

1 Do You Know Your Daily Antibiotic Intake through Residues in Your Diet?

2

3 Jegak Seo<sup>1\*</sup>, Frank Kloprogge<sup>2</sup>, Andrew M. Smith<sup>3</sup>, Kersti Karu<sup>4</sup>, and Lena Ciric<sup>1</sup>

4

5 Affiliations

6 <sup>1</sup> Healthy Infrastructure Research Group, Department of Civil, Environmental and Geomatic

7 Engineering, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT

8 <sup>2</sup> Institute for Global Health, University College London, Rowland Hill Street, London, NW3

9 2PF, UK

10 <sup>3</sup> Eastman Dental Institute, University College London, Rowland Hill Street, London, NW3

11 2PF, UK

12 <sup>4</sup> Department of Chemistry, University College London, 20 Gordon Street, London, WC1H

13 OAJ, UK

14

15 \*Corresponding author:

16 Jegak Seo, Healthy Infrastructure Research Group, Department of Civil, Environmental and

17 Geomatic Engineering, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT; email:

18 [jegak.seo.20@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:jegak.seo.20@ucl.ac.uk)

19

20 Keywords: Diet survey; Food contamination; Antibiotic residues; Low-Temperature

21 Partitioning Extraction; Exposure modelling

## 22 **Abstract**

23           While the use of a wide range of antibiotics has been reported as extensive in the  
24 rearing of agricultural animals, extremely limited information is available on the antibiotic  
25 residues in animal products and the adverse impact consistent low-level exposure to  
26 antibiotics might have on the human body as well as its microbiome. The aim of this study  
27 was to estimate the possible antibiotic concentrations humans are exposed to via their diet  
28 using the concentration of antibiotics in animal food products and water, and an online  
29 survey on dietary habits. A total of 131 participants completed the dietary habits survey, the  
30 majority belonging to the omnivorous diet habit. Distinct dietary trends were observed into  
31 omnivorous and unknown groups eating food-producing animal products, with specific food  
32 types dominating each meal: pork (e.g. ham) and dairy products (e.g. milk, yoghurt) during  
33 breakfast, beef (e.g. burger) and chicken (e.g. chicken breast) products during lunch, and  
34 fish (e.g. salmon fillet) during dinner. 34 different animal-based food and drink products  
35 were tested for the presence of ten different antibiotics. Low levels of nine of the ten  
36 antibiotics were detected across the samples tested with amoxicillin and trimethoprim  
37 being the most frequently detected antibiotics from all samples with concentrations ranging  
38 from 216.7-6866.9 µg/kg and 55.2-461.7 µg/kg, respectively. Of all products tested, over  
39 35% exceeded the acceptable daily intake antibiotic concentration for amoxicillin, ampicillin,  
40 and enrofloxacin.

## 41 **1. Introduction**

42 Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) poses a significant global threat and has the potential  
43 to become the next pandemic. Currently, AMR is responsible for 700,000 deaths annually,  
44 and without substantial policy changes, this number is projected to escalate to 10 million  
45 deaths per year by 2050, as highlighted by the report from Jim O'Neil in 2016 (O'Neill, 2016).  
46 Extensive research efforts have primarily concentrated on the direct intake of antibiotics by  
47 humans through prescriptions, pharmacy purchases, and hospital use (Ayukekbong,  
48 Ntemgwa, & Atabe, 2017; Llor & Bjerrum, 2014; van Staa et al., 2020). However, it is  
49 becoming increasingly evident that exposure risks associated with the consumption of food-  
50 producing animals, including meats and dairy products, are of growing concern. Excessive  
51 agricultural and veterinary antibiotic usage has led to the pervasive detection of veterinary  
52 antibiotic residues in animal products worldwide, creating a vicious cycle of escalating  
53 veterinary antibiotic use driven to the increasing levels of antibiotic resistance in animals  
54 (Andrew Bamidele & Oluwakamisi Festus, 2019; Economou & Gousia, 2015; FAO, 2016;  
55 Treiber & Beranek-Knauer, 2021). Furthermore, the control and regulation of veterinary  
56 antibiotic purchase and usage pose significant challenges in most countries (Manyi-Loh,  
57 Mamphweli, Meyer, & Okoh, 2018), resulting in the inappropriate use of antibiotics in  
58 animals as growth promoters and for treatment without adhering to prescribed withdrawal  
59 periods (Morehead & Scarbrough, 2018).

60 Antibiotics have been detected in food products and drinking water due to a wide  
61 range of antibiotic used not only for treatment in infectious disease but also in agricultural  
62 run-off, wastewater treatment, non-medical applications, and open defecations (Manyi-Loh  
63 et al., 2018). The identification and quantification of antibiotics in food and drinking water  
64 has become a new field of study to exploring the undiscovered world which is harmfully

65 polluted with variety of antibiotics by humans since 2000s (Kraemer, Ramachandran, &  
66 Perron, 2019). A recent comprehensive review of antibiotic monitoring studies conducted  
67 throughout the world identified residues of antibiotics which are used in humans and  
68 animals in meat and dairy products, plants and drinking water (Klein et al., 2018; Manyi-Loh  
69 et al., 2018). Antibiotics administered to humans are frequently detected in food and  
70 drinking water, and their presence is also often observed in plants, likely due to exposure  
71 through irrigation or the use of fertilizers derived from wastewater and manure (Ali Mirza et  
72 al., 2020; Stockwell & Duffy, 2012). These studies recommend that the risk of AMR through  
73 chronic consumption of a trace level of antibiotics in foods or drinks is significant.

74 The overall aim of this study was to estimate daily intake of antibiotic residues via  
75 diet habits using antibiotic concentrations present in drinking water and animal-based food  
76 products from the UK establishing a measure of the subsequent risk of human exposure.  
77 Specifically, this research aimed to explore the antibiotic concentration in food products,  
78 including beef, pork, chicken and fish, dairy products, and drinking water by monitoring  
79 questionnaires and analysis of food samples collected in local stores. Therefore, this study  
80 was delivered through three specific objectives: (1) to characterise, using an online  
81 questionnaire, how public populations can come into contact with antibiotics through the  
82 consumption of food-producing animal products and drinking water, (2) to determine the  
83 levels of antibiotic concentrations in food-producing animal products and drinking water by  
84 collecting samples from large supermarket chains, (3) to analyse the range of antibiotic  
85 exposure among survey participants by combining data on their dietary habits with the  
86 concentration of antibiotic residues in food-producing animal products and drinking water.

87

## 88 **2. Materials and Methods**

## 89 **2.1. Online diet survey**

90 The online survey is used as a direct method for dietary assessment which collects  
91 primary dietary data from individuals (FAO, 2018). UCL Opinio  
92 (<https://opinio.ucl.ac.uk/admin/folder.do>) was used to apply a quantitative method to  
93 determine both types and amounts of food consumed. Ethical approval for the  
94 questionnaire was provided by the UCL Research Ethics Committee, project number  
95 19139/001.

96 Two days of 24-hour recall and food frequency questionnaire (FFQ) were the main  
97 channel using a retrospective approach; estimated food record and weighed food record  
98 were included as subsidiary functions using Likert scales and open-ended questions; and  
99 innovative technologies supported by any devices, were used to support the technical  
100 approaches for the participants and increasing the accuracy of the survey. In the 24-hour  
101 recall section, participants were asked to recall the intakes for 48 hours in total. Twenty  
102 slots for food or drinks per day were provided to ensure sufficient opportunities to record all  
103 animal-based food and drinks consumed. Time, place, type and name of product, and  
104 volume (ml) or mass (g) of product were required for each different food or drink type. After  
105 24-hour recall, FFQ was assessed to investigate the frequency with which foods and drinks,  
106 and/or food groups were consumed over a certain time period. After completing the two  
107 sections, the participants were asked to compare their dietary history to their general intake  
108 in a week using Likert scales. Firstly, participants were asked to estimate the number of  
109 intake days per week. Then, the amount of each recorded food and drink was compared to  
110 the general intake in a week by rating in percentage, on a Likert scale of between less than  
111 10% or more than 200%.

112 In accordance with the FAO guidelines (2018), the survey was designed to facilitate a  
113 nuanced analysis of results. The focus was placed on the detailed collection of dietary  
114 histories, which was pivotal for the estimation of antibiotic consumption. The US FDA's  
115 Estimated Meal Intake formula (equation 1), which standardises the weight assumption for  
116 an adult participant at 60 kg, was utilized for this purpose (FDA, 2018). In this research, the  
117 reference to 12 o'clock was intended to encompass the time range between 1200 and 1259,  
118 and similarly, other hourly references were aligned with their respective one-hour time  
119 intervals.

120

## 121 **2.2. Antibiotic quantification in food and drink**

### 122 **2.2.1. Antibiotics, chemicals and reagents**

123 The following antibiotics (CAS number): tetracycline (64-75-5), oxytetracycline (6153-  
124 64-6), amoxicillin (61336-70-7), ampicillin (7177-48-2), trimethoprim (738-70-5),  
125 sulfadiazine (68-35-9), ciprofloxacin (85721-33-1), enrofloxacin (93106-60-6), erythromycin  
126 (114-07-8), and tylosin (1405-54-5), were purchased from Sigma- Aldrich (St. Louis, MO,  
127 USA), all with purities  $\geq 99\%$ . All reagents chromatographic grade acetonitrile (ACN), water,  
128 formic acid (FA) with purity higher than 99.8% used for LC-MS analysis were ordered from  
129 Fisher Scientific (Lancashire, UK).

130

### 131 **2.2.2. Low Temperature Partitioning Extraction (LTPE)**

132 All samples were purchased from large supermarket chains in London, United  
133 Kingdom. The samples were purchased at the same time as when the survey was open to  
134 participants, i.e. 28/May/2021 to 30/Jul/2021 and 12/Jan/2022 to 17/Mar/2022.

