

1 A Genomic Snapshot of *Enterococcus faecalis* within Public Hospital 2 Environments in South Africa

3
4 Christiana O. Shobo^{1, 2, 3}, Daniel G. Amoako^{1, 3, 4*}, Mushal Allam⁴, Arshad Ismail⁴, Sabiha Y.
5 Essack¹, Linda A. Bester^{3*}

6
7 ¹Antimicrobial Research Unit, College of Health Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal,
8 Durban, South Africa;

9 ²School of Laboratory Medicine and Medical Science, Department of Medical Microbiology,
10 University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa;

11 ³Biomedical Resource Unit, School of Laboratory Medicine and Medical Sciences, College of
12 Health Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal; Durban, South Africa;

13 ⁴Sequencing Core Facility, National Institute for Communicable Diseases, National Health
14 Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa;

15
16 *Corresponding Authors: Linda A. Bester (Ph.D.), besterl@ukzn.ac.za (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5726-681X>) and Daniel G. Amoako (Ph.D.), **Email:** amoakodg@gmail.com, Tel.: +27(0)
17 [+27 \(0\) 843308957](tel:+270843308957); **ORCID:** <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3551-3458>.
18

19
20 **Keywords:** Comparative Genomics, *Enterococcus faecalis*, sequence type, resistome,
21 mobilome, contamination, hospital environment, Phylogenomics, South Africa

22
23 **Running title:** Genomics of *E. faecalis* from hospital environments in South Africa
~~None. This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.~~

24 Abstract

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

46 1.0. Introduction

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

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

63 *Enterococcus faecalis* (*E. faecalis*) is a good indicator bacterium in hospital
64 environment monitoring, being Gram-positive cocci these opportunistic pathogens not only
65 form noxious biofilms on implanted medical devices and catheters, they also cause
66 abdominal infection, urinary tract infections, surgical site wound infections, bacteremia,
67 endocarditis and burn [9]. Antibiotic resistance is either intrinsic or through sporadic
68 mutation or through the acquisition of foreign genetic material, by horizontal gene exchange
69 occurring with the aid of mobile genetic elements plasmids, prophages and insertion

70 sequences [10,11]. Difficulties in treating *E. faecalis* and *E. faecium* (most prevalent species in
71 human) have emerged due to acquired resistance, predominantly multi-drug resistance to
72 universally used drugs as well as vancomycin [12]. A number of previous surveillance studies
73 involving *E. faecalis* in Africa have focused either on wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs)
74 and hospital effluent but not on the internal hospital environment [13,14]. Moreover, in
75 South Africa, studies on the contamination of *E. faecalis*, using high discrimination resolution
76 typing are scarce. This study, therefore, uses WGS in delineating the resistome, mobile
77 genetic support, the clones and phylogenomic relationship of *E. faecalis* isolated from the
78 hospital environment in places frequently touched by patients and healthcare workers at four
79 different levels of healthcare in the metropolitan city of Durban, South Africa.

80

81 **2.0. Materials and Methods**

82

83 **2.1. Ethical approval**

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

90

91 **2.2. Study setting**

92 The selected hospitals were all public hospitals situated in the eThekweni region in Durban,
93 South Africa. For non-disclosure reasons, the names of the hospitals were withheld and

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

112

113 **2.3. Isolation and identification of *Enterococcus***

114

115 **2.3.1. Phenotypic determination of *Enterococcus***

116 The samples were inoculated separately into Tryptone Soya Broth (TSB) (Oxoid, Hampshire,
117 England) and incubated at 37 °C for 2 h with shaking at 100 rpm. Following incubation, 1 ml

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

131

132 2.3.2. Molecular confirmation of isolates

133 Stock cultures were resuscitated on TSA plates incubated at 37 °C for 24 h. DNA was
134 extracted using the heat lysis method as previously described [16]. A multiplex polymerase
135 chain reaction (PCR) was performed to confirm isolates at the genus and species level.
136 Genus-specific and species-specific primer used in all the reactions were as previously
137 described [17,18] (**Table S1**). Two PCR reaction mixtures, both containing the *Enterococcus*
138 genus-specific primers, were set up for different primer sets as follows: Group 1: *E. faecalis*.
139 Each reaction was performed in a total volume of 15 µl consisting of 8 µl of DreamTaq Green
140 PCR Master Mix (2X) (Thermo Scientific, Vilnius, Lithuania), 0.5 µl of each primer pair (final
141 concentration of 10 µM of each primer, 2.5 µl of template DNA and 1.5 µl of nuclease-free

142 water. The following thermal cycling conditions used: initial denaturation at 95 °C for 4 min,
143 30 cycles of denaturation at 95 °C for 30 s, amplification at 46.1 °C for 1 min, elongation at 72
144 °C for 1 min and a final extension at 72 °C for 7 min. All reactions were carried out in a T100
145 thermal cycler (Bio-Rad, Hercules, California, USA) [19]. All reactions included a positive
146 control (**Table S1**) and a “no template control (NTC)”. The PCR products were
147 electrophoresed at 90 V on a 1.8% gel run in Tris-borate-EDTA (0.5X) containing 0.5 µg/ml
148 ethidium bromide and visualised using the Gel Doc XR+ imaging system (Bio-Rad, Hercules,
149 California, USA). Of the 620 samples taken, 295 *Enterococcus* spp. were obtained, of which
150 245 were confirmed as *Enterococcus faecalis* via phenotypic and molecular assays. A sub-
151 sample of all the 38 vancomycin-intermediate *E. faecalis* isolates were selected for the
152 genotypic characterization by WGS and bioinformatics analysis (Table 1).

153

154 **2.4. Antibiotic susceptibility testing (AST)**

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

165

166 2.5. DNA isolation, genome sequencing, assembly and annotation

167 Genomic DNA (gDNA) was extracted using GenElute bacterial genomic DNA kit (Sigma–
168 Aldrich, St. Louis, Missouri, United States) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. The
169 quantification of extracted gDNA was determined on a Nanodrop ND1000
170 spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific, Waltham, USA), Qubit 2.0 fluorometer (Invitrogen,
171 Oregon, USA) and verified on an agarose gel electrophoresis. Multiplexed paired-end libraries
172 (2 × 300 bp) were prepared using the Nextera DNA Flex sample preparation kit (Illumina, San
173 Diego, California, United States) and sequences determined on an Illumina MiSeq platform
174 with 100× coverage at the National Institute of Communicable Diseases Sequencing Core
175 Facility, South Africa. The resulting raw reads were checked for quality, trimmed and de novo
176 assembled into contigs using the CLC Genomics Workbench version 10.1 (CLC, Bio-QIAGEN,
177 Aarhus, Denmark). Default parameters were used for all software unless otherwise specified.
178 The CheckM tool version 0.9.7 [22] was used to verify that the sequence reads were not from
179 mixed-species using lineage-specific marker sets from other genetically well-characterised
180 closely-related *E. faecalis* isolates. The *de-novo* assembled reads were uploaded in GenBank
181 and annotated using National Centre for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) prokaryotic
182 genome annotation pipeline and Rapid Annotations using Subsystems Technology (RAST) 2.0
183 server [23].

