

1 **Title:** Validation of rectal swabbing for total and aerobic gut microbiota study.

2

3 Julie Marin<sup>1</sup>, Paul Albin Bertoye<sup>1,3</sup>, Andre Birgy<sup>1,2</sup>, Samira Dziri<sup>3</sup>, Mathilde Lescat<sup>1,3,4</sup>.

4 <sup>1</sup> Université Sorbonne Paris Nord and Université Paris Cité, Inserm, IAME, F-93000 Bobigny,  
5 France

6 <sup>2</sup> Service Microbiologie, AP-HP, Hôpital Robert-Debré, F-75019 Paris, France

7 <sup>3</sup> Service Microbiologie, AP-HP, Hôpital Avicenne, F-93000 Bobigny, France

8 <sup>4</sup> Université Paris Cité, Inserm, Institut Cochin, F-75014 Paris, France

9

10 Corresponding author: Mathilde Lescat ([mathilde.lescat@gmail.com](mailto:mathilde.lescat@gmail.com))

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

27 **Abstract**

28 In microbiota research, whole stool sampling is the conventional approach but can be  
29 problematic or infeasible for certain patients. This study aims to validate the use of rectal  
30 swabbing as an alternative method for microbiota analysis and determine optimal storage  
31 conditions suitable for various clinical settings, including intensive care units. We evaluated  
32 different sampling techniques, conservation media and storage temperatures. Our findings  
33 indicated that rectal swabs yield microbiota diversity comparable to whole stool samples.  
34 Notably, storage conditions significantly impacted microbiota profiles, with increased *E. coli*  
35 and *Enterococcus sp.* quantifications observed at room temperature. Consequently, we  
36 recommend immediate refrigeration of rectal swabs to reliably assess aerobic and total  
37 microbiota, particularly for patients requiring urgent care such as antibiotic treatment.

38 **Keywords:** digestive microbiota, intensive care patients, rectal swab

39  
40 **Importance**

41 We developed a pragmatic approach to study total and aerobic gut microbiota, applicable in  
42 numerous clinical units such as intensive care or emergency units, where whole stool sampling  
43 is often impractical. This approach employs ESwab™ devices which are already commonly used  
44 in hospital.

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

## 52 **Introduction**

53           The human microbiota, a diverse community of microorganisms residing in our bodies,  
54 is a key area in health research. Particularly, the gut microbiota, mainly influenced by diet and  
55 antibiotics, plays a vital role in human health (De Filippo et al. 2010; Dethlefsen and Relman  
56 2011). Dysbiosis, characterized by imbalances in microbial composition, has been linked to  
57 various diseases, including obesity, inflammatory bowel diseases and cirrhosis (Liu et al. 2012;  
58 Tremaroli and Bäckhed 2012; Xu et al. 2012; Purchiaroni et al. 2013). Quantitative assessment  
59 of aerobic bacteria is also crucial for understanding severe infections. Indeed, imbalances in the  
60 gut microbiota are linked to infections, such as urinary tract infections caused by *Escherichia*  
61 *coli*, which correlate with elevated *E. coli* quantities in the digestive tract pre-infection.  
62 Understanding the interactions between the microbiota and pathogenic agents is of primary  
63 importance in the prevention and treatment of multiple diseases, paving the way for novel  
64 therapeutic strategies targeting microbiota modulation.

65           Investigating the gut microbiota in numerous patients presents challenges, especially  
66 when it comes to obtaining high-quality samples through conventional total fecal sampling  
67 methods. This difficulty is particularly pronounced in severely ill patients who require urgent  
68 antibiotic therapy. A comparison between rectal swabs and whole stool sampling has shown  
69 promise as an alternative, yielding comparable microbial compositions using 16S rRNA  
70 analysis (Radhakrishnan et al. 2023). However, these studies utilized dry swabs, which are no  
71 longer standard in microbiology analyses. Previous evaluations of gut microbiota using  
72 FecalSwab™ highlighted some differences compared to analyses performed on whole stools  
73 stored without a conservation medium. Notably, no evaluations have been conducted using  
74 ESwab™ devices which are the most often swabs used in hospitals (Tedjo et al. 2015a).

