97 conducted across the entire coverslip for each sample to estimate infection intensity. Due to  
98 limited fecal sample volumes, traditional zinc sulfate ( $ZnSO_4$ ) centrifugal flotation for *Giardia*  
99 oocyst detection was omitted; instead, samples were processed for coproantigen testing, which is  
100 considered more sensitive for detecting *Giardia* antigen. Furthermore, insufficient fecal material  
101 precluded the use of fecal sedimentation and the Baermann technique, restricting the  
102 parasitological assessment to flotation and antigen-based diagnostics.

103 **Antigen-based, serologic and molecular testing**

104 Due to sample volume and assay availability, coproantigen and serologic testing were performed  
105 on subsets of available samples. For this, fecal, serum, and whole blood samples were submitted  
106 to the Cornell University Animal Health Diagnostic Center (AHDC) for further analysis.

107 Fecal samples (n=43) were tested for *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium* using ProSpecT™ Giardia  
108 Microplate Assay (Thermo Fisher, USA) and ProSpecT™ Cryptosporidium Microplate Assay  
109 (Thermo Fisher, USA), respectively. Although these commercial enzyme-linked immunosorbent  
110 assays (ELISA) were originally developed for human diagnostics, they have been validated for  
111 veterinary species at the Cornell AHDC and are verified in-house for the detection of *Giardia*  
112 and *Cryptosporidium* in veterinary samples. These assays are widely used for detection of  
113 protozoal infections in animals and contaminated environments with higher sensitivity compared  
114 with flotation alone [11]. Genomic DNA was extracted from positive fecal samples for molecular  
115 confirmation using PCR assays [12, 13].

116 Serum samples (n=45) were screened for *T. gondii* antibodies using the modified agglutination  
117 test (MAT), with titers  $\geq 1:25$  considered evidence of prior exposure, consistent with previous  
118 studies in cats and wildlife [14, 15]. Occult Heartworm ELISA test was performed to detect the  
119 presence of *Dirofilaria immitis* antigen following validated AHDC protocol.

120 DNA was extracted from EDTA anticoagulated whole blood samples (n=45) for detection of  
121 *Cytauxzoon felis* by real-time PCR targeting the 18S rRNA gene using species-specific primers  
122 and DNA sequencing [16].

123 **Data analysis**

124 Parasite prevalence was calculated separately for each diagnostic method using appropriate  
125 denominators: fecal flotation (n=87), protozoal antigen testing (n=43), and *T. gondii* serology

126 (n=45). Prevalence estimates were reported as percentages with 95% confidence intervals.

127 Associations between host demographic factors such as age (young cats: <1 year old, comprising

128 kittens and juveniles; adults:  $\geq 1$  year old), sex, lactation status and parasite infection status were

129 assessed using chi-square tests or Fisher's exact tests when expected cell counts were less than 5,

130 with statistical significance evaluated at  $p \leq 0.05$ . Odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence

131 intervals were calculated for significant predictors.

132 Multivariable logistic regression models were constructed to assess independent effects of age

133 and sex on binary infection outcomes (any parasite infection) while controlling for potential

134 confounding. Model coefficients were exponentiated to yield adjusted odds ratios (aOR) with

135 95% confidence intervals.

136 For infection intensity analysis, overdispersion in egg per gram (EPG) count data was assessed

137 by calculating variance-to-mean ratios. Due to substantial overdispersion (variance/mean ratio =

138 835.7), negative binomial generalized linear models (GLMs) were fitted to model EPG as a

139 function of age and sex. Incidence rate ratios (IRR) with 95% confidence intervals were

140 calculated to quantify the magnitude of associations. Non-parametric Mann-Whitney U tests

141 were used to compare EPG distributions between two groups, and Kruskal-Wallis tests were

142 employed for comparisons across three age categories (kittens, juveniles, and adults). All

143 statistical analyses were performed using R version 4.3.1 [17] with packages including tidyverse,

144 MASS, binom, epitools, and DescTools.

## 145 **Results**

### 146 **Study population**

147 A total of 87 free-roaming cats were sampled and included in parasitological analysis. Among

148 cats with complete demographic data (n=59), most were classified as young (<1 year old, n=43,

149 72.9%), comprising 5 kittens (<6 months) and 38 juveniles (6–12 months), with 16 adults (>12  
 150 months, 27.1%). The population included 33 males and 26 females. Among females with known  
 151 reproductive status, 11 were pregnant and 7 were lactating at the time of examination.

