1	Carriage of a single strain of non-toxigenic Corynebacterium diphtheriae
2	biovar Belfanti (Corynebacterium belfantii)
3	in four patients with cystic fibrosis
4	
5	Diane Pivot <sup>1</sup> , Annlyse Fanton <sup>2</sup> , Edgar Badell-Ocando <sup>3,4</sup> , Marion Benouachkou <sup>1</sup> , Karine
6	Astruc <sup>1</sup> , Frederic Huet <sup>2</sup> , Lucie Amoureux <sup>5</sup> , Catherine Neuwirth <sup>5</sup> , Alexis Criscuolo <sup>6</sup> , Serge
7	Aho <sup>1</sup> , Julie Toubiana <sup>3,4</sup> and Sylvain Brisse <sup>3,4,*</sup>
8	
9	<sup>1</sup> Epidemiology and Hygiene Department, Dijon University Hospital, Dijon, France
10	<sup>2</sup> Centre de Ressources et de Compétences de la Mucoviscidose (CRCM), Dijon, Hôpital
11	d'Enfants, Dijon, France
12	<sup>3</sup> Institut Pasteur, Biodiversity and Epidemiology of Bacterial Pathogens, Paris, France
13	<sup>4</sup> National Reference Center for Corynebacteria of the <i>diphtheriae</i> complex, Paris, France
14	<sup>5</sup> Bacteriology Department, Dijon University Hospital, Dijon, France
15	<sup>6</sup> Institut Pasteur, Bioinformatics and Biostatistics Hub, C3BI, USR 3756 IP CNRS, Paris,
16	France
17	
18	* Corresponding author
19	
20	Running title: C. diphtheriae in cystic fibrosis

### 21 ABSTRACT

22 Cystic fibrosis (CF) patients are commonly colonized by bacterial pathogens, which can 23 induce persistent lung inflammation and may contribute to clinical deterioration. Colonization 24 of CF patients and cross-transmission by Corynebacterium diphtheriae has not been reported 25 so far. The aim of this article was to investigate the possibility of a cross transmission of 26 C. diphtheriae biovar Belfanti between four patients of a CF center. C. diphtheriae biovar 27 belfanti (now formally called C. belfantii) isolates were collected from four patients in a 28 single CF care center over a 6 years period and analyzed by microbiological methods and 29 whole genome sequencing. Epidemiological links among patients were investigated. Ten 30 isolates were collected from 4 patients. Whole genome sequencing of one isolate from each 31 patient showed that a single strain was shared among them. In addition, one patient had the 32 same strain on two consecutive samplings nine months apart. The strain was non-toxigenic 33 and was susceptible to most antimicrobial agents. Ciprofloxacin resistance was observed in 34 one patient. Transmission of the strain among patients was supported by the occurrence of 35 same-day visits to the CF center. This study demonstrates colonization of CF patients by 36 C. diphtheriae biovar Belfanti (C. belfantii) and shows persistence and transmission of a 37 unique strain during at least six years in a single CF patient care center.

38

39

40 Keywords: cystic fibrosis; colonization; Corynebacterium diphtheriae; Corynebacterium

41 *belfantii*; epidemiology; genomic sequencing; transmission

42	Abbreviations					
43	CF: cystic fibrosis					
44	MLST: multilocus sequence typing					
45	MALDI-TOF: Matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization time-of-flight					
46						
47	Potential conflicts of interest					
48	All authors report no conflicts of interest					
49						
50	Funding					
51	This work was supported financially by Dijon University Hospital, Institut Pasteur and Public					
52	Health France.					
53						
54	Previous meeting presentations					
55	The information in this work was not previously presented in any meeting.					
56						
57	Corresponding author: Sylvain Brisse. Biodiversity and Epidemiology of Bacterial					
58	Pathogens, Institut Pasteur, 25 rue du Docteur Roux, F-75724 Paris, France.					
59	E-mail: sylvain.brisse@pasteur.fr; Phone +33 1 45 68 83 34					
60						
61	Accession numbers					
62	The genomic sequence data generated in this work were submitted to the European					
63	Nucleotide Archive and are available from the International Nucleotide Sequence Database					
64	Collaboration (NCBI/ENA/DDBJ) databases under project accession number PRJEB28372					
65	and run data accession numbers ERR2757916 to ERR2757921.					

