Large variation in the association between seasonal antibiotic use and resistance across multiple bacterial species and antibiotic classes

Daphne S. Sun[1], Stephen M. Kissler[1], Sanjat Kanjilal[2,3,4,5], Scott W. Olesen[1], Marc Lipsitch[1,6], Yonatan H. Grad[1,3]

1. Department of Immunology and Infectious Diseases, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA
2. Department of Population Medicine, Harvard Medical School and Harvard Pilgrim Health Care Institute, Boston, MA, USA
3. Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA
4. Department of Pathology, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
5. Division of Infectious Disease, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
6. Center for Communicable Disease Dynamics, Department of Epidemiology, Harvard Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

Correspondence: Yonatan H. Grad (ygrad@hsph.harvard.edu)

Abstract

Understanding how antibiotic use drives resistance is crucial for guiding effective strategies to limit the spread of resistance, but the variation in the use-resistance relationship across pathogens and antibiotics remains unclear. Here, we applied sinusoidal models to evaluate the seasonal use-resistance relationship across 3 species and 5 antibiotic classes in Boston, Massachusetts. Use of all 5 classes and resistance in 10 of 15 species-antibiotic combinations showed significant amplitudes of seasonality. However, while seasonal peaks in use varied by class, resistance in all 10 species-antibiotic combinations peaked in the winter and spring. The correlations between seasonal use and resistance thus varied widely, with resistance to all antibiotic classes being most positively correlated with use of the winter-peaking classes (penicillins and macrolides). These findings suggest that in some cases the simple model of use selecting for resistance is inadequate and stewardship strategies will not be equally effective across all species and antibiotics.

Introduction

Antibiotic resistance is a growing threat to society, with important public health[1] and economic consequences[2]. Antibiotic use is considered a primary driver of resistance not only in the pathogen targeted by the antibiotic but also in host-associated bacteria subject to 'bystander selection'[3]. As such, the effort to reduce antibiotic use is an important strategy for broadly limiting the spread of resistance. However, such interventions may not be equally effective across all antibiotics and bacterial pathogens and will likely depend on the strength of the relationship between use and resistance in each case. Therefore, we need to expand our understanding of these use-resistance relationships and identify factors that influence their strength.

The reported associations between antibiotic use and resistance have varied widely across previous ecological studies on the scale of European countries and US states[4–10]. Several reports found strong use-resistance associations in a small number of bacterial pathogens (primarily *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and *Escherichia coli*) and antibiotics (macrolides, β-lactams, and quinolones)[4–8]. However, a recent study that analyzed 72 species-antibiotic combinations found that the correlation between use and resistance, while generally positive, covered a large range and often appeared weaker than might be expected based on earlier reports[9]. In some cases, the difficulty in detecting associations may be attributed to several challenges of using annual geographic data to infer use-resistance relationships[11]. For example, the similar levels of use between regions and the existence of possibly strong 'spillover' effects[12] – where use in one region affects resistance in surrounding regions due to transmission between populations – can limit the power to detect associations. Geographic analyses are also limited by confounding from comparing between populations, which arises when there are variations between regions in factors other than antibiotic use, such as population

demographics, healthcare infrastructure, and dominant strains of circulating pathogens, that can also contribute to differing levels of resistance.

Seasonal variations in antibiotic use and resistance within a single region offer another approach to studying the use-resistance relationship[13–16], with several advantages. First, seasonality studies enable assessment within a single population, thus minimizing confounding from comparing between populations or along secular trends[11]. Thus seasonality studies may better approximate the causal use-resistance relationship than geographic analyses. Second, the magnitude of seasonal variations in use often exceeds the variation in use across years or geographic regions[16,17], which can provide seasonality studies with greater power to detect associations between use and resistance.

Previous studies found that the antibiotic use-resistance relationship is detectable on a seasonal timescale, with positive associations in *Streptococcus pneumoniae*[13], *Escherichia coli*[14,15], *Staphylococcus aureus*[14], and *Neisseria gonorrhoeae*[16]. However, these studies focused on the most highly prescribed antibiotic classes, such as β-lactams and macrolides, for which use peaks in the wintertime[17]. Further, many of the species-antibiotic combinations studied were the same combinations that showed among the strongest use-resistance correlations in earlier geographic studies[4,9]. Therefore, it remains unclear whether the strength of the seasonal use-resistance relationship extends across a broader range of species and antibiotics, particularly for antibiotics with different seasonal patterns and lower rates of use.

In this study, we evaluated the extent to which seasonal variations in antibiotic use correlate with variations in resistance across multiple antibiotic classes and bacterial species in Boston, Massachusetts. Our analysis included 5 antibiotic classes—penicillins, macrolides, quinolones, nitrofurans, and tetracyclines—which represent a range of prescribing rates and seasonal

patterns of use[13,14,16,17] and 3 bacterial species—*Staphylococcus aureus*, *Escherichia coli*, and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*—which represent skin/nasal and gut colonizing bacteria[18,19] that cause a diversity of infections types and are subject to strong bystander selection[3]. To conduct our study, we compared seasonal antibiotic use data for Boston residents, obtained from a centralized state-wide insurance claims database, with resistance data from two major Boston-area hospitals. Given the near-universal health insurance coverage in the state[20], this analysis provided a unique opportunity to characterize the antibiotic use-resistance relationship in a dataset that captures close to the full picture of antibiotic use in a population. Overall, this work contributes to our understanding of the use-resistance landscape and helps inform the design of effective stewardship policies to reduce the overall burden of resistance.

Results

Seasonality in antibiotic use varies across classes

The five antibiotic classes included in this study, which accounted for 74% of the total outpatient antibiotic claims in this dataset, each displayed measurable seasonal patterns of use (**Figure 1A**). Penicillins and macrolides were most frequently prescribed, with year-round averages of 14.6 and 12.4 monthly claims per 1000 people, respectively. Quinolones, tetracyclines, and nitrofurans were prescribed with year-round averages of 5.3, 3.1, and 1.6 monthly claims per 1000 people, respectively.