184

185 2.6. WGS-based molecular typing of *E. faecalis* isolates

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

190

191 2.7. Phylogenomic analysis of *Enterococcus faecalis* isolates

192 The de novo-assembled contigs were uploaded, and the analysis was submitted to CSI (Call
193 SNPs & Infer) Phylogeny-1.4 (<https://cge.cbs.dtu.dk/services/CSIPhylogeny-1.2>), an online
194 service which identifies single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNPs) from WGS data, filters and
195 validates the SNP positions, and then infers phylogeny based on concatenated SNP profiles
196 [26]. The pipeline was run with default parameters: a minimal depth at SNP positions of 10
197 reads, a minimal relative depth at SNP positions of 10%, a minimal distance between SNPs of
198 10 bp, a minimal *Z-score* of 1.96, a minimal SNP quality of 30 and a minimal read mapping
199 quality of 25. A bootstrapped with 100 replicates indicator was applied to identify
200 recombined regions and provide the phylogenetic accuracy in groups with little homoplasy.
201 The Figtree (<http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree/>) was used to edit and visualise the
202 phylogenetic tree. The phylogeny was visualised alongside metadata for isolate demographics
203 (including hospital, source, ward), sequence type and antibiotic resistome using Phandango
204 [27] to provide a comprehensive analysis of the generated phylogenomic tree.

205

206 2.8. Genomic identification of the antibiotic resistome and mobile genetic elements (MGEs)

207 The bacterial analysis pipeline, ResFinder [28] was used to annotate and identify antibiotic-
208 resistant genes using default parameters (threshold ID of 90% and a minimum length of
209 60%). Plasmid replicons were predicted through PlasmidFinder [29]
210 (<https://cge.cbs.dtu.dk/services/PlasmidFinder/>). The PHAge Search Tool (PHAST;
211 <http://phast.wishartlab.com/>) [30] server was used for the identification, annotation, and
212 visualization of prophage sequences. The assembled genomes were further analysed for
213 insertion sequences and transposons using ISFinder (<https://isfinder.biotoul.fr/>) [31]. RAST

214 SEEDVIEWER (<https://rast.nmpdr.org/seedviewer.cgi>) [32] and Integrall database
215 (<http://integrall.bio.ua.pt/>) [33] was also used to annotate and identify the investigated
216 genomes for integrons and associated gene cassettes.

217

218 2.9. Data availability

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

221

222 3.0. RESULTS

223

224 3.1. Prevalence and Antibiotic susceptibility testing

225 Of the 620 isolated samples, 295 were identified as *Enterococcus* spp. viz; *E. faecalis* 245
226 (83.1%) and other Enterococci spp. 50 (16.9%) in all the hospitals. The *E. faecalis* distributions
227 in the hospital were 27 (93%) from the district hospital [with samples only isolated from the
228 phone (1), mops (6), occupied beds (5), nurse's table (7) and door handles (8)], 86 (85.1%)
229 from the regional hospital [samples were isolated from all sites, phones (8), drip-stand (1), bp
230 apparatus (6), patient files (7), ventilators (4), mops (14), sinks (9), occupied beds (14),
231 unoccupied beds (3) nurse's table (12) and door handles (8)].

232 From the tertiary hospital, 86 (77.5%) [Samples were also isolated from all sites,
233 phones (16), drip-stand (9), bp apparatus (6), patient files (8), ventilators (3), mops (12), sinks
234 (5), occupied beds (9), unoccupied beds (7) nurse's table (7) and door handles (4)]. From the
235 central hospital, 48 (88.9%) samples were isolated from phones (7), patient files (6), mop (8),
236 sink (4), occupied bed (12), unoccupied bed (3) and nurse's table (8)]. The sites with the
237 highest contamination rates were the occupied beds and the mops with 30.2% each. In the

238 district hospital, most positive samples identified were from the door handles 27.6%, the
239 nurses' tables with 24.1% and mops with 20.6%. In the regional hospital, the mops and the
240 occupied beds 13.8% each and the nurses tables 11.9%. For the tertiary hospital, the ward
241 phones with 14.4% and mop 10.8%. While in the central, were the occupied beds 22.2%,
242 followed by the nurses' tables and mop with 20.3% each.

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

252

253 3.2. WGS-based species confirmation and molecular typing

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

260

261 3.3. Antibiotic resistance genes of *E. Faecalis* isolates

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

271

272 3.4. WGS detection of mobile genetic support

273 WGS analysis revealed 11 different plasmid replicons from seven *rep* families that occurred in
274 different combinations in the *E. faecalis* isolates (Table 2). pTEF2 (rep9), pTEF3 (repUS13),
275 pAD1 (rep9) and pEFC1 (rep6) were the most predominant replicon types occurring in 14
276 (37%), 13 (34%), 13 (34%) and 9 (24%) isolates, respectively. Of note, two isolates 2SIL2 and
277 2SPJ101 from hospital D concomitantly harboured unique plasmid replicons (pk214 (rep7),
278 pEFR (rep11), pPD1 (rep9), pRE25 (rep2), pUB110 (repUS14), pKH7 (rep7)) that were absent
279 in the other isolates (Table 2). Eight (21%) of the isolates did not possess any plasmid
280 replicons. The replicons harboured by the isolates were clonally related. For instance, major
281 replicon pTEF2 (rep9) was harboured by isolates belonging to ST21 while the replicon set
282 pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9) and pEFC1 (rep6) were harboured in ST40 isolates.
283 Furthermore, most of the isolates (n=5) belonging to ST16 lacked plasmids.

284 The prophage analysis revealed all isolates hosted at least one intact bacteriophage
285 except for three isolates belonging to different STs (Table 2). The predominant intact

286 bacteriophages found were the Entero_phiFL1A (n=16, 42%), Entero_phiFL3A (n=6, 16%),
287 Entero_vB_IME197 (n=6, 16%) and Entero_phiEf11 (n=5, 13%). Four prophages were
288 identified in one *E. faecalis* ST16 (3UPF4) strain isolated from the mop of a paediatric ward in
289 hospital B with a peculiar bacteriophage (Lactoc_PLgT_1). The isolates 1C1H3, 1MPD4, 2U1K2
290 and 2UPF3 from different hospitals hosted 3 prophages. The prophage harboured by the
291 isolates were clonally related (Table 2).

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

300

301 3.5. Phylogenomic and metadata analysis

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

307 Phylogenomic trees coupled metadata visualization analysis provided a more in-depth
308 insight into the characteristics and distinctions between isolates and revealed the intra-clonal
309 spread of *E. faecalis* strains between different sources within the same hospitals (Figure 1).

310 Specifically, ST21 was found on the drip stand, patient file, sink and nurses table in both ICU
311 and paediatric ward of hospital C. Similarly, ST40 was found on phone, patient file, mop,
312 occupied bed and nurses table of the paediatric ward hospital A. The ST16 clone was isolated
313 on the mop (paediatric ward), phone and BP apparatus (ICU) of hospital B. More so, ST386
314 linked with the phone, BP apparatus, and unoccupied bed in the paediatric ward of hospital B
315 while ST126 was found on the occupied bed and nurses table in the ICU of the same hospital.

