

LSHTM Research Online

Leclerc, Quentin J; Lindsay, Jodi A; Knight, Gwenan M; (2019) Mathematical modelling to study the horizontal transfer of antimicrobial resistance genes in bacteria: current state of the field and recommendations. Journal of The Royal Society Interface, 16 (157). p. 20190260. ISSN 1742-5689 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2019.0260

Downloaded from: http://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/4653972/

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2019.0260

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at https://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk/policies.html or alternatively contact researchonline@lshtm.ac.uk.

Available under license: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/

https://researchonline.lshtm.ac.uk

1 Mathematical modelling to study the horizontal transfer of antimicrobial

2 resistance genes in bacteria: current state of the field and recommendations

3

4 Authors: Quentin J. Leclerc^{1*}, Jodi A. Lindsay², Gwenan M. Knight¹

5

6 <u>Affiliations:</u>

¹ Centre for Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases, Department of Infectious Disease
 Epidemiology, Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical
 Medicine, London, UK

10 ² Institute for Infection and Immunity, St George's University of London, London, UK

11 *Corresponding author: quentin.leclerc@lshtm.ac.uk

12

13 ABSTRACT

14 Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is one of the greatest public health challenges we are currently facing. 15 To develop effective interventions against this, it is essential to understand the processes behind the 16 spread of AMR. These are partly dependent on the dynamics of horizontal transfer of resistance genes 17 between bacteria, which can occur by conjugation (direct contact), transformation (uptake from the environment) or transduction (mediated by bacteriophages). Mathematical modelling is a powerful 18 19 tool to investigate the dynamics of AMR, however the extent of its use to study the horizontal transfer 20 of AMR genes is currently unclear. In this systematic review, we searched for mathematical modelling 21 studies which focused on horizontal transfer of AMR genes. We compared their aims and methods 22 using a list of predetermined criteria, and utilised our results to assess the current state of this 23 research field. Of the 43 studies we identified, most focused on the transfer of single genes by 24 conjugation in Escherichia coli in culture, and its impact on the bacterial evolutionary dynamics. Our 25 findings highlight the existence of an important research gap on the dynamics of transformation and 26 transduction, and the overall public health implications of horizontal transfer of AMR genes. To further 27 develop this field and improve our ability to control AMR, it is essential that we clarify the structural 28 complexity required to study the dynamics of horizontal gene transfer, which will require cooperation 29 between microbiologists and modellers.

30

31 Keywords:

Antimicrobial resistance, horizontal gene transfer, mathematical modelling, epidemiology,microbiology

34 INTRODUCTION

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is undeniably one of the greatest global public health challenges we 35 36 are currently facing [1]. The recent discoveries on the spread of resistance genes for key antimicrobials 37 such as NDM-1 for carbapenem resistance [2–4] suggest that to tackle this challenge, instead of only 38 studying the spread of resistant bacteria, we must understand the processes by which individual 39 resistance genes spread. The first is "vertical gene transfer", where genes are passed from parent to 40 progeny during bacterial replication. The second, which is our focus here, is "horizontal gene transfer" 41 (HGT). This allows bacteria to acquire genetic material, including AMR genes, from their environment 42 or other bacteria [5–7]. There are three mechanisms of HGT. Firstly, "transformation" is the capacity 43 of bacteria to intake genetic material from their environment. Secondly, "conjugation" occurs when two bacteria come into contact with each other and form a conjugative bridge, enabling direct 44 exchange of genetic material. Finally, "transduction" occurs when a bacteriophage (a virus that can 45 46 infect bacteria) replicates and packages a bacterial gene instead of its own genetic material, then acts 47 as a vector and transfers this gene into another bacterium.

48 The consequences of HGT of AMR in a bacterial population are varied and can change depending on 49 the setting that this process occurs in. Firstly, HGT can often be at the origin of new combinations of 50 resistances to multiple antimicrobials in single bacteria strains [8]. This is amplified by the fact that 51 HGT can occur both intra- and inter-species [9], therefore allowing for mixing between many different 52 gene pools. Fortunately, these resistance mechanisms often impose a fitness cost which reduces the 53 competitiveness of bacteria with AMR genes in settings where antibiotics are absent [10], thereby 54 limiting the increase in the prevalence of these bacteria in the environment. Studying HGT of AMR can 55 be further complicated by differences in transfer rates and importance of transfer mechanisms 56 between bacterial species [11], with transformation for example being rare for *Staphylococcus aureus* 57 [12] but common for Neisseria gonorrhoea [13], and by differences between rates estimated in-vitro 58 and in-vivo, as was seen with transduction in Staphylococcus aureus [14] and conjugation in Klebsiella 59 pneumoniae and Escherichia coli [15]. Lastly, HGT dynamics appear to vary depending on the presence 60 or absence of antibiotics in the surrounding environment [16–20], therefore requiring studies to be 61 conducted in multiple settings to fully capture this process.

It is essential to fully understand HGT of AMR since it can impact the overall transmission of AMR, and 62 63 therefore the predicted effect of interventions against bacterial infections, to varying degrees 64 depending on the setting. A most striking example of this is phage therapy, where bacteriophages are 65 proposed as antimicrobials. A risk is that therapeutic phages could perform transduction and increase 66 the proportion of bacteria in the patient that carry a resistance gene. In that case, if the phage therapy 67 treatment fails to clear all the bacteria this could leave the patient at a higher risk of antimicrobialresistant bacteria infection [21,22]. In addition to the aforementioned differences between bacterial 68 69 species, HGT mechanisms themselves are biologically complex. For example, the capacity to form a 70 conjugative bridge generally requires the presence of a specific set of "tra" genes [23]. These can 71 themselves be transferred, leading to an increase through time in the prevalence of bacteria that can 72 perform conjugation. Transformation gene expression is extremely variable depending on the 73 environmental conditions that bacteria are exposed to [6], therefore we cannot realistically assume 74 that bacteria are able to perform transformation at all times. Finally, some phages can either undergo 75 a "lytic cycle", where they immediately replicate upon infecting a bacterium, or a "lysogenic cycle",

where they first integrate into the bacterial genome for a variable duration [12]. Consequently,
 transduction dynamics can be further complicated by the characteristics of the phage life cycle.

78 HGT is therefore complex in its dynamics, and studying these requires appropriate tools. Mathematical 79 modelling is often used to study infectious disease processes [24]. It provides a simulation 80 environment that can be informed by real-life data, in which dynamics can be disentangled and easily 81 studied. Mathematical models can be split into "deterministic models", which always generate the 82 same results for a given set of parameter values [24], and "stochastic models", which generate 83 variability in their results using random events [24]. Mathematical modelling is already being used to 84 study AMR dynamics and their public health implications [25,26]. For example, it has been employed 85 to study within-host bacterial dynamics (i.e. the bacterial processes that occur during colonisation or 86 infection of a host) and derive conclusions on patterns of AMR seen in the host population [27]. 87 Consequently, it can provide novel insight into optimal strategies to combat AMR spread by analysing 88 the effect that these have on the transmission dynamics [28]. However, existing models may not 89 always capture the relevant and complex microbiological dynamics of HGT. In this systematic review, 90 we aimed to find modelling studies which focus on HGT of AMR, to record their methods and research 91 questions, and hence, to identify potential research gaps and areas for improvement in this field.

92 METHODS

- 93 The methodology of our systematic review follows the recommended PRISMA guidelines [29].
- 94 Inclusion criteria:
- 95 In order to be included in this review, studies had to fulfil all of the following criteria:
- 96 1) Study the horizontal transfer of genes between bacteria
- 97 2) The genes studied must explicitly be identified as genes encoding antimicrobial resistance
- 98 3) Use at least one dynamic population model. A model is "dynamic" if it tracks the changes in
 99 the number of bacteria belonging to various populations (e.g. antibiotic-resistant and
- 100 susceptible bacteria) over time
- 101 <u>Screening process:</u>
- 102 The entire screening process is summarised in Figure 1. We searched two databases on the 26th of 103 April 2019 using the following terms:
- PubMed search: "(antimicrobial OR antibacterial OR antibiotic) resist* AND (horizontal transfer OR mobile genetic element OR plasmid OR transformation OR conjugation OR transduction OR phage) AND (math* OR dynamic*) model*", 171 results
- Web of Science search: "TS = ((antimicrobial OR antibacterial OR antibiotic) resist* AND
 (horizontal transfer OR mobile genetic element OR plasmid OR transformation OR
 conjugation OR transduction OR phage) AND (math* OR dynamic*) model*)", 185 results
- After removal of duplicates, these combined searches yielded a list of 272 studies. Both QL and GK
- independently screened the titles and abstracts of all 272 studies. 54 studies were retained by both
- authors, and two more were discussed and retained after an additional screen of the methods due to
- uncertainty, leading to a total of 56 studies retained after the first screening step.
- 114 The full texts of these 56 studies were then screened by QL, leading to 34 studies being retained as
- relevant for this review. Finally, by screening the reference lists in these 34 studies, nine more were included, leading to a total of 43 studies to discuss in this review.



Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram of the search and exclusion process.

120 Information extracted from the included studies:

121 To maximise comparability between studies, we devised a list of 11 elements to extract from every

122 study. These are summarised and explained in Table 1.

- **Table 1.** Elements recorded from all included studies. Where no "Possible values" are given in the
- table, this indicates that the values were not restricted to a predetermined list.

Transfer mechanismBiological mechanism of horizontal gene transfer modelled"Conjugation" or "Transformation" or "Transformation" "Fourial population, or to understand its impact on public health, or bothBacterial environment Antibiotic effect consideredAny environment which contained bacteria in the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Experimental" and/or "External" and/or "External" and/or "Stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model]Type of modelWhether t	RECORDED ELEMENT	SIGNIFICATION	POSSIBLE VALUES	
horizontal gene transfer modelled"Transformation" or "Transduction"BacteriaAny species of bacteria explicitly modelled-Aim of the studyWhether the study looked at gene transfer to understand evolutionary trends seen in the bacterial population, or to understand its impact on public health, or both"Evolutionary" or "Public Health" or "Both"Bacterial environmentAny environment which contained bacteria in the model-Antibiotic effect consideredWhether the model(s) tracked model(s)"Yes" or "No"Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost of resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic, or obth (if the study presented more than one model)Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic," or "Sampled" "Deterministic," or "Sampled"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic," or "Sampled" "Deterministic," or "Sampled from distributions before each model run"Yes" or "No"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Deterministic" or "Sampled"	Transfer mechanism	Biological mechanism of	"Conjugation" or	
modelled"Transduction"BacteriaAny species of bacteria explicitly modelled-Aim of the studyWhether the study looked at gene transfer to understand evolutionary trends seen in the bacterial population, or to understand its impact on public health, or both"Evolutionary" or "Public Health" or "Both"Bacterial environmentAny environment which contained bacteria in the model-Antibiotic effect considered consideredWhether one or more antibiotic(s) were present in the model(s)"Yes" or "No"Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Both"Type of modelIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic," whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		horizontal gene transfer	"Transformation" or	
BacteriaAny species of bacteria explicitly modelled-Aim of the studyWhether the study looked at gene transfer to understand evolutionary trends seen in the bacterial population, or to understand its impact on public health, or both"Evolutionary" or "Public Health" or "Both"Bacterial environmentAny environment which contained bacteria in the model-Antibiotic effect consideredWhether one or more antibiotic(s) were present in the model(s)"Yes" or "No"Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic, or with"Type of modelIf the model(s) structure of the model(s) structure was "Deterministic, or stochastic, or obth (if the study presented more than one model)"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Stochastic" or "Stochastic" or "Stochastic, or obth (if the study parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		modelled	"Transduction"	
Aim of the studymodelled"Evolutionary" or "Public Health" or "Both"Aim of the studyWhether the study looked at gene transfer to understand evolutionary trends seen in the bacterial population, or to understand its impact on public health, or bothHealth" or "Both"Bacterial environmentAny environment which contained bacteria in the model-Antibiotic effect considered understand (s) were present in the model(s)"Yes" or "No"Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)Type of modelWhether the study performed and (s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Constant" or "Sampled"Type of parameter valuesWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis performed"Yes" or "No"	Bacteria	Any species of bacteria explicitly	-	
Aim of the studyWhether the study looked at gene transfer to understand evolutionary trends seen in the bacterial population, or to understand its impact on public health, or both"Evolutionary" or "Public Health" or "Both"Bacterial environmentAny environment which contained bacteria in the model-Antibiotic effect considered consideredWhether one or more antibiotic(s) were present in the model(s)"Yes" or "No"Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene"Experimental" and/or "Experimental" and/or "External" and/or "Assumed"Source of model parameters values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Both"Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		modelled		
gene transfer to understand evolutionary trends seen in the bacterial population, or to understand its impact on public health, or bothHealth" or "Both"Bacterial environmentAny environment which contained bacteria in the model-Antibiotic effect consideredWhether one or more antibiotic(s) were present in the model(s)-Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost of resistance gene"Experimental" and/or "Experimental" data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Both"Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"	Aim of the study	Whether the study looked at	"Evolutionary" or "Public	
evolutionary trends seen in the bacterial population, or to understand its impact on public health, or bothBacterial environmentAny environment which contained bacteria in the model-Antibiotic effect considered antibiotic(s) were present in the model(s)-Multiple resistances consideredWhether one or more antibiotic(s) were present in the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or "Deterministic, or "Stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Constant" or "Sampled"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic," whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Yes" or "No"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		gene transfer to understand	Health" or "Both"	
bacterial population, or to understand its impact on public health, or both-Bacterial environment Antibiotic effect consideredAny environment which contained bacteria in the model-Antibiotic effect considered antibiotic(s) were present in the model(s)-"Yes" or "No"Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Constant" or "Sampled"Type of parameter values iditributions before each model any type of sensitivity analysis performedIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic" or "No"		evolutionary trends seen in the		
understand its impact on public health, or both-Bacterial environmentAny environment which contained bacteria in the model-Antibiotic effect consideredWhether one or more antibiotic(s) were present in the model(s)"Yes" or "No"Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene"Experimental" and/or "Experimental" and/or "External" and/or "Assumed"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Both"Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Constant" or "Sampled"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Yes" or "No"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		bacterial population, or to		
health, or both-Bacterial environmentAny environment which contained bacteria in the model-Antibiotic effect consideredWhether one or more antibiotic(s) were present in the model(s)"Yes" or "No"Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Both"Type of modelIf the model(s) structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Constant" or "Sampled"Type of parameter values us parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Yes" or "No"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		understand its impact on public		
Bacterial environment Any environment which contained bacteria in the model - Antibiotic effect considered Whether one or more antibiotic(s) were present in the model(s) "Yes" or "No" Multiple resistances considered Whether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately "Yes" or "No" Fitness cost of resistance considered Whether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene "Yes" or "No" Source of model parameters Whether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values "Experiministic" or "Stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model) Type of model If the model(s) structure was "Deterministic, or were sampled from distributions before each model run "Constant" or "Sampled" Sensitivity analysis performed Whether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter "Yes" or "No"		health, or both		
Antibiotic effect considered antibiotic (s) were present in the model(s)"Yes" or "No"Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic," or "Both"Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Constant" or "Sampled"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic" or "Stochastic," or were sampled from distributions before each model"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"	Bacterial environment	Any environment which	-	
Antibiotic effect consideredWhether one or more antibiotic(s) were present in the model(s)"Yes" or "No"Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)Type of modelIf the model(s) structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Constant" or "Sampled"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Sampled""Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		contained bacteria in the model		
antibiotic(s) were present in the model(s)antibiotic(s) were present in the model(s)"Yes" or "No"Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parameters values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Experimentistic" or "Stochastic" or "Both"Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Constant" or "Sampled"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Constant" or "No"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"	Antibiotic effect considered	Whether one or more	"Yes" or "No"	
Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic, or of "Both"Type of modelIf the model(s) structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Constant" or "Sampled"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Yes" or "No"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		antibiotic(s) were present in the		
Multiple resistances consideredWhether the model(s) tracked multiple resistance genes that could be transferred separately"Yes" or "No"Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)Type of modelIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic, or whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model model from distributions before each model mut yupe of sensitivity analysis performed"Yes" or "No"		model(s)		
consideredmultiple resistance genes that could be transferred separatelyFitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"External" and/or "Assumed"Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Stochastic" or "Stochastic," or were sampled from distributions before each model runSensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"	Multiple resistances	Whether the model(s) tracked	"Yes" or "No"	
could be transferred separatelyFitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"External" and/or "Assumed"Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Sampled"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"	considered	multiple resistance genes that		
Fitness cost of resistance consideredWhether the model(s) included a fitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance gene"Yes" or "No"Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"External" and/or "Assumed"Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Sampled"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Constant" or "No"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		could be transferred separately		
consideredfitness cost for bacteria carrying a resistance geneSource of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Experimental" and/or "Assumed"Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Sompled"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"	Fitness cost of resistance	Whether the model(s) included a	"Yes" or "No"	
resistance geneSource of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"External" and/or "Assumed"Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Both"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"	considered	fitness cost for bacteria carrying a		
Source of model parametersWhether the study also generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"External" and/or "Assumed"Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Stochastic" or "Stochastic" or "Stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		resistance gene		
generated its own experimental data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"External" and/or "Assumed"Type of modelWhether thes values (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Both"Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Constant" or "Sampled"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Yes" or "No"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"	Source of model parameters	Whether the study also	"Experimental" and/or	
data to support its parameter values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" orType of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Deterministic" or "Both"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		generated its own experimental	"External" and/or "Assumed"	
values, or chose values informed by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Both"Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Coterministic" or "Sompled"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Yes" or "No"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		data to support its parameter		
by previous studies (which could be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" orType of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Deterministic" or "Both"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysisWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		values, or chose values informed		
be experimental studies or not), or assumed values"Deterministic" orType of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Deterministic" or "Both"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		by previous studies (which could		
Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Deterministic" or "Both"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		be experimental studies or not),		
Type of modelWhether the structure of the model(s) was deterministic, or stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model)"Deterministic" or "Stochastic" or "Both"Type of parameter valuesIf the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run"Constant" or "Sampled"Sensitivity analysis performedWhether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter"Yes" or "No"		or assumed values	//-	
model(s) was deterministic, or "Stochastic" or "Both" stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model) "Constant" or "Sampled" Type of parameter values If the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run "Constant" or "Sampled" Sensitivity analysis performed Whether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter "Yes" or "No"	Type of model	Whether the structure of the	"Deterministic" or	
Stochastic, or both (if the study presented more than one model) Type of parameter values If the model(s) structure was "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run "Constant" or "Sampled" Sensitivity analysis Whether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter "Yes" or "No"		model(s) was deterministic, or	Stochastic of Both	
Type of parameter values If the model(s) structure was "Constant" or "Sampled" "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant "Constant" or "Sampled" or were sampled from distributions before each model "Unit the study performed Sensitivity analysis Whether the study performed "Yes" or "No" performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter		stochastic, or both (if the study		
Type of parameter values If the model(s) structure was Constant of sampled "Deterministic", whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run If the model(s) structure was Constant of sampled Sensitivity analysis Whether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter "Yes" or "No"	Turne of normation values	If the model(c) structure was	"Constant" or "Compled"	
Deterministic , whether the parameter values were constant or were sampled from distributions before each model run Sensitivity analysis Whether the study performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter	Type of parameter values	"Deterministic", whether the	Constant or Sampled	
Sensitivity analysis Whether the study performed "Yes" or "No" performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter		Deterministic, whether the		
Sensitivity analysis Whether the study performed "Yes" or "No" performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter		or wore compled from		
Sensitivity analysis Whether the study performed "Yes" or "No" performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter "Yes" or "No"		distributions before each model		
Sensitivity analysis Whether the study performed "Yes" or "No" performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter		run		
performed any type of sensitivity analysis of the effect of model parameter	Sensitivity analysis	Whather the study performed	"Ves" or "No"	
the effect of model parameter	nerformed	any type of sensitivity analysis of		
		the effect of model parameter		
values on the results		values on the results		

