Gut microbiota predict *Enterococcus* expansion but not Vancomycin-resistant

Enterococcus acquisition

Rishi Chanderraj MD^{1,2}, Christopher A. Brown², Kevin Hinkle², Nicole Falkowski²,

Piyush Ranjan², Robert P. Dickson^{2,3,a}, Robert J. Woods^{1,4,a}

1. Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Internal Medicine, University of

Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, MI, USA.

2. Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine,

University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, MI, USA.

3. Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Michigan Medical School,

Ann Arbor, MI, USA.

4. Computational Medicine and Bioinformatics, University of Michigan Medical School,

Ann Arbor, MI, USA.

a. These authors contributed equally to this work.

Keywords: Microbiome, Vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus*, colonization resistance,

hospital-acquired infection

Running title: Gut microbiota and VRE infection

Summary: 16S profile of the gut microbiome does not predict VRE acquisition in

hospitalized patients, likely due to the rapid and profound microbiota change in this

population. VRE expansion and VRE acquisition may be two distinct processes.

Corresponding Author:

Robert Woods

5520A MSRB III

1150 W. Medical Center Drive

Ann Arbor, MI 48109

734-647-5899

robertwo@med.umich.edu

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND: Vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus* (VRE) is a leading cause of hospital-acquired infections, and continues to spread despite widespread implementation of pathogen-targeted control guidelines. Commensal gut microbiota provide colonization resistance to VRE, but the role of gut microbiota in VRE acquisition in at-risk patients is unknown.

METHODS: We performed a case-control study of gut microbiota in hospitalized patients who did (cases) and did not (controls) acquire VRE. We matched case subjects to control subjects by known risk factors and "time at risk," defined as the time elapsed between admission until positive VRE screen. We characterized gut bacterial communities using 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing of rectal swab specimens.

RESULTS: We analyzed 236 samples from 59 matched case-control pairs. At baseline, case and control subjects did not differ in gut microbiota when measured by community diversity ($p=0.33$) or composition ($p=0.30$). After hospitalization, gut communities of cases and controls differed only in the abundance of the *Enterococcus* containing operational taxonomic unit (OTU), with the gut microbiota of case subjects having more of this OTU than time-matched control subjects ($p=0.01$). Otherwise, case and control communities after the time at risk did not differ in diversity ($p=.33$) or community structure ($p=0.12$). Among patients who became VRE colonized, those having the *Blautia* containing OTU on admission had lower *Enterococcus* relative abundance once colonized ($p = 0.004$).

CONCLUSIONS: The 16S profile of the gut microbiome does not predict VRE acquisition in hospitalized patients, likely due to rapid and profound microbiota change. The gut microbiome does not predict VRE *acquisition*, but may be associated with *Enterococcus expansion*, suggesting that these should be considered as two distinct processes.

INTRODUCTION:

Vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus (VRE) is a highly antibiotic-resistant bacteria, is a leading cause of healthcare-associated infections, and is classified as a serious public health threat by the Centers for Disease Prevention and Control[4,5]. Colonization with VRE precedes infection[6,7], and molecular epidemiologic analyses show patient-to-patient hospital transmission is the primary means of spread[8]. Preventing transmission between hospitalized patients is a significant challenge, and despite the widespread application of pathogen-targeted control measures[9], VRE remains endemic in many hospitals[4,5].

Both indirect human evidence and animal experimentation demonstrate that gut microbiota prevent VRE colonization when a patient is exposed, a phenomenon termed "colonization resistance" [2,10,11]. Colonization resistance may entail competition for resources, secretion of bactericidal factors[3,12], and indirect stimulation of host immune defense mechanisms that target VRE[13,14]. Though colonization resistance plays a crucial role in suppressing VRE expansion and

preventing VRE infection[1,15], to date, no study has evaluated whether variation in intestinal microbiota can explain variation in VRE *acquisition* among at-risk patients.

To address this gap in our understanding of VRE transmission, we investigated whether the gut microbiome of at-risk patients predicts VRE colonization in a hospitalized patient population. We hypothesized that if the gut microbiome can confer colonization resistance for VRE acquisition, variation in baseline microbiota would explain variation in patient susceptibility to VRE acquisition. To test this hypothesis, we designed a case-control study using 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing of rectal swabs acquired from hospitalized patients.

