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What drives antibiotic resistance changes in hospital-associated MRSA?

## MRSA overview

- S. aureus is a commensal
( $\sim 25 \%$ population ${ }^{1,2}$ )
- UK: MRSA causes $16 \%$ of all hospitalacquired infections ${ }^{3}$
- Many "lineages", but small number dominate in each country
e.g. UK MRSA: CC22 and CC30


## Core

Core variable
Mobile Genetic Elements (MGEs) ${ }^{4}$

University of London

1. van Belkum (2009)
2. Klutymans (1997)
3. Smyth (2008)
4. Lindsay (2006)

## Aims

- Quantify naturally occurring fitness differences between clinical MRSA isolates associated with

1. Antibiotic resistance
2. Lineage background

- Use these to parameterise models of antibiotic resistance evolution in MRSA


## Isolates

| Antibiotic | 202 | 215 | 201 | 211 | 228 | 221 | 226 | 205 | 224 | 206 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ampicillin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Penicillin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oxacillin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teicoplanin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vancomycin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ciprofloxacin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rifampicin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chloramphenicol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clindamycin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Erythromycin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gentamicin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kanamycin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tobramycin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tetracycline |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fusidic Acid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trimethoprim |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mupirocin |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# of isolates | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Plasmid presence | $\times$ |  |  |  | $\times$ | $\times$ | $\times$ |  |  |  |

## 1. Effect of antibiotic resistance on fitness

> Pairwise comparison: With plasmid (202) vs Without plasmid (215)

$>$ Under a range of mathematical measures: no significant difference ( $\alpha=0.05$ )

## 1. Effect of antibiotic resistance on fitness

> Across antibiogram comparison
With plasmid vs Without plasmid
Independent growth


Hour from inoculum
(Knight, 2013)
$>$ Under a range of mathematical measures: no significant difference ( $\alpha=0.05$ )

## 2. Effect of lineage background on fitness

> Across lineage comparison
CC22 CC30 CC239

(Knight, 2013)
> Under a range of mathematical measures: there was significant difference ( $\alpha=0.05$ )

## Fitness differences within MRSA populations

1. Antibiotic resistance had little effect on fitness

- even when due to large plasmid carriage
- across a range of different resistances

2. Lineage background had a large impact

- due to SCCmec size differences

What implications does this have for the clinical MRSA population?

## Lineage changes in UK

- UK hospital clones: CC22 SCCmecIV and CC30 SCCmecll ${ }^{1}$


1. Ellington (2010)
2. Knight (2012)

## Antibiotic usage roughly constant

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { [ }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Resistance changes

- Phenotypic resistances ( $\mathrm{n}=18$ )

CC22


1. Shuffling coincides with success

2. > 99\% MRSA resistant to fluoroquinolones

Does hospital wide prescribing of ciprofloxacin (a fluoroquinolone) contribute to the selection of colonizing MRSA?

## Controlling MRSA infection rates

"New antibiotic guidelines for the whole Trust with restriction of cephalosporins and quinolones" (Spring 2007)


- Beta-lactamase resistant beta-lactams
- Ciprofloxacin


## Modelling

- Test above hypothesis
- Stochastic differential equation model

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{d F}{d t}=\lambda_{F}-\beta F S-(1+\bar{c}) \beta F R+v R-\mu F+(a-\bar{c} \beta R) S \\
& \frac{d S}{d t}=\lambda_{S}+\beta F S-a S-\mu S-b \beta S R \\
& \frac{d R}{d t}=\lambda_{R}+(1+\bar{c}) \beta F R-v R-\mu R+(b+\bar{c}) \beta S R
\end{aligned}
$$




- Parameters from St George's

For, MRSA (UK), the key drivers are fitness / shuffling / ciprofloxacin resistance

What drives antibiotic resistance changes in TB?

## Tuberculosis



## EVERY YEAR 9 MILLION PEOPLE GET SICK WITH TB.

3 MILLION DON'T GET THE CARE THEY NEED.

HELP US REACH THEM.


## REACH THE 3 MILLION.

FIND. TREAT. CURE TB.

## Natural history of TB



Typical TB model structure


What are the key drivers of TB resistance evolution?

## The key drivers from modelling



## The key drivers



What do we know about resistance in TB?

## Fitness experiments



Fig. 1. Relative competitive fitness of laboratory-derived rifampin-resistant mutants of $M$. tuberculosis. All mutants had a statistically significant fitness cost (error bars indicate $95 \%$ confidence intervals). This cost was less in $r p o B S 531 \mathrm{~L}$ mutants than in other $r p o B$ mutants, irrespective of the strain background. Light gray bars, CDC1551 mutants; dark gray bars, T85 mutants. Y, Tyr; W, Trp; P, Pro.
(Gagneux, 2006)


Figure 3 | Relationship between antibiotic resistance and bacterial fitness.
Numbers shown on the $y$ axes are from empirical data $a^{20,61,38} \cdot a \mid$ High-level resistance to

## Modelling heterogeneous fitness




Drug resistant-TB

(Cohen \& Murray, 2004)

## How does mean relative fitness change over time?



Are "generalized" functions of fitness over time achievable?

