

Competition of Hospital-Acquired and Community-Acquired Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Strains in Hospitals

GLENN F. WEBB¹, MARY ANN HORN^{1,2}, ERIKA M. C. D'AGATA³,
ROBERT C. MOELLERING JR.³, AND SHIGUI RUAN^{4,*}

¹*Department of Mathematics, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37240, USA*

²*Division of Mathematical Sciences, National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA 22230, USA*

³*Division of Infectious Diseases, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center,
Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02215, USA*

⁴*Department of Mathematics, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL 33124-4250, USA*

Abstract

Recently, we (D'Agata *et al.*, Modeling the invasion of community-acquired methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* into the hospital setting, submitted) proposed a deterministic mathematical model to characterize the factors contributing to the replacement of hospital-acquired methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (HA-MRSA) with the community-acquired methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (CA-MRSA) and to quantify the effectiveness of interventions aimed at limiting the spread of CA-MRSA in the hospital setting. Numerical simulations of the model strongly suggest that CA-MRSA will become the dominant MRSA strain in the hospital setting. In this companion paper, we provide mathematical analysis and more numerical simulations of the model. It is shown that when no colonized or infected patients enter the hospital, competitive exclusion of HA-MRSA by CA-MRSA will occur with increased severity of CA-MRSA infections resulting in longer hospitalizations and a larger in-hospital reservoir of CA-MRSA. Improving compliance with hand hygiene and decolonization of CA-MRSA carriers are effective control strategies.

Key words. Transmission dynamics, epidemic model, basic reproduction number, competition exclusion, disease-free and endemic steady states.

AMS Subject Classification. 92B05, 92D30.

*Corresponding author (E-mail: ruan@math.miami.edu).

1 Introduction

Staphylococcus aureus is a gram-positive bacterium that colonizes the skin and is present in the anterior nares in about a quarter of the population (Grundmann et al. [4]). The bacterium acquires resistance against all classes of antibiotics by either mutation of an existing bacterial gene or horizontal transfer of a resistance gene from another bacterium (Grundmann et al. [4]). Since it was first reported in the 1950's, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) has been regarded as a healthcare-associated pathogen affecting predominantly the elderly and debilitated (Kuehnert et al. [13], Grundmann et al. [4]) and MRSA infections are an important clinical and public health problem (Harbarth [5]). It was estimated that deaths in patients with MRSA in the United States in 2005 surpassed those caused by HIV/AIDS in the same year (Klevens et al. [11], Bancroft [1]).

In 1998, a new strain of MRSA emerged in the community setting occurring among young healthy individuals with no exposure to the health care setting (Herold et al. [8]). Since then, this community-acquired MRSA strain (CA-MRSA) has rapidly spread throughout the world (Zetola et al. [23], Tristan et al. [21], Kluytmans-VandenBergh and Kluytmans [12], Klein et al. [10]). Outbreaks of CA-MRSA have been reported among children (Herold et al. [8]), athletes (MMWR [15]), nurseries (Otter and French [16]), and obstetrical wards (Saiman et al. [19]). With the use of mathematical models, it has been shown that the presence of a community reservoir has a major impact on the control of MRSA in the hospital (Cooper et al. [2], Levin [14], Smith et al. [20], Robotham et al. [18]). It has been suggested that CA-MRSA may be replacing the traditional HA-MRSA (Popovich et al. [17]).

Recently, we (D'Agata et al. [3]) developed a deterministic mathematical model to quantify the temporal patterns of CA-MRSA spread into the hospital setting and its competitive exclusion of HA-MRSA over time. The transmission dynamics of CA-MRSA within the hospital setting and the effectiveness of current infection control strategies were quantified to determine the optimal strategy or combination of strategies, aimed at preventing the spread of CA-MRSA between patients. The deterministic model describes the transmission dynamics of CA-MRSA within a 400-bed tertiary care hospital with approximately 25,000 admissions per year. The impact of an increasing influx of CA-MRSA into the hospital setting as a result of the persistent and rising dissemination of CA-MRSA within the community is quantified and the effect of different interventions aimed at limiting the spread of CA-MRSA are analyzed and compared. Individuals within the hospital are in five mutually exclusive states: susceptible, colonized with either CA-MRSA or HA-MRSA and infected with either CA-MRSA or HA-MRSA. Individuals enter the hospital in one of these states and exit via death or discharge. Within the hospital, susceptible individuals can become colonized with either CA-MRSA or HA-MRSA and can subsequently become infected with the respective MRSA strain. Transmission of MRSA between individuals occurs through the hands of health-care workers, the main vectors of antimicrobial-resistant bacteria. Control strategies for preventing the spread of MRSA include improving compliance with hand hygiene and placing individuals who are infected with MRSA on contact precautions as per standard Centers for Disease Control and Prevention requirements.

