# Carriage and acquisition of Extended Spectrum Beta-Lactamase producing Enterobacterales among neonates admitted to hospital in Kilifi, Kenya

## Abstract

**Background**

Infections caused by extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing Enterobacterales (ESBL-E) among hospitalized neonates in sub-Saharan Africa pose significant clinical challenges. However, sources of infection and risk factors for transmission are not clearly defined in this setting.

**Methods**

In a cohort study of consecutive neonatal admissions to Kilifi County Hospital (KCH) from July 2013-August 2014, we estimated ESBL-E carriage prevalence on admission using rectal swab cultures and identified risk factors using logistic regression. Using
twice-weekly follow up swabs, we estimated the incidence and identified risk factors for ESBL-E acquisition in hospital using Poisson regression.

Results

The prevalence of ESBL-E carriage at admission was 10% (59/569). Caesarean section delivery, older neonatal age, and smaller household size were significant risk factors. Of the 510 infants admitted without ESBL-E carriage, 238 (55%) acquired carriage during their hospital stay. The incidence of acquisition was 21.4% (95% CI 19.0, 24.0) per day. The rate was positively associated with the number of known neonatal ESBL-E carriers and with the total number of neonates on the same ward.

Conclusions

Carriage of ESBL-E was common among neonates on admission and acquisition in hospital was rapid. The dissemination and selection of ESBL-E appears to be driven by hospital exposures; operative delivery and neonatal ward patient density. Further attention to infection control, patient crowding and carriage surveillance is warranted.

Response to Reviewers:

Response to reviewer 1:

A very clear and well written manuscript highlighting the rapidity of acquisition of ESBL coliforms in hospitalized neonates. It will be of interest to paediatric infection specialists and neonatologists.

I have a few minor technical queries / comments on the methods:
- Can the authors include the year / version number of the CLSI guidelines in the text for clarity.

Response: We used the CLSI guideline for the year 2014 and reference to it was overlooked during writing up the manuscript. We have updated this in the text and references.

- The method for detection of ESBL in Enterobacter needs clarification since this genus is not included in the CLSI guidance and the presence of AmpC complicates things.

Response: The reviewer is correct; phenotypic ESBL testing is problematic for Enterobacter species due to AmpC beta-lactamase production. We have described the limitation of our methods in terms of Enterobacter species that may give false negative results in phenotypic ESBL testing in the discussion as follows: “Our prevalence and incidence estimates may also be underestimates since stool culture may be more sensitive than rectal swab culture, a single sample is less sensitive than multiple samples for culture and some Enterobacter spp, which are known to produce AmpC beta-lactamas, may have tested falsely-negative for ESBL by the phenotypic method used.”

We do have whole-genome sequencing data for 19 Enterobacter species from this study, that were ESBL positive using the CLSI phenotypic assay for E. coli and K. pneumoniae, and can report that all of them possessed bla CTX-M-15 in addition to an AmpC cephalosporinase.

- Please provide a definition of “multi-drug resistant” (results line 172).

Response: We defined multi-drug resistance as resistance to at least one agent in three or more antimicrobial categories as recommended by Magiorakos et al. 2012.

- I am not a statistician but am aware of the problems of over-dispersion in Poisson regression modelling: was this checked for?

Response: The reviewer is correct that over dispersion is sometimes an issue when using Poisson models. It arises, for example, when there are multiple events per person and heterogeneity between individuals in the rate of acquisition. Under these circumstances the variability in the number of events per person is greater than that predicted by the Poisson model (i.e., the data are over-dispersed relative to the Poisson distribution). However, our analysis is different because we modelled time to first acquisition (i.e., maximum of 1 event per person). In this situation it is impossible to identify heterogeneity and hence over-dispersion does not play a role.
The results in Tables 2 and 3 is duplicated in the supplementary tables: would it be possible just include just once?

Response: Thank you for this excellent suggestion. We have removed Table 2 and 3 and replaced the two tables with supplementary tables S2 and S3 in the main text.

Response to reviewer 2:
This very interesting study by Dr. Kangia and colleagues focuses on ESBL-E colonization in hospitalized neonates and, in particular, on sources of infection and risk factors for transmission.

Although the data were collected between 2013-2014 in only one rural Kenyan hospital this paper provides very useful and relevant information, specifically providing incidence data on acquisition of ESBL in hospitalized neonates.

*This topic is relevant for clinical practice because despite the fact that these infections often have a poor outcome, the epidemiology of transmission is poorly characterized. There is some evidence of hospital-acquired carriage in older children but this is the first study investigating the sequential rate of acquisition of ESBL-E carriage in hospital over time. Previous studies have collected data at admission and discharge only.

**This study is a prospective study estimating ESBL-E carriage prevalence from rectal swab with a robust systematic approach (day 0, 2, 4, 6, and twice weekly thereafter until an ESBL-E was isolated or until hospital discharge or death, whichever came first). In addition to the epidemiological and clinical data, the number of neonates in each room, bed-location and antimicrobial use of all participants was recorded daily.

This study reveals that among neonates admitted, 10% were already carriers of ESBL-E. Interestingly, the authors showed how the incidence of ESBL-E acquisition was 21.4 (95% CI 19.0, 24.0) per 100 child days of observation, and the median time to acquisition among these patients was 3 (IQR 1-5) inpatient days. This data provides a reasonably robust baseline to assist in the design and conduct of future IPC/ASP interventional trials.

The Authors’ findings suggest that the greatest risk factors for ESBL-E acquisition in hospital are the increased numbers of existing ESBL-E carriers among neonatal patients and hospital crowding. Although it may seem intuitive, only few studies currently support this. Interestingly, Authors’ findings suggest a threshold effect where risk plateaued after admitting more that 10-14 neonates in a ward. It would be useful to reference the recent paper by Smit et al in the discussion of the complexity of gene transfer (Smit PW, Stoesser N, Pol S, et al. Transmission Dynamics of Hyper-Endemic Multi-Drug Resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae in a Southeast Asian Neonatal Unit: A Longitudinal Study With Whole Genome Sequencing. Front Microbiol. 2018 Jun 5;9:1197. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2018.01197. eCollection 2018. PubMed PMID: 29951041. Response: Thank you for this suggestion, it is a very interesting paper. We have included it in the discussion as follows:

“A study in Cambodia of transmission of third-generation cephalosporin-resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae isolates in a newly opened neonatal unit found that most clusters were likely to have been due to patient sources while 2 of 9 clusters could have been due to either an environmental or a patient source.”

In this study 93% of neonates were receiving antibiotics during hospitalization and this, of course, underpowered the observation of any differences. The Authors state: “specifically use of third generation cephalosporins during the inpatient stay was not shown to be correlated with ESBL-E acquisition”. It would be very interesting to know what proportion of the neonates were on ampicillin and gentamicin or third generation cephalosporins and whether there was any difference between the regimens.

