

# A model of the number of antibiotic resistant bacteria in rivers

Bonita Lawrence<sup>a</sup>, Anna Mummert<sup>b,\*</sup>, Charles Somerville<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Mathematics Department, Marshall University, Huntington, WV 25755, Email: lawrence@marshall.edu

<sup>b</sup>Mathematics Department, Marshall University, Huntington, WV 25755, Email: mummerta@marshall.edu

<sup>c</sup>Biology Department, Marshall University, Huntington, WV 25755, Email: somervil@marshall.edu

---

## Abstract

The large reservoir of antibiotic resistant bacteria in raw and treated water supplies is a matter of public health concern. Currently, the National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring Systems, a collaborative effort of the Centers for Disease Control, the US Department of Agriculture, and the US Food and Drug Administration, does not monitor antimicrobial resistance in surface waters. Given the serious nature of antibiotic resistance in clinical settings, and the likelihood that antibiotic resistant bacteria can be transmitted to humans from large environmental reservoirs via drinking water, explanations for the distribution of antibiotic resistant bacteria and tools for studying this distribution must be found. Here we focus on mathematical modeling of cultivable bacteria in a river, which will be used to study the distribution of antibiotic resistant bacteria in the environment. We consider both antibiotic resistant and non-antibiotic resistant bacteria in the model, and, taking into account the strong correlation between land use and antibiotic resistant bacteria in rivers, we include a function for the influx of bacteria into the river from the shore. We simulate the model for two different time scales and show that if there is too many bacteria from the land entering the river, the river entirely fills with antibiotic resistant bacteria, while less frequent influxes allows time for the bacteria to lose the antibiotic resistant gene. This mathematically verifies that reduction in antibiotic use near the banks of rivers, will reduce the counts of antibiotic resistant bacteria in rivers.

*Keywords:* mathematical model, non-linear population dynamics, antibiotic resistance, bacteria, riverine system

---

## 1. Introduction

The age of antibiotics is usually traced back to 1928 - the year that Alexander Fleming discovered penicillin. The first clinical uses of penicillin occurred in the early 1940's (Dawson et al., 1941; Parascandola, 1997; Grossman, 2008), and penicillin resistance was first reported

---

\*Corresponding author. Email: mummerta@marshall.edu; Phone: (304) 696 3041; Fax: (304) 696 4646  
Preprint submitted to Elsevier September 13, 2021

13 in hospital isolates in 1947, only a few years after its introduction (Lewis, 1995). Since  
14 that time, antibiotic resistance in clinically relevant bacteria has become a major health  
15 concern. The US Food and Drug Administration estimates that approximately 70 percent  
16 of pathogenic bacteria encountered in hospital settings are resistant to one or more of the  
17 drugs commonly used in their treatment (Bren, 2002). Concern over the spread of antibiotic  
18 resistant bacteria led to the formation of the National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring  
19 System (NARMS) in 1997 (Bartholomew et al., 2006). NARMS is a collaborative effort of  
20 the Centers for Disease Control, the US Department of Agriculture, and the US Food and  
21 Drug Administration. Although NARMS monitors antibiotic resistant bacteria isolated from  
22 humans, food animals, and raw food products, it does not monitor antimicrobial resistance  
23 in surface waters.

24 The nation's surface waters are vital, multiple-use resources. Major rivers, in particular,  
25 are used as transportation routes, recreational venues, and industrial water sources, as well  
26 as, receptacles of stormwater runoff, sanitary sewage, and industrial wastes. In addition, sur-  
27 face waters are the sources of drinking water for millions of people worldwide. For example,  
28 the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission estimates that the Ohio River provides  
29 drinking water for more than five million people (ORSANCO, 2008). Several studies have  
30 shown that large numbers of freshwater bacteria found in these life sustaining waterways  
31 are resistant to one or more antibiotics (Cooke, 1976; Ash et al., 2002; Niemi et al., 1983;  
32 Kelch and Lee, 1978; Bennett and Kramer, 1999; Smith, 2006; Dotson, 2008). The resis-  
33 tance found in freshwater bacteria is problematic for humans since, it has been shown that  
34 antibiotic resistant bacteria can be isolated from tap water (Armstrong et al., 1981; Nagy  
35 et al., 2009). Therefore, the large reservoir of antibiotic resistant bacteria in raw and treated  
36 water supplies is a matter of public health concern.