### 66 INTRODUCTION

67 A large fraction of the mortality of cystic fibrosis (CF) patients is attributed to infections of 68 the respiratory tract, which can be caused by multiple pathogens, and cross-transmission 69 within CF centers themselves is an important healthcare related issue (1, 2)(3). The genus 70 Corynebacterium includes a high number of pathogens, most of them being opportunistic (4). 71 So far, only C. pseudodiphtheriticum, C. propinguum and C. accolens were reported from CF 72 patients (5-7). C. diphtheriae, the most pathogenic Corvnebacterium species that causes 73 diphtheria, was not reported in pauci- or asymptomatic CF lung colonization to our 74 knowledge. Typical diphtheria is caused by strains that produce the diphtheria toxin. 75 Although the disease has almost disappeared in countries with high toxoid vaccine coverage, 76 the pathogen still circulates in the human population (8-10). Further, non-toxigenic 77 C. diphtheriae strains can be recovered from a variety of infections including respiratory tract 78 infections, skin infections and bacteremia (11, 12). Three biovars of C. diphtheriae are 79 distinguished by biochemical characteristics. Whereas biovars Mitis and Gravis can harbor 80 the diphtheria toxin gene, biovar Belfanti isolates were only exceptionally described as 81 toxigenic (13-15). Recently, C. diphtheriae biovar Belfanti isolates were recognized as 82 representing a novel species called C. belfantii (16). The aim of this study was to investigate 83 potential cross-transmission within a group of four patients with lower respiratory tract 84 colonization by nontoxigenic C. diphtheriae. These patients were followed in a single CF 85 center during a period of six years, and our genomic analyses showed that they were 86 colonized by a single C. diphtheriae strain.

### 87 METHODS

#### 88 Identification of cases

89 Cases were identified in the regional consultation CF Center of a university hospital 90 between January 2011 and November 2016. During their visits at the center, patients are 91 screened for the presence of opportunistic infectious agents and the evolution of antimicrobial 92 resistance is monitored. The inclusion of cases was performed retrospectively based on at 93 least one sample positive for C. diphtheriae upon microbiological screening from sputum or 94 induced sputum. Clinical and laboratory data (sex, age at the time of diagnosis, pulmonary 95 functionality, long-term or sequential antibiotic therapies, symptomatology at the time of 96 diagnosis, respiratory co-infections) were collected for each patient.

97

### 98 Epidemiological investigations

99 The CF center includes three wards (consultation, pulmonary function testing and 100 chest physiotherapy) and an imaging department. The timeline of patients visits to the various 101 wards of the CF center was investigated from their clinical records. Patients undergo chest 102 physiotherapy either before or after their consultation with the physician, and a sputum 103 specimen was systematically collected. Afterwards, they are directed to the pulmonary 104 function testing ward.

To investigate infection control measures and detect possible factors that might have favored patient-to-patient transmission, all healthcare workers of the three wards who had worked during the study period were met and interviewed about implementation of standard precautions, material management and patient care organization. Besides, healthcare workers who were in charge of the included patients were screened based on a voluntary basis at the time of the study (June to October 2017) for *C. diphtheriae* colonization in the nasopharynx. For this purpose, swabs were plated onto blood agar medium, on which five fosfomycin disks 112 (50  $\mu$ g/disk) were then deposited. Colonies growing around the disks after 18-24 h at 37°C 113 were sub-cultivated on Tinsdale medium agar and incubated at 37°C.

114

### 115 **Bacterial identification and characterization**

116 The isolates were identified as C. diphtheriae at the local microbiology laboratory by 117 MALDI-TOF (Bruker) since Sept. 2016, or using API Coryne (bioMerieux) until August 118 2016. Confirmatory analysis and *tox* gene detection were performed at the National Reference 119 Center. The biovar of isolates was determined based on the combination of nitrate reductase 120 (positive in Mitis and Gravis, negative in Belfanti) and glycogen fermentation (positive in 121 Gravis only). Antimicrobial susceptibility was characterized by the disk diffusion method 122 (Bio-Rad, Marnes-la-Coquette, France) and the minimum inhibitory concentration was 123 determined by the E-test method (BioMérieux, Marcy l'Etoile, France). The sensitivity was interpreted using CA-SFM/EUCAST V.1.0 (mars 2017) criteria for Corynebacterium 124

125 (http://www.sfm-microbiologie.org/UserFiles/files/casfm/CASFMV1\_0\_MARS\_2017.pdf).

