Cumulative survival profiling: a new PAP-based method for detecting heteroresistance in staphylococcal clinical isolates

Ramzi A. Alsallaq[a#], Tina Dao[a], Jason W. Rosch[a], Elisa Margolis[a]

[a] Department of Infectious Diseases, St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, 262 Danny Thomas Place, MS 320, Memphis, Tennessee 38105-3678, USA

Running Title: New PAP-based heteroresistance detection method

[#]Address correspondence to Ramzi Alsallaq, ralsalla@stjude.org

Author contributions: R.A.A. and E.M. designed the study. T.D. and J.W.R. performed the PAP experiments. T.D. and E.M. performed the Etest experiments. R.A.A. developed the CSP method and conducted related analyses. R.A.A. wrote the first draft, and all authors contributed equally to writing the final manuscript.

Conflict of interest: All authors declare no conflict of interest

Abstract

The modified area under the curve of the population analysis profile (PAP-AUC) developed by Wootton et al. (J Antimicrob Chemother 47(4) 2001) is considered the gold standard for detecting heteroresistance in staphylococci. However, the PAP-AUC method does not explicitly control for the variation in the amount of initial inoculum between tested isolates and the comparator reference heterogeneous vancomycin-intermediate *S. aureus* (hVISA) strain (Mu3), which has been reported to influence

classification results. Further, the method requires batching the isolates and utilizing single Mu3 PAP for each, which does not capture the heterogeneity of Mu3 and adds to the labor intensity of the method.

We confirmed that the area under the PAP curve for Mu3 is strongly dependent on the initial inoculum. After interpreting this strong relationship, we derived the cumulative survival: a new metric that lacks the initial inoculum influence and measures the experience under the vancomycin concentration gradient. We devised a new method, termed cumulative survival profiling (CSP), to infer a distribution for the cumulative survival metric for isolates; CSP requires conducting multiple PAPs with a broad range of initial inoculum values. We used CSP to profile Mu3 and one isolate (CoNSB18) from 67 clinical isolates of coagulase-negative staphylococci associated with central-line bloodstream infection (CoNS CLABSI). Mu3 and CoNSB18 were the respective references for hVISA and hVISA that is associated with poor clinical response. Their CSPs reveal two overlapping distributions of cumulative survival, reflecting the heterogeneity of hVISA and indicating that the most resistant in the hVISA spectrum are likely to be associated with a poor clinical response. The 2.5% quantiles of their distributions successfully cross-validated >80% of their PAPs (accuracy). To detect similar isolates to these two reference strains among the CoNS CLABSI isolates, rather than conducting CSP for each isolate, we retrospectively estimated the cumulative survivals using point estimate profiling (PEP) utilizing single PAPs. We estimated that two-thirds of the CoNS CLABSI isolated from unique subjects are heteroresistant and that about 80% of those may be associated with a poor clinical response.

Standardization of PAP-based detection of heteroresistance and/or poor clinical response is within reach by using CSP and PEP. Our results should raise the profile of heteroresistance in CoNS CLABSI.

Introduction

Vancomycin is the last-resort treatment for infections caused by multi-drug–resistant bacteria, such as methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA). However, therapeutic failures with vancomycin have been reported in cases where *in vitro* assays measuring the clinical minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) indicated susceptibility to vancomycin. These infections are caused by heterogeneous vancomycin-intermediate staphylococci. In this context, a single isolate represents a majority of the susceptible population to vancomycin, whereas a tiny proportion of bacterial cells demonstrate resistance to vancomycin [1]. There have been several cases of reduced susceptibility to vancomycin only a few decades after the first use of vancomycin. In 1996, a 64-year-old man, who acquired MRSA pneumonia after an operation for primary lung cancer, experienced failed treatment after an extensive course of vancomycin [2]. The causative MRSA strain, Mu3, was isolated from sputum and was categorized as heterogenous vancomycin-resistant *S. aureus* (hVISA). Since then, various methods of

detection have shown vancomycin heteroresistance in other staphylococcal strains, including coagulase-negative staphylococci (CoNS) [3–9].

The presence of the resistant subpopulation in multi-resistant or opportunistic pathogens (e.g., *S. epidermidis* and *S. haemolyticus*) contributes to reduced efficacy of vancomycin, limiting treatment options, especially for patients undergoing chemotherapy for whom vancomycin is the last resort against bacterial infection. The resistant subpopulation is very difficult to detect and is often misclassified by the common clinical diagnostic tests. The Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute methods, which use an inoculum of approximately 10^4 CFU per assay, cannot detect the resistant subpopulation, which is present at a frequency of 10^{-6} or lower [10]. Therefore, detecting heteroresistance in clinical isolates with high accuracy is critical for clinical decision making.