METHODS:

Study setting and design:

We previously conducted a retrospective case-control study of clinical risk factors for VRE acquisition among patients who did (cases) and did not (controls) acquire VRE during their admissions at the University of Michigan Healthcare System from January 2013 until June 2016[16]. We studied gut microbiome communities in 236 rectal swab samples from 59 matched pairs of case and control subjects from patients admitted to the University of Michigan Hospital in 2016. 64 out of 118 subjects in this study (54%) were a part of our previous clinical risk factor analysis. The remaining subjects were admitted from June to December 2016 (outside the timeframe of the previous study by six months). The University of Michigan Healthcare system consists of ~1000 inpatient beds and

serves as a tertiary referral hospital for southeastern Michigan. The institutional review board at the University of Michigan approved the study before its initiation.

The infection control practice throughout the study period was to perform routine surveillance for VRE on eight adult units, including intensive care units, the hematology and oncology ward, and the bone marrow transplant ward. All patients were routinely screened on admission and weekly thereafter with rectal swabs that were tested by Bio-Rad VRESelect™ chromogenic medium to detect VRE. Cases were defined as subjects with an initial negative swab followed by a positive swab when evaluated by this selective culture. We further identified the "time at risk" for each case patient, here defined as the time elapsed between admission and positive VRE screen. We matched each case subject to a control subject with an initial negative swab followed by repeat negative swab within the same time at risk (+/- 5%). An additional matching factor was the unit from which the first positive VRE was recovered for cases or the matched swab after the time at risk for controls.

Bacterial DNA isolation:

Genomic DNA was extracted from rectal swabs re-suspended in 360 µl ATL buffer (Qiagen DNeasy Blood & Tissue kit) and homogenized in fecal DNA bead tubes using a modified protocol previously demonstrated to isolate bacterial DNA[17,18]. Sterile laboratory water and AE buffer used in DNA isolation were collected and analyzed as potential sources of contamination. ZymoBIOMICS

Microbial Community DNA Standard (Zymo Research cat# D6306) was sequenced for error analysis.

16s rRNA gene sequencing

The V4 region of the 16s rRNA gene was amplified using published primers and the dual-indexing sequencing strategy developed previously [17]. Sequencing was performed using the Illumina MiSeq platform (San Diego, CA), using a MiSeq Reagent Kit V2 (500 cycles), according to the manufacturer's instructions with modifications found in the standard operating procedure of the laboratory of Dr. Patick Schloss [17,19]. Accuprime High Fidelity Taq was used in place of Accuprime Pfx SuperMix[20]. Primary PCR cycling conditions were 95°C for two minutes, followed by 20 cycles of touchdown PCR (95°C 20 seconds, 60°C 20 seconds and decreasing 0.3 degrees each cycle, 72°C for 5 minutes), then 20 cycles of standard PCR (95°C for 20 seconds, 55°C for 15 seconds, and 72°C for 5 minutes), and finished with 72°C for 10 minutes.

Statistical analyses:

Sequence data were processed and analyzed using the software mothur v.1.43.0[21] according to the standard operating procedure for MiSeq sequence data using a minimum sequence length of 250 base pairs[17,22]. To summarize, the SILVA rRNA database[23] was used as a reference for sequence alignment and taxonomic classification. K-mer searching with 8mers was used to assign raw sequences to their closest matching template in the reference database, and pairwise alignment was performed with the Needleman-Wunsch[24] and NAST

algorithms[25]. A k-mer based Naïve Bayesian classifier[26] was used to assign sequences to their correct taxonomy with a bootstrap confidence score threshold of 80. Pairwise distances between aligned sequences were calculated with the method employed by Sogin et al. [27], where pairwise distance equals mismatches, including indels, divided by sequence length. A distance matrix was passed to the OptiCLUST clustering algorithm[28] to cluster sequences into 'Operational Taxonomic Units' (OTUs) by maximizing the Matthews Correlation Coefficient with a dissimilarity threshold of 3%[29].

After clustering and classification of raw sequencing data, we evaluated differences in community structure with Permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) in the *vegan* package (v 2.0-4)[30] in R (v 3.6.4) [31]. We performed resampling of multiple generalized linear models with the *mvabund*[32] package in R to look for individual OTU differences between communities. We set a significance threshold of 0.01 after adjusting for multiple comparisons using a stepdown resampling procedure to reduce the type I error rate[33]. We confirmed individual OTU differences with random forest classification and regression models built with the *ranger* package in R (v 0.11.2) [34]. We used the *caret* (v 6.0-84)[35] package in R for cross-validation and to optimize the hyperparameters of the number of decision trees in the model and the number of features considered by each tree when splitting a node. We corrected for feature importance bias in random forest models with a permutation importance (PIMP) heuristic developed by Altmann et al. [36]. All OTUs were

included in diversity and abundance analyses. We performed bivariate analysis with conditional logistic regression using the *survival* (v 3.1-8) package in R[37,38]. Differences in means of final *Enterococcus* abundance in *cases only* were compared with the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U-Test. We used the *vegan* package in R to calculate both the average species diversity in an individual rectal swab (Shannon Diversity) and the change in community structure between initial swab and second swab for each subject (Jaccard Distance). We used Spearman's rank correlation coefficient to determine if Jaccard distance was significantly correlated with the time between swabs, and used non-linear least squares regression to fit a model of Jaccard Distance over time for cases and controls.