126 Susceptibility was tested for the following antimicrobial agents: vancomycin, kanamycin, 127 gentamycin, penicillin G, oxacillin, amoxicillin, imipenem, cefotaxime, clindamycin, 128 azithromycin, spiramycin, clarithromycin, erythromycin, ciprofloxacin, moxifloxacin, cotrimoxazole, trimethoprim, sulfonamide, pristinamycin, rifampicin, tetracyclin and 129 130 linezolid. Genomic sequencing was performed using a NextSeq-500 instrument (Illumina, San 131 Diego, USA) with a 2 x 150 nt paired-end protocol and based on Nextera libraries. Contig sequences were assembled using SPAdes v3.9 (http://cab.spbu.ru/software/spades/). 132 133 Multilocus sequence typing (MLST) was performed from genomic assemblies using the 134 international nomenclature database webpage (https://pubmlst.org/cdiphtheriae/). Read 135 mapping and calling of high quality single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP) were performed 136 as described (17). Identification to C. belfantii was performed by genomic comparison with

- 137 the type strains of *C. belfantii* and *C. diphtheriae* based on the average nucleotide identity
- 138 metric calculated with JspeciesWS (18) as in (16).
- 139

# 140 **Ethical statement**

- 141 The work was conducted in accordance with local and national regulation, as well as the
- 142 Helsinki Declaration, and was approved by the local Ethics committee (Committee for the
- 143 Protection of Persons EST I, France).

### 144 **RESULTS**

145 Patients. From January 2011 to November 2016, four patients of the CF Center had positive 146 screening respiratory samples for C. diphtheriae. This species was identified from these 147 patients because of the presence of abundant, even though not numerically dominant, 148 coryneform gram-positive colonies in their oropharyngeal microbiological flora. The timeline 149 of patients visits to the CF center and detection of *C. diphtheriae* is represented in Figure 1. 150 The patient characteristics and medical records are summarized in **Table 1**. Only patients 2 151 and 4 presented with respiratory exacerbation at the time of C. diphtheriae detection and 152 received antibiotics, but they did not require hospitalization. None of the four patients had a 153 dermatological disease or chronic wound. Patient 2 was positive for C. diphtheriae during at 154 least 15 months.

155

156 **Phenotypic and molecular identification of the isolates.** One isolate from patients 1 157 (February 2011), 3 (January 2016) and 4 (November 2016), and 2 isolates from patient 2 158 collected 9 months apart (April 2015, January 2016), were stored and available for analysis 159 (Figure 1). The five isolates were identified as *C. diphtheriae*. None of the isolates was 160 toxigenic and all were of biovar Belfanti. MLST showed that the five isolates belonged to the 161 same sequence type, ST208. Whole-genome sequence variation among the 5 isolates revealed 162 only 62 SNPs among them. The largest SNP distance between two isolates was 58 SNPs, 163 observed between isolates FRC0074 and FRC0381. Hence, the five isolates were very closely 164 related, showing that they belong to a single strain. Phylogenetic analysis based on SNPs 165 (Figure S1) revealed three subtypes, comprising respectively (1) the isolate from patient 1 166 (FRC0074); (2) One isolate from patient 2 (isolate FRC0318) and the isolate from patient 3 167 (FRC0381); and (3) The other isolate (FRC0382) from patient 2 and the isolate from patient 4 168 (FRC0455). Within subtypes, only eighteen SNPs separated FRC0318 and FRC0381, and 4

SNPs separated FRC0382 and FRC0455. Following the recent description of *C. belfantii* (16),
the five isolates were re-identified based on their genomic sequence. Their average nucleotide
identity with *C. belfantii* type strain (FRC0043<sup>T</sup>) was 99.47%, whereas it was only 94.89%
with NCTC11397<sup>T</sup>, the type strain of *C. diphtheriae*. Therefore, the five isolates belong to the
novel species *C. belfantii*.