152

153 **Parasitological findings**

154 Overall, 57.5% (50/87; 95% CI: 46.9–67.4%) of cats were positive for at least one endoparasite  
 155 species detected by fecal flotation. *Toxocara* spp. eggs were the most prevalent, detected in  
 156 54.0% (47/87; 95% CI: 43.4–64.3), followed by *Ancylostoma* spp. eggs in 13.8% (12/87; 95%  
 157 CI: 8.2–22.6), and coccidia oocysts in 11.5% (10/87; 95% CI: 6.4–19.9) (Table 1).

158

159 **Table 1. Prevalence of parasites in free-roaming cats in New York City. Prevalence with**  
 160 **95% Confidence Interval (CI) was calculated using total samples tested per method.**

Parasites	Diagnostic method	Positive / Total	Prevalence (%)	95% CI
<b>Helminths</b>				
<i>Toxocara</i> spp.	Fecal flotation	47 / 87	54.0	43.6 – 64.1
<i>Ancylostoma</i> spp.	Fecal flotation	12 / 87	13.8	8.1 – 22.6
<b>Protozoa</b>				
Coccidia	Fecal flotation	10 / 87	11.5	6.4 – 19.9
<i>Giardia</i> spp.	Coproantigen ELISA	5 / 43	11.6	5.1 – 24.5
<i>Cryptosporidium</i> spp.	Coproantigen ELISA	1 / 43	2.3	0.4 – 12.1
<i>Toxoplasma gondii</i>	Serology (MAT)	4 / 45	8.9	3.5 – 20.7

161

162 Co-infections were frequently observed, with 21.8% (19/87; 95% CI: 14.5–31.6%) of the cats  
163 harboring two or more parasite species simultaneously. The most common combination was  
164 *Toxocara* spp. and *Ancylostoma* spp., which was identified in 11.5% (10/87; 95% CI: 6.4–19.9%)  
165 of the screened cats.

166 Antigen testing of 43 fecal samples identified *Giardia* in 11.6% (5/43; 95% CI: 5.1–24.5) and  
167 *Cryptosporidium* in 2.3% (1/43; 95% CI: 0.4–12.1), including infections that were not detected  
168 by flotation alone. DNA of *Gardia* as well as *Cryptosporidium* was not amplified using PCR  
169 assay.

170 Of the 45 serum samples tested, 8.9% (4/45; 95% CI: 3.5–20.7) were seropositive for *T. gondii*  
171 antibodies, indicating prior exposure despite the absence of detectable *T. gondii* oocysts in fecal  
172 flotation. No heartworm antigen was detected in any cat, and real-time PCR did not identify *C.*  
173 *felis* DNA in any tested blood sample.

174

## 175 **Risk factor analysis**

176 *Risk factor for infection:* Univariable analysis revealed no significant demographic risk factors  
177 for the overall presence of parasites. The prevalence of "any parasite" did not differ significantly  
178 between young cats (81.4%) and adults (75.0%) ( $p=0.60$ ), nor between males (84.2%) and  
179 females (60.5%) ( $p=0.06$ ). When analyzing specific parasites, male sex was identified as a  
180 significant risk factor for *Toxocara* spp. infection ( $OR=4.36$ ; 95% CI: 1.10–17.37;  $p=0.04$ ). No  
181 significant demographic associations were found for *Ancylostoma* spp. or coccidia. While  
182 lactating females showed a higher prevalence of coccidia (27.3%) compared to non-lactating  
183 females (3.4%), this difference approached but did not reach statistical significance ( $OR=10.5$ ;  
184  $p=0.056$ ).

185 *Infection intensity:* While the prevalence of infection was largely consistent across  
 186 demographics, the intensity of egg shedding exhibited distinct biological patterns. *Toxocara* spp.  
 187 egg counts were highly overdispersed and significantly associated with both age and sex (Table  
 188 2). A negative binomial GLM identified young cats as "super-shedders," with an Incidence rate  
 189 ration (IRR) of 9.76 ( $p<0.001$ ) compared to adults. Males also shed significantly higher numbers  
 190 of *Toxocara* eggs than females (IRR=3.95;  $p=0.015$ ). In contrast, shedding intensity for  
 191 *Ancylostoma* spp. did not differ significantly by age (Young median: 25.0 EPG vs. Adult median:  
 192 94.2 EPG;  $p=0.52$ ) or sex ( $p=0.69$ ). Similarly, coccidia oocyst counts showed no significant  
 193 intensity differences between demographic groups ( $p=0.29$ ).

