

1 **Article Summary Line:**

2 Possums, powerlines, and native vegetation are associated with the presence of  
3 *Mycobacterium ulcerans* in residential properties in Victoria, Australia.

4 **Running Title:**

5 Environmental factors and *M. ulcerans*, Australia

6 **Keywords:**

7 *Mycobacterium ulcerans*, Buruli ulcer, case-control study, risk factors, humans, animals,  
8 Marsupialia, red fox, feces, soil, plants

9

10 **Environmental risk factors associated with the presence of *Mycobacterium ulcerans* in  
11 Victoria, Australia**

12 **Authors:**

13 Kim R. Blasdell, Bridgette McNamara, Daniel P. O'Brien, Mary Tachedjian, Victoria Boyd,  
14 Michael Dunn, Peter T. Mee, Simone Clayton, Julie Gaburro, Ina Smith, Katherine B.  
15 Gibney, Ee Laine Tay, Emma C Hobbs, Nilakshi Waidyatillake, Stacey E. Lynch, Timothy P.  
16 Stinear, Eugene Athan

17 **Author Affiliations:**

18 Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Geelong, Victoria, Australia  
19 (K.R. Blasdell, M. Tachedjian, V. Boyd, M. Dunn, S. Clayton, J. Gaburro)  
20 Barwon Health, Geelong, Victoria, Australia (B. McNamara, DP O'Brien, N. Waidyatillake,  
21 E. Athan)

22 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**  
Department of Health, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia (DP O'Brien, EL. Tay)

23 Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, Australian Capital  
24 Territory, Australia (I. Smith)  
25 Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia (K.B. Gibney,  
26 E.C. Hobbs)  
27 The University of Melbourne, Werribee, Victoria, Australia (E.C. Hobbs)  
28 Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity,  
29 University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia (T.P. Stinear)  
30 Agriculture Victoria Research, AgriBio Centre for AgriBiosciences, Bundoora, Victoria,  
31 Australia (P.T. Mee, S.E. Lynch)

32 Geelong Centre for Emerging Infectious Diseases, Geelong, Victoria, Australia (E. Athan)

33

#### 34 **Abstract**

35 In recent years reported cases of Buruli ulcer (BU), caused by *Mycobacterium ulcerans*  
36 (MU), have increased substantially in Victoria, Australia, with the epidemic also expanding  
37 geographically. To develop an understanding of how MU circulates in the environment and  
38 transmits to humans we analyzed environmental samples collected from 115 properties of  
39 recent BU cases and from 115 postcode-matched control properties, for the presence of MU.  
40 Environmental factors associated with increased odds of MU presence at a property included  
41 certain native plant species and native vegetation in general, more alkaline soil, lower  
42 altitude, the presence of common ringtail possums (*Pseudocheirus peregrinus*) and overhead  
43 powerlines. However, only powerlines and the absence of the native plant *Melaleuca*  
44 *lanceolata* were associated with BU case properties. Samples positive for MU were more  
45 likely to be found at case properties and were associated with detections of MU in ringtail

46 possum feces, supporting the hypothesis that MU is zoonotic, with ringtail possums the  
47 strongest reservoir host candidate. However, the disparity in environmental risk factors  
48 associated with MU positive properties versus case properties indicates a strong human  
49 behavioral component or the influence of other environmental factors in disease acquisition  
50 that requires further study.

51

## 52 **Introduction**

53 Buruli ulcer (BU) is a neglected tropical disease, caused by the environmental pathogen  
54 *Mycobacterium ulcerans* (MU). Affecting all age groups, the disease causes severe  
55 destructive lesions of skin and soft tissue and results in significant morbidity, sometimes  
56 leading to long term disability and deformity (O'Brien et al., 2015). Endemic to more than 30  
57 countries, the highest disease burden is in sub-Saharan Africa (Johnson et al., 2005; O'Brien  
58 et al., 2019). Case numbers have increased in Australia (O'Brien et al., 2018; O'Brien et al.,  
59 2019), most markedly in the temperate, southern state of Victoria (Loftus et al., 2018) where  
60 case numbers increased from 32 in 2010 to a peak of 340 in 2018, with 217 cases in 2020 and  
61 208 cases reported up to October 2021 (Victorian DH, 2021a). The endemic area is also  
62 expanding geographically, with new disease hotspots reported both in Victoria's second  
63 largest city (Geelong; Victorian DH, 2019) and most recently in Melbourne's inner suburbs  
64 (Victorian DH, 2021b; Tai et al., 2018).

65 Previous studies have identified several risk factors and potential transmission routes. In  
66 Africa, BU foci are often associated with natural water bodies (Aiga et al., 2004; Bratschi et  
67 al., 2014) and in Victoria, an outbreak was linked to exposure to a contaminated water  
68 irrigation system at a golf course (Veitch et al., 1997). In a questionnaire-based case control  
69 study in one Victorian hotspot, the risk of having BU was found to be increased in people

70 who did not wash minor skin wounds immediately, did not frequently wear insect repellent or  
71 long trousers outdoors, and who received mosquito bites to the lower legs or arms (Quek et  
72 al., 2007). Molecular detection of MU in mosquitoes collected from several localities within  
73 the Victorian endemic area (Johnson et al., 2007; Lavender et al., 2011), and the  
74 demonstration that *Ae. notoscriptus* can act as mechanical vectors for BU in a mouse model  
75 (Wallace et al., 2017) suggests that mosquitoes may be involved with BU transmission in  
76 Victoria. Several studies have also suggested that MU may be a zoonotic pathogen in  
77 Victoria. Evidence of infection and disease has been reported in several native and non-native  
78 mammals (Elsner et al., 2008; Mitchell et al., 1987; O'Brien et al., 2011; O'Brien et al., 2013;  
79 O'Brien et al., 2014; Van Zyl et al., 2010), but there is increasing evidence that two common  
80 possum species may be acting as reservoirs hosts in south east Australia (Fyfe et al., 2010).  
81 Both common brushtail (BT; *Trichosurus vulpecula*) and common ringtail (RT;  
82 *Pseudocheirus peregrinus*) possums can develop BU and possum feces are the environmental  
83 sample type most commonly PCR positive for MU in Victorian endemic areas (Fyfe et al.,  
84 2010; O'Brien et al., 2014). There is evidence of a clear geographic correlation between the  
85 presence of human cases and MU-positive possum feces (Carson et al., 2014; Fyfe et al.,  
86 2010).

87 Here we present the environmental results from the first systematic, large-scale case-control  
88 study to encompass almost the entire Victorian endemic area. By assessing the environmental  
89 characteristics of participants' gardens and the distribution of MU in different environmental  
90 sample types within these, we establish: (1) which environmental sources are more predictive  
91 of MU presence (including predicting the presence of viable bacteria); (2) what features make  
92 a property more likely to be positive for MU or more likely to contain a human case of BU;  
93 and (3) how MU status changes through time. These findings will aid public education  
94 around this disease and inform the development of intervention strategies to prevent disease.

95

## 96 **Methods**

### 97 *Ethics*

98 The study was approved by the Victorian Department of Health (DH) Human Research  
99 Ethics Committee and the CSIRO Health and Medical Human Research Ethics Committee  
100 (application no. 10/18). Access to electoral information for medical research purposes was  
101 granted by the Australian Electoral Commission. Written informed consent was obtained for  
102 the property environmental field surveys.

### 103 *Study area*

104 The study was conducted in the known Buruli ulcer-endemic area of Victoria, Australia. This  
105 is primarily located around Port Phillip Bay, with the main concentration of recognized cases  
106 from the Mornington and Bellarine Peninsulas and the Melbourne regional (Bayside) area.