A widely used method for detecting heteroresistance to an antibiotic in staphylococcal clinical isolates is the modified area under the curve of the population analysis profile (PAP-AUC) method described by Wootton et.al. [11], which uses the Mu3 strain as a positive-control comparator. The PAP-AUC method is considered the gold standard with which all other methods are compared [12–15]. In the PAP-AUC method, a prepared initial inoculum of the bacterial isolate is plated into different plates forming a gradient of antibiotic concentrations, then the bacterial density that survived the antibiotic at each concentration is recorded to construct the population analysis profile (PAP). A similar PAP is prepared for Mu3 in tandem of a batch of one [16] or several [11] isolates' PAPs and used for comparison. Usually, the initial inoculum values varies widely, by as much as 1.5log10 [17–22], across the batch and differs from that of the Mu3. It has been reported that the area under the PAP curve is influenced by the initial inoculum [9].

It is unclear how much this variation in the initial inoculum influences the PAP-AUC results. But if confirmed to be significant, then neglecting to account for the variation of the initial inoculum could diminish the role of the experience of isolates under the antibiotic gradient, which is the basis for PAP-based methods owing to increased PAP-AUC by exposure to antibiotics in heteroresistant staphylococci [17]. This is because the seemingly increased PAP-AUC could be just due to the initial inoculum of the isolate being higher than that of Mu3.

Further, a comparative method such as the PAP-AUC must combine cross-validation and detection by demonstrating high-accuracy heteroresistance detection in replicas of the positive control (Mu3) in conjunction with and before detecting heteroresistance in clinical isolates. However, following Wootton et al's cross-validation of their method on replicas of Mu3 PAPs [11], the PAP-AUC method has been typically applied in literature without the necessary prior cross-validation by using a single Mu3 PAP to detect heteroresistance in multiple isolates.

Even if the initial inoculums of Mu3 and the isolates' PAPs are hypothetically identical, using a single Mu3 PAP represents picking a random single value from a broad spectrum that typically characterizes heteroresistance [23]. For example, a single Mu3 PAP could reflect susceptibility to vancomycin [5]. Using a single Mu3 PAP could lead to biased classification of tested isolates by increasing the possibility of false-negatives and clouds the association between clinical outcomes and heteroresistance. Therefore, it is not surprising to see conflicting results on the prevalence of heteroresistance in clinical isolates and on the association between poor clinical response and heteroresistance.

Here we introduced a PAP-based method that is free from the influence of the initial inoculum, characterizes the broad spectrum of heteroresistance, and allows cross-validation and detection of heteroresistance and of heteroresistance that is associated with poor clinical response based on this broad spectrum. We believe that this method would pave the way to standardize PAP-based detection of heteroresistance in staphylococci and offers an adequate assessment of the association of heteroresistance with poor clinical response.

Methods

Bacterial isolates

We retrospectively studied 74 isolates obtained with permission from all patients in whom coagulase-negative staphylococcal central-line bloodstream infection (CoNS CLABSI) developed during treatment for leukemia at our institution between January 1, 2010, and March 28, 2016. The deidentified isolates were stored in glycerol at -80 ºC and identified as CoNS via sequencing by the clinical microbiology laboratory before being tested for association with clinical outcomes. The prototype heteroresistant *Staphylococcus aureus* strain Mu3 was obtained from ATCC (Manassas, VA) and used as a positive control. Conventional testing (vitek 2, bioMérieux, Inc., Marcy-l'Étoile, France; MIC range <0.5-2 $\mu g/mL$) classified all isolates as being susceptible to vancomycin (catalog number SBR00001, Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO). Tryptic Soy Broth (TSB) media (catalog number 211825, BD Sciences) was used to grow each clinical isolate overnight at 37ºC, and Brain Heart Infusion (BHI, Bacto Brain Heart Infusion and Bacto agar, BD Biosciences) media was used for agar plates. To identify a clinical isolate as *Staphylococcus aureus* or other Staphylococcal species, each one was inoculated onto a mannitol salt agar plate, which served as a differential growth medium.

Population analysis profiles (PAPs)

Population analysis profiling was the basis for all heteroresistance-related detection in clinical isolates. PAP was performed according to standard preparation techniques for staphylococci [11, 24]. Each isolate was grown in 10 mL TSB overnight at 37ºC. Overnight stationary-phase cultures were then serially diluted 1:100 in 1×PBS, ranging from 10^{-2} to 10^{-8}, and 100 μL of each dilution was streaked on BHI agar

121 plates containing 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, or 8 $\mu g/mL$ of vancomycin. Each isolate was inoculated onto duplicate
122 plates at each dilution at each vancomycin concentration. After incubation for 48 hours at 37ºC, colonies
123 were counted to determine and plot the counts of bacteria in *CFU/mL* growing at each antibiotic
124 concentration. The resulting PAPs were used in the analyses. The area under the colony-counts is what we
125 used; however, the area under the log10 of the colony-counts is used for Wootton et al.'s method [11].

