

1 Using contact network dynamics to implement 2 efficient interventions against pathogen spread in 3 hospital settings

4 Quentin Leclerc^{a,b,c*} [1], Audrey Duval^{a,b,c#} [1], Didier Guillemot^{a,b,d}, Lulla Opatowski^{a,b} [2],
5 Laura Temime^{c,e} [2]

6 * corresponding author (quentin.leclerc@pasteur.fr)

7 ¹ these authors contributed equally

8 ² these authors contributed equally

9

10 ^a Institut Pasteur, Université Paris Cité, Epidemiology and Modelling of Bacterial Escape to
11 Antimicrobials (EMEA), 75015 Paris, France

12 ^b INSERM, Université Paris-Saclay, Université de Versailles St-Quentin-en-Yvelines, Team
13 Echappement aux Anti-infectieux et Pharmacoépidémiologie U1018, CESP, 78000 Versailles,
14 France

15 ^c Laboratoire Modélisation, Epidémiologie et Surveillance des Risques Sanitaires,
16 Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, 75003 Paris, France

17 ^d AP-HP, Paris Saclay, Department of Public Health, Medical Information, Clinical research, F-
18 92380, Garches

19 ^e Institut Pasteur, Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, Unité PACRI, 75015 Paris, France

20 # Current address : Imagine Institute, Data Science Platform, INSERM UMR 1163, Université
21 de Paris, 75015 Paris, France

22

23 **Classification:** Biological Sciences, Biophysics and Computational Biology

24 **Keywords:** long-term care facility, contact network, individual-based model, nosocomial

25 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
pathogens, interventions

26 **Abstract**

27 Long-term care facilities (LTCF) are hotspots for pathogen transmission. Infection control
28 interventions are essential, but the high density and heterogeneity of inter-individual contacts
29 within LTCF may hinder their efficacy. Here, we explore how the patient-staff contact
30 structure may inform effective intervention implementation. Using an individual-based
31 model, we reproduced methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* colonisation dynamics over
32 a detailed contact network recorded within an LTCF, and examined the potential impact of
33 three types of interventions against transmission (reallocation reducing the number of unique
34 contacts per staff, reinforced contact precautions, and vaccination protecting against
35 acquisition), targeted towards specific populations. All three interventions were effective
36 when applied to all nurses or healthcare assistants (median reduction in MRSA colonisation
37 incidence up to 21%), but the benefit did not exceed 8% when targeting any other single staff
38 category. We identified “supercontactor” individuals with most contacts (“frequency-based”,
39 overrepresented amongst nurses, porters and rehabilitation staff) or with the longest
40 cumulative time spent in contact (“duration-based”, overrepresented amongst healthcare
41 assistants and geriatric and persistent-vegetative-state patients). Targeting supercontactors
42 enhanced interventions against pathogen spread in the LTCF. With contact precautions,
43 targeting frequency-based staff supercontactors led to the highest incidence reduction (13%).
44 Vaccinating duration-based patient supercontactors led to a higher reduction (22%) than all
45 other approaches. Targeting supercontactors remained the most effective strategy when
46 varying epidemiological parameters, indicating this approach can be broadly applied to
47 prevent transmission of other nosocomial pathogens. Importantly, both staff and patients
48 may be supercontactors, highlighting the importance of including patients in measures to
49 prevent pathogen transmission in LTCF.

50

51 **Significance statement**

52 Pathogen transmission is a challenge in long-term care facilities (LTCF) due to frequent and
53 heterogeneous contacts of staff and patients. By characterising this contact structure and
54 understanding the categories of staff and patients more likely to be “supercontactors”, with

55 either more or longer contacts than others, we can implement more efficient interventions
56 against pathogen spread. We illustrate this using a mathematical model to reproduce
57 transmission of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* across a detailed contact network
58 recorded in a LTCF. We show how the most efficient implementation strategy depends on the
59 intervention (reallocation, contact precautions, vaccination) and target population (staff,
60 patients, supercontactors). By varying epidemiological parameters, we demonstrate that
61 these results are broadly applicable to prevent transmission of other nosocomial pathogens.

62 Introduction

63 Healthcare associated infections (HAI) are a major threat worldwide, with more than 4 million
64 infections occurring each year in Europe [1]. The recent COVID19 pandemic has underlined
65 the high risk of pathogen dissemination in health care settings, similarly to what was
66 previously reported for other coronaviruses, seasonal influenza or Ebola epidemics [2,3].
67 Bacterial nosocomial outbreaks are also frequently described, becoming more and more
68 difficult to control with the rise of multidrug resistance [4]. In addition to significantly
69 impacting the morbidity and mortality of hospitalized patients and potentially healthcare
70 workers (HCWs), HAI generate additional costs due to longer hospital stays or additional
71 expensive therapeutics, as well as legal consequences for practitioners and healthcare settings
72 in case of patient lawsuits.

73 Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) is an important cause of such HAI, as these
74 infections most often affect individuals in a weakened immunological state, such as
75 hospitalized patients [5]. Crucially, MRSA colonization is a risk factor for infection, since
76 individuals are more likely to be infected by a *S. aureus* strain they are carrying [6].
77 Consequently, it is essential to understand how individuals become colonized by MRSA in
78 healthcare settings and to control the acquisition risk.

79 To limit pathogen dissemination through human cross-transmission in healthcare settings, a
80 range of measures can be implemented, mostly based on improving contact precautions, such
81 as patient isolation, hand-washing, wearing of gloves or masks. Vaccines to reduce the risk of
82 pathogen colonisation also represent ongoing research and development topics, although
83 none are commercially available and there have only been limited attempts to evaluate their
84 impact in healthcare settings thus far [7]. However, the high density of human contacts
85 involving HCWs, patients, and visitors, combined with variations in individual behaviours and
86 overall stochasticity in transmission often limit the impact of these control measures. For
87 instance, while efficient in general, hand-washing may fail due to a few “super-spreader”
88 individuals who do not comply with hygiene recommendations [8].

89 Because the structure of contact networks within healthcare settings influences the spread of
90 HAI pathogens [9], manipulating contact network structures or targeting highly connected
91 individuals may significantly improve the efficacy of control measures [10]. Here, using


92 individual-based modelling of nosocomial pathogen spread, combined with fine-grained
93 longitudinal data on human close-proximity interactions (CPIs), we show how detailed
94 knowledge of the structure of human interactions may help design more effective
95 interventions for HAI control. We illustrate this point through an application to control the
96 spread of colonisation by MRSA in a long-term care facility (LTCF).