### 107 *Recruitment*

108 All laboratory confirmed BU cases (Betts et al, 2018) aged  $\geq 18$  years notified to the Victorian  
109 DH between 12<sup>th</sup> June 2018 and 11<sup>th</sup> June 2020 were eligible to participate. Potential control  
110 participants (aged  $\geq 18$  years) were randomly selected from either the 2017 Victorian  
111 Population Health Survey (VPHS) or the Australian Electoral Roll. Participants were asked to  
112 complete a paper-based questionnaire (results to be reported elsewhere). Environmental  
113 surveys were conducted on a subset of case and control properties within the endemic area.

114 ***Case properties*** had at least one resident with a laboratory-confirmed diagnosis of BU within  
115 the study period (12<sup>th</sup> June 2018 to 11<sup>th</sup> June 2020). ***Control properties*** had no residents  
116 diagnosed with BU within the study period or reported as having had BU prior to the study  
117 period.

118 Cases who completed the study questionnaire were purposely selected by postcode to ensure  
119 a representative spread of sampling across the affected area based on reported BU prevalence  
120 (i.e. more properties were surveyed in postcodes with more cases). Control properties were  
121 then purposely selected based on postcode and matched 1:1 to case properties.

### 122 *Property environmental field surveys*

123 Prior to an environmental field survey being conducted at a property, geocoordinates (latitude  
124 and longitude), altitude (all from <https://www.google.com/maps>) and approximate property  
125 size (<https://www.freemaptools.com/area-calculator.htm>) were recorded and an outline of the  
126 property, including buildings was prepared. During the property visit, additional information  
127 was recorded, including presence of key plant species (Supplemental Figure 1), garden type  
128 and samples collected (Supplemental Figure 2; Supplemental Figure 3, Supplemental  
129 material: Field Collection Sheet). Garden type was categorized as Non-native (>60% non-  
130 native vegetation), Mixed (40-60% native/non-native) or Native (>60% native vegetation).  
131 Five different sample types were collected as outlined in Table 1, namely soil, water, plants  
132 (Supplemental Figure 4), feces and insects. Soil texture was determined as per standard  
133 protocols ([https://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/168866/texture-  
134 salinity.pdf](https://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/168866/texture-salinity.pdf)). Up to 20 environmental samples were collected per property. In addition, a  
135 mains water sample was also collected from each property as a negative control, to validate  
136 sample collection techniques and detect potential contamination. The total number of  
137 observable water sources on a property was recorded, although samples were not always  
138 collected from all sources. The presence of mosquito larvae in any of the water sources was  
139 also recorded.

140 A proportion of properties were visited twice. For these properties first visits were made  
141 between 5th August 2019 and 3rd March 2020, whilst return visits were made between 19th  
142 March 2020 and 23rd June 2020. The interval between visits was impacted by work and

143 travel restrictions imposed during the COVID-19 pandemic. For all return environmental  
 144 field surveys at a property, the property outline from the initial visit was used to enable the  
 145 same sample types to be collected from the same locations. Any different samples collected  
 146 and significant environmental changes between the two field surveys were recorded. All  
 147 samples were returned to the laboratory and maintained at -70°C until processed.

148

149 Table 1: Environmental field survey sample type categories. The mains water negative  
 150 control is not included in the property sample total.

<b>Sample type</b>	<b>Sub-types</b>	<b>No. collected per property</b>	<b>Notes/description</b>
Soil	N/A	2	Collected from opposite ends of the property; color, temperature and texture recorded
Water	Bore water	1	If present on property
	Bin, bird bath, bowl, bromeliad, bucket, dish, drain, jug/vase, pond, pot, surface water, swimming pool, tray, tub/trough, tire, water feature, water tank, watering can, other	Various	Water sources accessible to mosquitoes
Plants	Food source plants	Various	Plants eaten by wild and feral mammals

	Spiky plants		Plants that could produce a puncturing injury
Feces	Ringtail (RT) possum	Various	Feces from wild native and feral mammals
	Brushtail (BT) possum		
	Rodent (rats/mice)		
	Rabbit		
	Fox		
	Other: bat, echidna, wallaby, unidentified		
Insects	Mosquitoes	Various	Hematophagous insects, collected by handheld aspirator
	March flies		
TOTAL NO. OF ENVIRONMENTAL SAMPLES COLLECTED PER PROPERTY		Up to 20	

151


152 *Laboratory processing and analysis*

153 Soil samples were processed to determine soil bulk density ( $\text{g/cm}^3$ ), pH, conductivity  
154 ( $\mu\text{S/cm}$ ) and salinity class. For soil bulk density,  $50\text{cm}^3$  of each soil sample was weighed  
155 before and after heating in an oven at  $105^\circ\text{C}$  for two hours and the dry weight divided by the  
156 soil volume. For pH and conductivity, soil was resuspended in distilled water at a 1:5 ratio,  
157 before testing with a VisionPlus pH/EC80 meter (Jenco). Soil salinity class was determined  
158 based on the meter reading for conductivity with reference to the soil texture type determined  
159 during the field survey (<https://www.agric.wa.gov.au/soil-salinity/measuring-soil-salinity>).



160 Samples for nucleic acid extraction were thawed prior to processing and transferred to 2ml  
161 tubes containing approximately 2.4g of a mixture of 2.3mm and 0.5mm zirconia/silica beads  
162 (Bio Spec Products, Inc.). Water samples were added in 500µl volumes to 500µl of  
163 DNA/RNA Shield (Zymo). For plant, soil and fecal samples, approximately 0.2g (plants) or  
164 0.1g (feces/soil) was added to 1ml of DNA/RNA Shield (Zymo). Samples were homogenized  
165 at 6500rpm for 30sec on a Precellys 24 (Bertin Technologies) and clarified for 5 mins at  
166 16,000g. Total nucleic acid was extracted from 200µl of the cleared supernatant using the  
167 Kingfisher Flex benchtop automated extraction instrument (ThermoFisher) and the Quick  
168 DNA/RNA MagBead Pathogen kit (Zymo) as per the manufacturer's instructions. All  
169 samples were subjected to the IS2404 real-time PCR assay, which is routinely used for the  
170 molecular diagnosis of MU infection in clinical samples and has been used previously on  
171 environmental samples (Fyfe et al., 2007). As this assay detects other mycolactone-producing  
172 *Mycobacteria* in addition to MU, any sample that tested positive by this assay ( $C_T < 40$ ,  
173 threshold 0.02) was subjected to confirmatory testing using two MU specific assays (IS2606  
174 and KR; Fyfe et al., 2007) as well as an RNA-based assay targeting the MU 16S rRNA to  
175 assess viability (Beissner et al., 2012). This viability assay can also detect some strains of *M.*  
176 *marinum*, although it is unlikely that this species would be present in most of the sample  
177 types collected. Based on the results of these assays, all samples were classified as negative  
178 (IS2404 not detected or  $C_T \geq 40$ ); IS2404 detected ( $C_T < 40$ , threshold 0.02); confirmed (MU  
179 detected by both IS2606 and KR assays); or viable (MU 16S rRNA detected) (Figure 1). A  
180 property was assigned an 'IS2404 not detected' or 'negative' status if IS2404 was not  
181 detected in any samples collected from that property and was classified as IS2404 detected /  
182 confirmed / viable if any samples collected from that property met these definitions (N.B. a  
183 'viable' property would also be both 'IS2404 detected' and 'confirmed'; a 'confirmed'  
184 property would also be 'IS2404 detected').

