Targeting community-level drivers of antimicrobial resistance in sub-Saharan Africa: the effect of a community-based intervention bundle on household transmission of Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamase-producing *E. coli* in rural Burkina Faso - a cluster randomised trial

Aizouk R[1], Sibidou Y[2], Valia D[2], Ingelbeen B[3], Campbell L[4], Kouanda Juste S[2], Welgo A[2], Diagne PM[5], Riems B[3], Hardy L[3], Wouters E[4], Meudec M[3], van der Sande MAB[6], Halidou T[2], Cooper BS[1], van Kleef E[1,6], CABU-EICO study team[§]

1 Centre of Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, United Kingdom
2 Institut de Recherche en Sciences de la Santé, Direction Régionale du Nando/Clinical Research Unit of Nanoro - Nanoro (Burkina Faso),
3 Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp (Belgium)
4 Centre for Population, Family and Health, University of Antwerp, Antwerp (Belgium)
5 Anthropology and Ecology of Disease Emergence Unit, Institut Pasteur, Université Paris Cité, Paris, France
6 Julius Centre for Health Sciences and Primary Care, UMCU, Utrecht University (Netherlands)

Corresponding author: esther.vankleef@ndm.ox.ac.uk

[§]Members of the CABU-EICO study team not spelled out in full are listed in the acknowledgement

Keywords
Antimicrobial resistance, behavioural community intervention, Antimicrobial Stewardship, WaSH, Extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing *E. coli* community-acquisition, sub-Saharan Africa

Summary (300 words max)

Background: In sub-Saharan Africa (sSA), invasive antimicrobial-resistant infections often originate from community-level acquisition. We assessed whether a behavioural intervention bundle targeting sub-optimal antibiotic use and hygiene practices reduced household-level acquisition of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase–producing *E. coli* (ESBL-E).

Methods: We conducted a cluster-randomised controlled trial in 22 village clusters in Nanoro district, Burkina Faso. We enrolled 12 randomly selected households per cluster to assess intervention impact on ESBL-E household-transmission. The intervention comprised three rounds at three-month intervals and combined WHO AWaRe–based educational feedback for formal and informal medicine providers with a community-wide WASH and antibiotic-use behaviour change campaign. Consenting household members provided stool samples before, during, and after intervention rollout, alongside a pre–post household WASH survey. We estimated intervention effects on ESBL-E acquisition using Bayesian Markov models. Cox frailty models assessed associations between WASH exposures and acquisition. ClinicalTrials.gov, NCT05378880.

Findings: Between Oct 11, 2022, and Feb 19, 2024, 1203 individuals were enrolled. At baseline, 56·6% (342/604) of control and 47·2% (283/599) of intervention household members were colonised. Pre-intervention acquisition incidence was 3·8 per 100 person-days (95% credible interval [CrI] 2·0–9·9) in the intervention group and 3·5 (95% CrI 1·8–9·6) in the control group. The intervention did not change the risk of ESBL-E acquisition in months 1–6 (hazard ratio [HR] 1·02, 95% CrI 0·78–1·31), while we estimated a reduction in ESBL-E acquisition from months 6–9 (HR 0·82, 95% CrI 0·56–1·14). Acquisition risk was higher in the rainy season (peak HR 1·73, 95% CI 1·49–2·00), while improved sanitation was associated with lower risk (HR 0·77, 95% CI 0·59–1·00).

Interpretation: Findings, though inconclusive, were consistent with a modest intervention-related reduction in ESBL-E incidence. Higher acquisition rates associated with the rainy season and poor sanitation highlight the need to tackle environmental drivers of AMR transmission in addition to antibiotic use in rural sSA.

Funding: JPI-AMR CABU EICO grant number: JPIAMR2021-053

Research in context

Evidence before this study

A systematic review of antimicrobial stewardship interventions published in 2019 found that although most studies evaluate antibiotic use (i.e. exposure) outcomes, only about 23% reported microbiological outcomes, underscoring a widespread lack of evidence on how stewardship interventions affect resistant bacteria acquisition dynamics. Since then, this gap remains particularly pronounced in sub-Saharan Africa (sSA). Here, invasive antimicrobial-resistant (AMR) infections are frequently community-associated. Two systematic reviews, including one published in 2025, indicate that household transmission is the dominant pathway for community-level AMR acquisition, reporting ESBL-E acquisition rates of 0·17–0·29 per 100 person-days and approximately 50% clearance within 3–4 months. However, all 11 studies identified that quantified dynamics of intrahousehold transmission were from high-income contexts. The Drivers of Resistance in Uganda and Malawi (DRUM) study provided important One Health insights into human, animal, and environmental reservoirs of ESBL-E and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, and found high ESBL-E prevalences up to 60%, but was observational and did not evaluate interventions or quantify community-level transmission. The published community-level interventions in sSA have largely focused on formal healthcare providers or prescribers to reduce sub-optimal antibiotic use. A recent scoping review identified only seven intervention studies targeting general communities in sSA, highlighting a lack of rigorous evaluations of community-centred stewardship and AMR mitigation efforts more broadly and outside formal healthcare settings. None of these studies measured microbiological outcomes or effects on community transmission of resistant bacteria.

Added value of this study

The CABU-EICO trial is, to our knowledge, the first cluster-randomised AMR intervention in rural sSA to quantify the effects of an intervention targeting both providers and communities on household ESBL-E transmission. The intervention bundle targeted both sub-optimal antibiotic use - across formal and informal medicine providers - and hygiene-related behaviours, and was co-developed with communities to ensure contextual relevance and feasibility. Using repeated stool sampling from all household members and a continuous-time multi-state modelling framework, we directly estimated ESBL-E acquisition hazards while accounting for household-level clustering in unmeasured AMR drivers and seasonal variation. By moving beyond prevalence-based outcomes and antibiotic-use metrics alone, the CABU-EICO trial provides a statistically efficient and mechanistically informative framework for evaluating AMR interventions.

Implications of all the available evidence

This study demonstrates that community-level AMR interventions incorporating microbiological transmission outcomes are feasible in rural sSA. We identified substantial household-level transmission of ESBL-E in rural, low-income settings. Notably, we observed a marked seasonal increase in the risk of ESBL-E acquisition during the rainy season - a period when antibiotic consumption is reportedly lower in our setting - as well as an increased risk associated with poor sanitation (open defecation). Finally, we found evidence of a modest reduction in household-level ESBL-E transmission following the intervention, alongside a marked reduction in community-level antibiotic use. Community-level transmission dynamics are therefore likely driven by a combination of antibiotic selection pressure and environmental exposures. This is consistent with recently published genomic evidence from the DRUM study showing frequent co-circulation and spillover of ESBL-producing *E. coli* between humans, animals, and the environment, including hundreds of inferred transmission events across One Health compartments in Eastern Africa. Future AMR control strategies in similar settings will therefore likely require integrated One Health approaches that combine antibiotic stewardship with structural and environmental interventions, and that incorporate both acquisition and transmission endpoints to fully capture intervention impact.

