

This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of:

Selection and transfer of an IncI1-tet(A) plasmid of Escherichia coli in an ex vivo model of the porcine cecum at doxycycline concentrations caused by cross-contaminated feed

Reference:

Peeters Laura E.J., De Mulder Thijs, Van Coillie Els, Huygens Judith, Smet Annemieke, Daeseleire Els, Dewulf Jeroen, Imberechts Hein, Butaye Patrick, Haesebrouck Freddy,- Selection and transfer of an IncI1-tet(A) plasmid of Escherichia coli in an ex vivo model of the porcine cecum at doxycycline concentrations caused by cross-contaminated feed

The journal of applied microbiology - ISSN 1364-5072 - 123:5(2017), p. 1312-1320

Full text (Publisher's DOI): <https://doi.org/10.1111/JAM.13561>

To cite this reference: <http://hdl.handle.net/10067/1458890151162165141>

**Selection and transfer of an IncI1-*tet*(A) plasmid of *Escherichia coli*
in an *ex vivo* model of the porcine cecum at doxycycline
concentrations caused by cross-contaminated feed**

Laura E. J. Peeters^{1,2*}, Thijs De Mulder³, Els Van Coillie³, Judith Huygens³, Annemieke Smet²,
Els Daeseleire³, Jeroen Dewulf⁴, Hein Imberechts¹, Patrick Butaye^{2,5}, Freddy Haesebrouck²,
Siska Croubels⁶, Marc Heyndrickx^{2,3}, Geertrui Rasschaert³

1 Department of General Bacteriology, Veterinary and Agrochemical Research centre, 1180
Brussels, Belgium

2 Department of Pathology, Bacteriology and Avian Diseases, Ghent University, 9820
Merelbeke, Belgium

3 Technology and Food Science Unit, Institute for Agricultural and Fisheries Research, 9090
Melle, Belgium

4 Veterinary Epidemiology Unit, Department of Reproduction, Obstetrics and Herd health,
Ghent University, 9820 Merelbeke, Belgium

5 Department of Biosciences, Ross University School of Veterinary Medicine, St Kitts and
Nevis, West Indies

6 Department of Pharmacology, Toxicology and Biochemistry, Ghent University, 9820
Merelbeke, Belgium

Running headline: Resistance selection in porcine cecum

* Corresponding author: Laura E. J. Peeters, email, Laura.Peeters@ugent.be; tel, +32 9 272 30
89; fax, +32 272 30 01

Key words: porcine cecum, *E. coli*, plasmid, transfer, doxycycline, cross-contamination

24 **Abstract**

25 ***Aims***

26 The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of subtherapeutic intestinal doxycycline
27 (DOX) concentrations (4 and 1 mg l⁻¹), caused by cross-contamination of feed, on the
28 enrichment of a DOX resistant commensal *E. coli* and it's resistance plasmid in an *ex vivo*
29 model of the porcine cecum.

30 ***Methods and Results***

31 A DOX resistant, *tet(A)* carrying, porcine commensal *E. coli* strain (EC 682) was cultivated for
32 6 days in the porcine cecum model under different conditions (0, 1 and 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX). EC 682,
33 other coliforms and anaerobic bacteria were enumerated daily. A selection of isolated DOX
34 resistant coliforms (n=454) was characterized by rep-PCR clustering, PCR assays [*Inc1* and
35 *tet(A)*] and micro broth dilution susceptibility tests (Sensititre).

36 Both 1 and 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX enriched medium had a significantly higher selective effect on EC
37 682 and other resistant coliforms than medium without DOX. Transconjugants of EC 682 were
38 isolated more frequently in the presence of 1 and 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX compared to medium without
39 DOX.

40 ***Conclusions***

41 Subtherapeutic intestinal DOX concentrations have the potential to select for DOX resistant *E.*
42 *coli*, and promote the selection of transconjugants in a porcine cecum model.

43 ***Significance and Impact of Study***

44 Cross-contamination of feed with antimicrobials such as DOX likely promotes the spread of
45 antimicrobial resistance. Therefore it is important to develop or fine-tune guidelines for the safe
46 use of antimicrobials in animal feed and its storage.

Introduction

Antimicrobial resistance has traditionally been considered as a problem linked to the (mis)use of antimicrobials in human and veterinary medicine. During the last decade however, it has become clear that also low concentrations of antimicrobials may contribute to the selection and spread of antimicrobial resistance (Andersson and Hughes 2014), however the extent of this has not been quantified. Pig feed may become contaminated with antimicrobials through carry-over from medicated to non-medicated feed at the feed mill, during transport or at the farm (Stolker et al. 2013; Filippitzi et al. 2016). As the preferred administration methods for antimicrobials differ between countries, the main routes and levels of cross-contamination are also country-specific. Production of antimicrobial medicated feed at the feed mill has been banned in Denmark and The Netherlands, consequently cross-contamination at the feed mill is ruled out in these countries. The levels of cross-contamination at the feed mill can be highly variable. A wide range of antimicrobial concentrations have been found in a study concerning carry-over in 21 feed mills in The Netherlands (Stolker et al. 2013). Furthermore, it should be noted that the actual concentrations to which the pigs will finally be exposed to is also dependent on the half-life of the antimicrobial and other factors that influence the stability of the antimicrobial.

A mathematical model estimated that when 2% of the pig feed produced in a country per year is antimicrobial medicated feed, 5.5% (95% CI = 3.4%; 11.4%) of the total feed produced in a year is likely cross-contaminated with different concentrations of antimicrobials due to practices related to production, transport, storage and distribution of medicated feed (Filippitzi et al. 2016).

The concentrations of doxycycline (DOX), chlortetracycline (CTC) or sulfadiazine-trimethoprim in pigs' intestines, due to a 3% carry-over level in the feed, have been determined before in an *in vivo* study (Peeters et al. 2016). Based upon this information, it is possible to

investigate the effect of the observed intestinal concentrations on the selection of resistant bacteria in the intestinal microbiota. The maximum concentration of DOX was approximately 4 mg l⁻¹ in the porcine cecum and colon. Because the above mentioned study showed a high transfer rate of tetracyclines from feed to gut, it was decided to test the selective effect of the maximum observed concentration of DOX in cecum and colon (4 mg l⁻¹). As a consequence of a recent Belgian covenant (2013), stating that carry-over levels of antimicrobials in pig feed should not exceed 1% of the recommended dose, the results of the *in vivo* study were also extrapolated to a 1% cross-contamination level (1 mg l⁻¹ DOX).

The selective pressure of these two concentrations of DOX has recently been investigated using pure bacterial cultures (Peeters et al., 2017). These competition studies between DOX resistant and susceptible porcine commensal *Escherichia coli* strains showed that both 1 and 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX supplemented medium select for the resistant strain compared to blank medium.

Taking into account the latter results, these low DOX concentrations might also exert a selective pressure on the porcine intestinal microbiota.

The low DOX concentrations may not only select for DOX resistant bacteria but may also promote the transfer of the tetracycline resistance genes. Moreover, other resistance genes carried by these bacteria could be co-selected and/or be co-transferred (Leverstein-van Hall et al. 2002; Gullberg et al. 2014).

The aim of the present study was thus to investigate the enrichment in the porcine cecal microbiota of a well characterized DOX resistant *E. coli* field strain, using an *ex vivo* model simulating the porcine cecum. This experiment allowed to observe two different mechanisms of resistance spread: selection of the donor strain and transfer of its resistance plasmid, followed by selection of transconjugants. The resistant donor strain was characterized in a previous study (Peeters et al. 2017) and carried *tet(A)*, encoding the efflux pump TetA, which is a concentration dependent resistance mechanism that confers resistance to tetracyclines (Moller et al. 2016). In

addition, resistant coliforms other than the donor strain were characterized to determine whether the resistance plasmid of the donor strain was transferred to other strains.

Material and methods

Bacterial strain

EC 682 is a commensal *E. coli* strain that was isolated from pig feces during a national Belgian antimicrobial resistance monitoring program (Hanon et al. 2015). EC 682 carries a mobile IncII plasmid (pEC682, EMBL accession number FNLQ01000000) conferring resistance to ampicillin, sulfonamides, streptomycin, tetracyclines and trimethoprim. Resistance to tetracyclines was encoded by the *tet(A)* gene located on the mobile plasmid pEC682 (Peeters et al. 2017). A non-lactose fermenting mutant of this strain was selected to be able to distinguish it from other (lactose fermenting) *E. coli* on MacConkey n°3 agar, on which this mutant forms white colonies (Smet et al. 2011). The non-lactose fermenting mutant showed the same minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) for DOX as the original strain, namely 16 mg l⁻¹. The *in vitro* growth rate of this strain (0.245 min⁻¹) was not affected by the presence of 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX, whereas 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX reduced the growth rate slightly by 0.0037 min⁻¹. The transfer frequency (ratio transconjugants/total recipients after 24h incubation) of pEC682 to two different recipient strains (1,58.10⁻⁵ and 1,57.10⁻⁶, respectively) was not affected significantly by the presence of 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX or 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX (Peeters et al. 2017).

