

# 1 A Genomic Snapshot of *Enterococcus faecalis* within Public Hospital 2 Environments in South Africa

3  
4 Christiana O. Shobo<sup>1, 2, 3</sup>, Daniel G. Amoako<sup>1, 3, 4\*</sup>, Mushal Allam<sup>4</sup>, Arshad Ismail<sup>4</sup>, Sabiha Y.  
5 Essack<sup>1</sup>, Linda A. Bester<sup>3\*</sup>

6  
7 <sup>1</sup>Antimicrobial Research Unit, College of Health Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal,  
8 Durban, South Africa;

9 <sup>2</sup>School of Laboratory Medicine and Medical Science, Department of Medical Microbiology,  
10 University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa;

11 <sup>3</sup>Biomedical Resource Unit, School of Laboratory Medicine and Medical Sciences, College of  
12 Health Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal; Durban, South Africa;

13 <sup>4</sup>Sequencing Core Facility, National Institute for Communicable Diseases, National Health  
14 Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa;

15  
16 \*Corresponding Authors: Linda A. Bester (Ph.D.), [besterl@ukzn.ac.za](mailto:besterl@ukzn.ac.za) (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5726-681X>) and Daniel G. Amoako (Ph.D.), **Email:** [amoakodg@gmail.com](mailto:amoakodg@gmail.com), Tel.: +27(0)  
17 [+27 \(0\) 843308957](tel:+270843308957); **ORCID:** <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3551-3458>.  
18

19  
20 **Keywords:** Comparative Genomics, *Enterococcus faecalis*, sequence type, resistome,  
21 mobilome, contamination, hospital environment, Phylogenomics, South Africa

22  
23 **Running title:** Genomics of *E. faecalis* from hospital environments in South Africa  
~~None. This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.~~

## 24 Abstract

25 Enterococci are among the most common opportunistic hospital pathogens. This study used  
26 whole-genome sequencing (WGS) and bioinformatics to determine the antibiotic resistome,  
27 genetic support, clones and phylogenetic relationship of *Enterococcus faecalis* isolated from  
28 hospital environments in South Africa. Isolates were recovered from 11 frequently touched  
29 sites by patients and healthcare workers in different wards at 4 levels of healthcare (A, B, C  
30 and D) in Durban, South Africa. Following microbial identification and antibiotic susceptibility  
31 tests. Of the 245 *E. faecalis* isolates identified, 38 were subjected to WGS on the Illumina  
32 MiSeq platform. The *tet(M)* (31/38, 82%) and *erm(C)* (16/38, 42%) genes were the most  
33 common antibiotic resistome found in isolates originating from the different hospital  
34 environments which corroborated with their antibiotic resistance phenotypes. The isolates  
35 harboured mobile genetic elements consisting of plasmids (n=11) and prophages (n=14), that  
36 were mostly clone-specific. Of note, a large number insertion sequence (IS) families were  
37 found with the IS3 (55%), IS5 (42%), IS1595 (40%) and Tn3 Transposon been the most  
38 predominate. Microbial typing using WGS data revealed 15 clones with 6 major sequence  
39 types (ST) belonging to ST16 (n =7), ST40 (n = 6), ST21 (n =5), ST126 (n = 3), ST23 (n =3) and  
40 ST386 (n=3). Phylogenomic analysis showed that the major clones were mostly conserved  
41 within specific hospital environments. However, further metadata insights revealed the  
42 complex intra-clonal spread of these *E. faecalis* major clones between the sampling sites  
43 within each specific hospital setting. The results of these genomic analyses will offer insights  
44 into *E. faecalis* in the hospital environments relevant in the design of optimal infection  
45 prevention strategies in hospital settings.

## 46 1.0. Introduction

47 The surveillance of hospital environments can be a useful tool to better understand the  
48 opportunistic microbial communities within the hospital [1], to identify the source of an  
49 outbreak[2], and to evaluate the efficacy of environmental disinfection or other infection  
50 prevention and control measures [3]. Inadequate control practices have played a significant  
51 role in the dissemination, persistence, intra- and inter-hospital spread of drug-resistant  
52 organisms. Regrettably, good clinical trials comparing the different approaches to, and the  
53 impact of infection prevention and control interventions on the control of drug-resistant  
54 bacteria in hospitals and other healthcare facilities are minimal [4,5]. Accurate identification  
55 of resistant bacterial reservoirs and modes of transmission help inform such interventions.

56 The latest successes in tracing worldwide epidemics [6] and nosocomial outbreaks [7]  
57 have been attributed to whole-genome sequencing (WGS). Genomic comparison has aided  
58 our understanding of the evolution and spread of infectious agents. Comparative genomic  
59 analyses have been made possible through the use of WGS, showing the extent of genomic  
60 variation, which may result in varied phenotypes, thus expanding our understanding of  
61 diverse genomic determinants such as antibiotic resistance genes and their genetic support  
62 in bacterial species [7,8].

63 *Enterococcus faecalis* (*E. faecalis*) is a good indicator bacterium in hospital  
64 environment monitoring, being Gram-positive cocci these opportunistic pathogens not only  
65 form noxious biofilms on implanted medical devices and catheters, they also cause  
66 abdominal infection, urinary tract infections, surgical site wound infections, bacteremia,  
67 endocarditis and burn [9]. Antibiotic resistance is either intrinsic or through sporadic  
68 mutation or through the acquisition of foreign genetic material, by horizontal gene exchange  
69 occurring with the aid of mobile genetic elements plasmids, prophages and insertion

70 sequences [10,11]. Difficulties in treating *E. faecalis* and *E. faecium* (most prevalent species in  
71 human) have emerged due to acquired resistance, predominantly multi-drug resistance to  
72 universally used drugs as well as vancomycin [12]. A number of previous surveillance studies  
73 involving *E. faecalis* in Africa have focused either on wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs)  
74 and hospital effluent but not on the internal hospital environment [13,14]. Moreover, in  
75 South Africa, studies on the contamination of *E. faecalis*, using high discrimination resolution  
76 typing are scarce. This study, therefore, uses WGS in delineating the resistome, mobile  
77 genetic support, the clones and phylogenomic relationship of *E. faecalis* isolated from the  
78 hospital environment in places frequently touched by patients and healthcare workers at four  
79 different levels of healthcare in the metropolitan city of Durban, South Africa.

80

## 81 **2.0. Materials and Methods**

82

### 83 **2.1. Ethical approval**

84 Ethical clearance was received from the Biomedical Research Ethics Committee of the  
85 University of KwaZulu-Natal (Ref. BE606/16). The study was also registered on the Health  
86 Research and Knowledge Management database (HRKM 098/17) of the KwaZulu-Natal  
87 Provincial Health Research Ethics Committee. Gate keeper's approval was further granted by  
88 participating hospitals. No Human samples were taken in the study. All protocols were  
89 executed according to the agreed ethical approval terms and conditions.

90

### 91 **2.2. Study setting**

92 The selected hospitals were all public hospitals situated in the eThekweni region in Durban,  
93 South Africa. For non-disclosure reasons, the names of the hospitals were withheld and

94 referred to as A, B, C and D representing central, tertiary, regional and district facilities,  
95 respectively. The central hospital (A), with a 1200 bed-size, offers tertiary level sub-specialist  
96 services and serves as a referral hospital for the district, regional and tertiary hospitals. The  
97 tertiary hospital (B) with 800 beds also has specialist services and receives referrals from  
98 regional and district hospitals not limited to provincial boundaries. The regional hospital (C),  
99 with a 743 bed-size, provides services to a specific regional population and receives referrals  
100 from several district hospitals. The district hospital (D) has 300 beds and serves as a health  
101 district and supports primary health care services on a 24-hour basis. Samples were collected  
102 in the intensive care unit (ICU) and paediatric ward from 11 sites that included the  
103 telephones, ventilators, blood pressure apparatus, patient files, drip stands, sinks, occupied  
104 beds, unoccupied beds, nurses' tables, mops and the door handle of the linen room. A total  
105 number of 620 samples were collected over a period of three months from the four levels of  
106 healthcare. These samples were collected weekly in batches viz; 1<sup>st</sup> batch collected at the  
107 beginning of the week, 2<sup>nd</sup> in the middle of the week and 3<sup>rd</sup> batch at the end of the week. All  
108 samples were collected by randomly swabbing approximately 5 cm of the site using pre-  
109 labelled Nylon flock swabs with transport media (FLOQSwabs COPEN diagnostics Inc, USA).  
110 The swabs were then transported to the laboratory in iceboxes and processed within 3 to 4  
111 hrs of sampling.

