1 High Throughput qPCR validation and controls

2 The PCR mixture for this assay consisted of 50 nl of 2×LightCycler 480 SYBR® Green I Master Mix (Roche 3 Inc., USA), 10 nl of each forward and reverse primers with the final concentration of 1 μ M, 20 nl of 4 DNAse and RNAse free distilled water and finally 10 nl of DNA template making the final reaction 5 volume 100 nl. A non-template control was included per chip. Cycling conditions were described 6 previously.[1] Samples with multiple melting peaks as well as amplification efficiency beyond the 7 range 1·8-2·2 were discarded. The absolute copy number of 16S rRNA gene was quantified separately 8 by Roche 480 using a SYBR® Green approach. Moraxella catarrhalis genomic DNA was used as standard 9 and the same primers and cycling conditions, used in high-throughput qPCR were used for this assay.

10

11 A total of fourteen chips with a 16 (samples) x 296 (assays) format were used. In each chip 15 DNA 12 extracts plus one non-template control were amplified. Each sample was run as a single replicate. As 13 validation of the methodology four ARG primer pairs were continually positive in the non-14 template control and were therefore discarded from the analysis. Additionally, two multidrug 15 resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae with known ARG profiles were used as positive controls and for these 16 the expected ARG profile was obtained. Three concentrations of human genomic DNA (Bioline) of 17 2.8×10^2 , 2.8×10^3 and 2.8×10^4 genomes/µl respectively were used to determine whether a high 18 background contamination of human DNA could cause false positives in ARG amplification; no 19 interference was observed by the presence of human DNA in the amplification of ARGs detected in 20 this study. Finally, a single background contamination control of the DNA extraction procedure was 21 included for which no ARGs were detected. A threshold cycle (Ct) less than 31 was used as the 22 detection limit based on the previous studies.[1-8]

23

Though each sample was run as a single replicate internal controls support the strength of data. β globin and actin, human housekeeping genes, showed the significant correlation which would be expected (figS1 A). Moreover, there were strong correlations observed among a number of other

- 27 genes which would be predicted to be linked figS1 B-H). Such links could be due to them being in the
- 28 same operon (*mefA* and *matA/mel*), upon the same mobile genomic element (*ermB* and *tetM*), or by
- 29 them being mosaic genes (*tetO* and *tetW*).
- 30
- 31
- 32

Table S1: Correlation between prevalence of ARGs per subject and clinical parameters in a) all

subjects b) subjects that received the antibiotics amoxicillin or co-amoxiclav.

| 36 |
|----|
|----|

| Α | | | | | | |
|--|---------|--------|--------------|----------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | Stable | Exacerbation | Recovery | ΔΔ Stable- Exacerbation | ΔΔ Exacerbation- Recovery |
| Post-bronchodilator FEV ₁ , L | r | 0.07 | 0.12 | -0.11 | -0.02 | -0.23 |
| * | p value | 0.59 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.91 | 0.10 |
| mCRQ** | r | -0.07 | -0.16 | 0.13 | -0.26 | -0.18 |
| | p value | 0.61 | 0.26 | 0.35 | 0.05 | 0.20 |
| Total VAS*** | r | 0.11 | -0.17 | -0.17 | 0.06 | 0.11 |
| | p value | 0.44 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.70 | 0.41 |

| В | |] | | | | |
|--|---------|--------|--------------|----------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | Stable | Exacerbation | Recovery | ΔΔ Stable- Exacerbation | ΔΔ Exacerbation- Recovery |
| Post-bronchodilator FEV ₁ , L | r | -0.05 | -0.13 | -0.27 | -0.22 | -0.38 |
| * | p value | 0.79 | 0.46 | 0.12 | 0.21 | 0.03 |
| mCRQ | r | -0.17 | -0.21 | 0.00 | -0.25 | -0.34 |
| | p value | 0.33 | 0.22 | 0.98 | 0.15 | 0.04 |
| Total VAS | r | 0.20 | -0.12 | -0.14 | 0.23 | 0.08 |
| | p value | 0.28 | 0.51 | 0.42 | 0.23 | 0.65 |

* FEV₁ = forced expiratory volume in 1 second ; ** CRQ = Chronic Respiratory Disease Questionnaire score;

