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Abstract
Enterococci are among the most common opportunistic hospital pathogens. This study used whole-genome sequencing (WGS) and bioinformatics to determine the antibiotic resistome, genetic support, clones and phylogenetic relationship of Enterococcus faecalis isolated from hospital environments in South Africa. Isolates were recovered from 11 frequently touched sites by patients and healthcare workers in different wards at 4 levels of healthcare (A, B, C and D) in Durban, South Africa. Following microbial identification and antibiotic susceptibility tests. Of the 245 E. faecalis isolates identified, 38 were subjected to WGS on the Illumina MiSeq platform. The tet(M) (31/38, 82%) and erm(C) (16/38, 42%) genes were the most common antibiotic resistome found in isolates originating from the different hospital environments which corroborated with their antibiotic resistance phenotypes. The isolates harboured mobile genetic elements consisting of plasmids (n=11) and prophages (n=14), that were mostly clone-specific. Of note, a large number insertion sequence (IS) families were found with the IS3 (55%), IS5 (42%), IS1595 (40%) and Tn3 Transposon been the most predominate. Microbial typing using WGS data revealed 15 clones with 6 major sequence types (ST) belonging to ST16 (n =7), ST40 (n = 6), ST21 (n =5), ST126 (n = 3), ST23 (n =3) and ST386 (n=3). Phylogenomic analysis showed that the major clones were mostly conserved within specific hospital environments. However, further metadata insights revealed the complex intra-clonal spread of these E. faecalis major clones between the sampling sites within each specific hospital setting. The results of these genomic analyses will offer insights into E. faecalis in the hospital environments relevant in the design of optimal infection prevention strategies in hospital settings.
1.0. Introduction

The surveillance of hospital environments can be a useful tool to better understand the opportunistic microbial communities within the hospital [1], to identify the source of an outbreak[2], and to evaluate the efficacy of environmental disinfection or other infection prevention and control measures [3]. Inadequate control practices have played a significant role in the dissemination, persistence, intra- and inter-hospital spread of drug-resistant organisms. Regrettably, good clinical trials comparing the different approaches to, and the impact of infection prevention and control interventions on the control of drug-resistant bacteria in hospitals and other healthcare facilities are minimal [4,5]. Accurate identification of resistant bacterial reservoirs and modes of transmission help inform such interventions.

The latest successes in tracing worldwide epidemics [6] and nosocomial outbreaks [7] have been attributed to whole-genome sequencing (WGS). Genomic comparison has aided our understanding of the evolution and spread of infectious agents. Comparative genomic analyses have been made possible through the use of WGS, showing the extent of genomic variation, which may result in varied phenotypes, thus expanding our understanding of diverse genomic determinants such as antibiotic resistance genes and their genetic support in bacterial species [7,8].

*Enterococcus faecalis* (*E. faecalis*) is a good indicator bacterium in hospital environment monitoring, being Gram-positive cocci these opportunistic pathogens not only form noxious biofilms on implanted medical devices and catheters, they also cause abdominal infection, urinary tract infections, surgical site wound infections, bacteremia, endocarditis and burn [9]. Antibiotic resistance is either intrinsic or through sporadic mutation or through the acquisition of foreign genetic material, by horizontal gene exchange occurring with the aid of mobile genetic elements plasmids, prophages and insertion
sequences [10,11]. Difficulties in treating *E. faecalis* and *E. faecium* (most prevalent species in human) have emerged due to acquired resistance, predominantly multi-drug resistance to universally used drugs as well as vancomycin [12]. A number of previous surveillance studies involving *E. faecalis* in Africa have focused either on wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) and hospital effluent but not on the internal hospital environment [13,14]. Moreover, in South Africa, studies on the contamination of *E. faecalis*, using high discrimination resolution typing are scarce. This study, therefore, uses WGS in delineating the resistome, mobile genetic support, the clones and phylogenomic relationship of *E. faecalis* isolated from the hospital environment in places frequently touched by patients and healthcare workers at four different levels of healthcare in the metropolitan city of Durban, South Africa.

2.0. Materials and Methods

2.1. Ethical approval

Ethical clearance was received from the Biomedical Research Ethics Committee of the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Ref. BE606/16). The study was also registered on the Health Research and Knowledge Management database (HRKM 098/17) of the KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Health Research Ethics Committee. Gate keeper’s approval was further granted by participating hospitals. No Human samples were taken in the study. All protocols were executed according to the agreed ethical approval terms and conditions.