112

### 113 **2.3. Isolation and identification of *Enterococcus***

114

#### 115 **2.3.1. Phenotypic determination of *Enterococcus***

116 The samples were inoculated separately into Tryptone Soya Broth (TSB) (Oxoid, Hampshire,  
117 England) and incubated at 37 °C for 2 h with shaking at 100 rpm. Following incubation, 1 ml

118 of each culture was inoculated into 9 ml of TSB supplemented with 6.5% NaCl and incubated  
119 at 37 °C for 24 h with shaking at 100 rpm. All 24 h cultures were sub-cultured by spread  
120 plating 100 µl onto Bile Esculin Azide agar (Himedia, Mumbai, India). Plates were incubated  
121 for 24 h at 37 °C, and brown-grey colonies surrounded by black halos were considered  
122 presumptive enterococci. Presumptive colonies were streaked onto Bile Aesculin agar (Lab  
123 M, Lancashire, UK), and incubated at 37 °C to obtain pure colonies. For characterisation of  
124 haemolysis, cultures were prepared on 5% Sheep Blood agar (Oxoid, Hampshire, England),  
125 and on Tryptone Soya Agar (TSA) (Oxoid, Hampshire, England) for biochemical  
126 characterisation and the Gram stain test [15]. Phenotypic identification was undertaken using  
127 API 20 Strep kits (Biomérieux SA, Marcy l 'Etoile, France). *Staphylococcus aureus* American  
128 Type Culture Collection (ATCC) 29213 and *E. faecalis* ATCC 29212 were used as controls.  
129 Presumptive enterococci were stored in 10% glycerol stock solution at - 80 °C until further  
130 processing.

131

### 132 2.3.2. Molecular confirmation of isolates

133 Stock cultures were resuscitated on TSA plates incubated at 37 °C for 24 h. DNA was  
134 extracted using the heat lysis method as previously described [16]. A multiplex polymerase  
135 chain reaction (PCR) was performed to confirm isolates at the genus and species level.  
136 Genus-specific and species-specific primer used in all the reactions were as previously  
137 described [17,18] (**Table S1**). Two PCR reaction mixtures, both containing the *Enterococcus*  
138 genus-specific primers, were set up for different primer sets as follows: Group 1: *E. faecalis*.  
139 Each reaction was performed in a total volume of 15 µl consisting of 8 µl of DreamTaq Green  
140 PCR Master Mix (2X) (Thermo Scientific, Vilnius, Lithuania), 0.5 µl of each primer pair (final  
141 concentration of 10 µM of each primer, 2.5 µl of template DNA and 1.5 µl of nuclease-free

142 water. The following thermal cycling conditions used: initial denaturation at 95 °C for 4 min,  
143 30 cycles of denaturation at 95 °C for 30 s, amplification at 46.1 °C for 1 min, elongation at 72  
144 °C for 1 min and a final extension at 72 °C for 7 min. All reactions were carried out in a T100  
145 thermal cycler (Bio-Rad, Hercules, California, USA) [19]. All reactions included a positive  
146 control (**Table S1**) and a “no template control (NTC)”. The PCR products were  
147 electrophoresed at 90 V on a 1.8% gel run in Tris-borate-EDTA (0.5X) containing 0.5 µg/ml  
148 ethidium bromide and visualised using the Gel Doc XR+ imaging system (Bio-Rad, Hercules,  
149 California, USA). Of the 620 samples taken, 295 *Enterococcus* spp. were obtained, of which  
150 245 were confirmed as *Enterococcus faecalis* via phenotypic and molecular assays. A sub-  
151 sample of all the 38 vancomycin-intermediate *E. faecalis* isolates were selected for the  
152 genotypic characterization by WGS and bioinformatics analysis (Table 1).

153

#### 154 **2.4. Antibiotic susceptibility testing (AST)**

155 Antibiotic susceptibility of the isolates was determined using the Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion  
156 method [20] according to Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) guidelines [21].  
157 The following antibiotics were used: ampicillin (10 µg), penicillin (5 µg), vancomycin (30 µg),  
158 teicoplanin (30 µg), erythromycin (15 µg), tetracycline (30 µg), ciprofloxacin (5 µg),  
159 levofloxacin (5 µg), nitrofurantoin (300 µg), chloramphenicol (30 µg), linezolid (30 µg) and  
160 rifampicin (5 µg). All discs were sourced from Oxoid (Basingstoke, United Kingdom).  
161 *Staphylococcus aureus* ATCC 25923 was used as the control. High-level aminoglycoside  
162 resistance was determined using gentamicin (120 µg) and streptomycin (300 µg) discs on  
163 Mueller-Hinton agar (Oxoid, Hampshire, England) with *E. faecalis* ATCC 29212 as the control  
164 isolate.

165

## 166 2.5. DNA isolation, genome sequencing, assembly and annotation

167 Genomic DNA (gDNA) was extracted using GenElute bacterial genomic DNA kit (Sigma–  
168 Aldrich, St. Louis, Missouri, United States) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. The  
169 quantification of extracted gDNA was determined on a Nanodrop ND1000  
170 spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific, Waltham, USA), Qubit 2.0 fluorometer (Invitrogen,  
171 Oregon, USA) and verified on an agarose gel electrophoresis. Multiplexed paired-end libraries  
172 (2 × 300 bp) were prepared using the Nextera DNA Flex sample preparation kit (Illumina, San  
173 Diego, California, United States) and sequences determined on an Illumina MiSeq platform  
174 with 100× coverage at the National Institute of Communicable Diseases Sequencing Core  
175 Facility, South Africa. The resulting raw reads were checked for quality, trimmed and de novo  
176 assembled into contigs using the CLC Genomics Workbench version 10.1 (CLC, Bio-QIAGEN,  
177 Aarhus, Denmark). Default parameters were used for all software unless otherwise specified.  
178 The CheckM tool version 0.9.7 [22] was used to verify that the sequence reads were not from  
179 mixed-species using lineage-specific marker sets from other genetically well-characterised  
180 closely-related *E. faecalis* isolates. The *de-novo* assembled reads were uploaded in GenBank  
181 and annotated using National Centre for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) prokaryotic  
182 genome annotation pipeline and Rapid Annotations using Subsystems Technology (RAST) 2.0  
183 server [23].

184

## 185 2.6. WGS-based molecular typing of *E. faecalis* isolates

186 Multilocus sequence typing (MLST) typing was performed in-silico using the WGS data online  
187 platform tool MLST 1.8 [24] which also predicted the allelic profiles of the seven  
188 housekeeping genes, *aroE*, *gdh*, *gki*, *gyd*, *psts*, *xpt*, and *yqil* of *E. faecalis* as described  
189 previously [25].



190

## 191 2.7. Phylogenomic analysis of *Enterococcus faecalis* isolates

192 The de novo-assembled contigs were uploaded, and the analysis was submitted to CSI (Call  
193 SNPs & Infer) Phylogeny-1.4 (<https://cge.cbs.dtu.dk/services/CSIPhylogeny-1.2>), an online  
194 service which identifies single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNPs) from WGS data, filters and  
195 validates the SNP positions, and then infers phylogeny based on concatenated SNP profiles  
196 [26]. The pipeline was run with default parameters: a minimal depth at SNP positions of 10  
197 reads, a minimal relative depth at SNP positions of 10%, a minimal distance between SNPs of  
198 10 bp, a minimal *Z-score* of 1.96, a minimal SNP quality of 30 and a minimal read mapping  
199 quality of 25. A bootstrapped with 100 replicates indicator was applied to identify  
200 recombined regions and provide the phylogenetic accuracy in groups with little homoplasy.  
201 The Figtree (<http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree/>) was used to edit and visualise the  
202 phylogenetic tree. The phylogeny was visualised alongside metadata for isolate demographics  
203 (including hospital, source, ward), sequence type and antibiotic resistome using Phandango  
204 [27] to provide a comprehensive analysis of the generated phylogenomic tree.

205

## 206 2.8. Genomic identification of the antibiotic resistome and mobile genetic elements (MGEs)

207 The bacterial analysis pipeline, ResFinder [28] was used to annotate and identify antibiotic-  
208 resistant genes using default parameters (threshold ID of 90% and a minimum length of  
209 60%). Plasmid replicons were predicted through PlasmidFinder [29]  
210 (<https://cge.cbs.dtu.dk/services/PlasmidFinder/>). The PHAge Search Tool (PHAST;  
211 <http://phast.wishartlab.com/>) [30] server was used for the identification, annotation, and  
212 visualization of prophage sequences. The assembled genomes were further analysed for  
213 insertion sequences and transposons using ISFinder (<https://isfinder.biotoul.fr/>) [31]. RAST

214 SEEDVIEWER (<https://rast.nmpdr.org/seedviewer.cgi>) [32] and Integrall database  
215 (<http://integrall.bio.ua.pt/>) [33] was also used to annotate and identify the investigated  
216 genomes for integrons and associated gene cassettes.

217

## 218 2.9. Data availability

219 The raw read sequences and the assembled whole-genome contigs have been deposited in  
220 GenBank. The data is available under project number **PRJNA523601**.