Introduction

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is considered a critical global health threat, disproportionately affecting resource-limited settings, sub-Saharan Africa (sSA) in particular.[1,2] Key assumed drivers contributing to the propagation of AMR include inappropriate use of antibiotics, poor Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) conditions, and close contact with animals and/or food products, particularly in settings characterised by a low socioeconomic position.[3–5] Recognising the urgency of this threat, world leaders committed in September 2024 to ambitious targets to curb AMR, including reducing AMR-related mortality by 10% by 2030, achieving 70% global use of Access antibiotics, and ensuring universal access to improved WASH standards.[6]

In sSA, invasive AMR syndromic infections are often caused by pathogens associated with community-level acquisition.[e.g.7] Extended-spectrum-lactamase-producing *Escherichia coli* (ESBL-E) serves as a commonly used proxy for AMR spread, given its widespread occurrence and its frequent identification as causative agent of severe infections globally.[8] Invasive infections caused by AMR bacteria, including ESBL-E, are linked to asymptomatic colonisation, with human-to-human transmission within households considered an important yet understudied pathway both in low- and high income settings.[9–12] A recent study from urban Nairobi identified within-household transmission as a predominant source of ESBL-E strain sharing.[13] Other studies from rural sSA, including Nanoro (Burkina Faso), and Malawi, have reported high colonisation rates with ESBL-E in healthy individuals, which varied by rainy and dry seasons, and were associated with household environmental exposures including clean water access, and hand hygiene practices.[14,15] Misuse and overuse of antibiotics could increase intestinal carriage of AMR bacteria, hence raising colonisation pressure and facilitating onward transmission, especially in settings where hygiene standards are poor, and self-medication is common.[16,17]

Despite evidence pointing to household and community spread of AMR bacteria, interventions to mitigate AMR in resource-limited settings have predominantly focused on healthcare settings.[12] Reported stewardship interventions, including those from LMICs, have shown reductions in antibiotic use across both inpatient and outpatient/community settings. However, these studies generally suffer from low methodological quality and report variable effects on improving antibiotic use, in part related to heterogenous intervention designs.[18,19] Among randomised controlled trials of community-level stewardship interventions in LMICs, only one study from India targeted informal medicine sellers. Bundled stewardship strategies, which combine persuasive and/or educational approaches targeted at the community, generally showed most promise in improving antibiotic use.[19,20] However, the impact of these community-based interventions on microbiological outcomes - such as reducing acquisition of AMR bacteria - as well as clinical outcomes are rarely measured or reported.[18]

144 To address these evidence gaps, we conducted a cluster-randomised controlled behavioural intervention
145 trial in rural sSA to evaluate the effect of an intervention bundle, co-developed with healthcare providers
146 and community members from rural Burkina Faso and Democratic Republic of Congo (DRCongo). The
147 intervention targeted community-level medicine providers, and surrounding communities to reduce sub-
148 optimal antibiotic use and improve hygiene.[21] We evaluated both the effect of the intervention on
149 community-level antibiotic use - reported in [DOI to joint submission] - and its impact on within-
150 household transmission of bacterial AMR, reported here.

151 **Methods**

152 *Study design*

153 CABU-EICO study was implemented in both Burkina Faso and DRCongo as a multi-country cluster-
154 randomised controlled trial. The present paper reports on the microbiological results from the Burkina
155 Faso study site where we conducted longitudinal stool sampling to evaluate the intervention effect on
156 AMR acquisition and decolonisation dynamics. Located in the Nanoro Health District, the latter site has
157 established field and laboratory infrastructure, prior evidence from pilot work of high prevalence of
158 community ESBL-E carriage (Valia et al - accepted), and, thanks to a Health and Demographic
159 Surveillance System (HDSS), well-characterised household structures that allowed longitudinal follow-
160 up. Eligible clusters consisted of villages with ≥500 residents with at least one medicine outlet, i.e.
161 primary health centre or informal community-level medicine provider as the main medical dispenser.
162 The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee for Health Research of Burkina Faso
163 (reference N°2022-03-050) and obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the Institute of Tropical
164 Medicine, Antwerp, Belgium (1559/22, dd 29/03/2022), and from the Ethics Committee of the Antwerp
165 University Hospital, Belgium (3363, dd 09052022).

166 *Randomisation and masking*

167 In total, 22 clusters were randomised 1:1 to either intervention or control arms (Figure 1). We stratified
168 randomisation by village cluster community-level medicine provider (i.e. formal or informal). Total
169 population coverage in the 22 clusters was 82,018 individuals. To evaluate ESBL-E
170 acquisition/decolonisation and WASH outcomes related to the intervention, we randomly selected 36
171 households per cluster from the HDSS, and conducted stool sampling in a subsequent twelve randomly
172 selected households.

173 *Intervention and participants*

174 The intervention is described in detail in Table S1. Briefly, the intervention bundle was implemented,
175 for each cluster, over a six-month period, covering three rounds three months apart. Each of the 11
176 intervention village clusters were subsequently visited for 2-4 days per round, and followed up for nine-

177 months (Figure 1). A number of enabling and persuasive interventions were co-developed following
178 qualitative focus groups, photovoice and interviews with local community members and formal and
179 informal medicine providers over a six-month period. These interventions targeted suspected main
180 modifiable drivers of AMR, i.e. unnecessary antibiotic use and WASH (Table S1), combining provider-
181 focused antimicrobial stewardship education based on the WHO AWaRe Antibiotic Book with
182 community-wide WASH, and antibiotic-use behaviour change education activities (Table S1). The first
183 two rounds introduced adapted treatment guidance for four syndromes accounting for most community
184 antibiotic use, while the third round reinforced prior content and focused on provider–patient
185 communication on antibiotic use and community commitments to appropriate care-seeking and hygiene
186 practices.

187 To evaluate ESBL-E acquisition/decolonisation and WASH outcomes related to the intervention we
188 included households and household members using a household stool collection survey and a WASH
189 survey (supplementary material section 1) among those meeting the following inclusion criteria (box 1).

Box 1: CABU-EICO microbiological and WASH study participants*

Inclusion criteria

- Member of a household in a study cluster (resident for ≥3 months);
- Agreement of the household head for all household members (including children) to participate to the collection of four stool samples during the study period, through informed written consent;
- Individual informed consent (plus assent for adolescent participants) for each participating household member;
- Be in good physical health (no current infectious disease);

Exclusion criteria

- Inhabitant of study clusters who planned to move or be absent during the following year;
- Ongoing infectious disease or ongoing treatment for an active infection. Field workers returned to collect stools once the patient has recovered.

190
191 **Box 1: CABU-EICO household survey in- and exclusion criteria**. *For the households where only the WASH
192 survey was conducted and not stool sampling, the household head signed informed consent

193 Household stool collection: Stool collection took place between 11 October 2022 and 19 February 2024.
194 Stool samples were collected from all eligible and consenting household members three months before
195 the start of the intervention, at the start, and at month 3, and 9 post-intervention start in both intervention
196 and control clusters using pre-labelled sterile containers with an electronic questionnaire (Figure 1,
197 supplementary material section 1). Written informed consent was obtained from all individuals aged at
198 least 18 years. For patients aged between 14 and less than 18 years, oral assent was obtained in addition

to parents or caretakers' written informed consent. For patients under 14 years, written informed consent was obtained from parents or caretaker. Faecal sampling was undertaken from all consenting household members. In case of more than six household members, faecal samples were collected from six randomly selected individuals. Field workers provided instructions to household members on sampling and storage. The following morning, stool samples were collected by trained field agents, and the specimens were transported to the laboratory in a cooler box maintaining temperatures between 2–8 °C. All samples reached the clinical microbiological laboratory in Nanoro within 8 hours of production, in accordance with procedures ensuring biosafety for field staff and the public. Upon arrival at the laboratory, each sample was recorded and processed immediately on selective CHROMagar™ ESBL plates according to the manufacturer's instructions. Suspected ESBL-producing *E. coli* were further identified using standard biochemical tests. Antimicrobial susceptibility testing was performed following CLSI guidelines.

