

1 **Increasing tolerance of hospital *Enterococcus faecium* to hand-rub alcohols**

2 **Authors:** Timothy P. Stinear^{1,*}, Sacha J. Pidot¹, Margaret M. C. Lam¹, Susan A. Ballard^{2,5}, M.
3 Lindsay Grayson², Andrew A. Mahony², Elizabeth A. Grabsch², Geoffrey W. Coombs^{3,4}, J. Owen
4 Robinson^{3,4}, Benjamin P. Howden^{1,5} and Paul D. R. Johnson^{1,2}

5 **Affiliations:**

6 ¹Department of Microbiology and Immunology, The Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity,
7 University of Melbourne, Victoria, 3010, Australia.

8 ²Infectious Diseases and Microbiology Departments, Austin Health, Heidelberg, Victoria, 3084, Australia.

9 ³Australian Collaborating Centre for *Enterococcus* and *Staphylococcus Species* (ACCESS) Typing and
10 Research, School of Veterinary and Life Sciences, Murdoch University, Murdoch, Western Australia, 6150,
11 Australia.

12 ⁴Department of Microbiology, PathWest Laboratory Medicine, Fiona Stanley Hospital, Murdoch, Western
13 Australia, 6150, Australia.

14 ⁵Microbiological Diagnostic Unit Public Health Laboratory, Department of Microbiology and Immunology,
15 The Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, University of Melbourne, Victoria, 3010, Australia.

16

17 **To whom correspondence should be addressed:*

18 *Prof Tim Stinear, 792 Elizabeth St, Melbourne, VIC, 3000, Australia; e tstinear@unimelb.edu.au; t +61 3 8344 5693*

19

20 **Keywords:** *Enterococcus faecium*, VRE, infection control, alcohol-based hand hygiene, alcohol
21 tolerance

22 **Running title:** *Enterococcus faecium* alcohol tolerance

23 **Summary:** We observed increasing tolerance over time of the hospital pathogen *Enterococcus*
24 *faecium* to the alcohols used in alcohol-based hand rubs (ABHR). The progressive gain in tolerance
25 helps explain the failure of standard precautions that rely on ABHR to control cross-transmission.

26

27 **Abstract:**

28 **Background:** Alcohol-based hand rubs (ABHR) are a pillar of infection control, recommended by
29 the World Health Organization. The introduction of ABHR and hand hygiene to Australian
30 hospitals from 2002 has been associated with a decrease in *Staphylococcus aureus* infections.
31 However, this decrease has been paralleled by a nationwide increase in vancomycin resistant
32 *Enterococcus faecium* (VRE Efm) infections. Here, we tested the hypothesis that recent clinical
33 isolates of Efm are more tolerant than stored historical isolates to the alcohols now used extensively
34 in hospital hand hygiene programs.

35 **Methods:** We studied 77 stored clinical isolates of Efm, 66 randomly selected by year from our
36 hospital over 18 years (1998-2015), and 11 obtained recently from other Australian hospitals with
37 sequence types not encountered locally. We measured \log_{10} reduction in colony forming units after
38 five minutes exposure to isopropyl alcohol, stratified by year of isolation and multi-locus sequence
39 type.

40 **Results:** There was a highly significant increase in Efm alcohol tolerance over time observed across
41 all sequence types tested in this assay, with differences of up to 4.6 \log_{10} kill at five minutes
42 between invasive isolates from 1998 compared to those from 2015 (\log_{10} reduction after alcohol
43 exposure by year of isolation; Spearman Rank $r = 0.43$, $p < 0.0004$).

44 **Conclusions:** Recent isolates of Efm obtained from bloodstream infections were significantly more
45 tolerant to alcohol than the earliest isolates tested. The progressive gain in alcohol tolerance partly
46 explains the failure of standard precautions that rely on alcohol-based hand rubs to control VRE
47 cross-transmission.

