

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

The red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) as a potential natural reservoir of human cryptosporidiosis by *Cryptosporidium hominis* in Northwest Spain

Juan P. Barrera, David Carmena, Elena Rodríguez, Rocío Checa, Ana M. López, Luis E. Fidalgo, Rosa Gálvez, Valentina Marino, Isabel Fuentes, Guadalupe Miró, Ana Montoya.

Transbound Emerg Dis. 2020 Apr 17.

which has been published in final form at

<https://doi.org/10.1111/tbed.13569>

1 **The red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) as a potential natural reservoir of human cryptosporidiosis by**

2 ***Cryptosporidium hominis* in Northwest Spain**

3 **Running head:** *Cryptosporidium hominis* infection in red foxes

4

5 Juan Pedro Barrera¹, David Carmena², Elena Rodríguez¹, Rocío Checa¹, Ana María López³, Luis

6 Eusebio Fidalgo³, Rosa Gálvez¹, Valentina Marino¹, Isabel Fuentes², Guadalupe Miró¹, Ana

7 Montoya¹

8

9 ¹ Departamento de Sanidad Animal, Facultad de Veterinaria, Universidad Complutense de Madrid,
10 Madrid. Spain.

11 ² Laboratorio de Referencia e Investigación en Parasitología, Centro Nacional de Microbiología,
12 Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Majadahonda, Madrid, Spain

13 ³ Departamento de Ciencias Clínicas Veterinarias, Facultad de Veterinaria, Universidad de Lugo,
14 Spain

15

16 **Correspondence**

17 David Carmena, Laboratorio de Referencia e Investigación en Parasitología, Centro Nacional de
18 Microbiología, Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Ctra. Majadahonda-Pozuelo Km 2, 28008
19 Majadahonda, Madrid, Spain.

20 Email: dacarmena@isciii.es

21

22 Guadalupe Miró, Departamento de Sanidad Animal, Facultad de Veterinaria, Universidad
23 Complutense de Madrid, Avda. Puerta de Hierro s/n, 28040 Madrid. Spain.

24 Email: gmiro@ucm.es

25 **SUMMARY**

26 *Giardia duodenalis* and *Cryptosporidium* spp. are ubiquitous intestinal protozoa that
27 parasitize domestic and wild animals, as well as human beings. Due to their zoonotic potential,
28 the objective of the present study was to determine the presence of these pathogens in the fox
29 population (*Vulpes vulpes*) located in Northwest Spain. A total of 197 faecal samples from
30 legally hunted foxes were collected in the autonomous region of Galicia. The presence of *G.*
31 *duodenalis* and *Cryptosporidium* spp. was investigated by PCR-based methods amplifying the
32 small subunit ribosomal RNA (*ssu* rRNA) gene of the parasites. Attempts to genotype
33 obtained positive samples were subsequently conducted at the glutamate dehydrogenase (*gdh*)
34 and β -giardin (*bg*) genes of *G. duodenalis*, and the 60 kDa glycoprotein (*gp60*) gene of
35 *Cryptosporidium*. *Giardia duodenalis* and *Cryptosporidium* spp. were identified in 19 (9.6%)
36 and 12 (6.1%) of the investigated samples, respectively. However, five *Cryptosporidium*
37 species were detected at the *ssu* rRNA locus: *C. hominis* (33.4%, 4/12), *C. canis* (25.0%,
38 3/12), *C. parvum* (16.7%, 2/12), *C. ubiquitum* (8.3%, 1/12), and *C. suis* (8.3%, 1/12). An
39 additional *Cryptosporidium*-positive sample was identified at the genus level only. Typing
40 and subtyping of *Giardia*- and *Cryptosporidium*-positive samples was unsuccessful. The
41 detection of *C. hominis* in wild foxes indicates the probable overlapping of sylvatic and
42 domestic cycles of this parasite in rural settings. Besides, this finding raises the question of
43 whether red foxes may act as natural reservoirs of *C. hominis*. The detection of *C. parvum* and
44 *C. suis* is suggestive of active transmission events between farm and wild animals, opening
45 up the possibility of transmission to human beings.

46

47 **KEYWORDS:** *Cryptosporidium hominis*; *Giardia*; Foxes; Genotyping; Prevalence; Sylvatic
48 cycle; Spain

49 1. INTRODUCTION

50 *Giardia* (phylum Metamonada) and *Cryptosporidium* (phylum Apicomplexa) are worldwide
51 intestinal parasites that infect a broad spectrum of vertebrates. Both are considered relevant
52 pathogens in public and animal health and have a significant zoonotic impact because certain
53 species are able to infect animals and human beings (Thompson, 2004; Xiao, 2010; Ryan &
54 Cacciò, 2013; Ryan et al., 2016; Thompson & Ash, 2016). Infection typically occurs after
55 ingestion of contaminated water or food. Not surprisingly, *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium* are
56 common causes of waterborne and foodborne outbreaks of diarrhoea globally (Chalmers et al.,
57 2010; Efstratiou et al., 2017; Robertson, 2018).

58 Subclinical carriage of *Giardia* and *Cryptosporidium* is frequent (Reh et al., 2019), but
59 both pathogens can cause a wide range of gastrointestinal-related conditions including chronic
60 small bowel diarrhoea, vomiting, fever, and progressive weight loss. *Cryptosporidium* infection
61 is a major cause of diarrhoea in immunocompromised adults and immunocompetent children,
62 whereas *G. duodenalis* is the main intestinal parasite affecting people in developed countries
63 (Cacciò & Chalmers, 2016; Mmbaga & Houpt, 2017). In Spain, according to data from the
64 National Epidemiological Surveillance Network, human clinical cases of cryptosporidiosis and
65 giardiasis have gradually increased since 2010, with children aged between 1 and 9 years being
66 particularly at risk of these infections (NESN, 2016).

67 *G. duodenalis* is considered a multispecies complex with at least eight distinct
68 assemblages (A-H) differing in host specificities and genetic content. There is extensive genetic
69 sub-structuring within assemblages A and B, further divided within sub-assemblages AI-AIII
70 and BIII-BIV, respectively (Feng & Xiao, 2011). Assemblages A and B infect a wide diversity
71 of mammal species including humans and are therefore considered zoonotic. The remaining
72 assemblages are likely to be host-specific and are only sporadically found infecting humans.

73 The genus *Cryptosporidium* encompasses thus far 38 recognized species (Feng et al.,
74 2018). *C. hominis* primarily (but not exclusively) infects humans, whereas *C. parvum* is
75 considered the most important *Cryptosporidium* zoonotic species, having as main reservoirs
76 cattle and humans. Several other *Cryptosporidium* species from mammals and birds (e.g. *C.*
77 *meleagridis*, *C. canis*, *C. felis*, and *C. ubiquitum*, among others) pose also zoonotic risk at
78 varying degrees, causing animal contact-associated or waterborne and foodborne
79 cryptosporidiosis in humans (Ryan et al., 2014; Efstratiou et al., 2017, Ryan et al., 2018).
80 Importantly, the notion that *C. hominis* is a human-specific *Cryptosporidium* species has being
81 increasingly challenged by numerous molecular epidemiological studies revealing that the
82 actual host range of *C. hominis* is much wider than initially thought (Widmer et al., in press).

