

1 Investigating risks for human colonisation with extended spectrum beta-lactamase producing *E.*  
2 *coli* and *K. pneumoniae* in Malawian households: a one health longitudinal cohort study

3

4 **Authors:**

5 Derek Cocker\*<sup>1,2</sup>, Kondwani Chidziwisano<sup>3,4</sup>, Madalitso Mphasa<sup>1</sup>, Taonga Mwapasa<sup>3</sup>, Joseph M.  
6 Lewis<sup>2,5</sup>, Barry Rowlingson<sup>6</sup>, Melodie Sammarro<sup>2,6</sup>, Winnie Bakali<sup>1</sup>, Chifundo Salifu<sup>1</sup>, Allan Zuza<sup>1</sup>,  
7 Mary Charles<sup>1</sup>, Tamandani Mandula<sup>1</sup>, Victor Maiden<sup>1</sup>, Stevie Amos<sup>3</sup>, Shevin T Jacob<sup>1,7</sup>, Henry  
8 Kajumbula<sup>8</sup>, Lawrence Mugisha<sup>9,10</sup>, David Musoke<sup>11</sup>, Rachael Byrne<sup>12</sup>, Thomas Edwards<sup>12</sup>,  
9 Rebecca Lester<sup>2</sup>, Nicola Elviss<sup>13</sup>, Adam Roberts<sup>14</sup>, Andrew C Singer<sup>15</sup>, Christopher Jewell<sup>6</sup>, Tracy  
10 Morse<sup>¶3,4</sup>, Nicholas A Feasey<sup>¶1,2</sup>.

11

12 ¶ Indicates authors contributed equally

13 \*Corresponding author

14

15 **Affiliations**

- 16 1. Malawi Liverpool Wellcome Research Programme, Kamuzu University of Health Sciences,  
17 Blantyre, Malawi
- 18 2. Department of Clinical Sciences, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK
- 19 3. Centre for Water, Sanitation, Health and Appropriate Technology Development (WASHTED),  
20 Malawi University of Business and Applied Sciences (MUBAS), P/Bag 303, Chichiri, Blantyre  
21 3, Malawi
- 22 4. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK
- 23 5. Department of Clinical Infection, Microbiology and Immunology, University of Liverpool,  
24 Liverpool, UK
- 25 6. Centre for Health Informatics Computing and Statistics, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK

- 26 7. Global Health Security Department, Infectious Disease Institute, Makerere University,  
27 Kampala, Uganda
- 28 8. Department of Medical Microbiology, College of Health Sciences, Makerere University,  
29 Kampala, Uganda
- 30 9. College of Veterinary Medicine, Animal Resources and Biosecurity (COVAB), Makerere  
31 University, Kampala, Uganda
- 32 10. Conservation & Ecosystem Health Alliance, Kampala, Uganda
- 33 11. Department of Disease Control and Environmental Health, School of Public Health, College  
34 of Health Sciences, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda
- 35 12. Centre for Drugs and Diagnostics, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool, UK
- 36 13. Science Group, United Kingdom Health Security Agency, London, UK
- 37 14. Department of Tropical Disease Biology, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool,  
38 UK
- 39 15. UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Benson Lane, Wallingford, UK

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52 **Abstract:**

53

54 Background

55 Low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) have high morbidity and mortality from drug-resistant  
56 infections, especially from enteric bacteria such as *Escherichia coli*. LMICs have varying infrastructure  
57 and services in the community to separate people from human and animal waste, creating risks for  
58 ESBL-Enterobacterales (ESBL-E) transmission. Limited data exist from Southern Africa on the  
59 prevalence of ESBL-E the community.

60

61 Methods and findings

62 In this longitudinal cohort study we took a one-health approach to investigating prevalence and  
63 distribution of ESBL-E in urban, peri-urban and rural Malawian households between May 2018 and  
64 October 2020. We described human health, antibiotic usage (ABU), health seeking behaviour,  
65 structural and behavioural environmental health practices, and animal husbandry at these  
66 households. In parallel, human and animal stool and diverse environmental samples were collected  
67 and cultured to identify presence of ESBL *E. coli* and ESBL *K. pneumoniae*. Univariable and  
68 multivariable analysis was performed to determine associations with human ESBL-E colonisation.

69

70 We recruited 300 households, totalling 841 visits, and a paucity of environmental health  
71 infrastructure and materials for safe sanitation was noted across all sites. In total, 11,975 samples  
72 were cultured and ESBL-E were isolated from 41.8% (n=1190) of human stool and 29.8% (n=290) of  
73 animal stool samples. Animal species with particularly high rates of ESBL-E colonisation included pigs  
74 (56.8%, n=21) poultry (32.5%, n=148) and dogs (58.8% n= 30). ESBL-E were isolated from 66.2%  
75 (n=339) of river water samples and 46.0% (n=138) of drain samples. Urban areas had greater ESBL-E  
76 contamination of food, household surfaces, floors and the external environment, alongside the

77 highest rates of ESBL-E colonisation in humans (47.1%, n=384) and animals (55.1%, n=65).  
78 Multivariable models illustrated that human ESBL *E. coli* colonisation was associated with the wet  
79 season (aOR = 1.66, 95%CrI: 1.38-2.00), living in urban areas (aOR = 2.01, 95%CrI: 1.26-3.24),  
80 advanced age (aOR = 1.14, 95%CrI: 1.05-1.24) and in households where animals were observed  
81 interacting with food (aOR = 1.62, 95%CrI: 1.17-2.28) or kept inside (aOR = 1.58, 95%CrI: 1.00-2.43).  
82 Human ESBL *K. pneumoniae* colonisation was also associated with the wet season (aOR = 2.23,  
83 95%CrI: 1.63-2.76.

84

85 Conclusion.

86 We identified extremely high levels of ESBL-E colonisation in humans and animals and contamination  
87 of the environment in Southern Malawi. Urbanisation and season are key risks for ESBL-E  
88 colonisation, perhaps reflecting environmental contamination as toilets overflow in high population  
89 density areas in heavy rains in the wet season. Without adequate efforts to improve environmental  
90 health, ESBL transmission is likely to persist in this setting.

91

## 92 **Introduction:**

93 In sub-Saharan Africa (sSA) there is a high morbidity and mortality from infections caused by  
94 antimicrobial resistant (AMR) bacteria, especially extended-spectrum  $\beta$ -lactamase (ESBL) producing  
95 Enterobacterales (1). Given the heavy reliance on 3<sup>rd</sup>-generation cephalosporins (3GCs) in human  
96 health, two of the most important AMR bacteria found in sSA include *Escherichia coli*, responsible  
97 for a spectrum of community acquired infections and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, more typically  
98 associated with healthcare associated infection (HCAI) (2). These bacteria are present in the guts of  
99 humans and animals and also within the broader environment (3). Households are therefore a focal  
100 point from which these enteric bacteria can disseminate via human and animal waste into the  
101 environment, potentially facilitating onward transmission of these bacteria to further human and  
102 animal hosts (4,5).

103

104 In low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), paucity of infrastructure and services to support  
105 environmental health (including water, sanitation, food safety and hygiene) are a key facilitator of  
106 unrestricted interaction between people and both human and animal waste in the environment.  
107 These infrastructural and service delivery inadequacies are compounded by poor hygiene practices,  
108 which increase the complexity and opportunity for these interactions (6,7). Environmental health  
109 factors are therefore thought to play a central role in environmental ESBL-Enterobacterales (ESBL-E)  
110 transmission, which may lead to onward risks for vulnerable individuals (6). Interventions to  
111 interrupt community ESBL-E transmission need to target key transmission routes, yet context  
112 specific data to guide such interventions are lacking.

