1	Estimating the Per-Application Effectiveness of Chlorhexidine Gluconate and Mupirocin in
2	Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus Decolonization in Intensive Care Units
3	
4	Eric T. Lofgren PhD ¹ , Matthew Mietchen MPH ¹ , Christopher Short PhD ¹ , Kristen V. Dicks ² ,
5	Rebekah Moehring MD ² , Deverick Anderson MD ² for the CDC MIND-Healthcare Program
6	
7	¹ Paul G. Allen School for Global Animal Health, Washington State University, Pullman, WA
8	² Duke Center for Antimicrobial Stewardship and Infection Prevention, Durham, NC
9	
10	Eric T. Lofgren
11	Paul G. Allen School for Global Animal Health
12	Washington State University
13	240 SE Ott Road, Room 311
14	Pullman, WA 99164-7090
15	
16	Email: <u>Eric.Lofgren@wsu.edu</u>
17	Phone: (509) 335-4022
18	Fax: (509) 335-6328
19	
20	Abbreviated Title: Estimating Per-Application Effectiveness of Chlorhexidine
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

2

26 Abstract

Introduction: Chlorhexidine gluconate and mupirocin are widely used to decolonize patients 27 28 with methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) and reduce risks of infection in 29 hospitalized populations. The probability that a treated patient would be decolonized, which 30 we term per-application effectiveness, is difficult to directly measure. Quantifying the efficacy of per-application effectiveness of CHG and mupirocin is important for studies evaluating 31 32 alternative decolonization strategies or schedules as well as identifying whether there is room 33 for improved decolonizing agents. 34 35 Methods: Using a stochastic compartmental model of an intensive care unit (ICU), the per-36 application effectiveness of chlorhexidine and mupirocin were estimated using approximate 37 Bayesian computation. Extended sensitivity analysis examined the potential impact of a latent 38 period between MRSA colonization and detection, the timing of decolonization administration, 39 and parameter uncertainty.

40

Results: The estimated per-application effectiveness of chlorhexidine was 0.15 (95% Credible
Interval: 0.01, 0.42), while the estimated effectiveness of mupirocin was is 0.15 (95% CI: 0.01,
0.54). A lag in colonization detection markedly reduced both estimates, which were particularly
sensitive to the value to the modeled contact rate between nurses and patients. Gaps longer
than 24-hours in the administration of decolonizing agents still resulted in substantial reduction
of within-ICU MRSA transmission.

47

Discussion: The per-application effectiveness estimates for chlorhexidine and mupirocin suggest there is room for substantial improvement in anti-MRSA disinfectants, either in the compounds themselves, or in their delivery mechanism. Despite these estimates, these agents are robust to delays in administration, which may help in alleviating concerns over patient comfort or toxicity.

53

3

55 Introduction

Despite recent progress in reducing the incidence of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus* 56 57 *aureus* (MRSA) in hospitals¹, it remains a targeted pathogen for infection prevention and public 58 health efforts. One intervention with increasingly widespread use is decolonization of patients 59 with MRSA using chlorhexidine gluconate (CHG) baths for the skin and mupirocin for the nares. While these interventions have shown to be effective in a number of randomized controlled 60 trials², the results from some community-based studies have been more equivocal³. There are 61 62 several possible explanations for this discrepancy. The results from the randomized trials may 63 not generalize well to settings with lower MRSA incidence. Similarly, lower-incidence settings 64 may not be sufficiently powered to detect an effect of implementing decolonization programs. 65 Finally, there may be changes in implementation from the trial setting to everyday use that 66 decreases the overall effect of the intervention. Thus, infection prevention programs considering these strategies in lower incidence settings must justify the cost of the 67 decolonization products and implementation effort in their hospitals. A better understanding of 68 69 effectiveness on the per patient application level may help weigh the implementation costs of 70 these interventions.

71 Evaluating these discrepancies requires a mechanistic understanding of the 72 effectiveness of decolonization – that is, what is the probability, if a patient is treated with a 73 decolonization agent, that they are indeed decolonized? This estimate is essential for a number 74 of potential uses: cost-effectiveness studies, quantifying the impact of a decolonization 75 protocol in conjunction with other interventions, or studying the future impact of changes in 76 effectiveness, due to new technology, emerging resistance to decolonizing agents, or other 77 factors. Obtaining such an estimate empirically, especially in a community setting, would be 78 difficult, requiring intensive and repeated sampling of patients with already complicated clinical 79 cases. Rather than directly measuring the probability of successful decolonization, a 80 mathematical modeling approach can define what probability best supports the results seen in 81 the clinical trials – and with what degree of certainty.

