

1 **Population Structure Drives Differential Methicillin-resistant**

2 ***Staphylococcus aureus* Colonization Dynamics**

3

4 **Matthew S. Metchen MPH<sup>1</sup>, Christopher T. Short PhD<sup>1</sup>, Matthew Samore MD<sup>2</sup>, Eric**

5 **T. Lofgren MSPH, PhD<sup>1</sup> for the CDC Modeling Infectious Diseases in Healthcare**

6 **Program (MInD-Healthcare)**

7

8 <sup>1</sup>Paul G. Allen School for Global Animal Health, College of Veterinary Medicine,

9 Washington State University, Pullman, WA

10 <sup>2</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, University of Utah School of Medicine, University of

11 Utah, Salt Lake City, UT

12

13 Corresponding Author Email: [Eric.Lofgren@wsu.edu](mailto:Eric.Lofgren@wsu.edu)

14

15 **Keywords:** MRSA, colonization, ICU, mathematical model, metapopulation

16

17 **Abstract**

18 **Background:** Using a model of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA)  
19 within an intensive care unit (ICU), we explore how differing hospital population  
20 structures impact these infection dynamics.

21 **Methods:** Using a stochastic compartmental model of an 18-bed ICU, we compared the  
22 rates of MRSA acquisition across three potential population structures: a Single Staff  
23 Type (SST) model with nurses and physicians as a single staff type, a model with  
24 separate staff types for nurses and physicians (Nurse-MD model), and a  
25 Metapopulation model where each nurse was assigned a group of patients. By varying  
26 the proportion of time spent with the assigned patient group ( $\gamma$ ) within the  
27 Metapopulation model, we explored whether simpler models may be acceptable  
28 approximations to more realistic patient-healthcare staff contact patterns.

29 **Results:** The SST, Nurse-MD, and Metapopulation models had a mean annual number  
30 of cumulative MRSA acquisitions of 40.6, 32.2 and 19.6 respectively. All models were  
31 sensitive to the same parameters in the same direction, although the Metapopulation  
32 model was less sensitive. The number of acquisitions varied non-linearly by values of  $\gamma$ ,  
33 with values below 0.40 resembling the Nurse-MD model, while values above that  
34 converged toward the metapopulation structure.

35 **Discussion:** The population structure of a modeled hospital has considerable impact on  
36 model results, with the SST model having more than double the acquisition rate of the  
37 more structured Metapopulation model. While the direction of parameter sensitivity  
38 remained the same, the magnitude of these differences varied, producing different  
39 infection rates across relatively similar populations. The non-linearity of the model's

40 response to differing values of  $\gamma$  suggests only a narrow space of relatively dispersed  
41 nursing assignments where simple model approximations are appropriate.

42 **Conclusion:** Simplifying assumptions around how a hospital population is modeled,  
43 especially assuming random mixing, may overestimate infection rates and the impact of  
44 interventions.

45

## 46 **Introduction**

47           The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) considers methicillin-  
48 resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) to be a serious threat to patient safety, and  
49 recent trends show that the incidence of infection is no longer declining as aggressively  
50 as it has for much of the last decade [1]. The evidence base for interventions to  
51 successfully address MRSA is mixed. For example, it has been difficult to quantify the  
52 effectiveness of MRSA screening and contact precautions, which has led to  
53 disagreement over their benefit [2]–[5]. Other efforts, such as improved hand hygiene  
54 are often successful [6], [7], but reducing MRSA acquisitions by means of improved  
55 transmission prevention continues to be a focus for hospital infection control efforts.

56           Preventing the spread of MRSA within intensive care units (ICUs) is especially  
57 critical, due to the vulnerable nature of the patients and the difficulty in treating severe  
58 infections. Patients admitted to the ICU have been found to have persistent colonization  
59 with MRSA 12-14 days after discharge from the hospital [8]. There is strong evidence  
60 that frequency and patterns of interaction between staff and patients play a critical role  
61 in transmission [9]. The ratio of nurses to patients has been found to contribute to the  
62 overall level of colonization and transmission within healthcare settings and ICUs.  
63 Lower nurse-to-patient ratios have a positive correlation with increased transmission  
64 and poor health outcomes [10]. Beyond this, clinical practices such as the use of  
65 consistent care teams, grouping particular types of patients together, or even the  
66 hospital's built environment may create distinctive sub-populations even within a single  
67 unit. These sub-populations then form a larger, interconnected "metapopulation", the  
68 infection dynamics of which, in a hospital setting, remain largely unexplored. In other

69 areas of infectious disease epidemiology, metapopulations and other complex  
70 population structures have been shown to be important [11], [12].

71 Studying the transmission of MRSA within an ICU is often a difficult task due to  
72 the highly constrained environment. The patient population within any given ICU is  
73 small, with patients sharing care team, being impacted by the same policies, and  
74 sharing the same environment, which violates the independence assumptions  
75 underlying many statistical techniques. There are limited or no control groups due to co-  
76 occurring interventions and the clinical care mission, and many potential interventions,  
77 such as policy changes, are difficult if not impossible to effectively blind as part of a  
78 clinical trial.