Adequacy of Sequencing

We performed 16S rRNA gene amplicon sequencing on 236 rectal swab specimens and 15 negative control specimens, which identified 1,188 unique operational taxonomic units (OTUs, genus-level bacterial taxa) at a dissimilarity threshold of 3%. After bioinformatics processing, the mean number of reads per sample was 71,484±2,684. No specimens were excluded from the analysis. Rectal swab specimens had clear differences in community structure compared to control specimens, which was confirmed as statistically significant using multiple methods of hypothesis testing [mvabund and PERMANOVA (adonis), $p < 0.01$ both] (**Supplemental figure 1**). Sequences generated from negative control specimens were dominated by a single *Pseudomonas*-classified OTU

(OTU001). This OTU was included in all reported analyses, though the exclusion of this OTU did not affect any of the reported results.

Data availability

Sequences are available via the NCBI Sequence Read Archive (accession number PRJNA633879). OTU tables, taxonomy classification tables, and metadata tables are available at https://github.com/rishichanderraj/Microbiota_Predictors_VRE_Acquisition.

RESULTS:

Study population and medication exposures

We studied gut microbiome communities in 236 rectal swab samples from 59 matched pairs of case and control subjects (**Table 1**). Cases and controls did not differ in demographics (age, sex, ethnicity) nor in the relative frequency of common comorbidities (e.g. immunosuppression, malignancy, or gastrointestinal disease). Antibiotic use was widespread among all subjects and was nearly equal across groups (**Table 2**). Vancomycin, cefepime, metronidazole, and piperacillin-tazobactam were the most commonly used antibiotics in the study population. Cases and controls did not differ significantly in their exposure to any specific antibiotics prior to initial sampling. More cases received proton pump inhibitors prior to initial sampling ($P = 0.04$). During time-at-risk (between initial and subsequent sampling), case and controls did not differ in their exposure to antibiotics or proton pump inhibitors.

Admission gut microbiota do not predict VRE acquisition.

We first compared baseline microbiota across patients who did (*cases*) and did not (*controls*) subsequently acquire VRE. Baseline gut communities of cases and controls did not differ in their community composition, determined either via permutation testing ($p=0.30$ by PERMANOVA) or via visualization (principal component analysis, **Figure 1a**). Similarly, baseline gut communities of cases and controls did not differ in their species diversity as measured by the Shannon diversity index (mean of 2.72 ± 0.90 for controls, mean of 2.71 ± 0.76 for cases, $p=0.96$ for all matched case-control pairs) (**Figure 1b**). We concluded that the gut microbiota, as represented by the 16S profile of these samples of hospitalized patients, do not predict subsequent VRE acquisition.

At the time of VRE detection, the gut communities of cases and controls differ only in the abundance of *Enterococcus*

We next compared gut communities across matched *cases* and *controls* after time-at-risk: after cases had been colonized and time-matched controls had not. After time-at-risk, gut microbiota did differ across *cases* and *controls* ($p < 0.001$, by PERMANOVA), though Shannon diversity index did not (mean of 2.38 ± 0.106 for controls, mean of 2.22 ± 0.115 for cases, $p=0.33$ for all matched case-control pairs). The difference in gut microbiota was driven by the increased relative abundance of a single OTU, the *Enterococcus*-classified taxonomic group (OTU0004), which was greater in *cases* than *controls* [$p=0.01$ via *mvabund*, $p < 0.001$ via Random Forest] (**Figure 2**). When this *Enterococcus* OTU was

excluded from the analysis, we found no significant difference in communities across cases and controls [$p=0.12$ by PERMANOVA] (**Figure 3**). We thus concluded that at the time of VRE acquisition, the gut microbiota of VRE-infected and uninfected patients differ only in the relative abundance of *Enterococcus*, and do not consistently differ in their non-*Enterococcus* microbiota.

