

1 **Hospital Perinatal Transmission Dynamics of Antimicrobial Resistance,**

2 **Bangladesh, 2020**

3

4 **Authors:** Ashley Styczynski^{1*}, Mohammed Badrul Amin², Shahana Parveen³, Abu Pervez⁴,

5 Dilruba Zeba⁵, Akhi Akhter⁵, Helen Pitchik⁶, Mohammad Aminul Islam⁷, Muhammed Iqbal

6 Hossain², Sumita Rani Saha², Emily S. Gurley⁸, Stephen Luby¹

7

8 **Affiliations:**

9 1 Division of Infectious Diseases and Geographic Medicine, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA, USA

10 2 Laboratory of Food Safety and One Health, Laboratory Sciences and Services Division, icddr,b, Dhaka,

11 Bangladesh

12 3 Programme on Emerging Infections, Infectious Disease Division, icddr,b, Dhaka, Bangladesh

13 4 Department of Pediatrics, Faridpur Medical College Hospital, Faridpur, Bangladesh

14 5 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faridpur Medical College Hospital, Faridpur, Bangladesh

15 6 Division of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

16 7 Paul G. Allen School for Global Health, Washington State University, Pullman, WA, USA

17 8 Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA

18

19 *Corresponding author

20 E-mail: astyczyn@stanford.edu (AS)

21

22 **Abstract**

23 Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is a growing global health threat that contributes to substantial
24 neonatal mortality. Bangladesh has reported some of the highest rates of AMR among bacteria
25 causing neonatal sepsis. To better understand routes of AMR transmission to newborns, we
26 aimed to characterize the frequency of and risk factors for AMR colonization of mothers and
27 newborns during hospitalization for delivery. We enrolled 177 pregnant women presenting for
28 delivery to a tertiary care hospital in Faridpur, Bangladesh, during February-October 2020. We
29 collected vaginal and rectal swabs from mothers on presentation and after delivery as well as
30 rectal swabs from newborns. We also collected swabs from the hospital environment proximal
31 to the patients. Swabs were plated on chromogenic agars selective for extended-spectrum-
32 beta-lactamase producing organisms (ESBL) and carbapenem-resistant organisms (CRO). We
33 performed univariable and multivariable analyses to determine factors associated with
34 ESBL/CRO colonization. Prior to delivery, 17% of mothers had vaginal colonization and 71% had
35 rectal colonization with ESBLs; 4% had vaginal colonization and 13% had rectal colonization
36 with CROs. Seventy-nine percent of women underwent cesarean deliveries (C-section). Ninety-
37 eight percent of women received prophylactic antibiotics during hospitalization. Following
38 delivery, nearly 90% of mothers and newborns were colonized with ESBLs and over 70% with
39 CROs. Of the 290 environmental samples, 77% were positive for ESBLs, and 69% were positive
40 for CROs. Maternal and newborn colonization at discharge were both associated with C-section
41 (RR for maternal 1.4; 95% CI 1.0-1.8 and newborn 1.3; 95% CI 1.1-1.7). Facility-based deliveries
42 increase exposure to AMR organisms, likely driven by intense use of antibiotics and frequent C-
43 sections. Greater attention should be given to the use of perinatal antibiotics, indications for C-

- 44 sections, and infection prevention practices to reduce the high prevalence of colonization with
- 45 antibiotic resistant bacteria.

46 **Introduction**

47 Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is a growing global health threat that disproportionately affects
48 low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) and represents one of the leading causes of mortality
49 worldwide.[1,2] Neonates are a key risk group for infections with AMR organisms given their
50 lack of microbiome. Neonates are often first exposed to these organisms at the time of birth,
51 which can result in colonization. Colonization occurs when bacteria persist in or on body
52 surfaces without causing illness. Although colonization does not directly cause disease,
53 colonization with resistant bacteria can predispose individuals to developing drug-resistant
54 infections in the future, particularly among newborns with prematurity and low birthweight.[3–
55 5] Moreover, colonized individuals can still spread resistant organisms to other people and their
56 environment. Neonatal sepsis caused by AMR organisms results in higher rates of mortality.[6]
57 An estimated 200,000 neonatal deaths annually have been attributed to infections with AMR
58 organisms.[1,7]

59
60 In many LMICs, the majority of cases of neonatal sepsis are caused by Gram-negative bacteria,
61 many of which are multidrug resistant (MDR).[6,8–11] A report from 2020 demonstrated that
62 81% of Gram-negative bacteria causing sepsis in newborns across three neonatal care units in
63 Bangladesh were resistant to carbapenems, one of the last line antibiotic options.[10] Similar
64 concerning trends of increasing AMR in neonatal infections have been observed elsewhere in
65 South and Southeast Asia, including among homebirths, demonstrating an increasing
66 community reservoir for AMR.[12–14]

67

68 Increased availability of antibiotics has led to their overuse in human and agricultural contexts.
69 The selective pressure created by repeated antibiotic exposure facilitates emergence and
70 spread of resistance factors in the community.[15] Healthcare facilities, in particular, have been
71 implicated as an important source of AMR amplification because of the associated intense
72 antibiotic use and admixing of ill and susceptible patients.[16,17] This is further exacerbated in
73 low-resource hospitals because of overcrowding, understaffing, inadequate hygiene and
74 sanitation, and a lack of access to diagnostics. In these settings, antibiotics are often used
75 liberally in healthcare facilities as a substitute for improved hygiene and sanitation, and the lack
76 of diagnostics precludes antibiotic stewardship practices.[18,19] The convergence of abundant
77 antibiotics and a heavily contaminated environment creates the ideal scenario for AMR
78 organisms and genes to spread and novel mutations to arise. Understanding the environments
79 that are promoting evolution and transmission of such organisms is an essential step towards
80 preventing exposure, thereby avoiding downstream consequences such as resistant infections
81 that may be difficult or impossible to treat.

82

83 The objective of this study was to estimate the burden and risk factors for colonization with
84 extended-spectrum beta-lactamase producing (ESBL) organisms and carbapenem-resistant
85 organisms (CRO) among mothers and newborns in the context of facility-based deliveries. As
86 one step in the infection pathway, colonization provides a useful parameter for monitoring
87 transmission patterns that could predispose to infection.[20–22]

88

89 **Methods**


90 **Participant enrollment**

91 We enrolled pregnant women presenting for delivery at a tertiary care public medical college
92 hospital in Faridpur, Bangladesh, during February – March and August – October, 2020. A four-
93 month interruption in enrollment (April-July) occurred as a result of data collection restrictions
94 during the COVID-19 pandemic. A trained member of the nursing staff collected a set of vaginal
95 and rectal swabs. The project research physician conducted interviews with the participants to
96 obtain demographic and community exposure information about exposures that were
97 hypothesized could be related to AMR colonization, including socioeconomic status, sanitation,
98 animal contact, antibiotic use, and healthcare contact (Supplementary Figure 1). Over the
99 course of the hospitalization, the research physician gathered information from the medical
100 charts and care providers regarding treatments and interventions. Prior to hospital discharge,
101 and at least 24 hours after delivery, the nursing staff collected a second set of vaginal and rectal
102 swabs from the mothers and a rectal swab from their newborns. A total of 177 mother/baby
103 pairs completed data collection (Figure 1).

104

105 **Figure 1. Study enrollment of pregnant mothers presenting for delivery at a tertiary care**
106 **facility, Faridpur, Bangladesh, 2020**

107



108

109 Figure 1 caption: Number of pregnant women approached for enrollment, number enrolled, and number who
110 completed all surveys and specimen collections, as well as the reasons for attrition.

111 **Environmental sampling**

112 During the same time interval as participant enrollment, the study team collected samples of
113 the hospital environment from the perinatal ward, labor room, and the operating room in
114 which cesarean deliveries (C-section) were performed. The selection of sampled items was
115 determined following a 3-day observation period during which frequently touched surfaces and
116 shared equipment were identified and counts of hand contacts were noted for each type of
117 surface or equipment. We purposefully sampled these sites throughout the study period. The
118 sampling sites included hands of healthcare workers and patient attendants, shared medical
119 equipment, beds, faucets, doors, toilet facilities, oxygen delivery devices, floors, and other
120 surfaces. For each day of participant enrollment, we obtained 3 environmental swabs. Swabs
121 were first moistened with sterile water before swabbing surfaces for a duration of 20-30
122 seconds.

