

1 THE NASAL AND OROPHARYNGEAL MICROBIOMES OF HEALTHY LIVESTOCK
2 WORKERS

3

4 Authors/ affiliations: Ashley E. Kates, PhD¹; Mark Dalman, PhD²; James C. Torner, PhD¹; Tara
5 C. Smith, PhD²

6 ¹The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa

7 ²Kent State University, Kent, Ohio

8 Corresponding Author: Tara C. Smith, PhD

9 Mailing address: Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Environmental
10 Health Services, College of Public Health, Kent State University, 750 Lowry
11 Hall, Kent, OH 44240

12 Phone number: 330-672-3946

13 Fax number: 330-672-6505

14 Email address: tsmit176@kent.edu

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 **ABSTRACT**

25 Little information exists on the microbiomes of livestock workers. A cross-sectional,
26 epidemiological study was conducted enrolling 59 participants (26 of which had livestock
27 contact) in Iowa. Participants were enrolled in one of four ways: from an existing prospective
28 cohort study (n=38), from the Iowa Department of Natural Resources Animal Feeding
29 Operations database (n=17), through Iowa county fairs (n=3), and through snowball sampling
30 (n=1). We collected two sets of swabs from the nares and oropharynx of each participant. The
31 first set of swabs was used to assess the microbiome via 16s rRNA sequencing and the second
32 was used to culture *S. aureus*. We observed livestock workers to have greater diversity in their
33 microbiomes compared to those with no livestock contact. In the nares, there were 26 operational
34 taxonomic units found to be different between livestock workers and non-livestock workers with
35 the greatest difference seen with *Streptococcus* and *Proteobacteria*. In the oropharynx, livestock
36 workers with swine exposure were more likely to carry several pathogenic organisms. The
37 results of this study are the first to characterize the livestock worker nasal and oropharyngeal
38 microbiomes.

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **INTRODUCTION**

55 The importance of microorganisms in maintaining human health has been recognized for
56 many years. The composition of the microbiome is greatly influenced by ones environment [1].
57 It has been hypothesized the microbiome may protect those raised on farms from diseases such
58 as asthma and atopy through animal-associated microbes and plant materials that stimulating the
59 immune system and is known as the farm effect [2].

60 However, the farm effects ability to help protect against early disease is primarily seen in
61 childhood. Adults working in close proximity to animals are at increased risk of respiratory
62 conditions including chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), occupational asthma, and
63 organic dust toxic syndrome. This is in part due to the inhalation of organic dust containing
64 microorganisms [3, 4]. This is especially true for individuals working in enclosed animal houses
65 as is common in swine and poultry production.

66 In order to better understand the relationship between the microbiome and livestock
67 workers health, research is needed to characterize the microbiome of those with livestock
68 contact. While research exists characterizing the air around livestock production facilities as well
69 as the animals themselves, there is surprising limited information on the workers themselves.
70 The aim of this study was to assess the microbial composition of the anterior nares and
71 oropharynx of livestock workers compared to those without livestock contact using culture-
72 independent techniques. To our knowledge, our study is the first to assess the microbiomes of the
73 anterior nares and oropharynx of healthy livestock workers.

74 **METHODS**

75 *Study Population*

76 Participants were enrolled into a cross-sectional study between April 2015 and March
77 2016 in Eastern Iowa. Eligibility criteria were: 18 years of age, speak English, have not taken
78 antibiotics or inhaled corticosteroids in the prior three months, not had the nasal influenza
79 vaccine in the last month, no active infections of the upper respiratory tract, no hospitalized for
80 greater than 24 hours in the last three months, and did not have HIV/AIDS. We also requested
81 participants not eat, drink, or brush their teeth within one hour of sample collection.

82 Participants were enrolled in one of four ways. First, through a pre-existing cohort
83 consisting of 95 families (177 participants over 18 years of age). One individual from each
84 family was contacted by letter and then by phone call to schedule enrollment. If the original
85 contact person for each family was either not interested or ineligible for participation, a letter
86 was sent to the other members of the family unit until all eligible adults in the cohort were
87 contacted. Only one individual from each family unit was eligible for participation. Participants
88 enrolled from the pre-existing cohort were both livestock workers and non-livestock workers.

89 Livestock workers were also enrolled through the Iowa Department of Natural Resources
90 (DNR) Animal Feeding Operations (AFO) database [5], Iowa county fairs, and snowball
91 sampling. Operations were chosen from the DNR AFO database based on county (Johnson, Linn,
92 Keokuk, Washington, and Louisa Counties) and mailed an invitation letter. One individual per
93 AFO was eligible for enrollment. At the Iowa and Jones County fairs, a researcher passed out
94 information on the study to livestock workers attending the fair. Participants could either take an
95 information packet and contact the study team at a later date or could answer several eligibility
96 questions and schedule an enrollment date while at the fair. Lastly, snowball sampling was used
97 to recruit participants. Already enrolled livestock workers were asked to reach out to other
98 livestock workers they knew (who did not live in their household and did not work on the same

99 operation). The enrolled workers did not have to inform the study team how many packets were
100 handed out or to whom. Interested potential participants then called the study team to set up
101 enrollment. All study protocols were approved by the University of Iowa Institutional Review
102 Board prior to enrollment.

