Within-host dynamics explain the coexistence of antibiotic-sensitive and

resistant bacteria

Nicholas G. Davies[1,2], Stefan Flasche[1,2], Mark Jit[1,2,3], Katherine E. Atkins[1,2]

[1]Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases, London School of

Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

[2]Department for Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Faculty of Epidemiology and

Population Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

[3]Modelling and Economics Unit, Public Health England, London, UK

Corresponding Author: Nicholas.Davies@lshtm.ac.uk

Antibiotic resistance is one of the foremost threats to human health[1,2], yet the spread of resistance is poorly understood. Resistant and sensitive strains of the same bacteria nearly always coexist in host populations[3–5], but mathematical models of disease transmission have failed to identify a general, empirically-supported mechanism that can reproduce this phenomenon[6–9]. Such a model should be structurally neutral[10], meaning that coexistence arises from the biology of sensitive and resistant strains rather than being an assumption embedded into the model structure. However, existing models have only applied the principle of structural neutrality at the population level, not within individual hosts where resistant and sensitive strains may interact. Here, we show that within-host dynamics between resistant and sensitive strains creates frequency-dependent selection for resistance, promoting coexistence at the population level, and that extending structural neutrality to the within-host level allows us to reproduce empirical patterns of resistance in commensal bacteria across 30 European countries. In doing so, we identify a parsimonious and biologically-plausible explanation for coexistence that resolves a long-standing conflict between theoretical prediction and empirical observation. Simple mathematical models that mechanistically capture resistance transmission dynamics will allow us to more accurately predict the impact of much-needed strategies for managing resistance.

When two different species compete for the same resource, standard ecological theory predicts competitive exclusion: that the better-adapted species will fully outcompete the other[11]. If instead, long-term coexistence between competitors is

observed, then either the two species occupy different niches, or there is a

mechanism that specifically promotes species diversity[11]. One such mechanism is

negative frequency-dependent selection[12], in which an individual's fitness is

higher when their species is rarer. Negative frequency dependence has long been

known to promote stable coexistence among animal[13, 14], plant[15], and bacterial[16]

competitors. Here, we argue that it may also have a hitherto underappreciated

role in the spread of antibiotic resistance.

The simplest epidemiological model of antibiotic resistance assumes that hosts

can be colonised by either a sensitive or a resistant strain, but not both

simultaneously (**Fig. 1a**). In this single carriage model, sensitive strains benefit

from a fitness advantage in the absence of antibiotic treatment[17, 18], while

resistant strains benefit from being unaffected by antibiotics. Lacking any

selection for strain diversity, this model results in competitive exclusion, such

that above a particular threshold rate of treatment, resistant strains fully

outcompete sensitive strains, while below it, they are unable to emerge at all

(**Fig. 1b**). This competitive exclusion is not observed empirically, and there is

little evidence that the intermediate resistance prevalences we observe are only

transient states on the way to competitive exclusion[7]. Instead, sensitive and

resistant strains of the same bacteria stably coexist in natural populations[7–9],

with the prevalence of resistance to a particular antibiotic gradually increasing

with consumption of that antibiotic[3–5] (**Fig. 1c**). Existing mathematical models

are not in agreement over how best to explicitly integrate our biological and

epidemiological understanding into a general mechanism that reconciles our

theoretical understanding of antibiotic resistance with observed patterns of

coexistence. However, without a mechanistic understanding of resistance

dynamics, we cannot predict the likely impact of public health interventions for

managing resistance.

One way to resolve this discrepancy between theory and observation is to

introduce simultaneous dual carriage of both sensitive and resistant strains[7, 19].

Although dual carriage is known to promote coexistence[7], the mechanism by

which it does so has remained unclear. Here, we identify frequency-dependent

selection for resistance as the mechanism by which dual carriage promotes

coexistence. Specifically, if resistant cells are successfully transmitted to a host

already carrying a sensitive strain, and that host subsequently undergoes

antibiotic treatment, the resident sensitive strain is killed and the invading

resistant cells can grow in number to fully occupy the host niche (**Fig 1d**). By

contrast, if resistant cells are instead transmitted to a host already carrying a

resistant strain, subsequent treatment has no such effect. Hence, resistant strains

enjoy a relative fitness advantage when sensitive-strain carriers are more

common. As the resistant strain multiplies, sensitive-strain carriers become less

common, and this frequency-dependent advantage diminishes. Coexistence

stabilises at intermediate frequencies when the sensitive and resistant strains

have equal fitness.

To further investigate dual carriage as a mechanism for coexistence, we began by

analysing a parsimonious mathematical model of dual carriage[7, 19] in which there

is one class of non-carriers, *X*, and three classes of carriers: *S* carriers, who are

colonised by the sensitive strain; *R* carriers, who are colonised by the resistant

strain; and *SR* carriers, who are colonised by both strains in equal measure (**Fig.**

2a). In this model, dual carriage occurs when *S* or *R* carriers are colonised by the

strain they do not carry through contact with other single or dual carriers. If an

SR carrier is again re-colonised, "knockout" occurs, with the incoming strain

taking the place of one of the two resident strains: for example, an *SR* carrier re-

colonised by the sensitive strain becomes *SR* or *S* with equal probability (**Fig.**

2b). Because dual carriers maintain carriage of both sensitive and resistant

strains in equal measure, we refer to this model as the "within-host balancing"

model. Lipsitch and colleagues[10] showed that balancing and knockout are

required for this dual carriage model to be "structurally neutral". That is, if strain

one and strain two are identical in all but label, when a small number of strain-

two carriers is introduced into a population primarily consisting of strain-one

carriers, a structurally neutral model would not predict that strain-two carriers

increase in frequency to reach some stable equilibrium prevalence (*e.g.*, 50%);

since the strains are equivalent, this behaviour would indicate that coexistence

follows from unspecified assumptions of the model structure. The within-host

balancing model produces coexistence, which increases with the relative

efficiency of co-colonisation, *k* (**Fig. 2c**), consistent with the role of negative

frequency dependence outlined above. However, it does not permit enough

coexistence to capture observed resistance patterns in bacteria such as

Streptococcus pneumoniae (**Fig. 2d**), even when co-colonisation is more efficient

than single colonisation (*k* > 1; **Supplementary Information**).

