

Table 1: Growth on culture from water samples (N=30)

Water samples	No growth f (%)	Growth f (%)
Drinking Water (n =15)	11 (73.3)	4 (26.7)
Wastewater (n =15)	0	15 (100)
Total (N=30)	11 (36.7)	19 (63.3)

Table 2: Pattern of bacterial growth isolated from water samples

Water samples	Single organism f (%)	Two organisms f (%)	More than Two organisms f (%)
Drinking water (n =15)	3 (20.0)	0	1 (6.7)
Wastewater (n =15)	12 (80.0)	2 (13.3)	1 (6.7)

Table 3: Bacteria isolated from water samples

Name of organisms	Drinking water (n=15) f (%)	Wastewater (n=15) f (%)
<i>Pseudomonas</i> spp. (n=9)	3 (33.3)	6 (66.7)
<i>Enterobacter</i> spp. (n=7)	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)
<i>Escherichia coli</i> (n=5)	0	5 (100.0)
<i>Citrobacter freundii</i> (n=1)	0	1 (100.0)
<i>Citrobacter koseri</i> (n=1)	0	1 (100.0)
<i>Acinetobacter</i> spp. (n=1)	1 (100.0)	0
<i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i> (n=1)	1 (100.0)	0
Total (n=25)	6 (24.0)	19 (76.0)

Table 4: Biochemical test results for bacteria isolated from drinking water samples

Strain code	Biochemical tests									Isolated organism
	Catalase	Oxidase	TSI	Gas Production	H ₂ S Production	Motility	Indole	Urease production	Citrate	
DW06	+	+	alk/alk	--	--	+	--	--	+	Pseudomonas spp
DW07	+	+	alk/alk	--	--	+	--	--	+	Pseudomonas spp
DW09	+	--	aci/aci	+++	--	--	--	+	+	Klebsiella oxytoca
	+	--	aci/aci	--	--	+	--	--	+	Enterobacter spp.
DW13	+	+	alk/alk	--	--	+	--	--	+	Pseudomonas spp
	+	--	alk/alk	--	--	--	--	--	+	Acinetobacter spp

Table 5: Biochemical test results for bacteria isolated from wastewater samples

	Biochemical tests									Isolated organism
	Catalase	Oxidase	TSI	Gas Production	H ₂ S Production	Motility	Indole	Urease production	Citrate	
WW-01	+	+	alk/alk	--	--	+	--	--	+	Pseudomonas spp
WW-02	+	--	aci/aci	+++	--	+	+	--	--	Esch coli
	+	--	aci/aci							Enterobacter spp.
WW-03	+	--	aci/aci	++	--	+	--	--	+	Enterobacter spp.
WW-04	+	+	alk/alk	--	--	+	--	--	+	Pseudomonas spp
WW-05	+	+	alk/alk	--	--	+	--	--	+	Pseudomonas spp
WW-06	+	+	alk/alk	--	--	+	--	--	+	Pseudomonas spp
WW-07	+	--	aci/aci	++	--	+	+	--	--	Esch coli
WW-08	+	--	aci/aci	++	--	+	+	--	--	Esch coli
WW-09	+	+	alk/alk	--	--	+	--	--	+	Pseudomonas spp
	+	--	aci/aci	++	--	+	+	--	--	Citrobacter freundii
WW-10	+	--	aci/aci	+++	--	+	--	--	+	Esch coli
WW-11	+	--	aci/aci	++	+	+	+	--	+	Citrobacter koseri
WW-12	+	+	alk/alk	--	--	+	--	--	+	Enterobacter spp.
	+	--	aci/aci	++	--	+	+	--	--	Esch coli
	+	+	alk/alk	--	--	+	--	--	+	Pseudomonas spp
WW-13	+	--	aci/aci	+	--	+	--	--	+	Enterobacter spp.
WW-14	+	--	aci/aci	+	--	+	--	--	+	Enterobacter spp.
WW-15	+	--	aci/aci	--	--	+	--	--	+	Enterobacter spp.

Table 6: Antibiotic sensitivity test results for bacteria isolated from drinking water samples

Strain code	Name of organisms	Antibiotic sensitivity test										
		AK	AMC	AMP	AT	CFM	CIP	CTR	CXM	GEN	IPM	MRP
DW6	Pseudomonas spp	S	-	-	I	-	S	-	-	S	I	S
DW7	Pseudomonas spp	I	-	-	R	-	S	-	-	S	I	S
DW9	Klebsiella oxytoca	S	R	R	S	R	-	R	R	S	R	S

DW13	Enterobacter spp.	S	R	-	-	R	S	R	R	S	S	S
	Pseudomonas spp	R	-	-	S	-	S	-	-	R	I	S
	Acinetobacter spp	R	R	-	S	-	S	R	-	R	R	S

(AK-amikacin, AMC-amoxicillin with clavulanic acid, AMP-ampicillin, AT- aztreonam, CFM- cefuroxime, CIP- ciprofloxacin, CTR-ceftriaxone, CXM- cefixime, GEN- gentamicin, IPM- imipenem, MRP- Meropenem)

Table 7: Antibiotic sensitivity test results for bacteria isolated from wastewater samples

Strain code	Name of organisms	Antibiotic sensitivity test												
		AK	AMC	AMP	AT	CIP	CFC	CFM	COT	CTR	CXM	GEN	IPM	MRP
WW-01	Pseudomonas spp	S	--	--	I	I	R	--	--	R	--	S	I	R
WW-02	Esch coli	S	R	--	S	R	--	R	--	R	R	S	I	S
	Enterobacter spp.	S	R	--	--	R	--	R	R	R	R	S	S	S
WW-03	Enterobacter spp.	R	--	--	--	R	--	--	R	R	R	R	R	R
WW-04	Pseudomonas spp	S	--	--	I	R	R	--	--	R	--	S	R	R
WW-05	Pseudomonas spp	S	R	--	R	R	R	--	--	R	--	R	R	R
WW-06	Pseudomonas spp	I	--	--	R	I	--	--	--	R	--	I	R	R
WW-07	Esch coli	I	R	--	--	S	--	--	S	R	S	S	I	S
WW-08	Esch coli	I	R	--	--	R	--	R	T	R	R	R	R	S
WW-09	Pseudomonas spp	R	I	--	R	R	R	--	--	R	--	R	R	R
	Citrobacter freundii	S	R	--	--	S	--	--	R	R	R	R	--	R
WW-10	Esch coli	I	R	--	S	I	--	R	R	I	S	I	I	S
WW-11	Citrobacter koseri	R	R	--	--	R	--	--	R	R	R	I	--	R
WW-12	Enterobacter spp.	S	R	--	--	R	--	R	R	R	R	S	S	S
	Esch coli	S	R	--	S	R	--	R	--	R	R	S	I	S
	Pseudomonas spp	S	R	--	R	R	R	--	--	R	--	R	R	R
WW-13	Enterobacter spp.	R	R	--	--	R	--	--	R	R	R	R	I	S
WW-14	Enterobacter spp.	S	R	--	--	S	--	R	R	R		S	I	S
WW-15	Enterobacter spp.	S	R	--	--	S	--	--	I	R	R	R	I	R

(AK-amikacin, AMC-amoxicillin with clavulanic acid, AMP-ampicillin, AT- aztreonam, CIP- ciprofloxacin, CFC- cefepime with clavulanic acid, CFM- cefuroxime, COT- co-trimoxazole, CTR-ceftriaxone, CXM- cefixime, GEN- gentamicin, IPM- imipenem, MRP- Meropenem)

Table 8: Suspected Gene detection for resistant bacteria isolated from drinking water samples

Strain code	Name of organisms	Suspected Genes						
	By Culture	SHV	CTX-15	IMP	VIM	KPC	OXA1	NDM1
DW6	Pseudomonas spp	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
DW7	Pseudomonas spp	X	X	X	X	√	X	X
DW9	Klebsiella oxytoca	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
DW13	Acinetobacter spp.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Table 9: Suspected Gene detection for bacteria isolated from wastewater samples

Strain Code	Name Of Organisms	Suspected Genes						
	By Culture	SHV	CTX-15	IMP	VIM	KPC	OXA1	NDM1
WW1	Pseudomonas spp.	X	X	X	X	X	X	√
WW 2	Esch. Coli	X	√	X	X	√	X	X
WW 3	Enterobacter spp,	X	√	X	X	√	X	X
WW 4	Pseudomonas spp .	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
WW 5	Pseudomonas spp .	X	X	X	√	√	X	X
WW 6	Pseudomonas spp .	√	X	X	X	√	X	X
WW 7	Esch Coli	X	√	X	X	X	X	X
WW 8	Esch Coli	√	√	X	X	X	X	X
WW 9	Citrobacter Freundi	X	√	X	√	√	X	X
WW 10	Esch Coli	X	√	X	X	X	X	X
WW 11	Citrobacter Koseri	X	X	X	X	√	X	X
WW 12	Pseudomonas spp ,	√	√	X	X	X	X	X
WW 13	Enterobacter spp	X	√	√	√	X	X	X
WW 14	Enterobacter spp	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
WW 15	Enterobacter spp	X	X	X	X	√	X	X