103 *Sample Collection and Processing*

104 Enrollment occurred in the participant's home. After consenting, participants filled out
105 questionnaires assessing demographic characteristics, medical history, and animal contact.
106 Following the questionnaires, each participant provided swabs from their anterior nares and
107 oropharynx. All samples were collected by a trained researcher and transported to the University
108 of Iowa Center for Emerging Infectious Diseases (CEID) for processing. Samples were collected
109 on sterile, dry, nylon flocked swabs (Copan Diagnostics, Murrieta, CA).

110 Bacterial DNA was isolated using the MO BIO PowerSoil DNA isolation kit (Mo BIO
111 Laboratories Inc, Carlsbad, CA) adapted for swab use by removing the swab head and placing it
112 in the tube during bead beating. Negative controls (kit reagents only) were used for every batch
113 of extractions. Samples were sent for sequencing (including library preparation) to the University
114 of Minnesota Genomics Center. 16s rRNA sequencing of the v1-v3 region was done on the
115 Illumina MiSeq using 2x300 nt reads. Briefly, DNA was normalized to 5ng/ μ L for amplicon
116 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) followed by a PCR clean-up step using AMPure XP beads to
117 prepare for indexing. Index PCR was then done to attach the dual indices and sequencing
118 adapters using the Nextera XT Index kit followed by another PCR clean-up step and library
119 validation. Fluorometry was used for library quantification followed by normalization and
120 pooling. The library was diluted to 4 nM and 5 μ l of diluted DNA was used for pooling. The
121 library was then denatured (using NaOH and heat) and diluted to prepare for sequencing on the

122 MiSeq using the v3 chemistry. Primer sequences and PCR conditions can be found in the
123 supplemental (Table S1).

124 *Statistical analysis*

125 Sequences were assessed for quality using FastQC (Babraham Institute, Cambridge, UK)
126 with poor quality reads filtered out (poor quality sequencing reads are defined as sequences with
127 low base quality scores, short reads less than 200bp, reads with uncalled nucleotide bases, or any
128 reads that could not assemble into paired reads). Reads were assembled using FLASH with the
129 following parameters: minimum overlap = 30, maximum overlap = 150, and mismatch = 0.1 [6].
130 Adapters were removed from the merged file using Cutadapt [7]. USEARCH version 8.1.1861
131 and Python version 2.7.12 were used for chimera removal, operational taxonomic unit (OTU)
132 binning, and taxonomy assignment at the genus level. The Ribosomal Database Project (RDP)
133 classifier was used as the reference database. OTUs were grouped together based on 97%
134 similarity. Any species level classification was done using BLAST+2.4.0 and the blastn function.
135 Human-associated OTUs were also removed from the dataset using BLAST+2.4.0 and the blastn
136 function. R version 3.3.1 was used for all statistical analyses and plot generation using the
137 following packages: phyloseq [8], vegan [9], DESeq2 [10], and ampvis [11]. Alpha diversity was
138 assessed using the Inverse Simpson diversity index [12] and beta diversity was assessed using
139 the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity measure [13]. Principal coordinates analysis (PCoA) was used to
140 visualize beta diversity. PERMANOVA, through the vegan package, was used to assess diversity
141 differences between groups. PERMANOVA was chosen because it does not assume any
142 distribution, unlike parametric tests [14]. The DESeq2 and ampvis packages were used to assess
143 microbiota differences between groups. The DESeq2 package is only able to perform
144 comparisons between two groups, as such animal contact was collapsed to swine versus all

145 others when considering differentially abundant OTUs. Results were considered significant if the
146 P was less than 0.05.

147 **RESULTS**

148 ***Participant demographics***

149 Fifty-nine participants (26 livestock workers and 33 non-livestock workers) were enrolled
150 (Figure 1). The average age of participants was 54.6 years (range: 28-85 years) and 41 (69.5%)
151 were male. Livestock workers were significantly older than non-livestock workers (59.1 and 51.1
152 years respectively, $P=0.027$) and were predominantly male (92.3%) while males only made up
153 51.5% of the non-livestock workers ($P = 0.0007$) (Table 1). Those without livestock contact
154 were more likely to brush their teeth daily ($P < 0.001$), use liquid hand soaps ($P < 0.001$), and
155 more likely to use a gym ($P=0.011$) compared to those with livestock contact. (Table 2). There
156 were no other significant differences between those with and without livestock contact.

157 Twenty-six participants had current exposure to livestock (Table 3). The majority of
158 participants worked with swine ($n=18$). Several participants currently worked with more than
159 one type of animal with seven participants working with two animal types, two working with
160 three animal types, and one participant working with five animal types (swine, poultry, cattle,
161 sheep, goats, and horses). The most frequent combination of animal types was swine and cattle
162 ($n=4$).

