

**UWL REPOSITORY**  
**repository.uwl.ac.uk**

Antibiotic pollution in surface fresh waters: Occurrence and effects

Danner, Marie-Claire, Robertson, Anne, Behrends, Volker and Reiss, Julia (2019) Antibiotic pollution in surface fresh waters: Occurrence and effects. *Science of the total environment*, 664. pp. 793-804. ISSN 0048-9697

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.01.406>

This is the Accepted Version of the final output.

UWL repository link: <https://repository.uwl.ac.uk/id/eprint/11475/>

**Alternative formats:** If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact: [open.research@uwl.ac.uk](mailto:open.research@uwl.ac.uk)

**Copyright:** Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy:** If you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact us at [open.research@uwl.ac.uk](mailto:open.research@uwl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

# Antibiotic Pollution in Surface Fresh Waters: Occurrence and Effects

Danner, Marie-Claire<sup>1\*</sup>, Robertson, Anne<sup>1</sup>, Behrends, Volker<sup>1</sup>, and Julia Reiss<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Life Sciences, Whitelands College, Roehampton University, London SW15 4JD, United Kingdom.*

\* Corresponding author

Email: [dannerm@roehampton.ac.uk](mailto:dannerm@roehampton.ac.uk)

Keywords: antibiotic, surface water, bioassays, mixtures, food-webs, antibiotic resistance

## 1 **Abstract**

2 Worldwide, antibiotic usage exceeds 100,000 tons per year and there is increasing concern  
3 over the fate of these substances. Antibiotics are ubiquitous in the environment and  
4 significant concentrations have been detected in fresh waters. In this review, we highlight  
5 important aspects of antibiotic pollution in fresh waters: that concentrations of antibiotics in  
6 the environment are substantial, that micro-organisms are susceptible to this, that bacteria can  
7 evolve resistance in the environment, and that antibiotic pollution affects natural food webs  
8 while interacting with other stressors; which taken together poses a number of challenges for  
9 environmental scientists.

10 In the literature, we found examples of considerable antibiotic pollution in fresh waters. In  
11 the Americas, antibiotic concentrations of up to 15  $\mu\text{g/L}$  have been measured; with higher  
12 concentrations reported from European and African studies (over 10  $\mu\text{g/L}$  and 50  $\mu\text{g/L}$   
13 respectively), and in Asian-pacific countries concentrations over 450  $\mu\text{g/L}$  have been  
14 detected.

15 While these concentrations might not be deemed harmful to humans, non-target freshwater  
16 organisms could be affected by them. Bioassays show that some of the antibiotics found in  
17 surface waters affect microbes at concentrations below 10  $\mu\text{g/L}$ . Among the most potent  
18 antibiotics are those that prevail in streams and rivers in these concentrations, such as  
19 ciprofloxacin. Sub-lethal concentrations might not kill prokaryotes but contribute to increased  
20 bacterial resistance and change the composition of single-celled communities, as  
21 demonstrated in laboratory experiments. This has implications for the microbial food web  
22 (e.g. interactions among and between bacteria and their protozoan consumers) and by  
23 extension, larger organisms and ecosystem health.

24 The fact that the effects of antibiotics are extremely context-dependent represents a  
25 challenge, particularly for in vitro research. We suggest future research avenues, taking into

- 1 account food web experiments, antibiotics interacting with one another (and other stressors)
- 2 and discuss how these can help to answer multi-layered research questions.

## 1 **1. Introduction**

2 Antibiotics are antimicrobial drugs that kill or inhibit the growth of bacteria. There are  
3 several kinds of antibiotics and they can be classified based on their action mechanisms or  
4 chemical structure. They have been used in large quantities for some decades and resistance  
5 of pathogens to antibiotics has long been a focal point of research in clinical settings and, in  
6 more recent years, in environmental research. The parent compounds of antibiotics, or their  
7 metabolites, can be stable enough to bypass water treatment processes and leak into the  
8 environment (Kümmerer, 2009), and although diluted by a factor of over one million  
9 compared to concentrations in the human body (Jjemba, 2006), the antibiotics dispersed in  
10 the environment could have important consequences for both human health and ecosystems.

11 While antibiotics are specifically administered therapeutically to treat pathogen  
12 infection and/or prophylactically to boost yields (in livestock farming), non-target organisms  
13 (that are part of ecological processes, such as nutrient cycling or degradation of pollutants)  
14 are inevitably exposed once antibiotics reach the environment (Flaherty and Dodson, 2005).  
15 The resulting concentration of antibiotics entering aquatic systems can interact with the  
16 native organisms and can, for example, begin to change the microbial community structure  
17 and genetics (e.g., prevalence of resistance genes) (Singer et al., 2016). Prokaryote  
18 microalgae (cyanobacteria) can be particularly vulnerable to antibiotics (Cabello, 2006) and  
19 continuous exposure of the environment to antibiotics can enhance the selection of resistant  
20 bacterial strains, which include potential pathogens (Kümmerer, 2004). Another, much less  
21 studied hypothesis is that antibiotics could also have indirect cascading effects on species that  
22 are not directly affected by antibiotics but feed on prokaryotes.

23 This review firstly provides a synopsis of antibiotic concentrations in fresh waters  
24 (especially running water – i.e. streams and rivers), highlighting the dominant antibiotics in  
25 the open water (as opposed to the sediment). Secondly, we cross-referenced these antibiotic

1 concentrations with available literature on aquatic organisms' susceptibility in bioassays to  
2 estimate whether concentrations found in the field affect freshwater organisms. Thirdly, we  
3 look at available data on antibiotic resistance in natural microbial communities in fresh water  
4 settings. Finally, we aim to place this evidence into the context of more complex scenarios,  
5 such as potential effects of antibiotic pollution for real food webs (involving a whole suite of  
6 organisms from prokaryotes to single celled eukaryotes to metazoans) or interactions of  
7 antibiotics with each other and temperature. We suggest future research avenues including  
8 food web experiments that provide a realistic and rigorous way to demonstrate how micro-  
9 pollutants affect microbial assemblages and by extension entire communities.

10 In the following, we build our arguments on existing reviews on this topic such as  
11 Carvalho and Santos (2016) and Segura et al. (2015) (both on antibiotic concentrations in  
12 fresh waters), Grenni et al., (2018) (antibiotic effects on bacteria in the environment), and on  
13 reviews on micro-pollutants in running waters (Hughes et al., 2012; Monteiro and Boxall,  
14 2015). We want to highlight that there is a substantial body of literature on antibiotics in the  
15 environment and that we chose examples from that literature that we believe to be relevant  
16 and representative.

17

## 18 **2. The sources and fate of antibiotic pollution in fresh water**

19 There are three major pathways for antibiotics into fresh waters: (1) effluents from  
20 Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTPs), (2) chemical manufacturing plants and (3) animal  
21 husbandry and aquaculture (Kümmerer, 2009; Singer et al., 2016). Wise (2002) estimated  
22 antibiotic consumption worldwide to lie between 100,000 and 200,000 ton per annum, with  
23 approximately 50% used for veterinary medicine and as growth promoters. Global  
24 antibiotic consumption by humans alone increased by 36% between 2000 and 2010 which  
25 illustrates that antibiotic pollution is an ever-growing problem (Van Boeckel et al., 2014).

1           In general, 50-80% of total parent compounds is excreted through urine and faeces:  
2 higher excretion rates are observed for ciprofloxacin (50 to 80%) and tetracycline (80 to  
3 90%), while lower excretion rates are observed for erythromycin (5 to 10%),  
4 sulfamethoxazole (15 to 30%) or clarithromycin (25%) (Mompelat et al., 2009). In  
5 wastewater disposal systems, antibiotics can be eliminated through retention in sludge and/or  
6 biotic and abiotic degradation. However, breakdown is often incomplete, and antibiotics and  
7 their metabolites end up entering the environment (mainly fresh waters such as streams and  
8 rivers). The proportion of the parent compound excreted via WWTP effluents can differ  
9 greatly among antibiotics and the process used (Monteiro and Boxall, 2015) but Kümmerer  
10 and Henninger (2003) found that approximately 70% of the consumed amount of antibiotics  
11 was excreted unchanged from hospitals and households into effluents in Germany. The  
12 sorption behaviour of antibiotics (i.e. what they preferentially absorb onto the solid phase)  
13 can also be very complex. For example, fluoroquinolones become highly enriched in sewage  
14 sludge (Giger et al., 2003) while in the case of sulfonamides, it has been found that  
15 elimination by sorption to soil particles is a significant process, meaning that they are  
16 preferentially found in wastewater (Heise et al., 2006).