## Heterogeneous fitness

Number of individuals with active TB due to resistant strain


Mean relative fitness

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =12 / 16 \times 0.6+4 / 16 \times 1 \\
& =0.7
\end{aligned}
$$

## Heterogeneous fitness

Number of individuals with active TB dunta macictant ctroin

Challenges

- Long term dynamics of TB
- Time step approximation


Mean relative fitness $=0.6$


Unfit ( $f=0.6$ )
Fit $(f=1)$
Select acquisitions from different distributions



Multiple fitness levels
hean relative fitness
$=12 / 16 \times 0.6+4 / 16 \times 1$
$=0.7$

## Generalised fitness function

- Proportion at fitness level " $x$ " (just transmission)

$$
\begin{aligned}
x(t+1) & =\frac{Z(t) x(t) r_{x}}{Z(t)\left(x(t) r_{x}+y(t) r_{y}\right)} \\
& =\frac{x(t) r_{x}}{x(t) r_{x}+y(t) r_{y}} \\
& =\frac{x(t) r_{x}}{f(t)}
\end{aligned}
$$



$$
\begin{gathered}
\lambda_{S}=\beta A_{S} \\
\lambda_{R}=f \beta A_{R}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Generalised fitness function

- $\mathrm{M}(\mathrm{n}, \mathrm{t})$ = matrix of distribution over $n$ fitness levels over time for ACTIVE cases
- $\mathrm{v}=$ vector of $n$ relative fitness levels
- Mean relative fitness:
$f(t+1)=M(n, t+1) v$
$=$ (Active remain) ${ }^{*} M(t)+$ (Active Dependent on the relative fitness in the last time step

new rel. fit $=$ transmissions $\times$ rel. fit + acquisitions $\times$ rel. fit
+ reactivations $x$ rel. fit
Requires keeping track of latent population distribution of fitness


## Model fit



Proportion of acquisitions

lel fit

## Conclusions

- MRSA
- Resistance levels give information on the selective pressures seen in the environment e.g. on commensals
- Three key drives to being a successful resistant MRSA isolate in a UK hospital:
- Fitness / Shuffle / ciprofloxacin resistance
- The most successful were not the most resistant
- TB
- Levels of resistance to new regimens will be governed by
- Fitness costs to resistance / treatment success / acquisition rates
- To be continued...
- Fitness is a dynamic process
- More data is needed on how this changes in populations over time
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## Heterogeneous fitness

Number of individuals with active TB due to resistant strain


Mean relative fitness

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =0.9 \times 0.6+0.1 \times 1 \\
& =0.64 \\
\lambda_{S} & =\beta A_{S} \\
\lambda_{R} & =f \beta A_{R}
\end{aligned}
$$



Mean relative fitness

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =12 / 14 \times 0.6+2 / 14 \times 1 \\
& =0.66
\end{aligned}
$$Unfit ( $f=0.6$ )

Fit $(f=1)$


## Treatment and antimicrobial resistance in TB

- First line: 6 months combination therapy
- Resistance:
- MDR-TB = resistance to two of first line drugs
- XDR-TB = MDR + resistance to any of second line
- $4 \%$ of new and $20 \%$ of previously treated MDR-TB ${ }^{1}$
- >70\% undetected ${ }^{1}$
- MDR-TB treatment 24months...
- New regimens under investigation
- Shorter
- New drugs


## Modelling explanation



## Modelling explanation

- Using hospital parameters the effect of the decline in fluoroquinolones can be captured
- Using to make predictions about other control mechanisms




## Dependence on relative fitness



$$
\begin{gathered}
\lambda_{S}=\beta\left(A_{S}+g A_{S R}\right) \\
\lambda_{R}=f \beta\left(A_{R}+(1-g) A_{S R}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

fitness for the levels of $\left(r_{x}, r_{y}\right)$. If $Z(t)$ is the pool of individuals that can be infected via transmission of resistant strains multiplied by the per capita transmission rate $(\beta)$ and proportion that progress to active TB $p$, then the number of transmissions $T$ at time $t+1$ is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
T(t+1)=Z(t)\left(x(t) r_{x}+y(t) r_{y}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, as a reworking of (2), the mean relative fitness of the resistant strain population at time $t$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(t)=\left(x(t) r_{x}+y(t) r_{y}\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is the fitness value used to determine the number of transmissions of the resistant strains in time step $t+1$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
x(t+1) & =\frac{Z(t) x(t) r_{x}}{Z(t)\left(x(t) r_{x}+y(t) r_{y}\right)} \\
& =\frac{x(t) r_{x}}{x(t) r_{x}+y(t) r_{y}} \\
& =\frac{x(t) r_{x}}{f(t)}
\end{aligned}
$$