Although the within-host balancing model is structurally neutral at the between-

host level, we argue that its balancing and knockout mechanisms contradict the

principle of structural neutrality at the within-host level. That is, if a small

amount of an invading strain colonises a host already carrying a larger,

established resident population, the within-host balancing model assumes that

the invading strain increases in frequency to reach an equal proportion to that of

the resident strain. Moreover, if a dual carrier is re-colonised, this process

repeats, with the host losing one of its two existing strains. To overcome these

violations of structural neutrality at the within-host level, we developed a

"within-host neutral" model by including two dual carrier states: S_R and R_S, who

primarily carry the sensitive or resistant strain with a small complement of

resistant or sensitive bacteria, respectively (**Fig. 2e**). In this new model, a strain

invading an already-colonised host does not immediately reach an equal

proportion with the resident strain, it does not knock out any resident strains,

and it is not transmitted further due to its relatively small frequency (**Fig. 2f**).

While knockout is required in the within-host balancing model to maintain

symmetry of colonisation events, it also has the effect of reducing the frequency

of dual carriage, because knockout reduces strain diversity within hosts.

Accordingly, incorporating within-host neutrality substantially increases

coexistence between sensitive and resistant strains (**Fig. 2g**) without violating

structural neutrality at the population level. Moreover, by calibrating the within-

host neutral model to empirical data, we show that it readily captures *S.*

pneumoniae resistance prevalence across 27 European countries (**Fig. 2h**). In

reality, there is an indefinite number of dual carriage frequencies corresponding

to different ratios of susceptible and resistant strain densities within the host.

However, our simple two-state dual carriage model reproduces the simulation

results of a more complex individual-based model that allows for arbitrary

within-host strain frequencies (**Fig. 2g**).

Both the standard within-host balancing and our within-host neutral models

distinguish sensitive from resistant strains by assuming the latter has a reduced

transmission rate. By assuming instead that the two strains differ in their within-

host fitness[17, 18], such that a resistant strain will, in the absence of antibiotic

treatment, be outcompeted by a sensitive stain, we add within-host succession to

the neutral model. We capture within-host succession by allowing R_S hosts to

become S_R hosts at rate b (i.e., the higher growth rate of the sensitive strain

allows it to outcompete the resistant strain within the host), and remove the

transmission cost, c, for resistant strains (**Fig. 2i, j**). Including within-host

competition expands the parameter space over which coexistence is maintained

(**Fig. 2k**), with the largest range of coexistence found when immunity to

reinfection is low ($k = 1$). Succession further promotes coexistence by

strengthening frequency dependence, adding a new mechanism under which

sensitive strains also have a fitness advantage when rare, because sensitive cells

colonising an R carrier can grow over time to become the dominant strain in the

host. Again, this relative advantage dissipates as S carriers become more

common, since sensitive cells have a lower probability of colonising an R carrier;

together, this yields frequency-dependent fitness advantages for both the

sensitive and resistant strains. The neutral model with succession yields an

improved model fit to the same *S. pneumoniae* resistance data (**Fig. 2l**). This

result is robust to feasible assumptions concerning the loss of resistant cells

from S_R hosts (**Supplementary Information**).

Finally, to evaluate the robustness of our results across other bacteria-antibiotic

combinations, we re-parameterised all three models for two additional

facultatively pathogenic bacterial species, *Escherichia coli* and *Staphylococcus*

aureus (**Supplementary Information**). We then recalibrated the suite of models

to pan-European data on resistance prevalence against the most widely used

antibiotics for all three species (**Fig. 3**). Consistent with the results for *S.*

pneumoniae penicillin non-susceptibility (**Fig. 2 d,h,l**), the trends observed over

the further four bacteria-antibiotic combinations are better captured by both the

within-host neutral models than by the within-host balancing model (**Fig. 3**).

When selecting the model that gives the statistical best fit to these data, the

neutral model with succession has the most support under all bacteria-drug

combinations (**Figs. 2, 3**).

Existing mathematical models have not convincingly replicated empirical trends

of resistance prevalence. Although a number of mechanisms that could explain

coexistence between drug-sensitive and resistant pathogens have been

proposed[6–9, 20, 21], some only support modest amounts of coexistence[7, 9], while the

mechanisms proposed have been potentially difficult to generalize empirically,

such as specific immune responses to resistance determinants[7], strongly age-

assortative mixing[7], or independent mappings of balancing selection[8]. Here we

find that incorporating structural neutrality at the within-host scale resolves this

incompatibility for the first time by providing a single generalizable mechanism

for co-existence across a range of important bacteria-drug combinations.

Our class of structurally neutral models provides two advances on previous

work. First, it captures structural neutrality at the within-host level, thereby

harmonising the epidemiology and the within-host dynamics. Second, unlike

previous models, this new class better captures observed patterns of resistance

prevalence and does so parsimoniously. Our proposed models rely on dual

carriage of resistant and sensitive strains, which is generated in our models

through co-colonisation. An alternative mechanism through which dual carriage

could occur is frequent mutation, which would itself promote coexistence

through both mutation-selection balance and an increase in the prevalence of

dual carriage. The extent to which dual carriage may drive coexistence of

resistant and sensitive strains is an empirical proposition, and will best be

answered through a combination of modelling and empirical observation. The

empirical prevalence of dual carriage is not well known, but a study of *S. aureus*

carriage in children found 21% of hosts carried both resistant and sensitive

strains[22] and—although resistance phenotypes were not measured—other

studies have found up to 48% multiple carriage of genetically-distinct *S.*

pneumoniae strains[23, 24] and 42% multiple carriage of virulent *E. coli* strains[25].