17           Remarkable concentrations of micropollutants are detected in effluent wastewaters.  
18 For example, in hospital effluents near the Ter River in Spain, ofloxacin and ciprofloxacin  
19 have been found at concentrations of over 13 µg/L (Rodriguez-Mozaz et al., 2015). Östman  
20 et al. (2017) in Sweden found ciprofloxacin and erythromycin with concentrations of 1.41  
21 µg/L and 0.47 µg/L in incoming sewage water and 0.06 µg/L and 0.35 µg/L in treated  
22 effluent respectively. From WWTP effluents to The Cache la Poudre River in northern  
23 Colorado ampicillin and oxacillin have been reported at concentrations of 86 µg/L and 95  
24 µg/L respectively (Cha et al., 2006) and from WWTP effluents to the Msunduzi River in  
25 South Africa ampicillin and ciprofloxacin were found at concentrations of 9 µg/L and 27

1  $\mu\text{g/L}$  respectively (Agunbiade and Moodley, 2016). Much higher concentrations are possible:  
2 in the effluent from a wastewater treatment plant serving about 90 bulk drug manufacturers in  
3 Patancheru, near Hyderabad in India, ofloxacin and ciprofloxacin have been found at  
4 concentrations up to  $160 \mu\text{g/L}$  and  $31,000 \mu\text{g/L}$  respectively (Larsson et al., 2007). This area  
5 can be considered as an exception as there is a very large number of industries congregated in  
6 a limited area (Larsson, 2014) but nonetheless, the concentrations of antibiotics are  
7 alarmingly high.

8           WWTP effluents and run-off from the terrestrial landscape are the main sources for  
9 antibiotic pollution (and other micropollutants) in the open water of streams and rivers. We  
10 mainly focus on antibiotic concentrations that can be found in the open water of streams and  
11 rivers because data for the open water are more readily available. However, it is worth  
12 mentioning that micropollutants such as antibiotics attenuate in the sediment (Peralta-  
13 Maraver et al., 2018b; Robertson and Wood, 2010), and that sediment acts as a mechanical  
14 and biogeochemical filter ('bioreactor') (Lewandowski et al., 2011). Clearly, the sediment  
15 has a critical role in pollution attenuation and removal rates of emerging micropollutants  
16 (Peralta-Maraver et al., 2018b, 2018a).

17

### 18 **3. Antibiotic concentrations in open water of streams and rivers**

19 Previous reviews on concentrations of antibiotics in freshwaters have been published  
20 (Carvalho and Santos, 2016; Segura et al., 2015). Our review focusses specifically on studies  
21 that reported antibiotic concentrations in surface waters of streams and rivers worldwide, in  
22 areas away from WWTP outfalls. In these studies, most of the antibiotic concentrations were  
23 measured by targeted liquid chromatography–mass spectrometry (LC–MS), an analytical  
24 technique that combines the physical separation capabilities of liquid chromatography with a  
25 high sensitivity mass spectrometer (Dinh et al., 2011; García-Galán et al., 2010) (Table 1).



1 We selected studies where concentration values were higher than the limits of quantification  
2 and the sample was clearly identified as surface water.

3 We found 54 studies in total, from 28 different countries (Table 1). The countries with  
4 the highest number of reports about the occurrence of antibiotics were Spain and China  
5 (Table 1). In Europe, some antibiotics were measured at concentrations above 10 µg/L such  
6 as sulfapyridine (Díaz-Cruz et al., 2008) and sulfamethoxazole (Ginebreda et al., 2010), both  
7 in Spain (Table 1). Based on the data available to us, Spain is the European country with the  
8 highest number of studies reported (15) and with the highest concentration of antibiotics (1.3  
9 µg/L on average found in surface waters - for European full data see the electronic  
10 supplementary material, table S1).

11 In the Americas, antibiotic concentrations of around 2 µg/L or less were found in  
12 fresh waters, except for sulfadimethoxine, found at 15 µg/L in Kansas, USA (Lindsey et al.,  
13 2001), and most of the publications were from the United States of America (Table 1). The  
14 highest antibiotic concentrations were found in Asia: oxytetracycline has been found at 484  
15 µg/L more than 20 km downstream from a WWTP in the Xiao river (Li et al., 2008).  
16 Sulfamethazine has been reported with a concentration of 19 µg/L in Vietnam (Managaki et  
17 al., 2007), and aus der Beek et al. (2016) reported ofloxacin and sulfamethoxazole at 17.7  
18 µg/L and 14.3 µg/L respectively (Table 1). Finally, in Africa, sulfamethoxazole was reported  
19 at 53.8 µg/L in Mozambique (Segura et al., 2015) and at 38.9 µg/L in Kenya (Madikizela et  
20 al., 2017) (Table 1). In South African streams and rivers, nalidixic acid and ciprofloxacin  
21 were reported with concentrations of 23 µg/L and 14 µg/L respectively (Agunbiade and  
22 Moodley, 2016) (Table 1).

23 Segura et al. (2015) reported that the mean concentration of antibiotics in  
24 contaminated fresh waters was significantly higher in low income countries, due to a lack of  
25 sanitation facilities and wastewater treatment. We found similar results as the mean

1 concentration of antibiotics was 17.7  $\mu\text{g/L}$  and 11.3  $\mu\text{g/L}$  in Asia-Pacific and Africa  
2 respectively, and 0.9  $\mu\text{g/L}$  and 0.4  $\mu\text{g/L}$  in America and Europe (for Europe: mean  
3 concentration based on the reports in electronic supplementary material, table S1). It is worth  
4 pointing out that consumption of antibiotics is higher in high-income countries (Klein et al.,  
5 2018).

6 The studies paint a highly divergent picture, with different antibiotics found at vastly  
7 different concentrations but overall concentrations found in surface waters are lower than  
8 concentrations found in effluent wastewaters as pointed out in section 2. Furthermore, a  
9 standardised panel for the determination of antimicrobial concentrations in the environment  
10 has not yet been agreed on in these countries. Nevertheless, the presence of these  
11 antimicrobials and their often-unquantified metabolites is of concern.

12

#### 13 **4. Toxic potential of antibiotics**

14 While it is important to know about the presence and concentrations of antibiotics occurring  
15 in fresh waters, it is arguably more important to determine whether the compounds have an  
16 effect on the different organismal groups inhabiting the environment. Here, the challenge of  
17 replicating the complex natural setting in the laboratory becomes apparent. For bacteria,  
18 antibiotic susceptibility profiles are obtained under highly reproducible rich media  
19 conditions, to eliminate variation between laboratories, because antibiotic susceptibility is  
20 highly condition dependent (Greulich et al., 2015). It is questionable whether these profiles  
21 can be readily applied to natural freshwater systems where nutrients are often limited.

22 To evaluate the antibacterial toxicity effects on non-target organisms, specific tests  
23 measure either acute effects (often cell death or mortality rates, i.e. antibiotics short term  
24 effects) or chronic toxicity (often exposure over a prolonged period of time, growth index or  
25 reproduction, i.e. long term effects of antibiotics) (Soares et al., 2012). Multi-component

1 bioassays typically measure the overall response to a substance and assess the impact on  
2 different levels of biological organisation such as community, population, individual and/or  
3 sub-organism level (Carvalho et al., 2014). Bioassay measures are the EC<sub>50</sub> (concentration  
4 giving half of the maximum response), LC<sub>50</sub> (concentration giving half lethality), IC<sub>50</sub>  
5 (concentration giving half inhibition), NOEC (concentration with no observed effect) and  
6 LOEC (concentration giving the lowest observed effect). Such tests are generally regarded as  
7 good indicators of the potential risks posed by individual chemicals, but there is no model  
8 system and by design they fail to take into account chemical-chemical or chemical-  
9 organismal interactions.

10         The database “Wikipharma” (Molander et al., 2009) compiles publicly available  
11 ecotoxicity data for Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients (APIs), including antibiotics  
12 ([www.wikipharma.org](http://www.wikipharma.org), DOI: 10.1016/j.yrtph.2009.08.009). The rationale for choosing  
13 “Wikipharma” as an example for a database was that it is a free, interactive, comprehensive  
14 and up-to-date database on the effects caused by pharmaceuticals on non-target animals  
15 (Molander et al., 2009). Our aim was not to perform a meta-analysis as such but to illustrate  
16 that many antibiotics show high toxicity in bioassays with freshwater organisms (single  
17 celled pro- and eukaryotes and multicellular organisms). We searched the database for studies  
18 on toxicity tests using antibiotics and freshwater organisms and found 49 publications, which  
19 - taken together - report the effects of 47 antibiotics in 513 different experiments. We define  
20 one experiment as the measured effect of one antibiotic concentration on one species or on  
21 bacterial communities (see the electronic supplementary material table S2). More than 50%  
22 of these bioassay experiments included non-target bacteria, including 71 studies on  
23 cyanobacteria. The antibiotics most studied in bioassays were trimethoprim (57 experiments  
24 – 11%), sulfamethoxazole and oxytetracycline (48 – 9%), chloramphenicol (35 – 7%),  
25 erythromycin (31 – 6%), ofloxacin (27 – 5%), and ciprofloxacin and ampicillin (25 -5%), the

1 remaining antibiotics were studied in less than 20 experiments (see the electronic  
2 supplementary material table S2).