221

## 222 3.0. RESULTS

223

### 224 3.1. Prevalence and Antibiotic susceptibility testing

225 Of the 620 isolated samples, 295 were identified as *Enterococcus* spp. viz; *E. faecalis* 245  
226 (83.1%) and other Enterococci spp. 50 (16.9%) in all the hospitals. The *E. faecalis* distributions  
227 in the hospital were 27 (93%) from the district hospital [with samples only isolated from the  
228 phone (1), mops (6), occupied beds (5), nurse's table (7) and door handles (8)], 86 (85.1%)  
229 from the regional hospital [samples were isolated from all sites, phones (8), drip-stand (1), bp  
230 apparatus (6), patient files (7), ventilators (4), mops (14), sinks (9), occupied beds (14),  
231 unoccupied beds (3) nurse's table (12) and door handles (8)].

232 From the tertiary hospital, 86 (77.5%) [Samples were also isolated from all sites,  
233 phones (16), drip-stand (9), bp apparatus (6), patient files (8), ventilators (3), mops (12), sinks  
234 (5), occupied beds (9), unoccupied beds (7) nurse's table (7) and door handles (4)]. From the  
235 central hospital, 48 (88.9%) samples were isolated from phones (7), patient files (6), mop (8),  
236 sink (4), occupied bed (12), unoccupied bed (3) and nurse's table (8)]. The sites with the  
237 highest contamination rates were the occupied beds and the mops with 30.2% each. In the

238 district hospital, most positive samples identified were from the door handles 27.6%, the  
239 nurses' tables with 24.1% and mops with 20.6%. In the regional hospital, the mops and the  
240 occupied beds 13.8% each and the nurses tables 11.9%. For the tertiary hospital, the ward  
241 phones with 14.4% and mop 10.8%. While in the central, were the occupied beds 22.2%,  
242 followed by the nurses' tables and mop with 20.3% each.

243 Antibiotic susceptibility testing revealed that none of the 245 identified *E. faecalis*  
244 isolates was vancomycin-resistant (VRE). However, a total of thirty-eight (38) were of  
245 intermediate susceptibility to vancomycin and were selected for genotypic characterization  
246 by WGS and bioinformatics analysis (Table 1). These 38 vancomycin intermediate isolates  
247 showed high resistance to both tetracycline (n=30, 79%) followed by resistance to  
248 erythromycin (n=18, 47%). A small number of the isolates showed aminoglycoside resistance  
249 (gentamicin [n=4] and streptomycin [n=6]). Majority of the isolates were susceptible to  
250 ampicillin, penicillin, teicoplanin and levofloxacin while all the isolates were susceptible  
251 nitrofurantoin (Table S2).

252

### 253 3.2. WGS-based species confirmation and molecular typing

254 The identification of *E. faecalis* isolates was confirmed with generated genomic data via the  
255 Global Platform for Genomic Surveillance (Pathogenwatch). MLST-analyses (ST) revealed that  
256 the *E. faecalis* in the provincial public health-care facilities were multiclonal belonging to 15  
257 different STs with the 6 major STs belonging to ST16 (n =7), ST40 (n = 6), ST21 (n =5), ST126  
258 (n = 3), ST23 (n =3) and ST386 (n=3) (Table 1), with diverse allelic profiles. Moreover, one  
259 isolate belonged newly defined ST bearing a novel allele (ST922) [34].

260

### 261 3.3. Antibiotic resistance genes of *E. Faecalis* isolates

262 In total, 14 antibiotic resistance genes (ARGs) and variants were detected (Table 1). There  
263 were no specific differences in the resistome with regards to their hospital levels and wards.  
264 The frequency of ARGs ranged between 2–13 genes, with fifteen isolates carrying 3  
265 resistance genes. Acquired ARGs conferring resistance to tetracycline [*tet(M)* and *tet(L)*],  
266 macrolide-lincosamide-streptogramin B (MLS<sub>B</sub>) [*erm(B)* and *mphD*], aminoglycosides (*sat4A*,  
267 *aph3-III*, *ant6-la*, *aac6-aph2*), trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (*dfrG* and *dfrK*) and phenicols  
268 (*catA* and *optrA*) were found in the isolates as shown in Table 1. The *tet(M)* and *erm(B)* genes  
269 were found in 82% (31/38) and 42% (16/38) of the isolates, respectively. The *dfrG* gene  
270 predominately caused resistance to trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (Table 1 and Table S2).

271

### 272 3.4. WGS detection of mobile genetic support

273 WGS analysis revealed 11 different plasmid replicons from seven *rep* families that occurred in  
274 different combinations in the *E. faecalis* isolates (Table 2). pTEF2 (rep9), pTEF3 (repUS13),  
275 pAD1 (rep9) and pEFC1 (rep6) were the most predominant replicon types occurring in 14  
276 (37%), 13 (34%), 13 (34%) and 9 (24%) isolates, respectively. Of note, two isolates 2SIL2 and  
277 2SPJ101 from hospital D concomitantly harboured unique plasmid replicons (pk214 (rep7),  
278 pEFR (rep11), pPD1 (rep9), pRE25 (rep2), pUB110 (repUS14), pKH7 (rep7)) that were absent  
279 in the other isolates (Table 2). Eight (21%) of the isolates did not possess any plasmid  
280 replicons. The replicons harboured by the isolates were clonally related. For instance, major  
281 replicon pTEF2 (rep9) was harboured by isolates belonging to ST21 while the replicon set  
282 pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9) and pEFC1 (rep6) were harboured in ST40 isolates.  
283 Furthermore, most of the isolates (n=5) belonging to ST16 lacked plasmids.

284 The prophage analysis revealed all isolates hosted at least one intact bacteriophage  
285 except for three isolates belonging to different STs (Table 2). The predominant intact

286 bacteriophages found were the Entero\_phiFL1A (n=16, 42%), Entero\_phiFL3A (n=6, 16%),  
287 Entero\_vB\_IME197 (n=6, 16%) and Entero\_phiEf11 (n=5, 13%). Four prophages were  
288 identified in one *E. faecalis* ST16 (3UPF4) strain isolated from the mop of a paediatric ward in  
289 hospital B with a peculiar bacteriophage (Lactoc\_PLgT\_1). The isolates 1C1H3, 1MPD4, 2U1K2  
290 and 2UPF3 from different hospitals hosted 3 prophages. The prophage harboured by the  
291 isolates were clonally related (Table 2).

292 A myriad of IS families was found in the isolates with no association with respect to  
293 the hospital and ward. The 5 major IS families were IS3 (predicted to be linked with  
294 *Enterococcus faecium*/*Streptococcus agalactiae* sources), IS5 (predicted to be associated with  
295 *Cyanotheca sp.* sources), IS1595 (predicted to be linked with *Bacillus subtilis*), ISL3 (predicted  
296 to be linked with *Streptococcus mutans/thermophilus*) and IS607 (predicted to be linked with  
297 both *Campylobacter sp.* and *Virus NY2A*), (Table S3). The transposase (Tn3) linked with  
298 *Bacillus thuringiensis* was found in 7 of the isolates identified from different sources (Table  
299 S3). All the isolates lacked integrons and their associated gene cassettes.

300

### 301 3.5. Phylogenomic and metadata analysis

302 A phylogenetic tree reconstructed to analyse genetic relationships between the isolates  
303 revealed a high divergence of isolates according to the different levels of care (Figure 1). For  
304 instance, each hospital was generally associated with specific dominant clones (i.e., ST40 and  
305 ST498 were mostly found in hospital A; ST16, ST126, and ST386 were found in hospital B; and  
306 ST21 was predominately found in hospital C (Table 1 and Figure 1).

307 Phylogenomic trees coupled metadata visualization analysis provided a more in-depth  
308 insight into the characteristics and distinctions between isolates and revealed the intra-clonal  
309 spread of *E. faecalis* strains between different sources within the same hospitals (Figure 1).

310 Specifically, ST21 was found on the drip stand, patient file, sink and nurses table in both ICU  
311 and paediatric ward of hospital C. Similarly, ST40 was found on phone, patient file, mop,  
312 occupied bed and nurses table of the paediatric ward hospital A. The ST16 clone was isolated  
313 on the mop (paediatric ward), phone and BP apparatus (ICU) of hospital B. More so, ST386  
314 linked with the phone, BP apparatus, and unoccupied bed in the paediatric ward of hospital B  
315 while ST126 was found on the occupied bed and nurses table in the ICU of the same hospital.