Penicillins had the greatest magnitude change in prescribing rate across seasons, with an amplitude of 3.3 additional claims per 1000 people above the yearly average at its peak (95% CI, 2.7 to 4.0). This was followed by macrolides (amplitude, 2.2; 95% CI, 1.6 to 2.7), quinolones (amplitude, 0.26; 95% CI, 0.12 to 0.40), nitrofurans (amplitude, 0.14; 95% CI, 0.07 to 0.22), and tetracyclines use (amplitude, 0.12; 95% CI, 0.04 to 0.20) (**Figure 1B**).

The timing of peak prescribing varied by antibiotic class (**Figure 1B**). Macrolide and penicillin use peaked in the winter, around late January (phase, 1.8 months; 95% CI, 1.3 to 2.2; note that phase is indexed to 1.0 representing January 1st) and mid-February (phase, 2.3 months; 95% CI, 1.9 to 2.6), respectively. Tetracycline and nitrofuran use peaked in the summer, around late June (phase, 6.7 months; 95% CI, 4.8 to 8.5) and late August (phase, 8.7 months; 95% CI, 8.0 to 9.4), respectively. Finally, quinolone use peaked twice a year in late December and late June (phase, 0.9 months; 95% CI, 0.3 to 1.4).

Seasonality in antibiotic resistance is prevalent across species and antibiotic classes

Resistance was seasonal for 10 out of 15 species-antibiotic combinations (**Figure 2, Figure S1, Figure S2**), with significant amplitudes of seasonality (FDR < 0.05) ranging from 0.012 to 0.064 doubling dilutions (**Figure 3**). Ciprofloxacin resistance and nitrofurantoin resistance were seasonal in all three species with a 12-month period (**Figure 2, Figure S1, Figure S2**). Resistance to erythromycin in *S. aureus* was also seasonal with a 12-month period (amplitude, 0.049; 95% CI, 0.013 to 0.086). Conversely, tetracycline resistance was not seasonal in any of the three species (**Figure 2, Figure S1, Figure S2**). Seasonality of resistance to penicillin class antibiotics was variable across species. Oxacillin resistance in *S. aureus* was seasonal with a 12-month period (amplitude, 0.033; 95% CI, 0.010 to 0.055), while both penicillin resistance in *S. aureus* (amplitude, 0.013; 95% CI, -0.008 to 0.034) and amoxicillin/clavulanate resistance in *K. pneumoniae* (amplitude, 0.032; 95% CI, -0.0003 to 0.064) did not show evidence of seasonality. Ampicillin and amoxicillin/clavulanate resistance in *E. coli* were the only species-antibiotic combinations that showed a 6-month period in seasonality, with amplitudes of 0.033 (95% CI, 0.018 to 0.047) and 0.012 (95% CI, 0.001 to 0.022), respectively. Of note, despite having a slightly worse fit, the 12-month period model of ampicillin resistance in *E. coli* also appeared seasonal (amplitude, 0.040; 95% CI, 0.018 to 0.061) (**Figure S3**).

Resistance peaked in the winter-spring months in all 10 seasonal species-antibiotic combinations, with peaks ranging from early December to mid-April (**Figure 4**). Comparing across species, resistance in *E. coli* (median phase, 3.0; IQR, 0.9) tended to peak slightly later in the year than resistance in *S. aureus* (median phase, 1.7; IQR, 0.6) and *K. pneumoniae* (median phase, 1.1; IQR, 1.1). Peak resistance to macrolides and penicillins in *S. aureus* and the first peak in resistance to penicillins in *E. coli* occurred around the same time of year as peak use of macrolides and penicillins. However, resistance to penicillins in *E. coli* also peaked a second time during the year in late August and October, though use did not. In addition, resistance to nitrofurans in all 3 species peaked at the opposite time of year from its use, between 3.3 to 5.8 months after peak nitrofuran use. Finally, resistance to quinolones in all 3 species peaked once a year about 1.0 to 2.3 months after the first peak in quinolone use.

Seasonal resistance is positively correlated with use of winter-peaking antibiotic classes

Spearman correlation coefficients between use-resistance antibiotic pairs across all species ranged from -0.76 to 0.94 (**Figure 5**). Resistance to every antibiotic, regardless of class, in all three species was most positively correlated with use of winter-peaking classes, penicillins and macrolides (median Spearman's ρ, 0.68; IQR, 0.52). Resistance to most antibiotics also showed a negative correlation with use of summer-peaking classes, tetracyclines and nitrofurans (median Spearman's ρ, -0.46; IQR, 0.42). Finally, resistance was not significantly correlated with use of quinolones, which peaked twice a year, for any antibiotic in any species (median Spearman's ρ, -0.28; IQR, 0.26).

Discussion

Under a simple model in which antibiotic use drives resistance, seasonal variation in antibiotic consumption is expected to be associated with variation in population-level resistance that is in phase with or lagged up to a quarter period behind use[21]. Findings from previous seasonality

studies have been largely consistent with this model, where use of winter-peaking antibiotics were associated with winter to spring peaks in resistance[13–16]. However, by including antibiotic classes with different seasonal peaks in use, we found that resistance to all antibiotics still peaked in the winter or spring, resulting in a large variation in correlations between use and resistance of the same antibiotic class. Resistance to all antibiotics best correlated with use of winter-peaking antibiotics, suggesting the need for other factors in models of the relationship between use and resistance.