79 Using mathematical models can help alleviate many of these issues. Widely used  
80 models generally which assume random mixing between healthcare workers and  
81 patients, where all patients are cared for by all healthcare workers, but clinical practices  
82 such as the use of consistent care teams, grouping particular types of patients together,  
83 etc. naturally creates a metapopulation like structure within hospital units. Patient  
84 isolation and limited interaction with other patients creates sub-populations within the  
85 larger patient population forming a weakly connected metapopulation.

86 Evidence suggests that modeling disease transmission dynamics within  
87 metapopulations has an important role in understanding the underlying patterns that  
88 govern disease spread. One previous study [13] suggested that nurses caring for  
89 specific patients can reduce the basic reproductive number ( $R_0$ ) of a healthcare-  
90 associated pathogen below 1.0, though this model examined a particularly strict form of  
91 non-random mixing, examining the circumstance of a nurse visiting the *same* patient as

92 they previously cared for rather than visiting another patient. More specifically, the  
93 spatial patterns and aggregation of host populations are important in identifying how a  
94 pathogen is introduced and dispersed within a population [14]. Rarely, however, are  
95 healthcare settings modeled as metapopulations.

96 Using a stochastic compartmental model of an 18-bed ICU, we compared three  
97 potential population structures: a single staff type model with nurses and physicians as  
98 the same type of healthcare worker, a model with separate staff types for nurses and  
99 physicians where they are different types of healthcare workers, and a highly structured  
100 model where each nurse is assigned a specific group of patients, in order to examine  
101 the impact of treating an ICU with a metapopulation type structure. These models are  
102 hereafter referred to as “SST”, “Nurse-MD” and “Metapopulation” respectively. We  
103 explored the impact on the estimated number of MRSA acquisitions and the sensitivity  
104 of the different models to changes in their underlying parameters.

105 We then developed a hybrid model that allows a nurse to randomly interact with  
106 patients not originally under their direct care over some proportion of their workday. This  
107 hybrid model allows for a population that is primarily, but not exclusively, organized into  
108 distinct sub-populations, but still allows for some interaction between nurses and all  
109 patients. The limited random interaction represents variance from patient assignments  
110 often seen in the ICU environment, such as cross-coverage during breaks or complex  
111 procedures that require higher numbers of healthcare workers.

112

## 113 **Methods**

### 114 *Model Structure*

115 MRSA transmission was simulated in an 18-bed ICU that included six nurses and  
116 a dedicated critical care physician based on a previously published model [15]. Hospital  
117 staff are either uncontaminated ( $S_U$ ) or contaminated ( $S_C$ ), representing the presence of  
118 infectious material on their hands or person. Patients, similarly, are either uncolonized  
119 ( $P_U$ ) or colonized ( $P_C$ ). In the baseline model, patients are assumed to mix randomly with  
120 healthcare workers (HCWs) in the ICU, with no distinction between the nurses or the  
121 intensivist (Fig. 1).

122 Three alternative models were created to compare how different population  
123 structures within the ICU impacted MRSA acquisitions when relaxing the random mixing  
124 assumption. The “Nurse-MD” model retained random mixing but separated the  
125 intensivist from the nursing staff (Fig. 2). Separation of the physician also allowed the  
126 interactions between healthcare workers and the patients to be more realistic, using  
127 role-specific contact rates with patients, rather than a generic behavior that was the  
128 weighted average of nurse and physician contact rates. This resulted in physicians  
129 having less direct care tasks (touching the patient or their immediate surrounding  
130 environment) involving patients when compared to either nurses or the generic  
131 healthcare workers in the SST model. This model thus had six compartments within it:  
132 the number of patients either colonized ( $P_C$ ) or uncolonized ( $P_U$ ), the number of nurses  
133 either contaminated ( $N_C$ ) or uncontaminated ( $N_U$ ), and the two additional compartments  
134 representing the physician as either contaminated ( $D_C$ ) or uncontaminated ( $D_U$ ).

135 The second alternative model, the Metapopulation model, further segregated the  
136 healthcare workers by assigning each nurse a specific group of patients (one nurse for  
137 every three patients) and assuming the nurse cared exclusively for those patients. This

138 practice is common in many ICUs for continuity of care, familiarity, and scheduling  
139 purposes, and may be assumed to predominantly care for those patients. The model's  
140 compartments thus become further divided into six subpopulations, with the physician  
141 acting as a bridge between them by visiting all patients. (Fig. 3). This model structure  
142 creates a metapopulation that is closer to the actual organizational structure. This  
143 model does not assume full random mixing, but rather only assumes that the nurse  
144 visits each patient in their assigned group randomly.