Response: Table 2 provides data on how many neonates received different antibiotic regimens among those who were admitted with ESBL-E carriage. 455/510 (89%) neonates received ampicillin and gentamicin and 116/510 (23%) received a third-generation cephalosporin.
The other major question is whether there is in fact higher rates of carriage of ESBL-E populations on admission, but as this is low level colonization they are not identified as plated colonies. After exposure with antibiotics, the non-ESBL organisms are selected out, and then much higher rates of ESBL containing colonies are identified on the plates. Can the authors comment on whether ESBL-E carriage could in fact be the same on admission and discharge and the apparent acquisition is an artifact of antibiotic selection and sub-culture methods.

Response: This is an interesting suggestion and we have added it into the discussion. While it is certainly possible that low-level ESBL-E carriage, below detection rate by culture methods, is amplified by selection pressure from the use of antibiotics until it is detectable, we do not think it is likely that this accounts for the entire effect seen in the study. Certainly, the association we saw between age at admission and carriage at admission would not be explained by antibiotic use. We have included this possibility in the discussion as follows:

“It is theoretically possible that low-level ESBL-E carriage was more prevalent at admission than we were able to determine; below detection rate by culture methods, but then amplified by selection pressure from the use of antibiotics in hospital until detectable.”

Is there any chance to retrieve information on resistance patterns for different post natal ages? Although these are low numbers, it would be interesting to determine whether resistance phenotype can be used to assist in differentiating community and hospital based ESBL-E acquisition (see Blackburn et al (Epidemiol Infect. 2014 Apr;142(4):803-11. doi: 10.1017/S0950268813001520. Epub 2013 Jul 11.)

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. Unfortunately, we observed no difference in the antibiotic sensitivity profile from ESBL-E carriage isolates among neonates of different ages.

Overall the manuscript will benefit from only minor revisions:

Abstract needs some re-writing as it doesn’t do justice to the study. For example, the sentence “However, sources of infection and risk factors for transmission are not clearly defined in this setting” does not clearly define what the Authors are going to present.

Response: We have rewritten this section as suggested: “Data on prevalence and acquisition of ESBL-E carriage among hospitalized neonates in the region are few and risk factors for transmission are not clearly defined.”

Materials and Methods section
It would be helpful to have a summary in the text (instead of in table TS1) of the exclusion criteria for this study.

Response: All neonatal admissions during the study period were eligible to be recruited in the study. We state in the methods “Neonatal admissions were eligible for recruitment into the study if they were admitted to the High Dependency Unit (HDU) between 1st July 2013 and 29th August 2014 or to the neonatal rooms in the general pediatric ward between 16th August 2013 and 29th August 2014.” In addition, we describe the important differences between eligible included neonates and excluded neonates in the discussion as follows: “Of note, significantly more parents/guardians of older neonates, and neonates born in hospital by caesarean section, declined to participate in the study (Supplementary table S1)”
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Corresponding author* We report a prospective hospital-based longitudinal study that estimates the ESBL-E carriage prevalence among neonates on admission, the incidence of acquisition of ESBL-E carriage in hospital and the risk factors for neonatal prevalent and incident ESBL-E carriage.
ABSTRACT

Background
Infections caused by extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing Enterobacterales (ESBL-E) among hospitalized neonates in sub-Saharan Africa pose significant clinical challenges. Data on prevalence and acquisition of ESBL-E carriage among hospitalized neonates in the region are few and risk factors for transmission are not clearly defined.

Methods
In a cohort study of consecutive neonatal admissions to Kilifi County Hospital (KCH) from July 2013-August 2014, we estimated ESBL-E carriage prevalence on admission using rectal swab cultures and identified risk factors using logistic regression. Using twice-weekly follow up swabs, we estimated the incidence and identified risk factors for ESBL-E acquisition in hospital using Poisson regression.

Results
The prevalence of ESBL-E carriage at admission was 10% (59/569). Caesarean section delivery, older neonatal age, and smaller household size were significant risk factors. Of the 510 infants admitted without ESBL-E carriage, 238 (55%) acquired carriage during their hospital stay. The incidence of acquisition was 21.4% (95% CI 19.0, 24.0) per day. The rate was positively associated with the number of known neonatal ESBL-E carriers and with the total number of neonates on the same ward.

Conclusions
Carriage of ESBL-E was common among neonates on admission and acquisition in hospital was rapid. The dissemination and selection of ESBL-E appears to be driven by hospital exposures; operative delivery and neonatal ward patient density. Further attention to infection control, patient crowding and carriage surveillance is warranted.
INTRODUCTION

Infection and carriage rates of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase producing *Enterobacterales* (ESBL-E) are on the rise globally and pose a particular threat to neonates [1–3]. Outbreaks of multi-drug resistant infections due to ESBL-E in hospitals are common[4–7] and are a growing burden, especially among neonates[3].

It is known that neonatal ESBL-E carriage can be a precursor to invasive infections[7,8] but the epidemiology of transmission in sub Saharan Africa (sSA) is poorly characterized. In sSA, data on neonatal ESBL-E infection and carriage are scarce[2,3] but there is some evidence of hospital-acquired carriage in older children. In a general pediatric ward in Madagascar, prevalence of carriage of ESBL-E in stool was found to be 21% on admission and 57% on discharge, among patients discharged ≥48 hours after admission[9]. In the community, amongst children and adults in Madagascar[10], prevalence of ESBL carriage was 10%.

At Kilifi County Hospital (KCH), we have observed sporadic outbreaks of ESBL-E bacteraemia among neonatal admissions over several years. These infections often have a poor outcome (in KCH the case-fatality risk for hospital-acquired paediatric bloodstream infections is 54%[11]). We have also observed an increase in the proportion of ESBL-producing invasive *Klebsiella pneumoniae* over a decade at Kilifi County hospital[12].

Here we report a prospective hospital-based longitudinal study at KCH to estimate the ESBL-E carriage prevalence among neonates on admission, the incidence of acquisition of ESBL-E carriage in hospital and the risk factors for neonatal prevalent and incident ESBL-E carriage.
METHODS

Study design and sampling procedure
Neonatal admissions were eligible for recruitment into the study if they were admitted to the High Dependency Unit (HDU) between 1st July 2013 and 29th August 2014 or to the neonatal rooms in the general pediatric ward between 16th August 2013 and 29th August 2014. The HDU consists of an open ward with six beds for older children and two small rooms for neonatal admissions. The neonatal rooms are of equal size and have a combined bed-capacity of eight. In the general pediatric ward, there are two neonatal rooms with a combined bed-capacity of 24, including five incubators, four small beds and fifteen cots. KCH practices comprehensive obstetric care, as defined by the World Health Organization, with caesarean section services available.