Cecal culture conditions

The microbial ecosystem of the porcine cecum was simulated in an *ex vivo* model, described by Messens et al. (2010). Briefly, the bacterial growth conditions of the porcine cecum were simulated in two parallel bioreactors, operated as continuous culture systems. The bioreactors both consisted of a BioFlo 110/115 unit (New Brunswick Scientific, Enfield, CT, USA) and a 1.3 l reactor vessel. At day 0, the reactor vessel was filled with 0.5 l of nutritional medium (Table 1) and autoclaved (121°C, 30 min) and cooled down until 37°C. From that moment on,

a constant temperature (37°C), pH (6.5) and agitation (150 rpm) were maintained and the headspace of the vessel was flushed constantly with a 80% nitrogen-20% carbon dioxide mixture at 20 ml min⁻¹ to create anaerobic conditions. Fermentation was started by adding 10 ml of pooled cecal content of 10 organic raised pigs that did not receive antimicrobials during rearing, and 1 ml of a 0.25 OD₆₀₀ suspension of EC 682 (containing approximately 10⁸ cells ml⁻¹). Immediately after inoculation, a sample was taken to determine the initial total count of EC 682 in the fermentation system. Subsequently, the reactor was operated in batch mode during 24h (day 0). Starting from day 1, fresh medium of pH 2 (stored at 5°C in an autoclaved 13 l pyrex vessel) was added at a constant rate of approximately 1.8 ml min⁻¹ and waste liquid and cells were removed at the same rate to obtain a constant working volume of 0.5 l. This corresponds with a retention time of approximately 4.6 h. A constant pH of 6.5 was maintained using a 3 mol l⁻¹ NaOH solution. At day three, the nutritional medium was supplemented with 1 or 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX (doxycycline hyclate, Fagron, Waregem, Belgium) and continuously administered until the end of the experiment, i.e. day nine. For each condition (0, 1 and 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX), three reactor runs were conducted. Additionally, one run without EC 682 and without DOX was performed as a negative control experiment to determine whether IncI1 and *tet(A)* carrying plasmids were already present in the inoculum.

Bacterial population dynamics

Tenfold serial dilutions of reactor content samples were plated daily in duplicate on MacConkey n°3 agar (MC) (Oxoid, Basingstoke, UK) with or without 8 mg l⁻¹ DOX [= maximum cut-off value of DOX considering coliform bacteria according to EUCAST (2016) data] and incubated overnight at 37°C. Samples of the negative control run without EC 682 were plated on MC, MC + 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX (= EUCAST ECOFF DOX for *E. coli*) and MC + 8 mg l⁻¹ DOX. EC 682 (white colonies) and other coliforms (red colonies) were counted on both MC with and without DOX. The number of susceptible coliforms was calculated by subtracting the resistant

coliforms count from the total coliforms count. The same dilutions of the reactor content were also plated in duplicate on Reinforced Clostridial Agar (RCA, Oxoid) as a control to detect possible fluctuations in the culturable (facultative) anaerobic microbial population. The RCA plates were incubated anaerobically during 48h at 37°C and the total number of colonies was counted.

Isolation of DOX resistant *E. coli* and identification of transconjugants of EC 682

Each day, 10 red colonies were randomly picked from MC + 8 mg l⁻¹ DOX (resistant coliforms), further purified and stored at -80°C for further characterization. As the purpose of the negative control run was to detect IncI1 and *tet*(A) carrying isolates in the inoculum, a broad variety of resistant coliforms needed to be isolated. Therefore, also from the MC plates with 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX, 10 colonies per day were isolated and stored. In this way, also resistant coliform species such as *E. coli* with a MIC value between 4 and 8 mg l⁻¹ could be isolated. A representative collection (all isolates from day 3, 5, 7 and 9; in total 454) was selected for further characterization. These isolates were grown on RAPID' *E. coli* 2 agar (Bio-Rad, Temse, Belgium) to distinguish *E. coli* from other coliforms.

Genomic DNA of the 454 isolates was obtained using a boiling method. Briefly, one colony was suspended into 100 µl of ultra-pure water, heated during 10 min at 95°C in a warm water bath and finally centrifuged at 10,000 g during 2 min.

First, the 80 isolates originating from the negative control run without EC 682 were subjected to both IncI1 and *tet*(A) detecting PCR assays (Ng et al. 2001; Carattoli et al. 2005) to check whether coliforms carrying both *tet*(A) and the IncI1 replicon were already present in the inoculum. Next, the 374 isolates from the other runs were subjected to the IncI1 PCR assay to verify if they harboured plasmids with the IncI1 replicon. For isolates that carried the IncI1 replicon, the presence of *tet*(A) was also verified by PCR assay. Isolates that carried both the

IncI1 replicon and the *tet(A)* gene could be considered as possible transconjugants of donor strain EC 682.

All 454 isolates were then clustered into groups of indistinguishable or closely related isolates using rep-PCR with (GTG)₅ primers and under PCR conditions (Versalovic et al. 1991). The PCR mix consisted of 1× Red diamond buffer (Eurogentec, Seraing, Belgium), (GTG)₅ primer (100 pmol), 1.5 mM Mg₂Cl (Eurogentec), 1 U Red Diamond Taq DNA Polymerase (Eurogentec) and 0.2 mM of deoxynucleotide trisphosphates (GE Healthcare Europe, Munich, Germany) in a total reaction volume of 25 µl. This PCR mix was placed in a Gene Amp PCR System 9700 Gold (Applied Biosystems, Fostercity, CA, US). Amplicons were separated using capillary gel electrophoresis (QIAxcel Advanced System, QIAGEN, Hilden, Germany) with the QIAxcel DNA High Resolution Kit (QIAGEN) using method OM1200 with an additional 120-seconds separation time and the QX Alignment Marker (15 bp/3 kb, QIAGEN) added to each PCR product. The similarities between the obtained fingerprints were calculated using the Pearson correlation and clustered using UPMGA (1% curve smoothing) in BioNumerics version 7.6 (Applied Maths, Sint-Martens-Latem, Belgium).

Subsequently, 16 IncI1 and *tet(A)* carrying isolates (at least one per rep-PCR cluster) and two isolates from the negative control run were selected for Sensititre micro broth dilution analysis with EUVSEC plates (TREK Diagnostic Systems, West Sussex, UK) according to EURL-AR (2013) guidelines. The MIC's of the following panel of antimicrobials were determined: ampicillin, cefotaxime, ceftazidime, meropenem, nalidixic acid, ciprofloxacin, tetracycline, colistin, gentamicin, trimethoprim, sulfamethoxazole, chloramphenicol, azithromycin and tigecycline. Isolates were considered resistant or susceptible based on the cut-off values given in the EURL-AR guidelines (EURL-AR 2013). As such, isolates showing resistances encoded by plasmid pEC682 (except for streptomycin, which is no longer included in the standard Sensititre plates) could be detected. The latter could then be considered as pEC682 carrying

transconjugants, regarding that no such strains were isolated from the negative control run without EC 682.

Statistical analysis

Significant changes as a response to the inclusion of DOX in the medium over a period of six days were analysed using a linear mixed effects model (Rpackage lme4, Bates et al. 2015), including ‘medium’ and ‘time’ as fixed factors. The reactor run number was considered as a random factor to include reactor variability in the model.

Statistical analysis was conducted on log transformed counts of EC 682, resistant and susceptible coliforms, total culturable anaerobes from reactor runs with 1 and 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX compared to the runs with the blank medium. Only population sizes starting from day four until day nine were included for statistical analysis. P-values of significant results were calculated using ANOVA and the function lsmeans.

Results

Cecal bacterial dynamics at 0, 1 and 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX

The EC 682 population size in the simulated porcine cecum was significantly higher ($p < 0.001$) in reactors supplemented with 1 and 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX (average increase of $1.20 \pm 0.18 \log_{10}$ CFU ml⁻¹ and $1.19 \pm 0.18 \log_{10}$ CFU ml⁻¹ respectively) compared to the blank controls (Figure 1). However, no difference in population sizes of EC 682 was observed between the two DOX concentrations. In addition, a significant effect ($p < 0.001$) of the factor ‘time’ on the population sizes of EC 682 was observed, since the EC 682 counts in blank medium decreased with time. In the experiments with 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX, the resistant coliforms (Figure 2) showed a significantly ($p < 0.001$) higher population size (average increase of $1.17 \pm 0.29 \log_{10}$ CFU ml⁻¹) compared to the population size in the blank controls. No other significant differences in population sizes of resistant coliforms were observed. Also, no effect of time was observed for the population sizes of the resistant coliforms.

No significant differences in population sizes of the susceptible coliforms (Figure 3) were seen between any of the experiments, although the factor time did have a significant effect ($p = 0.016$) on these population sizes.

Besides the coliforms, the population size of a more representative bacterial group of the microbiota was monitored by counting the total anaerobic bacteria on RCA (Figure 4). A significantly higher population size of these anaerobes was found in the experiments with 4 mg l⁻¹ compared to those with 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX (average increase of $0.42 \pm 0.10 \log_{10} \text{CFU ml}^{-1}$, $p = 0.022$) and the blank controls (average increase of $0.28 \pm 0.10 \log_{10} \text{CFU ml}^{-1}$, $p < 0.001$).