113

114 It is likely that transmission routes are heterogeneous across different settings: environmental  
115 health infrastructure and practices typically differ between urban and rural settings, with urban  
116 areas considered at particular risk of AMR transmission due to high-density housing, increased

117 antibiotic use (ABU) and a paucity of environmental health infrastructure (8). Regional differences in  
118 animal ownership and husbandry practices are likely to further impact risks of AMR transmission.  
119 Therefore, a one health approach interrogating human, animal and environmental health factors  
120 across urban and rural settings in LMIC is critical to generate data to inform cost-effective  
121 interventions. To date, little evidence exists in the literature on the prevalence of ESBL bacteria in  
122 LMIC households and communities, especially one health data incorporating contemporaneously  
123 collected data on the prevalence of ESBL colonisation in co-located animals and the local  
124 environment (9).

125

126 Here, we have placed households in urban, peri-urban and rural settings in Malawi at the heart of  
127 our study; our objectives were i) to describe the prevalence of ESBL-E found in human, animal and  
128 environmental compartments in Blantyre, Malawi, and ii) identify key one health factors associated  
129 with human ESBL-E colonisation to inform future interventions.

130

## 131 **Methods:**

132 Between May 2018 and October 2020 we aimed to recruit 300 households, 100 in each of Ndirande  
133 (urban), Chileka (peri-urban) and Chikwawa (rural) in the Southern region of Malawi using GPS  
134 coordinates derived via an inhibitory with close pair spatial design to avoid systematic biases (see  
135 (10) for detailed protocol). These study sites were included to enable variations in environmental  
136 health practices, animal practices, antibiotic usage (ABU), and contamination with ESBL-producing  
137 bacteria to be contrasted. Households identified at or near GPS locations were screened for  
138 inclusion and excluded if (i) they did not fall into the demarcated study boundaries, (ii) had <2  
139 people inhabiting the household, (iii) did not speak English or Chichewa, or (iv) if they did not  
140 consent to take part in the study. 65 households per region were assigned for longitudinal follow-up

141 and had 4 visits in total over a 6-month period and the remaining 35 households had a baseline visit  
142 alone.

143

144 Case report forms (CRFs) were completed at each visit, providing information at both an individual  
145 and household level on human health, antibiotic usage (ABU), health seeking behaviour, structural  
146 and behavioural environmental health proxies and animal husbandry. In parallel, observational  
147 checklists were completed, documenting key environmental health and household sanitation  
148 practices. Lastly, at each visit, up to 20 microbiological samples were taken, inclusive of human stool,  
149 animal stool and a broad range of environmental sites (See (10) for details).

150

151 Samples were incubated in an enrichment broth (buffered peptone water) at  $37 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$  for 18-24  
152 hours and plated onto CHROMagar™ ESBL chromogenic agar (CHROMagar™, France). Plates were  
153 then placed in an aerobic incubator at  $37 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$  for 18-24 hours and read for growth of ESBL bacteria.  
154 Pink colonies and indole positive white colonies were categorised as ESBL *E. coli*, while blue colonies  
155 underwent speciation for *K. pneumoniae* using high resolution melt-curve (HRM) PCR, to identify  
156 ESBL *K. pneumoniae* isolates (11).

157

158 Statistical analyses and graphic visualisations were performed using R v4.1.2 (R foundation for  
159 statistical computing, Vienna, Austria). Summaries are presented as proportions medians +/-  
160 interquartile range (IQR) or means +/- standard deviation (SD). Kruskal-Wallis and Fisher's exact  
161 were used to test the equivalence of regional groups (i.e. urban, peri-urban and rural) for continuous  
162 and categorical variables respectively. Chi-squared was used to test for differences in bacterial  
163 species composition of samples and seasonal variations in prevalence (wet/dry). Wet season was  
164 classified as samples obtained between Nov-Apr and dry season was classified as samples obtained  
165 between May-Oct.

166

167 Statistical analysis used Bayesian logistic regression to identify factors associated with human ESBL-E  
168 colonisation; nonindependence of within-participant and within-household samples was accounted  
169 for using hierarchical random effects. Before building regression models, principal component  
170 analysis (PCA) was used to visualise variation in the dataset across regions (urban, peri-urban, and  
171 rural) using the FactoMineR package in R (12). Putative individual-level variables (e.g age, sex),  
172 household level variables (e.g. household size, presence of toilet) and environmental contamination  
173 variables (e.g. presence of ESBL-E in drain or stored water) likely to be associated with human ESBL-E  
174 colonisation were identified *a priori* by the DRUM consortium (**S1a-1c Tables**) and PCA performed on  
175 each group of variables, after log-transforming continuous variables. Individuals and households  
176 were then plotted in PCA space for each of the groups of variables with 95% confidence ellipses for  
177 each region (i.e. the region that contains 95% of all samples that can be drawn from the underlying  
178 normal distribution).

179

180 A variable selection strategy was used to construct the logistic regression models. The outcome  
181 variable was ESBL-E colonisation in human stool, with separate models fit for ESBL *E. coli* and ESBL *K.*  
182 *pneumoniae*. Individual and household variables were considered for inclusion. Environmental  
183 contamination variables were not included as these were considered to be on the causal pathway  
184 from other variables to the outcome. A stratified univariable analysis using logistic regression in each  
185 region separately was performed to determine which variables to include in the final analysis.  
186 Variables that were significantly associated with ESBL colonisation by univariable analysis ( $p < 0.05$ ) in  
187 any region were considered for inclusion into multivariable models, and those which were not  
188 significant or where data was unavailable for at least one region were not included. Region as well as  
189 a random intercept per individual, which was nested within a random intercept per household were  
190 included in the final models as well as the other selected variables. The models were fit with Stan  
191 v2.21.0 via the R *brms* v2.13.5 package with 4 chains per dataset each with 2000 iterations in total,  
192 with 1000 warm up iterations. Default priors were used and convergence of models assessed by



193 inspection of traceplots and by the R-hat convergence diagnostic value being close to 1. Outputs  
194 were expressed as odds ratios (OR) with 95% credible interval (CrI).

195

196 To allow for the possibility that some variables may have different effects on human ESBL-E  
197 colonisation in different settings, (for example be protective in urban but not rural settings) further  
198 models were built allowing for interaction effects between region and covariates. Here, ESBL *E. coli*  
199 and ESBL *K. pneumoniae* univariable models with and without a region by covariate interaction term  
200 were fitted and compared by likelihood ratio testing. If the model with the interaction term was a  
201 better fit to the data (defined as  $p < 0.05$ ) then the interaction term was included in the final  
202 “regional” model; otherwise it was omitted. These models included the variables selected, alongside  
203 a random intercept per individual, nested within a random intercept per household as before, and fit  
204 using the same methods outlined in the final model. Households that did not undergo follow-up only  
205 provided baseline data, and longitudinal sample data for these households was not included in the  
206 final models. A STROBE statement checklist (**S2 Table**) and primary datasets (**S3a-d Tables**) have  
207 been included in the supplementary material. Anonymised IDs have been used for participant and  
208 households.

209

210 Ethical approval was obtained from Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM) Research and  
211 Ethics Committee, UK (REC, #18-090) and College of Medicine Research and Ethics Committee,  
212 Malawi (#P.11/18/2541). In addition, administrative permissions were granted from community  
213 leaders and support obtained from local community advisory groups. Sensitizations of study  
214 communities were conducted prior to initiation, and full informed written consent was obtained  
215 from all household participants recruited into the study, in their local language.

216

217 **Results:**

218 Between May 2018 and October 2020, 611 households (urban=263, peri-urban=229 and rural=119)  
219 were screened and 300 households (100 per region) were recruited (**Fig 1**). 179 households  
220 underwent longitudinal visits, 105 underwent a baseline visit only and 16 households were lost to  
221 follow-up (841 visits). There were 1351 household members across 300 households, 71.4%  
222 (n=965/1351) of whom consented to recruitment.