Data and clinical sample collection
Epidemiological and clinical data were collected on admission and entered in real-time into an electronic medical record system. Rectal swabs were collected on admission (day 0), at days 2, 4 and 6, and twice weekly thereafter until an ESBL-E was isolated or until hospital discharge or death, whichever came first. Rectal swabs were collected using pre-moistened viscose-tipped swabs and placed in Amies transport media (Deltalabs, Barcelona, Spain). The number of neonates in each room, bed-location and antimicrobial use of all participants was recorded daily. Blood culture is performed routinely at admission on all children hospitalized at KCH[13]. Clinical samples are collected at the discretion of the attending clinician.

Laboratory procedure
Rectal swabs were inoculated onto 5% horse blood agar and MacConkey agar supplemented with 8% gentamicin. Cefotaxime (30 ug) and ceftazidime (30 ug) antibiotic discs (Oxoid, United Kingdom) were added on the 2nd and 4th streaking zones on the blood agar plate to detect bacteria
resistant to third-generation cephalosporins. Blood agar plates were incubated in a CO$_2$ incubator while MacConkey agar plates were incubated in an aerobic incubator for 24 hours at 35 +/- 2°C. Oxidase-negative, gram-negative rods were subcultured and identified using standard techniques (API 20E; BioMérieux, France). Antimicrobial susceptibility testing was performed using the disc diffusion method according to the Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI, 2014) guidelines[14]. ESBL testing was performed for isolates that were non-susceptible to third generation cephalosporins using the double disc method[14]. External quality assurance was provided for by UK National External Quality Assessment service.

**Analysis**

The binomial confidence interval around a prevalence estimate is widest (for a fixed sample size) when the estimate is 50%. We calculated that a sample size of 555 neonates would be required to estimate a 50% prevalence of ESBL-E carriage with a precision of +/-5%.

Carriage on admission (prevalent carriage) was defined as a positive culture on the first rectal swab, provided it was obtained within 48 hours of admission. Logistic regression was used to determine risk factors for carriage at admission. The factors considered were: infant age, sex, maternal age, infant weight at admission, current method of feeding, place and mode of delivery, prematurity (less than or equal to 37 weeks gestation, estimated by the admitting clinician), number living in the same household, type of toilet and main source of water. Multivariable logistic regression models were fitted after confounders had been identified (Figure 1). Infant age at admission was adjusted for prematurity and place/mode of delivery, and prematurity was adjusted for age on admission.

Kaplan-Meier curves were used to describe the time to acquisition of carriage in hospital among neonates who did not have ESBL-E carriage at admission. In this analysis, follow up time, which
was measured in days after admission, was censored at the earliest of: (i) time of the first ESBL-
E culture positive swab (ii) time of last swab collection if the neonate died or was discharged and
had remained negative throughout the course of admission. For neonates who acquired ESBL-E,
the date of acquisition was assumed to be the midpoint between the date of the last negative
swab and the date of the first positive swab.

We calculated the rate of ESBL-E acquisition per 100 days at risk. Poisson regression was used
to identify predictors of the acquisition rate and to test for interactions. The potential predictors
were both time-invariant (e.g. weight at admission, place/mode of delivery, mother’s age and age
at admission) and time-varying (e.g. number of known ESBL carriers on the ward). A multivariable
Poisson regression model was fitted to investigate the effect of crowding on ESBL-E acquisition.
The model included as covariates the ward, the number of neonates on the ward and the number
of known ESBL-E carriers on the ward.

We defined multi-drug resistance as resistance to at least one agent in three or more antimicrobial
categories[15]. Statistical analyses were done with STATA 12.0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX,
USA).

Study clearance and ethical considerations
The KEMRI National Ethical Review Committee approved the study (SSC 2301). Informed
consent was obtained from all parents/guardians before enrollment.

RESULTS
During the study period, 1,014 neonates were admitted to Kilifi County Hospital, and the
parents/guardians of 597 neonates gave consent for them to participate in the study (Figure 2).
The median age of the participants was one day (IQR 0-3 days) and the median duration of hospital stay was 5 days (IQR 3-9 days).

Of 597 who gave consent to participate, five parents/guardians withdrew consent and 23 neonates had no swab collected. The prevalence of ESBL carriage at admission was 10% (59/569). From the 59 neonates with ESBL-E carriage at admission, there were 65 isolates consisting of 31 *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, 25 *Escherichia coli*, 8 *Enterobacter cloacae* and 1 *Klebsiella oxytoca*. Multiple colonization, ie. colonization with two or more ESBL-E from one participant, was found in 6/59 neonates (10%).

Among the 510 non-carriers on admission, 55% (283/510) acquired ESBL-E during their hospital stay. The incidence of ESBL-E acquisition was 21.4 (95% CI 19.0, 24.0) per 100 child days of observation, and the median time to acquisition among these patients was 3 (IQR 1-5) inpatient days (Figure 3). Nine neonates were diagnosed with ESBL-E bacteraemia during this study, all of whom had ESBL-E isolated from fecal carriage prior to or on the same day as blood was collected.

Most ESBL-E isolates were multi-drug resistant; resistance to chloramphenicol, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole, quinolones and gentamicin being common, none were resistant to imipenem and only 5% were resistant to amikacin (Table 1).

**Risk factors for ESBL-E carriage at admission**

In the univariable analysis, variables associated with prevalent ESBL-E carriage on admission were: being born at term, older infant age at admission, having fewer than eight people living in the same house, and hospital delivery, particularly by caesarean section (CS) (Table 2 and Supplementary Table S1). Babies born prematurely were more commonly admitted directly to the
neonatal ward (107/157, 68%) than babies born at full term (114/410, 28%; P-value<0.001). After adjusting for prematurity and place/mode of delivery, increasing infant age was positively associated (p<0.001) with ESBL-E carriage at admission, with odds ratios 1.72 (95% CI 0.69 – 4.27) and 3.88 (95% CI 1.47 - 10.21) among neonates aged 1-2 days and 3-28 days respectively, relative to the odds of ESBL carriage among neonates admitted on the day of birth. Being born at term was not associated with ESBL-E carriage after adjusting for the effect mediated through age on admission. We did not estimate an adjusted OR for place/mode of delivery and number of people in the same household since the associations were not confounded (Figure 1).

**Risk factors associated with acquisition of ESBL-E during hospitalization**

In the univariable analysis, hospital ward on admission, the number of neonates present in the hospital, the number of other neonates admitted in the same ward, and the number of known ESBL-E carriers were associated with incident acquisition of carriage (Table 3). Both current number of known neonatal ESBL-E carriers and number of other neonates in the same ward were positively associated with carriage acquisition when simultaneously included in multivariable model (Table 4), and there was no interaction between these risk factors. In both the univariable and multivariable analyses, the number of neonates in the ward exhibited a threshold effect whereby there was a plateau effect in carriage acquisition beyond 10 patients per ward. Recorded antibiotic prescription, specifically use of third generation cephalosporins during the inpatient stay was not shown to be associated with ESBL-E acquisition.

