Examining the Impact of ICU Population Interaction Structure on Modeled Colonization Dynamics of *Staphylococcus aureus*

Matthew S. Mietchen MPH¹, Christopher T. Short PhD¹, Matthew Samore MD², Eric T. Lofgren MSPH, PhD¹ for the CDC Modeling Infectious Diseases in Healthcare Program (MInD-Healthcare)

¹Paul G. Allen School for Global Health, College of Veterinary Medicine, Washington State University, Pullman, WA

²Department of Internal Medicine, University of Utah School of Medicine, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT

Corresponding Author Email: Eric.Lofgren@wsu.edu

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

Abstract

Background: Complex transmission models of healthcare-associated infections provide insight for hospital epidemiology and infection control efforts; however, many are difficult to implement and come at high computational costs. Structuring more simplified models to incorporate the heterogeneity of the intensive care unit (ICU) patient-provider interactions, we explore how methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) dynamics and acquisitions may be better represented and approximated.

Methods: Using a stochastic compartmental model of an 18-bed ICU, we compared the rates of MRSA acquisition across three ICU population interaction structures: a model with nurses and physicians as a single staff type (SST), a model with separate staff types for nurses and physicians (Nurse-MD model), and a Metapopulation model where each nurse was assigned a group of patients. The proportion of time spent with the assigned patient group (γ) within the Metapopulation model was also varied.

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

Discussion: Complex population interactions of a modeled hospital ICU has considerable impact on model results, with the SST model having more than double the acquisition rate of the more structured metapopulation model. While the direction of

parameter sensitivity remained the same, the magnitude of these differences varied, producing different colonization rates across relatively similar populations. The non-linearity of the model's response to differing values of a parameter gamma (γ) suggests only a narrow space of relatively dispersed nursing assignments where simple model approximations are appropriate.

Conclusion: Simplifying assumptions around how a hospital population is modeled, especially assuming random mixing, may overestimate infection rates and the impact of interventions. In many, if not most cases, more complex models that represent population mixing with higher granularity are justified.

Author Summary: Some models of healthcare-associated infection assume random mixing between healthcare workers and patients – that is, all healthcare workers care for all patients in the model at equal frequency. This paper explores the impact of that assumption, creating a model of an 18-bed intensive care unit that compares a model with random mixing with one that segments patients into distinct groups with a single nurse assigned to them while a dedicated critical care physician continues to see all patients. Higher rates of segmentation result in lower rates of predicted acquisitions of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, as well as more modest predicted impacts of interventions – represented by changes in parameter values. These findings suggest that the simpler random mixing models that are used for analytical tractability or computational speed may not be appropriate approximations in settings where healthcare workers are not uniformly distributed among patients due to scheduling, patient complexity or cohorting, the built environment, or hospital policy, and that

- 63 balancing the computational costs with the trend toward more complex models in
- 64 hospital epidemiology is justified.

Introduction

Dynamic transmission models have provided valuable insight toward controlling healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) for decades, particularly in addressing intervention effectiveness to limit colonization and spread of pathogens between hospitalized patients and healthcare workers^{1–5}. The complexity and variation of HAI transmission models, as well as the advancement of methods for model fitting and sensitivity analysis, has increased over time as discussed in a 2013 systematic review by van Kleef *et al.* However, they identified that many of the models used homogenous mixing compartmental models with limited hospital structure⁶. Methods used in HAI modeling studies continued to vary widely, from adaptations of the classic Ross-McDonald model⁷ that are simplified but analytically approachable^{8–12} to complex network or agent-based models that include high fidelity representations of patient-to-staff interactions but are correspondingly more complex and vulnerable to results arising from subtle and unintuitive interactions between agents^{13–18}.

Another systematic review performed by Nguyen *et al.* in 2019 noted that while “systems dynamics models” – their term for compartmental models with homogeneous mixing – accounted for 38% of the models they reviewed, agent-based and discrete event models, which began to appear almost a decade later, already accounted for the same volume of studies (38%). The authors note the widespread simplifying assumptions of these models, including modeling a single, unstructured ward, or a simplified hospital with no ward structure. While they note ABMs can overcome the limitations of systems dynamics models, the authors also highlight the extensive

computational costs, need for extensive data, and accompanying uncertainty analysis as major limitations¹⁹.

Concerns regarding the heterogeneous contact patterns that exist in hospitals suggest the need for network and agent-based models. Accompanying this are efforts to address how to improve their generalizability and reproducibility²⁰. Additionally, work in quantifying trade-offs related to the vast array of mathematical models, simulation methods, and software packages currently available for infectious disease research continues to grapple with the question of what level of complexity is required for robust results^{21,22}. These contact patterns arise in a number of different ways, both within and between hospitals. Specifically focusing on within-hospital heterogeneity, patient healthcare needs, clinical practices such as the use of consistent care teams where designated providers interact with their patients over the entire course of the shift, cohorting or the grouping together of patients with a known infection, etc. can all contribute. Very specific levels of interactions with distinctive subpopulations within single units or wards become apparent. Emergent population interaction structures created by the hospital-built environment, such as single-occupancy rooms, and physical ward structures have also been studied using network and agent-based models^{23,24}. Rarely, however, are the sensitivity of the resulting models to these structure decisions examined. Complex network or agent-based models are computationally intensive and require a degree of software engineering expertise. If, and under what circumstances, simpler model formulations may be acceptable approximations of more complicated models, and what impacts these simplifications have on the model findings, remains an area that is underdeveloped within healthcare-

associated infection modeling with potential benefits for the accessibility of these models.

As an approach to understanding and quantifying these trade-offs, we consider the impact of structured contacts within a compartmental modeling framework using Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) as a motivating example. MRSA is a well-studied infection that is important in intensive care settings^{2,3,11,19,24–29}. The vulnerable nature of the patients and the difficulty in treating severe infections makes preventing the spread of this antibiotic-resistant pathogen a priority among infection control efforts.