Table 10: Specific diagnostic information for assessment of Risk

Sanitary Inspection Risk Score (Y=1/N=0)													
SL NO.	ID NO.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total score (out of 11) Y=1, N=0
		Is there any point of leakage between source and reservoir ?	Is there any cover in reserve tank?	If there is a cover, is it damaged or inadequate to prevent contamination?	Distance between service point and reservoir ?	Are there any leak in the distribution network?	In the reservoir crack or eroded or unclean?	Is there any leakage in reserve tank?	Is there any sanitation within 10 meters of the pipeline(e.g. Latrines,	Is this reservoir cleaned within a month?	How often is the reservoir cleaned?	Is there any authority that inspects the Reserve Tank?	

									sewers, septic tank or burial ground)				
1	DWR 01	N	Y	N	100 MT	N	Y	N	N	N	yearly	N	4
2	DWR 02	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	6months interval	N	4
3	DWR 03	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	6m-yearly	N	2
4	DWR 04	N	Y	NA	Y	NK	N	N	N	N	yearly	N	3
5	DWR 05	N	Y	Y	200 MT	N	N	N	N	N	6months interval	N	4
6	DWR 06	N	Y	N	200FT	N	N	N	N	N	yearly	NA	3
7	DWR 07	N	Y	N	NA	N	NA	N	Y	N	yearly	N	3
8	DWR 08	N	Y	N	NA	N	N	N	Y	N	3months	Y	4
9	DWR 09	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	yearly	N	4
10	DWR 10	N	Y	N	1 METER	N	N	N	N	N	yearly	Y	4
11	DWT0 1	N	Y	N	100 MT	N	Y	N	N	N	yearly	N	4
12	DWT0 2	N	Y	N	Y	NK	N	N	Y	N	6months interval	N	4
13	DWT0 3	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	3
14	DWS0 1	N	N	Y	200 MT	N	N	N	N	N	6months interval	N	3
15	DWS0 2	N	Y	N	200FT	N	N	N	N	N	yearly	Y	4

Table 11: Sanitary inspection risk score classification

Hazard score	Risk interpretation	Findings n (%)
0-2	Low risk	2 (18.1)
3-5	Intermediate risk	9 (90.9)
6-8	High risk	0
≥ 9	Very high risk	0

1 **Molecular characterization of antimicrobial resistance**
2 **organisms from drinking water and wastewater in**
3 **a metropolitan city**

4
5 **Khursheda Akhtar¹, Nasreen Farhana², Md. Alamgir Hossain³, Fahmida**
6 **Khanam⁴**

- 7
8 1. Associate Professor Public Health and Hospital Administration National Institute of
9 Preventive and Social Medicine (NIPSOM), Mohakhali, Dhaka-1212, Bangladesh. Email:
10 dr.khursheda1974@gmail.com
11 2. Associate professor, Department of Microbiology and Mycology, National Institute of
12 Preventive and Social Medicine (NIPSOM), Mohakhali, Dhaka-1212, Bangladesh.
13 Email:nas.farhana19@gmail.com
14 3. Deputy Chief microbiologist and Head, Department of Microbiology and Chemical, Water
15 Supply and Sewerage Authority (WASA), Dhaka1207, Bangladesh. Email:
16 mh1967alamgir@gmail.com
17 4. Associate professor, Department of Microbiology and Mycology, National Institute of
18 Preventive and Social Medicine (NIPSOM), Mohakhali, Dhaka-1212, Bangladesh. Email:
19 fahmidak2@gmail.com
20

21 **Running Title:** AMR in drinking and wastewater

22
23 **Abstract:**

24
25 **Background**

26 Antimicrobial resistant (AMR) organisms in environment may harm people. This
27 study assessed the phenotypic and genotypic characteristics of AMR organisms from
28 drinking and wastewater.

29 **Materials and methods**

30
31 This cross-sectional study conducted randomly on 30 samples (15 drinking water
32 samples from household places; 15 sewage lifts stations) and collected aseptically,
33 filtered, inoculated and isolated from culture plates, identified biochemically of
34 pathogenic bacteria, and disc diffusion tested for antibiotic susceptibility. The primers
35 of the targeted antimicrobial resistance genes were used for molecular amplification.

36 **Results**

37 Twenty-five bacteria were isolated from 30 drinking and wastewater samples.
38 *Pseudomonas* spp. (36%), *Enterobacter* spp. (28%), *Escherichia coli* (20%), *Citrobacter*
39 spp.(4%), *Acinetobacter* spp (4%) and *Klebsiella oxytoca* (4%) were isolated. Most of
40 the isolates exhibited resistance to multiple groups of antibiotics, with meropenem,
41 imipenem, gentamicin, ciprofloxacin, and amikacin showing the highest sensitivity
42 against the isolates. Multiplex PCR confirmed the presence of two ESBL genes

43 (*blaSHV* and *blaCTX-M-15*) and five carbapenemase genes (*blaIMP*, *blaVIM*, *blaKPC*,
44 *blaOXA1*, *blaNDM1*) in resistant bacteria and *blaCTX-M-15* (53.3%) followed by
45 *blaKPC* (46.7%) genes were the most prevalent from drinking and wastewater samples
46 respectively. According to WHO's sanitary inspection risk score classification, 60% of
47 drinking water samples scored 4 out of 11, categorizing them as intermediate risk based
48 on hazard score.

49 **Conclusions**

50 This study addresses antimicrobial resistance in the environment, emphasizing public
51 health implications; advocating for improved environmental regulations to mitigate
52 AMR organism discharge through wastewater and drinking water.

53

54 **The significance of the study:**

55

56 The study attempted to determine the pattern of antimicrobial resistance of
57 microorganisms using phenotypic and genotypic methods by polymerase chain
58 reaction (PCR), targeting particular genes with specific sequence of primers. As in
59 Bangladesh very few studies for antimicrobial resistance organisms from drinking
60 water and wastewater around household and hospital environments in Dhaka city, yet
61 finished to change public health perspectives, and inform respective authorities for
62 making decision. Thus the research contributes to generating some evidence-based
63 information about the reservoir of antimicrobial resistance in environment.

64

65 **Keywords:** Antimicrobial resistance (AMR), Drinking water, Wastewater,
66 Molecular characterization, PCR

67

68 **Introduction:**

69

70 Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) has emerged as one of the most serious public health
71 issues of the twenty-first century, threatening the effective prevention and treatment
72 of an ever-increasing range of infections caused by bacteria, parasites, viruses, and
73 fungi that are no longer susceptible to common antimicrobials including antibiotics,
74 antivirals, antifungals and anti-parasites.¹ The World Health Organization (WHO) has
75 long recognised the need for an improved and coordinated global effort to contain
76 AMR. In 2001, the WHO Global Strategy for Containment of Antimicrobial
77 Resistance has provided a framework of interventions to slow the emergence and
78 reduce the spread of antimicrobial-resistant microorganisms.² In 2012, WHO

79 published The Evolving Threat of Antimicrobial Resistance – Options for Action
80 proposing a combination of interventions that include strengthening health systems
81 and surveillance; improving use of antimicrobials in hospitals and in community;
82 infection prevention and control; encouraging the development of appropriate new
83 drugs and vaccines; and political commitment.³

84 During the last years, the importance of the environment in the spread of antibiotic
85 resistance has been widely recognised. Water is a major way of dissemination of
86 bacteria between different environmental compartments. Infectious diseases caused
87 by pathogenic bacteria, viruses and parasites (e.g. protozoa and helminths) are the
88 most common and widespread health risk associated with drinking-water.⁴ Large
89 amounts of antibiotics are released into municipal wastewater due to incomplete
90 metabolism in human beings or due to disposal of unused antibiotics. Some available
91 data show that antibiotic resistant bacteria and antibiotic-resistant genes can be
92 detected in wastewater samples and that the conditions in wastewater treatment plants
93 (WWTPs) are favourable for the proliferation of resistant bacteria.⁵

94 The public health burden is determined by the severity and incidence of the illnesses
95 associated with these pathogens, their infectivity and the population exposed. The
96 threat AMR poses on global public health necessitates mitigation of dissemination of
97 AMR bacteria, and therefore the identification of possible dissemination routes.⁶
98 Breakdown in water supply safety (source, treatment and distribution) may lead to
99 large-scale contamination and potentially to detectable disease outbreaks. In some
100 cases, low-level, potentially repeated contamination may lead to significant sporadic
101 disease, but public health surveillance is unlikely to identify contaminated drinking-
102 water as the source.⁴

103 AMR occurs when bacteria, viruses, fungi and parasites change over time and no
104 longer respond to medicines making infections harder to treat and increasing the risk
105 of disease spread, severe illness and death. The main drivers of antimicrobial
106 resistance include the misuse and overuse of antimicrobials; lack of access to clean
107 water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) for both humans and animals; poor infection
108 and disease prevention and control in health-care facilities and farms; poor access to
109 quality, affordable medicines, vaccines and diagnostics; lack of awareness and
110 knowledge; and lack of enforcement of legislation.^{7,8}

111 The One Health approach brings together multiple sectors and stakeholders engaged
112 in human, terrestrial and aquatic animal and plant health, food and feed production
113 and the environment to communicate and work together in the design and
114 implementation of programmes, policies, legislation and research to attain better
115 public health outcomes.⁹

116

117 Currently, resistant infections result in 700,000 deaths every year, but the global
118 resistance-associated mortality is estimated to top 10 million lives per year in 2050.
119 Along with high income countries (Europe, USA); in low- and middle-income
120 countries, AMR infections have been responsible for the deaths of 58,000 children
121 and 38,000 adults in India and Thailand, respectively.¹⁰