223

## 224 **Demographic and human health**

225

226 The median (IQR) residents per household was 4 (3-5), with urban, peri-urban and rural sites having  
227 4 (3-5), 4 (3-6) and 4 (3-5) members respectively (**Table 1**). Most households comprised of a mix of  
228 adults and children, with 2 (2-3) adults, 1 (0-2) adolescent, 0 (0-1) children and 0 (0-1) infants per  
229 household. Household income was higher in urban and peri-urban regions than the rural region.  
230 However, 97.7% (n=293) of households lived in absolute poverty, as defined by the World Bank  
231 (<\$1.90/day per individual).

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244  
245  
246  
247

**Table 1.** Baseline household and participant characteristics, stratified by region

<i>Household characteristic</i>	<b>Total</b> (n=300)	<b>median (IQR)</b>			<b>p</b>
		<b>Urban</b> (n=100)	<b>Peri-urban</b> (n=100)	<b>Rural</b> (n=100)	
Number of household members	4 (3-5)	4 (3-5)	4 (3-6)	4 (3-5)	.281
Household Income (Malawi Kwacha/month)*	30,000 (20,000-50,000)	50,000 (28,750-60,000)	40,000 (30,000-70,000)	20,000 (10,000-30,000)	>.001
<b>n (%) unless otherwise stated</b>					
<i>Individual characteristics</i>	<b>Total</b> (n=965)	<b>Urban</b> (n=312)	<b>Peri-urban</b> (n=383)	<b>Rural</b> (n=270)	<b>p</b>
Age [median yrs (IQR)]	18 (7-34)	15 (7-32)	20 (9-37)	17 (7-32)	.031
Sex, male	420 (43.5%)	122 (39.1%)	170 (44.4%)	128 (47.4%)	.121
Job status					
Student	372 (38.5%)	137 (43.9%)	140 (36.6%)	95 (35.2%)	.059
Unemployed	379 (39.3%)	107 (34.3%)	129 (33.7%)	143 (53.0%)	>.001
Employed	214 (22.2%)	68 (21.8%)	114 (29.7%)	32 (11.8%)	
<i>Health status and healthcare exposures</i>					
Co-morbidities, yes	66 (6.8%)	12 (4.0%)	24 (6.3%)	30 (11.1%)	.003
Living with HIV	66 (14.0%)	19 (10.5%)	26 (23.6%)	21 (11.3%)	.026
Previous TB	12 (1.2%)	5 (2.0%)	4 (1.0%)	3 (1.1%)	.765
Illness episode in last month	154 (16.0%)	35 (11.2%)	65 (17.0%)	54 (20.0%)	.011
Healthcare exposure as patient (last 6 months)	25 (2.6%)	6 (1.9%)	10 (2.6%)	9 (3.3%)	.541
Healthcare exposure as guardian (last 6 months)	28 (2.9%)	6 (1.9%)	8 (2.1%)	14 (5.2%)	.046
Healthcare exposure for work	4 (0.4%)	2 (0.6%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.4%)	.828
<i>Medication usage<sup>^</sup></i>					
Non-communicable disease medications	28 (2.9%)	12 (3.8%)	6 (1.6%)	10 (3.7%)	.120
Antiretroviral therapy*	62 (93.9%)	17 (89.5%)	25 (96.2%)	20 (95.2%)	.263
Co-trimoxazole preventative therapy*	60 (90.9%)	16 (84.2%)	24 (92.3%)	20 (95.2%)	.105
<i>Antibiotic exposure in last 6 months</i>					
Antibiotic usage, yes	147 (15.2%)	51 (16.3%)	35 (9.1%)	61 (22.6%)	>.001

248 \* Adjusted for HIV individuals in each site (urban (n=19), peri-urban (n=26) and rural (n=21)). <sup>^</sup>Ongoing at  
249 baseline. \*1000MK = ~1 US Dollar.

250  
251  
252  
253

The median age of the study population was 18 years (IQR 7-34), and 56.5% (n=545) of household respondents were women (Table 1). 51% (n=492) of the study population had no documented HIV status, and the HIV prevalence amongst those with a reported HIV test was 14.0% (n=66), highest in

254 the peri-urban region, with high anti-retroviral therapy (ART) and co-trimoxazole preventative  
255 therapy (CPT) uptake (93.9% [n=62] on ART and 90.9% [n=60] on CPT).

256

257 There were no cases of active TB in the cohort, and only 12 participants reported past TB therapy.  
258 Non-infectious comorbidities were infrequent, with 6.8% (n=66) of the cohort reporting conditions  
259 such as hypertension, peptic ulcer disease and COPD, and only 2.9% (n=28) took any form of regular  
260 medication other than ART or CPT (**Table 1**). There were low levels of recent healthcare exposure,  
261 with 2.6% (n=25) of participants admitted to hospital, 2.9% of participants attending hospital as a  
262 guardian and 0.4% of participants working in healthcare settings during the last 6 months, although  
263 15.2% (n=142) of participants received antibiotics in the last 6 months (**Table 1**) predominantly  
264 limited to oral amoxicillin, metronidazole and co-trimoxazole (**S4a Table**). Children were more likely  
265 to be prescribed antibiotics, with under 5s being the age group with the greatest chance of having  
266 been given an antibiotic in the last 6 months (**S4b Table**).

267

## 268 **Animal husbandry practices**

269

270 58.7% (n=176) of households reported co-habitation with domestic or livestock animals, with 36.0%  
271 (n=36), 59.0% (n=59) and, 81.0% (n=81) of households in the urban, peri-urban and rural sites  
272 owning  $\geq 1$  animal respectively (**Table 2**). A total of n=2169 animals were linked to a study household  
273 at baseline, and both the composition of species and number of animals present per households  
274 varied by region (**Table 2 and S5 Table**). Companion animals (cats and dogs) were located in low  
275 numbers per house and made up a large proportion of the animal species owned in urban (n=23/36,  
276 63.9%) and peri-urban (n=25/59, 42.4%) households. Many households kept poultry (i.e. chickens,  
277 doves and ducks), and chickens were both the most commonly owned and most numerous animals  
278 (urban=18% (n=18), peri-urban=39% (n=39) and rural=59% (n=59) households). Larger animals (pigs,  
279 goats and cattle) were seen at fewer households and primarily in the rural or peri-urban settings,

280 highlighting regional differences in animal ownership. 25.7% of households specifically owned  
 281 animals for breeding and selling purposes, especially in the rural area.