2.2. Study setting

The selected hospitals were all public hospitals situated in the eThekweni region in Durban, South Africa. For non-disclosure reasons, the names of the hospitals were withheld and
referred to as A, B, C and D representing central, tertiary, regional and district facilities, respectively. The central hospital (A), with a 1200 bed-size, offers tertiary level sub-specialist services and serves as a referral hospital for the district, regional and tertiary hospitals. The tertiary hospital (B) with 800 beds also has specialist services and receives referrals from regional and district hospitals not limited to provincial boundaries. The regional hospital (C), with a 743 bed-size, provides services to a specific regional population and receives referrals from several district hospitals. The district hospital (D) has 300 beds and serves as a health district and supports primary health care services on a 24-hour basis. Samples were collected in the intensive care unit (ICU) and paediatric ward from 11 sites that included the telephones, ventilators, blood pressure apparatus, patient files, drip stands, sinks, occupied beds, unoccupied beds, nurses’ tables, mops and the door handle of the linen room. A total number of 620 samples were collected over a period of three months from the four levels of healthcare. These samples were collected weekly in batches viz; 1st batch collected at the beginning of the week, 2nd in the middle of the week and 3rd batch at the end of the week. All samples were collected by randomly swabbing approximately 5 cm of the site using pre-labelled Nylon flock swabs with transport media (FLOQSwabs COPEN diagnostics Inc, USA). The swabs were then transported to the laboratory in iceboxes and processed within 3 to 4 hrs of sampling.

2.3. Isolation and identification of *Enterococcus*

2.3.1. Phenotypic determination of *Enterococcus*

The samples were inoculated separately into Tryptone Soya Broth (TSB) (Oxoid, Hampshire, England) and incubated at 37 °C for 2 h with shaking at 100 rpm. Following incubation, 1 ml
of each culture was inoculated into 9 ml of TSB supplemented with 6.5% NaCl and incubated at 37 °C for 24 h with shaking at 100 rpm. All 24 h cultures were sub-cultured by spread plating 100 µl onto Bile Esculin Azide agar (Himedia, Mumbai, India). Plates were incubated for 24 h at 37 °C, and brown-grey colonies surrounded by black halos were considered presumptive enterococci. Presumptive colonies were streaked onto Bile Aesculin agar (Lab M, Lancashire, UK), and incubated at 37 °C to obtain pure colonies. For characterisation of haemolysis, cultures were prepared on 5% Sheep Blood agar (Oxoid, Hampshire, England), and on Tryptone Soya Agar (TSA) (Oxoid, Hampshire, England) for biochemical characterisation and the Gram stain test [15]. Phenotypic identification was undertaken using API 20 Strep kits (Biomerieux SA, Marcy I ‘Etoile, France). Staphylococcus aureus American Type Culture Collection (ATCC) 29213 and E. faecalis ATCC 29212 were used as controls. Presumptive enterococci were stored in 10% glycerol stock solution at - 80 °C until further processing.

2.3.2. Molecular confirmation of isolates

Stock cultures were resuscitated on TSA plates incubated at 37 °C for 24 h. DNA was extracted using the heat lysis method as previously described [16]. A multiplex polymerase chain reaction (PCR) was performed to confirm isolates at the genus and species level. Genus-specific and species-specific primer used in all the reactions were as previously described [17,18] (Table S1). Two PCR reaction mixtures, both containing the Enterococcus genus-specific primers, were set up for different primer sets as follows: Group 1: E. faecalis. Each reaction was performed in a total volume of 15 µl consisting of 8 µl of DreamTaq Green PCR Master Mix (2X) (Thermo Scientific, Vilnius, Lithuania), 0.5 µl of each primer pair (final concentration of 10 µM of each primer, 2.5 µl of template DNA and 1.5 µl of nuclease-free
water. The following thermal cycling conditions used: initial denaturation at 95 °C for 4 min, 30 cycles of denaturation at 95 °C for 30 s, amplification at 46.1 °C for 1 min, elongation at 72 °C for 1 min and a final extension at 72 °C for 7 min. All reactions were carried out in a T100 thermal cycler (Bio-Rad, Hercules, California, USA) [19]. All reactions included a positive control (Table S1) and a “no template control (NTC)”. The PCR products were electrophoresed at 90 V on a 1.8% gel run in Tris-borate-EDTA (0.5X) containing 0.5 µg/ml ethidium bromide and visualised using the Gel Doc XR+ imaging system (Bio-Rad, Hercules, California, USA). Of the 620 samples taken, 295 *Enterococcus* spp. were obtained, of which 245 were confirmed as *Enterococcus faecalis* via phenotypic and molecular assays. A subsample of all the 38 vancomycin-intermediate *E. faecalis* isolates were selected for the genotypic characterization by WGS and bioinformatics analysis (Table 1).