135 For all sample preparation, at least of 3.0 g of a whole food or drink sample was  
136 homogenized using a kitchen blender (BOSCH, MSM6B150GB) for 1 min in triplicate. 1.0 g of  
137 the homogenized sample was aliquoted to a 50 mL test tube. Aliquoted replicates were  
138 further homogenized using pellet pestles (Bel-ART SP SCIENCEWARE, 19923-000) for 1 min.  
139 The processed sample vials were covered with aluminium foil and stored at -20 °C prior to  
140 analysis. 1.0 g of HPLC-LiChropur™ NaCl (Merck, 7647-14-5) was added to the tube and  
141 vortexed at 448 xg for 1 min, followed by addition of 8.0 mL of Acetonitrile 50%, water  
142 47.5%, TFA 2.5% (Honeywell, 19182-250mL) to the tube. The tube was vortexed and  
143 centrifuged for another 5 mins. The prepared samples were stored at -20 °C freezer  
144 overnight. Then, 1.5 mL of the organic phase was removed and transferred to a 2.0 mL  
145 microcentrifuge tube. The samples were centrifuged at 3,278 xg for 10 mins at 25 °C and 1.0  
146 mL of supernatant was transferred to individual HPLC glass vial for LC-MS analysis.

147

### 148 **2.2.3. LC-MS analysis**

149 Samples were analysed using a liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry  
150 (LC-MS/MS) instrument. The instrument consisted of an Accela LC system connected to a  
151 Finnigan Linear Trap Quadrupole (LTQ) Linear Ion Trap mass spectrometer from Thermo  
152 Fisher Scientific, UK. The chromatographic separation was achieved using a Hypersil GOLD  
153 C18 column (150 mm x 2.1 mm, 1.9 µm; Thermo Fisher Scientific, UK). The column  
154 temperature was maintained at 30 °C. Mobile phases A and B were: (A) water with 0.1%  
155 formic acid and (B) acetonitrile with 0.1% formic acid, and the flow rate was 200 µL/min.  
156 The gradient program was as follows: 2% of B for the first 2 min and after gradual change to  
157 98% B in 16 minutes and changed to 2% of B in 0.1 min and remained at 2% B for another  
158 1.9 minutes. The total run time was 20 minutes per sample. The injected sample volume

159 was 10  $\mu$ L. The liquid effluent from the C18 column was directed into the electrospray (ESI)  
160 source of the LTQ mass spectrometer (MS). The ESI was in positive mode and the source  
161 parameters were as follows: a spray voltage of 4500 V, capillary temperature set to 280  $^{\circ}$ C,  
162 sheath gas at a pressure of 40 psi, ion sweep gas pressure (0 psi), auxiliary gas set at 5 psi,  
163 and a skimmer offset at 25 V. The data was collected using a full-scan MS event with a mass  
164 range from  $m/z$  50 to 1000 and in the MS/MS event, which was set-up for each  $m/z$  value  
165 antibiotic corresponding to each antibiotic as per Figure S2. The isolation width was 2.0 and  
166 a collision energy of 35. The analytical batch was set-up containing water blanks ( $H_2O$ ),  
167 which were analysed after each sample analysis and a quality control which consisted of a  
168 pure antibiotic at concentration of 10  $\mu$ g/L.

169

#### 170 **2.2.4. The method validation**

171 Figure S2 shows chromatographic separation of 10 antibiotics on the C18 column,  
172 and their retention times are summarised in Table S3. The LC-MS method validation  
173 parameters such as accuracy, limit of detection (LOD), and limit of quantification (LOQ) were  
174 calculated and summarised in Supplementary Materials Table S1. For calibration curves, five  
175 replicates at nominal concentrations of 50, 100, and 500  $\mu$ g/L were prepared and analysed  
176 by LC-MS. An accuracy (%) and relative standard deviation (RSD; %) of the measurements  
177 were determined and the calibration curves were constructed for each antibiotic (Table S3).  
178 The accuracy and RSD ranged between 97.2 to 111.22% and 0.01 to 0.92%, respectively.

179 The LTPE validation is summarised in Supplementary Materials. Pork chop meat was  
180 used as a pure matrix to compare the accuracy of the LTPE methods. Triplicates of the non-  
181 spiked pure matrix were tested with LTPE methods to determine the presence of antibiotics.  
182 Triplicates of the pure matrix were spiked at the nominal concentrations of 100  $\mu$ g/L of 10



183 antibiotic mixture solution and the antibiotics were extracted with the LTPE methods. Linear  
184 regression analysis was carried to calculate the linearity ( $R^2 > 0.999$ ) of the calibration curves  
185 by Microsoft Excel version 16.53 (Microsoft Excel, 2021) and results are summarised in  
186 Table S4. The recovery of LTPE method using 100 µg/kg of 10 antibiotic mixture stock  
187 solution was between 87.6 to 93.5%, and the recovery of using triplicates of pork chop  
188 matrix spiked with a 100 µg/kg of 10 antibiotics mixture was between 89.6 to 95.4% (Table  
189 S4).

190

### 191 **2.3. Estimated Meal Intake (EMI)**

192 The estimated daily intake formula from the US FDA (FDA, 2018) was modified to  
193 calculate the antibiotic intake from each meal instead of the total intake of substances in a  
194 day by equation 1. Also, additional dilution factors such as average volume of drinks and  
195 meal, stomach acid and bile juice in the human digestive system were taken account to  
196 determine the luminal concentration of antibiotic in human duodenum.

197

198 Equation (1):

199 ***Estimated Meal Intake<sub>x</sub> (EMI) =***

200 
$$\sum_{f=1}^F \left( \frac{Freq_f \times Port_f \times Conc_{xf}}{N} \times \frac{Port_f}{V_{total}} \right)$$

201 Where,

202 F = Total number of foods in which antibiotic “x” can be found

203  $Freq_f$  = Average portion size for food “f”

204  $Port_f$  = Number of eating occasions of food “f” over “N” meals in during the survey

205  $Conc_{xf}$  = Concentration of the antibiotic “x” in food “f”

206 N = Total number of meals in the survey

207  $V_{\text{total}}$  = Average volume of drinks + average volume of meal + average volume of human  
208 stomach juice (60 ml)

209 The most frequently consumed meat type was chosen for the representative food  
210 type of each meal. The list of consumed foods and drinks were determined in each meal  
211 over the 48hr diet survey. The detected antibiotics were determined from the specified  
212 foods and drinks and the average concentrations of detected antibiotics were applied.  
213 However, any concentrations below the ADI concentration ([https://apps.who.int/food-](https://apps.who.int/food-additives-contaminants-jecfa-database/)  
214 [additives-contaminants-jecfa-database/](https://apps.who.int/food-additives-contaminants-jecfa-database/)) were excluded to the list for each food item. The  
215 total volume of each meal was calculated by adding the average volume of the consumed  
216 drinks and foods during a meal and average volume of gut juice, 60 ml, which is the volume  
217 when the human stomach is empty (Schiller et al., 2005).

218

## 219 **2.5. Statistical Analysis**

220 Regression analysis was carried to determine the accuracy and validity ( $R^2 > 0.999$ ) of  
221 calibration curves for the antibiotic measurement using LC-MS. The mean difference of food  
222 and drink consumption in different days and seasons were statistically analysed and  
223 compared by one-way ANOVA test with post-hoc Bonferroni test.

224

## 225 **3. Results and Discussion**

### 226 **3.1. Demographical profiles and overall consumption trend**

227 The online survey to investigate participants' dietary habits over 48 hours was  
228 conducted between 28/05/2021 and 30/07/2021 in summer (n= 51) and 12/01/2022 and  
229 17/03/2022 (n= 80; dd/mm/yyyy). All participants (n= 131) agreed to the UCL General  
230 Research Participant Privacy Notice.

231

232

**Table 1. Profile of participants in the summer and winter dietary habit survey**

233

**(2021/2022).**

Season (Year)	Participant Age					
	20s (18-29)	30s (30-39)	40s (40-49)	50s (50-59)	60s (60-69)	70s (>70)
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
Summer (2021) <sup>a</sup>	39	13	8	0	1	0
Winter (2022) <sup>b</sup>	33	17	15	11	3	1
Total <i>n</i> = 141 (21/22)	62	30	23	11	4	1

Season (Year)	Dietary Habits					
	Omnivorous	Vegetarian	Vegan	Protein-based	Halal	Unknown
	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
Summer (2021) <sup>a</sup>	30	3	2	1	0	15
Winter (2022) <sup>b</sup>	70	6	0	0	2	2
Total <i>n</i> = 141 (21/22)	100	9	2	1	2	17

234 <sup>a</sup> Summer data was collected from 28/05/2021 to 30/07/2021.

235 <sup>b</sup> Winter data was collected from 12/01/2022 to 17/03/2022.

236

237

The total participant count for this research was adjusted to 117 (45 from the

238

summer survey and 72 from the winter survey), encompassing both omnivores and

239

individuals with unknown dietary habits as it provided a diverse representation of food-

240

producing animal product dietary habits and a statistically sufficient number of respondents

241

(FAO, 2018; UK Government, 2021).

242

To capitulate briefly, we have shown that our survey results are in line with

243

previously published research and national surveys in the UK (UK Government, 2021). In

244

general, meat consumption followed the peaks of water consumption. In both seasons, only

245

pork was consumed during breakfast over the two days. Similarly, chicken and beef were

246

mostly consumed at lunch. Fish and chicken were the most frequently consumed animal

247 products, respectively, in both seasons. Most of the participants had meals at regular times  
248 without special occasions such as celebrations or irregular skipping meals.

249 UK adults in the national survey (n= 8174) reported consuming pork products such as  
250 ham, bacon, and sausages the most at breakfast(Gaal, Kerr, Ward, McNulty, & Livingstone,  
251 2018). Moreover, the participants had the highest consumption of beef > chicken > fish over  
252 the rest of the day. It was also determined from the national survey that the most  
253 consumed meats in the UK were (in order of highest to lowest) beef, chicken, and fish(Gaal  
254 et al., 2018). It is reasonable to assume that the participants dairy products intake is most  
255 via drinking milk at breakfast. Water intake is directly related to food consumption.


256

### 257 **3.2. Meat consumption**

258 Based on the overall meat consumption trend, the peaks of meat consumptions are  
259 shown in figure 1. In summer and winter, both had the same pattern of food product type in  
260 each meal. For instance, pork, chicken and fish for the day 1 and pork, beef, and chicken for  
261 the day.