Patients admitted to the ICU have been found to have persistent colonization with MRSA 12-14 days after discharge from the hospital³⁰. There is strong evidence that frequency and patterns of interaction between staff and patients play a critical role in transmission³¹. The ratio of nurses to patients has been found to contribute to the overall level of pathogen colonization and transmission within healthcare settings and ICUs^{32–35}. Lower nurse-to-patient ratios have a positive correlation with increased transmission and poor health outcomes³⁵. Hospital staffing levels, patient interactions, surveillance detection, and important parameters such as hand hygiene have been explored for several decades using mathematical models^{2,3,27,28}.

Using a stochastic compartmental model of an 18-bed ICU, we compared three potential population interaction structures: a single staff type model with nurses and physicians as the same type of healthcare worker, a model with separate staff types for nurses and physicians where they are different types of healthcare workers, and a highly structured model where each nurse is assigned a specific group of patients, in

order to examine the impact of treating an ICU with a metapopulation type structure. These models are hereafter referred to as “SST”, “Nurse-MD”, and “Metapopulation”, respectively. We explored the impact on the estimated number of MRSA acquisitions and the sensitivity of the different models to changes in their underlying parameters. These models represent moving from an extremely simple model structure to one that is of intermediate complexity, verging on attempting to model the same interactions that might appear in a network or agent-based model while still adhering to the compartmental model framework (allowing it to use the same parameters and for differences in software implementation to be ignored in understanding the differences between models).

To further evaluate how important the nurse-patient interactions affect MRSA acquisitions, a hybrid model was developed that allows a nurse to randomly interact with patients not originally under their direct care over some proportion of their workday. This hybrid model consists of a metapopulation that is primarily but not exclusively, organized into distinct subpopulations but still allows for some interaction between nurses and all patients. The limited random interaction represents variance from patient assignments often seen in the ICU environment, such as cross-coverage during breaks, staff shortages, or complex procedures that require higher numbers of healthcare workers. In doing so, we explore the entire staff-patient interaction spectrum from random mixing to a highly structured model.

Methods

Model Structure

MRSA transmission was simulated in an 18-bed medical ICU that included six nurses and a dedicated critical care physician based on a previously published model²⁹. Three models were implemented with varying structures of provider-patient interactions. While ICU size and staffing levels can vary, we chose an 18-bed ICU with a nurse-to-patient ratio of 1:3 based on averages obtained from a large multicenter clinical trial³⁶. These models represent different structural assumptions, stepping from a simplified model that makes several broad simplifications to one approaching the granularity of a basic network or agent-based model while remaining a compartmental model. A summary of all transmission model parameters can be found in Table 1.

In the single staff type (SST) model, patients are assumed to mix randomly with healthcare workers (HCWs), with no distinction between the nurses or the physician (Fig. 1). Hospital staff are either uncontaminated (S_U) or contaminated (S_C), representing infectious material on their hands or person. Patients are either uncolonized (P_U) or colonized (P_C). This model, while unrealistic, was important to use as a baseline for comparison as it represents a homogenous mixing population often found in compartmental models. This simplified representation is also similar to how some agent-based models of larger-scale hospital networks represent single hospitals¹⁴. The SST model equations are available in Table S1.

Figure 1. Schematic representation of the compartmental flow of a mathematical model of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) acquisition with a single type of staff. Solid arrows indicate possible transition states, while dashed arrows indicate potential routes of MRSA contamination or colonization (transition parameters found in

Table 1). Healthcare staff are classified as uncontaminated (SU) or contaminated (Sc), while patients are classified as uncolonized (PU) or colonized (PC). Model equations are found in Table S1.

To relax the random mixing assumption, two additional models were developed and implemented. First, the “Nurse-MD” model retained random mixing but separated the physician from the nursing staff as two distinct populations (Fig. 2). Separation of the physician also allowed the interactions between healthcare workers and the patients to be more realistic, using role-specific contact rates with patients. This resulted in physicians having less direct care tasks (touching the patient or their immediate surrounding environment) when compared to either nurses or the generic healthcare workers in the SST model. This model had six compartments within it: the number of patients either colonized (P_C) or uncolonized (P_U), the number of nurses either contaminated (N_C) or uncontaminated (N_U), and the two additional compartments representing the physician as either contaminated (D_C) or uncontaminated (D_U). The equations for the Nurse-MD model may be found in Table S2.

Figure 2. Schematic representation of the compartmental flow of a mathematical model of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) acquisition with nurses and intensivists separated into different staff types. Solid arrows indicate possible transition states, while dashed arrows indicate potential routes of MRSA contamination or colonization (transition parameters found in Table 1). Nurses and doctors are classified

as uncontaminated (N_U or D_U) and contaminated (N_C and D_C), while patients are classified as uncolonized (P_U) or colonized (P_C). Model equations are found in Table S2.

The second alternative model, referred to as the “Metapopulation model”, further segregated the healthcare workers by assigning each nurse a specific group of patients (one nurse for every three patients) and assuming the nurse cared exclusively for those patients. This practice is common in many ICUs for continuity of care, familiarity, and scheduling purposes. The model compartments thus become further divided into six subpopulations, with the physician acting as a bridge between them (Fig. 3). This model structure creates a metapopulation that better represents an actual ICU organizational staffing structure at the cost of increased complexity and reduced analytical tractability. This model only assumes that the nurse visits each patient in their assigned group randomly. The equations for the Metapopulation model, as well as the extension discussed below, may be found in Table S3.

Figure 3. Schematic representation of a Metapopulation model of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) acquisition (transmission parameters found in Table 1). Patients (blue) are treated by a single assigned nurse (orange). A single intensivist (red) randomly treats all patients. Model equations are found in Table S3.