The observed pattern for penicillins and macrolides—peak wintertime use followed by peaks in resistance in late winter to spring—was mostly consistent with previous findings[13,14,16] and with some theoretical predictions from models in which use drives resistance[21]. In *S. aureus*, use and resistance to oxacillin and erythromycin peaked in the winter, consistent with a previous seasonality study that compared macrolide use and resistance in methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA)[14], as well as findings in other species-antibiotic combinations that have shown winter peaks in use and resistance with little to no lag[13–15]. In *E. coli*, the first peaks in ampicillin and amoxicillin/clavulanate resistance occurred in the winter and spring, respectively, about 0.5 to 2.5 months after the peak in penicillins use. A several month lag between use and resistance has also been previously reported in *E. coli*[14] and *N. gonorrhoeae*[9]. Resistance to penicillins in *E. coli* also showed a second peak in resistance 6 months later, in the absence of a second peak in use, a finding that has not been previously reported. However, we note that a 12-month period model for ampicillin resistance in *E. coli* also met our criterion for seasonality and showed a single winter peak in resistance, which is more consistent with previous findings in *E. coli*[14,15].

Antibiotic classes with different seasonal patterns of use, such as nitrofurans and quinolones, showed seasonal patterns of resistance that could not readily be explained based on their patterns of use. Nitrofurans, which are almost exclusively used to treat urinary tract infections

(UTIs)[22], showed summer peaks in use during the same season as peak UTI incidence[23–26]. Quinolones, which are used to treat both respiratory infections and UTIs[27], showed both winter and summer peaks in use. However, resistance to nitrofurans and quinolones in all 3 species showed only one peak in the winter or early spring. This result for quinolone resistance is consistent with a previous finding in *E. coli*[14], which showed a single winter peak in quinolone use followed by a winter peak in resistance.

Several species-antibiotic combinations did not show seasonality in resistance. In each case, this may be due to a lack of association between use and resistance, a lack of strong seasonal variation in use of some antibiotic classes, or other factors, such as a signal too small to be identified in our dataset. The lack of seasonality in *S. aureus* resistance to penicillin may be explained by the already high prevalence of penicillin resistance in *S. aureus*[28] (83% in this dataset, **Table S3**), which may limit observable selection for resistance from increased wintertime use of penicillins. For *K. pneumoniae* resistance to amoxicillin-clavulanate, additional data may narrow the confidence intervals around the estimated amplitude of seasonality (0.032; 95% CI -0.0003, 0.064). The absence of observed seasonality in tetracycline resistance in all 3 species may be explained by the lack of a strong seasonal variation in tetracycline use, as tetracyclines showed the lowest amplitude of seasonal use among antibiotic classes (**Figure 1**). This finding is also consistent with a previous study that found no significant correlation between tetracycline use and resistance in *E. coli*[14].

Our finding that resistance to all antibiotics most correlated with use of winter-peaking antibiotic classes suggests that the simple model in which use of a given antibiotic independently selects for resistance is insufficient to explain the full seasonal use-resistance landscape. At least two additional factors may contribute to this result. First, resistance to one antibiotic could be indirectly selected for by increased wintertime use of a second antibiotic in bacteria that are co-

resistant to both antibiotics. This is supported by evidence that co-resistance is common across many bacterial species[29]. We might expect that selection by use of pencillins and macrolides dominates over selection by other antibiotics because they are prescribed at substantially higher rates and show greater seasonal variations in use[17]. In a previous seasonality study, antibiotics with higher rates of use showed stronger correlations between seasonal use and resistance[14]. In addition, use of macrolides and penicillins have been shown to be more strongly correlated with resistance than less frequently prescribed antibiotics[9].

Second, the observed winter peaks in resistance may be explained by increased sampling of demographics and types of infections with higher overall rates of resistance, rather than selection by antibiotic use. Rates of resistance have been shown to vary by age, sex, and site of infection[30–32]; and, the incidence of infections from each of these groups can also vary by season[26,33,34]. As such, an increased incidence of infections from groups with higher rates of resistance could in turn lead to a winter spike in resistance, irrespective of patterns of use.

There were several limitations to this study. First, while antibiotic use is one important driver of resistance, we cannot rule out other seasonal effects that could also contribute to seasonal variations in resistance, such as a sampling bias for demographics or infection types with higher levels of resistance during certain seasons. Second, although our study analyzed data from a single city, there is still some disparity between the populations represented in the antibiotic use and resistance datasets. We compared outpatient antibiotic use data from 97% of Boston, MA residents under age 65 to antibiotic resistance data from both inpatients and outpatients at two major Boston-area hospitals, with patient populations that skew towards older ages. Previous studies have shown that community antibiotic use has strong impact on resistance in both the hospital and community settings[35,36]. However, other aspects of the patient population in the resistance dataset, such as their age distribution, may not be representative of the overall

population in the use dataset, potentially limiting our conclusions. Finally, due to data limitations, the antibiotic use and resistance datasets for each species and antibiotic often spanned overlapping but different year ranges. Therefore, we aggregated monthly use and resistance data across years to perform our correlation analyses, assuming that seasonal patterns of use and resistance were stable across the years included in our study.

In conclusion, we found evidence of a seasonal relationship between antibiotic use and resistance, which varied widely across antibiotic classes but was largely consistent across the three bacterial species, *S. aureus*, *E. coli*, and *K. pneumoniae*. While antibiotic use showed varied seasonal patterns across classes, resistance to all antibiotics peaked in the winter to spring, resulting in large variations in the correlation between cognate pairs. This indicates that the simplest model of antibiotic use independently selecting for resistance to the same antibiotic is inadequate and underscores the need to identify additional factors that shape the use-resistance relationship across diverse species and antibiotics. In addition, these findings may contribute to guiding future stewardship efforts by identifying antibiotic targets, such as penicillins and macrolides, that may have the broadest effect in reducing overall resistance.