75           Concerning, culturomic based analysis other researchers have also investigated the use  
76 of rectal swabs, particularly ESwab™, which maintains the viability of several aero-anaerobic

77 bacteria such as *Streptococcus pneumoniae* and *Haemophilus influenzae*, as well as strictly  
78 anaerobic bacteria, for up to 48 hours at room temperature, with even better preservation at  
79 refrigerated temperatures (Van Horn et al. 2008). Additionally, comparative studies between  
80 ESwab™ and FecalSwab™ media have been conducted to assess the viability of various  
81 diarrheagenic bacteria under different temperature conditions. These studies found that  
82 FecalSwab™ devices provided better viability for some diarrheagenic strains and reference  
83 strains, such as *E. coli* ATCC 25922 and *Enterococcus faecalis* ATCC 29212, under  
84 refrigerated and frozen conditions (Hirvonen and Kaukoranta 2014). However, these studies  
85 did not focus on the viability of various natural isolates of commensal *Enterobacteriaceae* or  
86 *Enterococcus species*, which are the most frequent bacteria involved in infections originating  
87 from the digestive tract in cirrhotic patients. Beyond bacterial culture with reference strains,  
88 other studies have demonstrated that the ESwab™ medium can reliably be used to study the  
89 vaginal or skin microbiota (Bjerre et al. 2019; Mattei et al. 2019). Thus, the validation of rectal  
90 swabs using ESwab™, (the devices we use in the hospital), as a reliable tool for microbiota  
91 studies (16SrRNA and cutluomic analysis) is crucial.

92 To address the challenges of studying microbiota diversity in intensive care and other  
93 emergency units, we aimed in this study to (i) validate the sampling conditions and (ii) establish  
94 a robust conservation methodology using rectal ESwab™ for analyzing gut microbiota,  
95 encompassing both total and aerobic populations.

96

## 97 **Materials and methods**

### 98 **Healthy volunteer sampling**

99 Thirteen healthy donors provided fecal samples for our study. None had taken  
100 antibiotics or experienced any medical issues in the preceding 6 months. In accordance with  
101 APHP ethics regulations and the Declaration of Helsinki, all participants received

102 comprehensive information and provided consent. Fecal samples and rectal swabs, self-  
103 collected by the volunteers, were directly placed into sterile containers or ESwab™.  
104 Subsequently, the samples were transported to the laboratory within 24 hours of collection  
105 (Figure 1A). The figure 1 (A and B) was made with BioRender (biorender.com).

## 106 Evaluation of the rectal swab method for total microbiota sequencing and analysis

107 *DNA Extraction.* We collected 200 mg of total feces or the pellet of liquid contained in  
108 the ESwab™ (Copan Diagnostics, Italy) devices after centrifugation during 10 mn at 5000 rpm.  
109 We then used the DNeasyPowerSoil Pro 250kit® (Qiagen, Les Ulis, France) for total manual  
110 DNA extraction, following the manufacturer's protocol.

111 *16SrRNA Gene Sequencing.* Intestinal gut microbiota composition in collected samples  
112 was analyzed using 16SrRNA gene sequencing (Yarza et al. 2014) targeting the V4 variable  
113 region (Bukin et al. 2019). The manufacturer's instructions for the library preparation were  
114 followed, using KAPAHiFi HotStart ReadyMix (RocheLaboratories, Basel, Switzerland).  
115 Briefly, the amplification of the 16S region ("PCR1") was performed with the 515 forward  
116 primer (5'-GTGCCAGCMGCCGCGGTAA-3') and the 806 reverse primer (5'-  
117 GGACTACHVGGGTWTCTAAT-3') as described elsewhere (Caporaso et al. 2011). The  
118 multiplexing step of the samples on the 16S amplified regions ("PCR2") required the Nextera®  
119 Index Kit and Nextera®XT Index Kit V2 SetD. PCR products were quantified using the Qubit  
120 HS® normalized to 4nM for pooling and sequencing. 16SrRNA gene sequencing was  
121 performed with the Illumina MiSeq technology (paired-end reads 2\*250bp).

122 *Pipeline settings.* We followed the pipeline described in Li et al. (Li et al. 2016) the  
123 main steps are below. We controlled the quality and removed ambiguous sequences with  
124 FastQC (Andrews, 2010). We trimmed the residual sequences with Trimmomatic (Bolger et al.  
125 2014) (base quality score >20 and read lengths >50bp). We sorted the filtered reads into  
126 fragments 16 rRNA with SortMeRNA (Kopylova et al. 2012) using the rRNA reference

127 database SILVA\_SSU (Quast et al. 2013). Next with mothur (Schloss 2020) we i) removed  
128 sequences with ambiguous bases and sequences without overlapped regions (longer than 310  
129 bp), ii) aligned the bacterial 16S rRNA sequences to the regionally enriched bacterial  
130 references, iii) clustered highly similar sequences (with one or two nucleotide differences), iv)  
131 identified and removed chimeric sequences (UCHIME (Edgar et al. 2011)), v) taxonomically  
132 assigned the sequences to different phylotypes using a naive Bayesian algorithm (Wang et al.  
133 2007) and v) determined the taxonomic rank and computed the relative abundance for each  
134 phylotype.