145       Even where nurses are assigned a specific group of patients, a nurse will have  
146 some interaction with patients outside their assigned group due to cross coverage, staff  
147 breaks, or patient care tasks that require more than one nurse to perform. The final  
148 extension of this model adds an additional parameter,  $\gamma$ , to represent the amount of time  
149 a nurse spends in their assigned group, with the remainder of the time spent moving  
150 randomly among patients outside their assignment. In doing so, the expanded model  
151 effectively hybridizes the previous models, allowing the exploration of intermediate  
152 population structures between a purely random mixing model and one with strict  
153 assignment. In essence, when  $\gamma = 1/6$ , this model replicates the Nurse-MD model, as a  
154 nurse is no more likely to spend time with their assigned patients as they are any other  
155 five patient groups not assigned to them. Similarly, when  $\gamma = 1$ , the model replicates the  
156 Metapopulation model, where nurses are strictly confined to treating their assigned  
157 patients. The state transitions for each model, and the equations that govern those  
158 transitions, may be found in the Supplemental Material as Tables S1, S2 and S3  
159 respectively for the SST, Nurse-MD and the expanded Metapopulation model with  $\gamma$   
160 respectively.



161           Several assumptions underlie all four models. First, patients are assumed to  
162 have a single-occupancy room and not to interact with other patients. The nurses and  
163 the physician only interact with the patients and do not interact with each other – or  
164 more specifically, do not interact in ways relevant to pathogen transmission. The ICU is  
165 considered a “closed ICU” – physicians from outside the ICU do not see patients. The  
166 ICU is also considered to be at 100% capacity – if a patient is discharged it is assumed  
167 another patient is admitted to the bed immediately [16]. A hand hygiene opportunity  
168 occurs after every direct care task and personal protective equipment such as gowns  
169 and gloves are changed on entry and exit from the rooms of colonized patients. Note  
170 both of these are performed with imperfect compliance (Table 1). Lastly, we assumed  
171 that MRSA colonization was detected instantly and with perfect sensitivity and  
172 specificity to simplify the model.

173

#### 174 *Parameterization*

175           Parameter values were obtained predominantly from a previously published  
176 model of MRSA transmission in an ICU [17] and are described in Table 1. The  
177 alternative models introduce new interactions between the patient and their healthcare  
178 team, which required rederivation of some parameters from their original sources [18]–  
179 [20]. Specifically, the hand hygiene and gown/glove change rates incorporate nurse and  
180 physician specific contact rates, which were recalculated using the same methods as in  
181 the previous work.

182           Contact rates between patients and healthcare workers were represented by  
183 direct care tasks per hour for each healthcare worker type. Direct care tasks are defined

184 as the physical interaction of the healthcare worker with the patient or their surrounding  
185 environment [20]. Effective hand-decontaminations per hour ( $\iota$ ) were calculated by the  
186 number of direct care tasks and taking into consideration the compliance rate and  
187 handwashing efficacy. Effective gown and glove changes per hour ( $\tau$ ) were calculated  
188 based on the number of visits to a patient per hour and a compliance rate – changing  
189 gowns and gloves was assumed to be 100% effective at removing contamination from a  
190 healthcare worker.

191 One additional parameter was added to the model differing from previously  
192 published work. A natural decolonization rate based on results from the STAR\*ICU Trial  
193 was added based on evidence that colonization of MRSA is limited, and natural  
194 decolonization can occur without targeted treatment or decontamination efforts, moving  
195 patients from  $P_C$  to  $P_U$  at a low rate absent any direct intervention [8], [21].

196

### 197 *Model Simulation*

198 The SST, Nurse-MD and Metapopulation models were simulated to count the  
199 number of patients who transitioned to the colonized state ( $P_C$ ) in order to compare the  
200 average number of MRSA acquisitions. The models were stochastically simulated using  
201 Gillespie's Direct Method [25] in Python 3.6 using the StochPy package [26] for 1000  
202 iterations per model. The initial conditions for each model was set to have no  
203 contaminated healthcare workers, either nurses or the physician, and no colonized  
204 patients, with initial MRSA infections being seeded from colonized members of the  
205 community being admitted to the ICU. Each iteration was run for a single year. The  
206 distribution of the acquisitions for each model's 1000 iterations was visualized in R

207 v3.5.1 using the vioplot package [27], and the difference between them assessed using  
208 a Kruskal-Wallis test. The code for the model simulation and subsequent analysis may  
209 be found at [github.com/epimodels/Metapopulation\\_MRSA](https://github.com/epimodels/Metapopulation_MRSA).

210

### 211 *Model Recalibration*

212 In addition to considering model outcomes using a single set of parameters  
213 (originally calibrated to the SST model), we also examined the difference in the  
214 estimated value of a single free parameter which could be fit within each model. The  
215 purpose of this recalibration is two-fold. First, it allows for a comparison of the models in  
216 a setting where their outcomes are equal. Second, it allows us to examine how each  
217 model form might influence the value of an estimated parameter – important information  
218 in a setting where models may be used to perform statistical inference and estimate  
219 intervention efficacy. The parameter chosen for this recalibration,  $\psi$ , is the probability of  
220 an effective colonization of an uncolonized patient from contact between a  
221 contaminated healthcare worker.