Household WASH survey*:* A household WASH survey took place from 11 October 2022 - 1 February 2023 (baseline), and 12-months later (post-intervention round). At baseline, household member heads or another available adult household member were surveyed using an electronic questionnaire recording details on household structure, WASH exposures following UNICEF and WHO guidance,[22] in addition to antibiotic consumption in the last month and last three months and healthcare-seeking behaviours for all household members.

Outcomes

The primary outcome of this trial, changes in provision of WHO Watch-group antibiotics is reported in the joint submission. Here we report in detail on key secondary outcomes, i.e. change in rates of person-to-person transmission and duration of carriage of ESBL-producing *E.coli* within households. We assessed these outcomes as:

1. Change in instantaneous acquisition and decolonisation hazards, expressed as the intervention hazard ratio for di ESBL-E acquisition/decolonisation, capturing how the intervention altered the rate at which susceptible individuals acquired/cleared ESBL-E colonization.
2. Change in acquisition incidence density, expressed as the relative difference in ESBL-E incidence per 100 person-days. This captures how the intervention altered cumulative population-level ESBL-E acquisition over the full follow-up period using the incidence rate ratio (IRR).

Further secondary outcomes included the change in hygiene practices and exposures (reported here for the Nanoro site only).

Statistical analyses

232 Sample size calculation

233 For the stool sample collection, using a simulation-based approach, we estimated the power to detect
234 reductions in transmission resulting from the intervention (supplementary material section 2). For an
235 intervention that reduces the transmission rate by 40%, 30%, and 20% respectively, and with a two-
236 sided type 1 error of 5% we estimated that a study with 12 households per cluster and 22 clusters would
237 have 99%, 82% and 43% power respectively to detect a reduction in transmission. This implied 132
238 households per intervention arm. For a change in WASH indicators, sample size calculation assumed
239 that 30% of households practiced correct handwashing at baseline. With an intra-cluster correlation
240 coefficient of 0.05 and a design effect of 2.75, a sample of 792 households across 22 clusters (36 per
241 cluster) provided 80% power to detect a 15-percentage-point absolute increase in correct handwashing
242 (e.g., from 30% to 45%) with 80% power and an expected precision of ±5.3 percentage points for
243 baseline estimates.

244

245 Intervention evaluation

246 We evaluated multiple intervention-effect scenarios to reflect plausible mechanisms through which the
247 intervention could influence ESBL-E acquisition dynamics. In the baseline scenario (scenario 1), we
248 assumed a progressive intervention effect, whereby the first two rounds - introducing provider-focused
249 antimicrobial stewardship and community behaviour change activities - reduced acquisition rates during
250 an early intervention phase (months 1–6), with the third round reinforcing prior messages and potentially
251 yielding additional reductions during a late intervention phase (months 6–9).

252



253

Figure 1: Intervention and study design and data collection scheme (A); Modelling framework and intervention effect scenarios considered (B). R1 = Intervention round one; R2 = Intervention round two; R3 = Intervention round three. Sea-blue dotted lines mark the start of each of the three intervention rounds. Coral dotted lines mark the start of each of the stool collection rounds, which were planned one week after the roll-out of each of the intervention rounds. The interventions were implemented in each of the 11 villages consecutively, spanning for round one and round three a three-month period. Round two was implemented over one-month to ensure the activities were implemented before the rainy season. Each of the stool collection rounds were anticipated to start one week after the introduction of the intervention in each of the respective village clusters, again over a three month period. λ_{12} corresponds to the instantaneous daily rate of ESBL-E acquisition, whereas λ_{21} representents the daily decolonisation rate.

In alternative intervention effect scenarios we:

- Assumed a single immediate sustained intervention effect across the study period, consistent with the later rounds maintaining rather than enhancing intervention effects (scenario 2),
- Extended scenarios 1 and 2 by assuming that the intervention could affect both acquisition and decolonisation hazards, i.e. shortening colonisation duration in addition to reducing acquisition risk (scenario 3 and 4).

Measured change in ESBL-E acquisition dynamics: To evaluate the effect of the intervention bundle on ESBL-E acquisition and decolonisation, we fitted Bayesian continuous-time Markov chain (CTMC) models to the longitudinal stool data. This framework jointly estimates the individual-level acquisition rate (λ_{12}), the loss-of-carriage rate (λ_{21}), and how these rates vary with the intervention and covariates at individual and household levels. Each participant is assumed uncolonised (S_1) or colonised with detectable ESBL-E (S_2), and transitions between these states are determined by the underlying hazard rates (Figure 1B). The model incorporated seasonality, demographic factors (age, sex), and household-level clustering, with random effects capturing between-household variation in not explicitly included AMR drivers. Unlike standard time-to-event models, the CTMC approach infers transitions by integrating hazards over each observation interval, allowing for uncertain event times and multiple transitions that may occur between sampling points. Because intervention rounds were implemented at different times across villages, the model accounted for village-specific intervention start dates, enabling correct attribution of exposure within each household's observation intervals for the early intervention effect (after the start of intervention rounds 1 and 2) and late intervention effects (after intervention round 3). To capture temporal fluctuations in acquisition risk, we estimated daily transition rates across 28-day calendar-time segments. Seasonal structure was represented using both a sinusoidal term (Scenarios 1-4A) and a penalised B-spline smooth over calendar time (Scenarios 1-4B). We assessed comparative model fit of models with and without terms for seasonality and different intervention impact scenarios (Table S2) using leave-one-out cross-validation (LOO-CV). All models were implemented in *Stan version 2.23.2*. Further modelling detail, including model fitting, rigorous simulation-based model checking procedures, as well as sensitivity analyses are provided in Supplementary Material Section 2.

292 WASH exposures associated with ESBL-E acquisition risk: As a contextual analysis to understand
293 which intervention-related changes in AMR drivers might explain the estimated effect on ESBL-E
294 acquisition, we first assessed whether WASH-related exposures were associated with the risk of ESBL-
295 E acquisition in our study site. We fitted mixed-effects Cox proportional hazards frailty models for each
296 predefined WASH indicator, estimated using a staggered-entry (left-truncation) framework on a
297 calendar-time scale (days since the global study start date). Because the intervention also targeted
298 antibiotic use - an important potential mediator of ESBL-E acquisition that was not the focus of this
299 analysis and for which detailed household- or cluster-level data were not available - we restricted this
300 analysis to participants in the control arm. For individuals who converted from ESBL-E negative to
301 ESBL-E positive between sampling visits, the event time was imputed as the midpoint between the last
302 negative and first positive sample. Those who remained ESBL-E negative were censored, as well as
303 those who went from positive to negative were censored at their last observation. Each participant
304 contributed person-time from the date of their first ESBL-E negative sample. To account for clustering,
305 random intercepts were included at both the individual and household levels. The model was
306 implemented in R (version 4.4.1) using the *coxme* package.