316

#### 317 4.0. Discussion

318 In line with the global trend, reports on bacterial contamination in hospital  
319 environments is increasing in Africa across all sectors [35], and *E. faecalis* is one of the most  
320 common enterococcal species isolated from the hospital environment. This is evident from  
321 our results where *E. faecalis* (n=245) was the most prevalent organisms compared to *E.*  
322 *faecium* (n= 53). *E. faecalis* is recognised as an important hospital-associated pathogen  
323 responsible for approximately 80-90% of cases reported in the hospital settings followed by  
324 5-10% *E. faecium* [36] and hence has been placed in the category of pathogens posing a  
325 major threat to healthcare systems [37]. Furthermore, *E. faecalis* represent major infection  
326 prevention attributed to their ability to persist for long periods on hands and remain viable  
327 on environmental surfaces (inanimate surfaces) due to their microbial structure thus, can  
328 serve as a reservoir for ongoing transmission in the absence of regular decontamination [38].  
329 Additionally, *E. faecalis* posses the ability to acquire additional resistance through the  
330 transfer of mobile genetic support such as plasmids, prophages, and insertion sequences  
331 [39,40]. The acquisition of resistance and genetic support poses a therapeutic challenge.

332 The WGS results showed that none of the *E. faecalis* harbored vancomycin-resistant  
333 genes which corroborated with the phenotypes [12]. This affirms the view of Ellington *et al*

334 on the role of WGS in antimicrobial susceptibility testing of bacteria for the explanation of  
335 phenotypic result for samples [41] and further confirms WGS as a more discriminatory tool to  
336 infer antibiotic susceptibility as compared to relying fully on phenotypic testing alone.  
337 Majority of the isolates were susceptible to ampicillin, penicillin, teicoplanin, levofloxacin,  
338 and nitrofurantoin confirming their use as treatment options in South Africa, particularly  
339 ampicillin (the drug of choice for *E. faecalis* infections) [42].

340 Tetracycline demonstrated reduced susceptibility against *E. faecalis* mediated mostly  
341 by the ribosomal protection protein, *tet(M)* [11,43]. This was consistent with previous studies  
342 that found the *tet(M)* as the dominant gene causing tetracycline resistance in *E. faecalis*  
343 isolates across all the one-health sectors (human-animal-environment interface) [35]. For  
344 instance, in a 2014 hospital-based study in China by Jia *et al.*[44], *tet(M)* was found to cause  
345 tetracycline-resistant *E. faecalis* isolates. Similarly, Said *et al.* [45] also detected *tet(M)* as  
346 96.1% of all tetracycline-resistant *Enterococcus* isolates in Egypt. However, the tetracycline  
347 resistance exhibited by 2SIL2 isolate was mediated by both ribosomal-protection gene  
348 [*tet(M)*] and active-efflux gene [*tet(L)*]. This indicates the significant role played by efflux  
349 pumps in mediating antibiotic resistance [46]. The low prevalence of the *tet(L)* was not  
350 unusual and pointed to the fact that ribosomal protection protein is the main mechanism of  
351 tetracycline-resistant *E. faecalis* isolates. The moderate level of erythromycin resistance was  
352 mediated by *erm(B)* genes which are the most common mechanism of resistance reported  
353 for the macrolide class of antibiotics in Africa [35] and globally [11,47] for *Enterococcus*.  
354 There was small number of isolates showing aminoglycoside resistance across the different  
355 levels of care, which corresponded to the aminoglycoside-modifying enzymes found.  
356 However, these isolates exhibited high-level resistance encoding a set of enzymes (*sat4A*,  
357 *aph3-III*, *ant6-Ia*, *aac6-aph2*). However, this was not unusual as some *Enterococcus* spp. are

358 known to produce low-level resistance to aminoglycosides by limiting drug uptake, which is  
359 associated with the proteins involved in electron transport [48]. More so, the *OptrA* gene  
360 implicated in linezolid resistance was found in only one isolate (2SIL2) however, it was  
361 unexpressed as the isolate was susceptible to linezolid (Table 1 and S2) as reported in study  
362 in China where *OptrA* was found in eighteen linezolid non-resistant enterococci [49].

363 A noticeable polyclonal nature was observed in the *E. faecalis* isolates with 15 distinct  
364 STs, including one novel STs, highlighting the diverse nature of the strains in the province.  
365 The major STs found such as ST16, ST40 and ST21 were previously reported in Saudi Arabia,  
366 China, Tunisia, France, and Spain from human subjects, hospitalised patients, animals and  
367 wastewater [36,50–53]. Similarly, other studies have also reported the ST126, ST23 and  
368 ST386 in different settings (human, animal and environment) and hence do not suggest any  
369 kind of host specificity in these major STs reported in this study [54]. However, unlike other  
370 countries, the population structure of *E. faecalis* from different settings in South Africa are  
371 minimally monitored, if at all, making it difficult to correlate our results with studies in South  
372 Africa. This calls for the need for *E. faecalis* to be included in surveillance schemes to enable  
373 the monitoring of the molecular epidemiology of isolates collected over larger tempo-spatial  
374 scales using high throughput technologies such as WGS [55]. Such surveillance would help  
375 microbiologists and public health practitioners to gain better insights into the evolution and  
376 dissemination of *E. faecalis*.

377 Characterizing the genetic support in the isolates indicated that the majority of *E.*  
378 *faecalis* in the different hospitals are likely reservoirs for diverse mobile genetic elements and  
379 associated ARGs (especially for tetracycline, erythromycin). There was a higher plasmid  
380 prevalence rate (seven *rep* families) and the detection of two or more distinct replicons in  
381 one strain. Accordingly, this finding agrees with the fact that numerous types of plasmids are



382 often present in enterococci from a clinical setting [56–58]. More so, other studies have  
383 shown that single isolates of *E. faecalis* may harbour multiple plasmids [57,59].

384         There was no specific pattern between the acquisition of insertion sequence families  
385 or transposable elements with respect to the ward and level of care however the presence of  
386 major IS families in *E. faecalis* clones imply that these elements are spread by horizontal gene  
387 transfer (HGT) [39]. Moreover, the acquisition of these elements can lead to transposition in  
388 the genome aid in the transfer of resistance genes, enabling it to adapt to new environmental  
389 challenges and colonise new niches [60]. For instance, IS3 family upstream of the *EmrB* gene  
390 has been reported for enhanced erythromycin resistance [60]. The ability of these clones to  
391 acquire novel genetic features may contribute to their increased persistence and highlights  
392 its potential public health threat.

393         Comparative phylogenomics using WGS SNPs analysis revealed a higher genetic  
394 diversity between the strains with respect to each specific hospital. This implied that the  
395 major clones were mostly hospital-specific, which was in concordance with the *in-silico* MLST  
396 typing scheme (Figure 1). Interestingly, a study by Kawalec *et al.*, [61] also found a higher  
397 diversity in the clonal structure of *E. faecalis* strains among hospitals in Poland. Visualizing the  
398 phylogenomic tree with metadata revealed the major clones in the various hospitals. This  
399 further depicted the intra-clonal spread of *E. faecalis* strains between different sources  
400 within the same hospital, reiterating the need for phylo/meta- analysis to increase  
401 confidence in molecular epidemiological studies. For instance, at the paediatric ward of  
402 hospital A, the ST40 clone was isolated from a phone, nurses table, patient file, mop and  
403 occupied bed which may be due to hand contamination by patients and/or healthcare  
404 workers (nurses, janitor staff, etc.) (Figure 1). A similar scenario occurred in hospital B, where  
405 ST386 was found in the paediatric ward (on the phone, BP apparatus and unoccupied bed)

406 while the ST126 was isolated in the ICU (on nurses table and occupied bed). Reports on  
407 enterococci transient carriage on the hands of healthcare workers and patients as well their  
408 presence on, medical equipment, or environmental surfaces has been documented in several  
409 studies [62–65]. Other studies have reported the movement of colonised patients among  
410 different settings in the hospital as responsible for these patterns of transmission [64,66].  
411 Moreover, hospitals B and C observed intra-ward spreads (both ICU and paediatric ward) of  
412 ST16 and 21, respectively from different sites with each hospital. The transmission of  
413 enterococcal strains has been documented within medical units, given credence to the study  
414 findings [67,68].

415 Frequent contact with healthcare providers and movement of colonised patients  
416 among different healthcare settings is a probable means for these patterns of transmission in  
417 hospitals A, B and C. However, there were limited isolates from district hospital (Hospital D)  
418 due to the number of isolates obtained for any detailed comparative analysis. Even though  
419 the findings of our study may not be generalised to the overall situation in the country, this  
420 study improves the understanding of the prevalence, genetic content, and relatedness of *E.*  
421 *faecalis* contamination of hospital environments. It is thus recommended that scheduled  
422 periodic identification of transmitting sources in the hospitals' inanimate environment, strict  
423 enforcement and adhesions of IPC practices amongst the health workers and isolation of  
424 colonised patients should be imposed to reduce the incidence and transmission of *E. faecalis*  
425 hospital environments. More so, the study was limited by the number of isolates selected for  
426 sequencing and hence there is the need for large-scale genomic epidemiology to elucidate  
427 the population structure in the various hospital environments in South Africa.

428

429 **5.0. Conclusion**

430 This genomic analysis provided a snapshot of the hospital inanimate environment as a  
431 reservoir of resistant *E. faecalis*, its associated mobilome (plasmids, prophages, insertion  
432 sequences and transposons) and revealed a complex intra-clonal spread of *E. faecalis* major  
433 clones between the sites within each specific hospital setting. This study improves our  
434 understanding of the dissemination of *E. faecalis* in hospital environments and will aid in the  
435 design of optimal infection prevention and control strategies in clinical settings.