126 The isolates were analyzed in two batches, with 44 isolates (59%) that were analyzed at a later stage
127 requiring addition of 0.2% yeast extract (catalog number 212750, BD Sciences) to the overnight culture
128 as a growth supplement. Each batch run was accompanied by replicate runs of Mu3 strain as a positive
129 control (3 and 7 replicas for the first and second patch, respectively, with growth supplement added to
130 each of the 7 replicas' overnight cultures). To determine the effect of the initial inoculum on PAP-AUC,
131 we prospectively obtained 10 more PAPs for Mu3 and 7 PAPs for 1 CoNS CLABSI isolate (CoNSB18)
132 from 1:2 dilutions and 2x and 4x concentrations to create initial inoculum values spanning the range 10^7
133 to 10^9 *CFU/mL* for Mu3 and 10^8 to 10^9 *CFU/mL* for CoNSB18 for overnight cultures that otherwise were
134 prepared and used to generate PAPs as described previously.

135 Etest

136 Each clinical isolate and Mu3 were grown in 10*mL* of TSB overnight at 37ºC and were then diluted 1:100
137 in fresh 10 *mL* TSB. The bacterial strains were incubated at 37ºC until OD at 600 nm 0.2 (McFarland unit
138 2). Then 100 μL of the culture were spread on BHI before placing the vancomycin Etest strips (bio-
139 Mérieux, Marcy-l'Étoile, France) on the plate. The plates were incubated at 37ºC for 48 hours. Each
140 isolate was classified as heteroresistant if isolated colonies were observed in the inhibition eclipse, as
141 determined by two independent readings.

142 Quantitative and statistical analysis

143 We created a new format for the analyses whereby each singlet PAP contributes a row, and the columns
144 enlist the bacterial counts in *CFU/mL* for the PAP at 0,1,2,3,4,6, and 8 $\mu g/mL$ of vancomycin. Each PAP
145 from the isolates and Mu3 was first checked for missing initial inoculum or for having two data points or
146 fewer and dropped if either was true. None of the 20 Mu3 PAPs were dropped, but 14 duplicated PAPs
147 from 7 isolates and 3 singlets were dropped from the analyses for not passing either of the two filters. The
148 remaining isolate PAPs were then divided into two unique isolate sets: training and verification sets of 66
149 and 65 singlet PAPs from 67 isolates, which included 56 and 54 first-episode isolates from 56 and 54
150 patients, respectively.

151 The area under the counts and the area under the log10 counts were calculated by using *auc* module from
152 the Python package scikit-learn and were validated with corresponding calculations by using GraphPad
153 Prism 7.

154 The linear relationship between the area under the bacterial counts and the counts at 0 $\mu g/mL$ (the initial
155 inoculum) was firstly explored using ordinary linear square regression fit; the goodness of which was
156 judged by the p-values for the regression coefficients (slope and intercept) and the R-squared value. A
157 better fit in terms of the p-values for the coefficients was obtained using mixed effect linear regression
158 model with random intercept to adjust for PAP to PAP variation. For the cumulative survival profiling
159 (CSP) method we obtained the distribution of the cumulative survival under vancomycin gradient of the
160 reference strain using a mixed-effect linear regression analyses within Bayesian framework (further
161 details are in the Supplementary Information Appendix). Because obtaining replica PAPs is not practical
162 for the CoNS CLABSI isolates, we estimated the cumulative survival using a single PAP by dividing the
163 area under the counts by the initial inoculum. We call this estimate point-estimate-profiling (PEP).

164 We used the 2.5% quantile of the Bayesian credible interval of the distribution obtained by CSP for the
165 reference as a threshold for detection. The detection accuracy of this threshold is determined through
166 cross-validation over 50 iterations by dividing available PAPs of the reference into reference (80% of
167 PAPs) and validation (20%) sets randomly selected in each iteration and then obtaining the mean and
168 standard deviations of the percentage of validation PAPs detected by the method over the iterations. An
169 isolate is heteroresistant if its estimated cumulative survival using PEP is $\geq$ the 2.5% quantile of the
170 Bayesian credible interval of the cumulative survival estimated from the reference set.

171 The cross validation of heteroresistance detection over 20 Mu3 PAPs was compared for four methods:
172 CSP, Wootton's (AUC under the log10 counts) [11, 17, 20, 24, 25], semi-Wootton's (AUC under the
173 counts) [26–28] and altered semi-Wootton's (counts are altered to match the initial inoculum of the
174 reference before calculating AUC) [9]. The detection accuracy via cross-validation for each method was
175 estimated like the CSP method except for the detection criterion. For all methods except the CSP, a given
176 PAP from the validation set is heteroresistant if AUC is $\geq$ 0.9 the AUC of the averaged PAP of the
177 reference.

178 Following successful cross-validation, credible detection of heteroresistance in the CoNS CLABSI
179 isolates by the CSP method is deemed possible. The total number of twenty Mu3 PAPs encompassed the
180 reference set from which a distribution of the cumulative survival was obtained and the cumulative
181 survival for each isolate was estimated by PEP and compared with the 2.5% quantile of the reference
182 similar to what is described above for the Mu3 validation set.