48

49

50 **Introduction**

51 *Enterococcus faecium* (*E. faecium*) has become a leading cause of hospital acquired blood stream
52 infections (BSI) worldwide [1]. Most of these infections are due to hospital-adapted clonal-complex
53 17, clade A-1 *E. faecium* strains that are typically resistant to ampicillin, aminoglycosides and
54 quinolones. [2] Hospital-adapted *E. faecium* may also become highly vancomycin resistant through
55 the acquisition of mobile DNA elements harbouring *van* operons. US estimates of VRE
56 colonization on hospital admission range from 10-14% [3]. A survey of European countries
57 performed in 2014 reported that 8% of *E. faecium* isolates overall from patients with BSI were
58 vancomycin-resistant. Contemporary surveys in the UK, Ireland and Australia revealed even higher
59 incidences of vancomycin-resistance with rates of 21%, 45% and 51% respectively [4, 5].

60 In Australia there have been systematic improvements in health-care worker hand-hygiene
61 compliance in hospitals since the introduction and promotion of alcohol-based hand-rubs (ABHR)
62 under the guidance of Hand Hygiene Australia [6] and the Australian Commission on Safety and
63 Quality in Health Care (ACSQHC) [7]. These programs have been linked to progressive reductions
64 in hospital-acquired infections caused by methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) [8]
65 so it is somewhat of a paradox that Australia appears to now have a higher proportion of BSIs
66 caused by vancomycin resistant *E. faecium* (VRE) than most other comparable countries [5, 9].

67 One possibility to explain this paradox is partial failure of universal precautions to prevent
68 cross-transmission through the development of tolerance to alcohols widely used either in hand
69 hygiene products or alcohol impregnated wipes used to clean shared equipment in hospital wards.
70 [10] Although these vary between hospitals, most ABHR products contain 70% (v/v) isopropyl or
71 ethyl alcohol [11-13]. Waterless disinfection with ABHR for 30 seconds has better efficacy and is
72 much quicker than traditional approaches with soap and water, more than meeting the required 3.5
73 log₁₀ reduction in bacterial counts considered to indicate effectiveness [13, 14]. The presence of
74 high-concentration alcohol in ABHR is responsible for rapid killing of almost all bacterial
75 pathogens. However, some bacteria are relatively resistant to alcohol at lower concentrations. This

76 phenomenon, referred to as alcohol tolerance, has been described across several bacterial genera
77 [12, 15, 16]. In the current study, motivated by our observation that successive waves of new *E.*
78 *faecium* clones were driving increased clinical infection in our hospital despite much improved
79 health care worker hand hygiene compliance, we investigated tolerance to alcohol in clinical
80 isolates of *E. faecium* collected at the Austin hospital, a University of Melbourne teaching hospital,
81 over an 18-year period.

82

83 **Materials and Methods**

84 *Bacterial isolates.*

85 Table 1 lists the 66 *E. faecium* isolates investigated in this study that were randomly selected within
86 each year from predominantly blood culture isolates obtained at the Austin Hospital between 1998
87 and 2015. Thirty-seven of the isolates were vancomycin resistant (31 *vanB*-type, 6 *vanA*-type) and
88 included recently emergent epidemic clones ST203 [9] and ST796 [17]. Some of these isolates have
89 been described in a previous study on the epidemiology of *E. faecium* at the hospital between 1998
90 and 2009 [9]. Isolates from other hospitals around Australia, representing different *E. faecium*
91 outbreak genotypes but not seen frequently at the Austin Hospital, were included to investigate
92 whether any changes we might observe were linked to particular STs or particular hospitals only.
93 Therefore we included one *E. faecium* ST341, one ST414 and four ST555 isolates from an
94 Australian-wide enterococci sepsis screening program conducted by the Australian Group on
95 Antimicrobial Resistance (AGAR) [5].

96

97 *Alcohol tolerance assays.*

98 In preliminary experiments, various concentrations of alcohol and *E. faecium* inoculum sizes were
99 assessed (data not shown). At ‘full strength’ isopropyl alcohol (70% v/v), killing was complete and
100 resulted in greater than 8-log₁₀ reductions in broth culture and an inability to detect differences
101 between isolates. However, by lowering the alcohol concentration in a stepwise fashion, we were