436

#### 437 **Acknowledgment**

438 We are grateful to the Sequencing Core Facility, National Institute for Communicable  
439 Diseases, National Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa; the South African  
440 Research Chairs Initiative of the Department of Science and Technology and the National  
441 Research Foundation of South Africa (Grant number: **98342**); and the College of Health young  
442 researcher grant, University of KwaZulu-Natal, for sponsoring this research.

443

#### 444 **General Disclaimer**

445 Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are  
446 those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the organisations or  
447 agencies that provided support for the project. The funders had no role in the study design,  
448 nor the decision to submit the work for publication.

449

#### 450 **Competing interests**

451 The authors have no competing interests to declare.

452

#### 453 **Author Contributions**

454 C.S co-conceptualised the study, undertook sample collection, microbiological and  
455 bioinformatic analyses and drafted the manuscript. D.G.A. co-conceptualised the study,  
456 undertook bioinformatics analyses, data interpretation and a critical revision of the  
457 manuscript. M.A and A.I. performed whole-genome sequencing analysis and critical revision  
458 of the manuscript. S.Y.E. and L.B co-conceptualised the study, supervised the study and  
459 undertook critical revision of the manuscript.

460

#### 461 List of Tables

462 **Table 1:** Summary of the hospital levels, the source of sample collected, sample type, and  
463 genotypic characteristics of the *E. Faecalis* isolates.

464

465 **Table 2:** Genomic analysis of mobile genetic elements (MGEs).

466

#### 467 Figure Legends

468

469 **Figure 1:** The whole-genome MLST phylogenomic branch and metadata of isolate information  
470 (including isolate identity, hospital, source, and ward) and WGS *in-silico typing* (sequence  
471 type and antibiotic resistome) coupled using Phandango *E. faecalis* isolates at different level  
472 of care in Durban, South Africa. The linking lines in the phylogenetic tree differentiate  
473 between the different clades. Metadata annotations show that there were generally distinct  
474 major sequence types between the 4 hospital environments however within each hospital  
475 there was the spread of these major clones between different sources in the wards.

476

#### 477 Supplemental Material

478 **Table S1:** List of genus-and species-specific primers and control strains used in this study.

479 **Table S2:** Antibiotic susceptibility profiles of *E. faecalis* (n=38).

480 **Table S3:** Distribution of 6 major insertion sequence (IS)/transposase families and their  
481 associated predicted sources among *E. faecalis* isolates via the ISFinder database.

482

483 **References:**

- 484 1. Comar, M.; D'Accolti, M.; Cason, C.; Soffritti, I.; Campisciano, G.; Lanzoni, L.; Bisi, M.;  
485 Volta, A.; Mazzacane, S.; Caselli, E. Introduction of NGS in Environmental Surveillance  
486 for Healthcare-Associated Infection Control. *Microorganisms* **2019**, *7*, 708,  
487 doi:10.3390/microorganisms7120708.
- 488 2. Gilchrist, C.A.; Turner, S.D.; Riley, M.F.; Petri, W.A.; Hewlett, E.L. Whole-Genome  
489 Sequencing in Outbreak Analysis. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* **2015**, *28*, 541–563,  
490 doi:10.1128/CMR.00075-13.
- 491 3. Bani-Yaghoub, M.; Gautam, R.; Döpfer, D.; Kaspar, C.W.; Ivanek, R. Effectiveness of  
492 environmental decontamination as an infection control measure. *Epidemiol. Infect.*  
493 **2012**, *140*, 542–553, doi:10.1017/S0950268811000604.
- 494 4. Dusé, A. Infection control in developing countries with particular emphasis on South  
495 Africa. *South Afr J Epidemiol Infect* **2005**, *20*, 37–41.
- 496 5. Harbarth, S.; Balkhy, H.H.; Goossens, H.; Jarlier, V.; Kluytmans, J.; Laxminarayan, R.;  
497 Saam, M.; Van Belkum, A.; Pittet, D. Antimicrobial resistance: one world, one fight!  
498 *Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control* **2015**, *4*, 49, doi:10.1186/s13756-015-0091-2.
- 499 6. Mcgann, P.; Bunin, J.L.; Snesrud, E.; Singh, S.; Maybank, R.; Ong, A.C.; Kwak, Y.I.;  
500 Seronello, S.; Clifford, R.J.; Hinkle, M.; et al. Real time application of whole genome  
501 sequencing for outbreak investigation – What is an achievable turnaround time ?

- 502        *Diagn. Microbiol. Infect. Dis.* **2016**, *85*, 277–282,  
503        doi:10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2016.04.020.
- 504    7.    Quainoo, S.; Coolen, J.P.M.; van Hijum, S.A.F.T.; Huynen, M.A.; Melchers, W.J.G.; van  
505        Schaik, W.; Wertheim, H.F.L. Whole-Genome Sequencing of Bacterial Pathogens: the  
506        Future of Nosocomial Outbreak Analysis. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* **2017**, *30*, 1015–1063,  
507        doi:10.1128/CMR.00016-17.
- 508    8.    Balloux, F.; Brønstad Brynildsrud, O.; van Dorp, L.; Shaw, L.P.; Chen, H.; Harris, K.A.;  
509        Wang, H.; Eldholm, V. From Theory to Practice: Translating Whole-Genome  
510        Sequencing (WGS) into the Clinic. *Trends Microbiol.* **2018**, *26*, 1035–1048,  
511        doi:10.1016/j.tim.2018.08.004.
- 512    9.    Zaheer, R.; Cook, S.R.; Barbieri, R.; Goji, N.; Cameron, A.; Petkau, A.; Polo, R.O.;  
513        Tymensen, L.; Stamm, C.; Song, J.; et al. Surveillance of Enterococcus spp. reveals  
514        distinct species and antimicrobial resistance diversity across a One-Health continuum.  
515        *Sci. Rep.* **2020**, *10*, 3937, doi:10.1038/s41598-020-61002-5.
- 516    10.    Hollenbeck, B.L.; Rice, L.B. Intrinsic and acquired resistance mechanisms in  
517        enterococcus. *Virulence* **2012**, *3*, 421–569, doi:10.4161/viru.21282.
- 518    11.    Miller, W.R.; Munita, J.M.; Arias, C.A. Mechanisms of antibiotic resistance in  
519        enterococci. *Expert Rev. Anti. Infect. Ther.* **2014**, *12*, 1221–1236,  
520        doi:10.1586/14787210.2014.956092.
- 521    12.    Shobo, C.O.; Essack, S.Y.; Bester, L.A. Enterococcal contamination of hospital  
522        environments in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **2021**,  
523        doi:10.1111/jam.15224.
- 524    13.    Iweriebor, B.; Gaqavu, S.; Obi, L.; Nwodo, U.; Okoh, A. Antibiotic Susceptibilities of  
525        Enterococcus Species Isolated from Hospital and Domestic Wastewater Effluents in

- 526 Alice, Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2015**, *12*,
- 527 4231–4246, doi:10.3390/ijerph120404231.
- 528 14. Ekwanzala, M.D.; Dewar, J.B.; Kamika, I.; Momba, M.N.B. Comparative genomics of
- 529 vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus* spp. revealed common resistome determinants
- 530 from hospital wastewater to aquatic environments. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2020**, *719*,
- 531 137275, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.137275.
- 532 15. Gregersen, T. Rapid method for distinction of gram-negative from gram-positive
- 533 bacteria. *Eur. J. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **1978**, *5*, 123–127,
- 534 doi:10.1007/BF00498806.
- 535 16. Englen, M.D.; Kelley, L.C. A rapid DNA isolation procedure for the identification of
- 536 *Campylobacter jejuni* by the polymerase chain reaction. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* **2000**, *31*,
- 537 421–426, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2672.2000.00841.x.
- 538 17. Jackson, C.R.; Fedorka-Cray, P.J.; Barrett, J.B. Use of a genus- and species-specific
- 539 multiplex PCR for identification of enterococci. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **2004**, *42*, 3558–3565,
- 540 doi:10.1128/JCM.42.8.3558-3565.2004.
- 541 18. Ke, D.; Picard, F.J.; Martineau, F.; Ménard, C.; Roy, P.H.; Ouellette, M.; Bergeron, M.G.
- 542 Development of a PCR assay for rapid detection of enterococci. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **1999**,
- 543 *37*, 3497–503.
- 544 19. Molechan, C.; Amoako, D.G.; Abia, A.L.K.; Somboro, A.M.; Bester, L.A.; Essack, S.Y.
- 545 Molecular epidemiology of antibiotic-resistant *Enterococcus* spp. from the farm-to-
- 546 fork continuum in intensive poultry production in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Sci.*
- 547 *Total Environ.* **2019**, *692*, 868–878, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.07.324.
- 548 20. Yang, Y.; Jiang, X.-T.; Zhang, T. Evaluation of a hybrid approach using UBLAST and
- 549 BLASTX for metagenomic sequences annotation of specific functional genes. *PLoS One*

