

# Modelling diverse sources of *Clostridium difficile* in the community: importance of animals, infants and asymptomatic carriers

Angus McLure<sup>1\*</sup>, Archie C. A. Clements<sup>1†</sup>, Martyn Kirk<sup>1</sup>, Kathryn Glass<sup>1</sup>

**Affiliations:** <sup>1</sup>Research School of Population Health, Australian National University, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia

**\*Corresponding author:** 62 Mills Road  
2601, ACT, Australia  
angus.mclure@anu.edu.au

**†Present address/affiliation:** Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia, Australia

## Abstract

*Clostridium difficile* infections (CDIs) affect patients in hospitals and in the community, but the relative importance of transmission in each setting is unknown. We developed a mathematical model of *C. difficile* transmission in a hospital and surrounding community that included infants, adults, and transmission from animal reservoirs. We assessed the role of these transmission routes in maintaining disease and evaluated the recommended classification system for hospital and community-acquired CDIs. The reproduction number in the hospital was  $<1$  (range: 0.16-0.46) for all scenarios. Outside the hospital, the reproduction number was  $>1$  for nearly all scenarios without transmission from animal reservoirs (range: 1.0-1.34). However, the reproduction number for the human population was  $<1$  if a minority ( $>3.5$ -26.0%) of human exposures originated from animal reservoirs. Symptomatic adults accounted for  $<10\%$  transmission in the community. Under conservative assumptions, infants accounted for 17% of community transmission. An estimated 33-40% of community-acquired cases were reported but 28-39% of these reported cases were misclassified as hospital-acquired by recommended definitions. Transmission could be plausibly sustained by asymptomatically colonized adults and infants in the community or exposure to animal reservoirs, but not hospital transmission alone. Underreporting of community-onset cases and systematic misclassification underplays the role of community transmission.

**Keywords:** *Clostridium difficile*; mathematical disease model; hospital-acquired infection; community-acquired infection; zoonotic infection;

## Introduction

*Clostridium difficile* is an emerging pathogen that causes potentially life-threatening diarrhoea and is increasing in burden in many parts of the world [1–3]. In the United States it caused an estimated 453,000 infections and contributed to 29,300 deaths in 2011 [3]. *C. difficile* infections (CDIs) are common in healthcare facilities where they account for 71% of hospital-associated gastrointestinal infections [4], but there is increasing recognition of community-acquired cases and healthcare-acquired cases with onset of symptoms in the community [3]. It is likely that many CDIs in the community go unreported, either because affected people do not seek treatment [5], do not submit a stool sample when they seek treatment [5] or their stool sample is not tested for *C. difficile* when submitted [6]. However, the extent of underreporting has not known.

Colonised infants [7–10], contaminated food [11] and animals reservoirs [12] have been identified as possible sources of *C. difficile* outside hospitals, however their contribution to transmission has not been well quantified. Infants have much higher prevalence of colonisation than adults [13], can be colonised for over six months by a single strain [7], and rarely develop symptoms but shed the same density of spores in their faeces as adults with CDI [8]. However, existing models of *C. difficile* do not capture infant colonisation or their potential role in transmission. Toxigenic *C. difficile* isolated from livestock, meat and fresh produce contaminated by animal faeces are closely related to those that cause disease in

humans [11,12]. However, the proportion of human cases that are acquired from food or animals, and the ramifications for disease control are unknown.

The Infectious Disease Society of America (IDSA) and the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology America (SHEA) recommend that CDI cases be classified as community-acquired or hospital-acquired according to time between onset of symptoms and most recent hospital admission or discharge [14]. Though the recommended system is not evidence-based [14], the system and minor variants are widely used to estimate the incidence of hospital and community acquired cases in the US and many other countries [2,3,15,16]. The recommended classification system has been shown to incorrectly classify many CDIs amongst hospitalised patients, underestimating the proportion of cases acquired prior to hospitalisation [17]. However, there has been no published assessment of the full classification system as applied to hospital-onset and community-onset cases.

Despite the importance of the community as both a source of new infections and the location of onset for some healthcare-associated infections, there is to date only one published model of *C. difficile* transmission that explicitly models patients outside hospitals [18]. The same model estimates an upper bound to the transmission from food and animals, but does not explore the consequences of animal exposure as a source of *C. difficile* transmission. There have been no models that include the potentially important role of infants. We developed a model of *C. difficile* transmission in hospitals and communities to explore the contributions of hospitals, communities, adults, infants, animals and food to the transmission of *C. difficile* in human populations. We also estimated the extent of underreporting in the community and assessed the commonly used definitions of hospital and community-acquired CDI.

## Methods

### Model Structure

We adapted a compartmental model of *Clostridium difficile* transmission in hospitals [19], to model transmission in a hospital and the surrounding community, adding treatment seeking, compartments for infants, demographic processes, waning immunity and transmission from animal reservoirs. The model of the adult population had the same structure in both the hospital and community, with adults distributed amongst different compartments according to their immunity to *C. difficile* toxins, *C. difficile* colonisation state and the state of their gut flora. However, antibiotic prescription rates and treatment seeking behaviour differed between the hospital and community and infants were only modelled in the community. The structure is summarised in **Figure 1** and **Supp. Figure 1**.

The adult population had three immune statuses: able to mount an effective immune response to *C. difficile* toxins conferring resistance or immunity to symptoms but not colonisation; naive to *C. difficile* toxins but with a healthy immune system; and unable to mount an effective immune response to *C. difficile* toxins because of advanced age or a suppressed immune system. Immunity could be conferred to any non-suppressed adult by either extended asymptomatic carriage or recovery from CDI. Any immune person could have their immunity wane when they are not colonised and any non-suppressed individual (including infants) could age to become suppressed.