37 Many studies have correlated the presence of antibiotic resistant bacteria in surface waters  
38 with the human activities occurring along the shore. Land uses that have been correlated  
39 with antibiotic resistance include wastewater treatment plants (Frank, 2005), urban areas  
40 and other impervious surfaces (Boon and Cattanach, 1999; Somerville et al., 2004), industrial  
41 and heavy metal pollution (McArthur and Tuckfield, 2000), and agricultural pastures and  
42 row crops (Kuhn et al., 2005; Dotson, 2008). As an example, regarding the Mud River, WV,  
43 Dotson specifically studied the watershed land use in relation to the count and distribution  
44 of antibiotic resistant bacteria, and concludes "the evidence shows a correlation of antibiotic  
45 resistant bacteria to areas of livestock in the watershed (Dotson, 2008)."

46 The source of environmental antibiotic resistant strains has been attributed to the use  
47 of antibiotics both in medical and agricultural settings. Therefore, previous studies have  
48 assumed that aquatic antibiotic resistance derives directly from human and animal fecal  
49 contamination entering surface waters via inadequate sewage treatment or runoff (Cooke,  
50 1976; Ash et al., 2002; Raloff, 1999). If this assumption holds true, then antibiotic resis-

51 tant bacteria in an environmental sample should be a subset of fecal bacteria, and their  
52 distribution should be predicted using standard methods for the microbiological assessment  
53 of water and wastewater. However, recent studies have shown that cultivable antibiotic  
54 resistant bacteria are not a subset of fecal indicator bacteria, which implies that their dis-  
55 tribution in freshwater environments cannot be predicted by standard techniques (Smith,  
56 2006; Somerville et al., 2007; Dotson, 2008).

57 We conclude, there is a large population of antibiotic resistant bacteria in surface waters  
58 and drinking water that are not monitored under NARMS surveillance, and whose distribu-  
59 tion cannot be predicted by standard water quality analyses. Given the serious nature of  
60 antibiotic resistance in clinical settings, and the likelihood that antibiotic resistant bacteria  
61 can be transmitted to humans from large environmental reservoirs via drinking water, tools  
62 for modeling the distribution of antibiotic resistant bacteria in the environment are needed.

63 Mahloch (1974) offers one of the first comparisons of mathematical models of bacteria  
64 in rivers. Mahloch compares six models for the count and distribution of coliform bacteria  
65 in rivers, three deterministic and three stochastic, with data collected from the Leaf River,  
66 MS. The six models do consider influx of bacteria from tributaries, though not from other  
67 sources, such as runoff from agricultural pastures and row crops. Also, the models are for  
68 counts of bacteria only, not for bacteria with or without an antibiotic resistant gene.

69 Since Mahloch, models have been introduced to study the transfer of the antibiotic re-  
70 sistant gene, both at the bacteria level and at the human level. The mechanisms of gene  
71 transfer have been modeled with a mass action term (Levin et al., 1979) and later with  
72 a Michaelis-Menten kinetic (Andrup et al., 1998). Transfer of antibiotic resistance among  
73 humans is most notable in hospitals. In the hospital setting, Webb et al. (2005) present  
74 a model which captures both the patient level and the bacteria level, in the sense of the  
75 bacterial load contributed by each patient. We know of no models, of the sort we present  
76 here, that focus on antibiotic resistant bacteria in a river with the possibility of bacteria  
77 entering the river due to human activity along the shore line.

78 In this paper we present a novel model for cultivable bacteria in a river focusing on  
79 the influx of bacteria due to human activities along the shore. We consider both antibiotic  
80 resistant and non-antibiotic resistant bacteria in the model. Taking into account the strong  
81 correlation between land use and antibiotic resistant bacteria in water, we include a function  
82 for the influx of bacteria into the river from the shore. Our model includes the possibility  
83 of both vertical and horizontal transfer of the antibiotic resistant gene, and the fact that  
84 the land bacteria are not adapted to the river ecosystem and will not survive in the river.  
85 In Section 2 we describe the model and the model implementation. Realistic parameters  
86 are discussed and the model is simulated in Section 3. We conclude with our discussion in  
87 Section 4.

## 88 2. Model assumptions and implementation

89 Throughout our model description we use the phrase “antibiotic resistant” to mean re-  
90 sistance in the clinical sense to a particular unspecified antibiotic, such as, tetracycline, and  
91 “non-antibiotic resistant” to mean not resistant to that particular antibiotic. In general, any  
92 one bacterium could be non-resistant to all antibiotics, or resistant to any number of antibi-  
93 otics at once. Though we consider only clinical resistance to one particular antibiotic, this  
94 model could easily be extended to consider bacteria with multiple resistance or to compare  
95 clinical and weaker forms of resistance.