131 Note that in our analysis, "Type of parameter values" and "Sensitivity analysis performed" are two 132 independent criteria. We can therefore report that a study only uses "Constant" parameter values, 133 yet still performs a sensitivity analysis. If a study is reported to have "Sampled" parameters, this 134 means that the values of the parameters vary for each model run, and that this is represented in 135 the main results, with figures showing model output with ranges instead of single lines for 136 example. If a sensitivity analysis was performed, this means that the authors report conducting 137 such a procedure to support their findings (e.g. to argue that their choice of "Constant" parameter 138 values is a reasonable assumption, and does not significantly affect their results).

139 **<u>RESULTS</u>**

140 The table showing all of the recorded elements from the 43 included studies can be found in the141 Supplementary Material of this paper.

142 Firstly, when looking at the transfer mechanism modelled by these studies, we observe that almost all 143 exclusively focus on conjugation (40 out of 43) [30–69] (Figure 2). Of the remaining three, two focused 144 on transformation [70,71], and one on transduction [72]. Additionally, more than a third of the studies 145 (16/43) chose exclusively Escherichia coli (E. coli) as the bacteria in which to model the transfer 146 processes [30,34,36,41–46,52,53,59,64,66,68,72] (Figure 2). It is also worth noting that another third 147 of the studies (15/43) do not model a specific organism, and instead indicate that they are looking at 148 bacteria in general [31,32,37,38,48,51,54,56–58,61,62,65,67,69]. Finally, while eight studies applied their model to more than one bacterial species [33,35,39,40,47,49,60,63], only four of these modelled 149

- 150 two strains of bacteria simultaneously and captured inter-species transfer of resistance genes
- 151 [39,49,60,63].

152



153



155

In terms of the aims of these studies, all except eight [32,55,58,60,63-65,69] used modelling 156 157 approaches exclusively to improve the understanding of bacterial evolutionary dynamics (Figure 3). This covered questions such as how the prevalence of resistance genes in the bacterial population 158 159 changes over time (as in [34] for example), or how the rise of multi-drug resistant bacteria varied 160 under different environmental conditions (as in [30] for example). Inversely, the remaining eight studies [32,55,58,60,63–65,69] attempted to place at least some of their results in a public health 161 setting by, for example, quantifying the impact of transfer on the incidence of multi-drug resistant 162 163 bacteria infection in humans [32,69]. In accordance with this previous point, almost half of the studies 164 (20/43) modelled bacteria exclusively in culture [33-42,47,49,50,52,53,58,59,66,70,71], and only

- seven modelled bacteria in humans [30,32,55,60,63,65,69] (Figure 3). In the remaining studies, seven
- did not specify an environment for their bacteria [31,48,56,57,61,62,67].
- 167



168



170

Almost all of the studies included a bacterial fitness cost for the carriage of a resistance gene in their models (Table 2), except for six [32,42,48,63,66,71]. On the other hand, despite the fact that in reality bacteria can acquire multiple AMR genes independently (i.e. the acquisition of each gene is a separate HGT event), only four studies included this feature [30,32,60,69] (Table 2). Lastly, it is important to note that almost half of the studies did not model the presence of antibiotics, and therefore did not consider the effect of antibiotics on transfer rates [33–36,39–42,47,52,53,59,63,66,68,71,72] (Table 2).

178

179	Table 2. Summary of the presence	e or absence of model	characteristics in the 43 s	tudies we reviewed.
	, ,			

	Include antibiotic effect	Include multiple AMR genes	Include fitness cost	Include sensitivity analysis
Yes	26	4	37	29
No	17	39	6	14

181 Almost half of these modelling studies (19/43) included their own experimental work to generate data and estimate at least some parameter values for their models [33-36,39-42,47,49,51-182 54,59,66,68,70,71] (Figure 4). On the other hand, more than half (23/43) chose to assume the values 183 of at least some of their parameters, without explicitly citing any sources to support their choices, and 184 a quarter (12/43) assumed the values of all of their parameters [31,32,37,38,65,67]. Finally, a third 185 (15/43) used previous studies to obtain at least some of their parameter values. For these, except for 186 187 three studies (two of which were each the direct follow-up of another one on the same topic [44,50], 188 and one an analysis of data collected during an outbreak [63]), more than one previous study was 189 taken to estimate the value of parameters, with a median number of studies of 8 and a maximum of 190 42.