### 2.4. Antibiotic susceptibility testing (AST)

Antibiotic susceptibility of the isolates was determined using the Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion method [20] according to Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) guidelines [21]. The following antibiotics were used: ampicillin (10 µg), penicillin (5 µg), vancomycin (30 µg), teicoplanin (30 µg), erythromycin (15 µg), tetracycline (30 µg), ciprofloxacin (5 µg), levofloxacin (5 µg), nitrofurantoin (300 µg), chloramphenicol (30 µg), linezolid (30 µg) and rifampicin (5 µg). All discs were sourced from Oxoid (Basingstoke, United Kingdom). *Staphylococcus aureus* ATCC 25923 was used as the control. High-level aminoglycoside resistance was determined using gentamicin (120 µg) and streptomycin (300 µg) discs on Mueller-Hinton agar (Oxoid, Hampshire, England) with *E. faecalis* ATCC 29212 as the control isolate.
2.5. DNA isolation, genome sequencing, assembly and annotation

Genomic DNA (gDNA) was extracted using GenElute bacterial genomic DNA kit (Sigma–Aldrich, St. Louis, Missouri, United States) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. The quantification of extracted gDNA was determined on a Nanodrop ND1000 spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific, Waltham, USA), Qubit 2.0 fluorometer (Invitrogen, Oregon, USA) and verified on an agarose gel electrophoresis. Multiplexed paired-end libraries (2 × 300 bp) were prepared using the Nextera DNA Flex sample preparation kit (Illumina, San Diego, California, United States) and sequences determined on an Illumina MiSeq platform with 100× coverage at the National Institute of Communicable Diseases Sequencing Core Facility, South Africa. The resulting raw reads were checked for quality, trimmed and de novo assembled into contigs using the CLC Genomics Workbench version 10.1 (CLC, Bio-QIAGEN, Aarhus, Denmark). Default parameters were used for all software unless otherwise specified. The CheckM tool version 0.9.7 [22] was used to verify that the sequence reads were not from mixed-species using lineage-specific marker sets from other genetically well-characterised closely-related E. faecalis isolates. The de-novo assembled reads were uploaded in GenBank and annotated using National Centre for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) prokaryotic genome annotation pipeline and Rapid Annotations using Subsystems Technology (RAST) 2.0 server [23].

2.6. WGS-based molecular typing of E. faecalis isolates

Multilocus sequence typing (MLST) typing was performed in-silico using the WGS data online platform tool MLST 1.8 [24] which also predicted the allelic profiles of the seven housekeeping genes, aroE, gdh, gki, gyd, psts, xpt, and yqi of E. faecalis as described previously [25].
2.7. Phylogenomic analysis of *Enterococcus faecalis* isolates

The de novo-assembled contigs were uploaded, and the analysis was submitted to CSI (Call SNPs & Infer) Phylogeny-1.4 ([https://cge.cbs.dtu.dk/services/CSIPhylogeny-1.2](https://cge.cbs.dtu.dk/services/CSIPhylogeny-1.2)), an online service which identifies single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNPs) from WGS data, filters and validates the SNP positions, and then infers phylogeny based on concatenated SNP profiles [26]. The pipeline was run with default parameters: a minimal depth at SNP positions of 10 reads, a minimal relative depth at SNP positions of 10%, a minimal distance between SNPs of 10 bp, a minimal Z-score of 1.96, a minimal SNP quality of 30 and a minimal read mapping quality of 25. A bootstrapped with 100 replicates indicator was applied to identify recombined regions and provide the phylogenetic accuracy in groups with little homoplasy. The Figtree ([http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree/](http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree/)) was used to edit and visualise the phylogenetic tree. The phylogeny was visualised alongside metadata for isolate demographics (including hospital, source, ward), sequence type and antibiotic resistome using Phandango [27] to provide a comprehensive analysis of the generated phylogenomic tree.