While nurses may be assigned to a specific group of patients, eventually a nurse will interact with patients outside their assigned group due to cross-coverage, staff breaks, or patient care tasks that require more than one nurse to perform. The final

extension of this model adds a parameter, gamma (γ), to represent the amount of time a nurse spends in their assigned group, with the remainder of the time spent moving randomly among patients outside their assignment. This expanded model hybridizes the previous models, allowing exploration of intermediate population interactions between purely random mixing and strict nurse-patient groupings. When $\gamma = 1/6$, this model replicates the Nurse-MD model, as a nurse is no more likely to spend time with their assigned patients as they are any other five patient groups. Similarly, when $\gamma = 1$, the model replicates the Metapopulation model, where nurses only treat their assigned patients.

Several assumptions underlie all four models. First, patients are assumed to have a single-occupancy room, do not leave their room at any time, and therefore do not interact with other patients. The nurses and the physician only interact with the patients and do not interact with each other in ways relevant to pathogen transmission. The ICU is considered a “closed ICU”, meaning physicians or other hospital staff from outside the ICU do not interact with patients. The ICU is also considered to be at 100% capacity at all times, therefore if a patient is discharged it is assumed another patient is admitted to the bed immediately³⁷. A hand hygiene opportunity occurs after every direct care task or any contact between a healthcare provider and a patient, and in addition, personal protective equipment (PPE) such as gowns and gloves are changed on entry and exit from the rooms of all colonized patients. Note both hand hygiene and PPE are performed with imperfect compliance (Table 1). Lastly, we assumed that MRSA colonization is detected instantly and with perfect sensitivity and specificity to simplify

the model, and other than the natural decolonization parameter, μ (μ), there are no treatments or interventions performed for colonized patients.

Parameterization

Parameter values were obtained predominantly from a previously published model of MRSA transmission in an ICU³⁶ and are described in Table 1. The alternative models introduce new interactions between the patient and their healthcare team, which required rederivation of some parameters from their original sources^{41,43,44}. Specifically, the hand hygiene and gown/glove change rates incorporate nurse and physician specific contact rates, which were recalculated using the same methods as in the previous work.

Contact rates between patients and healthcare workers were represented by direct care tasks per hour for each healthcare worker type. Direct care tasks are defined as the physical interaction of the healthcare worker with the patient or their surrounding environment⁴¹. Effective hand-decontaminations per hour (ι) were calculated by the number of direct care tasks and taking into consideration the compliance rate and handwashing efficacy. Effective gown and glove changes per hour (τ) were calculated based on the number of visits to a patient per hour and a compliance rate – changing gowns and gloves was assumed to be 100% effective at removing contamination from a healthcare worker.

One additional parameter was added to the model differing from previously published work. A natural decolonization rate based on results from the STAR*ICU Trial was added based on evidence that colonization of MRSA is limited, and natural

decolonization can occur without targeted treatment or decontamination efforts, moving patients from P_C to P_U at a low rate absent any direct intervention^{30,42}.

Model Simulation

The SST, Nurse-MD and Metapopulation models were simulated to count the number of patients who transitioned to the colonized state (P_C) in order to compare the average number of MRSA acquisitions. The models were stochastically simulated using Gillespie's Direct Method⁴⁵ in Python 3.6 using the StochPy package⁴⁶ for 1,000 iterations per model. The initial conditions for each model were set to have no contaminated healthcare workers, either nurses or the physician, and no colonized patients, with initial MRSA infections being seeded from colonized members of the community being admitted to the ICU. Each iteration was run for a single year. The distribution of the acquisitions for each model's 1,000 iterations was visualized in R v3.5.1 using the vioplot package⁴⁷, and the difference between them assessed using a Kruskal-Wallis test. The code for the model simulation and subsequent analysis may be found at github.com/epimodels/Metapopulation_MRSA.

Model Recalibration

In addition to considering model outcomes using a single set of parameters (originally calibrated to the SST model), we also examined the difference in the estimated value of a single free parameter which could be fit within each model. The purpose of this recalibration is two-fold. First, it allows for a comparison of the models in a setting where their outcomes are equal. Second, it allows us to examine how each

model form might influence the value of an estimated parameter – important information in a setting where models may be used to perform statistical inference and estimate intervention efficacy. The parameter chosen for this recalibration, ψ , is the probability of an effective colonization of an uncolonized patient from contact between a contaminated healthcare worker.

Approximate Bayesian Computation (ABC)⁴⁸ was used for the parameter fitting and to obtain an approximate Bayesian posterior of ψ for the SST, Nurse-MD and Metapopulation models. This method samples a candidate value from a prior distribution, performs the model simulation using that candidate, and compares a summary statistic from that simulation to a target statistic. The candidate value is accepted if the simulation's summary statistic equals the target statistic $\pm$ an error term epsilon (ϵ). This is performed repeatedly, and the resulting distribution of accepted candidates approximates a Bayesian posterior distribution.

For this analysis, the target number of acquisitions was set to 5.94 acquisitions per 1,000 person-days with an epsilon (ϵ) of 15%, matching the rate seen in the control arm of a large randomized clinical trial on MRSA prevention during the study period³⁶. A uniform prior bounded by 0.0 and 1.0 was used, and 1,000,000 candidate parameters were drawn from this distribution to obtain the approximated Bayesian posterior of ψ for each model, using a simulation procedure similar to the one described above. For comparison between models, the median of this distribution was used as the value for ψ .

Parameter Sensitivity Analysis

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

A more structural sensitivity question within the Metapopulation model was explored by varying the amount of time a nurse spends exclusively with their assigned group vs. other patients on the ward, γ . The Metapopulation model including γ was simulated 10,000 times, drawing a value of γ for each iteration from a uniform distribution bounded by $1/6$ and 1 . A segmented Poisson regression model was then fit to detect any thresholds in the value of γ where it's relationship to the rate of MRSA acquisitions notably changed, or if the transition between the Nurse-MD model ($\gamma=1/6$) and the Metapopulation model ($\gamma=1$) was linear. This model incorporated linear and quadratic terms for γ and allowed the model to choose any number of break points.