316

317 4.0. Discussion

318 In line with the global trend, reports on bacterial contamination in hospital
319 environments is increasing in Africa across all sectors [35], and *E. faecalis* is one of the most
320 common enterococcal species isolated from the hospital environment. This is evident from
321 our results where *E. faecalis* (n=245) was the most prevalent organisms compared to *E.*
322 *faecium* (n= 53). *E. faecalis* is recognised as an important hospital-associated pathogen
323 responsible for approximately 80-90% of cases reported in the hospital settings followed by
324 5-10% *E. faecium* [36] and hence has been placed in the category of pathogens posing a
325 major threat to healthcare systems [37]. Furthermore, *E. faecalis* represent major infection
326 prevention attributed to their ability to persist for long periods on hands and remain viable
327 on environmental surfaces (inanimate surfaces) due to their microbial structure thus, can
328 serve as a reservoir for ongoing transmission in the absence of regular decontamination [38].
329 Additionally, *E. faecalis* posses the ability to acquire additional resistance through the
330 transfer of mobile genetic support such as plasmids, prophages, and insertion sequences
331 [39,40]. The acquisition of resistance and genetic support poses a therapeutic challenge.

332 The WGS results showed that none of the *E. faecalis* harbored vancomycin-resistant
333 genes which corroborated with the phenotypes [12]. This affirms the view of Ellington *et al*

334 on the role of WGS in antimicrobial susceptibility testing of bacteria for the explanation of
335 phenotypic result for samples [41] and further confirms WGS as a more discriminatory tool to
336 infer antibiotic susceptibility as compared to relying fully on phenotypic testing alone.
337 Majority of the isolates were susceptible to ampicillin, penicillin, teicoplanin, levofloxacin,
338 and nitrofurantoin confirming their use as treatment options in South Africa, particularly
339 ampicillin (the drug of choice for *E. faecalis* infections) [42].

340 Tetracycline demonstrated reduced susceptibility against *E. faecalis* mediated mostly
341 by the ribosomal protection protein, *tet(M)* [11,43]. This was consistent with previous studies
342 that found the *tet(M)* as the dominant gene causing tetracycline resistance in *E. faecalis*
343 isolates across all the one-health sectors (human-animal-environment interface) [35]. For
344 instance, in a 2014 hospital-based study in China by Jia *et al.*[44], *tet(M)* was found to cause
345 tetracycline-resistant *E. faecalis* isolates. Similarly, Said *et al.* [45] also detected *tet(M)* as
346 96.1% of all tetracycline-resistant *Enterococcus* isolates in Egypt. However, the tetracycline
347 resistance exhibited by 2SIL2 isolate was mediated by both ribosomal-protection gene
348 [*tet(M)*] and active-efflux gene [*tet(L)*]. This indicates the significant role played by efflux
349 pumps in mediating antibiotic resistance [46]. The low prevalence of the *tet(L)* was not
350 unusual and pointed to the fact that ribosomal protection protein is the main mechanism of
351 tetracycline-resistant *E. faecalis* isolates. The moderate level of erythromycin resistance was
352 mediated by *erm(B)* genes which are the most common mechanism of resistance reported
353 for the macrolide class of antibiotics in Africa [35] and globally [11,47] for *Enterococcus*.
354 There was small number of isolates showing aminoglycoside resistance across the different
355 levels of care, which corresponded to the aminoglycoside-modifying enzymes found.
356 However, these isolates exhibited high-level resistance encoding a set of enzymes (*sat4A*,
357 *aph3-III*, *ant6-Ia*, *aac6-aph2*). However, this was not unusual as some *Enterococcus* spp. are

358 known to produce low-level resistance to aminoglycosides by limiting drug uptake, which is
359 associated with the proteins involved in electron transport [48]. More so, the *OptrA* gene
360 implicated in linezolid resistance was found in only one isolate (2SIL2) however, it was
361 unexpressed as the isolate was susceptible to linezolid (Table 1 and S2) as reported in study
362 in China where *OptrA* was found in eighteen linezolid non-resistant enterococci [49].

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

377 Characterizing the genetic support in the isolates indicated that the majority of *E.*
378 *faecalis* in the different hospitals are likely reservoirs for diverse mobile genetic elements and
379 associated ARGs (especially for tetracycline, erythromycin). There was a higher plasmid
380 prevalence rate (seven *rep* families) and the detection of two or more distinct replicons in
381 one strain. Accordingly, this finding agrees with the fact that numerous types of plasmids are

382 often present in enterococci from a clinical setting [56–58]. More so, other studies have
383 shown that single isolates of *E. faecalis* may harbour multiple plasmids [57,59].

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

393 Comparative phylogenomics using WGS SNPs analysis revealed a higher genetic
394 diversity between the strains with respect to each specific hospital. This implied that the
395 major clones were mostly hospital-specific, which was in concordance with the *in-silico* MLST
396 typing scheme (Figure 1). Interestingly, a study by Kawalec *et al.*, [61] also found a higher
397 diversity in the clonal structure of *E. faecalis* strains among hospitals in Poland. Visualizing the
398 phylogenomic tree with metadata revealed the major clones in the various hospitals. This
399 further depicted the intra-clonal spread of *E. faecalis* strains between different sources
400 within the same hospital, reiterating the need for phylo/meta- analysis to increase
401 confidence in molecular epidemiological studies. For instance, at the paediatric ward of
402 hospital A, the ST40 clone was isolated from a phone, nurses table, patient file, mop and
403 occupied bed which may be due to hand contamination by patients and/or healthcare
404 workers (nurses, janitor staff, etc.) (Figure 1). A similar scenario occurred in hospital B, where
405 ST386 was found in the paediatric ward (on the phone, BP apparatus and unoccupied bed)

406 while the ST126 was isolated in the ICU (on nurses table and occupied bed). Reports on
407 enterococci transient carriage on the hands of healthcare workers and patients as well their
408 presence on, medical equipment, or environmental surfaces has been documented in several
409 studies [62–65]. Other studies have reported the movement of colonised patients among
410 different settings in the hospital as responsible for these patterns of transmission [64,66].
411 Moreover, hospitals B and C observed intra-ward spreads (both ICU and paediatric ward) of
412 ST16 and 21, respectively from different sites with each hospital. The transmission of
413 enterococcal strains has been documented within medical units, given credence to the study
414 findings [67,68].

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

428

429 **5.0. Conclusion**

430 This genomic analysis provided a snapshot of the hospital inanimate environment as a
431 reservoir of resistant *E. faecalis*, its associated mobilome (plasmids, prophages, insertion
432 sequences and transposons) and revealed a complex intra-clonal spread of *E. faecalis* major
433 clones between the sites within each specific hospital setting. This study improves our
434 understanding of the dissemination of *E. faecalis* in hospital environments and will aid in the
435 design of optimal infection prevention and control strategies in clinical settings.