3 Most of the antibiotics used in ecotoxicological assays were found in fresh waters  
4 (Fig. 1) and in most cases  $EC_{50}$  was reported. The Commission of the European Communities  
5 classifies chemicals with an  $EC_{50}$  between 10 and 100 mg/L as harmful, from 1 to 10 mg/L as  
6 toxic and those under 1 mg/L as very toxic to aquatic organisms (European Commission,  
7 1996; Petrie et al., 2014) (Table 2). Interestingly, for unicellular organisms, the average  $EC_{50}$   
8 was below 1 mg/L (i.e. the antibiotics were ‘very toxic’) and in some cases the  $EC_{50}$  was  
9 measured at much lower concentrations (Fig. 1A) and within the range found in streams and  
10 rivers with antibiotic pollution (Table 1). Half of the studies that used concentrations below  
11 10  $\mu$ g/L showed that these concentrations were harmful to single-celled pro- and eukaryotes.  
12 For instance, some of these bioassay studies revealed that low concentrations (in the  $\mu$ g/L  
13 range) of antibiotics can have negative effects on bacteria (Table 2) and a third of the tests on  
14 bacteria, looking at survival or bioluminescence (i.e. acute toxicity), measured  $EC_{50}$  below 1  
15 mg/L or even in the microgram range. For example, Ando et al. (2007) tested the effects of  
16 ampicillin on the cyanobacterium *Microcystis aeruginosa*, with a range of concentrations  
17 from 30 ng/L to 200 mg/L, and measured  $EC_{50}$  at only 0.2  $\mu$ g/L (see Table 2).

18 According to the Wikipharma data, 25% of all studies estimating the effects of  
19 antibiotics on eukaryotic, single celled algae, found  $EC_{50}$  values below 1 mg/L and 12 studies  
20 even report  $EC_{50}$  to be below 100  $\mu$ g/L (electronic supplementary material table S2). The  
21 tests performed were measured as growth inhibition, usually after 72 hours. Two studies, one  
22 investigating the effects of amoxicillin on *Synechococcus leopolensis* and one of  
23 clarithromycin on *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata* showed very high sensitivity of  
24 eukaryotic algae to antibiotics, as they found the  $EC_{50}$  to be 2  $\mu$ g/L (Andreozzi et al., 2004;  
25 Isidori et al., 2005) (Table 2).

1           In the Wikipharma database, multicellular species generally showed EC<sub>50</sub> values  
2 above 1 mg/L and all average values were in 10-1000 mg/L range (Fig. 1B). Therefore, they  
3 seem less susceptible to antibiotics and are possibly not influenced by those concentrations  
4 measured in running waters (Table 1) but the database showed notable exceptions, such as  
5 duckweed. Multicellular plants used in bioassays were represented by duckweed and 14  
6 experiments using this plant found an EC<sub>50</sub> for growth inhibition under 1 mg/ L (Brain et al.,  
7 2004; Robinson et al., 2005) (Table 2).

8           Metazoans have also extensively been used in bioassays reported in Wikipharma  
9 (Table 2), including species belonging to: fish (40 studies), molluscs (16), crustaceans (117),  
10 rotifers (19) and cnidarians (4). Low levels of antibiotics directly in contact with invertebrates  
11 (such as crustaceans, cnidarians and molluscs) did not affect their degree of survival, their  
12 reproduction, nor their sex-ratio, with the exception of a few cases, and only five of the 137  
13 experiments measured an EC<sub>50</sub> lower than 1 mg/L (Calleja et al., 1993; Isidori et al., 2005).

14           Therefore, the Wikipharma data base search on bioassays indicates that single-celled  
15 organisms (both pro- and eukaryotes) are most susceptible to low antibiotic concentrations.  
16 These findings are backed up by more studies and reviews. For example, Bengtsson-Palme  
17 and Larsson (2016) reviewed the effects of antibiotics on clinically relevant bacteria and  
18 found the lowest minimal inhibitory concentrations (MIC) at 2 µg/L for 13 antibiotics,  
19 corresponding to the lowest concentration tested. Le Page et al. (2007) calculated relative  
20 species sensitivity and found that prokaryotes were the most sensitive to antibiotics, and  
21 Valitalo et al. (2017) who reviewed the toxicological impact of antibiotics on microscopic  
22 aquatic organisms found that cyanobacteria and ammonium oxidizing bacteria were the most  
23 sensitive to antibiotics in general. Therefore, natural microbial communities are the most  
24 vulnerable to antibiotics discharge in the aquatic environment (as also pointed out by Grenni  
25 et al. (2018)).

1           Taking this literature into account, and judging from the examples listed in the  
2 database, we can identify some particularly problematic antibiotics in terms of their  
3 occurrence in fresh waters and their toxicity. While some of the antibiotics affecting those  
4 organisms are not frequently found in the environment, some others like ciprofloxacin and  
5 ofloxacin can be found at relatively high concentrations in fresh waters (aus der Beek et al.,  
6 2016; Feitosa-Felizzola and Chiron, 2009; Ginebreda et al., 2010) (Table 1) and are among  
7 the most potent antibiotics at low concentrations (Bengtsson-Palme and Larsson, 2016).  
8 Studies found that ciprofloxacin was inhibiting the growth of the cyanobacteria *Mycrocystis*  
9 *aeruginosa* at 5 µg/L (Halling-Sørensen et al., 2000) and 17 µg/L (Robinson et al., 2005).  
10 This antibiotic was found in fresh waters at concentrations in a similar range: 14.33 µg/L in  
11 South Africa (Agunbiade and Moodley, 2016), and 9.66 µg/L in France (Feitosa-Felizzola  
12 and Chiron, 2009) (Table 1). Ofloxacin can inhibit the growth of the bacterium *Vibrio*  
13 *fischeri* at 0.9 µg/L and the algae *Pseudokirchnella subcapitata* at 4.74 µg/L (Table 2), and  
14 was detected up to 17.7 µg/L in Asia (aus der Beek et al., 2016) and up to 8.7 µg/L in Spain  
15 (Ginebreda et al., 2010). Similarly, chloramphenicol, erythromycin, norfloxacin,  
16 oxytetracycline, streptomycin, and tylosin are classified as ‘very toxic’ for aquatic organisms  
17 (European Commission, 1996; Petrie et al., 2014) and they have been detected at  
18 concentrations of over 1 µg/L in fresh waters (Table 1).

19           Bioassays are useful to study the toxicity of new pharmaceutical compounds and the  
20 EC<sub>50</sub> data give us some indication of the antibiotics’ toxicity in an environmental context,  
21 however, they do not give information on the effect antibiotics can have in a complex natural  
22 system. Also, they do not demonstrate that prokaryotes have the ability to metabolise  
23 antibiotics and to evolve in response to antibiotic pollution.

24

## 25 **5. Antibiotic resistance in natural bacterial communities**

1 Standard bioassays do not provide information about microbial resistance, but we know that  
2 environmental antimicrobials can act in that way. For instance, many studies have linked  
3 antibiotic occurrence in wastewater and antibiotic resistance in WWTP impacted streams  
4 (Guo et al., 2017; Schwartz, 2003). Significant correlations are found between the exposure  
5 to antibiotics and their corresponding antibiotic resistance genes (ARGs), and the selective  
6 pressure for ARGs increase with the concentrations of antibiotics (Li et al., 2012; Rodriguez-  
7 Mozaz et al., 2015). It is known that very low antibiotic concentrations (10–100 times below  
8 clinically determined minimum inhibitory concentrations) can increase the relative  
9 abundance of resistant bacteria and select for resistance by promoting the rate of adaptive  
10 evolution (Friman et al., 2015; Gullberg et al., 2011; Lundström et al., 2016).

11 The emergence of resistance to antimicrobial compounds such as antibiotics is a  
12 natural process that has its origins, much as many antibiotics themselves, in inter-species  
13 competition in natural environments. It is not surprising, therefore, that bacteria resistant to  
14 antibiotics have been found in relatively pristine aquatic and soil environments. A seminal  
15 study by Dantas et al. (2008) showed that communities of soil bacteria were able not just to  
16 tolerate antibiotics, but to use them as their only source of carbon.

17 In the clinical context, near consensus has been reached that overuse of available  
18 antibiotics combined with the failure to discover new ones is likely to be one of the key  
19 challenges of the healthcare sector in the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Piddock, 2012). Most research has,  
20 understandably, focussed on this issue, elucidating genetic determinants of secondary  
21 resistance, i.e. mutations that confer increased tolerance to the antibiotic upon exposure to it.  
22 This differs from primary or intrinsic resistance that can have a number of reasons, for  
23 example the inability of most penicillins to reach their target site in Gram-negative bacteria.  
24 Mechanisms of resistance, e.g. degradation or modification of the antibiotic, upregulation of  
25 efflux pumps, modification of the target enzyme/substructure rendering the antibiotic useless

1 and ways for genetic dissemination between bacteria via horizontal gene transfer (HGT) are  
2 well understood (Blair et al., 2014).

3 While the potential for wide-spread resistance can therefore be regarded as near  
4 ubiquitous, the dynamics promoting and limiting the spread of resistance across bacterial  
5 populations in the natural environment, both within and between species are less well  
6 understood. Importantly, the effect of sublethal levels of antibiotics and resulting  
7 physiological and phenotypic adaptations, which are governed by environmental factors and  
8 also greatly influence (future) resistance potential have recently gained increased attention  
9 (Dörries et al., 2014; Fernández et al., 2011).