222 Approximate Bayesian Computation (ABC) [28] was used for the parameter  
223 fitting and to obtain an approximate Bayesian posterior of  $\psi$  for the SST, Nurse-MD and  
224 Metapopulation models. This method samples a candidate value from a prior  
225 distribution, performs the model simulation using that candidate, and compares a  
226 summary statistic from that simulation to a target statistic. The candidate value is  
227 accepted if the simulation's summary statistic equals the target statistic  $\pm$  an error term  
228  $\epsilon$ . This is performed repeatedly, and the resulting distribution of accepted candidates is  
229 an approximation of a Bayesian posterior distribution.

230 For this analysis, the target number of acquisitions was set to 5.94 acquisitions  
231 per 1,000 person-days with an  $\varepsilon$  of 15%, matching the rate seen in the control arm of a  
232 large randomized clinical trial on MRSA prevention during the study period [17]. A  
233 uniform prior bounded by 0.0 and 1.0 was used, and 1,000,000 candidate parameters  
234 were drawn from this distribution to obtain the approximated Bayesian posterior of  $\psi$  for  
235 each model, using a simulation procedure similar to the one described above. For  
236 comparison between models, the median of this distribution was used as the value for  
237  $\psi$ .

238

### 239 *Parameter Sensitivity Analysis*

240 In addition to assessing the difference in raw acquisitions in each model, we  
241 assessed the sensitivity of this outcome to changes in the model's parameters. All  
242 parameters in the model were allowed to vary uniformly  $\pm 50\%$  of their original values,  
243 and 100,000 parameter combinations were simulated for each model. For each model,  
244 the recalibrated value for  $\psi$  was used in order to ensure the models were compared  
245 against a consistent acquisition rate. The number of acquisitions in each simulation was  
246 then normalized as a percentage-change from the mean number of acquisitions. Linear  
247 regression was used on the normalized acquisition rate to determine the percentage  
248 change in acquisitions due to a single-percentage change in each parameter value.

249 A more structural sensitivity question within the Metapopulation model was  
250 explored by varying the amount of time a nurse spends exclusively with their assigned  
251 group vs. other patients on the ward,  $\gamma$ . The Metapopulation model including  $\gamma$  was  
252 simulated 10,000 times, drawing a value of  $\gamma$  for each iteration from a uniform

253 distribution bounded by 1/6 and 1. A segmented Poisson regression model was then fit  
254 to detect any thresholds in the value of  $\gamma$  where it's relationship to the rate of MRSA  
255 acquisitions notably changed, or if the transition between the Nurse-MD model ( $\gamma=1/6$ )  
256 and the Metapopulation model ( $\gamma=1$ ) was linear. This model incorporated linear and  
257 quadratic terms for  $\gamma$  and allowed the model to choose any number of break points.

258

## 259 **Results**

### 260 *Model Comparison*

261 When using the same parameter set (calibrated to the SST model), the  
262 probability density and average number of MRSA acquisition were significantly different  
263 between the SST, Nurse-MD and Metapopulation models ( $\chi^2 = 1796.8$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p >$   
264  $0.001$ ) (Fig. 4). Using the SST model as the baseline for comparison, a decrease in the  
265 average number of MRSA acquisitions were observed in both the separate Nurse-MD  
266 model and the Metapopulation model. By separating the physician from the nurses, the  
267 mean acquisitions decreased 20.7% from 40.6 acquisitions to 32.2 acquisitions,  
268 respectively. The Metapopulation model experienced a 51.7% decrease from the  
269 original SST model at 19.6 acquisitions.

270

### 271 *Model Recalibration*

272 The model parameter  $\psi$  (psi) (the probability of effective colonization of an  
273 uncolonized patient from contact with a contaminated healthcare worker) was used to  
274 calibrate the models. Calibration of the SST model resulted in the median value of the  
275 parameter of 0.024 (95% Credible Interval: 0.016, 0.034). The Nurse-MD model results

276 were very similar to the SST model, with a median value of 0.029 (95% Credible  
277 Interval: 0.019,0.042). In contrast, the Metapopulation model had a median  $\psi$  value of  
278 0.046 (95% Credible Interval: 0.032, 0.07), both a substantially higher estimate than the  
279 other models and one in which the bounds of the credible interval did not contain the  
280 other estimates. The altered contact patterns in the Metapopulation model thus needs  
281 substantially higher per-contact colonization probabilities to sustain the same level of  
282 contact.

