medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Environmental detection of *Burkholderia pseudomallei* and associated melioidosis risk: a molecular detection and case-control cohort study

Sukritpong Pakdeerat[1] BSc*; Chalita Chomkatekaew[1,2] MSc*; Phumrapee Boonklang[1,3] MPhil*; Arin Wongprommoon[1,3] PhD; Kesorn Angchagun[1] BSn; Yaowaret Dokket[1] BSc; Areeya Faosap[1] Bsc; Gumphol Wongsuwan[1] MSc; Premjit Amornchai[1] MSc; Vanaporn Wuthiekanun[1] BSc; Jirameth Changklom[4] PhD; Suwatthiya Siriboon[5] MD; Parinya Chamnan[6] PhD; Sharon J Peacock[7] PhD; Jukka Corander[3,8] PhD; Nicholas PJ Day[1,9] DM, Nicholas R Thomson[3] PhD; Chayasith Uttamapinant[10] PhD; Somsakul Pop Wongpalee[11] PhD; Claire Chewapreecha[1,3,12] PhD on behalf of the BurkHostGEN study

Affiliations:

1. Mahidol Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit (MORU), Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand
2. Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
3. Wellcome Sanger Institute, Hinxton, UK
4. Faculty of Engineering, Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand
5. Department of Infectious Medicine, Sunpasitthiprasong Regional Hospital, Ubon Ratchathani, Thailand
6. Cardiometabolic Research Group, Department of Social Medicine, Sunpasitthiprasong Regional Hospital, Ubon Ratchathani, Thailand
7. Department of Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
8. Institute of Basic Medical Science, University of Oslo, Olso, Norway
9. Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
10. School of Biomolecular Science and Engineering, Vidyasirimedhi Institute of Science and Technology (VISTEC), Rayong, Thailand
11. Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Medicine, Chiangmai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand
12. Department of Clinical Tropical Medicine, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

*Contributed equally

Correspondence to:
Claire Chewapreecha, Mahidol-Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit (MORU), Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok Thailand 10400, claire@tropmedres.ac
(+66(0)952743357)

BurkHostGEN study group (other members): Salwaluk Panapipat, Thatsanun Ngernseng, Naomi Waithira, Steve Walton, Direk Limmathurotsakul, Anoree Surawong, Narisara Chantratita, Susie Dunachie, Emma E Davenport, Julian Knight, and Julian Parkhill

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Summary

Background

Environmental acquisition of *Burkholderia pseudomallei* can cause melioidosis, a life-threatening yet underreported disease. Understanding environmental exposure is essential for effective public health interventions, yet existing tools are limited in their ability to quantify exposure risks.

Methods

We conducted two complementary studies across a 15,118 km^2 area of northeast Thailand to improve detection methods and investigate risk factors for melioidosis. In the first study, we compared a newly developed, equipment-light CRISPR-based assay (CRISPR-BP34) with conventional culture methods using both spiked samples and real water samples from household and community sources (November 2020 - November 2021). The second study involved a case-control analysis of 1,135 participants (October 2019 - January 2023) to evaluate the association between environmental exposure to *B. pseudomallei* (detected in Study 1) and melioidosis risk.

Findings

The CRISPR-BP34 assay demonstrated improved sensitivity (93.52% vs 19.44% for conventional methods) and specificity (100% vs 97.98%), allowing for more accurate detection of *B. pseudomallei* and exposure risk quantification. Environmental exposure to *B. pseudomallei* in water sources within a 10 km radius of participants' households was significantly associated with increased melioidosis risk (OR: 2.74 [95% CI 1.38-5.48]). This risk was also heightened by known factors: occupational exposure among agricultural workers (4.46 [2.91-6.91]), and health factors like elevated hemoglobin A1c, indicating diabetes (1.35 [1.19-1.31]).

Interpretation

Our findings underscore the impact of environmental contamination on melioidosis risk. The robust association between contaminated water sources, including piped water systems, and clinical cases highlights the urgent need for improved water sanitation to mitigate melioidosis risk.

Funding

Wellcome Trust

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Evidence before this study

We conducted a PubMed search, without language restrictions from database inception to 11 September 2024, using the following search terms: ("*Burkholderia pseudomallei*" AND "environment* sampl*") or ("*Burkholderia pseudomallei*" AND "spatial"), yielding 172 research and review articles. Several studies attempted to link the detection of *B. pseudomallei* in the environment with melioidosis risk through case-control and case-only designs. However, none demonstrated a statistically significant relationship between environmental presence of *B. pseudomallei* and infection risk (case-control) or clinical severity (case-only). The main challenges included low detection rates in environmental samples, inconsistent sampling methodologies, and outdated guidelines, which restricted the use of individual analyses or meta-analyses across combined studies. While soil is widely considered the natural reservoir for *B. pseudomallei*, its distribution varies significantly across soil textures, moisture levels, and depths, often leading to inconsistent or inconclusive data. These variations complicate efforts to establish a reliable link between soil contamination and melioidosis risk. Water sampling has been suggested as a viable alternative due to its more homogenous nature and simpler collection methods. Water also directly reflects human exposure risk, as people are regularly in contact with natural water bodies and treated water systems. However, detecting *B. pseudomallei* in water is challenging due to its low abundance. Molecular techniques such as PCR, following an enrichment process, have shown the highest sensitivity for detecting *B. pseudomallei*. The enrichment step enhances *B. pseudomallei* growth while suppressing competing microorganisms. For example, in a study conducted in a disease hotspot in Laos, positive detection rates improved from a median of 50% (IQR 42.5 - 53.8%) using conventional culture inspection methods, to 55% using PCR alone, and 75% with PCR following enrichment. While this approach is promising, it requires access to PCR equipment, which is often unavailable in resource-limited, melioidosis-endemic regions. These challenges create gaps in current detection methods and hinder the ability to accurately quantify environmental exposure risks and identify high-risk areas.