163 ***Microbiota analysis***

164 The Inverse Simpson diversity index (Figure 2a) was greater for those with livestock
165 contact compared to those without livestock contact in the nasal samples ($p > 0.001$); however,
166 there was no difference in the oropharyngeal samples ($p = 0.542$). The ordination plot of the
167 Bray-Curtis distances for all samples is shown in Figure 2b. The samples cluster by sample type

168 ($P = 0.001$) and livestock exposure ($P = 0.038$, P for the interaction between sample type and
169 livestock exposure = 0.035). Because samples cluster by both livestock exposure and sample
170 type, the nasal (Figure 2c) and oropharyngeal samples (Figure 2d) were assessed separately. A
171 significant difference remained in the nasal samples ($P = 0.002$), but not the oropharyngeal
172 samples ($P = 0.559$). There were no differences in the diversity of the microbiomes based on any
173 participant characteristics (data not shown).

174 There was no difference in alpha diversity by animal type (cattle, poultry, swine, more
175 than one animal type) in either the nares ($P = 0.762$) or oropharynx ($P = 0.941$). In the nares,
176 there was a difference by animal types ($P = 0.009$); however, there are no differences in the
177 oropharynx ($P = 0.297$).

178 Actinobacteria and Firmicutes were the most prevalent phyla in both the livestock
179 workers and non-livestock workers. Bacteroidetes were more abundant in the livestock workers.
180 The barplot and boxplot of the most abundant OTUs can be found in the supplemental (Figures
181 S3, S4). A total of 26 OTUs were differentially represented between the livestock workers and
182 non-livestock workers, 25 of which were significantly more abundant in those with livestock
183 contact. Only two OTUs belonging to the *Streptophyta* genus were more abundant in the non-
184 livestock workers (Figure 3).

185 Unlike the nasal microbiome, there is a great deal of similarity between those with and
186 without livestock contact in the oropharynx. There were no OTUs significantly differentially
187 abundant between the livestock workers and those without livestock contact. The *Streptococcus*
188 genera was the most prevalent genus observed in the oropharynx followed by *Provetella* and
189 *Heamophilus* genera.

190 When stratifying by animal type in the nares, *Corynebacterium* and *Staphylococcus* were
191 the most abundant genera with members of the Firmicutes phylum being the most abundant.
192 When comparing swine workers to those with any other animal contact, one OTU was
193 significantly more abundant in the swine workers, *Clostridium sensu stricto* (2-fold change: 8.58,
194 $P < 0.001$). In the oropharynx there were nine OTUs significantly more abundant in the swine
195 workers compared to those with all other animal types and two *Lactobacillus* OTUs with
196 increased abundance in those with no swine contact (Figure 4).

197 **DISCUSSION**

198 Very little is known about the healthy livestock worker nasal and oropharyngeal
199 microbiomes. The majority of studies assessing the microbial communities related to livestock
200 work have either been done in animals [15, 16] or have studied the aerosolization of
201 microorganisms in and around livestock facilities [3, 4, 17]. Here we have described the nasal
202 and oropharyngeal microbiomes of 26 livestock workers and 33 non-livestock workers in Iowa.

203 The population was comprised of primarily older (mean age of 54.6 years), Caucasian
204 (98.3%) males (69.5%). Those with livestock contact were significantly older than those without
205 livestock contact (59.1 years compared to 51.1 years) as well as more likely to be male (92.3%
206 male compared to 51.5% male). This represents the average farmer worker in the United States
207 where a majority of farm workers are males [18]. In the majority of Iowa counties, including
208 Keokuk County, less than 10% of farm workers are female. Additionally, we observed no
209 microbiota differences between males and females (data now shown). Furthermore, as of 2012
210 the average age of principal farmworkers was 58.3 years with 61% being between 35 and 64
211 years nationwide [18].

212 The importance of livestock contact on the human microbiome has been recognized in
213 relation to respiratory diseases. It has been suggested that the farm effect is protective against
214 asthma. This is particularly true for children where it has been shown early life exposure to
215 microbes and microbial components prime the immune system by the upregulation of T-helper 1
216 cells and the downregulation of T-helper 2 cells reducing the risk of atopy [19]. Studies have
217 shown having a parent in a farming occupation – particularly ones with livestock exposure – is
218 significantly associated with lower rates of allergen disorders and allergy attacks and there is a
219 dose response relationship with less atopy in children with parents who are full-time farmers [20,
220 21]. It is thought the high-diversity of microorganism – likely inhaled – outcompete the harmful
221 bacteria that may promote asthma [2]. In adults farmer’s asthma is low (around 4%) as is atopy
222 (14%); however, unlike in children, asthma rates are higher among those who work with
223 livestock, particularly swine and cattle [22]. Studies have also shown asthma to be more common
224 in farmers without atopy than those with atopy and individuals with more than one type of
225 animal exposure were at increased risk of non-atopic asthma [22].

226 Livestock workers had significantly more diverse nasal microbiomes compared to non-
227 livestock workers likely due to inhalation. Livestock workers are exposed to high levels of
228 inhalable dust which contains microorganisms [3, 4]. The *Ruminococcaceae* family and
229 *Lactobacillus* which were both found to be significantly more abundant in the nares of those
230 participants with livestock contact than those lacking this exposure, have been identified in
231 inhalable dust [23]. *Moraxella* – a human commensal also known to cause respiratory tract
232 infections [24] – is a bacterial air contaminant in livestock houses [25]. Others have found
233 organisms belonging to the *Aerococcaceae* family, *Dietzia*, and *Prevotella* in air surrounding
234 livestock [17]. OTUs belonging to all of these genera were significantly more abundant in the

235 nares of those with livestock contact in our population leading to the conclusion these organism
236 may be being inhaled.