Results

Model Comparison

When using the same parameter set (calibrated to the SST model), the probability density and average number of MRSA acquisition were significantly different

between the SST, Nurse-MD and Metapopulation models ($\chi^2 = 1786.5$, $df = 2$, $p > 0.001$) (Fig. 4). Using the SST model as the baseline for comparison, a decrease in the average number of MRSA acquisitions were observed in both the separate Nurse-MD model and the Metapopulation model. By separating the physician from the nurses, the mean acquisitions decreased 20.6% from 40.7 acquisitions to 32.3 acquisitions, respectively. The Metapopulation model experienced a 51.4% decrease from the original SST model at 19.8 acquisitions.

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

Model Recalibration

The model parameter ψ is the probability of effective colonization of an uncolonized patient from contact with a contaminated healthcare worker and was used to calibrate each of the models. Calibration of the SST model resulted in the median value of the parameter of 0.024 (95% Credible Interval: 0.016, 0.034). The Nurse-MD model results were very similar to the SST model, with a median value of 0.029 (95% Credible Interval: 0.019, 0.042). In contrast, the Metapopulation model had a median ψ value of 0.046 (95% Credible Interval: 0.032, 0.07), both a substantially higher estimate than the other models and one in which the bounds of the credible interval did not contain the other estimates. The altered contact patterns in the Metapopulation model require substantially higher per-contact colonization probabilities to sustain the same level of colonization.

Sensitivity Analysis

While the Metapopulation model resulted in fewer acquisitions, certain parameters were found to affect the model outcomes to a larger magnitude when compared to the other models. The three parameters in SST model showing the largest proportional change (> 0.20) in cumulative acquisitions (Fig. 5a): contact rate (ρ), probability of patient colonization (ψ), and hand-decontamination (ι). Similar findings were also found in the Nurse-MD model, though generally only for the nurse-specific parameters (Fig. 5b). The doctor-specific parameters had little effect on the model outcomes. Only one parameter of the Metapopulation model had a large change in cumulative acquisitions (> 0.20) – the nurse-specific contact rate (ρ_N). However, the parameters with the largest effects were consistent with the previous two models (Fig. 5c).

The directionality of the overall change in cumulative acquisitions by parameter is an important measure of model stability and correct parameter estimates, as this reflects whether the models *qualitatively* give the same results as to whether or not a particular parameter value changing results in an increase or decrease in MRSA acquisitions, even if the models disagree as to the specific value of that change. All the parameters between the models are consistent in terms of directionality, with the Metapopulation model having a smaller change in magnitude of the cumulative acquisitions (Fig. 5d).

Figure 5. Global parameter sensitivity of three modeled ICU population structures.

Panel A depicts the change in proportional change in cumulative MRSA acquisitions per one-percent change in the value of a specific parameter, with light bars indicating increased acquisitions, and dark bars indicating decreased acquisitions for a model assuming random mixing and with a single staff type for both nurses and physicians. Panel B depicts the same for a model that separates nurses and physicians into different staff types, while Panel C depicts the same for a metapopulation model where nurses were assigned to a strict subpopulation of patients. Panel D depicts the difference in proportional changes between the Metapopulation and Nurse-MD models.

Metapopulation Interactions

Evaluating the relationship between gamma (γ), the proportion of time a nurse interacts with their originally assigned patient group, and MRSA acquisitions was identified as non-linear (Fig. 6), with progressively higher values of γ resulting in drastically reduced rates of MRSA acquisitions. The segmented Poisson regression model identified a single change point, gamma* (γ^*), at 0.40 (95% Confidence Interval: 0.37, 0.42). This value reflects a nurse spending a slim majority of their time (40%) with the fifteen patients not directly assigned to them, with the remainder focused on the three patients who are. Values below γ^* were well approximated by the Nurse-MD model, and values above it rapidly approached the stricter assignment of the Metapopulation model.

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

Discussion

The reduction and control of healthcare-associated infections in recent decades has been a major accomplishment. In 2015, a point-prevalence survey found that HAIs affected roughly 3.2% of hospitalized patients in the United States, down from about 4% in 2011⁴⁹. Unfortunately, many drug-resistant or multidrug-resistant organisms (MDROs) remain an urgent or serious threat according to The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and certain pathogens, such as MRSA, continue to cause over 10,000 deaths annually⁵⁰. The CDC continues to consider MRSA a serious threat to patient safety, and recent trends show that the incidence of hospital-onset bloodstream infections are no longer declining as observed for much of the last decade⁵¹. The evidence base for interventions to successfully address MRSA is mixed. For example, it has been difficult to quantify the effectiveness of MRSA screening and contact precautions, which has led to disagreement over their benefit^{52–55}. However, more recent evidence clearly suggests that contact precautions among MRSA patients in

Veterans Affairs acute care hospitals has a large reduction in transmission⁵⁶. Other efforts, such as improved hand hygiene are often successful^{57,58}, but reducing MRSA acquisitions by means of improved transmission prevention continues to be a focus for hospital infection control efforts.

Here we suggest that even fairly subtle changes in model structure increase the detail of how patient-provider interactions are modeled and can have significant impacts on both modeled colonization rates as well as the results of parameter estimation. By extension, these changes can greatly impact the estimated effectiveness of interventions. While remaining in the compartmental modeling framework, the more complex Metapopulation model was considerably more conservative when producing estimates of intervention effectiveness. While the models considered in this study had similar parameter sensitivity in terms of the *direction* of changes, the more highly structured models were relatively less sensitive. In all cases, the contact rate (ρ), probability of patient colonization (ψ), and hand-decontamination (ι) parameters had the largest impact, consistent with many of the known drivers of infection rates within hospitals. A model that assumes completely random mixing allows a higher degree of interaction with the patients and healthcare workers, resulting in an over-estimation of both the overall rate of MRSA acquisition and an over-estimation of the impact of interventions.