Materials and Methods

Antibiotic use data. Outpatient antibiotic use data was obtained from the Massachusetts All Payer Claims Database[37], which covers >94% of outpatient prescriptions claims for Massachusetts residents under the age of 65[38]. Rates of use for each antibiotic class were measured as the number of antibiotic claims per 1000 people for each month from January 2011 to May 2015. This data was subset to include only individuals residing in ‘Boston City’ census tracks, as defined by the US Census Bureau[39], to capture the antibiotic use patterns in the communities served by the hospitals in our resistance dataset. We aggregated use data by antibiotic class according to the WHO ATC index[40] for 5 antibiotic classes, which together make

up 74% of the total outpatient antibiotic claims in Boston: penicillins (ATC code, J01C), macrolides (ATC code, J01F), quinolones (ATC code, J01M), tetracyclines (ATC code, J01A), and nitrofurans (ATC code, JO1XE). The distribution of use of individual antibiotics within each class is shown in **Table S1**.

Antibiotic resistance data. Clinical microbiology data was obtained for *S. aureus*, *E. coli*, and *K. pneumoniae* isolates collected at two tertiary care hospitals in Boston, MA: Brigham and Women's Hospital (BWH) and Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH), from 2007-2019 and 2007-2016, respectively. Included in this analysis were all non-surveillance isolates from inpatients and outpatients of all demographics, collected from the 5 most common body sites across the 3 species: blood, skin and soft tissue, abscess/fluid, respiratory tract, and urinary tract. The distribution of isolates by hospital, patient demographic group, and body site is shown in **Table S2**. Isolates of the same species that were collected from the same patient within 2 weeks were assumed to represent a single infection and thus treated as a single isolate. Our final dataset comprised 47,219 *S. aureus*, 131,856 *E. coli*, and 27,245 *K. pneumoniae* isolates.

Antibiotic susceptibility testing was performed on each isolate either by automated broth microdilution (Vitek 2, Biomerieux, Marcy l'Etoile, France) or by E-test. Resulting minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) values were $\log_2$-transformed. Due to variations in hospital testing guidelines across the years, we excluded tests on isolates that did not report an MIC value, either because a different test method was used (e.g. disk diameter) or due to missing data. We then excluded years/months from our analysis for each species-antibiotic combination in each hospital where MIC values were reported for less than 80% of isolates or only a subset of isolate types (e.g., only testing nitrofurantoin resistance in urinary tract isolates). **Table S3** lists date ranges for each species-antibiotic combination included in our analysis. For each species,

we analyzed MIC data for individual antibiotics that are in each of the 5 corresponding antibiotic use classes, as listed in **Table S3**.

Statistical methods. We quantified the extent of seasonality in antibiotic use and resistance by fitting the use and MIC data to a pair of mathematical models, based on a previously described method[16]. Both models consist of a sinusoidal component to describe seasonal deviations from average year-round use and MICs and a linear component to adjust for secular trends in use and resistance across years. To describe the seasonality of use, monthly claims data for each antibiotic class were fit to

$$a_i \sim A_{use} \cos[\omega(t_i - P_{use})] + B_{y(i)} t_i + C_{y(i)} \quad (1)$$

where a_i is the reported claims/1000 people during month t_i, A_{use} is the amplitude of use seasonality, ω is the frequency of seasonality where $\omega = \frac{2\pi}{period}$, P_{use} is the phase of use seasonality, and $B_{y(i)}$ and $C_{y(i)}$ are the within-year slope and intercept terms. To describe the seasonality of resistance, MICs for each isolate were fit to

$$y_i \sim A_{MIC} \cos[\omega(t_i - P_{MIC})] + B_{h(i)} t_i + C_{h(i)} \quad (2)$$

where y_i is the $\log_2$-transformed MIC and t_i is the month of collection of the ith isolate, A_{MIC} is the amplitude of resistance seasonality, ω is the frequency of seasonality where $\omega = \frac{2\pi}{period}$, P_{MIC} is the phase of resistance seasonality, and $B_{h(i)}$ and $C_{h(i)}$ are the within hospital/year slope and intercept terms.

The amplitude, phase, slope, and intercept terms in both models were estimated by non-linear regression, using the *nls* function in R (version 3.6.2). We examined periods of both 12 and 6 months to account for annual or biannual cycles in use and resistance. To determine whether to use a 12- or 6-month period for each species-antibiotic combination, we performed model comparisons using the Akaike information criterion (AIC) and used the period that resulted in

the lower AIC (**Tables S4 & S5**). We determined that there was seasonality in use or resistance if the 95% confidence interval of the amplitude did not include 0. We accounted for multiple comparisons by applying the Benjamini-Hochberg correction with a 5% false discovery rate to the p-values of the amplitude estimates.

Next, we quantified the association between the observed seasonal patterns of use and resistance using Spearman's rank correlations. To eliminate the impact of annual trends, we calculated correlations between the average monthly seasonal deviates in use and resistance, rather than the raw use and MIC data. We define a 'seasonal deviate' as the deviation in use (in claims per 1000 people) or resistance (in doubling dilutions) at a given time of year from the year-round average, which we estimated by the linear component of the models described above. Seasonal deviates in use for each year and month were calculated as

$$a_i' = a_i - \widehat{B_{y(i)}} t_i - \widehat{C_{y(i)}} \quad (3)$$

where a_i' is the seasonal deviate in use of the reported claims/1000 people during month t_i, a_i is the reported claims/1000 people during month t_i, and $\widehat{B_{y(i)}}$ and $\widehat{C_{y(i)}}$ are the within-year slope and intercept terms estimated from the model fit (Eqn. 1) for the corresponding year. Similarly, seasonal deviates in resistance for each isolate were calculated as

$$y_i' = y_i - \widehat{B_{h(i)}} t_i - \widehat{C_{h(i)}} \quad (4)$$

where y_i' is the seasonal deviate of the $\log_2$-transformed MIC of the ith isolate, y_i is the $\log_2$-transformed MIC of the ith isolate, t_i is the month of collection of the ith isolate, and $\widehat{B_{h(i)}}$ and $\widehat{C_{h(i)}}$ are the hospital/year slope and intercept estimated from the model fit (Eqn. 2) for the hospital and year that the ith isolate was collected in.