4

The aim of this mathematical modeling study was to estimate the per-application effectiveness of both CHG bathing and CHG bathing in conjunction with mupirocin decolonization of the nares.

85

86 Methods

87 MRSA Transmission Model

We adapted a previously published stochastic compartmental model ^{4,5} of transmission 88 of MRSA through an ICU. The model included compartments for patient colonization status and 89 90 the presence or absence of contamination on the hands or clothing of healthcare workers 91 (HCWs). Patients were modeled as being either presently uncolonized (P_U) or colonized (P_c). 92 were modeled as being either presently uncolonized (P_U) or colonized (P_C), while HCWs were 93 modeled as being either uncontaminated (S_U) or contaminated (S_C) . The model assumed that 94 transmission occurred when a contaminated HCW came into contact with an uncolonized 95 patient, and contamination occurred when an uncontaminated HCW came into contact with a 96 colonized patient (Figure 1). As there is considerable evidence that MRSA can be spread via 97 surface-contamination as well as direct contact⁶, we modeled contact between a patient and an HCW as a direct care task^{7,8} involving either interaction with a patient or their immediate 98 99 surroundings. 100 We simulated an 18-bed closed ICU assumed to be at maximum capacity, with a 1:3

nurse:patient ratio and a single dedicated intensivist. Because an intensive care unit is a highly structured population, this model relaxes the random mixing assumption used in many compartmental models, instead sub-dividing the patient population such that each patient is cared for by a single nurse and that nurse exclusively cares for three patients. While this is a simplification of the structure of an ICU, previous work has shown it to be a more conservative assumption when compared to random mixing⁴. The intensivist was assumed to treat all patients (Figure 2).

This model makes several simplifying assumptions intended to largely mimic the
environment of a hospital with no major outstanding failings in their infection control program.
Patients were assumed to be homogeneous in their risk of MRSA acquisition, and the contact

5

111 frequency between HCWs and patients, while non-random, was uniform (i.e. there are no 112 particularly difficult or contact-intensive patients). Patients were assumed to not interact with 113 each other directly and to be assigned to single-occupancy rooms. Hospitals were assumed to 114 follow standard contact precaution guidelines set forward by the CDC and to detect MRSA 115 colonization with perfect accuracy. Finally, all HCWs were assumed to wash their hands after each direct care task and to change their gloves and/or gowns at a rate equal to when entering 116 117 and exiting the patient room. These assumptions are intended to largely mimic the 118 environment of a hospital with no major outstanding failings in their infection control program. 119

120 Parameterization and Model Calibration

The model largely used parameter values from a previously published model^{4,5}. The values of each parameter in the model, and the source they were drawn from, are detailed in Table 1. The stochastic reaction equations that govern the model and code necessary to run the simulations are available at https://github.com/epimodels/chg_effectiveness. The transition terms are provided in Supplemental Appendix A. Where possible, parameters were drawn from studies from large academic medical centers similar to the ones conducting large RCTs on decolonization protocols.

128

129 Decolonization Intervention Efficacy Estimation

130 In order to estimate the per-application effectiveness of a CHG and/or a CHG-Mupirocin combination intervention, we used a three-step fitting procedure: baseline, intervention 1 (CHG 131 132 baths), and intervention 2 (CHG baths plus nasal mupirocin). First, a baseline model of a pre-133 intervention intensive care unit was fit using a single free parameter, ψ , that governs the 134 probability an uncolonized patient becomes colonized after contact with contaminated 135 healthcare worker. This parameter was tuned such that the model had an average incidence of 5.89 MRSA acquisitions per 1000 patient-days^{5,9}. Second, we introduced a new parameter, δ , to 136 137 represent CHG-based decolonization, when a patient moved patients from a colonized status to 138 an uncolonized status (Intervention 1). This parameter was assumed to result in a 0.748 139 incidence rate ratio compared to the baseline model, in line with a meta-analysis of CHG-only

6

studies by Kim *et al*². Third, a second parameter which moved patients from colonized to
uncolonized, ζ, was fit to represent the addition of nasal decolonization with mupirocin
accompanying a CHG bathing protocol (Intervention 2), resulting in a combined incident rate
ratio of 0.578. This formulation assumes that the effects of CHG and mupirocin are additive and
that there is no synergistic effect between them.