To detect heteroresistance that may be associated with poor clinical response, we used CSP on 7 PAPs from 1 of the CoNS isolates (CoNSB18), which is found to be both heteroresistant and associated with poor clinical response under vancomycin treatment. As was done for Mu3, the detection accuracy was measured first by cross-validation. Association of detections with the measured poor clinical response was determined by using Cox proportional hazard regression.

We verified the accuracy and robustness of our CSP-based detections over replicated PAPs of isolates by comparing heteroresistance detection (with and without association with poor clinical response) for duplicates of 64 common isolates in the training and the verification sets.

Results

Initial inoculum strong influence on PAP-AUC

It has been reported by one study [9] that the initial inoculum has a large influence on PAP-AUC. Using 20 Mu3 PAPs, we confirmed the strong association between the area under the counts and the initial inoculum (R^2 = 0.90 in the log space; Figure 1 A). A one log10 $\mu g/mL$ change in the initial inoculum of Mu3 increases the area under the PAP counts by 1.0 log10 $CFU/mL.\mu g/mL$ (p<0.001). This strong dependence holds true also for clinical isolates (R^2 = 0.90; Figure 1 B) by plating one selected CoNS isolate (CoNSB18) using broad range of initial inoculum values. These results indicate that in PAP-based methods that detect heteroresistance by comparing PAP-AUCs, differences in the initial inoculums of Mu3, and an isolate such as CoNSB18 will propagate to influence their heteroresistance detection. An alternative metric to the area under the curve that is free from the influence of the initial inoculum is needed to adequately compare isolates to Mu3.



Figure 1: The strong dependence of the area under the counts on the initial inoculums for A) Mu3 using 20 PAPs and B) a selected CoNS isolate (CoNSB18) using 7 PAPs. In both cases, R^2 = 0.90 and p<0.001.

New metric: the cumulative survival under the antibiotic concentration gradient

The strong relationships in Figure 1 suggest the following model:

Bacterial counts (CFU/mL) at vancomycin concentration c = initial inoculum (CFU/mL) × survival probability at the given concentration c ----------(1)

which leads to (see Supplementary Information Appendix for the derivation and explanation)

Area under counts (CFU/mL.μg/mL) = initial inoculum (CFU/mL) × cumulative survival under the concentration gradient (μg/mL) ----------(2)

That is, for a single isolate (e.g. Mu3 or CoNSB18 in Figure 1), we interpret the y-intercept in Figure 1 as the log10 of the "cumulative survival under the antibiotic gradient". In the above model, the information specifying the experience of the isolate under an antibiotic gradient is fully specified by the cumulative survival under that gradient, which is the needed metric free from the influence of the initial inoculum.

CSP of Mu3: inferring the full distribution of Mu3 cumulative survival

Here we used the CSP method to infer the value of the cumulative survival of Mu3 under a vancomycin concentration gradient up to 8 *μg/mL* utilizing 20 Mu3 PAPs.

The Bayesian linear mixed-effects regression model fits data well, as shown in Figure 2 A, and the inferred cumulative survival for Mu3 (Figure 2 B) reveals not a single value but a wide distribution, with a median of 1.2 *μg/mL* and a 95% Bayesian credible interval (BCI) of 0.82-1.54 *μg/mL*. To utilize this distribution, we use the 2.5% quantile of the 95% BCI (q2.5%) to verify and detect heteroresistance of Mu3 profiles and of clinical isolates, respectively.



Figure 2: Cumulative survival profiling (CSP) of Mu3. A) Bayesian linear mixed-effects regression fit, B) the inferred distribution of the cumulative survival of Mu3 under a vancomycin gradient up to 8 *μg/mL*.

Cross-validation of Mu3 heteroresistance: comparison with other methods

Compared to three other PAP-based methods used in the literature, the q2.5% of the inferred distribution of cumulative-survival of Mu3 (CSP method) was superior (Table 1), cross-validating the heteroresistance of Mu3 PAPs, on average, 82% of the time. This indicates that the CSP of Mu3 would detect heteroresistance in clinical isolates at a rate higher than that of the three other methods.

Table 1: Cross-validation of 20 Mu3 PAPs using four methods. SD=standard deviation. Detection accuracy=% of Mu3 PAPs detected to be heteroresistant.

Method	AUC (mean, SD)	Detection accuracy
Wootton's[1]	(29.2,7.2)	52 +/- 23
semi-Wootton's[2]	(7.4,8.7) 10^8 $CFU/mL.\mu g/mL$	46 +/- 26
Altered semi-Wootton's[3]	(1.34,0.78)	60 +/- 26
CSP applied to Mu3	Uses cumulative survival	82 +/- 22

[1]AUC under the log10 counts [11, 17, 20, 24, 25].

[2]AUC under the counts [26–28].

[3]counts are altered to match the initial inoculum of the reference before calculating AUC [9].

Prevalence of heteroresistance in CoNS-CLABSI

Next, we used the cross-validated q2.5% threshold to detect heteroresistance in a set of 66 CoNS-CLABSI PAPs with 56 PAPs representing first-episode samples from 56 subjects (training set). Heteroresistance was detected in 37, suggesting a 66% prevalence among subjects from whom first-episode CoNS CLABSI were sampled (Table 2).