96 We use the independent variable time  $t$  in our model to represent time from the head of  
97 the river. As time passes, we assume the bacteria are transported down the river in such  
98 a way that all bacteria in the same cohort at time  $t$  stay together as they travel down the  
99 river. Typical data collected from rivers (e.g. Dotson (2008); Smith (2006)) mark the water  
100 sample collection points using mile marks along the direction of the river, not time, which  
101 leads one to believe that distance should be the independent variable. However, typically  
102 mathematical models use time as the independent variable, as we do here. This should cause  
103 the reader no concern, since by using river flow rates, distance from the head of the river  
104 can be converted to time from the head of the river.

105 Only some bacteria are able to be cultivated and counted using current methods, and  
106 so, throughout, we consider only cultivable bacteria in the river. In general, there are  
107 many more bacteria in a river that cannot be cultivated and counted. The main model  
108 assumptions are schematically represented in Figure 1. Details of the model assumptions  
109 and their mathematical implementation are presented below.

110 We consider two distinct classes of cultivable bacteria in the river: those that are “river”  
111 bacteria,  $R$ , and those that are “land” bacteria,  $L$ . The river bacteria are naturally occurring  
112 bacteria which are adapted to survive in the river. The land bacteria enter the river from the  
113 shore and we assume they are not adaptable to the river. Mathematically, the land bacteria  
114 have an additional death rate, which is large enough to offset any reproduction. Therefore,  
115 the only increase in the land bacteria in the river comes in the form of immigration from the  
116 shore. In the river, all bacteria are homogeneously mixed, so any bacterium can come into  
117 contact with any other bacterium. We assume that neither type of bacteria can transform  
118 into the other.

119 Both the river and land bacteria are further subdivided into those that have the antibiotic  
120 resistant gene, called “resistant”,  $R_I, L_I$ , and those that do not, called “susceptible”,  $R_S, L_S$ .  
121 We always have one particular gene in mind, for example, the gene to make a bacterium  
122 resistant to tetracycline. In this model, we are most interested in assessing human activities  
123 along the shore in relation to the antibiotic resistance in rivers, so we assume the land  
124 bacteria which are antibiotic resistant gained the gene through human activity, though some

125 may naturally be resistant (see for example D’Costa et al. (2006)).

126 The bacteria with the antibiotic resistant gene can transfer the gene to the susceptible  
127 bacteria and the bacteria with the antibiotic resistant gene can lose the gene. A resistant  
128 bacterium of either type can transfer the gene to a susceptible bacterium of either type.  
129 The transfer of the antibiotic resistant gene is similar to the transfer of a disease: one  
130 ‘infected’ (resistant) bacterium comes into contact with a ‘susceptible’ bacterium and with  
131 some probability the result of the contact is two ‘infected’ (resistant) bacteria. In particular,  
132 a resistant bacterium does not lose the antibiotic resistant gene when the gene is transferred.  
133 An susceptible-infected (SI) disease model is used to represent the transfer of the antibiotic  
134 resistant gene. Gonzalo et al. (1989) shows that antibiotic resistant bacteria survive less  
135 in less polluted water. Therefore, we assume that the loss of the antibiotic resistant gene  
136 depends on the pollution,  $P$ , in the river. The loss rate is  $B(P)$ , where the function has  
137 the property that as  $P$  increases  $B$  decreases and as  $P$  decreases  $B$  increases. Many such  
138 functions exists, and we use in this model  $B(P) = \frac{\beta}{L_S + L_I + 1}$ , so that pollution is measured  
139 by the bacteria in the river from the shore.

140 Both the river bacteria and the land bacteria compete for space resources in the river  
141 leading to a river carrying capacity. The carrying capacity for the river used in the model  
142 is the carrying capacity for only the cultivable bacteria; in general, a river will have a larger  
143 carrying capacity for all bacteria including those that are not cultivable. We assume that  
144 the river has a constant carrying capacity for the length relevant to these interactions. A  
145 logistic growth model is used to represent the populations’ dependence on the river carrying  
146 capacity. The river carrying capacity can allow an increase in the number of river bacteria,  
147 but not in the number of land bacteria. We assume that the additional death rate of the  
148 land bacteria is large enough to offset any population growth that occurs due to the river  
149 carrying capacity.

150 Since we assume that neither river nor land bacteria can transform into the other, the  
151 influence of the land bacteria (river bacteria) on the river bacteria (land bacteria) occurs in  
152 two ways: through contact and transfer of the antibiotic resistant gene, and through total  
153 population size in accordance with the river carrying capacity.