191



- 193 **Figure 4.** Sources of parameter values in the 43 studies included in our review. "Assume" (top,
- 194 green): no clear reference is given to support the choice of parameter value; "Experimental" (right,
- 195 orange): the study generated its own experimental data to support the choice of parameter value;
- 196 "External" (left, brown): the study references a previous study to support the choice of parameter
- 197 value. Studies in an overlap region used each of the corresponding methods at least once to
- 198 estimate the value of their parameters.
- 199

200 Finally, more than three quarters of the studies (33/43) exclusively relied on deterministic models to 201 obtain their results [30,32,34,36-40,42,43,45,47-51,53-56,58,59,61,63-69,71-73]. All of these 202 deterministic models were composed of a set of ordinary differential equations to track the different 203 sub-populations (susceptible bacteria, resistant bacteria etc...) through time. As for the ten studies 204 which relied on stochastic models [31,33,35,41,44,52,57,60,62,70], most of these were agent-based 205 models, where the bacteria were tracked individually [31,33,41,52,57,60], while the remaining ones 206 either used stochastic differential equations [44,62,70] or difference equations [35]. Out of the studies 207 which exclusively used deterministic models, only eight acknowledge variability in the parameter 208 values by running their model multiple times and sampling parameters from distributions instead of 209 assuming them to be constant [32,38,43,46,56,64,65,72]. Nevertheless, most studies performed 210 sensitivity analyses of the effect of their parameter values on their model results (Table 2). Overall, 211 nine studies still relied solely on a deterministic model without either sampling their parameter values 212 or performing sensitivity analyses [30,36,40,42,48,54,55,58,68]. We also noted that except for the one study on transduction [72], all the studies modelled transfer as a mass-action process. This assumes 213 214 that the number of transfer events is determined by multiplying the number of bacteria that can 215 receive the gene, the number of bacteria that can transfer the gene, and the rate at which transfer 216 occurs. This is therefore generally written as some form of β *S*R/N, where β is a rate of transfer, S is 217 the number of bacteria that can receive the resistance gene, R is the number of bacteria that can 218 provide the resistance gene, and N is the total bacterial population in the system.

219 DISCUSSION

We used a systematic literature review of mathematical models of horizontal gene transfer (HGT) to 220 221 determine our current understanding of the dynamics of HGT of AMR. The first main observation from 222 our results is that the majority of studies assessed only focus on HGT by conjugation (40 out of 43). 223 The likely reason for this is the simplicity of conjugation dynamics. Effectively, these are comparable 224 to infections transmitted upon contact, such as influenza, where established modelling exists using 225 mass-action dynamics [24]. Consequently, modelling conjugation does not require much complexity 226 to be added to these models. However, we know that transformation and transduction also contribute 227 to HGT [7,14] and the lack of studies on these mechanisms is worrying.

228 Conjugation, transformation and transduction fundamentally differ in their biology, making it essential 229 to study each of them in their own modelling framework; it is unknown whether models of conjugation 230 could be directly applied to transformation and transduction. When looking at the studies which attempted to model these two processes, we first see that the one which focused on transduction 231 232 [72] attempted to place it in a complex setting, with the phage able to undergo both lytic and lysogenic 233 cycle, and the possibility for some bacteria to be resistant to phage infection. Transduction is 234 represented as a multi-step process in this model, as opposed to relying on a single rate. The phage 235 must first successfully infect a bacterium, then pick up a resistance gene, before successfully 236 transferring this gene to a different bacterium. This model aims to accurately represent most of the 237 biological complexity of transduction, which necessarily requires many assumptions regarding 238 parameter values. Further study of this trade-off would be greatly beneficial; it is currently unclear 239 whether this complexity is required, at the cost of more assumptions, or if the process of transduction 240 could be simplified and modelled using fewer parameters, which could be estimated from 241 experimental data. The two studies which focused on transformation [70,71] applied similar mass-242 action dynamics to this process as what can be seen in models of conjugation. However, this approach 243 assumes that the number of resistance genes available in the environment is equivalent to the number 244 of bacteria carrying these genes. This is questionable, as we would only expect these genes to be 245 available in the environment after the bacteria die and release their genetic material; while it is 246 possible for bacteria to actively release their genetic material while still alive, the extent of this 247 phenomenon is unclear [6]. Further exploration of this assumption, and perhaps redesigns of model 248 structures for transformation would be of value.

E. coli is the most commonly studied model organism for bacteria in general [74]. Its rapid growth and 249 250 consistent behaviour in in-vitro settings make it amenable to experimental work, including transfer 251 studies, therefore its overwhelming presence as the organism of choice for studies modelling HGT of 252 AMR genes is not a surprise. However, HGT is known to occur with varying rates in multiple bacterial 253 species, consequently it is unlikely that the rates of transfer estimated by looking at E. coli are equally 254 applicable to other bacterial species [7]. In addition, HGT of AMR is a process that can also occur 255 between bacterial species [9,11], while most models here exclusively focused on E. coli alone. Some 256 resistances in bacterial species are in fact thought to have been originally acquired following a gene 257 transfer event with another species, such as the mecA resistance gene in Staphylococcus aureus 258 acquired from S. fleurettii [75].

Despite the fact that the carriage of an AMR gene often imposes a reduction in the growth rate of the
bacteria [10], a few studies did not model this (6/43), but only one argued that this element could be
ignored after fitting their model to experimental data [66]. However, this was once more only based

262 on observations in-vitro, which are likely to differ from the in-vivo reality. Including a fitness cost, while 263 requiring the estimation of an additional parameter, does not add any particular complexity to the 264 model structure itself, effectively only requiring a reduced growth rate value for the bacteria carrying AMR genes as opposed to bacteria susceptible to the modelled antibiotic (as can be seen in [68] for 265 266 example), and should therefore be included at least for sensitivity analyses. In addition, although it is understandable that the first models of HGT of AMR should focus on tracking single genes to 267 understand the basic dynamics of this process, in reality many bacteria carry multiple AMR genes that 268 269 can be transferred independently [8]. However, we only identified four studies in our review which 270 included more than one independent AMR gene in their model [30,32,60,69]. 13 studies did model 271 the transfer of multiple linked genes [34,35,66,68,70,40–42,47,49,53,55,59]; however in these cases 272 a single HGT event causes the transfer of all of these genes, therefore there is little difference between 273 the model structures of these 13 studies and those of other studies which modelled the transfer of 274 single genes.

275 Many studies did not allow for the presence of an antibiotic in their model. However, antibiotics are 276 likely to modify HGT dynamics by directly affecting transfer rates, as well as the survival of bacteria 277 not carrying the AMR gene [16–20]. The former has been shown to occur for transduction in S. aureus, 278 where the addition of antibiotics induced a higher proportion of transducing phage compared to lytic 279 phage [76]. On the other hand, some studies correctly argue that it is equally important to understand 280 the dynamics of HGT in the absence of antibiotics. Effectively, it is common for bacterial populations 281 to rapidly transition between being exposed to antibiotics or not, with the most obvious example 282 being individuals transiently consuming antibiotics. Consequently, understanding the dynamics of HGT 283 of AMR both in the presence and absence of antibiotics is essential.

284 HGT of AMR has been studied in laboratory settings, consequently data around which models can be 285 built have been generated and are available [7,77]. However, we note that, to the best of our 286 knowledge, most data appear to focus on conjugation in *in-vitro* settings. The availability of 287 experimental data on HGT of AMR by transformation or transduction, and on any of the three HGT 288 mechanisms in more complex settings (such as in-vivo), is unclear. This should be investigated in future 289 work to further refine the recommendations we make here, and identify where more data are needed 290 to support the development of mathematical models. This is essential to understand which of the gaps 291 we identify are due to theory outpacing data collection, and which are due to under-utilisation of 292 available data. In any case, using these external data sources for purposes they were not originally 293 designed for can require assumptions to be made in the model structure and parameters. In addition, 294 it is essential to bear in mind how these data were originally collected, since for example combining 295 sources which look at bacteria in multiple environments to derive parameters in a single environment-296 specific model is far from ideal. On the other hand, the fact that a quarter of the studies we reviewed 297 (12/43) assumed all of their parameter values is worrying. While the purpose of some of these studies 298 was to exclusively test a range of parameter values to identify conditions for a specific event to occur 299 (e.g. AMR prevalence increases), the absence of any clear sources for the limits of these ranges is 300 questionable. Looking at studies which determined their parameter values experimentally, we see 301 that some of these also assume values such as the initial proportion of bacteria capable of performing 302 transformation and the rate at which they can gain this ability [70], the bacterial growth rate and the 303 conjugation rate [40], or the fitness cost of carrying an AMR gene and the rate at which such genes 304 are lost by the bacteria [34]. Informing models with data is essential to ensure that they are accurate 305 representations of reality, therefore, as stated above, we believe that further work is required to

review the availability of data on HGT of AMR, and the methods that could be used to generate themwhen they are currently missing.