Table 2: Prevalence of heteroresistance in training and verification sets of CoNS CLABSI as revealed by q2.5% of the CSP of Mu3. The numbers and percentages of poor clinical response cases as measured by a clinical laboratory in our institution are also shown.

CoNS CLABSI set	Total			First episode		
	N	Heteroresistant, n (%)	Poor clinical response, n (%)	N	Heteroresistant, n (%)	Poor clinical response, n (%)
Training	66	46 (70)	18 (27)	56	37 (66)	15 (27)
Verification	65	48 (74)	18 (28)	54	39 (72)	15 (28)

We verified the accuracy of our detections over replicated PAPs of isolates by using another set of 65 CoNS-CLABSI PAPs (verification set) with 64 replicated PAPs of isolates in the training set and 54 PAPs representing the first episode from 54 subjects. The estimated prevalence of heteroresistance in the first-episode CoNS-CLABSI PAPs in the verification set is 72% (Table 2). The CSP method accurately classified 58 of 64 replicas by heteroresistance status, giving an accuracy of 91% over replicated PAPs.

252 The association of detected heteroresistance with measured poor clinical response for CoNS-CLABSI is
253 not significant (p>0.05) regardless of the set of isolates. This is likely because, within the spectrum of the
254 hVISA heteroresistance revealed by the distribution in Figure 2 B, only those with the highest cumulative
255 survival might be intuitively associated with poor clinical response.

256 Detection of poor clinical response attributable to heteroresistant CoNS CLABSI

257 To establish whether poor clinical response might be attributable to detected heteroresistance, we needed
258 to estimate the proportion of CoNS CLABSI that are *potentially* associated with poor clinical response by
259 profiling a CoNS CLABSI isolate that is heteroresistant and associated with poor clinical response. The
260 isolate CoNSB18, with the PAP replicas in Figure 1B, fitted these characteristics. The CSP for this isolate
261 revealed a cumulative survival of 1.76 (95% BCI:1.15-2.81) *μg/mL,* suggesting a threshold of 1.15 *μg/mL*
262 to detect heteroresistant CoNS CLABSI that may be associated with poor clinical response. Cross-
263 validating the 7 PAPs for this isolate by using this q2.5% threshold gave an average detection accuracy of
264 80% (SD=33%) for the heteroresistance that may be associated with poor clinical response.

265 We then detected similar isolates among our CoNS CLABSI samples using this cross-validated threshold
266 (Table 3). Cox proportional hazard regression analyses reveal significant association between our
267 detections and time to measured poor clinical response or censorship (p<0.05), regardless of the set of
268 isolates (Table 3). We estimated that more than 80% (31/37 and 32/39 from the training and verification
269 sets, respectively) of heteroresistant CoNS CLABSI may be associated with poor clinical response. The
270 threshold that successfully detected heteroresistance with potential association with poor clinical response
271 is about the median for Mu3 CSP (Figure 3).

272 Table 3: Prevalence of heteroresistance that is potentially associated with poor clinical response in
273 training and verification sets of CoNS CLABSI as revealed by q2.5% of the CSP of CoNSB18.

CoNS CLABSI set	Total			First episode		
	N	Heteroresistant and associated with poor outcomes, n (%)	p-value	N	Heteroresistant and associated with poor outcomes, n (%)	p-value
Training	66	40 (61)	0.018	56	31 (55)	0.019
Verification	65	41 (63)	0.030	54	32 (59)	0.039

274



Figure 3: Inferred cumulative survival profiles for Mu3 and CoNSB18. The cumulative survival threshold that successfully detected heteroresistant isolates with potential association with poor clinical response (hVISA + poor outcomes) is higher than the threshold that successfully detected all heteroresistant isolates regardless of association with clinical outcomes (hVISA).

Comparison with Etest

Next, we compared Etest classification results to the two heteroresistance classifications: Mu3-like and CoNSB18-like detection, taking each separately as the gold standard. Etest accurately predicted the heteroresistance status of 60% and 62% of the isolates as respectively classified by Mu3-like and CoNSB18-like detection. The corresponding sensitivities of Etest were 75% and 79% and the specificities were 26 and 33%, respectively. The results were robust across PAP replicas (Table 4).

Table 4: Comparing Etest classification to the classifications by CSP of Mu3 and of CoNSB18, taking each separately as the gold standard.