In this companion paper, we provide mathematical analysis and more numerical simulations of the model. It is shown that when no colonized or infected patients enter the hospital, competitive exclusion of HA-MRSA by CA-MRSA will occur with increased severity of CA-MRSA infections

resulting in longer hospitalizations and a larger in-hospital reservoir of CA-MRSA. Numerical simulations also demonstrate that if some of the patients admitted to the hospital are colonized or infected with HA-MRSA and CA-MRSA strains, then both strains can persist in the hospital in terms of positive equilibria.

2 The Model

The patients in the hospital are divided into five compartments:

$S(t)$ = number of susceptible patients at time t .

$CC(t)$ = number of patients colonized with the community MRSA strain at time t .

$CH(t)$ = number of patients colonized with the hospital MRSA strain at time t .

$IC(t)$ = number of patients infected with the community MRSA strain at time t .

$IH(t)$ = number of patients infected with the hospital MRSA strain at time t .

Patients are admitted at a total rate of Λ per day with the fractions of CA-MRSA colonized, CA-MRSA infected, HA-MRSA colonized, and HA-MRSA infected patient admissions = λ_{CC} , λ_{IC} , λ_{CH} , λ_{IH} , respectively. Susceptible patients have an average length of stay (LOS) = $1/\gamma_S$, and colonized CA-MRSA and colonized HA-MRSA have average LOS = $1/\gamma_C$ and $1/\gamma_H$, respectively. The colonization rates of susceptible patients to the colonized CA-MRSA compartment are $(1 - \eta)\beta_{CC}/N$ and $(1 - \eta)\beta_{IC}/N$ and to the colonized HA-MRSA compartment are $(1 - \eta)\beta_{CH}/N$ and $(1 - \eta)\beta_{IH}/N$. Here η = the compliance with hand washing hygiene (with $\eta = 0$ corresponding to 0% compliance and $\eta = 1$ corresponding to 100% compliance), $\beta_{CC}, \beta_{IC}, \beta_{CH}, \beta_{IH}$ = the colonization transmission rates of patients from health care workers (HCW) contaminated by colonized CA-MRSA, infected CA-MRSA, colonized HA-MRSA, and infected HA-MRSA patients, respectively, and N is the total number of patients in the hospital. The ratios β_{CC}/β_{CH} and β_{IC}/β_{IH} are approximately 4/3 because of the more rapid doubling time of CA-MRSA. In the simulations the average LOS of susceptible patients (γ_S) is adjusted so that the number of patients in the hospital is maintained at N . The rates of infection of colonized CA-MRSA and colonized HA-MRSA patients are ϕ_C and ϕ_H , respectively. The cure rates of infected CA-MRSA and infected HA-MRSA patients are τ_C and τ_H , respectively. The death rates of infected CA-MRSA and infected HA-MRSA patients are δ_C and δ_H , respectively. The rates of decolonization of colonized CA-MRSA and colonized HA-MRSA patients are α_{CC} and α_{CH} , respectively. Parameter estimates were obtained from the Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center's computerized database system, which provides patient and infection control data and from the literature (Table 1).