2.8. Genomic identification of the antibiotic resistome and mobile genetic elements (MGEs)

The bacterial analysis pipeline, ResFinder [28] was used to annotate and identify antibiotic-resistant genes using default parameters (threshold ID of 90% and a minimum length of 60%). Plasmid replicons were predicted through PlasmidFinder [29] ([https://cge.cbs.dtu.dk/services/PlasmidFinder/](https://cge.cbs.dtu.dk/services/PlasmidFinder/)). The PHAge Search Tool (PHAST; [http://phast.wishartlab.com/](http://phast.wishartlab.com/)) [30] server was used for the identification, annotation, and visualization of prophage sequences. The assembled genomes were further analysed for insertion sequences and transposons using ISFinder ([https://isfinder.biotoul.fr/](https://isfinder.biotoul.fr/)) [31].
SEEDVIEWER ([https://rast.nmpdr.org/seedviewer.cgi](https://rast.nmpdr.org/seedviewer.cgi)) [32] and Integrall database ([http://integrall.bio.ua.pt/](http://integrall.bio.ua.pt/)) [33] was also used to annotate and identify the investigated genomes for integrons and associated gene cassettes.

### 2.9 Data availability

The raw read sequences and the assembled whole-genome contigs have been deposited in GenBank. The data is available under project number PRJNA523601.

### 3.0 RESULTS

#### 3.1. Prevalence and Antibiotic susceptibility testing

Of the 620 isolated samples, 295 were identified as Enterococcus spp. viz; E. faecalis 245 (83.1%) and other Enterococci spp. 50 (16.9%) in all the hospitals. The E. faecalis distributions in the hospital were 27 (93%) from the district hospital [with samples only isolated from the phone (1), mops (6), occupied beds (5), nurse’s table (7) and door handles (8)], 86 (85.1%) from the regional hospital [samples were isolated from all sites, phones (8), drip-stand (1), bp apparatus (6), patient files (7), ventilators (4), mops (14), sinks (9), occupied beds (14), unoccupied beds (3) nurse’s table (12) and door handles (8)]. From the tertiary hospital, 86 (77.5%) [Samples were also isolated from all sites, phones (16), drip-stand (9), bp apparatus (6), patient files (8), ventilators (3), mops (12), sinks (5), occupied beds (9), unoccupied beds (7) nurse’s table (7) and door handles (4)]. From the central hospital, 48 (88.9%) samples were isolated from phones (7), patient files (6), mop (8), sink (4), occupied bed (12), unoccupied bed (3) and nurse’s table (8)]. The sites with the highest contamination rates were the occupied beds and the mops with 30.2% each. In the
district hospital, most positive samples identified were from the door handles 27.6%, the nurses' tables with 24.1% and mops with 20.6%. In the regional hospital, the mops and the occupied beds 13.8% each and the nurses tables 11.9%. For the tertiary hospital, the ward phones with 14.4% and mop 10.8%. While in the central, were the occupied beds 22.2%, followed by the nurses' tables and mop with 20.3% each.

Antibiotic susceptibility testing revealed that none of the 245 identified E. faecalis isolates was vancomycin-resistant (VRE). However, a total of thirty-eight (38) were of intermediate susceptibility to vancomycin and were selected for genotypic characterization by WGS and bioinformatics analysis (Table 1). These 38 vancomycin intermediate isolates showed high resistance to both tetracycline (n=30, 79%) followed by resistance to erythromycin (n=18, 47%). A small number of the isolates showed aminoglycoside resistance (gentamicin [n=4] and streptomycin [n=6]). Majority of the isolates were susceptible to ampicillin, penicillin, teicoplanin and levofloxacin whiles all the isolates were susceptible nitrofurantoin (Table S2).

3.2. WGS-based species confirmation and molecular typing

The identification of E. faecalis isolates was confirmed with generated genomic data via the Global Platform for Genomic Surveillance (Pathogenwatch). MLST-analyses (ST) revealed that the E. faecalis in the provincial public health-care facilities were multiclonal belonging to 15 different STs with the 6 major STs belonging to ST16 (n =7), ST40 (n = 6), ST21 (n =5), ST126 (n = 3), ST23 (n =3) and ST386 (n=3) (Table 1), with diverse allelic profiles. Moreover, one isolate belonged newly defined ST bearing a novel allele (ST922) [34].

