

1 **Genomic sequencing surveillance of patients colonized with vancomycin-resistant**
2 ***Enterococcus* (VRE) improves detection of hospital-associated transmission**

3
4 Alexander J. Sundermann, DrPH,^{1,2} Vatsala Rangachar Srinivasa, MPH,¹⁻³ Emma G. Mills, BS,²
5 Marissa P. Griffith, BS,¹⁻³ Eric Evans, MPH,² Jieshi Chen, MS,⁴ Kady D. Waggle, BS,¹⁻³ Graham
6 M. Snyder, MD, MS,^{2,5} Lora Lee Pless, PhD,^{1,2} Lee H. Harrison, MD,¹⁻³ & Daria Van Tyne,
7 PhD^{2#}

8
9 1. Microbial Genomic Epidemiology Laboratory, Center for Genomic Epidemiology,
10 University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA.

11 2. Division of Infectious Diseases, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh,
12 Pennsylvania, USA.

13 3. Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh,
14 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA

15 4. Auton Lab, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA

16 5. Department of Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology, UPMC Presbyterian,
17 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA

18
19 **Corresponding Author:**

20 #Daria Van Tyne; VANTYNE@pitt.edu

21 University of Pittsburgh

22 BST E1059

23 200 Lothrop Street

24 Pittsburgh, PA 15213

25 Telephone: (412) 648-4210

26 **Word count:** Abstract: 247/250; Text: 2,663/3,000

27 **Key words:** Whole genome sequencing surveillance, Vancomycin-resistant enterococci,

28 hospital-associated transmission

29 **Summary (36/40):** This study demonstrates that inclusion of VRE rectal swabs in hospital
30 surveillance enhances detection of geotemporal pathogen transmission. Rectal swab sampling
31 and forward VRE transmission was associated with readmission and death in 10-20% of VRE
32 patients.

33 **ABSTRACT**

34 **Background:** Vancomycin-resistant enterococcal (VRE) infections pose significant challenges
35 in healthcare. Transmission dynamics of VRE are complex, often involving patient colonization
36 and subsequent transmission through various healthcare-associated vectors. We utilized a whole
37 genome sequencing (WGS) surveillance program at our institution to better understand the
38 contribution of clinical and colonizing isolates to VRE transmission.

39 **Methods:** We performed whole genome sequencing on 352 VRE clinical isolates collected over
40 34 months and 891 rectal screening isolates collected over a 9-month nested period, and used
41 single nucleotide polymorphisms to assess relatedness. We then performed a geo-temporal
42 transmission analysis considering both clinical and rectal screening isolates compared with
43 clinical isolates alone, and calculated 30-day outcomes of patients.

44 **Results:** VRE rectal carriage constituted 87.3% of VRE acquisition, with an average monthly
45 acquisition rate of 7.6 per 1000 patient days. We identified 185 genetically related clusters
46 containing 2-42 isolates and encompassing 69.6% of all isolates in the dataset. The inclusion of
47 rectal swab isolates increased the detection of clinical isolate clusters (from 53% to 67%,
48 $P < 0.01$). Geo-temporal analysis identified hotspot locations of VRE transmission. Patients with
49 clinical VRE isolates that were closely related to previously sampled rectal swab isolates
50 experienced 30-day ICU admission (17.5%), hospital readmission (9.2%), and death (13.3%).

51 **Conclusions:** Our findings describe the high burden of VRE transmission at our hospital and
52 shed light on the importance of using WGS surveillance of both clinical and rectal screening
53 isolates to better understand the transmission of this pathogen. This study highlights the potential
54 utility of incorporating WGS surveillance of VRE into routine hospital practice for improving
55 infection prevention and patient safety.

56 INTRODUCTION

57 Vancomycin-resistant enterococci (VRE) are a major cause of healthcare-associated
58 infections and are associated with high morbidity and mortality. Within the United States, VRE
59 have been estimated to cause over 54,000 infections in hospitalized patients and over 5,400
60 deaths annually.¹ VRE have the ability to persist in the hospital environment and colonize the
61 gastrointestinal tracts of patients.²⁻⁴ Immunocompromised individuals and other high-risk
62 patients with invasive procedures or indwelling devices are at higher risk for VRE infections.^{5,6}
63 The limited treatment options that are active against VRE further complicates the management of
64 these infections.⁴