102 able to identify a dynamic range in which we observed marked differences in the time-kill curves
103 between isolates. Guided by these experiments and published literature [18] we selected 23.0%
104 (v/v) isopropyl alcohol for the majority of experiments. Overnight cultures were grown at 37°C in
105 10 mL of BHI medium (Difco, BD). After overnight growth, each strain was diluted to an OD_{600nm}
106 value of 0.5 using PBS. To 1 mL of the diluted culture, either 23% (v/v) isopropyl alcohol or PBS
107 was added and samples were vigorously vortexed, followed by a 5-minute incubation at room
108 temperature. Immediately prior to sampling, each culture was again vortexed for 5 seconds and
109 samples were serially diluted between 10-1000 fold in 7.5% Tween80 in PBS (v/v) to inactivate
110 alcohol killing and to give a countable number of colonies on each plate [19]. An automatic spiral
111 plater (Don Whitley Scientific) was used to plate 50 ul aliquots of an appropriate dilution of each
112 strain in triplicate onto BHI agar plates. Plates were incubated overnight at 37°C and colonies were
113 counted using an aCOLyte-3 colony counter (Synbiosis). The limit of detection with this technique
114 was 6000 CFU/ml.

115 Colonies were counted following overnight incubation at 37°C and an average colony
116 forming units (CFU) value was calculated. Biological replicates were performed for each isolate
117 and average CFU values for cultures exposed to isopropyl alcohol and those exposed to PBS (as a
118 control) were obtained. From these data a mean log₁₀ CFU reduction was calculated for each isolate
119 by subtracting the log₁₀ CFU remaining after 5 minutes of exposure to isopropyl alcohol from the
120 mean log₁₀ CFU of cultures treated with PBS. Differences in population means for *E. faecium*
121 isopropyl alcohol tolerance were explored using a Mann-Whitney test with a two-tailed P-value.
122 The null hypothesis (no difference between sample means) was rejected for p<0.05. The Spearman
123 rank test with two-tailed P-value was used to assess the correlation between *E. faecium* isopropyl
124 alcohol and tolerance isolation date. Statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism
125 (v6.0f).

126

127 **Results:**

128 *Increasing isopropyl alcohol tolerance among hospital E. faecium isolates over time*

129 We first assessed the isopropyl alcohol tolerance for the 66 Austin Hospital *E. faecium* isolates
130 derived from blood cultures by measuring bacterial survival after exposure of 10^8 CFU to 23% (v/v)
131 isopropyl alcohol for 5 minutes. There was considerable variation in survival, with a difference of
132 up to $4\text{-}6\text{-log}_{10}$ between isolates. This difference was independent of sequence type but we noticed
133 that isolates collected earlier in time were likely to be more sensitive to isopropyl alcohol killing
134 than recent isolates, an observation that was supported by significantly different population mean
135 tolerance when comparing pre-2006 with post-2009 isolates ($1\text{-}2\text{-log}_{10}$ mean difference, $p < 0\text{-}001$)
136 (Figure 1A). Comparing all 66 isolates from 1998 to 2015 revealed a significant, continuous
137 increase in isopropyl alcohol tolerance with time, again suggesting that hospital *E. faecium*
138 populations might be under the same selective pressure (Figure 1B). The positive correlation
139 between isolation date and resistance to isopropyl alcohol killing was highly statistically significant
140 ($r=0\text{-}4250$, $p < 0\text{-}0004$, Figure 1B). There was considerable genetic diversity among the *E. faecium*
141 population across this time period with two dominant MLST types (ST17 and ST203) that each
142 incrementally displayed increasing isopropyl alcohol tolerance (Figure 1C, 1D). Isolates
143 representing the most recently emerged clone (ST796, a new ST first recognised in 2012) exhibited
144 uniformly high isopropyl alcohol tolerance ($n=10$, median: $0\text{-}92\text{-log}_{10}$ reduction, Table S1, Figure
145 1E). Exposure of a selection of *E. faecium* isolates to ethyl alcohol showed similar tolerance
146 patterns as isopropyl alcohol, with ST796 also significantly more ethyl alcohol tolerant compared to
147 representatives of all other *E. faecium* sequence types (data not shown). There was no relationship
148 between vancomycin resistance and isopropyl alcohol tolerance.

