

1 **Title:** A Tear-Based Approach for Rapid Identification of Bacterial Pathogens in Corneal Ulcers
2 Using Nanopore Sequencing

3
4 **Authors:** Mark Dibbs, BS,¹⁺ Michelle Matesva, MD,¹⁺ Despoina Theotoka, MD, MSc,¹
5 Christina Jayaraj, BS,¹ Beruk Metiku, BS,¹ Patrick Demkowicz, BS,¹ Jacob S. Heng, MD, PhD,¹
6 Yvonne Wang, MD,¹ Christine Y. Bakhoun, MD, MAS,^{2,3} Jessica Chow, MD,¹ and Mathieu F.
7 Bakhoun, MD, PhD^{1,4,5*}

8
9 ⁺ denotes equal contributions

10 *Corresponding author

11

12 Meeting Presentation: N/A

13

14 Financial support: This study was supported through a grant from the Connecticut Lions Eye
15 Research Foundation. M.F.B. is supported by NIH Research Grant P30CA016359 from the
16 National Cancer Institute, R21EY035090 from the National Eye Institute, and by the Office of
17 the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs through the Melanoma Research Program
18 under Award No. HT9425-23-1-1070. C.Y.B. is funded by American Heart Association Award
19 857722 and K23 DK129836 from the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney
20 Diseases.

21

22 Conflict of Interest: No conflicting relationship exists for any author.

23

24 Address for Reprints:

25 Mathieu F. Bakhoun, MD, PhD

26 300 George St. #8107B

27 New Haven, CT 06511

28 mathieu.bakhoun@gmail.com

29

30 Keywords: Corneal ulcers, Tears, Nanopore sequencing

31

32 Abbreviations and Acronyms: PCR = polymerase chain reaction

33

¹ Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Science, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut.

² Section of Nephrology, Department of Pediatrics, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut.

³ Clinical and Translational Research Accelerator, Department of Medicine, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut.

⁴ Department of Pathology, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut.

⁵ Yale Cancer Center, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

34 **Abstract**

35
36 **Purpose:** Corneal ulcers pose a significant threat to vision, with the need for prompt and precise
37 pathogen identification being critical to effective treatment. This study assesses the efficacy of
38 using next-generation portable sequencing (Nanopore Technology) to detect and identify
39 bacterial pathogens directly from tear samples, providing a non-invasive alternative to traditional
40 corneal scraping and culture, which are limited by high false-negative rates.

41
42 **Design:** Prospective observational study.

43
44 **Participants:** Ten participants diagnosed with corneal ulcers.

45
46 **Methods:** Tear samples were collected from the ocular surface using Schirmer strips. Corneal
47 scrapings and cultures were performed as medically indicated. The 16S rRNA gene was
48 amplified directly from the tear samples using polymerase chain reaction (PCR), and Nanopore
49 sequencing was used for bacterial species identification and taxonomic classification.
50 Comparative analysis was conducted to evaluate the concordance between Nanopore sequencing
51 results and traditional culture methods.

52
53 **Main Outcome Measures:** Comparison of bacterial species detected via Nanopore sequencing
54 with those identified through traditional culture methods.

55
56 **Results:** Bacterial DNA was identified in 8 of the 10 samples analyzed using the tear-based
57 sequencing method. Notably, Nanopore sequencing accurately identified the causative bacteria in
58 all 4 samples that exhibited bacterial growth on culture. Additionally, it detected bacterial
59 pathogens in 2 of the 4 ulcers that did not show bacterial growth on culture. In 2 cases where
60 cultures could not be obtained due to the small size of the ulcer, tear sequencing successfully
61 identified bacterial species, highlighting potentially overlooked pathogens in corneal ulcers.

62
63 **Conclusions:** PCR amplification of 16S RNA directly from tears followed by Nanopore
64 sequencing is an effective, non-invasive method to identify bacterial pathogens in corneal ulcers,
65 offering non-inferior results to traditional culture methods. This technique not only allows for the
66 detection of traditionally hard-to-culture organisms, providing immediate diagnostic value to
67 guide treatment, but also enhances our understanding of the microbiological landscape of corneal
68 ulcers, thereby informing more effective treatment strategies.