Attribute	Mu3-like (training/verification), n/n	CoNSB18-like (training/verification), n/n
Accuracy	60/61	62/63
Sensitivity	75/73	79/79
Specificity	26/29	33/38

Discussion

The initial inoculum used in PAP-based heteroresistance detections in staphylococci strongly influences the area under the PAP curve and should not be part of evaluating the experience under the antibiotic gradient. We introduced the cumulative survival under the antibiotic gradient as an alternative metric and a distribution of which must be estimated for reference strains. We introduced our method, cumulative

294 survival profiling (CSP), for inferring this distribution and removing the influence of the initial inoculum
295 by using replicated PAPs with a wide range of initial inoculum values. We applied the CSP method on
296 two reference isolates Mu3 (heteroresistant) and CoNSB18 (heteroresistant and associated with poor
297 clinical response). We estimated that about two-thirds of our first-episode CoNS CLABSI isolates are
298 heteroresistant to vancomycin and that 80% of the heteroresistant isolates may be associated with a poor
299 clinical response. These estimates raise the profile of heteroresistance to vancomycin as a risk factor for
300 poor clinical response in CoNS-CLABSI isolated from the pediatric leukemia population.

301 The inclusion of cross-validation in the CSP method is critically important, as it ensures the reliability of
302 reference-like detection based on cumulative survival in clinical isolates. The cross-validation of the CSP
303 method reveals a false-negative rate of <20%. Although this false-negative rate might never by zero for
304 Mu3 given that some PAPs of Mu3 inherently reflect susceptibility to vancomycin (which argues against
305 using single Mu3 PAPs for detecting heteroresistance), using more PAPs would decrease this rate.

306 Our CSP profiles are specific to the vancomycin gradient and might be specific to the experimental
307 preparation that was followed for PAPs and should not be directly applicable to other antibiotics, different
308 vancomycin gradients, or different experimental preparations. Apart from Mu3, we have not tested our
309 method on *S. aureus* isolates, and the samples of CoNS used might not represent other populations. Using
310 different methods, it has been observed that prevalence of hVISA could vary among populations [26].

311 The finding that a larger cumulative survival threshold (median compared to q2.5% of the CSP of Mu3)
312 was needed to successfully detect heteroresistance associated with a poor clinical response than that
313 needed to detect all heteroresistance highlights the wide spectrum of heteroresistance as revealed by the
314 inferred distribution from CSP of Mu3 and that only the most-resistant CoNS isolates (those with
315 relatively higher cumulative survival above the median CSP distribution of Mu3) may be associated with
316 poor clinical response (as revealed by the inferred distribution from CSP of CoNSB18). The predictability
317 of heteroresistance with potential association with a poor clinical response using the median of Mu3
318 might not be generalizable to other staphylococci strains, to other CoNS with PAPs conducted by
319 different experimental procedures, or to a different population from which the CoNS are sampled. This
320 variability suggests that an adequate reference isolate is always needed to predict/confirm association
321 with clinical outcomes of prospective isolates.

322 Therefore, we are making the method available to other investigators so that they may test it on their
323 isolates prospectively or retrospectively.

324 Although the most robust estimate for the cumulative survival would require profiling each clinical isolate
325 by applying CSP using multiple PAPs of the isolate, in case of multiple clinical isolates, a single PAP for

each might be enough. However, this supposition warrants further testing. We showed robustness of classification results to replicated PAPs of isolates.

The comparison of detection results of Etest to CSP-detection of CoNSB18 indicate a relatively low false-negative rate of 20%, suggesting that Etest might be used first on CoNS to detect hVISA-like heteroresistance associated with poor clinical response, with an understanding of the limitation of this false-negative rate.

Our estimate of the heteroresistance prevalence in CoNS is consistent with the 68% prevalence of heteroresistance among MRSA CoNS [4] and with the 62.5% prevalence estimate among MRSA *S. captis* from blood samples in neonatal intensive care units (NICUs) [7] and within the range reported among CoNS in NICUs [6].

The CSP method offers asynchronous profiling of Mu3 and prospective isolates, whereby the same experimental setup is used to first conduct PAPs for Mu3 and build its cumulative survival profile. The detection accuracy is then estimated via cross-validation using the Mu3 PAPs. The same experimental setup is used to conduct PAPs for isolates as they come forward and to detect heteroresistance in each. This method could pave the way to standardization of the detection of heteroresistance and its association with clinical response in staphylococci based on cumulative survival comparisons. Along these lines, the asynchronous profiling must not mean different experimental procedures are used for the reference and isolates' PAPs. Any differences should be investigated and reported. In this regard, the CSP method explicitly controls for the variation in the initial inoculum and only the random experimental errors occurring within the same experimental procedure. The addition of growth supplement to the overnight cultures would have a direct effect on the distribution of the initial inoculum.

Acknowledgment

We thank Elaine Tuomanen for discussion and encouragement. We thank Cherise Guess, PhD ELS for scientifically editing the manuscript.

Funding

EM receives funding from ALSAC. JWR is supported by 1U01AI124302 and 1RO1AI110618.

References

1. El-Halfawy OM, Valvano MA. Antimicrobial Heteroresistance: an Emerging Field in Need of Clarity. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2015;28:191–207.

2. Hiramatsu K, Hanaki H, Ino T, Yabuta K, Oguri T, Tenover FC. Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus clinical strain with reduced vancomycin susceptibility. J Antimicrob Chemother. 1997;40:135–6.

357 3. Becker K, Heilmann C, Peters G. Coagulase-Negative Staphylococci. Clinical Microbiology Reviews.
358 2014;27:870–926.