Since we observed some seasonal patterns of resistance that better aligned with use of non-cognate antibiotic classes, we calculated use-resistance correlations between each pairwise

combination of target antibiotics and use classes. We only included use-resistance pairs in this analysis for which both use and resistance met our criterion for seasonality.

All analyses were performed in R version 3.6.2[41]. Code is available at: https://github.com/gradlab/use-resistance-seasonality

Acknowledgements

The authors thank R. Monina Klevens for assistance in acquiring the antibiotic prescribing data and Enterprise Research Infrastructure & Services at Partners HealthCare for their computational resources and support. This work was supported by funds from the HSPH Dean's Award (to Y.H.G.) and Wellcome Trust (to Y.H.G.). D.S.S. is supported by the National Institutes of Health training grant (T32AI132120).

Competing interests

Y. H. G. and M. L. have received grant support from Pfizer. The other authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Antibiotic resistance threats in the United States, 2019. https://www.cdc.gov/drugresistance/pdf/threats-report/2019-ar-threats-report-508.pdf. Published 2019. Accessed September 18, 2020.
2. Jit M, Ng DHL, Luangasanatip N, et al. Quantifying the economic cost of antibiotic resistance and the impact of related interventions: Rapid methodological review, conceptual framework and recommendations for future studies. *BMC Med*. 2020;18(1):38. doi:10.1186/s12916-020-1507-2
3. Tedijanto C, Olesen SW, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Estimating the proportion of bystander selection for antibiotic resistance among potentially pathogenic bacterial flora. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2018;115(51):E11988-E11995. doi:10.1073/pnas.1810840115
4. Goossens H, Ferech M, Vander Stichele R, Elseviers M. Outpatient antibiotic use in Europe and association with resistance: a cross-national database study. *Lancet*. 2005. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(05)17907-0
5. García-Rey C, Aguilar L, Baquero F, Casal J, Dal-Ré R. Importance of local variations in antibiotic consumption and geographical differences of erythromycin and penicillin resistance in Streptococcus pneumoniae. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2002;40(1):159-164. doi:10.1128/JCM.40.1.159-164.2002
6. Bronzwaer SLAM, Cars O, Buchholz U, et al. The relationship between antimicrobial use and antimicrobial resistance in Europe. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2002;8(3):278-282. doi:10.3201/eid0803.010192
7. Van De Sande-Bruinsma N, Grundmann H, Verloo D, et al. Antimicrobial drug use and resistance in Europe. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2008;14(11):1722-1730. doi:10.3201/eid1411.070467
8. Hicks LA, Chien Y-W, Taylor TH, Haber M, Klugman KP. Outpatient Antibiotic Prescribing and Nonsusceptible Streptococcus pneumoniae in the United States, 1996–2003. *Clin*

Infect Dis. 2011;53(7):631-639. doi:10.1093/cid/cir443

9. Olesen SW, Barnett ML, Macfadden DR, et al. The distribution of antibiotic use and its association with antibiotic resistance. *Elife*. 2018;7. doi:10.7554/eLife.39435

10. Bell BG, Schellevis F, Stobberingh E, Goossens H, Pringle M. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effects of antibiotic consumption on antibiotic resistance. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2014;14(1):13. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-14-13

11. Olesen SW, Grad YH. Deciphering the Impact of Bystander Selection for Antibiotic Resistance in Neisseria gonorrhoeae. *J Infect Dis*. 2020;221(7):1035. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiz156

12. Olesen SW, Lipsitch M, Grad YH. The role of “spillover” in antibiotic resistance. *bioRxiv*. June 2019:536714. doi:10.1101/536714

13. Dagan R, Barkai G, Givon-Lavi N, et al. Seasonality of Antibiotic-Resistant *Streptococcus pneumoniae* That Causes Acute Otitis Media: A Clue for an Antibiotic-Restriction Policy? *J Infect Dis*. 2008;197(8):1094-1102. doi:10.1086/528995

14. Sun L, Klein EY, Laxminarayan R. Seasonality and Temporal Correlation between Community Antibiotic Use and Resistance in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2012;55(5):687-694. doi:10.1093/cid/cis509

15. Ramsey EG, Royer J, Bookstaver PB, et al. Seasonal variation in antimicrobial resistance rates of community-acquired Escherichia coli bloodstream isolates. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2019;54(1):1-7. doi:10.1016/J.IJANTIMICAG.2019.03.010

16. Olesen SW, Torrone EA, Papp JR, Kirkcaldy RD, Lipsitch M, Grad YH. Azithromycin Susceptibility Among *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* Isolates and Seasonal Macrolide Use. *J Infect Dis*. 2019;219(4):619-623. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiy551

17. Suda KJ, Hicks LA, Roberts RM, Hunkler RJ, Taylor TH. Trends and seasonal variation in outpatient antibiotic prescription rates in the united states, 2006 to 2010. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2014;58(5):2763-2766. doi:10.1128/AAC.02239-13

18. Kluytmans J, Van Belkum A, Verbrugh H. Nasal carriage of Staphylococcus aureus: Epidemiology, underlying mechanisms, and associated risks. *Clin Microbiol Rev*. 1997;10(3):505-520. doi:10.1128/cmr.10.3.505-520.1997

19. Huttenhower C, Gevers D, Knight R, et al. Structure, function and diversity of the healthy human microbiome. *Nature*. 2012;486(7402):207-214. doi:10.1038/nature11234

20. Berchick ER, Barnett JC, Upton RD. *Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2018 Current Population Reports*.; 2019.