Added value of this study

Our study addressed these gaps by developing an equipment-light device capable of detecting *B. pseudomallei* in environmental samples after enrichment. This approach eliminates the need for complex PCR equipment while maintaining high sensitivity and specificity, comparable to qPCR. Our findings established a statistically significant link between environmental exposure to *B. pseudomallei* within a 10 km radius of households and 2.74-fold increased odds [95% CI: 1.38-5.48] of acquiring melioidosis. This risk remains significant even after adjusting for confounding factors such as underlying health conditions (e.g. diabetes) and occupational exposures.

Implications of all the available evidence

Our results confirm that *B. pseudomallei* can be detected in both natural water reservoirs and publicly treated piped water systems in endemic regions, and that its presence is positively associated with the occurrence of melioidosis. The detection of *B. pseudomallei* in treated water systems emphasises the urgent need for improved water sanitation measures. These results highlight the importance of environmental monitoring and targeted interventions to reduce melioidosis risks in the endemic areas.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Infectious diseases caused by environmental pathogens pose a significant and growing public health threat, particularly in resource-constrained settings where inadequate access to clean water and sanitation exacerbates health risk[1–3]. Melioidosis, a neglected tropical disease caused by the environmental bacterium *Burkholderia pseudomallei*, exemplifies this issue[4,5]. The disease is endemic in tropical and subtropical regions, including northern Australia, South and Southeast Asia, Africa, and Central and South America, many of which are LMICs[6]. Infections typically occur through skin inoculation, inhalation, or ingestion of contaminated soil or water, with rare human-to-human transmission[6]. Agricultural workers are at higher risk of infection due to their frequent exposure to contaminated environments[7]. Melioidosis results in an approximate 165,000 cases and 89,000 deaths worldwide each year[8]. In Thailand, a known hotspot for melioidosis, projections estimate 7,572 cases and 2,838 deaths annually; yet reported cases are significantly lower[9], suggesting potential underreporting and misdiagnosis. This disparity highlights a gap in surveillance efforts, which primarily focuses on clinical diagnosis - a stage where patients often present too late for effective disease prevention or accurate estimation of the true burden of melioidosis.

Environmental surveillance offers a proactive approach to detect *B. pseudomalllei*, which is essential for melioidosis prevention[10,11] and intervention[5]. Water plays a vital role in daily hygiene and agriculture, making it a key indicator of human exposure to pathogens. Monitoring water samples from various sources from natural water reservoirs[11,12] to public[10,13] or private[4,14,15] water systems used in households offers insights into *B. pseudomallei* distribution and potential human exposure across extensive areas. Current surveillance practices[16] involve collecting water samples and using selective media[17] for bacterial detection. However, the rising antibiotic resistance of other environmental microbes complicates the differentiation of *B. pseudomallei*. While molecular methods like PCR enhance detection rates[18], they require complex equipment that is often unavailable in resource-limited settings, many of which are endemic to melioidosis.

This study introduces a sampling protocol called CRISPR-BP34[19,20], an equipment-light and highly sensitive assay to detect *B. pseudomallei* in water, and applies it to samples from public systems, groundwater (boreholes), ponds, lakes, and rivers in northeast Thailand, covering a 15,118 km^2 area in Ubon Ratchathani and surrounding provinces. We examine whether individuals in areas with higher environmental *B. pseudomallei* occurrence were at increased risk of developing melioidosis. Our enhanced detection methods provided an improved assessment of *B. pseudomallei* presence and exposure risk, supporting the need for improved access to clean water and better sanitation.

Methods

Study design

We conducted two inter-related studies to improve *B. pseudomallei* detection sensitivity in environmental samples and to assess the link between environmental presence and melioidosis clinical incidence (Figure 1).

Study 1 evaluated the performance of CRISPR-BP34 against a conventional approach, with two qPCR assays as the a reference standard. A total of 356 water samples were collected between November 2020 and November 2021 from households and nearby natural water sources of 243 participants (Figure 2 & Appendix pp 10-13), who were part of the case-control cohort from **Study 2** in Ubon Ratchathani and nearby provinces in northeast Thailand, areas

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

known to be endemic for melioidosis. This study adhered to the Standards for Reporting of Diagnostic Accuracy (STARD) guideline.

Study 2 investigated the association between the presence of *B. pseudomallei* in water samples and the incidence of melioidosis in households of cases and controls. From October 2019 to January 2023, 1,135 participants were recruited from a melioidosis cohort. This cohort consisted of 439 melioidosis patients, 190 patients with other community-acquired infections, and 506 non-infection controls. Melioidosis and other infectious cases were recruited immediately after a culture-confirmed diagnosis at Sunpasitthiprasong Hospital, using hospital computer records. Controls were selected from blood donors or non-infectious outpatients at the same hospital. After obtaining informed consent, demographic information such as age, sex, ethnicity and underlying health conditions was extracted from medical records, while participants provided details about their exposure risks and household locations (Appendix pp 20-21).