123 **Bacterial culturing of swab samples**

124 Participant (rectal and vaginal) and environmental swabs were stored at 2-8°C until they could
125 be transported to the lab. All swabs were processed within 24 hours of collection. Participant
126 swabs were directly inoculated onto CHROMagar™ ESBL, selective for ESBL-producing
127 organisms, and CHROMagar mSuperCARBA (CHROMagar, Paris, France), selective for CROs.
128 Environmental swab samples were enriched with trypticase soy broth (TSB) with overnight
129 incubation at 37°C before the samples were inoculated onto the same media as the participant
130 swabs. From the chromogenic agars, bacterial colony growth color and characteristics were
131 recorded after overnight incubation at 37°C.

132 **Statistical analysis**

133 We performed descriptive statistics to summarize epidemiologic characteristics of participants.
134 We compared the proportion of colonized individuals and environmental samples before the
135 start of the COVID-19 pandemic (Feb-Mar) and during COVID (Aug-Oct). We examined the
136 relationship between community-based exposures on pre-delivery AMR colonization patterns
137 and hospital-based exposures on post-delivery AMR colonization patterns (either ESBL-
138 producing organisms, CROs, or both) using generalized linear models. We calculated unadjusted
139 risk ratios for all community- and hospital-based exposures with at least 10% prevalence. We
140 used McNemar's test to determine differences in colonization prevalence across various time
141 points for paired samples and a test of proportions to determine differences in colonization for
142 unpaired samples.

143

144 Community or hospital exposures with p-values <0.2 that had at least 10% prevalence and were
145 not collinear were included in multivariable analysis. No additional model refining was
146 performed as the objective of the analysis was not to optimize a final predictive model, which
147 would likely not be robust given the limited dataset, but to generate hypotheses regarding
148 factors most likely to drive AMR colonization.

149 **Ethics**

150 We obtained written informed consent from all adult study participants. Consent for newborn
151 enrollment was provided by the parents and/or legal guardians. The study protocol was
152 reviewed and approved by the IRB at Stanford University (protocol #53442) and the Research
153 and Ethics Review Committees at icddr,b (protocol #PR-19119).

154 **Funding**

155 Funding was provided by NIH FIC Global Health Equity Scholars D43 TW010540 as well as the
156 Thrasher Research Fund (award #15188). The funders had no role in the study design,
157 interpretation of results, or decision to publish.

158

159 **Results**

160 **Demographics of pregnant women enrolled in the study**

161 Of the 177 women enrolled in the study, the median age was 25 years (range 17-40) (Table 1).
162 The majority of participants (73%) had at least a secondary school education. The median
163 monthly household income was 201 USD (amounting to \$1.34/person/day). Almost all

164 households had improved drinking water sources, with 98% of households reporting tube wells
165 as the main water source. Pit latrines were the most common toilet type (79%). Approximately
166 one-third (33%) of the women had no prior pregnancies. While most women had received
167 some prenatal care, only 14% reported 4 or more visits. Anemia was the most frequent
168 pregnancy complication, reported by nearly half of participants. Two-thirds of deliveries
169 occurred at or post-term.

170

171 **Table 1. Community-based characteristics of pregnant mothers presenting for delivery,**

172 **Faridpur, Bangladesh, 2020 (N=177)**

	<u>n</u>	<u>% or range</u>
Number of women enrolled	177	
Number of babies enrolled	179	
Median age of women	25	17-40
Highest education completed		
No formal education	12	6.8%
Primary school	36	20%
Secondary school	112	63%
Bachelor's degree	10	5.6%
Master's degree	8	4.5%
Occupation		
Homemaker	174	98%
Poultry/livestock rearer	14	7.9%
Student	6	3.4%

Domestic animal contact during pregnancy	177	100%
Median monthly income (USD)	201	60-885
Median household size	5	2-8+
Main water source – tube well	173	98%
Toilet type		
Shared pit latrine	82	46%
Private pit latrine	57	32%
Flush/pour flush toilet	38	22%
Nulliparous at enrollment	58	33%
Antenatal care visits		
None	35	20%
1-3 visits	117	66%
4 or more visits	25	14%
Pregnancy complications		
Anemia	87	49%
Urinary infection	32	18%
Bleeding	17	9.6%
High blood pressure	14	7.9%
Antibiotic use within 30 days prior to admission	23	13%
Hospitalization during pregnancy prior to delivery	21	12%
Timing of delivery		
Preterm (<37 weeks)	54	31%
Full term (37-42 weeks)	110	62%

Post term (>42 weeks)	13	7.3%
-----------------------	----	------

173

174 The majority of women (79%) delivered via C-section (Table 2). Duration of hospitalization was
175 longer for women undergoing C-section compared with vaginal delivery (4.0 versus 1.6 days,
176 $p=0.00$). Nearly all women received perinatal prophylactic antibiotics (98%), of whom, 91%
177 received them before or during delivery. The prescribed duration of antibiotics was longer for
178 women who underwent C-section compared with vaginal delivery (10 versus 7.6 days, $p=0.00$).
179 The most common antibiotics administered were metronidazole (89%), flucloxacillin (69%), and
180 third generation cephalosporins (67%) (Supplementary Table 1). The most frequent antibiotic
181 regimen was a 3-drug combination of a cephalosporin (any generation), metronidazole, and
182 flucloxacillin (66%). No carbapenem use was reported. More than half of the participants
183 experienced a pregnancy complication, including fetal distress/cord prolapse (40%),
184 obstructed/prolonged labor (27%), or prolonged rupture of membranes (23%).

185

186 **Table 2. Hospital-based characteristics and management of pregnant mothers presenting for**
187 **delivery, Faridpur, Bangladesh, 2020 (N=177)**

	<u>n</u>	<u>% or range</u>
Labor management		
Membrane sweeping/stripping	50	28%
6 or more vaginal exams	45	25%
Artificial rupture of membranes	19	11%
Mechanical cervical ripening	14	7.9%
Mode of delivery		

Vaginal delivery	37	21%
Cesarean delivery	140	79%
Mother received antibiotics	174	98%
Duration of antibiotics, median (days)*	10	3-15
Timing of antibiotic initiation*		
Before/during delivery	158	91%
After delivery	16	9.2%
Indication for antibiotics*		
Prevention	174	100%
Treatment	1	0.6%
Delivery complications		
Fetal distress/cord prolapse	70	40%
Obstructed/prolonged labor	48	27%
Prolonged rupture of membranes	41	23%
Retained placenta	7	6.4%
Duration of hospitalization, median (d)	3	1-9
Admission to ICU	9	5.1%

188 *N=174, the number who received antibiotics; ICU: Intensive care unit; d: days

189

190 Among the newborns, nearly all received airway clearing, wiping and wrapping, temperature
191 and weight measuring, and feeding initiation within the first hour of birth (Table 3).

192 Approximately one-quarter underwent resuscitation with two newborns requiring artificial

193 ventilation. Five percent of newborns received antibiotics, including 3 (1.7%) newborns with

194 clinically-diagnosed neonatal sepsis. No blood cultures were collected at the time of diagnosis

195 or during the course of treatment. No neonatal deaths occurred among enrolled newborns
 196 during the course of the study.

197

198 **Table 3. Hospital-based characteristics and management of newborns delivered at a tertiary**
 199 **care facility, Faridpur, Bangladesh, 2020 (N=177*)**

	<u>n</u>	<u>% (range)</u>
Female	82	46%
Birthweight, median (g)	2900	1500-4200
Immediate management of newborn (within 1 hour of birth)		
Cleared airway	176	99%
Wiped and wrapped	176	99%
Temperature and weight measured	173	98%
Initiated feeding	171	97%
Administered vitamin K	98	55%
Resuscitated	40	23%
Mechanical ventilation	2	1.1%
Newborn received antibiotics	9	5.1%
Duration of antibiotics, median (d)**	3	1-5
Indication for antibiotics**		
Prevention	8	89%
Treatment	1	11%
Newborn sepsis	3	1.7%
Duration of hospitalization, median (d)	3	1-7
Admission to neonatal ICU	9	5.1%

200 *For the two sets of twins, one twin was randomly excluded from each set for analysis purposes.


201 **N=9, the number of newborns who received antibiotics; d: days.

202 **Colonization patterns of mothers and newborns with ESBL-producing and carbapenem-**
203 **resistant organisms**

204 On admission, 17% of women (n=30) had vaginal colonization and 71% (n=125) had rectal
205 colonization with organisms recovered from CHROMagar ESBL plates (hereafter referred to as
206 “ESBLs”), but only 15% (n=27) had rectal or vaginal colonization with organisms recovered from
207 CHROMagar mSuperCARBA plates (hereafter referred to as “CROs”) (Figure 2). At the time of
208 discharge following delivery, nearly all women had either rectal or vaginal colonization with
209 ESBLs (98%, n=174), 86% (n=153) had rectal CRO colonization, and 74% (n=130) had vaginal
210 CRO colonization. Newborns demonstrated rectal colonization patterns similar to maternal
211 colonization patterns on discharge: 89% (n=157) were colonized with ESBLs, and 72% (n=128)
212 were colonized with CROs.