69 **Introduction**

70
71 Corneal ulcers represent a significant ophthalmological emergency, often leading to irreversible
72 corneal damage and visual impairment. Globally, microbial keratitis, which is the primary cause
73 of corneal ulcers, is estimated to contribute to approximately 1.5 to 2 million cases of unilateral
74 blindness annually.¹ In the United States, bacterial infections are most frequently responsible for
75 these conditions.² Traditionally, the diagnosis of corneal ulcers has relied on corneal scraping to
76 collect samples for culturing and identifying the causative organism. This method, while
77 considered the gold standard, is invasive, time-consuming, and exhibits variable sensitivity (38-
78 66%),³ largely dependent on the size of the ulcer and the type of organism. Culture results, which
79 can take several days to weeks, often delay the initiation of appropriate antimicrobial therapies,
80 thereby extending patient discomfort and increasing the risk of complications and vision loss.

81
82 In contrast, next-generation sequencing technologies, such as Nanopore sequencing, offer a
83 compelling alternative for microbial identification. This portable sequencing technology enables
84 real-time basecalling, which significantly accelerates the pathogen identification process. Prior
85 studies have validated the efficacy of Nanopore sequencing in various clinical scenarios,
86 demonstrating its capability not only to identify microbial agents but also to predict antibiotic
87 resistance.⁴⁻⁸ However, traditional approaches still require DNA extraction – and in the case of
88 corneal ulcers invasive corneal scrapings – which necessitates specialized equipment and skills.

89
90 Tears possess a robust antimicrobial defense system which is crucial for protecting the ocular
91 surface from infections. Factors such as Immunoglobulin A, which neutralizes and prevents
92 pathogen adhesion; lysozyme, an enzyme that breaks down bacterial cell walls; lactoferrin,
93 which possesses direct bactericidal effects; and enzymes like secretory Phospholipase A2 and
94 Beta-lysin, which disrupt bacterial membranes, all contribute to this protective mechanism.^{9,10}
95 These antimicrobial agents not only protect the eye but also facilitate the lysis of microbial cells,
96 leading to the release of microbial DNA directly into the tears.

97
98 Under this premise, we hypothesized that it would be possible to detect microbial DNA directly
99 from tear samples obtained from eyes with corneal ulcers, thus eliminating the need for corneal
100 scrapings and DNA extraction. This would provide a non-invasive, efficient method for
101 diagnosing ocular surface infections. Here, we conducted a prospective study on individuals
102 presenting with bacterial corneal ulcers to compare the diagnostic sensitivity and specificity of
103 the tear-based sequencing method to the traditional culture method.

104
105

106 **Methods**

107

108 **Study Design and Subjects Enrollment**

109 This is a prospective observational cohort study that was conducted in accordance with the
110 principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the Institutional Review Board of
111 Yale University. Informed consent was obtained from all patients. Data on demographics,
112 medical history, and medication use were collected from the patients' medical records at the time
113 of enrollment. Statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics software (version
114 29).

115

116 Participants included in the study were adults aged 18 years and older who had a clinical
117 diagnosis of microbial keratitis confirmed by an ophthalmologist. Eligible individuals presented
118 with symptoms consistent with corneal ulcers, such as eye redness, pain, and visual impairment,
119 and were able to provide informed consent. Exclusion criteria included individuals with a history
120 of corneal transplantation within the prior 6 months. We also excluded those diagnosed with
121 viral or fungal keratitis based on preliminary clinical assessments, culture results, or prior
122 medical records.

123

124 **Tear Collection**

125 Tear samples were collected from the inferior fornix using a sterile Schirmer strip, avoiding
126 contact with the eyelashes. The strip was subsequently placed in a microcentrifuge tube. Tears
127 were collected following centrifugation for 2 minutes at 5000 RPM and stored at -80°C.

128

129 **Corneal Scraping**

130 Corneal scraping was performed as part of the standard of care for patients presenting with
131 symptoms indicative of microbial keratitis, in accordance with established clinical guidelines.
132 The decision to perform corneal scraping was made at the discretion of the treating physician
133 based on the severity of the ulcer, size, location, and clinical presentation of the infection. The
134 procedure was carried out using a slit lamp for magnification. The patient's eye was anesthetized
135 with a topical anesthetic to ensure comfort during the procedure. Using a sterile blade, a small
136 sample of the epithelial tissue was carefully removed from the ulcer. The collected samples were
137 immediately placed in appropriate culture media or transport media to preserve microbial
138 viability and transported to the laboratory for prompt culturing and analysis.