3.3. Antibiotic resistance genes of E. Faecalis isolates
In total, 14 antibiotic resistance genes (ARGs) and variants were detected (Table 1). There were no specific differences in the resistome with regards to their hospital levels and wards. The frequency of ARGs ranged between 2–13 genes, with fifteen isolates carrying 3 resistance genes. Acquired ARGs conferring resistance to tetracycline \([tet(M)\) and \(tet(L)\)], macrolide-lincosamide-streptogramin B (MLS\(_B\)) \([erm(B)\) and \(mphD)\], aminoglycosides \([sat4A, aph3-III, ant6-la, aac6-aph2]\), trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole \([dfrG\) and \(dfrK)\] and phenicols \([catA\) and \(optrA)\] were found in the isolates as shown in Table 1. The \(tet(M)\) and \(erm(B)\) genes were found in 82% (31/38) and 42% (16/38) of the isolates, respectively. The \(dfrG\) gene predominately caused resistance to trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (Table 1 and Table S2).

### 3.4. WGS detection of mobile genetic support

WGS analysis revealed 11 different plasmid replicons from seven \(rep\) families that occurred in different combinations in the \(E. faecalis\) isolates (Table 2). \(pTEF2\) \((rep9)\), \(pTEF3\) \((repUS13)\), \(pAD1\) \((rep9)\) and \(pEFC1\) \((rep6)\) were the most predominant replicon types occurring in 14 (37%), 13 (34%), 13 (34%) and 9 (24%) isolates, respectively. Of note, two isolates 2SIL2 and 2SPJ101 from hospital D concomitantly harboured unique plasmid replicons \((pk214\) \((rep7)\), \(pEFR\) \((rep11)\), \(pPD1\) \((rep9)\), \(pRE25\) \((rep2)\), \(pUB110\) \((repUS14)\), \(pKH7\) \((rep7)\)) that were absent in the other isolates (Table 2). Eight (21%) of the isolates did not possess any plasmid replicons. The replicons harboured by the isolates were clonally related. For instance, major replicon \(pTEF2\) \((rep9)\) was harboured by isolates belonging to ST21 while the replicon set \(pTEF3\) \((repUS13)\), \(pAD1\) \((rep9)\) and \(pEFC1\) \((rep6)\) were harboured in ST40 isolates. Furthermore, most of the isolates \((n=5)\) belonging to ST16 lacked plasmids.

The prophage analysis revealed all isolates hosted at least one intact bacteriophage except for three isolates belonging to different STs (Table 2). The predominant intact
bacteriophages found were the Entero_phiFL1A (n=16, 42%), Entero_phiFL3A (n=6, 16%), Entero_vB_IME197 (n=6, 16%) and Entero_phiEf11 (n=5, 13%). Four prophages were identified in one E. faecalis ST16 (3UPF4) strain isolated from the mop of a paediatric ward in hospital B with a peculiar bacteriophage (Lactoc_PLgT_1). The isolates 1C1H3, 1MPD4, 2U1K2 and 2UPF3 from different hospitals hosted 3 prophages. The prophage harboured by the isolates were clonally related (Table 2).

A myriad of IS families was found in the isolates with no association with respect to the hospital and ward. The 5 major IS families were IS3 (predicted to be linked with Enterococcus faecium/Streptococcus agalactiae sources), IS5 (predicted to be associated with Cyanotheca sp. sources), IS1595 (predicted to be linked with Bacillus subtilis), ISL3 (predicted to be linked with Streptococcus mutans/thermophilus) and IS607 (predicted to be linked with both Campylobacter sp. and Virus NY2A), (Table S3). The transposase (Tn3) linked with Bacillus thuringiensis was found in 7 of the isolates identified from different sources (Table S3). All the isolates lacked integrons and their associated gene cassettes.

3.5. Phylogenomic and metadata analysis

A phylogenetic tree reconstructed to analyse genetic relationships between the isolates revealed a high divergence of isolates according to the different levels of care (Figure 1). For instance, each hospital was generally associated with specific dominant clones (i.e., ST40 and ST498 were mostly found in hospital A; ST16, ST126, and ST386 were found in hospital B; and ST21 was predominately found in hospital C (Table 1 and Figure 1).

Phylogenomic trees coupled metadata visualization analysis provided a more in-depth insight into the characteristics and distinctions between isolates and revealed the intra-clonal spread of E. faecalis strains between different sources within the same hospitals (Figure 1).
Specifically, ST21 was found on the drip stand, patient file, sink and nurses table in both ICU and paediatric ward of hospital C. Similarly, ST40 was found on phone, patient file, mop, occupied bed and nurses table of the paediatric ward hospital A. The ST16 clone was isolated on the mop (paediatric ward), phone and BP apparatus (ICU) of hospital B. More so, ST386 linked with the phone, BP apparatus, and unoccupied bed in the paediatric ward of hospital B while ST126 was found on the occupied bed and nurses table in the ICU of the same hospital.