213

214 **Figure 2. Vaginal and rectal colonization of mothers and rectal colonization of newborns with**
215 **ESBL-producing and carbapenem resistant organisms at a tertiary care facility, Faridpur,**
216 **Bangladesh, 2020 (N=177)**



217


218 Figure 2 caption. Prevalence of AMR colonization patterns among mothers and newborns. Colonization was
219 compared pre- and post-delivery to determine differences between community-based colonization and
220 colonization following healthcare exposure. ESBL = organisms recovered from agar selective for extended-
221 spectrum beta-lactamase-producing organisms; CRO = organisms recovered from agar selective for carbapenem
222 resistant organisms. ***McNemar's test $p < 0.001$.

223 Prevalence of ESBLs and CROs in environmental samples

224 A total of 290 environmental swab samples were collected from the perinatal ward, labor
225 room, and operating room (Supplementary Table 2). Overall, 77% (n=222) of samples were
226 positive for ESBLs, and 69% (n=201) were positive for CROs, and patterns were similar across
227 types of samples analyzed (Figure 3). However, many surfaces had multiple colony
228 morphologies on the selective plates, demonstrating broad organism diversity (Supplementary
229 Figure 2).

230

231 **Figure 3. Environmental detection of ESBL-producing and carbapenem resistant organisms in**
232 **the obstetric facilities of a tertiary care hospital, Faridpur, Bangladesh, 2020 (N=290)**



233

234 Figure 3 caption. Frequency of contamination of various hospital environmental surfaces during the study period.

235 Hand samples were taken from healthcare workers as well as patient attendants. ESBL = organisms recovered from

236 agar selective for extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing organisms; CRO = organisms recovered from agar

237 selective for carbapenem resistant organisms.

238 **Prevalence of ESBL/CRO colonization in relation to COVID-19**

239 Pre-delivery rectal ESBL colonization was significantly higher after the start of the COVID-19

240 pandemic (80.5%) compared with before COVID (63.0%, $p=0.01$) (Supplementary Table 3).

241 Similarly, rectal CRO colonization increased during COVID (8.0% vs. 19.5%, $p=0.02$). Pre-delivery

242 vaginal ESBL and CRO colonization also increased, but the differences were not significant

243 (ESBL: 15.0% vs. 19.5%, $p=0.43$; CRO: 2.0% vs. 6.3%, $p=0.13$).

244

245 In contrast, post-delivery rectal colonization was similar before and after the start of COVID

246 (ESBL: 96.0% vs. 98.7%, $p=0.28$; CRO 83.0% vs. 90.9%, $p=0.13$). Post-delivery vaginal

247 colonization was also stable (ESBL: 92.0% vs. 85.7%, $p=0.18$; CRO: 72.0% vs. 75.3%, $p=0.62$).

248 Newborn colonization increased, but the differences were only marginally significant (ESBL:
249 85.0% vs. 93.5%, $p=0.08$; CRO: 67.0% vs. 79.2%, $p=0.07$).

250
251 Overall environmental contamination with ESBLs and CROs was markedly higher during COVID
252 compared with before the pandemic (ESBL: 53.9% vs. 94.4%, $p=0.00$; CRO: 44.5% vs. 88.9%,
253 $p=0.00$) (Supplementary Figure 3).

254 **Community and hospital exposures associated with ESBL/CRO colonization in mothers and** 255 **newborns**

256 Colonization outcome variables that were correlated were collapsed into combined categories,
257 except for pre-delivery rectal ESBL and rectal CRO colonization given substantial variability in
258 prevalence (Supplementary Table 4). The pre-delivery colonization outcome variables are:
259 vaginal ESBL and/or CRO, rectal ESBL, and rectal CRO; the post-delivery colonization outcome
260 variables are vaginal ESBL and/or CRO, rectal ESBL and/or CRO, and newborn ESBL and/or CRO.

261
262 Hospitalization during pregnancy (apart from during delivery) was associated with an increased
263 risk for vaginal ESBL/CRO and rectal CRO colonization across colonization categories in
264 multivariate analyses (vaginal ESBL/CRO RR 2.1, 95% CI 1.3-3.4; rectal ESBL RR 1.3, 95% CI 1.2-
265 1.5; rectal CRO RR 2.9, 95% CI 1.4-6.2) (Table 4). Preterm delivery was also associated with pre-
266 delivery vaginal ESBL/CRO colonization (RR 2.6, 95% CI 1.5-4.4). Having a private pit latrine
267 compared with a shared pit latrine was associated with less vaginal ESBL/CRO colonization (RR
268 0.44, 95% CI 0.24-0.81). While it did not reach statistical significance at a $p<0.05$ cutoff, raising

- 269 ducks outside the home had the highest measures of association with pre-delivery AMR
- 270 colonization (vaginal ESBL/CRO RR 2.5, 95% CI 0.78-8.0; rectal CRO RR 6.6, 95% CI 0.92-48).

Table 4. Association of community-based exposures with maternal pre-delivery ESBL/CRO vaginal and rectal colonization, Faridpur, Bangladesh, 2020

	Vaginal ESBL/CRO				Rectal ESBL				Rectal CRO			
	Univariable		Multivariable		Univariable		Multivariable		Univariable		Multivariable	
	RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI
Household size												
<5	Ref		-		Ref		-		Ref		-	
5-6	1	0.49-2.1	-		0.96	0.78-1.2	-		1.2	0.48-2.8	-	
7 or more	1.9	0.81-4.4	-		1.1	0.87-1.5	-		2.4	0.87-6.5	-	
Highest education												
Primary or below	Ref		-		Ref		-		Ref		-	
Secondary	1.4	0.65-1.4	-		0.95	0.76-1.2	-		1.2	0.43-3.2	-	
College or above	0.82	0.28-2.4	-		1	0.78-1.3	-		1.6	0.55-4.7	-	
Income												
<12000 BDT	Ref		-		Ref		-		Ref		-	
12000-25000 BDT	1	0.51-2.0	-		1.1	0.90-1.4	-		0.54	0.21-1.4	-	
>25000 BDT	0.4	0.14-1.2	-		1	0.79-1.4	-		0.86	0.35-2.1	-	
Toilet type												
Shared pit latrine	Ref		Ref.		Ref		Ref		Ref		-	
Private pit latrine	0.45	0.19-1.1	0.44	0.24-0.81	0.84	0.67-1.1	0.83	0.68-1.0	0.92	0.38-2.2	-	
Flush/pour flush toilet	0.68	0.30-1.6	0.59	0.32-1.1	0.86	0.66-1.1	0.82	0.64-1.1	0.98	0.37-2.6	-	
Water storage												
Open container	Ref		-		Ref		-		Ref		Ref	
Closed container	0.71	0.38-1.4	-		1	0.83-1.2	-		1.9	0.78-4.6	2	0.85-4.7
Water treatment												
Any water treatment	0.88	0.42-1.9	-		0.99	0.80-1.2	-		1.4	0.61-3.0	-	
Water filter	0.73	0.30-1.8	-		0.99	0.78-1.3	-		1.7	0.73-3.7	-	
Water sources												
Rainwater	1.4	0.71-2.6	-		1	0.83-1.3	-		0.76	0.32-1.8	-	
Bottled water	1.5	0.65-2.4	-		1	0.83-1.2	-		0.83	0.39-1.8	-	
Goat consumption	0.76	0.38-1.5	-		1.1	0.88-1.3	-		1.5	0.69-3.2	-	
Animal contact												
Chickens inside home	0.97	0.51-1.9	-		1.1	0.89-1.3	-		1.3	0.59-3.0	-	
Ducks outside home	2.6	0.82-8.0	2.5	0.78-8.0	1.2	0.92-1.6	1.2	0.89-1.5	6	0.83-43	6.6	0.92-48
Goats outside home	0.76	0.39-1.5	-		0.92	0.75-1.1	-		0.65	0.30-1.4	-	
Cows outside home	1.3	0.42-3.8	-		1.3	0.86-1.9	-		3	0.42-21	-	
Prior pregnancy	0.77	0.40-1.5	-		1	0.82-1.2	-		0.64	0.29-1.4	-	
Prior miscarriage	1.8	0.88-3.7	1.8	0.97-3.3	0.94	0.77-1.1	-		0.96	0.44-2.1	-	