135 *Diversity analysis.* To be able to compare alpha-diversity estimators among samples and  
136 methods, all samples were standardized to the same number of sequences (1000 sequences) by  
137 randomly resampling the OTU table ('rarefy\_even\_depth' function in the R package  
138 phyloseq(McMurdie and Holmes 2012)). We conducted alpha-diversity analysis at the bacterial  
139 genus level. We computed the Shannon index, which takes into account the number of OTU  
140 and their abundances ('estimate\_richness' function in the R package phyloseq(McMurdie and  
141 Holmes 2012)). Finally, we evaluated the OTU differential abundance ('DESeq2' function in  
142 the R package DESeq (Love et al. 2014).

### 143 **Evaluation of the rectal swab method for aerobic microbiota study**

144 *Comparison of sampling strategies and evaluation of ESwab™ medium.* To compare  
145 sampling conditions among 13 healthy volunteers, we estimated bacterial quantification by  
146 plating dilutions of suspensions from freshly weighed feces in physiological serum (as the  
147 reference) or suspensions from freshly weighed feces in ESwab™(Copan Diagnostics, Italy), as  
148 well as from weighted rectal swabs ESwab™ for each individual. These were plated on  
149 UriSelect4 plates (Bio-Rad, La Coquette Marches, France), as detailed in **Figure 1A**. Aerobic  
150 microbiota analysis involved quantifying bacteria in four main classes: *Escherichia coli*,  
151 *Enterococcus species* and other Gram negative and Gram positive bacteria species. Main

152 morphologies were confirmed using Matrix assisted Laser Desorption Ionisation Time of Flight  
153 (MALDI-TOF) mass spectrometer (Bruker, Champs-sur -Marne, France) identification before  
154 classification into the aforementioned groups. For each condition (WSeS for whole stool in  
155 ESwab™, RSeS for rectal swab in ESwab™

156 *Evaluation of Temperature storage.* To validate the storage temperature conditions  
157 post-sampling, we conducted a comparison of *E. coli* and *Enterococcus sp* quantification after  
158 inoculating feces from 10 other healthy volunteers into two tubes of ESwab™. One tube was  
159 stored at +4°C while the other was kept at room temperature. For each tube, we quantified *E.*  
160 *coli* and *Enterococcus sp.* at various time points: initial time (T0), 2 hours (T+2), 4 hours (T+4),  
161 8 hours (T+8), and 24 hours (T+24). Quantification involved plating dilutions of the ESwab™  
162 medium from each feces onto UriSelect4 plates (Bio-Rad, Marne La Coquette, France), as  
163 outlined in **Figure 1B**. In each case, suspected colonies of *E. coli* and *Enterococcus sp* were  
164 confirmed using MALDI-TOF identification (Bruker, Champs-sur -Marne, France). Then, for  
165 each condition of temperature (+4°C and 21°C) at each time point (T0, T+2; T+4, T+8 and  
166 T+24), we calculated the ratio of logarithms of quantifications of *E. coli* and *Enterococcus sp*,  
167 divided by the logarithm of the corresponding quantification at T0, respectively.

168

## 169 **Results**

### 170 **Validation of the sampling procedure: Evaluation of the rectal swab method for total** 171 **microbiota study**

172 We compared the alpha and beta diversities obtained with two sampling methods, rectal  
173 swab and whole stool, and two conservation media, ESwab™. We did not find any difference  
174 for the alpha diversity (OTU richness or Shannon index) between the two sampling methods,  
175 whether with ESwab™ conservation (paired Wilcoxon test, pvalue=0.25 and 0.84 for OTU  
176 richness and Shannon index respectively) (**Figure 2**). Next, we tested the OTU differential

177 abundance. With the ESwab™ conservation method, we did not find any difference, with the  
178 exception of the genus *Enterococcus* which was overrepresented in the whole stool samples  
179 compared to the rectal swab samples (Wald test, pvalue=9.88e-06).