DOX resistant coliforms and pEC682 carrying transconjugants

The donor strain EC 682 showed a rep-PCR pattern that was different from all DOX resistant coliforms that were isolated from the experiments. Of the 454 DOX resistant strains isolated from the blank experiments (n=132), the experiments with 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX (n=123), those with 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX (n=119) and the negative control experiment without EC 682 (n=80), 420 showed *E. coli* morphology on RAPID' *E. coli* 2 agar (Table 2). These 420 *E. coli* isolates were assigned to 41 different clusters by rep-PCR. One cluster (n° 8), including 127 *E. coli* isolates originating from the three different experimental runs, was remarkably larger than the others. Interestingly, no isolates from the negative control run were assigned to this large cluster. Other clusters comprised isolates originating from only one or two experiment type(s).

Fifty-one of the 420 *E. coli* isolates carried the IncI1 replicon, of which 4 originated from the blank runs, 33 from the runs with 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX and 14 from the runs with 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX. All 51 isolates also carried the *tet(A)* gene (Table 2) and were assigned to 11 clusters (Table 3). None of these 51 isolates could be assigned to the large cluster (n° 8).

The 34 isolates that showed different morphology on RAPID' *E. coli* 2 agar than *E. coli*, were assigned to 8 different clusters and did not carry the IncI1 replicon or *tet(A)* gene.

The 80 tetracycline resistant *E. coli* isolates originating from the negative control run without EC 682 were assigned to five different rep-clusters, of which four clusters also included isolates originating from the experimental runs. None of these 80 isolates were found to be both IncII and *tet(A)* positive, but 14 of them, belonging to 3 different clusters, did carry *tet(A)*. Sixteen IncII and *tet(A)* positive *E. coli* isolates (at least one isolate per cluster, see Table 3) were characterized with Sensititre. Eleven of these isolates showed the same resistance profile as EC 682 (Table 3). The other isolates from the experimental runs (n=5), only showed resistance against tetracycline. One of the two *tet(A)* carrying isolates from the negative control without EC 682 only showed resistance against tetracycline, the second isolate showed resistance to tetracycline and trimethoprim (Table 3).

Discussion

Resistance selection in the pig microbiota caused by cross-contamination of feed with antimicrobials is worrisome, especially since it is assumed that resistant bacteria can be persistent and are thus not necessarily outcompeted by susceptible bacteria when antimicrobial selective pressure is withdrawn (Andersson and Hughes 2011). It has also been stated that, theoretically, sub-MIC selected resistant mutants of bacteria would be more stable in bacterial populations than those selected at high antimicrobial concentrations because of the lower fitness cost (Sandegren 2014). Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate the selective effect of intestinal DOX concentrations due to cross-contamination of feed on the porcine microbiota. The enumerations of DOX resistant *E. coli* EC 682 in the simulated porcine cecum clearly showed that both 1 and 4 mg l⁻¹ of DOX have a selective effect on this strain. The population size of the phenotypically resistant EC 682 was maintained or increased slightly in the DOX supplemented media, while in the blank medium this population size decreased. Presumably, EC 682 was not able to maintain its population size in this latter medium due to the lack of selective advantage compared to the susceptible microbial population present in the reactor. In

addition, EC 682 might have started eliminating its resistance plasmid (pEC682) in the absence of antimicrobial pressure because of the cost of fitness to replicate (Sherratt 1982), although we were not able to demonstrate this in this type of experiment. Furthermore, similar trends were observed in a previous study with a cefotaxime resistant *E. coli* strain in bioreactor experiments simulating the human cecum and ascending colon (Smet et al. 2011). Interestingly, no significant difference in selective effect between 1 and 4 mg l⁻¹ was found. This finding could possibly be explained by the tetracycline resistance mechanism of EC 682, i.e. the TetA efflux pump and regulation protein TetR, as a recent study showed that TetA producing *E. coli* exhibit a prolonged generation time with increasing tetracycline concentrations (Moller et al. 2016). Consequently, it is likely that the fitness of EC 682 was affected more in the medium with 4 mg l⁻¹ compared to 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX, thus neutralizing the potential higher selective effect of 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX.

As EC 682 was not the only tetracycline resistant coliform present in the microbial population, the counts of coliforms were also investigated in general, and more specific to see whether transconjugants were arising. The resistant coliform counts were also affected by DOX supplementation (Figure 2), although statistical analysis only confirmed a selective effect in medium with 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX. The coliform population comprises many different species, which likely harbour different types of resistance mechanisms concomitant with different fitness costs, which can explain variable selective effects depending on the DOX concentration (Vogwill and MacLean 2015). The prolonged generation time with increasing tetracycline concentrations of bacteria using an efflux pump as resistance mechanism could, in this case, also explain the lower selective effect of 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX compared to 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX (Moller et al. 2016).

Probably, the enrichment of the EC 682 population and other resistant coliforms did not affect the size of the susceptible coliform population because they represent a small minority in the total microbiota present in the bioreactor. Indeed, over 90% of the bacteria in the porcine cecum

belong to the phyla Firmicutes and Bacteroidetes, whereas *E. coli* have been reported to represent between 0.72% and 4.8% of the microbiome (Leser et al. 2002; Yang et al. 2016). The diversity of anaerobes that are culturable on RCA (i.a. Clostridia, Lactobacilli) presumably masks the effect of DOX supplementation on the anaerobic population. Different species can show different growth rates and can harbour different resistance mechanisms, which can each affect the bacterial fitness differently (Vogwill and MacLean 2015). In general, the populations of anaerobes seemed to maintain more or less the size that was established before the start of DOX supplementation.

Regardless of the mechanism of selection, the characterization of the resistant coliforms showed that more pEC682 carrying *E. coli* could be isolated from the experiments with DOX supplementation compared to the blank experiment (Table 3). In other words, not only EC 682 itself but also its resistance plasmid pEC682, conferring resistance to five different antimicrobials, was enriched more in the experiments with DOX supplemented medium compared to the experiments with blank medium. It should be noted though that this was not a quantitative study, as this would require at least a systematical characterization of all isolates growing on one agar plate. Consequently, it was not possible to confirm the observed trends statistically. Although the clustering seemed to show a slightly larger variety of transconjugants in the experiments with DOX supplemented media, it is unclear whether the positive selection of the plasmid was caused by a higher plasmid transfer frequency, or by enrichment of transconjugants. This is only one of the various confounding factors that complicate the interpretation of plasmid transfer frequency, which make that conjugation dynamics under antimicrobial selective pressure are to date poorly understood (Lopatkin et al. 2016).

Our results are in line with previous *in vitro* competition experiments between susceptible commensal *E. coli* strains and EC 682 and two other *tet(A)* carrying commensal *E. coli*, where similar selective effects of 1 and 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX with the same statistical significance were

observed (Peeters et al. 2017). In addition, different studies confirm our finding that resistance genes conferring resistance to other antimicrobials than the one(s) administered can be co-selected (Leverstein-van Hall et al. 2002; Looft et al. 2012; Agga et al. 2015). The selection of tetracycline genes on multidrug resistance plasmids obviously contributes to a widespread dissemination of multidrug resistant enteric bacteria.

In conclusion, cecal concentrations of DOX (1 and 4 mg l⁻¹) caused by a 1% and 3% carry-over level of DOX in pig feed, have the potential to enrich *tet(A)* carrying *E. coli* in the porcine cecum. Since this study revealed that 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX does not necessarily have a higher selective effect than 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX, and previous observations indicate that very low antimicrobial concentrations (ng ml⁻¹) can select for persistent (*de novo*) resistance (Gullberg et al. 2011; Andersson and Hughes 2014; Gullberg et al. 2014), questions could be raised about the relevance of current maximum levels of cross-contamination of feed with respect to resistance selection. However, the type of antimicrobial and associated resistance mechanisms may strongly influence the extent to which selection of resistant bacteria occurs. Therefore, additional research is needed to elucidate quantitative differences in selective effect of different contamination levels of antimicrobials used in medicated pig feed, to be able to optimize legal limits for cross-contamination levels.

Acknowledgements

This study was financially supported by the Belgian Federal Public Service of Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment (grant number RT 12/03 CROSSCONTAM). The authors wish to thank Stephanie Van Weyenberg for the help with the statistical analysis.

Conflict of interest

No conflict of interest declared.

References

- Agga, G.E., Scott, H.M., Vinasco, J., Nagaraja, T.G., Amachawadi, R.G., Bai, J.F., Norby, B., Renter, D.G., Dritz, S.S., Nelssen, J.L. and Tokach, M.D. (2015) Effects of chlortetracycline and copper supplementation on the prevalence, distribution, and quantity of antimicrobial resistance genes in the fecal metagenome of weaned pigs. *Prev Vet Med* **119**, 179-189.
- Andersson, D.I. and Hughes, D. (2011) Persistence of antibiotic resistance in bacterial populations. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* **35**, 901-911.
- Andersson, D.I. and Hughes, D. (2014) Microbiological effects of sublethal levels of antibiotics. *Nat Rev Microbiol* **12**, 465-478.
- Bates, D., Machler, M., Bolker, B.M. and Walker, S.C. (2015) Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *J Stat Softw* **67**, 1-48.
- BEMEFA and FAVV. Convenant betreffende gemedicineerde voeders. (2013) www.favv.be/extra/convenant/documents/2013-01-30_CONVENANT-FAVV-BEMEFA-gemedicineerde-voeders_finaal_jan-2013_NL.pdf
- Carattoli, A., Bertini, A., Villa, L., Falbo, V., Hopkins, K.L. and Threlfall, E.J. (2005) Identification of plasmids by PCR-based replicon typing. *J Microbiol Meth* **63**, 219-228.
- EUCAST. Antimicrobial wild type distributions of microorganisms <http://mic.eucast.org/Eucast2/SearchController/search.jsp?action=performSearch&BeginIndex=0&Micdif=mic&NumberIndex=50&Antib=315&Specium=-1>
- EURL-AR. Cut-off values recommended by the EU Reference Laboratory for Antimicrobial Resistance. (2013) <http://www.crl-ar.eu/data/images/faq/eurl-recommended%20cut%20off%20values-29-11-2013.pdf>

366 Filippitzi, M.E., Sarrazin, S., Imberechts, H., Smet, A. and Dewulf, J. (2016) Risk of
 367 cross-contamination due to the use of antimicrobial medicated feed throughout the trail of feed
 368 from the feed mill to the farm. *Food Addit Contam A* **33**, 644-655.