Children at home												
0-1	Ref		-		Ref		-		Ref		-	
2+	1.2	0.63-2.4	-		0.92	0.76-1.1	-		1.4	0.64-3.2	-	
Prenatal care												
None	Ref		-		Ref		-		Ref		-	
1-3 visits	0.85	0.39-1.9	-		1	0.79-1.3	-		0.65	0.27-1.6	-	
4 or more visits	0.8	0.26-2.5	-		0.9	0.62-1.3	-		0.93	0.29-3.0	-	
Pregnancy complications												
Any complication	0.75	0.39-1.4	-		0.95	0.78-1.2	-		1.3	0.59-3.0	-	
Anemia	0.97	0.51-1.8	-		0.92	0.76-1.1	-		0.8	0.37-1.7	-	
Urinary infection	1.09	0.49-2.4	-		0.97	0.75-1.3	-		1.3	0.51-3.1	-	
Hospitalization during pregnancy	2.2	1.1-4.4	2.1	1.3-3.4	1.2	0.93-1.5	1.3	1.2-1.5	3.3	1.5-7.0	2.9	1.4-6.2
Antibiotic use within 30 days	0.99	0.38-2.6	-		1.1	0.89-1.4	-		1.4	0.5-3.8	-	
Preterm delivery	2.1	1.1-4.0	2.6	1.5-4.4	1.1	0.92-1.4	-		1.5	0.67-3.2	-	
Vaginal ESBL/CRO	N/A		N/A		0.9	0.68-1.3	-		1.7	0.71-3.9	-	
Rectal ESBL	0.76	0.39-1.5	-		N/A		N/A		ND		-	
Rectal CRO	1.6	0.74-3.5	-		ND		-		N/A		N/A	

Includes all variables with at least 10% prevalence. Multivariable analysis includes all non-collinear variables with $p < 0.2$. Results in bold have $p < 0.05$ level. RR = relative risk; ESBL = organisms recovered from agar selective for extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing organisms; CRO = organisms recovered from agar selective for carbapenem resistant organisms. N/A = not applicable; ND = not defined.

271 Among hospital exposures, vaginal ESBL/CRO colonization and newborn ESBL/CRO colonization
272 were associated with C-section (vaginal ESBL/CRO RR 1.4, 95% CI 1.0-1.8; newborn ESBL/CRO
273 RR 1.3, 95% CI 1.1-1.7) (Table 5). Because duration of hospitalization was collinear with type of
274 delivery, it was not included in the multivariable analysis. Similarly antibiotics administered to
275 mothers before delivery was also collinear with type of delivery and was thus excluded from
276 multivariable analysis. Newborn ESBL/CRO colonization was not associated with maternal post-
277 delivery colonization, though newborn colonization was associated with pre-delivery rectal CRO
278 colonization (RR 1.1, 95% CI 1.1-1.2). No other hospital-based exposures were found to be
279 significantly associated with AMR colonization.

Table 5. Association of hospital-based exposures with maternal and newborn ESBL/CRO vaginal and rectal colonization, Faridpur, Bangladesh, 2020

	Vaginal ESBL/CRO				Rectal ESBL/CRO				Newborn ESBL/CRO			
	Univariable		Multivariable		Univariable		Multivariable		Univariable		Multivariable	
	RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI	RR	95% CI
Delivery mode												
Vaginal delivery	Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref		Ref	
Cesarean delivery	1.4	1.1-1.8	1.4	1.0-1.8	1.1	0.97-1.2	0.99	0.97-1.0	1.3	1.1-1.7	1.3	1.1-1.7
Duration of hospitalization												
<3 days	Ref		-		Ref		-		Ref		-	
3-4 days	1.4	1.1-1.9	-		1.1	0.98-1.2	-		1.3	1.1-1.7	-	
5 or more days	1	1.0-1.7	-		1.1	0.95-1.2	-		1.3	0.98-1.7	-	
Birth management												
None	1.2	1.0-1.4	-		ND		-		N/A		N/A	
Membrane stripping/sweeping	0.8	0.68-0.95	-		0.96	0.89-1.0	-		N/A		N/A	
6 or more vaginal exams	0.83	0.71-0.98	-		0.98	0.91-1.1	-		N/A		N/A	
Artificial rupture of membranes	0.87	0.69-1.11	-		0.98	0.87-1.1	-		N/A		N/A	
Maternal complications												
Any complications	1.1	0.90-1.4	-		1	0.92-1.1	-		N/A		N/A	
Premature rupture of membranes	0.93	0.81-1.1	-		0.97	0.89-1.0	-		N/A		N/A	
Obstructed labor	1	0.92-1.1	-		1.0	0.96-1.1	-		N/A		N/A	
Fetal distress	1.1	0.98-1.2	0.99	0.93-1.1	0.99	0.94-1.0	-		N/A		N/A	
Timing of maternal complications												
Before delivery	1.1	0.94-1.4	-		1.1	0.95-1.2	-		N/A		N/A	
At time of delivery	0.93	0.85-1.0	1.0	0.96-1.1	0.98	0.93-1.0	-		N/A		N/A	
Antibiotics administered to mother before delivery	1.2	0.94-1.6	-		ND		-		1.2	0.93-1.6	-	
Mother received 3rd generation cephalosporin	1.1	0.98-1.3	1.1	0.95-1.2	1.0	0.96-1.1	-		1.1	0.94-1.2	-	
Low birthweight	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		0.97	0.83-1.1	-	
Postnatal management of newborn												
Skin-to-skin or kangaroo care	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		0.95	0.85-1.1	-	
Administration of vitamin K	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		0.98	0.88-1.1	-	
Resuscitation	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		0.95	0.82-1.1	-	
Pre-delivery vaginal ESBL/CRO colonization	1.0	0.89-1.2	-		0.99	0.93-1.1	-		0.93	0.79-1.1	-	
Pre-delivery rectal ESBL colonization	1.0	0.92-1.2	-		1.0	0.97-1.1	-		0.97	0.87-1.1	-	
Pre-delivery rectal CRE colonization	0.92	0.75-1.1	-		ND		-		1.1	0.98-1.2	1.1	1.1-1.2
Post-delivery vaginal ESBL/CRO colonization	N/A		N/A		1.2	0.96-1.4	1.2	0.97-1.5	1.2	0.93-1.6	-	
Post-delivery rectal ESBL/CRO colonization	2.3	0.77-6.7	1.4	0.76-2.6	N/A		N/A		1.5	0.73-1.1	-	

Includes all variables with at least 10% prevalence. Multivariable analysis includes all non-collinear variables with $p < 0.2$. Results in bold have $p < 0.05$ level. RR = relative risk; ESBL = organisms recovered from agar selective for extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing organisms; CRO = organisms recovered from agar selective for carbapenem resistant organisms. N/A = not applicable; ND = not defined.

280 Discussion

281 This study revealed a high prevalence of perinatal colonization with ESBLs and CROs among
282 mothers and newborns undergoing facility-based deliveries at a tertiary care hospital in
283 Bangladesh. Colonization prevalence was substantially higher in mothers at the time of
284 discharge compared with admission, particularly for CROs, perhaps because ESBL colonization
285 was already frequent on admission. Additionally, there were concurrently high rates of C-
286 sections and prescribing of prolonged courses of prophylactic antibiotics.

287
288 Newborn colonization prevalence more closely resembled maternal colonization at discharge
289 compared with admission and occurred within the context of widespread environmental
290 contamination. A similarly high prevalence of ESBL colonization in newborns has been reported
291 from studies in India, Cambodia, Madagascar, and Tanzania, though CRO colonization was
292 infrequent.[23–26] Another study from Bangladesh revealed that 82% of healthy infants were
293 colonized with *Escherichia coli* resistant to third-generation cephalosporins.[27] Much lower
294 neonatal AMR colonization rates have been reported in high income countries such as Israel
295 and Sweden where ESBL colonization ranged from 5-14%.[28,29] This may reflect differences in
296 local epidemiology as well as facility-based practices. This study has revealed one of the highest
297 reported prevalences of CRO colonization among newborns, which is particularly concerning
298 given the lack of effective treatment options for infections with these organisms. It is likely
299 these organisms are leading to infections given studies showing high levels of CROs causing
300 neonatal sepsis in Bangladesh.[10] Furthermore, the remarkably high prevalence of CRO

301 colonization occurred despite no reported use of carbapenem antibiotics, demonstrating that
302 other beta-lactam antibiotics may be promoting CRO colonization.