83 Although there is some controversy about the role played by production animals in
84 transmission (e.g. O’Handley, 2007), genotyping of *Giardia*- and *Cryptosporidium*-positive
85 samples is essential to ascertain the epidemiology of these pathogens and their public veterinary
86 health relevance. Conventionally, livestock and companion animal species have been regarded
87 as the most important sources of zoonotic human cryptosporidiosis cases (Ryan & Cacciò,
88 2013; Slapeta, 2013; Ryan et al., 2014). However, due to the steady but continuous human
89 encroachment into wildlife habitats, free-living animals including foxes, raccoons, and wild
90 boars are becoming an increasingly common sight on the urban and peri-urban areas of many
91 European cities (Mackenstedt et al., 2015). Given this scenario, wild animals may play a more
92 important role in the spreading of pathogens and as natural source of human and pet infections
93 than previously anticipated (Thompson, 2013; Ryan et al., 2016; Zahedi et al., 2016).

94 In Spain, very few epidemiological surveys have attempted to investigate the occurrence
95 of *G. duodenalis* and *Cryptosporidium* spp. infection in the red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*). These
96 molecular-based studies revealed the presence of *C. canis*, *C. felis*, *C. parvum*, and *C. ubiquitum*

97 circulating in fox populations in the North and Central areas of the country (Mateo et al., 2017;
98 Navarro-i-Martinez et al., 2011). However, no data are currently available on the occurrence
99 and distribution of *G. duodenalis* and *Cryptosporidium* spp. in wild canids in Northwest Spain,
100 a region where these pathogens have been previously reported in wild and domestic animals,
101 humans, and even environmental (water) samples (Castro-Hermida et al., 2002, 2007, 2008,
102 2009, 2011; Castro-Hermida et al., 2006; Gómez-Couso et al., 2006; García-Presedo et al.,
103 2013; Gabín-García et al., 2017). Because red fox populations have significantly increased in
104 rural and peri-urban settings of this region (average density: 3.9–5.4 foxes/km²) in recent years,
105 this epidemiological scenario may favour the transition from sylvatic to domestic transmission
106 cycles of these parasites (López Becerro, 2009). The aims of the present study were i) to
107 determine the presence and molecular diversity of zoonotic protozoa in faeces from foxes living
108 in Northwest Spain, ii) to conduct a preliminary assessment of the zoonotic potential risk that
109 fox populations pose in areas where sylvatic and domestic transmission cycles overlap, and iii)
110 to identify biological and environmental factors potentially associated to a higher risk of
111 infection.

112 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

113 **2.1 Ethical statement**

114 This study was carried out in accordance with Spanish legislation guidelines (RD 8/2003) and
115 with the International Guiding Principles for Biomedical Research Involving Animals issued
116 by the Council for International Organization of Medical Sciences and the International Council
117 for Laboratory Animal Science (RD 53/2013).

118 **2.2 Study area, sampling and data collection**

119 The carcasses of 197 wild red foxes obtained in three out of the four provinces of the autonomous
120 region of Galicia (NW Spain) between 2015 and 2019 were included in this study (Figure 1).
121 The foxes had been legally shot during the official hunting season (from January to February)
122 of each year. Faecal samples were collected from the rectum, transferred into sterile containers,
123 and kept at 4 °C until further processing, usually within 72 h.

124 Information including specific coordinates of sampling sites, sample identification
125 number, date, capture site, age, clinical status and sex were carefully recorded for each animal
126 in an Excel spreadsheet. Clinical signs (change in the colour of mucous membranes, body and
127 skin condition, lymphadenomegaly) were also assessed at the time of sampling. A body
128 condition score (based on the thickness of the fat layer in the thoracic and abdominal cavities
129 and the amount of visceral fat observed at necropsy) ranging from 1 to 5 was used, with a score
130 of 1 being cachectic and 5 being overweight (Winstanley et al., 1998). Animal age was
131 estimated according to several factors including body development (complete or not), external
132 appearance, developmental stage of genitals (external or internal) and dentition (presence,
133 development and teeth wear, periodontal disease). Three age groups were established: immature
134 or juvenile (individuals <1 year-old), adults (reproductive individuals between 1–5 years-old),
135 and old adults (individuals >5 years-old showing teeth wear and/or varying degree of
136 periodontal disease or even loss of teeth).

137 **2.3 Faecal sample processing**

138 An aliquot (3–5 g) of each faecal sample was suspended into 20 mL volumes of 1× phosphate
139 buffered saline (PBS) and thoroughly homogenized. The homogenate was then filtered through
140 a sieve mesh (250 µm diameter) double gauze. The filtered suspension was divided into two 10
141 mL tubes and centrifuged at 500 × g for 10 min. After careful removal of the supernatant, the

142 remaining pellet was transferred to a clean 1.5 mL tube and stored at -20 °C until DNA
143 extraction was performed.

144 **2.4 DNA extraction and purification**

145 DNA was extracted from faecal samples using the QIAmp DNA Stool Mini Kit (QIAGEN,
146 Hilden, Germany) following the manufacturer's instructions. The extracted DNA was stored at
147 4 °C until PCR analyses. Elapsed time between sample processing and PCR testing was 1–6
148 months.

149 **2.5 Molecular detection and characterisation of *G. duodenalis***

150 To detect *G. duodenalis*, a real-time PCR (qPCR) protocol was used to amplify a ~62-bp region
151 of the small subunit ribosomal RNA (*ssu* rRNA) gene of the parasite (Verweij et al., 2003). The
152 reaction mixture (25 µL) contained 3 µL of template DNA, 12.5 pmol of each primer Gd-80F
153 (5'-GACGGCTCAGGACAACGGTT-3') and Gd-127R (5'-TTGCCAGCGGTGTCCG-3'),
154 10 pmol of probe (6-carboxyfluorescein[FAM]-5'-CCCGCGGCGGTCCCTGCTAG-3'-
155 blackhole quencher 1 [BHQ1]), and 1X TaqMan® Gene Expression Master Mix (Applied
156 Biosystems, CA, USA). Negative and positive controls were included in all PCR runs.
157 Amplification reactions were performed in a Corbett Rotor-Gene 6000 qPCR cycler
158 (QIAGEN). Cycling conditions were: an initial hold step of 2 min at 55 °C and 15 min at 95 °C,
159 followed by 45 cycles of 15 s at 95 °C and 1 min at 60 °C. For genotyping purposes, a semi-
160 nested and a nested PCR protocols were used, respectively, to amplify partial fragments of the
161 glutamate dehydrogenase (*gdh*; Read et al., 2004) and β-giardin (*bg*; Lalle et al., 2005) genes
162 of *G. duodenalis*. Amplification reactions (25 µL) contained 0.4–0.5 µM of each primer, 2.5
163 units of MyTAQ™ DNA polymerase (Bioline GmbH, Luckenwalde, Germany), 5 µL of 5×
164 MyTAQ™ Reaction Buffer containing 5 mM dNTPs and 15 mM MgCl₂, and 3–5 µL of

165 template DNA. Amplifications were conducted in a 2720 thermal cycler (Applied Biosystems).
166 PCR products were resolved on 2% D5 agarose gels (Conda, Madrid, Spain) stained with
167 Pronasafe nucleic acid staining solution (Conda).