21. Blanquart F, Lehtinen S, Fraser C. An evolutionary model to predict the frequency of antibiotic resistance under seasonal antibiotic use, and an application to Streptococcus pneumoniae. 2017. doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.0679

22. Guay DR. An update on the role of nitrofurans in the management of urinary tract infections. *Drugs*. 2001;61(3):353-364. doi:10.2165/00003495-200161030-00004

23. Stamm WE, McKevitt M, Roberts PL, White NJ. Natural History of Recurrent Urinary Tract Infections in Women. *Rev Infect Dis*. 1991;13(1):77-84. doi:10.1093/CLINIDS/13.1.77

24. Anderson JE. Seasonality of symptomatic bacterial urinary infections in women. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 1983;37:286-290.

25. Czaja CA, Scholes D, Hooton TM, Stamm WE. Population-Based Epidemiologic Analysis of Acute Pyelonephritis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2007;45(3):273-280. doi:10.1086/519268

26. Rosello A, Pouwels KB, Domenech De Cellès M, et al. Seasonality of urinary tract infections in the United Kingdom in different age groups: Longitudinal analysis of The Health Improvement Network (THIN). *Epidemiol Infect*. 2018;146(1):37-45. doi:10.1017/S095026881700259X

27. Hooper DC. Clinical applications of quinolones. *Biochim Biophys Acta - Gene Struct Expr*. 1998;1400(1-3):45-61. doi:10.1016/S0167-4781(98)00127-4

28. Kanjilal S, Abdul Sater MR, Thayer M, et al. Trends in antibiotic susceptibility in

staphylococcus aureus in Boston, Massachusetts, from 2000 to 2014. Ledeboer NA, ed. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2018;56(1). doi:10.1128/JCM.01160-17

29. Chang H-H, Cohen T, Grad YH, Hanage WP, O'Brien TF, Lipsitch M. Origin and Proliferation of Multiple-Drug Resistance in Bacterial Pathogens. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev*. 2015;79(1):101-116. doi:10.1128/mmbr.00039-14

30. Mcgregor JC, Elman MR, Bearden DT, Smith DH. Sex- and age-specific trends in antibiotic resistance patterns of Escherichia coli urinary isolates from outpatients. *BMC Fam Pract*. 2013;14:25. doi:10.1186/1471-2296-14-25

31. Garcia A, Delorme T, Nasr P. Patient age as a factor of antibiotic resistance in methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus. *J Med Microbiol*. 2017;66(12):1782-1789. doi:10.1099/jmm.0.000635

32. Lagacé-Wiens PRS, DeCorby MR, Baudry PJ, Hoban DJ, Karlowsky JA, Zhanel GG. Differences in antimicrobial susceptibility in Escherichia coli from Canadian intensive care units based on regional and demographic variables. *Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol*. 2008;19(4):282-286. doi:10.1155/2008/568458

33. Simmering J, Tang F, Cavanaugh J, Polgreen L, Polgreen PM. Trends and Seasonal Effects in Hospitalizations for Urinary Tract Infection Differ by Age and Sex. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2015;2(suppl_1). doi:10.1093/ofid/ofv133.1128

34. Leekha S, Diekema DJ, Perencevich EN. Seasonality of staphylococcal infections. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2012;18(10):927-933. doi:10.1111/j.1469-0691.2012.03955.x

35. Knight GM, Costelloe C, Deeny SR, et al. Quantifying where human acquisition of antibiotic resistance occurs: A mathematical modelling study. *BMC Med*. 2018;16(1):137. doi:10.1186/s12916-018-1121-8

36. Macfadden DR, Fisman DN, Hanage WP, Lipsitch M. The Relative Impact of Community and Hospital Antibiotic Use on the Selection of Extended-spectrum Beta-lactamase-producing Escherichia coli. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2019;69(1):182-188. doi:10.1093/cid/ciy978

37. Massachusetts All Payer Claims Database. https://www.chiamass.gov/ma-apcd/. Accessed September 16, 2020.

38. Klevens RM, Caten E, Olesen SW, DeMaria A, Troppy S, Grad YH. Outpatient Antibiotic Prescribing in Massachusetts, 2011–2015. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2019;6(5). doi:10.1093/ofid/ofz169

39. US Census Bureau. https://data.census.gov/cedsci/. Published 2020. Accessed September 16, 2020.

40. WHOCC - ATC/DDD Index. https://www.whocc.no/atc_ddd_index/. Accessed June 13, 2020.

41. R Core Team (2019). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/.



Figure 1. **Seasonal patterns of antibiotic use by class. (A)** Monthly antibiotic claims per 1000 people in Boston, MA from 2011 to 2015[37]. Lines indicate LOESS smoothing curves and shaded regions indicate 95% confidence intervals. **(B)** Sinusoidal model fits for monthly prescribing rate. Points indicate monthly mean seasonal deviates in antibiotic claims per 1000 people and error bars indicate the standard error of the mean. Lines indicate the point estimate for the amplitude and phase of the sinusoidal model. Shaded regions indicate the 95% confidence intervals for the amplitude.



Figure 2. Seasonality of antibiotic use and resistance by class in *Staphylococcus aureus*. Solid lines indicate point estimates of the amplitude and phase from the best-fitting sinusoidal models of resistance to each antibiotic, colored by class. Dashed grey lines indicate point estimates of the amplitude and phase of sinusoidal models for use of the corresponding antibiotic class. Points indicate the monthly mean seasonal deviates in doubling dilutions and error bars indicate the standard error of the mean. Shaded regions indicate the 95% confidence intervals for the amplitude.



Figure 3. Amplitudes of seasonality of resistance by species and antibiotic class. Comparison of amplitudes estimated from best-fitting sinusoidal models of resistance across antibiotics in *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Escherichia coli*, and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals of the amplitude. Point color indicates the antibiotic class. AMC, Amoxicillin-Clavulanate; AMP, Ampicillin; CIP, Ciprofloxacin; ERY, Erythromycin; NIT, Nitrofurantoin; OXA, Oxacillin; PEN, Penicillin; TET, Tetracycline.