185



186

187 Figure 1: Flow diagram for sample processing and interpretation of results based on the  
 188 different RT-PCR assay results.

189

190 *Statistical analysis*

191 We investigated relationships between each of the property outcomes (IS2404 detected,  
192 confirmed, viable and case status) with environmental variables including garden type, and  
193 property location, size and altitude. For initial analysis Fisher's Exact (where expected values  
194  $\leq 5$ ) and chi-square tests were used to compare categorical variables, and either Student's t-  
195 test or one-way ANOVA with a post-hoc Tukey Kramer test were used to compare  
196 differences in mean values of continuous variables. Logistic regression models were used to  
197 estimate the strength of the relationships between each of the selected environmental  
198 characteristics and i) properties with one or more sample positive for MU, or ii) case status of  
199 the property, expressed as odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (95%CI). The  
200 potential for confounding by covariates was assessed using a subject matter informed directed  
201 acyclic graph (DAG) and appropriate confounders included in each adjusted model  
202 (Supplemental Figure 5), along with variables that had  $P < 0.1$  in the univariate analysis and  
203 were identified in 30 or more properties. Descriptive statistical tests were conducted using  
204 pre-prepared spreadsheets available from <http://www.biostathandbook.com> (McDonald,  
205 2014). Regression models were conducted using Stata 15 (Statacorp).

206


## 207 **Results**

### 208 *Numbers sampled: Participants/Field surveys/Samples/Assays*

209 Of the 3,433 individuals contacted, 283/497 (56.9%) cases and 520/2936 (17.7%) controls  
210 participated in the case-control study. Of these, 256 (90.5%) case participants and 458  
211 (88.1%) control participants agreed to be contacted about the property environmental  
212 surveys. Property environmental field surveys were conducted at 230 properties, comprising  
213 115 case and 115 control properties, located across 20 postcodes (Figure 2). A second field  
214 survey was carried out within three to nine months of the initial survey at 27 properties (13

215 case properties; 14 control properties), all located within three of the most severely impacted  
216 postcodes.

217



218

219 Figure 2: Map of affected area, illustrating the number of property surveys conducted by  
220 suburb. An Asterisk (\*) is shown on suburbs where repeat sampling was undertaken. N.B.  
221 Geographical boundaries are not available by postcode and some postcodes contain more  
222 than one suburb.

223

224 A total of 4363 environmental samples (excluding insect samples) were collected during the  
225 field surveys, 3907 from initial surveys and 456 from return surveys (Table 2). Of these, 475  
226 (10.9%) samples were 'IS2404 detected' (highest for feces (20.5%) and soil (13.2%)) and  
227 237 (5.4%) samples were 'confirmed', most commonly for feces in general (13.3%), and for

228 fox and RT possum feces in particular (20.0% and 16.7% respectively)) (Table 2). Of  
229 ‘IS2404 detected’ samples, considerably higher proportions of feces were also ‘confirmed’  
230 compared to other sample types. Sixty-seven samples (1.5% of all samples) were ‘viable’. At  
231 least one sample from each sample type was IS2404 detected and confirmed, however only  
232 feces were ‘viable’ – most frequently from RT possums (64 samples) but also from two BT  
233 possums and a fox.

234 For the initial surveys, 157/230 (68.3%) properties were IS2404 detected, of which 103  
235 (44.8%) were confirmed and 46 (20.0%) viable. For the second (return) surveys, 16/27  
236 (59.3%) were IS2404 detected, nine (33.3%) confirmed and two (7.4%) viable. Among case  
237 properties, the interval between case notification date and field collection date did not affect  
238 the odds of a property testing IS2404 detected, confirmed or viable (data on request). At  
239 individual properties, a maximum of 10 samples were IS2404 detected, six samples were  
240 confirmed, and four samples were viable. Of the 20 postcodes in which properties were  
241 surveyed, at least one property was IS2404 detected in 17 postcodes, confirmed in 13  
242 postcodes, and viable in ten postcodes (Supplemental Figure 6).

243

244 Table 2: Results of sample testing by sample type, with sub-type shown for fecal and insect samples.

Sample type	No. tested	IS2404 detected			Confirmed			Viable	
		n	%	Mean positive C <sub>T</sub> (range)	n	% of all samples	% of IS2404 positive samples	n	% of all samples
Soil	524	69	13.2	38.0 (22.78 – 39.80)	16	3.1	23.2	0	0.0
Plant	928	37	4.0	38.66 (31.90 – 39.95)	4	0.4	10.8	0	0.0
Water	1097	36	3.3	38.21 (21.20 – 39.90)	1	0.1	2.7	0	0.0
Insects	193	1	0.5	33.70 (N/A)	1	0.5	100.0	0	0.0
~Mosquito	177	1	0.6	33.70 (N/A)	1	0.6	100.0	0	0.0
~March fly	16	0	0.0	N/A	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
Feces	1621	332	20.5	34.50 (21.12 - 39.99)	215	13.3	64.4	67	4.1
~Ringtail	1182	283	23.9	34.14 (21.12 – 39.99)	197	16.7	69.1	64	5.4
~Brushtail	179	14	7.8	35.74 (28.54 – 39.78)	8	4.5	57.1	2	1.1
~Rodent	170	21	12.4	38.30 (32.26 – 39.76)	2	1.2	9.5	0	0.0
~Fox	20	6	30.0	34.92 (24.57 – 39.90)	4	20.0	66.7	1	5.5

~Rabbit	29	2	6.9	36.59 (34.03 – 39.14)	1	3.5	50.0	0	0.0
~Other/ unknown	40	6	15.0	36.73 (27.50 – 39.23)	2	5.0	33.3	0	0.0
<b>Total/ Average</b>	<b>4363</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>35.65 (21.12 - 39.99)</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>49.9</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>1.5</b>

246 *Comparison of PCR assays*

247 Excluding insect samples (due to a single positive), IS2404  $C_T$  values differed significantly  
248 between the sample types (one-way ANOVA,  $p < 0.001$ ), although the ‘between sample type’  
249 variance was considerably lower than the ‘within sample type’ variance (26.7% and 73.3%  
250 respectively). Fecal  $C_T$  values were significantly lower (suggesting higher bacterial loads)  
251 (mean = 34.50) than those for all other sample types (mean = 38.23 combined, Tukey-Kramer  
252 test,  $p < 0.05$ ). There were no significant differences in  $C_T$  values between the other sample  
253 types (means: plant = 38.66; soil = 38.0; water = 38.21). Lower IS2404  $C_T$  values were  
254 observed for confirmed samples (median = 33.69; IQR = 7.20) than unconfirmed samples  
255 (median = 38.79; IQR = 1.11). Only 8/238 (3.3%) of IS2404-positive samples that were  
256 unconfirmed had  $C_T$  values of  $< 35$ .

257 Case properties were more likely to be ‘IS2404 detected’ and ‘confirmed’ than control  
258 properties when considering all samples and when restricted to fecal samples or RT possum  
259 feces only (Table 3). No significant relationships were observed for the viability assay.

260

261 *Environmental characteristics of different property types*

262 Mean property size varied between the different study areas (ANOVA,  $p < 0.05$ ). Sampled  
263 properties in the Mornington Peninsula ( $n=148$  properties, postcodes 3930-3944, mean  
264 property size  $1087\text{m}^2$ ) were larger than those in Bayside ( $n=56$ , postcodes 3190-3199, mean  
265  $695\text{m}^2$ ) but did not differ significantly from sampled properties in Bellarine ( $n=22$ , postcodes  
266 3223-3227, mean= $890\text{m}^2$ ) or the Surf Coast ( $n=4$ , postcode 3231, mean =  $677\text{m}^2$ ). No  
267 significant differences were found between area and altitude, with average property elevation  
268 ranging between 13.5m (Bellarine) to 22.75m (Bayside).