282

283 **Table 2.** Baseline animal husbandry characteristics, stratified by region

	n (%)				
	Total (n=300)	Urban (n=100)	Peri-urban (n=100)	Rural (n=100)	p
<b>Animal husbandry</b>					
Households that own animals	176 (58.7%)	36 (36%)	59 (59%)	81 (81%)	> .001
<b>Species of animals owned<sup>^</sup></b>					
Chickens	116 (38.7%)	18 (18.0%)	39 (39.0%)	59 (59.0%)	> .001
Goats	49 (16.3%)	0 (0.0%)	12 (12.0%)	37 (37.0%)	> .001
Dogs	43 (14.3%)	14 (14.0%)	19 (19.0%)	10 (10.0%)	.212
Cats	24 (8.0%)	9 (9.0%)	6 (6.0%)	7 (7.0%)	.790
Cattle	23 (7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	23 (23.0%)	NA
Pigs	17 (5.7%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (5.0%)	12 (12.0%)	> .001
Ducks	14 (4.7%)	2 (2.0%)	2 (2.0%)	10 (10.0%)	.017
Doves	13 (4.3%)	1 (1.0%)	5 (5.0%)	7 (7.0%)	.092
Other	6 (2.8%)	2 (2.4%)	3 (3.5%)	1 (2.4%)	1.00
Guinea fowl	3 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.0%)	.109
Turkeys	2 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.0%)	0 (0.0%)	.331
Households that rear animals to sell?	77 (25.7%)	3 (3.0%)	25 (25.0%)	49 (49.0%)	> .001
Chickens kept inside the house, yes*	70 (60.3%)	15 (83.3%)	25 (64.1%)	30 (50.8%)	.041
Goats kept inside the house, yes*	8 (16.3%)	NA	5 (41.7%)	3 (8.1%)	.015
<b>Animal disease and antibiotic usage</b>					
<b>Disease noted in last 12 months, yes</b>					
Poultry	51 (44.3%)	8 (44.4%)	17 (44.7%)	26 (44.0%)	
Cattle	8 (34.8%)	NA	NA	8 (34.8%)	
Pigs	4 (23.5%)	NA	0 (0.0%)	4 (33.3%)	
Goats	11(22.4%)	NA	1 (8.3%)	10 (27.0%)	
Access to professional animal health services	47 (26.9%)	7(19.4%)	11 (19.0%)	29 (35.8%)	0.054
Antibiotics given to animals in the last 2 months	7 (4.0%)	1 (2.8%)	2 (3.4%)	4 (4.9%)	1.00

284 \*= denominator includes only those households that either owned chickens or goats.

285

286 Regional differences in animal husbandry practices were found, with animals frequently kept inside  
 287 the house in the urban setting, particularly poultry (**Table 2 & S5 Table**). Co-located animals often  
 288 had episodes of presumed illness, especially poultry (43.3%, n=51), but households had limited  
 289 access to, or awareness of, veterinarian services (26.9%, n=47). Households reported that they

290 would often do nothing if animals became unwell (**S6 Table**), and only 7 households treated any  
291 animals with antibiotics prior to recruitment into the study (**Table 2**).

292

## 293 **Environmental interaction and environmental health**

294

295 Households typically obtained water from boreholes (48.7%, n=153), public kiosks (25.2%, n=79) or  
296 taps piped into the household compound (16.9%, n=53). Water was infrequently treated prior to  
297 drinking (8.3%, n=25) and often left uncovered when stored (31.9%, n=143). In total, 89.0% (n=267)  
298 of households owned a toilet, most commonly a pit latrine (88.8%, n=137), and frequently shared  
299 their toilet with other non-household members (41.9%, n=112). Open defecation was common, with  
300 28.7% (n=86) of households reporting at least 1 member of the household practicing open  
301 defecation, and human faeces were found on the floor in or around the household compound at  
302 8.1% of visits. Access to infrastructure and consumables for adequate hand-hygiene was limited  
303 (**Table 3**). Anal cleansing materials were identified at 18.9% of toilet visits, and despite 89.7% of  
304 households reporting they washed their hands after toileting, only 41.0% (n=120) households had a  
305 handwashing facility (HWF), 49.0% (n=166/339) of which had soap and 85.8% (n=349/408) of which  
306 had access to water upon visits. 4.3% (n=13) of households had adequate management of animal  
307 faeces and 8.0% (n=24) of households had adequate waste management of household rubbish.

308

309 Households relied on local markets for purchasing vegetables (86.7%, n=260) and frequently ate  
310 street food (89.0% n=267). Cooked food was often seen to be covered (92.3%, n=286), but raw fruit  
311 and vegetables (38.1%, n=131), and cooking utensils (15.9% n=129) were often left uncovered.  
312 Where households owned animals, they were often seen in contact with human food (62.8% n=123)  
313 and were frequently present in food preparation areas (24.1% n=196).

314

315 Key environmental exposures included human contact, particularly children, with standing water,  
 316 open drains and local rivers (Table 3). Observations of environmental sanitation practices were  
 317 undertaken by study staff on each household visit, and where standing water was identified,  
 318 children (24.6%, n=16) and animals (50.8%, n=33) were frequently observed interacting with it. High  
 319 levels of interactions were also seen with the local sewerage system, with children and animals  
 320 observed to be in contact with open drains 20.4% (n=28) and 43.8% (n=60) of the time respectively.  
 321 Among the households, 22.0% (n=66) reported adults and 33.0% (n=99) reported children had  
 322 regular contact with the local river network.

323

324 **Table 3.** Baseline environmental health infrastructure, practices and environmental exposures

	n (%) unless otherwise indicated				
	Total (n=300)	Urban (n=100)	Peri-urban (n=100)	Rural (n=100)	P
<b>Water management</b>					
<b>Drinking water source</b>					
Tube well/ Borehole	153 (48.7%)	7 (7.0%)	60 (60.0%)	86 (86.0%)	<.001
Public tap/ standpipe	79 (25.2%)	64 (64.0%)	12 (12.0%)	3 (3.0%)	<.001
Piped outside dwelling	53 (16.9%)	22 (22.0%)	20 (20.0%)	11 (11.0%)	.036
Piped into dwelling	24 (7.6%)	10 (10.0%)	12 (12.0%)	2 (2.0%)	.015
Unprotected well /spring	2 (0.6%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.00
Bottled	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.00
Tube well with powered pump	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.00
Surface water (i.e. lake / river)	1 (0.3%)	1 (1.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.00
<b>Drinking water treatment</b>	25 (8.3%)	4 (4.0%)	4 (4.0%)	17 (17.0%)	<.001
<b>Is household drinking water visibly covered?*</b>	305 (68.1%)	120 (62.2%)	85 (62.0%)	100 (84.7%)	<.001
<b>Alternative water source used for cleaning and drinking</b>	52 (17.3%)	29 (29.0%)	12 (12.0%)	11 (11.0%)	.001
<b>Visible separation seen in water used for drinking and other household activities*</b>	225 (75.5%)	74 (74.0%)	70 (70.7%)	81 (81.8%)	.072
<b>Toileting, sanitation and waste management</b>					
<b>Toilet present at household</b>	267 (89.0%)	95 (95.0%)	97 (97.0%)	75 (75.0%)	<.001
<b>Toilet type (where present)</b>					
Pit latrine	237 (88.8%)	90 (94.7%)	73 (75.3%)	74 (98.7%)	<.001
Flush toilet to septic tank	15 (5.6%)	4 (4.2%)	9 (9.3%)	0 (0.0%)	.013
Flush toilet to mains	7 (2.6%)	1 (1.1%)	6 (6.2%)	0 (0.0%)	.030
<b>Households who share their toilet with non-household members</b>	112 (41.9%)	59 (62.1%)	30 (30.9%)	23 (30.7%)	<.001
<b>Number of households toilet shared with. [median (IQR)]</b>	3 (2-4)	3 (2-5)	2 (2-3)	2 (1-2)	

Households where $\geq 1$ member practices open defecation?	86 (28.7%)	25 (25.0%)	28 (28.0%)	33 (33.0%)	.485
Human faeces present in / around the household compound? *	66 (8.1%)	18 (6.8%)	6 (2.3%)	42 (14.7%)	<.001
Drophole cover present at toilet	92 (34.5%)	21 (22.1%)	35 (35.4%)	36 (48.0%)	.002
Drophole cover in place (where available) *	184 (73.0%)	44 (91.7%)	69(69.0%)	71 (68.3%)	.003
Anal cleansing materials present at toilet *	133 (18.9%)	26 (10.7%)	88 (33.4%)	19 (9.3%)	<.001
Households that have an adequate system to manage animal waste?^	13 (4.3%)	1 (1.0%)	8 (8.0%)	4 (4.0%)	.055
Households that have an adequate system to manage household waste^	24 (8.0%)	20 (20.0%)	3 (3.0%)	1 (1.0%)	<.001