308 Regarding model structures, the majority of studies relied on deterministic models. To allow variability 309 in the dynamics and therefore increased realism, studies more often chose to sample their parameter 310 values, run their deterministic model, and repeat this process a number of times (as can be seen in 311 [32,38,43,46,56,64,65,72]), a simpler alternative to developing new stochastic models. Acknowledging 312 stochasticity when looking at HGT is essential; HGT rates are typically low (estimates from studies in 313 our review include for example 5.1*10⁻¹⁵(cells/mL)⁻¹hour⁻¹ for conjugation [49] and 10⁻¹⁶(cells/mL)⁻ 314 ¹hour⁻¹ for transformation [70]). These are therefore models of rare events which, by chance, might 315 not always occur as expected, a feature which deterministic models fail to capture [24]. Sensitivity 316 analysis is extremely important in any case since a small change in parameter value can lead to a 317 greater change in the results. Despite this, nine studies exclusively relied on a deterministic model 318 without sampling parameters or performing sensitivity analyses [30,36,40,42,48,54,55,58,68]. 319 Interestingly, five of these nine studies also generated their own parameter values experimentally 320 [36,40,42,54,68]. Although they capture variation when measuring the parameters experimentally, 321 often providing distributions for their values, they then only retain fixed point estimates for their 322 corresponding model parameter values instead of sampling them from these distributions, and only 323 use these fixed estimates to derive their conclusions. Acknowledging variability in microbiological 324 observations by specifying distributions rather than point estimates is essential, and this must be 325 represented in the corresponding mathematical models.

326 This also raises the question of how to best represent these microbiological events in mathematical 327 models. Effectively, almost all of the models here describe transfer as a mass-action process (42/43). 328 However, as stated above this approach is acceptable for conjugation, but might not fully apply to 329 transformation, where transfer depends on the density of DNA in the surrounding environment rather 330 than the number of bacteria, and transduction, which follows vector-like dynamics with the phage 331 acting as carriers of resistance genes between bacteria. Transformation dynamics might therefore be 332 better represented by models of environmental transmission of infections (such as [78]), and 333 transduction by models of vector-borne diseases (such as [79]), as opposed to mass-action models. 334 The degree of modelling complexity required to accurately represent HGT is therefore unclear. This is 335 also true for models designed to understand the public health implications of HGT of AMR, for which 336 the level of detail required to represent within-host dynamics must be clarified. In addition, since 337 transfer dynamics have thus far been mostly studied in bacterial culture, mostly "short" time-frames 338 have been explored (hours or days), with long term dynamics remaining unclear despite our 339 knowledge that even resistant bacteria can colonise us for weeks or months [80–82]. To best guide 340 our public health policies with mathematical modelling, we must first clarify the complexity of the 341 process we are actually attempting to model, and the time required to fully capture its in-vivo 342 dynamics.

This is the first attempt at providing an overview of existing mathematical modelling work on HGT of AMR. Our systematic review methods, with two individuals separately screening the titles and abstracts of candidate studies, allowed us to identify and bring together key studies on this topic. Using our list of comparison elements, we extracted and contrasted essential information between studies, overall allowing us to obtain a broad overview of the field and identify research gaps. However, our approach also has some limitations. Firstly, it was necessary for us to specify "(math*

OR dynamic*) model*" rather than just "model*" in the search, since otherwise it would have 349 350 returned results on experimental models (e.g. mice) as opposed to mathematical models. Effectively, 351 repeating our search with "model*" instead of "(math* OR dynamic*) model*" yields 2,360 and 1,560 352 results on PubMed and Web of Science respectively, as opposed to our 171 and 185 results. The 353 consequence of our choice however was that nine relevant studies were missed in the search, and 354 were only identified by screening the references of already included studies. These nine studies were 355 missed in the original literature search due to the absence of at least one of the search terms, with 356 some studies for example referring to their models as "mass action models" instead of "mathematical 357 models". In addition, we only searched for studies which modelled transfer of AMR genes, as opposed 358 to HGT of any gene. This is firstly due to our specific research interest; horizontal transfer of AMR 359 genes is an especially strong evolutionary driver for bacteria populations, compared to transfer of 360 other genes. This is because AMR genes can be strongly selected for by environmental factors, such as the presence of antibiotics, while many other genes are often not subject to such selection 361 362 pressures. In addition, AMR genes can be selected in more settings compared to other genes; for 363 example, genes involved in immune evasion will only be selected for during infection of the host, while 364 AMR genes can also be selected for during asymptomatic colonisation. The consequences of HGT of 365 AMR in the bacterial population can therefore be greater than for other genes, which is why we believe it is important to study this process. Secondly, repeating the search without "(antimicrobial 366 OR antibacterial OR antibiotic) resist*" yields 12,236 and 38,148 results on PubMed and Web of 367 Science respectively, which would be too many to cover in a single systematic review. Nevertheless, 368 this suggests that there are other studies which model HGT more broadly. These could be a source of 369 370 methodologies that could be applied to further develop the specific field of HGT of AMR modelling. In 371 terms of the elements gathered from the studies to compare them, we were unable to extract any 372 meaningful quantitative data (e.g. estimated gene transfer rates) common to all studies due to the 373 high variability of study designs. This variability also prevented us from identifying common measures 374 of study quality we could report aside from the presence or absence of sensitivity analysis.

375 Studying the effect of HGT of AMR on bacterial evolutionary dynamics is a necessary first step to 376 understand the overall importance of this process. This has been the focus of the vast majority of the 377 studies identified in this review, however the public health implications remain vastly unknown. This 378 is related to the observation that the majority of studies model bacteria in an *in-vitro* setting; to 379 understand the public health impact of HGT of AMR, it is essential to expand this to include other 380 bacterial environments such as within humans and animals. In addition, important differences have 381 been identified between transfer rates estimated in-vitro and in-vivo, with in-vivo transduction rates 382 in S. aureus and conjugation rates in K. pneumoniae and E. coli for example being much higher than 383 expected [14,15]. This difference in dynamics is attributable to the fact that in-vitro conditions fail to 384 capture essential biological mechanisms influencing bacteria and therefore HGT [6,10]. Studying HGT 385 in-vitro allows for a controlled environment to understand the basic dynamics of this process and the 386 factors that might influence them (e.g. antibiotic exposure), and consequently offers a starting point 387 to inform *in-vivo* models. We therefore recommend that future modelling studies should build upon 388 the work of existing in-vitro studies to evaluate HGT of AMR in more complex scenarios, utilising 389 parameter estimates from *in-vitro* studies as a baseline and refining them using data generated with 390 in-vivo model organisms such as mice [68]. Due to the added complexity (e.g. immune system, 391 simultaneous within-host and between-hosts dynamics, rapidly varying host exposure to antibiotics 392 and therefore selection pressure on the bacteria...), this will require major extensions to existing

models. However, we believe that this is necessary to truly assess the potential consequences of HGTof AMR on human well-being.

395 This systematic review allowed us to identify key research gaps on the dynamics of HGT of AMR. Firstly, 396 we recommend that future studies should focus on developing models of transformation and 397 transduction to determine the required complexity to represent these dynamics. Since these 398 mechanisms fundamentally differ in their biological characteristics, this will likely require substantial, 399 novel modelling work as opposed to the extension of existing models of conjugation. In parallel, since 400 the basic dynamics of conjugation are already reasonably well understood, future studies on this 401 mechanism should focus on other bacterial species than E. coli, preferably in a setting where inter-402 specific HGT and the movement of multiple, separate AMR genes can both be observed. This should 403 be achievable simply by re-parameterisation or minor extension of existing models; the greatest 404 challenge would be to generate new data on HGT in these currently unexplored settings. The optimal 405 solution to address these research questions would be to design frameworks to study HGT of AMR 406 that encompass both laboratory and modelling work; this would ensure that the data collected are 407 appropriate for the modelling needs, and that the actual model is a good representation of the 408 situation measured in the laboratory. We therefore believe that, to fully understand the complexity 409 of both the biology and the dynamics of HGT, collaboration of both microbiologists and mathematical 410 modellers would be the best strategy for future research on this topic, and that studies should attempt 411 to generate both their own data and models to reduce the assumptions they require.