149

150 *Isopropyl alcohol tolerance - a nationwide phenomenon*

151 We obtained 11 *E. faecium* isolates representing other contemporary clone types (predominantly
152 ST341 and ST555) causing hospital outbreaks in other Australian states [5] and found that these

153 isolates also exhibited significant alcohol tolerance, indistinguishable from the Austin Health *E.*
154 *faecium* isolates obtained from the same period (Table 1, Figure 2).

155

156 **Discussion**

157 In 2005 we published a 3-year study describing a progressive decline in rates of hospital-acquired
158 methicillin resistant *S. aureus* and Gram-negative infections following the introduction and
159 promotion of alcohol based hand rubs (ABHR) [10]. Similar programs were progressively rolled
160 out to all major hospitals in Australia and compliance with ABHR has become a nationally
161 reportable key performance indicator [20]. In 2015 Hand Hygiene Australia reported >80%
162 compliance in health care facilities across Australia (www.hha.org.au) and this program has been
163 linked to a national reduction in hospital acquired methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*
164 infections [8, 21]. However, coincident with the introduction of ABHR and steadily improving
165 health care worker compliance, there has been a paradoxical nationwide increase in colonization
166 and infection with vancomycin resistant enterococci in Australian hospitals, first observed from
167 2005 [22, 23]. At first we associated change in VRE epidemiology with the appearance of a new
168 sequence type, ST203, which was identified initially as vancomycin sensitive *E. faecium* in blood
169 cultures but then acquired *vanB* vancomycin resistance operons and caused a nationwide outbreak
170 of VRE colonisation and infection [5, 9]. However ST203, while still present, is being pushed aside
171 now by new waves of different *E. faecium* STs – ST555 in Western Australia (both vancomycin
172 sensitive and resistant), ST796 in Victoria (virtually all vancomycin resistant *vanB*) [5], *vanA*
173 ST203 and ST80 in Victoria and ST80 and ST17 *vanA* in New South Wales and Western Australia
174 (unpublished). Rapid change in the *E. faecium* population can be partly explained by the inherent
175 propensity for frequent recombination in *E. faecium* [24] [25] but other factors are likely to be
176 driving this rapid evolution. As each new *E. faecium* ST appears we do not observe increased
177 antibiotic resistance or increased likelihood of carriage of known virulence genes [5, 9, 25] yet
178 Australia now has the highest proportion of VRE of any comparable country [5]. We wondered

179 whether this phenomenon - at least in part – could be explained by the acquisition of resistance or
180 tolerance by *E. faecium* to the constituents of ABHR products.

181 In this study we have demonstrated that recent isolates of both vancomycin sensitive and
182 resistant *E. faecium* that are causing contemporary hospital acquired blood stream infections are
183 much more likely to be tolerant to alcohol at a concentration of 23% (v/v) than the earliest available
184 isolates obtained 18 years ago. For example, one of our recent *E. faecium* BSI isolates from 2014,
185 an ST796 *vanB* VRE, is more than 4-logs more tolerant than ST17 *E. faecium* BSI isolates obtained
186 in 1998. Time of isolation is strongly linked to this phenomenon; it is not restricted to any particular
187 sequence type or to isolates obtained from just one hospital or just one Australian state.

188 At present we have only established an association between time, increasing alcohol
189 tolerance and increasing incidence of infection with *E. faecium*, particularly VRE, in Australian
190 hospitals. We acknowledge that we have not established causation and may have discovered an
191 epiphenomenon that is not itself involved in the increased rates of colonisation and infection. In the
192 tolerance assay we implemented, concentrations of alcohols were set lower than the usual 70% v/v
193 of most ABHR products to obtain a practical dynamic range for meaningful comparisons between
194 isolates. However, in our own previous clinical research using full concentration ABHR in 20
195 human volunteers with two strains of *E. faecium* VRE (one ST17, one ST203, Figure 1C, D), we
196 identified a mean 3-6- \log_{10} reduction in vancomycin resistant *E. faecium* on the hands of test
197 subjects, but the variance in these experiments was large. For two volunteers, the reduction of
198 vancomycin resistant *E. faecium* was less than 1-6- \log_{10} , suggesting that some host factors might
199 not only result in containment failure (or even “super-spreading”), but also enhance the clinical
200 likelihood for selection of *E. faecium* alcohol tolerance [26]. As tolerance increases, we hypothesise
201 that there will be skin surfaces in contact with ABHR or inanimate surfaces in contact with alcohol-
202 based cleaning agents that do not receive the correct biocide concentration or contact time required
203 for effective bacterial killing. Increasing tolerance to alcohol may allow some *E. faecium* cells to
204 exploit suboptimal use of ABHR and alcohol impregnated wipes in hospitals. It is not hard to