369 Gullberg, E., Albrecht, L.M., Karlsson, C., Sandegren, L. and Andersson, D.I. (2014)
 370 Selection of a Multidrug Resistance Plasmid by Sublethal Levels of Antibiotics and Heavy
 371 Metals. *Mbio* **5**.

372 Gullberg, E., Cao, S., Berg, O.G., Ilback, C., Sandegren, L., Hughes, D. and Andersson,
 373 D.I. (2011) Selection of Resistant Bacteria at Very Low Antibiotic Concentrations. *Plos Path*
 374 **7**.

375 Hanon, J.-B., Jaspers, S., Butaye, P., Wattiau, P., Méroc, E., Aerts, M., Imberechts, H.,
 376 Vermeersch, K. and Van der Stede, Y. (2015) A trend analysis of antimicrobial resistance in
 377 commensal *Escherichia coli* from several livestock species in Belgium (2011–2014). *Prev Vet*
 378 *Med* **122**, 443-452.

379 Leser, T.D., Amenuvor, J.Z., Jensen, T.K., Lindecrona, R.H., Boye, M. and Moller, K.
 380 (2002) Culture-Independent Analysis of Gut Bacteria: the Pig Gastrointestinal Tract Microbiota
 381 Revisited. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **68**, 673-690.

382 Leverstein-van Hall, M.A., Box, A.T.A., Blok, H.E.M., Paauw, A., Fluit, A.C. and
 383 Verhoef, J. (2002) Evidence of extensive interspecies transfer of integron-mediated
 384 antimicrobial resistance genes among multidrug-resistant Enterobacteriaceae in a clinical
 385 setting. *J Infect Dis* **186**, 49-56.

386 Looft, T., Johnson, T.A., Allen, H.K., Bayles, D.O., Alt, D.P., Stedtfeld, R.D., Sul, W.J.,
 387 Stedtfeld, T.M., Chai, B., Cole, J.R., Hashsham, S.A., Tiedje, J.M. and Stanton, T.B. (2012) In-
 388 feed antibiotic effects on the swine intestinal microbiome. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **109**, 1691-
 389 1696.

390 Lopatkin, A.J., Huang, S., Smith, R.P., Srimani, J.K., Sysoeva, T.A., Bewick, S., Karig,
 391 D.K. and You, L. (2016) Antibiotics as a selective driver for conjugation dynamics. *Nat*
 392 *Microbiol* **1**, 16044.

393 Messens, W., Goris, J., Dierick, N., Herman, L. and Heyndrickx, M. (2010) Inhibition
 394 of *Salmonella typhimurium* by medium-chain fatty acids in an in vitro simulation of the porcine
 395 cecum. *Vet Microbiol* **141**, 73-80.

396 Moller, T.S.B., Overgaard, M., Nielsen, S.S., Bortolaia, V., Sommer, M.O.A.,
 397 Guardabassi, L. and Olsen, J.E. (2016) Relation between tetR and tetA expression in
 398 tetracycline resistant *Escherichia coli*. *BMC Microbiol* **16**.

399 Ng, L.K., Martin, I., Alfa, M. and Mulvey, M. (2001) Multiplex PCR for the detection
 400 of tetracycline resistant genes. *Mol Cell Probes* **15**, 209-215.

401 Peeters, L.E., Daeseleire, E., Devreese, M., Rasschaert, G., Smet, A., Dewulf, J.,
 402 Heyndrickx, M., Imberechts, H., Haesebrouck, F., Butaye, P. and Croubels, S. (2016) Residues
 403 of chlortetracycline, doxycycline and sulfadiazine-trimethoprim in intestinal content and feces
 404 of pigs due to cross-contamination of feed. *BMC Vet Res* **12**, 209.

405 Peeters, L.E., Croubels, S., Rasschaert, G., Imberechts, H., Daeseleire, E., Dewulf, J.,
 406 Heyndrickx, M., Butaye, P., Haesebrouck, F. and Smet, A. Effect of residual doxycycline
 407 concentrations on resistance selection and transfer in porcine commensal *Escherichia coli*.
 408 Accepted for publication in *Int J Antimicrob Ag*, 2017.

409 Sandegren, L. (2014) Selection of antibiotic resistance at very low antibiotic
 410 concentrations. *Ups J Med Sci* **119**, 103-107.

411 Sherratt, D.J. (1982) The maintenance and propagation of plasmid genes in bacterial
 412 populations. The Sixth Fleming Lecture. *J Gen Microbiol* **128**, 655-661.

Smet, A., Rasschaert, G., Martel, A., Persoons, D., Dewulf, J., Butaye, P., Catry, B.,
Haesebrouck, F., Herman, L. and Heyndrickx, M. (2011) In situ ESBL conjugation from avian
to human *Escherichia coli* during cefotaxime administration. *J Appl Microbiol* **110**, 541-549.

Stolker, A.A.M., Manti, V., Zuidema, T., van Egmond, H., Deckers, E.R., Herbes, R.,
Hooglugt, J., Heuvel, E.O. and de Jong, J. (2013) Carry-over of veterinary drugs from
medicated to non-medicated feeds in commercial feed manufacturing plants. *Food Addit
Contam A* **30**, 1100-1107.

Versalovic, J., Koeuth, T. and Lupski, J.R. (1991) Distribution of repetitive DNA
sequences in eubacteria and application to fingerprinting of bacterial genomes. *Nucleic Acids
Res* **19**, 6823-6831.

Vogwill, T. and MacLean, R.C. (2015) The genetic basis of the fitness costs of
antimicrobial resistance: a meta-analysis approach. *Evol Appls* **8**, 284-295.

Yang, H., Huang, X.C., Fang, S.M., Xin, W.S., Huang, L.S. and Chen, C.Y. (2016)
Uncovering the composition of microbial community structure and metagenomics among three
gut locations in pigs with distinct fatness. *Sci Rep* **6**.

Tables

Table 1. Composition of the nutritional medium.

	g l ⁻¹
Starch from corn (1)	5
Casein from bovine milk (1)	10
Casein hydrolysate acid (1)	0.5
Soybean oil (Carrefour sojaolie) (4)	1
L-cysteine hydrochloride anhydrous (1)	0.65
Pectin from citrus peel (1)	2.7
Alphacel (2)	13.8
Mucin from porcine stomach, type II (1)	5
Vitamin-mineral premix (5)	2.35
KH ₂ PO ₄ (3)	0.93
Na ₂ HPO ₄ 12H ₂ O (1)	1.12

(1) Sigma-Aldrich, Bornem, Belgium, (2) MP Biomedicals, (3) Merck, Overijse, Belgium, (4) N.V. Carrefour, Evere, Belgium, (5) Vitamex N.V., Drongen, Belgium.

The medium was acidified to pH 2 with 4 ml l⁻¹ HCl 37% (Merck)

Table 2. Clustering of DOX resistant *E. coli* by rep-PCR and *tet(A)* and IncI1 carrying isolates

Run condition ^a	Number of isolates ^b	Clusters ^c	<i>tet(A)</i> and IncI1 carrying isolates (clusters) ^d
Blank	112	11	4 (2)
1 mg l ⁻¹ DOX	119	15	33 (5)
4 mg l ⁻¹ DOX	109	19	14 (4)

^aFor each condition, 3 runs were performed. Strains were isolated from all runs

^b*E. coli* strains isolated on day 3 (just before DOX administration), 5, 7 and 9

^cTotal number of detected Rep-PCR clusters

^dTotal number of isolates with both IncI1 and *tet(A)* and between brackets the number of different clusters they were assigned to

Note: No *tet(A)* and IncI1 carrying isolates could be identified from the run without donor strain EC 682, the negative control experiment (80 isolates tested).