The equations of the model are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dS}{dt} = & \underbrace{\Lambda(1 - \lambda_{CC} - \lambda_{CH} - \lambda_{IC} - \lambda_{IH})}_{\text{admissions per day}} \\ & - \underbrace{\frac{(1 - \eta)\beta_{CC}}{N}S(t)CC(t) - \frac{(1 - \eta)\beta_{IC}}{N}S(t)IC(t)}_{\text{CA-MRSA colonization}} \\ & - \underbrace{\frac{(1 - \eta)\beta_{CH}}{N}S(t)CH(t) - \frac{(1 - \eta)\beta_{IH}}{N}S(t)IH(t)}_{\text{HA-MRSA colonization}} \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

Table 1: Variables and Parameters of the Model (D'Agata et al. [3])

Symbol	Interpretation	Baseline Value
N	total number of patients in the hospital	400
Λ	total admissions per day	70
λ_{CC}	fraction of colonized CA-MRSA admissions per day	varies
λ_{CH}	fraction of colonized HA-MRSA admissions per day	varies
λ_{IC}	fraction of infected CA-MRSA admissions per day	varies
λ_{IH}	fraction of infected HA-MRSA admissions per day	varies
$1/\gamma_S$	average length of stay of susceptible patients	5 days
$1/\gamma_{CC}$	average length of stay of colonized CA-MRSA patients	5 days
$1/\gamma_{CH}$	average length of stay of colonized HA-MRSA patients	7 days
$1/\gamma_{IC}$	average length of stay of infected CA-MRSA patients	10 days
$1/\gamma_{IH}$	average length of stay of infected HA-MRSA patients	18 days
η	hand hygiene compliance fraction (0 to 1)	.6 (60%)
β_{CC}	colonized/colonized CA-MRSA transmission rate	.36
β_{CH}	colonized/colonized HA-MRSA transmission rate	.27
β_{IC}	infected/colonized CA-MRSA transmission rate	.09
β_{IH}	infected/colonized HA-MRSA transmission rate	.07
$\delta_C \times \gamma_{IC}$	infected CA-MRSA patient death rate	.033/10 (3.3% per day)
$\delta_H \times \gamma_{IC}$	infected HA-MRSA patient death rate	.2/18 (20% per day)
$\phi_C \times \gamma_{CC}$	colonized CA-MRSA patient infection rate	.1/5 (10% per day)
$\phi_H \times \gamma_{CH}$	colonized HA-MRSA patient infection rate	.1/7 (10% per day)
$\tau_C \times \gamma_{IC}$	infected CA-MRSA patient cure rate	.967/10 (96.7% per day)
$\tau_H \times \gamma_{IH}$	infected HA-MRSA patient cure rate	.8/18 (80% per day)
$\alpha_C \times \gamma_{CC}$	infected CA-MRSA patient cure rate	.0/5 (0% per day)
$\alpha_H \times \gamma_{CH}$	infected HA-MRSA patient cure rate	.0/7 (0% per day)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \underbrace{\alpha_C CC(t) + \alpha_H CH(t)}_{\text{decolonization}} - \underbrace{\gamma_S S(t)}_{\text{exit from hospital}} \\
 \frac{dCC}{dt} = & \underbrace{\Lambda \lambda_{CC}}_{\text{admissions per day}} + \underbrace{\frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{CC}}{N} S(t)CC(t) + \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{IC}}{N} S(t)IC(t)}_{\text{CA-MRSA colonization}} \\
 & + \underbrace{\tau_C IC(t)}_{\text{treatment}} - \underbrace{\phi_C CC(t)}_{\text{infection}} - \underbrace{\alpha_C CC(t)}_{\text{decolonization}} - \underbrace{\gamma_C CC(t)}_{\text{death}} \quad (2.2)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dCH}{dt} = & \underbrace{\Lambda \lambda_{CH}}_{\text{admissions per day}} + \underbrace{\frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{CH}}{N} S(t)CH(t) + \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{IH}}{N} S(t)IH(t)}_{\text{HA-MRSA colonization}} \\
 & + \underbrace{\tau_H IH(t)}_{\text{treatment}} - \underbrace{\phi_H CH(t)}_{\text{infection}} - \underbrace{\alpha_H CH(t)}_{\text{decolonization}} - \underbrace{\gamma_H CH(t)}_{\text{death}} \quad (2.3)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{dIC}{dt} = \underbrace{\Lambda\lambda_{IC}}_{\text{admissions per day}} + \underbrace{\phi_C CC(t)}_{\text{infection}} - \underbrace{\tau_C IC(t)}_{\text{treatment}} - \underbrace{\delta_C IC(t)}_{\text{death}} \quad (2.4)$$