237 We identified several potential pathogens as more abundant in livestock workers' nares
238 and oropharynx. One of the organisms found to be significantly more abundant in the livestock
239 worker microbiome was *Dietzia*, a gram positive genus known to be an opportunistic pathogen
240 and able to colonize skin and formerly classified as *Rhodococcus maris* [26]. It is unsurprising
241 that this genus is also able to colonize the anterior nares, as they are anatomically similar to the
242 skin [27]. *Dietzia* is predominantly a zoonotic pathogen, but has been identified in invasive
243 human infections as well [28-30]. Due to its similarity to *Rhodococcus* spp., it is often
244 mistakenly identified as a contaminant [26, 31]. *Dietzia* was found to be roughly seven times
245 more abundant in livestock workers compared to those with no livestock contact (2-fold change
246 of -3.55) in our population. While *Dietzia* was found in the negative controls, it was found in few
247 samples and likely was not a large enough contaminant to account for the large difference
248 between the groups. *Dietzia* infection has been thought to be potentially related to prior livestock
249 exposure in case reports [32] and has been identified in the air of poultry (duck) barns [33]. Due
250 to its high prevalence in livestock workers, it may be a potential cause of difficult-to-diagnose
251 infections in people with livestock contact, especially in the immunocompromised [34];
252 however, little information on *Dietzia* as an opportunistic pathogen exists. Other potential
253 pathogens found in higher abundance in livestock workers were *Prevotella* [35-37],
254 *Streptococcus* [38-40], *Moraxella* [41, 42], *Rothia* [43], and *Oscillibacter* [44].

255 *Prevotella* spp., particularly *P. ruminicola*, are difficult to culture microorganism
256 prevalent in the gastrointestinal tracts of all livestock animals in addition to ruminants. It has
257 been demonstrated *P. ruminicola* has the ability to transfer tetracycline resistance to other

258 members of the Bacteroidetes phylum, particularly to other *Prevotella* species, in the host and
259 horizontal transfer of the *tetQ* gene among *Prevotella* spp. is common in the human and ruminant
260 intestines as well as the human oral cavity [45]. While it was not significantly enhanced in the
261 livestock worker microbiome, *P. ruminicola* was present as were many oral-associated
262 *Prevotella* species. *Prevotella* spp. are frequent causes of odontogenic infections associated with
263 gram-negative, anaerobic bacteria [46, 47]. These organisms are also known to cause infections
264 of the respiratory system, head, and neck [47]. This is of interest as tetracycline is still commonly
265 used in agriculture as well as a treatment for periodontal disease [48, 49] and *Prevotella* spp.
266 were very common in the nares and oropharynx in our population and significantly more
267 abundant in the oropharynx of swine workers.

268 As it is likely these organisms are being inhaled while working around livestock, it is
269 possible their presence is contamination and not true colonization. While there is little research
270 surrounding contamination vs. colonization, several studies have been done with regard to
271 livestock worker colonization with *S. aureus* and have found many livestock workers drop *S.*
272 *aureus* carriage within 24 hours [50]. On average it had been roughly 30 hours since swine
273 workers had their last contact with swine, 24 hours since cattle workers had their last contact
274 with cattle, and 1.5 hours since poultry workers had their last contact with poultry at the time of
275 swabbing. It is possible some of the organisms observed in the nasal microbiome were due to
276 contamination from recently being around their livestock, especially in those with poultry
277 contact. As many of the swine and cattle workers were close to 24 hours since their last contact
278 with animals, it is difficult to determine if the presence of these organisms is true colonization or
279 temporary contamination without further longitudinal research.

280 We observed three participant behaviors to be significantly different between those with
281 and without livestock contact: type of soap used, gym usage, and the frequency of tooth
282 brushing. However, none of these behaviors were significantly associated with alterations in
283 either the nasal or oropharyngeal microbiomes. The most surprising of these was that frequency
284 of tooth brushing, which was less frequent in the livestock workers, but was not associated with
285 any differences in oral microbiota. One explanation for this is frequency of tooth brushing may
286 not be an adequate marker of oral hygiene. While we chose to assess oral health through a single
287 question (frequency of tooth brushing) in this pilot study as the enrollment visit was already long
288 and required participants to fill out up to three surveys, in future studies directed towards
289 assessing oral health and the livestock worker microbiome, this will not be sufficient. A better
290 marker for oral hygiene may have been to assess the number of dental carries, gingivitis, gum
291 disease, and/or halitosis. In the future, it would be better to assess oral hygiene using a
292 standardized survey, such as the NHANES Oral Health Survey [51].

293 Our study is the first we are aware of to assess the microbiome of livestock workers using
294 next-generation sequencing technology and great deal of additional research is needed. More
295 research is needed to better understand the relation of the livestock worker respiratory
296 microbiomes and diseases such as asthma. Longitudinal studies need to be done to first
297 characterize the livestock workers over time and at different stages of life. Animal-based studies
298 are needed to more definitively assess the relationship between the core microbes of the livestock
299 worker airways and their impact on asthma. Animal models are necessary for this research to be
300 able to determine if the microbes encountered during early childhood exposure to farm-life may
301 be able to prevent asthma.