Table 3. Phenotypic resistance profile of *tet(A)* and IncI1 carrying *E. coli* isolates

Run condition	Cluster n° (<i>a</i> , <i>b</i>)*	Strain n°	Phenotypic resistance profile
Blank	24 (1, 1)	135	tet
	25 (3, 3)	207	amp-smx-tet-tmp
		210	amp-smx-tet-tmp
1 mg l ⁻¹ DOX	5 (6, 1)	517	amp-smx-tet-tmp
	26 (1, 1)	304	amp-smx-tet-tmp
	36 (8, 8)	491	tet
		506	tet
	37 (22, 22)	324	amp-smx-tet-tmp
		385	amp-smx-tet-tmp
		403	amp-smx-tet-tmp
	38 (1, 1)	400	amp-smx-tet-tmp
4 mg l ⁻¹ DOX	22 (5, 1)	791	tet
	30 (2, 1)	747	tet
	32 (7, 7)	589	amp-smx-tet-tmp
	39 (5, 5)	728	amp-smx-tet-tmp
		744	amp-smx-tet-tmp
Blank without EC 682	5 (6, 1) [§]	1011	tet-tmp
	28 (9, 0) [†]	960	tet

amp, ampicillin; smx, sulfamethoxazole; tet, tetracycline; tmp, trimethoprim

* *a*: total number of isolates assigned to this cluster; *b*: total number of both IncI1 and *tet(A)* positive isolates in this cluster

[§]Isolate n° 1011 belonged to a cluster with five *tet(A)* positive isolates originating from the negative control run and one IncI1 and *tet(A)* positive isolate originating from an experiment with 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX.

[†]Isolate n° 960 belonged to a cluster with eight *tet(A)* positive isolates and one *tet(A)* negative isolate, all originating from the negative control run.

Figure captions

Figure 1. Enumeration of DOX resistant *E. coli* strain EC 682 in the simulated pig cecum containing 0 (blank —●—), 1 (—■—) or 4 (—▲—) mg l⁻¹ DOX. Strain EC 682 (white colonies) was enumerated daily in duplicate on MacConkey n°3 agar with 8 mg l⁻¹ DOX (overnight incubation at 37°C) during 10 days. The population size of EC 682 is given in log transformed CFU ml⁻¹ (mean values of three runs + SD) and plotted against time (days). The start of DOX administration is indicated with a red dashed line. The population size of the DOX resistant *E. coli* EC 682 after DOX administration (starting from day 4) was significantly higher in the presence of 1 and 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX compared to blank medium. No significant difference in population size was observed between 1 and 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX.

Figure 2. Enumeration of DOX resistant coliforms other than EC 682 in the simulated pig cecum containing 0 (blank —●—), 1 (—■—) or 4 (—▲—) mg l⁻¹ DOX. Resistant coliforms (red colonies) were enumerated daily in duplicate on MacConkey n°3 agar with 8 mg l⁻¹ DOX (overnight incubation at 37°C) during 10 days. The population size of resistant coliforms is given in log transformed CFU ml⁻¹ (mean values of three runs + SD) and plotted against time (days). The start of DOX administration is indicated with a red dashed line. Starting from day 4, the population size of the resistant coliforms was significantly higher in the presence of 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX compared to the blank controls. No other significant differences were observed.

Note: No growth could be observed at day 0 in the blank experiments and experiments with 4 mg l⁻¹ DOX. The value given for day 0 of the experiments with 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX, represents the count of only one of the three runs. The other two runs showed no growth at day 0.

Figure 3. Enumeration of DOX susceptible coliforms in the simulated pig cecum containing 0 (blank —●—), 1 (—■—) or 4 (—▲—) mg l⁻¹ DOX. Total coliforms and resistant coliforms (red colonies) were enumerated daily during 10 days in duplicate on MacConkey n°3 agar without DOX and with 8 mg l⁻¹, respectively (overnight incubation at 37°C). The number

of susceptible coliforms was calculated by subtracting the resistant coliform count from the total coliform count and is given in log transformed CFU ml⁻¹ (mean values of three runs + SD) and plotted against time (days). The start of DOX administration is indicated with a red dashed line. No significant differences in population sizes of the susceptible coliforms were observed between any of the experiments.

Figure 4. Enumeration of total anaerobes in the simulated pig cecum containing 0 (blank
), 1 (—■—) or 4 (····▲····) mg l⁻¹ DOX. Total anaerobes were enumerated daily in duplicate on Reinforced Clostridial Agar without DOX (48h anaerobic incubation at 37°C) during 10 days. The number of total anaerobes is given in log transformed CFU ml⁻¹ (mean values of three runs + SD) and plotted against time (days). The start of DOX administration is indicated with a red dashed line. A significantly higher population size of anaerobes was observed in the experiments with 4 mg l⁻¹ compared to those with 1 mg l⁻¹ DOX and the blank controls. No other significant differences were seen.

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Table S2: Stability of DOX in LB broth (30 mL) with or without inoculation of strain EC 682 during 48 hours of incubation at 37°C on a horizontal shaker.

Initial DOX concentration (mg/L)	Medium	Percentage of initial concentration after 23h	Percentage of initial concentration after 48h
	LB	88	70
	LB + EC 682	82	65
	LB	86	76
	LB + EC12 682	87	71

Table S3. Competition experiment (type 1) between susceptible *E. coli* EC 298 and three tetracycline resistant *E. coli* strains (EC 682, EC 202, EC 292)

Number of Resistant Bacteria		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	6,00E+06	2,01E+07	3,51E+07	1,46E+07	1,89E+07	1,06E+07	nd	1,62E+07	3,26E+07	3,35E+07	2,74E+07	7,95E+06
	1 mg/L DOX	1,19E+08	3,44E+08	1,62E+08	1,71E+08	1,99E+08	8,62E+07	6,20E+07	3,21E+08	1,01E+08	2,28E+08	1,78E+08	1,03E+08
	4 mg/L DOX	5,45E+07	1,40E+08	1,19E+08	1,28E+08	1,10E+08	3,30E+07	2,19E+07	6,45E+07	4,50E+07	2,13E+07	3,82E+07	1,80E+07
	Blank	4,50E+06	8,84E+07	3,71E+07	2,40E+07	3,85E+07	3,10E+07	1,05E+07	4,49E+07	7,06E+07	5,53E+07	4,53E+07	2,21E+07
	1 mg/L DOX	7,15E+07	2,25E+08	8,75E+07	1,27E+08	1,28E+08	5,95E+07	1,93E+07	2,03E+07	1,19E+08	2,56E+07	4,59E+07	4,20E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	3,65E+07	2,15E+08	1,48E+08	1,35E+08	1,34E+08	6,36E+07	1,72E+07	8,25E+06	1,40E+07	1,66E+07	1,40E+07	3,53E+06
	Blank	1,05E+07	8,61E+07	1,57E+07	4,24E+07	3,87E+07	2,99E+07	9,73E+07	8,38E+07	7,76E+07	4,63E+07	7,62E+07	1,87E+07
	1 mg/L DOX	8,16E+07	3,09E+08	8,90E+07	8,80E+07	1,42E+08	9,63E+07	2,54E+08	1,97E+08	1,65E+08	1,08E+08	1,81E+08	5,26E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	6,11E+07	2,86E+08	7,65E+07	1,15E+08	1,34E+08	8,94E+07	3,89E+07	3,05E+07	4,80E+07	1,32E+08	6,24E+07	4,07E+07
Number of Susceptible Bacteria		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	4,50E+08	8,15E+08	4,17E+08	5,35E+08	5,54E+08	1,57E+08	3,20E+08	1,33E+09	6,60E+08	5,35E+08	7,10E+08	3,75E+08
	1 mg/L DOX	1,98E+08	6,55E+07	8,50E+07	1,62E+08	1,28E+08	5,42E+07	1,15E+08	2,77E+08	7,80E+07	1,13E+08	1,46E+08	7,70E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	6,50E+07	3,10E+07	2,55E+07	3,40E+07	3,89E+07	1,54E+07	2,85E+07	2,27E+08	2,86E+07	4,62E+07	8,24E+07	8,35E+07
	Blank	3,71E+08	6,20E+08	6,25E+08	2,45E+08	4,65E+08	1,64E+08	6,50E+08	9,30E+08	9,40E+08	8,50E+08	8,43E+08	1,16E+08
	1 mg/L DOX	1,36E+07	3,50E+07	2,90E+06	1,63E+07	1,69E+07	1,16E+07	5,65E+06	4,15E+06	2,45E+07	3,83E+06	9,53E+06	8,67E+06
	4 mg/L DOX	5,60E+06	1,60E+07	6,85E+06	3,00E+06	7,86E+06	4,90E+06	4,30E+06	8,75E+06	4,20E+06	2,15E+06	4,85E+06	2,41E+06
	Blank	3,65E+08	4,50E+08	3,55E+08	3,45E+08	3,79E+08	4,18E+07	4,55E+08	5,00E+08	4,35E+08	6,30E+08	5,05E+08	7,59E+07
	1 mg/L DOX	1,37E+08	1,08E+08	9,40E+07	1,19E+08	1,14E+08	1,55E+07	1,50E+08	1,58E+08	7,90E+07	1,09E+08	1,24E+08	3,18E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	5,75E+07	8,75E+07	7,35E+07	6,25E+07	7,03E+07	1,15E+07	2,31E+08	6,70E+07	7,95E+07	5,70E+07	1,09E+08	7,09E+07
LOG10 (Resistant/Susceptible)		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	-1,88	-1,61	-1,07	-1,57	-1,53	0,29	-3,10	-1,91	-1,31	-1,20	-1,88	0,75
	1 mg/L DOX*	-0,22	0,72	0,28	0,02	0,20	0,35	-0,27	0,06	0,11	0,31	0,05	0,21
	4 mg/L DOX*	-0,08	0,65	0,67	0,58	0,46	0,31	-0,11	-0,55	0,20	-0,34	-0,20	0,28
	Blank	-1,92	-0,85	-1,23	-1,01	-1,25	0,41	-1,79	-1,32	-1,12	-1,19	-1,35	0,26
	1 mg/L DOX*	0,72	0,81	1,48	0,89	0,97	0,30	0,53	0,69	0,68	0,82	0,68	0,10
	4 mg/L DOX*	0,81	1,13	1,33	1,65	1,23	0,31	0,60	-0,03	0,52	0,89	0,50	0,33
	Blank	-1,54	-0,72	-1,35	-0,91	-1,13	0,33	-0,67	-0,78	-0,75	-1,13	-0,83	0,18
	1 mg/L DOX*	-0,22	0,46	-0,02	-0,13	0,02	0,26	0,23	0,09	0,32	0,00	0,16	0,12
	4 mg/L DOX*	0,03	0,51	0,02	0,26	0,21	0,20	-0,77	-0,34	-0,22	0,36	-0,24	0,41