### 180 **Evaluation of the rectal swab method for an aerobic microbiota study**

181 Overall, for the 13 volunteers, 11 brought back complete sampling (whole stool and  
182 rectal swabs), 2 only brought back whole stool. We then inoculated whole stool in ESwab™  
183 medium and compared the quantifications of the 4 main class of species between the whole  
184 stool, we considered as a reference, the whole stool in ESwab™ to determine the effect of the  
185 medium and the rectal swab in ESwab™ to determine the effect of the rectal swabbing. Overall,  
186 we observed a conservation of all Gram negative bacteria (*E. coli* and other when present in  
187 whole stool) in all conditions. However, we detected an important increase of *E. coli*  
188 quantifications in RSeS (multiple t-test with Benjamini-Hochberg correction, pvalue = 0.036  
189 and 0.042 when comparing RSeS to WS and RSeS respectively). For Gram positive bacteria,  
190 we found at least the species *Enterococcus* in their whole stool. We observed a loss of one and  
191 two out of the 13 donors in ESwab™ medium (for WTeS and RSeS respectively). We also  
192 observed the effect of rectal swabbing with the loss of respectively one *Enterococcus sp* and  
193 other Gram positive bacteria (*Streptococcus sp*) for respectively one and three volunteers  
194 **(Figure 3, Table S1).**

195 Considering increase of *E. coli* quantification in rectal swabs and the fact that healthy  
196 volunteers brought their samples (whole stool without any medium and rectal swabs in ESwab™  
197 medium) without any precaution of storage, we hypothesized that that media could have  
198 enhance multiplication of some bacteria in it. We then performed a comparison of *E. coli* and  
199 *Enterococcus sp* quantifications after inoculating feces from 10 other healthy volunteers into  
200 two tubes of ESwab™ in two conditions of temperature of storage (+4°C and room temperature)  
201 and quantified those two types of bacteria through time (T0, T+2, T+4, T+8, and T+24h)



202 **(Figure 4, Table S2)**. We observed a significant increase of quantifications of *E. coli* at room  
203 temperature (Pearson's correlation test,  $r = 0.62$ ,  $pvalue = 1.65e-06$ ) after 4 hours of incubation.  
204 We also detected an increase, although non-significant of *Enterococcus sp.* quantifications at  
205 room temperature (Pearson's correlation test,  $r = 0.25$ ,  $pvalue = 9.24e-02$ ). Quantifications  
206 remained stable at +4°C for both quantifications of *E. coli* and *Enterococcus sp.* (Pearson's  
207 correlation test,  $r = 0.04$  and  $0.07$ ,  $pvalue = 0.78$  and  $0.63$  respectively).

208

## 209 **Discussion**

210 In this study, we aimed to validate the conditions of sampling and conservation  
211 methodology for microbiota (total and aerobic) using rectal ESwab™. Our goal was to develop  
212 a pragmatic approach applicable in numerous clinical units such as intensive care or emergency  
213 units, where obtaining whole stool samples from fragile patients is often impractical.

214 We validated the rectal swab and the use of ESwab™ medium method for microbiota  
215 analysis by comparing different sampling conditions and conservation media using samples  
216 from 13 healthy volunteers. This evaluation was never been done to our knowledge on natural  
217 isolates of aerobic bacteria from digestive origin (Van Horn et al. 2008; Tedjo et al. 2015b).  
218 The samples included both whole stool and rectal swabs. We focused on alpha-diversities  
219 obtained from total microbiota analysis and quantifications of aerobic bacteria by aerobic  
220 cultures across four main classes: *E. coli*, *Enterococcus sp.*, other Gram negative and Gram  
221 positive bacteria. We observed a notable increase in *E. coli* quantification under rectal swabbing  
222 conditions. Healthy volunteers performed their swabbing and brought back it to the lab. They  
223 possibly did not properly conserve the sample at +4°C, which might explain our quantification  
224 results. To investigate this hypothesis, we tested storage conditions and found that samples  
225 stored at room temperature showed significant increases in *E. coli* quantifications, and in a  
226 lesser degree in *Enterococcus sp.* quantifications, while quantifications remained stable at 4°C.

227 This finding underscores the importance of maintaining appropriate storage temperatures for  
228 accurate bacterial quantifications.