Antimicrobial susceptibility profiles of the five isolates showed that they were susceptible to all antimicrobial agents, with one remarkable exception: isolate FRC0074 from patient 1 was non-susceptible to ciprofloxacin. Genomic sequence inspection showed that this isolate had a unique mutation, A to G at position 277 of the *gyrA* gene, coding for subunit A of gyrase, the target of ciprofloxacin. This SNP corresponds to a deduced amino-acid change of D to N at protein position 91, which is located within the quinolone-resistance determining region of the gyrase of *Corynebacteria*.

181

182 Investigations of possible strain transmission risks. Patient 1 had no recorded contact 183 opportunity with the three other patients at the clinic. In contrast, patients 2 and 3 visited the 184 CF center the same day on eight occasions for consultations, physiotherapy or for pulmonary 185 function tests between January 2014 and November 2016 (Figure 1). Further, patient 4 had a 186 consultation and physiotherapy session 30 minutes after patient 2 in April 2016 and then in 187 November 2016, on the day when he had a positive expectoration sample for *C. diphtheriae*. 188 In addition, patient 4 had a pulmonary function test on the same day as patient 2 in September 189 2014 and November 2016 (Figure 1). Therefore, several opportunities for cross-transmission 190 within the CF center were identified among patients 2, 3 and 4, even though social interaction 191 between CF patients was not identified.

192 Inspections of hygiene measures was retrospectively conducted by the infection 193 control team between June 2016 and June 2017. Local infection control protocols and recommendations regarding healthcare staff hygiene (mostly masks, disposable mouthpieces and filters, specific equipment and hand hygiene) and rooms and equipment disinfection were correctly observed. However, it was noted that the salbutamol inhalation chamber was disinfected with low-level disinfectant instead of a mid-level disinfectant. Furthermore, after their physiotherapy session, patients did not always wear masks while undergoing pulmonary function testing.

Ten healthcare workers of the CF center who were regularly in contact with the four patients were retrospectively screened for throat colonization by *C. diphtheriae*. No *Corynebacterium* was isolated in any of the samples from the screened workers.

### 203 **DISCUSSION**

204 We report four cases of CF patients colonization by non-toxigenic C. diphtheriae biovar 205 Belfanti (now formally called C. belfantii). To our knowledge, C. diphtheriae was never 206 described from CF patients. Although non-toxigenic isolates can cause a variety of infections, 207 including bacteremia (11), two patients were not symptomatic, whereas the two other had 208 lung exacerbation at the time of first C. diphtheriae detection. Other opportunist pathogens of 209 the Corynebacterium genus might be involved in CF lung exacerbations (5, 19). In recent 210 years, C. diphtheriae became easier to identify by the use of MALDI-TOF. However, C. 211 diphtheriae may still be difficult to detect in the CF lungs, given the polymicrobial 212 colonization occurring in most samples, as was observed during this study (Table 1). It is 213 therefore not unlikely that additional cases of colonization might have gone undetected.

214 Multiple CF patients are typically followed in a given CF center, which creates 215 opportunities for bacterial transmission among patients despite the enforcement of strong 216 infection control measures. A strong suspicion of cross-transmission of C. diphtheriae 217 between four patients in our clinic arose given the repeated observation of patients colonized 218 by C. diphtheriae. Microbiological investigations fully supported the hypothesis of a single 219 strain. MLST showed that the five isolates belonged to the same sequence type. The MLST 220 genotype of the isolates, ST208, was not reported previously in the C. diphtheriae MLST 221 database, suggesting that it is not common. Whole genome sequencing defines the genetic 222 relatedness among C. diphtheriae isolates with high precision (20-22). This approach 223 demonstrated that the five isolates belong to the same strain and provided strong support to 224 the hypothesis of cross transmission among patients and/or contamination from a common 225 source. Besides, the data showed that the strain persisted within patient 2 for at least 9 226 months. Unfortunately, the additional isolates detected from patient 2 and 3 were not stored.