10 It is important to determine dynamics promoting and limiting the spread of resistance  
11 across bacterial populations in the natural environment, and to identify the environments  
12 where an increase of ARGs can occur. Chemicals driving resistance to antibiotics can include  
13 – in addition to antibiotics themselves – biocides such as disinfectants, metals and  
14 phytochemicals (Friedman, 2015; Gullberg et al., 2014; Pal et al., 2015; Wales and Davies,  
15 2015). Moreover, new research is showing that microplastic can be a vehicle for antibiotics  
16 and resistance genes in aquatic ecosystems (Arias-Andres et al., 2018; McCormick et al.,  
17 2014). In contrast with other chemical pollutants, bacterial contaminants and their ARGs are  
18 capable of persisting and spreading in the environment, and ultimately could transfer their  
19 resistance to human pathogens (Bengtsson-Palme et al., 2018; Berendonk et al., 2015).  
20 Integrating the capacity of ARGs to transfer from contaminated sources to pathogenic  
21 bacteria into risk assessment is a considerable challenge and we also need to be able to test  
22 for the occurrence of resistance determinants in the environment (Berendonk et al., 2015).

23 Several studies are looking into the effects of sub-inhibitory concentrations of  
24 antibiotics in complex aquatic bacterial communities. Quinlan et al. (2011) exposed a stream  
25 biotic community to tetracyclines (0.5-100 µg/L) and found changes in antibiotic resistance,



1 bacteria abundance and productivity after seven days. Lundstrom et al. (2016) also tested the  
2 effects of tetracyclines on biofilms (0.1-1000 µg/L) and found an increase in antibiotic  
3 resistance bacteria at 10 µg/L and changes in the biofilm taxonomic composition. The  
4 development of antibiotic resistance in natural microbial communities is an indirect effect of  
5 antibiotics in the environment but they can also have direct effects on the microbial  
6 community structure and functioning. Bactericides can cause the disappearance of microbial  
7 populations and change the entire bacterial community. Proia et al. (2013) found alterations  
8 in the bacterial community composition when exposed to a mixture of 16 antibiotics  
9 (concentrations ranging from 0.005 to 1.5 µg/L) with an increase in Actinobacteria and  
10 Laverman et al. (2015) found an effect on bacterial community structures when exposed to  
11 vancomycin (1000 µg/L) in river sediments downstream of a WWTP.

12         Low concentrations of antibiotics can also play an important role in the structure of  
13 biofilms, for example, low concentrations of the antibiotic tobramycin (50-1000 µg/L)  
14 induced biofilm formation in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* by modulating the aminoglycoside  
15 resistance gene which also regulates cell surface adhesiveness (Hoffman et al., 2005). The  
16 effect of sub-lethal levels of antibiotics and resulting physiological and phenotypic  
17 adaptations, which are governed by environmental factors, have recently gained increased  
18 attention (Dorries et al., 2014; Fernández et al., 2011). Furthermore, physiological and  
19 genetic adaptations to antibiotic stress do not happen in isolation, but are often tied to  
20 changes in other bacterial behaviours such as virulence (Behrends et al., 2013; Martínez and  
21 Rojo, 2011; Watkinson et al., 2007; Yeung et al., 2011).

22

## 23 **6. Evaluation of antibiotics under more complex and realistic scenarios**

24 Our literature search shows that antibiotic concentrations measured in fresh waters, despite  
25 concentrations being well below clinically-relevant levels, are very likely to have direct, and

1 indirect, effects on at least the microbial component of freshwater communities.  
2 Environmental scientists are now challenged to show if antibiotic loadings can be detrimental  
3 for freshwater communities - as a mixture and under global change scenarios. To capture the  
4 true effects of antibiotic impacts on whole communities, and the ecosystem processes they  
5 drive, we propose three major future research avenues: i) food webs, ii) antibiotic mixtures  
6 and iii) interaction with other stressors such as temperature (Fig. 2), as we outline in the  
7 following paragraphs.

8         The impact of antibiotic pollution on bacteria and aquatic food-webs is likely to be  
9 substantial but is complex to determine. While standard bioassays are a valid tool to elucidate  
10 the effects of one contaminant on one single species, they generally do not provide  
11 information as to how antibiotic exposure influences species assemblages and therefore  
12 ecosystem functioning. Sub-inhibitory concentrations of antibiotics can have potential effects  
13 on species interactions such as changes in population dynamics and bacterial community  
14 composition which can lead to changes in trophic interactions but we are still lacking a  
15 population-level perspective (Grenni et al., 2018; Hiltunen et al., 2017). A recent study also  
16 found that cooperative communities (i.e. when metabolites produced by one organism are  
17 used as nutrients or energy source by another) are more susceptible to antibiotics and as  
18 cross-feeding is nearly ubiquitous in microbial communities, low antibiotic concentrations  
19 might have a stronger effect than previously thought (Adamowicz et al., 2018).

20         In addition to bacteria interacting with other bacteria, important interactions in natural  
21 microbial communities are those with protozoan predators. Protozoans are the most abundant  
22 predators feeding on bacteria and can have a profound effect on bacterial abundance. There  
23 are experiments showing that protozoan predators and antibiotic resistance are linked. One  
24 study shows that antibiotics can lead to cascading indirect effects in species in other trophic  
25 levels (Friman et al., 2015). This study used the bacterium *Pseudomonas fluorescens* and its

1 protozoan consumers (the ciliate *Tetrahymena pyriformis* and the flagellate *Chilomonas*  
2 *paramecium*) to explore the effects of 40 µg/L of gentamicin and found that bacteria  
3 increased resistance to both antibiotics and predators in a manner dependent on the antibiotic  
4 concentration (Friman et al., 2015). The bacterial adaptation cascaded through the food web  
5 leading to a reduced predator-prey abundance ratio, which increased the instability of  
6 populations and lowered the predator community (Friman et al., 2015). In another study the  
7 protozoan predator *Tetrahymena termophila* increased the persistence and spread of an  
8 antibiotic resistance plasmid in populations of the bacterial pathogen *Serratia marcescens*  
9 (Cairns et al., 2016).

10 In other food web studies including metazoan consumers, Quinlan *et al.* (2011)  
11 looked at the effect of tetracycline in stream mesocosms and observed a decrease in bacterial  
12 abundance but also a reduction in the algal periphyton biomass and nematode abundance.  
13 Additionally, they showed that at the highest dose of tetracycline (10 µg/L and 100 µg/L),  
14 and after 28 days of non-exposure, the bacterial productivity recovered but not the abundance  
15 of bacteria, algae and nematodes (Quinlan et al., 2011). Little is known about the extent that  
16 antibiotics are taken up and redistributed among different types of organisms within a food  
17 web. A recent study investigated the bioconcentration of trimethoprim over several months in  
18 an aquatic food web but they did not detect the antibiotic in the biota (Lagesson et al.,  
19 2016). Simple laboratory experiments could explore whether antibiotics change the  
20 composition of microscopically small aquatic communities - consisting of bacteria, viruses  
21 and protists (Fig. 2; e.g. following the approach used by Friman et al. (2015)). Laboratory  
22 cultures could even include larger invertebrates (such as microscopically small crustaceans)  
23 to explore how changes in the microbial food web influence the reproduction of larger  
24 invertebrates. Certainly it is important to expand these experiments to the 'real world' and  
25 natural biofilms are an ideal system to test the effects of antibiotics (Lundström et al., 2016;

1 Quinlan et al., 2011). We believe an important focus is predator-prey oscillations with prey  
2 that is evolving resistance (see Fussman et al., 2014 for an example of a microcosm set-up  
3 and data analysis).

4 Another complex angle to antibiotic pollution in the environment is that organisms  
5 and food webs are faced with ‘antibiotic cocktails’. Different classes of antibiotics are  
6 typically detected simultaneously in fresh water (Table 1) and therefore, aquatic organisms  
7 are exposed to mixtures of antibiotics. The individual concentrations of antibiotics that are  
8 measured in the environment might be low, but the combined concentrations could result in  
9 significant toxicity to aquatic organisms. For example, in the Llobregat River basin in Spain,  
10 four antibiotics were analysed (erythromycin, sulfamethoxazole, trimethoprim and ofloxacin)  
11 with very low individual concentrations but with a total concentration of 2.4 µg/L (López-  
12 Roldán et al., 2010).

13 Chemicals in mixtures potentially interact with each other, in synergy or antagonistically.  
14 It is therefore essential to investigate the potential interactions between antibiotics in the  
15 environment but only a few studies have done this. A theoretical link between the toxicity of  
16 the individual antibiotics and the effects of a mixture would allow the prediction of the  
17 effects of antibiotic mixtures on aquatic organisms. Two principle concepts, the concentration  
18 addition (CA) and the independent action (IA), are often applied for the assessment of  
19 pharmaceutical mixtures in the environment (Backhaus, 2014).

20 For example, the mixture toxicity of ten quinolones (from 14 µg/L to 1020 µg/L) on the  
21 test organism *Vibrio fischeri*, was estimated using these two concepts and results indicated  
22 that the mixture was best predicted with the concentration addition (Backhaus et al., 2000).  
23 González-Pleiter et al. (2013) also showed that the combined effect can be ‘more than the  
24 sum of its parts’ by testing the effects of antibiotics used singly, binary and in mixtures of  
25 four and five antibiotics. The toxicological interactions of the antibiotics were analysed using

1 the combination index (CI) and they showed that the combination of erythromycin and  
2 tetracycline had a synergistic effect on the green algae *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata* at  
3 environmentally relevant concentrations (González-Pleiter et al., 2013). Erythromycin and  
4 tetracycline added together inhibited the growth of the algae at only 1/8<sup>th</sup> of their individual  
5 inhibition concentrations. However, to date, synergistic or antagonistic effects have rarely  
6 been observed in multi-components mixtures.