***VAS = visual analog score

| β-lactam | MLSB | Multidrug | Tetracycline | |
|-------------|------------|---------------|--------------|--|
| ampC-01 | erm(36) | acrA-01 | tet(32) | |
| ampC-04 | ermA/ermTR | acrA-04 | tet(37) | |
| ampC/blaDHA | ermB | acrA-05 | tetA-01 | |
| bla-L1 | ermC | acrF | tetB-01 | |
| blaCMY2-01 | ermF | сеоА | tetB-02 | |
| blaCMY2-02 | ermX | emrD | tetC-01 | |
| blaCTX-M-02 | matA/mel | терА | tetC-02 | |
| blaCTX-M-04 | mefA | mexE | tetG-02 | |
| blaOXY | mphA-01 | mexF | tetK | |
| blaSFO | mphA-02 | mtrD-02 | tetM-01 | |
| blaTEM | msrA-01 | mtrD-03 | tetM-02 | |
| blaZ | pikR2 | oprD | tetO-01 | |
| cfiA | | oprJ | tetPB-02 | |
| cfxA | | pmrA | tetQ | |
| cphA-01 | | qacEdelta1-02 | tetR-02 | |
| cphA-02 | | qacH-01 | tetR-03 | |
| fox5 | | toIC-02 | tetW-01 | |
| pbp2x | | tolC-03 | | |
| | | yceL/mdtH-01 | | |
| | | yidY/mdtL-01 | | |

Table S2. List of Individual genes for each ARG family in the same order as present in figure 2 & S2 heatmaps. MLSB, Macrolide-Lincosamide-Streptogramin B resistance

| 54 | | |
|----------|--------|---|
| 55 | | |
| 56 57 | | |
| 57 58 | | |
| 58 59 | | |
| 60 | | |
| 61 | | |
| 62 | | |
| 63 | | |
| 64 | | |
| 65 | | |
| 66 | | |
| 67 | | |
| 68 60 | Refere | ences |
| 69 70 | 1 | Vul at al. Ugh throughout profiling of antihistic resistance gapes in drinking |
| 70 71 | 1. | Xu, L., et al., <i>High-throughput profiling of antibiotic resistance genes in drinking</i> |
| 71 | | <i>water treatment plants and distribution systems.</i> Environ Pollut, 2016. 213 : p. 119-26. |
| 72 73 | r | |
| 73 74 | 2. | Wang, F.H., et al., <i>High throughput profiling of antibiotic resistance genes in urban</i> |
| 74 75 | | <i>park soils with reclaimed water irrigation.</i> Environ Sci Technol, 2014. 48 (16): p. 9079-85. |
| 75 76 | 2 | Ouyang, W.Y., et al., Increased levels of antibiotic resistance in urban stream of |
| 70 77 | 3. | Jiulongjiang River, China. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol, 2015. 99 (13): p. 5697-707. |
| 77 78 | 4. | Chen, Q.L., et al., An underappreciated hotspot of antibiotic resistance: The |
| 78 79 | 4. | groundwater near the municipal solid waste landfill. Sci Total Environ, 2017. 609: p. |
| 80 | | 966-973. |
| 80 81 | 5. | Chen, QL., et al., <i>Do manure-borne or indigenous soil microorganisms influence the</i> |
| 82 | 5. | spread of antibiotic resistance genes in manured soil? Soil Biology and Biochemistry, |
| 82 83 | | 2017. 114 : p. 229-237. |
| 83 84 | 6. | Zhu, Y.G., et al., Continental-scale pollution of estuaries with antibiotic resistance |
| 85 | 0. | genes. Nat Microbiol, 2017. 2 : p. 16270. |
| 86 | 7. | Zhao, Y., et al., Feed additives shift gut microbiota and enrich antibiotic resistance in |
| 87 | 7. | swine gut. Sci Total Environ, 2018. 621 : p. 1224-1232. |
| 88 | 8. | Chen, QL., et al., Effect of biochar amendment on the alleviation of antibiotic |
| 89 | 0. | resistance in soil and phyllosphere of Brassica chinensis L. Soil Biology and |
| 90 | | Biochemistry, 2018. 119 : p. 74-82. |
| 91 | | bioticinistry, 2010. 119. p. 7 + 02. |
| | | |