283

#### 284 *Sensitivity Analysis*

285 While the Metapopulation model resulted in fewer acquisitions, certain  
286 parameters were found to affect the model outcomes to a larger magnitude when  
287 compared to the other models. The three parameters in SST model showing the largest  
288 proportional change ( $> 0.20$ ) in cumulative acquisitions (Fig. 5a): contact rate ( $\rho$ ),  
289 probability of patient colonization ( $\psi$ ), and hand-decontamination ( $\tau$ ). Similar findings  
290 were also found in the Nurse-MD model, though generally only for the nurse-specific  
291 parameters (Fig. 5b). The doctor-specific parameters had little effect on the model  
292 outcomes. Only one parameter of the Metapopulation model had a large change in  
293 cumulative acquisitions  $> 0.20$  – the nurse-specific contact rate. However, the  
294 parameters with the largest effects were consistent with the previous two models (Fig.  
295 5c).

296 The directionality of the overall change in cumulative acquisitions by parameter is  
297 an important measure of model stability and correct parameter estimates, as this  
298 reflects whether the models *qualitatively* give the same results as to whether or not a

299 particular parameter value changing results in an increase or decrease in MRSA  
300 acquisitions, even if the models disagree as to the specific value of that change. All of  
301 the parameters between the models are consistent in terms of directionality, with the  
302 Metapopulation model having a smaller change in magnitude of the cumulative  
303 acquisitions (Fig. 5d).

304

### 305 *Metapopulation Interactions*

306 The relationship between  $\gamma$  and MRSA acquisitions was non-linear (Fig. 6), with  
307 progressively higher values of  $\gamma$  resulting in drastically reduced rates of MRSA  
308 acquisition. The segmented Poisson regression model identified a single change point,  
309  $\gamma^*$ , at 0.40 (95% Confidence Interval: 0.37, 0.42). Values below  $\gamma^*$  were well  
310 approximated by the Nurse-MD model, and values above it rapidly approached the  
311 stricter assignment of the Metapopulation model.

312

### 313 **Discussion**

314 Developing interventions to reduce the spread or transmission of antibiotic-  
315 resistant pathogens, such as MRSA, is an important public health and healthcare goal  
316 due to costly on-going hospitalizations and difficulty of treatment. Mathematical models  
317 are an important tool in the development of these interventions, but only if they can  
318 represent the population and transmission dynamics of a hospital.

319 One important aspect of the highly structured hospital population is the  
320 interaction between patients and healthcare workers. Nurses in particular are typically  
321 assigned to a group of patients within a particular shift, suggesting the possibility of

322 modeling a hospital unit as a metapopulation. We developed a model using a  
323 metapopulation structure that explores how nurses-to-patient interactions may affect the  
324 transmission of pathogens in an ICU setting.

325 As compared to a model that assumes random mixing, which dominate the  
326 epidemiological compartmental model literature, a more structured metapopulation  
327 appears to be warranted when modeling MRSA within an ICU. The random mixing  
328 assumption allows a higher degree of interaction with the patients and healthcare  
329 workers, resulting in an over-estimation of both the overall rate of MRSA acquisition and  
330 an over-estimation of the impact of interventions.

331 While the models considered in this study had similar parameter sensitivity in  
332 terms of the *direction* of changes, the more highly structured models were relatively less  
333 sensitive. In all cases, the contact rate ( $\rho$ ), probability of patient colonization ( $\psi$ ), and  
334 hand-decontamination ( $\iota$ ) parameters had the largest impact, consistent with many of  
335 the known drivers of infection rates within hospitals.

336

## 337 **Conclusion**

338 When combined, these results suggest that while compartmental models that  
339 assume random mixing and those that have more structured populations may give  
340 qualitatively the same answer as to the benefit of an intervention, the magnitude of  
341 these estimates may vary considerably, which has implications for cost-effectiveness  
342 models and other studies that rely on these estimates. Additionally, if the interventions  
343 suggested by the model are implemented in practice, the performance of the  
344 intervention may differ from the model's predictions due to the choice of population



345 structure. Finally, these results show that fitted parameters can vary considerably even  
346 for very similar models, suggesting even mild changes in model form necessitate  
347 refitting, and parameter estimates are not transportable from one model to another  
348 model with a differing population structure.

349 Even within a highly structured population, there are events that will lead to the  
350 interactions outside the normal structure. In an ICU setting, it is foreseeable that events  
351 like emergencies, breaks, or cross-coverage of nurses will occur with a reasonable  
352 degree of frequency. Our model suggests that even relatively small increases in the rate  
353 at which these interactions occur can have outsized impacts on MRSA rates. This  
354 finding has broad implications for staffing levels and hospital policy and may provide an  
355 avenue for reducing MRSA rates that does not rely on individual-level actions.

356 This study has several limitations. While the Metapopulation model is a more  
357 granular representation of a hospital population than the more-common SST model, it  
358 too is a simplification. Similarly, the parameter estimates used in the model are  
359 imperfect. In particular, it is likely that the hand hygiene rate is likely higher than the  
360 rates occurring in many hospitals, as reported rates are often substantially inflated.  
361 However, these estimates are drawn primarily from the established literature, and  
362 represent the field's best understanding of the underlying processes.