Figure 4. Phases of seasonality of use and resistance by species and antibiotic class. Points indicate peak month(s) of seasonal resistance estimated by the best-fitting sinusoidal model for each species-antibiotic combination, and error bars indicate the 95% confidence intervals. Vertical lines indicate the peak month(s) of seasonal use estimated by the best-fitting sinusoidal model for each antibiotic class, and the shaded regions indicate the 95% confidence intervals. Included are species-antibiotic combinations for which the amplitude met our criteria for seasonality (95% confidence intervals did not cross 0). AMC, Amoxicillin-Clavulanate; AMP, Ampicillin; CIP, Ciprofloxacin; ERY, Erythromycin; NIT, Nitrofurantoin; OXA, Oxacillin.



Figure 5. Seasonal resistance to multiple antibiotics is positively correlated with seasonal use of penicillins and macrolides. Spearman's rank correlation coefficients were calculated between the mean seasonal deviate in resistance (in doubling dilutions) and the mean seasonal deviate in use (in claims/1000 people) in each month for every pairwise combination of antibiotics and classes. Error bars indicate the 95% confidence intervals. Colors indicate the use antibiotic class. Mac, Macrolides; Nit, Nitrofurantoin; Pen, Penicillins; Qui, Quinolones; Tet, Tetracyclines. AMC, Amoxicillin-Clavulanate; AMP, Ampicillin; CIP, Ciprofloxacin; ERY, Erythromycin; NIT, Nitrofurantoin; OXA, Oxacillin.



Supplemental Figure 1. Seasonality of antibiotic use and resistance by class in *Escherichia coli.* Solid lines indicate point estimates of the amplitude and phase from the best-fitting sinusoidal models of resistance to each antibiotic, colored by class. Dashed grey lines indicate point estimates of the amplitude and phase from sinusoidal models of use of the corresponding antibiotic class. Points indicate the monthly mean seasonal deviates in doubling dilutions and error bars indicate the standard error of the mean. Shaded regions indicate the 95% confidence intervals for the amplitude. Amox/Clav, Amoxicillin-Clavulanate.



Supplemental Figure 2. Seasonality of antibiotic use and resistance by class in *Klebsiella pneumoniae.* Solid lines indicate point estimates of the amplitude and phase from the best-fitting sinusoidal models of resistance to each antibiotic, colored by class. Dashed grey lines indicate point estimates of the amplitude and phase from sinusoidal models of use of the corresponding antibiotic class. Points indicate the monthly mean seasonal deviates in doubling dilutions and error bars indicate the standard error of the mean. Shaded regions indicate the 95% confidence intervals for the amplitude. Amox/Clav, Amoxicillin-Clavulanate.



Supplemental Figure 3. Seasonality of use and resistance for penicillins in *Escherichia coli* with a 12-month period model. Solid lines indicate point estimates of the amplitude and phase from 12-month period sinusoidal models of resistance to each antibiotic. Dashed grey lines indicate point estimates of the amplitude and phase from a 12-month period sinusoidal model of use of penicillins class antibiotics. Points indicate the monthly mean seasonal deviates in doubling dilutions and error bars indicate the standard error of the mean. Shaded regions indicate the 95% confidence intervals for the amplitude. Amox/Clav, Amoxicillin-Clavulanate.

Antibiotic class	Antibiotic name	ATC code	Percent of total use within antibiotic class
Penicillins	Amoxicillin	J01CA04	82.731
	Phenoxymethylpenicillin	J01CE02	15.627
	Dicloxacillin	J01CF01	1.14
	Ampicillin	J01CA01	0.349
	Benzylpenicillin	J01CE01	0.091
	Piperacillin	J01CA12	0.036
	Naficillin	J01CF06	0.024
	Oxacillin	J01CF04	0.003
Macrolides	Azithromycin	J01FA10	51.002
	Clindamycin	J01FF01	28.273
	Erythromycin	J01FA01	16.948
	Clarithromycin	J01FA09	3.775
	Telithromycin	J01FA15	0.001
	Lincomycin	J01FF02	0.001
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	J01MA02	66.561
	Levofloxacin	J01MA12	13.512
	Ofloxacin	J01MA01	13.311
	Moxifloxacin	J01MA14	5.683
	Gatifloxacin	J01MA16	0.853
	Norofloxacin	J01MA06	0.071
	Gemifloxacin	J01MA15	0.01
Tetracyclines	Doxycycline	J01AA02	79.097
	Minocycline	J01AA08	18.816
	Tetracycline	J01AA07	1.98
	Tigecycline	J01AA12	0.054
	Demeclocycline	J01AA01	0.053
Nitrofurans	Nitrofurantoin	J01XE01	100

Supplemental Table 1. Percent of claims by individual antibiotics within each class. Antibiotic claims data for Boston, MA residents was obtained from the Massachusetts All Payers Claims Database[37] and subset by antibiotic class according to the following ATC codes[40]: penicillins, J01C; macrolides, J01F; quinolones, J01M, tetracyclines, J01A; and nitrofurans, JO1XE. All antibiotics under each ATC header that were present in this dataset were included in the analysis. The percentage of the total claims within each antibiotic class made-up by each individual antibiotic is listed in the last column of the table.