194

195 **Table 2. Associations between host demographic factors and both infection prevalence**  
 196 **(risk) and egg shedding intensity (burden) for dominant helminths in free-roaming cats**  
 197 **around New York City.**

<b>Demographic Group</b>	N	<i>Toxocara</i> spp.		<i>Ancylostoma</i> spp.	
		Prevalence (%) (OR; 95% CI)	Median EPG (IRR; p-value)	Prevalence (%) (OR; 95% CI)	Median EPG (p-value)
<b>Age</b>					
<b>Young (&lt;1 yr)</b>	43	<b>81.4</b> (1.6; 0.5–5.2)	84.2 <b>(9.76; &lt;0.001)</b>	16.3 (0.8; 0.2–3.8)	25.0 (0.52)
<b>Adult (≥1 yr)</b>	16	75.0 (Reference)	10 (Reference)	18.8 (Reference)	94.2
<b>Sex</b>					
<b>Male</b>	19	<b>84.2</b>	<b>109.3</b>	26.3	247.0 (0.69)

		<b>(4.4; 1.1–17.4)</b>	<b>(3.95; 0.015)</b>	(2.5; 0.6–10.0)	
198	<b>Female</b>	43	60.5 (Reference)	10 (Reference)	11.6 (Reference)

199 **Note:** EPG = Eggs Per Gram of feces. OR = odds ratio from Fisher's exact test. IRR = incidence rate ratio from  
200 negative binomial generalized linear model. Median egg counts were calculated among infected animals only.

201 **Significant associations are shown in bold.**

202

## 203 Discussion

204 This study reports a high burden of gastrointestinal parasites in free-roaming cats around NYC  
205 and highlights important demographic patterns with direct relevance to zoonotic risk and  
206 environmental contamination in urban environments. More than half of the cats examined were  
207 infected with at least one endoparasite species, with *Toxocara* spp. and *Ancylostoma* spp.  
208 occurring at prevalences comparable to or exceeding those reported in other urban cat  
209 populations in the northeastern United States [18, 19]. These findings reinforce the role of free-  
210 roaming cats as reservoirs of environmentally persistent zoonotic helminths in densely populated  
211 landscapes.

212 The high prevalence of *Toxocara* spp. found in this population is consistent with the parasite's  
213 ubiquity and ability to contaminate the environment, particularly in urban areas where feral cat  
214 colonies exist and feces are not promptly removed. This rate exceeds those reported in many  
215 other urban centers in developed nations and aligns more closely with prevalences found in  
216 developing regions or rural environments [20]. Recent environmental surveillance by Tyungu et  
217 al. (2020) detected *Toxocara* eggs in 38.5% of NYC public playgrounds, with contamination

218 rates reaching 66.7% in the Bronx [18]. Critically, that study identified *T. cati* as the predominant  
219 species in soil samples, rather than the canine variant *T. canis*. Our findings support the idea that  
220 the free-roaming cat population is the active biological source of this environmental burden. The  
221 robust nature of *Toxocara* eggs, which can remain infective in soil for years and withstand the  
222 freeze-thaw cycles of northeastern winters, means that the eggs shed by these cats represent a  
223 long-term public health risk.

224 By quantifying egg counts alongside prevalence, this study adds an important dimension to  
225 understanding transmission risk: infection intensity is highly aggregated, with a subset of cats  
226 responsible for a disproportionate share of environmental egg output. The intensity of egg  
227 shedding varied greatly by age and sex, even though parasites were present in high numbers  
228 across all demographic groups. Young cats were classified as "super-shedders," demonstrating an  
229 egg shedding intensity nearly tenfold greater than that of adults (IRR=9.76; p<0.001). This  
230 pattern is consistent with age-acquired immunity and reduced worm fecundity in older hosts, as  
231 described for ascarid infections in both domestic and wild carnivores (Zajac et al. 2021). Male  
232 cats were identified as being four times more likely to be infected with *Toxocara* spp. (OR=4.36)  
233 and showed significantly higher egg shedding intensity than females (IRR=3.95; p=0.015). This  
234 male bias has been observed in other mammalian host-parasite systems [21] and is often  
235 attributed to the immunosuppressive effects of testosterone or behavioral factors such as larger  
236 home ranges that increase exposure to contaminated soil and paratenic hosts [22, 23]. From a  
237 management standpoint, the emergence of young males as "super-shedders" suggests that  
238 targeted interventions in this demographic group could yield outsized reductions in  
239 environmental contamination. Administering broad-spectrum anthelmintics to heavily shedding  
240 juveniles and young males during TNR procedures may be more efficient, in terms of eggs