4.0. Discussion

In line with the global trend, reports on bacterial contamination in hospital environments is increasing in Africa across all sectors [35], and *E. faecalis* is one of the most common enterococcal species isolated from the hospital environment. This is evident from our results where *E. faecalis* (n=245) was the most prevalent organisms compared to *E. faecium* (n= 53). *E. faecalis* is recognised as an important hospital-associated pathogen responsible for approximately 80-90% of cases reported in the hospital settings followed by 5-10% *E. faecium* [36] and hence has been placed in the category of pathogens posing a major threat to healthcare systems [37]. Furthermore, *E. faecalis* represent major infection prevention attributed to their ability to persist for long periods on hands and remain viable on environmental surfaces (inanimate surfaces) due to their microbial structure thus, can serve as a reservoir for ongoing transmission in the absence of regular decontamination [38]. Additionally, *E. faecalis* posses the ability to acquire additional resistance through the transfer of mobile genetic support such as plasmids, prophages, and insertion sequences [39,40]. The acquisition of resistance and genetic support poses a therapeutic challenge.

The WGS results showed that none of the *E. faecalis* harbored vancomycin-resistant genes which corroborated with the phenotypes [12]. This affirms the view of Ellington *et al*
on the role of WGS in antimicrobial susceptibility testing of bacteria for the explanation of phenotypic result for samples [41] and further confirms WGS as a more discriminatory tool to infer antibiotic susceptibility as compared to relying fully on phenotypic testing alone. Majority of the isolates were susceptible to ampicillin, penicillin, teicoplanin, levofloxacin, and nitrofurantoin confirming their use as treatment options in South Africa, particularly ampicillin (the drug of choice for *E. faecalis* infections) [42].

Tetracycline demonstrated reduced susceptibility against *E. faecalis* mediated mostly by the ribosomal protection protein, *tet(M)* [11,43]. This was consistent with previous studies that found the *tet(M)* as the dominant gene causing tetracycline resistance in *E. faecalis* isolates across all the one-health sectors (human-animal-environment interface) [35]. For instance, in a 2014 hospital-based study in China by Jia *et al.*[44], *tet(M)* was found to cause tetracycline-resistant *E. faecalis* isolates. Similarly, *Said et al.* [45] also detected *tet(M)* as 96.1% of all tetracycline-resistant *Enterococcus* isolates in Egypt. However, the tetracycline resistance exhibited by 2SIL2 isolate was mediated by both ribosomal-protection gene [*tet(M)*] and active-efflux gene [*tet(L)*]. This indicates the significant role played by efflux pumps in mediating antibiotic resistance [46]. The low prevalence of the *tet(L)* was not unusual and pointed to the fact that ribosomal protection protein is the main mechanism of tetracycline-resistant *E. faecalis* isolates. The moderate level of erythromycin resistance was mediated by *erm(B)* genes which are the most common mechanism of resistance reported for the macrolide class of antibiotics in Africa [35] and globally [11,47] for *Enterococcus*. There was small number of isolates showing aminoglycoside resistance across the different levels of care, which corresponded to the aminoglycoside-modifying enzymes found. However, these isolates exhibited high-level resistance encoding a set of enzymes (*sat4A, aph3-III, ant6-la, aac6-aph2*). However, this was not unusual as some *Enterococcus* spp. are...
known to produce low-level resistance to aminoglycosides by limiting drug uptake, which is associated with the proteins involved in electron transport [48]. More so, the OptrA gene implicated in linezolid resistance was found in only one isolate (2SIL2) however, it was unexpressed as the isolate was susceptible to linezolid (Table 1 and S2) as reported in study in China were OptrA was found in eighteen linezolid non-resistant enterococci [49].

A noticeable polyclonal nature was observed in the E. faecalis isolates with 15 distinct STs, including one novel STs, highlighting the diverse nature of the strains in the province. The major STs found such as ST16, ST40 and ST21 were previously reported in Saudi Arabia, China, Tunisia, France, and Spain from human subjects, hospitalised patients, animals and wastewater [36,50–53]. Similarly, other studies have also reported the ST126, ST23 and ST386 in different settings (human, animal and environment) and hence do not suggest any kind of host specificity in these major STs reported in this study [54]. However, unlike other countries, the population structure of E. faecalis from different settings in South Africa are minimally monitored, if at all, making it difficult to correlate our results with studies in South Africa. This calls for the need for E. faecalis to be included in surveillance schemes to enable the monitoring of the molecular epidemiology of isolates collected over larger tempo-spatial scales using high throughput technologies such as WGS [55]. Such surveillance would help microbiologists and public health practitioners to gain better insights into the evolution and dissemination of E. faecalis.

