Stabilising effects of competition and diversity determine vaccine impact on

antibiotic resistance evolution

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

1. Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases; Vaccine Centre; and

Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, London School of Hygiene and Tropical

Medicine, London, UK.

2. Modelling and Economics Unit, Public Health England, London, UK.

3. Centre for Global Health, Usher Institute of Population Health Sciences and

Informatics, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.

* Corresponding author. Address: Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology,

Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical

Medicine, Keppel Street, London WC1E 7HT, United Kingdom. Phone: +44 20 7927

2880. E-mail: nicholas.davies@lshtm.ac.uk.

One sentence summary: Frequency-dependent competition and extrinsically-

maintained diversity shape selection for antibiotic resistance following vaccination.

Bacterial vaccines can protect recipients from contracting potentially antibiotic-resistant infections. But by altering the selective balance between sensitive and resistant strains, vaccines may also suppress—or spread—antibiotic resistance among unvaccinated individuals. Predicting the outcome requires knowing what drives selection for resistance in bacterial pathogens, and in particular, what maintains the circulation of both antibiotic-sensitive and resistant strains of bacteria. Using mathematical modelling, we show that the frequency of penicillin resistance in *Streptococcus pneumoniae* (pneumococcus) across 27 European countries can be explained by between-host diversity in antibiotic use, heritable diversity in pneumococcal carriage duration, or frequency-dependent selection brought about by within-host competition between resistant and sensitive strains. We use our calibrated models to predict the impact of non-serotype-specific pneumococcal vaccination upon the prevalence of carriage, incidence of disease, and frequency of resistance for *S. pneumoniae*. We find that the relative strength and directionality of competition between resistant and sensitive pneumococcal strains is the most important determinant of whether vaccination promotes, inhibits, or has little effect upon the evolution of antibiotic resistance. Finally, we show that country-specific differences in pathogen transmission substantially alter the predicted impact of vaccination, highlighting that policies for managing resistance with vaccines must be tailored to a specific pathogen and setting.

In an age of widespread antibiotic resistance, there is growing interest in using vaccines to prevent bacterial infections that would otherwise call for treatment with antibiotics (*1–4*). This interest arises for two main reasons: first, vaccines are effective against both antibiotic-resistant and antibiotic-sensitive bacteria; and second, successful prophylaxis removes the need for a course of antibiotic therapy that might promote more resistance (*2–5*). Over the past two decades, the use of pneumococcal conjugate vaccines (PCVs) has seemingly borne out these advantages. Administering PCVs to young children has substantially reduced disease caused by *S. pneumoniae* (*5–8*)—a common asymptomatic coloniser of the nasopharynx which can cause pneumonia, meningitis and other infections when invasive—and has decreased demand for antibiotic therapy, largely by reducing cases of otitis media (*5, 9*). But because PCV formulations target only a fraction

of the ~100 known pneumococcal serotypes, the niche vacated by PCV-targeted

serotypes has been filled by non-vaccine serotypes, and overall pneumococcal carriage

has rebounded to pre-vaccine levels (*10*, *11*). Concomitantly, the incidence of infections

attributed to non-vaccine serotypes (*12*) and the proportion of non-vaccine-type

infections exhibiting antibiotic resistance (*5*, *13*) have risen in many settings. Concern

over serotype replacement—along with the high cost of PCV manufacturing—has

spurred the development of "universal" (non-serotype-specific) whole-cell or protein-

based pneumococcal vaccines protecting against all serotypes, some of which are now

in early-stage clinical trials (*14*). If successful, universal pneumococcal vaccines could

reduce the burden of pneumococcal disease without selecting for serotype replacement.

However, it is unclear how universal vaccination itself may impact upon the evolution of

antibiotic resistance in *S. pneumoniae*, which is a concern given that vaccination is

unlikely to eliminate pneumococcal carriage entirely (*15*). Mathematical models of

bacterial transmission can be used to predict the impact of vaccination on antibiotic

resistance (*16*, *17*), but existing models for *S. pneumoniae* focus on serotype-specific

vaccines and, even then, disagree over the expected impact of vaccination on resistance

evolution (*18–24*). Comparing and interpreting the results of these models is hampered

by the fact that none starts from a position of recapitulating large-scale empirical

patterns of antibiotic resistance. The main challenge in replicating these patterns lies in

identifying the mechanisms that maintain long-term coexistence between sensitive and

resistant pneumococcal strains across a wide range of antibiotic treatment rates, like

those seen across Europe and the United States (*25*, *26*). Robust predictions of the long-

term impact of non-serotype-specific vaccination on resistant pneumococcal disease

require a mechanistic understanding of these patterns.

78   **Results**

Stability in resistance evolution can be maintained by frequency-dependent

competition or extrinsically-imposed diversity. A model must be able to explain the

current burden of an infectious disease before it can be used to robustly predict the

impact of interventions for managing that disease. Across Europe, the frequency of

antibiotic resistance among isolates from pneumococcal infections shows two salient

features for models to recapitulate (Fig. S1). One feature is spatial: the frequency of

penicillin non-susceptibility varies between countries, and is higher in countries where

more penicillin is consumed (*27*). The other is temporal: although in individual

countries, resistance fluctuates from year to year, the overall frequency across Europe

of penicillin non-susceptibility in pneumococcal isolates has remained steady at roughly

12% since consolidated records began in 2005 (*28*). These observations contradict

simple models of resistance evolution, which predict that intermediate frequencies of

resistance cannot be stably maintained in the long term: that is, either sensitive strains

will competitively exclude resistant strains, or resistant strains will competitively

exclude sensitive strains, unless there is some mechanism that maintains coexistence

between them (*25, 29*).

By conducting a literature search, we identified nine such mechanisms (*25, 26, 30–41*)

that fall into two broad classes. In one class, coexistence is maintained by

environmental or genetic diversity that effectively creates separate niches for resistant

and sensitive strains, preventing them from completely overlapping in competition. In

the other class, competition between resistant and sensitive strains is itself the

stabilising factor that maintains coexistence, because resistant and sensitive strains

exhibit alternative competitive phenotypes that afford strains a competitive advantage

when rare, thus promoting negative frequency-dependent selection for resistance. Thus,

extrinsically-imposed diversity and frequency-dependent competition are two key

forces maintaining stability in resistance evolution. We find that four of the nine

identified mechanisms for maintaining coexistence are biologically plausible for *S.*

pneumoniae (Table 1).

Four models of resistance evolution. To compare these four mechanisms, we embed

each in a shared model framework of person-to-person transmission of nasopharyngeal

pneumococcal carriage. This framework tracks the country-specific frequency of

resistance in pneumococci circulating among children under five years old, the age

group that drives the majority of pneumococcal transmission and disease (*42, 43*). We

assume that each individual makes effective contact with another random individual at

rate β, thereby potentially acquiring a strain (either sensitive or resistant) carried by

the contacted person. With probability c, resistant strains fail to transmit, where c

Table 1. Mechanisms for maintaining coexistence.

	Mechanism	Mode of action	Plausible mechanism for coexistence in *S. pneumoniae*?	Consistent with empirical patterns? (Fig. 2)
DIVERSITY	**Treatment diversity**	Assortatively-mixing subpopulations differ in treatment rates (*25, 34–37*)	✔ Yes	✔ Yes
	Pathogen diversity	Subtypes maintained by diversifying selection differ in propensity for resistance (*38*)	✔ Yes	✔ Yes
	Treated class	Individuals currently in treatment maintain resistant strains (*25, 34, 39, 40*)	✘ No: Only supports a small amount of coexistence (*25*)	▪ N/A
	Within-host niches	Sensitive and resistant strains exploit separate niches within the host (*30, 41*)	✘ No: Resistant and sensitive strains are known to occupy the same niches (*29*)	▪ N/A
	Mutation pressure	Mutation-selection balance maintains intermediate resistance frequency (*30, 31, 37*)	✘ No: De novo acquisition of resistance in *S. pneumoniae* is not frequent enough (*25*)	▪ N/A
	Prescription feedback	Doctors reduce prescribing of a drug as resistance to it increases (*37, 39*)	✘ No: Does not explain how coexistence is maintained over a range of treatment rates	▪ N/A
COMPETITION	**Within-host competition: Treatment competition**	Within-host competition creates frequency-dependent selection for resistance (*25, 26, 32, 33, 40*)	✔ Yes	✔ Yes
	Within-host competition: Growth competition	"	✔ Yes	✔ Yes
	Superinfection	Superinfection creates frequency-dependent selection for resistance (*30*)	✘ No: Requires resistant strain to transmit better than sensitive strain in absence of antibiotics	▪ N/A

Fig. 1. Four models of resistance evolution. X hosts are uncolonised, S hosts are colonised with the sensitive strain and R hosts are colonised with the resistant strain. Force of infection terms λ_A are equal to the person-to-person contact rate β times the probability that a contacted individual carries strain A; c is the transmission cost of resistance; u is the natural clearance rate; and τ is the rate of antibiotic treatment. **(a)** "Treatment diversity": each country is split into subpopulations varying in treatment rate τ_i, with treatment rates drawn from a gamma distribution with shape κ. Within a country, individuals assort with their own subpopulation with probability g; this assortative mixing among treatment-varying subpopulations allows coexistence between sensitive and resistant strains. **(b)** "Pathogen diversity": the pathogen comes in multiple subtypes maintained by diversifying selection, each with its own natural carriage duration u_d^{-1}. Diversifying selection is stronger (*i.e.*, more equalizing) as a increases, while carriage durations span a greater range as δ increases. Only those subtypes whose carriage duration exceeds a critical threshold (dashed line) are selected for resistance, so that overall, both sensitive and resistant strains can circulate. **(c)** "Treatment competition": singly-colonised hosts can acquire a small amount of another strain at relative rate k (host states S_R and R_S). Dually-colonized hosts only transmit the dominant strain, so there is within-host competition between co-colonising strains. Population-level coexistence is maintained by treatment-mediated within-host competition. **(d)** "Growth competition": as in panel c, but the transmission cost of resistance is removed and sensitive strains now outgrow resistant strains within co-colonised hosts at rate b. Coexistence is maintained by both treatment-mediated and growth-mediated within-host competition. Panels a–d illustrate alternative model dynamics for a single country; our full model framework tracks dynamics for 27 European countries simultaneously, which themselves mix with assortativity f.

represents the transmission cost of resistance (*44*, *45*). A carrier naturally clears all

strains at rate u, and is exposed to antibiotic therapy at a country-specific rate τ, which

clears the host of sensitive strains only. We assume this treatment rate is independent

of carriage status (*46*) and we do not explicitly track disease progression in hosts.