139

140

141 **Nanopore 16S rRNA Amplification and Sequencing**

142 Amplification and sequencing of the 16S rRNA gene, which is universal across bacterial species,
143 were performed using the Oxford Nanopore Technology 16S Barcoding Kit 1-24 (SQK-16S024).
144 The 16S rRNA gene was amplified using the LongAmp Hot Start Taq 2X Master Mix (New
145 England Biolabs, Massachusetts, USA). One uL of the tear sample was added to the master mix

146 and barcoded primers in a reaction mix volume of 50 uL. Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) was
147 performed at the following settings: an initial denaturation step at 95°C for 1 minute, followed by
148 50 cycles at 95°C for 20 seconds, 55°C for 30 seconds, and 65°C for 2 minutes, and a final
149 extension step at 65°C for 5 minutes. The rest of the library preparation was performed using the
150 recommended protocol for ONT kit SQK-16S024 for compatibility with the Flongle flow cell.
151 PCR products were purified using AMPure XP Beads (Beckman Coulter, USA) following the
152 Nanopore protocol. Sequencing runs were performed using the R9.4.1 Flongle flow cell (FLO-
153 FLG001, Oxford Nanopore Technologies) on a MinION Mk1B Nanopore sequencer. Sequencing
154 was allowed to proceed until a plateau of reads was achieved, which generally took between 4
155 and 12 hours.

156

157 **Analysis and Bacterial Identification**

158 Basecalling was performed using the built-in Guppy basecaller on MinKnow, which translates
159 the raw signal data from the Nanopore sequencer into nucleotide sequences. For species
160 identification, the cloud-based EPI2ME FASTQ16S pipeline (v2023.04.21) provided by Oxford
161 Nanopore Technology was utilized. The pipeline classifies the results from each sequencing run
162 according to the NCBI 16S rRNA gene BLAST database. A minimum *qscore* of 7 was set,
163 which indicates the quality threshold for basecalling accuracy; a higher *qscore* represents a
164 higher confidence in the accuracy of the nucleotide base calls. In cases where multiple reads
165 were identified, the determination of the causative organism was based on the highest read count.

166 **Results**

167

168 **Demographics of study participants and clinical presentation**

169

170 There were 10 subjects who were included after meeting the study criteria. The mean age was
171 50.2 years. There were 6 males and 4 females. The ulcer was present in the left eye of 5 subjects
172 and right eye of 5 subjects. Patient demographics are summarized in **Table 1**.

173

174 Symptoms at presentation included blurred vision, pain, pink eye, foreign body sensation,
175 discharge, tearing, and sensitivity to light. Time of symptom onset prior to presentation ranged
176 from 1 to 14 days with a mean of 4.7 days. Risk factors for the development of corneal ulcer
177 included use of soft contact lenses (n = 6), history of long hospitalization with associated
178 bacteremia (n = 1), blepharitis (n = 1), status post superficial keratectomy 7 days prior to
179 diagnosis (n = 1), and loose suture in a patient with a penetrating keratoplasty (n = 1). Best
180 corrected or pinhole visual acuity at presentation ranged from 0 to 2.40 LogMAR with a mean of
181 1.07 LogMAR, and a standard deviation of 0.88 LogMAR.

182

183 On examination, 9 patients presented with a single corneal infiltrate while one patient had 2
184 infiltrates of comparable size. Corneal ulcers were centrally located in 50% of the cases, with the
185 remainder being peripheral. The average size of infiltrates measured 2.09 mm vertically (range, 1
186 mm to 5 mm) and 2.20 mm horizontally (range, 1 mm to 5 mm). No ulcers extended to the sclera
187 or limbus. Two patients developed hypopyon.

188

189 Eight subjects underwent corneal scraping for culture, while 2 had ulcers considered too small
190 for scraping. A total of 10 tear samples were collected.