269



270 Table 3: Significant relationships observed between case properties and sample status as  
271 assessed by Chi-square test

Status	Factor	No. (%) case properties	No. (%) control properties	p-value
IS2404 detected	Any IS2404 detected sample	88 (76.5)	69 (60.0)	0.007
	IS2404 detected feces	73 (63.5)	50 (43.5)	0.002
	IS2404 detected ringtail feces	63 (54.8)	46 (40.0)	0.025
Confirmed	Any confirmed sample	63 (54.8)	40 (34.8)	0.002
	Confirmed feces	59 (50.9)	36 (31.3)	0.002
	Confirmed ringtail feces	54 (47.0)	34 (29.6)	0.007

272

273

274 *Univariate analysis of property characteristics and study outcomes (IS2404 detected,*  
275 *confirmed, viable and case status)*

276 Univariate analyses are presented in Table 4 (unadjusted OR) and Supplementary Table 1.  
277 Due to the close association between garden type and the presence of selected native plant  
278 species, the former was not included in the multivariable models, despite properties with  
279 native gardens having higher odds of being IS2404 detected, confirmed and viable. Due to

280 low sample size, the presence of rabbit feces was also not included in the multivariable  
281 models, even though properties with rabbit feces were more likely to have viable MU at the  
282 property. Two significant relationships that were observed in univariate analyses but not in  
283 multivariable analyses were the positive association between *Melaleuca lanceolata* and  
284 IS2404 detected, confirmed and viable properties, and the higher soil salinity associated with  
285 IS2404 and confirmed properties.

286 *Multivariable analysis of property characteristics and study outcomes (IS2404, confirmed,*  
287 *viable and case status)*

288 In multivariable analysis, the presence of selected plant species was associated with both  
289 increased odds of property status (*Leptospermum laevigatum* for confirmed properties; *M.*  
290 *lanceolata* (Moonah) for viable properties) and decreased odds of property status (*M.*  
291 *lanceolata* (Moonah) for case properties; *Leucopogon parviflorus* (coastal beard heath) for  
292 confirmed properties; and *Pittosporum* (cheesewoods) for IS2404 properties). Likewise,  
293 while presence of RT possums was associated with increased odds of a property being  
294 confirmed, BT possums were associated with decreased odds of a property being IS2404  
295 detected. It is also important to note that all viable properties had RT possum feces present  
296 and thus adjustment for this factor was not included in the model. Increased property size and  
297 more alkaline soil were associated with being a confirmed property. Lower altitude was  
298 associated with a property being confirmed, while presence of power lines was associated  
299 with a property being IS2404 detected, confirmed and a case property.

Table 4: Relationships between environmental characteristics and MU property status (IS2404 positive, confirmed, viable) or case status

	<b>Property status</b>							
	<b>IS2404 positive</b>		<b>Confirmed</b>		<b>Viable</b>		<b>Case</b>	
	Unadjusted OR [95%CI]	Adjusted OR [95%CI]	Unadjusted OR [95%CI]	Adjusted OR [95%CI]	Unadjusted OR [95%CI]	Adjusted OR [95%CI]	Unadjusted OR [95%CI]	Adjusted OR [95%CI]
<b>Garden Type</b>								
Non-native	1.00	-	1.00	-	1.00	-	1.00	-
Mixed	<b>3.18</b> [1.62,6.27]	-	<b>2.22</b> [1.14,4.32]	-	2.19 [0.88,5.43]	-	1.39 [0.74,2.61]	-
Native	<b>3.97</b> [1.92,8.21]	-	<b>3.90</b> [1.96,7.77]	-	<b>3.38</b> [1.39,8.25]	-	1.05 [0.55,2.01]	-
<b>Presence of Plant species</b>								
<i>Melaleuca lanceolata</i>	<b>2.54</b>	1.75	<b>3.01</b>	1.76	<b>3.45</b>	<b>2.39</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0.48</b>

(Moonah)	<b>[1.42,4.54]</b>	[0.78, 3.95]	<b>[1.76,5.17]</b>	[0.82, 3.78]	<b>[1.70,6.98]</b>	<b>[1.00,5.71]</b>	<b>[0.33,0.93]</b>	<b>[0.24, 0.96]</b>
<i>Leptospernum</i>								
<i>laevigatum</i> (coastal tea tree)	<b>3.15</b>	1.71	<b>4.17</b>	<b>2.82</b>	<b>3.61</b>	2.10	1.20	1.89
	<b>[1.77,5.61]</b>	[0.74, 3.95]	<b>[2.35,7.42]</b>	<b>[1.23, 6.49]</b>	<b>[1.65,7.90]</b>	[0.75, 5.71]	[0.71,2.02]	[0.90, 3.98]
<i>Leucopogon parviflorus</i>								
(coast beard heath)	1.76	0.94	1.43	<b>0.33</b>	<b>2.04</b>	0.91	0.60	0.61
	[0.95,3.25]	[0.40, 2.25]	[0.83, 2.48]	<b>[0.14, 0.76]</b>	<b>[1.06,3.94]</b>	[0.39, 2.14]	[0.35,1.05]	[0.30,1.25]
<i>Pittosporum</i> spp.								
(cheesewoods)	<b>0.48</b>	<b>0.40</b>	0.88	1.12	0.78	0.78	0.65	0.68
	<b>[0.27,0.86]</b>	<b>[0.20, 0.80]</b>	[0.50,1.54]	[0.56, 2.23]	[0.38,1.58]	[0.35, 1.76]	[0.37,1.13]	[0.37, 1.25]
Spiky aloe succulents	1.97	1.85	1.45	1.16	0.63	0.43	1.31	1.53
	[0.99,3.93]	[0.82, 4.21]	[0.81,2.63]	[0.56, 2.43]	[0.29,1.41]	[0.18, 1.04]	[0.73,2.37]	[0.80, 2.93]

<b>Presence of animal feces</b>								
Ring tail possum	<b>3.80</b> [1.41,10.26]	2.56 [0.78, 8.38]	<b>15.8</b> [2.06,120.59]	<b>11.22</b> [1.32, 95.68]	<b>All viable</b>	<b>All viable</b>	1 [0.38,2.62]	0.96 [0.32, 2.90]
Brush tail possum	<b>0.45</b> [0.25,0.80]	<b>0.40</b> [0.20, 0.80]	0.68 [0.39,1.18]	0.87 [0.43, 1.73]	0.72 [0.35,1.47]	0.82 [0.35, 1.84]	1.00 [0.58,1.73]	1.05 [0.57, 1.93]
Rodent	0.67 [0.38,1.18]	0.78 [0.39, 1.57]	<b>0.55</b> [0.32,0.95]	0.60 [0.30, 1.18]	0.56 [0.28,1.13]	0.64 [0.28, 1.47]	1.2 [0.71,2.04]	1.09 [0.60, 1.99]
Fox	2.28 [0.64, 8.21]	-	1.84 [0.68, 5.03]	-	0.85 [0.23, 3.08]	-	0.88 [0.33, 2.37]	-
Rabbit	4.38 [0.54,35.23]	-	3.01 [0.76,11.96]	-	<b>4.37</b> [1.21,15.78]	-	0.24 [0.05,1.14]	-
<b>Presence of bore water</b>								
Yes (ref=no)	1.82	0.81	1.97	0.93	1.89	1.19	1.35	1.52