Under the "Treatment diversity" and "Pathogen diversity" models, extrinsically-

maintained diversity among hosts or among pathogens prevents competitive exclusion

by keeping resistant and sensitive strains from fully competing with each other. In the

"Treatment diversity" model (Fig. 1a), heterogeneity in the consumption of antibiotics

between host subpopulations within a country maintains coexistence (*25*, *34*, *35*). These

subpopulations could correspond to geographical regions, socioeconomic strata, host

age and risk classes, or a combination of these. Provided that transmission between

high-consumption (resistance-promoting) and low-consumption (resistance-inhibiting)

subpopulations is not too frequent, an intermediate frequency of resistance can be

maintained across the whole population. Because coexistence is maintained by

assortative mixing between subpopulations differing in antibiotic use, the key

parameters governing coexistence in this model are κ, the variability in antibiotic

consumption between subpopulations, and g, the relative rate at which within-country

contact is made within subpopulations rather than between them (Fig. S2).

In the "Pathogen diversity" model (Fig. 1b), pneumococci are divided into subtypes ("D-

types"(*38*)) that vary in their mean duration of natural carriage. All else equal, the D-

type with the longest carriage duration would be expected to competitively exclude all

other strains; the model assumes that diversifying selection acting on the D-type locus

keeps all subtypes in circulation. What D-types correspond to is not explicitly specified

by this model, but one candidate is serotype variation. For example, if antigenic

diversity is promoted by host acquired immunity to capsular serotypes, and serotypes

tend to differ in their intrinsic ability to evade clearance by the immune system, then

intermediate resistance can be maintained because selection for resistance tends to be

greater in serotypes that have a longer duration of carriage (*38*). Long-lasting serotypes

will tend to evolve resistance, while shorter-lived serotypes will tend not to—a pattern

observed in *S. pneumoniae* (*38*) and reproduced by this model (Fig. S3). The parameters

governing coexistence in this model are a, the strength of diversifying selection on the

D-type locus, and δ, the variability between subtypes in clearance rate.

Under the "Treatment competition" and "Growth competition" models, coexistence is

maintained by within-host competition between sensitive and resistant strains. In these

models, hosts can be co-colonised by multiple strains. Then, competition between

strains within the host niche determines which strain is transmitted to other potential

hosts (*26*). The "Treatment competition" model (Fig. 1c) assumes that antibiotic therapy

mediates within-host competition, such that when a co-colonised host takes antibiotics

(*i.e.*, at rate τ), the sensitive strains are cleared and only the resistant strains are

transmitted to other hosts. The "Growth competition" model (Fig. 1d) has both

treatment-mediated and growth-mediated competition: while in the presence of

antibiotics, resistant strains still outcompete co-colonising sensitive strains, in the

absence of antibiotics, sensitive strains gradually outcompete co-colonising resistant

strains at rate b. We assume that there is no transmission cost of resistance in this latter

model (*i.e.*, $c = 0$); instead, the within-host growth advantage b of sensitive strains

accounts for the cost of resistance. In these competition models, resistant strains have

an advantage in antibiotic-mediated competition, while sensitive strains have an

advantage in growth-mediated competition. These alternative forms of within-host

competition can both promote coexistence because rare strains can more consistently

exploit a competitive advantage over common strains, thus creating negative frequency-

dependent selection for resistance (*26*). The key parameter governing coexistence in

these two models is k, the relative rate of co-colonisation compared to primary

colonisation.

In all four models, we assume that contact between individuals is assortative by

country, such that with probability f, contact is with a random person from the same

country, and with probability $1 - f$, contact is with a random person from any country.

We implement these models using systems of ordinary differential equations. All four

models (*25*, *26*, *38*) are structurally neutral (*25*, *29*), meaning that any coexistence

exhibited by the models is accounted for by the specified biological mechanism rather

than by any bias in the logical structure of the model that generates coexistence "for

free" (*29*). Additionally, while the within-host competition models capture co-

colonisation using a simplified subset of only 2 "mixed-carriage" states (S_R and R_S, Fig.

1a&b), we have previously shown (*26*) that this is equivalent to a more complex

individual-based model with an arbitrary number of mixed-carriage states.

All four models reproduce observed patterns of resistance. The European Centre

for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) monitors antibiotic consumption and

resistance evolution across European countries (*13*, *28*). These data capture a natural

experiment in resistance evolution: for each monitored drug and pathogen, each

country reports a different rate of antibiotic consumption in the community and

exhibits a different frequency of resistance among invasive bacterial isolates. By fitting

models to this multi-country data set, we can potentially rule out models that cannot

reproduce the large-scale patterns that are observed. We use Bayesian inference to fit

the model-predicted equilibrium frequency of resistance to the reported frequency of

penicillin non-susceptibility in *S. pneumoniae* across 27 European countries, assuming a

50% carriage prevalence (*11*, *42*) and a carriage duration of 47 days (*47*, *48*) in children

under five years old. We begin by assuming that countries only differ by their reported

treatment rate—where we define a treatment course as equivalent to $z = 5$ defined daily

doses of penicillin—with other model parameters shared across countries.

Strikingly, each model fits equally well to the empirical relationship between resistance

and antibiotic use (all model WAICs are similar; Fig. 2a) and recovers plausible

posterior parameter distributions (Fig. 2b; Fig. S4). That is, the empirical data do not

distinguish between the four alternative mechanisms of resistance evolution we have

identified. Later, we relax the assumption that only the treatment rate varies between

countries, allowing us to capture additional between-country variation in resistance not

explained by population-wide penicillin consumption.

Mechanisms of resistance evolution determine the impact of vaccination on

resistant disease. To determine the impact of universal vaccination on pneumococcal

disease, we consider three outcomes. The first is the impact of the vaccine upon the

prevalence of pneumococcal carriage. The second is the vaccine impact upon the

frequency of penicillin resistance among circulating pneumococcal strains remaining

after vaccination. The third is the impact of the vaccine upon the prevalence of resistant

245
246
Fig 2. Four models reproduce patterns of resistance in *S. pneumoniae* in Europe. (a) Model
fits with associated WAIC (± standard error). Points and vertical lines show the mean and 95%
highest density intervals (HDIs) for the reported proportion of invasive *S. pneumoniae* isolates
that are resistant to penicillin plotted against the penicillin consumption rate in under-5s.
Ribbons show the 50% and 95% HDIs for resistance prevalence from each fitted model. **(b)** The
top row shows estimated posterior distributions for the free parameters in each model; the
bottom row shows model outputs associated with these parameters to aid interpretation.

pneumococcal carriage—*i.e.*, the prevalence of carriage multiplied by the frequency of

penicillin resistance. Since all four models are equally capable of recapitulating

observed patterns of penicillin resistance in *S. pneumoniae*, our aim is to determine

whether the mechanism maintaining stability in resistance evolution—frequency-

dependent competition or extrinsically-imposed diversity—matters when forecasting

the impact of interventions for managing resistance.

We consider two alternative non-serotype-specific vaccines: an "acquisition-blocking"

vaccine, which prevents carriage from being established with probability ε_a, and a

"clearance-accelerating" vaccine, which shortens the duration of carriage by a fraction

ε_c. Both vaccines reduce pneumococcal transmission through alternative modes of host

immunity that might be elicited by a whole-cell or protein-based universal

pneumococcal vaccine. Analogously to naturally-acquired serotype-independent

pneumococcal immunity (*49*), the protective effect of whole-cell vaccines manifests as

accelerated clearance (*50*); it is unclear whether protein-based vaccines would block

pneumococcal acquisition, like PCVs, or accelerate clearance (*51*). We refer to ε_a or ε_c as

the vaccine efficacy, and for simplicity, we assume that all children under five years old

have vaccine protection, as would be established by an infant vaccination programme

rolled out across Europe. In order to compare these vaccines with an alternative

intervention of antibiotic stewardship, we also evaluate the impact of reducing the rate

of penicillin prescribing by a fraction ε_s.

We find that both vaccines have a similar impact upon carriage prevalence, regardless

of whether competition or diversity maintains stability in resistance evolution (Fig. 3a).

Specifically, as the vaccine efficacy ε_a or ε_c increases, carriage decreases, with the

elimination of pneumococcal carriage occurring at a vaccine efficacy between 50 and

60%. Reducing antibiotic prescribing moderately increases pneumococcal carriage,

such that carriage prevalence increases to approximately 54% across all countries

when penicillin prescribing is eliminated completely.

However, the mechanism of resistance evolution has a substantial impact upon whether

vaccines increase or decrease the frequency of resistance in *S. pneumoniae* in the long

term (Fig. 3b). In the "Treatment diversity" and "Pathogen diversity" models, the

Fig. 3. Impact of interventions. Impact of vaccine and treatment interventions on **(a)** carriage prevalence, **(b)** resistance frequency, and **(c)** resistant carriage (mean and 95% HDI). **(d)** Illustration of the strongest forces selecting for greater or lesser resistance across models.

acquisition-blocking vaccine has relatively little impact upon the frequency of

resistance, because administering a universal pneumococcal vaccine to all individuals

does not substantially alter the distribution of antibiotic use or of heritable variation in

clearance rates. By contrast, in the within-host competition models, vaccination has a

substantial impact upon resistance evolution because by reducing pneumococcal

circulation, vaccines decrease the rate at which strains encounter each other within

hosts, and hence strongly decrease competition between pneumococcal strains.

Specifically, the acquisition-blocking vaccine selects strongly against resistance in the

"Treatment competition" model: since antibiotic-mediated within-host competition

benefits the resistant strain in this model, the vaccine works against this competitive

advantage and therefore inhibits resistance. Conversely, in the "Growth competition"

model, growth-mediated competition benefits the sensitive strain, and so by reducing

competition, vaccination tends to promote resistance. These results expand upon our

previous finding that the rate of co-colonisation modulates resistance evolution through

its impact upon within-host competition (26).

The clearance-accelerating vaccine exhibits similarly divergent impacts across

mechanisms of resistance evolution. However, compared with the acquisition-blocking

vaccine, it also has an additional resistance-inhibiting effect across all models, because a

shorter duration of carriage—whether natural or vaccine-induced—selects against

resistance (38). This suggests that vaccines that accelerate natural clearance have a

particular potential for managing resistant infections. As expected, reducing the rate of

penicillin prescribing selects against resistance, exhibiting a similar impact across all

four models.

The impact on resistant carriage (Fig. 3c), which combines changes in the prevalence of

carriage and changes in the frequency of resistance, can be treated as a proxy for the

incidence of resistant infections. Overall, under the "Growth competition" model,

vaccination at intermediate efficacy is expected to increase the rate of resistant carriage,

and hence the number of cases of resistant disease. In other models, vaccination always

reduces resistant carriage, particularly under the "Treatment competition" model. A

summary of the strongest vaccine impacts is shown in Fig. 3d.