307 Measured change in WASH exposures: We developed a binary WASH evaluation framework in
308 collaboration with a WASH expert (BR), drawing on WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme
309 definitions, and validated indicator coding with DV to ensure contextual appropriateness. This allowed
310 for estimating population-weighted prevalence ratios (PRs) for six WASH indicators targeted by the
311 intervention community-campaign, capturing access to improved drinking water, sanitation, correct
312 handwashing, and livestock-related exposure risks (Table 1; coding in Table S3). Using household
313 survey data, we estimated intervention effects with survey-weighted quasi-Poisson regression models
314 with a log link and an interaction between intervention group and survey round. Models accounted for
315 household clustering within villages, sampling weights proportional to village population size divided
316 by the number of households surveyed per round, and rainy season to capture seasonal variation in
317 WASH behaviours. To allow comparison across villages surveyed at different times, we standardised
318 predicted prevalences to the dry season. We conducted all analyses in R (version 4.4.1) using the *survey*
319 package.

320 Handling of missing data

321 In all analyses, for age and sex, missing entries were imputed using the follow-up observation closest in
322 time. Individuals with no age or sex recorded at any time were excluded. Sampling dates were taken
323 from stool collection records, with consent dates used as proxies when missing. For individuals with no
324 ESBL-E stool collection at baseline, we imputed the ESBL-E status by sampling from a Bernoulli
325 distribution using the baseline prevalence specific to their trial arm as the probability. The CTMC was
326 fitted to data from individuals with at least two observations; participants with fewer than two valid

observations were excluded because transitions could not be modelled. The Cox proportional hazard model was fitted to individuals with four stool samples, to allow for equally spaced observation intervals. All other individuals were excluded.

Results

Description of the study population

Of the 1203 individuals enrolled at baseline, 1097 (91·2%) from 259/265 households provided at least two consecutive stool samples. Households were generally large, with a median size of 8 members [IQR: 6–12]. A median of four household members were tested per household [IQR: 3–6].



Figure 2: Trial profile diagram. Villages were assessed for eligibility, enrolled, and allocated to intervention or control clusters. The diagram shows the number of households, participants, and stool samples contributing data across study rounds, including baseline, intervention start, three months after intervention start, and post-intervention. Exclusions due to village eligibility criteria and missing age or sex information are indicated for each intervention group. WASH = water, sanitation, and hygiene. R2 = intervention start; R3= three months after intervention start.

The study population was predominantly female (60·1%, 723/1203), with a median age of 18 years [range: 1–92 years] and a majority (373/1203, 31·0%) between 5-17 years old (Table 1). WASH

346 characteristics, measured in 808 households, were comparable for handwashing, and animal faeces
347 identified on household floors (Table S4).

		Control (N=604)	Intervention (N=599)	Total (N=1203)
Household characteristics				
N households		133	132	265
N households with individuals with >1 observation (%)		131 (98·5%)	128 (97·0%)	259 (97·7%)
N household per cluster, median [min, max]		12 [12 - 12]	12 [12 -13]	12 [12 - 13]
Household size, median [min, max]		8·00 [3·00, 37·0]	8·00 [1·00, 32·0]	8·00 [1·00, 37·0]
N household members tested per household, median [IQR]		4 [3 - 6]	4 [3 - 6]	4 [3 - 6]
% Children <5, median [min, max]		1·00 [0, 9·00]	2·00 [0, 10·0]	2·00 [0, 10·0]
Individual characteristics				
N individuals with >1 observation (%)		582 (96·4%)	569 (95·0%)	1097 (91·2%)
N individuals with 4 observations (%)		390 (64·6%)	357 (59·6%)	747 (62·1%)
Age, median [min, max]		18·0 [1·00, 92·0]	18·0 [1·00, 85·0]	18·0 [1·00, 92·0]
Age group, n (%)				
	0-4 years	86 (14·2%)	73 (12·2%)	159 (13·2%)
	5-17 years	215 (35·6%)	243 (40·6%)	458 (38·1%)
	18-64 years	185 (30·6%)	188 (31·4%)	373 (31·0%)
	50+ years	113 (18·7%)	84 (14·0%)	197 (16·4%)
	Missing	5 (0·8%)	11 (1·8%)	16 (1·3%)
Sex, n (%)				
	Male	241 (39·9%)	244 (40·7%)	485 (40·3%)
	Female	363 (60·1%)	352 (58·8%)	715 (59·4%)
	Missing	0 (0%)	3 (0·5%)	3 (0·2%)
Social economic status				
	Highest quintile	111 (18·4%)	72 (12·0%)	183 (15·2%)
	Fourth	79 (13·1%)	119 (19·9%)	198 (16·5%)
	Third	148 (24·5%)	102 (17·0%)	250 (20·8%)
	Second	126 (20·9%)	222 (37·1%)	348 (28·9%)
	Lowest	128 (21·2%)	46 (7·7%)	174 (14·5%)
	Missing	12 (2·0%)	38 (6·3%)	50 (4·2%)

348 **Table 1: Baseline characteristics of study population from households where follow-up faecal samples were**
349 **collected.**

350

351 Differences were only observed in primary drinking water sources. In the control arm, 336/409, 82·2%
352 (dry) and 324/409, 79·2% (rainy) of households used an improved source, compared with 383/399,
353 96·0% and 367/399, 92·0% in the intervention arm. Similarly, sanitation practices differed between

intervention groups, with unimproved sanitation reported in 266/409, 65·0% control, versus 313/399, 78·4% intervention households. These unimproved sanitation practices largely concerned open defecation, while improved primary water sources were mostly boreholes. Animal contact was widespread, occurring both inside and outside household structures (382/409, 93·4% and 349/399, 87·5% of the control and intervention households respectively).

Pre-intervention ESBL-E transmission dynamics

At baseline, 342/604 (56·6%) of individuals were identified positive for ESBL-E colonisation in the control group. This was 283/599 (47·2%) in the intervention group. Under the base case scenario, our model estimated a baseline daily acquisition rates of 0·0135 (95% CrI: 0·0095 - 0·0239) and an ESBL-E loss-of-carriage rates of 0·0095 (95% CrI: 0·0065–0·0147), corresponding to a median duration of colonisation of ~3·4 months (102 days [95% CrI: 68–154]). Pre-intervention ESBL-E incidence rates were comparable between control and intervention villages, at 3·8 (95% CrI: 2·0–9·9) and 3·5 (95% CrI: 1·8–9·6) per 100 person-days, respectively. Incidence rates among villages varied from 2·6 (95% CrI: 1·0–17·8) to 4·7 (95% CrI: 1·9–17·1) per 100 person-days, with one village estimated to have a markedly lower baseline rate (95% CrI: 0·1 [0·1–0·9], Table S5).

Intervention bundle effect on ESBL-E transmission dynamics - Base case scenario

Over the 9-month period after the intervention-start, ESBL-E acquisition incidence averaged 7·4 per 100 person-days in control villages (95% CrI: 3·9–18·2) and 6·3 per 100 person-days in intervention villages (95% CrI: 3·2–17·2), yielding an incidence rate ratio (IRR) of 0·91 (95% CrI: 0·67–1·30).