<b>Property size</b>	[0.82, 4.04]	[0.30, 2.17]	[0.99, 3.90]	[0.39, 2.19]	[0.87, 4.07]	[0.47, 3.00]	[0.68, 2.66]	[0.68, 3.41]
per 100m <sup>2</sup>	1.07	1.06	<b>1.07</b>	<b>1.07</b>	1.03	1.04	0.98	0.98
	[1.00,1.15]	[0.99, 1.12]	<b>[1.01,1.13]</b>	<b>[1.01, 1.12]</b>	[1.00,1.07]	[1.00, 1.08]	[0.94,1.01]	[0.94, 1.03]
<b>Presence of power lines</b>								
Yes (ref=no)	<b>2.03</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>1.98</b>	<b>3.44</b>	1.55	2.30	<b>2.90</b>	<b>2.72</b>
	<b>[1.05,3.93]</b>	<b>[1.82, 10.04]</b>	<b>[1.00,3.89]</b>	<b>[1.46, 8.08]</b>	[0.64,3.72]	[0.83,6.40]	<b>[1.46,5.79]</b>	<b>[1.30, 5.71]</b>
<b>Altitude</b>								
per m	<b>0.98</b>	0.99	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.96</b>	0.98	0.98	1.00	1.00
	<b>[0.97,1.00]</b>	[0.97, 1.01]	<b>[0.95,0.99]</b>	<b>[0.93 , 0.99]</b>	[0.96,1.01]	[0.95, 1.02]	[0.98,1.01]	[0.98,1.02]
<b>Soil conditions</b>								
pH (per unit increase in pH)	<b>1.64</b>	1.21	<b>2.12</b>	<b>1.68</b>	<b>1.97</b>	1.29	1.00	1.08
	<b>[1.21,2.22]</b>	[0.79, 1.85]	<b>[1.52,2.95]</b>	<b>[1.09, 2.59]</b>	<b>[1.26,3.07]</b>	[0.76, 2.21]	[0.75,1.32]	[0.75, 1.56]

<i>Soil Salinity classification</i>								
Non – Slightly Saline (ref)	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Moderately saline	<b>5.75</b> [1.45,22.78]	<b>5.71</b> [1.18,27.61]	3.00 [0.57,15.82]	1.36 [0.21, 8.89]	2.89 [0.31,26.55]	1.23 [0.11, 13.53]	1.42 [0.40,4.99]	1.41 [0.34,5.89]
Highly saline	<b>5.34</b> [1.55,18.48]	3.29 [0.77, 14.09]	<b>5.14</b> [1.09,24.29]	1.71 [0.28, 10.29]	3.43 [0.42,27.90]	0.93 [0.09, 9.49]	1.30 [0.42,4.06]	1.43 [0.37,5.44]
Severely saline	<b>6.56</b> [1.80,23.95]	4.22 [0.90, 19.83]	<b>5.60</b> [1.15,27.27]	1.58 [0.25, 10.01]	2.71 [0.32,23.14]	0.70 [0.06, 7.87]	1.33 [0.41,4.33]	1.18 [0.29,4.76]
Extremely saline	<b>8.12</b>	4.45	<b>8.57</b>	2.49	5.42	1.62	1.50	1.33

	<b>[1.99,33.09]</b>	[0.85, 23.28]	<b>[1.65,44.43]</b>	[0.37, 16.83]	<b>[0.62,47.14]</b>	[0.15, 17.90]	<b>[0.43,5.26]</b>	[0.30,5.80]
--	---------------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------	---------------------	---------------	--------------------	-------------

**Odds Ratios (OR); 95% confidence intervals in brackets**

Adjusted analyses for each property type included variables with an association observed (at  $p < 0.1$ ) for any property type. Variables were excluded where the total number of properties with that variable was less than 30.



### *Return/follow-up property field surveys*

A total of 27 properties were visited twice. The number of days between visits varied between 92 days (~3 months) and 261 days (~8.7 months), showing a right-skewed distribution with a median of 147 days (~4.9 months; IQR = 92 days). Property status remained the same between visits for 19 (70.4%) properties based on IS2404 results, 22 (81.5%) for confirmed results and 23 (85.5%) for viability results (Table 5). At properties that remained positive, RT possum feces were the main sample type that remained positive at 10/14 (71%) properties for IS2404, 8/9 (89%) for confirmed and 2/2 (100%) for viable.

Table 5: Property status between first and second field surveys by assay type

	Number of properties (% of total properties)		
Property status	IS2404 detected	Confirmed	Viable
Remained negative	5 (18.5)	13 (48.1)	21 (77.8)
Remained positive	14 (51.9)	9 (33.3)	2 (7.4)
<b><i>Status unchanged</i></b>	<b><i>19 (70.4)</i></b>	<b><i>22 (81.5)</i></b>	<b><i>23 (85.2)</i></b>
Positive became negative	6 (22.2)	5 (18.5)	4 (14.8)
Negative became positive	2 (7.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
<b><i>Status changed</i></b>	<b><i>8 (29.6)</i></b>	<b><i>5 (18.5)</i></b>	<b><i>4 (14.8)</i></b>

Under the assumption that properties with positive status at both visits were positive for the entire period between the two sampling visits, we documented one property that remained IS2404 detected for at least 8.7 months, which was also the longest time between visits for any property. Of properties that remained IS2404 detected, half (7/14) had an interval between sampling of over six months. For nine confirmed properties, five properties

remained confirmed for over six months, with the longest sampling interval of 7.9 months. The two properties that remained positive for the viability assay were positive for over six months. Only for the IS2404 assay did any property become positive, with two properties that were initially IS2404 negative becoming positive at the second visit (7.4%; Table 5); all other changes of property status were from positive at the first visit, to negative at the second visit (Table 5).

## Discussion

The findings from this study support the hypothesis that BU may be a zoonotic disease in Australia, with native mammals, specifically species of possum, acting as reservoir hosts (Carson et al., 2014; O'Brien et al., 2014). Consistent with previous findings, fecal samples were the sample type most commonly positive for MU and had the highest bacterial loads (Fyfe et al. 2010). This was also the sample type most likely to remain positive at return properties and the only sample type that appeared to contain viable bacteria. In Australia, numerous species of both native and introduced mammals including feces from RT possum, BT possum and rodents have tested positive for MU in the past, (Fyfe et al., 2010; Roltgen et al., 2017)) as also found in this study. In addition, in our study fecal samples from wild fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) and rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*) tested positive; a first report for both species, although laboratory rabbits have been infected experimentally (Norden & Linell, 1951). Fox feces collected during this study had the highest proportion of positives in IS2404 and confirmatory assays. However, RT possum feces were the sample type with the second highest proportion of positives by both these assays, the primary sample type positive by the viability assay and the sample type most commonly collected in this study (>28% of all

samples collected). Only feces from RT possums, BT possums and a single fox were found to be viable, suggesting that all three species may be involved in the transmission of MU.