412 While exclusively microbiological approaches have successfully been used to identify when HGT 413 occurs, combining these with modelling has allowed us to estimate rates at which these events occur, 414 and to disentangle the finer temporal dynamics of this process. For example, some studies we 415 identified in our review which combined microbiology and modelling work answered questions such 416 as how changing the exposure of bacteria to antibiotics influences HGT rates [49], how a bacterium 417 interacts in space with its neighbours to perform HGT [31], or how to adjust shaking speed to maximise 418 contact between bacteria, and thus the rate of HGT, in a liquid culture [66]. Modelling also allows 419 faster exploration of situations that could be harder to test using only microbiological methods, since 420 an experiment where the bacteria need to grow for 24 hours in the lab could be completed in a few 421 seconds using a mathematical model. Crucially, this requires the model to be an accurate 422 representation of reality, which in turn requires it to be informed by microbiological data to begin 423 with. Our conclusion here is therefore not that either one of modelling or microbiology is superior to 424 the other, but that both approaches complement each other. Consequently, we believe that close 425 cooperation between these two fields would allow us to greatly improve our understanding of 426 complex microbiological processes, such as HGT of AMR.

427 CONCLUSIONS

In this systematic review, we aimed to assess the current state of mathematical modelling as a tool to 428 429 improve our understanding of horizontal gene transfer of antimicrobial resistance. From the 43 430 studies identified, we found that the majority focused on conjugation in E. coli, exploring evolutionary 431 dynamics of HGT in culture. Whilst this provides a solid base for a key method of HGT, future work 432 must also consider HGT by transformation and transduction which are also essential drivers of HGT in 433 bacteria. Importantly for public health implications, only one bacterial species was considered in most 434 models when we know that inter species transfer is responsible for many of our epidemic AMR clones 435 and much of the work was fitted to data in the absence of antibiotic exposure. Crucially, to answer 436 these questions we must first clarify the level of modelling complexity required to accurately represent 437 HGT dynamics, as well as the availability and capacity to generate experimental data on these 438 processes. This complex topic requires close collaboration between mathematical modellers and 439 microbiologists in order to determine the full impact of these processes on our ability to control the 440 public health threat posed by antimicrobial resistance.

441

442 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors jointly developed the search strategy. QL and GK independently screened the titles and
abstracts of the identified studies. QL then evaluated the full texts of the included studies, and wrote
the first draft of the manuscript. All authors subsequently edited the manuscript.

446

447 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Dr Katherine Atkins for helpful discussions on the search strategy forthis systematic review.

450

451 **FUNDING**

452 This work was supported by the Medical Research Council (grant number: MR/P014658/1), and by a

453 Medical Research Council London Intercollegiate Doctoral Training Program studentship (grant

454 number: MR/N013638/1).

455 **<u>REFERENCES</u>**

- 456 1. World Health Organisation. 2015 Global Action Plan on Antimicrobial Resistance.
- 457 2. Kumarasamy KK *et al.* 2010 Emergence of a new antibiotic resistance mechanism in India,
 458 Pakistan, and the UK: a molecular, biological, and epidemiological study. *Lancet Infect. Dis.*459 10, 597–602. (doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(10)70143-2)
- 460 3. Woodford N, Johnson AP. 2013 Global spread of antibiotic resistance: the example of New
 461 Delhi metallo-β-lactamase (NDM)-mediated carbapenem resistance. *J. Med. Microbiol.* 62,
 462 499–513. (doi:10.1099/jmm.0.052555-0)
- 463 4. Cantón R, González-Alba JM, Galán JC. 2012 CTX-M Enzymes: Origin and Diffusion. *Front.*464 *Microbiol.* 3, 110. (doi:10.3389/fmicb.2012.00110)
- 465 5. Ochman H, Lawrence JG, Groisman EA. 2000 Lateral gene transfer and the nature of bacterial
 466 innovation. *Nature* 405, 299–304. (doi:10.1038/35012500)
- 467 6. Thomas CM, Nielsen KM. 2005 Mechanisms of and Barriers to, Horizontal Gene Transfer
 468 between Bacteria. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **3**, 711–721. (doi:10.1038/nrmicro1234)
- von Wintersdorff CJH, Penders J, van Niekerk JM, Mills ND, Majumder S, van Alphen LB,
 Savelkoul PHM, Wolffs PFG. 2016 Dissemination of Antimicrobial Resistance in Microbial
 Ecosystems through Horizontal Gene Transfer. *Front. Microbiol.* 7, 173.
 (doi:10.3389/fmicb.2016.00173)
- 473 8. Tanwar J, Das S, Fatima Z, Hameed S. 2014 Multidrug resistance: an emerging crisis.
 474 *Interdiscip. Perspect. Infect. Dis.* 2014, 541340. (doi:10.1155/2014/541340)
- 475 9. Naidoo J. 1984 Interspecific co-transfer of antibiotic resistance plasmids in staphylococci in
 476 vivo. J. Hyg., Camb. 93.
- 477 10. Melnyk AH, Wong A, Kassen R. 2015 The fitness costs of antibiotic resistance mutations. *Evol.*478 *Appl.* 8, 273–83. (doi:10.1111/eva.12196)
- 479 11. Watanabe T, Fukasawa T. 1961 Episome-mediated transfer of drug resistance in
 480 Enterobacteriaceae I. Transfer of resistance factors by conjugation.
- Lindsay JA. 2014 Staphylococcus aureus genomics and the impact of horizontal gene transfer. *Int. J. Med. Microbiol.* **304**, 103–109. (doi:10.1016/J.IJMM.2013.11.010)
- Hamilton HL, Dillard JP. 2006 Natural transformation of *Neisseria gonorrhoeae* : from DNA
 donation to homologous recombination. *Mol. Microbiol.* 59, 376–385. (doi:10.1111/j.13652958.2005.04964.x)
- 486 14. McCarthy AJ, Loeffler A, Witney AA, Gould KA, Lloyd DH, Lindsay JA. 2014 Extensive
 487 horizontal gene transfer during Staphylococcus aureus co-colonization in vivo. *Genome Biol.*488 *Evol.* 6, 2697–708. (doi:10.1093/gbe/evu214)
- 489 15. Gottig S, Gruber TM, Stecher B, Wichelhaus TA, Kempf VAJ. 2015 In Vivo Horizontal Gene
 490 Transfer of the Carbapenemase OXA-48 During a Nosocomial Outbreak. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 60,
 491 1808–1815. (doi:10.1093/cid/civ191)
- 492 16. Velkov VW. 1999 How environmental factors regulate mutagenesis and gene transfer in493 microorganisms.
- Hastings PJ, Rosenberg SM, Slack A. 2004 Antibiotic-induced lateral transfer of antibiotic
 resistance. *Trends Microbiol.* 12, 401–404. (doi:10.1016/J.TIM.2004.07.003)