262

### Seasonal Meat Consumption Mass (g) in Each Meal



263

264 **Figure 1. The meat intake volume (g) in each meal at summer and winter. Each of the**

265 **meat intake time was selected by the highest overall meat consumption in each meal**

266 **during the summer and winter. Red line represents the mean value of intake. During**

267 **summer mornings, pork consumption varied between 60g and 90g, averaging around 88g.**

268 **For lunch on the first day, chicken and beef showed comparable totals, each with a**

269 **minimum of 100g. Chicken's maximum consumption, however, was notably higher at**

270 **600g. Fish dominated dinner on the first day with a maximum of 400g, while mean fish**

271 **consumption matched the maximum pork intake. On the second day, chicken**

272 **consumption (400g) surpassed pork (300g), with similar mean values. Winter consumption**

273 **mirrored these patterns, with pork exclusive to breakfast (60g minimum), higher average**

274 **on the first day (81.3g), and chicken and beef prevailing in lunch (minimum 100g).**

275

276           During the summer season, breakfast consumption of pork showed variations with  
277   minimum quantities of 60 g and maximum quantities of 90 g and 80 g, respectively. The  
278   average breakfast consumption for each day was approximately 88 g. At lunch on the first  
279   day, chicken and beef had comparable total consumption, with minimum values of 100 g for  
280   both types. However, chicken had a significantly higher ( $p<0.05$ ) maximum consumption of  
281   600 g compared to beef. The average consumption of chicken (250 g) was slightly higher  
282   than that of beef (200 g). For lunch on the second day, beef consumption at 12 o'clock was  
283   lower compared to the consumption at 13 o'clock, although the maximum, mean, and  
284   median values (250 g, 190.5 g, and 200 g) were higher during the earlier time period. In  
285   terms of dinner on the first day, fish was the most consumed meat type with a maximum  
286   quantity of 400g. The mean consumption of fish (200 g) matched the maximum pork  
287   consumption. On the second day, chicken consumption (400 g) exceeded pork consumption  
288   (300 g), with similar mean and median values for both.

289           Similar consumption patterns were observed during the winter season, with pork  
290   being the only meat consumed during breakfast. The minimum pork consumption remained  
291   the same at 60 g for both days, but the average consumption was slightly higher on the first  
292   day (81.3 g) compared to the second day (77.1 g). For lunch on each day, chicken and beef  
293   were the predominant meat types consumed. On the first day, chicken consumption  
294   exceeded fish consumption by 108%, while on the second day, beef consumption was more  
295   than four times higher than other meat types. The mean lunch consumption for chicken and  
296   beef was 248.1 g and 195.8 g, respectively. During dinner on the first day, fish consumption  
297   was more than double that of the second most consumed meat, chicken. However, on the  
298   second day, beef consumption was significantly higher. The mean consumption for fish and  
299   chicken during dinner was 195 g and 269.2 g, respectively.

300 Detailed information on dairy product consumption is provided in the  
301 Supplementary Materials Table S5. In both summer and winter, the peak consumption of  
302 dairy products occurred between 0800 and 0859. The maximum, median, and minimum  
303 consumption levels for dairy products during breakfast were 350 g, 60 g, and 50 g or mL,  
304 respectively, in summer. In winter, the maximum and minimum consumption remained the  
305 same at 300 g or mL, while the median consumption on the second day (140 g or mL) was  
306 slightly higher than that of the first day (100 g or mL). Additionally, participants consumed  
307 slightly more dairy products on the first day during summer, whereas the trend was  
308 reversed in winter.

309 The meat consumption patterns observed in this study exhibit cultural influences,  
310 personal preferences, and seasonal variations. The preference for specific types of meat in  
311 each meal align with the findings of the impact of cultural values and beliefs on meat  
312 consumption (Hansen et al., 2021). For example, the consistent consumption of pork for  
313 breakfast reflects cultural norms, while the higher average consumption of chicken  
314 compared to beef may be influenced by perceptions of chicken as a lean and healthy choice  
315 (Wang et al., 2023). Additionally, seasonal availability and individual taste preferences  
316 contribute to variations in meat consumption. Ueland et al. (2022) found that individuals  
317 consume more poultry during winter months when other meat sources may be limited,  
318 supporting the higher chicken and beef consumption observed during winter lunches  
319 (Ueland, Rødbotten, & Varela, 2022). Spence et al. (2021) also emphasized the role of  
320 flavour preferences and seasonal associations, explaining the consistent patterns observed  
321 between summer and winter meat consumption (Spence, 2021).

322 These findings have implications for public health initiatives aiming to promote  
323 healthier and sustainable meat consumption. By considering cultural influences, nutritional

324 profiles, and seasonal variations, tailored interventions can be developed. Understanding  
325 the complex interplay between individual preferences, cultural norms, and health  
326 considerations is crucial. Further research should explore these factors in depth to develop  
327 evidence-based strategies. Overall, this study contributes to the growing body of knowledge  
328 on meat consumption patterns, informing efforts to promote balanced and sustainable  
329 dietary choices.

330


### 331 **3.3. Water consumption**

332 Water consumption, including water-based drinks such as water, coffee, and tea,  
333 exhibited similar patterns throughout both summer and winter periods (Table S6). In  
334 summer, the total cumulative daily water intake ranged from 4,398 to 4,899 mL. During the  
335 morning hours (07:00 to 11:59), approximately 28.8% and 28.3% of the total water  
336 consumption occurred. The period between lunch and dinner (12:00 to 17:59) accounted for  
337 approximately 38.5% and 37.6% of the total water intake, while the evening hours (18:00 to  
338 23:59) constituted 32.7% and 34.1% of the total intake. In winter, the total daily water  
339 intake ranged from 3,838 to 4,346 mL. Similar to summer, the morning hours accounted for  
340 approximately 30.7% and 29.5% of the total water consumption. The period between lunch  
341 and dinner represented approximately 40.9% and 40.0% of the total water intake, while the  
342 evening hours accounted for 28.4% and 30.5% of the total intake.

343



## Seasonal Water Intake Volume (mL) in Each Meal



344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

**Figure 2. The water intake volume (ml) in each meal at summer and winter. Each of the water intake time was followed by the highest meat consumption in each meal during the summer and winter. Red line represents the mean value of the water intake.**

Figure 2 presents the maximum, minimum, median, and mean hourly water consumption for each day. In summer, the mean water intake during breakfast, lunch, and dinner on the first day was 241.1 mL, 367.8 mL, and 268.0 mL, respectively. On the second day, the mean water intake slightly increased during dinner compared to the first day, with values of 252.2 mL, 305.7 mL, and 384.4 mL for breakfast, lunch, and dinner, respectively. In winter, the mean volume of water intake during each meal was generally higher than in summer. Specifically, the mean intake during breakfast, lunch, and dinner on the first day was 321.8 mL, 353.6 mL, and 339 mL, respectively. On the following day, the mean intake

357 for breakfast, lunch, and dinner was 315.4 mL, 453.0 mL, and 325.8 mL, respectively.  
358 Additional details regarding the maximum, minimum, and median consumption volumes  
359 can be found in the Supplementary Materials Table S6.

360 The analysis of water consumption patterns among university faculties revealed  
361 consistent trends in both summer and winter, indicating stable hydration practices  
362 regardless of the season (Foster et al., 2019; Nishi et al., 2023). These observations align  
363 with the findings of previous research on water consumption patterns (Guelinckx et al.,  
364 2015; Kenney, Long, Craddock, & Gortmaker, 2015). The consistent water intake during these  
365 specific time intervals suggests that individuals prioritize hydration during the morning and  
366 lunch hours, possibly to support gut digestion and overall well-being (Vanhaecke, Bretin,  
367 Poirel, & Tap, 2022). Adequate water intake during these periods can aid in diluting the  
368 concentrations of antibiotics ingested through food, thereby potentially reducing their  
369 impact on the gut microbiome (Conlon & Bird, 2014; Zhang, 2022).

370 In addition to the consistent trends in water consumption, the mean intake volumes  
371 during breakfast, lunch, and dinner varied between summer and winter. Higher mean intake  
372 volumes in winter may be attributed to the increased thermoregulatory demands during  
373 colder months, leading to higher fluid intake (Hosseinelou, Khamnei, & Zamanlu, 2013;  
374 Shirreffs, Watson, & Maughan, 2007). This observation is in line with studies that have  
375 shown increased water needs in response to environmental factors (Kavouras, 2019).  
376 Understanding these variations in water intake throughout the year can inform public  
377 health strategies aimed at promoting optimal hydration and managing antibiotic exposure in  
378 food-producing animals' products (Murray et al., 2017).

379

380 **3.4. Antibiotic detection and quantification from the meat samples**

381            Triplicates of 34 food and drink samples were tested to determine the presence of  
382            the target antibiotics. All foods mentioned in the survey responses from omnivorous and  
383            unknown dietary habit groups in the online survey were included. Most of the detections  
384            were over the LOD and LOQ with relatively high accuracy.

385 **Table 2. Theoretical maximum daily intake (TMDI), acceptable daily intake (ADI), and Maximum residual level (MRL) of the target antibiotics**  
 386 **from the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA), and limit of detection (LOD), limit of quantification (LOQ) and R<sup>2</sup>**  
 387 **values of calibration curves for each antibiotic.**

Antibiotics	TMDI (µg/person/day; JECFA)	ADI (µg/kg; JECFA)	MRL (µg/kg; JECFA)		LOD (µg/L)	LOQ (µg/L)	R <sup>2</sup>
			Beef, Chicken, Pork, and Fish	Dairy			
Amoxicillin	31.0	2.0	50.0	4.0	10.3	31.3	0.9995
Ampicillin	31.0	2.0	50.0	NA	11.0	33.4	0.9995
Oxytetracycline	370.0	30.0	200.0	100.0	8.50	25.8	0.9997
Tetracycline	370.0	30.0	200.0	NA	10.9	33.2	0.9995
Ciprofloxacin	NA	2.0	39.0	NA	8.93	27.1	0.9996
Enrofloxacin	NA	2.0	39.0	NA	11.7	35.5	0.9994
Sulfodiazine	87.5	50.0	100.0	NA	8.32	25.2	0.9997
Trimethoprim	NA	4.2	50.0	50.0	12.5	38.0	0.9993
Erythromycin	27500.0	700.0	100.0	NA	5.75	17.4	0.9999
Tylosin	230.0	30.0	100.0	NA	10.0	30.4	0.9996