Gut microbiota change rapidly and profoundly in hospitalized patients

Given the lack of differentiation of gut communities across cases and controls at admission and at the time of VRE colonization, we then asked if the temporal change in gut microbiota could distinguish the two groups. We did this by calculating the relative dissimilarity of admission and index (time-at-risk) communities for each subject using Jaccard Distance, a metric of dissimilarity between gut microbial communities measured on a scale of 0 (complete similarity) to 1 (complete dissimilarity, **Figure 4**). The gut communities of both groups underwent a rapid, profound change in composition. Within several days of admission, gut communities of both cases and controls bore little similarity to the communities detected at the time of admission. Size of change in gut communities did not differ across cohorts (0.87 ± 0.016 for cases, 0.86 ± 0.017 controls, $p=0.84$). Cases and controls also had similar decreases in Shannon diversity (-0.48 ± 0.090 for cases, -0.40 ± 0.077 for controls, $p = 0.93$ for all matched case-control pairs). We found that Jaccard distance was significantly correlated with time (Spearman's rank correlation coefficient $\rho = 0.32$, $p = 0.0006$), and determined that a negative exponential model best fit the data, with gut

microbiota approaching complete dissimilarity at an exponential rate of $0.47 * e^{-0.47*t+32}$ (t representing the time between swabs). We found no significant difference in the rate of change between the two groups. We noted that the predicted mean Jaccard distance for two rectal swab samples taken on the same day ($t=0$) was 0.79 ± 0.058 , implying a substantial amount of variation in community structure within the same day of admission.

Gut microbiota on admission are associated with *Enterococcus* expansion

Finding no difference in the community composition, diversity, or temporal rate of change across patients who did (*cases*) and did not (*controls*) acquire VRE during their hospitalization, we asked if gut microbiota on admission could predict the relative *abundance* of *Enterococcus* in VRE colonized patients. We restricted our analysis to case subjects and built a random forest regression model to identify taxa present on admission that were predictive of final *Enterococcus* relative abundance. Only *Blautia* and *Lactobacillus* were significant after correcting for multiple testing and feature importance bias (**Figure 5, Supplemental Table 1, Supplemental Figure 2**). *Blautia* spp (OTU 0092) on admission was predictive of decreased *Enterococcus* (-10.3% relative abundance adjusted $p = 0.004$ by Mann-Whitney U-test), and *Lactobacillus* spp (OTU 0026) was with an increased abundance of *Enterococcus* after the time at risk (+12.5% relative abundance $p = 0.007$ by Mann-Whitney U-Test). Thus, we found that the presence of specific anaerobes previously implicated in *Enterococcus* colonization resistance[2,15,40] are predictive of decreased

Enterococcus abundance in VRE colonized patients. These findings suggest that VRE acquisition and *Enterococcus* expansion are two distinct processes with different risk factors and pathophysiology.

DISCUSSION:

In this study gut microbiota did not predict VRE acquisition in hospitalized patients. Secondary analysis identified individual members of the gut microbiota that do predict *Enterococcus* abundance at the time of VRE acquisition, implying that acquisition and expansion of VRE may be distinct processes. The community composition, diversity, and temporal rate of change did not differ across patients who did (cases) and did not (controls) acquire VRE during their hospitalization. As expected based on the study design, gut communities of cases had a greater abundance of *Enterococcus* than controls after the time at risk.

Gut communities of all subjects demonstrated a rapid and dramatic change during hospitalization that was time-dependent. In this population, antibiotic use was prevalent (Table 2), gut microbial communities were remarkably dynamic (Figure 5), and admission gut microbiota provided very little information about microbiota after the time at risk. Our model of Jaccard distance over time estimated a mean Jaccard distance of 0.79 between two rectal swabs taken on the same day of admission, implying that only 21% of gut microbiota remain constant with resampling within 24 hours. Given the significant correlation

between Jaccard distance and time, some of this change is likely due to the disruptive pressures that face gut microbiota upon hospitalization (i.e., antibiotics). However, a large portion of this change may represent stochasticity and noise introduced by variation in sample collection and storage. These results have important implications for the clinical use of gut microbiota for therapy, prediction, and risk stratification. Given the rapid change of gut communities upon hospitalization, a single static 16S analysis of gut microbiota may miss subtle dynamics important for VRE *acquisition* and is subject to a large amount of noise that may obscure a true biologically meaningful association. Future study of the gut microbiota in VRE *acquisition* may need to move beyond traditional 16S analysis, which can be time-consuming and miss important species-level information [41,42]. Real-time metagenomics and rapid, ultrasensitive quantification technologies hold promise as tools with better resolution to evaluate these processes [43,44].

Despite the dramatic change in community structure, we did find some evidence of colonization resistance, as admission microbiota *were* predictive of *Enterococcus abundance* at the time of VRE detection. VRE colonized subjects with *Blautia* had less *Enterococcus* expansion, consistent with prior studies [2,15,40]. We hypothesize that there may be a distinction between VRE acquisition and VRE expansion. In conjunction with earlier studies [2,40,45], our findings suggest that commensal anaerobes may play a significant role in suppressing VRE once colonized. In this context, our results further support the

possibility of microbiome manipulation to reduce VRE burden even in patients
already colonized to prevent progression to VRE infection in the individual
 patient[15,45] or transmission into the surrounding environment and other
 hospitalized patients[2,10,40].