RT possums were more likely to be found at confirmed and viable properties and their feces were more likely to be positive for MU at case properties. Previous studies have also found a correlation between the geographic location of cases and the presence of positive possum feces (Carson et al., 2014; Fyfe et al 2010), supporting the reservoir host hypothesis. The findings from this study suggest that the presence of RT possums *per se* at a property does not increase the risk of the residents contracting BU, but the presence of RT possums positive for MU does. This intrinsically makes sense but requires effective communication to local residents to discourage the indiscriminate removal or translocation of possums, which are a protected species in Victoria. In the UK, removal of badgers as part of bovine tuberculosis (TB) control measures led to increased bovine TB prevalence in some regions. This was hypothesized to be because culling disrupted badger social organization, leading to long-distance movement and dispersal of individual badgers, resulting in increased TB transmission among badgers (Donnelly et al., 2003; Donnelly et al., 2006; Woodroffe et al., 2005). Increases in *Leptospira* carriage in rat populations subjected to indiscriminate lethal control methods in Vancouver, Canada have also been attributed to altered social structure and subsequent increases in aggressive interactions (Lee et al., 2018). As possums are territorial, removal or disturbance of individual resident animals impacts both social interactions and movement patterns (Matthews et al., 2004), which may in part help explain the shifting dynamics of this disease and the expansion of the Victorian endemic area. Movement of MU into previously unaffected areas may also be facilitated by infected foxes, which demonstrate considerably larger home ranges than RT possums: individual foxes in a similar coastal habitat in New South Wales were found to have a mean home range of 135 ha

(Meek & Saunders, 2000), compared to <1ha for RT possums (Lindenmayer et al., 2008).

However, further research into the role of foxes in BU transmission is needed.

It is thought that MU can also persist outside of a vertebrate host, although the duration and the environmental conditions required have not been well defined (Bratschi et al., 2014; Garchitorena et al., 2015). Overall, soil was the second most commonly positive sample type, and particular soil characteristics were associated with positive properties. It is possible that the higher conductivity, salinity and alkalinity detected at these properties may enhance environmental survival of MU and/or aid transmission between hosts. The link between MU and slightly alkaline soil was unexpected as these bacteria have been associated with mildly acidic pH conditions in two aquatic communities in Cameroon (Garchitorena et al., 2015). Under laboratory conditions MU also appears to grow better at mildly acidic pH, although growth can also occur under mildly alkaline conditions (Portaels & Pattyn, 1982). It is possible that in soil (in contrast to water), other biotic factors may interact with pH to make alkaline conditions more favorable to MU. However, as only a minority of IS2404 positive soil samples were confirmed positive and none were considered viable, the detection of MU in soil may represent the presence of DNA from non-viable, degrading MU. If this is the case, then these environmental conditions may favor the preservation of MU DNA rather than bacterial survival. There seemed to be little association between MU and water at the scale analyzed in this study. Very few water sources returned IS2404 positive results and only a single water source was confirmed positive (from a bucket). This is consistent with previous environmental surveys in the region that also found low rates of MU positivity in soil and water (Fyfe et al 2010). There was also no association between property status and the number of water sources present or the presence of bore water. This suggests that in Victoria, water plays a limited role in determining the fine-scale distribution of MU.

Infection through puncturing injuries received from plants, biting insects and other objects contaminated with MU has also been hypothesized as a transmission pathway to humans (Street et al., 1991; Wallace et al., 2017). Relatively few insects were screened in this study making it difficult to assess associations with cases. However, one confirmed mosquito (*Aedes notoscriptus*) was detected in a case property, consistent with MU mosquito positivity reported in previous field surveys in this region (Johnson et al., 2007; Lavender et al., 2011). However, no association with mosquito or March fly presence and property status was observed. In addition, few plants tested positive by IS2404 for MU and only four samples were confirmed positive: one bromeliad (*Aechmea sp.*), one rose (*Rosa sp.*) and two yuccas (*Yucca sp.*). There was also no association between any of the most common spiky plant types and either case or positive properties. This suggests that plants, similar to water, are unlikely to be a common source of infection in Victoria. However, the presence of certain native plant species was associated with the presence of MU at properties. Coastal tea tree (*L. laevigatum*) and Moonah (*M. lanceolata*) are both indigenous to parts of the Mornington and Bellarine Peninsulas (Yugovic, 2002), and are utilized heavily by possum species for denning and as food sources (K. Blasdell, personal observation; Pahl, 1987). Interestingly, Moonahs were less likely to be found at case properties, although this may be due to the tendency of local residents (particularly those personally affected by MU) to discourage possums from visiting their properties through environmental modification due to the perception that possums are carriers of these bacteria. Certainly, the gardens of some properties visited by the researchers had been re-landscaped or modified by their owners post BU diagnosis (K Blasdell, personal observation). As gardens containing native or mixed vegetation were more likely to be positive for MU than those containing mainly non-native vegetation, this suggests that native environments may promote better survival of the bacteria, potentially because they appear to support denser populations of native mammalian hosts, such as possums.

To persist, possums require a suitable area of habitat containing sufficient resources. Habitat patches below a certain size (such as most urban and suburban gardens) are unlikely to provide these requirements unless they are well connected to other similar patches (Goddard et al., 2010). For example, individual BT possums in Melbourne, Australia regularly foraged in several residential gardens despite denning in urban forest fragments (Harper et al., 2005), whilst in New Zealand, BT possum occupancy of urban gardens decreased with increasing housing density and decreasing green cover (Adams et al., 2013). Assuming that RT possums respond in a similar way, this may explain the association between larger properties and positive status. However, this could also be a geographic effect, as properties surveyed in the Mornington Peninsula (the current epicenter of BU in Victoria/Australia) were larger than those surveyed closer to Melbourne (Bayside area). Powerlines were more likely to be found at IS2404 detected, confirmed and case properties. As possums regularly use power lines to travel around urban areas (K Blasdell, personal observation), this feature might promote connectivity between properties and facilitate the presence of these potential hosts. Similar to our study, BU prevalence was found to increase with decreasing elevation in Benin, with the authors proposing that MU survival might be promoted by the wetter conditions often found at lower altitudes (Sopoh et al., 2011).

Although return surveys were only conducted at a small proportion of properties, the findings suggest that MU bacteria can remain at a specific location for a considerable period of time (>6 months). This has also been found in Cameroon, where a village water source remained positive for over two years (Bratschi et al., 2014). However, as each property was only sampled at two time points, it is possible that undetected changes may have occurred at properties during that interval, and additionally that a property might remain positive for MU for longer than the maximum 8.7 months observed here. Although it is unknown what factors changed between sampling points for those properties where MU status did alter, some

environmental changes were observed at some of these properties that may have impacted the presence and survivability of MU. For example, at one property that became IS2404 positive at the return visit, de-vegetation and construction of a new house on the neighboring plot, which had previously been vacant and covered in native flora, may have resulted in the movement of infected wildlife onto the sampled plot. Most properties changed from positive to negative, which may suggest that the environmental disease risk in this region decreased slightly over the study period. At individual properties this may be because the resident infected possum (or other host) dies and is replaced by a non-infected individual, although this requires further exploration. However, two properties did become positive by IS2404, demonstrating this is a dynamic situation.

This study's findings cast some light on (1) what the 'ideal property' for MU presence looks like and (2) how this differs from what the 'ideal' case property looks like. The results suggest that the average MU property is a larger property located at lower altitudes with soil that is slightly alkaline. It has overhead powerlines and contains native vegetation, particularly coastal tea trees, which in turn support a healthy population of RT possums. In contrast, the 'ideal' case property has overhead powerlines present, is less likely to contain Moonahs, but more likely to contain MU-positive wild mammals, especially RT possums. Further longitudinal investigation is required to understand these differences in environmental associations between properties where MU was detected and properties where human cases occurred. It should be noted that although there was a clear association between the presence of infected RT possums and human cases, MU-positive RT possum feces and other samples were also found at many control properties. Human behavioral impacts on BU disease risk will be assessed through the analysis of the questionnaires collected as part of this case-control study (results to be published separately).