388 Table 2 shows the MRL is the maximum amount of antibiotic residue that is expected  
389 to legally remain in food products. ADI is then calculated based on chronic intake of the MRL  
390 and a theoretical daily food basket (consisting of 300g meat, 1500mL milk, and 100g eggs).  
391 Lastly, TMDI is calculated based on the high quartile bounds of food intake, 65 to 80%, to  
392 stress worst-case scenario or conservative limits. Highly consumed antibiotics in table 2  
393 have been detected in all environmental samples including foods and drinking water over  
394 the world. The vast majority of those studies reported concentrations which were typically  
395 in the ng/L, ng/kg to  $\mu\text{g/L}$  or  $\mu\text{g/kg}$  range (Fick et al., 2009; Granados-Chinchilla & Rodríguez,  
396 2017; Jammoul & El Darra, 2019; Lucchetti et al., 2004; Patel et al., 2019; Qin et al., 2020; Xu  
397 et al., 2021). Although the WHO has limited the concentration of penicillin to be below 100  
398  $\mu\text{g/kg}$  in animal products, greater concentrations were detected in the foods and drinking  
399 water (Huang et al., 2020; Jammoul & El Darra, 2019; Okocha, Olatoye, & Adedeji, 2018;  
400 Patel et al., 2019; Sachi, Ferdous, Sikder, & Azizul Karim Hussani, 2019). The concentration  
401 of amoxicillin and ampicillin in milk were in the range of 28.4 to 96.8  $\mu\text{g/L}$  and in meat were  
402 58.2 to 157  $\mu\text{g/kg}$  (Jammoul & El Darra, 2019). Moreover, the concentration between 0 to  
403 17.8  $\mu\text{g/L}$  of amoxicillin and ampicillin were found in the drinking water (Patel et al., 2019).  
404 Tetracycline and oxytetracycline were detected between 57.0 to 137  $\mu\text{g/L}$  in milk  
405 and 82.0 to 691  $\mu\text{g/kg}$  in meat (Granados-Chinchilla & Rodríguez, 2017). In drinking water  
406 and tap water, 0.09 to 21.1  $\mu\text{g/L}$  of tetracycline and oxytetracycline were detected (Xu et al.,  
407 2021). Long-term consumption of a trace level of tetracyclines needed to be focused on due  
408 to its poor biodegradability which may accumulate in the body to make a reservoir of  
409 pathogens to have greater resistance. Samples of poultry meats in Europe demonstrated  
410 contamination of sulfadiazine and trimethoprim in ranges of 0.64 to 243  $\mu\text{g/kg}$  (Patel et al.,

411 2019). Furthermore, 0.20 to 15.2 µg/L of sulfonamides in drinking water were reported over  
412 the world (Qin et al., 2020).

413         There are no relevant erythromycin and tylosin antibiotic pollution in foods and  
414 drinking water data available on these molecules because the usage has been decreased  
415 significantly compared to the past decades. However, it has a huge potential to become a  
416 high-risk antibiotic as food consumption and production are projected to be increased  
417 significantly in South American, Asian, and African countries in the future (Tiseo, Huber,  
418 Gilbert, Robinson, & Van Boeckel, 2020). In addition, the FAO designated the concentration  
419 of ciprofloxacin and enrofloxacin limit to 2 µg/kg but edible trout still contained 170 to 1006  
420 µg/kg of enrofloxacin in European countries (Lucchetti et al., 2004). Concentration up to 6.5  
421 mg/L of ciprofloxacin was found in drinking water in India (Fick et al., 2009).

422 **Table 3. The detected antibiotics ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$  or  $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$ ) from meat samples including beef, chicken, pork, fish, and dairy products from different**  
 423 **supermarket chains in London. Non-detected products (organic salted butter, organic unsalted butter, medium cheddar, dairy spray cream,**  
 424 **Greek style yoghurt, sweetened probiotic milk, London tap water, and two different water brand) were not included.**

Type	Name	Concentration of antibiotics ( $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ or $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$ )									
		TET	OTC	TMP	SDZ	CIP	ENR	AMOX	AMP	TYL	ERY
Beef	Ribeye*	-	-	90.10	-	-	616.79	674.42	1186.64	-	-
Beef	Corned Beef	-	-	113.74	-	-	62.79	1940.68	271.47	-	-
Beef	Meatballs	-	-	173.55	-	-	2021.48	-	348.59	-	-
Beef	Sirloin*	-	-	88.90	-	-	675.16	646.48	659.73	-	-
Beef	Burger Patty*	-	-	220.99	-	-	1446.31	310.89	708.35	-	-
Beef	Rump*	-	-	111.15	-	-	451.82	775.70	988.77	-	-
Beef	Diced Beef*	-	-	78.57	-	-	300.86	484.49	537.97	-	-
Beef	Minced Beef*	-	-	264.87	-	-	170.3	1611.62	632.76	-	-
Chicken	Drumsticks*	-	116.00	111.32	654.02	-	-	1199.00	-	-	-
Chicken	Thighs*	-	-	197.79	1349.36	-	-	1535.16	-	-	-
Chicken	Whole Chicken	-	-	336.22	3743.12	151.38	-	-	-	-	-
Chicken	Organic Whole Chicken	-	-	114.12	986.95	56.78	-	1404.57	-	-	-
Chicken	Organic Drumsticks	-	96.27	96.87	856.55	-	-	1403.14	-	-	-
Chicken	Organic Thighs	-	-	55.23	1028.51	-	-	1140.38	-	-	-
Chicken	Chicken Wings	-	-	67.52	674.58	-	5976.17	589.5	-	-	-
Chicken	Free Range Eggs	-	-	-	-	-	-	715.58	-	-	-
Chicken	Organic Free-Range Eggs	-	-	-	-	-	-	818.88	-	-	-
Chicken	Organic Chicken Breast Fillets	-	-	75.71	20.00	-	-	233.03	-	-	-
Chicken	Chicken Breast Fillets*	171.55	-	214.79	53.19	321.31	-	1421.10	-	327.82	-

Type	Name	Concentration of antibiotics (µg/kg or µg/L)									
		TET	OTC	TMP	SDZ	CIP	ENR	AMOX	AMP	TYL	ERY
Dairy	Whole Milk	-	-	95.92	-	-	-	-	36.61	-	-
Dairy	Semi-skimmed Milk*	-	-	171.34	-	-	-	760.04	-	-	-
Dairy	Organic Semi-skimmed Milk	-	-	96.40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dairy	Skimmed Milk	-	-	288.82	-	-	-	481.62	-	-	-
Fish	Mackerel Fillets	391.00	374.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fish	Salmon Fillets	-	-	191.21	-	-	-	-	415.78	-	-
Fish	Tuna Chunks in Sunflower Oil	-	-	76.39	765.34	-	-	2968.48	-	-	-
Fish	Cod Fillets	648.25	1298.77	-	-	-	205.42	-	-	-	-
Fish	Haddock Fillets	279.27	220.61	-	-	-	538.61	-	-	-	-
Pork	Salami Slices*	-	-	81.25	-	425.09	4220.61	6866.87	-	-	-
Pork	Pork Sausages*	-	-	-	-	-	5497.34	216.67	-	-	-
Pork	Salty Canned Pork	-	-	184.56	77.91	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pork	Smoked Streaky Bacon Rashers	-	-	222.18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pork	Unsmoked Streaky Bacon Rashers	-	-	120.02	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pork	British Pork Ribs	-	-	170.53	34.80	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pork	British Pork Chops	-	-	461.68	116.19	-	-	1616.09	-	-	-
Pork	British Pork Belly Slices	-	-	107.55	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pork	British Pork Loin	-	-	185.42	1117.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pork	Smoked Back Bacon Rashers	-	-	123.07	-	-	61.68	-	-	-	-
Pork	Unsmoked Back Bacon Rashers	-	-	156.97	-	-	37.24	-	-	-	-
Pork	Ham Slices*	-	71.83	305.11	-	-	-	2387.85	-	-	-

\*Products that exceed ADI level of amoxicillin, ampicillin and enrofloxacin and selected for the EMI calculation based on the diet survey.



426 In table 3, the concentration of detected antibiotic residues in animal food product  
427 samples were calculated based on the survey and chemical analysis results. We have  
428 observed 9 of our target antibiotics except erythromycin in samples. Interestingly,  
429 processed products such as salami, tuna chunks, ham, meatballs, and sausages exceeded  
430 concentration of antibiotics compared to the MRLs. The most exceeded concentration in  
431 meat was ENR in sausages (5497.3 µg/kg) which was 141.0 times greater than the MRL (39.0  
432 µg/kg). In addition, the concentration of AMOX in skimmed milk (1481.6 µg/kg) exceeded  
433 the MRL by 370.4 times (4 µg/kg). No antibiotics were detected in water samples.

434

#### 435 **3.4.1. Beef and dairy products**

436 In beef, 8 different products were analysed including ribeye, sirloin, rump, diced  
437 beef, minced beef, corned beef, burger patty, and meatballs. AMOX, AMP, ENR, and TMP  
438 were commonly detected from all beef products, while AMOX was not detected in  
439 meatballs. All the detected concentrations were greater than MRLs. Ten different dairy  
440 products were tested but there were no target antibiotics detected in 6 of the products  
441 including organic salted butter, organic unsalted butter, medium cheddar, dairy spray  
442 cream, Greek-style yoghurt, and sweetened yoghurt drink. However, β-lactams and TMP  
443 were commonly found in the remaining 4 products (Whole milk, semi-skimmed milk, organic  
444 semi-skimmed milk, and skimmed milk). AMP in whole milk was detected below the MRL,  
445 but concentrations of AMOX 29.6 times higher than the MRL were detected in skimmed  
446 milk.

447 Cattle are routinely given antibiotics to treat and prevent mastitis which is an  
448 infection of the udder and very common (Smith et al., 1998). It can be subclinical, where  
449 they show no obvious symptoms, or clinal which causes painful swellings in one or more

450 quarters of the udder. Mastitis is commonly treated with antibiotics administered as an  
451 intramammary directly into the cow's teat (Holman, Yang, & Alexander, 2019). There are  
452 various types of mastitis-causing organisms including staphylococci. Antibiotics used to treat  
453 *Staphylococcus aureus* mastitis including, AMOX, AMP, ERY, TYL, ENR, and TMP, which it  
454 makes highly probable with our antibiotic detection from beef and dairy products (Rayner &  
455 Munckhof, 2005) (Table 3). Furthermore, mastitis infection can be monitored in herds  
456 through cell counts in milk and farmers are financially penalised by dairy companies for high  
457 cell counts (EU, 2017). Milk from infected cows must be withheld from sale for the required  
458 withdrawal periods. However, the fermented or intensively processed products such as  
459 yoghurt, cheese, cream, and butter were prevented to use antibiotics and put extra-care  
460 with the antibiotic detections for the higher rate of fermentation or cost-effectiveness  
461 (Erdogan, Gurses, Turkoglu, & Sert, 2001). It explains why the milk had antibiotic residues  
462 while no detections from fermenting-based products.