7         The individual concentrations of antibiotics, which are measured in the environment,  
8 can be low but the combined concentrations could result in significant toxicity for aquatic  
9 organisms (Fig. 2). An example for a study that attempted a more complex approach comes  
10 from Bundschuh et al. (2009), who tested the effects of antibiotic mixtures with  
11 sulfamethoxazole, trimethoprim, erythromycin, roxithromycin and clarithromycin on a  
12 decomposer detritivore system (the freshwater crustacean *Gammarus fossarum* feeding on  
13 leaves colonised by bacteria and fungi). They found that fungal biomass was higher at a total  
14 antibiotic concentration of 200 µg/L and thus *Gammarus* preferred leaves ‘contaminated’  
15 with this antibiotic cocktail (Bundschuh et al., 2009). It was suggested that the antibiotic  
16 mixture inhibited bacterial growth, which reduced competition for fungi and therefore  
17 promoted fungal growth (Bundschuh et al., 2009) but the design of the experiment did not  
18 allow mechanisms to be extracted.

19         It is essential to investigate the potential interactions between antibiotics in the  
20 environment. These questions could be addressed in experiments that mirror the logic of  
21 biodiversity-ecosystem functioning research, where the effects of single vs. multi-species  
22 treatments on ecosystem processes have been assessed (Lawrence et al., 2012; Perkins et al.,  
23 2015; Reiss et al., 2011, 2010, 2009). In analogy to these experiments, it is possible to run  
24 laboratory experiments with antibiotic mixtures and to investigate their single- and mixture  
25 effects, both on individual species (bacteria) or mini food webs. As a response variable, we

1 consider the adaptation of bacteria to antibiotic mixtures to be a priority research focus as  
2 adaptation to antibiotics can induce changes in the bacterial community and bacteria  
3 consumers can be susceptible to them.

4 In ecosystems, the effects of antibiotics are complex and context-dependent, as  
5 highlighted by taking food webs and mixtures into account, and environmental scientists are  
6 faced with the fact that antibiotics are not the only stressors in the system. The rise of  
7 ‘ecological surprises’ in the primary scientific literature highlights the growing uncertainty  
8 over the cumulative impacts of multiple novel and extreme environmental changes, or  
9 ‘stressors’ (Jackson et al., 2016). Ecological surprises are unexpected findings on the  
10 combined effects of stressors such as synergism or antagonism. The organisms in the  
11 environment are not only exposed to climate change or land use or pollution alone but  
12 simultaneously to a multitude of stressors (Fig. 2). If those other stressors have an impact on  
13 the diversity of microbial communities, it could affect the spread of antibiotic resistance  
14 genes via HGT as species composition and diversity can be a major factor determining how  
15 resistance genes spread (Tamminen et al., 2012). For example, a study shows that plasmid  
16 transfer is likely to occur to abundant strains and to low-abundance strains in the presence of  
17 a more structured spatial environment (Cairns et al., 2018). This study also suggests that  
18 plasmid transfer is more likely to happen to more bacterial strains if antibiotics are present  
19 (Cairns et al., 2018).

20 Therefore, it is important to consider how other factors, such as temperature, change  
21 the effects of antibiotics. Temperature is a key factor to include in antibiotic studies because  
22 both chemical reactions, and the metabolic activity of freshwater organisms, are governed by  
23 strict physical laws. In aquatic ecology, theoretical frameworks that include temperature and  
24 traits of organisms already exist and can explain how communities respond to temperature  
25 changes (Perkins et al., 2015). The use of microcosms, mesocosms and field experiments

1 have improved our ability to predict effects of contaminants on higher levels of biological  
2 organisation (Thompson et al., 2015) as we can test complex, multifactorial hypotheses  
3 concerning interactions between the contaminants and environmental factors.

4

## 5 **7. Concluding remarks**

6 In this paper, we illustrate that antibiotic pollution in fresh water is ubiquitous and that  
7 concentrations in the field are substantial; that many antibiotics are toxic for fresh water  
8 organisms from bacteria to multicellular organisms; and that even sub-lethal concentrations  
9 have the ability to induce changes in freshwater communities via bacterial resistance. This  
10 has knock-on effects for species interactions within the entire fresh water community and is  
11 complicated by the fact that antibiotics interact with each other and other stressors. Clearly,  
12 freshwater ecologists have the tools to show how antibiotic pollution has, and will, impact  
13 upon natural freshwater communities. We believe that it is possible to run experiments that  
14 can build on recent research (such as protozoans grazing on adapted bacteria) to find out  
15 under which scenarios antibiotics affect natural communities (e.g. competition between  
16 prokaryotes and fungi) and how antibiotic effects can cascade from prokaryotes to the entire  
17 ecosystem.

18 It is obvious that antibiotic mixtures can have an effect on important ecosystem  
19 processes such as organic matter decomposition in stream ecosystems that are also  
20 experiencing stressors such as species loss, habitat alteration and warming. Further, we  
21 should also keep in mind that antibiotics are not the only substances found in the fresh water  
22 and that complex chemical mixtures with other pollutants should be tested under  
23 environmentally relevant scenarios.

24 Going forward, we believe some general considerations can help future studies.  
25 Firstly, in a food web context, we have to consider predator-prey oscillations with prey that is

1 evolving resistance. Secondly, in the field, the combined concentration of antibiotics can be  
2 high but whether effects are synergistic, additive or antagonistic depends on the particular  
3 antibiotics. Therefore, it is critical to remember that for mixtures of antibiotics the whole  
4 effect might be different from the sum of its parts. Thirdly, it is essential to move beyond a  
5 bioassay approach and to consider the context-dependency of sub-lethal antibiotic  
6 concentrations (i.e. realistic field concentrations), to assess fluctuations within the microbial  
7 food web through time and to estimate how interactions change with temperature and other  
8 anthropogenic stressors.

9

#### 10 **Data accessibility**

11 The datasets supporting this article have been uploaded as part of the supplementary material.

#### 12 **Competing interests**

13 We declare no competing interests.

#### 14 **Authors' contributions**

15 M-CD carried out the literature search, data compilation, and wrote the manuscript; JR, VB  
16 and AR wrote the manuscript; M-CD and JR conceived of the study. All authors gave final  
17 approval for publication.

#### 18 **Acknowledgments**

19 M-CD was supported by a University of Roehampton, London research studentship and  
20 supervised by JR and AR. This project was matched to funding by the European Union's  
21 Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Marie-Skłodowska-Curie grant  
22 agreement No. 641939. We thank five anonymous reviewer whose comments greatly  
23 improved this manuscript.



## 1 **References**

2

3 Adamowicz, E.M., Hunter, R.C., Flynn, J., Harcombe, W.R., 2018. Cross-feeding modulates  
4 antibiotic tolerance in bacterial communities. *bioRxiv* 243949.

5 <https://doi.org/10.1101/243949>

6 Agunbiade, F.O., Moodley, B., 2016. Occurrence and distribution pattern of acidic  
7 pharmaceuticals in surface water, wastewater, and sediment of the Msunduzi River,  
8 Kwazulu-Natal, South Africa. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 35, 36–46.

9 <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3144>

10 Ando, T., Nagase, H., Eguchi, K., Hirooka, T., Nakamura, T., Miyamoto, K., Hirata, K.,  
11 2007. A novel method using cyanobacteria for ecotoxicity test of veterinary  
12 antimicrobial agents. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 26, 601–6. [https://doi.org/10.1897/06-](https://doi.org/10.1897/06-195R.1)

13 [195R.1](https://doi.org/10.1897/06-195R.1)

14 Andreozzi, R., Caprio, V., Ciniglia, C., de Champdoré, M., Lo Giudice, R., Marotta, R.,  
15 Zuccato, E., 2004. Antibiotics in the environment: occurrence in Italian STPs, fate, and  
16 preliminary assessment on algal toxicity of amoxicillin. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 38,

17 6832–6838. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es049509a>

18 Arias-Andres, M., Klümper, U., Rojas-Jimenez, K., Grossart, H.P., 2018. Microplastic  
19 pollution increases gene exchange in aquatic ecosystems. *Environ. Pollut.* 237, 253–261.

20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.02.058>

21 aus der Beek, T., Weber, F.A., Bergmann, A., Hickmann, S., Ebert, I., Hein, A., Küster, A.,  
22 2016. Pharmaceuticals in the environment-Global occurrences and perspectives.