241 removed from the environment per treatment, than uniformly treating all cats with low-intensity  
242 infections. Operationalizing such targeted deworming will require further work on feasibility,  
243 cost, and potential for repeated treatment in colonies, but the principle of focusing on high-  
244 shedding individuals is well aligned with modern parasite control strategies.

245 The observed prevalence of *Ancylostoma* spp. in this population has important implications for  
246 both animal and human health in New York City. Although *A. tubaeforme* is the most common  
247 feline hookworm, its eggs are morphologically indistinguishable from those of the zoonotic  
248 species *A. braziliense*, which cats can also shed [24]. Without molecular speciation, the precise  
249 zoonotic risk associated with these infections cannot be determined; however, the presence of a  
250 sizeable hookworm-infected free-roaming cat population in a temperate urban setting is  
251 noteworthy given ongoing climate-driven shifts in helminth distributions. Reports of *A.*  
252 *braziliense* in dogs across a broad swath of the United States, including northern regions, suggest  
253 that ecological conditions are becoming increasingly permissive for subtropical hookworms,  
254 warranting continued surveillance and molecular characterization of feline hookworms in the  
255 Northeast [25, 26]. Coccidia oocysts were also detected at a moderate prevalence. Although  
256 species-level identification was not pursued, these oocysts are most likely members of the  
257 *Cystoisospora* complex that commonly infects cats and primarily affects young or  
258 immunocompromised individuals. While feline coccidia are generally regarded as having limited  
259 direct zoonotic relevance, their presence in free-roaming cats is epidemiologically relevant  
260 because they can contribute to gastrointestinal disease and poor body condition in kittens. The  
261 trend toward higher coccidia prevalence in lactating females further suggests that reproductive  
262 and nutritional stress may influence susceptibility or shedding. Together, the hookworm and

263 coccidia findings highlight the need to consider both zoonotic risk and animal welfare when  
264 designing parasite control strategies for urban TNR programs.

265 *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium* infections in this study were detected using coproantigen assays  
266 applied to a subset of fecal samples. In field-based studies of small mesocarnivores, particularly  
267 when fecal samples are collected rectally during brief handling windows, available sample  
268 volume is severely limited, and degradation cannot always be prevented before processing.  
269 Under these constraints, coproantigen ELISAs offer practical advantages: they require minimal  
270 fecal material, are more sensitive than flotation for detecting low-intensity or intermittent  
271 shedding (especially for *Giardia*), and tolerate suboptimal sample preservation better than  
272 microscopy. Conventional flotation, by contrast, requires larger volumes and yields lower  
273 sensitivity when oocyst/cyst output is sparse. However, coproantigen assays cannot differentiate  
274 zoonotic from host-adapted assemblages, and the absence of PCR amplification likely reflects  
275 low parasite loads, intermittent shedding, or inhibitors in field-collected samples rather than true  
276 absence. These findings underscore the utility of antigen-based methods for TNR surveillance  
277 but highlight the need for future work coupling sensitive antigen detection with genotyping to  
278 clarify the specific role of urban cats in *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium* transmission cycles  
279 relevant to human health.

280 The non-detection of *C. felis* DNA in any cat tested is also noteworthy, given the rapid range of  
281 expansion of its primary vector, the lone star tick (*Amblyomma americanum*), into New York  
282 State [27]. Populations of *A. americanum* are now well-established on Long Island and Staten  
283 Island and have been detected in the Bronx [28]. The presence of the competent vector without  
284 the pathogen suggests that NYC is currently a "receptive" zone for *C. felis*. The lack of infection  
285 in our sample likely reflects the absence of the natural reservoir host, the bobcat (*Lynx rufus*),

286 from the urban core. However, the risk of introduction remains. The movement of infected  
287 domestic cats from endemic regions (e.g., the southern US) could theoretically introduce the  
288 pathogen to the local tick population, establishing a novel urban transmission cycle. Our negative  
289 findings serve as an important baseline against which future emergence can be measured.