154 Land bacteria can enter the river at time  $t$ . The increase in land bacteria in the river  
155 is split into those with the antibiotic resistant gene and those without,  $F_I(t)$  and  $F_S(t)$ ,  
156 respectively. We assume that  $F_I(t) \geq 0$  and  $F_S(t) \geq 0$  for all  $t$ . Generally, these rates are  
157 not constant and depend on time (location down river). Mathematically, these terms provide  
158 an external forcing term for the model.

159 For simplicity, we assume that all rates which effect both river and land bacteria are  
160 constant and are the same for both types of bacteria. For example, the antibiotic resistance  
161 gene transfer rate is a constant  $\alpha$  for both types of bacteria.

162 Let the total cultivable bacteria in the river be denoted  $TCB = R_S + R_I + L_S + L_I$ .  
 163 Note that  $TCB$  is not a constant since bacteria are added to the river from the land. Set  
 164 the pollution measure to be  $L = L_S + L_I$ . Our model can be described with the following  
 165 system of differential equations.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dR_S}{dt} &= -\alpha R_S(R_I + L_I) + \left(\frac{\beta}{L+1}\right) R_I + r \left(1 - \frac{TCB}{K}\right) R_S \\
 \frac{dR_I}{dt} &= \alpha R_S(R_I + L_I) - \left(\frac{\beta}{L+1}\right) R_I + r \left(1 - \frac{TCB}{K}\right) R_I \\
 \frac{dL_S}{dt} &= F_S(t) - \gamma L_S - \alpha L_S(R_I + L_I) + \left(\frac{\beta}{L+1}\right) L_I + r \left(1 - \frac{TCB}{K}\right) L_S \\
 \frac{dL_I}{dt} &= F_I(t) - \gamma L_I + \alpha L_S(R_I + L_I) - \left(\frac{\beta}{L+1}\right) L_I + r \left(1 - \frac{TCB}{K}\right) L_I
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

166 The parameter interpretations are:  $\alpha$  is the transfer rate of the antibiotic resistant gene;  $\beta$   
 167 is the loss rate of the antibiotic resistant gene;  $r$  is the demographic rate due to the river  
 168 carrying capacity;  $F_S(t)$  and  $F_I(t)$  are the rates of bacteria entering the river from the shore;  
 169 and  $\gamma$  is the death rate due to the land bacteria not being adapted to survive in the river.  
 170 The parameter interpretations, along with their dimensions, are also presented in Table 1.  
 171 (In Table 1, AR is used as an abbreviation for antibiotic resistant). We assume that the land  
 172 bacteria death rate  $\gamma$  is large enough to offset any population growth that occurs due to the  
 173 river carrying capacity; specifically, when  $\gamma > r$  any reproduction, mathematically due to  
 174 the carrying capacity term, will be offset by the bacterial death due to not being adapted to  
 175 survive in the river.

176 It is easy to verify that the non-negative state space is invariant, that is, any initial  
 177 condition (a set of four population levels) that is non-negative results in population levels  
 178 that are non-negative for all time.

### 179 3. Model Simulation

180 The mathematical model presented here can qualitatively and quantitatively describe the  
 181 distribution of antibiotic resistant bacteria in a river effected by bacteria entering the river  
 182 from the shore, and the subsequent transfer and loss of the antibiotic resistant gene.

183 We demonstrate the model with a simulation of antibiotic resistant and non-antibiotic re-  
 184 sistant land bacteria entering a river which initially has no antibiotic resistant bacteria. Most  
 185 model parameters are determined from literature on survival and reproduction of bacteria in  
 186 rivers, and on transfer and loss of antibiotic resistant genes in rivers. The parameter values  
 187 used in our simulations and their corresponding references are given Table 2. For parameters

188  $r$  and  $\gamma$  the values were determined using information on the half-life of bacteria in rivers  
189 found in Hendricks (1972) and the model developed for the Ohio River by LimnoTech (2001),  
190 respectively. The transfer rate  $\alpha$  applies in situations when the water (river specifically) is  
191 dilute; it was taken from Andrup and Anderson (1999) who assume that time is measured  
192 in hours. The antibiotic resistance loss rate is known to be higher in less polluted water  
193 (Gonzalo et al., 1989). Thus we set the loss rate to be a function of pollution, in the model  
194 pollution is represented by the land bacteria. If the pollution reaches 0, then the loss rate  
195 is  $\beta = 100$ , while if the pollution is at the river carrying capacity, then the loss rate is very  
196 small, 0.0001. We assume a river carrying capacity of 1,000,000. Before the influx of any  
197 land bacteria, the river is assume to contain only non-antibiotic resistant bacteria and these  
198 bacteria have reached the carrying capacity, that is,  $R_S(0) = K$ ,  $R_I(0) = 0$ ,  $L_S(0) = 0$ , and  
199  $L_I(0) = 0$ .