65 The transmission dynamics of VRE within healthcare settings are complex and involve
66 multiple factors. Patients may become colonized and harbor VRE in their gastrointestinal tract,
67 thereby acting as a moving reservoir for transmission to other patients.⁷ Direct contact with
68 contaminated surfaces, healthcare workers, or other colonized patients plays a significant role in
69 the spread of VRE.⁸ Outbreaks of VRE in healthcare settings are well described in the literature
70 including from medical procedures, environmental contamination on specialized units, or
71 emergence and transmission within individual hospitals.⁹⁻¹³ Many of these outbreaks are
72 characterized by prolonged spread over the course of several months or years.^{14,15}

73 Traditional epidemiological methods are likely to be insufficient in elucidating the
74 complex spread of VRE in healthcare settings. The limitations of these methods stem from their
75 inability to differentiate between closely related strains, identify long-range transmission events,
76 and accurately discern geo-temporal patterns of transmission.¹⁶ Consequently, a deeper
77 understanding of the routes and mechanisms of VRE transmission in modern hospitals is crucial
78 for effective infection control and the development of targeted interventions. The use of whole

79 genome sequencing (WGS) has emerged as a useful tool to accurately differentiate the
80 relatedness of pathogens, enabling investigators to confirm or refute the presence of transmission
81 events or outbreaks.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ In the context of VRE, WGS has been invaluable in directing
82 interventions and understanding transmission patterns.¹⁹⁻²¹ However, the majority of these
83 studies use WGS in reaction to suspected outbreaks rather than as pro-active surveillance to
84 identify and characterize undetected transmission patterns of endemic pathogens (like VRE) in
85 healthcare settings.

86 In November 2016 we began the Enhanced Detection System for Healthcare-Associated
87 Transmission (EDS-HAT) program at our institution, which combines WGS surveillance of
88 major bacterial pathogens, including VRE, to better detect and intervene on healthcare
89 outbreaks.²² The purpose of this study was to summarize the genomic epidemiology and
90 transmission dynamics of VRE at our institution using WGS surveillance of clinical and rectal
91 screening VRE isolates during a 34-month period.

92

93

94

95 **METHODS**

96 **Study setting.** The UPMC Presbyterian Hospital is an adult tertiary care hospital with
97 over 750 beds (including 134 critical care beds) and performs over 400 solid organ transplants
98 annually. During the study period contact precautions were used for the care of any patient with
99 a history of VRE carriage. Patients with VRE carriage were cared for in single-bedded rooms or
100 were cohorted in double-bedded rooms only if the roommate was known to have VRE carriage.
101 No method for performing or evaluating for decolonization was employed. Ethics approval was
102 obtained from the University of Pittsburgh Institutional Review Board (Protocol
103 STUDY21040126).

104 **Isolate collection.** We collected potentially healthcare-associated VRE clinical cultures,
105 as defined by patients with a hospital stay ≥ 3 days or a recent healthcare exposure in the prior
106 30-days, from November 2016 through August 2019. From September 2017 through May 2018,
107 we also collected and sequenced VRE isolates obtained through rectal swab screening of
108 admitted patients. As part of standard infection prevention practice during the study period,
109 patients admitted to our hospital without prior VRE history were screened via rectal swab on
110 admission, weekly, and at discharge until positive. Monthly VRE incidence was calculated using
111 patient days at our hospital with newly detected VRE from clinical or rectal swab cultures.

112 **Retrospective whole genome sequencing and analysis.** Genomic DNA was extracted
113 from VRE isolates that were grown overnight at 37 °C on a blood agar plate. WGS was
114 performed on the Illumina platform using 2 x 150bp paired end reads on a NextSeq2000. The
115 resulting reads were assembled using SPAdes,²³ and multilocus sequence types (STs) were
116 identified using PubMLST.²⁴ Isolate genomes were compared to one another using snippy
117 (<https://github.com/tseemann/snippy>) and split kmer analysis (SKA).²⁵ Clusters of genetically

118 related isolates were identified using hierarchical clustering with average linkage and a cut-off of
119 20 single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) as determined by SKA. Evolutionary rates were
120 estimated by linear regression of pairwise SNPs calculated using snippy or SKA versus days
121 between collection dates for all isolates sampled from the same patient.