Characterizing the genetic support in the isolates indicated that the majority of E. faecalis in the different hospitals are likely reservoirs for diverse mobile genetic elements and associated ARGs (especially for tetracycline, erythromycin). There was a higher plasmid prevalence rate (seven rep families) and the detection of two or more distinct replicons in one strain. Accordingly, this finding agrees with the fact that numerous types of plasmids are
often present in enterococci from a clinical setting [56–58]. More so, other studies have shown that single isolates of *E. faecalis* may harbour multiple plasmids [57,59].

There was no specific pattern between the acquisition of insertion sequence families or transposable elements with respect to the ward and level of care however the presence of major IS families in *E. faecalis* clones imply that these elements are spread by horizontal gene transfer (HGT) [39]. Moreover, the acquisition of these elements can lead to transposition in the genome aid in the transfer of resistance genes, enabling it to adapt to new environmental challenges and colonise new niches [60]. For instance, IS3 family upstream of the *EmrB* gene has been reported for enhanced erythromycin resistance [60]. The ability of these clones to acquire novel genetic features may contribute to their increased persistence and highlights its potential public health threat.

Comparative phylogenomics using WGS SNPs analysis revealed a higher genetic diversity between the strains with respect to each specific hospital. This implied that the major clones were mostly hospital-specific, which was in concordance with the *in-silico* MLST typing scheme (Figure 1). Interestingly, a study by Kawalec et al., [61] also found a higher diversity in the clonal structure of *E. faecalis* strains among hospitals in Poland. Visualizing the phylogenomic tree with metadata revealed the major clones in the various hospitals. This further depicted the intra-clonal spread of *E. faecalis* strains between different sources within the same hospital, reiterating the need for phylo/meta- analysis to increase confidence in molecular epidemiological studies. For instance, at the paediatric ward of hospital A, the ST40 clone was isolated from a phone, nurses table, patient file, mop and occupied bed which may be due to hand contamination by patients and/or healthcare workers (nurses, janitor staff, etc.) (Figure 1). A similar scenario occurred in hospital B, where ST386 was found in the paediatric ward (on the phone, BP apparatus and unoccupied bed).
while the ST126 was isolated in the ICU (on nurses table and occupied bed). Reports on enterococci transient carriage on the hands of healthcare workers and patients as well their presence on, medical equipment, or environmental surfaces has been documented in several studies [62–65]. Other studies have reported the movement of colonised patients among different settings in the hospital as responsible for these patterns of transmission [64,66].

Moreover, hospitals B and C observed intra-ward spreads (both ICU and paediatric ward) of ST16 and 21, respectively from different sites with each hospital. The transmission of enterococcal strains has been documented within medical units, given credence to the study findings [67,68].

Frequent contact with healthcare providers and movement of colonised patients among different healthcare settings is a probable means for these patterns of transmission in hospitals A, B and C. However, there were limited isolates from district hospital (Hospital D) due to the number of isolates obtained for any detailed comparative analysis. Even though the findings of our study may not be generalised to the overall situation in the country, this study improves the understanding of the prevalence, genetic content, and relatedness of *E. faecalis* contamination of hospital environments. It is thus recommended that scheduled periodic identification of transmitting sources in the hospitals’ inanimate environment, strict enforcement and adherences of IPC practices amongst the health workers and isolation of colonised patients should be imposed to reduce the incidence and transmission of *E. faecalis* hospital environments. More so, the study was limited by the number of isolates selected for sequencing and hence there is the need for large-scale genomic epidemiology to elucidate the population structure in the various hospital environments in South Africa.