145 Approximate Bayesian Computation (ABC) was used to fit these parameters. Details on ABC for model fitting may be found elsewhere^{10,11}. Briefly, ABC is a computational technique 146 that draws a candidate value from a prior distribution, simulates the model using that value, 147 148 and accepts the candidate value if the simulated result is within an error band around a given summary statistic. In this case, we fit the model to incidence rates corresponding to the 149 150 baseline and the two simulated interventions. The distribution of these accepted values is an 151 approximation of a Bayesian posterior. In this study, all parameters were fit using 1,000,000 152 parameter draws from a uniform prior distribution bounded by 0.0 and 1.0. Candidate 153 parameters were accepted with an error term, $\varepsilon = 0.05$, indicating that the simulated incidence 154 rates had to be within \pm 5% of the target incidence rate on the log scale.

155

156 Sensitivity Analysis

Three separate sensitivity analyses were conducted. The first varied the frequency with which decolonization was applied, comparing a baseline of no decolonization to applications of CHG and mupirocin every 24, 48, 72, 96, and 120 hours to see if a substantial portion of the modeled efficacy is dependent on the typical schedule of a daily CHG bath.

The second was a global sensitivity analysis, simultaneously allowing each parameter to vary uniformly ± 50% of its original value. For each parameter draw, 200 model runs were performed and the joint efficacy of CHG and mupirocin (as a single parameter) was reestimated. This process was repeated 5,000 times, and linear regression was used to estimate the relative impact of a single percentage change in each parameter value on the estimated efficacy.

167 Finally, we conducted a structural sensitivity analysis examining the impact of assuming
 168 – as our model did – that there is no latent period in MRSA colonization, wherein a patient is

7

169 colonized at sub-detectable levels. We added a latent period to our model, wherein patients 170 transitioned from P_s to a new compartment, P_E – representing latent colonization–before finally 171 transitioning to the P_c colonized state. The rate of transition from P_E to P_c varied randomly from 172 one to four days¹². Patients in P_E were assumed not to shed sufficient amounts of MRSA to 173 contaminate healthcare workers. Effectively, this creates a small pool of patients who, despite 174 being decolonized due to treatment, are not recognized as such, as their MRSA acquisition has not yet been detected. The per-application efficacy of CHG and mupirocin were then re-175 176 estimated using the same procedures as the main model.

177

178 Results

179 Per-Application Efficacy of CHG Bathing and CHG-Mupirocin Combinations

180 The estimated per-application efficacy of CHG bathing to induce colonization rates 181 similar to those seen in Kim et al. was 0.15 (95% Credible Interval (CI): 0.01, 0.42), meaning a 182 little under a sixth of all applications of CHG are expected to result in effective decolonization of 183 the patient. Mupirocin had an estimated per-application effectiveness of 0.15 (95% CI: 0.01, 184 0.54). The posterior densities of the efficacy estimates are shown in Figure 3. The addition of a 185 1 to 4-day latent period in between the transmission event and recognized MRSA colonization reduced both efficacy estimates. In this case, CHG and Mupirocin had estimated per-application 186 187 efficacies of 0.11 (95% CI: 0.01, 0.30) and 0.10 (0.004, 0.34) respectively (Figure 3).

188

189 Model Sensitivity to Variation in Timing and Parameter Uncertainty

190 Despite this relatively modest per-application efficacy estimate, the results of the timing 191 sensitivity analysis showed that substantial decreases in MRSA acquisitions can be achieved at 192 much less frequent bathing intervals. Compared to a mean of 1.23 acquisitions per 1,000 193 patient-days in the control scenarios, a bathing protocol administering CHG and mupirocin 194 every 120 hours (5 days) resulted in a mean acquisition rate of 1.03 acquisitions per 1,000 195 patient days, a 16.3% decrease (p > 0.001) (Figure 4). 196 The model's results were most sensitive to the value of ρ_N , the contact rate between

196 The model's results were most sensitive to the value of ρ_N , the contact rate between 197 nurses and patients. A 1% increase in the value of this parameter corresponded to a 0.73%

8

increase in the estimated combined efficacy of CHG and mupirocin (95% CI: 0.71, 0.75). Other sensitive parameters included ψ , the probability of colonization given contact between a contaminated HCW and a patient (0.43% (95% CI: 0.41, 0.44) and v, the proportion of admissions colonized with MRSA (0.37% (95% CI: 0.35, 0.39). The sensitivity estimates for all varied parameters is shown in Figure 5.