168 **2.6 Molecular detection and characterisation of *Cryptosporidium* spp.**

169 Detection and identification of *Cryptosporidium* species was achieved using a nested PCR
170 protocol to amplify a partial (~587 bp) fragment of the *ssu* rRNA gene of the parasite (Tiangtip
171 & Jongwutiwes, 2002). The outer primers were CR-P1 (5'–
172 CAGGGAGGTAGTGACAAGAA–3') and CR-P2 (5'–TCAGCCTTGCGACCATACTC–3')
173 and the inner primers were CR-P3 (5'–ATTGGAGGGCAAGTCTGGTG–3') and CPB-DIAGR
174 (5'–TAAGGTGCTGAAGGAGTAAGG–3'). The reaction mix (50 µL) comprised 0.3 µM of
175 each primer, 2.5 units of DNA polymerase, 10 µL of 5× Reaction Buffer, and 3 µL of template
176 DNA. Cycling conditions for the primary and secondary PCR reactions included one cycle of
177 94 °C for 3 min, followed by 35 cycles of 94 °C for 40 s, 50 °C for 40 s and 72 °C for 1 min,
178 and a final extension of 72 °C for 10 min. DNA samples positive to *C. parvum*/*C. hominis* and
179 *C. ubiquitum* at the *ssu*-PCR were subtyped at the 60-kDa glycoprotein (*gp60*) of the parasite
180 using specific protocols (Feltus et al., 2006; Li et al., 2014). PCR reagents and equipment used
181 were the same as described above for the *gdh*-PCR and the *bg*-PCR protocols.

182 **2.7 Sequence analyses**

183 Obtained PCR products were sequenced in both directions with the corresponding internal
184 primer sets described above using Big Dye™ chemistries and an ABI 3730xl sequencer
185 analyser (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA). Raw sequencing data in both forward and
186 reverse directions were viewed using the Chromas Lite version 2.1 sequence analysis
187 program. The BLAST tool was used to compare nucleotide sequences with appropriate

188 reference sequences retrieved from the National Center for Biotechnology Information
189 (NCBI) database. Generated DNA consensus sequences were aligned to appropriate reference
190 sequences using the MEGA 7 software to confirm species identity. Phylogenetic relationships
191 among *Cryptosporidium* sequences identified in the present survey and known
192 *Cryptosporidium* sequences retrieved from the NCBI public repository was done by the
193 Neighbor-Joining (NJ) method using MEGA 7 (Tamura et al., 2013). Genetic distance was
194 calculated with the Kimura 2-parameter model, and the rate variation among sites was
195 modelled with a gamma distribution (shape parameter = 2).

196 **2.8 Statistical analysis**

197 Potential association between all the variables examined were investigated with the Chi-
198 square test. We also explored whether proximity of infected foxes to river courses could be
199 linked to an increased risk of environmental surface water contamination with *Cryptosporidium*
200 oocysts and *Giardia* cysts, or, on the contrary, foxes may acquire these infections through
201 consumption of water contaminated with faecal material from human or livestock origin. To do
202 so, we first use the GIS software ArcGis Pro v.2.3.3 (ESRI, Redlands, CA) to assign each
203 sampling site coordinate the real distance to the closest river course, taking into account spatial
204 information derived from a 200 m resolution digital elevation model provided by the National
205 Center for Geographic Information (CNIG). Secondly, T-student and Mann-Whitney U tests
206 were used to assess correlation between foxes testing positive to *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia*
207 and distance from river courses. Analyses were conducted using SPSS Statistics package 17.0
208 (IBM, Chicago, IL, USA). Significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

209 **3. RESULTS**

210 A total of 197 faecal samples from individual red foxes were collected and included in the
211 present survey. After examination, foxes were classified according to sex (107 males, 90
212 females) and estimated age (60 juveniles, 109 adults and 28 old adults). Body condition
213 appraisal revealed that most (83%, 163/197) of the animals fell within scores 2 and 3. Overall,
214 40 animals were captured in the province of A Coruña, 94 in Lugo, 11 in Ourense, and 52 in
215 Pontevedra (Figure 1 and Table 1).

216 Based on PCR methods, *G. duodenalis* and *Cryptosporidium* spp. were identified in
217 9.6% (19/197) and 6.1% (12/197) of the investigated faecal samples, respectively. *Giardia*
218 *duodenalis* was equally present in male and female foxes of all age groups investigated.
219 However, vixens were more likely ($P < 0.05$) to be infected by *Cryptosporidium* spp. than male
220 foxes. Animals with a body condition score of 2 were more prone to have cryptosporidiosis,
221 although this difference was not statistically significant. No foxes with a body condition of 5
222 (overweight) were found. The three foxes with a body condition score of 1 (cachectic) were
223 found infected neither by *G. duodenalis* nor *Cryptosporidium* spp. None of these pathogens
224 were identified infecting foxes captured in Ourense, although this finding may be associated to
225 the relatively low number of animals sampled in that particular province (Table 1).

226 Samples that tested positive to *G. duodenalis* by qPCR had cycle threshold (Ct) values
227 ranging from 33.0 to 43.4 (median: 39.1). Attempts to amplify these samples at the *gdh* and *bg*
228 loci of the parasite failed repeatedly. BLAST sequence alignments of the *Cryptosporidium*-
229 positive amplicons obtained at the *ssu*-PCR allowed the identification of five different
230 *Cryptosporidium* species including *C. hominis* (33.4%, 4/12), *C. canis* (25.0%, 3/12), *C.*
231 *parvum* (16.7%, 2/12), *C. ubiquitum* (8.3%, 1/12), and *C. suis* (8.3%, 1/12). An additional
232 *Cryptosporidium*-positive sample was only confirmed at the genus level. The main

233 epidemiological and clinical features of the red foxes harbouring *Cryptosporidium* infections
234 are summarized in Table 2.