229 Our findings also indicated a significant decrease in Gram positive retrieval for Gram  
230 positive bacteria such as *Enterococcus sp.* and *Streptococcus sp.* under rectal swabbing  
231 conditions and ESwab™. These observations suggest that rectal swabs might be less effective  
232 for certain bacterial populations, possibly due to challenges in conservation or sampling  
233 efficiency. Nevertheless, our study demonstrates that rectal swabs can reliably reflect the alpha  
234 diversity (OTU richness and Shannon index) observed in whole stool samples even if we  
235 observed some differences for *Enterococcus sp.* in quantifications and OTU richness.  
236 Differences in the relative abundance of bacteria species has also been reported when  
237 comparing total stool and Fecal transport swabs (FecalSwab™, Copan) (Tedjo et al. 2015).  
238 These differences might be explained by a slight growth disadvantage of certain bacterial taxa  
239 in some media, *Enterococcus species* in ESwab™ medium in our case.

## 240 **Conclusion**

241 Overall, despite some variability in quantifications of specific bacterial populations,  
242 rectal swabs remain a viable method for microbiota studies, particularly when optimized storage  
243 conditions are maintained. This decision simplifies procedures in hospital settings where  
244 ESwab™ devices are already commonly utilized.

245

## 246 **Ethical authorizations**

247 All individuals were collected thanks to ethical authorization n°CLEA 2019-72  
248 obtained by the “Comité local de Protection des Personnes” des hôpitaux universitaires de  
249 Paris Seine Saint Denis.

250

## 251 **Acknowledgements**

252 We thank all the participants of the study.

253

## 254 **Bibliographic references**

255 Andrews S. FastQC: A Quality Control Tool for High Throughput Sequence Data [Online].

256 Available online at: <http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/>.

257 Bjerre RD, Hugerth LW, Boulund F, Seifert M, Johansen JD, Engstrand L. Effects of

258 sampling strategy and DNA extraction on human skin microbiome investigations. *Sci Rep*.

259 2019 Nov 21;9(1):17287.

260 Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data.

261 *Bioinforma Oxf Engl*. 2014 Aug 1;30(15):2114–20.

262 Bukin YuS, Galachyants YuP, Morozov IV, Bukin SV, Zakharenko AS, Zemskaya TI. The

263 effect of 16S rRNA region choice on bacterial community metabarcoding results. *Sci Data*.

264 2019 Feb 5;6:190007.

265 Caporaso JG, Lauber CL, Walters WA, Berg-Lyons D, Lozupone CA, Turnbaugh PJ, et al.

266 Global patterns of 16S rRNA diversity at a depth of millions of sequences per sample. *Proc*

267 *Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2011 Mar 15;108(Suppl 1):4516–22.

268 De Filippo C, Cavalieri D, Di Paola M, Ramazzotti M, Poullet JB, Massart S, et al. Impact of

269 diet in shaping gut microbiota revealed by a comparative study in children from Europe and

270 rural Africa. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2010 Aug 17;107(33):14691–6.

271 Dethlefsen L, Relman DA. Incomplete recovery and individualized responses of the human

272 distal gut microbiota to repeated antibiotic perturbation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2011 Mar

273 15;108 Suppl 1:4554–61.

274 Edgar RC, Haas BJ, Clemente JC, Quince C, Knight R. UCHIME improves sensitivity and

275 speed of chimera detection. *Bioinforma Oxf Engl*. 2011 Aug 15;27(16):2194–200.

276 Hirvonen JJ, Kaukoranta SS. Comparison of FecalSwab and ESwab Devices for Storage and  
277 Transportation of Diarrheagenic Bacteria. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2014 Jul 1;52(7):2334–9.

278 Kopylova E, Noé L, Touzet H. SortMeRNA: fast and accurate filtering of ribosomal RNAs in  
279 metatranscriptomic data. *Bioinforma Oxf Engl.* 2012 Dec 15;28(24):3211–7.

280 Li F, Henderson G, Sun X, Cox F, Janssen PH, Guan LL. Taxonomic Assessment of Rumen  
281 Microbiota Using Total RNA and Targeted Amplicon Sequencing Approaches. *Front*  
282 *Microbiol.* 2016;7:987.

283 Liu J, Wu D, Ahmed A, Li X, Ma Y, Tang L, et al. Comparison of the gut microbe profiles  
284 and numbers between patients with liver cirrhosis and healthy individuals. *Curr Microbiol.*  
285 2012 Jul;65(1):7–13.

286 Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-  
287 seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol.* 2014;15(12):550.

288 Mattei V, Murugesan S, Al Hashmi M, Mathew R, James N, Singh P, et al. Evaluation of  
289 Methods for the Extraction of Microbial DNA From Vaginal Swabs Used for Microbiome  
290 Studies. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol.* 2019;9:197.