Our findings provide additional evidence to support the hypothesis that MU is a zoonotic pathogen, at least in the Victorian endemic area. Although RT possums are clearly the strongest reservoir host candidate, the high proportion of fox feces that were IS2404 and confirmed positive, along with evidence of viability in one sample, indicate the foxes may also contribute to the circulation of this pathogen. Further research is needed to explore whether the more mobile fox could introduce MU to new areas.

## **Acknowledgments**

We gratefully acknowledge Loretta Vaughen for help with accessing the VPHS database. We also thank all who assisted with field collections and questionnaire deployment, and all of the project participants, with particular thanks to those who allowed us to conduct field surveys at their properties.

## **Funding**

This study was funded by NHMRC Partnership Project Grant APP1152807, “Controlling Buruli ulcer in Victoria”, with co-funding provided by the Victorian Department of Health.

## **Author contributions**

KRB created the study design, collected, analyzed and interpreted the data and drafted the manuscript. BM analyzed and interpreted the data and drafted the manuscript. DPO’B assisted with the study design, interpreted the data and drafted the manuscript. MT, SC and JG assisted with the study design and collected the data. VB, MD and PTM assisted with the study design, collected, analyzed and interpreted the data. IS, KBG, ET and SEL assisted with the study design, interpreted the data and drafted the manuscript. ECH and NW



interpreted the data and drafted the manuscript. TPS and EA assisted with the study design, interpreted the data and drafted the manuscript. All authors reviewed and edited the manuscript.

## References

- Adams AL, Dickinson KJ, Robertson BC, van Heezik Y. Predicting summer site occupancy for an invasive species, the common brushtail possum (*Trichosurus vulpecula*), in an urban environment. *PloS one*. 2013 Mar 4;8(3):e58422.
- Aiga H, Amano T, Cairncross S, Domako JA, Nanas OK, Coleman S. Assessing water-related risk factors for Buruli ulcer: a case-control study in Ghana. *The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene*. 2004 Oct 1;71(4):387-92.
- Beissner M, Symank D, Phillips RO, Amoako YA, Awua-Boateng NY, Sarfo FS, Jansson M, Huber KL, Herbinger KH, Battke F, Löscher T. Detection of Viable *Mycobacterium ulcerans* in Clinical Samples by a Novel Combined 16S rRNA Reverse Transcriptase/IS 2404 Real-Time qPCR Assay. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*. 2012 Aug 28;6(8):e1756.
- Betts JM, Tay EL, Johnson PDR, Lavender CJ, Gibney KB, O'Brien DP, Globan M, Tzimourtas N, O'Hara MA, Crouch SR. Buruli ulcer: a new case definition for Victoria. *Communicable diseases intelligence (2018)*. 2020 Nov 21;44.
- Bratschi MW, Ruf MT, Andreoli A, Minyem JC, Kerber S, Wantong FG, Pritchard J, Chakwera V, Beuret C, Wittwer M, Noumen D. *Mycobacterium ulcerans* persistence at a village water source of Buruli ulcer patients. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*. 2014 Mar 27;8(3):e2756.

Carson C, Lavender CJ, Handasyde KA, O'Brien CR, Hewitt N, Johnson PD, Fyfe JA.

Potential wildlife sentinels for monitoring the endemic spread of human Buruli ulcer in South-East Australia. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*. 2014 Jan 30;8(1):e2668.

Donnelly CA, Woodroffe R, Cox DR, Bourne J, Gettinby G, Le Fevre AM, McInerney JP, Morrison WI. Impact of localized badger culling on tuberculosis incidence in British cattle. *Nature*. 2003 Dec;426(6968):834-7.

Donnelly CA, Woodroffe R, Cox DR, Bourne FJ, Cheeseman CL, Clifton-Hadley RS, Wei G, Gettinby G, Gilks P, Jenkins H, Johnston WT. Positive and negative effects of widespread badger culling on tuberculosis in cattle. *Nature*. 2006 Feb;439(7078):843-6.

Elsner L, Wayne J, O'Brien CR, McCowan C, Malik R, Hayman JA, Globan M, Lavender CJ, Fyfe JA. Localised *Mycobacterium ulcerans* infection in a cat in Australia. *Journal of feline medicine and surgery*. 2008 Aug;10(4):407-12.

Fyfe JA, Lavender CJ, Johnson PD, Globan M, Sievers A, Aзуolas J, Stinear TP. Development and application of two multiplex real-time PCR assays for the detection of *Mycobacterium ulcerans* in clinical and environmental samples. *Applied and environmental microbiology*. 2007 Aug 1;73(15):4733-40.

Fyfe JA, Lavender CJ, Handasyde KA, Legione AR, O'Brien CR, Stinear TP, Pidot SJ, Seemann T, Benbow ME, Wallace JR, McCowan C. A major role for mammals in the ecology of *Mycobacterium ulcerans*. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*. 2010 Aug 10;4(8):e791.

Garchitorena A, Guégan JF, Léger L, Eyangoh S, Marsollier L, Roche B. *Mycobacterium ulcerans* dynamics in aquatic ecosystems are driven by a complex interplay of abiotic and biotic factors. *Elife*. 2015 Jul 28;4:e07616.

Goddard MA, Dougill AJ, Benton TG. Scaling up from gardens: biodiversity conservation in urban environments. *Trends in ecology & evolution*. 2010 Feb 1;25(2):90-8.

Harper MJ. Home range and den use of common brushtail possums (*Trichosurus vulpecula*) in urban forest remnants. *Wildlife Research*. 2006 Jan 6;32(8):681-7.

Johnson PD, Stinear T, Pamela LC, Pluschke G, Merritt RW, Portaels F, Huygen K, Hayman JA, Asiedu K. Buruli ulcer (*M. ulcerans* infection): new insights, new hope for disease control. *PLoS Medicine*. 2005 Apr 26;2(4):e108.

Johnson PD, Azuolas J, Lavender CJ, Wishart E, Stinear TP, Hayman JA, Brown L, Jenkin GA, Fyfe JA. *Mycobacterium ulcerans* in mosquitoes captured during outbreak of Buruli ulcer, southeastern Australia. *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2007 Nov;13(11):1653.

Lavender CJ, Fyfe JA, Azuolas J, Brown K, Evans RN, Ray LR, Johnson PD. Risk of Buruli ulcer and detection of *Mycobacterium ulcerans* in mosquitoes in southeastern Australia. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*. 2011 Sep 20;5(9):e1305.

Lee MJ, Byers KA, Donovan CM, Bidulka JJ, Stephen C, Patrick DM, Himsforth CG. Effects of culling on *Leptospira interrogans* carriage by rats. *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2018 Feb;24(2):356.

Lindenmayer DB, MacGregor C, Welsh A, et al. The use of hollows and dreys by the common ringtail possum (*Pseudocheirus peregrinus*) in different vegetation types. *Australian journal of zoology*. 2008 Jul 29;56(1):1-1.

Loftus MJ, Tay EL, Globan M, Lavender CJ, Crouch SR, Johnson PD, Fyfe JA. Epidemiology of Buruli ulcer infections, Victoria, Australia, 2011–2016. *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2018 Nov;24(11):1988.

Matthews A, Lunney D, Waples K, Hardy J. Brushtail possums: “Champion of the suburbs” or “Our tormentors”. Urban Wildlife: more than meets the eye’. (Eds D. Lunney and S. Burgin.) pp. 2004 Jan 1:159-68.

McDonald JH. Handbook of Biological Statistics, 3rd Edn Sparky House Publishing. Baltimore, MD. 2014: Available <http://www.biostathandbook.com/transformation>.