23 *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 35, 823–835. <https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3339>

24 Backhaus, T., 2014. Medicines, shaken and stirred: a critical review on the ecotoxicology of  
25 pharmaceutical mixtures. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*

- 1 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0585>
- 2 Backhaus, T., Scholze, M., Grimme, L.H., 2000. The single substance and mixture toxicity of  
3 quinolones to the bioluminescent bacterium *Vibrio fischeri*. *Aquat. Toxicol.* 49, 49–61.
- 4 Behrends, V., Ryall, B., Zlosnik, J.E.A., Speert, D.P., Bundy, J.G., Williams, H.D., 2013.  
5 Metabolic adaptations of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* during cystic fibrosis chronic lung  
6 infections. *Environ. Microbiol.* 15, 398–408.
- 7 Bengtsson-Palme, J., Kristiansson, E., Larsson, D.G.J., 2018. Environmental factors  
8 influencing the development and spread of antibiotic resistance. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.*  
9 42, 68–80. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsre/fux053>
- 10 Bengtsson-Palme, J., Larsson, D.G.J., 2016. Concentrations of antibiotics predicted to select  
11 for resistant bacteria: Proposed limits for environmental regulation. *Environ. Int.* 86.  
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2015.10.015>
- 13 Berendonk, T.U., Manaia, C.M., Merlin, C., Fatta-Kassinos, D., Cytryn, E., Walsh, F.,  
14 Bürgmann, H., Sørum, H., Norström, M., Pons, M.N., Kreuzinger, N., Huovinen, P.,  
15 Stefani, S., Schwartz, T., Kisand, V., Baquero, F., Martinez, J.L., 2015. Tackling  
16 antibiotic resistance: The environmental framework. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.*  
17 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro3439>
- 18 Blair, J.M.A., Webber, M.A., Baylay, A.J., Ogbolu, D.O., Piddock, L.J. V., 2014. Molecular  
19 mechanisms of antibiotic resistance. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 13, 42–51.  
20 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro3380>
- 21 Brain, R.A., Johnson, D.J., Richards, S.M., Sanderson, H., Sibley, P.K., Solomon, K.R.,  
22 2004. Effects of 25 pharmaceutical compounds to *Lemna gibba* using a seven- day  
23 static- renewal test. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 23, 371–382. [https://doi.org/10.1897/02-](https://doi.org/10.1897/02-576)  
24 576
- 25 Bundschuh, M., Hahn, T., Gessner, M.O., Schulz, R., 2009. Antibiotics As a Chemical

1 Stressor Affecting an Aquatic Decomposer–Detritivore System. *Environ. Toxicol.*  
2 *Chem.* 28, 197. <https://doi.org/10.1897/08-075.1>

3 Cabello, F.C., 2006. Heavy use of prophylactic antibiotics in aquaculture: a growing problem  
4 for human and animal health and for the environment. *Environ. Microbiol.* 8, 1137–  
5 1144. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-2920.2006.01054.x>

6 Cairns, J., Jalasvuori, M., Ojala, V., Brockhurst, M., Hiltunen, T., 2016. Conjugation is  
7 necessary for a bacterial plasmid to survive under protozoan predation. *Biol. Lett.* 12,  
8 2015–2018. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2015.0953>

9 Cairns, J., Ruokolainen, L., Hultman, J., Tamminen, M., Virta, M., Hiltunen, T., 2018.  
10 Ecology determines how low antibiotic concentration impacts community composition  
11 and horizontal transfer of resistance genes. *Commun. Biol.* 2018 11 1, 35.  
12 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-018-0041-7>

13 Calleja, M.C., Persoone, G., Geladi, P., 1993. predictive potential of a battery of  
14 ecotoxicological tests for human acute toxicity, as evaluated with the first 50 MEIC  
15 chemicals. *Altern. to Lab. Anim. ATLA.*

16 Carvalho, I.T., Santos, L., 2016. Antibiotics in the aquatic environments: A review of the  
17 European scenario. *Environ. Int.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2016.06.025>

18 Carvalho, R.N., Arukwe, A., Ait-Aissa, S., Bado-Nilles, A., Balzamo, S., Baun, A., Belkin,  
19 S., Blaha, L., Brion, F., Conti, D., Creusot, N., Essig, Y., Ferrero, V.E., Flander-Putrlé,  
20 V., Furhacker, M., Grillari-Voglauer, R., Hogstrand, C., Jonas, A., Kharlyngdoh, J.B.,  
21 Loos, R., Lundebye, A.K., Modig, C., Olsson, P.E., Pillai, S., Polak, N., Potalivo, M.,  
22 Sanchez, W., Schifferli, A., Schirmer, K., Sforzini, S., Sturzenbaum, S.R., Softeland, L.,  
23 Turk, V., Viarengo, A., Werner, I., Yagur-Kroll, S., Zounkova, R., Lettieri, T., 2014.  
24 Mixtures of chemical pollutants at European legislation safety concentrations: how safe  
25 are they? *Toxicol. Sci.* 141, 218–233. <https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kfu118>

- 1 Dantas, G., Sommer, M.O., Oluwasegun, R.D., Church, G.M., 2008. Bacteria subsisting on  
2 antibiotics. *Science* 320, 100–103. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1155157>
- 3 Díaz-Cruz, M.S., García-Galán, M.J., Barceló, D., 2008. Highly sensitive simultaneous  
4 determination of sulfonamide antibiotics and one metabolite in environmental waters by  
5 liquid chromatography–quadrupole linear ion trap–mass spectrometry. *J. Chromatogr. A*  
6 1193, 50–59. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2008.03.029](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2008.03.029)
- 7 Dinh, Q.T., Alliot, F., Moreau-Guigon, E., Eurin, J., Chevreuil, M., Labadie, P., 2011.  
8 Measurement of trace levels of antibiotics in river water using on-line enrichment and  
9 triple-quadrupole LC–MS/MS. *Talanta* 85, 1238–1245.  
10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2011.05.013>
- 11 Dorries, K., Schlueter, R., Lalk, M., 2014. Impact of antibiotics with various target sites on  
12 the metabolome of *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 58, 7151–  
13 7163. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.03104-14> [doi]
- 14 Dörries, K., Schlueter, R., Lalk, M., 2014. Impact of antibiotics with various target sites on  
15 the metabolome of *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 58, 7151–  
16 7163. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.03104-14>
- 17 European Commission, 1996. Technical Guidance Document in Support of Commission  
18 Directive 93/67/EEC on Risk Assessment for New Notified Substances and Commission  
19 Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 on Risk Assessment for Existing Substances. Part II.  
20 Environ. Risk Assessment, Luxemb.
- 21 Feitosa-Felizzola, J., Chiron, S., 2009. Occurrence and distribution of selected antibiotics in a  
22 small Mediterranean stream (Arc River, Southern France). *J. Hydrol.* 364, 50–57.  
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2008.10.006>
- 24 Fernández, L., Breidenstein, E.B.M., Hancock, R.E.W., 2011. Creeping baselines and  
25 adaptive resistance to antibiotics. *Drug Resist. Updat.* 14, 1–21.

1 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drug.2011.01.001>

2 Flaherty, C.M., Dodson, S.I., 2005. Effects of pharmaceuticals on *Daphnia* survival, growth,  
3 and reproduction. *Chemosphere* 61, 200–207.

4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2005.02.016>

5 Friedman, M., 2015. Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria: Prevalence in Food and Inactivation by  
6 Food-Compatible Compounds and Plant Extracts. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* 63, 3805–3822.

7 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.5b00778>

8 Friman, V.P., Guzman, L.M., Reuman, D.C., Bell, T., 2015. Bacterial adaptation to sublethal  
9 antibiotic gradients can change the ecological properties of multitrophic microbial  
10 communities. *Proceedings Biological Sci. / R. Soc.* 282, 20142920.

11 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.2920>

12 Fussmann, K.E., Schwarzmüller, F., Brose, U., Jousset, A., Rall, B.C., 2014. Ecological  
13 stability in response to warming. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 4, 206–210.

14 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2134>

15 García-Galán, M.J., Villagrasa, M., Díaz-Cruz, M.S., Barceló, D., 2010. LC-QqLIT MS  
16 analysis of nine sulfonamides and one of their acetylated metabolites in the Llobregat  
17 River basin. Quantitative determination and qualitative evaluation by IDA experiments.  
18 *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* 397, 1325–1334. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-010-3630-y)  
19 [010-3630-y](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-010-3630-y)

20 Giger, W., Alder, A.C., Golet, E.M., Kohler, H.-P.E., McArdell, C.S., Molnar, E., Siegrist,  
21 H., Suter, M.J.-F., 2003. Occurrence and Fate of Antibiotics as Trace Contaminants in  
22 Wastewaters, Sewage Sludges, and Surface Waters. *Chim. Int. J. Chem.* 57, 485–491.