463

#### 464 **3.4.2. Chicken**

465 In chicken, 11 different products consisting of 5 organic products and 6 conventional  
466 products were tested. In general, AMOX, SDZ, and TMP were detected from the products.  
467 All OTC and TET detections were lower than MRLs. CIP concentrations from the chicken  
468 breast were also lower than the MRL. ENR in BBQ chicken wings (5492.3 µg/kg) was the  
469 highest concentration detected from all samples and it exceeded MRL by 153.2 times.  
470 Interestingly, 4 out of 5 organic products (drumstick, chicken breast, eggs, and whole  
471 chicken) had higher concentrations of antibiotics compared to the same types of  
472 conventional products. The organic drumstick, chicken breast, and egg had 17.0, 509.9, and  
473 14.4% higher concentration of AMOX compared to the conventional products, respectively.

474 Also, 31.0% higher concentration of SDZ was detected in organic drumstick. 1404.6 µg/kg of  
475 AMOX was detected at organic whole chicken while AMOX was not detected in the  
476 conventional product.

477 The poultry industry is split into two parts: the broiler industry, which produces birds  
478 slaughtered at 6 to 7 weeks old for the table, and the egg-producing sector where layers are  
479 reared and placed in battery cages at 16 to 18 weeks for one egg laying cycle and then  
480 killed. Treatment is required for any outbreak of necrotic enteritis, *Colispticaemia*  
481 *salmonellosis* causing mortality, outbreak of mycoplasma infection or outbreak of necrotic  
482 dermatitis (*Staphylococcus aureus*) (Christian, Vivian Etsiapa, Crystal Ngofi, & Frank Boateng,  
483 2018). The antibiotics used for salmonella and *E. coli* may include ENR and AMOX, which are  
484 reflecting to our results in table 3. We can assume that CIP is metabolized from ENR, and it  
485 is important to regulate the intensive usage of ENR because of the incidence of isolates of  
486 multi drug-resistant *Salmonella typhimurium DT104* from humans which are resistant to CIP  
487 (Weill et al., 2006).

488

### 489 **3.4.3. Pork**

490 We had the highest variety of food products from pork, 12, and all the products  
491 contained TMP except sausages. Although TMP was the most frequently detected, lipophilic  
492 antibiotics such as AMOX and ENR were detected at concentrations exceeding MRL. For  
493 instance, 137.3 and 108.2 times higher AMOX and ENR than its MRLs were measured in  
494 salami, and 141.0 times higher concentration of ENR was detected in sausage. The  
495 concentration of OTC in ham, ENR in unsmoked back bacon, SDZ in ribs and Salty Canned  
496 Pork were lower than respective MRLs.

497 Swine is reared indoors receive intensive antibiotic treatment throughout their life  
498 until slaughter, usually at under 6 months old. Most conventional herds are watered or fed  
499 with the growth promoters during the early stages of growth. It is true that we did not  
500 detect any of growth promoters from pork products (Table 3), but there are various growth  
501 promoter antibiotics used in pig farming that are more cost-effective compared to our  
502 macrolides. For instance, avilamycin, carbadox, flavomycin, olaquinox, spiramycin, and  
503 salinomycin (Lekagul, Tangcharoensathien, & Yeung, 2019). Our detection could be  
504 explained with the most conventional herds which their antibiotic treatment starts soon  
505 after birth. Piglets are typically treated with AMP, ENR, TMP and SDZ for *E. coli* enteritis and  
506 for respiratory disease (Rhouma, Fairbrother, Beaudry, & Letellier, 2017) and slaughtered  
507 after 6 months.

508

#### 509 **3.4.4. Fish**

510 Five different farmed and wild fish products were tested and OTC, TET and ENR were  
511 commonly detected from wild fish including mackerel, cod, and haddocks, while  $\beta$ -lactam  
512 and sulfonamides were measured in farmed fish such as salmon and tuna. All the measured  
513 concentrations were above the MRLs. ENR was measured at 13.8 times higher than the MRL  
514 from haddock fillets, and AMOX was detected at a concentration 59.4 times higher  
515 compared to its MRL.

516 Fish farming products are still contaminated with antibiotics with relatively high  
517 concentrations, though the official usage of antibiotics has been significantly reduced from  
518 the past due to increased regulation, vaccination, and the segregation of farmed fish by age  
519 (Ma, Bruce, Jones, & Cain, 2019). Recent studies have raised concerns that antibiotics enter  
520 fish farms not only direct medication, but also feeding with chicken faeces which treated

521 with intensive treatments (Elsaidy, Abouelenien, & Kirrella, 2015; Ke et al., 2020). In table 3,  
522 it is not unreasonable to postulate that AMOX, SDZ, and TMP concentrations from chicken  
523 were similar to the farmed fishes such as salmon and tuna. Moreover, a large number of  
524 feed pellets were found in the gut contents of wild fishes such as mackerel, cod, and  
525 haddocks near a fish farm in Scotland (Black, Hansen, & Holmer, 2008). Furthermore, wild  
526 fishes are more vulnerable to antibiotic aquatic pollution which is rarely taken into  
527 consideration (Naylor et al., 2021). It is worth noting that most of the antibiotics used are  
528 persistent in the environment and spread from the farms to surrounding areas where  
529 accumulation in sediments may occur (Devarajan et al., 2015). Residues of antibiotic  
530 concentrations may far exceed levels accepted for human consumption (Black et al., 2008).  
531 In addition, fishes were also treated with antibiotics after being caught from the ocean to  
532 avoid the pathogenic penalties of regulation (Booth, Aga, & Wester, 2020).

533

### 534 **3.5. The elimination of antibiotics during cooking processes**

535 The application of veterinary antibiotics to food-producing animals has led to  
536 residues occurring in the food products such as beef, chicken, pork, and dairy products  
537 which increases the risks to human health. In addition, the removal of antibiotics in drinking  
538 water is highly variable depending on treatment technologies, including activated carbon  
539 adsorption, ozonation, membrane filtration, and advanced oxidation process (AOPs)  
540 (Reungoat, Escher, Macova, & Keller, 2011). According to Liu et al. (2015), removal of  
541 antibiotics was effective using a combination of activated carbon adsorption and ozonation  
542 in water treatment process (Liu et al., 2016). Sand biofiltration is expected to be widely  
543 demanding technology because of the low cost of sand (Paredes, Fernandez-Fontaina,  
544 Lema, Omil, & Carballa, 2016). AOPs such as Fenton oxidation and photocatalytic oxidation,

545 demonstrated high efficiencies of antibiotic removal (>90%), however, formation of various  
546 by- products of antibiotic are the main concern of AOPs (Luo et al., 2014). Properties of  
547 antibiotics including pharmacokinetic characteristics, physicochemical or biological  
548 processes, and improper usages are considered as factors influencing the occurrence of  
549 antibiotic residues in foods and drinking water (Manyi-Loh et al., 2018).

550 Most hygiene guidance states that foods should be kept above boiling point for  
551 enough time to kill the harmful pathogens (US Government, 2023). Although the majority of  
552 pathogens are killed in the cooking process, studies have found that the concentration of  
553 antibiotic residues in foods was not significantly degraded after cooking at a temperature  
554 above 100°C for more than 30 mins (Shaltout, 2019). Different cooking practices, including  
555 boiling, frying, and grilling, at different periods of cooking time were examined to  
556 understand antibiotic concentration reduction in foods (Abou-Raya, Shalaby, Salama, &  
557 Mehaya, 2013; Moats, 1999; Shalaby, Salama, Abou-Raya, Emam, & Mehaya, 2011). Firstly,  
558 tetracyclines, including oxytetracycline, tetracycline, chlortetracycline, and doxycycline,  
559 were tested to determine the reduction of antibiotic concentrations with different cooking  
560 procedures (boiling, microwave, and roasting) at different time ranges (0, 10, 15, 20, 30, 40,  
561 60, and 80 minutes (Abou-Raya et al., 2013). A significant reduction of chlortetracycline and  
562 doxycycline concentration was observed with all cooking procedures from 30 mins above.  
563 However, oxytetracycline and tetracycline were not reduced by more than 50% at the  
564 maximum exposure time, 80 mins. In addition, the concentration of chlortetracycline and  
565 oxytetracycline reduced by 27.6% and 35.6% after boiling milk for 30 mins, respectively  
566 (Moats, 1999). Also, 11.1% of antibiotics were inactivated by heating for 30 mins in  
567 water(Moats, 1999).

568 Furthermore, degrading antibiotics, including ciprofloxacin, tylosin, oxytetracycline,  
569 sulfonamides, in beef, chicken, and rabbit meat samples were ineffective to reduce the  
570 concentration in the meat samples by boiling and roasting processes (Fahim, Shaltout, & El  
571 shatter, 2019; Salama, Abou-Raya, Shalaby, Emam, & Mehaya, 2011). For instance,  
572 ciprofloxacin was reduced by 17.0% and 22.4% after roasting and boiling chicken muscle for  
573 30 mins, respectively (Fahim et al., 2019). Furusawa and Hanabusa (2002) have tested the  
574 degradation effect of boiling, roasting and microwaving to sulfonamides in chicken muscle  
575 (Furusawa & Hanabusa, 2002). Sulfadiazine was appeared to be stable in boiling, roasting  
576 and microwaving methods with showing 32.3% reduction at maximum compared to other  
577 sulfonamides, including sulfamethoxazole, sulfamonomethoxine, and sulfaquinoxaline  
578 (45.0-61.0%). In addition, degradation of tylosin in chicken meatball under microwaving had  
579 a least reduction (2.8%) compared to the other antibiotics while the microwaving was  
580 showing a strong antibiotic reduction (Salaramoli, Heshmati, Kamkar, & Hassan, 2015).  
581 Interestingly, the concentration of enrofloxacin in raw meat samples were increased by  
582 44.0-310% during grilling and roasting due to the loss of moisture content in the samples  
583 (Sobral, Cunha, Faria, & Ferreira, 2018).