122 **Transmission analysis.** Transmission analysis was performed using a geo-temporal
123 approach considering clustered patients who shared a hospital unit commonality using two
124 separate approaches (**Figure S1**). One scenario considered the prior 100 days from the exposed
125 patient's positive culture date to have a unit commonality concurrently or after the clustered
126 index patient, who was already culture-positive.²⁶ The second scenario was similar but
127 considered the 50 days after the exposed patient's positive culture date for an index patient to
128 have a positive culture date. This analysis was performed for both clinical and rectal isolates and
129 for clinical isolates only to determine the contribution of rectal isolates in elucidating possible
130 transmission routes for clinical isolates. We additionally calculated a transmission rate by
131 summing the number of transmissions per day during the clinical-only time period versus the
132 combined clinical and rectal time period.

133 **Outcome analysis.** In order to estimate the impact of transmission from patients with
134 VRE colonization, we recorded 30-day all-cause clinical outcomes including intensive care unit
135 (ICU) admission, hospital readmission, and death among patients with a clinical isolate
136 genetically related to an isolate from a patient with colonization. The subset of outcomes was
137 defined as those that were directly associated with VRE infection. We additionally characterized
138 whether each clinical isolate was classified as an HAI using National Healthcare Safety Network
139 definitions, as adjudicated by infection preventionists as part of normal operations.^{27,28}

140 **Statistical analysis.** Mann Whitney U-test was used to assess differences in days
141 between same-ST isolates versus different-ST isolates among patients that were repeatedly
142 sampled. Linear regression was performed to calculate rates of SNP accumulation over time and
143 how they differed between SKA versus snippy. Differences in average cluster size between
144 clinical isolates only versus clinical and rectal swab isolates were assessed with a one-sided
145 difference in means t-test. To calculate the difference in proportion of clustered isolates between
146 clinical isolates only versus clinical and rectal swab isolates, a one-sided difference in proportion
147 hypothesis test was performed. A Wilcoxon Signed Ranked test was used to assess differences in
148 transmission rates between collection periods with clinical isolates only versus clinical and rectal
149 swab isolates.

150 **RESULTS**

151 **VRE incidence and carriage.** From November 2016 to August 2019, there were 4,472
152 new VRE acquisition events at our hospital (569 clinical, 3,903 rectal screening). The overall
153 VRE acquisition rate was 7.54 per 1,000 patient days (**Figure 1**). Incidence appeared to follow a
154 seasonal pattern, with higher incidence in winter months and lower incidence in summer months.
155 During the study period, we sequenced the genomes of 1,243 VRE isolates (891 rectal and 352
156 clinical) that were collected from 1096 unique patients. The sequenced isolates were
157 predominantly *E. faecium* (n=1192, 96%) with the remaining belonging to *E. faecalis* (n=51,
158 4%). The *E. faecium* isolates were found to belong to 44 defined multi-locus sequence types
159 (STs), with the most frequently sampled STs being ST17 (n=465, 37%), ST736 (n=174, 14%),
160 and ST1471 (n=133, 11%) (**Table S1**).

161 **Genomic analysis of same-patient isolates.** Of the 1096 patients sampled, 67 patients
162 had multiple isolates, with 2-6 isolates collected from each patient. Within these patients, the
163 number of days between culture dates of VRE isolates belonging to different STs was higher
164 than that of isolates belonging to the same ST (mean: 148 days vs. 5 days, $P = 0.0012$),
165 suggesting that some patients were colonized or infected with the same VRE strain, while others
166 were colonized or infected with different strains (**Figure 2A**). When we compared isolates
167 belonging to the same patient and same ST, the SNPs identified via split kmer analysis (SKA)
168 showed higher variability compared to a reference-based SNP identification approach,
169 supporting increased sensitivity in detecting SNP differences between closely related isolates
170 (**Figure 2B**). As an extension to this analysis, we determined the rates of SNP accumulation over
171 time for both SKA and reference-based SNPs using a SNP threshold of 20 SKA SNPs and 10
172 reference-based SNPs (upper whisker, $1.5 * IQR$ for each group, **Figure 2B**). SKA was more

173 sensitive to determining SNP accumulation over time ($P < 0.0001$) as compared to SNPs
174 identified using a reference-based approach, which did not show statistically significant
175 differences in SNP accumulation over time ($P = 0.2$, **Figure 2C**).