These studies find that carriage is typically dominated by one strain with other

strains carried at low frequency, consistent with our model structure. While it is

possible that coexistence is maintained by forces additional to dual carriage, we

suggest that any model that incorporates dual carriage should also integrate

within-host neutrality to avoid biasing the model against coexistence.

Although our mathematical models are robust across multiple bacteria-antibiotic

combinations[3–5], there are bacteria-specific mechanisms that should be noted.

For example, to more accurately quantify *S. pneumoniae* carriage and the spread

of resistance, particularly in the era of pneumococcal conjugate vaccines (PCVs),

mathematical models would ideally integrate serotype dynamics[9, 26, 27].

Moreover, it is clear that there is substantial between-country variation in

resistance prevalence that the models analysed here do not capture. Part of this

variation is likely to stem from differences in the frequency of person-to-person

transmission as well as disease- and age-specific antibiotic treatment rates[9].

Other variation across countries may occur from importation of resistant or

sensitive strains from sources including travel outside the country of origin and

agricultural transmission. Providing a framework in which to answer public

health questions will require a balance between mathematical tractability and

identifiability of the models on one side, and necessary complexity on the other.

Building on the simple models proposed here will help to establish that balance.

Without a clear mechanistic understanding of the spread of antimicrobial

resistance, it will be difficult to disentangle the complex suite of factors that are

likely to affect the global prevalence of resistance. If mathematical models are

able to incorporate a truly mechanistic understanding of resistance, they will be

better able to explain common patterns of resistance and to accurately predict

the effect of interventions at a national and global level[28]. With growing calls for

an integrated and multifaceted approach to the problem of antimicrobial

resistance[1, 2], a new generation of mechanistic mathematical models will be

uniquely placed to support the evidence-based adoption of impactful and cost-

effective strategies.

Methods

Single-carriage model — The single-carriage model is given by

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \beta S X - (u + \tau) S$$

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \beta (1 - c) R X - u R$$

$$X = 1 - S - R .\qquad\qquad\qquad(1)$$

Here, $S = S(t)$ is the fraction of sensitive strain carriers in the population; $R = R(t)$

is the fraction of resistant strain carriers in the population; and $X = X(t)$ is the

fraction of non-carriers. The parameter β is the person-to-person transmission

rate of the sensitive strain, u is the natural clearance rate, τ is the per capita rate

of antibiotic treatment, and c is the transmission cost of resistance.

Within-host balancing model — Following previous work[7, 10], the balancing

model is given by

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \beta S_{tot} X - (u + \tau) S - k \beta (1 - c) R_{tot} S + \frac{k \beta S_{tot} D}{2}$$

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \beta (1 - c) R X - u R - k \beta S_{tot} R + \frac{k \beta (1 - c) R_{tot} D}{2} + \tau D$$

$$\frac{dD}{dt} = k \beta (1 - c) R_{tot} S + k \beta S_{tot} R - (u + \tau) D - k \beta S_{tot} D - k \beta (1 - c) R_{tot} D$$

$$X = 1 - S - R - D .\qquad\qquad\qquad(2)$$

Here, the additional compartment $D = D(t)$ is the fraction of dual carriers in the

population (*SR* carriers in the main text), k is the efficiency of multiple

colonisation relative to single colonisation, and $S_\text{tot} = S + D/2$ and $R_\text{tot} = R + D/2$

give the effective population burden of sensitive- and resistant-strain

colonisation, respectively. The resistance prevalence is given by $\rho = R_\text{tot}/(1-X)$.

Within-host neutrality model — The novel neutral model is given by

$\qquad \frac{dS}{dt} = \beta(S + S_R)X - (u + \tau)S - k\beta RS$

$\qquad \frac{dS}{dt} = \beta(1 - c)RX - uR + \tau S_R$

$\qquad \frac{dR}{dt} = \beta(1 - c)RX - uR + \tau S_R$

$\qquad \frac{dS_R}{dt} = k\beta(1 - c)RS - (u + \tau)S_R$

$\qquad X = 1 - S - R - S_R$. $\qquad\qquad\qquad$ (3)

Here, the compartment $S_R = S_R(t)$ captures the fraction of the population

predominantly colonised with sensitive bacteria, but also carrying a small

amount of resistant bacteria, and $S + S_R$ gives the effective population burden of

sensitive-strain colonisation. The $R_S = R_s(t)$ compartment shown in **Fig. 2e** is

omitted as it does not impact upon the overall resistance prevalence in this

model, $\rho = R/(1-X)$.

Within-host neutrality model with succession — Finally, the neutral model with

succession is given by

$\qquad \frac{dS}{dt} = \beta(S + S_R)X - (u + \tau)S - k\beta(R + R_S)S$

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \beta RX - uR + \tau(S_R + R_S) - k\beta(S + S_R)R$$

$$\frac{dS_R}{dt} = k\beta(R + R_S)S - (u + \tau)S_R + bR_S$$

$$\frac{dR_S}{dt} = k\beta(S + S_R)R - (u + \tau)R_S - bR_S$$

$$X = 1 - S - R - S_R - R_S \,. \qquad\qquad (4)$$

Here, the R_S compartment captures dual carriers predominantly colonised with

resistant bacteria plus a small amount of sensitive bacteria, and b captures the

within-host benefit of sensitivity.

Ordinary differential equation solutions — All models are solved by setting single-

carriage compartments (S and R) equal to 0.001 and all dual-carriage

compartments to 0, then integrating the systems of ordinary differential

equations numerically using the Runge–Kutta Dorman–Prince method until they

reach equilibrium. All models were simulated using C++.