363 Other limitations include the structure of the model – it focuses specifically on  
364 healthcare worker and patient interactions and does not account for interactions with  
365 individuals other than nurses and the physician. For example, interactions among  
366 patients, visitation by family and friends, medical or radiological technicians performing

367 a specific procedure, etc. are not represented. Similarly, transmission purely through  
368 environmental contamination is not represented.

369 Hospital settings are characterized by highly structured populations and very  
370 limited types of interactions. Despite this, these environments are rarely modeled as  
371 metapopulations, especially at the ward level. This study shows that the random mixing  
372 assumption results in an over-estimation of both the overall rate of MRSA acquisition  
373 and an over-estimation of the impact of interventions as expressed as changes in model  
374 parameter values. In contrast, a metapopulation model tends to result in proportionately  
375 lower acquisition rates and somewhat more attenuated responses to changes in  
376 parameters. These findings are consistent with observations of the effect of  
377 metapopulations in the disease ecology literature. These results suggest that, even at  
378 small scales, models that assume random mixing may be inappropriate and result in an  
379 overestimation in both acquisition rates and the impact of interventions.

380

### 381 **Acknowledgements**

382 Funding: This work was supported by the CDC Cooperative Agreement RFA-CK-17-  
383 001-Modeling Infectious Diseases in Healthcare Program (MInD-Healthcare). The  
384 authors would also like to acknowledge Justin O'Hagan for his thoughtful input.

385

### 386 **Conflict of Interest Statement**

387 The authors declare they have no conflicts of interest.


388

389


## 390 References

- 391 [1] A. Kourtis, K. Hatfield, and J. Baggs, "Vital Signs: Epidemiology and Recent Trends in  
392 Methicillin-Resistant and in Methicillin-Susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus* Bloodstream  
393 Infections — United States.," *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*, no. 68, pp. 214–219, 2019.
- 394 [2] G. Fätkenheuer, B. Hirschel, and S. Harbarth, "Screening and isolation to control  
395 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*: sense, nonsense, and evidence," *The Lancet*, vol.  
396 385, no. 9973, pp. 1146–1149, Mar. 2015.
- 397 [3] D. J. Morgan, P. Malani, and D. J. Diekema, "Diagnostic Stewardship—Leveraging the  
398 Laboratory to Improve Antimicrobial Use," *JAMA*, vol. 318, no. 7, p. 607, Aug. 2017.
- 399 [4] D. J. Morgan, R. P. Wenzel, and G. Bearman, "Contact Precautions for Endemic MRSA  
400 and VRE: Time to Retire Legal Mandates," *JAMA*, vol. 318, no. 4, p. 329, Jul. 2017.
- 401 [5] M. A. Rubin, M. H. Samore, and A. D. Harris, "The Importance of Contact Precautions for  
402 Endemic Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* and Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci,"  
403 *JAMA*, vol. 319, no. 9, pp. 863–864, Mar. 2018.
- 404 [6] L. P. G. Derde *et al.*, "Interventions to reduce colonisation and transmission of  
405 antimicrobial-resistant bacteria in intensive care units: an interrupted time series study and  
406 cluster randomised trial," *Lancet Infect. Dis.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 31–39, Jan. 2014.
- 407 [7] J. M. Boyce and D. Pittet, "Guideline for Hand Hygiene in Health-Care Settings:  
408 Recommendations of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee and the  
409 HICPAC/SHEA/APIC/IDSA Hand Hygiene Task Force," *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.*, vol. 23,  
410 no. S12, pp. S3–S40, Dec. 2002.
- 411 [8] M. R. Haverkate, L. P. G. Derde, C. Brun-Buisson, M. J. M. Bonten, and M. C. J. Bootsma,  
412 "Duration of colonization with antimicrobial-resistant bacteria after ICU discharge," *Intensive  
413 Care Med.*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 564–571, Apr. 2014.
- 414 [9] B. G. Mitchell, A. Gardner, P. W. Stone, L. Hall, and M. Pogorzelska-Maziarz, "Hospital  
415 Staffing and Health Care–Associated Infections: A Systematic Review of the Literature," *Jt.  
416 Comm. J. Qual. Patient Saf.*, Jun. 2018.
- 417 [10] A. Lee, Y. S. L. Cheung, G. M. Joynt, C. C. H. Leung, W.-T. Wong, and C. D. Gomersall,  
418 "Are high nurse workload/staffing ratios associated with decreased survival in critically ill  
419 patients? A cohort study," *Ann. Intensive Care*, vol. 7, no. 1, Dec. 2017.
- 420 [11] G. Hess, "Disease in Metapopulation Models: Implications for Conservation," *Ecology*,  
421 vol. 77, no. 5, pp. 1617–1632, Jul. 1996.
- 422 [12] M. Jesse, P. Ezanno, S. Davis, and J. A. P. Heesterbeek, "A fully coupled, mechanistic  
423 model for infectious disease dynamics in a metapopulation: Movement and epidemic  
424 duration," *J. Theor. Biol.*, vol. 254, no. 2, pp. 331–338, Sep. 2008.
- 425 [13] D. J. Austin and R. M. Anderson, "Studies of antibiotic resistance within the patient,  
426 hospitals and the community using simple mathematical models," *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B.  
427 Biol. Sci.*, vol. 354, no. 1384, pp. 721–738, Apr. 1999.
- 428 [14] A. R. North and H. C. J. Godfray, "The dynamics of disease in a metapopulation: The role  
429 of dispersal range," *J. Theor. Biol.*, vol. 418, pp. 57–65, Apr. 2017.
- 430 [15] E. T. Lofgren, "Estimating the impact of post randomization changes in staff behavior in  
431 infection prevention trials: a mathematical modeling approach," *BMC Infect. Dis.*, vol. 17, no. 1,  
432 Dec. 2017.