The table shows the results (+ mean values and SD of quadruplicates 1- to 4-) of enumerations (after 24h and 48h) of resistant and susceptible bacteria and the results that were used for statistical analysis, namely LOG10 (Resistant/Susceptible). DOX concentrations that resulted in significant higher LOG10 (Resistant/Susceptible) values and thus have a significant higher selective effect than blank medium are denoted by an *

Table S4. Competition experiment (type 1) between susceptible *E. coli* EC 400 and three tetracycline resistant *E. coli* strains (EC 682, EC 202, EC 292)

Number of Resistant Bacteria		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	4,17E+05	1,25E+06	1,35E+06	1,48E+05	7,91E+05	5,19E+05	9,17E+05	8,33E+03	1,50E+05	2,50E+05	3,31E+05	3,49E+05
	1 mg/L DOX	3,17E+07	2,33E+08	3,17E+07	1,25E+07	7,73E+07	9,04E+07	1,83E+08	3,13E+08	2,85E+08	1,85E+08	2,41E+08	5,86E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	1,41E+08	1,03E+08	6,75E+07	1,12E+08	1,06E+08	2,61E+07	2,21E+08	9,75E+07	9,58E+07	1,28E+08	1,35E+08	5,09E+07
	Blank	1,42E+06	1,50E+06	4,08E+05	6,42E+05	9,92E+05	4,75E+05	2,87E+06	3,25E+06	1,98E+06	8,17E+06	4,07E+06	2,41E+06
	1 mg/L DOX	2,75E+07	1,88E+08	2,08E+07	2,42E+07	6,50E+07	7,08E+07	9,50E+07	2,41E+08	1,49E+08	2,03E+08	1,72E+08	5,52E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	1,64E+08	1,44E+08	1,82E+08	2,53E+08	1,86E+08	4,12E+07	1,28E+08	5,67E+07	4,42E+07	3,75E+07	6,67E+07	3,63E+07
	Blank	2,00E+06	6,00E+06	1,34E+06	1,54E+06	2,72E+06	1,91E+06	6,98E+06	1,38E+07	6,50E+06	1,39E+07	1,03E+07	3,55E+06
	1 mg/L DOX	2,33E+07	1,63E+08	4,00E+07	1,50E+07	6,04E+07	6,01E+07	1,43E+08	3,79E+08	1,81E+08	2,03E+08	2,26E+08	9,09E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	1,91E+08	2,23E+08	2,22E+08	2,75E+08	2,28E+08	3,02E+07	3,06E+08	2,20E+08	1,83E+08	1,88E+08	2,24E+08	4,94E+07
Number of Susceptible Bacteria		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	1,04E+09	9,75E+08	9,58E+08	1,24E+09	1,05E+09	1,13E+08	1,20E+09	1,31E+09	1,52E+09	1,63E+09	1,41E+09	1,70E+08
	1 mg/L DOX	2,81E+08	2,72E+08	5,92E+07	6,67E+06	1,55E+08	1,23E+08	6,58E+07	8,17E+07	2,58E+07	6,33E+07	5,92E+07	2,05E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	1,58E+08	9,92E+07	1,92E+07	2,50E+07	7,52E+07	5,70E+07	1,83E+08	8,42E+07	3,50E+07	5,75E+07	9,00E+07	5,66E+07
	Blank	1,21E+09	1,38E+09	1,12E+09	1,24E+09	1,24E+09	9,26E+07	1,04E+09	1,42E+09	1,42E+09	1,42E+09	1,32E+09	1,62E+08
	1 mg/L DOX	2,35E+08	2,69E+08	1,92E+07	2,50E+07	1,37E+08	1,16E+08	4,00E+07	5,33E+07	2,50E+07	4,42E+07	4,06E+07	1,02E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	1,49E+08	1,18E+08	3,33E+07	4,33E+07	8,58E+07	4,89E+07	8,08E+07	4,75E+07	4,83E+07	4,50E+07	5,54E+07	1,47E+07
	Blank	1,21E+09	1,76E+09	1,13E+09	1,10E+09	1,30E+09	2,67E+08	1,56E+09	1,93E+09	1,50E+09	1,46E+09	1,61E+09	1,89E+08
	1 mg/L DOX	2,21E+08	2,93E+08	6,67E+06	3,25E+07	1,38E+08	1,22E+08	7,42E+07	6,42E+07	6,08E+07	5,08E+07	6,25E+07	8,33E+06
	4 mg/L DOX	1,38E+08	1,48E+08	7,25E+07	6,83E+07	1,07E+08	3,67E+07	1,33E+08	1,54E+08	8,67E+07	1,13E+08	1,22E+08	2,50E+07
LOG10 (Resistant/Susceptible)		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	-3,40	-2,89	-2,85	-3,93	-3,27	0,44	-3,12	-5,20	-4,00	-3,82	-3,59	0,75
	1 mg/L DOX*	-0,95	-0,07	-0,27	0,27	-0,25	0,45	0,44	0,58	1,04	0,47	0,71	0,24
	4 mg/L DOX*	-0,05	0,02	0,55	0,65	0,29	0,31	0,08	0,06	0,44	0,35	0,26	0,16
	Blank	-2,93	-2,96	-3,44	-3,29	-3,15	0,21	-2,56	-2,64	-2,85	-2,24	-2,52	0,22
	1 mg/L DOX*	-0,93	-0,16	0,04	-0,01	-0,27	0,39	0,38	0,65	0,78	0,66	0,64	0,15
	4 mg/L DOX*	0,04	0,09	0,74	0,77	0,41	0,34	0,20	0,08	-0,04	-0,08	0,05	0,11
	Blank	-2,78	-2,47	-2,93	-2,85	-2,76	0,18	-2,35	-2,15	-2,36	-2,02	-2,20	0,14
	1 mg/L DOX*	-0,98	-0,25	0,78	-0,34	-0,20	0,63	0,28	0,77	0,47	0,60	0,57	0,18
	4 mg/L DOX*	0,14	0,18	0,49	0,60	0,35	0,20	0,36	0,15	0,32	0,22	0,27	0,08

The table shows the results (+ mean values and SD of quadruplicates 1- to 4-) of enumerations (after 24h and 48h of incubation) of resistant and susceptible bacteria and the results that were used for statistical analysis, namely LOG10 (Resistant/Susceptible). DOX concentrations that resulted in significant higher LOG10 (Resistant/Susceptible) values and thus have a significant higher selective effect than blank medium are denoted by an *

Table S5. Competition experiment (type 2) between susceptible *E. coli* EC 400RIF and three tetracycline resistant *E. coli* strains (EC 682, EC 202, EC 292)