The participants whose water samples were collected in Study 1 included 70 melioidosis patients, 69 patients with other infections, and 104 non-infectious controls from Study 2. To address sample variability, multiple water samples were collected from the household and surrounding areas of 80 participants, including 74 cross-seasonal samples to account for seasonal fluctuations (Appendix pp 14-15). This study received ethical approval from the Sunpasitthiprasong Hospital Ethical Review Board (015/62C) and the Oxford Tropical Research Ethics Committee (OxTREC 25-19). The full study protocol is described in [21] and followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guideline.

Environmental sample collection and processing

Five-litre water samples were collected from each household, except during the peak of SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks, when nearby water reservoirs were sampled due to visitation restrictions. Participants' water sources included pipe water, boreholes, ponds, lakes, canals or rivers (Appendix pp 10-11). Samples were transported in sterile plastic bags to the laboratory within three hours and processed promptly. Each sample was filtered (0.45-µm cellulose, Sartorius, Germany), and cultured on Ashdown[17] agar to promote *B. pseudomallei* growth. Plates were incubated at 40 C, and inspected daily for four days; plates with fungal overgrowth were discarded (Appendix pp 3-5). For conventional screening, colonies showing typical *B. pseudomallei* morphologies (Appendix pp 12-13) were confirmed using monoclonal antibody-based assays[22,23]. For the CRISPR-BP34 and qPCR tests, microbial lawn, including both visible and non-visible *B. pseudomallei,* were collected from the plates and preserved in glycerol stock (20% v/v, VWR, Belgium) at -80 °C for subsequent DNA extraction. All procedures were conducted in an enhanced biosafety level 2 laboratory but with biosafety level 3 practices. For each type of screening, the personnel performing the tests were blinded to the results of the other methods.

Bacterial DNA extraction

Microbes were revived from glycerol stocks for each sample. A loop of colonies was used for bacterial DNA extraction with QIAGEN Genomic-tips [Cat#10243, Germany] to preserve high molecular-weight pan-microbial DNA and minimise DNA shearing (Appendix pp 3-5). The extracted DNA had an average concentration of 278.42 ng/µL (IQR 181.00 - 433.23) and an A260/A280 purity score ranging from 1.68 and 1.94, ensuring high yield and low impurities, suitable for CRISPR-BP34 and qPCR detection.

PCR detection and determination of *B. pseudomallei* positive environmental samples

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

PCR was used as the reference test to detect *B. pseudomallei* (Figure 3), employing two independent primer sets, TTS1[24] and BPSS1386[25] (Appendix p 22), collectively referred to as double-qPCR. These primers were screened to ensure high sequence coverage for *B. pseudomallei* population (Appendix pp 18-19). Each sample was tested in duplicate for both sets. QPCR reactions were performed in a 20-µLvolumes using Maxima SYBR Green/ROX qPCR Master Mix (Cat#K0221, ThermoFisher Scientific) on a QuantStudio 6 Flex (Applied Biosystems). The protocol included an initial denaturation step at 95 C for 10 minutes, followed by 40 cycles of denaturation at 95 C at 15 seconds, with annealing temperature at 61 C for TTS1 and 64 C for BPSS1386 primers. Samples were processed in batches alongside known positive and negative controls. The cycle threshold (Ct) values were recorded for each sample. A sample was classified as positive if qPCR amplification occurred for both primers and the melting temperatures were consistent with the expected values. Samples were classified as inconclusive if amplification with correct melting temperature was observed with only one primer. Samples were considered negative if no amplification was detected or if amplification occurred with incorrect melting temperatures.

CRISPR-BP34 detection

The extracted DNA samples were amplified using the Recombinase Polymerase Amplification (RPA) method with TwistAmp® Basic (Cat#TABAS03KIT, TwistDx, Maidenhead, UK). RPA primers (Appendix pp 22-23) were used at a final concentration of 0.48 nM, and 2 - 6 µLof genomic DNA were added to a 30-µLRPA reaction, which was incubated at 39 °C for 30 minutes. The resulting amplicons were added to CRISPR reaction containing 1x HOLMES buffer, 200 nM LbCas12a enzyme, 100 nM crBP34, and 100 nM FAM-biotin probes in 50-µLreaction and incubated at 37 °C for 60 minutes (Appendix pp 3-5). A HybriDetect universal lateral flow assay kit (Cat#MGHD1, Milenia Biotec, Giessen, Germany) was dipped into the CRISPR reaction for 5 minutes. Results from the lateral flow kit were observed visually and interpreted without reference to the results of other tests.

Determination of molecular sensitivity for qPCR and CRISPR-BP34

We conducted a spiking experiment where we introduced varying concentrations of *B. pseudomallei* DNA (0, 2.5, 5, 10, 20, 50, and 250 copies/µL) into a 2 µLvolume of pan-microbial DNA background (Figure 2c). This background DNA was derived from common bacterial species[26] identified in water sources including *Escherichia coli, Klebsiella pneumoniae, Enterobacter cloacae, Serratia odorifera, Citrobacter freundii,* and *Leclercia adecarboxylata.* The pan-microbial DNA was prepared at a final concentration of 278 ng/µL, representative of the range observed in our actual samples. This setup mimicked the mixed microbial environment of the water samples and enabled us to evaluate the minimum concentration of *B. pseudomallei* detectable by both the qPCR and CRISPR-BP34 methods.