Evidence to inform policy and vaccine trials. For vaccines to be considered an efficient means of controlling resistant infections, they must compare favourably to existing interventions, such as reducing inappropriate antibiotic use (*52*). The UK government has recently announced an initiative to reduce antibiotic consumption by 15% by the year 2024 (*52*). Our models predict that a 15% reduction in primary-care penicillin consumption would reduce carriage of penicillin-non-susceptible pneumococci from 6% to 3%. The vaccine efficacy required to yield the same effect varies considerably depending upon the mechanism of resistance evolution (Fig 4a); for example, the required vaccine efficacy is lowest under the "Treatment competition" model (ε_a = 11% or ε_c = 7%), and highest under the "Growth competition" model (ε_a = 52% or ε_c = 50%). A full comparison of vaccine and stewardship interventions would require accounting for the economic cost of vaccines versus antibiotics, the wider range of resistant pathogens that would be targeted by restrictions on antibiotic use, and any potential increase in pathogen circulation that might be brought about by inadvertent decreases in appropriate antibiotic use.

In randomized controlled trials of pneumococcal vaccines, resistance-related endpoints have routinely been evaluated over a follow-up period of between 6 months and 3.5 years after vaccination (*53*, *54*). If vaccine-induced changes in resistance evolution unfold over a considerably longer timescale, similarly-designed trials may not fully capture vaccine impact on resistance. Indeed, we find that it can take 5–10 years for resistance to stabilise following vaccination (Fig. 4b), and that short-term drops in resistance can be reversed—or even give way to increased resistance—in the long term. Moreover, a trial in which vaccination is not offered to a substantial fraction of the population would not capture the full impact of reduced pneumococcal circulation, which is what drives competition-mediated changes in resistance in our models. Finally, our analysis assumes that vaccines are administered to all recipients simultaneously. In the real world, where vaccination is likely to be be rolled out gradually, the full effect of vaccination would take even longer to observe.

The impact of vaccination at a national level varies depending upon the treatment rate in a given country. Focusing on the specific outcome of childhood pneumococcal pneumonia cases, we find that while interventions have a consistent impact from

Fig. 4. Policy considerations. (a) Median equivalent reduction in prescribing across four
models of resistance evolution, in terms of vaccine efficacy at reducing the prevalence of
resistant pneumococcal carriage. This demonstrates the vaccine efficacy required to achieve a
similar decrease in resistant carriage to a given reduction in antibiotic prescription rates. The
impact on overall pneumococcal carriage is not considered here. The shaded bar shows an 8.8–
23.1% reduction in prescriptions, an estimate of the percentage of prescriptions which are
clinically inappropriate in the UK (*77*). The dashed line shows a 15% reduction in prescriptions,
which has recently been announced as a target by the UK government (*52*). **(b)** The full impact
of vaccination, illustrated here with 30% vaccine efficacy, can take 5–20 years to play out (mean
and 95% HDI). **(c)** Per-country impact of vaccination at 30% efficacy. Countries reporting to
ECDC are ordered from lowest (NL) to highest (CY) reported rate of penicillin consumption.
Diamonds show the estimated change in all pneumococcal pneumonia cases, while filled
distributions show the change in resistant cases.

country to country on the total pneumonia case rate, the impact on resistant pneumonia

cases is greatest in those countries where antibiotic use, and hence resistance, is highest

(Fig. 4c). We focus on resistant carriage, but the realised public health benefits of any

intervention targeting both resistant and sensitive strains will depend upon the relative

health burdens of susceptible versus non-susceptible *S. pneumoniae* infections;

enumerating these comparative burdens is the subject of ongoing research (*55*).

Vaccination in a high-burden setting. High prevalences of carriage, disease, and

resistance are often observed in low-income settings, and it is desirable to know

whether this could substantially alter predictions of vaccine impact. As an illustrative

example, a 90% pneumococcal carriage rate, with 81% of isolates resistant to penicillin,

has been observed among children under five years old in western Kenya (*56*). This may

be partly attributable to a longer average duration of carriage in this setting, as a 71-day

mean duration of natural pneumococcal carriage has been measured in Kilifi, eastern

Kenya (*57*).

To model a similar high-burden setting, we adjust model parameters estimated from

European data: increasing the mean natural carriage duration, transmission rate, and

treatment rate to match observed data, and ignoring mixing with any other countries (f

= 1), while keeping other parameters the same. We find that a comparatively greater

vaccine efficacy is needed to reduce the prevalence of resistant carriage in a high-

burden, high-resistance setting (Fig. 5). This is particularly true under the "Growth

competition" model, because in this model resistant carriage only declines as total

pneumococcal carriage declines, and it is particularly difficult to reduce overall carriage

in a high-transmission setting. Simultaneously, vaccination may have a comparatively

greater impact in high-burden settings because of a comparatively higher incidence of

disease: for example, Kenya has been estimated to have an 8.8-fold higher incidence of

severe pneumococcal pneumonia than the average in Europe (*58*).

Accounting for additional between-country variation does not substantially alter

predictions. Our focus thus far has been on the impact of the four identified

mechanisms *per se* upon resistance evolution, and accordingly we have focused on

reproducing the positive association between treatment rate and resistance frequency

Fig. 5. Vaccine impact in a high-burden setting. Adjusting fitted models to be consistent with a high-burden setting yields different predictions for vaccine impact (mean and 95% HDI), highlighting both increased challenges and greater opportunities for resistance management via vaccination.

413
414

Fig 6. Explaining additional between-country variation in resistance frequency. Allowing model parameters to vary across countries captures additional between-country variation in resistance frequency not captured by variation in the treatment rate. For example, **(a)** allowing the transmission rate β to vary across countries can explain the variation in some but not all models (points and vertical lines show mean credible resistance frequency and 95% HDI for each country). **(b)** Depending upon which parameter is allowed to vary, models differ in how well they explain all additional between-country variation, with a clear separation (dashed line) between flexible and inflexible models. **(c)** Model-specific predictions for the impact of vaccination among those parameters that do fully capture the observed variation remain similar. Solid grey lines show "base" model; dashed lines correspond with colours in panel b.

rather than attempting to capture the additional variability in resistance frequency

between countries not accounted for by the reported treatment rate alone (Fig. 2a). This

additional variability may partially stem from differences in national testing and

reporting practices, or between-country differences in the distribution of pneumococcal

serotypes among invasive isolates (*59*). However, another possibility is that this

additional variability in resistance results from systematic differences in pathogen

biology or host behaviour across countries which can be captured by our modelling

framework.

To help identify which model parameters could account for this variability, we relax the

assumption that only the treatment rate varies across countries, and perform Bayesian

maximum *a posteriori* fitting, assuming one additional parameter (c, b, β, u, f, z, g, κ, a, δ,

or k) is free to vary between countries while other parameters are held constant. We

find that additional variation in resistance between countries can be explained by

variation in certain other parameters, depending upon which model is used (Fig. 6a–b).

Importantly, among those parameters for which additional variation between countries

can explain the variation in resistance (Fig. 6c), predictions for the overall impact of

vaccination remain similar, with the major differences between scenarios still

attributable to the underlying mechanism of resistance evolution (Fig. 6d; Figs. S5–S16).

Models that could make more accurate country-specific predictions would need to

account for the effects of demographic structure, differences in carriage prevalence and

disease rates between settings, and variable vaccine protection among individuals.

448   **Discussion**

We have identified four mechanisms of resistance evolution that are capable of

recapitulating the observed relationship between penicillin consumption and penicillin

non-susceptibility in *S. pneumoniae* across Europe. These mechanisms are not mutually

exclusive, but the relative importance of each is predicted to have a substantial impact

upon predictions for resistance evolution under vaccination. In particular, the

"directionality" of within-host competition—that is, whether, on average, within-host

competition tends to benefit resistant or sensitive strains—strongly determines

whether vaccination selects for a decrease or an increase in antibiotic resistance in the

long term. This directionality may vary between pathogens, but is also sensitive to the

antibiotic treatment rate, and so may also vary between settings. Although we have

focused on competition between sensitive and resistant strains of *S. pneumoniae* only,

competition between serotypes (*24*) and with other bacteria colonizing the

nasopharynx will also impact upon resistance evolution, and determining the

importance of these other sources of within-host competition is crucial.

A key result of our models is that the mode of vaccine protection—whether acquisition-

blocking or clearance-accelerating—has an appreciable impact upon resistance

evolution. Whole-cell and purified-protein pneumococcal vaccines may induce

antibody-mediated humoral immunity, CD4+ T helper-17 cell-mediated immunity, or

both, with the type of immunity mediating pneumococcal acquisition, carriage, and

disease in ways that are still not fully understood (*49–51*). By modelling both modes of

vaccine action, we have highlighted that clearance-accelerating vaccines have increased

potential for preventing the spread of resistance, because in shortening the duration of

asymptomatic carriage they limit the fitness advantage of resistant pathogens under

selection pressure from antibiotic use.

We fit our models to a "snapshot" of penicillin non-susceptible *S. pneumoniae* as

observed across European countries in 2007, finding that each model recapitulated the

data equally well. This raises the question of what kind of data would be needed to

distinguish the models. One possibility would be to consider trends of resistance

evolution over time. Indeed, the prevalence of penicillin non-susceptibility in *S.*

pneumoniae remained largely stable in Europe between 2005–2017, a period which saw

the incorporation of PCV into the routine immunization schedules of most European

countries (*60*). This could be viewed as favouring the "diversity" mechanisms, which

predict little change in resistance evolution following vaccination. But because serotype

replacement has largely negated any vaccine impact on the prevalence of

nasopharyngeal pneumococcal carriage (*10*, *11*), it is not clear that we would be able to

detect any effects of competition-mediated resistance evolution following a serotype-

specific vaccine such as PCV—particularly given the complexity of detecting vaccine-

attributable changes in resistance in a population-level associational study that would

be confounded both by serotype replacement and by other changes in resistance

evolution that might be expected to occur at a national level over the course of multiple

years. However, it is known that the prevalence of pneumococcal carriage declines

substantially with age (*42*). Therefore, it might be possible to detect a signal of within-

host competition between sensitive and resistant strains by comparing the relative

prevalence of resistant pneumococcal carriage in younger versus older hosts, provided

that other differences could be controlled for.