The sensitivity analyses also provided insight into the importance of accurately modeling different classes of healthcare worker. Our results suggest that the physician contact rate (ρ_D) had a very small effect on the change in cumulative MRSA acquisitions, concluding that quantifying the level of contamination, stratified between

nurses and doctors, may not be informative. Our model suggests that further exploration of nurse interaction and contact is most likely a more important focus for future infection control efforts.

The impact of changing the structure of a simulation ICU was, importantly, non-linear, with a substantial portion of the available parameter space for how much time nurses spent only with their assigned patients (γ) from 16.7% (equivalent to random mixing) to 40% being well-approximated by the much simpler Nurse-MD model as compared to the relatively more complex Metapopulation model. Informal estimates from two tertiary care academic medical centers in the southeastern United States estimated their ICUs at 80% and 90% (personal communication), an area of the parameter space where the impact of how one chooses to model the structure of an ICU has a pronounced impact.

Conclusion

When combined, these results suggest that while compartmental models assuming random mixing and those that have more specified population interactions may give qualitatively the same answer as to the benefit of an intervention, the magnitude of these estimates may vary considerably, which has implications for cost-effectiveness models and other studies that rely on these estimates. Additionally, if the interventions suggested by the model are implemented in practice, the performance of the intervention may differ from the model's predictions due to the choice of how the population interacts. Finally, these results show that fitted parameters can vary considerably even for very similar models, suggesting even mild changes in model form

necessitate refitting, and parameter estimates are not transportable from one model to another model with a differing population interaction structure.

The results of this study do have clinical implications. In an ICU setting, it is foreseeable that events like emergencies, breaks, or cross-coverage of nurses will occur with a reasonable degree of frequency. The COVID-19 pandemic's impact on staffing, the creation of COVID-19 specific wards in spaces not intended for critical care, and the demands of treating COVID-19 patients is a particularly vivid example of this⁵⁹. Our model suggests that even relatively small increases in the rate at which these interactions occur can have outsized impacts on MRSA acquisition rates, which is likely to be true for other healthcare-associated pathogens as well.

Methodologically, our study suggests that the appropriateness of using simplified model structures for healthcare-associated infections is highly context dependent. In circumstances where a simple qualitative answer or generalized ranking is needed, a simplified compartmental model that does not attempt to represent patient-provider mixing patterns may be sufficient. The COVID-19 pandemic, which has demanded rapid turn-around of modeling results in a largely distributed fashion is an example of a circumstance where the tradeoff between speed and accuracy in model development is likely important.

Our results also suggest that ICUs with highly interactive nurse-patient populations may not need more complex models – and while this is likely not the case in developed world urban tertiary care academic medical centers, it may be true in other environments such as rural hospitals or LMIC settings. The appropriateness of such a model is measurable and observable and should be considered prior to embarking on

the creation of a model, as settings where nurses are primarily able to focus on their assigned patients both call for more complex models and these complex models will benefit from having that parameter already estimated.

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

Other limitations include the structure of the model – it focuses specifically on healthcare worker and patient interactions and does not account for interactions with individuals other than nurses and the physician. For example, interactions among patients, visitation by family and friends, medical or radiological technicians performing a specific procedure, etc. are not represented. Some of these individuals, such as technicians, arguably add an additional random element that would connect otherwise partially or wholly separated patients, and correspondingly increase infection rates. Others, such as visitors, primarily represent risk to a single patient. Similarly, transmission purely through environmental contamination is not represented. These simplifications were primarily chosen to make the illustration of the impact and potential necessity of moving to a more complex model structure as clear as possible.

This study shows that the random mixing assumption results in an over-estimation of both the overall rate of MRSA acquisition and an over-estimation of the

impact of interventions as expressed as changes in model parameter values. In many – but not all – circumstances the use of more complex models is likely warranted, even for small-scale models of a single ICU. Importantly however, this necessity can be established not using a heuristic or qualitative assessment based on a modeler’s bias or preferences, but with a straightforward parameter estimate. The estimation of this parameter in several different healthcare contexts, including rural and LMIC settings, is ongoing. More broadly, the results of this analysis show the need for structural sensitivity analysis to accompany analysis of parameter uncertainty. While all the models explored here are adaptations of familiar compartmental forms, and the steps between them relatively simple, they can have dramatic impacts on the results of the models – impacts that can be amplified when these results are incorporated into larger models, cost-effectiveness analyses, guidelines and position papers, etc.