303

304 This particular hospital is a tertiary care facility where many high-risk pregnancies are referred,
305 which may partially explain the high rates of C-sections. However, this also reflects national
306 trends in Bangladesh. In 2018, one-third of deliveries occurred by C-section, including 67% of
307 facility-based deliveries.[30] This is well above the 10-15% recommendation by WHO for rates
308 of C-section.[31] The WHO threshold is based on a review of data demonstrating no
309 improvement in perinatal mortality for higher rates of C-section.[32] This trend of increasing C-
310 sections is growing fastest in LMICs.[33] Rather than reflecting improved global access to a life-
311 saving procedure, the disparities in rates of C-sections - from 5% in sub-Saharan Africa to 43% in
312 Latin America and the Caribbean - reveals ongoing incongruencies and inappropriate surgical
313 stewardship. By 2030, nearly a third of all deliveries globally are expected to occur by C-section,
314 with the vast majority (nearly 90%) occurring in LMICs.

315

316 Along with frequent C-sections, perinatal antibiotic use was high among participants. Despite
317 WHO guidance recommending only a single dose of pre-operative prophylactic antibiotics for C-
318 sections, most participants who underwent C-section were advised to complete prolonged
319 courses of antibiotics.[34] Moreover, the WHO guidance emphasizes the use of narrow-
320 spectrum antibiotics for prophylaxis. Reports from India demonstrate prolonged courses of
321 prophylactic antibiotics being given to 80% women undergoing C-section, including frequent
322 use of 3-drug regimens.[35] A study from China revealed that 100% of women who underwent

323 C-section received a standard 7-day antibiotic regimen.[36] Similar practices have been
324 reported from other LMICs, indicating the use of prolonged prophylactic antibiotics for C-
325 section may be widespread, despite evidence showing no benefit from multiple doses of
326 antibiotics.[37–40] This contrasts with practices in high-resource contexts, such as the U.S.,
327 where multiple doses of antibiotics is rare.[41,42]

328

329 Although the analysis conducted here was exploratory, prior hospitalization was consistently
330 associated with increased risk for maternal ESBL/CRO colonization, implicating the role of
331 healthcare settings in the propagation of AMR. Additionally, there was an association between
332 preterm delivery and maternal vaginal ESBL/CRO colonization but not rectal colonization. This
333 suggests that the vaginal microbiome may be having an effect on preterm delivery, which has
334 been previously demonstrated.[43,44] It remains unclear what the mechanism is for how
335 colonization with resistant organisms modulates preterm delivery. However, it has been
336 proposed that antibiotic resistant bacteria may be associated with more inflammation and
337 perhaps reflective of dysbiosis.[45,46]

338

339 The protective effects associated with a private pit latrine (as opposed to a shared pit latrine)
340 on maternal ESBL/CRO colonization points to a hygiene component to community-based
341 colonization. This is consistent with prior studies demonstrating that shared sanitation carries
342 increased risk of exposure to pathogenic organisms, particularly AMR organisms.[47,48]
343 However, use of a shared pit latrine could also be a marker for low socioeconomic status, and
344 there could be other elements associated with socioeconomic status that are driving this

345 association. Previous studies from South Asia have shown that low socioeconomic status is
346 associated with increased risk for bacteriuria with antibiotic resistant bacteria in pregnancy.[49]
347
348 Duck rearing was associated with increased risk across colonization patterns. Though this
349 association was not statistically significant at $p < 0.05$, the relatively low number of participants
350 with this exposure may have contributed to this, and the pattern remains intriguing. No other
351 animal exposures carried such an association, mainly because there was little diversity among
352 other animal exposure types. Ducks, unlike other animals raised for food, have wider
353 geographic ranges that include surface water bodies. Notably, other studies from Bangladesh
354 have found high prevalence of ESBL *E. coli* in rural pond and river waters.[50] This same study
355 observed higher prevalence of ESBL *E. coli* in mixed poultry fecal litter, which included
356 droppings from chickens as well as ducks, compared with chicken fecal litter alone.
357 Furthermore, ducks have more liquid feces and higher volume of feces compared to chickens,
358 potentially resulting in greater environmental spread. This finding may warrant further
359 investigation into the One Health processes that could be contributing to AMR propagation and
360 dissemination.

361
362 C-section was the only hospital-based exposure associated with post-delivery maternal
363 ESBL/CRO colonization in the multivariable analysis, though prolonged hospital stay was also
364 significant in univariable analysis. Because these factors were collinear, length of hospital stay
365 was not included in the multivariable analysis. These same trends were observed for newborn
366 colonization. This is consistent with another study in a low-resource context examining

367 associations with neonatal AMR colonization that found aspects of the healthcare setting to be
368 the most highly associated factors, including antibiotic use, longer hospital stays, prematurity,
369 and lower staffing ratios.[51] Additionally, C-sections have been shown to lead to a disrupted
370 colonizing microbiota among neonates,[52–54] which may be exacerbated by antibiotic
371 use.[55] Even when the antibiotics are only administered to the mother, studies have
372 demonstrated negative health outcomes in the newborn, including necrotizing
373 enterocolitis,[56] neonatal sepsis,[57] and growth stunting.[55] Further, the magnitude of
374 disruption on the neonatal microbiome attributable to intrapartum antibiotics administered to
375 mothers has been found to be similar to postnatal antibiotics administered to newborns
376 directly.[58] Thus, ESBL and/or CRO colonization may be a marker of dysbiosis, induced by
377 upstream factors such as antibiotic exposure that provide an opportunity for colonization with
378 resistant bacteria.[46,59] Fecal microbiota transplantation has been tried as a successful
379 strategy for restoring the microbiota in neonates born by C-section.[60] In this study, the
380 impact of maternal antibiotic use on newborn colonization could not be assessed since nearly
381 all women received perinatal antibiotics.

382
383 While there are likely many aspects of the healthcare setting contributing to ESBL/CRO
384 colonization, both antibiotic use and C-section rates are potentially modifiable. Apart from
385 contributing to AMR, unnecessary C-sections may have additional negative health ramifications,
386 such as surgical site infections, blood clots, or injury to other organs. A review of indications for
387 C-sections in Bangladesh found that the majority were not performed out of medical
388 necessity.[61] This is a clear area for ongoing surveillance and changes to current practices.

389

390 Overuse of antibiotics is a known driver of AMR. The prolonged antibiotic courses received by
391 the majority of mothers for the purposes of prophylaxis pose a threat to community rates of
392 AMR through direct and indirect effects on resistance.[62] However, the situation in the
393 delivery ward is unlikely to be unique in Bangladesh given high levels of antibiotic resistance
394 reported across a variety of settings.[63,64] Reasons for liberal antibiotic use in Bangladesh
395 include lack of understanding of antibiotic function, low awareness of antibiotic resistance,
396 overemphasis on use of antibiotics for prevention, and a perception of antibiotics as a symbol
397 of power.[65] Additionally, this tertiary care facility does not have a functioning microbiology
398 laboratory or infectious disease consultant, limiting the ability to select appropriate antibiotics
399 based on antibiograms or culture results or seek expert consultation.

400

401 The high level of antibiotic use for prophylaxis also points to a heightened concern for
402 healthcare-associated infections (HAIs). Hospital-acquired neonatal infections are up to 20
403 times more common in LMICs compared with high-income contexts.[66] Accordingly, Zaidi, et al
404 note in the context of LMICs, any newborn infection in a hospital-born baby should be
405 considered a HAI, regardless of the timing of onset.[66] In LMICs such as Bangladesh, antibiotics
406 are a readily-available tool to mitigate HAIs, certainly more accessible than infrastructure
407 changes to improve hygiene and sanitation or even incentives for hospital workers to prioritize
408 cleanliness. In this scenario, antibiotics are likely acting both as a substitute for and an
409 extension of infection prevention and control efforts.[19] In fact, a prior study from Bangladesh

410 demonstrated that antibiotics given to patients on admission resulted in less hospital-onset
411 diarrhea resulting from contaminated food.[67]
412
413 Simultaneous recovery of abundant ESBLs/CROs from the hospital environment further
414 suggests that the environment is likely contributing to AMR transmission. This has been
415 corroborated by other studies in similar contexts that have shown that surface colonization
416 predicts infecting organisms in neonates.[68,69]. Antibiotic resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae*
417 strains isolated from newborns hospitalized in a neonatal intensive care unit were found to be
418 genetically closely related to strains isolated from other infants on the ward, supporting the
419 notion of transmission being driven by healthcare workers and/or shared equipment.[51]
420 Another study found that while *K. pneumoniae* transmission to newborns appears to be driven
421 by direct contact with colonized healthcare workers, spread of *Escherichia coli* and *Enterobacter*
422 *cloacae* are mediated through indirect contamination.[24] Further supporting the linkage
423 between exposure to the healthcare environment and ESBL/CRO colonization is the increased
424 environmental contamination during COVID-19 and concomitant increase in neonatal AMR
425 colonization. Increased environmental contamination during COVID-19 may have resulted from
426 decreased routine cleaning by staff who were concerned about heightened exposure to SARS-
427 CoV-2 in the hospital setting. This supports the need for enhanced environmental cleaning and
428 infection prevention efforts to reduce HAIs and AMR.
429
430 Some of the strengths of this study are that it employs a relatively low-cost method of AMR
431 surveillance that could be replicated in other low-resource contexts. It also uses colonization to

432 detect AMR burden and transmission, allowing for preventive measures to be implemented in
433 advance of infectious outcomes. Further, the examination of both community and hospital-
434 related factors and the measurement of colonization at two time points allows for better
435 triangulation of the most important risk factors for AMR colonization in both settings.