122

123 Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) has become an emerging issue in the developing
124 countries as well as in Bangladesh. A study was conducted by Islam MA (2017) that
125 wastewater samples from hospital-adjacent areas (HAR) and from community areas
126 (COM), as well as public tap water samples, for the occurrence and characteristics of
127 New Delhi metallo -1(NDM-1) producing bacteria. Of 72 HAR samples tested, 51
128 (71%) samples were positive for NDM-1-producing bacteria, as evidenced by
129 phenotypic tests and the presence of the *bla*NDM-1 gene, compared to 5 of 41
130 (12.1%) samples from COM samples (P 0.001). *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (44%) was the
131 predominant bacterial species among *bla*NDM-1-positive isolates, followed by
132 *Escherichia coli* (29%), *Acinetobacter* spp. (15%), and *Enterobacter* spp. (9%).¹¹

133

134 These bacteria were also positive for one or more other antibiotic resistance genes,
135 including *bla*CTX-M-1 (80%), *bla*CTX-M-15 (63%), *bla*TEM (76%), *bla*SHV (33%),
136 *bla*CMY-2 (16%), *bla*OXA-48-like (2%), *bla*OXA-1 (53%), and *bla*OXA-47-like
137 (60%) genes.¹² In another study by Toleman (2012) found that, in Bangladesh, the
138 *bla*NDM-1 gene were in 62% of environmental waters and in fermentative and non-
139 fermentative gram-negative bacteria. Resistance genes and plasmid profiles for a
140 subset of *Escherichia coli* strains was found in a study of extensively drug-resistant
141 NDM-1–encoding bacteria in the environment, Dhaka, Bangladesh.¹³ The presence of
142 NDM-1 β -lactamase-producing bacteria in environmental samples in New Delhi has
143 important implications for people living in the city who are reliant on public water
144 and sanitation facilities.¹⁴

145

146 As previously discussed, AMR is driven by complex interacting factors that could be
147 described as a resistance network.¹⁵ This network forms links between clinical factors
148 (e.g., human health, animal husbandry and veterinary medicine) and other
149 components, including human activities (e.g., travel, human displacement and over
150 and misuse of antimicrobial drugs) and environmental factors (e.g., persistence of
151 antimicrobial drugs and AMR organisms in soil and water).¹⁶⁻²⁰

152

153 The selective pressure associated with the exposure to antimicrobials in healthcare,
154 agriculture and the environment enhances the development of new AMR variants and
155 novel resistance mechanisms.²¹ Transmission of AMR can spread between people,
156 animals and the environment via a number of different routes.²² The environment acts
157 as a bridge for different compartments, between animals to compost to soil to water to
158 sediments to sewage.²³ While the environment acts as the reservoir, it also works
159 simultaneously to mix mobile genetic elements (MGEs) that interact and diffuse into
160 other parts or into human and animal hosts.^{22, 24,25}

161

162 Non-judicial use of antibiotics is considered to be most significant reason for the
163 emergence selection and spreading of antibiotic-resistant bacteria in both animals and
164 humans. Via food and water antibiotics can lead to the emergence and dissemination
165 of different resistant bacteria. Wastewater contains the faecal material with E coli;
166 simultaneously wastewaters are the prominent source of antibiotic resistance bacteria.
167 In Dhaka city 30 % sewage are only treated rests 70% are untreated and excrete into
168 environment, and hospital waste as well. There is limited information about the
169 Extended- Spectrum Beta Lactamase (ESBL) gene carriage in Bangladesh in
170 environment particularly in drinking and wastewater.²⁶ AMR is a complex problem
171 that requires a united multi sectorial approach. Without AMR containment, the
172 Sustainable Development Goals for 2030- such as ending poverty, ending hunger
173 ensuring healthy lives, reducing inequality and revitalizing global development
174 partnerships are less likely to be achieved.²⁷

175

176 It is critical to strengthen and harmonize the AMR surveillance through the
177 development of agreed epidemiological and microbiological methods, the adoption of
178 common definitions to enhance the ability to share and compare resistance
179 information, and to attain a better coordination of the surveillance networks. To
180 identify the magnitude of problem, this is also true for policies to prevent

181 contamination of the environment with antimicrobial residues from human and animal
182 use.

183

184 **Objectives :**

185

186 **General objective:** To detect the pattern of organisms in wastewater and drinking
187 water with the extent of their antibiotic resistance and presence of resistance genes

188

189 **Specific objectives:**

190 1) To isolate and identify of pathogenic organisms in drinking and wastewater

191 2) To detect antimicrobial resistant organisms phenotypically [by double disc
192 synergy test (DDS), combined disc (CD) assay, and modified Hodge test (MHT)]
193 from drinking and wastewater

194 3) To identify antimicrobial resistance gene by multiplex PCR (genotype encoding
195 *bla*SHV, *bla*CTX-M15 genes for beta-lactamases producers and *bla*OXA1,
196 *bla*NDM-1, *bla*VIM, *bla*IMP and *bla*KPC genes for carbapenemase producers)

197

198 **Rationale:**

199

200 Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is the major issue posing a serious global health
201 threat. Low- and middle-income countries are likely to be the most affected both in
202 terms of impact on public health and economic burden.²⁷ The cost of AMR to the
203 economy is significant. In addition to death and disability, prolonged illness results in
204 longer hospital stays, the need for more expensive medicines and financial challenges
205 for those impacted. Without effective antimicrobials, the success of modern medicine
206 in treating infections, including during major surgery and cancer chemotherapy,
207 would be at increased risk. Recently, the World Health Organization (WHO) Global
208 Antimicrobial Surveillance System (GLASS) reported increased levels of resistance
209 in a number of serious and common bacterial infections in many regions of the
210 world.²⁹

211 Anthropogenic activities, hospital effluents, industrial wastes, domestic sewage, and
212 urban/agricultural runoffs represent a significant source of emerging biological
213 contaminants including pathogenic organisms, antibiotic residues, antibiotic resistant
214 bacteria (ARB) and antibiotic resistant genes (ARGs) in aquatic ecosystems.³⁰ The
215 uncontrolled use of antibiotics exposes bacteria to antibiotics, which leads to

216 subsequent acquirement of resistance through mutations or by eliminating
217 nonresistant bacteria.³¹ The overuse of antibiotics and their subsequent poorly
218 managed release to the environment have been linked with the development of such
219 undesired characteristics. Hospitals and animal farms are amongst the leading
220 contributors of antibiotics, bacteria and antibiotic resistance genes and toxic metals in
221 the environment.³² However, the situation is a lot worse in developing countries
222 lacking adequate infrastructures to contain the spread of contaminated waters and
223 where wastewaters are rarely treated.

224

225 The selective pressure associated with the exposure to antimicrobials in healthcare,
226 agriculture and the environment enhances the development of new AMR variants and
227 novel resistance mechanisms. Transmission of AMR can spread between people,
228 animals and the environment via a number of different routes. While the environment
229 acts as the reservoir, it also works simultaneously to mix mobile genetic elements
230 (MGEs) that interact and diffuse into other parts or into human and animal hosts.³³
231 Beta-lactams are most widely used antibiotics including natural and synthetic
232 penicillin and their derivatives; resistance to beta-lactam antibiotics is of special
233 concern for human being.³⁴ Human infection due to ESBL producing bacteria is
234 associated with increased mortality, morbidity, high cost of hospitalization and delay
235 appropriate therapy. *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella spp.* are often common ESBL
236 producers isolated in environment. These bacteria are resistant to penicillins,
237 cephalosporins and aztreonam mainly due to the production of CTX-M, TEM and
238 SHV β -lactamases, which are encoded by *bla*CTX-M, *bla*SHV, and TEM genes
239 respectively.³⁵ There is limited information about environmental factor especially
240 waste and drinking water on ESBL/MRSA gene carriage in Bangladeshi.

241

242 Thus the research contributes to generating some evidence-based information about
243 the reservoir of antimicrobial resistance in environment. The implications of our
244 findings are likely to be significant from a public health standpoint. The urgent need
245 to place efficient wastewater treatment plants in health care settings as part of
246 biosecurity programs. More work should be done to understand the spread of MDR
247 bacteria, including the ESBL/NDM-1-producing ones in the environment and the
248 resultant health implications. In future with these samples further research (genomic
249 sequencing) was done.

250

251 **Methodology:**

252 This was a cross sectional study on environmental samples (drinking water from
253 household and wastewater from sewage lift stations near hospitals) in Dhaka city at
254 National Institute of Preventive and Social Medicine, Mohakhali, Dhaka, Bangladesh.
255 A total 30 samples was collected, among them 15 samples of wastewater and 15
256 samples of drinking water. In Dhaka city, WASA distribute the service by 10 MODS
257 zone³⁶ and from these zones, 5 MODS zones were selected randomly. For wastewater,
258 10 sample of wastewater randomly select from 28 sewage lift stations in Dhaka city
259 and five (05) samples purposively selected from sewage lift station near the hospitals
260 (wastewater drains within 3 mile of boundaries of the large public/private hospitals or
261 clinics). For drinking water, 15 samples were selected from 15 point of use
262 (household reservoirs/ public water supply that local residents use for drinking,
263 washing, and food preparation) randomly by using Google map. A structured
264 questionnaire and checklist was approached for sample collection and laboratory
265 purpose.