Model parameterisation and calibration — We calibrated the models using

European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control data on penicillin

consumption[3] and the prevalence of penicillin non-susceptibility among *S.*

pneumoniae invasive isolates[4] from 2007 for 27 European countries. We focused

on the year 2007 for this data set as criteria for penicillin non-susceptibility in *S.*

pneumoniae were changed in some countries after this year, yielding

inconsistencies in resistance data between countries[7, 28]. For calibration to all

other bacteria-drug combinations, we used data for the same 27 countries

collected in 2015, the most recent year for which data are available[3, 5]. Antibiotic

consumption rates were given in defined daily doses (DDD) per thousand

people; we converted these to overall treatment rates by assuming that 10 DDD

comprise one treatment course for penicillin[8] and fluoroquinolones, while 7 DDD

comprise one treatment course for macrolides.

We used Markov chain Monte Carlo with differential evolution[30] to calibrate the

model output to empirical data. We assumed that the number of resistant

isolates tested in a given country follows a binomial distribution with success

probability drawn from a beta distribution, with the model-predicted resistance

prevalence as the mode of the beta distribution. Setting the success probability

as a random variable allowed us to account for between-country variation in

resistance prevalence not captured by our dynamic model. The likelihood of the

observed resistance prevalence for bacteria-antibiotic set j across all countries,

d_j, given the model predicted resistance prevalence, ρ_j, and prevalence of

carriage, Y_j, is

$$L_j(d_j|\rho_j, Y_j) =$$

$$\prod_{i=1}^{C_j}\left(\left[Y_j^{(0)} \leq Y(\tau_{i,j}) \leq Y_j^{(1)}\right]\int_{x=0}^{1} \text{Beta}(x|\omega = \rho_j(\tau_{i,j}), \kappa = \kappa_j^*)\text{Bin}(r_{i,j}|n_{i,j}, x)dx\right).$$

Here, $\left[Y_j^{(0)} \leq Y(\tau_{i,j}) \leq Y_j^{(1)}\right]$ is 1 if $Y(\tau_{i,j})$ lies between $Y_j^{(0)}$ and $Y_j^{(1)}$, which are the

lower and upper bounds of duration of carriage, respectively, and 0 otherwise;

$\text{Beta}(x|\omega, \kappa) = x^{\alpha-1}(1-x)^{\beta-1}\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)/(\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta))|\alpha = \omega(\kappa-2)+1, \beta = (1-\omega)(\kappa-2)+1$ is the

beta distribution probability density with mode ω and concentration κ; and

$\text{Bin}(r|n, x) = \binom{n}{r} x^r (1 - x)^{n-r}$ is the binomial distribution probability density.

There are C_j countries in the data set j labelled $i = 1...C_j$; for a country i and

bacteria-antibiotic set j, the measured antibiotic use is $\tau_{i,j}$, the number of samples

taken of a particular bacteria is $n_{i,j}$, and the number of those samples tested as

non-susceptible to the particular antibiotic is $r_{i,j}$. The model prediction for

resistance prevalence given treatment rate τ is $\rho_j(\tau)$, the model prediction for

prevalence of carriage given treatment rate τ is $Y_j(\tau)$, and the estimated

concentration around the best-fit line, estimated from the data, is κ_j^*.

To estimate the concentration κ_j^* from the resistance prevalence data, we used a

truncated line function $f(\tau) = \max(0, a + g\tau)$ as the modal antibiotic resistance

prevalence and fixed κ_j^* as the concentration. We calculated the maximum

likelihood estimates of a_j^*, g_j^*, and κ_j^* by using the Nelder-Mead algorithm[31] to

maximize the following likelihood function:

$$L_j^{(1)}(a_j^*, g_j^*, \kappa_j^*)$$

$$= \prod_{i=1}^{C_j} \int_{x=0}^1 \text{Beta}\left(x \middle| \omega = \max\left(0, a_j^* \tau_{i,j} + g_j^*\right), \kappa = \kappa_j^*\right) \text{Bin}\left(r_{i,j} \middle| n_{i,j}, x\right) dx$$

Priors for all model fitting were identified from the literature and were bacteria-

specific (**Supplementary Information**).

For illustrative purposes, the parameters c and b for **Fig. 2c, g, k** were chosen

such that $\tau = 1.5$ courses per person per year would lead to 50% resistance

prevalence (**Fig. 3a-c**). This τ was chosen to roughly coincide with *S. pneumoniae*

empirical data[3, 5]. Other parameters used were $\beta = 4$, $u = 1$ (ref. 7) and k as given

in the figure.

Individual-based model — In the individual-based model, hosts are indexed by

$i \in 1 \dots N$, where N is the population size. Each host is characterised by a pair of

real numbers (s_i, r_i) giving the normalised load of sensitive and resistant bacteria

colonising the host ($s_i = r_i = 0$ in uncolonised hosts, while $s_i + r_i = 1$ in colonised

hosts). A new sensitive-strain colonisation changes a host's bacterial load to $(s_i',$

$r_i') = ((s_i + \iota)/(s_i + r_i + \iota), r_i/(s_i + r_i + \iota))$, while a new resistant-strain colonisation

changes a host's bacterial load to $(s', r') = (s/(s + r + \iota), (r + \iota)/(s + r + \iota))$, where ι

$\ll 1$ is the germ size. The rate at which hosts experience new colonisations is λ_S

$= \beta \sum_i s_i$ for sensitive colonisations and $\lambda_R = \beta(1-c) \sum_i r_i$ for resistant colonisations.

Hosts receive treatment at rate τ, which sets their $(s_i', r_i') = (0, r_i)$, and experience

natural clearance at rate u, which sets their $(s_i', r_i') = (0, 0)$. The model proceeds

in discrete time steps of 0.001 months.

References

1. World Health Organization. *United Nations high-level meeting on antimicrobial*

resistance.

http://www.who.int/antimicrobial-resistance/events/UNGA-meeting-amr-

sept2016/en (2016).

2. O'Neill J, *ed. Tackling drug-resistant infections globally: final report and*

recommendations. https://amr-review.org/home.html (2016).

3. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Antimicrobial

consumption rates by country.

http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/healthtopics/antimicrobial-resistance-and-

consumption/antimicrobial-consumption/esac-net-

database/Pages/Antimicrobial-consumption-rates-by-country.aspx (2017).