$$\frac{dIH}{dt} = \underbrace{\Lambda\lambda_{IH}}_{\text{admissions per day}} + \underbrace{\phi_H CH(t)}_{\text{infection}} - \underbrace{\tau_H IH(t)}_{\text{treatment}} - \underbrace{\delta_H IH(t)}_{\text{death}} \quad (2.5)$$

with initial conditions $S(0) = S_0$, $CC(0) = CC_0$, $CH(0) = CH_0$, $IC(0) = IC_0$ and $IH(0) = IH_0$ specified at time 0.

3 Mathematical Analysis

In our mathematical analysis we assume that no colonized or infected patients enter the hospital, that is, $\lambda_{CC} = \lambda_{CH} = \lambda_{IC} = \lambda_{IH} = 0$. If colonized or infected patients are admitted each day, then both strains co-exist in the hospital. In the absence of such admissions there is a competitive exclusion effect as the two strains compete in the hospital. The strain that dominates has the higher basic reproduction number, which must also be higher than 1.

3.1 The Disease-free Steady State

The disease-free steady state is

$$E_0 = \left(\frac{\Lambda}{\gamma_S}, 0, 0, 0, 0 \right). \quad (3.1)$$

The community MRSA strain in the absence of the hospital strain has a basic reproduction number defined by

$$R_0^C = \frac{(1 - \eta)\Lambda(\beta_{CC}(\tau_C + \delta_C) + \beta_{IC}\phi_C)}{N\gamma_S[(\alpha_C + \gamma_C)(\tau_C + \delta_C) + \delta_C\phi_C]} \quad (3.2)$$

and the hospital MRSA strain in the absence of the community strain has a basic reproduction number defined by

$$R_0^H = \frac{(1 - \eta)\Lambda(\beta_{CH}(\tau_H + \delta_H) + \beta_{IH}\phi_H)}{N\gamma_S[(\alpha_H + \gamma_H)(\tau_H + \delta_H) + \delta_H\phi_H]}. \quad (3.3)$$

First, we can prove the following results.

Theorem 3.1 *If $S(0), CC(0), CH(0), IC(0), IH(0) \geq 0$, then the solutions are nonnegative and remain bounded in the positive cone of R^5 . If $R_0^C < 1$ and $R_0^H < 1$, then the disease-free steady state E_0 is locally asymptotically stable. If either $R_0^C > 1$ or $R_0^H > 1$, then E_0 is unstable.*

Proof. The system is quasi-positive, so the solutions remain in the positive cone if the initial conditions are in the positive cone. Let $T(t) = S(t) + CC(t) + CH(t) + IC(t) + IH(t)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dT(t)}{dt} &= \Lambda - \gamma_S S(t) - \gamma_C CC(t) - \gamma_H CH(t) - \delta_C IC(t) - \delta_H IH(t) \\ &\leq \Lambda - \min\{\gamma_S, \gamma_C, \gamma_H, \delta_C, \delta_H\}T(t). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the solutions remain bounded in the positive cone of R^5 and the system induces a global semiflow in the positive cone of R^5 .

To determine the stability of the disease-free steady state E_0 , we use the results in van den Driessche and Watmough [22]. Re-order the components of E_0 as $(CC = 0, IC = 0, CH = 0, IH = 0, S = \frac{\Lambda}{\gamma_S})$. Set