**DISCUSSION**

Our study reveals that among neonates admitted to a rural Kenyan hospital, 10% were already carriers of ESBL-E. Among those neonates who were not carriers at admission, 21.4% acquired ESBL-E carriage each day of admission; thus, more than half of the neonates were colonized with ESBL within the first three inpatient days.
For babies coming in to hospital, the main risk factors for existing rectal carriage with ESBL-E were delivery in hospital via caesarean section and older infant age at admission. For those admitted without carriage of ESBL-E, the principal risk factors for acquisition in hospital were the number of other neonates in the ward and the number with ESBL-E carriage.

Delivery through caesarean section has been reported to be a significant risk factor for prolonged faecal colonization with ESBL producing *K. pneumoniae* [16] and also a determinant of intestinal microflora early in life [17,18]. Mothers undergoing caesarean section are treated with antibiotics for surgical prophylaxis, sometimes extended to treatment of wound infections [19], which may select for antibiotic-resistant enteric bacteria. In Cambodia, young hospital-born infants were found to be at a greater risk of early colonization by third generation cephalosporin resistant gram-negative rods compared to infants born at home, a health centre or other locations and subsequently admitted to hospital [20]. In Madagascar, Herindrainy *et al.* reported that low birth weight, caesarean section and use of antibiotics by mothers at delivery were independently associated with neonatal acquisition of ESBL-E during the first month of life [21].

The finding that babies coming from a large family of >8 household members were less likely to carry ESBL-E at admission was surprising. We speculate that these neonates may have a more diverse gut microbiome, which could be protective against acquisition of ESBL-E carriage. Increased neonatal age at hospital admission was associated with a greater likelihood of ESBL-E carriage, as expected, since older neonates have had more time to acquire carriage.

Overall, we isolated ESBL-E from 10% of swabs within 48 hours of admission. In a cross-sectional ESBL-E carriage study done in a Tanzanian hospital, the overall neonatal prevalence of ESBL-E carriage was 25.4% [22]. Our findings suggest that some acquisition occurs before neonates come into the paediatric wards and we can speculate that this does not only come from their
mothers but also from the procedures and settings of childbirth, particularly caesarian delivery. We did not collect data on ESBL-E carriage in mothers or maternal antibiotic use.

Among neonates admitted without carriage, 55% acquired ESBL-E during hospitalization. An ESBL-E carriage study in a tertiary hospital in Rwanda among inpatients of all ages reported that 55% of participants acquired ESBL-E carriage during hospitalization [23]. A study in Madagascar reported that 48% of pediatric non-carriers at admission acquired ESBL-E during hospitalization.

Our findings from the longitudinal study suggest that the greatest risk factors for ESBL-E acquisition in hospital were having increased numbers of existing ESBL-E carriers among the neonatal patients and a greater number of neonates admitted to the ward. We assume that increased numbers of ESBL-E carriers increase the opportunity for transmission. This finding corresponds with a prospective cohort study done in the general intensive care unit of a hospital in Greece; colonization pressure contributed significantly to acquisition of carriage of carbapenemase producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in hospital[24]. Intuitively, hospital crowding is expected to be associated with higher rates of ESBL-E transmission and our results support this. However, our findings suggest a threshold effect where risk plateaued after admitting more than 10-14 neonates in a ward, suggesting that transmission effects associated with crowding are complex. Restricting the number of neonatal admissions to the hospital is impractical, but this does justify allocating increased space to neonatal admissions. Fixed low healthcare staff numbers relative to numbers of patients, the cultural practice of mothers caring for each other’s babies on the ward, physical proximity of adjacent neonates, and shared hygiene facilities, may all contribute to acquisition of ESBL-E carriage by neonates in hospital. As well as direct transmission between babies on the ward, nosocomial carriage acquisition directly from the hospital environment is also possible. A study in Cambodia of transmission of third-generation cephalosporin-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* isolates in a newly opened neonatal unit found
that most clusters were likely to have been due to patient sources while 2 of 9 clusters could have
been due to either an environmental or a patient source[25].

During the study period, nine neonates were diagnosed with ESBL-E bacteraemia. Nosocomial
spread of ESBL-E carriage may result in outbreaks of ESBL-E bacteraemia in the hospital; such
outbreaks have occurred in KCH in recent years [12], signifying the importance of awareness of
ESBL-E carriage. There is potential for surveillance to help inform hospital infection control and
to assist in averting such outbreaks. At KCH screening for carriage of ESBL-E among neonates
is not routinely done, hand washing facilities frequently lack water supply, and there are no fully
dedicated infection control staff.

Antibiotic use has been shown to affect the composition of gut microbiota and is associated with
ESBL-E carriage and acquisition[9,16,17,24,26]. Antimicrobial stewardship services are used as
part of hospital infection control services to reduce ESBL carriage in well-resourced hospitals. We
were unable to detect antibiotic use as a risk factor for ESBL-E acquisition in our study. We
suspect that this is mainly attributed to the fact that 93% of our participants were given antibiotics
during their hospital stay and we were therefore underpowered to observe any differences
(Supplementary table S2).

We did not collect data from babies after they were discharged from hospital, but patients
discharged with ESBL-E carriage have been shown to spread these ESBL-E within family units
and close contacts[16,27]. In a prospective cohort study of infants and their families in Norway,
the median carriage duration among infants discharged with carriage of ESBL-producing
*Klebsiella pneumoniae* after a hospital outbreak was 12.5 months[16]. If carriage of ESBL-E
persists and intra-household transmission occurs, discharged patients may act as reservoirs of
ESBL-E in the community.
Being a hospital-based study, focusing on sick newborns, our estimates of ESBL-E prevalence at admission cannot be generalized to community prevalence. It is theoretically possible that low-level ESBL-E carriage was more prevalent at admission than we were able to determine; below detection rate by culture methods, but then amplified by selection pressure from the use of antibiotics in hospital until detectable. We also were only able to recruit 68% of eligible neonates limiting the generalizability of our findings (Supplementary table S1). Of note, significantly more parents/guardians of older neonates, and neonates born in hospital by caesarean section, declined to participate in the study suggesting that our estimate of prevalence of ESBL-E carriage at admission is likely to be an underestimate. Our prevalence and incidence estimates may also be underestimates since stool culture may be more sensitive than rectal swab culture, a single sample is less sensitive than multiple samples for culture and some *Enterobacter* spp, which are known to produce AmpC beta-lactamases, may have tested falsely-negative for ESBL by the phenotypic method used. We did not find any carbapenem resistant Enterobacterales (CRE) in this study, but it is known that such isolates are present in Kenya[28,29]. Use of central quality assisted microbiology laboratories in surveillance for ESBL-E carriage could therefore be expected to have the added benefit of an early warning system for the introduction of CRE carriage.