Statistical analysis

For study 1, the minimum sample size was calculated using the formula $n = z^2 \times p \times (1-p)/d^2$, with “z” as the 95% confidence interval at 1.96; “p” representing the prevalence at 0.5; and “d” as the margin of error at 0.1. At least 96 positive and 96 negative environmental samples were needed to validate the conventional approach and CRISPR-BP34. Sensitivity and specificity were computed using double-PCR results as the reference, with the 95% confidence interval estimated based on a binomial assumption. McNemar’s test was used to compare detection performance with paired data.

For study 2, the proportion of *B. pseudomallei* positive samples per area was calculated for each method (double-PCR, CRISPR-BP34, and conventional) by determining the number of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

positive samples relative to the total collected within the radii of 1 km to 10 km from participant households. This measure is reffered to as the positivity rate in neighbourhood water reservoirs. Distances were computed based on each participant's geoposition using the R package "geosphere". The association between *B. pseudomallei* in household and neighbourhood water reservoirs, participants' occupations, risk behaviours, and disease status were analysed using univariable (Appendix pp 23-24) and multivariable logistic regression models (Figure 4, Appendix pp 25-26). All tests were two-sided with a significance level of 0.05, and analyses were conducted using R (version 4.3.2), including data visualisation.

Sensitivity analyses were conducted to evaluate the robustness of the results under various conditions. First, we restricted the study population to the actual water sampling period from November 2020 to November 2021. Second, we expanded the study period to include data from October 2019 to January 2024. Third, we assessed the geographical ranges of exposure by using different radius distances from each household (Appendix pp 16-17). Additionally, we analysed the data by season (Appendix pp 14-15) to account for observed bacterial persistence in the environment across different seasons and the potential latency period, which may span several years before melioidosis develops[6].

Role of the funding source

The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

Results

Improved detection of *B. pseudomallei* from the environment

Between November 2020 and November 2021, 356 water samples were collected (Appendix pp 10-11), filtered and cultured on Ashdown agar (Figure 2a). Of these, 21 were discarded due to fungal overgrowth, while 335 samples exhibited mixed fungal and bacterial growth or mixed bacterial growth alone. Among these 335 samples, visual inspection identified 87 samples with colonies resembling *B. pseudomallei*, of which 23 tested positive using monoclonal antibody assays[22,23]. However, this conventional method has significant limitations. *B. pseudomallei* at low abundance can be outcompeted by dominant species, and visual inspection alone may lead to misidentification. To address these issues, we implemented CRISPR-BP34 alongside qPCR with two independent primers to provide a more accurate identification of *B. pseudomallei* and estimate the potential for under-detection with the conventional method.

Pan-microbial DNA was successfully extracted from 333 of the 335 successfully cultured samples. CRISPR-BP34 and qPCR target distinct DNA sequences: TSS1 and BPSS1386 by qPCR, and crBP34 by CRISPR-BP34 (Figure 2b**,** Appendix pp 18-19 & 22). To assess detection limits, we spiked known concentration of *B. pseudomallei* DNA into a mixed DNA medium of microbial species from the water samples. QPCR detected *B. pseudomallei* DNA at 5 copies/µl with the TSS1 primer and 10 copies/µl with the BPSS1386 primer, while CRISPR-BP34 detected it at 20 copies/µl using dipstick readouts (Figure 2c-d). Based on higher sensitivity of qPCR, we classified 108 samples as positive based on consistent results from both primers (referred to as double-PCR positive), 27 as inconclusive where the primers disagreed, and 198 as negative when neither primer detected *B. pseudomallei* (Figure 2d). This enabled a comparison between CRISPR-BP34 and the conventional method, with qPCR as the reference test (Table 1). CRISPR-BP34 demonstrated higher sensitivity, detecting 101 out of 108 positive samples (93.52%, 95% CI: 87.10-97.35), compared to 21 out of 108 samples (19.44%, 95% CI: 12.46-28.17) detected by the conventional method. CRISPR-BP34 also showed higher

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

specificity, correctly identifying all 198 negative samples (100%, 95% CI: 98.15-100.00), versus 194 out of 198 (97.98%, 95% CI: 94.91-99.45) with the conventional method. This highlights the significant number of positive samples (McNemar's test comparing CRISPR-BP34 to conventional method p-value = 5.83×10^{-8}), and thus the true environmental burden of melioidosis that the conventional approach would have missed.

The true prevalence of *B. pseudomallei* in the environment

Based on double-PCR classification, we next examined the distribution of *B. pseudomallei* in the environment across different water sources and seasons (Figure 3). *B. pseudomallei* was detected in all sampled water types, including public piped water, surface water from still bodies (ponds and lakes), surface water from running bodies (canals and rivers), and groundwater from boreholes. Boreholes had the highest positivity rate with 11 (73.3%) out of 15 samples testing positive. This finding is consistent with previous reports indicating that high *B. pseudomallei* prevalence is closely correlated with moisture levels, especially in groundwater. Unlike surface water, which can dry up during the dry season, groundwater remains saturated year-round, with water persistence reaching nearly 100%. Heavy rains and flooding can bring *B. pseudomallei* from deeper soil layers to surface[27,28], or increase surface runoff[29] which transport bacteria from contaminated soils into water sources. Consistent with this, we observed a higher positive rate of *B. pseudomallei* in water samples during the rainy or flood season compared to the dry season for non-groundwater sources (Figure 3b). Specifically, 56 (38.9%) out of 144 surface water samples from ponds, lakes, canals and rivers tested positive in the rainy or flood season, whereas none of the 23 samples (0%) from the dry season were positive (χ^2 p-val = 5.75×10^{-4}). Similarly, public piped water systems showed an increase in positivity with 37 (45.1%) out of 82 samples testing positive during the rainy or flood season, compared to 4 (6.3%) out of 63 samples in the dry season (χ^2 p-val < 2.2×10^{-16}). Participants reported using public piped water systems and boreholes for daily activities, including cooking and hygiene (**Figure 3c**). Both sources were found to contain *B. pseudomallei*, highlighting significant public health concerns.