23 <https://doi.org/10.2533/000942903777679064>

24 Ginebreda, A., Muñoz, I., de Alda, M.L., Brix, R., López-Doval, J., Barceló, D., 2010.  
25 Environmental risk assessment of pharmaceuticals in rivers: relationships between

1 hazard indexes and aquatic macroinvertebrate diversity indexes in the Llobregat River  
2 (NE Spain). *Environ. Int.* 36, 153–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2009.10.003>

3 González-Pleiter, M., Gonzalo, S., Rodea-Palomares, I., Leganés, F., Rosal, R., Boltes, K.,  
4 Marco, E., Fernández-Piñas, F., 2013. Toxicity of five antibiotics and their mixtures  
5 towards photosynthetic aquatic organisms: Implications for environmental risk  
6 assessment. *Water Res.* 47, 2050–2064. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2013.01.020>

7 Grenni, P., Ancona, V., Barra Caracciolo, A., 2018. Ecological effects of antibiotics on  
8 natural ecosystems: A review. *Microchem. J.* 136.  
9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.microc.2017.02.006>

10 Greulich, P., Scott, M., Evans, M.R., Allen, R.J., 2015. Growth-dependent bacterial  
11 susceptibility to ribosome-targeting antibiotics. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* 11, 796–796.  
12 <https://doi.org/10.15252/msb.20145949>

13 Gullberg, E., Albrecht, L.M., Karlsson, C., Gullberg, E., Albrecht, L.M., Karlsson, C.,  
14 Sandegren, L., Andersson, D.I., 2014. Selection of a Multidrug Resistance Plasmid by  
15 Sublethal Levels of Antibiotics and Heavy Metals. *MBio* 5, 19–23.  
16 <https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.01918-14.Editor>

17 Gullberg, E., Cao, S., Berg, O.G., Ilbäck, C., Sandegren, L., Hughes, D., Andersson, D.I.,  
18 2011. Selection of resistant bacteria at very low antibiotic concentrations. *PLoS Pathog*  
19 7, e1002158. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1002158>

20 Guo, J., Li, J., Chen, H., Bond, P.L., Yuan, Z., 2017. Metagenomic analysis reveals  
21 wastewater treatment plants as hotspots of antibiotic resistance genes and mobile genetic  
22 elements. *Water Res.* 123, 468–478. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2017.07.002>

23 Halling-Sørensen, B., Lützhøft, H.-C.H., Andersen, H.R., Ingerslev, F., 2000. Environmental  
24 risk assessment of antibiotics: comparison of mecillinam, trimethoprim and  
25 ciprofloxacin. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 46, 53–58.

1 [https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/46.suppl\\_1.53](https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/46.suppl_1.53)

2 Heise, J., Höltinge, S., Schrader, S., Kreuzig, R., 2006. Chemical and biological  
3 characterization of non-extractable sulfonamide residues in soil. *Chemosphere* 65,  
4 2352–2357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2006.04.084>

5 Hiltunen, T., Virta, M., Laine, A.-L., 2017. Antibiotic resistance in the wild: an eco-  
6 evolutionary perspective. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 372, 20160039.  
7 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0039>

8 Hoffman, L.R., D’Argenio, D.A., MacCoss, M.J., Zhang, Z., Jones, R.A., Miller, S.I., 2005.  
9 Aminoglycoside antibiotics induce bacterial biofilm formation. *Nature* 436, 1171–1175.

10 Hughes, S.R., Kay, P., Brown, L.E., 2012. Global synthesis and critical evaluation of  
11 pharmaceutical data sets collected from river systems. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 47, 661–  
12 677. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es3030148>

13 Isidori, M., Lavorgna, M., Nardelli, A., Pascarella, L., Parrella, A., 2005. Toxic and  
14 genotoxic evaluation of six antibiotics on non-target organisms. *Sci. Total Environ.* 346,  
15 87–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2004.11.017>

16 Jackson, M.C., Loewen, C.J.G., Vinebrooke, R.D., Chimimba, C.T., 2016. Net effects of  
17 multiple stressors in freshwater ecosystems: a meta- analysis. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 22,  
18 180–189. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13028>

19 Jjemba, P.K., 2006. Excretion and ecotoxicity of pharmaceutical and personal care products  
20 in the environment. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* 63, 113–130.  
21 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2004.11.011>

22 Klein, E.Y., Van Boeckel, T.P., Martinez, E.M., Pant, S., Gandra, S., Levin, S.A., Goossens,  
23 H., Laxminarayan, R., 2018. Global increase and geographic convergence in antibiotic  
24 consumption between 2000 and 2015. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 201717295.  
25 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1717295115>

- 1 Kümmerer, K., 2009. Antibiotics in the aquatic environment—a review—part I. *Chemosphere*  
2 75, 417–434. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2008.11.086>
- 3 Kümmerer, K., 2004. Resistance in the environment. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 54, 311–320.  
4 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkh325>
- 5 Kümmerer, K., Henninger, A., 2003. Promoting resistance by the emission of antibiotics  
6 from hospitals and households into effluent. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* 9, 1203–1214.  
7 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2003.00739.x>
- 8 Laverman, A.M., Cazier, T., Yan, C., Roose-Amsaleg, C., Petit, F., Garnier, J., Berthe, T.,  
9 2015. Exposure to vancomycin causes a shift in the microbial community structure  
10 without affecting nitrate reduction rates in river sediments. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 22,  
11 13702–13709. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-4159-6>
- 12 Lawrence, D., Fiegna, F., Behrends, V., Bundy, J.G., Phillimore, A.B., Bell, T., Barraclough,  
13 T.G., 2012. Species interactions alter evolutionary responses to a novel environment.  
14 *PLoS Biol* 10, e1001330. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001330>
- 15 Le Page, G., Gunnarsson, L., Snape, J., Tyler, C.R., 2017. Integrating human and  
16 environmental health in antibiotic risk assessment: A critical analysis of protection  
17 goals, species sensitivity and antimicrobial resistance. *Environ. Int.* 109, 155–169.  
18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2017.09.013>
- 19 Lewandowski, J., Putschew, A., Schwesig, D., Neumann, C., Radke, M., 2011. Fate of  
20 organic micropollutants in the hyporheic zone of a eutrophic lowland stream: Results of  
21 a preliminary field study. *Sci. Total Environ.* 409, 1824–1835.  
22 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.01.028>
- 23 Li, D., Yang, M., Hu, J., Ren, L., Zhang, Y., Li, K., 2008. Determination and fate of  
24 oxytetracycline and related compounds in oxytetrac. *Environ. Toxicol.* 27, 80–86.
- 25 Li, J., Wang, T., Shao, B., Shen, J., Wang, S., Wu, Y., 2012. Plasmid-Mediated Quinolone



1 Resistance Genes and Antibiotic Residues in Waste - water and Soil Adjacent to Swine  
2 Feedlots : Potential Transfer to Agricultural Lands 1144–1149.

3 Lindsey, M.E., Meyer, M., Thurman, E.M., 2001. Analysis of Trace Levels of Sulfonamide  
4 and Tetracycline Antimicrobials in Groundwater and Surface Water Using Solid-Phase  
5 Extraction and Liquid Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry. *October 73*, 4640–4646.  
6 <https://doi.org/10.1021/ac010514w>

7 López-Roldán, R., de Alda, M.L., Gros, M., Petrovic, M., Martín-Alonso, J., Barceló, D.,  
8 2010. Advanced monitoring of pharmaceuticals and estrogens in the Llobregat River  
9 basin (Spain) by liquid chromatography–triple quadrupole-tandem mass spectrometry in  
10 combination with ultra performance liquid chromatography–time of flight-mass  
11 spectrometry. *Chemosphere 80*, 1337–1344.  
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2010.06.042>

13 Lundström, S. V., Östman, M., Bengtsson-Palme, J., Rutgersson, C., Thoudal, M., Sircar, T.,  
14 Blanck, H., Eriksson, K.M., Tysklind, M., Flach, C.F., Larsson, D.G.J., 2016. Minimal  
15 selective concentrations of tetracycline in complex aquatic bacterial biofilms. *Sci. Total*  
16 *Environ. 553*, 587–595. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.02.103>

17 Madikizela, L.M., Tavengwa, N.T., Chimuka, L., 2017. Status of pharmaceuticals in African  
18 water bodies: Occurrence, removal and analytical methods. *J. Environ. Manage. 193*,  
19 211–220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.02.022>

20 Managaki, S., Murata, A., Takada, H., Bui, C.T., Chiem, N.H., 2007. Distribution of  
21 macrolides, sulfonamides, and trimethoprim in tropical waters: Ubiquitous occurrence of  
22 veterinary antibiotics in the Mekong Delta. *Environ. Sci. Technol. 41*, 8004–8010.  
23 <https://doi.org/10.1021/es0709021>

24 Martínez, J.L., Rojo, F., 2011. Metabolic regulation of antibiotic resistance. *FEMS*  
25 *Microbiol. Rev. 35*, 768–789. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6976.2011.00282.x>

- 1 McCormick, A., Hoellein, T.J., Mason, S.A., Schluep, J., Kelly, J.J., 2014. Microplastic is an  
2 abundant and distinct microbial habitat in an urban river. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 48,  
3 11863–11871. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es503610r>
- 4 Molander, L., Ågerstrand, M., Rudén, C., 2009. WikiPharma—A freely available, easily  
5 accessible, interactive and comprehensive database for environmental effect data for  
6 pharmaceuticals. *Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol.* 55, 367–371.  
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2009.08.009>
- 8 Mompelat, S., Le Bot, B., Thomas, O., 2009. Occurrence and fate of pharmaceutical products  
9 and by-products, from resource to drinking water. *Environ. Int.* 35, 803–814.  
10 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2008.10.008>
- 11 Monteiro, S.C., Boxall, A.B.A., 2015. Occurrence and Fate of Human Pharmaceuticals in the  
12 Environment, *Reviews of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*.  
13 <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20013-2>
- 14 Pal, C., Bengtsson-Palme, J., Kristiansson, E., Larsson, D.G.J., 2015. Co-occurrence of  
15 resistance genes to antibiotics, biocides and metals reveals novel insights into their co-  
16 selection potential. *BMC Genomics* 16, 1–14. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-015-2153-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-015-2153-5)  
17 5
- 18 Peralta-Maraver, I., Galloway, J., Posselt, M., Arnon, S., Reiss, J., Lewandowski, J.,  
19 Robertson, A.L., 2018a. Environmental filtering and community delineation in the  
20 streambed ecotone. *Sci. Rep.* 8, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-34206-z>
- 21 Peralta-Maraver, I., Reiss, J., Robertson, A.L., 2018b. Interplay of hydrology, community  
22 ecology and pollutant attenuation in the hyporheic zone. *Sci. Total Environ.* 610–611,  
23 267–275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.08.036>
- 24 Perkins, D.M., Bailey, R.A., Dossena, M., Gamfeldt, L., Reiss, J., Trimmer, M., Woodward,  
25 G., 2015. Higher biodiversity is required to sustain multiple ecosystem processes across