### Hand-hygiene

Facilities for hand washing available at households (any)*	123 (41.0%)	37 (37.0%)	63 (63.0%)	23 (23.0%)	<.001
Soap (liquid/bar/powder) present at HWFs*	166 (49.0%)	28 (43.1%)	130 (58.8%)	8 (15.1%)	<.001
Water present at HWFs*	349 (85.5%)	65 (71.4%)	231 (94.3%)	53 (73.6%)	<.001
When do household members normally wash their hands?					
Before eating	269 (89.7%)	90 (90.0%)	88 (88.0%)	91 (91.0%)	.840
After toilet	269 (89.7%)	89 (89.0%)	89 (89.0%)	91 (91.0%)	.916
When they look dirty	139 (46.3%)	39 (39.0%)	64 (64.0%)	36 (36.0%)	<.001
After eating	137 (45.7%)	74 (74.0%)	39 (39.0%)	24 (24.0%)	<.001
Before preparing food	110 (36.7%)	52 (52.0%)	24 (24.0%)	34 (33.0%)	<.001
After cleaning child nappy	67 (22.3%)	28 (28.0%)	18 (18.0%)	21 (21.0%)	.219
After working outside	62 (20.7%)	24 (24.0%)	12 (12.0%)	26 (26.0%)	.027
Before feeding child	52 (17.3%)	27 (27.0%)	12 (12.0%)	13 (13.0%)	<.001

### Food access and hygiene

Consumption of market produce (vegetable)	260 (86.7%)	98 (98.0%)	92 (92.0%)	70 (70.0%)	<.001
Use of shared plates	129 (43.0%)	28 (28.0%)	36 (36.0%)	65 (65.0%)	<.001
Consumption of street food	267 (89.0%)	93 (93.0%)	89 (89.0%)	85 (85.0%)	.213
Cooked food seen to be covered <sup>†</sup>	286 (92.3%)	124 (95.4%)	77 (96.3%)	85 (85.0%)	.007
Animals seen in the cooking area <sup>†</sup>	196 (24.1%)	30 (10.9%)	70 (26.4%)	96 (33.6%)	<.001
Animals seen in contact with food <sup>†</sup>	123 (62.8%)	24 (80.0%)	32 (45.7%)	67 (69.8%)	<.001
Utensils (covered) <sup>†</sup>	129 (15.9%)	68 (25.9%)	53 (20.0%)	8 (2.8%)	<.001
Fresh fruit and vegetables (covered) <sup>†</sup>	131 (38.1%)	86 (50.3%)	36 (35.0%)	9 (12.9%)	<.001
Meat (covered) <sup>†</sup>	145 (84.3%)	79 (73.1%)	52 (100.0%)	8 (66.7%)	<.001

### Environmental interactions

Standing water seen near the household*	65 (8.0%)	36 (13.7%)	26 (9.8%)	3 (1.0%)	<.001
Children observed interacting with standing water*	16 (24.6%)	11 (30.6%)	4(15.4%)	1 (33.3%)	.350
Animals observed interacting with standing water*	33 (50.8%)	18 (50.0%)	14 (53.8%)	1 (33.3%)	.847
Open drains seen near the household*	137 (16.8%)	41 (15.6%)	89 (33.6%)	7 (2.4%)	<.001
Children observed interacting with drains*	28 (20.4%)	11 (26.8%)	17 (19.1%)	0 (0.0%)	.304
Animals observed interacting with drains*	60 (43.8%)	20 (48.8%)	35 (39.3%)	5 (71.4%)	.205
Households reporting their children interacting with river water?	66 (22.0%)	18 (18.0%)	34 (34.0%)	14 (14.0%)	.001



Households reporting their adults interacting with river water?	99 (33.0%)	26 (26.0%)	56 (56.0%)	17 (17.0%)	<.001
---	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------

325 \* *observed (not self-reported) results from household visits over the total study, derived as follows: [n= visits where*  
326 *observational data on reported activity collected (% of n visits where specific activity was observed to occur)]. ^Adequate*  
327 *defined as: (human waste) disposal into communal collection container, and (animal waste) removal from the premises,*  
328 *and subsequent contained disposal away from human contact.*

330 **Prevalence of ESBL *E. coli* and ESBL *K. pneumoniae* in humans,**

331 **animals and the environment**

332

333 In total 11,975 samples (2845 human stool, 973 animal stool and 8157 environmental samples) were  
334 cultured and ESBL *E. coli* or ESBL *K. pneumoniae* were isolated from 41.8% (n=1190) of human stool  
335 and 29.8% (n=290) of animal stool samples (Fig 2 & S7 Table). Animal species with particularly high  
336 rates of ESBL-E colonisation included pigs (56.8%, n=21/37) poultry (32.5%, n=148/455) and dogs  
337 (58.8% n= 30/51) (Fig 3). ESBL *E. coli* or ESBL *K. pneumoniae* were also isolated from a range of  
338 household environment, hand-hygiene, food, and community environment samples, with 66.2%  
339 (n=339/512) of river water samples and 46.0% (n=138/300) of drain samples having ESBL-E present.

340

341 Amongst households with longitudinal follow-up 97.9% (n=191/195) had ≥1 ESBL colonised  
342 household member and 41.7% (n=50/120) of the households that owned animals had ≥1 ESBL  
343 colonised animal stool during the study period. 55.4% (n=108/195) of the households contained  
344 EBSL contaminated food and 45.6% (n=89/195) had contaminated environments at some point  
345 during the study. Longitudinal follow up revealed a high degree of flux (loss and acquisition) of ESBL-  
346 E in human household members, with 78.7% (n=588/747) of individuals undergoing longitudinal  
347 sampling having ESBL at any point (S2a-c Figs). Marked regional and seasonal regional differences in  
348 the prevalence of ESBL colonisation and contamination were noted (Fig 2, Table 4). Higher rates of  
349 ESBL-E were found in the urban settings, inclusive of animal stool, human stool, food, the household

350 environment, and local drainage and river networks. Wet season was associated with a greater  
 351 degree of ESBL presence in human stool, animal stool, stored drinking water and household floors  
 352 and environments (**Table 4**).

353

354

355 **Table 4.** Seasonal variations in ESBL prevalence of household samples.

<b>ESBL prevalence by season (% , SD)</b>			
<b>Sample Type</b>	<b>Wet season (Nov-Apr)</b>	<b>Dry season (May-Oct)</b>	<b>p</b>
Human stool	47.2% (49.9)	36.6% (48.2)	<b>&lt;.001</b>
Animal stool	33.3% (47.2)	25.5% (43.6)	<b>.010</b>
Food	14.4% (35.1)	12.3% (32.9)	.338
Drinking water	26.2% (44.0)	15.2% (35.9)	<b>&lt;.001</b>
Source water	6.5% (24.7)	8.8% (28.3)	.413
Household surfaces	8.8% (28.3)	4.5% (20.8)	<b>&lt;.001</b>
Household floor	11.5% (31.9)	6.6% (24.9)	<b>.031</b>
Clothing	9.1% (28.9)	5.6% (23.0)	.087
Hand-contact samples	25.8% (43.9)	17.9% (38.4)	.057
Household drains	44.7% (49.9)	48.2% (50.2)	.648
River water	69.1% (46.3)	62.9% (48.4)	.164

356 <sup>^</sup>p values generated by  $\chi^2$  test

357

### 358 **One health factors associated with ESBL-E colonisation.**

359

360 PCA was used to describe regional differences and similarities in the individual-level, household-  
 361 level, and environmental contamination variables (**Fig 4 & S3a-c Fig**). The first two individual-variable  
 362 PCA coordinates explained 30.5% of the variation in the 12 included variables, defining orthogonal  
 363 axes of age/employment and illness/ABU (**S3a Fig**). Household-variable PC1 and 2 explained 25.6%  
 364 of variation in the 23 included variables, and highlighted that some animal and environmental health  
 365 exposures tended to cluster together (**S3b Fig**). Environmental-contamination PC1 and 2 explained  
 366 38.7% of variation in the 9 environmental contamination variables and suggested that presence of  
 367 ESBL-E in one household location was associated with ESBL-E in other household locations (**S3c Fig**).