235 Table 3 shows the main molecular features of the 12 *Cryptosporidium ssu* rRNA
236 sequences generated in the present survey. Representative nucleotide sequences were deposited
237 in the GenBank database under accession numbers MK770260-MK770267 and MN996814-
238 MN996816. The two *C. parvum* sequences identified corresponded to known genetic variants
239 of the bovine genotype of the parasite, also known as *C. pestis* (GenBank accession number
240 AF108864) by some authors (Slapeta, 2006). Unexpectedly, a very high nucleotide diversity
241 was found among the four sequences assigned to *C. hominis*, including one known and three
242 novel genetic variants. The three sequences identified as *C. canis* are known to be circulating
243 in wild and domestic canids globally, but the *C. ubiquitum* and *C. suis* sequences corresponded
244 to genotypes not reported yet.

245 Attempts to determine the subtypes of the *C. hominis*, *C. parvum*, and *C. ubiquitum*
246 isolates at the *gp60* marker were unsuccessful. The phylogenetic tree for partial *ssu* rDNA
247 sequences including those generated in the present study and known and reference genotypes
248 of the parasite is shown in Fig. 2. The three novel *C. hominis* genotypes (GenBank accession
249 numbers MK770262-MK770264) formed a well-defined group together with other *C. hominis*
250 sequences previously obtained in wild mesocarnivore species and domestic dogs from Spain.
251 The novel *C. ubiquitum* sequence identified here (MK770267) clustered with reference
252 sequences belonging to this *Cryptosporidium* species but showed marked genetic differences
253 with the only fox sequence reported in Spain to date, belonging to an animal from the Basque
254 Country (Northern Spain). The novel *C. suis* sequence identified here (MN996816) clustered
255 together with reference sequence AF115377, but was also closely related (99.8% identify) to
256 *C. occultus* (MG699176).

257 Interestingly, fox faecal samples collected near main river courses were found
258 significantly more infected with *G. duodenalis*, but not with *Cryptosporidium* spp., than those
259 from more distant sites (Table 4).

260 **4. DISCUSSION**

261 Livestock and companion animal species have been long regarded as the main reservoir of
262 protozoal diseases to humans (Feng & Xiao, 2011; Esch & Petersen, 2013; Ryan et al., 2014).
263 However, wildlife are being increasingly recognised as an important source of emerging and/or
264 re-emerging human pathogens, including the diarrhoea-causing protozoa *Giardia duodenalis*
265 and *Cryptosporidium* spp. (Polley, 2005; Ryan et al., 2016). Data presented here fall within this
266 frame of thinking, demonstrating that *G. duodenalis* and *Cryptosporidium* spp. are common
267 findings in red foxes living in Northwest Spain, and that this host species can act as a suitable
268 natural reservoir of species/genotypes potentially infective to human beings, including *C.*
269 *hominis*.

270 The overall *G. duodenalis* prevalence found (9.6%) in the surveyed fox population was
271 slightly higher than that (mean: 8%; range: 0–18%) previously reported also by PCR in other
272 regions of the country (Mateo et al., 2017). In this very same area (Northwest Spain). *G.*
273 *duodenalis* has been detected previously in 7% of otters (Méndez-Hermida et al., 2007), 5% of
274 roe deer, and 1% of wild boars (Castro-Hermida et al., 2011b), but not in free-living foxes. In
275 the European scenario, documented infection rates in foxes ranged from 2–5% in Norway and
276 Croatia (Hammes et al., 2007; Beck et al., 2011), and up to 19% in Poland (Stojecki et al., 2015).
277 Our qPCR results revealed that all *Giardia*-positive samples delivered high (>33) Ct values,
278 strongly suggesting that infected foxes harboured light parasite burdens. This fact can explain
279 the failure to amplify *Giardia* DNA at the *gdh* and *bg* loci, as both markers are single-copy

280 genes with limited detection sensitivity. Unfortunately, this also means that we were unable to
281 assess the *G. duodenalis* assemblages/sub-assemblages (and their zoonotic relevance)
282 circulating in the fox population under study. This is a frequent problem encountered in many
283 molecular epidemiological investigations focusing on wild mesocarnivore species including
284 foxes (Mateo et al., 2017). Of note, zoonotic assemblages A and B have been identified in
285 Croatian and Norwegian foxes (Hamnes et al., 2007; Beck et al., 2011). Other wild canids
286 including wolves and raccoon dogs harboured infections with *G. duodenalis* assemblages A, C,
287 and D in Croatia (Beck et al., 2011) and Romania (Adriana et al., 2016).

288 *Cryptosporidium* infection was found in 6.1% of foxes, a prevalence similar to the
289 average rate (8%) previously reported at national level (Mateo et al., 2017). Additionally, the
290 parasite has also been identified in one out of four foxes in Eastern Spain (Navarro-i-Martinez
291 et al., 2010). In our study, female were significantly more infected by *Cryptosporidium* than
292 male foxes. This could be related to stress-induced immune compromise during the
293 reproductive season, since in the Iberian Peninsula mating usually occurs during the months of
294 January and February (López Becerro et al., 2009), overlapping with the hunting and capture
295 period of the foxes in the present study. This finding has not been described in previous studies,
296 so further research would be necessary to unravel the true influence of sex on the prevalence of
297 the infection by this parasite.

298 A striking finding was the confirmation of *C. hominis* as the most prevalent
299 *Cryptosporidium* species circulating in the investigated fox population. Until recent, *C. hominis*
300 was mainly thought to be specifically adapted to infect humans. However, an increasing number
301 of investigations, including experimental infections in animal models and molecular
302 epidemiological surveys in domestic and wildlife species, have demonstrated that *C. hominis* is
303 able to successfully infect a broad range of hosts including cattle, sheep, horses, donkeys, pigs,

304 rodents, geese, deer, dingoes, hedgehogs, kangaroos, wallabies, and several species of non-
305 human primates (e.g. Akiyoshi et al., 2002; Guk et al., 2004; Schiller et al., 2016; Zahedi et al.,
306 2016; Feng et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2019). Only in Spain, *C. hominis* has been reported in a
307 domestic dog from the Basque Country (Gil et al., 2017) and a free-living badger from Asturias
308 (Mateo et al., 2017). These findings raise interesting questions about the host specificity and
309 evolution of *C. hominis* (Widmer et al., in press). Even more intriguing was the fact that three
310 out of the four *C. hominis* sequences generated at the *ssu* rRNA locus corresponded to genetic
311 variants of the parasite not described previously, whereas the fourth one was identified as a
312 genotype commonly seen in Spanish clinical patients (e.g. GenBank accession number
313 KY499055) (de Lucio et al., 2016; Azcona-Gutiérrez et al., 2017). Such variety of distinct,
314 novel sequences may be indicative of true *C. hominis* infections rather than accidental carriage
315 (spurious infection) of ingested oocysts of the parasite. Unfortunately, our attempts to amplify
316 these samples at the *gp60* marker did not yield readable sequences, so the subtypes of the
317 parasite involved in these infection remains unknown. These findings provide preliminary
318 molecular evidence supporting the existence of a peri-domestic transmission cycles of *C.*
319 *hominis* maintained within humans and foxes. This does not preclude that a sylvatic
320 transmission cycle of the parasite may also be occurring in this geographical area, as suggested
321 by the three novel *C. hominis* sequences described above. The former scenario would be
322 favoured by the increasing proximity of fox populations to human settlements in rural Galicia.
323 These foxes may acquire the parasite by feeding from garbage and carrion remains of domestic
324 animals, or from water or food contaminated with faeces of human origin (Navarro-i-Martinez
325 et al., 2011). This epidemiological situation fits well with the rural land tenure structure in
326 Galicia, characterized by the presence of small family farms, holdings and parcels and a
327 resulting landscape in the form of a complex mosaic, unlike the rest of Spain (Crecente et al.,