Acknowledgements

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

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare they have no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Massad E, Lundberg S, Yang HM. Modeling and simulating the evolution of resistance against antibiotics. *Int J Biomed Comput*. 1993;33(1):65-81. doi:10.1016/0020-7101(93)90060-J
2. Sebille V, Chevret S, Valleron AJ. Modeling the Spread of Resistant Nosocomial Pathogens in an Intensive-Care Unit. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 1997;18(2):84-92.
3. McBryde ES, Pettitt AN, McElwain DLS. A stochastic mathematical model of methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* transmission in an intensive care unit: Predicting the impact of interventions. *J Theor Biol*. 2007;245(3):470-481. doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2006.11.008
4. Kachalov VN, Nguyen H, Balakrishna S, et al. Identifying the drivers of multidrug-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* at a European level. Wodarz D, ed. *PLOS Comput Biol*. 2021;17(1):e1008446. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008446
5. Eyre DW, Laager M, Walker AS, Cooper BS, Wilson DJ, on behalf of the CDC Modeling Infectious Diseases in Healthcare Program (MInD-Healthcare). Probabilistic transmission models incorporating sequencing data for healthcare-associated *Clostridioides difficile* outperform heuristic rules and identify strain-specific differences in transmission. Kouyos RD, ed. *PLOS Comput Biol*. 2021;17(1):e1008417. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008417
6. van Kleef E, Robotham JV, Jit M, Deeny SR, Edmunds WJ. Modelling the transmission of healthcare associated infections: a systematic review. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2013;13(1):294. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-13-294
7. Smith DL, Battle KE, Hay SI, Barker CM, Scott TW, McKenzie FE. Ross, Macdonald, and a Theory for the Dynamics and Control of Mosquito-Transmitted Pathogens. Chitnis CE, ed. *PLoS Pathog*. 2012;8(4):e1002588. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1002588
8. Lofgren ET, Moehring RW, Anderson DJ, Weber DJ, Fefferman NH. A Mathematical Model to Evaluate the Routine Use of Fecal Microbiota Transplantation to Prevent Incident and Recurrent *Clostridium difficile* Infection. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2014;35(1):18-27. doi:10.1086/674394
9. Plipat N, Spicknall IH, Koopman JS, Eisenberg JN. The dynamics of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* exposure in a hospital model and the potential for environmental intervention. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2013;13(1):595. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-13-595
10. D'Agata EMC, Webb GF, Horn MA, Moellering, Jr. RC, Ruan S. Modeling the Invasion of Community-Acquired Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* into Hospitals. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2009;48(3):274-284. doi:10.1086/595844

- 576 11. Chamchod F, Palittapongarnpim P. Effects of the proportion of high-risk patients and
577 control strategies on the prevalence of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in an
578 intensive care unit. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2019;19(1):1026. doi:10.1186/s12879-019-4632-9
- 579 12. Wang L, Ruan S. Modeling Nosocomial Infections of Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus*
580 *aureus* with Environment Contamination*. *Sci Rep.* 2017;7(1):580. doi:10.1038/s41598-
581 017-00261-1
- 582 13. Goldstein ND, Eppes SC, Mackley A, Tuttle D, Paul DA. A Network Model of Hand Hygiene:
583 How Good Is Good Enough to Stop the Spread of MRSA? *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.*
584 2017;38(08):945-952. doi:10.1017/ice.2017.116
- 585 14. Lee BY, McGlone SM, Wong KF, et al. Modeling the Spread of Methicillin-Resistant
586 *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) Outbreaks throughout the Hospitals in Orange County,
587 California. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol.* 2011;32(6):562-572. doi:10.1086/660014
- 588 15. Bartsch SM, Wong KF, Mueller LE, et al. Modeling Interventions to Reduce the Spread of
589 Multidrug-Resistant Organisms Between Health Care Facilities in a Region. *JAMA Netw*
590 *Open.* 2021;4(8):e2119212. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.19212
- 591 16. Wilson AM, Verhougstraete MP, Donskey CJ, Reynolds KA. An agent-based modeling
592 approach to estimate pathogen exposure risks from wheelchairs. *Am J Infect Control.*
593 2021;49(2):206-214. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2020.06.204
- 594 17. Rocha LEC, Singh V, Esch M, Lenaerts T, Liljeros F, Thorson A. Dynamic contact networks of
595 patients and MRSA spread in hospitals. *Sci Rep.* 2020;10(1):9336. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-
596 66270-9
- 597 18. Pei S, Liljeros F, Shaman J. Identifying asymptomatic spreaders of antimicrobial-resistant
598 pathogens in hospital settings. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2021;118(37):e2111190118.
599 doi:10.1073/pnas.2111190118
- 600 19. Nguyen LKN, Megiddo I, Howick S. Simulation models for transmission of health care–
601 associated infection: A systematic review. *Am J Infect Control.* 2020;48(7):810-821.
602 doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2019.11.005
- 603 20. Slayton RB, O'Hagan JJ, Barnes S, et al. Modeling Infectious Diseases in Healthcare
604 Network (MInD-Healthcare) Framework for Describing and Reporting Multidrug-resistant
605 Organism and Healthcare-Associated Infections Agent-based Modeling Methods. *Clin*
606 *Infect Dis.* Published online March 10, 2020:ciaa234. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa234
- 607 21. Funk S, King AA. Choices and trade-offs in inference with infectious disease models.
608 *Epidemics.* 2020;30:100383. doi:10.1016/j.epidem.2019.100383