290 The absence of heartworm antigen should be interpreted with caution. Feline heartworm disease  
291 is notoriously difficult to diagnose; cats typically harbor low worm burdens (1-3 worms) and  
292 often have single-sex infections that do not produce the antigen detected by commercial assays  
293 [29]. Studies utilizing antibody tests often reveal exposure rates significantly higher than antigen  
294 prevalence. While our results suggest that patent adult heartworm infection is not currently  
295 hyper-endemic in NYC feral cats, they do not rule out the presence of subclinical infections or  
296 exposure.

297 The seroprevalence of *T. gondii* (8.9%) in our study was lower than that reported in many other  
298 feral cat populations, which can exceed 25% [2, 30]. This relatively low rate may reflect an  
299 "urban shield" effect, where free-roaming cats in dense cities rely more heavily on anthropogenic  
300 food sources (e.g., intentional feeding, restaurant and household waste) than on hunting  
301 intermediate hosts like rodents and birds, thereby reducing their trophic exposure to tissue cysts.  
302 Seropositivity reflects prior exposure rather than active oocyst shedding, therefore, these findings  
303 indicate population-level exposure rather than current environmental contamination risk. Given  
304 the high density of cats in the city, even a low shedding rate contributes to a significant  
305 cumulative environmental load of oocysts, which can contaminate urban gardens and waterways.

306 Free-roaming cats have been proposed as sentinels for zoonotic pathogens and environmental  
307 contamination in urban settings because they occupy diverse habitats, prey on multiple species,  
308 and share public spaces with humans [31, 32]. The results from this study suggest that TNR

309 programs should ideally be coupled with parasite control strategies where feasible, although the  
310 logistics of treating free-roaming populations remain challenging. Collaboration between  
311 veterinarians, public health authorities, municipal park services, and wildlife managers can help  
312 mapping hotspots of contamination, implement targeted interventions, and monitor- trends in  
313 zoonotic pathogens prevalence and environmental contamination over time.

314

315 **Acknowledgments**

316 The authors thank the staff and volunteers of the Long Island University College of Veterinary  
317 Medicine Trap–Neuter–Return (TNR) program, in particular Marialouise Burgos and  
318 participating veterinary clinicians, for their assistance with animal handling and sample  
319 collection. The authors also acknowledge the Cornell University Animal Health Diagnostic  
320 Laboratory (AHDL) for diagnostic support. This study was supported by startup funds from  
321 Long Island University College of Veterinary Medicine, and Shreiber School of Veterinary  
322 Medicine. The authors additionally thank Maged Hemida, Melody Bauer, Abid Shah, Mani  
323 Lejeune, and Holly Ann White for their contributions to sample collection, laboratory analysis,  
324 and logistical support.

325 **References**

- 326 1. Traub RJ, Zendejas-Heredia PA, Massetti L, Colella V. Zoonotic hookworms of dogs and  
327 cats - lessons from the past to inform current knowledge and future directions of research. *Int J  
328 Parasitol.* 2021;51(13-14):1233–41. doi: 10.1016/j.ijpara.2021.10.005.
- 329 2. Taetzsch SJ, Gruszynski KR, Bertke AS, Dubey JP, Monti KA, Zajac AM, et al.  
330 Prevalence of zoonotic parasites in feral cats of Central Virginia, USA. *Zoonoses Public Health.*  
331 2018;65(6):728–35. doi: 10.1111/zph.12488.
- 332 3. Barbosa AD, Egan S, Feng Y, Xiao L, Ryan U. *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in cats and  
333 dogs: What is the real zoonotic risk? *Curr Res Parasitol Vector Borne Dis.* 2023;4:100158. doi:  
334 10.1016/j.crpvbd.2023.100158.
- 335 4. Jones JL, Dargelas V, Roberts J, Press C, Remington JS, Montoya JG. Risk factors for  
336 *Toxoplasma gondii* infection in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2009;49(6):878–84. doi:  
337 10.1086/605433.
- 338 5. Liu EW, Chastain HM, Shin SH, Wiegand RE, Kruszon-Moran D, Handali S, et al.  
339 Seroprevalence of antibodies to *Toxocara* species in the United States and associated risk factors,  
340 2011–2014. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2017;66(2):206–12. doi: 10.1093/cid/cix784.
- 341 6. Fakhri Y, Gasser RB, Rostami A, Fan CK, Ghasemi SM, Javanian M, et al. *Toxocara*  
342 eggs in public places worldwide - A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Environ Pollut.*  
343 2018;242(Pt B):1467–75. doi: 10.1016/j.envpol.2018.07.087.
- 344 7. Shapiro K, Bahia-Oliveira L, Dixon B, Dumètre A, de Wit LA, VanWormer E, et al.  
345 Environmental transmission of *Toxoplasma gondii*: Oocysts in water, soil and food. *Food  
346 Waterborne Parasitol.* 2019;15:e00049. doi: 10.1016/j.fawpar.2019.e00049.