In conclusion, our findings reveal a high incidence of ESBL-E colonization among hospitalized neonates, which is endemic in this setting. Further work to investigate the association between ESBL-E acquisition and both caesarean section delivery and crowding, perhaps including restrictions on room capacity, and more deliberate cohorting of older neonates and those born in hospital through caesarean section is needed. Given the link between ESBL-E carriage and outbreaks of potentially fatal ESBL-E infection, our data emphasize the importance of routine surveillance and hospital infection control.
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Table 1: Non-susceptibility profile for *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Escherichia coli* and *Enterobacter cloacae* carriage isolates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibiotic tested</th>
<th>Timing of admission</th>
<th><em>Klebsiella pneumoniae</em></th>
<th><em>Escherichia coli</em></th>
<th><em>Enterobacter cloacae</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on admission</td>
<td>N=31</td>
<td>N=25</td>
<td>N=8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after admission</td>
<td>N=196</td>
<td>N=73</td>
<td>N=42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloramphenicol</td>
<td>on admission</td>
<td>11 (35.5%)</td>
<td>3 (12.0%)</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after admission</td>
<td>66 (33.7%)</td>
<td>17 (23.3%)</td>
<td>33 (78.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>on admission</td>
<td>13 (41.9%)</td>
<td>16 (64.0%)</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after admission</td>
<td>99 (50.5%)</td>
<td>64 (87.7%)</td>
<td>25 (59.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotrimoxazole</td>
<td>on admission</td>
<td>31 (100%)</td>
<td>22 (88.0%)</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after admission</td>
<td>193 (98.5%)</td>
<td>70 (95.9%)</td>
<td>38 (90.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentamicin</td>
<td>on admission</td>
<td>30 (96.8%)</td>
<td>11 (44.0%)</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after admission</td>
<td>192 (98.0%)</td>
<td>58 (79.5%)</td>
<td>38 (90.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amikacin</td>
<td>on admission</td>
<td>2 (6.5%)</td>
<td>1 (4.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after admission</td>
<td>19 (9.7%)</td>
<td>3 (4.1%)</td>
<td>2 (4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imipenem</td>
<td>on admission</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after admission</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On admission: ≤48 hours after admission
After admission: >48 hours after admission

All isolates were Extended Spectrum beta-lactamase producing *Enterobacterales*
Table 2. Univariable analysis of risk factors for Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamase producing *Enterobacterales* colonization at admission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prematurity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.21 - 0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight at admission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2.5Kgs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥2.5Kgs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.93 - 2.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.76 - 2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age at admission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 days</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 days</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.11 - 6.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-28 days</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>3.09 - 15.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place/mode of delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital non-CS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.78 - 4.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital CS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.77 - 11.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother's age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;18 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-35 years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.37 - 2.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;35 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.17 - 2.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main water source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap in the compound</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap in community</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.34 - 1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borehole in community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.27 - 1.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural source</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.02 - 1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water vendor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.04 - 2.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current feed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breastfeeding</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No breastfeeding</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.39 - 1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of toilet</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet in house</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet shared in compound/community</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.44 - 1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.16 - 1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of people living in the same house</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.57 - 1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.16 - 0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CS  Caesarean section;
CI  Confidence interval
at admission: swabs collected within 48 hours after admission

Missing data: Prematurity n=2, Weight at admission n=6, Place/mode of delivery n=9, Mother’s age n=7, Main water source n=40, Current feed n=67, Type of toilet n=13, Number of people living in the same house n=13

CS  Caesarean section
CI  Confidence interval
Table 3. Univariable analysis of risk factors for acquisition of Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamase producing *Enterobacterales* (ESBL-E) colonization in hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Person days</th>
<th>Rate$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>Rate ratio</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prematurity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>802.5</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>521.5</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.79 - 1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight at admission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2.5kgs</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥2.5kgs</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.79 - 1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.66 - 1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at admission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 days</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 days</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>22.53</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.84 - 1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-28 days</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.80 - 1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place/mode of delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital, non-CS</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.76 - 1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital, CS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>166.5</td>
<td>28.23</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.94 - 1.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;18 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>146.5</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-35 years</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>21.51</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.78 - 1.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;35 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24.51</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.77 - 2.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated with antibiotics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>1242.5</td>
<td>21.17</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.55 - 1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated with ampicillin and gentamicin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.60 - 1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated with third-generation cephalosporins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>21.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.69 - 1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of antibiotic use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 days</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>133.5</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7 days</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>21.63</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.78 - 1.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;7 days</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.79 - 1.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Person days</td>
<td>Rate$^6$</td>
<td>Rate ratio</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of neonates present in the hospital per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-19</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>465.5</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-32</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.22 - 2.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>197.5</td>
<td>24.81</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.13 - 2.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of known ESBL-E carriers per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>260.5</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.37 - 3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>29.98</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.25 - 5.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>180.5</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.03 - 5.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of neonates on the same ward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.79 - 2.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>282.5</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.46 - 4.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>27.93</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.65 - 5.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>249.5</td>
<td>27.66</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.62 - 5.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward at admission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDU</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General pediatric</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.15 - 2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current feed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breastfeeding</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>661.5</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No breastfeeding</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>490.5</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.83 - 1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet in house</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet shared with community</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.71 - 1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>255.5</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70 - 1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main water source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap in compound</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>328.5</td>
<td>26.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap in community</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.64 - 1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borehole in community</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.45 - 1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural source</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.52 - 1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water vendor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.26 - 1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people living in the same house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>25.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>425.5</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.59 - 1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-40</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.64 - 1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CS  Caesarean section; HDU  High dependency unit;
§  Rate per 100 person day
Table 4: Multivariable analysis of risk factors for acquisition of Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamase producing *Enterobacterales* (ESBL-E) colonization in hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rate ratio</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of known ESBL-E carriers §</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.09 - 2.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.70 - 4.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-21</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.48 – 4.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of neonates on the same ward §§</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.74 - 2.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.16 - 3.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.04 - 3.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.93 - 3.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ Rate ratio adjusted for number of neonates on the same ward and ward at admission.

§§ Rate ratio adjusted for number of known ESBL-E carriers and ward at admission.
FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: Causal diagram for determinants of Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamase producing *Enterobacterales* carriage at admission

Footnote:
Only variables that had plausible interactions as shown in the casual diagram were included in the multivariable model

Figure 2: Flow of subjects recruited in the study

Footnote: Figure 2.
Among the n=177 not eligible neonatal admissions: 57 were admitted to the general pediatric ward before the study rolled out in that ward, 42 died before consenting, 30 not consented because there was no competent adult available to provide consent on behalf of the child within the first 48 hours of admission, 21 were discharged on admission, 5 were cases of readmission and their ESBL-E carriage status was known, 5 were not followed up after admission, 4 absconded and could not be traced after admission, 4 were considered too tiny for a sample to be collected, 3 were admitted for elective surgery and consenting was not done, 2 had congenital abnormalities and were not approached to participate, 2 could not be enrolled because the parent was a minor, 1 was not consented because the mother could not be approached for consenting, and 1 was enrolled after recruitment had stopped. +ve; positive and –ve; negative.