4. European Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance System. *EARSS Annual Report*

2007. Bilthoven: EARSS.

5. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. *Antimicrobial resistance*

surveillance in Europe 2015. Annual Report of the European Antimicrobial

Resistance Surveillance Network (EARS-Net). Stockholm: ECDC (2017).

6. Austin DJ, Kristinsson KG, Anderson RM. The relationship between the volume

of antimicrobial consumption in human communities and the frequency of

resistance. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **96**, 1152–1156 (1999).

7. Colijn C, *et al.* What is the mechanism for persistent coexistence of drug-

susceptible and drug-resistant strains of *Streptococcus pneumoniae*? *J. R. Soc.*

Interface **7**, 905–919 (2010).

8. Lehtinen S, *et al.* Evolution of antibiotic resistance is linked to any genetic

mechanism affecting bacterial duration of carriage. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **114**,

1075–1080 (2017).

9. Cobey S, *et al.* Host population structure and treatment frequency maintain

balancing selection on drug resistance. *J R Soc Interface* **14**, 20170295 (2017).

10. Lipsitch M, Colijn C, Cohen T, Hanage WP, Fraser C. No coexistence for free:

neutral null models for multistrain pathogens. *Epidemics* **1**, 2–13 (2009).

11. Hardin G. The competitive exclusion principle. *Science* **131**, 1292–1297

(1960).

12. Ayala FJ, Campbell CA. Frequency-dependent selection. *Ann Rev Ecol Syst* **5**,

115–138 (1974).

13. Ayala FJ. Competition between species: frequency dependence. *Science* **171**,

820–824 (1971).

14. Sinervo B, Lively CM. The rock-paper-scissors game and the evolution of

alternative male strategies. *Nature* **380**, 240–243 (1996).

15. Gigord LDB, Macnair MR, Smithson A. Negative frequency-dependent

selection maintains a dramatic flower color polymorphism in the rewardless

orchid *Dactylorhiza sambucina* (L.) Soò. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **98**, 6253–6255

(2001).

16. Rainey PB, Travisano M. Adaptive radiation in a heterogeneous environment.

Nature **394**, 69–72 (1998).

17. Andersson DI. The biological cost of mutational antibiotic resistance: any

practical conclusions? *Curr Opin Microbiol* **9**, 461–465 (2006).

18. Andersson DI, Hughes D. Antibiotic resistance and its cost: is it possible to

reverse resistance? *Nat Rev Microbiol* **8**, 260–271 (2010).

19. Lipsitch M. Vaccination against colonizing bacteria with multiple serotypes.

Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **94**, 6571–6576 (1997).

20. Dietz K. Epidemiologic interference of virus populations. *J Math Biol* **8**, 291–

300 (1979).

21. Gupta S, Swinton J, Anderson RM. Theoretical studies of the effects of

heterogeneity in the parasite population on the transmission dynamics of

malaria. *Proc R Soc Lond B* **256**, 231–238 (1994).

22. Mongkolrattanothai K, *et al.* Simultaneous carriage of multiple genotypes of

Staphylococcus aureus in children. *J Med Microbiol* **60**, 317–322 (2011).

23. Kamng'ona AW, *et al.* High multiple carriage and emergence of *Streptococcus*

pneumoniae vaccine serotype variants in Malawian children. *BMC Inf Diseases* **15**,

234 (2015).

24. Turner P, *et al.* Improved detection of nasopharyngeal cocolonization by

multiple pneumococcal serotypes by use of latex agglutination or molecular

serotyping by microarray. *J Clin Microbiol* **49**, 1784–1789 (2011).

25. Martinez-Medina M, *et al.* Molecular diversity of *Escherichia coli* in the human

gut: new ecological evidence supporting the role of adherent-invasive *E. coli*

(AIEC) in Crohn's disease. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* **15**, 872–882 (2009).

26. Cobey S, Lipsitch M. Niche and neutral effects of acquired immunity permit

coexistence of pneumococcal serotypes. *Science* **335**, 1376–1380 (2012).

27. Flasche S, *et al.* The impact of specific and non-specific immunity on the

ecology of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and the implications for vaccination. *Proc R*

Soc B **280**, 20131939 (2013).

28. Atkins KE, *et al.* Use of mathematical modelling to assess the impact of

vaccines on antibiotic resistance. *Lancet Infect Dis* (in press).

Additional references for Methods

29. Goossens MC, Catry B, Verhaegen J. Antimicrobial resistance to

benzylpenicillin in invasive pneumococcal disease in Belgium, 2003–2010: the

effect of altering clinical breakpoints. *Epidemiol Infect* **141**, 490–495 (2013).

30. Ter Braak CJF. A Markov chain Monte Carlo version of the genetic algorithm

differential evolution: easy Bayesian computing for real parameter spaces. *Stat*

Comp **16**, 239-249 (2006).

31. Nelder JA, Mead R. A simplex method for function minimization. *Comp J* **7**,

308–313 (1965).

Supplementary Information is included at the end of this document.

Acknowledgments. We thank M. Davies for assistance. NGD, MJ and KEA were

funded by the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research

Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Immunisation at the London School of Hygiene and

Tropical Medicine in partnership with Public Health England (PHE). The views

expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the

NIHR, the Department of Health or Public Health England.

Author contributions. NGD, SF, MJ and KEA conceived the study. NGD

performed the analyses. NGD and KEA drafted the manuscript, which all authors

revised.

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to

Nicholas.Davies@lshtm.ac.uk.

     Figures

Figure 1 | The problem of coexistence. (a) Observed prevalence of penicillin

non-susceptibility in invasive isolates of *S. pneumoniae* across 27 European

countries, illustrating widespread coexistence. **(b)** A simple two-strain single

carriage model defined by the system of ordinary differential equations

$\frac{dD}{dt} = \beta SX - (u + \tau)S, \frac{dR}{dt} = \beta(1 - c)RX - uR, X = 1 - S - R$. Here, β is the rate of

transmission (solid arrows), u is the rate of natural clearance (dotted arrows), τ

is the rate of antibiotic treatment (dashed arrow), and c is the cost of resistance.