205 imagine an increased survival advantage for bacteria transiently present at the edge of the “clean
206 zone” when doctors quickly rub their hands with alcohol between patients or busy nurses
207 incompletely wipe down a trolley with alcohol wipes between care episodes. We therefore propose
208 that the simplest explanation for the positive association between time and increasing alcohol
209 tolerance we report here (Figure 1B) is that the bacteria are responding to increased exposure to
210 alcohols and that the more tolerant strains are able to displace their less alcohol tolerant
211 predecessors. It is also possible that *E. faecium* are responding to another factor, and alcohol
212 tolerance is a passenger phenotype. Nevertheless, regardless of whether links are direct or indirect,
213 increasing tolerance has consequences for our approach to infection control.

214 For bacteria in general, short chain alcohols such as ethanol and isopropyl alcohol are
215 thought to kill by disrupting membrane integrity [27]. The penetration of ethanol into the
216 hydrocarbon components of bacterial phospholipid bilayers causes the rapid release of intracellular
217 components and disorganisation of membranes [28]. There has been very little research on
218 mechanisms employed by medically important organisms such as Enterococci to evade the effects
219 of alcohol. Data in this field has been largely derived from studies of Gram-positive bacteria
220 associated with spoilage of sake, in particular the lactic acid bacteria that are known to survive and
221 grow in high ethanol concentrations of greater than 18% (v/v). [29] However, there are some
222 examples of biocide tolerance and other biocide induced pleiotropic effects in medically important
223 bacteria. These include the findings that growth and virulence in *Acinetobacter baumannii* is
224 enhanced by exposure to low non-lethal concentrations of ABHR solution, [15, 30] and that sub-
225 lethal exposure of VRE *E. faecium* to chlorhexidine increases expression of vancomycin resistance
226 genes of the *vanA* but not the *vanB* genotype [31].

227 ABHR remains an important general primary defence against cross transmission of most
228 microbial and some viral pathogens in hospitals. However, in hospitals with endemic vancomycin
229 resistant enterococci, it would seem prudent to optimise adherence to ABHR protocols to ensure
230 adequate exposure times and use of sufficient volumes of ABHR product each time healthcare

231 workers clean their hands. In addition, consideration may need to be given to the use of foam or gel
232 formulations of ABHR since they are known to have variable (generally reduced) efficacy
233 compared to liquid ABHR solutions [32]. It would also seem prudent to implement contact
234 precautions during outbreaks with new emergent strains of VRE as horizontal control measures
235 such as universal standard precautions based on ABHR do not appear to be effective in controlling
236 VRE in hospitals [17]. The underlying genetic determinants of alcohol tolerance in *E. faecium* and
237 whether we have identified causation or just association are important topics for future research.

238

239 **Acknowledgments:** None

240

241 **Funding:** This work was supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council of
242 Australia, grant numbers GNT1027874 and GNT1084015.

243

244 **Conflicts of interest:** The authors have no conflicts to disclose.

245

246 **References:**

- 247 1. Cetinkaya Y, Falk P, Mayhall CG. Vancomycin-resistant enterococci. *Clin Microbiol Rev*
248 **2000**; 13(4): 686-707.
- 249 2. Wurster JL, Saavedra JT, Gilmore MS. Impact of Antibiotic Use on the Evolution of
250 *Enterococcus faecium*. *J Infect Dis* **2016**.
- 251 3. Ziakas PD, Thapa R, Rice LB, Mylonakis E. Trends and significance of VRE colonization
252 in the ICU: a meta-analysis of published studies. *PLoS One* **2013**; 8(9): e75658.
- 253 4. (EARS-Net) EARSN. European Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance Network (EARS-
254 Net) *Enterococcus faecium* 2011-2014. Available at:
255 <http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/activities/surveillance/EARS-Net/Pages/index.aspx>. Accessed 28/4/2016.