Figure 3: Kaplan-Meier estimate of Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamase producing *Enterobacterales* (ESBL-E) carriage acquisition as a function of days after admission among 510 neonates who were ESBL-E carriage negative at admission
All pediatric admissions N=4,117

Admissions aged >28 days N=3,103

All neonatal admissions N=1,014

Not eligible N=177

Invited to participate N=837

Consent declined N=240

Consented N=597

Withdrawals N=5

Included in the study N=592

No swab collected N=3

≥ 1 swab collected N=589

No admission swab collected N=20

Admission swab collected N=569

Admission swab culture +ve for ESBL N=59

Entered the follow up study N=510

Acquired ESBL carriage in hospital N=283

Discharged with -ve ESBL cultures N=227
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Table S1. Characteristics of study neonates and those who were eligible but not included, either because they were not swabbed, or because they withdrew prior to the start of the study, or because their parents did not provide consent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Included in study (N=569)</th>
<th>Excluded from study (N=268)</th>
<th>P - value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age at admission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 days</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 days</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-28 days</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight at admission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2.5kgs</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥2.5kgs</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prematurity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place/mode of delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital, non-CS</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital, CS</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;18 years</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-35 years</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;35 years</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CS = Caesarean section

Missing data:
Included in the study; Weight n=6, Prematurity n=2, Place/mode delivery n=9, Mother’s age n=7 and Excluded from the study; Weight n=3, Prematurity n=3, Place/mode delivery n=5, Mother’s age n=1

Table S2. Summaries on Antibiotics given for the 510 neonates recruited into the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibiotics given</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antibiotics given</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given ampicillin and gentamicin</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated with a third generation cephalosporin</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

Background
Infections caused by extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing *Enterobacterales* (ESBL-E) among hospitalized neonates in sub-Saharan Africa pose significant clinical challenges. Data on prevalence and acquisition of ESBL-E carriage among hospitalized neonates in the region are few and however, sources of infection and risk factors for transmission are not clearly defined in this setting.

Methods
In a cohort study of consecutive neonatal admissions to Kilifi County Hospital (KCH) from July 2013-August 2014, we estimated ESBL-E carriage prevalence on admission using rectal swab cultures and identified risk factors using logistic regression. Using twice-weekly follow up swabs, we estimated the incidence and identified risk factors for ESBL-E acquisition in hospital using Poisson regression.

Results
The prevalence of ESBL-E carriage at admission was 10% (59/569). Caesarean section delivery, older neonatal age, and smaller household size were significant risk factors. Of the 510 infants admitted without ESBL-E carriage, 238 (55%) acquired carriage during their hospital stay. The incidence of acquisition was 21.4% (95% CI 19.0, 24.0) per day. The rate was positively associated with the number of known neonatal ESBL-E carriers and with the total number of neonates on the same ward.

Conclusions
Carriage of ESBL-E was common among neonates on admission and acquisition in hospital was rapid. The dissemination and selection of ESBL-E appears to be driven by hospital exposures; operative delivery and neonatal ward patient density. Further attention to infection control, patient crowding and carriage surveillance is warranted.
INTRODUCTION

Infection and carriage rates of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase producing Enterobacterales (ESBL-E) are on the rise globally and pose a particular threat to neonates [1–3]. Outbreaks of multi-drug resistant infections due to ESBL-E in hospitals are common[4–7] and are a growing burden, especially among neonates[3].

It is known that neonatal ESBL-E carriage can be a precursor to invasive infections[7,8] but the epidemiology of transmission in sub Saharan Africa (sSA) is poorly characterized. In sSA, data on neonatal ESBL-E infection and carriage are scarce[2,3] but there is some evidence of hospital-acquired carriage in older children. In a general pediatric ward in Madagascar, prevalence of carriage of ESBL-E in stool was found to be 21% on admission and 57% on discharge, among patients discharged ≥48 hours after admission[9]. In the community, amongst children and adults in Madagascar[10], prevalence of ESBL carriage was 10%.

At Kilifi County Hospital (KCH), we have observed sporadic outbreaks of ESBL-E bacteraemia among neonatal admissions over several years. These infections often have a poor outcome (in KCH the case-fatality risk for hospital-acquired paediatric bloodstream infections is 54%[11]). We have also observed an increase in the proportion of ESBL-producing invasive Klebsiella pneumoniae over a decade at Kilifi County hospital[12].

Here we report a prospective hospital-based longitudinal study at KCH to estimate the ESBL-E carriage prevalence among neonates on admission, the incidence of acquisition of ESBL-E carriage in hospital and the risk factors for neonatal prevalent and incident ESBL-E carriage.
METHODS

Study design and sampling procedure

Neonatal admissions were eligible for recruitment into the study if they were admitted to the High Dependency Unit (HDU) between 1st July 2013 and 29th August 2014 or to the neonatal rooms in the general pediatric ward between 16th August 2013 and 29th August 2014. The HDU consists of an open ward with six beds for older children and two small rooms for neonatal admissions. The neonatal rooms are of equal size and have a combined bed-capacity of eight, although doubling up of neonates in beds or cots is frequently necessary at KCH. In the general pediatric ward, there are two neonatal rooms with a combined bed-capacity of 24, including five incubators, four small beds and fifteen cots. KCH practices comprehensive obstetric care, as defined by the World Health Organization, with caesarean section services available.

Data and clinical sample collection

Epidemiological and clinical data were collected on admission and entered in real-time into an electronic medical record system. Rectal swabs were collected on admission (day 0), at days 2, 4 and 6, and twice weekly thereafter until an ESBL-E was isolated or until hospital discharge or death, whichever came first. Rectal swabs were collected using pre-moistened viscose-tipped swabs and placed in Amies transport media (Deltalabs, Barcelona, Spain). The number of neonates in each room, bed-location and antimicrobial use of all participants was recorded daily. Blood culture is performed routinely at admission on all children hospitalized at KCH[13]. Clinical samples are collected at the discretion of the attending clinician.

Laboratory procedure

Rectal swabs were inoculated onto 5% horse blood agar and MacConkey agar supplemented with 8% gentamicin. Cefotaxime (30 ug) and ceftazidime (30 ug) antibiotic discs (Oxoid, United
Kingdom) were added on the 2nd and 4th streaking zones on the blood agar plate to detect bacteria resistant to third-generation cephalosporins. Blood agar plates were incubated in a CO₂ incubator while MacConkey agar plates were incubated in an aerobic incubator for 24 hours at 35 +/- 2°C.