Figure 3: Intervention effect on ESBL-E acquisitions. ESBL-E acquisition is expressed as incidence per 100 person-days per intervention phase of the intervention vs control group for scenario 1 (A) and scenario 2 (B). In scenario 1, a separate effect for the early post-intervention phase (1-6 month post-intervention) and the late post-intervention phase (6-9 months) was estimated. In scenario 2, a constant intervention effect was estimated, assuming the different intervention rounds would maintain the effect.

379 We observed no reduction in the acquisition hazard during the early intervention phase (months 1–6;
380 hazard ratio [HR] 1·02, 95% CrI: 0·78–1·31). In the later intervention phase (months 6–9), there was
381 some evidence of a decline in acquisition hazard in the intervention villages (HR 0·82, 95% CrI: 0·56–
382 1·14) (Figure 3). Intervention effects were broadly consistent across the 11 intervention villages, with
383 late-intervention phase ESBL-E IRRs relative to controls ranging from 0·71 (95% CrI: 0·37–1·15) to
384 0·81 (95% CrI: 0·50–1·32, Table S5).

385 *Intervention bundle effect on ESBL-E transmission dynamics - model scenario analyses*

386 Base case intervention scenario 1 had a comparable model fit to intervention scenario 2 (Table S3), with
387 good predictive performance (Figure S1). Under the latter scenario, assuming a consistent intervention
388 effect across the 9-month intervention period, the intervention was similarly associated with a modest
389 reduction in ESBL-E acquisition incidence (IRR 0·88 (95% CrI: 0·65 - 1·23, Figure 3). In contrast, in
390 scenarios that allowed the intervention to affect both acquisition and decolonisation hazards (scenarios
391 3 and 4), there was strong correlation between acquisition and decolonisation parameters in the posterior
392 distribution (Figure S2) and poor convergence (Table S3). These patterns indicate identifiability
393 limitations, suggesting that the available data cannot reliably separate intervention effects on acquisition
394 from those on decolonisation.

395
396 *Seasonal variation in ESBL-E transmission dynamics*

397 ESBL-E incidence rates increased in both intervention and control groups over the study period (Figure
398 4A), which was explained by a pronounced seasonal pattern, with increased ESBL-E acquisition during
399 the rainy season, with a peak acquisition risk in August (HR 1·73, 95% CrI: 1·49–2·00) - and lowest
400 risk in February (HR 0·58, 95% CrI: 0·50–0·67).

401 **A**



B



Figure 4: Seasonal pattern of ESBL-E acquisition (A). Baseline, sinusoidal approach. For cubic spline approach, see supplementary material. **Effect of individual intervention targets on acquisition from the Cox proportional hazard models (B).** Hazard ratio for the risk of household acquisition of ESBL-E in rural Burkina Faso among individuals in the control group. Shadings represent from light to dark: 95% Confidence Intervals (CI), 80%CI and 50%CI respectively. HR<1 indicates a decreased risk, HR>1 indicates an increased risk.

Fitting a more flexible cubic B-spline showed a similar seasonal peak and trough timing. Of note, the latter model exhibited less stable convergence and some divergent transitions (Table S3).

WASH practices associated with ESBL-E acquisition

Among control arm participants, 390/604, 63.2% provided four stool samples, with a baseline ESBL-E colonisation prevalence comparable to that of the full control study population (57·3%). Improved sanitation was associated with a lower risk of ESBL-E acquisition (HR 0·77, 95% CI 0·59–1·00; Figure 4B). No other WASH exposures and behaviours showed strong associations with acquisition risk.

Intervention related changes in WASH practices

The intervention did not convincingly improve household-level WASH behaviour (Table 2). Over the 12-month period, hygiene indicators related to modifiable behaviour targeted in the intervention showed little to no change, and trends were similar in both arms.

A. All households (n = 808)	**Baseline**		**Post-intervention**		
Practice/condition	**Control**	**Intervention**	**Control**	**Intervention**	**Adjusted PR**
Use of unimproved drinking water source (dry season)	11·0 (0·7–21·2)	3·5 (0·7–6·2)	8·4 (0·9–15·9)	3·7 (0·7–6·8)	1·41 (0·78–2·57)
Use of unimproved drinking water (rainy season)	13·0 (2·3–23·8)	6·1 (2·7–9·5)	7·6 (1·6–13·6)	3·3 (0·9–5·7)	0·93 (0·52–1·66)
Incorrect handwashing**	87·1 (76·9–97·3)	83·1 (72·3–93·8)	83·9 (70·2–97·6)	84·0 (74·6–93·4)	1·05 (0·91–1·21)
Using unimproved sanitary facility	61·2 (52·5–69·8)	65·8 (50·6–80·9)	54·2 (42·8–65·6)	63·0 (49·3–76·6)	1·08 (0·88–1·32)
Livestock animals access the house	92·1 (84·7–99·6)	85·3 (74·0–96·6)	76·5 (57·9–95·2)	78·2 (64·1–92·4)	1·10 (0·88–1·39)
Animal excrement on the house floor	66·7 (55·8–77·6)	65·1 (54·7–75·6)	51·8 (45·8–57·9)	57·4 (51·4–63·4)	1·13 (0·84–1·54)

B· Households with stool collection (n = 265)					
Practice/condition	**Control**	**Intervention**	**Control**	**Intervention**	**Adjusted PR**
Use of unimproved drinking water source (dry season)	15·3 (1·2–29·3)	4·7 (0·0–10·0)	13·2 (0·0–26·5)	5·7 (1·7–9·8)	1·42 (0·55–3·65)
Use of unimproved drinking water (rainy season)	17·7 (2·2–33·1)	8·3 (1·7–14·9)	10·7 (1·4–19·9)	4·9 (0·0–10·0)	0·98 (0·37–2·63)
Incorrect handwashing**	90·0 (79·8–100·3)	83·0 (72·7–93·3)	86·9 (75·4–98·4)	86·1 (76·2–96·1)	1·08 (0·90–1·29)
Using unimproved sanitary facility	68·5 (53·8–83·2)	67·7 (49·5–85·9)	58·4 (38·7–78·0)	62·1 (46·7–77·4)	1·08 (0·71–1·63)
Livestock animals access the house	87·0 (75·0–99·0)	85·3 (72·2–98·4)	71·9 (50·8–93·0)	75·7 (60·7–90·6)	1·07 (0·83–1·38)
Animal excrement on the house floor	64·0 (55·9–72·2)	63·3 (51·6–75·0)	49·0 (41·7–56·3)	51·5 (43·9–59·2)	1·06 (0·73–1·56)

Table 2: Change in WASH-indicators in all households where a household survey was taken (A) and households where a household survey and stool was sampled (B). Correct handwashing is defined as observed handwashing following defecation with soap available and used. Prevalence ratios (PRs) were estimated using survey-weighted quasi-Poisson regression models with a log link, accounting for household clustering within villages and survey weights proportional to the village population size divided by the number of households surveyed. Models included an interaction between intervention arm and survey round which yields a prevalence ratio representing the ratio of pre/post prevalence changes in the intervention group relative to the control group.