368 Projection of individuals or households onto PCA (**Fig 4**) space stratified by region demonstrates that  
369 individuals are similar across regions (**Fig 4a**), but there are regional differences in distributions of  
370 household-level (**Fig 4b**) and environmental contamination (**Fig 4c**) variables, consistent with  
371 differences in animal husbandry and environmental health behaviours, and ESBL-E contamination  
372 across urban, peri-urban, and rural areas.

373

374 To identify regional differences in human ESBL-E colonisation, we constructed mixed effect logistic  
375 regression models. Variable selection resulted (**Tables S8a-b**) in 24 fixed effect predictor variables  
376 for ESBL *E. coli* and 14 fixed effect predictor variables for *K. pneumoniae*, as well as individual and  
377 household random effects. Here, the key risk associated with both human ESBL *E. coli* (**Fig 5**) and  
378 ESBL *K. pneumoniae* (**Fig 6**) colonisation was the presence of the wet season (*E. coli*: aOR = 1.66,  
379 95%CrI: 1.38-2.00 / *K. pneumoniae*: aOR = 2.12, 95%CrI: 1.63-2.76).

380

381 Species-specific (i.e ESBL *E. coli* vs ESBL *K. pneumoniae*) risks other than the wet season were  
382 identified. Human ESBL *E. coli* colonisation was associated with advanced age (aOR = 1.14 per unit  
383 increase on log scale , 95%CrI: 1.05-1.25), within households where animals were kept inside the  
384 house (aOR = 1.58, 95%CrI: 1.00-2.43) or in those households where animals were observed  
385 interacting with food (aOR = 1.62, 95%CrI: 1.17-2.28) (**Fig 5**). Accounting for these factors did not  
386 fully explain the increased urban EBSL *E. coli* prevalence, therefore living in the urban environment  
387 was shown to be a risk compared to the peri-urban site (aOR = 2.01, 95%CrI: 1.26-3.24).

388

389 Human ESBL *K. pneumoniae* colonisation was only shown to be associated with the wet season (aOR  
390 = 2.12, 95%CrI: 1.63-2.76), and there was no effect of urbanisation seen. However, there was a trend  
391 towards increased risk seen in households with sub-optimal environmental sanitation, including  
392 those where human faecal contamination was observed in the internal/external environment (aOR =  
393 1.43, 95%CrI: 0.98-2.11), those where household members interacted with drain water (aOR = 1.75,

394 95%CrI: 0.93-3.24) and households with increasing density of members (aOR = 1.49, 95%CrI: 0.85-  
395 2.60) (Fig 6). Antibiotic usage was not identified as a risk for either ESBL *E. coli* or ESBL *K.*  
396 *pneumoniae* colonisation.

397

398 To explore the possibility that the difference in ESBL prevalence between urban, peri-urban and  
399 rural households could be explained by covariates exerting a different effect in different regions we  
400 fit models with a covariate by region interaction (S1a-b Figs & S9a-b Tables). The only covariate that  
401 seemed to exert a different effect across regions was seasonality: ESBL *E. coli* colonisation was  
402 associated with a higher risk in the peri-urban site during the wet season (aOR = 2.66, 95%CrI: 1.90-  
403 3.69) compared to the urban (aOR = 1.38, 95%CrI: 1.01-1.90) or rural (aOR = 1.25, 95%CrI: 0.90-1.72)  
404 site. However, confidence intervals were wide making it difficult to draw further conclusions, and no  
405 other differential regional effects were identified for ESBL *E. coli* or ESBL *K. pneumoniae*.

406

## 407 **Discussion:**

408 We have taken a One Health approach in this large, multi-site, longitudinal cohort study of ESBL-E in  
409 households in three regions with different degrees of urbanisation in southern Malawi. We  
410 identified extremely high levels of ESBL-E colonisation in humans and animals alongside extensive  
411 ESBL contamination of the environments in all urban, peri-urban and rural communities studied. We  
412 describe paucity of household environmental health infrastructure and access to materials that  
413 promote safe toileting, adequate sanitation, effective hand-hygiene or acceptable waste  
414 management and also note the variations in environmental practice and infrastructure between  
415 sites, with regional differences in ESBL-E colonisation rates and levels of environmental  
416 contamination. In particular, we highlight the effects of urbanisation and seasonal rainfall on ESBL  
417 colonisation, with the highest rates of human and animal ESBL-E colonisation identified in the urban

418 site compared to other regions and a higher prevalence of ESBL-E colonisation and contamination of  
419 household surfaces and drinking water noted in the wet season.

420

421 ABU is increasing globally, particularly within the commercial livestock production sector, and this  
422 has been highlighted by the many authorities as an important driver of AMR (13,14). Moderate  
423 levels of human ABU were reported, with under 5s and inhabitants in rural communities having a  
424 higher ABU overall. Antibiotic prescription was limited to oral co-trimoxazole, amoxicillin or  
425 metronidazole. These medications are on the international essential medicine lists for treatment of a  
426 number of infectious conditions (12–14), and the use of only a small number of antibiotics is  
427 consistent with findings from previous local descriptions from community-focussed ABU research  
428 (15). ABU in household animals was limited in our study, despite reports of animal illness. However,  
429 we did not include households practicing intensive small-scale farming, and in this context animals  
430 are regularly administered antimicrobials (15), kept in cramped conditions, and have a high rate of  
431 AMR colonisation, including ESBL *E. coli* (16–18).

432

433 Despite low rates of reported ABU, we observed high rates of ESBL-E colonisation in animals,  
434 especially in the urban region, consistent with evidence from other LMIC settings where sharing of  
435 ESBL-producing bacteria between household members and domestic animals / livestock (19,20) have  
436 been reported (21,22). Local animal husbandry practices including the proximity and location of  
437 animal co-habitation (23–25), household attitudes to animal and human waste management in the  
438 shared environment and animal interactions with key external environments are likely to promote  
439 ESBL transmission. In this study, we found that animals were regularly in contact with heavily  
440 contaminated external environments (open drains and rivers) and also with food / food preparation  
441 areas within the household, which in turn were associated with higher odds of ESBL-E colonisation in  
442 humans (aOR = 1.62, 95%CrI: 1.17-2.28). In addition to this, animals, especially poultry, were  
443 frequently kept inside the household providing an increased risk to residents (aOR = 1.58, 95%CrI:

444 1.00-2.43) and animal and human waste was commonly identified in or around the household. The  
445 dynamics of these animal-human-waste interactions may drive the maintenance and transmission  
446 for ESBL-E within animals, especially in the urban setting.

447

448 We found a paucity of environmental health infrastructure, a scarcity of access to preventative  
449 hygiene materials, and high-risk behavioural proxies for faecal-oral acquisition at a household level.  
450 This included frequent interactions with open drains and rivers within the local vicinity, where there  
451 are consistently high levels of ESBL bacteria, likely derived from inadequate human and animal  
452 waste management. Our data therefore point to unrestricted shedding of human and animal waste  
453 into an unprotected environment as playing a key role in AMR transmission, whether acquisition is  
454 from household members (i.e. human-human transmission), co-located animals (i.e. human-animal  
455 transmission or vice versa) or transmission to and from the external environment. We propose that  
456 availability of environmental health infrastructure and services, hygiene practices and environmental  
457 hygiene govern the transmission of ESBL bacteria in Malawian communities. Further research into  
458 the protective effects of environmental health interventions should be considered to determine  
459 their impact on the transmission and prevalence of ESBL colonisation within and between the three  
460 One-Health sectors.