Oxidase-negative, gram-negative rods were subcultured and identified using standard techniques (API 20E; BioMérieux, France). Antimicrobial susceptibility testing was performed using the disc diffusion method according to the Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI 2014) guidelines[14]. ESBL testing was performed for isolates that were non-susceptible to third generation cephalosporins using the double disc method[14]. External quality assurance was provided for by UK National External Quality Assessment service.

Analysis
The binomial confidence interval around a prevalence estimate is widest (for a fixed sample size) when the estimate is 50%. We calculated that a sample size of 555 neonates would be required to estimate a 50% prevalence of ESBL-E carriage with a precision of +/-5%.

Carriage on admission (prevalent carriage) was defined as a positive culture on the first rectal swab, provided it was obtained within 48 hours of admission. Logistic regression was used to determine risk factors for carriage at admission. The factors considered were: infant age, sex, maternal age, infant weight at admission, current method of feeding, place and mode of delivery, prematurity (less than or equal to 37 weeks gestation, estimated by the admitting clinician), number living in the same household, type of toilet and main source of water. Multivariable logistic regression models were fitted after confounders had been identified (Figure 1). Infant age at admission was adjusted for prematurity and place/mode of delivery, and prematurity was adjusted for age on admission.
Kaplan-Meier curves were used to describe the time to acquisition of carriage in hospital among neonates who did not have ESBL-E carriage at admission. In this analysis, follow up time, which was measured in days after admission, was censored at the earliest of: (i) time of the first ESBL-E culture positive swab (ii) time of last swab collection if the neonate died or was discharged and had remained negative throughout the course of admission. For neonates who acquired ESBL-E, the date of acquisition was assumed to be the midpoint between the date of the last negative swab and the date of the first positive swab.

We calculated the rate of ESBL-E acquisition per 100 days at risk. Poisson regression was used to identify predictors of the acquisition rate and to test for interactions. The potential predictors were both time-invariant (e.g. weight at admission, place/mode of delivery, mother’s age and age at admission) and time-varying (e.g. number of known ESBL carriers on the ward). A multivariable Poisson regression model was fitted to investigate the effect of crowding on ESBL-E acquisition. The model included as covariates the ward, the number of neonates on the ward and the number of known ESBL-E carriers on the ward.

We defined multi-drug resistance as resistance to at least one agent in three or more antimicrobial categories[15]. Statistical analyses were done with STATA 12.0 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA).

Study clearance and ethical considerations

The KEMRI National Ethical Review Committee approved the study (SSC 2301). Informed consent was obtained from all parents/guardians before enrollment.
RESULTS

During the study period, 1,014 neonates were admitted to Kilifi County Hospital, and the parents/guardians of 597 neonates gave consent for them to participate in the study (Figure 2). The median age of the participants was one day (IQR 0-3 days) and the median duration of hospital stay was 5 days (IQR 3-9 days).

Of 597 who gave consent to participate, five parents/guardians withdrew consent and 23 neonates had no swab collected. The prevalence of ESBL carriage at admission was 10% (59/569). From the 59 neonates with ESBL-E carriage at admission, there were 65 isolates consisting of 31 Klebsiella pneumoniae, 25 Escherichia coli, 8 Enterobacter cloacae and 1 Klebsiella oxytoca. Multiple colonization, ie. colonization with two or more ESBL-E from one participant, was found in 6/59 neonates (10%).

Among the 510 non-carriers on admission, 55% (283/510) acquired ESBL-E during their hospital stay. The incidence of ESBL-E acquisition was 21.4 (95% CI 19.0, 24.0) per 100 child days of observation, and the median time to acquisition among these patients was 3 (IQR 1-5) inpatient days (Figure 3). Nine neonates were diagnosed with ESBL-E bacteraemia during this study, all of whom had ESBL-E isolated from fecal carriage prior to or on the same day as blood was collected.

Most ESBL-E isolates in the study were multi-drug resistant; resistance to chloramphenicol, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole, quinolones and gentamicin being common, none were resistant to imipenem and only 5% were resistant to amikacin (Table 1).

Risk factors for ESBL-E carriage at admission
In the univariable analysis, variables associated with prevalent ESBL-E carriage on admission were: being born at term (rather than premature), older infant age at admission, having fewer than eight people living in the same house, and hospital delivery, particularly by caesarean section (CS) (Table 2 and Supplementary Table S1). Babies born prematurely were more commonly admitted directly to the neonatal ward (107/157, 68%) than babies born at full term (114/410, 28%; P-value<0.001). After adjusting for prematurity and place/mode of delivery, increasing infant age was positively associated (p<0.001) with ESBL-E carriage at admission, with odds ratios 1.72 (95% CI 0.69 – 4.27) and 3.88 (95% CI 1.47 - 10.21) among neonates aged 1-2 days and 3-28 days respectively, relative to the odds of ESBL carriage among neonates admitted on the day of birth. Being born at term was not associated with ESBL-E carriage after adjusting for the effect mediated through age on admission. We did not estimate an adjusted OR for place/mode of delivery and number of people in the same household since the associations were not confounded (Figure 1).

**Risk factors associated with acquisition of ESBL-E during hospitalization**

In the univariable analysis, hospital ward on admission, the number of neonates present in the hospital, the number of other neonates admitted in the same ward, and the number of known ESBL-E carriers were associated with incident acquisition of carriage (Table 3) and Supplementary table S2. Both current number of known neonatal ESBL-E carriers and number of other neonates in the same ward were positively associated with carriage acquisition when simultaneously included in multivariable model (Table 4), and there was no interaction between these risk factors. In both the univariable and multivariable analyses, the number of neonates in the ward exhibited a threshold effect whereby there was a plateau effect in carriage acquisition beyond 10 patients per ward. Recorded antibiotic prescription, specifically use of third generation cephalosporins during the inpatient stay was not shown to be associated with ESBL-E acquisition.
DISCUSSION

Our study reveals that among neonates admitted to a rural Kenyan hospital, 10% were already carriers of ESBL-E. Among those neonates who were not carriers at admission, 21.4% acquired ESBL-E carriage each day of admission; thus, more than half of the neonates were colonized with ESBL within the first three inpatient days.

For babies coming into hospital, the main risk factors for existing rectal carriage with ESBL-E were delivery in hospital via caesarean section and older infant age at admission. For those admitted without carriage of ESBL-E, the principal risk factors for acquisition in hospital were the number of other neonates in the ward and the number with ESBL-E carriage.