227 The SNP variation uncovered by the genomic analysis reflects evolution of the strain 228 since the last common ancestor of the five isolates. Three subtypes were distinguished, two of 229 which comprised isolates from two patients. Subtypes shared by patients may reflect direct 230 transmission between them. Epidemiological investigations support this possibility in one 231 case, as patients 2 and 3 had simultaneous visits to the CF center on several occasions. 232 However, knowledge on subtype diversity within patients would be required to infer 233 transmission chains with confidence (23). In this study, only one isolate was kept and 234 characterized from each sample. Therefore, one cannot exclude that subtypes coexisted within 235 single patients, which would lead to the possibility of other transmission patterns than those 236 suggested by the phylogeny.

Biovar Belfanti of *C. diphtheriae* (*C. belfantii*) is commonly isolated from the respiratory tract, generally from the nose or throat and often in association with ozaena (24). In contrast, its isolation from skin infections is extremely rare. Therefore, skin wounds of patients or the personnel is an unlikely reservoir. Transmission by direct respiratory contamination between patients appears as the most likely transmission route. Transmission of *C. striatum* in an intensive care unit and silent transmission of *C. pseudodiphtheriticum* among CF patients were previously reported (5, 25).

Evolution of antimicrobial resistance occurs frequently in bacterial isolates that colonize CF lungs (26). Our results showed ciprofloxacin resistance in one isolate, whereas the others were susceptible. As no prescription of quinolone antimicrobials was recorded for this patient, one possibility is that the strain had evolved resistance to ciprofloxacin in another ciprofloxacin-treated patient, in which the strain was not detected.

The main limitation of this study is that the infection control investigation was performed retrospectively and that no detailed pattern of transmission could therefore be ascertained. Healthcare workers or the materials used for patient care may have played the role of vector 252 of C. diphtheriae between the patients (27), even though the retrospective screening did not 253 reveal a potential carrier or source of infection. Further, hidden patient-to-patient cross 254 transmission cannot be excluded, as some patients may have been undetected for 255 C. diphtheriae carriage. Further studies are needed to better define carriage of C. diphtheriae 256 by CF patients and to investigate the possible role of patients, healthcare workers or 257 environmental sources in cross transmission. In addition, the clinical significance of non-258 toxigenic C. diphtheriae will need to be determined in order to define strategies of treatment, 259 prevention and control of contamination of CF patients by this bacterial pathogen. 260 261 Acknowledgements We acknowledge the help of Melody Dazas and Annick Carmi-Leroy for the microbiological 262 263 characterization of the isolates. We thank the "Plateforme de Microbiologie Mutualisée" from 264 Institut Pasteur for genomic sequencing. 265 References 266 267 Lipuma JJ. 2010. The changing microbial epidemiology in cystic fibrosis. Clin 1. 268 Microbiol Rev 23:299-323. 269 Saiman L. 2011. Infection prevention and control in cystic fibrosis. Curr Opin Infect Dis 2. 270 24:390-395. 271 3. Schaffer K. 2015. Epidemiology of infection and current guidelines for infection 272 prevention in cystic fibrosis patients. J Hosp Infect 89:309-313. 273 4. Funke G, von Graevenitz A, Clarridge JE, Bernard KA. 1997. Clinical microbiology of

coryneform bacteria. Clin Microbiol Rev 10:125-159.