429 PRs were consistently close to 1, i.e. 1·05 (0·91–1·21) for correct handwashing, and 1·13 (0·84–1·54)
430 for animal excrement on household floors. Livestock access to household structures also remained
431 high in both arms, with a PR of 1·10 (0·88–1·39).

432

433 **Discussion**

434 Our pre-intervention estimates indicated a high burden of ESBL-E transmission at the household level
435 in rural Burkina Faso. Pre-intervention colonisation prevalence was 56.6% in control villages and 47.2%
436 in intervention villages, with corresponding incidence rates of 3.8 and 3.5 acquisitions per 100 person-
437 days. This equates to approximately 1.1 and 1.0 acquisitions per household member per month,
438 respectively, and nearly double that rate when averaged annually. These acquisition rates are around
439 five times higher than those observed in Dutch households and substantially exceed estimates from other
440 high-income household settings.[10,12] Although not conclusive, our findings suggest that a community-
441 level behavioural intervention targeting medicine providers and serving communities may have reduced
442 ESBL-E acquisition risk by nearly 20% at 6–9 months after rollout (HR 0.82, 95% CrI: 0.56–1.14).

443 We did not identify measurable improvements in WASH behaviours in Nanoro following the
444 intervention, however community-level dispensing of Watch-group and overall antibiotics more than
445 halved following the intervention as reported in the joint submission. Given that antibiotic exposure can
446 facilitate ESBL-E acquisition by suppressing susceptible gut flora, the observed reductions in antibiotic
447 dispensing could have possibly contributed to the lower acquisition we measured.[16] Delayed population-
448 level responses to reduced antibiotic selection pressure have been documented elsewhere, with declines
449 in *E. coli* resistance (including amoxicillin–clavulanate and ampicillin) lagging reductions in prescribing
450 by 1–3 months.[23] In Nanoro, relatively low baseline healthcare seeking, as well as low Watch and overall
451 antibiotic dispensing (1·1 [95% CI 0·0–2·3] and 9·9 [95% CI 8·8–11·0] per 1000 inhabitants per month,
452 respectively) may have constrained the magnitude of intervention effects. For the DRCongo site, up to
453 six (overall) and 30 (Watch) times higher baseline antibiotic dispensing was observed, which could have
454 resulted in more pronounced effects on ESBL-E acquisition, which we did not assess due to operational
455 constraints.

456 However, ESBL-E acquisition risks almost doubled in the rainy season, suggesting that factors beyond
457 antibiotic use contribute to community transmission. Ongoing work in Nanoro will further characterise
458 seasonal patterns in antibiotic use,[24] but prior work from the same, and another rural district in Burkina
459 Faso (Nouna) found that antibiotic consumption among individuals attending primary health centers is
460 actually lower during the rainy season, when malaria cases dominate clinical care.[25,26] This finding
461 points to environmental or ecological factors - in addition to antibiotic consumption - driving AMR
462 fluctuations.[14,27] Indeed, similar seasonal patterns have been documented in Malawi where ESBL-

463 producing *E. coli* colonisation was associated with a range of environmental and household exposures,
464 including drinking water from tube wells or boreholes, and proximity to open defecation. [28] These
465 patterns align with our findings, where unimproved sanitation - mainly open defecation - was associated
466 with increased acquisition risk. Recent genomic data from Kenya similarly show that households with
467 safer water collection and storage exhibit reduced genetic clustering of ESBL-E, indicating lower
468 within-household transmission.[15] Improved drinking water in our setting did not involve chlorination at
469 the point of use, which could explain why we did not observe similar associations with ESBL-E
470 acquisition. Nonetheless, our findings combined with these, and other emerging large scale genomic
471 evidence from similar settings,[29] indicate that household- and community-level environmental
472 exposures likely play a substantial role in sustaining high AMR transmission in rural low-resource
473 settings. Consequently, high-AMR-burden rural settings may benefit from integrated One Health
474 strategies that combine environmental risk reduction with antibiotic stewardship interventions, similar
475 to our approach.[30,31]

476 At the same time, there remains a critical need for more robust, causal evidence on the relative
477 contributions of community-level drivers of AMR, as well as on the (cost-)effective and sustainable
478 delivery of WASH interventions in resource-poor settings. In view of this uncertainty, our intervention
479 was intentionally implemented as a bundled strategy, which necessarily limits the extent to which
480 observed effects can be attributed to specific components. A 2024 modelling analysis suggested that
481 universal WASH alone could avert ~247,800 (95% CI 160,000–337,800) AMR-associated deaths
482 through reduced diarrhoea incidence each year, with further gains from infection prevention and control
483 and vaccination.[32] That said, one of the key lessons from the few large-scale randomised controlled
484 WASH trials (which targeted childhood stunting and diarrhoea) is that sustaining individual-level
485 WASH behaviours in rural, resource-limited settings is inherently difficult. This may explain the
486 absence of measurable WASH behaviour change in our study and underscores the importance of
487 addressing broader structural and environmental pathways involving engineered, infrastructural and
488 systemic changes, alongside the need to co-design future solutions with communities.[33]

489 The trial was explicitly powered to detect intervention effects on ESBL-E acquisition and was supported
490 by longitudinal microbiological sampling. While power calculations indicated a high probability of
491 detecting a ≥30% reduction in acquisition, smaller effects such as those we observed may still be
492 clinically relevant. To our knowledge, this is the first study in rural sSA to quantify household-level
493 ESBL-E acquisition, a key precursor to clinical infection. By using continuous-time multi-state models,
494 we were able to estimate acquisition dynamics and seasonal variation while accounting for staggered
495 intervention timing and household-level heterogeneity, yielding statistically more efficient and
496 mechanistically informative intervention endpoints than simple prevalence-based measures. Hence, we
497 provide a methodological framework for evaluating AMR and antibiotic stewardship interventions

beyond current standard practice based solely on changes in targeted exposures. A limitation of our study was that our chosen microbiological sampling intervals did not allow for reliably distinguishing intervention effects on acquisition, from effects on decolonisation events. We opted for three and six months intervals, based on previously estimated mean duration of ESBL-E colonisation of three to four months,[34] but methodological approaches to define optimal spacing could help future AMR intervention trials that aim to similarly assess microbiological impacts.[35] Furthermore, recent genomic analyses show that transmission rates can vary even within single *E. coli* clades, which we did not account for.[36] However, as ESBL genes can spread across lineages and species via horizontal gene transfer, e.g[13] we believe our estimates still capture the broader ARG transmission dynamics, relevant for estimating our intervention effect. Within CABU-EICO, we have sequenced more than 900 ESBL-E isolates, and ongoing whole-genome analyses will provide higher-resolution insight. By integrating these genomic data into a hidden Markov or multi-state modelling framework,[37] we aim to further disentangle within-community transmission pathways and quantify their links to environmental exposures.[21]

Conclusion

Our findings are consistent with a modest reduction in household-level ESBL-E incidence following a contextualised, community-based behavioural intervention targeting both medicine providers and communities in rural Burkina Faso, with effects emerging several months after intervention implementation. Further research disentangling the individual and combined effects of the intervention components, and identifying how these interact with the environmental and seasonal drivers of ESBL-E acquisition identified in this study, will be important for guiding more targeted One Health intervention strategies in Burkina Faso and, more broadly, across rural sSA.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful for microbiological guidance provided by Prof Jan Jacobs. We are also very grateful to the participants and would like to acknowledge the effort provided by the drivers, administrative staff, field workers, lab staff, and community health workers. Specific thanks go to the members of the CABU-EICO study team from both the Nanoro and Kimpese study sites that have supported either the social sciences work that fed into the intervention design, study coordination, data collection, curation, and those that were involved in the remainder CABU EICO work packages on rodent AMR surveillance and molecular characterisation (alphabetical order): Iana Amke-Lowrey-Gold, César-Augustin Mambuku Khoso Muaka, Djibril Binga, Tamara Giles-Vernick, Leonard Heyerdahl, Oscar Kiabanza, Herwig Leirs, Adna Melanda, Richelin Makuaya, Joachim Marien, Didier Ndomba, Anicet Nzuzi, Delphin Mavinga Phanzu, Toussaint Rouamba, Franck Sovi Hien, Sandra Van Puyvelde, Rianne van Vredendaal, Eric Wendpouiré Tiendrébeogo.