- 550           2014, 9, e110947, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0110947.
- 551   21.    CLSI *Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing. CLSI supplement*  
552           *M100*.; 27th ed.; Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; Wayne, Pennsylvania,  
553           2017;
- 554   22.    Parks, D.H.; Imelfort, M.; Skennerton, C.T.; Hugenholtz, P.; Tyson, G.W. CheckM:  
555           assessing the quality of microbial genomes recovered from isolates, single cells, and  
556           metagenomes. *Genome Res.* **2015**, *25*, 1043–1055, doi:10.1101/gr.186072.114.
- 557   23.    Aziz, R.K.; Bartels, D.; Best, A.; DeJongh, M.; Disz, T.; Edwards, R.A.; Formsma, K.;  
558           Gerdes, S.; Glass, E.M.; Kubal, M.; et al. The RAST Server: Rapid annotations using  
559           subsystems technology. *BMC Genomics* **2008**, *9*, 1–15, doi:10.1186/1471-2164-9-75.
- 560   24.    Larsen, M. V; Cosentino, S.; Rasmussen, S.; Friis, C.; Hasman, H.; Marvig, R.L.; Jelsbak,  
561           L.; Sicheritz-Pontén, T.; Ussery, D.W.; Aarestrup, F.M.; et al. Multilocus Sequence  
562           Typing of Total-Genome-Sequenced Bacteria. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **2012**, *50*, 1355–1361,  
563           doi:10.1128/jcm.06094-11.
- 564   25.    Feil, E.J.; Cooper, J.E.; Grundmann, H.; Robinson, D.A.; Enright, M.C.; Berendt, T.;  
565           Peacock, S.J.; Smith, J.M.; Murphy, M.; Spratt, B.G.; et al. How Clonal Is *Staphylococcus*  
566           *aureus* ? **2003**, *185*, 3307–3316, doi:10.1128/JB.185.11.3307.
- 567   26.    Ahrenfeldt, J.; Skaarup, C.; Hasman, H.; Pedersen, A.G.; Aarestrup, F.M.; Lund, O.  
568           Bacterial whole genome-based phylogeny: construction of a new benchmarking  
569           dataset and assessment of some existing methods. *BMC Genomics* **2017**, *18*, 19,  
570           doi:10.1186/s12864-016-3407-6.
- 571   27.    Hadfield, J.; Croucher, N.J.; Goater, R.J.; Abudahab, K.; Aanensen, D.M.; Harris, S.R.  
572           Phandango: an interactive viewer for bacterial population genomics. *Bioinformatics*  
573           **2017**, *34*, 292–293, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btx610.



- 574 28. Zankari, E.; Hasman, H.; Cosentino, S.; Vestergaard, M.; Rasmussen, S.; Lund, O.;  
575 Aarestrup, F.M.; Larsen, M.V. Identification of acquired antimicrobial resistance genes.  
576 *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **2012**, *67*, 2640–2644, doi:10.1093/jac/dks261.
- 577 29. Carattoli, A.; Zankari, E.; García-Fernández, A.; Voldby Larsen, M.; Lund, O.; Villa, L.;  
578 Møller Aarestrup, F.; Hasman, H. In Silico Detection and Typing of Plasmids using  
579 PlasmidFinder and Plasmid Multilocus Sequence Typing. *Antimicrob. Agents*  
580 *Chemother.* **2014**, *58*, 3895–3903, doi:10.1128/AAC.02412-14.
- 581 30. Zhou, Y.; Liang, Y.; Lynch, K.H.; Dennis, J.J.; Wishart, D.S. PHAST: A Fast Phage Search  
582 Tool. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **2011**, *39*, 347–352, doi:10.1093/nar/gkr485.
- 583 31. Siguier, P. ISfinder: the reference centre for bacterial insertion sequences. *Nucleic*  
584 *Acids Res.* **2006**, *34*, D32–D36, doi:10.1093/nar/gkj014.
- 585 32. Overbeek, R.; Olson, R.; Pusch, G.D.; Olsen, G.J.; Davis, J.J.; Disz, T.; Edwards, R.A.;  
586 Gerdes, S.; Parrello, B.; Shukla, M.; et al. The SEED and the Rapid Annotation of  
587 microbial genomes using Subsystems Technology (RAST). *Nucleic Acids Res.* **2014**, *42*,  
588 D206–D214, doi:10.1093/nar/gkt1226.
- 589 33. Moura, A.; Soares, M.; Pereira, C.; Leitão, N.; Henriques, I.; Correia, A. INTEGRALL: A  
590 database and search engine for integrons, integrases and gene cassettes.  
591 *Bioinformatics* **2009**, *25*, 1096–1098, doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp105.
- 592 34. Shobo, C.O.; Amoako, D.G.; Allam, M.; Ismail, A.; Essack, S.Y.; Bester, L.A. Genome  
593 Sequence of a Novel *Enterococcus faecalis* Sequence Type 922 Strain Isolated from a  
594 Door Handle in the Intensive Care Unit of a District Hospital in Durban, South Africa.  
595 *Microbiol. Resour. Announc.* **2019**, *8*, 1–2, doi:10.1128/MRA.00582-19.
- 596 35. Osei Sekyere, J.; Mensah, E. Molecular epidemiology and mechanisms of antibiotic  
597 resistance in *Enterococcus* spp., *Staphylococcus* spp., and *Streptococcus* spp. in Africa:


- 598 a systematic review from a One Health perspective. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **2020**, *1465*,  
599 29–58, doi:10.1111/nyas.14254.
- 600 36. Farman, M.; Yasir, M.; Al-Hindi, R.R.; Farraj, S.A.; Jiman-Fatani, A.A.; Alawi, M.; Azhar,  
601 E.I. Genomic analysis of multidrug-resistant clinical *Enterococcus faecalis* isolates for  
602 antimicrobial resistance genes and virulence factors from the western region of Saudi  
603 Arabia. *Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control* **2019**, *8*, 55, doi:10.1186/s13756-019-0508-4.
- 604 37. Zarb, P.; Coignard, B.; Griskeviciene, J.; Muller, A.; Vankerckhoven, V.; Weist, K.;  
605 Goossens, M.; Vaerenberg, S.; Hopkins, S.; Catry, B.; et al. The European Centre for  
606 Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) pilot point prevalence survey of healthcare-  
607 associated infections and antimicrobial use. *Euro Surveill.* **2012**, *17*, 20316,  
608 doi:10.2807/ese.17.46.20316-en.
- 609 38. Kramer, A.; Schwebke, I.; Kampf, G. How long do nosocomial pathogens persist on  
610 inanimate surfaces? A systematic review. *BMC Infect. Dis.* **2006**, *6*, 130,  
611 doi:10.1186/1471-2334-6-130.
- 612 39. Mikalsen, T.; Pedersen, T.; Willems, R.; Coque, T.M.; Werner, G.; Sadowy, E.; van  
613 Schaik, W.; Jensen, L.B.; Sundsfjord, A.; Hegstad, K. Investigating the mobilome in  
614 clinically important lineages of *Enterococcus faecium* and *Enterococcus faecalis*. *BMC*  
615 *Genomics* **2015**, *16*, 282, doi:10.1186/s12864-015-1407-6.
- 616 40. Partridge, S.R.; Kwong, S.M.; Firth, N.; Jensen, S.O. Mobile Genetic Elements  
617 Associated with Antimicrobial Resistance. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* **2018**, *31*, e00088-17,  
618 doi:10.1128/CMR.00088-17.
- 619 41. Ellington, M.J.; Ekelund, O.; Aarestrup, F.M.; Canton, R.; Doumith, M.; Giske, C.;  
620 Grundman, H.; Hasman, H.; Holden, M.T.G.; Hopkins, K.L.; et al. The role of whole  
621 genome sequencing in antimicrobial susceptibility testing of bacteria: report from the