22. Nguyen LKN, Megiddo I, Howick S. Hybrid Simulation for Modeling Healthcare-associated Infections: Promising But Challenging. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021;72(8):1475-1480. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1276
23. Ueno T, Masuda N. Controlling nosocomial infection based on structure of hospital social networks. *J Theor Biol*. 2008;254(3):655-666. doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2008.07.001
24. Sadsad R, Sintchenko V, McDonnell GD, Gilbert GL. Effectiveness of Hospital-Wide Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) Infection Control Policies Differs by Ward Specialty. Kluytmans J, ed. *PLoS ONE*. 2013;8(12):e83099. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0083099
25. Laager M, Cooper BS, Eyre DW, the CDC Modeling Infectious Diseases in Healthcare Program (MInD-Healthcare). Probabilistic modelling of effects of antibiotics and calendar time on transmission of healthcare-associated infection. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):21417. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-00748-y
26. Despotovic A, Milosevic B, Milosevic I, et al. Hospital-acquired infections in the adult intensive care unit—Epidemiology, antimicrobial resistance patterns, and risk factors for acquisition and mortality. *Am J Infect Control*. Published online February 2020. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2020.01.009
27. Grundmann H, Hori S, Winter B, Tami A, Austin DJ. Risk Factors for the Transmission of Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in an Adult Intensive Care Unit: Fitting a Model to the Data. *J Infect Dis*. 2002;185(4):481-488. doi:10.1086/338568
28. Hall IM, Barrass I, Leach S, Pittet D, Hugonnet S. Transmission dynamics of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in a medical intensive care unit. *J R Soc Interface*. 2012;9(75):2639-2652. doi:10.1098/rsif.2012.0134
29. Lofgren ET. Estimating the impact of post randomization changes in staff behavior in infection prevention trials: a mathematical modeling approach. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2017;17(1). doi:10.1186/s12879-017-2632-1
30. Haverkate MR, Derde LPG, Brun-Buisson C, Bonten MJM, Bootsma MCJ. Duration of colonization with antimicrobial-resistant bacteria after ICU discharge. *Intensive Care Med*. 2014;40(4):564-571. doi:10.1007/s00134-014-3225-8
31. Mitchell BG, Gardner A, Stone PW, Hall L, Pogorzelska-Maziarz M. Hospital Staffing and Health Care–Associated Infections: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf*. Published online June 2018. doi:10.1016/j.jcjq.2018.02.002
32. Duffield C, Diers D, O’Brien-Pallas L, et al. Nursing staffing, nursing workload, the work environment and patient outcomes. *Appl Nurs Res*. 2011;24(4):244-255. doi:10.1016/j.apnr.2009.12.004

33. McGahan M, Kucharski G, Coyer F. Nurse staffing levels and the incidence of mortality and morbidity in the adult intensive care unit: A literature review. *Aust Crit Care*. 2012;25(2):64-77. doi:10.1016/j.aucc.2012.03.003
34. Swiger PA, Vance DE, Patrician PA. Nursing workload in the acute-care setting: A concept analysis of nursing workload. *Nurs Outlook*. 2016;64(3):244-254. doi:10.1016/j.outlook.2016.01.003
35. Lee A, Cheung YSL, Joynt GM, Leung CCH, Wong WT, Gomersall CD. Are high nurse workload/staffing ratios associated with decreased survival in critically ill patients? A cohort study. *Ann Intensive Care*. 2017;7(1). doi:10.1186/s13613-017-0269-2
36. Harris AD. Universal Glove and Gown Use and Acquisition of Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria in the ICU: A Randomized Trial. *JAMA*. Published online October 4, 2013. doi:10.1001/jama.2013.277815
37. Lofgren ET. Pools versus Queues: The Variable Dynamics of Stochastic “Steady States.” Muneeppeerakul R, ed. *PLOS ONE*. 2015;10(6):e0130574. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0130574
38. Westbrook JI, Duffield C, Li L, Creswick NJ. How much time do nurses have for patients? a longitudinal study quantifying hospital nurses’ patterns of task time distribution and interactions with health professionals. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2011;11(1). doi:10.1186/1472-6963-11-319
39. Austin DJ, Anderson RM. Studies of antibiotic resistance within the patient, hospitals and the community using simple mathematical models. Anderson RM, ed. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 1999;354(1384):721-738. doi:10.1098/rstb.1999.0425
40. Sickbertbenett E, Weber D, Gergenteague M, Sobsey M, Samsa G, Rutala W. Comparative efficacy of hand hygiene agents in the reduction of bacteria and viruses. *Am J Infect Control*. 2005;33(2):67-77. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2004.08.005
41. Ballermann MA, Shaw NT, Mayes DC, Gibney RN, Westbrook JI. Validation of the Work Observation Method By Activity Timing (WOMBAT) method of conducting time-motion observations in critical care settings: an observational study. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2011;11(1). doi:10.1186/1472-6947-11-32
42. Khader K, Thomas A, Huskins WC, et al. A Dynamic Transmission Model to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Infection Control Strategies. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. Published online December 8, 2016:ofw247. doi:10.1093/ofid/ofw247
43. Westbrook J, Ampt A, Kearney L. Work observation method by activity timing (WOMBAT) manual. Published online 2007.

- 678 44. Westbrook JI, Ampt A. Design, application and testing of the Work Observation Method by
679 Activity Timing (WOMBAT) to measure clinicians' patterns of work and communication☆.
680 *Int J Med Inf.* 2009;78:S25-S33. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2008.09.003
- 681 45. Gillespie DT. Exact stochastic simulation of coupled chemical reactions. *J Phys Chem.*
682 1977;81(25):2340-2361. doi:10.1021/j100540a008
- 683 46. Maarleveld TR, Olivier BG, Bruggeman FJ. StochPy: A Comprehensive, User-Friendly Tool
684 for Simulating Stochastic Biological Processes. Bourdon J, ed. *PLoS ONE.*
685 2013;8(11):e79345. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0079345
- 686 47. Adler D. *Vioplot: Violin Plot. R Package.*; 2005. [http://wsopuppenkiste.wiso.uni-](http://wsopuppenkiste.wiso.uni-goettingen.de/~dadler)
687 [goettingen.de/~dadler](http://wsopuppenkiste.wiso.uni-goettingen.de/~dadler)
- 688 48. Toni T, Welch D, Strelkowa N, Ipsen A, Stumpf MPH. Approximate Bayesian computation
689 scheme for parameter inference and model selection in dynamical systems. *J R Soc*
690 *Interface.* 2009;6(31):187-202. doi:10.1098/rsif.2008.0172
- 691 49. Magill SS, O'Leary E, Janelle SJ, et al. Changes in Prevalence of Health Care–Associated
692 Infections in U.S. Hospitals. *N Engl J Med.* 2018;379(18):1732-1744.
693 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1801550
- 694 50. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (U.S.). *Antibiotic Resistance Threats in the*
695 *United States, 2019.* Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (U.S.); 2019.
696 doi:10.15620/cdc:82532
- 697 51. Kourtis A, Hatfield K, Baggs J. Vital Signs: Epidemiology and Recent Trends in Methicillin-
698 Resistant and in Methicillin-Susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus* Bloodstream Infections —
699 United States. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2019;(68):214-219.
700 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6809e1>
- 701 52. Fätkenheuer G, Hirschel B, Harbarth S. Screening and isolation to control methicillin-
702 resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*: sense, nonsense, and evidence. *The Lancet.*
703 2015;385(9973):1146-1149. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(14)60660-7
- 704 53. Morgan DJ, Malani P, Diekema DJ. Diagnostic Stewardship—Leveraging the Laboratory to
705 Improve Antimicrobial Use. *JAMA.* 2017;318(7):607. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.8531
- 706 54. Morgan DJ, Wenzel RP, Bearman G. Contact Precautions for Endemic MRSA and VRE: Time
707 to Retire Legal Mandates. *JAMA.* 2017;318(4):329. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.7419
- 708 55. Rubin MA, Samore MH, Harris AD. The Importance of Contact Precautions for Endemic
709 Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* and Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci. *JAMA.*
710 2018;319(9):863-864. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.21122