Number of Donor Bacteria		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	2,13E+07	1,45E+07	2,63E+07	2,03E+07	2,06E+07	4,17E+06	5,69E+07	1,70E+08	1,58E+07	6,87E+06	6,24E+07	6,49E+07
	1 mg/L DOX	9,50E+07	1,11E+08	1,09E+08	3,12E+08	1,57E+08	8,96E+07	4,08E+08	3,75E+08	2,28E+08	2,24E+08	3,09E+08	8,34E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	2,70E+08	2,84E+08	3,41E+08	2,08E+08	2,76E+08	4,74E+07	3,84E+08	4,58E+08	3,40E+08	1,72E+08	3,38E+08	1,05E+08
	Blank	2,50E+07	1,01E+07	3,42E+06	1,39E+08	4,44E+07	5,53E+07	1,79E+08	2,54E+08	5,24E+07	2,11E+08	1,74E+08	7,51E+07
	1 mg/L DOX	9,00E+07	7,50E+07	9,00E+07	2,77E+08	1,33E+08	8,32E+07	4,16E+08	3,05E+08	1,99E+08	2,21E+08	2,85E+08	8,53E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	4,41E+08	5,18E+08	3,08E+08	3,43E+08	4,03E+08	8,23E+07	1,98E+08	2,11E+08	4,50E+08	1,67E+08	2,56E+08	1,13E+08
	Blank	2,83E+08	7,50E+07	5,17E+06	1,96E+08	1,40E+08	1,07E+08	9,50E+07	9,13E+07	3,61E+07	3,54E+08	1,44E+08	1,23E+08
	1 mg/L DOX	1,73E+08	1,29E+08	1,44E+08	3,18E+08	1,91E+08	7,49E+07	5,13E+08	4,80E+08	2,93E+08	3,21E+08	4,01E+08	9,60E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	4,86E+08	5,48E+08	5,06E+08	3,44E+08	4,71E+08	7,65E+07	6,86E+08	6,04E+08	6,63E+08	2,34E+08	5,47E+08	1,83E+08
Total number of recipient (EC 400RIF)		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	1,68E+08	6,75E+07	1,88E+08	1,61E+08	1,46E+08	4,63E+07	1,09E+08	2,46E+06	2,19E+08	2,45E+07	8,86E+07	8,49E+07
	1 mg/L DOX	5,59E+06	3,20E+06	6,22E+06	1,40E+06	4,10E+06	1,92E+06	2,53E+05	5,40E+04	1,29E+06	4,00E+03	4,01E+05	5,23E+05
	4 mg/L DOX	8,50E+05	1,25E+05	2,45E+07	8,57E+05	6,59E+06	1,04E+07	1,39E+05	1,57E+04	3,38E+04	2,73E+03	4,77E+04	5,37E+04
	Blank	1,88E+08	7,61E+07	1,95E+08	1,99E+08	1,65E+08	5,12E+07	1,20E+08	3,90E+06	1,28E+08	4,85E+07	7,51E+07	5,14E+07
	1 mg/L DOX	4,59E+06	1,94E+06	4,55E+06	2,53E+06	3,40E+06	1,19E+06	2,03E+05	1,11E+05	3,21E+05	3,47E+04	1,67E+05	1,07E+05
	4 mg/L DOX	2,96E+06	2,91E+06	2,83E+06	1,13E+07	4,99E+06	3,62E+06	1,96E+06	3,83E+05	1,97E+06	1,85E+06	1,54E+06	6,69E+05
	Blank	1,44E+08	7,38E+07	2,04E+08	1,95E+08	1,54E+08	5,17E+07	1,28E+08	9,76E+07	2,93E+08	1,79E+08	1,75E+08	7,45E+07
	1 mg/L DOX	1,68E+06	1,24E+06	2,98E+06	1,96E+07	6,37E+06	7,66E+06	2,37E+06	2,33E+05	1,89E+06	4,19E+06	2,17E+06	1,41E+06
	4 mg/L DOX	5,53E+06	3,33E+06	3,15E+06	1,62E+07	7,05E+06	5,37E+06	1,06E+07	3,61E+06	9,57E+06	1,43E+07	9,53E+06	3,85E+06
Number of Transconjugants		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	1,99E+03	2,03E+03	1,14E+03	2,47E+03	1,91E+03	4,79E+02	1,70E+04	1,72E+04	2,18E+04	3,88E+03	1,50E+04	6,68E+03
	1 mg/L DOX	5,00E+01	0,00E+00	2,90E+02	1,67E+01	8,92E+01	1,17E+02	8,75E+01	3,75E+01	8,33E+00	1,67E+01	3,75E+01	3,08E+01
	4 mg/L DOX	2,50E+01	0,00E+00	3,00E+01	8,33E+00	1,58E+01	1,22E+01	6,25E+01	0,00E+00	1,67E+01	8,33E+00	2,19E+01	2,42E+01
	Blank	2,60E+03	7,50E+02	1,00E+03	2,52E+03	1,72E+03	8,47E+02	5,19E+03	2,01E+03	1,07E+04	2,32E+03	5,05E+03	3,48E+03
	1 mg/L DOX	2,25E+02	5,00E+01	8,80E+02	1,58E+02	3,28E+02	3,25E+02	3,38E+02	2,50E+01	2,25E+02	6,67E+00	1,49E+02	1,39E+02
	4 mg/L DOX	8,75E+01	1,25E+01	1,69E+02	6,67E+02	2,34E+02	2,56E+02	4,00E+02	1,25E+01	0,00E+00	2,40E+02	1,63E+02	1,67E+02
	Blank	6,13E+03	7,50E+02	1,03E+02	1,46E+04	5,39E+03	5,81E+03	1,18E+05	5,98E+04	1,08E+05	3,14E+04	7,94E+04	3,55E+04
	1 mg/L DOX	1,38E+02	1,88E+02	8,80E+02	3,56E+03	1,19E+03	1,40E+03	5,23E+03	1,26E+03	1,48E+03	1,89E+03	2,47E+03	1,61E+03
	4 mg/L DOX	1,38E+02	3,75E+01	9,50E+01	2,73E+03	7,51E+02	1,15E+03	6,25E+02	8,75E+01	6,67E+01	3,17E+03	9,88E+02	1,28E+03

LOG10 (Resistant/Susceptible)*		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	-0,90	-0,67	-0,85	-0,90	-0,83	0,09	-0,28	1,84	-1,14	-0,55	-0,03	1,13
	1 mg/L DOX°	1,23	1,54	1,24	2,35	1,59	0,45	3,21	3,84	2,25	4,75	3,51	0,91
	4 mg/L DOX°	2,50	3,36	1,14	2,38	2,35	0,79	3,44	4,47	4,00	4,80	4,18	0,51
	Blank	-0,88	-0,88	-1,76	-0,16	-0,92	0,57	0,17	1,81	-0,39	0,64	0,56	0,81
	1 mg/L DOX°	1,29	1,59	1,30	2,04	1,55	0,30	3,31	3,44	2,79	3,80	3,34	0,36
	4 mg/L DOX°	2,17	2,25	2,04	1,48	1,99	0,30	2,00	2,74	2,36	1,95	2,27	0,32
	Blank	0,29	0,01	-1,60	0,00	-0,32	0,74	-0,13	-0,03	-0,91	0,30	-0,19	0,44
	1 mg/L DOX°	2,01	2,02	1,68	1,21	1,73	0,33	2,34	3,32	2,19	1,88	2,43	0,54
	4 mg/L DOX°	1,94	2,22	2,21	1,33	1,92	0,36	1,81	2,22	1,84	1,21	1,77	0,36
Plasmid transfer frequency		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	-0,90	-0,67	-0,85	-0,90	-0,83	0,09	-0,28	1,84	-1,14	-0,55	-0,03	1,13
	1 mg/L DOX	1,23	1,54	1,24	2,35	1,59	0,45	3,21	3,84	2,25	4,75	3,51	0,91
	4 mg/L DOX	2,50	3,36	1,14	2,38	2,35	0,79	3,44	4,47	4,00	4,80	4,18	0,51
	Blank	-0,88	-0,88	-1,76	-0,16	-0,92	0,57	0,17	1,81	-0,39	0,64	0,56	0,81
	1 mg/L DOX	1,29	1,59	1,30	2,04	1,55	0,30	3,31	3,44	2,79	3,80	3,34	0,36
	4 mg/L DOX	2,17	2,25	2,04	1,48	1,99	0,30	2,00	2,74	2,36	1,95	2,27	0,32
	Blank	0,29	0,01	-1,60	0,00	-0,32	0,74	-0,13	-0,03	-0,91	0,30	-0,19	0,44
	1 mg/L DOX°	2,01	2,02	1,68	1,21	1,73	0,33	2,34	3,32	2,19	1,88	2,43	0,54
	4 mg/L DOX	1,94	2,22	2,21	1,33	1,92	0,36	1,81	2,22	1,84	1,21	1,77	0,36

The table shows the results (+ mean values and SD of quadruplicates 1- to 4-) of enumerations (after 24h and 48h of incubation) of resistant bacteria, susceptible bacteria and transconjugants and the results that were used for statistical analysis, namely LOG10 (Resistant/Susceptible). DOX concentrations that resulted in significant higher LOG10 (Resistant/Susceptible) values and thus have a significant higher selective effect than blank medium are denoted by an °. DOX concentrations that resulted in significantly higher transfer frequencies are also indicated with an °

*Resistant = donor+ transconjugants ; Susceptible = recipient-transconjugants

Table S6. Competition experiment (type 2) between susceptible *E. coli* EC 588RIF and three tetracycline resistant *E. coli* strains (EC 682, EC 202, EC 292)