Meek PD, Saunders G. Home range and movement of foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*) in coastal New South Wales, Australia. Wildlife research. 2000;27(6):663-8.

Mitchell PJ, McOrist S, Bilney R. Epidemiology of *Mycobacterium ulcerans* infection in koalas (*Phascolarctos cinereus*) on Raymond Island, southeastern Australia. Journal of wildlife diseases. 1987 Jul;23(3):386-90.

Norden A, Linell F. A new type of pathogenic *Mycobacterium*. Nature. 1951 Nov 10;168, 826.

O'Brien CR, McMillan E, Harris O, O'Brien DP, Lavender CJ, Globan M, Legione AR, Fyfe JA. Localised *Mycobacterium ulcerans* infection in four dogs. Australian veterinary journal. 2011 Dec;89(12):506-10.

O'Brien C, Kuseff G, McMillan E, McCowan C, Lavender C, Globan M, Jerrett I, Oppedisano F, Johnson P, Fyfe J. *Mycobacterium ulcerans* infection in two alpacas. Australian veterinary journal. 2013 Jul;91(7):296-300.

O'Brien CR, Handasyde KA, Hibble J, Lavender CJ, Legione AR, McCowan C, Globan M, Mitchell AT, McCracken HE, Johnson PD, Fyfe JA. Clinical, microbiological and pathological findings of *Mycobacterium ulcerans* infection in three Australian Possum species. PLoS neglected tropical diseases. 2014 Jan 30;8(1):e2666.

O'Brien DP, Friedman ND, Cowan R, Pollard J, McDonald A, Callan P, Hughes A, Athan E. *Mycobacterium ulcerans* in the elderly: more severe disease and suboptimal outcomes. PLoS neglected tropical diseases. 2015 Dec 2;9(12):e0004253.

O'Brien DP, Athan E, Blasdell K, De Barro P. Tackling the worsening epidemic of Buruli ulcer in Australia in an information void: time for an urgent scientific response. Medical Journal of Australia. 2018 Apr;208(7):287-9.

O'Brien DP, Jeanne I, Blasdell K, Avumegah M, Athan E. The changing epidemiology worldwide of *Mycobacterium ulcerans*. Epidemiology & infection. 2019;147.

Pahl LI. Feeding-Behavior and Diet of the Common Ringtail Possum, *Pseudocheirus-Peregrinus*, in Eucalyptus Woodlands and *Leptospermum* Thickets in Southern Victoria. Australian journal of zoology. 1987;35(5):487-506.

Portaels F, Pattyn SR. Growth of mycobacteria in relation to the pH of the medium. Annals of Microbiology (Paris). 1982 Jan 1;133(2):213-.

Quek TY, Athan E, Henry MJ, Pasco JA, Redden-Hoare J, Hughes A, Johnson PD. Risk factors for *Mycobacterium ulcerans* infection, southeastern Australia. Emerging infectious diseases. 2007 Nov;13(11):1661.

Röltgen K, Pluschke G, Johnson PD, Fyfe J. *Mycobacterium ulcerans* DNA in Bandicoot Excreta in Buruli Ulcer-Endemic Area, Northern Queensland, Australia. Emerging infectious diseases. 2017 Dec;23(12):2042.

Sopoh GE, Johnson RC, Anagonou SY, Barogui YT, Dossou AD, Houézo JG, Phanzu DM, Tente BH, Meyers WM, Portaels F. Buruli ulcer prevalence and altitude, Benin. Emerging infectious diseases. 2011 Jan;17(1):153.

Street ML, Umbert-Millet IJ, Roberts GD, Su WD. Nontuberculous mycobacterial infections of the skin: report of fourteen cases and review of the literature. *Journal of the American academy of dermatology*. 1991 Feb 1;24(2):208-15.

Tai AY, Athan E, Friedman ND, Hughes A, Walton A, O'Brien DP. Increased severity and spread of *Mycobacterium ulcerans*, Southeastern Australia. *Emerging infectious diseases*. 2018 Jan;24(1):58.

Van Zyl A, Daniel J, Wayne J, McCowan C, Malik R, Jelfs P, Lavender CJ, Fyfe JA. *Mycobacterium ulcerans* infections in two horses in south-eastern Australia. *Australian veterinary journal*. 2010 Mar;88(3):101-6.

Veitch MG, Johnson PD, Flood PE, Leslie DE, Street AC, Hayman JA. A large localized outbreak of *Mycobacterium ulcerans* infection on a temperate southern Australian island. *Epidemiology & Infection*. 1997 Dec;119(3):313-8.

Victorian DH, 2019: <https://www2.health.vic.gov.au/about/news-and-events/healthalerts/increased-incidence-of-buruli-ulcer-in-victoria-april-2018>

Victorian DH, 2021a: <https://www2.health.vic.gov.au/public-health/infectious-diseases/infectious-diseases-surveillance/interactive-infectious-disease-reports/local-government-areas-surveillance-report>

Victorian DH, 2021b: <https://www2.health.vic.gov.au/about/news-and-events/healthalerts/buruli-ulcer-bacteria>

Wallace JR, Mangas KM, Porter JL, Marcsisin R, Pidot SJ, Howden B, Omansen TF, Zeng W, Axford JK, Johnson PD, Stinear TP. *Mycobacterium ulcerans* low infectious dose and mechanical transmission support insect bites and puncturing injuries in the spread of Buruli ulcer. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases*. 2017 Apr 14;11(4):e0005553.

Woodroffe R, Donnelly CA, Cox DR, Bourne FJ, Cheeseman CL, Delahay RJ, Gettinby G, Mcinerney JP, Morrison WI. Effects of culling on badger *Meles meles* spatial organization: implications for the control of bovine tuberculosis. *Journal of applied ecology*. 2006 Feb;43(1):1-0.

Yugovic J. Mornington Peninsula: Ecological vegetation class profiles. Biosis Research. 2002 Oct. (See <https://www.mornpen.vic.gov.au/Your-Property/Environment/Flora-Fauna-Biodiversity/Plants-of-the-Peninsula>)

### **Supplemental figure legends**

Supplemental Figure 1: Key indigenous (panels A-D) and non-indigenous (panel E) plants recorded for each property. A – *Melaleuca lanceolata* (Moonah/black paperbark); B - *Leptospernum laevigatum* (coastal tea tree); C - *Leucopogon parviflorus* (coast beard heath/native currant); D – *Allocasuarina verticillata/littoralis* (Drooping and black sheoaks); E – *Pittosporum* spp. (cheesewoods).

Supplemental Figure 2: Flow diagram for environmental property surveys and sample collection.

Supplemental Figure 3: Example of a property outline with locations of key features and sample locations marked. Yellow sticky traps (YST) were placed at the majority of properties for additional insect capture. Results from these traps will be reported in a separate publication.

Supplemental Figure 4: Examples of plant samples collected; Panel A – selection of ‘spiky’ plants sampled; Panel B – selection of fruits with evidence of mammalian gnaw marks.

Supplemental Figure 5: Directed acyclic graph (DAG) used for assessing the potential for confounding by covariates and for identifying the appropriate confounders to be included in each adjusted model.

Supplemental Figure 6: Map of affected area, illustrating the MU status by suburb. Suburbs containing at least one 'viable' property were classified as viable. Suburbs without 'viable' properties but with at least one 'confirmed' property were classified as confirmed. Suburbs without 'viable' or 'confirmed' properties but with at least one 'IS2404 detected' property were classified as 'IS2404 detected'. Suburbs without any 'IS2404 detected' properties were classified as negative. N.B. Geographical boundaries are not available by postcode and some postcodes contain more than one suburb.