5.0. Conclusion
This genomic analysis provided a snapshot of the hospital inanimate environment as a reservoir of resistant *E. faecalis*, its associated mobilome (plasmids, prophages, insertion sequences and transposons) and revealed a complex intra-clonal spread of *E. faecalis* major clones between the sites within each specific hospital setting. This study improves our understanding of the dissemination of *E. faecalis* in hospital environments and will aid in the design of optimal infection prevention and control strategies in clinical settings.
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Table 1: Summary of the hospital levels, the source of sample collected, sample type, and genotypic characteristics of the *E. Faecalis* isolates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isolate ID</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Sample Details</th>
<th>Typing</th>
<th>MLST (15)</th>
<th>Antibiotic resistance genes (ARGs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1MPA1</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>PHONE</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MPA3</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>PHONE</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MPD4</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>PATIENT FILE</td>
<td>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MPF1</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>MOP</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MPF3</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>MOP</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MPJ101</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>MOP</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MPK2</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>NURSES TABLE</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MPK3</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>NURSES TABLE</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MPK4</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>NURSES TABLE</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2MPJ104</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>OCCUPIED BED</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MPH1</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>SINK</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), tetL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MPJ101</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>SINK</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2UPJ104</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>OCCUPIED BED</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2UKK2</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>NURSES TABLE</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2UPA3</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>PHONE</td>
<td>mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2UPJ4</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>BP APPARATUS</td>
<td>mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2UPJ202</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>UNOCCUPIED BED</td>
<td>mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UJA2</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>PHONE</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, Str</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UJC1</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>BP APPARATUS</td>
<td>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, sat4A, aph3-III, ant6-la, aac6-Aph2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UIE2</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>VENTILATOR</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UIJ202</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>UNOCCUPIED BED</td>
<td>ermB, ------, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, sat4A, aph3-III, ant6-la, tetL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UPF3</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>MOP</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), dfrG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UPF4</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>MOP</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), dfrG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UPH1</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>SINK</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UIC2</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>BP APPARATUS</td>
<td>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, sat4A, aAph3-III, ant6-la, aac6-Aph2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CIB1</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>DRIP STAND</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CID1</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>PATIENT FILE</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CII3</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>SINK</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CPK2</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>NURSES TABLE</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CPK3</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>NURSES TABLE</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2CPF3</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>MOP</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2CPH2</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>MOP</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3CPH1</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>SINK</td>
<td>PEAD</td>
<td>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SWL2</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>DOOR HANDLE</td>
<td>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, dfrK, Str</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SPJ101</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>OCCUPIED BED</td>
<td>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SPL2</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>DOOR HANDLE</td>
<td>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PEAD: Paediatric ward; ICU: Intensive care unit.
TABLE 2: Genomic analysis of mobile genetic elements (MGEs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain ID</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>MLST (n=15)</th>
<th>Mobile Genetic Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1MPA1</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>ST40</td>
<td>pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEF47 (rep6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MPA3</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>ST40</td>
<td>pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MPD4</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>ST16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MFP1</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>ST498</td>
<td>pTEF3 (repUS13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MFP3</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>ST498</td>
<td>pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MP101</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>ST40</td>
<td>pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MPK2</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>ST40</td>
<td>pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MPK3</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>ST40</td>
<td>pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MPK4</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>ST40</td>
<td>pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2MPJ104</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>ST23</td>
<td>pAD1 (rep9), pEF47 (rep6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MPH1</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>ST610</td>
<td>pTEF2 (rep9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MP101</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>ST258</td>
<td>pTEF2 (rep9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2UIJ104</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ST126</td>
<td>pTEF2 (rep9), pAD1 (rep9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2UIJ202</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ST386</td>
<td>pTEF3 (repUS13), pEFC1 (rep6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2UPC4</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ST314</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2UPF4</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ST314</td>
<td>pTEF3 (repUS13), pEFC1 (rep6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UIA2</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ST16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UC1</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ST16</td>
<td>pTEF2 (rep9), pCF10 (rep9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UE2</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ST268</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UIJ202</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ST282</td>
<td>pTEF2 (rep9), pAD1 (rep9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UF3</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ST16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UF4</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ST16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UPH1</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ST23</td>
<td>pEFC1 (rep6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3UC2</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ST16</td>
<td>pTEF2 (rep9), pCF10 (rep9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CIB1</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>ST21</td>
<td>pTEF2 (rep9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CID1</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>ST21</td>
<td>pTEF2 (rep9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CH3</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>ST21</td>
<td>pTEF2 (rep9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CPK2</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>ST21</td>
<td>pTEF2 (rep9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CPK3</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>ST126</td>
<td>pTEF2 (rep9), pAD1 (rep9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2CPF3</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>ST41</td>
<td>pTEF3 (repUS13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2CPH2</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>ST16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3CPH1</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>ST123</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SPL2</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>ST314</td>
<td>pTEF2 (rep9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SIL2</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>ST922</td>
<td>pK214 (rep7), pAD1 (rep9), pEF2 (rep11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SPL2</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>ST314</td>
<td>pTEF2 (rep9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB. All the isolates lacked integrons and associated gene cassettes.