Association between the detection of *B. pseudomallei* and the incidence of melioidosis

We investigated the association between the presence of *B. pseudomallei* in household and neighbourhood water reservoirs and the incidence of melioidosis among participants. A total of 243 participants had water samples collected within three months of disease onset or enrollment (2020-2021), providing a snapshot closely aligned with the timing of disease incidence. An additional 889 participants, recruited either before or after this sampling period (2019-2020 or 2022-2023), lived in the same geographical areas and were likely exposed to the same environmental sources of *B. pseudomallei* (Figure 4 a-b). For participants with direct water sampling, we observed a higher prevalence of *B. pseudomallei* in water samples from the households of melioidosis patients (36 [51.4%] out of 70 participants) compared to non-infected controls (34 [32.7%] out of 104 participants; Fisher's exact test p-val = 0.040) (Appendix pp 16-17). However, this prevalence was not significantly different from that observed in patients with other infections (30 [43.5%] out of 69 participants; Fisher's exact test p-val = 0.61). Further analysis indicated distinct underlying health conditions such as diabetes and occupational risks between melioidosis patients and those with other infections (Appendix pp 20-21). This led us to investigate whether these conditions and risks might drive the observed cases of melioidosis.

To address these potential confounders, we expanded our analysis by aggregating data from all participants recruited between 2019-2023. We assessed whether the environmental density of *B. pseudomallei* within radii of 1 to 10 km from participants' households increased the risk of melioidosis, adjusting for risk factors such as diabetes and agricultural work. At a 10 km radius, which corresponds to the average household distance in our dataset (Figure 4d, Appendix pp 25-26), we found that the detection of *B. pseudomallei* in households and neighbourhood water

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

reservoir significantly increased the likelihood of developing melioidosis (Figure 4e, OR 2.74 [95% CI: 1.38-5.48]). Other established risk factors[7], including diabetes (OR 1.35 [1.19-1.31]) and agricultural work (OR 4.46 [2.91-6.91]), the latter of which likely heightens exposure to environmental *B. pseudomallei*, were also strongly associated with an elevated risk of infection.

Discussion

Our work demonstrates that linking environmental exposure to disease relies on having high-resolution to accurately detect species of interest. Few studies have connected the presence of environmental pathogens to the likelihood of developing disease, and none have statistically done so for melioidosis. For melioidosis, conventional assays used in this study (Figure 4e, OR 1.03 [95% CI: 0.28 -3.79]) and other case-control cohort[7] fall short in capturing this relationship. In contrast, molecular methods such as double-PCR assays (OR 2.74 [1.38-5.48]) and CRISPR-BP34 (OR 2.56 [1.31-5.04]) successfully establish this connection. Our study highlights the limitations of conventional methods, which often lead to high rates of false negatives when detecting *B. pseudomallei* in the environment (Appendix pp 4 & 12-13). The equipment-light and efficient CRISPR-BP34 shows great promise for environmental surveillance, offering reliable pathogen detection and enhancing our ability to monitor their presence.

Given the lack of up-to-date protocols for environmental surveillance of *B. pseudomallei*, our study still has certain technical and logistic limitations. First, the initial culture selection process resulted in the loss of some samples due to fungal overgrowth on the plates. While this issue could be mitigated by bypassing the selective culture step and directly testing for nucleic acids, we were concerned about the poorer detection performance without this treatment[18]. Additionally, nucleic acids from dead microbial cells - potentially due to chlorine or other water treatments - might also be detected. This could create a false correlation between environmental exposure and disease incidence, as dead pathogens as such do not cause illness. Therefore, we chose to include a culture enrichment step to promote the growth of viable *B. pseudomallei* strains.

Second, the reported inconclusive cases from double PCR assays may present false negatives due to imperfect primer design. However, considering the uncertain presence of *B. pseudomallei* and the possibility of DNA fragments being exchanged among environmental microbes in the same niche, we opted for precision in identifying *B. pseudomallei* by confirming their presence through two independent genomic regions. This approach reduces false positives and enhances the robustness of our analysis.

Third, we acknowledge a gap in water sample collection, as samples were obtained from 243 out of 1,135 participants in the cohort. This limitation was due to travel restrictions related to SARS-CoV-2 during the study period and the lack of resources. As a result, we infer that the *B. pseudomallei* detected between 2020 and 2021 may represent a bacterial population that persisted in deep soil or groundwater, contributing to both surface and untreated, leaking or contaminated pipe water in the studied area. This contamination likely contributed to melioidosis cases observed in the region from 2019-2023. Additionally, the latency of infection suggests that some patients may have been exposed to *B. pseudomallei* well before their diagnosis.