97 **Results**

98 **A simulated hospital contact network that realistically mimics the observed** 99 **contact network**

100 We designed a stochastic individual-based model (IBM) to reproduce the realistic dynamic
101 network of within-hospital between-human interactions. CPI data was collected by equipping
102 all patients and hospital staff in a French LTCF with proximity log-sensors over 84 days (i-Bird
103 study [11,12]). The model was then calibrated to generate simulated contact networks with
104 the same characteristics as the real network provided by the CPI data (see [13] for details). As
105 shown on Figure 1a, the simulated contact network accurately reproduced real average hourly
106 patterns of patient-to-patient, staff-to-staff and staff-to-patient interactions.

107



108

109 **Figure 1: Real and simulated contacts and MRSA incidence. (A) Hourly distribution of**
 110 **number of unique contacts.** The lines and points show the median estimates, and the
 111 shaded areas show the interquartile ranges. The real values come from the i-Bird study, and
 112 the simulated values are shown for 50 simulated contact networks. **(B) MRSA colonisation**
 113 **weekly incidence over 3 months.** Olive points correspond to the observed weekly incidence
 114 during the i-Bird study, with lines indicating the margin of error, estimated using the number
 115 of individuals swabbed that week. Simulated results are obtained from 15,000 stochastic
 116 model simulations (500 simulations of 50 simulated networks). The dark green line shows
 117 the median incidence, and the shaded area shows the 95% prediction interval, defined as
 118 the interval between the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles.

119

120 **Observed weekly MRSA incidence is well reproduced by simulations of** 121 **network-based transmission**

122 A Susceptible-Colonised process was implemented into the IBM to reproduce the transmission
123 process of a colonising pathogen, here MRSA, in the LTCF. The model was parameterized to
124 mimic the i-Bird study conditions. An initial 151 patients and 236 hospital staff members were
125 followed up over 84-day simulations. We categorised hospital staffs into 6 groups, (i)
126 healthcare assistants, (ii) nurses, (iii) rehabilitation staff, (iv) physicians, (v) hospital porters
127 and (vi) other. Each day, staff presence and patient admissions and discharges were also
128 simulated using the real data from the i-Bird study. The simulated dynamic contact network
129 described in the previous section was used to mimic between-human interactions and
130 assumed to be the support of MRSA transmission within this LTCF [11,14]. When initializing
131 the model with MRSA carriage of patients and staff as reported by the i-Bird data, the weekly
132 incidence of MRSA colonization predicted by the model reproduced well the observed trends
133 and weekly incidence over the study period (Figure 1b).

134


135 **Hospital staff reallocation, especially in healthcare assistants, reduces MRSA** 136 **spread**

137 To assess the extent to which the dissemination of MRSA can be restricted through an
138 optimized patient-staff allocation, we designed a series of interventions formalized as
139 modifications of the contact network. We assessed the impact of staff reallocation, defined
140 as the attribution of a reduced number of patients to each staff member during the entire
141 investigation period. We maintained the global care needs of patients over the entire period,
142 defined by the number of unique contacts in the data between patients and different staff
143 categories, by ward. A series of scenarios exploring different combinations of staff categories
144 affected by reallocation were implemented and, for each scenario, 30 new contact networks
145 were generated.

146 Simulating the transmission of MRSA over the different networks, we found that reallocation
147 scenarios targeting different hospital staff categories can help reduce cumulative incidence of
148 MRSA colonisation (Figure 2a for scenarios where 1, 2, or all staff categories were reallocated,

149 Supplementary Figure 1a for all scenarios). Importantly, the benefit of the intervention varied
150 depending on the categories of staff reallocated. When only a single staff category was
151 reallocated, the highest incidence reduction was obtained for healthcare assistant
152 reallocation (median decrease: 10%, 95% confidence interval: 9–11). All scenarios with two
153 categories reallocated involving healthcare assistants prevented between 10–20% of
154 colonisations over the entire simulation period. For comparison, reallocating all staff
155 categories prevented 39% of colonisations (CI: 38–40). Reallocation of either porters or
156 physicians alone barely led to any change in incidence compared to baseline, since these
157 interventions did not substantially change the number of unique staff-patient contacts within
158 the hospital and, therefore, did not substantially affect MRSA spread (Supplementary Figure
159 2). A pseudo-random contact network in which patients were homogeneously distributed
160 among all staff members led to more contacts and a higher incidence as compared to the one
161 generated by the baseline network (36% increase, CI: 35–37), since this increased unique staff-
162 patient contacts within the hospital (Supplementary Figure 2).

163 To see if the variability between scenarios was due to the different number of individuals
164 reallocated in each scenario, we divided the relative incidence reduction for each scenario by
165 the corresponding number of staff reallocated (Figure 2b). This changed the order of the
166 scenarios with the highest benefit, now calculated as relative incidence reduction per
167 reallocated staff. Scenarios where nurses or healthcare assistants were reallocated were
168 lower in the ranking, since they required a large number of staff to be allocated. On the other
169 hand, reallocation of rehabilitation staff and other staff led to the highest overall relative
170 reduction per staff reallocated (2.7×10^{-3} %, CI: 2.6×10^{-3} – 2.9×10^{-3}), even higher than if all
171 staff are reallocated (1.4×10^{-3} %, CI: 1.4×10^{-3} – 1.5×10^{-3}). In any case, we still note
172 heterogeneity in the efficacy of different scenarios, indicating that there are other relevant
173 characteristics which differ between staff categories.



174

175

176

177

178

179

180

Figure 2: Relative reduction in cumulative incidence of MRSA colonisation for different hospital staff reallocation scenarios, shown per scenario (a), or per scenario divided by number of staff reallocated in that scenario (b). Top: Each bar depicts, for a given scenario, the median relative reduction between 500 model simulations with no intervention, and 500 simulations with staff reallocation, along with the 95% confidence interval. A negative reduction indicates that the intervention led to an increase in cumulative incidence. **Bottom:**


181 In each scenario, staff categories coloured are those reallocated. In scenario 64, the contact
182 network is random. In each plot, the scenarios are ranked from most to least effective.

183

184 Reinforced contact precautions of nurses or healthcare assistants are more 185 effective than staff reallocation or vaccination

186 Next, we investigated the impact of reinforced contact precautions taken by hospital staff
187 (e.g., glove wearing or improved hand hygiene compliance) and vaccination. Contact
188 precautions were simulated as a 2- to 10-fold reduction in both patient-to-hospital staff and
189 hospital staff-to-patient MRSA transmission probabilities during contacts. Vaccination was
190 simulated as a 2- to 10-fold reduction in MRSA acquisition probabilities during contacts
191 between any colonised individual and a non-colonised vaccinated individual. As for the
192 previous analysis, MRSA transmission dynamics were simulated for the different scenarios of
193 reinforced contact precautions and vaccination in the 6 hospital staff categories (Figure 3).