328 2002). The extent and exact meaning of these results should be corroborated in further typing
329 and subtyping molecular surveys investigating simultaneously *Cryptosporidium*-positive faecal
330 specimens from human and animal (including wildlife) origin, and also from environmental
331 (soil, water) samples in this geographical area. Whatever the case, it seems clear that foxes
332 carrying and disseminating *C. hominis* oocysts should be considered as a potential source of
333 environmental contamination including surface waters intended for human consumption
334 (Gómez-Bautista et al., 2000; Navarro-i-Martínez et al., 2011).

335 The finding of zoonotic *C. parvum* is also relevant, as this *Cryptosporidium* species is a
336 major diarrhoea-causing agent in livestock (primarily calves) causing substantial economic
337 losses. *Cryptosporidium parvum* has been frequently reported in humans, domestic ruminants,
338 wildlife, and surface waters from Galicia (Castro-Hermida et al., 2011; García-Preedo et al.,
339 2013; Abal-Fabeiro et al., 2014), so the finding of this species in free-living foxes was somehow
340 expected, pointing out to the existence of transmission events between sylvatic and domestic
341 (involving livestock species and humans) cycles of the parasite (Navarro-i-Martínez et al.,
342 2003). Similar conclusions can be drawn for *C. suis*, a *Cryptosporidium* species adapted to
343 infect swine that has been previously described in farmed pigs in north-eastern Spain (Suárez-
344 Luengas et al., 2007). This is, to the best of our knowledge, the first description of *C. suis* in
345 red foxes. Interestingly, *C. suis* has also been described in five of 209 wild boars in Galicia
346 (García-Preedo et al., 2013). These facts support the hypothesis of cross-transmission of
347 *Cryptosporidium* spp. between domestic and free-living animal species.

348 Zoonotic *C. ubiquitum* has been regarded as a pathogen emerging in humans (Li et al.,
349 2014), although no human infections by this *Cryptosporidium* species have been documented
350 in Spain yet. The parasite is known to have a broad host spectrum including ruminants, rodents
351 and primates. Few studies have reported the presence of *C. ubiquitum* in different geographical

352 areas (Zahedi et al., 2016) including Spain (Mateo et al., 2017). Finally, *C. canis* is primarily
353 found infecting domestic and wild (including foxes) canids (Mateo et al., 2017; Zahedi et al.,
354 2016). Because of its narrower host preferences, human infections by *C. canis* are rarely
355 described, mainly in children and immunocompromised individuals. Therefore, this
356 *Cryptosporidium* species is considered of low zoonotic potential.

357 Finally, we also found that fox faecal samples collected near main water streams were
358 more likely to harbour *G. duodenalis* cysts than those recovered from more distant sites. This
359 finding may pose a significant (but still not fully evaluated) public health threat, as foxes
360 carrying *G. duodenalis* (and *Cryptosporidium*) infections can contribute to the environmental
361 burden of infective (oo)cysts and contaminate surface waters intended for human consumption
362 or recreation. This does not preclude that foxes may also acquire these infections, at least
363 partially, through drinking water contaminated with human or livestock faecal material. In this
364 regard we should keep in mind that Galician surface water bodies have been shown to be heavily
365 polluted with viable *G. duodenalis* cysts (range: 1–400 per litre) belonging to sub-assemblages
366 AI and AII and assemblage E, and *Cryptosporidium* oocysts (range: 1–1,200 per litre) assigned
367 to *C. hominis*, *C. parvum* and *C. andersoni* (Castro-Hermida et al., 2009, 2010). More research
368 is clearly needed to ascertain the frequency, directionality, and extent of these events.

369 **CONCLUSIONS**

370 In addition to previously known *C. canis*, *C. parvum* and *C. ubiquitum*, this is the first
371 description of *C. hominis* and *C. suis* infections from foxes globally, and the first report of *G.*
372 *duodenalis* infection in free-living fox populations from Northwest Spain. Molecular data
373 presented here, although preliminary and in need of confirmation, may indicate that *C. hominis*
374 can be naturally infecting wild red foxes, and that this host may be a significant reservoir of

375 *Cryptosporidium* in humans and domestic animals. Given this scenario, the increasing
376 urbanization of fox habitats favoured by their scavenging behaviour and the accessibility of
377 anthroponotic food may pose a greater public veterinary health risk than previously anticipated.

378 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

379 The red foxes used in this study were provided by the Wildlife Recovery Centres of Galicia,
380 Dirección Xeral de Patrimonio Natural (Xunta de Galicia, Spain) and by Federación Galega de
381 Caza. Molecular analyses conducted in this survey were funded by the Health Institute Carlos
382 III, Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness under project CP12/03081.

383 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

384 The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

385 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

386 The data that supports the findings of this study are available in the supplementary material of
387 this article.

388 **REFERENCES**

- 389 Abal-Fabeiro, J.L., Maside, X., Llovo, J., Bello, X., Torres, M., Treviño, M., Moldes, L.,
390 Muñoz, A., Carracedo, A., & Bartolomé, C. (2014). High-throughput genotyping assay
391 for the large-scale genetic characterization of *Cryptosporidium* parasites from human
392 and bovine samples. *Parasitology*, *141*(4), 491–500. [https://doi.org/
393 10.1017/S0031182013001807](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031182013001807)
- 394 Adriana, G., Zsuzsa, K., Mirabela Oana, D., Mircea, G.C., & Viorica, M. (2016). *Giardia*
395 *duodenalis* genotypes in domestic and wild animals from Romania identified by PCR-

396 RFLP targeting the *gdh* gene. *Veterinary Parasitology*, 217, 71–75.
397 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2015.10.017>

398 Akiyoshi, D.E., Feng, X., Buckholt, M.A., Widmer, G., & Tzipori, S. (2002). Genetic analysis
399 of a *Cryptosporidium parvum* human genotype 1 isolate passaged through different host
400 species. *Infection and Immunity*, 70, 5670–5675.
401 <https://doi.org/10.1128/iai.70.10.5670-5675.2002>

402 Azcona-Gutiérrez, J.M., de Lucio, A., Hernández-de-Mingo, M., García-García, C., Soria-
403 Blanco, L.M., Morales, L., Aguilera, M., Fuentes, I., & Carmena, D. (2017). Molecular
404 diversity and frequency of the diarrheagenic enteric protozoan *Giardia duodenalis* and
405 *Cryptosporidium* spp. in a hospital setting in Northern Spain. *PLoS One*, 12(6),
406 e0178575. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0178575>