200 To simulate the influx of land bacteria into the river, we assume that the bacteria enter  
201 the river from the shore at four distinct times, evenly spaced over the length of the river.  
202 At each of these influx times, the rate of influx of antibiotic resistant bacteria was chosen  
203 randomly to be between 0 and 25. The rate of influx of non-antibiotic resistant bacteria was  
204 also chosen randomly to be between 0 and 50, with the condition that the rate of influx of  
205 non-antibiotic resistant bacteria is larger than the influx of antibiotic resistant bacteria. The  
206 fact that  $F_S > F_I$  corresponds with data collected from the Mud River, WV (Dotson, 2008).  
207 At all other integer points, the influx is set to zero. The functions  $F_S(t)$  and  $F_I(t)$  are linear  
208 interpolations of these point sources.

209 Two different simulations are presented in Figures 2 and 3. In both of these simulations,  
210 the same bacteria influx functions are used, while two different time intervals are considered.  
211 The first has total time 100 and the second has time 1,000. In the first case, there is too  
212 much pollution and, if the simulation were to continue, all of the bacteria in the river will  
213 eventually have the antibiotic resistance gene. Most of the bacteria will be river bacteria,  
214  $R_I$ , though some will be land bacteria,  $L_I$ . In the second case, the river has enough time  
215 between the influx times for most antibiotic resistant bacteria to lose the antibiotic resistant  
216 gene. Between each influx, the river recovers and most bacteria are non-antibiotic resistant  
217 river bacteria,  $R_S$ .

218 Using these parameters and influx functions, and both of the time scales, a local parame-  
219 ter sensitivity analysis was performed for the model. Each parameter was adjusted by  $\pm 20\%$   
220 (the functions  $F_S$  and  $F_I$  were considered together as one parameter and were adjusted up  
221 or down together) and the effect of this change was studied graphically. For all populations  
222 and both time scales, the river carrying capacity rate,  $r$ , is the least influential parameter  
223 of the model, having no effect on the population levels throughout the entire simulation(s).  
224 Each of the other parameters,  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $K$ ,  $\gamma$ , and the functions  $F_S$  and  $F_I$ , was more influential  
225 on the longer time scale 1000 than on the shorter time scale 100.

226 For the shorter time scale, the number of non-antibiotic resistant river bacteria,  $R_S$ ,  
227 was overall the least influenced population, the population tends to 0 in every case, while  
228 the number of non-antibiotic resistant land bacteria was the most influenced population.  
229 Figure 4 shows the effect of the parameter sensitivity analysis on the non-antibiotic resistant  
230 land bacteria,  $L_S$ , on the shorter time scale. For the longer time scale,  $R_S$ ,  $R_I$ , and  $L_S$   
231 were very influenced by changes in all parameters, except  $r$ , while  $L_I$  was only influenced by  
232 changes in  $\gamma$  and the influx functions. Figure 5 shows the effect of the parameter sensitivity  
233 analysis on the non-antibiotic resistant river bacteria,  $R_S$ , on the longer time scale.

#### 234 4. Discussion

235 The model presented here is, by its very definition, a generalization of the actual processes  
236 that effect the amount and distribution of antibiotic resistant cultivable bacteria in rivers. We  
237 focus here on three aspects of antibiotic resistant bacteria in rivers: the influx of bacteria into  
238 the river from the shore, the transfer and loss of the antibiotic resistant gene, and the river  
239 carrying capacity. The model presented captures these aspects well and, by making some  
240 simplifying assumptions, the model uses only five parameters and the unknown functions  $F_S$   
241 and  $F_I$ .

242 The model simulations demonstrate that human involvement can have a significant influ-  
243 ence on the level of antibiotic resistance of bacteria in rivers. After each of the land bacteria  
244 influx points, the level of antibiotic resistant river bacteria increases, while the non-antibiotic  
245 resistant river bacteria decreases. And, only with sufficient time between influxes, can the  
246 bacteria lose the antibiotic resistant gene and the river recover. Sources of antibiotic resis-  
247 tance entering rivers must be determined and the corresponding activity adjusted to prevent  
248 the resistance gene from becoming typical in a river. Without such interventions, antibi-  
249 otic resistance will spread and clinical uses of antibiotics may become ineffective, leading to  
250 serious public health crises.