56. Khader K, Thomas A, Stevens V, et al. Association Between Contact Precautions and Transmission of Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(3):e210971. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.0971
57. Derde LPG, Cooper BS, Goossens H, et al. Interventions to reduce colonisation and transmission of antimicrobial-resistant bacteria in intensive care units: an interrupted time series study and cluster randomised trial. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2014;14(1):31-39. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(13)70295-0
58. Boyce JM, Pittet D. Guideline for Hand Hygiene in Health-Care Settings: Recommendations of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee and the HICPAC/SHEA/APIC/IDSA Hand Hygiene Task Force. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2002;23(S12):S3-S40. doi:10.1086/503164
59. Stachel A, Keegan LT, Blumberg S. Modeling transmission of pathogens in healthcare settings. *Curr Opin Infect Dis*. 2021;Publish Ahead of Print. doi:10.1097/QCO.0000000000000742

List of Legends for Supporting Information

Table S1 Transitions and Equations for the Single Staff Type (SST) Model of MRSA Acquisition

Table S2 Transitions and Equations for the Nurse-MD Model of MRSA Acquisition

Table S3 Transitions and Equations for the Metapopulation Model of MRSA Acquisition

Figure 1. Schematic representation of the compartmental flow of a mathematical model of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) acquisition with a single type of staff. Solid arrows indicate possible transition states, while dashed arrows indicate potential routes of MRSA contamination or colonization (transition parameters found in Table 1). Healthcare staff are classified as uncontaminated (S_U) or contaminated (S_C), while patients are classified as uncolonized (P_U) or colonized (P_C). Model equations are found in Table S1.

Figure 2. Schematic representation of the compartmental flow of a mathematical model of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) acquisition with nurses and a physician separated into different staff types. Solid arrows indicate possible transition states, while dashed arrows indicate potential routes of MRSA contamination or colonization (transition parameters found in Table 1). Nurses and doctors are classified as uncontaminated (N_U or D_U) and contaminated (N_C and D_C), while patients are classified as uncolonized (P_U) or colonized (P_C). Model equations are found in Table S2.

754

755
756
757
758
759
760

Figure 3. Schematic representation of a Metapopulation model of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) acquisition (transition parameters found in Table 1). Patients (blue) are treated by a single assigned nurse (orange). A single physician (red) randomly treats all patients. Model equations are found in Table S3.

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

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

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

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

Parameter	Parameter Description	Parameter Value	Source(s)
ρ	Contact rate between patients and HCWs	4.154 (# of direct care tasks/hour)	8,38
ρ_N	Contact rate between patients and nurses	3.973 (# of nurse direct care tasks/hour)	8,38
ρ_D	Contact rate between patients and physician	0.181 (# of physician direct care tasks/hour)	8,38
σ	Probability that a HCW's hands are contaminated from a single contact with a colonized patient	0.054	39
ψ_{SST}	Probability of successful colonization of an uncolonized patient due to contact with a contaminated HCW when randomly mixed	0.0236	Fitted to ³⁶
$\psi_{Nurse-MD}$	Probability of successful colonization of an uncolonized patient due to contact with a contaminated HCW with physician separated	0.0285	Fitted to ³⁶
$\psi_{Metapopulation}$	Probability of successful colonization of an uncolonized patient due to contact with a contaminated HCW in metapopulation structure	0.0464	Fitted to ³⁶
θ	Probability of discharge	4.39 days ⁻¹	36
v_u	Proportion of admissions uncolonized with MRSA	0.9221	36
v_c	Proportion of admissions colonized with MRSA	0.0779	36
ι	Effective hand-decontaminations/hour (direct care tasks $\times$ hand hygiene compliance $\times$ efficacy)	5.740 (10.682 direct care tasks/hour $\times$ 56.55% compliance $\times$ ~ 95% efficacy)	8,36,38,40
ι_N	Effective nurse hand-decontaminations/hour	6.404 (11.92 direct care tasks/hour $\times$ 56.55% compliance $\times$ ~ 95% efficacy)	8,36,38,40
ι_D	Effective physician hand-decontaminations/hour	1.748 (3.253 direct care tasks/hour $\times$ 56.55% compliance $\times$ ~ 95% efficacy)	8,36,38,40
τ	Effective gown or glove changes/hour (2 $\times$ # of visits $\times$ compliance)	2.445 (2.957 changes/hour $\times$ 82.66% compliance)	36,39,41
τ_N	Effective nurse gown or glove changes/hour	2.728 (3.30 changes/hour $\times$ 82.66% compliance)	36,39,41
τ_D	Effective physician gown or glove changes/hour	0.744 (0.90 changes/hour $\times$ 82.66% compliance)	36,39,41
μ	Natural decolonization rate	20.0 days ⁻¹	42