$$\mathcal{F} = \begin{bmatrix} F_1 \\ F_2 \\ F_3 \\ F_4 \\ F_5 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{CC}S(t)CC(t)}{N} + \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{IC}S(t)IC(t)}{N} \\ 0 \\ \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{CH}S(t)CH(t)}{N} + \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{IH}S(t)IH(t)}{N} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathcal{V} = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 \\ V_2 \\ V_3 \\ V_4 \\ V_5 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (\phi_C + \alpha_C + \gamma_C)CC(t) - \tau_C IC(t) \\ (\tau_C + \delta_C)IC(t) - \phi_C CC(t) \\ (\phi_H + \alpha_H + \gamma_H)CH(t) - \tau_H IH(t) \\ (\tau_H + \delta_H)IH(t) - \phi_H CH(t) \\ \frac{(1-\eta)}{N}S(t)[\beta_{CC}CC(t) + \beta_{CH}CH(t) + \beta_{IC}IC(t) + \beta_{IH}IH(t)] + \gamma_S S(t) - \alpha_C CC(t) - \alpha_H CH(t) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial CC} & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial IC} & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial CH} & \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial IH} \\ \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial CC} & \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial IC} & \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial CH} & \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial IH} \\ \frac{\partial F_3}{\partial CC} & \frac{\partial F_3}{\partial IC} & \frac{\partial F_3}{\partial CH} & \frac{\partial F_3}{\partial IH} \\ \frac{\partial F_4}{\partial CC} & \frac{\partial F_4}{\partial IC} & \frac{\partial F_4}{\partial CH} & \frac{\partial F_4}{\partial IH} \end{bmatrix}_{E_0} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{CC}\Lambda}{N\gamma_S} & \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{IC}\Lambda}{N\gamma_S} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{CH}\Lambda}{N\gamma_S} & \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{IH}\Lambda}{N\gamma_S} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Similarly,

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_C + \alpha_C + \gamma_C & -\tau_C & 0 & 0 \\ -\phi_C & \tau_C + \delta_C & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \phi_H + \alpha_H + \gamma_H & -\tau_H \\ 0 & 0 & -\phi_H & \tau_H + \delta_H \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore,

$$FV^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} R_0^C & \frac{(1-\eta)\Lambda[\beta_{CC}\tau_C + \beta_{IC}(\phi_C + \alpha_C + \gamma_C)]}{N\gamma_S[(\alpha_C + \gamma_C)(\tau_C + \delta_C) + \delta_C\phi_C]} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & R_0^H & \frac{(1-\eta)\Lambda[\beta_{CH}\tau_H + \beta_{IH}(\phi_H + \alpha_H + \gamma_H)]}{N\gamma_S[(\alpha_H + \gamma_H)(\tau_H + \delta_H) + \delta_H\phi_H]} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which implies that the spectral radius of the matrix FV^{-1} is

$$\rho(FV^{-1}) = \max(R_0^C, R_0^H).$$

If $R_0^H < 1$ and $R_0^C < 1$, then $\rho(FV^{-1}) < 1$. By Theorem 2 in van den Driessche and Watmough [22], we know that the disease-free steady state E_0 is locally asymptotically stable. E_0 is unstable if $R_0^H > 1$ or $R_0^C > 1$.

Remark 3.2 The case when $R_0^H < 1$ and $R_0^C < 1$ corresponds to the situation that there are no MRSA strains prevailing in the hospital.

3.2 The Disease Steady States

Now, if $R_0^C < 1 < R_0^H$, then there is a disease steady state with the hospital MRSA strain

$$E_H = (S_H, 0, C_H, 0, I_H), \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$S_H = \frac{\Lambda}{\gamma_S R_0^H}, \quad C_H = \frac{(R_0^H - 1)\Lambda(\tau_H + \delta_H)}{R_0^H[\gamma_H(\tau_H + \delta_H) + \delta_H\phi_H]}, \quad I_H = \frac{\phi_H C_H}{\tau_H + \delta_H}.$$

Theorem 3.3 *If $R_0^C < 1 < R_0^H$, then the HA-MRSA strain endemic steady state E_H exists and is locally asymptotically stable.*

Proof. Re-order the steady state E_H as $(0, 0, C_H, I_H, S_H)$. Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we have

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{CC}S_H}{N} & \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{IH}S_H}{N} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad V = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_C + \alpha_C + \gamma_C & -\tau_C \\ -\phi_C & \tau_C + \delta_C \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$FV^{-1} = \frac{(1-\eta)\Lambda}{N\gamma_S R_0^H[(\alpha_C + \gamma_C)(\tau_C + \delta_C) + \delta_C\phi_C]} \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{CC}(\tau_C + \delta_C) + \beta_{IC}\phi_C & \beta_{CC}\tau_C + \beta_{IC}(\phi_C + \alpha_C + \gamma_C) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, the spectral radius of FV^{-1} is given by

$$\rho(FV^{-1}) = \frac{R_0^C}{R_0^H}.$$

Since $R_0^C < 1 < R_0^H$, we have $\rho(FV^{-1}) < 1$, which implies that E_H is locally asymptotically stable By Theorem 2 in van den Driessche and Watmough [22].