Despite these limitations, our study is the first to statistically link the presence of *B. pseudomallei* in the living environment with clinical cases of melioidosis. Our findings highlight potential sources of *B. pseudomallei* in water sources used by participants for daily activities, particularly piped water, and underscore the urgent need for further investigation. This alarming issue likely stems from inadequate water treatment practices, such as insufficient chlorine dosing that fails to eradicate pathogens effectively. Moreover, leaks, pipe breaks and poor

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

maintenance may allow pathogens to infiltrate the water supply. We have reported this situation to Thailand Provincial Waterworks Authority, ensuring that relevant authorities are aware of this matter.

Our study highlights significant occupational risks that increase exposure to *B. pseudomallei*, particularly among individuals with underlying health conditions such as diabetes, which further elevate the risk of melioidosis. In Thailand, agriculture continues to play a vital role in the economy. Simultaneously, there has been a concerning rise in diabetes cases within the population[30]. This situation underscores the need for timely interventions and robust public health measures to protect vulnerable populations with specific health issues and occupational hazards. We have communicated these findings to the Provincial Ministry of Public Health who will discuss strategies to strengthen protective measures for communities in this melioidosis endemic area.

Contributors

SP, CCho and PB contributed equally. CChe, NPJD and NRT conceived the cohort study. CChe and JCo conceived the additional water sample activities. CChe, SPW and CU conceived the CRISPR- study. CChe and SP secured funding. CChe, SPW, CU, NRT, NPJD, SJP, DL, PC and SS designed the study. SP, CCho, PB, KA, and CChe collected water samples. SP, CCho, PB, YD, AF, GW, and PA processed water samples. GW, PA, and VW provided conventional detection methods. SPW and CU provided molecular detection methods. SP, KA, AW prepared data for the analysis. CChe did the analysis. SP, CCho, PB, AW, SJP, JCh, JCo, CU, SPW, CChe interpreted the data. JCh communicated with Thailand Provincial Waterwork Authorities and proposed engineering resolutions to reduce risks. SP, CCho, PB, AW, and CChe assessed and verified underlying data of the study. All authors had full access to all data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication. CChe wrote the first draft. All authors read and approved the manuscript.

Data sharing

De-identified participant data that underlie the results reported in the Article will be made available on request. Proposals should be directed to the corresponding author, claire@tropmedres.ac. Proposals will be reviewed on the basis of compliance with the informed consent and scientific merit. Rain and flood data in Ubon Ratchathani are publicly available from Thailand Royal Irrigation Department (https://www.rid.go.th/index.php/th/). Temperature data are publicly available from the Google Earth Engine.

Declaration of interests

We declare no competing interests.

Acknowledgements

CChe was funded by the Wellcome International Intermediate Fellowship (216457/Z/19/Z), the Sanger International Fellowship, and the University of Oxford Nuffield Department of Medicine Career Development Scheme. This research was funded in part by the Wellcome Trust [220211 and 206194] and Thailand Science Research and Innovation, Fundamental Fund 2024 [FRB670026/0457, to CU]. For the purpose of Open Access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright license to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Figure legends

Figure 1 The study flow chart and data distribution.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(a) Cohort study design, including participants with water samples collected directly between November 2020 and November 2021, as well as participants from the circumscribed area who were likely exposed to the same environment, recruited between 2019-2023. (b) Detection of *Burkholderia pseudomallei* in water samples from the above cohort, categorised by different assay types.

Figure 2 Detection method and molecular sensitivity.
(a) Workflow diagram illustrating the sample collection and processing steps for both conventional methods and nucleic acid-based detection techniques (PCR and CRISPR-BP34). (b) Overview of the target sequences used in the nucleic acid-based detection methods. (c) Molecular sensitivity of the CRISPR-BP34 detection method. (d) Molecular sensitivity of the PCR detection method using two different primers. (e) Performance comparison of the conventional method, CRISPR-BP34 test, and double PCR reference test for detecting *Burkholderia pseudomallei* in water samples.

Figure 3 Water types and seasonal fluctuations in positive detection rates.
(a) Diagram showing the types of water samples, including groundwater (boreholes), surface water (ponds, lakes, canals, and rivers), and treated piped water. (b) Proportion of samples testing positive, inconclusive and negative for *B. pseudomallei*, with variation observed across different seasons. (c) Proportion of participants reporting the use of public water systems and boreholes for their daily activities.

Figure 4 Association between the presence of B*. pseudomallei* in the household water supplies or neighbourhood reservoirs and the incidence of melioidosis.
(a) Geographical landscape of Ubon Ratchathani, illustrating the water terrain. (b) Map showing participant households, including those with directly collected water samples and those without samples but residing in close proximity. (c) Positive correlation between the number of water samples collected and population density per district. (d) average distance (in kilometres) between participant households in the cohort. (e) Odds ratios from multivariable logistic regression showing factors contributing to melioidosis based on *B. pseudomallei* detection using double-PCR, CRISPR-BP, and conventional approach. Districts are abbreviated: Buntharik (BTR), Don Mot Daeng (DMD), Det Udom (DUD), MSS, Khong Chiam (KC), Kut Khaopun (KKP), Khemarat (KMR), Khuang Nai (KN), Lao Suea Kok (LSK), Mueang (M), Muang Sam Sip (MSS), Na Chaluai (NCL), Nam Khun (NK), Na Tan (NT), Na Yia (NYi), Nam Yuen (NYu), Phibun Mangsahan (PBM), Pho Sai (PS), Samrong (SR), Sawang Wirawong (SWW), Sirindhorn (SRD), Si Mueang Mai (SMM), Trakan Phuet Phon (TPP), Tan Sum (TS), Thung Si Udom (TSU), Warin Chamrap (WRC)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1 Improved sensitivity offered by CRISPR-BP34 compared to conventional approach

	Sensitivity (percent, 95% confidence interval)	Specificity (percent, 95% confidence interval)
Conventional plate inspection	21 of 108 (19.44%, 12.46-28.17)	194 of 198 97.98% (94.91-99.45)
CRISPR-BP34	101 of 108 (93.52%, 87.10-97.35)	198 of 198 (100%, 98.15-100.00)

References

1 Ikuta KS, Swetschinski LR, Robles Aguilar G, *et al.* Global mortality associated with 33 bacterial pathogens in 2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet* 2022; **400**: 2221–48.