436

437 **Acknowledgment**

438 We are grateful to the Sequencing Core Facility, National Institute for Communicable
439 Diseases, National Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa; the South African
440 Research Chairs Initiative of the Department of Science and Technology and the National
441 Research Foundation of South Africa (Grant number: **98342**); and the College of Health young
442 researcher grant, University of KwaZulu-Natal, for sponsoring this research.

443

444 **General Disclaimer**

445 Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are
446 those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the organisations or
447 agencies that provided support for the project. The funders had no role in the study design,
448 nor the decision to submit the work for publication.

449

450 **Competing interests**

451 The authors have no competing interests to declare.

452

453 **Author Contributions**

454 C.S co-conceptualised the study, undertook sample collection, microbiological and
455 bioinformatic analyses and drafted the manuscript. D.G.A. co-conceptualised the study,
456 undertook bioinformatics analyses, data interpretation and a critical revision of the
457 manuscript. M.A and A.I. performed whole-genome sequencing analysis and critical revision
458 of the manuscript. S.Y.E. and L.B co-conceptualised the study, supervised the study and
459 undertook critical revision of the manuscript.

460

461 List of Tables

462 **Table 1:** Summary of the hospital levels, the source of sample collected, sample type, and
463 genotypic characteristics of the *E. Faecalis* isolates.

464

465 **Table 2:** Genomic analysis of mobile genetic elements (MGEs).

466

467 Figure Legends

468

469 **Figure 1:** The whole-genome MLST phylogenomic branch and metadata of isolate information
470 (including isolate identity, hospital, source, and ward) and WGS *in-silico typing* (sequence
471 type and antibiotic resistome) coupled using Phandango *E. faecalis* isolates at different level
472 of care in Durban, South Africa. The linking lines in the phylogenetic tree differentiate
473 between the different clades. Metadata annotations show that there were generally distinct
474 major sequence types between the 4 hospital environments however within each hospital
475 there was the spread of these major clones between different sources in the wards.

476

477 Supplemental Material

478 **Table S1:** List of genus-and species-specific primers and control strains used in this study.

479 **Table S2:** Antibiotic susceptibility profiles of *E. faecalis* (n=38).

480 **Table S3:** Distribution of 6 major insertion sequence (IS)/transposase families and their
481 associated predicted sources among *E. faecalis* isolates via the ISFinder database.

482

483 **References:**

- 484 1. Comar, M.; D'Accolti, M.; Cason, C.; Soffritti, I.; Campisciano, G.; Lanzoni, L.; Bisi, M.;
485 Volta, A.; Mazzacane, S.; Caselli, E. Introduction of NGS in Environmental Surveillance
486 for Healthcare-Associated Infection Control. *Microorganisms* **2019**, *7*, 708,
487 doi:10.3390/microorganisms7120708.
- 488 2. Gilchrist, C.A.; Turner, S.D.; Riley, M.F.; Petri, W.A.; Hewlett, E.L. Whole-Genome
489 Sequencing in Outbreak Analysis. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* **2015**, *28*, 541–563,
490 doi:10.1128/CMR.00075-13.
- 491 3. Bani-Yaghoub, M.; Gautam, R.; Döpfer, D.; Kaspar, C.W.; Ivanek, R. Effectiveness of
492 environmental decontamination as an infection control measure. *Epidemiol. Infect.*
493 **2012**, *140*, 542–553, doi:10.1017/S0950268811000604.
- 494 4. Dusé, A. Infection control in developing countries with particular emphasis on South
495 Africa. *South Afr J Epidemiol Infect* **2005**, *20*, 37–41.
- 496 5. Harbarth, S.; Balkhy, H.H.; Goossens, H.; Jarlier, V.; Kluytmans, J.; Laxminarayan, R.;
497 Saam, M.; Van Belkum, A.; Pittet, D. Antimicrobial resistance: one world, one fight!
498 *Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control* **2015**, *4*, 49, doi:10.1186/s13756-015-0091-2.
- 499 6. Mcgann, P.; Bunin, J.L.; Snesrud, E.; Singh, S.; Maybank, R.; Ong, A.C.; Kwak, Y.I.;
500 Seronello, S.; Clifford, R.J.; Hinkle, M.; et al. Real time application of whole genome
501 sequencing for outbreak investigation – What is an achievable turnaround time ?

- 502 *Diagn. Microbiol. Infect. Dis.* **2016**, *85*, 277–282,
503 doi:10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2016.04.020.
- 504 7. Quainoo, S.; Coolen, J.P.M.; van Hijum, S.A.F.T.; Huynen, M.A.; Melchers, W.J.G.; van
505 Schaik, W.; Wertheim, H.F.L. Whole-Genome Sequencing of Bacterial Pathogens: the
506 Future of Nosocomial Outbreak Analysis. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* **2017**, *30*, 1015–1063,
507 doi:10.1128/CMR.00016-17.
- 508 8. Balloux, F.; Brønstad Brynildsrud, O.; van Dorp, L.; Shaw, L.P.; Chen, H.; Harris, K.A.;
509 Wang, H.; Eldholm, V. From Theory to Practice: Translating Whole-Genome
510 Sequencing (WGS) into the Clinic. *Trends Microbiol.* **2018**, *26*, 1035–1048,
511 doi:10.1016/j.tim.2018.08.004.
- 512 9. Zaheer, R.; Cook, S.R.; Barbieri, R.; Goji, N.; Cameron, A.; Petkau, A.; Polo, R.O.;
513 Tymensen, L.; Stamm, C.; Song, J.; et al. Surveillance of Enterococcus spp. reveals
514 distinct species and antimicrobial resistance diversity across a One-Health continuum.
515 *Sci. Rep.* **2020**, *10*, 3937, doi:10.1038/s41598-020-61002-5.
- 516 10. Hollenbeck, B.L.; Rice, L.B. Intrinsic and acquired resistance mechanisms in
517 enterococcus. *Virulence* **2012**, *3*, 421–569, doi:10.4161/viru.21282.
- 518 11. Miller, W.R.; Munita, J.M.; Arias, C.A. Mechanisms of antibiotic resistance in
519 enterococci. *Expert Rev. Anti. Infect. Ther.* **2014**, *12*, 1221–1236,
520 doi:10.1586/14787210.2014.956092.
- 521 12. Shobo, C.O.; Essack, S.Y.; Bester, L.A. Enterococcal contamination of hospital
522 environments in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **2021**,
523 doi:10.1111/jam.15224.
- 524 13. Iweriebor, B.; Gaqavu, S.; Obi, L.; Nwodo, U.; Okoh, A. Antibiotic Susceptibilities of
525 Enterococcus Species Isolated from Hospital and Domestic Wastewater Effluents in