191

192 **Summary of culture results**

193 Of the 8 subjects who underwent corneal scraping and culture, 4 exhibited bacterial growth on
194 culture. The bacteria identified included coagulase negative *Staphylococcus* in broth (Subject 1),
195 *Staphylococcus aureus* (Subject 2), and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (Subjects 3 and 4), all
196 identified one day post-diagnosis. The remaining 4 subjects showed no bacterial growth on
197 culture media including blood agar, chocolate agar, and thioglycolate broth, which were
198 monitored for growth for 5 days. Results from culture are listed in **Table 2**.

199

200 **Nanopore sequencing results**

201 For the 4 subjects whose ulcer scrapings exhibited growth on culture, Nanopore sequencing
202 identified the predominant bacterial pathogens in each tear sample as follows: *Staphylococcus*
203 *saccharolyticus*, *Staphylococcus roterodami*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and again *Pseudomonas*
204 *aeruginosa*, respectively. *Staphylococcus saccharolyticus* is coagulase negative,¹¹ and
205 *Staphylococcus roterodami* is within the *Staphylococcus aureus* complex.¹²

206

207 Among the 4 subjects whose ulcers did not exhibit growth on culture, Nanopore sequencing
208 detected no bacteria in 2 cases, while identifying *Staphylococcus saccharolyticus* and
209 *Cutibacterium acnes* in the remaining 2.

210

211 For the 2 subjects with ulcers too small for culture, Nanopore sequencing identified
212 *Staphylococcus saccharolyticus* in one and *Kocuria rhizophila* in the other. Results from
213 Nanopore sequencing compared to results from culture are listed in **Table 2**. Detailed results
214 featuring taxonomic classification for each case along with a synopsis of the clinical presentation
215 are provided in **Figures S1-S8**.

216

217 **Discussion**

218

219 Our findings demonstrate the efficacy of PCR amplification of the 16S gene directly from tears,
220 followed by Nanopore sequencing, in identifying the causative bacterial agents of corneal ulcers.
221 This method demonstrated high sensitivity, successfully detecting bacterial pathogens in all
222 samples that were positive by traditional culture methods. Notably, it also identified bacterial
223 DNA in cases where traditional cultures failed, suggesting that tear-based Nanopore sequencing
224 may offer greater sensitivity compared to standard culture-based methods. This non-invasive
225 approach eliminates the need for DNA extraction and delivers results within hours, which is
226 crucial for the timely management of corneal ulcers.

227

228 Traditional culture-based diagnostics are often limited by high false-negative rates, which range
229 between 32.6-79.4%.^{13,14} This limitation stems from several factors, including variability in
230 sample collection techniques and the fastidious nature of certain pathogens that do not grow
231 under standard culture conditions. In contrast, our tear-based sequencing approach, which relies
232 on detecting bacterial DNA, should in theory circumvent these hurdles. Expectedly, in our study,
233 this method identified bacterial reads in 2 of the 4 ulcers that did not exhibit growth on culture,
234 indicating higher sensitivity than traditional methods. Specifically, Nanopore sequencing
235 identified *Staphylococcus saccharolyticus* and *Cutibacterium acnes* as the predominant bacterial
236 species in culture-negative ulcers, both of which are known to be associated with corneal ulcers
237 or eye infections.^{15,16} Notably, *Cutibacterium acnes*, formerly known as *Propionibacterium*
238 *acnes*, is considered a fastidious organism due to its stringent growth requirements.^{17,18}

239

240 Moreover, the tear-based approach could be particularly useful in clinical settings where access
241 to an ophthalmologist is not feasible or laboratory resources are limited, as it requires no
242 specialized equipment or training for sample collection, compared with the traditional culture
243 techniques which require corneal scrapings by an ophthalmologist using a slit-lamp. The
244 sequencing method offers significant benefits because it is non-invasive, eliminating the
245 discomfort and potential complications associated with corneal scrapings. Additionally, its

246 ability to bypass DNA extraction helps deliver rapid results, meeting a critical clinical need for
247 quick and accurate diagnostics to guide treatment.