291 McMurdie PJ, Holmes S. Phyloseq: a bioconductor package for handling and analysis of  
292 high-throughput phylogenetic sequence data. *Pac Symp Biocomput Pac Symp Biocomput.*  
293 2012;235–46.

294 Purchiaroni F, Tortora A, Gabrielli M, Bertucci F, Gigante G, Ianiro G, et al. The role of  
295 intestinal microbiota and the immune system. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci.* 2013  
296 Feb;17(3):323–33.

297 Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, Gerken J, Schweer T, Yarza P, et al. The SILVA ribosomal  
298 RNA gene database project: improved data processing and web-based tools. *Nucleic Acids*  
299 *Res.* 2013 Jan;41(Database issue):D590-596.

300 Schloss PD. Reintroducing mothur: 10 Years Later. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2020 Jan  
301 7;86(2):e02343-19.

302 Tedjo DI, Jonkers DMAE, Savelkoul PH, Masclee AA, van Best N, Pierik MJ, et al. The  
303 effect of sampling and storage on the fecal microbiota composition in healthy and diseased  
304 subjects. *PloS One.* 2015a;10(5):e0126685.

305 Tedjo DI, Jonkers DMAE, Savelkoul PH, Masclee AA, van Best N, Pierik MJ, et al. The  
306 effect of sampling and storage on the fecal microbiota composition in healthy and diseased  
307 subjects. *PloS One.* 2015b;10(5):e0126685.

308 Tremaroli V, Bäckhed F. Functional interactions between the gut microbiota and host  
309 metabolism. *Nature.* 2012 Sep 13;489(7415):242–9.

310 Van Horn KG, Audette CD, Sebeck D, Tucker KA. Comparison of the Copan ESwab System  
311 with Two Amies Agar Swab Transport Systems for Maintenance of Microorganism Viability.  
312 *J Clin Microbiol.* 2008 May;46(5):1655–8.

313 Wang Q, Garrity GM, Tiedje JM, Cole JR. Naive Bayesian classifier for rapid assignment of  
314 rRNA sequences into the new bacterial taxonomy. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2007  
315 Aug;73(16):5261–7.

316 Xu M, Wang B, Fu Y, Chen Y, Yang F, Lu H, et al. Changes of fecal Bifidobacterium species  
317 in adult patients with hepatitis B virus-induced chronic liver disease. *Microb Ecol.* 2012  
318 Feb;63(2):304–13.

319 Yarza P, Yilmaz P, Pruesse E, Glöckner FO, Ludwig W, Schleifer KH, et al. Uniting the  
320 classification of cultured and uncultured bacteria and archaea using 16S rRNA gene  
321 sequences. *Nat Rev Microbiol.* 2014 Sep;12(9):635–45.

322

323

324 **Figure legends**

325 **Figure 1.** Schematic description of the protocols tested to validate (A) the conditions of  
326 sampling (total stool/rectal swab) in ESwab™ medium and (B) the temperature condition of  
327 storage for the total and aerobic microbiota studies in intensive conditions of clinical practice.

328 **Figure 2.** Comparison of the alpha diversity (OTU richness and Shannon index) among  
329 sampling (rectal swab versus whole stool) in ESwab™.

330 **Figure 3.** Quantifications of four main groups of bacteria (*Escherichia coli*, other Gram  
331 negative bacteria, *Enterococcus sp.* and other Gram positive bacteria) for different media and  
332 sampling procedure. The quantifications were in logarithmic scales. The different conditions  
333 were indicated respectively as WSeS for whole stool in ESwab™ and RSeS for rectal swab in  
334 ESwab™. Missing samples are indicated in grey.

335 **Figure 4.** Relative quantifications of *Escherichia coli* and *Enterococcus sp* across time to the  
336 corresponding ones at T0. The quantifications were in logarithmic scales. FS and RT  
337 corresponded to the temperature conditions of storage, +4°C and room temperatures.

338


339 **Supplementary Online Material (SOM)**

340 **Table S1.** Quantifications of four main groups of bacteria (*Escherichia coli*, other Gram  
341 negative bacteria, *Enterococcus sp.* and other Gram positive bacteria) for different sampling  
342 procedure.

343 **Table S2.** Quantifications of *Escherichia coli* and *Enterococcus sp.* in ESwab™ medium across  
344 the time at fridge and room temperatures.


345

A.




Created in BioRender.com 

B.




Created in BioRender.com 

# ESwabTM medium



OTU richness



Shannon

rectal swab

whole stool