359 4. Sieradzki K, Villari P, Tomasz A. Decreased Susceptibilities to Teicoplanin and Vancomycin among
360 Coagulase-Negative Methicillin-Resistant Clinical Isolates of Staphylococci. Antimicrobial Agents and
361 Chemotherapy. 1998;42:100–7.

362 5. Nunes APF, Teixeira LM, Iorio NLP, Bastos CCR, de Sousa Fonseca L, Souto-Padrón T, et al.
363 Heterogeneous resistance to vancomycin in Staphylococcus epidermidis, Staphylococcus haemolyticus
364 and Staphylococcus warneri clinical strains: characterisation of glycopeptide susceptibility profiles and
365 cell wall thickening. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2006;27:307–15.

366 6. Chong J, Caya C, Lévesque S, Quach C. Heteroresistant Vancomycin Intermediate Coagulase Negative
367 Staphylococcus in the NICU: A Systematic Review. PLOS ONE. 2016;11:e0164136.

368 7. Rasigade J-P, Raulin O, Picaud J-C, Tellini C, Bes M, Grando J, et al. Methicillin-resistant
369 Staphylococcus capitis with reduced vancomycin susceptibility causes late-onset sepsis in intensive care
370 neonates. PLoS ONE. 2012;7:e31548.

371 8. Van Der Zwet WC, Debets-Ossenkopp YJ, Reinders E, Kapi M, Savelkoul PHM, Van Elburg RM, et
372 al. Nosocomial spread of a Staphylococcus capitis strain with heteroresistance to vancomycin in a
373 neonatal intensive care unit. J Clin Microbiol. 2002;40:2520–5.

374 9. D'mello D, Daley AJ, Rahman MS, Qu Y, Garland S, Pearce C, et al. Vancomycin heteroresistance in
375 bloodstream isolates of Staphylococcus capitis. J Clin Microbiol. 2008;46:3124–6.

376 10. Antimicrobial and Antifungal Susceptibility Testing Resources. Clinical & Laboratory Standards
377 Institute. https://clsi.org/about/about-clsi/about-clsi-antimicrobial-and-antifungal-susceptibility-testing-
378 resources/. Accessed 2 Jul 2019.

379 11. Wootton M, Howe RA, Hillman R, Walsh TR, Bennett PM, MacGowan AP. A modified population
380 analysis profile (PAP) method to detect hetero-resistance to vancomycin in Staphylococcus aureus in a
381 UK hospital. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2001;47:399–403.

382 12. Satola SW, Farley MM, Anderson KF, Patel JB. Comparison of Detection Methods for
383 Heteroresistant Vancomycin-Intermediate Staphylococcus aureus, with the Population Analysis Profile
384 Method as the Reference Method. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2011;49:177–83.

385 13. Hal SJ van, Wehrhahn MC, Barbagiannakos T, Mercer J, Chen D, Paterson DL, et al. Performance of
386 various testing methodologies for detection of heteroresistant vancomycin intermediate Staphylococcus
387 aureus (hVISA) in bloodstream isolates. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2011.
388 doi:10.1128/JCM.02302-10.

389 14. Walsh TR, Bolmström A, Qwärnström A, Ho P, Wootton M, Howe RA, et al. Evaluation of Current
390 Methods for Detection of Staphylococci with Reduced Susceptibility to Glycopeptides. Journal of
391 Clinical Microbiology. 2001;39:2439–44.

392 15. Wootton M, MacGowan AP, Walsh TR, Howe RA. A Multicenter Study Evaluating the Current
393 Strategies for Isolating Staphylococcus aureus Strains with Reduced Susceptibility to Glycopeptides.
394 Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2007;45:329–32.

395 16. Walsh TR, Bolmström A, Qwärnström A, Ho P, Wootton M, Howe RA, et al. Evaluation of Current
396 Methods for Detection of Staphylococci with Reduced Susceptibility to Glycopeptides. Journal of
397 Clinical Microbiology. 2001;39:2439–44.

398 17. Bhateja P, Purnapatre K, Dube S, Fatma T, Rattan A. Characterisation of laboratory-generated
399 vancomycin intermediate resistant Staphylococcus aureus strains. International Journal of Antimicrobial
400 Agents. 2006;27:201–11.

401 18. da Costa TM, Morgado PGM, Cavalcante FS, Damasco AP, Nouér SA, Dos Santos KRN. Clinical
402 and Microbiological Characteristics of Heteroresistant and Vancomycin-Intermediate Staphylococcus
403 aureus from Bloodstream Infections in a Brazilian Teaching Hospital. PLoS ONE. 2016;11:e0160506.

404 19. Harigaya Y, Ngo D, Lesse AJ, Huang V, Tsuji BT. Characterization of heterogeneous vancomycin-
405 intermediate resistance, MIC and accessory gene regulator (agr) dysfunction among clinical bloodstream
406 isolates of staphyloccocus aureus. BMC Infectious Diseases. 2011;11. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-11-287.