176 **Inclusion of rectal swab isolates increases linkage between clinical isolates.** To
177 identify groups of closely related isolates that might constitute putative transmission clusters, we
178 performed hierarchical clustering using a cut-off of 20 SKA SNPs. Clustering of just clinical
179 isolates identified 61 clusters, each containing 2-16 patients (median 2 patients per cluster). A
180 total of 185 patient isolates (53%) clustered with at least one other isolate in this group. In
181 contrast, clustering of all 1243 rectal and clinical isolates revealed 185 clusters, each containing
182 2-42 isolates (**Figure 3A, B**). A total of 233 clinical (66%) and 632 rectal swab isolates (71%)
183 clustered with at least one other isolate in this group. The median SNP distance between
184 clustered isolates was 8 SKA SNPs, which was slightly higher than the SNP distance between
185 isolates collected from the same patient (median = 5 SKA SNPs) but was much lower than
186 between isolates residing in different clusters (median = 120 SKA SNPs) (**Figure S2**). Compared
187 with clustering of clinical isolates only, significantly more clinical isolates resided in clusters
188 when rectal swab isolates were included (53% vs. 66%, $P < 0.01$). Additionally, the average
189 cluster size was greater when rectal swab isolates were included (3.0 vs. 5.7 isolates per cluster,
190 $P < 0.05$). Inclusion of rectal swab isolates also increased the linkage between clinical isolates
191 compared to cluster analysis with clinical isolates only ($P = 0.01$) (**Figure 3C**).

192 **Inclusion of rectal swab isolates reveals increased transmission rates in healthcare**
193 **settings.** We performed a geo-temporal analysis to identify potential sources of transmission in
194 our hospital (**Figure S1**). Considering clusters containing both clinical and rectal swab isolates,
195 geo-temporal analysis revealed potential sources of transmission for 271 (31.3%) isolates (224

196 rectal, 47 clinical) (**Table S2**). Considering clinical isolates alone, the same analysis revealed
197 possible sources of transmission for only 33 (17.8%) clustered clinical isolates. A general
198 intensive care unit was the unit with the highest number of infections with potential geo-temporal
199 links in the combined clinical and rectal dataset (55 infections) as well as in the clinical-only
200 dataset (5 infections) (**Figure 4**). During the rectal screening time frame, we observed a higher
201 transmission rate (defined as the number of days between related isolates) than during the
202 clinical-only time frame ($P < 0.0001$) (**Figure S3**). Among the 120 clinically clustered isolates
203 that were closely related to prior rectal isolates, VRE was associated with 11 (9.2%) 30-day
204 readmissions, 21 (17.5%) ICU admissions, and 16 (13.3%) deaths (**Table S3**). Only 42 (35.0%)
205 of these infections were reported as healthcare-associated.

206 **DISCUSSION**

207 In this study, we examined the genomic epidemiology of VRE at our hospital spanning a
208 period of 34 months. We observed high rates of VRE transmission, which was particularly
209 evident when focusing on rectal screening isolates during a nine-month nested period. Our data
210 highlight the complexities of understanding transmission of VRE in healthcare settings, but also
211 demonstrate the usefulness of WGS surveillance to elucidate and better understand these
212 patterns.

213 Prior studies have shown that VRE is endemic within healthcare systems worldwide and
214 spreads through the dissemination of polyclonal lineages. Prior studies have reported clonal
215 domination of vancomycin-resistant *E. faecium* lineages ST17, ST80, ST117, and ST1478, all of
216 which belong to the hospital-adapted clonal complex CC-17.²⁹⁻³³ Such lineages have been
217 responsible for widespread transmission events within healthcare systems. Similarly, we have
218 identified the presence of these global, problematic lineages at high incidence within our own
219 hospital. Prior studies have characterized healthcare-associated VRE transmission rates ranging
220 from 60-80%.^{9,34} Consistent with these prior reports, we found that 70% of VRE isolates in our
221 study were genetically linked to one another when we considered both clinical and rectal swab
222 isolates, however this proportion fell to only 53% when we considered clinical isolates only.
223 Together these findings suggest that the inclusion of rectal swabs increases clustering of related
224 isolates, and may improve both within and between patient lineage tracking.