203

204 Discussion

Using a mathematical model to translate from population-level effect estimates to a per-application effectiveness estimate, this study suggests that on a per-application basis both CHG and mupirocin are at best mildly effective at decolonizing patients with MRSA. Under ideal circumstances, the combination of the two compounds was estimated to be effective 30% of the time. Under more realistic circumstances where there is some delay and uncertainty between the acquisition and detection of MRSA, either due to biological processes surrounding colonization or laboratory testing, this estimate drops dramatically to 20%.

212 These results should not be taken as a condemnation of the utility of CHG as an option 213 for reducing the transmission of MRSA within hospitals. Rather, it illustrates that even relatively 214 imperfect interventions may still have impact. Further, it suggests that there may be room for 215 substantial further gains by improving the methods by which we decolonize patients. 216 Importantly, this model cannot distinguish whether or not the effectiveness of CHG and 217 mupirocin are due to the compounds themselves or the way in which they are applied. This 218 means that, even in the absence of novel compounds, improvements to the methods of applying CHG and mupirocin may reap considerable benefits^{13,14}. 219

The results of the timing-focused sensitivity analysis show that considerable deviations from an intensive 24-hour decolonization schedule can still result in substantial reductions in the unit-level MRSA acquisition rate. Most healthcare-associated pathogens have relatively low transmissibility^{15–17}, and as such any reduction in the colonization pressure within an ICU, even a modest one, can interrupt delicate transmission chains. This study suggests that deviations from a daily CHG bathing schedule due to concerns over toxicity in pediatric populations, patient-reported skin irritation, or other practical demands are still potentially useful

9

interventions. These results are also potentially useful for future studies, allowing facilities to
estimate the expected impact in their specific settings, allowing for the critical evaluation of
existing studies, and providing clear estimates that can be used to estimate the impact of
resistance to CHG, mupirocin, or both.

231 This study is not without limitations. Broadly, it assumes that the ICU represented in the 232 model, which is meant to represent the type of academic medical center where large-scale 233 intervention trials are most often conducted, is a reasonable representation of the environment 234 in which the studies were actually conducted. The parameter sensitivity analysis shows that the 235 model is most sensitive to errors in the contact rate between nurses and patients. Further, like 236 the meta-analysis by Kim et al. that was used to calibrate the model and estimate the per-237 application effectiveness of CHG and mupirocin, this study assumes that the studies in question, 238 a mix of randomized trials and interrupted time-series studies, were capable of estimating the population-level impact of decolonization without bias. Additionally, this model assumes there 239 is no cumulative benefits to repeated bathing - each application is treated as a separate and 240 241 independent event.

242 Despite these limitations, this study represents an innovative use of mathematical 243 modeling to estimate the effectiveness of a hospital epidemiology intervention using summary 244 statistics to estimate an individual-level effect. In particular, estimating the per-application 245 efficacy of these compounds would be difficult, if not impossible, to directly measure in a working healthcare setting. It shows that there are still substantial prospects for improved 246 247 decolonization interventions to further reduce MRSA rates in the ICU, and that there is room 248 for deviation from intensive daily protocols in response to patient or clinician needs without 249 overly jeopardizing their impact.