274

275	5.	Bittar F, Cassagne C, Bosdure E, Stremler N, Dubus JC, Sarles J, Reynaud-Gaubert M,
276		Raoult D, Rolain J-M. 2010. Outbreak of Corynebacterium pseudodiphtheriticum
277		infection in cystic fibrosis patients, France. Emerging Infect Dis 16:1231–1236.
278	6.	Prevaes SMPJ, de Winter-de Groot KM, Janssens HM, de Steenhuijsen Piters WAA,
279		Tramper-Stranders GA, Wyllie AL, Hasrat R, Tiddens HA, van Westreenen M, van der
280		Ent CK, Sanders EAM, Bogaert D. 2016. Development of the Nasopharyngeal
281		Microbiota in Infants with Cystic Fibrosis. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 193:504–515.
282	7.	Renwick J, McNally P, John B, DeSantis T, Linnane B, Murphy P, SHIELD CF. 2014.
283		The microbial community of the cystic fibrosis airway is disrupted in early life. PLoS
284		ONE 9:e109798.
285	8.	Hoskisson PA. 2018. Microbe Profile: Corynebacterium diphtheriae – an old foe always
286		ready to seize opportunity. Microbiology 164:865-867.
287	9.	Zakikhany K, Efstratiou A. 2012. Diphtheria in Europe: current problems and new
288		challenges. Future Microbiol 7:595-607.
289	10.	Lodeiro-Colatosti A, Reischl U, Holzmann T, Hernández-Pereira CE, Rísquez A, Paniz-
290		Mondolfi AE. 2018. Diphtheria Outbreak in Amerindian Communities, Wonken,
291		Venezuela, 2016-2017. Emerging Infect Dis 24:1340–1344.
292	11.	Patey O, Bimet F, Riegel P, Halioua B, Emond JP, Estrangin E, Dellion S, Alonso JM,
293		Kiredjian M, Dublanchet A, Lafaix C. 1997. Clinical and molecular study of
294		Corynebacterium diphtheriae systemic infections in France. Coryne Study Group. J Clin
295		Microbiol 35:441–445.

- 296 12. Wilson AP. 1995. The return of Corynebacterium diphtheriae: the rise of non-toxigenic
  297 strains. J Hosp Infect 30 Suppl:306–312.
- 298 13. Bolt F, Cassiday P, Tondella ML, Dezoysa A, Efstratiou A, Sing A, Zasada A, Bernard
- 299 K, Guiso N, Badell E, Rosso M-L, Baldwin A, Dowson C. 2010. Multilocus sequence
- 300 typing identifies evidence for recombination and two distinct lineages of
  301 Corynebacterium diphtheriae. J Clin Microbiol 48:4177–4185.
- 302 14. Efstratiou A, George RC. 1999. Laboratory guidelines for the diagnosis of infections
  303 caused by Corynebacterium diphtheriae and C. ulcerans. World Health Organization.
  304 Commun Dis Public Health 2:250–257.
- 305 15. Pimenta FP, Matias GAM, Pereira GA, Camello TCF, Alves GB, Rosa ACP, Hirata R,
  306 Mattos-Guaraldi AL. 2008. A PCR for dtxR gene: application to diagnosis of non307 toxigenic and toxigenic Corynebacterium diphtheriae. Mol Cell Probes 22:189–192.
- 308 16. Dazas M, Badell E, Carmi-Leroy A, Criscuolo A, Brisse S. 2018. Taxonomic status of
  309 Corynebacterium diphtheriae biovar Belfanti and proposal of Corynebacterium belfantii
  310 sp. nov. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 68:3826–3831.
- 311 17. Bouchez V, Guglielmini J, Dazas M, Landier A, Toubiana J, Guillot S, Criscuolo A,
  312 Brisse S. 2018. Genomic Sequencing of Bordetella pertussis for Epidemiology and
  313 Global Surveillance of Whooping Cough. Emerging Infect Dis 24:988–994.
- Richter M, Rosselló-Móra R, Oliver Glöckner F, Peplies J. 2016. JSpeciesWS: a web
  server for prokaryotic species circumscription based on pairwise genome comparison.
  Bioinformatics 32:929–931.