194



195

196 **Figure 3: Effect of contact precautions and vaccination targeting different hospital staff**
197 **categories, compared to staff reallocation.** The dashed lines show the median reduction
198 when reallocating all staff (turquoise), healthcare assistants only (orange), or nurses only
199 (brown). All other estimates are shown as median with 95% confidence interval calculated for
200 500 intervention simulations.

201 Contact precautions targeting healthcare assistants led to a large reduction in MRSA
202 colonisations, ranging from 10% to 21% as the assumed level of reduction in transmission
203 probabilities increased from 2 to 10-fold (Figure 3). This was closely followed by contact
204 precautions targeting nurses (10-18% reduction). Contact precautions for healthcare
205 assistants or nurses appear to be more effective than reallocation of either of those staff
206 categories alone, as even an assumed 4-fold reduction in transmission probabilities was
207 sufficient to achieve a decrease in incidence slightly higher than reallocation (Figure 3). Whilst
208 vaccination of healthcare assistants or nurses did reduce incidence, the reduction ranged from
209 6 to 12%, which is approximately equivalent to reallocation (Figure 3).

210 By opposition, contact precautions or vaccination focused exclusively on either hospital
211 porters, physicians, rehabilitation or other staff appeared ineffective, with percent reductions
212 below 5% irrespective of the assumed transmission probability reduction (Figure 3).

213

214 **Heterogeneous distribution of “supercontactors” amongst patients and staff**

215 To understand why intervention effectiveness to reduce the spread of MRSA varied depending
216 on the staff category targeted, we examined the extent to which different individuals were
217 connected in the contact network. We identified individuals substantially more connected
218 than others, and henceforth refer to them as “supercontactors”. We distinguish between two
219 types of supercontactors: (i) individuals with the highest number of daily distinct contacts
220 (henceforth called “frequency-based supercontactors”) and (ii) individuals with the highest
221 overall daily contact duration (henceforth called “duration-based supercontactors”).

222 We identified the top 60 duration- and frequency-based supercontactors for both patients
223 and staff (i.e. top 20% of individuals). If all individuals had the same probability of being
224 supercontactors, we expect that the distribution of patients/staff categories amongst
225 supercontactors (Figure 4, red and blue) would be aligned with the distribution of those same
226 categories amongst all patients/staff (grey).


227 Amongst patients, neurology patients are the first category of supercontactors (Figure 4, left;
228 34% of duration-based, 45% of frequency-based). The observed distribution of patient
229 categories amongst duration-based supercontactors (red) differed significantly from the

230 distribution of those categories amongst all patients (grey; log likelihood ratio test: p value <
231 0.001). We observed a greater proportion of PVS and geriatric patients amongst duration-
232 based supercontactors than amongst all patients (Figure 4, left). The difference was not
233 statistically significant for frequency-based supercontactors (log likelihood ratio test: p value
234 > 0.2).

235 Amongst staff, the majority of supercontactors were either healthcare assistants (Figure 4,
236 right; 52% of duration-based, 33% of frequency-based) or nurses (Figure 4, right; 26% of
237 duration-based, 40% of frequency-based). The observed distribution of staff categories
238 amongst supercontactors differed significantly from the distribution of those categories
239 amongst all staff (log likelihood ratio test: duration-based p value < 0.01, frequency-based p
240 value < 0.05). Compared to the distribution amongst all staff, we observed a greater
241 proportion of healthcare assistants amongst duration-based supercontactors, and a greater
242 proportion of nurses, porters and rehabilitation staff amongst frequency-based
243 supercontactors (Figure 4).

244 There was almost no overlap between the identities of the frequency and duration-based
245 supercontactors. Only three persistent-vegetative state patients, two neurology patients, one
246 nurse and one rehabilitation staff were in both categories.

247



248

249 **Figure 4: The distribution of supercontactors (SC) amongst hospital patients and staff is not**

250 **homogeneous.** The grey bars show the distribution of categories amongst all patients (left) or
251 staff (right), the red bars show the distribution of duration-based supercontactors, the blue
252 bars show the distribution of frequency-based supercontactors. If supercontactors were
253 homogeneously distributed amongst categories, all the coloured bars would be aligned with
254 the grey bars. Here, only the distribution of the top 60 frequency-based and duration-based
255 supercontactors for patients and staff is shown. PVS: persistent-vegetative state.

256


257 **Targeting supercontactors is most effective to reduce MRSA spread**

258 We used supercontactors as target for interventions in the hospital. We compared the effect
259 of reinforced contact precautions or vaccination, targeting different combinations of 60
260 supercontactors (*i.e.* contact-based or duration-based supercontactors among both patients
261 or hospital staff), 60 staff randomly chosen, or 60 patients randomly chosen. Here, we only
262 show the reductions for an assumed 6-fold reduction in transmission probabilities, with other
263 fold reductions shown in Supplementary Figure 3.

264 Targeting supercontactors within either staff or patients with an intervention was at least as
265 effective to reduce incidence than randomly targeting individuals in the same group with the

266 same intervention (grey, Figure 5). When selecting duration-based supercontactors (red),
267 vaccination targeting patients led to a higher reduction in MRSA colonisations than any
268 intervention targeting hospital staff (Figure 5). Conversely, when selecting frequency-based
269 supercontactors (blue), contact precautions targeting hospital staff gave better results in
270 terms of MRSA colonisations reduction than any intervention targeting patients (Figure 5).
271 Targeting a mix of half frequency- and half duration-based supercontactors (purple) gave
272 intermediary results (Figure 5). Regardless of the type of supercontactors targeted, reinforced
273 contact precautions were more effective than vaccination when targeting staff, whilst
274 vaccination was more effective than contact precautions when targeting patients (Figure 5).
275 Overall, vaccination of duration-based patient supercontactors appeared to be the most
276 effective, with up to 21% (CI: 20-22%) of colonisations prevented. These conclusions are
277 maintained when assessing different contact precautions or vaccination efficacies, i.e.
278 assuming 2, 4, 8 or 10-fold reductions in transmission or acquisition probabilities, respectively
279 (Supplementary Figure 3), or when targeting 20 or 100 individuals instead of 60
280 (Supplementary Figure 4).

281



282


283 **Figure 5: Comparison of contact precautions or vaccination for 60 staff, patients, or a mix of**
284 **staff and patients, targeting either duration-based supercontactors (SC), frequency-based**
285 **SC, a mix of duration and frequency-based SC, or random individuals. We assume the**

286 interventions lead to a 6-fold reduction in transmission probabilities. For each strategy, the
287 bar indicates the median relative reduction in cumulative incidence, with 95% confidence
288 interval, obtained for 500 simulations.