- 256 5. Coombs GW, Pearson JC, Daley DA, et al. Molecular epidemiology of enterococcal
257 bacteremia in Australia. *J Clin Microbiol* **2014**; 52(3): 897-905.
- 258 6. Australia HH. Hand Hygiene Australia. Available at: <http://www.hha.org.au/>. Accessed
259 25/4/2016.
- 260 7. Healthcare ACoSaQi. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Healthcare.
261 Available at: Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Healthcare. Accessed
262 25/4/2016.
- 263 8. Grayson ML, Russo PL, Cruickshank M, et al. Outcomes from the first 2 years of the
264 Australian National Hand Hygiene Initiative. *Med J Aust* **2011**; 195(10): 615-9.
- 265 9. Johnson PD, Ballard SA, Grabsch EA, et al. A sustained hospital outbreak of vancomycin-
266 resistant *Enterococcus faecium* bacteremia due to emergence of vanB E. faecium sequence
267 type 203. *The Journal of infectious diseases* **2010**; 202(8): 1278-86.
- 268 10. Johnson PD, Martin R, Burrell LJ, et al. Efficacy of an alcohol/chlorhexidine hand hygiene
269 program in a hospital with high rates of nosocomial methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*
270 *aureus* (MRSA) infection. *Med J Aust* **2005**; 183(10): 509-14.
- 271 11. Boyce JM, Pittet D. Guideline for Hand Hygiene in Health-Care Settings:
272 Recommendations of the Healthcare Infection Control Practices Advisory Committee and
273 the HICPAC/SHEA/APIC/IDSA Hand Hygiene Task Force. Society for Healthcare
274 Epidemiology of America/Association for Professionals in Infection Control/Infectious
275 Diseases Society of America. *MMWR Recomm Rep* **2002**; 51(RR-16): 1-45, quiz CE1-4.
- 276 12. Larson EL, and Morton, H. E. . Alcohols. In: SS B. Disinfection, sterilization and
277 preservation, 4th ed. Philadelphia, PA: Lea & Febiger, **1991**:191-203.
- 278 13. Rotter M. Hand washing and hand disinfection (Chapter 87). In: Mayhall CG. Hospital
279 Epidemiology and Infection Control, 2nd edition: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, **1999**.

- 280 14. Pittet D, Hugonnet S, Harbarth S, et al. Effectiveness of a hospital-wide programme to
281 improve compliance with hand hygiene. *Infection Control Programme. Lancet* **2000**;
282 356(9238): 1307-12.
- 283 15. Edwards J, Patel G, Wareham DW. Low concentrations of commercial alcohol hand rubs
284 facilitate growth of and secretion of extracellular proteins by multidrug-resistant strains of
285 *Acinetobacter baumannii*. *J Med Microbiol* **2007**; 56(Pt 12): 1595-9.
- 286 16. Ingram LO. Ethanol tolerance in bacteria. *Crit Rev Biotechnol* **1990**; 9(4): 305-19.
- 287 17. Lister DM, Kotsanas D, Ballard SA, et al. Outbreak of vanB vancomycin-resistant
288 *Enterococcus faecium* colonization in a neonatal service. *Am J Infect Control* **2015**; 43(10):
289 1061-5.
- 290 18. Boutibonnes P, Giard JC, Hartke A, Thammavongs B, Auffray Y. Characterization of the
291 heat shock response in *Enterococcus faecalis*. *Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek* **1993**; 64(1): 47-
292 55.
- 293 19. Kampf G, Hofer M, Wendt C. Efficacy of hand disinfectants against vancomycin resistant
294 enterococci in vitro. *J Hosp Infect* **1999**; 42: 143-50.
- 295 20. Grayson ML, Jarvie LJ, Martin R, et al. Significant reductions in methicillin-resistant
296 *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia and clinical isolates associated with a multisite, hand
297 hygiene culture-change program and subsequent successful statewide roll-out. *Med J Aust*
298 **2008**; 188(11): 633-40.
- 299 21. Mitchell BG, Collignon PJ, McCann R, Wilkinson IJ, Wells A. A major reduction in
300 hospital-onset *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia in Australia-12 years of progress: an
301 observational study. *Clin Infect Dis* **2014**; 59(7): 969-75.
- 302 22. Johnson PDR, Howden BP, J.K. F, Daley DA, Coombs GW. The Emergence of *vanA* VRE
303 in Australia. Australasian Society for Infectious Diseases Annual Scientific Meeting.
304 Launceston, **2016**.