251 There are aspects of the transfer of the antibiotic resistant gene between bacteria that  
252 are not captured by this model. For example, we assume (implicitly) that when a bacterium  
253 ‘dies’ it can no longer transmit the antibiotic resistant gene to another bacterium. In reality,  
254 some bacterial death can cause pieces of a bacterium’s cell makeup to disperse into the river,  
255 where it is possible for some other organisms to collect these dispersed pieces, including  
256 the antibiotic resistant gene. For another example, some researchers distinguish between  
257 antibiotic resistant (in the clinical sense) and weakly antibiotic resistant; this distinction  
258 does not appear in the model presented here, though extra population classes would be easy  
259 to add to the model for to separate clinical resistance from weakly resistant. Despite its  
260 limitations, we believe that the model captures some crucial aspects regarding the dynamics



261 of antibiotic resistant bacteria in rivers, specifically involving human use of antibiotics near  
262 rivers.

263 In this paper, we offer a model which is only a preliminary formalism of the river and  
264 antibiotic resistance situation, however, we believe that the main aspects of the situation have  
265 been accounted for in this model. This novel model opens a wide range of possible future  
266 directions for ecological study. The model and model simulations suggest some insights  
267 and refinements of the model, which will lead to better understanding of the count and  
268 distribution of antibiotic resistant bacteria in rivers.

- 269 1. Due to the uncertainty of the influx of the land bacteria and the sensitivity of the  
270 model to the influx functions  $F_S(t)$  and  $F_I(t)$ , care must be taken when these functions  
271 are determined. Studies have shown that activity along the shore, such as farming  
272 row crops, livestock pastures, and the presence of urban areas, has a strong positive  
273 correlation with the amount of antibiotic resistant bacteria are in the river (Dotson,  
274 2008). Assessing this dependence and using the relationship to generate accurate influx  
275 functions needs to be addressed.
- 276 2. Most rivers changes size, both width across and depth, throughout their length, which  
277 leads to the conclusion that the carrying capacity should be a function of the length  
278 of the river, time  $t$  in this model. For a given river, some measure of carrying capacity  
279 must be found and measured along the length of the river, and used to create a river  
280 carrying capacity function  $K(t)$  that depends on location along the river.
- 281 3. One obvious refinement would be to include spatial aspects in the model. Here we  
282 assume, basically, that the river is one dimensional; it just has a length, which cor-  
283 responds to time in the model. In the river, bacteria homogeneously mix, and all  
284 bacteria in the cohort at time  $t$  travel down the river together. From the shore, the  
285 land bacteria immediately enter the river and mix with the bacteria already present.  
286 A more realistic model would include the spatial spread of the bacteria from the shore,  
287 and the possibility of spreading down the river at different rates, not traveling together  
288 as a cohort.

289 We assert that this model could be generalized to any situation with non-native organisms  
290 entering an environment that they are not adapted to live in and their subsequent interactions  
291 with the native organisms. The transfer and loss mechanism could apply to many genetic  
292 traits, including, possibly, those responsible for reduction and oxidation of metals. The main  
293 environmental requirement that is assumed in this model for the interactions is homogeneous  
294 mixing of the organisms. Any environment that ensured homogeneous mixing, would be  
295 suitable for this model.