289

290 **Targeting supercontactors is also an effective strategy for other nosocomial** 291 **pathogens**

292 Although the epidemiological parameters we used in the previous sections were directly
293 estimated using data on MRSA, our model can be applied to any nosocomial pathogen for
294 which close-proximity interactions are the main vector of transmission. Naturally, the
295 epidemiology of such pathogens would likely vary compared to MRSA, with different
296 transmission rates and carriage/infectiousness durations compared to the values we
297 estimated. To investigate the applicability of our results to other pathogens, we repeated our
298 analysis above, doubling or halving either the transmission rates or the
299 carriage/infectiousness durations. Our qualitative results on the value of targeting
300 supercontactors to improve intervention effectiveness remained valid (Figure 6a-d), even with
301 different baseline incidences due to the parameter changes (Figure 6e). Interestingly, we see
302 that in a few scenarios targeting patients randomly could be slightly more effective than
303 targeting frequency-based patient supercontactors (Figure 6a-d). This is due to the high
304 effectiveness of targeting duration-based patient supercontactors in such instances,
305 combined with the non-overlapping identities of duration- and frequency-based
306 supercontactors. Inevitably, by exclusively targeting frequency-based supercontactors we
307 exclude duration-based supercontactors, while random targeting may still incidentally include
308 these individuals.



309

310 **Figure 6: Comparison of contact precautions or vaccination for 60 staff or patients, targeting**
 311 **either duration-based supercontactors (SC), frequency-based SC, a mix of duration and**
 312 **frequency-based SC, or random individuals, and varying either the baseline transmission**
 313 **rate or carriage duration. a) Halved transmission rate; b) Doubled transmission rate; c)**
 314 **Halved carriage duration; d) Doubled carriage duration. We assume the interventions lead**
 315 **to a 6-fold reduction in transmission probabilities. For each strategy, the bar indicates the**
 316 **median relative reduction in cumulative incidence, with 95% confidence interval, obtained for**
 317 **500 simulations. e) Absolute cumulative incidence without intervention using estimated**
 318 **parameter values, higher/lower transmission, or higher/lower carriage duration. Points**
 319 **indicate the mean, and lines mean +/- standard deviation, obtained for 500 simulations.**

320

321 Discussion

322 In this study, we present how the dynamic interindividual contact network of a healthcare
323 institution can be analysed to implement efficient interventions aimed at reducing pathogen
324 transmission. We first applied an individual-based model to a French long-term care facility
325 and confirmed that it reproduced well both the recorded network and MRSA dynamics. We
326 then evaluated and compared several network-based control strategies, demonstrating that
327 while hospital staff reallocation can help reduce MRSA transmission overall, staff contact
328 precautions and vaccination could be as or more effective than reallocation. Interestingly, the
329 efficacy varied depending on which staff category was targeted by the intervention. We
330 identified “supercontactors” in the contact network with more or longer contacts and found
331 that these were heterogeneously distributed amongst staff and patient categories. The
332 effectiveness of contact precautions and vaccination was further increased by targeting these
333 supercontactors in the LTCF, compared to randomly targeting individuals. Our conclusions
334 remained valid when varying epidemiological parameters, suggesting that targeting
335 supercontactors is also an effective strategy for other nosocomial pathogens transmitted via
336 close-proximity interactions.

337 Here we demonstrated that staff reallocation is an efficient strategy to reduce transmission
338 risk. Moreover, reallocation strategies involving healthcare assistants were the most effective.
339 Our simulation results are consistent with previous work on this topic, showing the best staff
340 reallocation strategies were those significantly lowering the degree of the hospital worker-to-
341 patient subgraph [10,15–21]. In a previous study, we examined the potential of different
342 hospital staff categories to spread nosocomial pathogens and to play a role of super-spreader,
343 showing the importance of adherence to contact precautions in “peripatetic” hospital staff.
344 These later were defined as hospital staff members with relatively short contacts, but with
345 many patients, a definition similar to the “frequency-based supercontactors” here [8].

346 Since transmission was modelled through the contact network, supercontactors can
347 mechanistically play the role of super-spreaders, but also be themselves more at risk of
348 acquiring the bacteria during a contact with a colonised individual. These factors explain why
349 targeting supercontactors for interventions led to a substantial reduction in colonisation
350 incidence. The most appropriate supercontactor type to target (duration-based or frequency-

351 based) surprisingly differed between patients and hospital staff: while targeting frequency-
352 based supercontactors was more relevant for hospital staff, duration-based supercontactors
353 were selected for patients. We also predicted that the most effective intervention to reduce
354 the overall incidence of colonisation was to vaccinate duration-based supercontactors
355 amongst patients with a vaccine, which here we assume protects against acquisition.
356 Interestingly, in staff, vaccination was less effective than reinforced contact precautions.
357 These results may be specific to the type of hospital investigated here. In LTCF, the frequency
358 and duration of patient-patient interactions are much higher than in acute care facilities. Our
359 results highlight the necessity of involving patients in intervention implementation in LTCF.

360 It is important to note that the hospital followed up during the i-Bird study included neurologic
361 wards hosting patients in persistent vegetative state (PVS). These PVS patients accounted for
362 one fifth of the individuals classified as duration-based supercontactors (Figure 3). While they
363 may be considered similar to sedated and ventilated patients in intensive care units, the
364 presence of this type of patients with particularly long contacts and specific behaviours is not
365 universal across all types of LTCF. To improve the generalisability of our results to other LTCF,
366 we performed an additional analysis in which PVS patients were excluded when identifying
367 supercontactors: this hypothesis did not affect our conclusions (Supplementary Figure 5).

368 The results presented here should be interpreted in the light of the following limits. Firstly, we
369 only considered here that MRSA transmission occurred through inter-individual contacts
370 among participants, with a risk of transmission saturating after one hour. This assumption was
371 based on previous analysis of the same data, suggesting that the proximity network was the
372 main transmission route for MRSA acquisition in this setting [11]. In this study, whilst
373 participation was high (95% of staff and patients agreed to wear the sensors), it was also
374 estimated that 25% of MRSA acquisitions were not explained by the contact network, and may
375 instead be mediated by other acquisition mechanisms not included in our model, such as
376 environmental contamination, or bacterial evolution within the host leading to the emergence
377 of resistance. Importations of new colonisations, through for example hospital visitors or
378 patient's permissions outside the hospital were also not included in the model, while they
379 could also have been sources of MRSA acquisition during the i-Bird study. This may explain
380 why model simulations slightly underestimated the incidence point on the 6th week, as
381 illustrated in Figure 1b.