436

437 This study has several limitations. The homogeneity of participants' community and hospital
438 exposures that we hypothesized to have strong associations with AMR colonization meant that
439 the associations between some factors and ESBL/CRO colonization could not be evaluated.
440 However, the descriptive characteristics provide insight on common practices that may be
441 implicated in AMR transmission, such as abundant antibiotic use.

442

443 Additionally, we only measured colonization status, which does not in itself carry negative
444 health consequences and may rapidly change after returning to the home environment. Yet,
445 other studies have shown that neonatal colonization patterns can persist for up to 5 years, with
446 greater persistence of more virulent bacterial strains.[28,70] A meta-analysis examining the
447 relationship between Gram-negative bacterial colonization and bloodstream infections in
448 neonates did not find a statistically significant correlation, though the analysis was limited by a
449 small number of studies to draw from and high heterogeneity between studies.[4] However,
450 subsequent studies and other studies not included in the meta-analysis have supported the role
451 of intestinal colonization as a predisposing factor to infection.[23,26,68,71]

452

453 In this study, we identified ESBL/CRO colonization by using direct culture of rectal/vaginal
454 swabs on chromogenic agars, which is an imperfect method of classification. However, we did
455 not use the chromogenic findings as a means of definitive identification, and instead
456 highlighted the relative changes between pre- and post-delivery as comparable and informative
457 indicators of underlying trends. Our findings do not prove that the environment was the source
458 of ESBL/CRO colonization among mothers and neonates as we lack bacterial characterization
459 data. Regardless, the remarkable abundance of ESBLs/CROs throughout the hospital
460 environment suggests this is likely to be a factor in at least some of the transmission pathways.
461 Future studies including whole genome sequencing-based characterization of isolates would
462 add further clarity to transmission dynamics and AMR diversity in this setting.

463 **Conclusion**

464

465 The scenario of rising AMR among newborns is becoming increasingly common across LMICs
466 and demands a close examination of the factors surrounding hospital-based deliveries,
467 including indications for C-sections and antibiotic administration. The findings of this study
468 highlight the need to avoid overmedicalization of deliveries. Pregnant women presenting to a
469 hospital for delivery may be more likely to be construed as “patients in need of treatment”.

470 Separating routine perinatal care from a healthcare facility to an adjacent birthing center may
471 help decrease the treatment imperative. Conducting randomized controlled trials
472 demonstrating the non-inferiority of reduced antibiotic use could further support changes in
473 antibiotic prescribing. However, this may not be supported without concomitant improvements

474 in infection prevention and control coupled with enhanced access to diagnostics and
475 microbiologic laboratory capacity. Unnecessary C-sections must also be curtailed to reduce the
476 disruption of the newborn microflora and associated morbidity. Interventions to reduce C-
477 sections could focus on understanding and dismantling the incentives driving increasing rates of
478 C-sections. Overall, these findings demonstrate the urgent and pressing need for better AMR
479 surveillance and associated interventions to ensure safer birthing environments.

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary Table 1. Maternal antibiotics and prophylactic antibiotic regimens (N=174)

Antibiotic	N (%)
Flucloxacillin	120 (69.0%)
1 st gen cephalosporin	25 (14.3%)
2 nd gen cephalosporin	33 (18.9%)
3 rd gen cephalosporin	116 (66.6%)
Cephalosporin/beta-lactamase inhibitor	2 (1.1%)
Ciprofloxacin	1 (0.6%)
Aminoglycoside	2 (1.1%)
Metronidazole	154 (88.5%)
Antibiotic Regimens	
3 rd gen cephalosporin + metronidazole + flucloxacillin	84 (48.3%)
2 nd gen cephalosporin + metronidazole + flucloxacillin	33 (19.0%)
1 st gen cephalosporin + metronidazole	25 (14.4%)

Supplementary Table 2. Surfaces sampled for environmental swab collection

Category	% Positive for ESBL	% Positive for CRO	Notes
Ward (n=36)	0.9	0.8	Nurses' desk, doctors' table, doors, sink faucet, patient bench, patient chair
Labor room (n=31)	0.8	0.6	Labor bed cover, delivery apron, delivery shoes, delivery room light, sink faucet, sink basin, doors, chair
OR (n=9)	0.6	0.4	Operating room table, light handle, OR shoes, IV pole, oxygen mask, gurney
Newborn surfaces (n=37)	0.8	0.8	Newborn scale, newborn resuscitation tray, newborn oxygen mask, newborn suction device
HCW hands (n=48)	0.5	0.4	Doctors, nurses, midwives, trainees/students
Bed (n=26)	0.9	0.8	Bed rails, mattresses, linens
Floor (n=29)	0.9	0.9	Perinatal ward, labor room, stairs, dressing room
Attendant hands (n=11)	0.9	0.7	Patient attendants' hands
Toilet (n=16)	0.9	0.9	Water tap, bodna (cleaning vessel), door
Gurney (n=7)	1.0	1.0	Gurneys for patient transport
Medicine (n=12)	0.8	0.8	Medicine bottles, medicine delivery tray

Equipment (n=19)	0.6	0.5	Stethoscope, IV pole, scissors, equipment tray
Other (n=9)	0.7	0.4	Cat (lives in perinatal ward), patient mobile phone, money, patient food table, food delivery cart

ESBL = organisms recovered from agar selective for extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing organisms; CRO = organisms recovered from agar selective for carbapenem resistant organisms.

Supplementary Table 3. Prevalence of ESBL/CRO colonization before and during COVID-19

	<u>Before COVID</u>	<u>During COVID</u>	<u>p-value</u>
Pre-vaginal ESBL	15.0%	19.4%	0.43
Pre-rectal ESBL	63.0%	80.5%	0.01
Pre-vaginal CRO	2.0%	6.5%	0.13
Pre-rectal CRO	8.0%	19.5%	0.02
Post-vaginal ESBL	92.0%	85.7%	0.18
Post-rectal ESBL	96.0%	98.7%	0.28
Post-vaginal CRO	72.0%	75.3%	0.62
Post-rectal CRO	83.0%	90.9%	0.13
Newborn ESBL	85.0%	93.5%	0.08
Newborn CRO	67.0%	79.2%	0.07

Results in bold are significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. ESBL = organisms recovered from agar selective for extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing organisms; CRO = organisms recovered from agar selective for carbapenem resistant organisms.


Supplementary Table 4. Correlations of outcome variables

	Prevag ESBL	Prerectal ESBL	Prevag CRO	Prerectal CRO	Postvag ESBL	Postvag CRO	Postrectal ESBL	Postrectal CRO	Newborn ESBL	Newborn CRO
Prevag ESBL	1									
Prerectal ESBL	-0.0723	1								
Prevag CRO	0.3719	0.0672	1							
Prerectal CRO	0.0941	0.2493	0.1802	1						
Postvag ESBL	0.0594	0.0568	-0.0233	-0.0831	1					
Postvag CRO	-0.0353	0.1177	0.0564	0.0041	0.5767	1				

Postrectal ESBL	-0.0139	0.1146	0.0346	0.0659	0.2714	0.2063	1			
Postrectal CRO	-0.085	0.0344	0.0804	0.0549	0.1825	0.4719	0.4305	1		
Newborn ESBL	-0.0766	-0.0343	0.0724	0.0849	0.1645	0.1895	0.1546	0.1714	1	
Newborn CRO	-0.158	0.0999	-0.004	0.0889	0.1934	0.2856	0.1231	0.3082	0.5769	1


ESBL = organisms recovered from agar selective for extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing organisms; CRO = organisms recovered from agar selective for carbapenem resistant organisms.

Supplementary Figure 1. Causal pathway




S. Figure 1 caption: A proposed causal pathway examining the relationship between community and hospital-based factors and colonization with antimicrobial resistant organisms.