407 Beck, R., Sprong, H., Lucinger, S., Pozio, E., & Cacciò, S.M. (2011). A large survey of Croatian
408 wild mammals for *Giardia duodenalis* reveals a low prevalence and limited zoonotic
409 potential. *Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis. Larchmt. N* 11, 1049–1055.
410 <https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2010.0113>

411 Cacciò, S.M., & Chalmers, R.M. (2016). Human cryptosporidiosis in Europe. *Clinical*
412 *Microbiology and Infection*, 22, 471–480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2016.04.021>

413 Castro-Hermida, J.A., González-Losada, Y.A., & Ares-Mazás, E. (2002). Prevalence of and
414 risk factors involved in the spread of neonatal bovine cryptosporidiosis in Galicia (NW
415 Spain). *Veterinary Parasitology*, 106, 1–10. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4017(02)00036-5)
416 [4017\(02\)00036-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4017(02)00036-5)

417 Castro-Hermida, JA., Almeida, A., González-Warleta, M., Da Costa, J.M.C., & Mezo, M.
418 (2006a). Prevalence and preliminary genetic analysis of *Giardia* isolated from adult
419 sheep in Galicia (northwest Spain). *Journal of Eukaryotic Microbiology*, 53 Suppl 1,

420 S172–173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1550-7408.2006.00220.x>

421 Castro-Hermida, J. A., Carro-Corral, C., González-Warleta, M., & Mezo, M. (2006b).
422 Prevalence and intensity of infection of *Cryptosporidium* spp. and *Giardia duodenalis*
423 in dairy cattle in Galicia (NW Spain). *Journal of Veterinary Medicine, Series B*, *53*,
424 244–246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0450.2006.00946.x>

425 Castro-Hermida, J.A., Almeida, A., González-Warleta, M., Correia da Costa, J.M., Rumbo-
426 Lorenzo, C., & Mezo, M. (2007). Occurrence of *Cryptosporidium parvum* and *Giardia*
427 *duodenalis* in healthy adult domestic ruminants. *Parasitology Research*, *101*, 1443–
428 1448. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-007-0624-6>

429 Castro-Hermida, J.A., García-Preledo, I., Almeida, A., González-Warleta, M., Correia Da
430 Costa, J.M., & Mezo, M. (2008). Contribution of treated wastewater to the
431 contamination of recreational river areas with *Cryptosporidium* spp. and *Giardia*
432 *duodenalis*. *Water Research*, *42*, 3528–3538.
433 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2008.05.001>

434 Castro-Hermida, J.A., García-Preledo, I., Almeida, A., González-Warleta, M., Da Costa,
435 J.M.C., & Mezo, M. (2009). Detection of *Cryptosporidium* spp. and *Giardia duodenalis*
436 in surface water: a health risk for humans and animals. *Water Research*, *43*, 4133–4142.
437 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2009.06.020>

438 Castro-Hermida, J.A., García-Preledo, I., Almeida, A., González-Warleta, M., Correia Da
439 Costa, J.M., & Mezo, M. (2011a). *Cryptosporidium* spp. and *Giardia duodenalis* in two
440 areas of Galicia (NW Spain). *Science of the Total Environment*, *409*, 2451–2459.
441 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.03.010>

442 Castro-Hermida, J.A., García-Preledo, I., González-Warleta, M., Mezo, M. (2010)
443 *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* detection in water bodies of Galicia, Spain. *Water*

444 *Research*, 44, 5887–5896. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2010.07.010>

445 Castro-Hermida, J.A., García-Preledo, I., González-Warleta, M., & Mezo, M. (2011b).
446 Prevalence of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in roe deer (*Capreolus capreolus*) and wild
447 boars (*Sus scrofa*) in Galicia (NW, Spain). *Veterinary Parasitology*, 179, 216-219.
448 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2011.02.023>

449 Chalmers, R.M., Robinson, G., Elwin, K., Hadfield, S.J., Thomas, E., Watkins, J., Casemore,
450 D., & Kay, D. (2010). Detection of *Cryptosporidium* species and sources of
451 contamination with *Cryptosporidium hominis* during a waterborne outbreak in north
452 west Wales. *Journal of Water & Health*, 8, 311–325.
453 <https://doi.org/10.2166/wh.2009.185>

454 Chen, L., Hu, S., Jiang, W., Zhao, J., Li, N., Guo, Y., Liao, C., Han, Q., Feng, Y., & Xiao, L.
455 (2019). *Cryptosporidium parvum* and *Cryptosporidium hominis* subtypes in crab-eating
456 macaques. *Parasites and Vectors*, 12, 350. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-019-3604-7>

457 Crecente, R., Alvarez, C., & Fra, U. (2002). Economic, social and environmental impact of land
458 consolidation in Galicia. *Land Use Policy*, 19, 135–147. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-8377(02)00006-6)
459 [8377\(02\)00006-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-8377(02)00006-6)

460 de Lucio, A., Merino, F.J., Martínez-Ruiz, R., Bailo, B., Aguilera, M., Fuentes, I., & Carmena,
461 D. (2016). Molecular genotyping and sub-genotyping of *Cryptosporidium* spp. isolates
462 from symptomatic individuals attending two major public hospitals in Madrid, Spain.
463 *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*, 37, :49-56.
464 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meegid.2015.10.026>

465 Efstratiou, A., Ongerth, J.E., & Karanis, P. (2017). Waterborne transmission of protozoan
466 parasites: Review of worldwide outbreaks - An update 2011-2016. *Water Research*,
467 114, 14–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2017.01.036>

468 Esch, K.J., & Petersen, C.A. (2013). Transmission and epidemiology of zoonotic protozoal
469 diseases of companion animals. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, 26, 58–85.
470 <https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.00067-12>

471 Feltus, D.C., Giddings, C.W., Schneck, B.L., Monson, T., Warshauer, D., & McEvoy, J.M.
472 (2006). Evidence supporting zoonotic transmission of *Cryptosporidium* spp. in
473 Wisconsin. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, 44, 4303–4308.
474 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.01067-06>

475 Feng, Y., & Xiao, L. (2011). Zoonotic potential and molecular epidemiology of *Giardia* species
476 and giardiasis. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, 24, 110–40.
477 <https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.00033-10>

478 Feng, Y., Ryan, U.M., & Xiao, L. (2018). Genetic diversity and population structure of
479 *Cryptosporidium*. *Trends in Parasitology*, 34, 997–1011.
480 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2018.07.009>

481 Gabín-García, L.B., Bartolomé, C., Abal-Fabeiro, J.L., Méndez, S., Llovo, J., & Maside, X.
482 (2017). Strong genetic structure revealed by multilocus patterns of variation in *Giardia*
483 *duodenalis* isolates of patients from Galicia (NW-Iberian Peninsula). *Infection, Genetics*
484 *and Evolution*, 48, 131–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meegid.2016.12.014>