		E. coli	*K. pneumoniae*	*S. aureus*
Total	Total	131856	27245	47219
Hospitals	BWH	54954 (41.7%)	11872 (43.6%)	17649 (37.4%)
	MGH	76902 (58.3%)	15373 (56.4%)	29570 (62.6%)
Patient type	Inpatient	22996 (17.4%)	9403 (34.5%)	16795 (35.6%)
	Outpatient	108860 (82.6%)	17842 (65.5%)	30424 (64.4%)
Infection site	Abscess or fluid NOS	1942 (1.5%)	797 (2.9%)	5128 (10.9%)
	Blood	2587 (2%)	1396 (5.1%)	2798 (5.9%)
	Respiratory tract	2619 (2%)	2823 (10.4%)	11537 (24.4%)
	Skin and soft tissue	3253 (2.5%)	1308 (4.8%)	23753 (50.3%)
	Urinary tract	121455 (92.1%)	20921 (76.8%)	4003 (8.5%)
Age group	00-19	7633 (5.8%)	702 (2.6%)	4444 (9.4%)
	20-39	31344 (23.8%)	2994 (11%)	10458 (22.1%)
	40-64	42006 (31.9%)	8969 (32.9%)	17243 (36.5%)
	65+	50873 (38.6%)	14580 (53.5%)	15074 (31.9%)
Gender	Female	111379 (84.5%)	18958 (69.6%)	21486 (45.5%)
	Male	20477 (15.5%)	8287 (30.4%)	25733 (54.5%)

Supplemental Table 2. Total number of isolates by demographics. Table of the total number of isolates of each species within each clinical or demographic category that we used in our analysis. In parentheses is the percent of the total number of isolates for that species. BWH, Brigham and Women's Hospital; MGH, Massachusetts General Hospital; NOS, not otherwise specified.

Species	Antibiotic (Antibiotic class)	Dates included at BWH	Dates included at MGH	Percent resistance at BWH	Percent resistance at MGH
E. coli	Amoxicillin/ Clavulanate (Penicillins)	May 2013 – Dec 2019	Jan 2007 – Dec 2016	17.5	17.2
	Ampicillin (Penicillins)	Jan 2007 – Dec 2019	Jan 2007 – Dec 2016	47.4	47
	Ciprofloxacin (Quinolones)	Jan 2007 – Dec 2019	Jan 2007 – Dec 2016	22.2	21.1
	Nitrofurantoin (Nitrofurans)	Jan 2007 – Jun 2013	Jan 2007 – Dec 2016	5.9	5.1
	Tetracycline (Tetracyclines)	May 2013 – Dec 2019	Jan 2007 – Dec 2016	28.8	29.3
K. pneumoniae	Amoxicillin/ Clavulanate (Penicillins)	May 2013 – Dec 2019	Jan 2007 – Dec 2016	10.1	8.2
	Ciprofloxacin (Quinolones)	Jan 2007 – Dec 2019	Jan 2007 – Dec 2016	11.5	11
	Nitrofurantoin (Nitrofurans)	Jan 2007 – Jun 2013	Jan 2007 – Dec 2016	69.2	68.1
	Tetracycline (Tetracyclines)	May 2013 – Dec 2019	Jan 2007 – Dec 2016	21.1	18.3
S. aureus	Ciprofloxacin (Quinolones)	May 2010 – Dec 2019	Jan 2009 – Dec 2016	29.5	30.7
	Erythromycin (Macrolides)	May 2010 – Dec 2019	Jan 2009 – Dec 2016	51.1	54.9
	Nitrofurantoin (Nitrofurans)	May 2010 – Jun 2013	Jan 2009 – Dec 2016	1.1	1
	Oxacillin (Penicillins)	May 2010 – Dec 2019	Jan 2009 – Dec 2016	29.8	35.9
	Penicillin (Penicillins)	May 2010 – Dec 2019	Jan 2009 – Apr 2015	81.5	84.3
	Tetracycline (Tetracyclines)	May 2010 – Dec 2019	Jan 2009 – Dec 2016	6.5	6

Supplemental Table 3. Antibiotics included in analysis and percent resistance by hospital. Resistance was determined by applying 2017 CLSI breakpoints to the reported minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) values for each isolate; isolates categorized as intermediate resistance were considered resistant. Percent resistance was calculated as the percentage of resistant isolates out of the total number of isolates from each hospital with a reported MIC value for that antibiotic. BWH, Brigham and Women's Hospital; MGH, Massachusetts General Hospital.

Antibiotic Class	Antibiotic Use Regression Model	
	12-month period	**6-month period**
Macrolides	183.3 (+0)	232.4 (+49.1)
Nitrofurans	-64.8 (+0)	-52 (+12.8)
Penicillins	191.4 (+0)	255.9 (+64.5)
Quinolones	67.9 (+4.4)	63.5 (+0)
Tetracyclines	-12.1 (+0)	-5.9 (+6.2)

Supplemental Table 4. Comparison of the Akaike information criterion (AIC) values across two sinusoidal models for antibiotic use. In parentheses is the difference in AIC from the model with the lower AIC.

Species	Antibiotic	Antibiotic Resistance Regression Model	
		12-month period	**6-month period**
E. coli	Amoxicillin/Clavulanate	343849.1 (+4.2)	343844.9 (+0)
	Ampicillin	526712.7 (+5)	526707.7 (+0)
	Ciprofloxacin	503167.1 (+0)	503174 (+6.9)
	Nitrofurantoin	199216.1 (+0)	199237.5 (+21.3)
	Tetracycline	427780.6 (+0.5)	427780.1 (+0)
K. pneumoniae	Amoxicillin/Clavulanate	65272.4 (+0)	65275.9 (+3.6)
	Ciprofloxacin	89763.1 (+0)	89774.1 (+11)
	Nitrofurantoin	66283 (+0)	66289.3 (+6.3)
	Tetracycline	80847.4 (+2)	80845.4 (+0)
S. aureus	Ciprofloxacin	188999.8 (+0)	189021.3 (+21.5)
	Erythromycin	215665.6 (+0)	215671.3 (+5.7)
	Nitrofurantoin	52311.1 (+0)	52327.2 (+16.1)
	Oxacillin	182474.7 (+0)	182482.9 (+8.2)
	Penicillin	125065.1 (+0)	125065.4 (+0.3)
	Tetracycline	131306 (+0)	131307.7 (+1.7)

Supplemental Table 5. Comparison of the Akaike information criterion (AIC) values across two sinusoidal models for antibiotic resistance. In parentheses is the difference in AIC from the model with the lower AIC.