250

251 Acknowledgements

252 This work was supported by the CDC Cooperative Agreement RFA-CK-17-001-Modeling

253 Infectious Diseases in Healthcare Program (MInD-Healthcare). We thank the members of the

254 MInD-Healthcare network for their advice and input.

- 255
- 256

10

257 **References**

258 Kourtis AP, Hatfield K, Baggs J, et al. Vital signs: Epidemiology and recent trends in 1. 259 methicillin-resistant and in methicillin-susceptible staphylococcus aureus bloodstream 260 infections - United States. Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2019. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm6809e1 Kim HY, Lee WK, Na S, Roh YH, Shin CS, Kim J. The effects of chlorhexidine gluconate 261 2. bathing on health care-associated infection in intensive care units: A meta-analysis. J Crit 262 *Care*. 2016. doi:10.1016/j.jcrc.2015.11.011 263 264 3. Dicks K V, Lofgren E, Lewis SS, Moehring RW, Sexton DJ, Anderson DJ. A Multicenter 265 Pragmatic Interrupted Time Series Analysis of Chlorhexidine Gluconate Bathing in 266 Community Hospital Intensive Care Units. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. February 267 2016:1-7. doi:10.1017/ice.2016.23 268 4. Mietchen MS, Short CT, Samore M, Lofgren ET. Population Structure Drives Differential 269 Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus Colonization 270 Dynamics. *medRxiv*. January 2019:19002402. doi:10.1101/19002402 271 5. Lofgren ET. Estimating the impact post randomization changes in staff behavior in 272 infection prevention trials: a mathematical modeling approach. BMC Infect Dis. 273 2017;17(1):539. doi:10.1186/s12879-017-2632-1 274 6. Otter JA, Yezli S, Salkeld JAG, French GL. Evidence that contaminated surfaces contribute 275 to the transmission of hospital pathogens and an overview of strategies to address 276 contaminated surfaces in hospital settings. Am J Infect Control. 2013. 277 doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2012.12.004 278 7. Westbrook JI, Duffield C, Li L, Creswick NJ. How much time do nurses have for patients? A 279 longitudinal study quantifying hospital nurses' patterns of task time distribution and interactions with health professionals. BMC Health Serv Res. 2011;11:319. 280 281 doi:10.1186/1472-6963-11-319 282 Ballermann MA, Shaw NT, Mayes DC, Gibney RTN, Westbrook JI. Validation of the Work 8. 283 Observation Method By Activity Timing (WOMBAT) method of conducting time-motion 284 observations in critical care settings: an observational study. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak. 285 2011;11:32. doi:10.1186/1472-6947-11-32

286	9.	Harris AD, Pineles L, Belton B, et al. Universal glove and gown use and acquisition of
287		antibiotic-resistant bacteria in the ICU: a randomized trial. JAMA. 2013;310(15):1571-
288		1580. doi:10.1001/jama.2013.277815
289	10.	Tanaka MM, Francis AR, Luciani F, Sisson SA. Using approximate Bayesian computation to
290		estimate tuberculosis transmission parameters from genotype data. Genetics. 2006.
291		http://www.genetics.org/content/173/3/1511.short.
292	11.	Sunnåker M, Busetto AG, Numminen E. Approximate bayesian computation. PLoS
293		Comput 2013.
294		http://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002803.
295	12.	Dancer SJ, Coyne M, Speekenbrink A, Samavedam S, Kennedy J, Wallace PGM. MRSA
296		acquisition in an intensive care unit. Am J Infect Control. 2006.
297		doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2005.08.009
298	13.	Rhee Y, Palmer LJ, Okamoto K, et al. Differential Effects of Chlorhexidine Skin Cleansing
299		Methods on Residual Chlorhexidine Skin Concentrations and Bacterial Recovery. Infect
300		Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2018. doi:10.1017/ice.2017.312
301	14.	Ryder M. Evaluation of Chlorhexidine Gluconate (CHG) Delivered to the Skin Following
302		Standard Pre-Op Prepping Protocols of 4% CHG Solution Versus No-Rinse 2% CHG Cloth.
303		Am J Infect Control. 2007. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2007.04.016
304	15.	Cooper BS, Medley GF, Stone SP, et al. Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus in
305		hospitals and the community: Stealth dynamics and control catastrophes. Proc Natl Acad
306		Sci U S A. 2004. doi:10.1073/pnas.0401324101
307	16.	Prosperi M, Veras N, Azarian T, et al. Molecular epidemiology of community-associated
308		Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus in the genomic era: A cross-sectional study.
309		Sci Rep. 2013. doi:10.1038/srep01902
310	17.	Batina NG, Crnich CJ, Anderson DF, Döpfer D. Identifyingconditions for elimination and
311		epidemic potential of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus in nursing homes.
312		Antimicrob Resist Infect Control. 2016. doi:10.1186/s13756-016-0130-7

- 313 18. Lofgren ET, Moehring RW, Anderson DJ, Weber DJ, Fefferman NH. A Mathematical
- 314 Model to Evaluate the Routine Use of Fecal Microbiota Transplantation to Prevent

- 315 Incident and Recurrent Clostridium difficile Infection. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*.
- 316 2014;35(1):18-27. doi:10.1086/674394
- 317 19. Austin DJ, Anderson RM. Studies of antibiotic resistance within the patient, hospitals and
- 318 the community using simple mathematical models. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*.
- 319 1999;354(1384):721-738. doi:10.1098/rstb.1999.0425
- 320 20. Sickbert-Bennett EE, Weber DJ. Comparative efficacy of hand hygiene agents in the
- 321 reduction of bacteria and viruses. *Am J* 2005.
- 322 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0196655304005875.
- 323 21. Khader K, Thomas A, Huskins WC, et al. A dynamic transmission model to evaluate the
- 324 effectiveness of infection control strategies. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 2017.
- 325 doi:10.1093/oid/ofw247
- 326



329

328

Figure 1. Schematic representation of the compartmental flow of a mathematical model of

331 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) acquisition and CHG/mupirocin

decolonization. Solid arrows indicate possible transition states, while dashed arrows indicate

potential routes of MRSA contamination or colonization. Nurses and doctors are classified as

uncontaminated (NU or DU) and contaminated (NC and DC), while patients are classified as

uncolonized (PU) or colonized (PC). Figure by Eric Lofgren is licensed under CC BY 4.0.