- 317 19. Freeman JD, Smith HJ, Haines HG, Hellyar AG. 1994. Seven patients with respiratory
- 318 infections due to Corynebacterium pseudodiphtheriticum. Pathology 26:311–314.
- 20. Dangel A, Berger A, Konrad R, Bischoff H, Sing A. 2018. Geographically Diverse
  Clusters of Nontoxigenic Corynebacterium diphtheriae Infection, Germany, 2016-2017.
- 321 Emerging Infect Dis 24:1239–1245.
- 322 21. Grosse-Kock S, Kolodkina V, Schwalbe EC, Blom J, Burkovski A, Hoskisson PA,
  323 Brisse S, Smith D, Sutcliffe IC, Titov L, Sangal V. 2017. Genomic analysis of endemic
  324 clones of toxigenic and non-toxigenic Corynebacterium diphtheriae in Belarus during
  325 and after the major epidemic in 1990s. BMC Genomics 18:873.
- Meinel DM, Kuehl R, Zbinden R, Boskova V, Garzoni C, Fadini D, Dolina M, Blümel
  B, Weibel T, Tschudin-Sutter S, Widmer AF, Bielicki JA, Dierig A, Heininger U,
  Konrad R, Berger A, Hinic V, Goldenberger D, Blaich A, Stadler T, Battegay M, Sing
  A, Egli A. 2016. Outbreak investigation for toxigenic Corynebacterium diphtheriae
  wound infections in refugees from Northeast Africa and Syria in Switzerland and
  Germany by whole genome sequencing. Clin Microbiol Infect 22:1003.e1-1003.e8.
- 332 23. Klinkenberg D, Backer JA, Didelot X, Colijn C, Wallinga J. 2017. Simultaneous
  333 inference of phylogenetic and transmission trees in infectious disease outbreaks. PLoS
  334 Comput Biol 13:e1005495.
- 335 24. Farfour E, Badell E, Dinu S, Guillot S, Guiso N. 2013. Microbiological changes and
  336 diversity in autochthonous non-toxigenic Corynebacterium diphtheriae isolated in
  337 France. Clin Microbiol Infect 19:980–987.

- 338 25. Leonard RB, Nowowiejski DJ, Warren JJ, Finn DJ, Coyle MB. 1994. Molecular
- evidence of person-to-person transmission of a pigmented strain of Corynebacterium
- 340 striatum in intensive care units. J Clin Microbiol 32:164–169.
- 341 26. Cullen L, McClean S. 2015. Bacterial Adaptation during Chronic Respiratory Infections.
  342 Pathogens 4:66–89.
- 27. Larsson P, Brinkhoff B, Larsson L. 1987. Corynebacterium diphtheriae in the
  environment of carriers and patients. J Hosp Infect 10:282–286.

345

# 

a ( <del>-</del>						
347	<b>Table 1.</b> Summary of th	he medical records of the four	natients with no	ositive C' di	<i>phtheriae</i> isolates in exi	pectoration samples
517	<b>Lable L</b> Summary of th	te meateur records of the rout	putternes with po	obline c. all	stuties the isolates in en	sector anon sumpres

Patient	Age/ Gen der	Baseline lung function	Symptoms at the time of positivity	Long-term or recurrent antibiotic therapy	Date of the first positive sample	Sampling	Other bacteria (co-infection)	Treatment following positivity	Current status
1	27/F	Non-invasive ventilation, oxygen requirement FEV 30%	Chronic respiratory failure	Amoxicillin, cotrimoxazole for exacerbations	Feb 2011	Sputum	S. maltophilia H. influenzae E. coli	No treatment	Deceased in 2013
2	25/ M	FEV 106%	Asymptomatic in Apr 2015, Exacerbation in Jul 2015	Inhaled tobramycin for one month on Jan 2014; Ofloxacin, fusidic acid	Apr 2015	Sputum	S. aureus	Fusidic acid, ofloxacin	Alive
3	39/ M	FEV 69%	Asymptomatic	amoxicillin/clavulanic acid, ofloxacin, amikacin for exacerbation	Jan 2016	Sputum	S. aureus A. baumannii S. maltophilia	No treatment	Alive
4	23/ M	FEV 75%	Exacerbation in Nov 2016	Piperacillin/tazobactam, teicoplanin, imipenem, cotrimoxazole for exacerbation in 2015 and 2016	Nov 2016	Sputum	S. aureus Achromobacter xylosoxidans	Amoxicillin/ clavulanic acid, cotrimoxazole	Alive

348 FEV: force expiration volume

## 351 Figure 1. Timeline of events and *C. diphtheriae* detection in four cystic fibrosis patients.

352 Months correspond to different columns in the grid; inside each month, days (not shown) are

353 distinguished as separate columns. The upper tree recapitulates the phylogenetic relationships

among the isolates, which are indicated in red boxes, linked with dotted arrows to their

- 355 respective patient and isolation time. The numbers of single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP)
- 356 per genome inferred to have occurred are given for each branch of the tree.
- 357
- 358