Under the "Treatment diversity" and "Pathogen diversity" models, we have argued that

universal pneumococcal vaccination will have little impact upon the long-term

evolution of antibiotic resistance because it does not change the sources of diversity

that modulate resistance evolution. Nonetheless, it is possible to target vaccines such

that this diversity is harnessed to manage resistance: high-resistance serotypes could

be targeted with a serotype-specific vaccine, or high-treatment subpopulations could be

targeted for vaccination in order to more effectively manage resistance. Indeed,

vaccination does have an additional inhibiting effect upon resistance in our models

because of the latter effect. This inhibition occurs because the vaccine has a relatively

greater impact upon transmission in populations where the prevalence of carriage is

already low, which in our models occur in countries or subpopulations with more

antibiotic consumption. Since these populations drive resistance more strongly, the

vaccine's comparatively greater impact in these populations tends to moderately inhibit

resistance overall. We note that while previous work (*38*) has suggested that resistance

evolution under a "Pathogen diversity" model results in a "stepped" resistance pattern

in which D-types are either fully sensitive or fully resistant at equilibrium, we find that

small amounts of mixing between populations can smooth out this pattern and allow

intermediate rates of resistance within subtypes (Fig. S2). Finally, while we have framed

"Treatment competition" and "Growth competition" as two distinct alternatives, they

can instead be viewed as endpoints on a continuum, with possible models of resistance

evolution for which both $c > 0$ and $b > 0$ lying between them. The impact of vaccination

on resistance in such a model would depend upon the relative importance of treatment-

mediated and growth-mediated competition.

This analysis has necessarily made simplifying assumptions. We have focused on

prevalence (the fraction of individuals who are carriers) rather than incidence (the rate

of new carriage episodes) of nasopharyngeal carriage in presenting our findings. There is evidence that pneumococcal disease progression is more likely to occur shortly after nasopharyngeal acquisition (*61*), suggesting that incidence may be more relevant than prevalence for predicting disease outcomes. Of particular note, recent modelling work has suggested that clearance-accelerating vaccines can increase rates of pneumococcal acquisition, if extended carriage is protective against new acquisition (*62*). However, it is not obvious how to compare rates of carriage acquisition across the models examined in this paper, particularly because co-colonisation is explicitly tracked in some but not all models. More work is required to clarify the links between acquisition, carriage, and disease across competing models of pneumococcal transmission. Additionally, we have assumed that antibiotic treatment rates among pneumococcal carriers remains constant after the introduction of a vaccine, even though treatment rates dropped in many settings following PCV introduction (*5*, *9*). However, for a universal pneumococcal vaccine that reduces antibiotic treatment rates because it reduces carriage and thereby prevents antibiotic-treatable disease, any reduction in treatment will only occur among individuals who, because of vaccine protection, are not pneumococcal carriers, all else being equal. It might then be expected that treatment rates in carriers would remain equally high among those individuals for whom vaccine protection has failed—although physicians may be less inclined to prescribe antibiotics for respiratory tract infection more generally after the introduction of a new pneumococcal vaccine. Finally, we have focused on modelling children under 5 years old only. We would not expect incorporating age structure to lead to qualitatively different results, but age-related maturation of the immune system has been shown to be important for maintaining the circulation of pneumococcal serotypes (*49*) which we have abstracted here.

Our work helps resolve the question: What explains the persistent coexistence between resistant and sensitive strains of *S. pneumoniae*? (*25*) by demonstrating that multiple mechanisms are capable of explaining trends of resistance across European countries. Since there is empirical support for within-host competition between sensitive and resistant pathogen strains (*63–66*), heritable differences in the propensity for resistance within species (*38*, *67*), and within-country heterogeneity in antibiotic consumption rates (*68–70*), all of these mechanisms likely contribute to this pattern. Our results contextualize previous mathematical studies which have variously suggested that

serotype-specific vaccination may increase (*24*), decrease (*22*) or have no impact upon

(*18*) the frequency of resistance in *S. pneumoniae*. While the potential for vaccination to

promote resistance because of competition between sensitive and resistant strains has

been described previously (*24*), we have shown that vaccination can either promote or

inhibit resistance depending upon the directionality of within-host competition. While

vaccines targeting highly-resistant serotypes can decrease resistance (*22*), we have

shown that a serotype-independent vaccine promoting accelerated natural clearance

can decrease resistance across all circulating subtypes. And where single-population

models have found no long-term impact of vaccination on resistance frequency (*18*), we

have shown that in multi-population models, vaccination can inhibit resistance if it has

a larger impact in subpopulations that consume more antibiotics. The direction and

magnitude of this effect would depend upon variation in vaccine uptake, vaccine

efficacy, and pathogen transmission among subpopulations, and we have not

systematically explored this variation here.

A highly efficacious serotype-independent pneumococcal vaccine can indeed reduce the

overall burden of antibiotic-resistant pneumococcal infections. However, the long-term

effect upon resistance of a vaccine with intermediate efficacy is less certain, as vaccine

impact depends crucially upon the mechanisms that drive resistance evolution. Thus,

empirical investigation of pathogen competitive dynamics—and the impact of setting-

specific factors on these dynamics—is needed to make accurate predictions of vaccine

impact on resistant infections.

Methods

Study design. This study comprises four parts: a literature search used to identify

plausible mechanisms through which coexistence can be maintained between sensitive

and resistant pneumococcal strains across a range of antibiotic treatment rates; a

mathematical modelling study embedding these mechanisms of resistance evolution in

four models of pneumococcal transmission; a Bayesian statistical analysis to fit these

models to empirically observed frequencies of penicillin non-susceptibility and

community penicillin consumption across 27 European countries for the year 2007; and

a vaccine impact analysis using these fitted models to forecast the impact of a universal

pneumococcal vaccine. We use data from 2007 because changes in pneumococcal
resistance reporting standards for some countries after this year hamper the between-
country comparability of data (*71*). Our objectives were to identify the mechanisms
potentially responsible for maintaining coexistence between resistant and sensitive
pneumococci in Europe, and to determine whether the impact of vaccination on the
evolution of resistance depends upon which mechanism is assumed to operate.
596
Mechanisms driving resistance. We searched PubMed using the terms: (AMR OR ABR OR
((antimicrobial OR antibiotic) AND resist*)) AND ((model OR modelling OR modeling)
AND (dynamic* OR transmi* OR mathematical)) AND (coexist* OR intermediate). This
yielded 93 papers (Table S1). We included all papers containing a dynamic host-to-host
pathogen transmission model analysing both sensitive and resistant strains with stable
coexistence as an outcome of the model. From the 11 studies meeting these criteria, we
identified nine unique mechanisms, two of which correspond to alternative
parameterisations of a within-host competition model. We ruled out four mechanisms
because of implausibility or because previous work shows that the mechanism does not
bring about substantial coexistence, leaving four mechanisms (Table 1).
607
608 *Model framework.* We analyse the evolution of antibiotic resistance by tracking the
609 transmission of resistant and sensitive bacterial strains among hosts in a set of M
610 countries indexed by $m \in \{1, 2, \ldots, M\}$ using systems of ordinary differential equations.
611
612 In a simple model, hosts can either be non-carriers (X), carriers of the sensitive strain
613 (S), or carriers of the resistant strain (R). Omitting country-specific subscripts m for
614 concision, model dynamics within a country are captured by
615
616 $\qquad \mathrm{d}S/\mathrm{d}t = \lambda_S X - (u + \tau)S$
617 $\qquad \mathrm{d}R/\mathrm{d}t = (1 - c)\lambda_R X - uR$
618 $\qquad X = 1 - S - R \,,$ $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ (1)
619
where λ_S is the force of infection of the sensitive strain, λ_R is the force of infection of the
resistant strain, c is the transmission cost of resistance, u is the rate of natural
clearance, and τ is the treatment rate. In this model, in a given country, the total

carriage of the sensitive strain is S and the total carriage of the resistant strain is R.

Force of infection terms are defined below; a summary of all model parameters can be

found in Table S2.

The "Treatment diversity" model extends the simple model (eq. 1) by structuring each

country into multiple subpopulations that exhibit different rates of antibiotic treatment

and make contact with each other at unequal rates (*25*, *34*, *35*, *72*). In each country, we

model N equally-sized representative subpopulations indexed by $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$, where

we assume $N = 10$. Dynamics within a country are

$\qquad dS_i/dt = \lambda_{S,i} X - (u + \tau_i) S$

$\qquad dR_i/dt = (1 - c)\lambda_{R,i} X - uR$

$\qquad X_i = 1 - S_i - R_i$ $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ (2)

where we assume that treatment rates of subpopulations within a country

approximately follow a gamma distribution with shape parameter κ and mean

treatment rate τ. Accordingly, the rate of antibiotic consumption in subpopulation i is

$\tau_i = \int_{Q_\Gamma\left(\frac{i-1}{N}|\kappa\right)}^{Q_\Gamma\left(\frac{i}{N}|\kappa\right)} t \, P_\Gamma(t|\kappa) \, dt$, where $Q_\Gamma(q|\kappa)$ is the quantile q of the gamma distribution

with shape κ and $P_\Gamma(t|\kappa)$ is the probability density at t of the same gamma distribution.

At the scale of individuals, antibiotic consumption is highly variable, with some people

taking no antibiotics in a given year and others taking many courses of antibiotics (*73*);

at regional scales, antibiotic consumption shows less extreme variability (*74*) and

approaches a normal distribution. We use a gamma distribution to model variation in

treatment rates among subpopulations because it can capture patterns at either of these

scales, or scales in between.

The "Pathogen diversity" model extends the simple model (eq. 1) by structuring the

pathogen population into D different "D-types" (we assume $D = 25$), each with a

different natural clearance rate, where each type is kept circulating by diversifying

selection acting on D-type (*38*). Dynamics within a country are

$\qquad dS_d/dt = q_d \lambda_{S,d} X - (u_d + \tau) S_d$

655    $dR_d/dt = q_d(1-c)\lambda_{R,d}X - u_d R_d$

656    $X = 1 - \Sigma_d (S_d + R_d)$            (3)

658 where q_d is the strength of diversifying selection for D-type $d \in \{1, 2, \ldots, D\}$ and u_d is

659 the clearance rate for D-type d. We follow Lehtinen *et al.* (*38*) in defining $q_d =$

660 $(1 - \frac{S_d + R_d}{\sum_{j=1}^{D}(S_j + R_j)} + \frac{1}{D})^a$ and $u_d = u\left(1 + \delta\left(2\frac{d-1}{D-1} - 1\right)\right)$, where a is the power of

661 diversifying selection and δ is the range of clearance rates. In a given country, the total

662 carriage of the type-d sensitive strain is S_d and the total carriage of the type-d resistant

663 strain is R_d.

665 Finally, the within-host competition models (*26*) allow hosts to carry a mix of both

666 strains. Hosts can carry the sensitive strain with a small complement of the resistant

667 strain (S_R) or the resistant strain with a small complement of the sensitive strain (R_S).