382 Secondly, we did not account for the infection status of patients in the model. Over the study,
383 several infections occurred in participating patients (eschar, cutaneous infection,
384 gastrostomy, colostomy, tracheotomy, ulcer etc.). When an infection occurs, bacterial load is
385 usually much higher, which could potentially increase the risk of bacterial dissemination in the
386 environment or transmission to contacts. Infections could also impact the dynamic of contacts
387 and of nurse scheduling, as infected patients are bound to have a higher care load, thus
388 requiring more contacts. Interestingly, this higher care load could reclassify infected patients
389 as supercontactors and, as we have shown here, identify them as key targets for interventions
390 to reduce spread. For these reasons, future work taking into consideration infected patients
391 may further improve our ability to implement effective interventions.

392 Lastly, the epidemiological parameters of the model, which included transmission probability
393 and carriage duration, were directly estimated for MRSA from the admission, schedule, swab
394 and contact data [11,12]. However, these parameters can vary depending on the estimation
395 period (e.g. holidays versus term-time), setting (e.g. long-term versus acute care), population
396 (e.g. older versus younger), and circulating bacterial or viral pathogen in the hospital. For
397 example, the probability of MRSA transmission that we estimated is slightly lower than in
398 other studies (e.g. 0.000023 per 30 seconds of contact on average for hospital staff-to-hospital
399 staff and 0.000789 for hospital staff-to-patient in our study with the real RFID network,
400 compared to a probability between 0.0005 and 0.0050 per 30 seconds of contact in the study
401 by Hornbeck et al [22]). The durations of MRSA colonization that we estimated from the data
402 (31 days for patients, 27 days for hospital staff) are also either shorter or longer than
403 previously reported estimates, but these values can be clone or setting-specific [23,24].
404 Among other pathogens transmitted by close-proximity interactions, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*
405 has characteristics within the range we explored in our analysis (transmission probability of
406 0.0005 per 30 seconds of contact, carriage duration of 3 weeks) [25]. SARS-CoV-2 is another
407 example with a similar transmission probability, although the infectious period (equivalent to
408 the carriage duration) is lower (9 days) [26]. As we have shown, our conclusions on the value
409 of interventions strategies targeting supercontactors were not impacted by changes in
410 parameters to reflect the epidemiology of these other pathogens instead of MRSA.

411 Despite their limitations, mathematical models are powerful tools to inform the efficacy of
412 control strategies in hospital settings [27], when they are based on a good understanding of

413 pathogen transmission routes and heterogeneity in human interactions [28,29]. Over the last
414 decades, different approaches have been used to acquire knowledge on interindividual
415 contacts, such as observational studies, diaries, interviews and more recently wearable
416 sensors [30–38]. While several IBMs of pathogen spread within hospitals [28,39–47] have
417 been developed to assess measures such as hygiene compliance [22] or antiviral prophylaxis
418 impact on influenza [48], few models have actually attempted to directly integrate such rich
419 empiric data. To our knowledge, only two published individual-based models simulated
420 transmission along an RFID-based contact network [11,22], one of which studied MRSA spread
421 [22]. In that work, Hornbeck et al. showed that the number of colonised patients increased
422 when the most connected nurses did not comply with infection control recommendations,
423 which is consistent with our results.

424 We must consider the feasibility, cost and social acceptability when deciding which control
425 strategies should be implemented. For instance, we suggest that the best strategy would be
426 to implement contact precautions or vaccination focusing on supercontactors, but identifying
427 and targeting supercontactors, in particular among patients, may not be as socially acceptable
428 as broadly targeting hospital staff categories. The benefit of patient vaccination, which we
429 identified as the best strategy in the LTCF, may also be reduced in acute care settings, due to
430 shorter patient lengths of stay and to the likely delay required for immunity to develop
431 following vaccination. In addition, here we chose to simulate the impact of the vaccine as a
432 reduction in the probability of pathogen acquisition, but alternatives could be considered
433 based on recent clinical trials, for example with the vaccine reducing the risk of infection
434 rather than colonisation or reducing the risk of transmission from vaccinated individuals [49].
435 In any case, achieving a 10-fold reduction in transmission probabilities with these
436 interventions might not actually be feasible, depending on the baseline level of pathogen
437 transmission, which is why we explored a range of reductions as previous studies have done
438 [50]. On the other hand, reallocation requires greater logistical efforts, and may not always
439 be feasible depending on the economic context of the healthcare institution and the care load.
440 Finally, the most effective reallocation strategies may not be the most “cost-effective”. For
441 instance, when considering the relative reduction in incidence per staff reallocated, targeting
442 only rehabilitation staff ranked higher than targeting all staff (Figure 2b).

443 In conclusion, this work sheds light on the importance of targeting control and prevention
444 measures in an LTCF towards specific hospital staff categories, but also of involving patients
445 in such efforts as they may too play an important role in the transmission network. Patients
446 need to be actors of their own prevention especially when their length of stay is long. More
447 importantly, we underline how monitoring contacts can be helpful to design highly effective
448 control strategies aimed at “supercontactor” individuals.

449 **Materials and methods**

450 **Data description**

451 Data used here were previously collected during the Individual-Based Investigation of
452 Resistance Dissemination (i-Bird) study [11,12], which took place within a rehabilitation and
453 LTCF from the beginning of July to the end of October 2009. Over this period, each participant
454 (patient or hospital staff) was wearing an RFID sensor that recorded close-proximity
455 interactions (CPIs, at less than 1.5m) every 30 seconds. A dynamic network of proximities is
456 therefore available over 117 days with information on individual ID, ward of affectation, age,
457 gender etc. In addition, dedicated nurses swabbed patients and hospital staff each week to
458 detect MRSA colonization.

459 The hospital was structured into five wards: (i) three neurological wards, (ii) one nutritional
460 care ward and (iii) one geriatric ward. In addition to neurologic, geriatric and nutritional care
461 patients, the hospital hosted a few persistent vegetative state (PVS), post-operative and
462 orthopaedic patients. Most patients had long hospitalization durations (median: 7 weeks). In
463 addition to “classic” staff categories such as nurses, physician, rehabilitation staff, patients
464 could interact with other staff members, such as hairdressers.

465 Overall, a total of 327 patients and 263 hospital staff had recorded contacts during the
466 investigation period. This study is described in more detail in [11,12].

467

468 **Model description**

469 We developed a stochastic Susceptible-Colonized-Susceptible individual-based model that
470 simulates the dynamic transmission of a pathogen within a hospital over a network
471 incorporating data on the detailed structure of CPIs. Individuals could either be patients or
472 hospital staff members. Hospital staff were divided into six categories: healthcare assistants,
473 nurses (including nurses, head nurses, and students), rehabilitation staff (occupational
474 therapists, physiotherapists, and other rehabilitation staff), physicians, hospital porters, and
475 other staff (animation, logistic, administration, and hospital service agents). The model
476 accounts for admissions and discharges from the hospital and inter-individual contacts. Once

477 admitted, a patient remains in the hospital until discharged, whereas hospital staff can be
478 present or absent according to their daily schedule. A probability per time unit for hospital
479 staff presence simulates this schedule.