- 622 EUCAST Subcommittee. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **2017**, *23*, 2–22,  
623 doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2016.11.012.
- 624 42. National Department of Health *Surveillance for resistance and consumption of*  
625 *antibiotics in South Africa*; 2018;
- 626 43. Warburton, P.J.; Amodeo, N.; Roberts, A.P. Mosaic tetracycline resistance genes  
627 encoding ribosomal protection proteins. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **2016**, *71*, 3333–  
628 3339, doi:10.1093/jac/dkw304.
- 629 44. Jia, W.; Li, G.; Wang, W. Prevalence and Antimicrobial Resistance of Enterococcus  
630 Species: A Hospital-Based Study in China. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2014**, *11*,  
631 3424–3442, doi:10.3390/ijerph110303424.
- 632 45. Said, H.S.; Abdelmegeed, E.S. Emergence of multidrug resistance and extensive drug  
633 resistance among enterococcal clinical isolates in Egypt. *Infect. Drug Resist.* **2019**, *12*,  
634 1113–1125, doi:10.2147/IDR.S189341.
- 635 46. Blanco, P.; Hernando-Amado, S.; Reales-Calderon, J.; Corona, F.; Lira, F.; Alcalde-Rico,  
636 M.; Bernardini, A.; Sanchez, M.; Martinez, J. Bacterial Multidrug Efflux Pumps: Much  
637 More Than Antibiotic Resistance Determinants. *Microorganisms* **2016**, *4*, 14,  
638 doi:10.3390/microorganisms4010014.
- 639 47. Tian, Y.; Yu, H.; Wang, Z. Distribution of acquired antibiotic resistance genes among  
640 Enterococcus spp. isolated from a hospital in Baotou, China. *BMC Res. Notes* **2019**, *12*,  
641 27, doi:10.1186/s13104-019-4064-z.
- 642 48. Shete, V.; Grover, N.; Kumar, M. Analysis of Aminoglycoside Modifying Enzyme Genes  
643 Responsible for High-Level Aminoglycoside Resistance among Enterococcal Isolates. *J.*  
644 *Pathog.* **2017**, *2017*, 1–5, doi:10.1155/2017/3256952.
- 645 49. Li, P.; Yang, Y.; Ding, L.; Xu, X.; Lin, D. Molecular Investigations of Linezolid Resistance in

- 646 Enterococci OptrA Variants from a Hospital in Shanghai. *Infect. Drug Resist.* **2020**,  
647 *Volume 13*, 2711–2716, doi:10.2147/IDR.S251490.
- 648 50. Zischka, M.; Künne, C.T.; Blom, J.; Wobser, D.; Sakıncı, T.; Schmidt-Hohagen, K.;  
649 Dabrowski, P.W.; Nitsche, A.; Hübner, J.; Hain, T.; et al. Comprehensive molecular,  
650 genomic and phenotypic analysis of a major clone of *Enterococcus faecalis* MLST ST40.  
651 *BMC Genomics* **2015**, *16*, 175, doi:10.1186/s12864-015-1367-x.
- 652 51. Kuch, A.; Willems, R.J.L.; Werner, G.; Coque, T.M.; Hammerum, A.M.; Sundsfjord, A.;  
653 Klare, I.; Ruiz-Garbajosa, P.; Simonsen, G.S.; van Luit-Asbroek, M.; et al. Insight into  
654 antimicrobial susceptibility and population structure of contemporary human  
655 *Enterococcus faecalis* isolates from Europe. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **2012**, *67*, 551–  
656 558, doi:10.1093/jac/dkr544.
- 657 52. Quiñones, D.; Kobayashi, N.; Nagashima, S. Molecular Epidemiologic Analysis of  
658 *Enterococcus faecalis* Isolates in Cuba by Multilocus Sequence Typing. *Microb. Drug*  
659 *Resist.* **2009**, *15*, 287–293, doi:10.1089/mdr.2009.0028.
- 660 53. McBride, S.M.; Fischetti, V.A.; LeBlanc, D.J.; Moellering, R.C.; Gilmore, M.S. Genetic  
661 Diversity among *Enterococcus faecalis*. *PLoS One* **2007**, *2*, e582,  
662 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0000582.
- 663 54. Raven, K.E.; Reuter, S.; Gouliouris, T.; Reynolds, R.; Russell, J.E.; Brown, N.M.; Török,  
664 M.E.; Parkhill, J.; Peacock, S.J. Genome-based characterization of hospital-adapted  
665 *Enterococcus faecalis* lineages. *Nat. Microbiol.* **2016**, *1*, 15033,  
666 doi:10.1038/nmicrobiol.2015.33.
- 667 55. Amoako, D.G.; Somboro, A.M.; Abia, A.L.K.; Allam, M.; Ismail, A.; Bester, L.; Essack, S.Y.  
668 Genomic analysis of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from poultry  
669 and occupational farm workers in Umgungundlovu District, South Africa. *Sci. Total*

- 670 *Environ.* **2019**, *670*, 704–716, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.03.110.
- 671 56. Zhu, W.; Murray, P.R.; Huskins, W.C.; Jernigan, J.A.; McDonald, L.C.; Clark, N.C.;
- 672 Anderson, K.F.; McDougal, L.K.; Hageman, J.C.; Olsen-Rasmussen, M.; et al.
- 673 Dissemination of an Enterococcus Inc18-Like vanA Plasmid Associated with
- 674 Vancomycin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **2010**,
- 675 *54*, 4314–4320, doi:10.1128/AAC.00185-10.
- 676 57. Garcia-Migura, L.; Sanchez-Valenzuela, A.J.; Jensen, L.B. Presence of Glycopeptide-
- 677 Encoding Plasmids in Enterococcal Isolates from Food and Humans in Denmark.
- 678 *FOODBORNE Pathog. Dis.* **2011**, *8*, 1191–1197, doi:10.1089/fpd.2011.0897.
- 679 58. Song, X.; Sun, J.; Mikalsen, T.; Roberts, A.P.; Sundsfjord, A. Characterisation of the
- 680 Plasmidome within Enterococcus faecalis Isolated from Marginal Periodontitis Patients
- 681 in Norway. *PLoS One* **2013**, *8*, e62248, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0062248.
- 682 59. Sedgley, C.; Clewell, D.B. Bacterial plasmids in the oral and endodontic microflora.
- 683 *Endod. Top.* **2004**, *9*, 37–51, doi:10.1111/j.1601-1546.2004.00077.x.
- 684 60. Vandecraen, J.; Chandler, M.; Aertsen, A.; Van Houdt, R. The impact of insertion
- 685 sequences on bacterial genome plasticity and adaptability. *Crit. Rev. Microbiol.* **2017**,
- 686 *43*, 709–730, doi:10.1080/1040841X.2017.1303661.
- 687 61. Kawalec, M.; Pietras, Z.; Danilowicz, E.; Jakubczak, A.; Gniadkowski, M.; Hryniewicz, W.;
- 688 Willems, R.J.L. Clonal Structure of Enterococcus faecalis Isolated from Polish Hospitals:
- 689 Characterization of Epidemic Clones. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **2007**, *45*, 147–153,
- 690 doi:10.1128/JCM.01704-06.
- 691 62. Tajeddin, E.; Rashidan, M.; Razaghi, M.; Javadi, S.S.S.; Sherafat, S.J.; Alebouyeh, M.;
- 692 Sarbazi, M.R.; Mansouri, N.; Zali, M.R. The role of the intensive care unit environment
- 693 and health-care workers in the transmission of bacteria associated with hospital

- 694 acquired infections. *J. Infect. Public Health* **2016**, *9*, 13–23,  
695 doi:10.1016/j.jiph.2015.05.010.
- 696 63. Agudelo Higueta, N.I.; Huycke, M.M. *Enterococcal Disease, Epidemiology, and*  
697 *Implications for Treatment*; 2014;
- 698 64. Daniel, D.S.; Lee, S.M.; Dykes, G.A.; Rahman, S. Public Health Risks of Multiple-Drug-  
699 Resistant Enterococcus spp. in Southeast Asia. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2015**, *81*,  
700 6090–6097, doi:10.1128/AEM.01741-15.
- 701 65. Evans Patterson, J.; Sweeney, A.H.; Simms, M.; Carley, N.; Mangi, R.; Sabetta, J.; Lyons,  
702 R.W. An Analysis of 110 Serious Enterococcal Infections Epidemiology, Antibiotic  
703 Susceptibility, and Outcome. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. **1995**, *74*, 191–200,  
704 doi:10.1097/00005792-199507000-00003.
- 705 66. Jackson, S.S.; Harris, A.D.; Magder, L.S.; Stafford, K.A.; Johnson, J.K.; Miller, L.G.; Calfee,  
706 D.P.; Thom, K.A. Bacterial burden is associated with increased transmission to health  
707 care workers from patients colonized with vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus. *Am. J.*  
708 *Infect. Control* **2019**, *47*, 13–17, doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2018.07.011.
- 709 67. D’Agata, E.M.C.; Green, W.K.; Schulman, G.; Li, H.; Tang, Y.-W.; Schaffner, W.  
710 Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci among Chronic Hemodialysis Patients: A  
711 Prospective Study of Acquisition. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **2001**, *32*, 23–29,  
712 doi:10.1086/317549.
- 713 68. Lund, B.; Agvald-Ohman, C.; Hultberg, A.; Edlund, C. Frequent Transmission of  
714 Enterococcal Strains between Mechanically Ventilated Patients Treated at an Intensive  
715 Care Unit. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **2002**, *40*, 2084–2088, doi:10.1128/JCM.40.6.2084-  
716 2088.2002




717

718 **Figure 1:** The whole genome MLST phylogenomic branch and metadata of isolate information (including isolate identity, hospital, source and  
 719 ward) and WGS *in-silico* typing (sequence type and antibiotic resistome) coupled using Phandango  
 720 (<https://jameshadfield.github.io/phandango/#>). *E. faecalis* isolates at different level of care in Durban, South Africa. The linking lines in the  
 721 phylogenetic tree differentiate between the different clades. Metadata annotations show that there were generally distinct major sequence  
 722 types between the 4 hospital environments however within each hospital there was the spread of these major clones between different sources  
 723 in the wards.