225 Data obtained from rectal swabs, even over a relatively short duration of nine months,
226 enhanced our understanding of the transmission dynamics of clinical VRE infections. Performing
227 WGS surveillance on clinical isolates alone missed large numbers of rectal transmission events
228 and also missed likely sources of transmission of clinical infections. Without inclusion of rectal

229 swabs, interventions directed as clinical transmission alone may be misdirected. This highlights
230 the potential of systematic surveillance in providing key insights into the behavior and spread of
231 VRE, which is continuing to emerge as more common and pathogenic.³⁵ Within our study,
232 contact precautions were used, however the efficacy of contact precautions in reducing VRE
233 transmission has been highly debated, with discontinuation showing no associated increase in
234 HAIs.³⁶ With 70% of our VRE isolates genetically related to one another, our data question the
235 effectiveness of contact precautions in preventing VRE transmission.

236 We found that VRE infections associated with readmissions (9.2%) and deaths (13.3%)
237 could be genetically linked with prior rectal screening isolates. These proportions indicate the
238 role of rectal colonization as a transmission source that contributes to subsequent, severe clinical
239 outcomes. Targeting of rectal colonization with infection prevention measures informed by
240 sequencing-based surveillance could address this issue by potentially curbing onward VRE
241 transmission and decreasing the rates of poor outcomes due to VRE infection.

242 The data presented in this study, along with findings from other research highlighting the
243 advantages of WGS surveillance in hospital settings, strongly advocate for the routine,
244 prospective use of WGS surveillance.^{22,37} This approach could enhance patient safety and
245 contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of pathogen evolution and transmission. As
246 hospitals navigate the complexities of HAIs, such as those caused by VRE colonization and
247 infection, the integration of innovative genomic technologies like WGS into routine diagnostic
248 protocols could make a substantial impact. The ability of WGS to quantify genetic differences
249 within and between bacterial strains can help accurately identify sources and patterns of
250 pathogen spread, providing key insights necessary to design effective control strategies.

251 Our study has several limitations. First, we only sequenced VRE isolates from infections

252 that were potentially healthcare-associated. However, this would only underestimate additional
253 related isolates that were introduced from community infections. Second, we only sequenced
254 rectal isolates during a nine-month nested period. Regardless, we still found a high percentage of
255 genetic relatedness among these isolates. Third, we only considered geo-temporal analysis
256 among clustered isolates and did not consider common procedures or common healthcare
257 personnel. Fourth, clusters of related isolates may represent common circulating community
258 strains. However, we did find geo-temporal links connecting many of these infections within our
259 hospital. Fifth, we only had access to the VRE isolates collected during the study period. Some
260 patients may have had prior VRE colonization or infection, which may have miscategorized their
261 study infections as new acquisitions.

262 In summary, we describe the genomic epidemiology of VRE in a hospital setting over a
263 nearly three-year period. The high rates of VRE transmission observed, especially among rectal
264 screening isolates, underscore the crucial role of systematic surveillance in understanding and
265 mitigating the spread of VRE. The real-time collection and WGS surveillance of VRE isolates
266 into hospital practice could potentially aid infection prevention efforts to prevent future
267 transmission and clinical infections, thus enhancing patient safety.

268

269 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

270 We gratefully acknowledge Jane Marsh, Vaughn Cooper, and Elise Martin for their expert
271 advice and assistance throughout the course of this study.

272

273 **Author Contributions:**

274 AJS: Conceptualization, Methodology, Analysis, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft,
275 Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization

276 VRS: Analysis, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization

277 EGM: Methodology, Analysis, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing, Visualization

278 MPG: Data Curation

279 EE: Writing - Review & Editing

280 JC: Data Curation

281 KDW: Data Curation

282 GMS: Conceptualization, Writing - Review & Editing

283 LLP: Writing - Review & Editing

284 LHH: Resources, Writing - Review & Editing, Funding acquisition

285 DVT: Conceptualization, Methodology, Analysis, Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Review

286 & Editing, Visualization, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition

287

288 **STUDY FUNDING**

289 This work was funded in part by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) through grants

290 R01AI127472 to LHH and R01AI165519 to DVT. The NIH played no role in data collection,

291 analysis, or interpretation; study design; writing of the manuscript; or decision to submit for
292 publication.