In this retrospective case-control study, we controlled for multiple confounders
 with our time and unit matched design. We used machine learning algorithms
 robust to multi-collinearity and overfitting, and applied permutation heuristics to
 correct for feature importance bias and decrease our false discovery rate. This
 study reveals an opportunity for future studies to delineate key differences in
 pathophysiology between VRE acquisition and domination.

In summary, VRE acquisition and expansion may be two distinct processes, and
 efforts to manipulate the microbiome to prevent the spread of VRE may be more
 beneficial in reducing VRE domination in colonized patients than in preventing
 VRE acquisition in un-colonized patients. Future studies of the role of the gut
 microbiota in VRE acquisition may need to move beyond single time point 16S
 analyses and address the role of temporal dynamics and stochasticity of gut
 microbiota in the acquisition and expansion of VRE.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

The authors would like to thank Aline Penkevich for assistance with acquiring
 rectal swabs for sequencing.

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

349 RC No conflict, CAB No Conflict, KH No Conflict, NF No Conflict, PR No Conflict,
350 RPD No Conflict, RJW No Conflict.

351 **FUNDING:**

352 This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health [grant numbers R01
353 HL144599 to R.P.D, R01 AI143852 to R.J.W, 5T32 HL007749-27 to R.C.]

354

355 1. Bhalla A, Pultz NJ, Ray AJ *et al.* Antianaerobic Antibiotic Therapy Promotes
356 Overgrowth of Antibiotic-Resistant, Gram-Negative Bacilli and Vancomycin-
357 Resistant Enterococci in the Stool of Colonized Patients. *Infect Control Hosp*
358 *Epidemiol* 2003;**24**:644–9.

359 2. Caballero S, Kim S, Carter RA *et al.* Cooperating Commensals Restore
360 Colonization Resistance to Vancomycin-Resistant *Enterococcus faecium*. *Cell*
361 *Host Microbe* 2017;**21**:592-602.e4.

362 3. Kim SG, Becattini S, Moody TU *et al.* Microbiota-derived lantibiotic restores
363 resistance against vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus*. *Nature* 2019;**572**:665–9.

364 4. Centers for Disease Control U. *Antibiotic Resistance Threats in the United*
365 *States, 2019.*

366 5. Weiner LM, Webb AK, Limbago B *et al.* Antimicrobial-Resistant Pathogens
367 Associated With Healthcare-Associated Infections: Summary of Data Reported to
368 the National Healthcare Safety Network at the Centers for Disease Control and
369 Prevention, 2011–2014. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2016, DOI:
370 10.1017/ice.2016.174.

371 6. Zirakzadeh A, Gastineau DA, Mandrekar JN *et al.* Vancomycin-resistant

- 372 enterococcal colonization appears associated with increased mortality among
- 373 allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients. *Bone Marrow Transplant*
- 374 2008;**41**:385–92.
- 375 7. Zirakzadeh A, Patel R. Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci: Colonization,
- 376 Infection, Detection, and Treatment. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2006;**81**:529–36.
- 377 8. Bonten MJ, Hayden MK, Nathan C *et al.* Epidemiology of colonisation of
- 378 patients and environment with vancomycin-resistant enterococci. *Lancet*
- 379 (*London, England*) 1996;**348**:1615–
- 380 9. Fishman N, Infectious Diseases Society of America, Pediatric Infectious
- 381 Diseases Society. Policy Statement on Antimicrobial Stewardship by the Society
- 382 for Healthcare Epidemiology of America (SHEA), the Infectious Diseases Society
- 383 of America (IDSA), and the Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society (PIDS). *Infect*
- 384 *Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2012;**33**:322–7.
- 385 10. Ubeda C, Bucci V, Caballero S, *et al.* Intestinal microbiota containing
- 386 *Barnesiella* species cures vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus faecium*
- 387 colonization. *Infect Immun* 2013;**81**:965–73.
- 388 11. Van Der Waaij D, Berghuis-de Vries JM, Lekkerkerk-Van Der Wees JEC.
- 389 Colonization resistance of the digestive tract in conventional and antibiotic-
- 390 treated mice. *J Hyg (Lond)* 1971;**69**:405–11.
- 391 12. Buffie CG, Pamer EG. *Microbiota-Mediated Colonization Resistance against*
- 392 *Intestinal Pathogens.*, 2013:790–801.
- 393 13. Cash HL, Whitham C V., Behrendt CL *et al.* Symbiotic bacteria direct
- 394 expression of an intestinal bactericidal lectin. *Science (80-)* 2006;**313**:1126–30.