248
249 Another advantage of this sequencing-based method is its ability to detect low-abundance
250 pathogens and provide insights into the polymicrobial nature of corneal ulcers. In our study,
251 causative organisms identified by Nanopore included pathogens commonly associated with
252 corneal ulcers such as *Staphylococcus*, *Pseudomonas*, and *Cutibacterium acnes*. Notably,
253 *Kocuria rhizophila* has not been previously reported as a cause of corneal ulcers. It belongs to
254 the *Kocuria* genus, a group of gram-positive bacteria that, in rare cases, can cause infectious
255 keratitis in immunocompromised patients.¹⁹⁻²¹ Nanopore sequencing was particularly effective at
256 identifying causative bacterial agents in corneal ulcers that were too small for conventional
257 scraping and culture, highlighting its utility in detecting the polymicrobial etiology of these
258 infections. Of the 8 eyes that yielded positive results on Nanopore, 7 showed reads from more
259 than one bacterial genus. This finding aligns with previous reports on the polymicrobial nature of
260 infection-induced corneal ulcers. For instance, in one study, among 81 corneal ulcers analyzed
261 via culture, 43% yielded more than one bacterial organism.²² Other studies have estimated that
262 between 1.9% and 25% of corneal ulcers are polymicrobial in nature.²³⁻²⁵ Our findings suggest
263 that polymicrobial infections may be more common than previously recognized, possibly due to
264 the enhanced detection capabilities of this new method. These findings also indicate that in
265 corneal ulcers, a favorable environment may be conducive to the growth of multiple bacterial
266 species.

267
268 This study is limited by its small sample size and the fact that it was conducted at a single center,
269 which may restrict the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the risk of contamination
270 from eyelid skin or during the tear collection and sequencing processes cannot be completely
271 ruled out. Some detected bacterial species might represent contaminants from the normal ocular
272 flora.²⁶⁻²⁹ Furthermore, while Nanopore sequencing demonstrated high sensitivity and specificity,
273 its accuracy needs to be validated across a broader spectrum of bacterial, fungal, and viral
274 pathogens.³⁰ Future research should also explore integrating this technology with antibiotic
275 susceptibility testing to enhance its clinical utility and inform more targeted treatment strategies.
276 Expanding the study to include more participants and multiple sites, along with testing for fungal
277 and viral pathogens and conducting real-time antimicrobial resistance profiling, are next steps to
278 build on these novel findings.

279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323

References

1. Ung L, Bispo PJM, Shanbhag SS, Gilmore MS, Chodosh J. The persistent dilemma of microbial keratitis: Global burden, diagnosis, and antimicrobial resistance. *Surv Ophthalmol.* May-Jun 2019;64(3):255-271. doi:10.1016/j.survophthal.2018.12.003
2. Hsu HY, Ernst B, Schmidt EJ, Parihar R, Horwood C, Edelstein SL. Laboratory Results, Epidemiologic Features, and Outcome Analyses of Microbial Keratitis: A 15-Year Review From St. Louis. *Am J Ophthalmol.* Feb 2019;198:54-62. doi:10.1016/j.ajo.2018.09.032
3. Cabrera-Aguas M, Khoo P, Watson SL. Infectious keratitis: A review. *Clin Exp Ophthalmol.* Jul 2022;50(5):543-562. doi:10.1111/ceo.14113
4. Low L, Fuentes-Utrilla P, Hodson J, et al. Evaluation of full-length nanopore 16S sequencing for detection of pathogens in microbial keratitis. *PeerJ.* 2021;9:e10778. doi:10.7717/peerj.10778
5. Khan M, Summers S, Rice SA, Stapleton F, Willcox MDP, Subedi D. Acquired fluoroquinolone resistance genes in corneal isolates of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Infect Genet Evol.* Nov 2020;85:104574. doi:10.1016/j.meegid.2020.104574
6. Sauerborn E, Corredor NC, Reska T, et al. Detection of hidden antibiotic resistance through real-time genomics. *Nature Communications.* 2024/06/28 2024;15(1):5494. doi:10.1038/s41467-024-49851-4
7. Leggett RM, Alcon-Giner C, Heavens D, et al. Rapid MinION profiling of preterm microbiota and antimicrobial-resistant pathogens. *Nature Microbiology.* 2020/03/01 2020;5(3):430-442. doi:10.1038/s41564-019-0626-z
8. Charalampous T, Kay GL, Richardson H, et al. Nanopore metagenomics enables rapid clinical diagnosis of bacterial lower respiratory infection. *Nature Biotechnology.* 2019/07/01 2019;37(7):783-792. doi:10.1038/s41587-019-0156-5
9. McDermott AM. Antimicrobial compounds in tears. *Exp Eye Res.* Dec 2013;117:53-61. doi:10.1016/j.exer.2013.07.014
10. Davidson HJ, Kuonen VJ. The tear film and ocular mucins. *Vet Ophthalmol.* Mar-Apr 2004;7(2):71-7. doi:10.1111/j.1463-5224.2004.00325.x
11. Ahle CM, Stødkilde K, Afshar M, et al. *Staphylococcus saccharolyticus*: An Overlooked Human Skin Colonizer. *Microorganisms.* Jul 23 2020;8(8)doi:10.3390/microorganisms8081105
12. Schutte AHJ, Strepis N, Zandijk WHA, Bexkens ML, Bode LGM, Klaassen CHW. Characterization of *Staphylococcus roterodami* sp. nov., a new species within the *Staphylococcus aureus* complex isolated from a human foot infection. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol.* Sep 2021;71(9)doi:10.1099/ijsem.0.004996
13. Ung L, Bispo PJM, Shanbhag SS, Gilmore MS, Chodosh J. The persistent dilemma of microbial keratitis: Global burden, diagnosis, and antimicrobial resistance. *Survey of Ophthalmology.* 2019/05/01/ 2019;64(3):255-271. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.survophthal.2018.12.003>
14. Zemba M, Dumitrescu OM, Dimirache AE, et al. Diagnostic methods for the etiological assessment of infectious corneal pathology (Review). *Exp Ther Med.* Feb 2022;23(2):137. doi:10.3892/etm.2021.11060
15. Priya R, Mythili A, Singh YR, et al. Virulence, Speciation and Antibiotic Susceptibility of Ocular Coagulase Negative Staphylococci (CoNS). *J Clin Diagn Res.* May 2014;8(5):Dc33-7. doi:10.7860/jcdr/2014/7867.4395