- 496 18. Beaber JW, Hochhut B, Waldor MK. 2004 SOS response promotes horizontal dissemination of
 497 antibiotic resistance genes. *Nature* 427, 72–74. (doi:10.1038/nature02241)
- Maiques E, Ubeda C, Campoy S, Salvador N, Lasa I, Novick RP, Barbé J, Penadés JR. 2006 beta lactam antibiotics induce the SOS response and horizontal transfer of virulence factors in
 Staphylococcus aureus. J. Bacteriol. 188, 2726–9. (doi:10.1128/JB.188.7.2726-2729.2006)
- Prudhomme M, Attaiech L, Sanchez G, Martin B, Claverys J-P. 2006 Antibiotic Stress Induces
 Genetic Transformability in the Human Pathogen Streptococcus pneumoniae. *Science (80-.).* **313**, 89–92. (doi:10.1126/SCIENCE.1127912)
- Jassim SAA, Limoges RG. 2017 Bacteriophage and Antimicrobial Resistance. In
 Bacteriophages: Practical Applications for Nature's Biocontrol, pp. 19–57. Cham: Springer
 International Publishing. (doi:10.1007/978-3-319-54051-1_2)
- Verheust C, Pauwels K, Mahillon J, Helinski DR, Herman P. 2010 Contained use of
 Bacteriophages: Risk Assessment and Biosafety Recommendations. *Appl. Biosaf.* 15, 32–44.
 (doi:10.1177/153567601001500106)
- 510 23. Drlica K, Gennaro ML. 2001 Plasmids. *Encycl. Genet.*, 1485–1490.
 511 (doi:10.1006/RWGN.2001.1000)
- 512 24. Anderson RM, May RM. 1991 *Infectious diseases of humans : dynamics and control*. Oxford
 513 University Press.
- 514 25. Opatowski L, Guillemot D, Boëlle P-Y, Temime L. 2011 Contribution of mathematical modeling
 515 to the fight against bacterial antibiotic resistance. *Curr. Opin. Infect. Dis.* 24, 279–287.
 516 (doi:10.1097/QCO.0b013e3283462362)
- van Kleef E, Robotham J V, Jit M, Deeny SR, Edmunds WJ. 2013 Modelling the transmission of
 healthcare associated infections: a systematic review. *BMC Infect. Dis.* 13, 294.
 (doi:10.1186/1471-2334-13-294)
- 52027.Davies NG, Flasche S, Jit M, Atkins KE. 2019 Within-host dynamics shape antibiotic resistance521in commensal bacteria. Nat. Ecol. Evol. , 1. (doi:10.1038/s41559-018-0786-x)
- van Kleef E, Luangasanatip N, Bonten MJ, Cooper BS. 2017 Why sensitive bacteria are
 resistant to hospital infection control. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2, 16.
 (doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.11033.2)
- 525 29. Liberati A *et al.* 2009 The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta526 analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ*527 **339**, b2700. (doi:10.1136/bmj.b2700)
- 528 30. D'Agata EMC, Dupont-Rouzeyrol M, Magal P, Olivier D, Ruan S. 2008 The Impact of Different
 529 Antibiotic Regimens on the Emergence of Antimicrobial-Resistant Bacteria. *PLoS One* 3,
 530 e4036. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0004036)
- 531 31. Gehring R, Schumm P, Youssef M, Scoglio C. 2010 A network-based approach for resistance
 532 transmission in bacterial populations. *J. Theor. Biol.* 262, 97–106.
 533 (doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2009.09.002)
- 53432.Obolski U, Hadany L. 2012 Implications of stress-induced genetic variation for minimizing535multidrug resistance in bacteria. *BMC Med.* **10**, 89. (doi:10.1186/1741-7015-10-89)
- 53633.Krone SM, Lu R, Fox R, Suzuki H, Top EM. 2007 Modelling the spatial dynamics of plasmid537transfer and persistence. *Microbiology* **153**, 2803–16. (doi:10.1099/mic.0.2006/004531-0)

- 538 34. Lundquist PD, Levin' BR. 1986 Transitory derepression and the maintenance of conjugative
 539 plasmids. *Genetics*. 113.
- S40 35. Ponciano JM, De Gelder L, Top EM, Joyce P. 2007 The population biology of bacterial
 plasmids: a hidden Markov model approach. *Genetics* 176, 957–68.
 (doi:10.1534/genetics.106.061937)
- 54336.Fischer EA, Dierikx CM, van Essen-Zandbergen A, van Roermund HJ, Mevius DJ, Stegeman A,544Klinkenberg D. 2014 The Incl1 plasmid carrying the blaCTX-M-1 gene persists in in vitro545culture of a Escherichia coli strain from broilers. BMC Microbiol. 14, 77. (doi:10.1186/1471-5462180-14-77)
- 547 37. Svara F, Rankin DJ. 2011 The evolution of plasmid-carried antibiotic resistance. *BMC Evol.* 548 *Biol.* 11, 130. (doi:10.1186/1471-2148-11-130)
- 38. Willms AR, Roughan PD, Heinemann JA. 2006 Static recipient cells as reservoirs of antibiotic
 resistance during antibiotic therapy. *Theor. Popul. Biol.* **70**, 436–51.
 (doi:10.1016/j.tpb.2006.04.001)
- 39. Hall JPJ, Wood AJ, Harrison E, Brockhurst MA. 2016 Source-sink plasmid transfer dynamics
 maintain gene mobility in soil bacterial communities. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 113, 8260–
 554 5. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1600974113)
- 55540.Dionisio F, Matic I, Radman M, Rodrigues OR, Taddei F. 2002 Plasmids spread very fast in556heterogeneous bacterial communities. *Genetics* 162, 1525–32.
- 557 41. Zhong X, Droesch J, Fox R, Top EM, Krone SM. 2012 On the meaning and estimation of
 558 plasmid transfer rates for surface-associated and well-mixed bacterial populations. *J. Theor.*559 *Biol.* 294, 144–152. (doi:10.1016/J.JTBI.2011.10.034)
- 56042.Qiu Z et al. 2015 Effects of nano-TiO2 on antibiotic resistance transfer mediated by RP4561plasmid. Nanotoxicology **9**, 895–904. (doi:10.3109/17435390.2014.991429)
- 43. Cazer CL, Ducrot L, Volkova V V., Gröhn YT. 2017 Monte Carlo Simulations Suggest Current
 Chlortetracycline Drug-Residue Based Withdrawal Periods Would Not Control Antimicrobial
 Resistance Dissemination from Feedlot to Slaughterhouse. *Front. Microbiol.* 8.
 (doi:10.3389/fmicb.2017.01753)
- Volkova V V, Lu Z, Lanzas C, Scott HM, Gröhn YT. 2013 Modelling dynamics of plasmid-gene
 mediated antimicrobial resistance in enteric bacteria using stochastic differential equations. *Sci. Rep.* **3**, 2463. (doi:10.1038/srep02463)
- 45. Baker M, Hobman JL, Dodd CER, Ramsden SJ, Stekel DJ. 2016 Mathematical modelling of
 antimicrobial resistance in agricultural waste highlights importance of gene transfer rate. *FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.* 92, fiw040. (doi:10.1093/femsec/fiw040)
- Volkova V V, Lanzas C, Lu Z, Gröhn YT. 2012 Mathematical model of plasmid-mediated
 resistance to ceftiofur in commensal enteric Escherichia coli of cattle. *PLoS One* 7, e36738.
 (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0036738)
- 575 47. Kneis D, Hiltunen T, Hess S. 2019 A high-throughput approach to the culture-based
 576 estimation of plasmid transfer rates. *Plasmid* 101, 28–34.
 577 (doi:10.1016/j.plasmid.2018.12.003)
- 578 48. Knopoff DA, Sanchez Sanso JM. 2017 A kinetic model for horizontal transfer and bacterial
 579 antibiotic resistance. *Int. J. Biomath.* **10**. (doi:10.1142/S1793524517500516)
- 580 49. Lopatkin AJ, Huang S, Smith RP, Srimani JK, Sysoeva TA, Bewick S, Karig DK, You L. 2016