Funding

The study was funded under the EU Joint Programme Initiative AMR (JPIAMR2021-053) with member state co-funding by the Belgium FWO, the British UKRI, the French ANR, and the Swedish SIDA. A framework agreement between ITM, CRUN and CRSK is financially supported by the Belgian Development Cooperation. The funders had no access to the data, nor had influence on the design, execution, analysis, or writing of the study report.

Author contributions

EvK, BC, BI, DV, and MvdS conceptualised the study; LC, KJS, WA, and MM coordinated the intervention development and implementation. DPM and LC oversaw the photovoice activities which informed the intervention design. BI, and DV developed and validated the WASH survey with input from MvdS and EvK; YS coordinated the microbiological analyses; BR developed the WASH coding framework for intervention evaluation. DV, and BI coordinated data collection; EvK curated, and validated the data; RA and EvK analysed the data, with input from BC; EvK wrote the first draft manuscript with input from RA; all authors revised the first and subsequent drafts of the manuscript; all authors had full access to the study data and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Declaration of interests

We declare no competing interests.

Data sharing

Pre-study sample size calculations are published at: https://github.com/esthervankleef/sample_size_jpiamr. Questionnaires, informed consent forms, pseudonymized datasets, data dictionaries, and the full analysis code is publicly available under an open-access license at: https://github.com/RaneemAizouk/CABU-EICO/tree/main. The study protocol was published: https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-023-07856-2.

558 **References**

559 1 Naghavi M, Vollset SE, Ikuta KS, *et al.* Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance 1990–
560 2021: a systematic analysis with forecasts to 2050. *The Lancet* 2024; **404**: 1199–226.

561 2 World Health Organization. Global antibiotic resistance surveillance report 2025: WHO Global
562 Antimicrobial Resistance and Use Surveillance System (GLASS). Geneva: World Health
563 Organization, 2025.

564 3 Chatterjee A, Modarai M, Naylor NR, *et al.* Quantifying drivers of antibiotic resistance in humans:
565 a systematic review. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2018; **18**: e368–78.

566 4 Blackmon S, Avendano EE, Nirmala N, *et al.* Socioeconomic status and the risk for colonisation or
567 infection with priority bacterial pathogens: a global evidence map. *The Lancet Microbe* 2024; :
568 100993.

569 5 Davis K, Limato R, Monga M, *et al.* Antimicrobial resistance, equity and justice in low- and
570 middle-income countries: an intersectional critical interpretive synthesis. *Nat Commun* 2025; **16**:
571 9078.

572 6 United Nations General Assembly Political Declaration of the High-level Meeting on Antimicrobial
573 Resistance. 2024; published online Sept 26.

574 7 Brent A, Ahmed I, Ndiritu M, *et al.* Incidence of clinically significant bacteraemia in children who
575 present to hospital in Kenya: community-based observational study. *The Lancet* 2006; **367**: 482–8.

576 8 World Health Organization. WHO integrated global surveillance on ESBL-producing E. coli using
577 a "One Health" approach: Implementation and opportunities. Geneva: World Health Organization,
578 2021.

579 9 Mughini-Gras L, Dorado-García A, van Duijkeren E, *et al.* Attributable sources of community-
580 acquired carriage of Escherichia coli containing β-lactam antibiotic resistance genes: a population-
581 based modelling study. *The Lancet Planetary Health* 2019; **3**: e357–69.

582 10 Haverkate MR, Platteel TN, Fluit AC, *et al.* Quantifying within-household transmission of
583 extended-spectrum β-lactamase-producing bacteria. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection* 2016; **23**:
584 46.e1-46.e7.

585 11 Ling W, Peri AM, Furuya-Kanamori L, Harris PNA, Paterson DL. Carriage Duration and
586 Household Transmission of Enterobacterales Producing Extended-Spectrum Beta-Lactamase in the
587 Community: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Microbial Drug Resistance* 2022; **28**: 795–
588 805.

589 12 Hobson C, Peiffer-Smadja N, Hamard M, Armand-Lefevre L, Birgand G, Kerneis S. Community
590 human-to-human transmission of multidrug resistant Enterobacterales in high-income countries: a
591 systematic review. *CMI Communications* 2025; **05146**.

592 13 Muloi DM, Wee BA, McClean DMH, *et al.* Population genomics of Escherichia coli in livestock-
593 keeping households across a rapidly developing urban landscape. *Nat Microbiol* 2022; **7**: 581–9.

594 14 Cocker D, Chidziwisano K, Mphasa M, *et al.* Investigating One Health risks for human
595 colonisation with extended spectrum β-lactamase-producing Escherichia coli and Klebsiella
596 pneumoniae in Malawian households: a longitudinal cohort study. *The Lancet Microbe* 2023; **4**:
597 e534–43.

598 15 Kim DD, Swarthout JM, Worby CJ, *et al.* Contaminated drinking water facilitates Escherichia coli
599 strain-sharing within households in urban informal settlements. *Nat Microbiol* 2025; **10**: 1198–209.

600 16 Lipsitch M, Samore MH. Antimicrobial Use and Antimicrobial Resistance : A Population
601 Perspective. *Emerging infectious diseases* 2002; **8**: 347–54.

602 17 Ramay BM, Caudell MA, Cordón-Rosales C, *et al.* Antibiotic use and hygiene interact to influence
603 the distribution of antimicrobial-resistant bacteria in low-income communities in Guatemala. *Sci*
604 *Rep* 2020; **10**: 13767.

605 18 Schweitzer VA, van Heijl I, van Werkhoven CH, *et al.* The quality of studies evaluating
606 antimicrobial stewardship interventions: a systematic review. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*
607 2019; **25**: 555–61.

608 19 Nair MM, Mahajan R, Burza S, Zeegers MP. Behavioral interventions to address rational use of
609 antibiotics in outpatient settings of low-income and lower-middle-income countries. *Tropical*
610 *Medicine & International Health* 2021. DOI:10.1111/tmi.13550.

611 20 Das J, Chowdhury A, Hussam R, Banerjee A. The impact of training informal health care providers
612 in India: A randomized controlled trial. *Science* 2016; **354**: aaf7384.