- 305 23. Christiansen K, Turnidge JD, Gottlieb T, et al. *Enterococcus* species Survey 2010
306 antimicrobial susceptibility and vancomycin resistant enterococci (VRE) Characterisation
307 Report. Available at: http://www.agargroup.org/files/ENTE_2010_Report_Final_secure.pdf. Accessed
308 2/5/2016.
- 309 24. van Hal SJ, Ip CL, Anzari MA, et al. Evolutionary dynamics of *Enterococcus faecium*
310 reveals complex genomic relationships between isolates with independent emergence of
311 vancomycin resistance. *Microbial Genomics* **2015**.
- 312 25. Howden BP, Holt KE, Lam MM, et al. Genomic insights to control the emergence of
313 vancomycin-resistant enterococci. *MBio* **2013**; 4(4).
- 314 26. Grayson ML, Ballard SA, Gao W, et al. Quantitative Efficacy of Alcohol-Based Handrub
315 against Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci on the Hands of Human Volunteers. *Infect*
316 *Control Hosp Epidemiol* **2012**; 33(1): 98-100.
- 317 27. Ortega Morente E, Fernandez-Fuentes MA, Grande Burgos MJ, Abriouel H, Perez Pulido R,
318 Galvez A. Biocide tolerance in bacteria. *Int J Food Microbiol* **2013**; 162(1): 13-25.
- 319 28. Torres S, Pandey A, Castro GR. Organic solvent adaptation of Gram positive bacteria:
320 Applications and biotechnological potentials. *Biotechnology Advances* **2011**; 29(4): 442-52.
- 321 29. Silveira MG, Baumgartner M, Rombouts FM, Abee T. Effect of adaptation to ethanol on
322 cytoplasmic and membrane protein profiles of *Oenococcus oeni*. *Appl Environ Microbiol*
323 **2004**; 70(5): 2748-55.
- 324 30. Smith MG, Des Etages SG, Snyder M. Microbial synergy via an ethanol-triggered pathway.
325 *Mol Cell Biol* **2004**; 24(9): 3874-84.
- 326 31. Bhardwaj P, Ziegler E, Palmer KL. Chlorhexidine Induces VanA-Type Vancomycin
327 Resistance Genes in Enterococci. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **2016**; 60(4): 2209-21.
- 328 32. Kramer A, Rudolph P, Kampf G, Pittet D. Limited efficacy of alcohol-based hand gels.
329 *Lancet* **2002**; 359(9316): 1489-90.

330

331 **Figure legends:**

332 **Fig. 1.** Single institution isopropyl alcohol tolerance phenotype variation among 66 *E. faecium*
333 isolates over 18 years. (A) Changing Isopropyl alcohol tolerance among the hospital *E. faecium*
334 population across three time periods between 1998 and 2015. Plotted are the mean \log_{10} CFU
335 reduction values for each *E. faecium* isolate obtained after exposure for 5 min to 23% Isopropyl
336 alcohol (v/v), with population mean and range within each time period indicated. (B) Depicted also
337 are the mean \log_{10} CFU reduction values with SEM for each *E. faecium* isolate plotted against
338 specimen collection date and highlighting the significant positive correlation of increasing isopropyl
339 alcohol tolerance with time. Trend line with 95% CI shown. Panels (C), (D), (E) show separately
340 the mean \log_{10} CFU reduction values with SEM for each of the three dominant clones. The red
341 arrows indicate isolates used in a previous hand-rub volunteer study [26].

342

343 **Fig. 2.** Isopropyl alcohol tolerance among 11 non-Austin hospital *E. faecium* isolates. Plotted are
344 the mean \log_{10} CFU reduction values for each *E. faecium* isolate obtained after exposure for 5 min
345 to 23% isopropyl alcohol (v/v), with population mean and range within each time period indicated.
346 A low and high tolerance *E. faecium* isolate were tested in parallel for comparison.