- 337
- 338 Figure 2. Schematic representation of a structured intensive care unit population to model
- 339 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) acquisition and CHG/mupirocin
- 340 decolonization. Patients (blue) are treated by a single assigned nurse (orange). A single
- intensivist (red) randomly treats all patients. Figure by Eric Lofgren is licensed under CC BY 4.0.
- 342





343

344 **Figure 3.** Approximate Bayesian Posterior Estimates for Per-Application Chlorhexidine

345 Gluconate (delta) and Mupirocin (zeta) Effectiveness. Each panel shows the density of accepted

values (dark line) and the median of this density (dotted line). Densities were estimated using a

normal kernel. Left-hand panels show the estimates assuming acquisition is instantly detected,

348 while the right-hand panels show the estimates assuming there is a one to four-day latent

- 349 period where a patient may be colonized (and decolonized) but their acquisition is not yet 350 detected.
- 351



352

353 Figure 4. Violin plot of the Sensitivity of Decolonization Protocols to Changes in Timing. Each

354 'violin' shows a smoothed kernel-density estimate of 1,000 runs of the model with a given

timing for the administration of decolonizing baths, in acquisitions per 1,000 patient-days.

356 Solid, black, horizontal bars indicate the mean estimate for each scenario.





358

359 **Figure 5.** Global sensitivity of a mathematical model of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*

360 *aureus* (MRSA) acquisition and CHG/mupirocin decolonization. Horizontal bars represent the

361 change in the estimated effectiveness of CHG/mupirocin decolonization per one-percent

362 change in the value of a specific parameter, with light bars indicating increased estimated

363 effectiveness and dark bars indicating decreased estimated effectiveness.

365 **Table 1.**

Parameter	Parameter Description	Parameter Value	Source(s)
ρ	Contact rate between patients and HCWs	4.154 (# of direct care tasks/hour)	7,18
ρ _Ν	Contact rate between patients and nurses	3.973 (# of nurse direct care tasks/hour)	7,18
ρ _D	Contact rate between patients and physician	0.181 (# of physician direct care tasks/hour)	7,18
σ	Probability that a HCW's hands are contaminated from a single contact with a colonized patient	0.054	19
Ψ	Probability of successful colonization of an uncolonized patient due to contact with a contaminated HCW in metapopulation structure	0.4481	Fitted to 9
θ	Probability of discharge	4.39 days ⁻¹	9
ν_{u}	Proportion of admissions uncolonized with MRSA	0.9221	9
ν _c	Proportion of admissions colonized with MRSA	0.0779	9
l	Effective hand-decontaminations/hour (direct care tasks × hand hygiene compliance × efficacy)	5.740 (10.682 direct care tasks/hour × 56.55% compliance × ~ 95% efficacy)	7,9,18,20
۱N	Effective nurse hand-decontaminations/hour	6.404 (11.92 direct care tasks/hour × 56.55% compliance × ~ 95% efficacy)	7,9,18,20
ι _D	Effective physician hand- decontaminations/hour	1.748 (3.253 direct care tasks/hour × 56.55% compliance × ~ 95% efficacy)	7,9,18,20
τ	Effective gown or glove changes/hour $(2 \times \# \text{ of visits} \times \text{ compliance})$	2.445 (2.957 changes/hour × 82.66% compliance)	8,9,19
τ _N	Effective nurse gown or glove changes/hour	2.728 (3.30 changes/hour × 82.66% compliance)	8,9,19
τ _D	Effective physician gown or glove changes/hour	0.744 (0.90 changes/hour × 82.66% compliance)	8,9,19
μ	Natural decolonization rate	20.0 days ⁻¹	21
δ	Per-application Effectiveness of CHG	Estimated	
ζ	Per-application Effectiveness of CHG + Mupirocin	Estimated	
η	Decolonization application frequency	24.0 hours ⁻¹	