613 21 CABU-EICO consortium, Van Der Sande M, Ingelbeen B, *et al.* Evaluating the effect of a
614 behavioural intervention bundle on antibiotic use, quality of care, and household transmission of
615 resistant Enterobacteriaceae in intervention versus control clusters in rural Burkina Faso and DR
616 Congo (CABU-EICO). *Trials* 2024; **25**: 91.

617 22 UNICEF, World Health Organisation. Core questions on water, sanitation and hygiene for
618 household surveys: 2018 update. New York: United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and World
619 Health Organization, 2018.

620 23 Sun DS, Kissler SM, Kanjilal S, Olesen SW, Lipsitch M, Grad YH. Analysis of multiple bacterial
621 species and antibiotic classes reveals large variation in the association between seasonal antibiotic
622 use and resistance. *PLoS Biol* 2022; **20**: e3001579.

623 24 van der Sande M, Valia D, Tigoi C, *et al.* ALARUM: Active One Health surveillance in LMICs
624 to monitor and predict Antimicrobial Resistance Using Metagenomics: study protocol. *BMJ Open*;
625 **Accepted**.

626 25 Sié A, Ouattara M, Bountogo M, *et al.* Indication for Antibiotic Prescription Among Children
627 Attending Primary Healthcare Services in Rural Burkina Faso. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2021;
628 **73**: 1288–91.

629 26 Valia D, Ingelbeen B, Kaboré B, *et al.* Use of WATCH antibiotics prior to presentation to the
630 hospital in rural Burkina Faso. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control* 2022; **11**: 59.

631 27 Lewis JM, Mphasa M, Banda R, *et al.* Colonization dynamics of extended-spectrum beta-
632 lactamase-producing Enterobacterales in the gut of Malawian adults. *Nat Microbiol* 2022; **7**: 1593–
633 604.

634 28 Sammarro M, Rowlingson B, Cocker D, *et al.* Risk Factors, Temporal Dependence, and
635 Seasonality of Human Extended-Spectrum β-Lactamases-Producing *Escherichia coli* and
636 *Klebsiella pneumoniae* Colonization in Malawi: A Longitudinal Model-Based Approach. *Clinical*
637 *Infectious Diseases* 2023; **77**: 1–8.

638 29 Fuhrmeister ER, Harvey AP, Nadimpalli ML, *et al.* Evaluating the relationship between community
639 water and sanitation access and the global burden of antibiotic resistance: an ecological study. *The*

640 *Lancet Microbe* 2023; **4**: e591–600.

641 30 Musicha P, Morse T, Cocker D, Mugisha L, Jewell CP, Feasey NA. Time to define One Health
642 approaches to tackling antimicrobial resistance. *Nat Commun* 2024; **15**: 8782.

643 31 Musicha P, Beale MA, Cocker D, *et al.* Transmission of extended spectrum β-lactamase-producing
644 Escherichia coli and antimicrobial resistance gene flow across One Health compartments in eastern
645 Africa: a whole-genome sequence analysis from a prospective cohort study. *The Lancet Microbe*
646 2025; : 101224.

647 32 Lewnard JA, Charani E, Gleason A, *et al.* Burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in low-
648 income and middle-income countries avertible by existing interventions: an evidence review and
649 modelling analysis. *The Lancet* 2024; **403**: 2439–54.

650 33 Pickering AJ, Crider Y, Sultana S, *et al.* Effect of in-line drinking water chlorination at the point of
651 collection on child diarrhoea in urban Bangladesh: a double-blind, cluster-randomised controlled
652 trial. *The Lancet Global Health* 2019; **7**: e1247–56.

653 34 Haverkate MR, Derde LPG, Brun-Buisson C, Bonten MJM, Bootsma MCJ. Duration of
654 colonization with antimicrobial-resistant bacteria after ICU discharge. *Intensive care medicine*
655 2014; **40**: 564–71.

656 35 Mehtälä J, Auranen K, Kulathinal S. Optimal Observation Times for Multistate Markov Models—
657 Applications to Pneumococcal Colonization Studies. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series*
658 *C: Applied Statistics* 2015; **64**: 451–68.

659 36 Ojala F, Pesonen H, Gladstone RA, *et al.* Basic reproduction number varies markedly between
660 closely related pandemic Escherichia coli clones. *Nat Commun* 2025; **16**: 9490.

661 37 Eyre DW, Laager M, Sarah Walker A, Cooper BS, Wilson DJ. Probabilistic transmission models
662 incorporating sequencing data for healthcare-associated Clostridioides difficile outperform heuristic
663 rules and identify strain-specific differences in transmission. *PLoS Computational Biology* 2021;
664 **17**. DOI:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008417.

665

Legends

Table legends

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of study population from households where follow-up faecal samples were collected.

Table 2: Change in WASH-indicators in all households where a household survey was taken (A) and households where a household survey and stool was sampled (B). Correct handwashing is defined as observed handwashing following defecation with soap available and used. Prevalence ratios (PRs) were estimated using survey-weighted quasi-Poisson regression models with a log link, accounting for household clustering within villages and survey weights proportional to the village population size divided by the number of households surveyed. Models included an interaction between intervention arm and survey round to estimate difference-in-differences effects.

Figure legends

Figure 1: Intervention and study design and data collection scheme (A); intervention effect scenarios considered (B); Modelling framework (C). R1 = Intervention round one; R2 = Intervention round two; R3 = Intervention round three. Sea-blue dotted lines mark the start of each of the three intervention rounds. Coral dotted lines mark the start of each of the stool collection rounds, which were planned one week after the roll-out of each of the intervention rounds. The interventions were implemented in each of the 11 villages consecutively, spanning for round one and round three a three-month period. Round two was implemented over one-month to ensure the activities were implemented before the rainy season. Each of the stool collection rounds were anticipated to start one week after the introduction of the intervention in each of the respective village clusters, again over a three month period. λ_{12} corresponds to the instantaneous daily rate of ESBL-E acquisition, whereas λ_{21} representents the daily decolonisation rate.

Figure 2: Trial profile diagram. Villages were assessed for eligibility, enrolled, and allocated to intervention or control clusters. The diagram shows the number of households, participants, and stool samples contributing data across study rounds, including baseline, intervention start, three months after intervention start, and post-intervention. Exclusions due to village eligibility criteria and missing age or sex information are indicated for each intervention group. WASH = water, sanitation, and hygiene. R2 = intervention start; R3= three months after intervention start.

Figure 3: Intervention effect on ESBL-E acquisitions. ESBL-E acquisition is expressed as incidence per 100 person-days per intervention phase of the intervention vs control group for scenario 1 (A) and scenario 2 (B). In scenario 1, a separate effect for the early post-intervention phase (1-6 month post-intervention) and the late post-intervention phase (6-9 months) was estimated. In scenario 2, a constant intervention effect was estimated, assuming the different intervention rounds would maintain the effect.

Figure 4: Seasonal pattern of ESBL-E acquisition (A). Baseline, sinusoidal approach. For cubic spline approach, see supplementary material. **Effect of individual intervention targets on acquisition from the Cox proportional hazard models (B).** Hazard ratio for the risk of household acquisition of ESBL-E in rural Burkina Faso among individuals in the control group. Shadings represent from light to dark: 95% Confidence Intervals (CI), 80%CI and 50%CI respectively. HR<1 indicates a decreased risk, HR>1 indicates an increased risk.