(c) The single carriage model produces competitive exclusion, with the sensitive

strain dominating the resistant strain if $c > \tau/(u + \tau)$. The region plot shows

outcomes when $\beta = 4$ months^{-1}, $u = 1$ months^{-1}. **(d)** Dual carriage allows

coexistence by promoting frequency-dependent selection on the resistant strain.

When the sensitive strain is relatively common, resistant-strain carriers (red

boxes) are more likely to transmit bacteria to sensitive-strain carriers (blue

boxes). If the resulting co-colonised carriers are then treated with antibiotics, the

resistant strain grows within the host to take the place of the killed sensitive

cells. Overall, this gives the resistant strain a fitness advantage when it is rare. As

the resistant strain becomes more common, it is less likely to colonise a

sensitive-strain carrier, diminishing the resistant strain's frequency-dependent

fitness advantage.

Figure 2 | Models of dual carriage. (a)–(d) The within-host balancing model[10].

(a) The two-strain model (**Fig. 1b**) is extended by the addition of a dual-carrier

compartment, SR. The parameter k gives the relative efficiency of transmission to

an already-colonised host; $k = 0$ eliminates dual carriage and recovers the two-

strain model. **(b)** An example sequence of colonisation events under the within-

host balancing model, illustrating equal co-colonisation and knockout. **(c)**

Although coexistence increases with the efficiency of multiple carriage, k, the

region of coexistence remains small for the within-host balancing model. **(d)** The

within-host balancing model provides a poor fit to penicillin non-susceptibility in

S. pneumoniae across European countries. **(e)** The within-host neutral model

features two dual-carriage components, S_R and R_S, reflecting the relative

dominance of a given strain within hosts. This model is structurally neutral at

both the population and the within-host level. **(f)** The same example sequence of

colonisation events as in panel **b** illustrates the absence of the balancing and

knockout mechanisms. **(g)** Integrating within-host neutrality expands the region

of coexistence. Overlaid markers are results from an individual-based model

with an arbitrary number of co-colonisation states (see **Methods**) for $k = 0.25$

and $k = 1$, showing agreement with the two-state co-colonisation model shown in

panel **e**. **(h)** Within-host neutrality provides a better fit to empirical data. **(i)** The

within-host neutral model with succession allows the sensitive strain to

outcompete the resistant strain within the host at rate b. **(j)** The same example

sequence illustrates frequency-dependent selection acting on the sensitive

strain. **(k)** Including within-host competition further increases coexistence and

(l) the resulting model provides the best fit to the data. Relative likelihoods were

calculated as 4.49×10^{-5} for the within-host balancing model and 0.635 for the

neutral model (relative to the neutral model with succession).

Figure 3 | Model fit to additional bacteria-drug combinations. Within-host

neutral models with (blue) or without (green) succession outperform the

balancing model (red). **(a)** *E. coli*, fluoroquinolone resistance. The balancing

model has likelihood 2.45×10^{-127}, and the neutral model 3.85×10^{-15}, relative to

the neutral model with succession. **(b)** *E. coli*, penicillin resistance. Relative

likelihoods are 3.22×10^{-163} for the balancing model and 3.41×10^{-28} for the neutral

model. **(c)** *S. aureus*, meticillin resistance. Relative likelihoods are 6.33×10^{-4} for

the balancing model and 0.141 for the neutral model. **(d)** *S. pneumoniae*,

macrolide resistance. Relative likelihoods are 6.57×10^{-15} for the balancing model

and 2.28×10^{-3} for the neutral model.

Supplementary information for:

Within-host dynamics explain the coexistence of antibiotic-sensitive and resistant

bacteria

Nicholas G. Davies[1,2], Stefan Flasche[1,2], Mark Jit[1,2,3], Katherine E. Atkins[1,2]

[1]Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases, London School of Hygiene

and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

[2]Department for Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Faculty of Epidemiology and

Population Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK

[3]Modelling and Economics Unit, Public Health England, London, UK

Corresponding Author: Nicholas.Davies@lshtm.ac.uk

Table of Contents

1. Sources for antibiotic consumption and resistance prevalence data

We used data from the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) and from the European Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance Network (EARS-Net) to parameterize our models for the consumption of antibiotics and prevalence of antibiotic resistance in EU countries.

The ECDC provides information on antimicrobial consumption in defined daily doses (DDD) per 1000 inhabitants per day for participating countries, with antimicrobials broken down into categories as classified in the World Health Organisation's (WHO) Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) Classification System. Consumption is classified into primary care and hospital use, with the majority of use in primary care. We focus on primary care usage only, as hospital usage data is sparse and we are focusing on community-acquired bacterial carriage. The ECDC releases online publications summarizing consumption data (*e.g.* ECDC 2014) and maintains a queryable online database (ECDC 2017b).

EARS-Net, formerly EARSS, provides information on resistance levels as measured in invasive isolates of various bacterial pathogens isolated from blood and cerebrospinal fluid (EARSS 2007; ECDC 2017a). We assume that invasive isolates are a sample of commensally-carried strains (Lehtinen *et al.* 2017). We summarize the data used and sources for the five data sets analysed (**Tab. S1**).