- 433 [16] E. T. Lofgren, "Pools versus Queues: The Variable Dynamics of Stochastic 'Steady  
434 States,'" *PLOS ONE*, vol. 10, no. 6, p. e0130574, Jun. 2015.
- 435 [17] A. D. Harris, "Universal Glove and Gown Use and Acquisition of Antibiotic-Resistant  
436 Bacteria in the ICU: A Randomized Trial," *JAMA*, Oct. 2013.
- 437 [18] J. Westbrook, A. Ampt, and L. Kearney, "Work observation method by activity timing  
438 (WOMBAT) manual." Health Informatics Research & Evaluation Unit, The University of Sydney,  
439 Sydney, 2007.
- 440 [19] J. I. Westbrook and A. Ampt, "Design, application and testing of the Work Observation  
441 Method by Activity Timing (WOMBAT) to measure clinicians' patterns of work and  
442 communication☆," *Int. J. Med. Inf.*, vol. 78, pp. S25–S33, Apr. 2009.
- 443 [20] M. A. Ballermann, N. T. Shaw, D. C. Mayes, R. N. Gibney, and J. I. Westbrook, "Validation  
444 of the Work Observation Method By Activity Timing (WOMBAT) method of conducting time-  
445 motion observations in critical care settings: an observational study," *BMC Med. Inform. Decis.*  
446 *Mak.*, vol. 11, no. 1, Dec. 2011.
- 447 [21] K. Khader *et al.*, "A Dynamic Transmission Model to Evaluate the Effectiveness of  
448 Infection Control Strategies," *Open Forum Infect. Dis.*, p. ofw247, Dec. 2016.
- 449 [22] J. I. Westbrook, C. Duffield, L. Li, and N. J. Creswick, "How much time do nurses have for  
450 patients? a longitudinal study quantifying hospital nurses' patterns of task time distribution and  
451 interactions with health professionals," *BMC Health Serv. Res.*, vol. 11, no. 1, Dec. 2011.
- 452 [23] E. T. Lofgren, R. W. Moehring, D. J. Anderson, D. J. Weber, and N. H. Fefferman, "A  
453 Mathematical Model to Evaluate the Routine Use of Fecal Microbiota Transplantation to  
454 Prevent Incident and Recurrent *Clostridium difficile* Infection," *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.*,  
455 vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 18–27, Jan. 2014.
- 456 [24] E. Sickbertbennett, D. Weber, M. Gergenteague, M. Sobsey, G. Samsa, and W. Rutala,  
457 "Comparative efficacy of hand hygiene agents in the reduction of bacteria and viruses," *Am. J.*  
458 *Infect. Control*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 67–77, Mar. 2005.
- 459 [25] D. T. Gillespie, "Exact stochastic simulation of coupled chemical reactions," *J. Phys.*  
460 *Chem.*, vol. 81, no. 25, pp. 2340–2361, Dec. 1977.
- 461 [26] T. R. Maarleveld, B. G. Olivier, and F. J. Bruggeman, "StochPy: A Comprehensive, User-  
462 Friendly Tool for Simulating Stochastic Biological Processes," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 8, no. 11, p.  
463 e79345, Nov. 2013.
- 464 [27] D. Adler, *vioplot: Violin plot. R package*. 2005.
- 465 [28] T. Toni, D. Welch, N. Strelkowa, A. Ipsen, and M. P. H. Stumpf, "Approximate Bayesian  
466 computation scheme for parameter inference and model selection in dynamical systems," *J. R.*  
467 *Soc. Interface*, vol. 6, no. 31, pp. 187–202, Feb. 2009.
- 468




470  
471 **Figure 1.** Schematic representation of the compartmental flow of a mathematical model  
472 of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) acquisition with a single type of  
473 staff. Solid arrows indicate possible transition states, while dashed arrows indicate  
474 potential routes of MRSA contamination or colonization. Healthcare staff are classified  
475 as uncontaminated ( $S_U$ ) or contaminated ( $S_C$ ), while patients are classified as  
476 uncolonized ( $P_U$ ) or colonized ( $P_C$ ).  
477