- 581 Antibiotics as a selective driver for conjugation dynamics. *Nat. Microbiol.* **1**, 16044. 582 (doi:10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.44)
- 583 50. Peña-Miller R, Rodríguez-González R, MacLean RC, San Millan A. 2015 Evaluating the effect of
 584 horizontal transmission on the stability of plasmids under different selection regimes. *Mob.*585 *Genet. Elements* 5, 29–33. (doi:10.1080/2159256X.2015.1045115)
- 586 51. Heuer H, Focks A, Lamshoeft M, Smalla K, Matthies M, Spiteller M. 2008 Fate of sulfadiazine
 administered to pigs and its quantitative effect on the dynamics of bacterial resistance genes
 in manure and manured soil. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 40, 1892–1900.
 (doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2008.03.014)
- 590 52. Freese PD, Korolev KS, Jimenez JI, Chen IA. 2014 Genetic Drift Suppresses Bacterial
 591 Conjugation in Spatially Structured Populations. *Biophys. J.* 106, 944–954.
 592 (doi:10.1016/j.bpj.2014.01.012)
- 53. Simonsen L, Gordon DM, Stewart FM, Levin BR. 1990 Estimating the rate of plasmid transfer:
 an end-point method. *J. Gen. Microbiol.* 136, 2319–2325. (doi:10.1099/00221287-136-112319)
- 59654.Gothwal R, Thatikonda S. 2018 Mathematical model for the transport of fluoroquinolone and597its resistant bacteria in aquatic environment. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. Int.* 25, 20439–20452.598(doi:10.1007/s11356-017-9848-x)
- 595. Ibargueen-Mondragon E, Romero-Leiton JP, Esteva L, Mariela Burbano-Rosero E. 2016
 600 Mathematical modeling of bacterial resistance to antibiotics by mutations and plasmids. *J.*601 *Biol. Syst.* 24, 129–146. (doi:10.1142/S0218339016500078)
- 56. Zwanzig M, Harrison E, Brockhurst MA, Hall JPJ, Berendonk TU, Berger U. 2019 Mobile
 Compensatory Mutations Promote Plasmid Survival. *mSystems* 4.
 (doi:10.1128/mSystems.00186-18)
- 57. Connelly BD, Zaman L, McKinley PK, Ofria C. 2011 Modeling the Evolutionary Dynamics of
 Plasmids in Spatial Populations. In *GECCO-2011: Proceedings of the 13th Annual Genetic and Evolutionary Computation conference* (ed N Krasnogor), pp. 227–233. 1515 BROADWAY, NEW
 YORK, NY 10036-9998 USA: ASSOC COMPUTING MACHINERY.
- 58. Khan A, Imran M. 2018 Optimal dosing strategies against susceptible and resistant bacteria. *J. Biol. Syst.* 26, 41–58. (doi:10.1142/S0218339018500031)
- 59. Malwade A, Nguyen A, Sadat-Mousavi P, Ingalls BP. 2017 Predictive Modeling of a Batch Filter
 Mating Process. *Front. Microbiol.* 8. (doi:10.3389/fmicb.2017.00461)
- 61360.Campos M et al. 2019 Simulating Multilevel Dynamics of Antimicrobial Resistance in a614Membrane Computing Model. *MBio* **10**, e02460-18. (doi:10.1128/mBio.02460-18)
- 61. Xu S, Yang J, Yin C, Zhao X. 2018 The dominance of bacterial genotypes leads to susceptibility
 616 variations under sublethal antibiotic pressure. *Future Microbiol.* 13, 165–185.
 617 (doi:10.2217/fmb-2017-0070)
- 618 62. Raz Y, Tannenbaum E. 2010 The influence of horizontal gene transfer on the mean fitness of
 619 unicellular populations in static environments. *Genetics* 185, 327–337.
 620 (doi:10.1534/genetics.109.113613)
- 63. Haverkate MR, Dautzenberg MJD, Ossewaarde TJM, van der Zee A, den Hollander JG,
 622 Troelstra A, Bonten MJM, Bootsma MCJ. 2015 Within-Host and Population Transmission of
 623 bla(OXA-48) in K. pneumoniae and E. coli. *PLoS One* **10**. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0140960)

624 64. Volkova V V, Lu Z, Lanzas C, Grohn YT. 2013 Evaluating targets for control of plasmid-625 mediated antimicrobial resistance in enteric commensals of beef cattle: a modelling 626 approach. Epidemiol. Infect. 141, 2294–312. (doi:10.1017/S0950268812002993) 627 65. Webb GF, D'Agata EMC, Magal P, Ruan S. 2005 A model of antibiotic-resistant bacterial 628 epidemics in hospitals. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 102, 13343-8. 629 (doi:10.1073/pnas.0504053102) Zhong X, Krol JEJE, Top EM, Krone SM. 2010 Accounting for mating pair formation in plasmid 630 66. 631 population dynamics. J. Theor. Biol. 262, 711–719. (doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2009.10.013) 632 67. Stewart FM, Levin BR. 1977 The Population Biology of Bacterial Plasmids: A PRIORI Conditions 633 for the Existence of Conjugationally Transmitted Factors. Genetics 87, 209–28. 634 68. Freter R, Freter RR, Brickner H. 1983 Experimental and mathematical models of Escherichia 635 coli plasmid transfer in vitro and in vivo. Infect. Immun. 39, 60-84. 69. 636 Gomes ALC, Galagan JE, Segrè D. 2013 Resource competition may lead to effective treatment 637 of antibiotic resistant infections. PLoS One 8, e80775. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0080775) 638 70. Johnsen PJ, Dubnau D, Levin BR. 2009 Episodic selection and the maintenance of competence 639 and natural transformation in Bacillus subtilis. Genetics 181, 1521–33. 640 (doi:10.1534/genetics.108.099523) 641 71. Lu N, Massoudieh A, Liang X, Kamai T, Zilles JL, Nguyen TH, Ginn TR. 2015 A kinetic model of 642 gene transfer via natural transformation of Azotobacter vinelandii. Environ. Sci. Res. Technol. 643 1, 363-374. (doi:10.1039/c5ew00023h) 644 72. Volkova V V, Lu Z, Besser T, Gröhn YT. 2014 Modeling the infection dynamics of 645 bacteriophages in enteric Escherichia coli: estimating the contribution of transduction to 646 antimicrobial gene spread. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 80, 4350-62. (doi:10.1128/AEM.00446-647 14) 648 73. Volkova V V., Lanzas C, Lu Z, Gröhn YT. 2012 Mathematical Model of Plasmid-Mediated 649 Resistance to Ceftiofur in Commensal Enteric Escherichia coli of Cattle. PLoS One 7, e36738. 650 (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0036738) 651 74. Cooper GM, Hausman RE. 2015 The Cell: A Molecular Approach, Seventh Edition. See 652 https://www.sinauer.com/media/wysiwyg/samples/TheCell7e_Brochure.pdf. 653 75. Tsubakishita S, Kuwahara-Arai K, Sasaki T, Hiramatsu K. 2010 Origin and molecular evolution 654 of the determinant of methicillin resistance in staphylococci. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 655 54, 4352-9. (doi:10.1128/AAC.00356-10) 656 76. Stanczak-Mrozek KI, Laing KG, Lindsay JA. 2017 Resistance gene transfer: induction of 657 transducing phage by sub-inhibitory concentrations of antimicrobials is not correlated to induction of lytic phage. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 72, 1624. (doi:10.1093/JAC/DKX056) 658 77. 659 Lerminiaux NA, Cameron ADS. 2019 Horizontal transfer of antibiotic resistance genes in 660 clinical environments. Can. J. Microbiol. 65, 34-44. (doi:10.1139/cjm-2018-0275) 661 78. Breban R, Drake JM, Stallknecht DE, Rohani P. 2009 The Role of Environmental Transmission 662 in Recurrent Avian Influenza Epidemics. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 5, e1000346. (doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000346) 663 664 79. Day T. 2002 Virulence evolution via host exploitation and toxin production in spore-producing 665 pathogens. Ecol. Lett. 5, 471-476. (doi:10.1046/j.1461-0248.2002.00342.x)

- 80. Haverkate MR, Derde LPG, Brun-Buisson C, Bonten MJM, Bootsma MCJ. 2014 Duration of
 colonization with antimicrobial-resistant bacteria after ICU discharge. *Intensive Care Med.* 40,
 564–571. (doi:10.1007/s00134-014-3225-8)
- 81. Haverkate MR, Weiner S, Lolans K, Moore NM, Weinstein RA, Bonten MJM, Hayden MK,
 Bootsma MCJ. 2016 Duration of Colonization With Klebsiella pneumoniae CarbapenemaseProducing Bacteria at Long-Term Acute Care Hospitals in Chicago, Illinois. *Open forum Infect. Dis.* **3**, ofw178. (doi:10.1093/ofid/ofw178)
- 673 82. O'Fallon E, Gautam S, D'Agata EMC. 2009 Colonization with Multidrug-Resistant Gram-674 Negative Bacteria: Prolonged Duration and Frequent Cocolonization. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **48**,
- 675 1375–1381. (doi:10.1086/598194)