Data set	Consumption: *ATC code, sector, year, and source*	Resistance: *Pathogen, resistance metric, year, and source*
Streptococcus pneumoniae penicillin resistance, 2007 (Figs. 1–2, main text)	J01C (Beta-lactam antibacterials, penicillins), primary care, 2007 (ECDC 2017b, 2014[†])	*S. pneumoniae*, percentage non-susceptible to penicillin, 2007 (EARSS 2007)
Escherichia coli fluoroquinolone resistance, 2015 (Fig. 3a, main text)	J01MA (Fluoroquinolones), primary care, 2015 (ECDC 2017b)	*E. coli*, percentage resistant to fluoroquinolones, 2015 (ECDC 2017a)
E. coli penicillin resistance, 2015 (Fig. 3b, main text)	J01C (Beta-lactam antibacterials, penicillins), primary care, 2015 (ECDC 2017b)	*E. coli*, percentage resistant to aminopenicillins, 2015 (ECDC 2017a)
Staphylococcus aureus meticillin resistance, 2015 (Fig. 3c, main text)	J01C (Beta-lactam antibacterials, penicillins), primary care, 2015 (ECDC 2017b)	*S. aureus*, percentage resistant to meticillin (MRSA), 2015 (ECDC 2017a)
S. pneumoniae macrolide resistance, 2015 (Fig. 3d, main text)	J01FA (Macrolides), primary care, 2015 (ECDC 2017b)	*S. pneumoniae*, percentage non-susceptible to macrolides, 2015 (ECDC 2017a)

Table S1 | Data sources for antibiotic consumption and antimicrobial resistance across five pathogen-drug combinations. [†]Portugal recorded no penicillin consumption for 2007 in the online ECDC database (ECDC 2017b), but the 2011 ECDC report (ECDC 2014) provides the corrected figure of 11.3 DDD per 1000 inhabitants per day for 2007.

2. Details of model fitting

Priors for duration of carriage

For *S. pneumoniae*, we assume an average duration of carriage of 1 month (Colijn *et al.* 2009), giving a clearance rate u = 1 months^{-1}. For *E. coli*, we assume that the average duration of carriage is 59 days (Li *et al.* 2012) to 98 days (Apisarnthanarak *et al.* 2008),

and accordingly set a uniform prior for u over the range 0.3–0.5 months^{-1}. For *S. aureus*,

we assume a duration of carriage of 3.3 months (estimated from ambulatory patients

clearing MRSA; Shenoy *et al.* 2014) to 5.9 months (Larsson *et al.* 2011), and accordingly

set a uniform prior for u over the range 0.17–0.3 months^{-1}.

The transmission parameter, β, is constrained by the likelihood function (see below), so

we set a uniform prior on β wide enough to overlap the full range of observed carriage

prevalence, Y, given the range of clearance rates u and treatment rates τ (*i.e.* $Y = 1 - (u +$

$\tau)/\beta$ for the sensitive strain alone, and $Y = 1 - u/(\beta(1-c))$ for the resistant strain alone).

Specifically, for *S. pneumoniae*, we use the range 1–6; for *E. coli*, we use the range 1–10;

and for *S. aureus*, we use the range 0.1–2.

Likelihood ranges for carriage prevalence
77

In the main text, we detail how the likelihood function used in model fitting constrains

model output such that all countries must exhibit a prevalence of carriage Y such that

$Y^{(0)} \leq Y \leq Y^{(1)}$. For *S. pneumoniae*, we follow Colijn *et al.* (2010) in assuming $0.2 \leq Y \leq 0.8$

in children. For *E. coli*, we restrict our attention to extraintestinal pathogenic *E. coli*

(ExPEC), a subset of *E. coli* that is responsible for most invasive infections, and assume

$0.499 \leq Y \leq 0.942$, which is derived from 95% confidence intervals around the observed

prevalence of carriage of ExPEC (9 of 12 healthy control subjects) from Martinez-

Medina *et al.* (2009). Finally, for *S. aureus*, we adopt $0.2 \leq Y \leq 0.6$ based on Bogaert *et al.*

(2004), which is based on the observed range of *S. aureus* colonization in Dutch

children, with a slightly wider range to capture more variation between European

countries.

MCMC details

Following the differential evolution MCMC algorithm (Ter Braak 2006), we run $10n$

chains, where n is the number of free parameters in the model, *i.e.* 30 for *S. pneumoniae*

(for which carriage duration is fixed at 1 month) and 40 for *E. coli* and *S. aureus*, for

which carriage duration is not fixed. The burn-in period lasts 1,000 iterations, after

which 100,000 samples from the posterior are taken across all chains.

3. Posterior distributions from model fitting

Here, we show the posterior distributions from model fitting from the main analysis

(**Fig. S1–S5**)

Figure S1 | Posterior distribution for *S. pneumoniae* / penicillin (2007). *Y* gives the

overall prevalence of carriage (whether single or dual) in the population; *dual* gives the

fraction of carriers who carry both sensitive and resistant strains; *beta* gives the

transmission parameter; *c* gives the transmission cost of resistance; *u* gives the

clearance rate (if the clearance rate is subject to fitting; for *S. pneumoniae*, $u = 1$); *k* gives

the efficiency of recolonisation, and *b* gives the within-host rate of succession (see

Methods, main text, for details).

Figure S2 | Posterior distribution for *E. coli* / fluoroquinolones (2015). See Fig. S1 for

details.

114 **Figure S3 |** Posterior distribution for *E. coli* / penicillin (2015). See Fig. S1 for details.

117 **Figure S4 |** Posterior distribution for *S. aureus* / meticillin (2015). See Fig. S1 for

118 details.

Figure S5 | Posterior distribution for *S. pneumoniae* / macrolides (2015). See Fig. S1 for

details.

4. Positive association between carriers: *k* > 1

In the main analysis, we assume that *k* measures relative efficiency of co-colonisation

compared to colonisation of an uncolonised host, and hence restrict our attention to *k* ≤

1. However, it is also possible to interpret *k* as capturing positive association between

carriers, as increasing *k* increases transmission among carriers without impacting upon

the overall prevalence of carriage in the population. Thus, it is possible to have *k* > 1

reflecting this mechanism. Allowing for the range 0 ≤ *k* ≤ 5, we find that (a) the fit of the

within-host balancing model does not substantially improve and that (b) similar levels

of coexistence are possible for the within-host neutral and within-host succession

models with lower prevalence of carriage. Here, for illustration, we adopt more

restrictive ranges on the prevalence of carriage: 0.2 ≤ *Y* ≤ 0.4 for *S. pneumoniae*, 0.4 ≤ *Y* ≤

0.8 for *E. coli*, and 0.2 ≤ *Y* ≤ 0.4 for *S. aureus* (**Fig. S6**).