266 **Sample collection procedure:** The sample from a drinking tap or wastewater were
267 collected after maintaining aseptic precaution according to standard guidelines.³⁷
268 Immediately after collection, samples were placed in an insulated ice boxes for
269 transport to NIPSOM laboratory, Mohakhali, Dhaka. Water samples were examined
270 as soon as possible on arrival and always within 6 hours of collection. Long distance
271 sample was dipped into Cary *Blair* transport medium (Hi Media Laboratories,
272 Mumbai, India) before shifting into the laboratory.

273 **Bacterial isolation and identification:**

274 The water samples were filtered with 0.02 micron filter paper and then inoculated in
275 5mL of nutrient broth and incubated overnight at 37°C and the swabs from the suspected
276 growth of the broths were then inoculated in non-selective culture plates and
277 incubated again overnight at 37°C.³⁸ The isolated colonies was further streaked on
278 various differentiation agar media (i.e. MacConkey agar, Chromogenic Coliform
279 Agar) for selective bacterial isolates. All the isolated organisms were identified by
280 their colony morphology, hemolytic criteria, staining characters. Gram stained smear
281 was examined for presence and arrangement of the organisms for presumptive
282 identification and to correlate these findings with results of biochemical tests. Gram
283 positive isolates was also differentiated by arrangement in Gram staining, colonial
284 characteristics, catalase test and coagulase tests. Gram negative bacteria was

285 identified based on colonial morphology and pigmentation, oxidase test, growth at
286 42°C, carbohydrate fermentation, H₂S production, citrate utilization, motility, indole
287 formation, and urea hydrolysis.³⁷

288 **Antimicrobial sensitivity test:**

289 This test was performed by Kirby-Bauer modified disc diffusion method on Mueller-
290 Hinton agar media according to the standards published by the Clinical and
291 Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) and inoculated plates was incubated aerobically
292 at 37°C for 24 hours. After 24 hours incubated each plate was examined to ensure the
293 confluence growth of organism³⁹ and evaluated with standard chart of CLSI guideline
294 into sensitive, intermediate and resistant categories on the basis of zone of inhibition
295 around the disc.⁴⁰ To assess the performance of the method, *Esch. coli* ATCC 25922
296 was used as a control strain.³⁹

297 **Phenotypic detection of antimicrobial-resistant bacteria**

298 Antimicrobial-resistant Gram positive bacteria was phenotypically detected with
299 standard disc diffusion method as per CLSI standards i.e. Methicillin resistance for
300 *staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) using oxacillin (1µg) and ceftiofur (30 µg) disc,
301 vancomycin resistant enterococci (VRE) using vancomycin (30 µg) disc and extended
302 spectrum beta lactamases (ESBL) producing Gram negative bacilli and
303 carbapenemase producing enterobacteriaecae (CRE) by double disc synergy test
304 (DDS), combined disc (CD) assay, and modified Hodge test (MHT) respectively.^{41,42}

305 **Molecular characterization of antibiotic-resistant bacteria:** The conventional
306 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) method was applied for molecular characterization
307 and freshly cultured isolates bacteria was used to prepare template deoxyribonucleic
308 acid (DNA) by the boiling method.⁴³ The bacterial samples were grown on nutrient
309 agar plates and a single colony was inoculated in the nutrient broth. The cultures was
310 grown overnight and centrifuged at 5000 rpm for 5 min at room temperature and the
311 bacterial pellet was washed with Tris buffer (1M Tris-hydrochloride [HCl], 0.1M
312 ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid [EDTA] and 0.1 M sodium chloride [NaCl]). The
313 pellet was suspended in 300 µl of sterile distilled water into eppendorf tubes and
314 vortexed until mixed. The tubes were heated at 100°C for 10 minutes in a heat block
315 (DAIHA Scientific, Seoul, Korea). After heating, immediately the eppendorf tubes
316 were placed on ice for 5 minutes and then centrifuged at 14,000 g at 4°C for 6
317 minutes. The supernatant were taken into another micro centrifuge tube by
318 micropipette and were used for DNA template. The extracted DNA was preserved at
319 4°C for 7-10 days and -20°C for long time.⁴⁴ The sequences of designed primers

320 encoding *bla*SHV, *bla*CTX-M-15 and *bla*OXA-1 genes for beta-lactamases producers
321 and *bla*NDM-1, *bla*VIM, *bla*IMP and *bla*KPC genes for carbapenemase
322 producers^{27,28}. downloaded from the GenBank database was used in this study (Table
323 2). Primers were mixed with Tris- EDTA (TE) buffer according to manufacturer's
324 instruction. PCR was performed in a final reaction volume of 25µl in a PCR tube,
325 containing 10 µl of mastermix [premixed mixture of 50 units/ml of Taq DNA
326 polymerase supplied in a proprietary reaction buffer (pH 8.5), 400µM dNTP, 3mM
327 MgCl₂ (Promega corporation, USA), 1 µl forward primer and 1 µl reverse primer
328 (Promega corporation, USA), 3 µl extracted DNA and 14 µl nuclease free water for
329 monoplex PCR. After a brief vortex, the PCR tubes were centrifuged in a micro
330 centrifuge machine for few seconds. PCR assays were performed in a DNA thermal
331 cycler. Each cycle of PCR reaction consists of initial denaturation at 95°C for 10
332 minutes followed by annealing temperature which varied in different reaction
333 followed by elongation at 72°C for 1 min. After 35 cycles final extension was done at
334 72°C for 10 minutes. Then the product was held at 4°C. After amplification, products
335 were processed for gel documentation by electrophoresis on 1.5% agarose gel. After
336 electrophoresis, the gel was stained with ethidium bromide (10 µl ethidium bromide
337 in 100 ml distilled water) for 30 minutes. It was then de-stained with sterile distilled
338 water for 15 minutes. The gel was then removed from the tray and observed under UV
339 Transilluminator (Gel Doc, Major science, Taiwan) for DNA bands. The DNA bands
340 were identified according to their molecular size by comparing with the molecular
341 weight marker (100 bp DNA ladder) loaded in a separate lane. Samples showing the
342 presence of corresponding bp band were considered positive for the presence of that
343 organism. Exact band size was calculated from a log graph.⁴²⁻⁴⁸

344 **Statistical analysis:**

345 Data was verified, entered and subsequently analyzed using Statistical Package for
346 Social Science (SPSS) software of recent version. Then, responses were initiated with
347 descriptive analysis. Frequencies, percentage, mean, median, mode, range, and
348 standard deviation were calculated for continuous variables, while frequencies and
349 percentages were calculated for categorial variables. Tables and graphs were used to
350 present the data.

351

352 **Ethical considerations:**

353 Prior to doing data collection, ethical clearance was obtained from Ethical review
354 committee of BMRC (Memo no.: BMRC/HPNSP-Research Grant/2022-2023/613(1-

355 18), Date: 15.01.2023). Permission was taken from the respective authority
356 (DWASA)(Memo no.- 46.113.519/520.00.00.154.2023.443.mi.chem.dept. ;
357 Date:29.03.2026) for wastewater collection and a signed informed consent was taken
358 from the household convincing that privacy was maintained. For safeguarding
359 confidentiality and protecting anonymity each of the samples was given a special ID
360 no. which was followed in collection, transport to lab and reporting, in each and every
361 step of the procedure.

362

363 **Results:**

364 **Isolation pattern of pathogenic bacteria:**

365 A total of 19 (63.3%) growths were yielded from the culture of 30 water samples
366 examined. Among them, four (26.7%) isolates out of 15 drinking water and 15
367 (100%) isolates from all the wastewater samples were detected (Table1). The drinking
368 water yielded single organism from 3 (20%) of samples while one (6.7%) sample was
369 identified with more than two organisms. On the other hand, the wastewater yielded
370 single organism from twelve (80.0%) samples, two organisms from two (13.3%)
371 samples and more than two organisms were detected from one (6.7%) samples (Table
372 2). A total of 25 organisms were isolated from 30 samples of both drinking and
373 wastewater and the predominant bacteria were *Pseudomonas* spp. (36%) followed by
374 *Enterobacter* spp. (28%), *Escherichia coli* (20.0%), *Citrobacter freundii* (4.0%),
375 *Citrobacter koseri* (4.0%), *Acinetobacter* spp (4.0%) and *Klebsiella oxytoca* (4.0%)
376 (Table 3). The isolated pathogenic bacteria from drinking and wastewater samples
377 were then identified by relevant biochemical tests (Table 4 and 5)

378

379 **Antimicrobial susceptibility tests**

380

381 The isolates were subjected to antimicrobial susceptibility tests by disc diffusion
382 against 13 different antimicrobial agents in order to evaluate their resistance patterns.
383 The phenotypic susceptibilities of the isolates against the different tested
384 antimicrobial agents have been summarized in Table 6 (of drinking water) and Table
385 7 (of wastewater). The majority of the isolates exerted resistance to more than one
386 group of antibiotics. The result of disc diffusion susceptibility testing revealed that
387 most sensitive antimicrobials were meropenem, imipenem, gentamicin, ciprofloxacin,
388 and amikacin.

389 **Detection of resistance genes among drinking samples**

390 The isolates were subjected to detect suspected ESBL and carbapenemase producing
391 resistance genes by PCR in order to evaluate their resistance patterns. Table 8 shows
392 distribution of two ESBL encoding genes (*blaSHV* and *blaCTX-M-15*) and five
393 carbapenemase encoding genes (*blaIMP*, *blaVIM*, *blaKPC*, *blaOXA1* and *blaNDM1*)
394 among suspected resistant bacteria isolated from drinking water samples. Among four
395 suspected ESBL producers, none were positive for ESBL encoding *blaSHV* and
396 *blaCTX-M-15* genes. Whereas among four suspected carbapenemase-producing
397 bacteria, only one (25%) (*Pseudomonas* spp) had carbapenemase encoding genes
398 *blaKPC* and others did not.