Delivery through caesarean section has been reported to be a significant risk factor for prolonged faecal colonization with ESBL producing *K. pneumoniae*[16] and also a determinant of intestinal microflora early in life[17,18]. Mothers undergoing caesarean section are treated with antibiotics for surgical prophylaxis, sometimes extended to treatment of wound infections[19], which may select for antibiotic-resistant enteric bacteria. In Cambodia, young hospital-born infants were found to be at a greater risk of early colonization by third generation cephalosporins resistant gram-negative rods compared to infants born at home, a health centre or other locations and subsequently admitted to hospital[20]. In Madagascar, Herindrainy *et al.* reported that low birth weight, caesarean section and use of antibiotics by mothers at delivery were independently associated with neonatal acquisition of ESBL-E during the first month of life[21]. *Hospital-born infants through caesarean section delivery have been found to be at a higher risk of ESBL-E carriage in Lebanon*[22].

The finding that babies coming from a large family of >8 household members were less likely to carry ESBL-E at admission was initially surprising. We speculate that these neonates may have a more diverse gut microbiome, which could be protective against acquisition of ESBL-E carriage.
Increased neonatal age at hospital admission was associated with a greater likelihood of ESBL-E carriage, as expected, since older neonates have had more time to acquire carriage.

Overall, we isolated ESBL-E from 10% of swabs within 48 hours of admission. In a cross-sectional ESBL-E carriage study done in a Tanzanian hospital, the overall neonatal prevalence of ESBL-E carriage was 25.4% [22]. Our findings suggest that some acquisition occurs before neonates come into the paediatric wards and we can speculate that this does not only come from their mothers but also from the procedures and settings of childbirth, particularly caesarian delivery. We did not collect data on ESBL-E carriage in mothers or maternal antibiotic use.

Among neonates admitted without carriage, 55% acquired ESBL-E during hospitalization. An ESBL-E carriage study in a tertiary hospital in Rwanda among inpatients of all ages reported that 55% of participants acquired ESBL-E carriage during hospitalization [23]. A study in Madagascar reported that 48% of pediatric non-carriers at admission acquired ESBL-E during hospitalization [9], while in a re-nutrition center in Niger, 94% of recovering malnourished children acquired ESBL-E during treatment with ceftriaxone, although only a few participants were sampled at discharge [25].

Our findings from the longitudinal study suggest that the greatest risk factors for ESBL-E acquisition in hospital were having increased numbers of existing ESBL-E carriers among the neonatal patients and a greater number of neonates admitted to the ward. We assume that increased numbers of ESBL-E carriers increase the opportunity for transmission. This finding corresponds with a prospective cohort study done in the general intensive care unit of a hospital in Greece; colonization pressure contributed significantly to acquisition of carriage of carbapenemase producing Klebsiella pneumoniae in hospital [24]. Intuitively, hospital crowding is expected to be associated with higher rates of ESBL-E transmission and our results support this.
However, our findings suggest a threshold effect where risk plateaued after admitting more than 10-14 neonates in a ward, suggesting that transmission effects associated with crowding are complex. Restricting the number of neonatal admissions to the hospital is impractical, but this does justify allocating increased space to neonatal admissions. Fixed low healthcare staff numbers relative to numbers of patients, the cultural practice of mothers caring for each other’s babies on the ward, physical proximity of adjacent neonates, and shared hygiene facilities, may all contribute to acquisition of ESBL-E carriage by neonates in hospital. As well as direct transmission between babies on the ward, nosocomial carriage acquisition directly from the hospital environment is also possible. A study in Cambodia of transmission of third-generation cephalosporin-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* isolates in a newly opened neonatal unit found that most clusters were likely to have been due to patient sources while 2 of 9 clusters could have been due to either an environmental or a patient source[25].

During the study period, nine neonates were diagnosed with ESBL-E bacteraemia. Nosocomial spread of ESBL-E carriage may result in outbreaks of ESBL-E bacteraemia in the hospital; such outbreaks have occurred in KCH in recent years [12], signifying the importance of awareness of ESBL-E carriage. There is potential for surveillance to help inform hospital infection control and to assist in averting such outbreaks. At KCH screening for carriage of ESBL-E among neonates is not routinely done, hand washing facilities frequently lack water supply, and there are no fully dedicated infection control staff. In this rural setting, most mothers use reusable cloth diapers and use a shared ablution block in the hospital where they wash soiled nappies for reuse.

Antibiotic use has been shown to affect the composition of gut microbiota and is associated with ESBL-E carriage and acquisition[9,16,17,24,26]. Antimicrobial stewardship services are used as part of hospital infection control services to reduce ESBL carriage in well-resourced hospitals. We were unable to detect antibiotic use as a risk factor for ESBL-E acquisition in our study. We
suspect that this is mainly attributed to the fact that 93% of our participants were given antibiotics 
during their hospital stay and we were therefore underpowered to observe any differences
(Supplementary table S2).

We did not collect data from babies after they were discharged from hospital, but patients 
discharged with ESBL-E carriage have been shown to spread these ESBL-E within family units 
and close contacts[16,27]. In a prospective cohort study of infants and their families in Norway, 
the median carriage duration among infants discharged with carriage of ESBL-producing
*Klebsiella pneumoniae* after a hospital outbreak was 12.5 months[16]. Another study reported the 
median time to ESBL-E clearance post discharge to be 6.6 months[30] from carriage data of
readmitted adult and paediatric patients. If carriage of ESBL-E persists and intra-household 
transmission occurs, discharged patients may act as reservoirs of ESBL-E in the community.

Being a hospital-based study, focusing on sick newborns, our estimates of ESBL-E prevalence at
admission cannot be generalized to community prevalence. It is theoretically possible that low-
level ESBL-E carriage was more prevalent at admission than we were able to determine; below
detection rate by culture methods, but then amplified by selection pressure from the use of
antibiotics in hospital until detectable. We also were only able to recruit 68% of eligible neonates
limiting the generalizability of our findings (Supplementary table S13). Of note, significantly more
parents/guardians of older neonates, and neonates born in hospital by caesarean section,
declined to participate in the study suggesting that our estimate of prevalence of ESBL-E carriage
at admission is likely to be an underestimate. Our prevalence and incidence estimates may also
be underestimates since stool culture may be more sensitive than rectal swab culture, a single
sample is less sensitive than multiple samples for culture —*s and some Enterobacter spp, which
are known to produce AmpC beta-lactamases, may have tested falsely-negative for ESBL by the
phenotypic method used.* We did not find any carbapenem resistant Enterobacterales (CRE) in
this study, but it is known that such isolates are present in Kenya \cite{28,29}, and globally are on the rise. Use of central quality assured microbiology laboratories in surveillance for ESBL-E carriage could therefore be expected to have the added benefit of an early warning system for the introduction of CRE carriage.

In conclusion, our findings reveal a high incidence of ESBL-E colonization among hospitalized neonates, which is endemic in this setting. Further work to investigate the association between ESBL-E acquisition and both caesarean section delivery and crowding, perhaps including restrictions on room capacity, and more deliberate cohorting of older neonates and those born in hospital through caesarean section is needed. Given the link between ESBL-E carriage and outbreaks of potentially fatal ESBL-E infection, our data emphasize the importance of routine surveillance and hospital infection control.
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