293

294 **Declaration of Interests**

295 None

REFERENCES

1. VRE in Healthcare Settings | HAI | CDC. Published November 6, 2019. Accessed February 8, 2024. <https://www.cdc.gov/hai/organisms/vre/vre.html>
2. Eichel V, Klein S, Bootsvelde C, et al. Challenges in interpretation of WGS and epidemiological data to investigate nosocomial transmission of vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus faecium* in an endemic region: incorporation of patient movement network and admission screening. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2020;75(7):1716-1721. doi:10.1093/jac/dkaa122
3. Lankford MG, Collins S, Youngberg L, Rooney DM, Warren JR, Noskin GA. Assessment of materials commonly utilized in health care: implications for bacterial survival and transmission. *Am J Infect Control*. 2006;34(5):258-263. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2005.10.008
4. O'Driscoll T, Crank CW. Vancomycin-resistant enterococcal infections: epidemiology, clinical manifestations, and optimal management. *Infect Drug Resist*. 2015;8:217-230. doi:10.2147/IDR.S54125
5. Kramer TS, Renschmidt C, Werner S, et al. The importance of adjusting for enterococcus species when assessing the burden of vancomycin resistance: a cohort study including over 1000 cases of enterococcal bloodstream infections. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2018;7:133. doi:10.1186/s13756-018-0419-9
6. Contreras GA, Munita JM, Simar S, et al. Contemporary Clinical and Molecular Epidemiology of Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococcal Bacteremia: A Prospective Multicenter Cohort Study (VENOUS I). *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2022;9(3):ofab616. doi:10.1093/ofid/ofab616
7. Liese J, Schüle L, Oberhettinger P, et al. Expansion of Vancomycin-Resistant *Enterococcus faecium* in an Academic Tertiary Hospital in Southwest Germany: a Large-Scale Whole-Genome-Based Outbreak Investigation. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2019;63(5):e01978-18. doi:10.1128/AAC.01978-18
8. Arias CA, Murray BE. The rise of the *Enterococcus*: beyond vancomycin resistance. *Nat Rev Microbiol*. 2012;10(4):266-278. doi:10.1038/nrmicro2761
9. Gouliouris T, Coll F, Ludden C, et al. Quantifying acquisition and transmission of *Enterococcus faecium* using genomic surveillance. *Nat Microbiol*. 2021;6(1):103-111. doi:10.1038/s41564-020-00806-7
10. Marom R, Mandel D, Haham A, et al. A silent outbreak of vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus faecium* in a neonatal intensive care unit. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2020;9(1):87. doi:10.1186/s13756-020-00755-0
11. Leong KWC, Cooley LA, Anderson TL, et al. Emergence of Vancomycin-Resistant *Enterococcus faecium* at an Australian Hospital: A Whole Genome Sequencing Analysis. *Sci Rep*. 2018;8(1):6274. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-24614-6

12. García Martínez de Artola D, Castro B, Ramos MJ, Díaz Cuevas Z, Lakhwani S, Lecuona M. Outbreak of vancomycin-resistant enterococcus on a haematology ward: management and control. *J Infect Prev*. 2017;18(3):149-153. doi:10.1177/1757177416687832
13. Andersson P, Beckingham W, Gorrie CL, et al. Vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus (VRE) outbreak in a neonatal intensive care unit and special care nursery at a tertiary-care hospital in Australia-A retrospective case-control study. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2019;40(5):551-558. doi:10.1017/ice.2019.41
14. Frakking FNJ, Bril WS, Sinnige JC, et al. Recommendations for the successful control of a large outbreak of vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus faecium in a non-endemic hospital setting. *J Hosp Infect*. 2018;100(4):e216-e225. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2018.02.016
15. Piezzi V, Wassilew N, Atkinson A, et al. Nosocomial outbreak of vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus faecium (VRE) ST796, Switzerland, 2017 to 2020. *Euro Surveill*. 2022;27(48):2200285. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.48.2200285
16. Abdelbary MHH, Senn L, Greub G, Chaillou G, Moulin E, Blanc DS. Whole-genome sequencing revealed independent emergence of vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus faecium causing sequential outbreaks over 3 years in a tertiary care hospital. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2019;38(6):1163-1170. doi:10.1007/s10096-019-03524-z
17. Tang P, Croxen MA, Hasan MR, Hsiao WWL, Hoang LM. Infection control in the new age of genomic epidemiology. *Am J Infect Control*. 2017;45(2):170-179. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2016.05.015
18. Udaondo Z, Abram K, Kothari A, Jun SR. Top-Down Genomic Surveillance Approach To Investigate the Genomic Epidemiology and Antibiotic Resistance Patterns of Enterococcus faecium Detected in Cancer Patients in Arkansas. *Microbiol Spectr*. 2023;11(3):e0490122. doi:10.1128/spectrum.04901-22
19. Permana B, Harris PNA, Runnegar N, et al. Using Genomics To Investigate an Outbreak of Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococcus faecium ST78 at a Large Tertiary Hospital in Queensland. *Microbiol Spectr*. 2023;11(3):e0420422. doi:10.1128/spectrum.04204-22
20. Raven KE, Gouliouris T, Brodrick H, et al. Complex Routes of Nosocomial Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococcus faecium Transmission Revealed by Genome Sequencing. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2017;64(7):886-893. doi:10.1093/cid/ciw872
21. Brodrick HJ, Raven KE, Harrison EM, et al. Whole-genome sequencing reveals transmission of vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus faecium in a healthcare network. *Genome Med*. 2016;8(1):4. doi:10.1186/s13073-015-0259-7
22. Sundermann AJ, Chen J, Kumar P, et al. Whole-Genome Sequencing Surveillance and Machine Learning of the Electronic Health Record for Enhanced Healthcare Outbreak Detection. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2022;75(3):476-482. doi:10.1093/cid/ciab946
23. Prjibelski A, Antipov D, Meleshko D, Lapidus A, Korobeynikov A. Using SPAdes De Novo Assembler. *Curr Protoc Bioinformatics*. 2020;70(1):e102. doi:10.1002/cpbi.102