399 **Detection of resistance genes among wastewater samples**

400 The isolates were subjected to detect suspected ESBL and carbapenemase producing
401 resistance genes by PCR in order to evaluate their resistance patterns. Table 9 shows
402 distribution of two ESBL encoding genes (*blaSHV* and *blaCTX-M-15*) and five
403 carbapenemase encoding genes (*blaIMP*, *blaVIM*, *blaKPC*, *blaOXA1* and *blaNDM1*)
404 among suspected resistant bacteria isolated from wastewater samples. Among 15
405 suspected ESBL producers, three (20%) and eight (53.3%) were positive for ESBL
406 encoding *blaSHV* and *blaCTX-M-15* genes respectively. On the other hand, among 15
407 suspected carbapenemase-producing bacteria, *blaKPC* genes were the most prevalent in
408 46.7% organisms whilst *blaVIM*, *blaIMP* and *blaNDM1* were the less common
409 carbapenemase producers constituting 20%, 6.7% and 6.7% among suspected resistant
410 bacteria respectively, and none was found *blaOXA1* producer.

411 According to sanitary inspection risk score classification by WHO (2011), most of the
412 drinking water samples score 4 (60%) out of 11 and categorized as intermediate risk
413 by hazard score (Table 10).

414

415 **Discussion:**

416 This study presents the distribution of AMR organism with their resistance genes in
417 drinking water, and wastewater in urban settings in Bangladesh. The high abundance
418 of AMR organisms in wastewater within all settings, and drinking water in the urban
419 area, raise important public health concerns.

420

421 In the present study, 63.3% of the water samples provided growths, while 26.7% of
422 the drinking water and all of the wastewater samples yielded growths. Among them,
423 20%) of the drinking water samples yielded a single organism, whereas one (6.7%)

424 sample yielded more than two organisms. The wastewater, on the other hand, yielded
425 a single organism from 80.0% of samples, two organisms from 13.3% samples, and
426 more than two organisms from one (6.7%) sample. Moges et al. (2014) reported that
427 85% of the samples were positive to one or more isolates which was higher than our
428 study. They reported that among the total samples 113 bacterial isolates were
429 recovered and 65 (57.5%) were from hospital environment and 48 (42.5%) were from
430 non-hospital environment.⁴⁹ Similar findings found in a study conducted in Nepal
431 showed the presence of heterotrophic bacteria in both tap and bottled water samples.⁵⁰
432

433 In this study, 25 organisms were isolated from 30 samples of both drinking and
434 wastewater and the predominant bacteria were found as *Pseudomonas* spp. (36%)
435 followed by *Enterobacter* spp. (28%), *Escherichia coli* (20.0%), *Citrobacter freundii*
436 (4.0%), *Citrobacter koseri* (4.0%), *Acinetobacter* spp.(4.0%) and *Klebsiella oxytoca*
437 (4.0%) (Table 3). There are many studies that have shown the presence of
438 different *Pseudomonas* spp. in drinking water.⁵¹⁻⁵³ Similar findings of this study were
439 reported in a study by Mulamattathil et al. (2014) in South Africa reported that
440 *Pseudomonas* species were isolated in large numbers in raw and treated water. The
441 study demonstrated the occurrence of total coliforms, faecal coliforms, heterotrophic
442 bacteria, and *Pseudomonas* in water samples analysed which indicated the incidence
443 of water contamination as some of these species are indicators of faecal
444 contamination.⁵⁴

445
446 The members belonging to the family Enterobacteriaceae, including *E. coli* and *E.*
447 *cloacae*, are known to be potential pathogens found in soil and water. Although *E.*
448 *cloacae* is not a primary human pathogen, it has been reported to cause nosocomial
449 infections.⁵⁵

450 The presence of coliforms like *Escherichia coli* with other enteric bacteria showed
451 faecal contamination of the water, which poses major health risks. Bhumbla et al
452 (2020) from India reported that *Esch. coli* was the predominant bacteria along with
453 *Klebsiella* spp. and Coagulase Negative *Staphylococcus* (CONS) respectively in the
454 water which were not similar with the present study.⁵⁶

455
456 A study by Deji-Agboola et al. in Nigeria revealed the presence of coliforms in the tap
457 water samples including *E. coli*, *Klebsiella* spp. and *Enterobacter* spp. which were
458 similar to our study.⁵⁷ In contrast to our study findings, several researchers reported

459 that most frequently isolated bacterium was *Klebsiella* spp., followed by
460 *Pseudomonas* spp., *E. coli* and *Citrobacter* spp , and *S. aureus* (8.2%) which were not
461 similar findings of this study.^{49,58,59}

462

463 In a study by Narciso-da-Rocha et al. isolated different species of *Acinetobacter* from
464 tap water which are considered opportunistic pathogens and very common in nature:
465 soil, water, plants (including fruits and vegetables), animals and organic material in
466 decomposition (sewage). They are also frequently found in water treatment systems
467 and a well-known nosocomial pathogen that causes infections in hospitalized
468 patients.⁶⁰ In contrast to our findings Ranbir et al (2020) investigated the tap water
469 quality of public toilets in Amritsar, Punjab, India and found that of the 25 isolates, 5
470 were of *Bacillus* spp., 4 were of *Pseudomonas* spp., as well as *E.*
471 *coli* and *Enterobacter* spp.⁵⁸

472

473 **Antimicrobial susceptibility tests**

474

475 The isolates were subjected to antimicrobial susceptibility tests by disc diffusion
476 against 13 different antimicrobial agents and the majority of the isolates exerted
477 resistance to more than one group of antibiotics. The result of disc diffusion
478 susceptibility testing revealed that most sensitive antimicrobials were meropenem,
479 imipenem, gentamicin, ciprofloxacin, and amikacin. Different types of multiple
480 antibiotic resistance patterns were observed amongst all the bacterial groups isolated
481 from the various sites. In some cases, some of the isolates were resistance to up to ten
482 different antibiotics.

483

484 This study also provides evidence of the prevalence of antibiotic-resistant bacteria in
485 tap water samples of different localities, similar to previous studies.⁶¹⁻⁶³ Antibiotic
486 resistance among bacterial species is spreading at an alarming rate and the lack of
487 effective antibacterial drugs against them is a major concern.

488

489 A study by Mulamattathil et al. (2014) in South Africa revealed that None of the
490 isolates were resistant to ciprofloxacin but a large proportion of the environmental
491 isolates were resistant to erythromycin, followed by trimethoprim and amoxicillin.⁵⁴
492 Moges et al. (2014) reported that multiple drug resistance was also common in gram
493 negative isolates to commonly used antibiotics in the study area. All isolates of *E.*

494 coli, *Citrobacter* spp. and *Enterobacter* spp. were 100% resistant to ampicillin. The
495 overall resistance of gram-negative bacteria to ampicillin was 97%, followed by
496 cephalotin 49%, cotrimoxazole 38%, tetracycline 37%, naldixic acid 36%, cefotaxime
497 33%; least resistant being ciprofloxacin 12% which was consistent to our study.⁴⁹

498

499 Antibiotic resistance in bacteria is mainly because of the indiscriminate use of
500 antibiotics by humans against various bacterial diseases and infections, animal
501 husbandry, and agriculture. The vertical and horizontal transfer of antibiotic resistance
502 genes from one bacterium to another of the same or a different genus through the
503 process of conjugation, transformation and transduction may disrupt the microbial
504 balance in favor of resistant bacteria.⁶⁴ In most developing countries, effluents are
505 discharged from the sewer systems directly into rivers and lakes and a major source of
506 contamination of the aquatic environment. These untreated effluents may contain AR
507 bacteria, which disseminate and potentially transfer their resistance genes.⁶⁵ In
508 particular, wastewater from pharmaceutical plants could play a role in the selection of
509 antibiotic-resistant bacteria in sewage.⁶⁷

510

511 The presence of Extended Spectrum β -lactamases (ESBLs) and Metallo β -lactamases
512 (MBLs) in the isolates from environmental samples has important implications for
513 humans who depend on public water supply and sanitation facilities. Several studies
514 have reported chromosomally encoded efflux mechanisms, abundant in gram negative
515 bacteria and particularly in *Pseudomonas* spp., *Escherichia coli* and *Enterococcus* spp
516 further contribute to raising the antibiotic resistance level and resistance genes in
517 environmental samples.^{68,69}

518

519 In our study among suspected resistant bacteria isolated from drinking water samples,
520 none were positive for ESBL encoding *blaSHV* and *blaCTX-M-15* genes. Whereas
521 among four suspected carbapenemase-producing bacteria, only one (25%)
522 (*Pseudomonas* spp) had carbapenemase encoding genes *blaKPC* and others did not. On
523 the other hand among 15 suspected carbapenemase-producing bacteria isolated from
524 wastewater samples, *blaKPC* genes were the most prevalent in 46.7% organisms whilst
525 *blaVIM*, *blaIMP* and *blaNDM1* were the less common carbapenemase producers
526 constituting 20%, 6.7% and 6.7% among suspected resistant bacteria respectively, and
527 none was found *blaOXA1* producer. A study was conducted by Islam MA (2017) among
528 wastewater samples from hospital-adjacent areas (HAR) and from community areas

529 (COM), as well as public tap water samples, and found that 51 (71%) samples were
530 positive for NDM-1-producing bacteria, as evidenced by phenotypic tests and the
531 presence of the blaNDM-1 gene, compared to 5 of 41 (12.1%) samples from COM
532 samples (P 0.001). *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (44%) was the predominant bacterial species
533 among blaNDM-1-positive isolates, followed by *Escherichia coli* (29%), *Acinetobacter*
534 spp. (15%), and *Enterobacter* spp. (9%).