302 **Acknowledgments/ funding**

303 The authors would like to thank Dr. Patrick Breheny for his invaluable guidance as well as the
304 University of Minnesota Genomics Center for conducting the sequencing. This publication was
305 supported in part by Grant Number 5 U54 OH007548-11 from CDC-NIOSH. Its contents are
306 solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of the
307 CDC, NIOSH, or the Great Plains Center for Agriculture Health.

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326 **TABLES AND FIGURES**

327 Table 1: Participant demographics

	Livestock Contact (n=26)	No livestock Exposure (n=33)	p-value	Full Cohort (n=59)
Age (years)	59.1	51.1	0.027	54.6
BMI	27.4	28.3	0.53	27.9
Sex				
Male	24 (92.3%)	17 (51.5%)		41 (69.5%)
Female	2 (7.7%)	16 (48.5%)	0.0007	18 (30.5%)
Race*				
Caucasian	25 (96.2%)	33 (100.0%)		58 (98.3%)
Other	1 (3.8%)	4 (12.0%)	0.394	5 (8.5%)
Income (net)				
<\$20,000	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.0%)		1 (1.7%)
\$20,000-\$39,999	3 (11.5%)	5 (15.2%)		8 (13.6%)
\$40,000-\$59,999	3 (11.5%)	6 (18.2%)		9 (15.3%)
\$60,000-\$79,999	9 (34.6%)	12 (36.4%)		21 (35.6%)
\$80,000-\$99,999	6 (23.1%)	2 (6.1%)		8 (13.6%)
>\$100,000	5 (19.2%)	7 (21.2%)	0.508	12 (20.3%)
Highest level of education				
Less than high school	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)		0 (0.0%)
High school graduate	8 (31.7%)	3 (9.1%)		11 (18.6%)
Some college	3 (11.5%)	5 (15.2%)		8 (13.6%)
College graduate	12 (46.2%)	15 (45.5%)		27 (45.8%)
Graduate level	3 (11.5%)	9 (27.3%)		12 (20.3%)
Professional level	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.0%)	.174	1 (1.7%)
House size				
<1500 sq. ft.	5 (19.2%)	5 (15.2%)		10 (16.9%)
>1500 sq. ft.	19 (73.1%)	27 (81.8%)		46 (77.9%)
Unknown	2 (7.7%)	1 (3.0%)	0.693	3 (5.1%)
Family Size				
1	4 (15.4%)	2 (6.1%)		6 (10.2%)
2	13 (50.0%)	14 (42.4%)		27 (45.8%)
3	3 (11.5%)	5 (15.2%)		8 (13.6%)
4	2 (7.7%)	6 (18.2%)		8 (13.6%)
≥5	4 (15.4%)	6 (18.2%)	0.589	10 (16.9%)

328

329

330 Table 2: Health and Hygiene characteristics of participants

	Livestock Contact (n=26)	No livestock Exposure (n=33)	p-value	Full Cohort (n=59*)
Asthma				
Yes	0 (0.0%)	3 (9.1%)	0.25	3 (5.1%)
No	25 (100.0%)	30 (90.0%)		55 (93.2%)
COPD				
Yes	1 (4.2%)	1 (3.1%)	0.429	2 (3.5%)
No	23 (95.8%)	32 (96.9%)		55 (96.5%)
Heart Disease				
Yes	2 (8.0%)	6 (18.2%)	0.445	8 (13.8%)
No	23 (92.0%)	27 (81.8%)		50 (86.2%)
Diabetes				
Yes	1 (4.0%)	1 (3.0%)	1.0	2 (3.4%)
No	24 (96.0%)	32 (97.0%)		56 (96.6%)
Cancer				
Yes	1 (4.0%)	3 (10.0%)	0.158	5 (9.1%)
No	24 (96.0%)	26 (86.7%)		49 (89.1%)
Don't know	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.3%)		1 (1.8%)
Past Cigarette Use				
Yes	2 (8.0%)	9 (27.3%)	0.09	11 (19.0%)
No	23 (92.0%)	24 (72.7%)		47 (81.0%)
Past Cigar Use				
Yes	0 (0.0%)	4 (12.1%)	0.123	4 (6.8%)
No	26 (100.0%)	29 (87.9%)		55 (93.2%)
Past Chew User				
Yes	2 (7.7%)	3 (9.1%)	0.848	5 (8.5%)
No	24 (92.3%)	30 (90.9%)		54 (91.5%)
Dentures				
Yes	0 (0.0%)	2 (6.3%)	0.497	2 (3.4%)
No	26 (100.0%)	30 (93.8%)		56 (96.6%)
Tooth Brushing Frequency				
Every morning	9 (34.6%)	26 (78.8%)	<0.001	35 (59.3%)
Every evening	17 (65.4%)	15 (45.5%)		32 (54.2%)
Most mornings	2 (7.7%)	1 (3.0%)		3 (5.1%)
Most evenings	4 (15.4%)	4 (12.1%)		8 (13.6%)
Some mornings	6 (23.1%)	1 (3.0%)		7 (11.9%)
Some evenings	2 (7.7%)	1 (3.0%)		3 (5.1%)
No mornings	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)		0 (0.0%)
No evenings	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)		0 (0.0%)
Probiotic usage				
Yes	3 (11.5%)	4 (12.1%)	1.0	7 (12.1%)
No	23 (88.5%)	29 (87.9%)		51 (87.9%)