461

462 The effect of urbanisation, where there was high prevalence of ESBL contamination of food,  
463 household surfaces, floors and the external environment, was of particular importance. This was  
464 likely to have been heavily influenced by a combination of animal and environmental health factors,  
465 including the ability of the local environment and environmental hygiene infrastructure to cope with  
466 extreme weather events such as high rainfall. Future interventions and policy designed to interrupt  
467 AMR transmission should be cognisant of regional differences in AMR-prevalence, there will not be a  
468 “one-size-fits-all” solution to community transmission of AMR.

469

470 There are limitations to our study. Due to the study design, the majority of our demographic, ABU,  
471 animal husbandry data and a portion of our environmental health data was obtained from self-  
472 reported responses, which are subject to recall bias. Self-reported hygiene behaviour data can  
473 especially be prone to recall bias, especially in our setting (26). To mitigate this, where possible we  
474 used observed data from checklists in place of self-reported data. Further the AMR data presented  
475 are solely phenotypic and future whole genome sequencing of the archive from this study is  
476 underway and will permit transmission modelling to be undertaken.

477

478 In conclusion, we found a staggeringly high prevalence of ESBL-E colonisation in humans and  
479 animals, together with extensive ESBL-E contamination of the households and broader environment  
480 (i.e. rivers and drains) in southern Malawi. The findings also highlight the key role that  
481 environmental health infrastructure and behavioural proxies have on driving human community  
482 carriage of ESBL bacteria in southern Malawi. We therefore propose that without adequate efforts  
483 to reduce ESBL contamination of the shared environment, both at a household level and community  
484 level, we are unlikely to control ESBL transmission in this setting. Lastly, regional differences in AMR-  
485 prevalence exist, which are influenced by regionally-specific environmental health and animal  
486 husbandry factors. Therefore, future interventions aimed at interrupting ESBL-E transmission should  
487 be sensitive to regional differences and tailored accordingly. These findings form a starting point  
488 from which a more detailed understanding of the drivers and ecological niches for ESBL *E. coli* and  
489 ESBL *K. pneumoniae* AMR in Malawi, and comparable LMIC settings can be built.

490

## 491 **Acknowledgements.**

492

493 We would like to thank the local communities for their acceptance of this study, and the households  
494 and participants who took part. We would also like to thank the wider DRUM consortium  
495 (<https://www.drumconsortium.org/about/the-drum-team>) for their advice, guidance and support.

497 **References**

- 498 1. Murray CJ, Ikuta KS, Sharara F, Swetschinski L, Aguilar GR, Gray A, et al. Global burden of  
499 bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019: a systematic analysis. *The Lancet*. 2022 Jan 19;0(0).
- 500 2. Tacconelli E, Carrara E, Savoldi A, Harbarth S, Mendelson M, Monnet DL, et al. Discovery,  
501 research, and development of new antibiotics: the WHO priority list of antibiotic-resistant  
502 bacteria and tuberculosis. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2018 Mar;18(3):318–27.
- 503 3. Pehrsson EC, Tsukayama P, Patel S, Mejía-Bautista M, Sosa-Soto G, Navarrete KM, et al.  
504 Interconnected microbiomes and resistomes in low-income human habitats. *Nature*. 2016;
- 505 4. Mughini-Gras L, Dorado-García A, van Duijkeren E, van den Bunt G, Dierikx CM, Bonten MJM, et  
506 al. Attributable sources of community-acquired carriage of *Escherichia coli* containing  $\beta$ -lactam  
507 antibiotic resistance genes: a population-based modelling study. *Lancet Planet Health*. 2019  
508 Aug 1;3(8):e357–69.
- 509 5. Holmes AH, Moore LSP, Sundsfjord A, Steinbakk M, Regmi S, Karkey A, et al. Understanding the  
510 mechanisms and drivers of antimicrobial resistance. *The Lancet*. 2016 Jan;387(10014):176–87.
- 511 6. WHO | Technical brief on water, sanitation, hygiene (WASH) and wastewater management to  
512 prevent infections and reduce the spread of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) [Internet]. WHO.  
513 World Health Organization; [cited 2021 Mar 9]. Available from:  
514 [http://www.who.int/water\\_sanitation\\_health/publications/wash-wastewater-management-](http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/publications/wash-wastewater-management-to-prevent-infections-and-reduce-amr/en/)  
515 [to-prevent-infections-and-reduce-amr/en/](http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/publications/wash-wastewater-management-to-prevent-infections-and-reduce-amr/en/)
- 516 7. Chidziwisano K, Slekiene J, Kumwenda S, Mosler HJ, Morse T. Toward Complementary Food  
517 Hygiene Practices among Child Caregivers in Rural Malawi. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2019  
518 Aug;101(2):294–303.
- 519 8. Nadimpalli ML, Marks SJ, Montealegre MC, Gilman RH, Pajuelo MJ, Saito M, et al. Urban  
520 informal settlements as hotspots of antimicrobial resistance and the need to curb  
521 environmental transmission. *Nat Microbiol*. 2020 Jun;5(6):787–95.
- 522 9. Lewis JM, Lester R, Garner P, Feasey NA. Gut mucosal colonisation with extended-spectrum  
523 beta-lactamase producing Enterobacteriaceae in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and  
524 meta-analysis. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2020 Jan 24;4:160.
- 525 10. Cocker D, Sammarro M, Chidziwisano K et al. Drivers of Resistance in Uganda and Malawi  
526 (DRUM): a protocol for the evaluation of One-Health drivers of Extended Spectrum Beta  
527 Lactamase (ESBL) resistance in Low-Middle Income Countries (LMICs) [version 1; peer review:  
528 awaiting peer review]. *Wellcome Open Res* 2022, 7:55  
529 (<https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.17581.1>).
- 530 11. Edwards T, Sasaki S, Williams C, Hobbs G, Feasey NA, Evans K, et al. Speciation of common  
531 Gram-negative pathogens using a highly multiplexed high resolution melt curve assay. *Sci Rep*.  
532 2018 Jan 18;8(1):1114.