Remark 3.4 The case when $R_0^C < 1 < R_0^H$ corresponds to the situation that only the hospital MRSA strain is prevailing in the hospital.

Finally, if $R_0^C > 1$, then the community MRSA strain endemic disease steady state

$$E_C = (S_C, C_C, 0, I_C, 0) \quad (3.5)$$

exists, where

$$S_C = \frac{\Lambda}{\gamma_S R_0^C}, \quad C_C = \frac{(R_0^C - 1)\Lambda(\tau_C + \delta_C)}{R_0^C[\gamma_C(\tau_C + \delta_C) + \delta_C\phi_C]}, \quad I_C = \frac{\phi_C C_C}{\tau_C + \delta_C}.$$

Moreover, we have the following result regarding the stability of E_H and E_C .

Theorem 3.5 *If $R_0^C > R_0^H > 1$, then both the HA-MRSA and CA-MRSA strain endemic steady states E_H and E_C exist. Moreover, E_C is locally asymptotically stable and E_H is unstable.*

Proof. For the CA-MRSA strain endemic steady state E_C , following the proof of Theorem 3.3 we have $\rho(FV^{-1}) = R_0^H/R_0^C < 1$ since $R_0^C > R_0^H$. Thus, E_C is locally asymptotically stable.

The Jacobian matrix at the HA-MRSA strain endemic steady state E_H is

$$\begin{bmatrix} -K_H - \gamma_S & -\frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{CC}\Lambda}{N\gamma_S R_0^H} + \alpha_C & -\frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{CH}\Lambda}{N\gamma_S R_0^H} + \alpha_H & -\frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{IC}\Lambda}{N\gamma_S R_0^H} & -\frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{IH}\Lambda}{N\gamma_S R_0^H} \\ -K_H & \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{CC}\Lambda}{N\gamma_S R_0^H} - (\phi_C + \alpha_C + \gamma_C) & 0 & \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{IC}\Lambda}{N\gamma_S R_0^H} + \tau_C & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{CH}\Lambda}{N\gamma_S R_0^H} - (\phi_H + \alpha_H + \gamma_H) & 0 & \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{IH}\Lambda}{N\gamma_S R_0^H} + \tau_H \\ 0 & \phi_C & 0 & -\tau_C - \delta_C & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \phi_H & 0 & -\tau_H - \delta_H \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$K_H = \frac{(1-\eta)(R_0^H - 1)\Lambda[\beta_{CH}(\tau_H + \delta_H) + \beta_{IH}\phi_H]}{NR_0^H[\gamma_H(\tau_H + \delta_H) + \delta_H\phi_H]}.$$

The Jacobian matrix has one eigenvalue $a + \sqrt{a^2 + 4b}$, where

$$a = \frac{(1-\eta)\beta_{CC}\Lambda}{N\gamma_S R_0^C} - (\phi_C + \alpha_C + \gamma_C + \tau_C + \delta_C),$$

$$b = \frac{R_0^C - R_0^H}{R_0^H} [(\alpha_C + \gamma_C)(\tau_C + \delta_C) + \delta_C\phi_C].$$

Since $b > 0$, $a + \sqrt{a^2 + 4b} > a + |a| \geq 0$ and this eigenvalue must be positive. Thus, E_H is unstable.

Remark 3.6 When R_0^C increases to greater than 1 and R_0^H , the CA-MRSA strain invades the hospital and eventually overtakes the HA-MRSA strain.

The above results on the existence and stability of equilibria can be summarized into the following table.