668 Dynamics within a country are

670    $dS/dt = \lambda_S X - (u + \tau)S - k(1-c)\lambda_R S + b_0 S_R$

671    $dS_R/dt = k(1-c)\lambda_R S - (u + \tau)S_R + bR_S - b_0 S_R$

672    $dR_S/dt = k\lambda_S R - (u + \tau)R_S - bR_S$

673    $dR/dt = (1-c)\lambda_R X - uR - k\lambda_S R + \tau(S_R + R_S)$

674    $X = 1 - S - R - S_R - R_S$,        (4)

676 where k is the rate of co-colonisation relative to primary colonisation, b is the within-

677 host growth benefit of sensitivity (i.e. the rate of the $R_S \rightarrow S_R$ transition), and b_0 is the

678 rate of the $S_R \rightarrow S$ transition. We follow Davies *et al.* (*26*) in setting $b_0 = 4b$. In a given

679 country, the total carriage of the sensitive strain is $S + S_R$ and the total carriage of the

680 resistant strain is $R + R_S$. "Treatment competition" assumes the cost of resistance is

681 incurred by reduced transmission potential ($b = 0$ and $c > 0$), while "Growth

682 competition" assumes that the cost of resistance is incurred through decreased within-

683 host growth ($b > 0$ and $c = 0$).

685 In equations 1, 3 and 4, the force of infection of a particular strain A in country m is $\lambda_A =$

686 $\beta\left(f A_{\text{tot}|m} + (1-f)\sum_{\ell=1}^{M} h_\ell A_{\text{tot}|\ell}\right)$, where β is the transmission rate, f is the between-

country assortativity, h_ℓ is the relative population size of country m (such that $\sum_\ell h_\ell =$

1), and $A_{\text{tot}|\ell}$ is the total carriage of strain A in country ℓ. The probability with which

individuals contact an individual from another country, $1 - f$, captures those contacts

made with individuals from another country in either one's home country or a foreign

country. In equation 2, the force of infection of a particular strain A in subpopulation i of

country m is $\lambda_{A,i} = \beta \left(f \left(g A_{\text{tot}|m,i} + (1 - g) \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} A_{\text{tot}|m,j} \right) + (1 - \right.$

$\left. f) \sum_{\ell=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{h_\ell}{N} A_{\text{tot}|\ell,j} \right)$, where g is the within-country assortativity and $A_{\text{tot}|\ell,j}$ is the

total carriage of strain A in subpopulation j of country ℓ.

Data and model fitting. We extracted community penicillin consumption and penicillin

non-susceptibility in *S. pneumoniae* invasive isolates from databases made available by

the ECDC (*13*, *28*). We assume that community penicillin consumption drives penicillin

resistance, that antibiotic consumption is independent of whether an individual is

colonised by pneumococcus, and that resistance among invasive bacterial isolates is

representative of resistance among circulating strains more broadly. Countries report

community penicillin consumption in defined daily doses (DDD) per thousand

individuals per day. To transform this bulk consumption rate into the rate at which

individuals undertake a course of antibiotic therapy, we analysed prescribing data from

eight European countries, estimating that, on average, 5 DDD in the population at large

correspond to one treatment course for a child under 5 years of age. This conversion

rate varies between countries (Table S3), but since the data are incomplete (8 of 27

countries) we have not explicitly accounted for this variability in our main model fitting

results.

Our model framework tracks carriage of *S. pneumoniae* among children aged 0–5 years,

the age group driving both transmission and disease. In European countries, we assume

that the prevalence of pneumococcal carriage in under-5s is 50% (*11*, *42*) and the

average duration of carriage is 47 days (*47*, *48*). We calculate the average incidence of *S.*

pneumoniae-caused severe pneumonia requiring hospitalisation as 610 per million

children under 5 per year (*58*) across the European countries in our data set. See Tables

S4, S5, and S6 for details of calculations relating to pneumococcal carriage duration and

disease incidence.

We use Bayesian inference via differential evolution Markov chain Monte Carlo (75) to
identify model parameters that are consistent with empirical data while accounting for
uncertainty in those estimates. Country m has antibiotic treatment rate τ_m and reports
r_m of n_m isolates are resistant. Over all M countries, these data are denoted $\tau =$
$(\tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_M)$, $r = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_M)$, and $n = (n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_M)$, respectively. The probability of
a given set of model parameters θ is then

$$P(\theta|\tau, r, n) \propto P(\tau, r, n|\theta)P(\theta),$$

where $P(\theta)$ is the prior probability of parameters θ and

$$P(\tau, r, n|\theta) = C\big(Y = Y(\tau|\theta)\big) \prod_{m=1}^{M} R\big(r = r_m, n = n_m, \rho = \rho(\tau_m|\theta)\big)^{N_m/\bar{N}}$$

is the likelihood of data τ, r, n given model parameters θ. Above, $Y(\theta)$ is the average
model-predicted prevalence of carriage across all countries and $\rho(\tau_m|\theta)$ is the model-
predicted resistance prevalence for country m. $C(Y)$ is the credibility of prevalence of
carriage Y and $R(r,n,\rho)$ is the credibility of r out of n isolates being resistant when the
model-predicted resistance prevalence is ρ. For $C(Y)$, we use a normal distribution with
mean 0.5 and standard deviation 0.002. For $R(r,n,\rho)$, we use $R(r, n, \rho) =$
$\int_0^1 T\big(x|\mu = \rho, \sigma = \sigma(\theta)\big)\binom{n}{r}x^r(1-x)^{n-r}\,dx$, a binomial distribution where the
probability of success is modelled as a [0,1]-truncated normal distribution centred on ρ
and with standard deviation σ. The parameter σ captures the unexplained between-
country variation in resistance frequency. Here, $T(x|\mu, \sigma) = \frac{\varphi(x|\mu,\sigma)}{(\Phi(1|\mu,\sigma) - \Phi(0|\mu,\sigma))}$, where
$\varphi(\mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} exp\left(-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$ is the untruncated normal PDF and $\Phi(\mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{2}(1 +$
$erf\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right))$ is the untruncated normal cumulative distribution function. Finally, N_m is the
population size of country m and $\bar{N}$ is the average population size across all countries;
the exponent $N_m/\bar{N}$ allows us to weight the importance of each country by its
population size, which allows a closer fit with the overall resistance prevalence across
all countries.

As prior distributions for parameter inference, we adopt $c \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha = 1.5, \beta = 8.5)$,

$b \sim \text{Gamma}(\kappa = 2, \theta = 0.5)$, $\beta \sim \text{Gamma}(\kappa = 5, \theta = 0.35)$, $g \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha = 10, \beta = 1.5)$,

$\kappa \sim \text{Gamma}(\kappa = 4, \theta = 2)$, $a \sim \text{Gamma}(\kappa = 2, \theta = 5)$, $\delta \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha = 20, \beta = 25)$, and

$k \sim \text{Normal}(\mu = 1, \sigma = 0.5)$. Priors for c, b, and β were chosen to be vague since these

parameters are heavily constrained by the data we fit our models to. Priors for g, κ, a, δ,

and k were chosen to keep parameters within biologically plausible ranges. Table S7

provides more detail on the choice of priors, and Fig. S4 shows which parameters are

most strongly constrained by these prior beliefs.

We set the unexplained between-country variation in resistance prevalence σ to 0.06

across all models based on a preliminary round of model fitting with σ as a free

parameter. We set the between-country assortativity f to 0.985 (*i.e.*, 1.5% of contacts

occur with individuals from a different country) based on rates of travel for EU

residents. Specifically, using Eurostat database tour_dem_tnw (*76*) we estimated that

the average EU resident spent 1.5% of their nights abroad in 2007; this overestimates

mixing because children under 5 travel less than the average person, but

underestimates mixing because it does not account for contacts made with visitors to an

individual's country of residence and because children may contract pneumococcal

carriage from adults who travel, and so we kept the value of 1.5%. See Table S8 for

MCMC diagnostics.

To match model predictions to a high-burden setting, we increase the duration of

carriage to 71.4 days; increase the transmission rate by a factor of 3.49 (Treatment

diversity), 3.62 (Pathogen diversity), 3.61 (Treatment competition), or 3.20 (Growth

competition), so that carriage prevalence reaches 90.0%; and increase the antibiotic

consumption rate to 1.670, 1.458, 1.138, or 5.887 courses per person per year,

respectively, so that resistance prevalence reaches 81.4%.

Interventions. Interventions have the following impact on model parameters: for the

acquisition-blocking vaccine, the transmission rate becomes $\beta' = (1-\varepsilon_a)\beta$; for the

clearance-accelerating vaccine, the clearance rate becomes $u' = u/(1-\varepsilon_c)$; and under

antibiotic stewardship, the average treatment rate in each country m becomes $\tau_m' = \tau_m$

$(1-\varepsilon_s)$.

Capturing additional between-country variation in resistance frequency. We begin by

finding the maximum *a posteriori* model fits according to the likelihood and prior

distributions for each of the four models of resistance evolution. This identifies the

following parameter values for each model. "Treatment diversity": $\beta = 1.41$, $c = 0.124$, g

$= 0.976$, and $\kappa = 2.22$. "Pathogen diversity": $\beta = 1.33$, $c = 0.191$, $a = 10.8$, and $\delta = 0.608$.

"Treatment competition": $\beta = 1.42$, $c = 0.191$, and $k = 1.64$. "Growth competition": $\beta =$

1.39, $b = 0.195$, and $k = 1.61$. Then, we perform maximum *a posteriori* model fits for each

potentially-varying parameter under each model, allowing the varying parameter to

take on a different value for each country and fixing other parameters at their maximum

a posteriori values as determined in the previous step, or at specific assumed values for

$u = 0.65$, $f = 0.985$, and $z = 5$. For the second step, we use a modified likelihood function

794
$$P(\tau, r, n | \theta) = C\big(Y = Y(\tau | \theta)\big) \prod_{m=1}^{M} \phi\left(\mu = \frac{r_m + 1}{n_m + 2}, \sigma = 0.001 \middle| x = \rho(\tau_m | \theta)\right)^{N_m/\bar{N}},$$

where $\phi(\mu, \sigma | x)$ is the normal probability density function. This modified likelihood

function ensures that the model-predicted resistance frequency for each country is

matched as closely as possible to the maximum-likelihood resistance prevalence $\frac{r_m+1}{n_m+2}$

(*i.e.*, assuming a uniform prior on resistance frequency) for each country m, so that

model fits are comparable across different varying parameters. We use the Nelder-Mead

algorithm to maximize the posterior probability in both steps.