724







**Table 1:** Summary of the hospital levels, the source of sample collected, sample type, and genotypic characteristics of the *E. Faecalis* isolates

Isolate ID	Sample Details			Typing	Antibiotic resistance genes (ARGs)
	Hospital	Source	Ward	MLST (15)	
1MPA1	Central	PHONE	PEAD	ST40	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
1MPA3	Central	PHONE	PEAD	ST40	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
1MPD4	Central	PATIENT FILE	PEAD	ST16	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, dfrK, Str</i>
1MPF1	Central	MOP	PEAD	ST498	<i>mphD, Isa(A)</i>
1MPF3	Central	MOP	PEAD	ST498-LIKE	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
1MPJ101	Central	OCCUPIED BED	PEAD	ST40	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
1MPK2	Central	NURSES TABLE	PEAD	ST40	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
1MPK3	Central	NURSES TABLE	PEAD	ST40	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
1MPK4	Central	NURSES TABLE	PEAD	ST40	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
2MPJ104	Central	OCCUPIED BED	PEAD	ST23-LIKE	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
3MPH1	Central	SINK	PEAD	ST610	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), tetL</i>
3MPJ101	Central	OCCUPIED BED	PEAD	ST258	<i>mphD, Isa(A)</i>
2UIJ104	Tertiary	OCCUPIED BED	ICU	ST126	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
2UIK2	Tertiary	NURSES TABLE	ICU	ST126	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
2UIK3	Tertiary	NURSES TABLE	ICU	ST21	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
2UPA3	Tertiary	PHONE	PEAD	ST386-LIKE	<i>mphD, Isa(A)</i>
2UPC4	Tertiary	BP APPARATUS	PEAD	ST386-LIKE	<i>mphD, Isa(A)</i>
2UPF4	Tertiary	MOP	PEAD	ST314	<i>mphD, Isa(A)</i>
2UPJ202	Tertiary	UNOCCUPIED BED	PEAD	ST386-LIKE	<i>mphD, Isa(A)</i>
3UIA2	Tertiary	PHONE	ICU	ST16	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, Str</i>
3UIC1	Tertiary	BP APPARATUS	ICU	ST16	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, sat4A, aph3-III, ant6-la, aac6-Aph2</i>
3UIE2	Tertiary	VENTILATOR	ICU	ST268	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
3UIJ202	Tertiary	UNOCCUPIED BED	ICU	ST282	<i>ermB, -----, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, sat4A, aph3-III, ant6-la, tetL</i>
3UPF3	Tertiary	MOP	PEAD	ST16	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), dfrG</i>
3UPF4	Tertiary	MOP	PEAD	ST16	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), dfrG</i>
3UPH1	Tertiary	SINK	PEAD	ST23	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
3UIC2	Tertiary	BP APPARATUS	ICU	ST16	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, sat4A, aAph3-III, ant6-la, aac6-Aph2</i>
1CIB1	Regional	DRIP STAND	ICU	ST21	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
1CID1	Regional	PATIENT FILE	ICU	ST21	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
1CIH3	Regional	SINK	ICU	ST21	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
1CPK2	Regional	NURSES TABLE	PEAD	ST21	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
1CPK3	Regional	NURSES TABLE	PEAD	ST126	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
2CPF3	Regional	MOP	PEAD	ST41	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
2CPH2	Regional	NURSES TABLE	PEAD	ST16-LIKE	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
3CPH1	Regional	SINK	PEAD	ST23	<i>tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>
2SIL2	District	DOOR HANDLE	ICU	ST922	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA, dfrG, dfrK, sat4A, aph3-III, ant6-la, tetL, fexA, optrA</i>
2SPJ101	District	OCCUPIED BED	ICU	ST6	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A), catA</i>
2SPL2	District	DOOR HANDLE	PEAD	ST314	<i>ermB, tetM, mphD, Isa(A)</i>

PEAD: Paediatric ward; ICU: Intensive care unit.

**TABLE 2:** Genomic analysis of mobile genetic elements (MGEs).

Strain ID	Hospital	MLST (n=15)	Mobile Genetic Support	
			Plasmids (plasmid replicons) (n=11)	Intact prophage (n=18)
1MPA1	Central	ST40	pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEF47 (rep6)	Entero_phiFL1A
1MPA3	Central	ST40	pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6)	Entero_phiFL1A
1MPD4	Central	ST16	-	Entero_phiFL1A, Entero_EFC_1, Lactob_PLE2
1MPF1	Central	ST498	pTEF3 (repUS13)	Entero_phiFL3A
1MPF3	Central	ST498	pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6)	Entero_phiFL3A, Entero_phiFL1A
1MPJ101	Central	ST40	pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6)	Entero_phiFL1A
1MPK2	Central	ST40	pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6)	Entero_phiFL1A
1MPK3	Central	ST40	pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6)	Entero_phiFL1A
1MPK4	Central	ST40	pTEF3 (repUS13), pAD1 (rep9), pEFC1 (rep6)	Entero_phiFL1A
2MPJ104	Central	ST23	pAD1 (rep9), pEF47 (rep6)	Entero_phiFL3A, Entero_phiFL1A
3MPH1	Central	ST610	pTEF2 (rep9)	-
3MPJ101	Central	ST258	pTEF2 (rep9)	Strept_9871
2UIJ104	Tertiary	ST126	pTEF2 (rep9), pAD1 (rep9)	Entero_phiFL1A, Lactoc_98201
2UIK2	Tertiary	ST126	pTEF2 (rep9), pAD1 (rep9)	Entero_phiFL1A, Lactoc_98201, Cronob_vB_CsaM
2UIK3	Tertiary	ST21	pTEF2 (rep9)	Entero_vB_IME197, Lactoc_63301
2UPA3	Tertiary	ST386	pTEF3 (repUS13), pEFC1 (rep6)	Entero_phiEf11
2UPC4	Tertiary	ST386	pTEF3 (repUS13), pEF47 (rep6)	Entero_phiEf11
2UPF4	Tertiary	ST314	-	-
2UPJ202	Tertiary	ST386	pTEF3 (repUS13), pEFC1 (rep6)	Entero_phiEf11
3UIA2	Tertiary	ST16	-	Entero_EF62phi, Strept_phiARI0460_1
3UIC1	Tertiary	ST16	pTEF2 (rep9), pCF10 (rep9)	Entero_phiEf11
3UIE2	Tertiary	ST268	-	Entero_phiFL1A
3UIJ202	Tertiary	ST282	pTEF2 (rep9), pAD1 (rep9)	-
3UPF3	Tertiary	ST16	-	Entero_EFC_1, Strept_phiARI0131_1, Strept_phiARI0460_1
3UPF4	Tertiary	ST16	-	Entero_phiFL1A, Entero_EFC_1, Strept_phiARI0460_1, Lactoc_PLgT_1
3UPH1	Tertiary	ST23	pEFC1 (rep6)	Entero_phiFL3A
3UIC2	Tertiary	ST16	pTEF2 (rep9), pCF10 (rep9)	Entero_phiFL1A, Entero_phiEf11
1CIB1	Regional	ST21	pTEF2 (rep9)	Entero_vB_IME197, Lactoc_63301
1CID1	Regional	ST21	pTEF2 (rep9)	Entero_vB_IME197, Lactob_PLE2
1CIH3	Regional	ST21	pTEF2 (rep9)	Entero_vB_IME197, Lactoc_63301, Stx2_c_1717
1CPK2	Regional	ST21	pTEF2 (rep9)	Entero_vB_IME197, Lactob_PLE2
1CPK3	Regional	ST126	pTEF2 (rep9), pAD1 (rep9)	Lactoc_98201
2CPF3	Regional	ST41	pTEF3 (repUS13)	Entero_vB_IME197, Lactob_PLE2
2CPH2	Regional	ST16	-	Entero_phiFL1A
3CPH1	Regional	ST23	-	Entero_phiFL3A, Entero_phiFL1A
2SIL2	District	ST922	pk214 (rep7), pAD1 (rep9), pEFR (rep11)	Entero_phiFL3A, Paenib_Xenia
2SPJ101	District	ST6	pTEF3 (repUS13), pPD1 (rep9), pRE25 (rep2), pUB110 (repUS14), pKH7 (rep7)	Entero_SANTOR1
2SPL2	District	ST314	pTEF2 (rep9)	Strept_9872

NB. All the isolates lacked integrons and associated gene cassettes.