Table 2: **Stability Chart for the Model with $\lambda_{CC} = \lambda_{CH} = \lambda_{IC} = \lambda_{IH} = 0$.**

Basic Reproduction Numbers	E_0	E_H	E_C
$\max\{R_0^H, R_0^C\} < 1$	stable	does not exist	does not exist
$R_0^C < 1 < R_0^H$	unstable	stable	does not exist
$1 < R_0^H < R_0^C$	unstable	unstable	stable

4 Numerical Simulations and Discussion

In this section, we carry out some numerical simulations to illustrate the results obtained in the previous section. Choose parameter as follows: $\Lambda = 70, N = 400, \eta = 0.6, \beta_{CC} = 0.36, \beta_{CH} = 0.27, \beta_{IC} = 0.09, \beta_{IH} = 0.07, \alpha_C = 0.6, \alpha_H = 0.6, \gamma_S = 0.2, \gamma_C = 0.2, \gamma_H = 0.1429, \tau_C = 0.0967, \tau_H = 0.0444, \phi_C = 0.02, \phi_H = 0.0143, \delta_C = 0.0033, \delta_H = 0.0111$. We can see that $R_0^H = 0.1652 < 1$ and $R_0^C = 0.1352 < 1$, so the disease-free steady state $E_0 = (0.88, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ is stable (Fig. 1). Now change some parameter values as follows: $\beta_{CH} = 0.71, \beta_{IH} = 0.17, \eta = 0.3, \alpha_H = 0.3,$




Figure 1: When $R_0^H < 1$ and $R_0^C < 1$, the disease-free steady state E_0 is stable.

then $R_0^H = 1.035 > 1 > R_0^C = 0.2891$ and the hospital MRSA strain steady state E_H is stable (Fig. 2). Finally, choose $\beta_{CC} = 0.87, \beta_{IC} = 0.19$, we have $R_0^C = 1.111 > R_0^H = 1.029 > 1$, and the community MRSA strain drives out the hospital MRSA strain. (Fig. 3).

Hand hygiene and decolonization are both efficient interventions. Figure 4 shows that, when is no entry of new cases, combining hand hygiene and decolonization can reduce the basic reproduction number for CA-MRSA to less than 1.

The above simulations were carried out with the assumption that no colonized or infected cases enter the hospital; that is, $\lambda_{CC} = \lambda_{CH} = \lambda_{IC} = \lambda_{IH} = 0$. If there are colonized or infected cases entering the hospital, then the outcomes are completely different. For example, if $\lambda_{CC} = 0.03, \lambda_{CH} = 0.07$, that is, some patients admitted to the hospital are colonized with HA-MRSA and CA-MRSA strain, respectively, then both strains will coexist in the hospital (Fig. 5). Similarly, if $\lambda_{IC} = 0.005, \lambda_{IH} = 0.0017$, that is, some patients admitted to the hospital are infected with HA-MRSA and CA-MRSA strain, respectively, then once again both strains will coexist in the hospital (Fig. 5).

Entry of new cases into the hospital is crucial for the spread and control of both HA-MRSA and CA-MRSA strains. The simulations in Figures 5 and Fig. 6 strongly support the suggestion of screening for MRSA at hospital admission for colonized and infected cases (Harbarth et al. [6, 7]). However, screening requires action and compliance with infection control precautions. If health-care workers do not comply with hand hygiene and other contact precautions when a patient is identified with MRSA through screening, then this intervention would not prevent the spread of MRSA. It also indicates that, when $\lambda_{CC}, \lambda_{CH}, \lambda_{IC}$, and λ_{IH} are not all zero, the modal can have positive steady states with the endemicity of both HA-MRSA and CA-MRSA strains. These cases deserve further analysis.




Figure 2: When $R_0^H > 1 > R_0^C$, the hospital MRSA strain steady state E_H is stable.




Figure 3: When $R_0^C > R_0^H > 1$, the community MRSA strain takes over.




Figure 4: Basic reproduction number R_0^C for the community MRSA strain with baseline parameter values as in Table 1, except that the hand hygiene % and decolonization % vary from 0 to 100.

Acknowledgements. This work was supported in part by the joint DMS/NIGMS Initiative through the NIH grant R01GM083607 (EMCD, GFW, SR). This work was also partially supported by the NSF (MAH, SR). Any opinion, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF.