- 526 Alice, Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2015**, *12*,
- 527 4231–4246, doi:10.3390/ijerph120404231.
- 528 14. Ekwanzala, M.D.; Dewar, J.B.; Kamika, I.; Momba, M.N.B. Comparative genomics of
- 529 vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus* spp. revealed common resistome determinants
- 530 from hospital wastewater to aquatic environments. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, *719*,
- 531 137275, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.137275.
- 532 15. Gregersen, T. Rapid method for distinction of gram-negative from gram-positive
- 533 bacteria. *Eur. J. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **1978**, *5*, 123–127,
- 534 doi:10.1007/BF00498806.
- 535 16. Englen, M.D.; Kelley, L.C. A rapid DNA isolation procedure for the identification of
- 536 *Campylobacter jejuni* by the polymerase chain reaction. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* **2000**, *31*,
- 537 421–426, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2672.2000.00841.x.
- 538 17. Jackson, C.R.; Fedorka-Cray, P.J.; Barrett, J.B. Use of a genus- and species-specific
- 539 multiplex PCR for identification of enterococci. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **2004**, *42*, 3558–3565,
- 540 doi:10.1128/JCM.42.8.3558-3565.2004.
- 541 18. Ke, D.; Picard, F.J.; Martineau, F.; Ménard, C.; Roy, P.H.; Ouellette, M.; Bergeron, M.G.
- 542 Development of a PCR assay for rapid detection of enterococci. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **1999**,
- 543 *37*, 3497–503.
- 544 19. Molechan, C.; Amoako, D.G.; Abia, A.L.K.; Somboro, A.M.; Bester, L.A.; Essack, S.Y.
- 545 Molecular epidemiology of antibiotic-resistant *Enterococcus* spp. from the farm-to-
- 546 fork continuum in intensive poultry production in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Sci.*
- 547 *Total Environ.* **2019**, *692*, 868–878, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.07.324.
- 548 20. Yang, Y.; Jiang, X.-T.; Zhang, T. Evaluation of a hybrid approach using UBLAST and
- 549 BLASTX for metagenomic sequences annotation of specific functional genes. *PLoS One*

- 550 2014, 9, e110947, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0110947.
- 551 21. CLSI *Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing. CLSI supplement*
552 *M100*.; 27th ed.; Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; Wayne, Pennsylvania,
553 2017;
- 554 22. Parks, D.H.; Imelfort, M.; Skennerton, C.T.; Hugenholtz, P.; Tyson, G.W. CheckM:
555 assessing the quality of microbial genomes recovered from isolates, single cells, and
556 metagenomes. *Genome Res.* **2015**, *25*, 1043–1055, doi:10.1101/gr.186072.114.
- 557 23. Aziz, R.K.; Bartels, D.; Best, A.; DeJongh, M.; Disz, T.; Edwards, R.A.; Formsma, K.;
558 Gerdes, S.; Glass, E.M.; Kubal, M.; et al. The RAST Server: Rapid annotations using
559 subsystems technology. *BMC Genomics* **2008**, *9*, 1–15, doi:10.1186/1471-2164-9-75.
- 560 24. Larsen, M. V; Cosentino, S.; Rasmussen, S.; Friis, C.; Hasman, H.; Marvig, R.L.; Jelsbak,
561 L.; Sicheritz-Pontén, T.; Ussery, D.W.; Aarestrup, F.M.; et al. Multilocus Sequence
562 Typing of Total-Genome-Sequenced Bacteria. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **2012**, *50*, 1355–1361,
563 doi:10.1128/jcm.06094-11.
- 564 25. Feil, E.J.; Cooper, J.E.; Grundmann, H.; Robinson, D.A.; Enright, M.C.; Berendt, T.;
565 Peacock, S.J.; Smith, J.M.; Murphy, M.; Spratt, B.G.; et al. How Clonal Is *Staphylococcus*
566 *aureus* ? **2003**, *185*, 3307–3316, doi:10.1128/JB.185.11.3307.
- 567 26. Ahrenfeldt, J.; Skaarup, C.; Hasman, H.; Pedersen, A.G.; Aarestrup, F.M.; Lund, O.
568 Bacterial whole genome-based phylogeny: construction of a new benchmarking
569 dataset and assessment of some existing methods. *BMC Genomics* **2017**, *18*, 19,
570 doi:10.1186/s12864-016-3407-6.
- 571 27. Hadfield, J.; Croucher, N.J.; Goater, R.J.; Abudahab, K.; Aanensen, D.M.; Harris, S.R.
572 Phandango: an interactive viewer for bacterial population genomics. *Bioinformatics*
573 **2017**, *34*, 292–293, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btx610.

- 574 28. Zankari, E.; Hasman, H.; Cosentino, S.; Vestergaard, M.; Rasmussen, S.; Lund, O.;
575 Aarestrup, F.M.; Larsen, M.V. Identification of acquired antimicrobial resistance genes.
576 *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **2012**, *67*, 2640–2644, doi:10.1093/jac/dks261.
- 577 29. Carattoli, A.; Zankari, E.; García-Fernández, A.; Voldby Larsen, M.; Lund, O.; Villa, L.;
578 Møller Aarestrup, F.; Hasman, H. In Silico Detection and Typing of Plasmids using
579 PlasmidFinder and Plasmid Multilocus Sequence Typing. *Antimicrob. Agents*
580 *Chemother.* **2014**, *58*, 3895–3903, doi:10.1128/AAC.02412-14.
- 581 30. Zhou, Y.; Liang, Y.; Lynch, K.H.; Dennis, J.J.; Wishart, D.S. PHAST: A Fast Phage Search
582 Tool. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **2011**, *39*, 347–352, doi:10.1093/nar/gkr485.
- 583 31. Siguier, P. ISfinder: the reference centre for bacterial insertion sequences. *Nucleic*
584 *Acids Res.* **2006**, *34*, D32–D36, doi:10.1093/nar/gkj014.
- 585 32. Overbeek, R.; Olson, R.; Pusch, G.D.; Olsen, G.J.; Davis, J.J.; Disz, T.; Edwards, R.A.;
586 Gerdes, S.; Parrello, B.; Shukla, M.; et al. The SEED and the Rapid Annotation of
587 microbial genomes using Subsystems Technology (RAST). *Nucleic Acids Res.* **2014**, *42*,
588 D206–D214, doi:10.1093/nar/gkt1226.
- 589 33. Moura, A.; Soares, M.; Pereira, C.; Leitão, N.; Henriques, I.; Correia, A. INTEGRALL: A
590 database and search engine for integrons, integrases and gene cassettes.
591 *Bioinformatics* **2009**, *25*, 1096–1098, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp105.
- 592 34. Shobo, C.O.; Amoako, D.G.; Allam, M.; Ismail, A.; Essack, S.Y.; Bester, L.A. Genome
593 Sequence of a Novel *Enterococcus faecalis* Sequence Type 922 Strain Isolated from a
594 Door Handle in the Intensive Care Unit of a District Hospital in Durban, South Africa.
595 *Microbiol. Resour. Announc.* **2019**, *8*, 1–2, doi:10.1128/MRA.00582-19.
- 596 35. Osei Sekyere, J.; Mensah, E. Molecular epidemiology and mechanisms of antibiotic
597 resistance in *Enterococcus* spp., *Staphylococcus* spp., and *Streptococcus* spp. in Africa:


- 598 a systematic review from a One Health perspective. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **2020**, *1465*,
599 29–58, doi:10.1111/nyas.14254.
- 600 36. Farman, M.; Yasir, M.; Al-Hindi, R.R.; Farraj, S.A.; Jiman-Fatani, A.A.; Alawi, M.; Azhar,
601 E.I. Genomic analysis of multidrug-resistant clinical *Enterococcus faecalis* isolates for
602 antimicrobial resistance genes and virulence factors from the western region of Saudi
603 Arabia. *Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control* **2019**, *8*, 55, doi:10.1186/s13756-019-0508-4.
- 604 37. Zarb, P.; Coignard, B.; Griskeviciene, J.; Muller, A.; Vankerckhoven, V.; Weist, K.;
605 Goossens, M.; Vaerenberg, S.; Hopkins, S.; Catry, B.; et al. The European Centre for
606 Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) pilot point prevalence survey of healthcare-
607 associated infections and antimicrobial use. *Euro Surveill.* **2012**, *17*, 20316,
608 doi:10.2807/ese.17.46.20316-en.
- 609 38. Kramer, A.; Schwebke, I.; Kampf, G. How long do nosocomial pathogens persist on
610 inanimate surfaces? A systematic review. *BMC Infect. Dis.* **2006**, *6*, 130,
611 doi:10.1186/1471-2334-6-130.
- 612 39. Mikalsen, T.; Pedersen, T.; Willems, R.; Coque, T.M.; Werner, G.; Sadowy, E.; van
613 Schaik, W.; Jensen, L.B.; Sundsfjord, A.; Hegstad, K. Investigating the mobilome in
614 clinically important lineages of *Enterococcus faecium* and *Enterococcus faecalis*. *BMC*
615 *Genomics* **2015**, *16*, 282, doi:10.1186/s12864-015-1407-6.
- 616 40. Partridge, S.R.; Kwong, S.M.; Firth, N.; Jensen, S.O. Mobile Genetic Elements
617 Associated with Antimicrobial Resistance. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* **2018**, *31*, e00088-17,
618 doi:10.1128/CMR.00088-17.
- 619 41. Ellington, M.J.; Ekelund, O.; Aarestrup, F.M.; Canton, R.; Doumith, M.; Giske, C.;
620 Grundman, H.; Hasman, H.; Holden, M.T.G.; Hopkins, K.L.; et al. The role of whole
621 genome sequencing in antimicrobial susceptibility testing of bacteria: report from the

- 622 EUCAST Subcommittee. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **2017**, *23*, 2–22,
623 doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2016.11.012.
- 624 42. National Department of Health *Surveillance for resistance and consumption of*
625 *antibiotics in South Africa*; 2018;
- 626 43. Warburton, P.J.; Amodeo, N.; Roberts, A.P. Mosaic tetracycline resistance genes
627 encoding ribosomal protection proteins. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **2016**, *71*, 3333–
628 3339, doi:10.1093/jac/dkw304.
- 629 44. Jia, W.; Li, G.; Wang, W. Prevalence and Antimicrobial Resistance of Enterococcus
630 Species: A Hospital-Based Study in China. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2014**, *11*,
631 3424–3442, doi:10.3390/ijerph110303424.
- 632 45. Said, H.S.; Abdelmegeed, E.S. Emergence of multidrug resistance and extensive drug
633 resistance among enterococcal clinical isolates in Egypt. *Infect. Drug Resist.* **2019**, *12*,
634 1113–1125, doi:10.2147/IDR.S189341.
- 635 46. Blanco, P.; Hernando-Amado, S.; Reales-Calderon, J.; Corona, F.; Lira, F.; Alcalde-Rico,
636 M.; Bernardini, A.; Sanchez, M.; Martinez, J. Bacterial Multidrug Efflux Pumps: Much
637 More Than Antibiotic Resistance Determinants. *Microorganisms* **2016**, *4*, 14,
638 doi:10.3390/microorganisms4010014.
- 639 47. Tian, Y.; Yu, H.; Wang, Z. Distribution of acquired antibiotic resistance genes among
640 Enterococcus spp. isolated from a hospital in Baotou, China. *BMC Res. Notes* **2019**, *12*,
641 27, doi:10.1186/s13104-019-4064-z.
- 642 48. Shete, V.; Grover, N.; Kumar, M. Analysis of Aminoglycoside Modifying Enzyme Genes
643 Responsible for High-Level Aminoglycoside Resistance among Enterococcal Isolates. *J.*
644 *Pathog.* **2017**, *2017*, 1–5, doi:10.1155/2017/3256952.
- 645 49. Li, P.; Yang, Y.; Ding, L.; Xu, X.; Lin, D. Molecular Investigations of Linezolid Resistance in

- 646 Enterococci OptrA Variants from a Hospital in Shanghai. *Infect. Drug Resist.* **2020**,
647 *Volume 13*, 2711–2716, doi:10.2147/IDR.S251490.
- 648 50. Zischka, M.; Künne, C.T.; Blom, J.; Wobser, D.; Sakıncı, T.; Schmidt-Hohagen, K.;
649 Dabrowski, P.W.; Nitsche, A.; Hübner, J.; Hain, T.; et al. Comprehensive molecular,
650 genomic and phenotypic analysis of a major clone of *Enterococcus faecalis* MLST ST40.
651 *BMC Genomics* **2015**, *16*, 175, doi:10.1186/s12864-015-1367-x.
- 652 51. Kuch, A.; Willems, R.J.L.; Werner, G.; Coque, T.M.; Hammerum, A.M.; Sundsfjord, A.;
653 Klare, I.; Ruiz-Garbajosa, P.; Simonsen, G.S.; van Luit-Asbroek, M.; et al. Insight into
654 antimicrobial susceptibility and population structure of contemporary human
655 *Enterococcus faecalis* isolates from Europe. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **2012**, *67*, 551–
656 558, doi:10.1093/jac/dkr544.
- 657 52. Quiñones, D.; Kobayashi, N.; Nagashima, S. Molecular Epidemiologic Analysis of
658 *Enterococcus faecalis* Isolates in Cuba by Multilocus Sequence Typing. *Microb. Drug*
659 *Resist.* **2009**, *15*, 287–293, doi:10.1089/mdr.2009.0028.
- 660 53. McBride, S.M.; Fischetti, V.A.; LeBlanc, D.J.; Moellering, R.C.; Gilmore, M.S. Genetic
661 Diversity among *Enterococcus faecalis*. *PLoS One* **2007**, *2*, e582,
662 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0000582.
- 663 54. Raven, K.E.; Reuter, S.; Gouliouris, T.; Reynolds, R.; Russell, J.E.; Brown, N.M.; Török,
664 M.E.; Parkhill, J.; Peacock, S.J. Genome-based characterization of hospital-adapted
665 *Enterococcus faecalis* lineages. *Nat. Microbiol.* **2016**, *1*, 15033,
666 doi:10.1038/nmicrobiol.2015.33.
- 667 55. Amoako, D.G.; Somboro, A.M.; Abia, A.L.K.; Allam, M.; Ismail, A.; Bester, L.; Essack, S.Y.
668 Genomic analysis of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from poultry
669 and occupational farm workers in Umgungundlovu District, South Africa. *Sci. Total*