535

536 These bacteria were also positive for one or more other antibiotic resistance genes,
537 including blaCTX-M-1 (80%), blaCTX-M-15 (63%), blaTEM (76%), blaSHV (33%),
538 blaCMY-2 (16%), blaOXA-48-like (2%), blaOXA-1 (53%), and blaOXA-47-like (60%)
539 genes.¹² In another study by Toleman (2012) found that, in Bangladesh, the blaNDM-1
540 gene were in 62% of environmental waters and in fermentative and non-fermentative
541 gram-negative bacteria. Resistance genes and plasmid profiles for a subset of
542 *Escherichia coli* strains was found in a study of extensively drug-resistant NDM-1–
543 encoding bacteria in the environment, Dhaka, Bangladesh.¹³ The presence of NDM-1 β-
544 lactamase-producing bacteria in environmental samples in New Delhi has important
545 implications for people living in the city who are reliant on public water and sanitation
546 facilities.¹⁴

547

548 The use of sanitary inspections combined with periodic water quality testing has been
549 recommended in some cases as screening tools for fecal contamination. First
550 introduced in 1991 and published in the World Health Organization (WHO)
551 monitoring guidelines in 1993, sanitary inspections have become a common
552 component of global water quality surveillance programs. They were developed to
553 provide a rudimentary comparable method for quantifying risk factors that can
554 contribute to microbiological contamination of water sources. Sanitary inspections
555 include a simple visual assessment of typically around 11 risk factor questions,
556 specific to the source type, which are answered with yes or no responses. Each risk
557 factor question is weighted equally. The sum of all the questions answered “yes” is the
558 sanitary inspection score (SIS). The higher the SIS value the higher the category of
559 risk.⁷⁰ According to sanitary inspection risk score classification by WHO, most of the
560 drinking water samples score 4 (60%) out of 11 and categorized as intermediate risk
561 by hazard score. In contrast of our study, Murei et al (2023) in India’s District
562 Municipality identified as having the highest sanitary risk score in different water
563 sources which were a cause for concern used by community members for domestic

564 purposes.⁷¹ In the Southern Region of Ethiopia, from the sanitary condition survey,
565 57.6% of the water sources exhibited from intermediate- to very high-risk level which
566 demonstrated the sanitary condition of water sources.⁷² These findings also help to fill
567 highlighted gaps in research on the microbiological quality of wastewater sources.

568

569

570 **Conclusions:**

571 Our study findings provide an insight into the waterborne transmission of AMR by
572 analyzing the distribution of ARB and ARGs in different aquatic environments in
573 Bangladesh. Despite a greater awareness of environmental AMR, this has not yet been
574 prioritized within environmental health policies or country-level national action plans,
575 especially in LMICs. This study provides baseline information for further
576 investigations into the prevalence of AMR bacteria in hospital and communal
577 effluents and their spread into the aquatic ecosystem, representing potential threats to
578 public health. Since these organisms may be vital to the safety and well-being of
579 patients who are hospitalized as well as individuals who are susceptible to infection.
580 Therefore, water treatment plant should be improved and sanitary measures should be
581 practiced.

582 **Limitation:**

583 In this study, genotyping of AMR with public health importance were implied rather
584 than multiple antimicrobial resistances (MAR) profiles.

585 **Recommendations:**

586 Improved sanitary measure with proper wastewater treatment plant should be
587 practiced. To reduce the burden of AMR in the environment, future interventions are
588 needed which include improved biosecurity practices, particularly waste disposal
589 systems, along with improved water, sanitation and hygiene infrastructure in rural and
590 in urban areas. Maintenance of proper sanitary conditions in toilets, cleaning of
591 dustbins, proper air ventilation, and disinfection of floors and chlorination of water
592 can decrease the chances of microbial contamination. In addition, touch-free flushing,
593 taps and door-opening devices should be recommended to avoid pathogen
594 transmission through contact. Materials used in the construction of water distribution
595 systems should be carefully selected to prevent biofilm formation by microbes.

596

597 Mapping of AMR using quantitative microbiological data from connected
598 environmental departments can provide valuable insights into an ecological setting

599 and this could be an important step in addressing environmental dimensions of AMR
600 through tailored mitigation measures.

601

602 **Funding agency:** Bangladesh Medical and Research Council (BMRC)

603

604 **Acknowledgement:** This research study is attributed to the Water Supply and
605 Sewerage Authority (WASA), Dhaka, Bangladesh. The authors are indebted to all the
606 medical technologists of the laboratory of NIPSOM for their assistance in
607 microbiology study.

608

609

610

611 **References:**

612

613 1. Pathog Glob Health. 2015;109(7):309-18. doi: 10.1179/2047773215Y.0000000030.

614

615 2. World Health Organization. WHO global strategy for containment of antimicrobial
616 resistance. Geneva: WHO; 2001

617

618 3. World Health Organization. The evolving threat of antimicrobial resistance.
619 Options for action. Geneva: WHO Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data; 2012

620

621 4. Edition F. Guidelines for drinking-water quality. WHO chronicle 2011;38(4):104–
622 8.

623 5. Bouki C, Venieri D, Diamadopoulos E. Detection and fate of antibiotic resistant
624 bacteria in wastewater treatment plants: a review. Ecotoxicol Environ Saf. 2013;91:1–
625 9.

626

627 6. MARAN. Monitoring of antimicrobial resistance and antibiotic usage in animals in
628 the Netherlands in 2012.2013. Available: [http://www.wageningenur.nl/nl/Expertises-](http://www.wageningenur.nl/nl/Expertises-Dienstverlening/Onderzoeksinstituten/Central-Veterinary-Institute/Publicaties-CVI/MARAN-Rapporten.htm)
629 [Dienstverlening/Onderzoeksinstituten/Central-Veterinary-Institute/Publicaties-](http://www.wageningenur.nl/nl/Expertises-Dienstverlening/Onderzoeksinstituten/Central-Veterinary-Institute/Publicaties-CVI/MARAN-Rapporten.htm)
630 [CVI/MARAN-Rapporten.htm](http://www.wageningenur.nl/nl/Expertises-Dienstverlening/Onderzoeksinstituten/Central-Veterinary-Institute/Publicaties-CVI/MARAN-Rapporten.htm)

631

632 7. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antimicrobial-resistance>

633 8. Review on Antimicrobial Resistance. Tackling Drug-Resistant Infections Globally:
634 Final Report and Recommendations. Available online: [https://amr-](https://amr-review.org/sites/default/files/160525_Final%20paper_with%20cover.pdf)
635 [review.org/sites/default/files/160525_Final%20paper_](https://amr-review.org/sites/default/files/160525_Final%20paper_with%20cover.pdf)
636 [with%20cover.pdf](https://amr-review.org/sites/default/files/160525_Final%20paper_with%20cover.pdf) (accessed
637 on 25 June 2019)

637

638 9. Aslam B, Khurshid M, Arshad M I, Muzammil S, Rasool M, Yasmeen N, et al.
639 Antibiotic Resistance: One Health One World Outlook. Frontiers in Cellular and
640 Infection Microbiology. 2021; vol.11 DOI=10.3389/fcimb.2021.771510

641

- 642 10. Central for Disease Control and Prevention. Info graphic: Antibiotic Resistance
643 The Global Threat. Available online:
644 [https://www.cdc.gov/globalhealth/infographics/antibiotic-](https://www.cdc.gov/globalhealth/infographics/antibiotic-resistance/antibiotic_resistance_global_threat.htm)
645 [resistance/antibiotic_resistance_global_threat.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/globalhealth/infographics/antibiotic-resistance/antibiotic_resistance_global_threat.htm) (accessed on 22 June 2023)
646
- 647 11. Hoque R, Ahmed SM, Naher N, et al. Tackling antimicrobial resistance in
648 Bangladesh: A scoping review of policy and practice in human, animal and
649 environment sectors. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(1):e0227947.
650 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0227947
651
- 652 12. Islam MA, Islam M, Hasan R, Hossain MI, Nabi A, Rahman M, et al.
653 Environmental spread of NDM-1- producing multi-drug resistant bacteria in Dhaka,
654 Bangladesh. *Appl Environ Microbiology.* 2017;AEM. 00793–17.
655
- 656 13. Toleman MA, Bugert JJ, Nizam SA. Extensively drug-resistant New Delhi
657 metallo- β -lactamase-encoding bacteria in the environment, Dhaka, Bangladesh,
658 2012. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2015;21(6):1027-1030. doi:10.3201/eid2106.141578
659
- 660 14. Walsh TR, Weeks J, Livermore DM, Toleman MA. Dissemination of NDM-1
661 positive bacteria in the New Delhi environment and its implications for human health:
662 an environmental point prevalence study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2011;11(5):355-362.
663 doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(11)70059-7
664
- 665 15. Holmes, A.H.; Moore, L.S.; Sundsfjord, A.; Steinbakk, M.; Regmi, S.; Karkey,
666 A.; Guerin, P.J.; Piddock, L.J. Understanding the mechanisms and drivers of
667 antimicrobial resistance. *Lancet* 2016, 387, 176–187
668
- 669 16. Schwartz, K.L.; Morris, S.K. Travel and the Spread of Drug-Resistant Bacteria.
670 *Curr. Infect. Dis.* 2018, 20, 29.
671
- 672 17. Memish, Z.A.; Venkatesh, S.; Shibl, A.M. Impact of travel on international spread
673 of antimicrobial resistance. *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents* 2003, 21, 135–142. [CrossRef]
674
- 674 18. Bell, B.G.; Schellevis, F.; Stobberingh, E.; Goossens, H.; Pringle, M. A systematic
675 review and meta-analysis of the effects of antibiotic consumption on antibiotic
676 resistance. *BMC Infect. Dis.* 2014, 14, 13.
677
- 678 19. Van Boeckel, T.P.; Glennon, E.E.; Chen, D.; Gilbert, M.; Robinson, T.P.;
679 Grenfell, B.T.; Levin, S.A.; Bonhoeffer, S.; Laxminarayan, R. Reducing antimicrobial
680 use in food animals. *Science* 2017, 357, 1350–1352.
681
- 682 20. Brinkac, L.; Voorhies, A.; Gomez, A.; Nelson, K.E. The Threat of Antimicrobial
683 Resistance on the Human Microbiome. *Microb. Ecol.* 2017, 74, 1001–1008.
684