- 324 16. Ashby NS, Johnson TJ, Castillo-Ronquillo Y, et al. Cutibacterium (Formerly
325 Propionibacterium) acnes Keratitis: A Review. *Eye & Contact Lens*. 2023;49(5):212-218.
326 doi:10.1097/icl.0000000000000975
- 327 17. Elston MJ, Dupaix JP, Opanova MI, Atkinson RE. Cutibacterium acnes (formerly
328 Propionibacterium acnes) and Shoulder Surgery. *Hawaii J Health Soc Welf*. Nov 2019;78(11
329 Suppl 2):3-5.
- 330 18. Ashby NS, Johnson TJ, Castillo-Ronquillo Y, et al. Cutibacterium (Formerly
331 Propionibacterium) acnes Keratitis: A Review. *Eye Contact Lens*. May 1 2023;49(5):212-218.
332 doi:10.1097/icl.0000000000000975
- 333 19. Pedro-Aguilar L, Ramirez-Miranda A, Bautista-de Lucio VM, Navas A, Ortiz-Casas M,
334 Graue-Hernandez EO. Epidemiology and Outcomes of Kocuria Keratitis. *Eye Contact Lens*. Sep
335 2016;42(5):e20-4. doi:10.1097/icl.0000000000000173
- 336 20. Kate A, Bagga B, Joseph J, Mohamed A. Clinical Features and Outcomes of Kocuria
337 Keratitis and Comparison With Coagulase-Negative Staphylococci Keratitis. *Cornea*.
338 2020;39(8):957-960.
- 339 21. Ahmed N, Biswal I, Roy P, Grover R. Kocuria kristinae, an unusual pathogen causing
340 opportunistic infections in patients with malignancy. *Indian journal of medical microbiology*.
341 2014;32(4):456.
- 342 22. Pakzad-Vaezi K, Levasseur SD, Schendel S, et al. The Corneal Ulcer One-Touch Study:
343 A Simplified Microbiological Specimen Collection Method. *American Journal of*
344 *Ophthalmology*. 2015/01/01/ 2015;159(1):37-43.e1.
345 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2014.09.021>
- 346 23. Chan L, Lopez JB, Saifee M, Padmanabhan S, Chan MF, Yung M. Characterization of
347 Polymicrobial and Antibiotic-Resistant Infectious Keratitis in a County Hospital Setting. *Cornea*
348 *Open*. 2023;2(3):e0016. doi:10.1097/coa.0000000000000016
- 349 24. Fernandes M, Vira D, Dey M, Tanzin T, Kumar N, Sharma S. Comparison Between
350 Polymicrobial and Fungal Keratitis: Clinical Features, Risk Factors, and Outcome. *American*
351 *Journal of Ophthalmology*. 2015/11/01/ 2015;160(5):873-881.e2.
352 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2015.07.028>
- 353 25. Lim NCS, Lim DKA, Ray M. Polymicrobial Versus Monomicrobial Keratitis: A
354 Retrospective Comparative Study. *Eye & Contact Lens*. 2013;39(5)
- 355 26. Peter VG, Morandi SC, Herzog EL, Zinkernagel MS, Zysset-Burri DC. Investigating the
356 Ocular Surface Microbiome: What Can It Tell Us? *Clin Ophthalmol*. 2023;17:259-271.
357 doi:10.2147/oph.S359304
- 358 27. Petrillo F, Pignataro D, Lavano MA, et al. Current Evidence on the Ocular Surface
359 Microbiota and Related Diseases. *Microorganisms*. Jul 13
360 2020;8(7)doi:10.3390/microorganisms8071033
- 361 28. Miller D, Iovieno A. The role of microbial flora on the ocular surface. *Curr Opin Allergy*
362 *Clin Immunol*. Oct 2009;9(5):466-70. doi:10.1097/ACI.0b013e3283303e1b
- 363 29. Severn MM, Williams MR, Shahbandi A, et al. The Ubiquitous Human Skin Commensal
364 Staphylococcus hominis Protects against Opportunistic Pathogens. *mBio*. Jun 28
365 2022;13(3):e0093022. doi:10.1128/mbio.00930-22
- 366 30. Garg P, Rao GN. Corneal ulcer: diagnosis and management. *Community Eye Health*.
367 1999;12(30):21-3.
368