- 395 14. Kobayashi KS, Chamaillard M, Ogura Y *et al.* Nod2-dependent regulation of
396 innate and adaptive immunity in the intestinal tract. *Science* (80-) 2005;**307**:731–
397 4.
- 398 15. Taur Y, Xavier JB, Lipuma L, *et al.* Intestinal Domination and the Risk of
399 Bacteremia in Patients Undergoing Allogeneic Hematopoietic Stem Cell
400 Transplantation. *Clin Infect Dis* 2012;**55**:905–14.
- 401 16. Chanderraj R, Millar JA, Patel TS *et al.* VRE acquisition in a tertiary care
402 hospital: testing the roles of antibiotic use, proton pump inhibitor use, and
403 colonization pressure. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2019, DOI: 10.1093/ofid/ofz139.
- 404 17. Kozich JJ, Westcott SL, Baxter NT *et al.* Development of a dual-index
405 sequencing strategy and curation pipeline for analyzing amplicon sequence data
406 on the Miseq Illumina sequencing platform. *Appl Environ Microbiol*
407 2013;**79**:5112–20.
- 408 18. Mason KL, Downward JRE, Mason KD *et al.* *Candida albicans* and bacterial
409 microbiota interactions in the cecum during recolonization following broad-
410 spectrum antibiotic therapy. *Infect Immun* 2012;**80**:3371–80.
- 411 19. GitHub - SchlossLab/MiSeq_WetLab_SOP.
- 412 20. Korbie DJ, Mattick JS. Touchdown PCR for increased specificity and
413 sensitivity in PCR amplification. *Nat Protoc* 2008;**3**:1452–6.
- 414 21. Schloss PD, Westcott SL, Ryabin T *et al.* Introducing mothur: Open-source,
415 platform-independent, community-supported software for describing and
416 comparing microbial communities. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2009;**75**:7537–41.
- 417 22. Schloss PD. MiSeq SOP:mothur. *MiSeq SOP:mothur* 2019.

418 23. Quast C, Pruesse E, Yilmaz P, et al. The SILVA ribosomal RNA gene
419 database project: improved data processing and web-based tools. *Nucleic Acids*
420 *Research* 2012. 41: D590-D596.

421 24. Needleman SB, Wunsch CD. A general method applicable to the search for
422 similarities in the amino acid sequence of two proteins. *J Mol Biol* 1970;**48**:443–
423 53.

424 25. Caporaso JG, Bittinger K, Bushman FD *et al.* PyNAST: a flexible tool for
425 aligning sequences to a template alignment. *Bioinformatics* 2010;**26**:266–7.

426 26. Wang Q, Garrity GM, Tiedje JM *et al.* Naïve Bayesian classifier for rapid
427 assignment of rRNA sequences into the new bacterial taxonomy. *Appl Environ*
428 *Microbiol* 2007;**73**:5261–7.

429 27. Sogin ML, Morrison HG, Huber JA *et al.* Microbial diversity in the deep sea
430 and the underexplored "rare biosphere." *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*
431 2006;**103**:12115–20.

432 28. Westcott SL, Schloss PD. OptiClust, an Improved Method for Assigning
433 Amplicon-Based Sequence Data to Operational Taxonomic Units. *mSphere* **2**,
434 DOI: 10.1128/mSphereDirect.00073-17.

435 29. Matthews BW. Comparison of the predicted and observed secondary
436 structure of T4 phage lysozyme. *BBA - Protein Struct* 1975;**405**:442–51.

437 30. Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Kindt R *et al.* Vegan: Community Ecology Package.
438 R package version 2.0-2. 2012.

439 31. R Development Core Team R. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical*
440 *Computing.*, 2019.

441 32. Wang Y, Naumann U, Wright ST *et al.* Mvabund- an R package for model-
442 based analysis of multivariate abundance data. *Methods Ecol Evol* 2012;**3**:471–
443 4.

444 33. ter Braak CJF, Peres-Neto P, Dray S. A critical issue in model-based
445 inference for studying trait-based community assembly and a solution. *PeerJ*
446 2017;**2017**, DOI: 10.7717/peerj.2885.

447 34. Wright MN, Ziegler A. Ranger: A fast implementation of random forests for
448 high dimensional data in C++ and R. *J Stat Softw* 2017;**77**, DOI:
449 10.18637/jss.v077.i01.