Supplementary Figure 2. Bacterial growth from different environmental surfaces



S. Figure 2 caption: The above panels show the bacteriologic results from some of the environmental samples. The top panel demonstrates 4 separate ESBL colony types and 3 CRO colony types. The bottom panel reveals a similar wide diversity of AMR organisms isolated from the labor room floor. ESBL = organisms recovered from agar selective for extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing organisms; CRO = organisms recovered from agar selective for carbapenem resistant organisms.

Supplementary Figure 3. Environmental contamination with ESBLs/CROs before and during COVID-19



S. Figure 3 caption: Environmental sampling demonstrated increased contamination with antimicrobial resistant organisms after the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic compared with before the pandemic. ESBL = organisms recovered from agar selective for extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing organisms; CRO = organisms recovered from agar selective for carbapenem resistant organisms. ****significant at the $p < 0.0001$ level*

References

1. Resistance, Review on Antimicrobial. Tackling drug-resistant infections globally: Final report and recommendations. 2016.
2. Murray CJL, Ikuta KS, Sharara F, Swetschinski L, Robles Aguilar G, Gray A, et al. Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019: a systematic analysis. *Lancet*. 2022. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)02724-0
3. Chan GJ, Lee ACC, Baqui AH, Tan J, Black RE. Risk of early-onset neonatal infection with maternal infection or colonization: a global systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med*. 2013;10: e1001502.
4. Folgori L, Tersigni C, Hsia Y, Kortsalioudaki C, Heath P, Sharland M, et al. The relationship between Gram-negative colonization and bloodstream infections in neonates: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2018;24: 251–257.
5. Nurjadi D, Eichel VM, Tabatabai P, Klein S, Last K, Mutters NT, et al. Surveillance for Colonization, Transmission, and Infection With Methicillin-Susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus* in a Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4: e2124938.
6. collaboration, Investigators of the Delhi Neonatal Infection Study (DeNIS). Characterisation and antimicrobial resistance of sepsis pathogens in neonates born in tertiary care centres in Delhi, India: a cohort study. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2016;4: e752–60.
7. Laxminarayan R, Matsoso P, Pant S, Brower C, Røttingen JA, Klugman K, et al. Access to effective antimicrobials: a worldwide challenge. *Lancet*. 2016;387: 168–175.
8. Chaurasia S, Sivanandan S, Agarwal R, Ellis S, Sharland M, Sankar MJ. Neonatal sepsis in South Asia: huge burden and spiralling antimicrobial resistance. *BMJ*. 2019;364: k5314.
9. Okomo U, Akpalu ENK, Le Doare K, Roca A, Cousens S, Jarde A, et al. Aetiology of invasive bacterial infection and antimicrobial resistance in neonates in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis in line with the STROBE-NI reporting guidelines. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2019. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(19)30414-1
10. Li G, Bielicki JA, Ahmed ASMNU, Islam MS, Berezin EN, Gallacci CB, et al. Towards understanding global patterns of antimicrobial use and resistance in neonatal sepsis: insights from the NeoAMR network. *Arch Dis Child*. 2020;105: 26–31.
11. Zaidi AK, Thaver D, Ali SA, Khan TA. Pathogens associated with sepsis in newborns and young infants in developing countries. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2009;28: S10–8.
12. Jajoo M, Manchanda V, Chaurasia S, Sankar MJ, Gautam H, Agarwal R, et al. Alarming rates of antimicrobial resistance and fungal sepsis in outborn neonates in North India. *PLoS One*. 2018;13: e0180705.
13. Ghafoor T, Hussain A, Qureshi MM, Mehmood T, Ali L. Antimicrobial susceptibility pattern of blood culture isolates from patients with suspected neonatal sepsis in a tertiary care hospital in Pakistan. *Sri Lankan J Infect Dis*. 2020;10: 30.

14. Le NK, Hf W, Vu PD, Khu DTK, Le HT, Hoang BTN, et al. High prevalence of hospital-acquired infections caused by gram-negative carbapenem resistant strains in Vietnamese pediatric ICUs: A multi-centre point prevalence survey. *Medicine*. 2016;95: e4099.
15. Laxminarayan R, Duse A, Wattal C, Zaidi AK, Wertheim HF, Sumpradit N, et al. Antibiotic resistance—the need for global solutions. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2013;13: 1057–1098.
16. Struelens MJ. The epidemiology of antimicrobial resistance in hospital acquired infections: problems and possible solutions. *BMJ*. 1998;317: 652–654.
17. Fischer MM, Bild M. Hospital use of antibiotics as the main driver of infections with antibiotic-resistant bacteria – a reanalysis of recent data from the European Union. *bioRxiv*. 2019. p. 553537. doi:10.1101/553537
18. Pearson M, Doble A, Glogowski R, Ibezim S, Lazenby T, Haile-Redai A, et al. Antibiotic prescribing and resistance: Views from low- and middle-income prescribing and dispensing professionals. World Health Organization; 2018. Available: <https://www.who.int/antimicrobial-resistance/LSHTM-Antibiotic-Prescribing-LMIC-Prescribing-and-Dispensing-2017.pdf>
19. Willis LD, Chandler C. Quick fix for care, productivity, hygiene and inequality: reframing the entrenched problem of antibiotic overuse. *BMJ Global Health*. 2019. p. e001590. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001590
20. Baier C, Pirr S, Ziesing S, Ebadi E, Hansen G, Bohnhorst B, et al. Prospective surveillance of bacterial colonization and primary sepsis: findings of a tertiary neonatal intensive and intermediate care unit. *J Hosp Infect*. 2019;102: 325–331.
21. Graham PL, Della-Latta P, Wu F, Zhou J, Saiman L. The gastrointestinal tract serves as the reservoir for Gram-negative pathogens in very low birth weight infants. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2007;26: 1153–1156.
22. Goldman DA. Bacterial colonization and infection in the neonate. *Am J Med*. 1981;70: 417–422.
23. Smith A, Anandan S, Veeraraghavan B, Thomas N. Colonization of the Preterm Neonatal Gut with Carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae and Its Association with Neonatal Sepsis and Maternal Gut Flora. *J Glob Infect Dis*. 2020;12: 101–104.
24. Bonneault M, Andrianoelina VH, Herindrainy P, Rabenandrasana MAN, Garin B, Breurec S, et al. Transmission Routes of Extended-Spectrum Beta-Lactamase-Producing Enterobacteriaceae in a Neonatology Ward in Madagascar. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2019;100: 1355–1362.
25. Silago V, Kovacs D, Msanga DR, Seni J, Matthews L, Oravcová K, et al. Bacteremia in critical care units at Bugando Medical Centre, Mwanza, Tanzania: the role of colonization and contaminated cots and mothers' hands in cross-transmission of multidrug resistant Gram-negative bacteria. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2020;9: 58.
26. Turner P, Pol S, Soeng S, Sar P, Neou L, Chea P, et al. High Prevalence of Antimicrobial-resistant Gram-negative Colonization in Hospitalized Cambodian Infants. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2016;35: 856–861.

27. Islam MA, Amin MB, Roy S, Asaduzzaman M, Islam MR, Navab-Daneshmand T, et al. Fecal Colonization with Multidrug-Resistant E. coli among Healthy Infants in Rural Bangladesh. *Front Microbiol.* 2019;10: 640.
28. Nordberg V, Jonsson K, Giske CG, Iversen A, Aspevall O, Jonsson B, et al. Neonatal intestinal colonization with extended-spectrum β -lactamase-producing Enterobacteriaceae—a 5-year follow-up study. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2018;24: 1004–1009.
29. Leikin-Zach V, Shany E, Yitshak-Sade M, Eshel R, Shafat T, Borer A, et al. Neonatal Risk Factors for Colonization with Extended-Spectrum Beta-Lactamase-Producing Bacteria in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. *Isr Med Assoc J.* 2018;20: 286–290.
30. Bangladesh Demographic and Health Survey 2017-18: Key Indicators. National Institute of Population Research and Training; 2019 Nov. Available: <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/PR104/PR104.pdf>
31. WHO statement on caesarean section rates. World Health Organization; 2015 Apr. Available: https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/maternal_perinatal_health/cs-statement/en/
32. Betran AP, Torloni MR, Zhang J, Ye J, Mikolajczyk R, Deneux-Tharaux C, et al. What is the optimal rate of caesarean section at population level? A systematic review of ecologic studies. *Reprod Health.* 2015;12: 57.
33. Betran AP, Ye J, Moller A-B, Souza JP, Zhang J. Trends and projections of caesarean section rates: global and regional estimates. *BMJ Glob Health.* 2021;6. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2021-005671
34. WHO recommendation on prophylactic antibiotics for women undergoing caesarean section. Geneva: WHO; 2021 Jun. Available: <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/341865/9789240028012-eng.pdf>
35. Mishra S, Raheja A, Agarwal K, Gandhi G. Antibiotic prophylaxis in cesarean sections: a tertiary care hospital based survey. *International Journal of Reproduction, Contraception, Obstetrics and Gynecology.* 2021;10: 2221–2224.
36. Liu R, Lin L, Wang D. Antimicrobial prophylaxis in caesarean section delivery. *Exp Ther Med.* 2016;12: 961–964.
37. Dohou AM, Buda VO, Yemoa LA, Anagonou S, Van Bambeke F, Van Hees T, et al. Antibiotic Usage in Patients Having Undergone Caesarean Section: A Three-Level Study in Benin. *Antibiotics (Basel).* 2022;11. doi:10.3390/antibiotics11050617
38. Carshon-Marsh R, Squire JS, Kamara KN, Sargsyan A, Delamou A, Camara BS, et al. Incidence of Surgical Site Infection and Use of Antibiotics among Patients Who Underwent Caesarean Section and Herniorrhaphy at a Regional Referral Hospital, Sierra Leone. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2022;19. doi:10.3390/ijerph19074048
39. Pobee F. Single versus multiple doses antibiotic prophylaxis for elective caesarean section at the Korle Bu Teaching Hospital. 2022. doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-1396754/v1