584

### 585 **3.6. Estimated Meal Intake (EMI) of antibiotics from each meal**

586 The estimation of antibiotic residues consumed via each meal provides valuable  
587 insights into the potential exposure of individuals to these antimicrobial agents. In this  
588 study, the estimated daily intake formula modified from the US FDA was utilized to calculate  
589 the antibiotic intake from each meal. The formula took into account factors such as portion  
590 size, concentration of antibiotics in the consumed foods, and the frequency of consumption.  
591 Moreover, the total volume of the gut juice in stomach and duodenum was set to 60 mL

592 based on the monitoring human digestive system using a magnetic resonance imaging  
593 quantification (Murray et al., 2017). By applying these parameters, the study aimed to  
594 estimate the antibiotics that individuals may be exposed to during specific meals.

595

596 **Table 4. The average of estimated antibiotic intake per meal (mg/L) during the**  
597 **summer and winter using EMI equation based on the survey results.**

Day	Meals	Estimated Antibiotics (mg/L)		
		Amoxicillin	Ampicillin	Enrofloxacin
1st	Breakfast	141.3	-	64.2
	Lunch	399.4	-	-
	Dinner	<ADI <sup>a</sup>	<ADI	-
2nd	Breakfast	132.5	<ADI	80.3
	Lunch	170.7	193.5	194.4
	Dinner	408.1	-	-

598 <sup>a</sup> Acceptable Daily Intake

599

600 The results showed varying levels of estimated antibiotic residues in different meals.  
601 In table 4, during the first day, the estimated antibiotic intake from breakfast included 141.3  
602 mg/L of amoxicillin and 64.2 mg/L of enrofloxacin, while lunch had an estimated intake of  
603 399.4 mg/L of amoxicillin. Notably, dinner on the first day was estimated to be below the  
604 acceptable daily intake (ADI) concentration for all antibiotics analysed. Similarly, the  
605 estimated antibiotic residues from each meal on the second day showed variations, with  
606 breakfast, lunch, and dinner containing different antibiotic concentrations.

607 It is essential to consider the potential health implications of consuming estimated  
608 antibiotic residues through meals. Antibiotic residues in food can contribute to the  
609 development and spread of antibiotic resistance, posing a significant public health concern.  
610 The ingestion of antibiotic residues can impact the gut microbiota, potentially disrupting its



611 balance and affecting overall gut health. Furthermore, exposure to subtherapeutic levels of  
612 antibiotics through food consumption may contribute to the selection and proliferation of  
613 antibiotic-resistant bacteria in the gut.

614         Recent research has highlighted the importance of monitoring and minimizing  
615 antibiotic residues in food. A study by Arsène et al. (2022) investigated the presence of  
616 antibiotic residues in animal-derived food products and assessed their potential impact on  
617 human health (Arsène et al., 2022). The findings underscored the need for strict monitoring  
618 and regulation of antibiotic residues in food to mitigate the risks associated with antibiotic  
619 resistance development.

620         The estimation of antibiotic residues consumed via each meal provides valuable  
621 information on the potential exposure of individuals to these antimicrobial agents. The  
622 results of this study demonstrate variations in estimated antibiotic residues in different  
623 meals, emphasizing the importance of monitoring and minimizing antibiotic residues in food  
624 to mitigate the risks associated with antibiotic resistance. Further research is warranted to  
625 evaluate the long-term effects of consuming estimated antibiotic residues and develop  
626 strategies to ensure food safety and preserve the effectiveness of antibiotics in the  
627 treatment of bacterial infections.

628         Investigating the luminal concentration of prescribed pharmaceuticals, particularly  
629 antibiotics, within the human digestive system presents unique challenges due to the  
630 complex dynamics of gastrointestinal environments. Previous research attempted to  
631 estimate luminal prescribed pharmaceutical concentrations by considering gut  
632 environmental conditions and geomatic assumptions (Korsten, Smits, Garssen, & Vromans,  
633 2019; Thursby & Juge, 2017). Notably, the uneven distribution of prescribed antibiotics  
634 within chyme or bolus formations in the small intestine leads to variations in antibiotic

635 concentrations in different pockets (Korsten et al., 2019). Even when assuming an even  
636 distribution throughout the bolus, luminal antibiotic concentrations calculated based on  
637 minimum prescription dosages still surpass the estimated concentrations presented in Table  
638 4. For instance, the minimum prescription dose of amoxicillin in the UK's NHS is 250 mg,  
639 which, when divided by the volume of a meal, yields concentrations around four times  
640 greater than our estimated maximum luminal antibiotic concentration. Similar calculations  
641 for ampicillin and enrofloxacin also demonstrate notable discrepancies between prescribed  
642 dosages and estimated luminal concentrations.

643 *Lactobacillus sp.*, *Escherichia coli* and *Enterococcus spp.* are the most predominant  
644 species in human duodenum (Angelakis et al., 2015). Considering the human gut  
645 microbiota's susceptibility to antibiotics, it is noteworthy that different bacterial species  
646 exhibit varying MICs. According to the EUCAST MIC dataset, *Lactobacillus sp.* displayed MIC  
647 levels of up to 32 mg/L for ampicillin. *E. coli* exhibited the highest MIC levels for amoxicillin  
648 and ampicillin, reaching up to 512 mg/L, and 8 mg/L for enrofloxacin. Meanwhile,  
649 *Enterococcus spp.* reported MIC levels of up to 256 mg/L for amoxicillin and ampicillin.  
650 Although enrofloxacin MIC data for *Enterococcus spp.* is unavailable, ciprofloxacin, the main  
651 metabolite of enrofloxacin, showed a maximum MIC level of 512 mg/L. In addition to MIC  
652 levels, the duration of antibiotic exposure is also critical. For example, to eradicate *E. coli*,  
653 one to three hours of antibiotic exposure is typically required, whereas the bacteria  
654 reproduce approximately every 20 mins (Korsten et al., 2019). With a duodenal transition  
655 time of around 18 mins, which is a third of the minimum time required to eliminate *E. coli*, it  
656 is likely that these bacteria would survive chronic exposure to sub-therapeutic antibiotic  
657 levels.

658           While the estimated luminal antibiotic exposure from dietary sources in our study  
659    may not reach levels sufficient to eradicate gut microbiota, understanding the potential  
660    consequences of chronic luminal exposure is crucial to assessing risks associated with  
661    antimicrobial resistance development. Future investigations should delve into the intricate  
662    interplay between chronic luminal antibiotic exposure and gut microbial communities to  
663    provide comprehensive insights into the possible implications on antimicrobial resistance  
664    development and overall gut health.

665

## 666    **Conclusions**

667           In conclusion, this study underscores the potential risks of dietary antibiotic  
668    exposure, even at sub-therapeutic levels, in contributing to the development of antibiotic  
669    resistance. The comparison of estimated luminal antibiotic concentrations from meals with  
670    prescribed dosages highlights substantial differences, raising concerns about the efficacy of  
671    dietary antibiotics. Additionally, the analysis of minimum inhibition concentrations for key  
672    gut bacteria emphasizes the complexity of microbial responses. Although dietary exposure  
673    may not achieve eradication levels, the chronic exposure to sub-therapeutic concentrations  
674    could foster antimicrobial resistance. This underscores the urgency for stringent regulation  
675    of antibiotic residues in food and a deeper investigation into the long-term impacts of  
676    chronic luminal antibiotic exposure on gut microbiota and antimicrobial resistance  
677    development.

678

## 679    **Acknowledgements**

680    We thank to the survey respondents who voluntarily participated in this study for providing  
681    valuable data during the pandemic.

682

683 **Declaration of interests**

684 There are no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have  
685 appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

686

687 **Author Contributions**

688 **Jegak Seo:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation,  
689 Writing- Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization, Project administration,  
690 Funding acquisition; **Frank Kloprogge:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - Review &  
691 Editing, Supervision, Project administration; **Andrew M. Smith:** Methodology, Validation,  
692 Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision; **Kersti Karu:** Methodology, Validation, Formal  
693 analysis, Investigation, Resources, Writing - Review & Editing; **Lena Ciric:** Conceptualization,  
694 Methodology, Validation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Resources, Writing - Review &  
695 Editing, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition

696

697 **Reference**

- 698 Abou-Raya, S., Shalaby, A. R., Salama, N., & Mehaya, F. (2013). Effect of Ordinary Cooking  
699 Procedures on Tetracycline Residues in Chicken Meat. *Journal of Food and Drug*  
700 *Analysis, 21*, 80-86.
- 701 Ali Mirza, S., Afzaal, M., Begum, S., Arooj, T., Almas, M., Ahmed, S., & Younus, M. (2020).  
702 Chapter 11 - Uptake mechanism of antibiotics in plants. In M. Z. Hashmi (Ed.),  
703 *Antibiotics and Antimicrobial Resistance Genes in the Environment* (Vol. 1, pp. 183-  
704 188): Elsevier.
- 705 Andrew Bamidele, F., & Oluwakamisi Festus, A. (2019). Veterinary Drug Residues in Meat  
706 and Meat Products: Occurrence, Detection and Implications. In B. Samuel Oppong, S.  
707 Mani, A. Reimmel Kwame & P. K. Ramkumar (Eds.), *Veterinary Medicine and*  
708 *Pharmaceuticals* (pp. Ch. 5). Rijeka: IntechOpen.
- 709 Angelakis, E., Armougom, F., Carrière, F., Bachar, D., Laugier, R., Lagier, J.-C., Robert, C.,  
710 Michelle, C., Henrissat, B., & Raoult, D. (2015). A Metagenomic Investigation of the  
711 Duodenal Microbiota Reveals Links with Obesity. *PLOS ONE, 10* (9), e0137784.
- 712 Arsène, M. M. J., Davares, A. K. L., Viktorovna, P. I., Andreevna, S. L., Sarra, S., Khelifi, I., &  
713 Sergueïevna, D. M. (2022). The public health issue of antibiotic residues in food and  
714 feed: Causes, consequences, and potential solutions. *Vet World, 15* (3), 662-671.
- 715 Ayukekbong, J. A., Ntemgwa, M., & Atabe, A. N. (2017). The threat of antimicrobial  
716 resistance in developing countries: causes and control strategies. *Antimicrobial*  
717 *Resistance & Infection Control, 6* (1), 47.
- 718 Black, K. D., Hansen, P. K., & Holmer, M. (2008). Salmon Aquaculture Dialogue: Working  
719 Group Report on Benthic Impacts and Farm Siting. In (pp. 54): Scottish Association