450 35. Kuhn M. Building predictive models in R using the caret package. *J Stat*
451 *Softw* 2008;**28**:1–26.

452 36. Altmann A, Toloşi L, Sander O *et al.* Permutation importance: a corrected
453 feature importance measure. *Bioinformatics* 2010;**26**:1340–7.

454 37. Therneau T. A Package for Survival Analysis in S. 2015.

455 38. Therneau T, Grambsch P. *Modeling Survival Data: Extending the Cox Model*.
456 New York: Springer-Verlag, 2000.

457 39. Burnham KP, Anderson DR. Multimodel Inference. *Sociol Methods Res*
458 2004;**33**:261–304.

459 40. Donskey CJ, Chowdhry TK, Hecker MT *et al.* Effect of Antibiotic Therapy on
460 the Density of Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci in the Stool of Colonized
461 Patients. *N Engl J Med* 2000;**343**:1925–32.

462 41. Ojima M, Motooka D, Shimizu K *et al.* Metagenomic Analysis Reveals
463 Dynamic Changes of Whole Gut Microbiota in the Acute Phase of Intensive Care

464 Unit Patients. *Dig Dis Sci* 2016;**61**:1628–34.

465 42. Dubin KA, Mathur D, McKenney PT *et al*. Diversification and Evolution of
466 Vancomycin-Resistant *Enterococcus faecium* during Intestinal Domination. *Infect*
467 *Immun* 2019;**87**, DOI: 10.1128/IAI.00102-19.

468 43. Pendleton KM, Erb-Downward JR, Bao Y *et al*. Rapid Pathogen Identification
469 in Bacterial Pneumonia Using Real-Time Metagenomics. *Am J Respir Crit Care*
470 *Med* 2017;**196**:1610–2.

471 44. Chanderraj R, Dickson RP. Rethinking pneumonia: A paradigm shift with
472 practical utility. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2018;**115**:13148–50.

473 45. Ubeda C, Taur Y, Jenq RR *et al*. Vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus*
474 domination of intestinal microbiota is enabled by antibiotic treatment in mice and
475 precedes bloodstream invasion in humans. *J Clin Invest* 2010;**120**:4332–41.

476

477 **Tables**

Table 1. Demographics and Comorbidities of Matched Cohorts

	<i>Controls</i> n = 59	<i>Cases</i> n = 59	<i>P</i> -value
Demographics			
Age (mean ± SE)	57.19 ± 1.62	60.2 ± 1.95	0.23
Female	23 (0.39)	22 (0.38)	0.56
Non-white race	9 (0.15)	9 (0.15)	0.28
Diagnoses and comorbidities			
<i>C. difficile</i> infection	4 (0.07)	11 (0.18)	0.07
Leukemia	21 (0.36)	17 (0.29)	0.38
Lymphoma	12 (0.21)	10 (0.17)	0.49
Bone marrow transplant	15 (0.25)	14 (0.24)	0.64
Solid organ malignancy	35 (0.6)	40 (0.67)	0.33
Metastatic malignancy	29 (0.49)	35 (0.59)	0.10
Diabetes	27 (0.46)	23 (0.39)	0.59
Coronary artery disease	6 (0.11)	10 (0.17)	0.72
Congestive heart failure	19 (0.32)	18 (0.3)	0.60
COPD	21 (0.35)	36 (0.61)	0.02
Peripheral vascular disease	6 (0.1)	2 (0.03)	0.31
End stage renal disease	18 (0.31)	26 (0.44)	0.07
Connective tissue disease	1 (0.01)	4 (0.06)	0.35
Peptic ulcer disease	9 (0.15)	6 (0.11)	0.50
Cirrhosis	2 (0.04)	9 (0.15)	0.06
Cerebrovascular disease	12 (0.21)	17 (0.29)	0.54
Hemiplegia	4 (0.06)	12 (0.2)	0.07
Dementia	1 (0.01)	3 (0.05)	0.34
Charlson Score (mean ± SE)	3.71 ± 0.22	4.45 ± 0.25	0.05

Cases and *controls* were matched by "time at risk" and unit or ward. Values are reported as n (proportion) unless otherwise noted.