331 *Several participants opted not to answer several questions

332 Table 2 continued: Health and Hygiene characteristics of participants

	Livestock Contact (n=26)	No livestock Exposure (n=33)	p- value	Full Cohort (n=59*)
Type of Hand Soap				
Non-antibacterial, bar	11 (42.3%)	12 (36.4%)		23 (40.0%)
Non-antibacterial, liquid	11 (42.3%)	17 (51.5%)		28 (47.5%)
Antibacterial, bar	11 (42.3%)	8 (24.2%)		19 (32.2%)
Antibacterial, liquid	11 (42.3%)	19 (57.6%)		30 (50.8%)
Other	1 (3.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0.001	1 (1.7%)
Visited a Correctional Facility				
Yes	1 (%)	1 (%)		2 (3.4%)
No	25 (%)	32 (%)	1.0	56 (96.6%)
Outpatient surgery in last 3 months?				
Yes	0 (0.0%)	1 (%)		1 (1.7%)
No	26 (100.0%)	31 (%)	1.0	57 (98.3%)
Visited a hospital or long-term care facility?				
Yes	14 (%)	10 (%)		24 (41.4%)
No	12 (%)	22 (%)	0.142	34 (58.6%)
Work/ volunteer in a healthcare facility?				
Yes	1 (%)	7 (%)		8 (14.0%)
No	25 (%)	24 (%)	0.59	49 (86.0%)

333 *Several participants opted not to answer several questions

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344 Table 3: Livestock contact (n=26)

Animal	N (%)	Ave. Number Animals (range)	Ave. Days per week (range)	Ave. Hours per day (range)
Swine	18 (69.2%)	3,024 (8-10,000)	6 d (2-7)	2.5 h (0.5-10)
Cattle	12 (46.2%)	191 (4-850)	6.4 d (1-7)	1.6 h (0.5-3)
Poultry	4 (15.4%)	1,644 (20-6,500)	7 d	1.0 h (0.25-2)
Other				
Sheep	4 (15.4%)	28 (10-50)	6.5 d (6-7)	1.4 h (0.25-3)
Horses	2 (7.7%)	6.5 (1-12)	6.5 d (6-7)	5.5 h (3-8)
Goats	1 (3.8%)	10	7 d	2 h

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362


363

364

365

366

367



368

369 Figure 1: Flow diagram of participant enrollment.


370

371

372

373

374



384

385

386

387

388

389


390

391

392

393

394



395 Figure 2: Diversity analysis by livestock contact.


396 a) alpha diversity of both nasal and oropharyngeal samples by livestock exposure. b) PCoA of
397 the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrix all samples by livestock exposure. c) PCoA of the nasal
398 samples. d) PCoA of the oropharyngeal samples. PC1 and PC2 = principle coordinates 1 and 2
399 respectively.

400

401

402


403



430 Figure 3: Log 2-fold Change of the significantly differentially abundant OTUs (Benjamini-
 431 Hochberg correction applied).

432 Points represent OTUs with phyla represented by color. Negative values represent OTUs
433 significantly more abundant in livestock workers and positive values represent OTUs
434 significantly more abundant in non-livestock workers. a) Differentially abundant OTUs in the
435 nares and b) differentially abundant OTUs in the nares by animal contact (swine vs. all others).

436



437

438 Figure 4: Log 2-fold Change of the significantly differentially abundant OTUs in the oropharynx
439 by animal contact (swine vs. all others). (Benjamini-Hochberg correction applied).

440 Points represent OTUs with phyla represented by color. Negative values represent OTUs
441 significantly more abundant in livestock workers and positive values represent OTUs
442 significantly more abundant in non-livestock workers