40. Huang Y, Yin X, Wang X, Zhou F, Cao X, Han Y, et al. Is a single dose of commonly used antibiotics effective in preventing maternal infection after cesarean section? A network meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2022;17: e0264438.
41. Argani C, Notis E, Moseley R, Huber K, Lifchez S, Price LA, et al. Survey of Cesarean delivery infection prevention practices across US academic centers. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2015;36: 1245–1247.
42. Reiff ES, Habib AS, Carvalho B, Raghunathan K. Antibiotic Prophylaxis for Cesarean Delivery: A Survey of Anesthesiologists. *Anesthesiol Res Pract*. 2020;2020: 3741608.
43. DiGiulio DB, Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ, Costello EK, Lyell DJ, Robaczewska A, et al. Temporal and spatial variation of the human microbiota during pregnancy. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2015;112: 11060–11065.
44. Callahan BJ, DiGiulio DB, Goltsman DSA, Sun CL, Costello EK, Jeganathan P, et al. Replication and refinement of a vaginal microbial signature of preterm birth in two racially distinct cohorts of US women. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2017;114: 9966–9971.
45. Wolf AJ, Liu GY, Underhill DM. Inflammatory properties of antibiotic-treated bacteria. *J Leukoc Biol*. 2017;101: 127–134.
46. Korach-Rechtman H, Hreish M, Fried C, Gerassy-Vainberg S, Azzam ZS, Kashi Y, et al. Intestinal Dysbiosis in Carriers of Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae. *mSphere*. 2020;5. doi:10.1128/mSphere.00173-20
47. Heijnen M, Cumming O, Peletz R, Chan GK-S, Brown J, Baker K, et al. Shared sanitation versus individual household latrines: a systematic review of health outcomes. *PLoS One*. 2014;9: e93300.
48. Beukes LS, King TLB, Schmidt S. Assessment of pit latrines in a peri-urban community in KwaZulu-Natal (South Africa) as a source of antibiotic resistant *E. coli* strains. *Int J Hyg Environ Health*. 2017;220: 1279–1284.
49. Alsan M, Kammili N, Lakshmi J, Xing A, Khan A, Rani M, et al. Poverty and Community-Acquired Antimicrobial Resistance with Extended-Spectrum β -Lactamase-Producing Organisms, Hyderabad, India. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2018;24: 1490–1496.
50. Rousham EK, Asaduzzaman M, Mozmader TIMAU, Amin MB, Rahman M, Hossain MI, et al. Human Colonization with Extended-Spectrum Beta-Lactamase-Producing *E. coli* in Relation to Animal and Environmental Exposures in Bangladesh: An Observational One Health Study. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2021;129: 37001.
51. Crellen T, Turner P, Pol S, Baker S, Nguyen Thi Nguyen T, Stoesser N, et al. Transmission dynamics and control of multidrug-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in neonates in a developing country. *Elife*. 2019;8. doi:10.7554/eLife.50468
52. Bäckhed F, Roswall J, Peng Y, Feng Q, Jia H, Kovatcheva-Datchary P, et al. Dynamics and Stabilization of the Human Gut Microbiome during the First Year of Life. *Cell Host Microbe*. 2015;17: 690–703.

53. Korpela K, Costea P, Coelho LP, Kandels-Lewis S, Willemsen G, Boomsma DI, et al. Selective maternal seeding and environment shape the human gut microbiome. *Genome Res.* 2018;28: 561–568.
54. Korpela K. Impact of Delivery Mode on Infant Gut Microbiota. *Ann Nutr Metab.* 2021; 1–9.
55. Uzan-Yulzari A, Turta O, Belogolovski A, Ziv O, Kunz C, Perschbacher S, et al. Neonatal antibiotic exposure impairs child growth during the first six years of life by perturbing intestinal microbial colonization. *Nat Commun.* 2021;12: 443.
56. Silverman MA, Konnikova L, Gerber JS. Impact of Antibiotics on Necrotizing Enterocolitis and Antibiotic-Associated Diarrhea. *Gastroenterol Clin North Am.* 2017;46: 61–76.
57. Zhou P, Zhou Y, Liu B, Jin Z, Zhuang X, Dai W, et al. Perinatal Antibiotic Exposure Affects the Transmission between Maternal and Neonatal Microbiota and Is Associated with Early-Onset Sepsis. *mSphere.* 2020;5. doi:10.1128/mSphere.00984-19
58. Tapiainen T, Koivusaari P, Brinkac L, Lorenzi HA, Salo J, Renko M, et al. Impact of intrapartum and postnatal antibiotics on the gut microbiome and emergence of antimicrobial resistance in infants. *Sci Rep.* 2019;9: 10635.
59. Goldmann DA, Leclair J, Macone A. Bacterial colonization of neonates admitted to an intensive care environment. *J Pediatr.* 1978;93: 288–293.
60. Korpela K, Helve O, Kolho K-L, Saisto T, Skogberg K, Dikareva E, et al. Maternal Fecal Microbiota Transplantation in Cesarean-Born Infants Rapidly Restores Normal Gut Microbial Development: A Proof-of-Concept Study. *Cell.* 2020;183: 324–334.e5.
61. Begum T, Rahman A, Nababan H, Hoque DME, Khan AF, Ali T, et al. Indications and determinants of caesarean section delivery: Evidence from a population-based study in Matlab, Bangladesh. *PLoS One.* 2017;12: e0188074.
62. Lipsitch M, Samore MH. Antimicrobial use and antimicrobial resistance: a population perspective. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2002;8: 347–354.
63. Ahmed I, Rabbi MB, Sultana S. Antibiotic resistance in Bangladesh: A systematic review. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2019;80: 54–61.
64. Safain KS, Bhuyan GS, Tasnim S, Hasib SH, Sultana R, Islam MS, et al. Situation of antibiotic resistance in Bangladesh and its association with resistance genes for horizontal transfer. *bioRxiv.* 2020. p. 2020.04.06.027391. doi:10.1101/2020.04.06.027391
65. Nahar P, Unicomb L, Lucas PJ, Uddin MR, Islam MA, Nizame FA, et al. What contributes to inappropriate antibiotic dispensing among qualified and unqualified healthcare providers in Bangladesh? A qualitative study. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2020;20: 656.
66. Zaidi AK, Huskins WC, Thaver D, Bhutta ZA, Abbas Z, Goldmann DA. Hospital-acquired neonatal infections in developing countries. *Lancet.* 2005;365: 1175–1188.
67. Bhuiyan MU, Luby SP, Zaman RU, Rahman MW, Sharker MAY, Hossain MJ, et al. Incidence of and

risk factors for hospital-acquired diarrhea in three tertiary care public hospitals in Bangladesh. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2014;91: 165–172.

68. Dias M, Saleem J. Surface colonization and subsequent development of infections with multi drug resistant organisms in a neonatal intensive care unit. *Ann Clin Microbiol Antimicrob.* 2019;18: 12.
69. Reich P, Boyle M, Sullivan M, Hogan PG, Thompson R, Muenks C, et al. Familial and Environmental Impact on Colonization with Antibiotic-resistant Organisms in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 2017;4: S685–S685.
70. Nowrouzian FL, Oswald E. Escherichia coli strains with the capacity for long-term persistence in the bowel microbiota carry the potentially genotoxic pks island. *Microb Pathog.* 2012;53: 180–182.
71. Basu S. Neonatal sepsis: the gut connection. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis.* 2015;34: 215–222.