- 347 8. Gerhold RW, Saraf P, Chapman A, Zou X, Hickling G, Stiver WH, et al. *Toxoplasma*  
348 *gondii* seroprevalence and genotype diversity in select wildlife species from the southeastern  
349 United States. *Parasit Vectors.* 2017;10(1):508. doi: 10.1186/s13071-017-2456-2.
- 350 9. Ahmadpour E, Rahimi MT, Ghojoghi A, Rezaei F, Hatam-Nahavandi K, Oliveira SMR,  
351 et al. *Toxoplasma gondii* infection in marine animal species, as a potential source of food  
352 contamination: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acta Parasitol.* 2022;67(2):592–605. doi:  
353 10.1007/s11686-021-00507-z.
- 354 10. Zajac AM, Conboy GA, Little SE, Reichard MV. *Veterinary Clinical Parasitology:* John  
355 Wiley & Sons; 2021.
- 356 11. Cirak VY, Bauer C. Comparison of conventional coproscopic methods and commercial  
357 coproantigen ELISA kits for the detection of *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium* infections in dogs  
358 and cats. *Berl Munch Tierarztl Wochenschr.* 2004;117(9-10):410–3.
- 359 12. Xiao L, Escalante L, Yang C, Sulaiman I, Escalante AA, Montali RJ, et al. Phylogenetic  
360 analysis of *Cryptosporidium* parasites based on the small-subunit rRNA gene locus. *Appl*  
361 *Environ Microbiol.* 1999;65(4):1578–83. doi: 10.1128/aem.65.4.1578-1583.1999.
- 362 13. Hong S-H, Anu D, Jeong Y-I, Abmed D, Cho S-H, Lee W-J, et al. Molecular  
363 characterization of *Giardia duodenalis* and *Cryptosporidium parvum* in fecal samples of  
364 individuals in Mongolia. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2014;90(1):43–7. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.13-0271.
- 365 14. Aston EJ, Mayor P, Bowman DD, Mohammed HO, Liotta JL, Kwok O, et al. Use of filter  
366 papers to determine seroprevalence of *Toxoplasma gondii* among hunted ungulates in remote  
367 Peruvian Amazon. *Int J Parasitol Parasites Wildl.* 2014;3(1):15–9. doi:  
368 10.1016/j.ijppaw.2013.12.001.

- 369 15. Wu SM, Zhu XQ, Zhou DH, Fu BQ, Chen J, Yang JF, et al. Seroprevalence of  
370 *Toxoplasma gondii* infection in household and stray cats in Lanzhou, northwest China. Parasit  
371 Vectors. 2011;4:214. doi: 10.1186/1756-3305-4-214.
- 372 16. Brown HM, Lockhart JM, Latimer KS, Peterson DS. Identification and genetic  
373 characterization of *Cytauxzoon felis* in asymptomatic domestic cats and bobcats. Vet Parasitol.  
374 2010;172(3-4):311–6. doi: 10.1016/j.vetpar.2010.04.041.
- 375 17. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for  
376 Statistical Computing; 2023.
- 377 18. Tyungu DL, McCormick D, Lau CL, Chang M, Murphy JR, Hotez PJ, et al.  
378 *Toxocara* species environmental contamination of public spaces in New York City. PLoS Negl  
379 Trop Dis. 2020;14(5):e0008249. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0008249.
- 380 19. Ganay J, Grigione M. Prevalence of endoparasites between domestic and community cat  
381 populations in Rockland county, New York. J Parasitol. 2022;108(6):595–9. doi: 10.1645/21-90.
- 382 20. Rostami A, Sepidarkish M, Ma G, Wang T, Ebrahimi M, Fakhri Y, et al. Chapter Thirty -  
383 Global prevalence of *Toxocara* infection in cats. In: Bowman DD, editor. Advances in  
384 Parasitology. 109: Academic Press; 2020. p. 615–39.
- 385 21. Habig B, Doellman MM, Woods K, Olansen J, Archie EA. Social status and parasitism in  
386 male and female vertebrates: a meta-analysis. Sci Rep. 2018;8(1):3629. doi: 10.1038/s41598-  
387 018-21994-7.
- 388 22. Sellau J, Hansen CS, Gálvez RI, Linnemann L, Honecker B, Lotter H. Immunological  
389 clues to sex differences in parasitic diseases. Trends Parasitol. 2024;40(11):1029–41. doi:  
390 10.1016/j.pt.2024.09.006.