Figure S6 | Model fits with $0 \leq k \leq 5$.

Posterior distributions from model fitting with $0 \leq k \leq 5$

Posterior distributions provided in **Figs. S7–S11**.

Figure S7 | Posterior distribution for *S. pneumoniae* / penicillin (2007) data set with $0 \leq$

$k \leq 5$.

Figure S8 | Posterior distribution for *E. coli* / fluoroquinolones (2015) data set with 0 ≤

k ≤ 5.

Figure S9 | Posterior distribution for *E. coli* / penicillin (2015) data set with 0 ≤ *k* ≤ 5.

Figure S10 | Posterior distribution for *S. aureus* / meticillin (2015) data set with $0 \leq k \leq$

5.

Figure S11 | Posterior distribution for *S. pneumoniae* / macrolides (2015) data set with

$0 \leq k \leq 5$.

Relative likelihoods from model fitting with $0 \leq k \leq 5$

We calculated the relative likelihood for the fitted models, M_i, by comparison of the

Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) of each model to that of the best model, M

$(\exp[(AIC(M) - AIC(M_i))/2])$ (**Tab. S2**).

Model	Within-host balancing	Within-host neutrality	Within-host neutrality plus succession
S. pneumoniae / penicillin (2007) (*n* = 3)	4.82×10^{-5}	0.453	1
E. coli / fluoroquinolones (2015) (*n* = 4)	1.11×10^{-127}	1.03×10^{-12}	1
E. coli / penicillin (2015) (*n* = 4)	1.12×10^{-161}	1.34×10^{-26}	1
S. aureus / meticillin (2015) (*n* = 4)	6.87×10^{-4}	0.696	1
S. pneumoniae / macrolides (2015) (*n* = 3)	3.84×10^{-14}	1.33×10^{-3}	1

Table S2 | Relative likelihoods for model fits with $0 \leq k \leq 5$. The number of parameters,

n, is given for each model.

5. S_R-to-S clearance in within-host neutral model with succession

In the within-host neutral model with succession, within-host competition causes R_S

carriers to transition into S_R carriers over time. However, an alternative model proposes

that the minor complement of resistant cells in S_R carriers may be outcompeted within

the host over time, transitioning S_R carriers to S carriers. To verify the robustness of our

results against the clearance of resistant cells from S_R carriers, we re-fit the the neutral

model with succession to the *S. pneumoniae* / penicillin data set assuming that S_R

carriers transition to S carriers at double the rate of the R_S to S_R transition, i.e. 2*b*.

Adding this transition has a minimal impact on the model fit (**Fig. S12**). The relative

likelihood of the model fitted with S_R-to-S clearance is 0.926 compared to the model

fitted without S_R-to-S clearance.

Figure S12 | Model fits for *S. pneumoniae* / penicillin (2007) data set without and with

S_R-to-S clearance.

References

Apisarnthanarak A, Bailey TC, Fraser VJ. (2008) Duration of stool colonization in

patients infected with extended-spectrum β-lactamase-producing *Escherichia*

coli and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*. *Clin Infect Dis* 46: 1322–1333.

Bogaert D, *et al.* (2004) Colonisation by *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and *Staphylococcus*

aureus in healthy children. *Lancet* 363: 1871–1872.

Colijn C, *et al.* (2010) What is the mechanism for persistent coexistence of drug-

susceptible and drug-resistant strains of *Streptococcus pneumoniae*? *J. R. Soc.*

Interface 7: 905–919.

European Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance System (2007) *EARSS Annual Report*

2007. Bilthoven: EARSS.

<https://ecdc.europa.eu/sites/portal/files/media/en/healthtopics/antimicrobi

al-resistance-and-consumption/antimicrobial_resistance/publications-

documents/Documents/2007_EARSS_Annual_Report.pdf>.

European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (2014) *Surveillance of*

antimicrobial consumption in Europe 2011. Stockholm: ECDC.

<https://ecdc.europa.eu/sites/portal/files/media/en/publications/Publications

/antimicrobial-consumption-europe-surveillance-2011.pdf>.

European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (2017a) *Antimicrobial resistance*

surveillance in Europe 2015. Annual Report of the European Antimicrobial

Resistance Surveillance Network (EARS-Net). Stockholm: ECDC.

<https://ecdc.europa.eu/sites/portal/files/media/en/publications/Publications

/antimicrobial-resistance-europe-2015.pdf>.

European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (2017b) Antimicrobial

consumption rates by country.

<http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/healthtopics/antimicrobial-resistance-and-

consumption/antimicrobial-consumption/esac-net-

database/Pages/Antimicrobial-consumption-rates-by-country.aspx>.

Larsson AK, *et al.* (2011) Duration of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*

colonization after diagnosis: A four-year experience from southern Sweden.

Scand J Inf Dis 43: 456–462.

Lehtinen S, *et al.* (2017) Evolution of antibiotic resistance is linked to any genetic

mechanism affecting bacterial duration of carriage. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 114:

1075–1080.

Li B, *et al.* (2012) Duration of stool colonization in healthy medical students with

extended-spectrum-β-lactamase-producing *Escherichia coli. Antimicrob Agents*

Chemother 56: 4558–4559.

Martinez-Medina M, *et al.* (2009) Molecular diversity of *Escherichia coli* in the human

gut: new ecological evidence supporting the role of adherent-invasive *E. coli*

(AIEC) in Crohn's disease. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 15: 872–882.

Shenoy ES, Paras ML, Noubary F, Walensky RP, Hooper DC (2014) Natural history of

colonization with methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) and

vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus* (VRE): a systematic review. *BMC Infect Dis*

14: 177.

Ter Braak CJF (2006) A Markov chain Monte Carlo version of the genetic algorithm

differential evolution: easy Bayesian computing for real parameter spaces. *Stat*

Comp 16: 239-249.