443

444

445

446 References

- 447 1. Betts, K.S., *A Study in Balance: How Microbiomes Are Changing the Shape of Environmental*
448 *Health*. Environmental Health Perspectives, 2011. **119**(8): p. a340-a346.
- 449 2. Wlasiuk, G. and D. Vercelli, *The farm effect, or: when, what and how a farming environment*
450 *protects from asthma and allergic disease*. Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol, 2012. **12**(5): p. 461-6.
- 451 3. Basinas, I., et al., *Exposure to inhalable dust and endotoxin among Danish pig farmers affected*
452 *by work tasks and stable characteristics*. Ann Occup Hyg, 2013. **57**(8): p. 1005-19.
- 453 4. Nonnenmann, M.W., et al., *Culture-independent characterization of bacteria and fungi in a*
454 *poultry bioaerosol using pyrosequencing: a new approach*. J Occup Environ Hyg, 2010. **7**(12): p.
455 693-9.
- 456 5. *Iowa Department of Natural Resources Animal Feeding Operations* [cited 2016 October 20];
457 Available from: [http://www.iowadnr.gov/Environmental-Protection/Land-Quality/Animal-](http://www.iowadnr.gov/Environmental-Protection/Land-Quality/Animal-Feeding-Operations)
458 [Feeding-Operations](http://www.iowadnr.gov/Environmental-Protection/Land-Quality/Animal-Feeding-Operations).
- 459 6. Magoc, T. and S.L. Salzberg, *FLASH: fast length adjustment of short reads to improve genome*
460 *assemblies*. Bioinformatics, 2011. **27**(21): p. 2957-63.
- 461 7. Martin, M., *Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads*.
462 EMBnetjournal, 2011. **17**(1).
- 463 8. McMurdie, P.J. and S. Holmes, *phyloseq: an R package for reproducible interactive analysis and*
464 *graphics of microbiome census data*. PLoS One, 2013. **8**(4): p. e61217.
- 465 9. Oksanen, J., et al. *vegan: Community Ecology Package*. R package version 2.4-0. 2016; Available
466 from: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan>.
- 467 10. Love, M.I., W. Huber, and S. Anders, *Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for*
468 *RNA-seq data with DESeq2*. Genome Biol, 2014. **15**(12): p. 550.
- 469 11. Albertsen, M., et al., *Back to Basics--The Influence of DNA Extraction and Primer Choice on*
470 *Phylogenetic Analysis of Activated Sludge Communities*. PLoS One, 2015. **10**(7): p. e0132783.
- 471 12. Simpson, E.H., *Measurement of Diversity*. Nature 1949. **163**: p. 688.
- 472 13. Bray, J.R. and J.T. Curtis, *An ordination of upland forest communities of southern Wisconsin*
473 *Ecological Monographs*, 1957. **27**: p. 325-349.
- 474 14. McArdle, B.H. and M.J. Anderson, *Fitting Multivariable Models to Community Data: A comment*
475 *on Distance-based Redundancy Analysis*. Ecology, 2001. **82**(1): p. 290-297.
- 476 15. Weese, J.S., et al., *Evaluation of the nasal microbiota in slaughter-age pigs and the impact on*
477 *nasal methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) carriage*. BMC Vet Res, 2014. **10**: p. 69.
- 478 16. Deusch, S., et al., *News in livestock research - use of Omics-technologies to study the microbiota*
479 *in the gastrointestinal tract of farm animals*. Comput Struct Biotechnol J, 2015. **13**: p. 55-63.
- 480 17. McEachran, A.D., et al., *Antibiotics, bacteria, and antibiotic resistance genes: aerial transport*
481 *from cattle feed yards via particulate matter*. Environ Health Perspect, 2015. **123**(4): p. 337-43.
- 482 18. *2012 Census of Agriculture Highlights: Farm Demographics - U.S. Farmers by Gender, Age, Race,*
483 *Ethnicity, and more*. 2014 November 2015 [cited 2016 July 24]; Available from:
484 https://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Online_Resources/Highlights/Farm_Demogr
485 [aphics/Highlights_Farm_Demographics.pdf](https://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Online_Resources/Highlights/Farm_Demogr).
- 486 19. Wong, G.W. and C.M. Chow, *Childhood asthma epidemiology: insights from comparative studies*
487 *of rural and urban populations*. Pediatr Pulmonol, 2008. **43**(2): p. 107-16.
- 488 20. Braun-Fahrlander, C., et al., *Prevalence of hay fever and allergic sensitization in farmer's children*
489 *and their peers living in the same rural community*. SCARPOL team. Swiss Study on Childhood
490 *Allergy and Respiratory Symptoms with Respect to Air Pollution*. Clin Exp Allergy, 1999. **29**(1): p.
491 28-34.