485 García-Preledo, I., Pedraza-Díaz, S., González-Warleta, M., Mezo, M., Gómez-Bautista, M.,
486 Ortega-Mora, L.M., & Castro-Hermida, J.A. (2013). Presence of *Cryptosporidium*
487 *scrofarum*, *C. suis* and *C. parvum* subtypes IIaA16G2R1 and IIaA13G1R1 in Eurasian
488 wild boars (*Sus scrofa*). *Veterinary Parasitology*, 196, 497–502.
489 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2013.04.017>

490 García-Preledo, I., Pedraza-Díaz, S., González-Warleta, M., Mezo, M., Gómez-Bautista, M.,
491 Ortega-Mora, L.M., Castro-Hermida, J.A. (2013). The first report of *Cryptosporidium*

492 *bovis*, *C. ryanae* and *Giardia duodenalis* sub-assemblage A-II in roe deer (*Capreolus*
493 *capreolus*) in Spain. *Veterinary Parasitology*, 197, 658–664.
494 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2013.07.002>

495 Gil, H., Cano, L., de Lucio, A., Bailo, B., Mingo, M.H., Cardona, G.A., Fernández-Basterra,
496 J.A., Aramburu-Aguirre, J., López-Molina, N., & Carmena, D. (2017). Detection and
497 molecular diversity of *Giardia duodenalis* and *Cryptosporidium* spp. in sheltered dogs
498 and cats in Northern Spain. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*, 50, 62–69.
499 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meegid.2017.02.013>

500 Gomez-Bautista, M., Ortega-Mora, L.M., Tabares, E., Lopez-Rodas, V., & Costas, E. (2000).
501 Detection of infectious *Cryptosporidium parvum* oocysts in mussels (*Mytilus*
502 *galloprovincialis*) and cockles (*Cerastoderma edule*). *Applied and Environmental*
503 *Microbiology*, 66, 1866–1870. <https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.66.5.1866-1870.2000>

504 Gómez-Couso, H., Mendez-Hermida, F., Ares-Mazas, E. (2006). First report of
505 *Cryptosporidium parvum* ‘ferret’ genotype in American mink (*Mustela vison* Shreber
506 1777). *Parasitology Research*, 100, 877–879. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-006-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-006-0338-1)
507 0338-1

508 Guk, S.M., Yong, T.S., Park, S.J., Park, J.H., & Chai, J.Y. (2004). Genotype and animal
509 infectivity of a human isolate of *Cryptosporidium parvum* in the Republic of Korea.
510 *Korean Journal of Parasitology*, 42, 85–89. <https://doi.org/10.3347/kjp.2004.42.2.85>

511 Hamnes, I.S., Gjerde, B.K., Forberg, T., & Robertson, L.J. (2007). Occurrence of *Giardia* and
512 *Cryptosporidium* in Norwegian red foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*). *Veterinary Parasitology*, 143,
513 347–353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2006.08.032>

514 Lalle, M., Pozio, E., Capelli, G., Bruschi, F., Crotti, D., & Cacciò, S.M. (2005). Genetic
515 heterogeneity at the beta-giardin locus among human and animal isolates of *Giardia*

516 *duodenalis* and identification of potentially zoonotic subgenotypes. *International*
517 *Journal for Parasitology*, 35, 207–213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2004.10.022>

518 Li N, Xiao L, Alderisio K, Elwin K, Cebelinski E, Chalmers R, Santin M, Fayer R, Kvac M,
519 Ryan U, Sak B, Stanko M, Guo Y, Wang L, Zhang L, Cai J, Roellig D, & Feng Y.
520 (2014). Subtyping *Cryptosporidium ubiquitum*, a zoonotic pathogen emerging in
521 humans. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 20, :217–224.
522 <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2002.121797>

523 López Beceiro, A.M., Riguera Rey, L., Espino López, L., & González Machado M.A. (2009)
524 O Raposo en Galicia. Gráficas Sogal (ed.). Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.
525 Conselleria de Medio Ambiente e Desenvolvemento Sostible. Xunta de Galicia. pp 70.

526 Mateo, M., de Mingo, M.H., de Lucio, A., Morales, L., Balseiro, A., Espí, A., Barral, M., Lima
527 Barbero, J.F., Habela, M.Á., Fernández-García, J.L., Bernal, R.C., Köster, P.C.,
528 Cardona, G.A., & Carmena, D. (2017). Occurrence and molecular genotyping of
529 *Giardia duodenalis* and *Cryptosporidium* spp. in wild mesocarnivores in Spain.
530 *Veterinary Parasitology*, 235, 86–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2017.01.016>

531 Mackenstedt, U., Jenkins, D., & Romig, T. (2015). The role of wildlife in the transmission of
532 parasitic zoonoses in peri-urban and urban areas. *International Journal for*
533 *Parasitology: Parasites and Wildlife*, 4, 71–79.
534 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijppaw.2015.01.006>

535 Méndez-Hermida, F., Gómez-Couso, H., Romero-Suances, R., & Ares-Mazás, E. (2007).
536 *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in wild otters (*Lutra lutra*). *Veterinary Parasitology*, 144,
537 153–156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2006.09.029>

538 Mmbaga, B.T., & Houpt, E.R. (2017). *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* infections in children: A
539 Review. *Pediatric Clinics of North America*, 64, 837–850.

540 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcl.2017.03.014>

541 Navarro-i-Martinez, L., Bornay-Llinares, F.J., Rueda, C., del Aguila, C., da Silva, A.J., Oleaga,
542 A., Ramajo, V., Fenoy, S., & Pieniazek, N.J. (2003). Molecular characterization of
543 *Cryptosporidium* sp. from animals in Spain. *Journal of Eukaryotic Microbiology*, 50,
544 Suppl, 553–554.

545 Navarro-i-Martinez, L. (2010) Detección y Caracterización Molecular de *Cryptosporidium* spp.
546 Aislados de Humanos y Animales [Doctoral thesis]. Sant Joan D’Alacant: Universidad
547 Miguel Hernández. p. 197.

548 Navarro-i-Martinez, L., del Águila, C., & Bornay-Llinares, F.J. (2011). *Cryptosporidium*: a
549 genus in revision. The situation in Spain. *Enfermedades Infecciosas y Microbiología*
550 *Clínica*, 29, 135–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eimc.2010.12.002>

551 NESN (National Network of Epidemiological Surveillance). Red Nacional de Vigilancia
552 Epidemiológica. Instituto de Salud Carlos III. Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y
553 Universidades. Resultados de la Vigilancia Epidemiológica de las enfermedades
554 transmisibles. Informe anual. Año 2016. p. 146.