- 391 23. Shilereyo M, Magige F, Ranke PS, Ongutu JO, Røskraft E. Ectoparasite load of small  
392 mammals in the Serengeti Ecosystem: effects of land use, season, host species, age, sex and  
393 breeding status. *Parasitol Res.* 2022;121(3):823–38. doi: 10.1007/s00436-022-07439-1.
- 394 24. Liotta JL, Koompapong KN, Yaros JP, Prullage J, Bowman DD. Prevalence of  
395 *Ancylostoma braziliense* in cats in three northern counties of Florida, United States. *J Parasitol.*  
396 2012;98(5):1032–3. doi: 10.1645/ge-2930.1.
- 397 25. Stocker T, Ward MP, Šlapeta J. Nationwide USA re-analysis of amplicon metabarcoding  
398 targeting β-tubulin isoform-1 reveals absence of benzimidazole resistant SNPs in *Ancylostoma*  
399 *braziliense*, *Ancylostoma tubaeforme* and *Uncinaria stenocephala*. *Vet Parasitol.*  
400 2024;327:110118. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2024.110118>.
- 401 26. Rupasinghe R, Chomel BB, Martínez-López B. Climate change and zoonoses: A review  
402 of the current status, knowledge gaps, and future trends. *Acta Tropica.* 2022;226:106225. doi:  
403 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actatropica.2021.106225>.
- 404 27. Springer YP, Eisen L, Beati L, James AM, Eisen RJ. Spatial distribution of counties in the  
405 continental United States with records of occurrence of *Amblyomma americanum* (Ixodida:  
406 Ixodidae). *J Med Entomol.* 2014;51(2):342–51. doi: 10.1603/me13115.
- 407 28. 2021 Health Advisory #10: Tick-borne Disease Advisory [Internet]. New York City  
408 Department of Health and Mental hygiene; 2021; 6/9/2021. Available from:  
409 <https://www.nyc.gov/assets/doh/downloads/pdf/han/advisory/2021/tick-borne-diseases.pdf>
- 410 29. Noack S, Harrington J, Carithers DS, Kaminsky R, Selzer PM. Heartworm disease -  
411 Overview, intervention, and industry perspective. *Int J Parasitol Drugs Drug Resist.* 2021;16:65–  
412 89. doi: 10.1016/j.ijpddr.2021.03.004. PubMed PMID: 34030109.

- 413 30. Zhu S, Camp L, Patel A, VanWormer E, Shapiro K. High prevalence and diversity of  
414 *Toxoplasma gondii* DNA in feral cat feces from coastal California. PLoS Negl Trop Dis.  
415 2023;17(12):e0011829. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0011829.
- 416 31. Candela MG, Fanelli A, Carvalho J, Serrano E, Domenech G, Alonso F, et al. Urban  
417 landscape and infection risk in free-roaming cats. Zoonoses Public Health. 2022;69(4):295–311.  
418 doi: 10.1111/zph.12919.
- 419 32. Selyemová D, Antolová D, Mangová B, Jarošová J, Ličková M, Havlíková SF, et al. Cats  
420 as a sentinel species for human infectious diseases – toxoplasmosis, trichinellosis, and COVID-  
421 19. Curr Res Parasitol Vector Borne Dis. 2024;6:100196. doi:  
422 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crpvbd.2024.100196>.
- 423



0      10      20 km