2 Wolf J, Hubbard S, Brauer M, *et al.* Effectiveness of interventions to improve drinking water, sanitation, and handwashing with soap on risk of diarrhoeal disease in children in low-income and middle-income settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet* 2022; **400**: 48–59.

3 Pinto Jimenez CE, Keestra S, Tandon P, *et al.* Biosecurity and water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) interventions in animal agricultural settings for reducing infection burden, antibiotic use, and antibiotic resistance: a One Health systematic review. *The Lancet Planetary Health* 2023; **7**: e418–34.

4 Petras JK, Elrod MG, Ty MC, *et al.* Locally Acquired Melioidosis Linked to Environment - Mississippi, 2020-2023. *N Engl J Med* 2023; **389**: 2355–62.

5 Tantirat P, Chantarawichian Y, Taweewigyakarn P, *et al.* Melioidosis in Patients with COVID-19 Exposed to Contaminated Tap Water, Thailand, 2021. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2024; **30**: 791–4.

6 Meumann EM, Limmathurotsakul D, Dunachie SJ, Wiersinga WJ, Currie BJ. Burkholderia pseudomallei and melioidosis. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2024; **22**: 155–69.

7 Limmathurotsakul D, Kanoksil M, Wuthiekanun V, *et al.* Activities of Daily Living Associated with Acquisition of Melioidosis in Northeast Thailand: A Matched Case-Control Study. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2013; **7**: e2072.

8 Limmathurotsakul D, Golding N, Dance DAB, *et al.* Predicted global distribution of Burkholderia pseudomallei and burden of melioidosis. *Nat Microbiol* 2016; **1**: 15008.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

9 Hantrakun V, Kongyu S, Klaytong P, *et al.* Clinical Epidemiology of 7,126 Melioidosis Patients in Thailand and the Implications for a National Notifiable Diseases Surveillance System. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* 2019; : ofz498.

10 Limmathurotsakul D, Wongsuvan G, Aanensen D, *et al.* Melioidosis caused by Burkholderia pseudomallei in drinking water, Thailand, 2012. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2014; **20**: 265–8.

11 Zimmermann RE, Ribolzi O, Pierret A, *et al.* Rivers as carriers and potential sentinels for Burkholderia pseudomallei in Laos. *Sci Rep* 2018; **8**: 8674.

12 Baker AL, Warner JM. Burkholderia pseudomallei is frequently detected in groundwater that discharges to major watercourses in northern Australia. *Folia Microbiol* 2016; **61**: 301–5.

13 Thaipadungpanit J, Chierakul W, Pattanaporkrattana W, *et al.* Burkholderia pseudomallei in water supplies, southern Thailand. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2014; **20**: 1947–9.

14 Webb JR, Mayo M, Rachlin A, *et al.* Genomic Epidemiology Links Burkholderia pseudomallei from Individual Human Cases to B. pseudomallei from Targeted Environmental Sampling in Northern Australia. *J Clin Microbiol* 2022; **60**: e01648-21.

15 Tran QTL, Phan PH, Bui LNH, *et al.* Child Melioidosis Deaths Caused by Burkholderia pseudomallei-Contaminated Borehole Water, Vietnam, 2019. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2022; **28**: 1689–93.

16 Limmathurotsakul D, Dance DAB, Wuthiekanun V, *et al.* Systematic review and consensus guidelines for environmental sampling of Burkholderia pseudomallei. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2013; **7**: e2105.

17 Ashdown LR. An improved screening technique for isolation of Pseudomonas pseudomallei from clinical specimens. *Pathology* 1979; **11**: 293–7.

18 Knappik M, Dance DAB, Rattanavong S, *et al.* Evaluation of Molecular Methods To Improve the Detection of Burkholderia pseudomallei in Soil and Water Samples from Laos. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2015; **81**: 3722–7.

19 Wongpalee SP, Thananchai H, Chewapreecha C, *et al.* Highly specific and sensitive detection of Burkholderia pseudomallei genomic DNA by CRISPR-Cas12a. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2022; **16**: e0010659.

20 Pakdeerat S, Boonklang P, Angchagun K, *et al.* Benchmarking CRISPR-BP34 for point-of-care melioidosis detection in low-income and middle-income countries: a molecular diagnostics study. *The Lancet Microbe* 2024; **5**: e379–89.

21 Angchagun K, Boonklang P, Chomkatekaew C, *et al.* BurkHostGEN: a study protocol for evaluating variations in the Burkholderia pseudomallei and host genomes associated with melioidosis infection. *Wellcome Open Res* 2023; **8**: 347.