Number of Donor bacteria		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	1,00E+05	7,45E+03	1,51E+05	2,79E+05	1,34E+05	9,79E+04	1,17E+05	4,45E+04		5,65E+06	1,94E+06	2,63E+06
	1 mg/L DOX	3,76E+07	4,05E+07	3,96E+07	4,38E+07	4,04E+07	2,24E+06	1,13E+08	8,30E+07	5,03E+08	1,36E+08	2,09E+08	1,71E+08
	4 mg/L DOX	1,44E+07	4,95E+07	3,80E+07	4,18E+07	3,59E+07	1,31E+07	1,05E+08	4,60E+07	2,05E+08	1,53E+08	1,27E+08	5,86E+07
	Blank	5,00E+03	3,58E+04	5,25E+03	1,35E+05	4,53E+04	5,33E+04	1,30E+04	1,65E+04	6,87E+05	4,78E+04	1,91E+05	2,86E+05
	1 mg/L DOX	1,47E+07	2,86E+07	9,65E+06	5,40E+07	2,67E+07	1,72E+07	3,01E+07	2,22E+07	1,19E+08	5,75E+07	5,72E+07	3,80E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	9,75E+06	3,10E+07	2,52E+07	1,33E+08	4,96E+07	4,85E+07	7,60E+06	5,24E+07	2,68E+08	1,99E+07	8,70E+07	1,06E+08
	Blank	1,45E+05	4,34E+05	8,66E+04	4,96E+05	2,90E+05	1,77E+05	0,00E+00	1,24E+06	1,68E+07	1,04E+07	7,10E+06	6,88E+06
	1 mg/L DOX	1,61E+07	2,58E+07	2,00E+07	1,11E+08	4,31E+07	3,91E+07	5,20E+07	3,91E+07	2,10E+08	1,51E+08	1,13E+08	7,06E+07
	4 mg/L DOX	1,25E+07	3,24E+07	3,51E+07	1,74E+08	6,33E+07	6,42E+07	2,36E+07	4,00E+07	1,53E+08	1,29E+08	8,63E+07	5,55E+07
Total number of Recipient (EC 588RIF)		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	1,95E+08	1,32E+08	3,35E+08	1,11E+09	4,44E+08	3,94E+08	2,65E+08	6,93E+07	1,99E+09	9,60E+09	2,98E+09	3,89E+09
	1 mg/L DOX	1,68E+08	3,40E+07	1,63E+08	3,61E+08	1,81E+08	1,17E+08	1,50E+07	2,55E+07	4,60E+07	3,45E+08	1,08E+08	1,37E+08
	4 mg/L DOX	4,95E+07	6,20E+07	1,23E+08	2,85E+08	1,30E+08	9,36E+07	1,00E+06	2,32E+06	4,85E+06	6,65E+06	3,71E+06	2,19E+06
	Blank	7,50E+07	2,88E+08	7,25E+07	3,20E+09	9,08E+08	1,32E+09	1,70E+08	9,00E+07	1,54E+09	1,55E+09	8,36E+08	7,07E+08
	1 mg/L DOX	1,70E+08	2,54E+08	1,22E+08	1,25E+09	4,49E+08	4,65E+08	6,15E+07	1,51E+07	1,55E+07	4,30E+06	2,41E+07	2,21E+07
	4 mg/mL DOX	3,50E+06	2,47E+08	2,82E+08	1,44E+08	1,69E+08	1,08E+08	1,00E+06	5,20E+05	8,70E+05	7,30E+05	7,80E+05	1,78E+05
	Blank	7,50E+07	4,30E+07	1,07E+08	1,22E+09	3,61E+08	4,96E+08	1,60E+08	8,80E+07	1,47E+09	1,58E+10	4,37E+09	6,60E+09
	1 mg/L DOX	3,30E+08	2,10E+08	1,85E+08	5,18E+08	3,11E+08	1,32E+08	5,20E+07	2,44E+08	3,45E+08	1,12E+08	1,88E+08	1,14E+08
	4 mg/L DOX	5,45E+07	3,07E+08	6,95E+07	2,11E+08	1,60E+08	1,04E+08	2,36E+07	6,33E+06	8,35E+07	7,75E+08	2,22E+08	3,21E+08
Number of Transconjugants		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	0,00E+00	2,55E+02	1,95E+02	4,21E+03	1,17E+03	1,76E+03	8,10E+03	1,63E+04	9,15E+03	4,52E+04	1,97E+04	1,50E+04
	1 mg/L DOX	5,00E+02	3,30E+02	2,00E+01	2,25E+02	2,69E+02	1,74E+02	4,70E+03	3,69E+03	3,55E+02	3,00E+03	2,94E+03	1,61E+03
	4 mg/L DOX	0,00E+00	1,80E+02	0,00E+00	1,00E+01	4,75E+01	7,66E+01	1,60E+03	3,04E+03	2,05E+02	2,35E+02	1,27E+03	1,17E+03
	Blank	3,00E+03	5,55E+03	2,70E+02	2,29E+03	2,78E+03	1,89E+03	0,00E+00	9,70E+04	4,54E+05	1,13E+03	1,38E+05	1,86E+05
	1 mg/L DOX	2,00E+03	2,76E+03	1,85E+02	1,40E+02	1,27E+03	1,14E+03	1,30E+03	5,75E+04	1,95E+02	7,00E+01	1,48E+04	2,47E+04
	4 mg/L DOX	0,00E+00	1,50E+01	5,50E+01	7,00E+01	3,50E+01	2,85E+01	0,00E+00	0,00E+00	5,00E+00	4,00E+01	1,13E+01	1,67E+01
	Blank	3,00E+01	6,50E+01	1,00E+01	1,50E+01	3,00E+01	2,15E+01	2,55E+03	8,10E+02	3,35E+02	1,77E+03	1,37E+03	8,55E+02
	1 mg/L DOX	2,08E+03	2,22E+04	1,00E+01	6,65E+02	6,24E+03	9,25E+03	2,75E+04	7,53E+05	1,96E+04	1,76E+03	2,00E+05	3,19E+05
	4 mg/L DOX	2,45E+02	2,19E+04	5,00E+00	6,30E+02	5,70E+03	9,36E+03	1,09E+04	3,83E+05	3,63E+03	6,00E+02	9,95E+04	1,64E+05

LOG10 (Resistant/Susceptible)*		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	-3,29	-4,23	-3,34	-3,60	-3,62	0,37	-3,33	-3,06	nd	-3,23	-3,20	0,11
	1 mg/L DOX°	-0,65	0,08	-0,61	-0,92	-0,53	0,37	0,88	0,51	1,04	-0,40	0,51	0,56
	4 mg/L DOX°	-0,54	-0,10	-0,51	-0,83	-0,49	0,26	2,02	1,30	1,62	1,36	1,58	0,28
	Blank	-3,97	-3,84	-4,12	-4,37	-4,08	0,19	-4,12	-2,90	-3,13	-4,50	-3,66	0,67
	1 mg/L DOX°	-1,06	-0,95	-1,10	-1,36	-1,12	0,15	-0,31	0,17	0,89	1,13	0,47	0,57
	4 mg/L DOX°	0,44	-0,90	-1,05	-0,04	-0,39	0,62	0,88	2,00	2,49	1,43	1,70	0,60
	Blank	-2,71	-2,00	-3,09	-3,39	-2,80	0,52	-4,80	-1,85	-1,94	-3,18	-2,94	1,19
	1 mg/L DOX°	-1,31	-0,91	-0,97	-0,67	-0,96	0,23	0,00	-0,78	-0,22	0,13	-0,22	0,35
	4 mg/L DOX°	-0,64	-0,98	-0,30	-0,08	-0,50	0,34	0,00	0,83	0,26	-0,78	0,08	0,58
Plasmid transfer frequency		1-24h	2-24h	3-24h	4-24h	Mean	SD	1-48h	2-48h	3-48h	4-48h	Mean	SD
	Blank	0,00E+00	1,93E-06	5,83E-07	3,78E-06	1,57E-06	1,45E-06	3,06E-05	2,35E-04	4,61E-06	4,70E-06	6,88E-05	9,67E-05
	1 mg/L DOX	2,98E-06	9,71E-06	1,23E-07	6,24E-07	3,36E-06	3,82E-06	3,13E-04	1,45E-04	7,72E-06	8,71E-06	1,19E-04	1,25E-04
	4 mg/L DOX	0,00E+00	2,90E-06	0,00E+00	3,51E-08	7,35E-07	1,25E-06	1,60E-03	1,31E-03	4,23E-05	3,53E-05	7,46E-04	7,15E-04
	Blank	4,00E-05	1,93E-05	3,72E-06	7,17E-07	1,59E-05	1,56E-05	0,00E+00	1,08E-03	2,95E-04	7,26E-07	3,43E-04	4,41E-04
	1 mg/L DOX	1,18E-05	1,09E-05	1,52E-06	1,12E-07	6,08E-06	5,29E-06	2,11E-05	3,82E-03	1,26E-05	1,63E-05	9,68E-04	1,65E-03
	4 mg/L DOX	0,00E+00	6,09E-08	1,95E-07	4,86E-07	1,85E-07	1,87E-07	0,00E+00	0,00E+00	5,75E-06	5,48E-05	1,51E-05	2,30E-05
	Blank	4,00E-07	1,51E-06	9,35E-08	1,23E-08	5,04E-07	5,99E-07	1,59E-05	9,20E-06	2,29E-07	1,12E-07	6,36E-06	6,63E-06
	1 mg/L DOX°	6,30E-06	1,06E-04	5,42E-08	1,28E-06	2,83E-05	4,47E-05	5,29E-04	3,09E-03	5,69E-05	1,57E-05	9,24E-04	1,27E-03
	4 mg/L DOX°	4,50E-06	7,13E-05	7,19E-08	2,99E-06	1,97E-05	2,98E-05	4,63E-04	6,06E-02	4,35E-05	7,74E-07	1,53E-02	2,61E-02

The table shows the results (+ mean values and SD of quadruplicates 1- to 4-) of enumerations (after 24h and 48h of incubation) of resistant bacteria, susceptible bacteria and transconjugants and the results that were used for statistical analysis, namely LOG10 (Resistant/Susceptible). DOX concentrations that resulted in significant higher LOG10 (Resistant/Susceptible) values and thus have a significant higher selective effect than blank medium are denoted by an °. DOX concentrations that resulted in significantly higher transfer frequencies are also indicated with an °

*Resistant = donor+ transconjugants ; Susceptible = recipient-transconjugants