24. Jolley KA, Bray JE, Maiden MCJ. Open-access bacterial population genomics: BIGSdb software, the PubMLST.org website and their applications. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2018;3:124. doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.14826.1
25. Harris SR. SKA: Split Kmer Analysis Toolkit for Bacterial Genomic Epidemiology. Published online October 25, 2018:453142. doi:10.1101/453142
26. Sundermann AJ, Griffith MP, Srinivasa VR, et al. Prolonged bacterial carriage and hospital transmission detected by whole genome sequencing surveillance. *Antimicrobial Stewardship & Healthcare Epidemiology.* 2024;4(1):e11. doi:10.1017/ash.2024.4
27. NHSN | CDC. Published January 4, 2024. Accessed February 8, 2024. <https://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/index.html>
28. Sundermann AJ, Penzelik J, Ayres A, Snyder GM, Harrison LH. Sensitivity of National Healthcare Safety Network definitions to capture healthcare-associated transmission identified by whole-genome sequencing surveillance. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2023;44(10):1663-1665. doi:10.1017/ice.2023.52
29. McCracken M, Mitchell R, Smith S, et al. Emergence of pstS-Null Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococcus faecium Clone ST1478, Canada, 2013-2018. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;26(9):2247-2250. doi:10.3201/eid2609.201576
30. Egan SA, Kavanagh NL, Shore AC, et al. Genomic analysis of 600 vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus faecium reveals a high prevalence of ST80 and spread of similar vanA regions via IS1216E and plasmid transfer in diverse genetic lineages in Ireland. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2022;77(2):320-330. doi:10.1093/jac/dkab393
31. Fang H, Fröding I, Ullberg M, Giske CG. Genomic analysis revealed distinct transmission clusters of vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus faecium ST80 in Stockholm, Sweden. *J Hosp Infect.* 2021;107:12-15. doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2020.10.019
32. Pinholt M, Lerner-Svensson H, Littauer P, et al. Multiple hospital outbreaks of vanA Enterococcus faecium in Denmark, 2012-13, investigated by WGS, MLST and PFGE. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2015;70(9):2474-2482. doi:10.1093/jac/dkv142
33. Jozefíková A, Valček A, Šoltys K, Nováková E, Bujdáková H. Persistence and multi-ward dissemination of vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus faecium ST17 clone in hospital settings in Slovakia 2017-2020. *Int J Antimicrob Agents.* 2022;59(4):106561. doi:10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2022.106561
34. Sherry NL, Gorrie CL, Kwong JC, et al. Multi-site implementation of whole genome sequencing for hospital infection control: A prospective genomic epidemiological analysis. *Lancet Reg Health West Pac.* 2022;23:100446. doi:10.1016/j.lanwpc.2022.100446
35. Rödenbeck M, Ayobami O, Eckmanns T, Pletz MW, Bleidorn J, Markwart R. Clinical epidemiology and case fatality due to antimicrobial resistance in Germany: a systematic review and meta-analysis, 1 January 2010 to 31 December 2021. *Euro Surveill.* 2023;28(20):2200672. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2023.28.20.2200672