22 Anuntagool N, Naigowit P, Petkanchanapong V, Aramsri P, Panichakul T, Sirisinha S. Monoclonal antibody-based rapid identification of Burkholderia pseudomallei in blood culture fluid from patients with community-acquired septicaemia. *J Med Microbiol* 2000; **49**: 1075–8.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

23 Chantratita N, Tandhavanant S, Wongsuvan G, *et al.* Rapid detection of Burkholderia pseudomallei in blood cultures using a monoclonal antibody-based immunofluorescent assay. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2013; **89**: 971–2.

24 Novak RT, Glass MB, Gee JE, *et al.* Development and evaluation of a qPCR assay targeting the type III secretion system of Burkholderia pseudomallei. *J Clin Microbiol* 2006; **44**: 85–90.

25 Lowe W, March JK, Bunnell AJ, O'Neill KL, Robison RA. PCR-based Methodologies Used to Detect and Differentiate the Burkholderia pseudomallei complex: B. pseudomallei, B. mallei, and B. thailandensis. *Curr Issues Mol Biol* 2014; **16**: 23–54.

26 Amornchai P, Wuthiekanun V, Langla S, *et al.* Prevalence of extended-spectrum β-lactamase-producing Enterobacterales in edible ice in Thailand. *Int Health* 2024; : ihae050.

27 Kaestli M, Grist EPM, Ward L, Hill A, Mayo M, Currie BJ. The association of melioidosis with climatic factors in Darwin, Australia: A 23-year time-series analysis. *J Infect* 2016; **72**: 687–97.

28 Bulterys PL, Bulterys MA, Phommasone K, *et al.* Climatic drivers of melioidosis in Laos and Cambodia: a 16-year case series analysis. *Lancet Planet Health* 2018; **2**: e334–43.

29 Rachlin A, Luangraj M, Kaestli M, *et al.* Using Land Runoff to Survey the Distribution and Genetic Diversity of Burkholderia pseudomallei in Vientiane, Laos. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2021; **87**: e02112-20, AEM.02112-20.

30 The Lancet Regional Health – Southeast Asia. Preventing diabetes in the southeast Asia region. *The Lancet Regional Health - Southeast Asia* 2023; **18**: 100326.

Figure 1

a

1,135 participants recruited to the study between 1 October 2019 - 30 January 2023

3 exclusion
2 participants withdrew consents
1 participant had no home address

Data analysed for 1,132 participants



b

House visits arranged for 243 participants recruited between October 2020 - November 2021

70 household of melioidosis patients

100 samples collected
5 samples cannot be retrieved
6 samples have inconclusive PCR results

39 samples positive by double PCR results
39/39 samples positive by CRISPR-BP34
6/39 samples positive by conventional approach

50 samples negative by double PCR results
50/50 samples negative by CRISPR-BP34
49/50 samples negative by conventional approach

69 household of other bacterial patients

117 samples collected
5 samples cannot be retrieved
9 samples have inconclusive PCR results

33 samples positive by double PCR results
31/33 samples positive by CRISPR-BP34
10/33 samples positive by conventional approach

70 samples negative by double PCR results
70/70 samples negative by CRISPR-BP34
68/70 samples negative by conventional approach

104 household of Non-infection control

139 samples collected
13 samples cannot be retrieved
12 samples have inconclusive PCR results

36 samples positive by double PCR results
32/36 samples positive by CRISPR-BP34
5/36 samples positive by conventional approach

78 samples negative by double PCR results
78/78 samples negative by CRISPR-BP34
78/78 samples negative by conventional approach

Figure 2


a
Samples processing
water collection
water filtration
selective agar
plate-sweep DNA extraction
followed by PCR or CRISPR-BP34
AGGCTAACATCCCGAAA
ATCCCGAAACCGGGTAG
ACCCTGGGGAAATTCATG
AGGGGCCCCTAGGGTAGTTT
AGGCTAACATCCCGAAA
ATCCCGAAACCGGGTAG
ACCCTGGGGAAATTCATG
AGGCTAACATCCCGAAA
ATCCCGAAACCGGGTAG
visible B. pseudomallei colony
Conventional visual inspection
followed by monoclonal antibody assays
b PCR and CRISPR-BP34 targets
Chr 1
4.2 Mb
PCR primer 2
1 Mb
0.1 Mb
CrBP34
3.7 Mb
PCR primer 1
Chr 2
c
CRISPR-BP34 limit of detection in multi-microbial DNA background
B. pseudomallei DNA (genomic copies/uL)
0
2.5
5
10
20
50
250
positive control
H2O
Dipstick readout
PCR ct scores
Primer1
Primer2
d PCR limit of detection in multi-microbial DNA background
PCR primer 1
B. pseudomallei DNA (genomic copies/uL)
0
2.5
5
10
20
50
250
positive control
H2O
PCR ct scores
rep 1
rep 2
rep 3
PCR primer 2
B. pseudomallei DNA (genomic copies/uL)
0
2.5
5
10
20
50
250
positive control
H2O
PCR ct scores
rep 1
rep 2
rep 3
e
PCR primer 1
PCR primer 2
double PCR result
conventional test
CRSIRP-BP34 test
Sample Index
333
300
250
200
150
100
50
1
PCR ct scores
12.00
17.76
23.60
28.53
34.97
37.50
39.02
no PCR product
Double PCR results
negative
inconclusive
positive
Conventional/CRISPR-BP34
positive
negative

Figure 3

a Likely source of bacterial environmental exposure



b Type of water used for consumption in each household



c



Figure 4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.21.24317607; this version posted November 23, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.