- 720 for Marine Science, Oban, Scotland, Institute for Marine Science, Bergen, Norway,  
721 University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark.
- 722 Booth, A., Aga, D. S., & Wester, A. L. (2020). Retrospective analysis of the global antibiotic  
723 residues that exceed the predicted no effect concentration for antimicrobial  
724 resistance in various environmental matrices. *Environment International*, *141*,  
725 105796.
- 726 Christian, A., Vivian Etsiapa, B., Crystal Ngofi, Z., & Frank Boateng, O. (2018). Antibiotic Use  
727 in Poultry Production and Its Effects on Bacterial Resistance. In K. Yashwant (Ed.),  
728 *Antimicrobial Resistance* (pp. Ch. 3). Rijeka: IntechOpen.
- 729 Conlon, M. A., & Bird, A. R. (2014). The impact of diet and lifestyle on gut microbiota and  
730 human health. *Nutrients*, *7* (1), 17-44.
- 731 Devarajan, N., Laffite, A., Graham, N. D., Meijer, M., Prabakar, K., Mubedi, J. I., Elongo, V.,  
732 Mpiana, P. T., Ibelings, B. W., Wildi, W., & Poté, J. (2015). Accumulation of clinically  
733 relevant antibiotic-resistance genes, bacterial load, and metals in freshwater lake  
734 sediments in Central Europe. *Environ Sci Technol*, *49* (11), 6528-6537.
- 735 Economou, V., & Gousia, P. (2015). Agriculture and food animals as a source of  
736 antimicrobial-resistant bacteria. *Infect Drug Resist*, *8*, 49-61.
- 737 Elsaidy, N., Abouelenien, F., & Kirrella, G. A. K. (2015). Impact of using raw or fermented  
738 manure as fish feed on microbial quality of water and fish. *The Egyptian Journal of*  
739 *Aquatic Research*, *41* (1), 93-100.
- 740 Erdogan, A., Gurses, M., Turkoglu, H., & Sert, S. (2001). Fixing the time of the milk ripening  
741 depending on the content of immobilized johourt ferment. *Pakistan Journal of*  
742 *Biological Sciences*, *4* (7), 886-887.

- 743 EU. (2017). Health and Food Audits and Analysis Programme 2017. In (pp. 57). Luxemburg:  
744 European Commission.
- 745 Fahim, H., Shaltout, F., & El shatter, M. A. (2019). Evaluate antibiotic residues in beef and  
746 effect of cooking and freezing on it. *Benha Veterinary Medical Journal*.
- 747 FAO. (2016). *Drivers, dynamics and epidemiology of antimicrobial resistance in animal*  
748 *production*. Rome.
- 749 FAO. (2018). *Dietary Assessment: A resource guide to method selection and application in*  
750 *low resource settings*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United  
751 Nations.
- 752 FDA, U. (2018). Guidance for Industry: Estimating Dietary Intake of Substances in Food. In U.  
753 FDA (Ed.).
- 754 Fick, J., Söderström, H., Lindberg, R. H., Phan, C., Tysklind, M., & Larsson, D. G. (2009).  
755 Contamination of surface, ground, and drinking water from pharmaceutical  
756 production. *Environ Toxicol Chem*, 28 (12), 2522-2527.
- 757 Foster, E., Lee, C., Imamura, F., Hollidge, S. E., Westgate, K. L., Venables, M. C., Poliakov, I.,  
758 Rowland, M. K., Osadchiy, T., Bradley, J. C., Simpson, E. L., Adamson, A. J., Olivier, P.,  
759 Wareham, N., Forouhi, N. G., & Brage, S. (2019). Validity and reliability of an online  
760 self-report 24-h dietary recall method (Intake24): a doubly labelled water study and  
761 repeated-measures analysis. *J Nutr Sci*, 8, e29.
- 762 Furusawa, N., & Hanabusa, R. (2002). Cooking effects on sulfonamide residues in chicken  
763 thigh muscle. *Food Research International*, 35, 37-42.
- 764 Gaal, S., Kerr, M. A., Ward, M., McNulty, H., & Livingstone, M. B. E. (2018). Breakfast  
765 Consumption in the UK: Patterns, Nutrient Intake and Diet Quality. A Study from the  
766 International Breakfast Research Initiative Group. *Nutrients*, 10 (8).

- 767 Government, U. (2021). National Diet and Nutrition Survey: Diet, nutrition and physical  
768 activity in 2020: A follow up study during COVID-19. In P. H. England & F. S. Agency  
769 (Eds.), (pp. 54).
- 770 Government, U. (2023). Cook to a Safe Minimum Internal Temperature. In F. Safety (Ed.).
- 771 Granados-Chinchilla, F., & Rodríguez, C. (2017). Tetracyclines in Food and Feedingstuffs:  
772 From Regulation to Analytical Methods, Bacterial Resistance, and Environmental and  
773 Health Implications. *J Anal Methods Chem*, 2017, 1315497.
- 774 Guelinckx, I., Iglesia, I., Bottin, J. H., De Miguel-Etayo, P., González-Gil, E. M., Salas-Salvadó,  
775 J., Kavouras, S. A., Gandy, J., Martinez, H., Bardosono, S., Abdollahi, M., Nasser, E.,  
776 Jarosz, A., Ma, G., Carmuega, E., Thiébaud, I., & Moreno, L. A. (2015). Intake of water  
777 and beverages of children and adolescents in 13 countries. *Eur J Nutr*, 54 Suppl 2  
778 (Suppl 2), 69-79.
- 779 Hansen, J., Sparleanu, C., Liang, Y., Büchi, J., Bansal, S., Caro, M. Á., & Staedtler, F. (2021).  
780 Exploring cultural concepts of meat and future predictions on the timeline of  
781 cultured meat. *Future Foods*, 4, 100041.
- 782 Holman, D. B., Yang, W., & Alexander, T. W. (2019). Antibiotic treatment in feedlot cattle: a  
783 longitudinal study of the effect of oxytetracycline and tulathromycin on the fecal and  
784 nasopharyngeal microbiota. *Microbiome*, 7 (1), 86.
- 785 Hosseinlou, A., Khamnei, S., & Zamanlu, M. (2013). The effect of water temperature and  
786 voluntary drinking on the post rehydration sweating. *Int J Clin Exp Med*, 6 (8), 683-  
787 687.
- 788 Huang, L., Mo, Y., Wu, Z., Rad, S., Song, X., Zeng, H., Bashir, S., Kang, B., & Chen, Z. (2020).  
789 Occurrence, distribution, and health risk assessment of quinolone antibiotics in



- 790 water, sediment, and fish species of Qingshitan reservoir, South China. *Scientific*  
791 *Reports*, 10 (1), 15777.
- 792 Jammoul, A., & El Darra, N. (2019). Evaluation of Antibiotics Residues in Chicken Meat  
793 Samples in Lebanon. *Antibiotics (Basel)*, 8 (2).
- 794 Kavouras, S. A. (2019). Hydration, dehydration, underhydration, optimal hydration: are we  
795 barking up the wrong tree? *Eur J Nutr*, 58 (2), 471-473.
- 796 Ke, F., Gao, Y., Liu, L., Zhang, C., Wang, Q., & Gao, X. (2020). Comparative analysis of the gut  
797 microbiota of grass carp fed with chicken faeces. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int*, 27 (26),  
798 32888-32898.
- 799 Kenney, E. L., Long, M. W., Cradock, A. L., & Gortmaker, S. L. (2015). Prevalence of  
800 Inadequate Hydration Among US Children and Disparities by Gender and  
801 Race/Ethnicity: National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2009-2012. *Am J*  
802 *Public Health*, 105 (8), e113-118.
- 803 Klein, E. Y., Van Boeckel, T. P., Martinez, E. M., Pant, S., Gandra, S., Levin, S. A., Goossens, H.,  
804 & Laxminarayan, R. (2018). Global increase and geographic convergence in antibiotic  
805 consumption between 2000 and 2015. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
806 *Sciences*, 115 (15), E3463-E3470.
- 807 Korsten, S. G. P. J., Smits, E. A. W., Garssen, J., & Vromans, H. (2019). Modeling of the  
808 luminal butyrate concentration to design an oral formulation capable of achieving a  
809 pharmaceutical response. *PharmaNutrition*, 10, 100166.
- 810 Kraemer, S. A., Ramachandran, A., & Perron, G. G. (2019). Antibiotic Pollution in the  
811 Environment: From Microbial Ecology to Public Policy. *Microorganisms*, 7 (6).
- 812 Lekagul, A., Tangcharoensathien, V., & Yeung, S. (2019). Patterns of antibiotic use in global  
813 pig production: A systematic review. *Veterinary and Animal Science*, 7, 100058.