36. Martin EM, Colaianne B, Bridge C, et al. Discontinuing MRSA and VRE contact precautions: Defining hospital characteristics and infection prevention practices predicting safe de-escalation. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2022;43(11):1595-1602.
doi:10.1017/ice.2021.457
37. Sundermann AJ, Chen J, Miller JK, et al. Whole-genome sequencing surveillance and machine learning for healthcare outbreak detection and investigation: A systematic review and summary. *Antimicrob Steward Healthc Epidemiol.* 2022;2(1):e91.
doi:10.1017/ash.2021.241

FIGURES

Figure 1. New VRE acquisition at a tertiary care hospital from November 2016 through August 2019. Newly identified VRE cases (clinical and rectal) per month for the study time period are shown. Year labels across the x-axis correspond to January of each year. Clinical isolates are shown in red, and rectal screening isolates are shown in blue. The black line indicates the rate of new VRE acquisition per 1000 patient days for each month.




Figure 2. Genomic analysis of same-patient isolates. (A) Days between sampling of isolates belonging to the same sequence type (ST) versus different STs in patients that were repeatedly sampled. P-value is from a Mann Whitney U-test. (B) Pairwise single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) between isolates collected from the same patient and belonging to the same ST, calculated using species SNPs (red), ST SNPs (green) and SKA SNPs (blue). (C) Pairwise SNPs versus days between samples for isolates collected from the same patient and belonging to the same ST, calculated with SKA SNPs (blue) or ST SNPs (green).




Figure 3. Inclusion of rectal swab isolates increases the number and size of genetically related VRE isolate clusters. (A) Waterfall timeline plot of isolate culture dates for 865 isolates belonging to 185 genetically related clusters. Isolates are colored by source and horizontal lines connecting isolates are colored by ST. The time period during which rectal swab isolates were collected is shaded in grey. (B) Cluster network diagram. All 1243 isolates are shown as nodes and are colored by collection source, with clinical isolates in red and rectal screening isolates in blue. Edges connect isolates within the same cluster. Isolates are grouped by MLST. All STs are *E. faecium*, except EF-ST6 which is *E. faecalis* ST6. (C) Raincloud plot showing cluster connections (i.e., edges in panel B) between clinical isolates when considering only clinical isolate clusters (red, left), versus clinical and rectal screening isolate clusters (teal, right).






Figure 4. Hospital units associated with VRE transmission. (A) Heatmap showing geo-temporal transmission links between isolates in each cluster, considering both clinical and rectal

screening isolates. (B) Heatmap showing geo-temporal transmission links between clustered

clinical isolates only. Counts within each cell represents the total number of isolates in the cluster

(vertical columns) with possible unit transmission (horizontal rows). Leftmost columns show the

total counts across all columns.



SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Table S1. List of isolates in the dataset, including isolate ID, year of collection, species, source, cluster, and ST.

Table S2. Geo-temporal links between clinical versus clinical and rectal isolates.

	Isolates Related			Isolates with Geo-temporal Links (%)		
	Clinical Isolates	Rectal Isolates	Total Isolates	Clinical Isolates	Rectal Isolates	Total
Clinical-only	185	NA	185	33 (17.8)	NA	33 (17.8)
Clinical + Rectal	233	632	865	47 (20.2)	224 (35.4)	271 (31.3)

Table S3. 30-day outcomes of 120 VRE clinical isolates that clustered with a prior rectal isolate.

Source	Isolates	Readmission (%)	ICU Admission (%)	Death (%)	NHSN HAI (%)
Blood	19	1 (5.3)	7 (36.8)	7 (36.8)	12 (63.2)
Body fluid/Other	5	2 (40.0)	3 (60.0)	2 (40.0)	2 (40.0)
Tissue/Wound	41	2 (4.9)	6 (14.6)	6 (14.6)	22 (53.7)
Urine	55	6 (10.9)	5 (9.1)	1 (1.8)	6 (10.9)
Total	120	11 (9.2)	21 (17.5)	16 (13.3)	42 (35.0)

ICU: Intensive-care unit; NHSN: National Healthcare Safety Network

Figure S1. Geo-temporal transmission analysis approach.




Figure S2. SNP distance comparisons. Pairwise SKA SNPs were calculated for all same-person isolates (blue), same-cluster isolates (green), and different person/different cluster isolates (red).




Figure S3. Transmission rates in the non-rectal screening versus clinical and rectal screening time periods. Transmission rate was defined as the number of days between collection of related isolates.