478  
479 **Figure 2.** Schematic representation of the compartmental flow of a mathematical model  
480 of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) acquisition with nurses and  
481 intensivists separated into different staff types. Solid arrows indicate possible transition  
482 states, while dashed arrows indicate potential routes of MRSA contamination or  
483 colonization. Nurses and doctors are classified as uncontaminated ( $N_U$  or  $D_U$ ) and  
484 contaminated ( $N_C$  and  $D_C$ ), while patients are classified as uncolonized ( $P_U$ ) or  
485 colonized ( $P_C$ ).  
486  
487  
488



489  
490 **Figure 3.** Schematic representation of a Metapopulation model of methicillin-resistant  
491 *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) acquisition. Patients (blue) are treated by a single  
492 assigned nurse (orange). A single intensivist (red) randomly treats all patients.  
493




494  
495 **Figure 4.** Distribution of cumulative MRSA acquisitions in 3,000 simulated 18-bed  
496 intensive care units under three theoretical population structures.  
497



498  
 499 **Figure 5.** Global parameter sensitivity of three modeled ICU population structures.  
 500 Panel A depicts the change in proportional change in cumulative MRSA acquisitions per  
 501 one-percent change in the value of a specific parameter, with light bars indicating  
 502 increased acquisitions, and dark bars indicating decreased acquisitions for a model  
 503 assuming random mixing and with a single staff type for both nurses and physicians.  
 504 Panel B depicts the same for a model that separates nurses and physicians in to  
 505 different staff types, while Panel C depicts the same for a metapopulation model where  
 506 nurses were assigned to a strict subpopulation of patients. Panel D depicts the  
 507 difference in proportional changes between the Metapopulation and Nurse-MD models.  
 508





509  
510 **Figure 6.** Relationship between the proportion of time nurses spend treating patients  
511 outside their assigned group ( $\gamma$ ) and cumulative MRSA acquisitions over 10,000  
512 simulations, randomly sampling  $\gamma$  from a uniform distribution between 1/6 and 1. Grey  
513 dots show an individual simulation, while the black line shows a segmented Poisson  
514 regression fit with linear and quadratic terms for  $\gamma$ . The vertical dashed line depicts the  
515 single segmentation point,  $\gamma^*$ , to the left of which these more complicated models are  
516 adequately approximated by the Nurse-MD model where random mixing occurs. The  
517 shaded area shows the corresponding confidence interval.  
518

519

**Table 1.** Parameters for modeling the acquisition of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in an Intensive Care Unit

Parameter	Parameter Description	Parameter Value	Source(s)
$\rho$	Contact rate between patients and HCWs	4.154 (# of direct care tasks/hour)	[22], [23]
$\rho_N$	Contact rate between patients and nurses	3.973 (# of nurse direct care tasks/hour)	[22], [23]
$\rho_D$	Contact rate between patients and physician	0.181 (# of physician direct care tasks/hour)	[22], [23]
$\sigma$	Probability that a HCW's hands are contaminated from a single contact with a colonized patient	0.054	[13]
$\Psi_{SST}$	Probability of successful colonization of an uncolonized patient due to contact with a contaminated HCW when randomly mixed	0.1494	Fitted to [17]
$\Psi_{Nurse-MD}$	Probability of successful colonization of an uncolonized patient due to contact with a contaminated HCW with physician separated	0.1660	Fitted to [17]
$\Psi_{Metapopulation}$	Probability of successful colonization of an uncolonized patient due to contact with a contaminated HCW in metapopulation structure	0.4481	Fitted to [17]
$\theta$	Probability of discharge	4.39 days <sup>-1</sup>	[17]
$\nu_u$	Proportion of admissions uncolonized with MRSA	0.9221	[17]
$\nu_c$	Proportion of admissions colonized with MRSA	0.0779	[17]
$\iota$	Effective hand-decontaminations/hour (direct care tasks × hand hygiene compliance × efficacy)	5.740 (10.682 direct care tasks/hour × 56.55% compliance × ~ 95% efficacy)	[17], [22]–[24]
$\iota_N$	Effective nurse hand-decontaminations/hour	6.404 (11.92 direct care tasks/hour × 56.55% compliance × ~ 95% efficacy)	[17], [22]–[24]
$\iota_D$	Effective physician hand-decontaminations/hour	1.748 (3.253 direct care tasks/hour × 56.55% compliance × ~ 95% efficacy)	[17], [22]–[24]
$\tau$	Effective gown or glove changes/hour (2 × # of visits × compliance)	2.445 (2.957 changes/hour × 82.66% compliance)	[13], [17], [20]
$\tau_N$	Effective nurse gown or glove changes/hour	2.728 (3.30 changes/hour × 82.66% compliance)	[13], [17], [20]
$\tau_D$	Effective physician gown or glove changes/hour	0.744 (0.90 changes/hour × 82.66% compliance)	[13], [17], [20]
$\mu$	Natural decolonization rate	20.0 days <sup>-1</sup>	[21]