- 685 21. Manyi-Loh, C.; Mamphweli, S.; Meyer, E.; Okoh, A. Antibiotic Use in
686 Agriculture and Its Consequential Resistance in Environmental Sources: Potential
687 Public Health Implications. *Molecules* 2018, 23, 795.
688
- 689 22. Woolhouse, M.; Ward, M.; van Bunnik, B.; Farrar, J. Antimicrobial resistance in
690 humans, livestock and the wider environment. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*
691 2015, 370, 20140083.
692
- 693 23. The Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, H.o.P.U. Reservoir of
694 Antimicrobial Resistance. Available online:
695 <https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/POST-PN-0595>
696 (accessed on 26 June 2023).
697
- 698 24. Food and Agricultural Organization of United Nations. Antimicrobial Resistance
699 in the Environment: Summary Report of an FAO Meeting of Experts FAO
700 Antimicrobial Resistance Working Group. Available online:
701 <http://www.fao.org/3/BU656en/bu656en.pdf> (accessed on 26 June 2019). 0-7w
702
- 703 25. European Medicine Agency. Reflection Paper on Antimicrobial Resistance in the
704 Environment: Considerations for Current and Future Risk Assessment of Veterinary
705 Medicinal Products (Draft). Available online:
706 [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/draft-reflection-paper-
707 antimicrobial-resistance-environment-considerations-current-future-risk_en.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/draft-reflection-paper-antimicrobial-resistance-environment-considerations-current-future-risk_en.pdf)
708 (accessed on 26 June 2023).
709
- 710 26. Nahar S, Urmi UL, Ali T, Rumnaz A, Haque TA, Ara B, Alam MS, Mosaddek
711 ASM, Islam S. ESBL genes, blaTEM, blaOXA, and blaSHV in poultry gut bacteria:
712 An endemic public health burden in Bangladesh. *Bangladesh Med Res Counc*
713
- 714 27. Jasovský D, Littmann J, Zorzet A, Cars O. Antimicrobial resistance-a threat to the
715 world's sustainable development. *Ups J Med Sci.* 2016 Aug;121(3):159-64. doi:
716 10.1080/03009734.2016.1195900. Epub 2016 Jul 14. PMID: 27416324; PMCID:
717 PMC4967260.
718
- 719 28. Fouz N, Pangesti KN, Yasir M, Al-Malki AL, Azhar EI, Hill-Cawthorne GA, Abd
720 El Ghany M. The contribution of wastewater to the transmission of antimicrobial
721 resistance in the environment: implications of mass gathering settings. *Tropical*
722 *medicine and infectious disease.* 2020 Feb 25;5(1):33.
723 <https://doi.org/10.3390/tropicalmed5010033>
724
- 725 29. World Health Organization. Global Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance System
726 (GLASS) Report Early Implementation 2017–2018. Available online:
727 [https://www.who.int/glass/resources/publications/earlyimplementation-report-2017-
728 2018/en/](https://www.who.int/glass/resources/publications/earlyimplementation-report-2017-2018/en/) (accessed on 26 June 2023)
729

- 730 30. Devarajan N, Laffite A, Mulaji CK, Otamonga JP, Mpiana PT, Mubedi JI,
731 Prabakar K, Ibelings BW, Poté J. Occurrence of antibiotic resistance genes and
732 bacterial markers in a tropical river receiving hospital and urban wastewaters. *PloS*
733 *one*. 2016 Feb 24;11(2):e0149211.
734
- 735 31. Cantón R, Morosini MI. Emergence and spread of antibiotic resistance following
736 exposure to antibiotics. *FEMS microbiology reviews*. 2011 Sep 1;35(5):977-91.
737
- 738 32. Al Salah DM, Laffite A, Poté J. Occurrence of bacterial markers and antibiotic
739 resistance genes in sub-Saharan rivers receiving animal farm wastewaters. *Scientific*
740 *Reports*. 2019 Oct 16;9(1):14847.
741
- 742 33. Samreen, Iqbal Ahmad, Hesham A. Malak, Hussein H. Abulreesh, Environmental
743 antimicrobial resistance and its drivers: a potential threat to public health, *Journal of*
744 *Global Antimicrobial Resistance*,
745 Volume 27, 2021, Pages 101-111, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jgar.2021.08.001>.
746
- 747 34. Bush K, Bradford PA. β -Lactams and β -Lactamase Inhibitors: An Overview. *Cold*
748 *Spring Harb Perspect Med*. 2016 Aug 1;6(8):a025247. doi:
749 10.1101/cshperspect.a025247. PMID: 27329032; PMCID: PMC4968164.
750
- 751 35. Sawatwong P, Sapchookul P, Whistler T, Gregory CJ, Sangwichian O,
752 Makprasert S, Jorakate P, Srisaengchai P, Thamthitiwat S, Promkong C,
753 Nanvatthanachod P, Vanaporn M, Rhodes J. High Burden of Extended-Spectrum β -
754 Lactamase-Producing *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* Bacteremia in
755 Older Adults: A Seven-Year Study in Two Rural Thai Provinces. *Am J Trop Med*
756 *Hyg*. 2019 Apr;100(4):943-951. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.18-0394. PMID: 30793684;
757 PMCID: PMC6447101.
758
- 759 36. [https://dwas.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/files/files/dwas.portal.gov.bd/page/c0a3b](https://dwas.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/files/files/dwas.portal.gov.bd/page/c0a3b947_9ad9_429a_8a3f_e320e33fea06/2021-01-17-16-51f23ad05cc0f676fe25cca345e2def230.pdf)
760 [947_9ad9_429a_8a3f_e320e33fea06/2021-01-17-16-51](https://dwas.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/files/files/dwas.portal.gov.bd/page/c0a3b947_9ad9_429a_8a3f_e320e33fea06/2021-01-17-16-51f23ad05cc0f676fe25cca345e2def230.pdf)
761 [f23ad05cc0f676fe25cca345e2def230.pdf](https://dwas.portal.gov.bd/sites/default/files/files/dwas.portal.gov.bd/page/c0a3b947_9ad9_429a_8a3f_e320e33fea06/2021-01-17-16-51f23ad05cc0f676fe25cca345e2def230.pdf)
762
- 763 37. Cheesbrough M. In: Cheesbrough M (editor), *District Laboratory Practice in*
764 *Tropical Countries*. Part 2. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University
765 Press; 2000: pp. 116-164).
766
- 767 38. Ghugare, G.S., Nair, A., Nimkande, V., Sarode, P., Rangari, P. and Khairnar, K.
768 (2017), Membrane filtration immobilization technique—a simple and novel method
769 for primary isolation and enrichment of bacteriophages. *J Appl Microbiol*, 122: 531-
770 539. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.13344>
771
- 772 39. Bauer AW, Kirby WM, Sherris JC, et al. Antibiotic susceptibility testing by a
773 standardized single disk method. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 1966;45(4):493–496
774