- 533 12. Lê S, Josse J, Husson F. FactoMineR: An R Package for Multivariate Analysis. *J. Stat. Soft.*  
534 [Internet]. 2008 Mar. 18 [cited 2022 Jul. 5];25(1):1-18. Available from:  
535 <https://www.jstatsoft.org/index.php/jss/article/view/v025i01>.
- 536 13. Booton RD, Meeyai A, Alhusein N, Buller H, Feil E, Lambert H, et al. One Health drivers of  
537 antibacterial resistance: Quantifying the relative impacts of human, animal and environmental  
538 use and transmission. *One Health*. 2021 Jun 1;12:100220.
- 539 14. Butcher A, Cañada JA, Sariola S. How to make noncoherent problems more productive: Towards  
540 an AMR management plan for low resource livestock sectors. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun*. 2021  
541 Nov 22;8(1):1–10.
- 542 15. Mankhomwa J, Tolhurst R, M’biya E, Chikowe I, Banda P, Mussa J, et al. A Qualitative Study of  
543 Antibiotic Use Practices in Intensive Small-Scale Farming in Urban and Peri-Urban Blantyre,  
544 Malawi: Implications for Antimicrobial Resistance. *Front Vet Sci*. 2022;9.
- 545 16. Mitman SL, Amato HK, Saraiva-Garcia C, Loayza F, Salinas L, Kurowski K, et al. Risk factors for  
546 third-generation cephalosporin-resistant and extended-spectrum  $\beta$ -lactamase-producing  
547 *Escherichia coli* carriage in domestic animals of semirural parishes east of Quito, Ecuador. *PLOS*  
548 *Glob Public Health*. 2022 Mar 23;2(3):e0000206.
- 549 17. Hedman HD, Vasco KA, Zhang L. A Review of Antimicrobial Resistance in Poultry Farming within  
550 Low-Resource Settings. *Animals*. 2020 Aug;10(8):1264.
- 551 18. Saliu EM, Vahjen W, Zentek J. Types and prevalence of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase  
552 producing Enterobacteriaceae in poultry. *Anim Health Res Rev*. 2017 Jun;18(1):46–57.
- 553 19. Salinas L, Loayza F, Cárdenas P, Saraiva C, Johnson TJ, Amato H, et al. Environmental Spread of  
554 Extended Spectrum Beta-Lactamase (ESBL) Producing *Escherichia coli* and ESBL Genes among  
555 Children and Domestic Animals in Ecuador. *Environ Health Perspect*. 129(2):027007.
- 556 20. Muloi DM, Wee BA, McClean DMH, Ward MJ, Pankhurst L, Phan H, et al. Population genomics of  
557 *Escherichia coli* in livestock-keeping households across a rapidly developing urban landscape.  
558 *Nat Microbiol*. 2022 Apr;7(4):581–9.
- 559 21. Subramanya SH, Bairy I, Metok Y, Baral BP, Gautam D, Nayak N. Detection and characterization  
560 of ESBL-producing Enterobacteriaceae from the gut of subsistence farmers, their livestock, and  
561 the surrounding environment in rural Nepal. *Sci Rep*. 2021 Jan 22;11(1):2091.
- 562 22. Benavides JA, Salgado-Caxito M, Opazo-Capurro A, González Muñoz P, Piñeiro A, Otto Medina  
563 M, et al. ESBL-Producing *Escherichia coli* Carrying CTX-M Genes Circulating among Livestock,  
564 Dogs, and Wild Mammals in Small-Scale Farms of Central Chile. *Antibiotics*. 2021  
565 May;10(5):510.
- 566 23. Marques C, Belas A, Aboim C, Cavaco-Silva P, Trigueiro G, Gama LT, et al. Evidence of Sharing of  
567 *Klebsiella pneumoniae* Strains between Healthy Companion Animals and Cohabiting Humans. *J*  
568 *Clin Microbiol*. 2019 May 24;57(6):e01537-18.
- 569 24. Purohit MR, Chandran S, Shah H, Diwan V, Tamhankar AJ, Stalsby Lundborg C. Antibiotic  
570 Resistance in an Indian Rural Community: A ‘One-Health’ Observational Study on Commensal  
571 Coliform from Humans, Animals, and Water. *Int J Env Res Public Health*. 2017 Apr 6;14(4).

- 572 25. Robinson TP, Bu DP, Carrique-Mas J, Fèvre EM, Gilbert M, Grace D, et al. Antibiotic resistance is  
573 the quintessential One Health issue. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 2016 05 06/20/received  
574 06/28/revised 06/30/accepted;110(7):377–80.
- 575 26. Chidziwisano K, Tilley E, Morse T. Self-Reported Versus Observed Measures: Validation of Child  
576 Caregiver Food Hygiene Practices in Rural Malawi. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2020  
577 Jun;17(12):4498.


578

## 579 **Supplementary data**


580

- 581 • **S1a Table:** Individual-level variables selected from the CRFs
- 582 • **S1b Table:** Household, WASH and sampling variables selected from the CRFs
- 583 • **S1c Table:** Outcome variables and covariates.
- 584 • **S2 Table:** STROBE checklist.
- 585 • **S3a Table:** Household data.
- 586 • **S3b Table:** WASH data.
- 587 • **S3c Table:** Individual data
- 588 • **S3d Table:** Laboratory data
- 589 • **S4a Table:** Baseline household ABU from urban, peri-urban and rural sites.
- 590 • **S4b Table:** AMU in different age groups
- 591 • **S5 Table:** Domestic animal and livestock ownership and husbandry
- 592 • **S6 Table:** Healthcare choices for household animals
- 593 • **S7 Table:** Numbers of samples screened for ESBL *E. coli* and ESBL *K. pneumoniae*, stratified  
594 by sample type and region.
- 595 • **S8a Table:** Regional univariable analysis of WASH and individual variables against human  
596 ESBL *E. coli* colonisation
- 597 • **S8b Table:** Regional univariable analysis of WASH and individual variables against human  
598 ESBL *K. pneumoniae* colonisation


- 599       • **S9a Table:** Table of parameter testing for regional adjustment of variables included in the  
600       ESBL *E. coli* mixed effects model
- 601       • **S9b Table:** Table of parameter testing for regional adjustment of variables included in the  
602       ESBL *K. pneumoniae* mixed effects model
- 603       • **S1a Fig:** Parameter estimates for the fixed-effects used in a multivariable model of ESBL *E.*  
604       *coli*
- 605       • **S1b Fig:** Parameter estimates for the fixed-effects used in a multivariable model of ESBL *K.*  
606       *pneumoniae* colonisation
- 607       • **S2a Fig:** Facet Plot showing flux of human ESBL-E colonisation amongst **urban** households
- 608       • **S2b Fig:** Facet Plot showing flux of human ESBL-E colonisation amongst **per-urban**  
609       households
- 610       • **S2c Fig:** Facet Plot showing flux of human ESBL-E colonisation amongst **rural** households
- 611       • **S3a Fig:** PCA analysis of individual variables
- 612       • **S3b Fig:** PCA analysis of household variables
- 613       • **S3c Fig:** PCA analysis of environmental contamination variables
- 614       • **S4 Fig:** Random effects from Bayesian multivariable models of (a) ESBL *E. coli*, and (b) ESBL *K.*  
615       *pneumoniae*.
- 616




**Figure 1.** CONSORT chart for households recruited into the study, describing the structure of household visits and loss to follow-up.




**Figure 2.** A) Proportion of samples positive for ESBL-E (*E. coli* or *ESBL K. pneumoniae*), at urban, peri-urban and rural households, coloured by category. Regional differences in the prevalence of ESBL for each sample type have been highlighted [ $*p > 0.05$ ,  $**p > 0.01$ , and  $***p > 0.001$ ]. B) Breakdown of urban, peri-urban and rural rates of ESBL, coloured by sample category. C) Proportion of the household human stool, animal stool and environmental samples positive for *ESBL E. coli* or *ESBL K. pneumoniae*, stratified by sample type, bacterial species and region. Variations in the proportion of *ESBL E. coli* vs *ESBL K. pneumoniae* by sample type are highlighted by  $*(X^2, p = < .001)$ .



**Figure 3.** Bubble plot of ESBL-E (*E. coli* or *K. pneumoniae*) prevalence in animal stool samples, stratified by species, and coloured by animal type. The volume of the circle represents the number of samples processed for each species.




**Figure 4.** Confidence ellipses of regional effects exhibited by the (a) individual-level dataset, (b) household level dataset and (c) environmental contamination dataset, from the first 2 PCs. Points in 4A represent individuals but points in 4B and 4C represent households



**Figure 5.** Parameter estimates for the fixed-effects used in a multivariable model of ESBL *E. coli* colonisation, expressed as odds ratios with 95% CrI. The distribution of random effects are visualised in **S4a Fig**.





**Figure 6.** Parameter estimates for the fixed-effects used in a multivariable model of ESBL *K. pneumoniae* colonisation, expressed as odds ratios with 95% CrI. The distribution of random effects are visualised in **S4b Fig**.