478

Table 2. Medication Exposure of Matched Cohorts

Prevalence of exposure	Duration of exposure
------------------------	----------------------

	Controls n = 59	Cases n = 59	P value	Controls n = 59	Cases N = 59	P value
Prior to admission swab						
Antibiotics						
Any antibiotics	29 (0.49)	40 (0.68)	0.05	1.72 ± 0.62	2.32 ± 0.47	0.44
Vancomycin	14 (0.24)	21 (0.36)	0.17	0.52 ± 0.3	0.36 ± 0.06	0.61
Metronidazole	8 (0.14)	14 (0.24)	0.17	0.14 ± 0.04	0.4 ± 0.16	0.16
Piperacillin-Tazobactam	8 (0.14)	12 (0.2)	0.29	0.14 ± 0.04	0.21 ± 0.06	0.25
Cefepime	7 (0.12)	11 (0.19)	0.32	0.4 ± 0.3	0.32 ± 0.12	0.81
Proton pump inhibitors	9 (0.15)	19 (0.32)	0.04	0.2 ± 0.07	0.61 ± 0.19	0.07
Between admission and "time at risk" swab						
Antibiotics						
Any antibiotics	56 (0.95)	52 (0.88)	0.18	21.66 ± 4.98	22.36 ± 3.66	0.82
Vancomycin	37 (0.63)	39 (0.66)	0.66	3.55 ± 0.82	3.33 ± 0.82	0.73
Metronidazole	20 (0.34)	24 (0.41)	0.43	2.01 ± 0.72	2.29 ± 0.6	0.75
Piperacillin-Tazobactam	26 (0.44)	25 (0.42)	0.83	3.66 ± 1.13	2.8 ± 0.64	0.42
Cefepime	21 (0.36)	24 (0.41)	0.56	2.92 ± 1.01	3.1 ± 0.82	0.85
Proton pump inhibitors	33 (0.56)	39 (0.66)	0.23	5.15 ± 1.48	6.75 ± 1.32	0.13

Prevalence values are reported as n (proportion). *Duration* values are reported as days of therapy ± SD.

Figures

Figure 1

A

B

484 **Figure 1** In Hospitalized patients, admission gut microbiota do not predict
 485 subsequent VRE acquisition. We used 16S rRNA sequencing to characterize
 486 gut bacterial communities in 118 hospitalized patients who tested negative for
 487 VRE at admission. We compared admission gut microbiota across 59 matched
 488 cases (patients who acquired VRE) and controls (patients who did not acquire
 489 VRE). A Visualization of admission gut microbial communities using Principal
 490 Component Analysis. The admission gut communities of cases and controls did
 491 not differ in their community composition, either visually or via permutation
 492 testing ($P=0.3$, PERMANOVA). B. Comparison of average species diversity as
 493 measured by Shannon diversity index in admission gut communities. The
 494 admission gut communities of cases and controls did not differ in their community
 495 Shannon Diversity index ($p=0.96$, Conditional logistic regression).

Figure 2

499 **Figure 2** After the time at risk, the gut microbiota of cases and controls differ
500 primarily in their relative abundance of *Enterococcus*. The ten most abundant
501 bacterial taxa are shown in controls (top) and cases (bottom), at the time of
502 admission (left) and following matched time-at-risk (right). Cases and controls did
503 not differ in their admission microbiota (left). After the time-at-risk, the gut
504 microbiota of cases were enriched with *Enterococcus* relative to control ($P < 0.01$,
505 *mvabund*), but otherwise did not differ in their community composition ($p > 0.05$
506 for all other taxa, *mvabund*).

Figure 3

511 **Figure 3** With the exception of *Enterococcus*, gut communities of VRE infected
 512 and uninfected patients do not differ. When we excluded *Enterococcus* OTU
 513 enriched in VRE-infected patients, we found no remaining difference in bacterial
 514 community composition, either visually (Principal Component Analysis) or via
 515 permutation testing ($P = 0.12$ PERMANOVA).
 516

517 **Figure 4**

518

519

Figure 4 Rapid and dramatic change in gut microbiota among hospitalized patients. We calculated the dissimilarity between admission and subsequent (index, time-at-risk) gut communities in both cohorts with Jaccard distance. Both cases and controls exhibited rapid changes in gut communities during hospitalization, with Jaccard distance changing at an exponential rate. Cases and controls did not differ from each other in temporal disruption of gut microbiota. Dashed lines in the figure represent the 95% confidence interval for predicted mean Jaccard distance (inner ribbon) and predicted Jaccard distance for an individual subject (outer ribbon).

Figure 5

Figure 5 Presence of *Blautia* species on admission is predictive of decreased Enterococcus abundance at the time of VRE acquisition. A random forest regression model identified 7 OTUs present on admission that predicted subsequent relative abundance of *Enterococcus* spp. Of these, the presence of *Enterobacteriaceae* spp., *Lactobacillus* spp., and *Blautia* spp. were significant predictors of final *Enterococcus* spp. relative abundance. Only *Lactobacillus* spp and *Blautia* spp. remained significant after correcting for multiple testing. Significance determined using the Mann-Whitney U test controlled for multiple comparisons.