480 ***Transmission process***

481 Every individual can either be colonized or non-colonized (susceptible) by the pathogen (here,
482 MRSA). At each contact between a susceptible and a colonized individual, the pathogen can
483 be transmitted from the colonized to the susceptible individual with a given probability. This
484 transmission probability is computed as the product of the between-individual contact
485 duration and the pathogen-specific transmission probability, assuming that risks saturate
486 after 1 hour. The model accounts for four different transmission probabilities depending on
487 the status of the individuals involved: patient-to-patient, patient-to-staff, staff-to-patient and
488 staff-to-staff (see Supplementary Text 1). A colonized individual can naturally recover to the
489 susceptible state after a colonization duration randomly drawn from a lognormal distribution.
490 Such individuals may subsequently be recolonised (no immunity is assumed). We also assume
491 that no active decolonisation measures are implemented.

492 Individuals are assumed to be screened for colonization with a probability estimated from the
493 data that depends on weekdays.

494 ***Model parameterization***

495 The model was parameterized using i-Bird data. Simulations ran over 84 days, with an initial
496 151 patients and 236 hospital staff members present, to reflect the duration and conditions
497 of the data collection. Values for model parameters were also computed from the observed
498 data on MRSA colonization among the patients and hospital staff. A summary list of model
499 parameters is provided in Table S2. Detailed information on parameter value calculations is
500 provided in Supplementary Text 1.

501

502 **Building synthetic contacts**

503 We built an algorithm to generate both realistic full and reported stochastic dynamic networks
504 of interindividual interactions in the hospital using parameters estimated from the observed

505 data. Details of parameters computations and CPI generation algorithm are provided in
506 reference [13].

507

508 **Implementing control strategies**

509 We evaluated three distinct contact-based control strategies: staff reallocation, contact
510 precautions, and vaccination.

511 *Reallocation* was simulated as a modification of the contact network, in which patients were
512 allocated to a given staff member of each category for their entire length of stay. We then
513 generated contacts using the algorithm we previously described [13], choosing in priority the
514 staff member allocated to that patient (or vice-versa) when a corresponding contact occurred.
515 For example, if we allocate patient $p1$ to nurse $n1$, then nurse $n1$ will systematically be chosen
516 in priority whenever the algorithm attempts to create a contact between $p1$ and a nurse. We
517 assumed that reallocation did not influence CPI rates.

518 *Contact precautions* were simulated by reducing instantaneous patient-to-hospital staff and
519 hospital staff-to-patient transmissions probabilities 2-, 4-, 6-, 8- or 10-fold, irrespective of CPI
520 rates. Three specific scenarios were investigated: (i) contact precautions for all members of
521 different staff categories, (ii) contact precautions for 60 randomly selected staff members
522 amongst nurses or all staff, and (iii) contact precautions for 60 individuals with the highest
523 rates of contacts, called “supercontactors”. Two definitions of supercontactors were assessed:
524 (i) based on the number of contacts (henceforth called “frequency-based supercontactors”)
525 and (ii) based on the duration of contact (henceforth called “duration-based
526 supercontactors”). Frequency-based supercontactors were defined as the patients or hospital
527 staff members who had the highest mean number of daily contacts with distinct individuals.
528 Duration-based supercontactors were defined as the patients or hospital staff members who
529 had the highest mean daily cumulative duration spent in contact with other individuals.
530 Several strategies were explored regarding the type (patients and/or staff members) of
531 selected supercontactors on whom to focus reinforced contact precautions.

532 *Vaccination* was simulated by reducing acquisition probabilities for vaccinated individuals by
533 2-, 4-, 6-, 8- or 10-fold, irrespective of CPI rates. This effectively corresponds to an

534 unvaccinated-to-vaccinated transmission probability reduction, regardless of the categories
535 of individuals in contact (staff or patient). For example, a 6-fold reduction would translate into
536 a vaccine efficacy of $1 - 1/6 = 83\%$ to reduce the risk of acquisition. We examined the same
537 scenarios as for contact precautions. We assume that the vaccine has been administered with
538 sufficient time before the simulation, and therefore do not consider a delay before reaching
539 maximum vaccine efficacy. We also do not account for potentially waning immunity due to
540 the relatively short time period of our simulation.

541 For all interventions and scenarios, the relative reduction in the cumulative incidence of MRSA
542 colonisation over the entire simulation period was used as an indicator of intervention
543 efficacy. This was calculated by simulating each scenario (including baseline) 500 times and
544 comparing each simulation result with 10 randomly chosen simulations of the baseline
545 scenario, leading to a total of 5000 comparison points per scenario. We used a Wilcoxon test
546 to check if the median relative reduction in cumulative incidence was significantly different
547 from 0.

548 We used the model to simulate the impact of these control strategies for other pathogens
549 than MRSA. To represent the varying epidemiological characteristics of these pathogens, we
550 either doubled or halved the values for the transmission rate or carriage duration (i.e.
551 infectious period) compared to the values we estimated from the data.

552

553 **Acknowledgements and funding sources**

554 This project has received funding from the Innovative Medicines Initiative 2 Joint Undertaking
555 under grant agreement No 101034420 (PrIMAVeRa). This Joint Undertaking receives support
556 from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme and EFPIA.

557 This communication reflects the author's view and that neither IMI nor the European Union,
558 EFPIA, or any Associated Partners are responsible for any use that may be made of the
559 information contained therein.