407 20. Khosrovaneh A, Riederer K, Saeed S, Tabriz MS, Shah AR, Hanna MM, et al. Frequency of reduced
408 vancomycin susceptibility and heterogeneous subpopulation in persistent or recurrent methicillin-resistant
409 Staphylococcus aureus bacteremia. Clin Infect Dis. 2004;38:1328–30.

410 21. Passalacqua KD, Satola SW, Crispell EK, Read TD. A Mutation in the PP2C Phosphatase Gene in a
411 Staphylococcus aureus USA300 Clinical Isolate with Reduced Susceptibility to Vancomycin and
412 Daptomycin. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2012;56:5212–23.

413 22. Silveira AC de O, da Cunha GR, Caierão J, de Cordova CMM, d'Azevedo PA. Molecular
414 epidemiology of heteroresistant vancomycin-intermediate Staphylococcus aureus in Brazil. The Brazilian
415 Journal of Infectious Diseases. 2015;19:466–72.

416 23. El-Halfawy OM, Valvano MA. Antimicrobial Heteroresistance: an Emerging Field in Need of Clarity.
417 Clin Microbiol Rev. 2015;28:191–207.

418 24. Wootton M, MacGowan AP, Walsh TR, Howe RA. A Multicenter Study Evaluating the Current
419 Strategies for Isolating Staphylococcus aureus Strains with Reduced Susceptibility to Glycopeptides.
420 Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2007;45:329–32.

421 25. Satola SW, Farley MM, Anderson KF, Patel JB. Comparison of Detection Methods for
422 Heteroresistant Vancomycin-Intermediate Staphylococcus aureus, with the Population Analysis Profile
423 Method as the Reference Method. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 2011;49:177–83.

424 26. Bae I-G, Federspiel JJ, Miró JM, Woods CW, Park L, Rybak MJ, et al. Heterogeneous vancomycin-
425 intermediate susceptibility phenotype in bloodstream methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus isolates
426 from an international cohort of patients with infective endocarditis: prevalence, genotype, and clinical
427 significance. J Infect Dis. 2009;200:1355–66.

428 27. Rybak MJ, Leonard SN, Rossi KL, Cheung CM, Sadar HS, Jones RN. Characterization of
429 Vancomycin-Heteroresistant Staphylococcus aureus from the Metropolitan Area of Detroit, Michigan,
430 over a 22-Year Period (1986 to 2007). J Clin Microbiol. 2008;46:2950–4.

431 28. Hal SJ van, Jones M, Gosbell IB, Paterson DL. Vancomycin Heteroresistance Is Associated with
432 Reduced Mortality in ST239 Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus Blood Stream Infections. PLOS
433 ONE. 2011;6:e21217.

29. Salvatier J, Wiecki TV, Fonnesbeck C. Probabilistic programming in Python using PyMC3. PeerJ Comput Sci. 2016;2:e55.

Supplementary Information Appendix

Deriving the cumulative survival under vancomycin from PAP profile

Recasting Eq.1 in the main text using mathematical symbols for convenience:

$$B(c) = CFU_0 \times S(c) \quad \text{---------- (S1)}$$

Where (CFU_0) is the initial inoculum and does not depend on the concentration of antibiotic (c) and $S(c)$ is the concentration-dependent survival fraction.

The cumulative survival can be derived from the PAP by mathematically integrating Eq. S1 over vancomycin gradient:

$$\int_0^{c_{max}} B(c)dc = \int_0^{c_{max}} CFU_0 \times S(c)dc = CFU_0 \times CumSurvival \quad \text{----------(S2)}$$

The left-hand side of Eq.S2 is the area under the counts. Thus, the cumulative survival can be obtained from a single PAP by dividing the area under the counts by the initial inoculum and for multiple PAPs by using regression analysis.

Bayesian mixed-effects regression analysis

For inferring the cumulative survival distribution for reference strains in the CSP method, we used Bayesian linear mixed-effects model. To do that we have $1,2,3,...,N$ PAPs that span a wide range of initial inoculum. Let the areas under the counts for these PAPs in $CFU/mL.\mu g/mL$ be y_i and the initial inoculums be x_i. We wish to infer the cumulative survival ξ. From Eq.S2 we know that:

$$\log10(y_i)=\log10(x_i)+\log10(\xi) \quad \text{----------(S3)}$$

To incorporate the random effect representing PAP to PAP variation, we introduce zero-centered random deviations from the mean initial inoculum of each PAP. Let this deviation be $\epsilon_i \sim N(0,10^8)$, then the mixed-effects regression model becomes:

$$\log10(y_i)=\log10(x_i+\epsilon_i)+\log10(\xi) \quad \text{----------(S4)}$$

Equation S4 defines the mean of our model and can be fitted with zero-centered residuals:

$$\log10(y_i)\sim N(\log10(x_i+\epsilon_i)+\log10(\xi),\sigma^2) \quad \text{----------(S5)}$$

Posterior samples were obtained by using MCMC with NUTS sampler by utilizing the python package PYMC3 [29]