- 670 *Environ.* **2019**, *670*, 704–716, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.03.110.
- 671 56. Zhu, W.; Murray, P.R.; Huskins, W.C.; Jernigan, J.A.; McDonald, L.C.; Clark, N.C.;
- 672 Anderson, K.F.; McDougal, L.K.; Hageman, J.C.; Olsen-Rasmussen, M.; et al.
- 673 Dissemination of an Enterococcus Inc18-Like vanA Plasmid Associated with
- 674 Vancomycin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **2010**,
- 675 *54*, 4314–4320, doi:10.1128/AAC.00185-10.
- 676 57. Garcia-Migura, L.; Sanchez-Valenzuela, A.J.; Jensen, L.B. Presence of Glycopeptide-
- 677 Encoding Plasmids in Enterococcal Isolates from Food and Humans in Denmark.
- 678 *FOODBORNE Pathog. Dis.* **2011**, *8*, 1191–1197, doi:10.1089/fpd.2011.0897.
- 679 58. Song, X.; Sun, J.; Mikalsen, T.; Roberts, A.P.; Sundsfjord, A. Characterisation of the
- 680 Plasmidome within Enterococcus faecalis Isolated from Marginal Periodontitis Patients
- 681 in Norway. *PLoS One* **2013**, *8*, e62248, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0062248.
- 682 59. Sedgley, C.; Clewell, D.B. Bacterial plasmids in the oral and endodontic microflora.
- 683 *Endod. Top.* **2004**, *9*, 37–51, doi:10.1111/j.1601-1546.2004.00077.x.
- 684 60. Vandecraen, J.; Chandler, M.; Aertsen, A.; Van Houdt, R. The impact of insertion
- 685 sequences on bacterial genome plasticity and adaptability. *Crit. Rev. Microbiol.* **2017**,
- 686 *43*, 709–730, doi:10.1080/1040841X.2017.1303661.
- 687 61. Kawalec, M.; Pietras, Z.; Danilowicz, E.; Jakubczak, A.; Gniadkowski, M.; Hryniewicz, W.;
- 688 Willems, R.J.L. Clonal Structure of Enterococcus faecalis Isolated from Polish Hospitals:
- 689 Characterization of Epidemic Clones. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **2007**, *45*, 147–153,
- 690 doi:10.1128/JCM.01704-06.
- 691 62. Tajeddin, E.; Rashidan, M.; Razaghi, M.; Javadi, S.S.S.; Sherafat, S.J.; Alebouyeh, M.;
- 692 Sarbazi, M.R.; Mansouri, N.; Zali, M.R. The role of the intensive care unit environment
- 693 and health-care workers in the transmission of bacteria associated with hospital

- 694 acquired infections. *J. Infect. Public Health* **2016**, *9*, 13–23,
695 doi:10.1016/j.jiph.2015.05.010.
- 696 63. Agudelo Higueta, N.I.; Huycke, M.M. *Enterococcal Disease, Epidemiology, and*
697 *Implications for Treatment*; 2014;
- 698 64. Daniel, D.S.; Lee, S.M.; Dykes, G.A.; Rahman, S. Public Health Risks of Multiple-Drug-
699 Resistant Enterococcus spp. in Southeast Asia. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2015**, *81*,
700 6090–6097, doi:10.1128/AEM.01741-15.
- 701 65. Evans Patterson, J.; Sweeney, A.H.; Simms, M.; Carley, N.; Mangi, R.; Sabetta, J.; Lyons,
702 R.W. An Analysis of 110 Serious Enterococcal Infections Epidemiology, Antibiotic
703 Susceptibility, and Outcome. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. **1995**, *74*, 191–200,
704 doi:10.1097/00005792-199507000-00003.
- 705 66. Jackson, S.S.; Harris, A.D.; Magder, L.S.; Stafford, K.A.; Johnson, J.K.; Miller, L.G.; Calfee,
706 D.P.; Thom, K.A. Bacterial burden is associated with increased transmission to health
707 care workers from patients colonized with vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus. *Am. J.*
708 *Infect. Control* **2019**, *47*, 13–17, doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2018.07.011.
- 709 67. D’Agata, E.M.C.; Green, W.K.; Schulman, G.; Li, H.; Tang, Y.-W.; Schaffner, W.
710 Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci among Chronic Hemodialysis Patients: A
711 Prospective Study of Acquisition. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **2001**, *32*, 23–29,
712 doi:10.1086/317549.
- 713 68. Lund, B.; Agvald-Ohman, C.; Hultberg, A.; Edlund, C. Frequent Transmission of
714 Enterococcal Strains between Mechanically Ventilated Patients Treated at an Intensive
715 Care Unit. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **2002**, *40*, 2084–2088, doi:10.1128/JCM.40.6.2084-
716 2088.2002



717

718 **Figure 1:** The whole genome MLST phylogenomic branch and metadata of isolate information (including isolate identity, hospital, source and
 719 ward) and WGS *in-silico* typing (sequence type and antibiotic resistome) coupled using Phandango
 720 (<https://jameshadfield.github.io/phandango/#>). *E. faecalis* isolates at different level of care in Durban, South Africa. The linking lines in the
 721 phylogenetic tree differentiate between the different clades. Metadata annotations show that there were generally distinct major sequence
 722 types between the 4 hospital environments however within each hospital there was the spread of these major clones between different sources
 723 in the wards.

724




Table 1: Summary of the hospital levels, the source of sample collected, sample type, and genotypic characteristics of the *E. Faecalis* isolates