555 O’Handley, R.M. (2007). *Cryptosporidium parvum* infection in cattle: are current perceptions
556 accurate? *Trends in Parasitology*, 23, 477–480.
557 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2007.08.005>

558 Polley, L. (2005). Navigating parasite webs and parasite flow: emerging and re-emerging
559 parasitic zoonoses of wildlife origin. *Int J Parasitol.* 35(11-12):1279-94. <https://doi.org/>

560 Read, C.M., Monis, P.T., & Thompson, R.C. (2004). Discrimination of all genotypes of *Giardia*
561 *duodenalis* at the glutamate dehydrogenase locus using PCR-RFLP. *Infection, Genetics*
562 *and Evolution*, 4, 125–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2005.07.003>

563 Reh, L., Muadica, A.S., Köster, P.C., Balasegaram, S., Verlander, N.Q., Chércoles, E.R., &

564 Carmena, D. (2019). Substantial prevalence of enteroparasites *Cryptosporidium* spp.,
565 *Giardia duodenalis* and *Blastocystis* sp. in asymptomatic schoolchildren in Madrid,
566 Spain, November 2017 to June 2018. *Euro Surveillance*, 24.
567 <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2019.24.43.1900241>.

568 Robertson, L.J. (2018). Parasites in food: From a neglected position to an emerging issue.
569 *Advances in Food and Nutrition Research*, 86, 71–113.
570 <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.afnr.2018.04.003>

571 Ryan, U., Fayer, R., & Xiao, L. (2014). *Cryptosporidium* species in humans and animals:
572 current understanding and research needs. *Parasitology*, 141, 1667–1685.
573 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031182014001085>

574 Ryan, U., & Cacciò, S.M. (2013). Zoonotic potential of *Giardia*. *International Journal for*
575 *Parasitology*, 43, 943–956. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2013.06.001>

576 Ryan, U., Zahedi, A., & Paparini, A. (2016). *Cryptosporidium* in humans and animals—a one
577 health approach to prophylaxis. *Parasite Immunology*, 38, 535–547.
578 <https://doi.org/10.1111/pim.12350>

579 Ryan, U., Hijjawi, & N., Xiao, L. (2018). Foodborne cryptosporidiosis. *International Journal*
580 *for Parasitology*, 48, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2017.09.004>

581 Schiller, S.E., Webster, K.N., & Power, M. (2016). Detection of *Cryptosporidium hominis* and
582 novel *Cryptosporidium* bat genotypes in wild and captive Pteropus hosts in Australia.
583 *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*, 44, 254–260.
584 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meegid.2016.07.002>

585 Šlapeta, J. (2006). *Cryptosporidium* species found in cattle: a proposal for a new species. *Trends*
586 *in Parasitology*, 22, 469–474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2006.08.005>

587 Šlapeta, J. (2013). Cryptosporidiosis and *Cryptosporidium* species in animals and humans: a
588 thirty colour rainbow? *International Journal for Parasitology*, *43*, 957–970.
589 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2013.07.005>

590 Stojcecki, K., Sroka, J., Caccio, S.M., Cencek, T., Dutkiewicz, J., & Kusyk, P. (2015).
591 Prevalence and molecular typing of *Giardia duodenalis* in wildlife from eastern Poland.
592 *Folia Parasitologica (Praha)*, *30*, 62. <https://doi.org/10.14411/fp.2015.042>

593 Suárez-Luengas, L., Clavel, A., Quílez, J., Goñi-Cepero, M.P., Torres, E., Sánchez-Acedo, C.,
594 & del Cacho, E. (2007). Molecular characterization of *Cryptosporidium* isolates from
595 pigs in Zaragoza (northeastern Spain). *Veterinary Parasitology*, *148*, 231–235.
596 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2007.06.022>

597 Tamura, K., Stecher, G., Peterson, D., Filipski, A. & Kumar, S. (2013). MEGA6: molecular
598 evolutionary genetics analysis version 6.0. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, *30*, 2725–
599 2729. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mst197>

600 Thompson, R.C.A. (2004). The zoonotic significance and molecular epidemiology of *Giardia*
601 and giardiasis. *Veterinary Parasitology*, *126*, 15–35.
602 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2004.09.008>

603 Thompson, R.C. (2013). Parasite zoonoses and wildlife: One Health, spillover and human
604 activity. *International Journal for Parasitology*, *43*, 1079–1088. <https://doi.org/>

605 Thompson, R.C.A., & Ash, A. (2016). Molecular epidemiology of *Giardia* and
606 *Cryptosporidium* infections. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*, *40*, 315–323.
607 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2013.06.007>

608 Tiangtip, R., & Jongwutiwes, S. (2002). Molecular analysis of *Cryptosporidium* species
609 isolated from HIV-infected patients in Thailand. *Tropical Medicine and International*
610 *Health*, *7*, 357–364. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3156.2002.00855.x>

611 Verweij, J.J., Schinkel, J., Laeijendecker, D., van Rooyen, M.A., van Lieshout, L., &
612 Polderman, A.M. (2003). Real-time PCR for the detection of *Giardia lamblia*.
613 *Molecular and Cellular Probes*, 17, 223–225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0890->
614 8508(03)00057-4

615 Widmer, G., Köster, P.C., & Carmena, D. 2020. *Cryptosporidium hominis* infections in non-
616 human animal species: Revisiting the concept of host specificity. *International Journal*
617 *for Parasitology*, in press.

618 Winstanley, R.K., Saunders, G., Buttermer, & W. Indices for predicting total body fat in red
619 foxes from Australia. 1998. *Journal of Wildlife Management*, 62, 1307–1312.
620 <https://doi.org/10.2307/3801995>

621 Xiao, L. (2010). Molecular epidemiology of cryptosporidiosis: an update. *Experimental*
622 *Parasitology*, 124, 80–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exppara.2009.03.018>

623 Zahedi, A., Papparini, A., Jian, F., Robertson, I., & Ryan, U. (2016). Public health significance
624 of zoonotic *Cryptosporidium* species in wildlife: Critical insights into better drinking
625 water management. *International Journal for Parasitology: Parasites and Wildlife*, 5,
626 88–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijppaw.2015.12.001>

627 **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

628 **Figure 1.** Map of the autonomous region of Galicia (Northwest Spain) showing the
629 geographical location where wild red foxes were sampled. Green and orange filled
630 circles/quadrants represent *Cryptosporidium*- and *Giardia*-positive results by PCR assays,
631 respectively. Yellow filled triangles represent samples that tested negative to both pathogens.
632

633 **Figure 2.** Phylogenetic tree depicting evolutionary relationships among *Cryptosporidium*
634 sequences at the *ssu* rRNA gene. The analysis was inferred using the Neighbor-Joining
635 method. Bootstrap values lower than 75% were not displayed. Filled triangles represent
636 sequences generated in the present study. Empty triangles indicate sequences from red foxes
637 previously reported in Spain and other countries, used for comparison purposes. Filled circles
638 represent reference sequences retrieved from the GenBank database. *Cryptosporidium fragile*
639 was used as outgroup taxa.