Figs. S5–S8 show maximum *a posteriori* fits when allowing an additional parameter to

vary freely between countries, along with the parameter values identified by model

fitting. Figs. S9–S12 show the impact of vaccination, focusing on those parameters for

which model fitting was able to capture the observed variability in resistance frequency

between countries (*i.e.*, those parameters plotted to the left of the dashed line in Fig. 6b

of the main text). Figs. S13–S16 show the impact of vaccination for the remaining

parameters.

List of Supplementary Materials

References

1.   J. O'Neill, "Vaccines and alternative approaches: reducing our dependence on

antimicrobials" (2016), (available at http://amr-

review.org/sites/default/files/Vaccines and alternatives_v4_LR.pdf).

2.   M. Lipsitch, R. Siber, How Can Vaccines Contribute to Solving the Antimicrobial

Resistance Problem ? **7**, 1–8 (2016).

3.   K. E. Atkins, M. Lipsitch, Can antibiotic resistance be reduced by vaccinating

against respiratory disease? *Lancet Respir. Med.* **6**, 820–821 (2018).

4.   J. P. Sevilla, D. E. Bloom, D. Cadarette, M. Jit, M. Lipsitch, Toward economic

evaluation of the value of vaccines and other health technologies in addressing

AMR. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **115**, 12911–12919 (2018).

5.   K. P. Klugman, S. Black, Impact of existing vaccines in reducing antibiotic

resistance: Primary and secondary effects. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **115**, 12896–

12901 (2018).

6.   M. H. Kyaw, R. Lynfield, W. Schaffner, A. S. Craig, J. Hadler, A. Reingold, A. R.

Thomas, L. H. Harrison, N. M. Bennett, M. M. Farley, R. R. Facklam, J. H. Jorgensen,

J. Besser, E. R. Zell, A. Schuchat, C. G. Whitney, Effect of Introduction of the

Pneumococcal Conjugate Vaccine on Drug-Resistant Streptococcus pneumoniae.

N. Engl. J. Med. **354**, 1455–1463 (2006).

7.   D. Thorrington, N. Andrews, J. Stowe, E. Miller, A. J. van Hoek, Elucidating the

impact of the pneumococcal conjugate vaccine programme on pneumonia, sepsis

and otitis media hospital admissions in England using a composite control. *BMC*

Med. **16**, 1–14 (2018).

8.   C. Chen, F. Cervero Liceras, S. Flasche, S. Sidharta, J. Yoong, N. Sundaram, M. Jit,

Effect and cost-effectiveness of pneumococcal conjugate vaccination: a global

modelling analysis. *Lancet Glob. Heal.* **7**, e58–e67 (2019).

9.   K. J. Wilby, D. Werry, A review of the effect of immunization programs on

antimicrobial utilization. *Vaccine*. **30**, 6509–6514 (2012).

10. W. P. Hanage, J. A. Finkelstein, S. S. Huang, S. I. Pelton, A. E. Stevenson, K.

Kleinman, V. L. Hinrichsen, C. Fraser, Evidence that pneumococcal serotype

replacement in Massachusetts following conjugate vaccination is now complete.

Epidemics. **2**, 80–84 (2010).

11.   S. Flasche, A. J. Van Hoek, E. Sheasby, P. Waight, N. Andrews, C. Sheppard, R.
George, E. Miller, Effect of pneumococcal conjugate vaccination on serotype-
specific carriage and invasive disease in England: a cross-sectional study. *PLoS*
Med. **8**, e1001017 (2011).

12.   J. A. Lewnard, W. P. Hanage, Making sense of differences in pneumococcal
serotype replacement. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **3099** (2019), doi:10.1016/s1473-
3099(18)30660-1.

13.   European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, Antimicrobial consumption
rates by country (2018), (available at
http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/healthtopics/antimicrobial_resistance/esac-net-
database/Pages/Antimicrobial-consumption-rates-by-country.aspx).

14.   World Health Organization, WHO vaccine pipeline tracker (2019), (available at
https://www.who.int/immunization/research/vaccine_pipeline_tracker_spreads
heet/en/).

15.   G. L. Masala, M. Lipsitch, C. Bottomley, S. Flasche, Exploring the role of
competition induced by non-vaccine serotypes for herd protection following
pneumococcal vaccination. *J. R. Soc. Interface.* **14** (2017),
doi:10.1098/rsif.2017.0620.

16.   K. E. Atkins, E. I. Lafferty, S. R. Deeny, N. G. Davies, J. V. Robotham, M. Jit, Use of
mathematical modelling to assess the impact of vaccines on antibiotic resistance.
Lancet Infect. Dis. **18**, e204–e213 (2018).

17.   K. E. Atkins, S. Flasche, Vaccination to reduce antimicrobial resistance. *Lancet*
Glob. Heal. **6**, e252 (2018).

18.   L. Temime, D. Guillemot, P. Y. Boëlle, Short- and long-term effects of
pneumococcal conjugate vaccination of children on penicillin resistance.
Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. **48**, 2206–2213 (2004).

19.   L. Temime, P. Y. Boëlle, A. J. Valleron, D. Guillemot, Penicillin-resistant
pneumococcal meningitis: High antibiotic exposure impedes new vaccine
protection. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **133**, 493–501 (2005).

20.   L. Opatowski, L. Temime, E. Varon, R. Leclerc, H. Drugeon, P.-Y. Boëlle, D.
Guillemot, Antibiotic Innovation May Contribute to Slowing the Dissemination of
Multiresistant Streptococcus pneumoniae: The Example of Ketolides. *PLoS One.* **3**,
e2089 (2008).

21. T. Van Effelterre, M. R. Moore, F. Fierens, C. G. Whitney, L. White, S. I. Pelton, W. P.
Hausdorff, A dynamic model of pneumococcal infection in the United States:
Implications for prevention through vaccination. *Vaccine*. **28**, 3650–3660 (2010).

22. M. D. De Cellès, M. Pons-Salort, E. Varon, M. A. Vibet, C. Ligier, V. Letort, L.
Opatowski, D. Guillemot, Interaction of vaccination and reduction of antibiotic use
drives unexpected increase of pneumococcal meningitis. *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 1–11 (2015).

23. P. K. Mitchell, M. Lipsitch, W. P. Hanage, Carriage burden, multiple colonization
and antibiotic pressure promote emergence of resistant vaccine escape
pneumococci. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **370**, 3–9 (2015).

24. U. Obolski, J. Lourenço, C. Thompson, R. Thompson, A. Gori, S. Gupta, Vaccination
can drive an increase in frequencies of antibiotic resistance among nonvaccine
serotypes of Streptococcus pneumoniae. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **115**, 3102–3107
(2018).

25. C. Colijn, T. Cohen, C. Fraser, W. Hanage, E. Goldstein, N. Givon-Lavi, R. Dagan, M.
Lipsitch, 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).

26. N. G. Davies, S. Flasche, M. Jit, K. E. Atkins, Within-host dynamics shape antibiotic
resistance in commensal bacteria. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* (2019), doi:10.1038/s41559-
018-0786-x.

27. H. Goossens, M. Ferech, R. Vander Stichele, M. Elseviers, Outpatient antibiotic use
in Europe and association with resistance: A cross-national database study.
Lancet. **365**, 579–587 (2005).

28. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, Data from the ECDC
Surveillance Atlas - Antimicrobial resistance (2016), (available at
https://ecdc.europa.eu/en/antimicrobial-resistance/surveillance-and-disease-
data/data-ecdc).

29. M. Lipsitch, C. Colijn, T. Cohen, W. P. Hanage, C. Fraser, No coexistence for free:
Neutral null models for multistrain pathogens. *Epidemics*. **1**, 2–13 (2009).

30. P. Rodrigues, M. G. M. Gomes, C. Rebelo, Drug resistance in tuberculosis-a
reinfection model. *Theor. Popul. Biol.* **71**, 196–212 (2007).

31. O. Patterson-Lomba, B. M. Althouse, G. M. Goerg, L. Hébert-Dufresne, Optimizing
Treatment Regimes to Hinder Antiviral Resistance in Influenza across Time

Scales. *PLoS One.* **8**, 1–11 (2013).

32.   I. M. Hastings, Complex dynamics and stability of resistance to antimalarial drugs.

Parasitology. **132**, 615–624 (2006).

33.   R. Sergeev, C. Colijn, T. Cohen, Models to understand the population-level impact

of mixed strain M. tuberculosis infections. *J. Theor. Biol.* **280**, 88–100 (2011).

34.   F. Blanquart, S. Lehtinen, M. Lipsitch, C. Fraser, The evolution of antibiotic

resistance in a structured host population. *J. R. Soc. Interface.* **15** (2018),

doi:10.1098/rsif.2018.0040.

35.   M. S. Krieger, A. L. Hill, Long-term coexistence and regional heterogeneity of

antibiotic-resistant infections reproduced by a simple spatial model. *bioRxiv.* **14**,

469171 (2018).

36.   R. Kouyos, E. Klein, B. Grenfell, Hospital-Community Interactions Foster

Coexistence between Methicillin-Resistant Strains of Staphylococcus aureus. *PLoS*

Pathog. **9** (2013), doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1003134.

37.   M. F. Boni, M. W. Feldman, Evolution of Antibiotic Resistance By Human and

Bacterial Niche Construction. *Evolution (N. Y).* **59**, 477 (2006).

38.   S. Lehtinen, F. Blanquart, N. J. Croucher, P. Turner, M. Lipsitch, C. Fraser, Evolution

of antibiotic resistance is linked to any genetic mechanism affecting bacterial

duration of carriage. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 1075–1080 (2017).

39.   D. J. Austin, K. G. Kristinsson, R. M. Anderson, The relationship between the

volume of antimicrobial consumption in human communities and the frequency

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

40.   A. B. Beams, D. J. A. Toth, K. Khader, F. R. Adler, Harnessing intra-host strain

competition to limit antibiotic resistance: mathematical model results. *Bull. Math.*

Biol. **78**, 1828–1846 (2016).

41.   K. Græsbøll, S. S. Nielsen, N. Toft, L. E. Christiansen, How fitness reduced,

antimicrobial resistant bacteria survive and spread: A multiple pig - multiple

bacterial strain model. *PLoS One.* **9** (2014), doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0100458.

42.   D. Bogaert, A. Van Belkum, M. Sluijter, A. Luijendijk, R. De Groot, H. C. Rümke, H. A.

Verbrugh, P. W. M. Hermans, Colonisation by *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and

Staphylococcus aureus in healthy children. *Lancet.* **363**, 1871–1872 (2004).

43.   D. M. Weinberger, V. E. Pitzer, G. Regev-Yochay, N. Givon-Lavi, R. Dagan,

Association between the Decline in Pneumococcal Disease in Unimmunized

Adults and Vaccine-Derived Protection Against Colonization in Toddlers and

Preschool-Aged Children. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **188**, 160–168 (2019).