1 temperature regimes. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 21, 396–406.  
2 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12688>

3 Petrie, B., Barden, R., Kasprzyk-Hordern, B., 2014. A review on emerging contaminants in  
4 wastewaters and the environment: Current knowledge, understudied areas and  
5 recommendations for future monitoring. *Water Res.* 72, 3–27.  
6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2014.08.053>

7 Piddock, L.J. V, 2012. The crisis of no new antibiotics—what is the way forward? *Lancet*  
8 *Infect. Dis.* 12, 249–253. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(11\)70316-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(11)70316-4)

9 Proia, L., Lupini, G., Osorio, V., Pérez, S., Barceló, D., Schwartz, T., Amalfitano, S., Fazi,  
10 S., Romaní, A.M., Sabater, S., 2013. Response of biofilm bacterial communities to  
11 antibiotic pollutants in a Mediterranean river. *Chemosphere* 92, 1126–1135.  
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2013.01.063>

13 Quinlan, E.L., Nietch, C.T., Blocksom, K., Lazorchak, J.M., Batt, A.L., Griffiths, R., Klemm,  
14 D.J., 2011. Temporal dynamics of periphyton exposed to tetracycline in stream  
15 mesocosms. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 45, 10684–10690.  
16 <https://doi.org/10.1021/es202004k>

17 Reiss, J., Bridle, J.R., Montoya, J.M., Woodward, G., 2009. Emerging horizons in  
18 biodiversity and ecosystem functioning research. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 24, 505–514.

19 Reiss, J., Schmid-Araya, J.M., 2011. Feeding response of a benthic copepod to ciliate prey  
20 type, prey concentration and habitat complexity. *Freshw. Biol.* 56, 1519–1530.  
21 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2011.02590.x>

22 Reiss, J., Schmid-Araya, J.M., 2010. Life history allometries and production of small fauna.  
23 *Ecology* 91, 497–507. <https://doi.org/10.1890/08-1248.1>

24 Robertson, A.L., Wood, P.J., 2010. Ecology of the hyporheic zone: origins, current  
25 knowledge and future directions. *Fundam. Appl. Limnol. / Arch. für Hydrobiol.* 176,

1 279–289. <https://doi.org/10.1127/1863-9135/2010/0176-0279>

2 Robinson, A.A., Belden, J.B., Lydy, M.J., 2005. Toxicity of fluoroquinolone antibiotics to  
3 aquatic organisms. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 24, 423–430. [https://doi.org/10.1897/04-](https://doi.org/10.1897/04-210R.1)  
4 210R.1

5 Rodriguez-Mozaz, S., Chamorro, S., Marti, E., Huerta, B., Gros, M., Sánchez-Melsió, A.,  
6 Borrego, C.M., Barceló, D., Balcázar, J.L., 2015. Occurrence of antibiotics and  
7 antibiotic resistance genes in hospital and urban wastewaters and their impact on the  
8 receiving river. *Water Res.* 69, 234–242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2014.11.021>

9 Schwartz, T., 2003. Detection of antibiotic-resistant bacteria and their resistance genes in 43.  
10 Segura, P.A., Takada, H., Correa, J.A., El Saadi, K., Koike, T., Onwona-Agyeman, S.,  
11 Ofosu-Anim, J., Sabi, E.B., Wasonga, O. V., Mghalu, J.M., dos Santos Junior, A.M.,  
12 Newman, B., Weerts, S., Yargeau, V., 2015. Global occurrence of anti-infectives in  
13 contaminated surface waters: Impact of income inequality between countries. *Environ.*  
14 *Int.* 80, 1386–1398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2015.04.001>

15 Singer, A.C., Shaw, H., Rhodes, V., Hart, A., 2016. Review of antimicrobial resistance in the  
16 environment and its relevance to environmental regulators. *Front. Microbiol.* 7, 1–22.  
17 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.01728>

18 Soares, J., Castro, L.F.C., Reis-Henriques, M.A., Monteiro, N.M., Santos, M.M., 2012.  
19 Zebrafish (*Danio rerio*) life-cycle exposure to chronic low doses of ethinylestradiol  
20 modulates p53 gene transcription within the gonads, but not NER pathways.  
21 *Ecotoxicology* 21, 1513–1522. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-012-0905-4>

22 Tamminen, M., Virta, M., Fani, R., Fondi, M., 2012. Large-scale analysis of plasmid  
23 relationships through gene-sharing networks. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 29, 1225–1240.  
24 <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msr292>

25 Thompson, M.S.A., Bankier, C., Bell, T., Dumbrell, A.J., Gray, C., Ledger, M.E., Lehmann,

1 K., McKew, B.A., Sayer, C.D., Shelley, F., 2015. Gene- to- ecosystem impacts of a  
2 catastrophic pesticide spill: testing a multilevel bioassessment approach in a river  
3 ecosystem. *Freshw. Biol.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12676>

4 Väliälto, P., Massei, R., Heiskanen, I., Behnisch, P., Brack, W., Tindall, A.J., Du Pasquier,  
5 D., Küster, E., Mikola, A., Schulze, T., Sillanpää, M., 2017. Effect-based assessment of  
6 toxicity removal during wastewater treatment. *Water Res.* 126, 153–163.  
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2017.09.014>

8 Van Boeckel, T.P., Gandra, S., Ashok, A., Caudron, Q., Grenfell, B.T., Levin, S.A.,  
9 Laxminarayan, R., 2014. Global antibiotic consumption 2000 to 2010: an analysis of  
10 national pharmaceutical sales data. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* 14, 742–750.  
11 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(14\)70780-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(14)70780-7)

12 Wales, A., Davies, R., 2015. Co-Selection of Resistance to Antibiotics, Biocides and Heavy  
13 Metals, and Its Relevance to Foodborne Pathogens. *Antibiotics* 4, 567–604.  
14 <https://doi.org/10.3390/antibiotics4040567>

15 Watkinson, A.J., Micalizzi, G.B., Graham, G.M., Bates, J.B., Costanzo, S.D., 2007.  
16 Antibiotic-resistant *Escherichia coli* in wastewaters, surface waters, and oysters from an  
17 urban riverine system. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 73, 5667–5670.  
18 <https://doi.org/AEM.00763-07>

19 Wise, R., 2002. Antimicrobial resistance: priorities for action. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 49,  
20 585–586. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/49.4.585>

21 Yeung, A.T., Bains, M., Hancock, R.E., 2011. The sensor kinase CbrA is a global regulator  
22 that modulates metabolism, virulence, and antibiotic resistance in *Pseudomonas*  
23 *aeruginosa*. *J. Bacteriol.* 193, 918–931. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00911-10>

24

25

1 **Figure legends**

2 **Fig. 1.** Ecotoxicity ( $EC_{50}$ ) of antibiotics, based on bioassays published in the database  
3 Wikipharma, for unicellular organisms (panel A) and for multicellular organisms (panel B).  
4 The responses measured were both chronic (e.g. growth inhibition, bioluminescence) and  
5 acute (e.g. death, survival) and are given in the electronic supplementary material Table S2.  
6 Only antibiotics used in at least 3 bioassays are represented. Boxes show interquartile range  
7 and median, whiskers show range and outliers. The widths of the boxes vary with the number  
8 of experiments (n). The red lines indicate the toxicity level: the Commission of the European  
9 Communities classifies chemicals with an  $EC_{50}$  between 10 and 100 mg/L as harmful, from 1  
10 to 10 mg/L as toxic and those under 1 mg/L as very toxic to aquatic organisms (European  
11 Commission, 1996; Petrie et al., 2014). The black triangles represent the highest  
12 concentrations of the antibiotic as found in fresh water (see Table 1).

13

14 **Fig. 2.** Possible effects of antibiotics and multiple stressors in freshwater ecosystems on a  
15 simple freshwater food web (bacteria, algae, a protist and a micro-crustacean). Arrows  
16 indicate trophic links between species (thin arrow: normal prey-to-predator ratio, thick arrow:  
17 destabilised prey-to-predator ratio). Left hand side panel: the food web without external  
18 stressors. Middle panel: the effect of a single antibiotic that might induce the death of one  
19 strain of bacteria and the resistance of another one, impacting the whole food web by  
20 changing the trophic links. The right-hand side panels show three further scenarios when  
21 more stressors are added such as: other antibiotics (the effect of a cocktail of antibiotics  
22 might induce stronger and additive effects on both bacteria and algae), or warming (the effect  
23 of antibiotics coupled with the effect of warming might induce an increase of the organisms'  
24 metabolic rates and therefore a quicker resistance for some bacteria), or warming and other  
25 antibiotics together.