Figure 5: When $\lambda_{CC} = 0.03$, $\lambda_{CH} = 0.07$, $\lambda_{IC} = \lambda_{IH} = 0$, both HA-MRSA and CA-MRSA strains establish in the hospital.




Figure 6: When $\lambda_{CC} = \lambda_{CH} = 0$, $\lambda_{IC} = 0.005$, $\lambda_{IH} = 0.0017$, there is a stable positive endemic steady state with both HA-MRSA and CA-MRSA strains in the hospital.

References

- [1] Bancroft EA (2007) Antimicrobial resistance: It's not just for hospitals, *JAMA* **298**, 803-804.
- [2] Cooper BS, et al. (2004) Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in hospitals and the community: stealth dynamics and control catastrophes, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **101**, 10223-10228.
- [3] D'Agata EMC, Webb GF, Horn MA, Moellering Jr. RC, Ruan S (2008) Modeling the invasion of community-acquired methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* into the hospital setting, submitted.
- [4] Grundmann H, Aires-de-Sousa M, Boyce J, Tiemersma E (2006) Emergence and resurgence of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* as a public-health threat, *Lancet* **368**, 874-885.
- [5] Harbarth S (2006) Control of endemic methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* - recent advances and future challenges, *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **12**, 1154-1162.
- [6] Harbarth S, et al. (2006) Evaluating the probability of previously unknown carriage of MRSA at hospital admission, *Amer. J. Med.* **119**, 275.e15-275.e23.
- [7] Harbarth S, et al. (2008) Universal screening for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* at hospital admission and nosocomial infection in surgical patients, *JAMA* **299**, 1149-1157.
- [8] Herold BC, et al. (1998) Community-acquired methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in children with no identified predisposing risk, *JAMA* **279**, 593-598.
- [9] Kajita E, Okano JT, Bodine EN, Layne SP, Blower S (2007), Modelling an outbreak of an emerging pathogen, *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **5**, 700-709.
- [10] Klein E, Smith DL, Laxminarayan R (2007) Hospitalizations and deaths caused by methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, United States, 1999-2005, *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **12**, 1840-1846.
- [11] Klevens RM, et al. (2007) Invasive methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* infections in the United States, *JAMA* **298**, 1763-1771.
- [12] Kluytmans-VandenBergh MFQ, Kluytmans JAJW (2006) Community-acquired methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*: Current perspectives, *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **12** (Suppl. 1), 9-15.
- [13] Kuehnert MJ, Hill HA, Kupronis BA, Tokars JI, Solomon SL, Jernigan DB (2005) Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* hospitalizations, United States, *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **11**, 868-872.
- [14] Levin BR (2001) Minimizing potential resistance: A population dynamics view, *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **33**, S161-S169.
- [15] MMWR (2003) Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* infections among competitive sports participants-Colorado, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Los Angeles county, 2000-2003, *Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **52**, 793-795.

- [16] Otter JA, French GL (2006) Nosocomial transmission of community-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*: An emerging threat, *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **6**, 753-755.
- [17] Popovich KJ, Weinstein RA, Hota B (2008) Are community-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) strains replacing traditional nosocomial MRSA strains? *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **46**, 795-798.
- [18] Robotham JV, Scarff CA, Jenkins DR, Medley GF (2007) Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) in hospitals and the community: Model predictions based on the UK situation, *J. Hospit. Infect.* **65**(S2), 93-99.
- [19] Saiman L, et al. (2003) Hospital transmission of community-acquired methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* among postpartum women, *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **37**, 1313-1319.
- [20] Smith DL, Dushoff J, Perencevich EN, Harris AD, Levin SA (2004) Persistent colonization and the spread of antibiotic resistance in nosocomial pathogens: Resistance is a regional problem, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **101**, 3709-3714.
- [21] Tristan A, et al. (2006) Global distribution of panton-valentine leukocidin-positive methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **13**, 594-600.
- [22] van den Driessche P, Watmough J (2002) Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission, *Math. Biosci.* **180**, 29-48.
- [23] Zetola N, Francis JS, Nuermberger EL, Bishai WR (2005) Community-acquired methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*: An emerging threat, *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **5**, 275-286.