- 775 40. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). Performance Standards for
776 Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. 32nd ed. CLSI supplement M100; Clinical and
777 Laboratory Standards Institute, USA, 2022 (ISBN 978-1-68440-134-5 [Print]; ISBN
778 978-1-68440-135-2 [Electronic].
779
- 780 41. Muntean MM, Muntean AA, Preda M, Manolescu LSC, Dragomirescu C, Popa
781 MI, Popa GL. Phenotypic and genotypic detection methods for antimicrobial
782 resistance in ESKAPE pathogens (Review). *Exp Ther Med*. 2022 Jun 9;24(2):508.
783 doi: 10.3892/etm.2022.11435. PMID: 35837033; PMCID: PMC9257796.
784
- 785 42. Collee, J.G., Miles, R.S. and Watt, B. (1996) Tests for the Identification of
786 Bacteria. In: Collee, J.G., Marmion, B.P., Fraser, A.G. and Simmons, A., Eds.,
787 Mackie & McCartney Practical Medical Microbiology, 14th Edition, Churchill
788 Livingstone, New York, 131-151.
789
- 790 43. Ghatak S, Muthukumaran RB, Nachimuthu SK. A simple method of genomic
791 DNA extraction from human samples for PCR-RFLP analysis. *J Biomol Tech*. 2013
792 Dec;24(4):224-31. doi: 10.7171/jbt.13-2404-001. PMID: 24294115; PMCID:
793 PMC3792701.
794
- 795 44. PrasannaKumar, Chinnamani. (2023). Lab in Microbial genetics and Molecular
796 Biology. 10.13140/RG.2.2.33417.52326.
797
- 798 45. Van TT, Chin J, Chapman T, Tran LT, Coloe PJ. Safety of raw meat and shellfish
799 in Vietnam: an analysis of *Escherichia coli* isolations for antibiotic resistance and
800 virulence genes. *Int J Food Microbiol*. 2008 Jun 10;124(3):217-23. doi:
801 10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2008.03.029. Epub 2008 Mar 31. PMID: 18457892.
802
- 803 46. Castanheira M, Deshpande LM, Mathai D, Bell JM, Jones RN, Mendes RE. Early
804 dissemination of NDM-1- and OXA-181-producing Enterobacteriaceae in Indian
805 hospitals: report from the SENTRY Antimicrobial Surveillance Program, 2006-2007.
806 *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2011 Mar;55(3):1274-8. doi: 10.1128/AAC.01497-
807 10. Epub 2010 Dec 28. PMID: 21189345; PMCID: PMC3067112.
808
- 809 47. Fallah F, Noori M, Hashemi A, Goudarzi H, Karimi A, Erfanimanesh S, Alimehr
810 S. Prevalence of bla NDM, bla PER, bla VEB, bla IMP, and bla VIM Genes among
811 *Acinetobacter baumannii* Isolated from Two Hospitals of Tehran, Iran. *Scientifica*
812 (Cairo). 2014;2014:245162. doi: 10.1155/2014/245162. Epub 2014 Jul 15. PMID:
813 25133013; PMCID: PMC4123593.
814
- 815 48. Fateh Rahimi, Mohammad Katouli, Mohammad R. Pourshafie; Characterization
816 of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* strains in sewage treatment plants in
817 Tehran, Iran. *J Water Health* 1 April 2021; 19 (2): 216–228.
818 doi: <https://doi.org/10.2166/wh.2021.247>
819

- 820 49. Moges F, Endris M, Belyhun Y, Worku W. Isolation and characterization of
821 multiple drug resistance bacterial pathogens from waste water in hospital and non-
822 hospital environments, Northwest Ethiopia. BMC Res Notes. 2014 Apr 5;7:215. doi:
823 10.1186/1756-0500-7-215. PMID: 24708553; PMCID: PMC4234977.
- 824
- 825 50. Pant, N.D., Poudyal, N. & Bhattacharya, S.K. Bacteriological quality of bottled
826 drinking water versus municipal tap water in Dharan municipality, Nepal. J Health
827 Popul Nutr 35, 17 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41043-016-0054-0>
828
- 829 51. Duquino HH, Rosenberg FA. Antibiotic-resistant *Pseudomonas* in bottled
830 drinking water. Can J Microbiol 1987;33(4):286–289.
831
- 832 52. Vaz-Moreira I, Nunes OC, Manaia CM. Diversity and antibiotic resistance in
833 *Pseudomonas* spp. from drinking water. Sci Total Environ. 2012;426:366–374.
834
- 835 53. Papapetropoulou M, Iliopoulou J, Rodopoulou G, Detorakis J, Paniara O.
836 Occurrence and antibiotic-resistance of *Pseudomonas* species isolated from drinking
837 water in southern Greece. J Chemother 1994;6(2):111–116.
838
- 839 54. Mulamattathil SG, Bezuidenhout C, Mbewe M, Ateba CN. Isolation of
840 environmental bacteria from surface and drinking water in mafikeng, South Africa,
841 and characterization using their antibiotic resistance profiles. J Pathog.
842 2014;2014:371208. doi: 10.1155/2014/371208. Epub 2014 Jul 6. PMID: 25105027;
843 PMCID: PMC4106082.
844
- 845 55. Keller R, Pedroso MZ, Ritchmann R et al. Occurrence of virulence-associated
846 properties in *Enterobacter cloacae*. Infect Immun. 1998;66(2):645–649.
847
- 848 56. Bhumbra U, Majumdar S, Jain S, Dalal AS. A study of isolation and identification
849 of bacteria from lake water in and around Udaipur, Rajasthan. J Family Med Prim
850 Care. 2020 Feb 28;9(2):751-754. doi: 10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_1032_19. PMID:
851 32318414; PMCID: PMC7113958.
852
- 853 57. Deji-Agboola MA, Museliu O, Olajubu FA, Osinupebi OA, Idowu AO.
854 Bacteriological analysis of potable water in areas with reported cholera outbreaks in
855 Ogun, Oyo and Lagos states, Nigeria. Ann Health Res 2017;3(2):105–111.
856
- 857 58. Rajanbir Kaur, Drishtant Singh, Anup Kumar Kesavan, Rajinder Kaur, Molecular
858 characterization and antimicrobial susceptibility of bacterial isolates present in tap
859 water of public toilets, International Health, Volume 12, Issue 5, September 2020,
860 Pages 472–483, <https://doi.org/10.1093/inthealth/ihz074>
861
- 862 59. Ekhaise FO, Omavwoya BP (2008). Influence of hospital wastewater discharged
863 from university of Benin teaching hospital (UBTH), Benin City on its receiving

864 environment. *American-Eurasian Journal of Agricultural Environmental Science*
865 4(4):484-488.

866

867 60. Narciso-da-Rocha C, Vaz-Moreira I, Svensson-Stadler L, Moore ER, Manaia CM.
868 Diversity and antibiotic resistance of *Acinetobacter* spp. in water from the source to
869 the tap. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol.* 2013;97(1):329–340.

870

871 61. Poonia S, Singh TS, Tsering DC. Antibiotic susceptibility profile of bacteria
872 isolated from natural sources of water from rural areas of East Sikkim. *Indian J*
873 *Community Med.* 2014;39(3):156–60.

874

875 62. Xi C, Zhang Y, Marrs CF, et al. Prevalence of antibiotic resistance in drinking
876 water treatment and distribution systems. *Appl Environ Microbiol.*
877 2009;75(17):5714–8.

878

879 63. Bergeron S, Boopathy R, Nathaniel R, Corbin A, LaFleur G. Presence of
880 antibiotic resistant bacteria and antibiotic resistance genes in raw source water
881 and treated drinking water. *Int Biodeter Biodegr* 2015;102:370–374.

882

883 64. Khan S, Beattie TK, Knapp CW. Relationship between antibiotic- and
884 disinfectant-resistance profiles in bacteria harvested from tap water.
885 *Chemosphere.* 2016;152:132–141.

886

887 65. Laffite A, Kilunga PI, Kayembe JM, Devarajan N, Mulaji CK, Giuliani G,
888 Slaveykova VI, Pote J. Hospital effluents are one of several sources of metal,
889 antibiotic resistance genes, and bacterial markers disseminated in Sub-Saharan
890 urban rivers. *Frontiers in microbiology.* 2016 Jul 22;7:1128.

891

892 66. Reddy KR, Khaleel R, Overcash MR. Behavior and transport of microbial pathogens
893 and indicator organisms in soils treated with organic wastes. *J Environ Qual.*
894 1981;10(3):255–266

895 67. Mackuľak T, Cverenkárová K, Vojs Staňová A, Fehér M, Tamáš M, Škulcová AB,
896 Gál M, Naumowicz M, Špalková V, Bírošová L. Hospital wastewater—Source of specific
897 micropollutants, antibiotic-resistant microorganisms, viruses, and their elimination.
898 *Antibiotics.* 2021 Sep 4;10(9):1070.

899

900 68. Naresh D, Thilo K, Periyasamy S, Christian van D, Crispin KM, Pius TM, Bastiaan
901 WI, John P, Antibiotic resistant *Pseudomonas* spp. in the aquatic environment: A
902 prevalence study under tropical and temperate climate conditions, *Water Research,*
903 Volume 115, 2017, Pages 256-265, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2017.02.058>.

904

- 905 69. Sirijan Santajit, Nitaya Indrawattana, "Mechanisms of Antimicrobial Resistance in
906 ESKAPE Pathogens", *BioMed Research International*, vol. 2016, Article ID 2475067, 8
907 pages, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/2475067>
908
- 909 70. Guidelines for Drinking-water Quality, Fourth Edition, 2011
910 https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/44584/9789241548151_eng.pdf
911
- 912 71. Murei, A., Kamika, I., Samie, A. et al. Assessment of the water sources for potential
913 channels of faecal contamination within Vhembe District Municipality using sanitary
914 inspections and hydrogen sulphide test. *Sci Rep* 13, 6250 (2023).
915 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-33551-y>
916
- 917 72. Alemayehu TA, Weldetinsae A, Dinssa DA, Derra FA, Bedada TL, Asefa YB,
918 Mengesha SD, Alemu ZA, Serte MG, Teklu KT, Woldegabriel MG, Kenea MA, van den
919 Berg H, de Roda Husman AM. Sanitary condition and its microbiological quality of
920 improved water sources in the Southern Region of Ethiopia. *Environ Monit Assess.* 2020
921 Apr 30;192(5):319. doi: 10.1007/s10661-020-08297-z. PMID: 32356229; PMCID:
922 PMC7192860.