560 References

- 561 1. World Health Organization. Report on the burden of endemic health care-associated infection
562 worldwide. World Health Organization; 2011. Available:
563 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/80135>
- 564 2. Vanhems P, Von Raesfeldt R, Ecochard R, Voirin N. Emergence of Ebola virus disease in a french
565 acute care setting: a simulation study based on documented inter-individual contacts. *Sci Rep*.
566 2016;6: 36301. doi:10.1038/srep36301
- 567 3. Rudberg A-S, Havervall S, Månberg A, Jernbom Falk A, Aguilera K, Ng H, et al. SARS-CoV-2
568 exposure, symptoms and seroprevalence in healthcare workers in Sweden. *Nat Commun*.
569 2020;11: 5064. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-18848-0
- 570 4. World Health Organization. Global antimicrobial resistance and use surveillance system (GLASS)
571 report: 2022. 2022 Dec. Available: [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-
572 redirect/9789240062702](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240062702)
- 573 5. O’Gara JP. Into the storm: Chasing the opportunistic pathogen *Staphylococcus aureus* from skin
574 colonisation to life-threatening infections. *Environmental Microbiology*. 2017;19: 3823–3833.
575 doi:10.1111/1462-2920.13833
- 576 6. Huang SS, Platt R. Risk of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* infection after previous
577 infection or colonization. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2003;36: 281–285. doi:10.1086/345955
- 578 7. Atkins KE, Lafferty EI, Deeny SR, Davies NG, Robotham JV, Jit M. Use of mathematical modelling
579 to assess the impact of vaccines on antibiotic resistance. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
580 2018;18: e204–e213. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(17)30478-4
- 581 8. Temime L, Opatowski L, Pannet Y, Brun-Buisson C, Boëlle PY, Guillemot D. Peripatetic health-
582 care workers as potential superspreaders. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2009;106: 18420–18425.
583 doi:10.1073/pnas.0900974106
- 584 9. Curtis DE, Hlady CS, Kanade G, Pemmaraju SV, Polgreen PM, Segre AM. Healthcare Worker
585 Contact Networks and the Prevention of Hospital-Acquired Infections. *PLOS ONE*. 2013;8:
586 e79906. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0079906
- 587 10. Valdano E, Poletto C, Boëlle P-Y, Colizza V. Reorganization of nurse scheduling reduces the risk
588 of healthcare associated infections. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11: 7393. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-86637-w
- 589 11. Obadia T, Silhol R, Opatowski L, Temime L, Legrand J, Thiébaud ACM, et al. Detailed Contact
590 Data and the Dissemination of *Staphylococcus aureus* in Hospitals. Salathé M, editor. *PLOS*
591 *Computational Biology*. 2015;11: e1004170. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004170
- 592 12. Duval A, Obadia T, Martinet L, Boëlle P-Y, Fleury E, Guillemot D, et al. Measuring dynamic social
593 contacts in a rehabilitation hospital: effect of wards, patient and staff characteristics. *Scientific*
594 *Reports*. 2018;8: 1686. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-20008-w
- 595 13. Duval A, Leclerc QJ, Guillemot D, Temime L, Opatowski L. An algorithm to build synthetic
596 temporal contact networks based on close-proximity interactions data. *medRxiv*. 2023.
597 doi:10.1101/2023.10.23.23296945

- 598 14. Obadia T, Opatowski L, Temime L, Herrmann J-L, Fleury É, Boëlle P-Y, et al. Interindividual
599 Contacts and Carriage of Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*: A Nested Case-Control
600 Study. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*. 2015;36: 922–929. doi:10.1017/ice.2015.89
- 601 15. Beggs CB, Noakes CJ, Shepherd SJ, Kerr KG, Sleigh PA, Banfield K. The influence of nurse
602 cohorting on hand hygiene effectiveness. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2006;34: 621–
603 626. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2006.06.011
- 604 16. Hussein K, Rabino G, Eluk O, Warman S, Reisner S, Geffen Y, et al. The association between
605 infection control interventions and carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae incidence in an
606 endemic hospital. *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 2017;97: 218–225.
607 doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2017.07.018
- 608 17. Jochimsen EM, Fish L, Manning K, Young S, Singer DA, Baker R, et al. Control of Vancomycin-
609 Resistant Enterococci at a Community Hospital: Efficacy of Patient and Staff Cohorting. *Infect
610 Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 1999;20: 106–109. doi:10.1086/501598
- 611 18. Meyers LA, Newman MEJ, Martin M, Schrag S. Applying Network Theory to Epidemics: Control
612 Measures for *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* Outbreaks. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2003;9: 204–210.
613 doi:10.3201/eid0902.020188
- 614 19. Austin DJ, Bonten MJM, Weinstein RA, Slaughter S, Anderson RM. Vancomycin-resistant
615 enterococci in intensive-care hospital settings: Transmission dynamics, persistence, and the
616 impact of infection control programs. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 1999;96: 6908–6913.
- 617 20. Pelat C, Kardaś-Stoma L, Birgand G, Ruppé E, Schwarzinger M, Andremont A, et al. Hand
618 Hygiene, Cohorting, or Antibiotic Restriction to Control Outbreaks of Multidrug-Resistant
619 *Enterobacteriaceae*. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2016;37: 272–280.
620 doi:10.1017/ice.2015.284
- 621 21. Abad CL, Barker AK, Safdar N. A systematic review of the effectiveness of cohorting to reduce
622 transmission of healthcare-associated *C. difficile* and multidrug-resistant organisms. *Infect
623 Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2020;41: 691–709. doi:10.1017/ice.2020.45
- 624 22. Hornbeck T, Naylor D, Segre AM, Thomas G, Herman T, Polgreen PM. Using sensor networks to
625 study the effect of peripatetic healthcare workers on the spread of hospital-associated
626 infections. *J Infect Dis*. 2012;206: 1549–1557. doi:10.1093/infdis/jjs542
- 627 23. Cluzet VC, Gerber JS, Nachamkin I, Metlay JP, Zaoutis TE, Davis MF, et al. Duration of
628 Colonization and Determinants of Earlier Clearance of Colonization With Methicillin-Resistant
629 *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2015;60: 1489–1496.
630 doi:10.1093/cid/civ075
- 631 24. Robicsek A, Beaumont JL, Peterson LR. Duration of Colonization with Methicillin - Resistant
632 *Staphylococcus aureus*. *CLIN INFECT DIS*. 2009;48: 910–913. doi:10.1086/597296
- 633 25. Duval A, Obadia T, Boëlle P-Y, Fleury E, Herrmann J-L, Guillemot D, et al. Close proximity
634 interactions support transmission of ESBL-K. pneumoniae but not ESBL-E. coli in healthcare
635 settings. *PLOS Computational Biology*. 2019;15: e1006496. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006496
- 636 26. Smith DRM, Duval A, Pouwels KB, Guillemot D, Fernandes J, Huynh B-T, et al. Optimizing COVID-
637 19 surveillance in long-term care facilities: a modelling study. *BMC Medicine*. 2020;18: 386.
638 doi:10.1186/s12916-020-01866-6