44. D. I. Andersson, The biological cost of mutational antibiotic resistance: any

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

45. D. I. Andersson, D. Hughes, Antibiotic resistance and its cost: Is it possible to

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

46. C. Tedijanto, S. Olesen, Y. Grad, M. Lipsitch, Estimating the proportion of

bystander selection for antibiotic resistance among potentially pathogenic

bacterial flora. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. **115**, E11988–E11995 (2018).

47. L. Högberg, P. Geli, H. Ringberg, E. Melander, M. Lipsitch, K. Ekdahl, Age- and

serogroup-related differences in observed durations of nasopharyngeal carriage

of penicillin-resistant pneumococci. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **45**, 948–952 (2007).

48. A. Melegaro, N. J. Gay, G. F. Medley, Estimating the transmission parameters of

pneumococcal carriage in households. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **132**, 433–441 (2004).

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

coexistence of pneumococcal serotypes. *Science (80-.).* **335**, 1376–1380 (2012).

50. R. Malley, P. W. Anderson, Serotype-independent pneumococcal experimental

vaccines that induce cellular as well as humoral immunity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.*

S. A. **109**, 3623–3627 (2012).

51. S. P. Jochems, J. N. Weiser, R. Malley, D. M. Ferreira, The immunological

mechanisms that control pneumococcal carriage. *PLoS Pathog.* **13**, 1–14 (2017).

52. UK Department of Health and Social Care, "Tackling antimicrobial resistance 2019

to 2024: the UK's 5-year national action plan" (2019), (available at

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-5-year-action-plan-for-

antimicrobial-resistance-2019-to-2024).

53. B. S. Buckley, N. Henschke, H. Bergman, B. Skidmore, E. J. Klemm, G. Villanueva, C.

Garritty, M. Paul, Impact of vaccination on antibiotic usage: a systematic review

and meta-analysis. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **In press** (2019),

doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2019.06.030.

54. A. Von Gottberg, L. De Gouveia, S. Tempia, V. Quan, S. Meiring, C. Von Mollendorf,

S. A. Madhi, E. R. Zell, M. Stat, J. R. Verani, K. L. O'Brien, C. G. Whitney, K. P.

Klugman, C. Cohen, Effects of vaccination on invasive pneumococcal disease in

South Africa. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **371**, 1889–1899 (2014).

55.   A. Cassini, L. D. Högberg, D. Plachouras, A. Quattrocchi, A. Hoxha, G. S. Simonsen,

M. Colomb-Cotinat, M. E. Kretzschmar, B. Devleesschauwer, M. Cecchini, D. A.

Ouakrim, T. C. Oliveira, M. J. Struelens, C. Suetens, D. L. Monnet, R. Strauss, K.

Mertens, T. Struyf, B. Catry, K. Latour, I. N. Ivanov, E. G. Dobreva, A. Tambic

Andraševic, S. Soprek, A. Budimir, N. Paphitou, H. Žemlicková, S. Schytte Olsen, U.

Wolff Sönksen, P. Märtin, M. Ivanova, O. Lyytikäinen, J. Jalava, B. Coignard, T.

Eckmanns, M. Abu Sin, S. Haller, G. L. Daikos, A. Gikas, S. Tsiodras, F. Kontopidou,

Á. Tóth, Á. Hajdu, Ó. Guólaugsson, K. G. Kristinsson, S. Murchan, K. Burns, P.

Pezzotti, C. Gagliotti, U. Dumpis, A. Liuimiene, M. Perrin, M. A. Borg, S. C. de Greeff,

J. C. Monen, M. B. Koek, P. Elstrøm, D. Zabicka, A. Deptula, W. Hryniewicz, M.

Caniça, P. J. Nogueira, P. A. Fernandes, V. Manageiro, G. A. Popescu, R. I. Serban, E.

Schréterová, S. Litvová, M. Štefkovicová, J. Kolman, I. Klavs, A. Korošec, B. Aracil, A.

Asensio, M. Pérez-Vázquez, H. Billström, S. Larsson, J. S. Reilly, A. Johnson, S.

Hopkins, Attributable deaths and disability-adjusted life-years caused by

infections with antibiotic-resistant bacteria in the EU and the European Economic

Area in 2015: a population-level modelling analysis. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **19**, 56–66

(2019).

56.   M. Kobayashi, L. M. Conklin, G. Bigogo, G. Jagero, L. Hampton, K. E. Fleming-Dutra,

M. Junghae, M. da G. Carvalho, F. Pimenta, B. Beall, T. Taylor, K. F. Laserson, J.

Vulule, C. Van Beneden, L. Kim, D. R. Feikin, C. G. Whitney, R. F. Breiman,

Pneumococcal carriage and antibiotic susceptibility patterns from two cross-

sectional colonization surveys among children aged <5 years prior to the

introduction of 10-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine - Kenya, 2009-2010.

BMC Infect. Dis. **17**, 1–12 (2017).

57.   M. Lipsitch, O. Abdullahi, A. D'Amour, W. Xie, D. M. Weinberger, E. Tchetgen

Tchetgen, J. A. G. Scott, Estimating rates of carriage acquisition and clearance and

competitive ability for pneumococcal serotypes in Kenya with a Markov

transition model. *Epidemiology*. **23**, 510–519 (2012).

58.   I. Rudan, K. L. O'Brien, H. Nair, L. Liu, E. Theodoratou, S. Qazi, I. Luksic, C. L. F.

Walker, R. E. Black, H. Campbell, Child Health Epidemiology Reference Group,

Epidemiology and etiology of childhood pneumonia in 2010: estimates of

incidence, severe morbidity, mortality, underlying risk factors and causative

pathogens for 192 countries. *J. Glob. Health*. **3**, S114-010401 (2013).

59.   A. N. Torné, J. G. Dias, C. Quinten, F. Hruba, M. C. Busana, P. L. Lopalco, A. J. A.
1041   Gauci, L. Pastore-Celentano, M. Sabbe, J. Verhaegen, M. Koliou, D. Pieridou-
1042   Bagkatzouni, P. Křižovà, J. Kozakova, J. Motlova, P. Valentiner-Branth, L.
1043   Lambertsen, T. Georgakopoulou, H. Humphreys, T. Melillo, P. Caruana, M. Knol, H.
1044   de Merkel, K. Elberse, D. Frimann, A. Skoczynska, W. Hryniewicz, A. Kuch, I.
1045   Paradowska-Stankiewicz, M. Pana, M. Vitek, V. Učakar, B. H. Normark, T. Lepp, M.
1046   Slack, P. A. Waight, European enhanced surveillance of invasive pneumococcal
1047   disease in 2010: Data from 26 European countries in the post-heptavalent
1048   conjugate vaccine era. *Vaccine.* **32**, 3644–3650 (2014).
1049   60.   M. Tin Tin Htar, D. Christopoulou, H. J. Schmitt, Pneumococcal serotype evolution
1050   in Western Europe. *BMC Infect. Dis.* **15**, 1–10 (2015).
1051   61.   B. Simell, K. Auranen, H. Käyhty, D. Goldblatt, R. Dagan, K. L. O'Brien, The
1052   fundamental link between pneumococcal carriage and disease. *Expert Rev.*
1053   *Vaccines.* **11**, 841–855 (2012).
1054   62.   S. Flasche, A. Guilder, Using a mathematical model to assess the potential effects
1055   of a new vaccine approach that targets enhanced clearance of pneumococcal
1056   carriage. (2018).
1057   63.   M. C. Negri, M. Lipsitch, J. Blázquez, B. R. Levin, F. Baquero, Concentration-
1058   dependent selection of small phenotypic differences in TEM beta-lactamase-
1059   mediated antibiotic resistance. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **44**, 2485–91
1060   (2000).
1061   64.   A. R. Wargo, S. Huijben, J. C. de Roode, J. Shepherd, A. F. Read, Competitive release
1062   and facilitation of drug-resistant parasites after therapeutic chemotherapy in a
1063   rodent malaria model. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **104**, 19914–19919 (2007).
1064   65.   N. Wale, D. G. Sim, M. J. Jones, R. Salathe, T. Day, A. F. Read, Resource limitation
1065   prevents the emergence of drug resistance by intensifying within-host
1066   competition. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 201715874 (2017).
1067   66.   J. A. Lewnard, P. A. Tähtinen, M. K. Laine, L. Lindholm, J. Jalava, P. Huovinen, M.
1068   Lipsitch, A. Ruohola, Impact of antimicrobial treatment for acute otitis media on
1069   carriage dynamics of penicillin-susceptible and penicillin–non-susceptible
1070   *Streptococcus pneumoniae. J. Infect. Dis.*, jiy343 (2018).
1071   67.   S. Lehtinen, F. Blanquart, M. Lipsitch, C. Fraser, On the evolutionary ecology of
1072   multidrug resistance in bacteria. *PLoS Pathog.* **15**, 1–22 (2019).

68. M. Filippini, G. Masiero, K. Moschetti, Socioeconomic determinants of regional

differences in outpatient antibiotic consumption: Evidence from Switzerland.

Health Policy (New. York). **78**, 77–92 (2006).

69. D. Koller, F. Hoffmann, W. Maier, K. Tholen, R. Windt, G. Glaeske, Variation in

antibiotic prescriptions: Is area deprivation an explanation? Analysis of 1.2

million children in Germany. *Infection.* **41**, 121–127 (2013).

70. M. Di Martino, A. Lallo, U. Kirchmayer, M. Davoli, D. Fusco, Prevalence of antibiotic

prescription in pediatric outpatients in Italy: The role of local health districts and

primary care physicians in determining variation. A multilevel design for

healthcare decision support. *BMC Public Health.* **17**, 1–8 (2017).

71. M. C. Goossens, B. Catry, J. Verhaegen, Antimicrobial resistance to benzylpenicillin

in invasive pneumococcal disease in Belgium, 2003-2010: The effect of altering

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

72. S. Cobey, E. B. Baskerville, C. Colijn, W. Hanage, C. Fraser, M. Lipsitch, Host

population structure and treatment frequency maintain balancing selection on

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

73. A. Pottegård, A. Broe, R. Aabenhus, L. Bjerrum, J. Hallas, P. Damkier, Use of

antibiotics in children: A danish nationwide drug utilization study. *J. Pediatr.*

Infect. Dis. **34**, e16–e22 (2015).

74. W. V. Kern, K. De With, K. Nink, M. Steib-Bauert, H. Schröder, Regional variation in

outpatient antibiotic prescribing in Germany. *Infection.* **34**, 269–273 (2006).

75. C. Ter Braak, A Markov Chain Monte Carlo version of the genetic algorithm

Differential Evolution: Easy Bayesian computing for real parameter spaces. *Stat.*

Comput. **16**, 239–249 (2006).