| Isolate ID | Sample Details | | | Typing | Antibiotic resistance genes (ARGs) |
|------------|----------------|----------------|------|------------|--|
| | Hospital | Source | Ward | MLST (15) | |
| 1MPA1 | Central | PHONE | PEAD | ST40 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 1MPA3 | Central | PHONE | PEAD | ST40 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 1MPD4 | Central | PATIENT FILE | PEAD | ST16 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, dfrK, Str</i> |
| 1MPF1 | Central | MOP | PEAD | ST498 | <i>mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 1MPF3 | Central | MOP | PEAD | ST498-LIKE | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 1MPJ101 | Central | OCCUPIED BED | PEAD | ST40 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 1MPK2 | Central | NURSES TABLE | PEAD | ST40 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 1MPK3 | Central | NURSES TABLE | PEAD | ST40 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 1MPK4 | Central | NURSES TABLE | PEAD | ST40 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 2MPJ104 | Central | OCCUPIED BED | PEAD | ST23-LIKE | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 3MPH1 | Central | SINK | PEAD | ST610 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), tetL</i> |
| 3MPJ101 | Central | OCCUPIED BED | PEAD | ST258 | <i>mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 2UIJ104 | Tertiary | OCCUPIED BED | ICU | ST126 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 2UIK2 | Tertiary | NURSES TABLE | ICU | ST126 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 2UIK3 | Tertiary | NURSES TABLE | ICU | ST21 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 2UPA3 | Tertiary | PHONE | PEAD | ST386-LIKE | <i>mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 2UPC4 | Tertiary | BP APPARATUS | PEAD | ST386-LIKE | <i>mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 2UPF4 | Tertiary | MOP | PEAD | ST314 | <i>mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 2UPJ202 | Tertiary | UNOCCUPIED BED | PEAD | ST386-LIKE | <i>mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 3UIA2 | Tertiary | PHONE | ICU | ST16 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, Str</i> |
| 3UIC1 | Tertiary | BP APPARATUS | ICU | ST16 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, sat4A, aph3-III, ant6-la, aac6-Aph2</i> |
| 3UIE2 | Tertiary | VENTILATOR | ICU | ST268 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 3UIJ202 | Tertiary | UNOCCUPIED BED | ICU | ST282 | <i>ermB, -----, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, sat4A, aph3-III, ant6-la, tetL</i> |
| 3UPF3 | Tertiary | MOP | PEAD | ST16 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), dfrG</i> |
| 3UPF4 | Tertiary | MOP | PEAD | ST16 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), dfrG</i> |
| 3UPH1 | Tertiary | SINK | PEAD | ST23 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 3UIC2 | Tertiary | BP APPARATUS | ICU | ST16 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, sat4A, aAph3-III, ant6-la, aac6-Aph2</i> |
| 1CIB1 | Regional | DRIP STAND | ICU | ST21 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 1CID1 | Regional | PATIENT FILE | ICU | ST21 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 1CIH3 | Regional | SINK | ICU | ST21 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 1CPK2 | Regional | NURSES TABLE | PEAD | ST21 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 1CPK3 | Regional | NURSES TABLE | PEAD | ST126 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 2CPF3 | Regional | MOP | PEAD | ST41 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 2CPH2 | Regional | NURSES TABLE | PEAD | ST16-LIKE | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 3CPH1 | Regional | SINK | PEAD | ST23 | <i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |
| 2SIL2 | District | DOOR HANDLE | ICU | ST922 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, dfrK, sat4A, aph3-III, ant6-la, tetL, fexA, optrA</i> |
| 2SPJ101 | District | OCCUPIED BED | ICU | ST6 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA</i> |
| 2SPL2 | District | DOOR HANDLE | PEAD | ST314 | <i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i> |

PEAD: Paediatric ward; ICU: Intensive care unit.

TABLE 2: Genomic analysis of mobile genetic elements (MGEs).

| Strain ID | Hospital | MLST (n=15) | Mobile Genetic Support | |
|-----------|----------|-------------|---|--|
| | | | Plasmids (plasmid replicons) (n=11) | Intact prophage (n=18) |
| 1MPA1 | Central | ST40 | pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEF47 (rep6) | Entero_phiFL1A |
| 1MPA3 | Central | ST40 | pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6) | Entero_phiFL1A |
| 1MPD4 | Central | ST16 | - | Entero_phiFL1A, Entero_EFC_1, Lactob_PLE2 |
| 1MPF1 | Central | ST498 | pTEF3 (repUS13) | Entero_phiFL3A |
| 1MPF3 | Central | ST498 | pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6) | Entero_phiFL3A, Entero_phiFL1A |
| 1MPJ101 | Central | ST40 | pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6) | Entero_phiFL1A |
| 1MPK2 | Central | ST40 | pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6) | Entero_phiFL1A |
| 1MPK3 | Central | ST40 | pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6) | Entero_phiFL1A |
| 1MPK4 | Central | ST40 | pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6) | Entero_phiFL1A |
| 2MPJ104 | Central | ST23 | pAD1 (rep9), pEF47 (rep6) | Entero_phiFL3A, Entero_phiFL1A |
| 3MPH1 | Central | ST610 | pTEF2 (rep9) | - |
| 3MPJ101 | Central | ST258 | pTEF2 (rep9) | Strept_9871 |
| 2UIJ104 | Tertiary | ST126 | pTEF2 (rep9), pAD1 (rep9) | Entero_phiFL1A, Lactoc_98201 |
| 2UIK2 | Tertiary | ST126 | pTEF2 (rep9), pAD1 (rep9) | Entero_phiFL1A, Lactoc_98201, Cronob_vB_CsaM |
| 2UIK3 | Tertiary | ST21 | pTEF2 (rep9) | Entero_vB_IME197, Lactoc_63301 |
| 2UPA3 | Tertiary | ST386 | pTEF3 (repUS13), pEFC1 (rep6) | Entero_phiEf11 |
| 2UPC4 | Tertiary | ST386 | pTEF3 (repUS13), pEF47 (rep6) | Entero_phiEf11 |
| 2UPF4 | Tertiary | ST314 | - | - |
| 2UPJ202 | Tertiary | ST386 | pTEF3 (repUS13), pEFC1 (rep6) | Entero_phiEf11 |
| 3UIA2 | Tertiary | ST16 | - | Entero_EF62phi, Strept_phiARI0460_1 |
| 3UIC1 | Tertiary | ST16 | pTEF2 (rep9), pCF10 (rep9) | Entero_phiEf11 |
| 3UIE2 | Tertiary | ST268 | - | Entero_phiFL1A |
| 3UIJ202 | Tertiary | ST282 | pTEF2 (rep9), pAD1 (rep9) | - |
| 3UPF3 | Tertiary | ST16 | - | Entero_EFC_1, Strept_phiARI0131_1, Strept_phiARI0460_1 |
| 3UPF4 | Tertiary | ST16 | - | Entero_phiFL1A, Entero_EFC_1, Strept_phiARI0460_1, Lactoc_PLgT_1 |
| 3UPH1 | Tertiary | ST23 | pEFC1 (rep6) | Entero_phiFL3A |
| 3UIC2 | Tertiary | ST16 | pTEF2 (rep9), pCF10 (rep9) | Entero_phiFL1A, Entero_phiEf11 |
| 1CIB1 | Regional | ST21 | pTEF2 (rep9) | Entero_vB_IME197, Lactoc_63301 |
| 1CID1 | Regional | ST21 | pTEF2 (rep9) | Entero_vB_IME197, Lactob_PLE2 |
| 1CIH3 | Regional | ST21 | pTEF2 (rep9) | Entero_vB_IME197, Lactoc_63301, Stx2_c_1717 |
| 1CPK2 | Regional | ST21 | pTEF2 (rep9) | Entero_vB_IME197, Lactob_PLE2 |
| 1CPK3 | Regional | ST126 | pTEF2 (rep9), pAD1 (rep9) | Lactoc_98201 |
| 2CPF3 | Regional | ST41 | pTEF3 (repUS13) | Entero_vB_IME197, Lactob_PLE2 |
| 2CPH2 | Regional | ST16 | - | Entero_phiFL1A |
| 3CPH1 | Regional | ST23 | - | Entero_phiFL3A, Entero_phiFL1A |
| 2SIL2 | District | ST922 | pk214 (rep7), pAD1 (rep9), pEFR (rep11) | Entero_phiFL3A, Paenib_Xenia |
| 2SPJ101 | District | ST6 | pTEF3 (repUS13), pPD1 (rep9), pRE25 (rep2), pUB110 (repUS14), pKH7 (rep7) | Entero_SANTOR1 |
| 2SPL2 | District | ST314 | pTEF2 (rep9) | Strept_9872 |

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