- 492 21. Von Ehrenstein, O.S., et al., *Reduced risk of hay fever and asthma among children of farmers.*
493 Clin Exp Allergy, 2000. **30**(2): p. 187-93.
- 494 22. Eduard, W., et al., *Do farming exposures cause or prevent asthma? Results from a study of adult*
495 *Norwegian farmers.* Thorax, 2004. **59**(5): p. 381-6.
- 496 23. Lin, W.Y., et al., *Evaluation of the effect of Lactobacillus paracasei (HF.A00232) in children (6-13*
497 *years old) with perennial allergic rhinitis: a 12-week, double-blind, randomized, placebo-*
498 *controlled study.* Pediatr Neonatol, 2014. **55**(3): p. 181-8.
- 499 24. Su, Y.C., B. Singh, and K. Riesbeck, *Moraxella catarrhalis: from interactions with the host immune*
500 *system to vaccine development.* Future Microbiol, 2012. **7**(9): p. 1073-100.
- 501 25. Brodka, K., et al., *The variability of bacterial aerosol in poultry houses depending on selected*
502 *factors.* Int J Occup Med Environ Health, 2012. **25**(3): p. 281-93.
- 503 26. Koerner, R.J., M. Goodfellow, and A.L. Jones, *The genus Dietzia: a new home for some known*
504 *and emerging opportunist pathogens.* FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol, 2009. **55**(3): p. 296-305.
- 505 27. Wilson, M., *Microbial inhabitants of human: their ecology and role in health and disease* Wilson.
506 2005, Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. 476.
- 507 28. Reyes, G., et al., *Type A aortic dissection associated with Dietzia maris.* Interact Cardiovasc
508 Thorac Surg, 2006. **5**(5): p. 666-8.
- 509 29. Bemer-Melchior, P., et al., *Bacteremia due to Dietzia maris in an immunocompromised patient.*
510 Clin Infect Dis, 1999. **29**(5): p. 1338-40.
- 511 30. Pidoux, O., et al., *Molecular identification of a Dietzia maris hip prosthesis infection isolate.* J Clin
512 Microbiol, 2001. **39**(7): p. 2634-6.
- 513 31. Bizet, C., et al., *Identification of Rhodococcus, Gordona and Dietzia species using carbon source*
514 *utilization tests ("Biotype-100" strips).* Res Microbiol, 1997. **148**(9): p. 799-809.
- 515 32. Azcona, J.M., et al., *Isolation of Dietzia maris from Bone Marrow in an Immunocompetent*
516 *Patient.* Clinical Microbiology Newsletter, 2011. **33**(7).
- 517 33. Kämpfer, P., et al., *Dietzia aerolata sp. nov., isolated from the air of a duck barn, and emended*
518 *description of the genus Dietzia Rainey et al. 1995.* International Journal of Systematic and
519 Evolutionary Microbiology, 2010. **60**(2): p. 393-396.
- 520 34. Augenbraun, M. and K. Workowski, *Bacteremia Due to Dietzia maris in an Immunocompromised*
521 *Patient.* Clin Infect Dis, 1999. **29**(5): p. 1338-1340.
- 522 35. Mehmood, M., et al., *Bacteremic skin and soft tissue infection caused by Prevotella loescheii.*
523 BMC Infect Dis, 2014. **14**: p. 162.
- 524 36. Fernandez-Canigia, L., et al., *Detection and genetic characterization of beta-lactamases in*
525 *Prevotella intermedia and Prevotella nigrescens isolated from oral cavity infections and*
526 *peritonsillar abscesses.* Anaerobe, 2015. **33**: p. 8-13.
- 527 37. Thomaidis, P.C., et al., *Sonication assisted microbiological diagnosis of implant-related infection*
528 *caused by Prevotella disiens and Staphylococcus epidermidis in a patient with cranioplasty.* BMC
529 Res Notes, 2015. **8**: p. 307.
- 530 38. Boyd, R., et al., *High burden of invasive group A streptococcal disease in the Northern Territory*
531 *of Australia.* Epidemiol Infect, 2016. **144**(5): p. 1018-27.
- 532 39. Hughes, G.J., et al., *The cost of hospital care for management of invasive group A streptococcal*
533 *infections in England.* Epidemiol Infect, 2015. **143**(8): p. 1719-30.
- 534 40. Mahida, N., et al., *Outbreak of invasive group A streptococcus infection: contaminated patient*
535 *curtains and cross-infection on an ear, nose and throat ward.* J Hosp Infect, 2014. **87**(3): p. 141-
536 4.
- 537 41. Shahani, L. and S. Tavakoli Tabasi, *Moraxella catarrhalis bacteraemia and prosthetic valve*
538 *endocarditis.* BMJ Case Rep, 2015. **2015**.

- 539 42. Abdullah, F.E., K.R. Ahuja, and H. Kumar, *Prevalence and emerging resistance of Moraxella*
540 *catarrhalis* in lower respiratory tract infections in Karachi. J Pak Med Assoc, 2013. **63**(11): p.
541 1342-4.
- 542 43. Ramanan, P., et al., *Rothia bacteremia: a 10-year experience at Mayo Clinic, Rochester,*
543 *Minnesota.* J Clin Microbiol, 2014. **52**(9): p. 3184-9.
- 544 44. Sydenham, T.V., et al., *Four cases of bacteremia caused by Oscillibacter ruminantium, a newly*
545 *described species.* J Clin Microbiol, 2014. **52**(4): p. 1304-7.
- 546 45. Nikolich, M.P., et al., *Evidence for natural horizontal transfer of tetQ between bacteria that*
547 *normally colonize humans and bacteria that normally colonize livestock.* Appl Environ Microbiol,
548 1994. **60**(9): p. 3255-60.
- 549 46. Nagy, E., *Anaerobic Infections.* Drugs, 2010. **70**(7): p. 841-858.
- 550 47. Bancescu, G., et al., *Antibiotic susceptibility of 33 Prevotella strains isolated from Romanian*
551 *patients with abscesses in head and neck spaces.* Anaerobe, 2015. **35**(Pt A): p. 41-4.
- 552 48. Ingman, T., et al., *Tetracycline inhibition and the cellular source of collagenase in gingival*
553 *crevicular fluid in different periodontal diseases. A review article.* J Periodontol, 1993. **64**(2): p.
554 82-8.
- 555 49. Pallasch, T.J., *Antibacterial and antibiotic drugs,* in *Pharmacology and Therapeutics for Dentistry,*
556 J.A. Yagiela, F.J. Dowd, and E.A. Neidle, Editors. 2004, Mosby: St. Louis. p. 643.
- 557 50. van Cleef, B.A., et al., *Persistence of livestock-associated methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus*
558 *aureus* in field workers after short-term occupational exposure to pigs and veal calves. J Clin
559 Microbiol, 2011. **49**(3): p. 1030-3.
- 560 51. Dye, B.A., et al., *Trends in oral health status: United States, 1988-1994 and 1999-2004.* Vital
561 Health Stat 11, 2007(248): p. 1-92.

562