296 **5. References**

297 **References**

- 298 Andrup, L., Andersen, K., Boe, L., 1998. Kinetics of conjugative transfer: A study of the  
299 plasmid pXO16 from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. *israelnsis*. Plasmid 40, 30–43.
- 300 Andrup, L., Anderson, K., 1999. A comparison of the kinetics of plasmid transfer in the  
301 conjugation systems encoded by the F plasmid from *Escherichia coli* and plasmid pCF10  
302 from *Enterococcus faecalis*. Microbiology 145, 2001–2009.
- 303 Armstrong, J. L., Shigeno, D. S., Calomiris, J. J., Seidler, R. J., August 1981. Antibiotic-  
304 resistant bacteria in drinking water. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 42 (2),  
305 277–283.
- 306 Ash, R. J., Mauck, B., Morgan, M., July 2002. Antibiotic resistance of gram-negative bacteria  
307 in rivers, United States. Emerging Infectious Diseases 8 (7), 713–716.
- 308 Bartholomew, M., Chiller, T., Fedorka-Cray, P., Hayes, J., Hall-Robinson, E., Kamara, I.,  
309 Karp, B., McDermott, P., Powers, J., Robens, J., Rushin, G., Tollefson, L., White, D.,  
310 Youngman, L., March 31, 2006. National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System  
311 (NARMS) internal review and recommendations.
- 312 Bennett, J., Kramer, G., May 30–June 3, 1999. Multidrug resistant strains of bacteria in  
313 the streams of Dubuque County, Iowa (abstract N-86). Abstracts of the 99th General  
314 Meeting of the American Society for Microbiology. American Society for Microbiology, p.  
315 464, Chicago, IL.
- 316 Boon, P. I., Cattanach, M., 1999. Antibiotic resistance of native and faecal bacteria isolated  
317 from rivers, reservoirs and sewage treatment facilities in Victoria, southeastern Australia.  
318 Letters in Applied Microbiology 28, 164–168.
- 319 Bren, L., July–August 2002. Battle of the bugs: Fighting antibiotic resistance. FDA Con-  
320 sumer Magazine 36.
- 321 Cooke, M. D., 1976. Antibiotic resistance in coliform and fecal coliform bacteria from natural  
322 water and effluents. New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 10 (3), 391–  
323 397.
- 324 Dawson, H. M., Hobby, G. L., Meyer, K., Chaffee, E., 1941. Penicillin as a chemotherapeutic  
325 agent. Journal of Clinical Investigation 20, 434.

- 326 D'Costa, V. M., McGrann, K. M., Hughes, D. W., Wright, G. D., January 20, 2006. Sampling  
327 the antibiotic resistome. *Science* 311 (5759), 374–377.
- 328 Dotson, T. S., 2008. Factors that influence the distribution of antibiotic resistant bacteria in  
329 the Mud River, WV. Master's thesis, Marshall University.
- 330 Frank, H., 2005. The effect of residential and agricultural runoff on the microbiology of a  
331 Hawaiian ahupua'a. *Water Environment Research* 75, 2988–2995.
- 332 Gonzalo, M. P., Arribas, R. M., Latorre, E., Baquero, F., Martinez, J. L., 1989. Sewage  
333 dilution and loss of antibiotic resistance and virulence determinants in *E. coli*. *Microbiology*  
334 *Letters* 59, 93–96.
- 335 Grossman, C. M., 2008. The first use of penicillin in the United States. *Annals of Internal*  
336 *Medicine* 149 (2), 135–136.
- 337 Hendricks, C. W., 1972. Enteric bacterial growth rates in river water. *Applied Microbiology*  
338 24 (2), 168–174.
- 339 Kelch, W. J., Lee, J. S., September 1978. Antibiotic resistance patterns of gram-negative  
340 bacteria isolated from environmental sources. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*  
341 36 (3), 450–456.
- 342 Kuhn, I., Iversen, A., Finn, M., Greko, C., Burman, L. G., Blanch, A. R., Vilanova, X.,  
343 Manero, A., Taylor, H., Caplin, J., Dominguez, L., Herrero, I. A., Moreno, M. A., Molby,  
344 R., September 2005. Occurrence and relatedness of vancomycin-resistant enterococci in an-  
345 imals, humans, and the environment in different european regions. *Applied Environmental*  
346 *Microbiology* 71, 5383–5390.
- 347 Levin, B. R., Stewart, F. M., Rice, V. A., 1979. The kinetics of conjugative plasmid trans-  
348 mission: Fit of a simple mass action model. *Plasmid* 2, 247–260.
- 349 Lewis, R., September 1995. The rise of antibiotic-resistant infections. *FDA Consumer Mag-*  
350 *azine*.
- 351 LimnoTech, 2001. Modeling the impact of CSOs on river bacteria levels.  
352 URL [www.limno.com/technology/louis.html](http://www.limno.com/technology/louis.html)
- 353 Mahloch, J. L., February 1974. Comparative analysis of modeling techniques for coliform  
354 organisms in streams. *Applied Microbiology* 27 (2), 340–345.