- 639 27. Grundmann H, Hellriegel B. Mathematical modelling: a tool for hospital infection control. The
640 Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2006;6: 39–45. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(05)70325-X
- 641 28. Polgreen PM, Tassier TL, Pemmaraju SV, Segre AM. Prioritizing Healthcare Worker Vaccinations
642 on the Basis of Social Network Analysis. Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology. 2010;31:
643 893–900. doi:10.1086/655466
- 644 29. Assab R, Temime L. The role of hand hygiene in controlling norovirus spread in nursing homes.
645 BMC Infect Dis. 2016;16: 395. doi:10.1186/s12879-016-1702-0
- 646 30. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, Beutels P, Auranen K, Mikolajczyk R, et al. Social Contacts and Mixing
647 Patterns Relevant to the Spread of Infectious Diseases. PLOS Medicine. 2008;5: e74.
648 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0050074
- 649 31. Champredon D, Najafi M, Laskowski M, Chit A, M. Moghadas S, 1 Agent-Based Modelling
650 Laboratory, York University, Toronto, ON M3J 1P3, Canada, et al. Individual movements and
651 contact patterns in a Canadian long-term care facility. AIMS Public Health. 2018;5: 111–121.
652 doi:10.3934/publichealth.2018.2.111
- 653 32. Lowery-North DW, Hertzberg VS, Elon L, Cotsonis G, Hilton SA, Vaughns CF, et al. Measuring
654 Social Contacts in the Emergency Department. Sueur C, editor. PLoS ONE. 2013;8: e70854.
655 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0070854
- 656 33. Isella L, Romano M, Barrat A, Cattuto C, Colizza V, Van den Broeck W, et al. Close Encounters in
657 a Pediatric Ward: Measuring Face-to-Face Proximity and Mixing Patterns with Wearable
658 Sensors. Cowling B, editor. PLoS ONE. 2011;6: e17144. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0017144
- 659 34. Lucet J-C, Laouenan C, Chelius G, Veziris N, Lepelletier D, Friggeri A, et al. Electronic Sensors for
660 Assessing Interactions between Healthcare Workers and Patients under Airborne Precautions.
661 Colizza V, editor. PLoS ONE. 2012;7: e37893. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0037893
- 662 35. Mastrandrea R, Soto-Aladro A, Brouqui P, Barrat A. Enhancing the evaluation of pathogen
663 transmission risk in a hospital by merging hand-hygiene compliance and contact data: a proof-
664 of-concept study. BMC Res Notes. 2015;8: 426. doi:10.1186/s13104-015-1409-0
- 665 36. Voirin N, Payet C, Barrat A, Cattuto C, Khanafer N, Régis C, et al. Combining High-Resolution
666 Contact Data with Virological Data to Investigate Influenza Transmission in a Tertiary Care
667 Hospital. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2015;36: 254–260. doi:10.1017/ice.2014.53
- 668 37. Herman T, Monsalve M, Pemmaraju S, Polgreen P, Segre AM, Sharma D, et al. Inferring Realistic
669 Intra-hospital Contact Networks Using Link Prediction and Computer Logins. 2012 International
670 Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust and 2012 International Confernece on Social
671 Computing. Amsterdam, Netherlands: IEEE; 2012. pp. 572–578. doi:10.1109/SocialCom-
672 PASSAT.2012.113
- 673 38. Vanhems P, Barrat A, Cattuto C, Pinton J-F, Khanafer N, Régis C, et al. Estimating Potential
674 Infection Transmission Routes in Hospital Wards Using Wearable Proximity Sensors. Viboud C,
675 editor. PLoS ONE. 2013;8: e73970. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0073970
- 676 39. Almagor J, Temkin E, Benenson I, Fallach N, Carmeli Y, on behalf of the DRIVE-AB consortium.
677 The impact of antibiotic use on transmission of resistant bacteria in hospitals: Insights from an
678 agent-based model. Zhou Z, editor. PLoS ONE. 2018;13: e0197111.
679 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0197111

- 680 40. Lanzas C, Dubberke ER. Effectiveness of Screening Hospital Admissions to Detect Asymptomatic
681 Carriers of *Clostridium difficile* : A Modeling Evaluation. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2014;35:
682 1043–1050. doi:10.1086/677162
- 683 41. Caudill L, Lawson B. A unified inter-host and in-host model of antibiotic resistance and infection
684 spread in a hospital ward. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*. 2017;421: 112–126.
685 doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2017.03.025
- 686 42. Barker AK, Alagoz O, Safdar N. Interventions to Reduce the Incidence of Hospital-Onset
687 *Clostridium difficile* Infection: An Agent-Based Modeling Approach to Evaluate Clinical
688 Effectiveness in Adult Acute Care Hospitals. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2018;66: 1192–1203.
689 doi:10.1093/cid/cix962
- 690 43. Codella J, Safdar N, Heffernan R, Alagoz O. An Agent-based Simulation Model for *Clostridium*
691 *difficile* Infection Control. *Med Decis Making*. 2015;35: 211–229.
692 doi:10.1177/0272989X14545788
- 693 44. D’Agata EMC, Horn MA, Webb GF. The Impact of Persistent Gastrointestinal Colonization on
694 the Transmission Dynamics of Vancomycin - Resistant Enterococci. *J INFECT DIS*. 2002;185:
695 766–773. doi:10.1086/339293
- 696 45. Rubin MA, Jones M, Leecaster M, Khader K, Ray W, Huttner A, et al. A Simulation-Based
697 Assessment of Strategies to Control *Clostridium Difficile* Transmission and Infection. Trotter CL,
698 editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2013;8: e80671. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0080671
- 699 46. Barnes SL, Rock C, Harris AD, Cosgrove SE, Morgan DJ, Thom KA. The Impact of Reducing
700 Antibiotics on the Transmission of Multidrug-Resistant Organisms. *Infect Control Hosp*
701 *Epidemiol*. 2017;38: 663–669. doi:10.1017/ice.2017.34
- 702 47. Ferrer J, Salmon M, Temime L. Nosolink: An Agent-based Approach to Link Patient Flows and
703 Staff Organization with the Circulation of Nosocomial Pathogens in an Intensive Care Unit.
704 *Procedia Computer Science*. 2013;18: 1485–1494. doi:10.1016/j.procs.2013.05.316
- 705 48. Najafi M, Laskowski M, de Boer PT, Williams E, Chit A, Moghadas SM. The Effect of Individual
706 Movements and Interventions on the Spread of Influenza in Long-Term Care Facilities. *Med*
707 *Decis Making*. 2017;37: 871–881. doi:10.1177/0272989X17708564
- 708 49. Clegg J, Soldaini E, McLoughlin RM, Rittenhouse S, Bagnoli F, Phogat S. *Staphylococcus aureus*
709 Vaccine Research and Development: The Past, Present and Future, Including Novel Therapeutic
710 Strategies. *Front Immunol*. 2021;12: 705360. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2021.705360
- 711 50. Hoge C, Van Effelterre T, Cassidy A. A model-based analysis: what potential could there be for
712 a *S. aureus* vaccine in a hospital setting on top of other preventative measures? *BMC Infectious*
713 *Diseases*. 2014;14: 291. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-14-291
- 714 51. Duval A, Smith D, Guillemot D, Opatowski L, Temime L. CTCmodeler: An Agent-Based
715 Framework to Simulate Pathogen Transmission Along an Inter-individual Contact Network in a
716 Hospital. In: Rodrigues JMF, Cardoso PJS, Monteiro J, Lam R, Krzhizhanovskaya VV, Lees MH, et
717 al., editors. *Computational Science – ICCS 2019*. Springer International Publishing; 2019. pp.
718 477–487. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-22741-8_34