- 814 Liu, J., Sun, Q., Zhang, C., Li, H. a., Song, W., Zhang, N. i., & Jia, X. (2016). Removal of typical  
815 antibiotics in the advanced treatment process of productive drinking water.  
816 *Desalination and Water Treatment*, 57 (24), 11386-11391.
- 817 Llor, C., & Bjerrum, L. (2014). Antimicrobial resistance: risk associated with antibiotic  
818 overuse and initiatives to reduce the problem. *Ther Adv Drug Saf*, 5 (6), 229-241.
- 819 Lucchetti, D., Fabrizi, L., Guandalini, E., Podestà, E., Marvasi, L., Zaghini, A., & Coni, E. (2004).  
820 Long depletion time of enrofloxacin in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*).  
821 *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*, 48 (10), 3912-3917.
- 822 Luo, Y., Guo, W., Ngo, H. H., Nghiem, L. D., Hai, F. I., Zhang, J., Liang, S., & Wang, X. C. (2014).  
823 A review on the occurrence of micropollutants in the aquatic environment and their  
824 fate and removal during wastewater treatment. *Science of The Total Environment*,  
825 473-474, 619-641.
- 826 Ma, J., Bruce, T. J., Jones, E. M., & Cain, K. D. (2019). A Review of Fish Vaccine Development  
827 Strategies: Conventional Methods and Modern Biotechnological Approaches.  
828 *Microorganisms*, 7 (11).
- 829 Manyi-Loh, C., Mamphweli, S., Meyer, E., & Okoh, A. (2018). Antibiotic Use in Agriculture  
830 and Its Consequential Resistance in Environmental Sources: Potential Public Health  
831 Implications. *Molecules*, 23 (4).
- 832 Moats, W. A. (1999). The effect of processing on veterinary residues in foods. *Adv Exp Med*  
833 *Biol*, 459, 233-241.
- 834 Morehead, M. S., & Scarbrough, C. (2018). Emergence of Global Antibiotic Resistance. *Prim*  
835 *Care*, 45 (3), 467-484.
- 836 Murray, K., Hoad, C. L., Mudie, D. M., Wright, J., Heissam, K., Abrehart, N., Pritchard, S. E., Al  
837 Atwah, S., Gowland, P. A., Garnett, M. C., Amidon, G. E., Spiller, R. C., Amidon, G. L.,

838 & Marciani, L. (2017). Magnetic Resonance Imaging Quantification of Fasted State  
839 Colonic Liquid Pockets in Healthy Humans. *Molecular Pharmaceutics*, 14 (8), 2629-  
840 2638.

841 Naylor, R. L., Hardy, R. W., Buschmann, A. H., Bush, S. R., Cao, L., Klinger, D. H., Little, D. C.,  
842 Lubchenco, J., Shumway, S. E., & Troell, M. (2021). A 20-year retrospective review of  
843 global aquaculture. *Nature*, 591 (7851), 551-563.

844 Nishi, S. K., Babio, N., Paz-Graniel, I., Serra-Majem, L., Vioque, J., Fitó, M., Corella, D., Pintó,  
845 X., Bueno-Cavanillas, A., Tur, J. A., Díez-Ricote, L., Martínez, J. A., Gómez-Martínez,  
846 C., González-Botella, A., Castañer, O., Álvarez-Sala, A., Montesdeoca-Mendoza, C.,  
847 Fanlo-Maresma, M., Cano-Ibáñez, N., Bouzas, C., Daimiel, L., Zulet, M. Á.,  
848 Sievenpiper, J. L., Rodríguez, K. L., Vázquez-Ruiz, Z., & Salas-Salvadó, J. (2023). Water  
849 intake, hydration status and 2-year changes in cognitive performance: a prospective  
850 cohort study. *BMC Medicine*, 21 (1), 82.

851 O'Neill, J. (2016). *Tackling drug-resistant infections globally: final report and*  
852 *recommendations*: Government of the United Kingdom.

853 Okocha, R. C., Olatoye, I. O., & Adedeji, O. B. (2018). Food safety impacts of antimicrobial  
854 use and their residues in aquaculture. *Public Health Reviews*, 39 (1), 21.

855 Paredes, L., Fernandez-Fontaina, E., Lema, J. M., Omil, F., & Carballa, M. (2016).  
856 Understanding the fate of organic micropollutants in sand and granular activated  
857 carbon biofiltration systems. *Sci Total Environ*, 551-552, 640-648.

858 Patel, M., Kumar, R., Kishor, K., Mlsna, T., Pittman, C. U., Jr., & Mohan, D. (2019).  
859 Pharmaceuticals of Emerging Concern in Aquatic Systems: Chemistry, Occurrence,  
860 Effects, and Removal Methods. *Chem Rev*, 119 (6), 3510-3673.

- 861 Qin, L. T., Pang, X. R., Zeng, H. H., Liang, Y. P., Mo, L. Y., Wang, D. Q., & Dai, J. F. (2020).  
862 Ecological and human health risk of sulfonamides in surface water and groundwater  
863 of Huixian karst wetland in Guilin, China. *Sci Total Environ*, *708*, 134552.
- 864 Rayner, C., & Munckhof, W. J. (2005). Antibiotics currently used in the treatment of  
865 infections caused by *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Intern Med J*, *35 Suppl 2*, S3-16.
- 866 Reungoat, J., Escher, B. I., Macova, M., & Keller, J. (2011). Biofiltration of wastewater  
867 treatment plant effluent: effective removal of pharmaceuticals and personal care  
868 products and reduction of toxicity. *Water Res*, *45* (9), 2751-2762.
- 869 Rhouma, M., Fairbrother, J. M., Beaudry, F., & Letellier, A. (2017). Post weaning diarrhea in  
870 pigs: risk factors and non-colistin-based control strategies. *Acta Veterinaria*  
871 *Scandinavica*, *59* (1), 31.
- 872 Sachi, S., Ferdous, J., Sikder, M. H., & Azizul Karim Hussani, S. M. (2019). Antibiotic residues  
873 in milk: Past, present, and future. *J Adv Vet Anim Res*, *6* (3), 315-332.
- 874 Salama, N. A., Abou-Raya, S. H., Shalaby, A. R., Emam, W. H., & Mehaya, F. M. (2011).  
875 Incidence of tetracycline residues in chicken meat and liver retailed to consumers.  
876 *Food Addit Contam Part B Surveill*, *4* (2), 88-93.
- 877 Salaramoli, J., Heshmati, A., Kamkar, A., & Hassan, J. (2015). Effect of cooking procedures on  
878 tylosin residues in chicken meatball. *Journal für Verbraucherschutz und*  
879 *Lebensmittelsicherheit*, *11*.
- 880 Schiller, C., Fröhlich, C. P., Giessmann, T., Siegmund, W., Mönnikes, H., Hosten, N., &  
881 Weitschies, W. (2005). Intestinal fluid volumes and transit of dosage forms as  
882 assessed by magnetic resonance imaging. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther*, *22* (10), 971-979.

- 883 Shalaby, A. R., Salama, N. A., Abou-Raya, S. H., Emam, W. H., & Mehaya, F. M. (2011).  
884 Validation of HPLC method for determination of tetracycline residues in chicken  
885 meat and liver. *Food Chemistry*, *124* (4), 1660-1666.
- 886 Shaltout, F. (2019). Impacts Of Different Types Of Cooking And Freezing On Antibiotic  
887 Residues In Chicken Meat. *Food Science and Nutrition*, *5*.
- 888 Shirreffs, S. M., Watson, P., & Maughan, R. J. (2007). Milk as an effective post-exercise  
889 rehydration drink. *Br J Nutr*, *98* (1), 173-180.
- 890 Smith, B. I., Donovan, G. A., Risco, C., Littell, R., Young, C., Stanker, L. H., & Elliott, J. (1998).  
891 Comparison of various antibiotic treatments for cows diagnosed with toxic puerperal  
892 metritis. *J Dairy Sci*, *81* (6), 1555-1562.
- 893 Sobral, M. M. C., Cunha, S. C., Faria, M. A., & Ferreira, I. M. (2018). Domestic Cooking of  
894 Muscle Foods: Impact on Composition of Nutrients and Contaminants. *Compr Rev*  
895 *Food Sci Food Saf*, *17* (2), 309-333.
- 896 Spence, C. (2021). Explaining seasonal patterns of food consumption. *International Journal*  
897 *of Gastronomy and Food Science*, *24*, 100332.
- 898 Stockwell, V. O., & Duffy, B. (2012). Use of antibiotics in plant agriculture. *Rev Sci Tech*, *31*  
899 (1), 199-210.
- 900 Thursby, E., & Juge, N. (2017). Introduction to the human gut microbiota. *Biochem J*, *474*  
901 (11), 1823-1836.
- 902 Tiseo, K., Huber, L., Gilbert, M., Robinson, T. P., & Van Boeckel, T. P. (2020). Global Trends in  
903 Antimicrobial Use in Food Animals from 2017 to 2030. *Antibiotics (Basel)*, *9* (12).
- 904 Treiber, F. M., & Beranek-Knauer, H. (2021). Antimicrobial Residues in Food from Animal  
905 Origin-A Review of the Literature Focusing on Products Collected in Stores and  
906 Markets Worldwide. *Antibiotics (Basel)*, *10* (5).

- 907 Ueland, Ø., Rødbotten, R., & Varela, P. (2022). Meat consumption and consumer attitudes –  
908 A Norwegian perspective. *Meat Science*, *192*, 108920.
- 909 van Staa, T. P., Palin, V., Li, Y., Welfare, W., Felton, T. W., Dark, P., & Ashcroft, D. M. (2020).  
910 The effectiveness of frequent antibiotic use in reducing the risk of infection-related  
911 hospital admissions: results from two large population-based cohorts. *BMC*  
912 *Medicine*, *18* (1), 40.
- 913 Vanhaecke, T., Bretin, O., Poirel, M., & Tap, J. (2022). Drinking Water Source and Intake Are  
914 Associated with Distinct Gut Microbiota Signatures in US and UK Populations. *J Nutr*,  
915 *152* (1), 171-182.
- 916 Wang, Y., Uffelman, C. N., Bergia, R. E., Clark, C. M., Reed, J. B., Cross, T. L., Lindemann, S. R.,  
917 Tang, M., & Campbell, W. W. (2023). Meat Consumption and Gut Microbiota: a  
918 Scoping Review of Literature and Systematic Review of Randomized Controlled Trials  
919 in Adults. *Adv Nutr*, *14* (2), 215-237.
- 920 Weill, F. X., Guesnier, F., Guibert, V., Timinouni, M., Demartin, M., Polomack, L., & Grimont,  
921 P. A. (2006). Multidrug resistance in *Salmonella enterica* serotype Typhimurium from  
922 humans in France (1993 to 2003). *J Clin Microbiol*, *44* (3), 700-708.
- 923 Xu, L., Zhang, H., Xiong, P., Zhu, Q., Liao, C., & Jiang, G. (2021). Occurrence, fate, and risk  
924 assessment of typical tetracycline antibiotics in the aquatic environment: A review.  
925 *Sci Total Environ*, *753*, 141975.
- 926 Zhang, P. (2022). Influence of Foods and Nutrition on the Gut Microbiome and Implications  
927 for Intestinal Health. *Int J Mol Sci*, *23* (17).
- 928