- 355 McArthur, J. V., Tuckfield, R. C., September 2000. Spatial patterns in antibiotic resistance  
356 among stream bacteria: Effects of industrial pollution. *Applied Environmental Microbiol-*  
357 *ogy* 66, 3722–3726.
- 358 Nagy, R. F., Swecker, C. N., Somerville, C. C., May 17–21, 2009. Are antibiotic resistant  
359 bacteria present in tap water? 109th General Meeting of the American Society for Micro-  
360 biology. American Society for Microbiology, Philadelphia, PA.
- 361 Niemi, M., Sibakov, M., Niemela, S., January 1983. Antibiotic resistance among different  
362 species of fecal coliforms isolated from water samples. *Applied and Environmental Micro-*  
363 *biology* 45 (1), 79–83.
- 364 ORSANCO, 2008. Annual report 2008. Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission.  
365 URL [www.orsanco.org/index.php/annual-report](http://www.orsanco.org/index.php/annual-report)
- 366 Parascandola, J., 1997. The introduction of antibiotics into therapeutics. In: Leavitt, J. W.,  
367 Numbers, R. L. (Eds.), *Sickness and Health in America*, 3rd Edition. University of Wis-  
368 consin Press, pp. 102–112, Madison, WI.
- 369 Raloff, J., June 1999. Waterways carry antibiotic resistance. *Science News* 155 (23), 365.
- 370 Smith, L., 2006. Antibiotic resistant and coliform bacteria in the Ohio River; 2002 to 2004.  
371 Master’s thesis, Marshall University.
- 372 Somerville, C. C., Smith, L. M., Loughman, K. R., Johnson, A. N., May 23 – 27, 2004.  
373 Antibiotic resistant and fecal coliform bacteria in the Ohio River: Comparisons to land use  
374 patterns, August 2003. 104th General Meeting of the American Society for Microbiology.  
375 American Society for Microbiology, New Orleans, LA.
- 376 Somerville, C. C., Sweeney, A. P., Chadwick, S. L., Dotson, T. S., September 17–18, 2007.  
377 Antibiotic-resistant bacteria in the Ohio River are not a subset of fecal indicator bacteria.  
378 *Science, Technology, and Research (STaR) Symposium*, Morgantown, WV.
- 379 Webb, G. F., D’Agata, E. M. C., Magal, P., Ruan, S., 2005. A model of antibiotic-resistant  
380 bacterial epidemics in hospitals. *PNAS* 102 (37), 13343–13348.




Figure 1: Schematic representation of the model assumptions. The dotted lines indicate bacteria entering the river from the shore. The dashed lines indicate interactions between bacteria which cause a transfer of the antibiotic resistant gene. The solid lines indicate the transfer or loss of the antibiotic resistant gene, reproduction, and death. The land bacteria are not adapted to the river and we assume they never reproduce. The river bacteria reproduce or die due to the influence of the river carrying capacity. Details are provided throughout the main text.

Parameter	Description	Dimension
$t$	time from head of the river	time
$R_S$	non-AR river bacteria	concentration
$R_I$	AR river bacteria	concentration
$L_S$	non-AR land bacteria	concentration
$L_I$	AR land bacteria	concentration
$TCB$	$R_S + R_I + L_S + L_I$	concentration
$\alpha$	transmission rate of AR gene	$\text{time}^{-1} \times \text{concentration}^{-1}$
$\beta$	loss rate of AR gene	$\text{concentration} \times \text{time}^{-1}$
$K$	carrying capacity of river	concentration
$r$	birth-death rate due to $K$	$\text{time}^{-1}$
$F_S$	entry of non-AR bacteria from land	$\text{concentration} \times \text{time}^{-1}$
$F_I$	entry of AR bacteria from land	$\text{concentration} \times \text{time}^{-1}$
$\gamma$	death rate of land bacteria	$\text{time}^{-1}$

Table 1: Parameters, descriptions, and dimensions

Parameter	Value	Reference
$\alpha$	0.00006	Andrup and Anderson (1999)
$\beta$	100	
$K$	1,000,000	
$r$	0.01	Hendricks (1972)
$\gamma$	0.02	LimnoTech (2001)

Table 2: Parameter values and references. Parameters without a reference were fixed from a reasonable range of possibilities for the simulations.




Figure 2: Simulation of the populations of bacteria in a river with influx of bacteria from the land, over the time interval 0 to 100.




Figure 3: Simulation of the populations of bacteria in a river with influx of bacteria from the land, over the time interval 0 to 1000.






Figure 4: Parameter sensitivities - effect on non-antibiotic land bacteria,  $L_S$ . Solid curve corresponds to the default parameter values; dashed curve corresponds to an increase in the parameter value by a factor of 20%, while keeping all other parameters at their default value; dotted curve corresponds to a decrease in the parameter value by a factor of 20%, while keeping all other parameters at their default value.




Figure 5: Parameter sensitivities - effect on non-antibiotic river bacteria,  $R_S$ . Solid curve corresponds to the default parameter values; dashed curve corresponds to an increase in the parameter value by a factor of 20%, while keeping all other parameters at their default value; dotted curve corresponds to a decrease in the parameter value by a factor of 20%, while keeping all other parameters at their default value.