Table 1. Demographics and Clinical Characteristics of the Study Subjects

Subject ID	Sex	Age	Laterality	Presenting symptoms	Risk factors
1	Male	70-79	Right	Eye pain, discharge	History of long hospital course with associated bacteremia
2	Female	60-69	Right	Eye pain, discharge, blurry vision, conjunctival injection	Superficial keratectomy for removal of Salzmann's nodules 7 days prior to presentation
3	Female	40-49	Left	Eye pain, discharge, blurry vision, conjunctival injection, tearing	Contact lens user
4	Female	70-79	Left	Eye pain, discharge, foreign body sensation	Contact lens user
5	Male	50-59	Left	Eye pain, discharge, redness	Blepharitis
6	Male	<30	Left	Eye pain, conjunctival injection, blurry vision, tearing, photosensitivity	Contact lens user
7	Male	40-49	Right	Eye pain, conjunctival injection, blurry vision, tearing	Contact lens user
8	Male	60-69	Left	Blurry vision	Loose suture following penetrating keratoplasty
9	Female	30-39	Right	Eye pain, conjunctival injection, blurry vision, photosensitivity	Contact lens user
10	Male	<30	Right	Eye pain, foreign body sensation	Contact lens user

Table 2. Summary of Culture Results and Nanopore Sequencing Results

Subject ID	Culture results	Nanopore sequencing results	Concordance
1	Coagulase-negative <i>Staphylococcus</i>	<i>Staphylococcus</i> <i>saccharolyticus</i>	Yes
2	<i>Staphylococcus</i> <i>aureus</i>	<i>Staphylococcus</i> <i>roterodami</i>	Yes
3	<i>Pseudomonas</i> <i>aeruginosa</i>	<i>Pseudomonas</i> <i>aeruginosa</i>	Yes
4	<i>Pseudomonas</i> <i>aeruginosa</i>	<i>Pseudomonas</i> <i>aeruginosa</i>	Yes
5	No growth	<i>Staphylococcus</i> <i>saccharolyticus</i>	No
6	No growth	<i>Cutibacterium</i> <i>acnes</i>	No
7	No growth	no bacteria detected	Yes
8	No growth	no bacteria detected	Yes
9	Too small to culture	<i>Staphylococcus</i> <i>saccharolyticus</i>	Not applicable
10	Too small to culture	<i>Kocuria</i> <i>rhizophila</i>	Not applicable