76. Eurostat (2019), (available at https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/home?).

77. T. Smieszek, K. B. Pouwels, F. C. K. Dolk, D. R. M. Smith, S. Hopkins, M. Sharland, A.

D. Hay, M. V Moore, J. V Robotham, Potential for reducing inappropriate antibiotic

prescribing in English primary care. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **73**, ii36–ii43

(2018).

1102

Acknowledgements

1103

1104

Funding: N.G.D., M.J. and K.E.A. were funded by the National Institute for Health

Research Health Protection Research Unit in Immunisation at the London School of

Hygiene and Tropical Medicine in partnership with Public Health England. The views

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

Institute for Health Research, Department of Health or Public Health England. S.F. was

supported by a Sir Henry Dale Fellowship jointly funded by the Wellcome Trust and

Royal Society (grant number 208812/Z/17/Z).

1112

1113 *Author contributions:* All authors designed the study. N.G.D. led the analysis with input

1114 from K.E.A., M.J., and S.F. The paper was written by N.G.D. and K.E.A. with input from M.J.

1115 and S.F.

1116

1117 *Competing interests:* The authors declare no competing interests.

1118

Code availability

1120

1121 C++ code used for model comparison is available at

1122 https://github.com/nicholasdavies/amr-competition-diversity.

1123   Supplementary Materials for

1124

1125   **Stabilising effects of competition and diversity**

1126   **determine vaccine impact on antibiotic resistance evolution**

1127

1128   Nicholas G. Davies, Stefan Flasche, Mark Jit, Katherine E. Atkins

1129

1130

Fig. S1. Patterns of penicillin non-susceptibility across European countries, 2005–

2017. (a) The frequency of penicillin non-susceptibility in pneumococcal isolates (mean

and 95% HDI) increases with the primary care consumption of penicillins, ATC class

J01C (least-squares linear regression $\beta = 0.0168, F(1,344) = 148.5, P < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$).

Data from Belgium after 2007 are excluded because of changes to the definition of

penicillin non-susceptibility after this year. **(b)** The frequency of penicillin non-

susceptibility has fluctuated in individual countries between 2005 and 2017, but the

European population-weighted average (thick dashed line) has remained stable at

roughly 12%. **(c)** We fit our models to the prevalence of penicillin non-susceptibility in

2007. Despite the introduction of pneumococcal conjugate vaccines into many

European national immunisation programmes starting in 2006, pneumococcal

resistance appears to have been relatively stable over the time period 2005–2009:

while mean penicillin non-susceptibility across European countries increased by 0.5%

per year over this time period, and the slope of penicillin non-susceptibility on primary-

care penicillin consumption decreased by 0.1%/DDD per year, neither of these changes

are significant (least-squares linear regression: $F(1,3) = 0.64$, $P = 0.48$ and $F(1,3) = 1.48$,

P = 0.31, respectively).

1148

1149

Fig. S2. Impact of key parameters upon the potential for coexistence in each model. (a) Potential for coexistence for each model, depending upon key parameters. In the top two panels, darker colours represent lower potential for coexistence while lighter colours represent higher potential for coexistence. **(b)** Schematic showing how to calculate the "potential for coexistence", an ad-hoc measurement of how much coexistence is exhibited by a given model under a given parameterisation. To find it, we set $\beta = 1.4$ months^{-1}, $u = 0.7$ months^{-1}, and set g, κ, δ, a, and k according to the values shown in the figure (panel a). We then numerically identify the value of c (or b for the "growth competition" model) which results in the equilibrium resistance frequency passing through exactly 30% for a single country in which the antibiotic consumption

rate is equal to τ = 1.2 courses per person per year (black dot; these values are chosen

to approximately match observations for *S. pneumoniae* in European countries). The

potential for coexistence is the probability that the equilibrium resistance frequency is

above 0 for a random treatment rate between τ = 0 and τ = 1.2 (in other words, it is the

proportion of the curve that "lifts off" from the x-axis; see figure). By this definition, a

model showing no coexistence has potential 0, while a model showing the maximum

amount of coexistence has potential 1.

1167

1168

Fig. S3. Carriage and resistance of D-types in the "Pathogen diversity" model. This verifies that the D-types with the highest prevalence of carriage (averaged over all countries, above) also exhibit the highest resistance frequency (separated by country, below), and shows that at equilibrium, D-types can exhibit intermediate frequencies of resistance.

1174

Fig. S4. Comparison of inferred model posteriors and conditional posterior maxima for each parameter. The conditional posterior maximum (green bars) is obtained by fixing the parameter of interest at a specific value, then allowing the other parameters to assume their maximum *a posteriori* values through numerical optimization of the model fit. This is repeated for multiple values of the parameter of interest. The position on the x-axis of the thin green bars shows these fixed values for the parameter of interest (chosen to "sweep" across the parameter range), while the height of the thin green bars is relative to the maximum posterior probability conditional on that fixed value. When the conditional posterior maximum (green bars) does not align with the posteriors from model fitting (blue bars, same as Fig. 2b, main text), this indicates that the prior distribution is strongly influencing the posterior distribution for a given parameter. This analysis shows that values inferred for *a* and δ under the "Pathogen diversity" model, and for *k* under the "Treatment competition" and "Growth competition" models, are strongly constrained by prior beliefs about plausible ranges for those parameters, while other parameters are less constrained.

1190

1191

1192

1193 **Fig. S5. Varying-parameter fits for the "Treatment diversity" model.** Maximum *a*

1194 *posteriori* fits for the "Treatment diversity" model allowing one parameter to vary

1195 between countries. Parameters *c* and *z* can capture the additional variation in resistance

1196 frequency between countries.

1197

1198

1199 **Fig. S6. Varying-parameter fits for the "Pathogen diversity" model.** Maximum *a*

1200 *posteriori* fits for the "Pathogen diversity" model allowing one parameter to vary

1201 between countries. Parameters *c*, δ, and *z* can capture the additional variation in

1202 resistance frequency between countries.

1203

1204

1205 **Fig. S7. Varying-parameter fits for the "Treatment competition" model.** Maximum *a*

1206 *posteriori* fits for the "Treatment competition" model allowing one parameter to vary

1207 between countries. Parameters β, *c*, *u*, *k*, and *z* can capture the additional variation in

1208 resistance frequency between countries.

1209

1210

1211 **Fig. S8. Varying-parameter fits for the "Growth competition" model.** Maximum *a*

1212 *posteriori* fits for the "Growth competition" model allowing one parameter to vary

1213 between countries. Parameters *b* and *z* can capture the additional variation in

1214 resistance frequency between countries.

1215

1216

1217 **Fig. S9. Vaccine impact for the "Treatment diversity" model, varying parameters *c***

1218 **and *z*.** Impact of vaccination under the "Treatment diversity" model, for those

1219 parameters able to capture the between-country variation in resistance frequency. The

1220 base model fit (thick grey solid line) is compared with the model fits in which

1221 parameters vary between countries (thin dashed lines).

1222

1223

1224 **Fig. S10. Vaccine impact for the "Pathogen diversity" model, varying parameters *c*,**

1225 **δ, and z.** Impact of vaccination under the "Pathogen diversity" model, for those

1226 parameters able to capture the between-country variation in resistance frequency. The

1227 base model fit (thick grey solid line) is compared with the model fits in which

1228 parameters vary between countries (thin dashed lines).

1229

1230

Fig. S11. Vaccine impact for the "Treatment competition" model, varying parameters *β, c, u, k,* and *z*. Impact of vaccination under the "Treatment competition" model, for those parameters able to capture the between-country variation in resistance frequency. The base model fit (thick grey solid line) is compared with the model fits in which parameters vary between countries (thin dashed lines).

Growth competition

1236

1237

1238 **Fig. S12. Vaccine impact for the "Growth competition" model, varying parameters**

1239 ***b* and *z*.** Impact of vaccination under the "Growth competition" model, for those

1240 parameters able to capture the between-country variation in resistance frequency. The

1241 base model fit (thick grey solid line) is compared with the model fits in which

1242 parameters vary between countries (thin dashed lines).

1243

1244

1245 **Fig. S13. Vaccine impact for the "Treatment diversity" model, varying other**

1246 **parameters.** Impact of vaccination under the "Treatment diversity" model, for those

1247 parameters *not* able to capture the between-country variation in resistance frequency.

1248 The base model fit (thick grey solid line) is compared with the model fits in which

1249 parameters vary between countries (thin dashed lines).

1250

1251

Fig. S14. Vaccine impact for the "Pathogen diversity" model, varying other parameters. Impact of vaccination under the "Pathogen diversity" model, for those parameters *not* able to capture the between-country variation in resistance frequency. The base model fit (thick grey solid line) is compared with the model fits in which parameters vary between countries (thin dashed lines).

1257

1258

1259 **Fig. S15. Vaccine impact for the "Treatment competition" model, varying other**

1260 **parameters.** Impact of vaccination under the "Treatment competition" model, for those

1261 parameters *not* able to capture the between-country variation in resistance frequency.

1262 The base model fit (thick grey solid line) is compared with the model fits in which

1263 parameters vary between countries (thin dashed lines).

Growth competition

1264

1265

1266 **Fig. S16. Vaccine impact for the "Growth competition" model, varying other**

1267 **parameters.** Impact of vaccination under the "Growth competition" model, for those

1268 parameters *not* able to capture the between-country variation in resistance frequency.

1269 The base model fit (thick grey solid line) is compared with the model fits in which

1270 parameters vary between countries (thin dashed lines).

1271

Tables S1–S7

These tables can be found in an Excel spreadsheet accompanying the article.

Table S1. Literature review — Details of the literature review used to identify mechanisms for maintaining coexistence between sensitive and resistant bacterial strains.

Table S2. Summary of model parameters — Table describing model parameters and assumed values or prior distributions for model fitting.

Table S3. Carriage duration — Calculation of mean pneumococcal carriage duration for children under 5 years old in European settings.

Table S4. Penicillin consumption — Calculation of the mean number of defined daily doses of penicillin corresponding to a single treatment course for children under 5 years old in European countries.

Table S5. Pneumococcal morbidity — Calculation of the annual number of pneumococcal pneumonia cases in children under 5 in Europe and Kenya.

Table S6. Carriage duration (Kilifi) — Calculation of mean pneumococcal carriage duration for children under 5 years old in Kilifi, Kenya.

Table S7. MCMC diagnostics — Widely Applicable Information Criteria (WAIC), Leave-One-Out Information Criteria (LOOIC), effective posterior sample size and Gelman-Rubin diagnostics for Bayesian inference model fitting using Markov chain Monte Carlo.