There were two possible commensal gut flora statuses for adults: disrupted and not disrupted. There were four possible *C. difficile* statuses: free of *C. difficile*, colonised, *C. difficile* overgrowth without treatment and *C. difficile* overgrowth with treatment. An individual could have almost any combination of gut flora and *C. difficile* statuses, but we assumed that *C. difficile* overgrowth could only occur in individuals with disrupted gut flora. Both symptomatic and asymptomatic individuals shed spores and so were infectious [20]. Spore shedding has been observed to increase before toxin production [21], but decrease during *C. difficile* treatment [22]. Therefore, asymptomatically colonised individuals with disrupted gut flora and individuals with overgrowth were equally infectious, patients receiving treatment had reduced infectiousness determined by the effectiveness and coverage of contact precautions [19] and colonised patients with intact gut flora transmitted at a reduced rate.

Since CDI is only rarely observed in infants and antibiotics do not predispose infants to carriage [10], the model for infants was much simpler than for adults, consisting of only three compartments. At birth, infants were not colonised [8,9] and did not have immunity [23]. As with adults, colonisation conferred immunity, but for simplicity we assumed this occurred immediately so there was no colonised-but-not-immune class for infants. Infants could clear their colonisation [8,9]. Infants aged by entering the corresponding adult class with intact gut flora that shared the same colonisation and immune states.

### Model Parameterisation

Many of the parameters used in this model were based on our previous model of *C. difficile* transmission in hospitals [19] and/or drawn from the literature [1,21,24–39] (**Supp. Table 1**). Eight parameters were fitted to data. The likelihood function used to fit the model was composed from data for the prevalence of colonisation [9] and immunity [23] at given ages, longitudinal infant colonisation [8,9], the proportion of hospital admissions with CDI as the primary diagnosis [40] and the incidence of reported hospital and community-acquired cases [3]. The reported estimates of the prevalence of toxigenic colonisation in the general adult population vary considerably between settings and studies and are typically based on small sample sizes [13]. Therefore we considered multiple scenarios each assuming that colonisation prevalence was in the range 2%-10%, with a default of 5%. We determined the values of the eight parameters that (A) ensured that a predetermined proportion (in the range 2-10%) of the general adult population was colonised and (B) maximised the model likelihood. This was repeated for a range of values of the colonisation prevalence in the general adult population. See supplementary materials for details of all parameters and how they were estimated.

### Transmission from Infants

Despite their high carriage rates, there is little research on the contribution of infants to *C. difficile* transmission. Furthermore, the relative infectiousness of infants and adults in the community cannot be determined using our model and available data. It has been shown that the mean density of *C. difficile* per gram of stool is similar for asymptomatically colonised infants and adults with CDI [8]. However, since adults with diarrhoea produce much more stool than healthy infants and have a larger contact network, infants may be less infectious. On the other hand, differences in hygiene practices and the way faeces are disposed may increase the infectiousness of infants. In a preliminary analysis, model fit was poor and/or the proportion of transmission from infants implausibly high in scenarios where

infant infectiousness exceeded that of symptomatic adults. Therefore we considered relative infant infectiousness in the range 0-1 for our sensitivity analysis with 0.5 as conservative default assumption.

### Accounting for Underreporting and Misclassification of CDIs

To fit our model to incidence estimates for CDI [3] we simulated the processes of treatment seeking, reporting and the classification of cases as hospital or community-acquired. We assumed that, as with other diarrheal diseases, some patients recover from CDI without seeking treatment [27], by modelling treatment seeking in the community and recovery as competing hazards (see sup. materials for details). To account the low testing rate for diarrhoea in general [5,27] and community-onset CDI in particular [6], we estimated the proportion,  $p_{\text{Report}}$ , of cases seeking treatment in the community that were identified, allowing us to compare model outputs to published estimates of disease burden based on notification data [3].

The Infectious Disease Society of America (IDSA) and Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America (SHEA) recommend surveillance definitions that classify where a CDI was acquired by location of onset of symptoms (healthcare facility or community) and by time since the most recent hospital discharge or admission [14] (**Figure 2**). Lessa et al. [3] employed a variant of these definitions to estimate the incidence of initial (i.e. non-recurrent) hospital and community acquired CDIs in the USA (**Figure 2**). We therefore emulated this classification system to fit our model to the incidence of hospital and community-acquired CDIs reported by Lessa et al (see supplementary materials for further details).

To determine the true origin of an infection in our model, we subdivided each *C. difficile* positive compartment into hospital-acquired and community-acquired compartments, allowing us to track where infection was acquired. We assumed that current hospital-acquired colonisation prevented community-acquired colonisation and vice versa. For each set of surveillance definitions, we calculated the sensitivity and precision to identify hospital and community-acquired cases amongst both hospital-onset and reported community-onset cases, using the true origin of infection in our model as a gold standard. We identified cut-offs which improved on the existing definitions amongst reported cases, considering classification systems with a single cut-off for time since hospital admission and a single cut-off for time since most recent hospital discharge (i.e. classifying no cases as indeterminate). The *balanced* pair of cut-offs had equal sensitivity to identify hospital and community-acquired cases amongst both hospital-onset cases and community-onset cases. The *optimal* pair of cut-offs had equal precision and sensitivity when identifying hospital-acquired cases, amongst both hospital-onset and community-onset cases.

### Reproduction Number

Since the extent of human exposure to animal reservoirs of *C. difficile* is unknown, we calculated reproduction numbers assuming that all exposure was due to person-to-person transmission – an upper bound for the true reproduction number. We calculated a reproduction number for the whole population, and for the community and the hospital individually. The latter calculations were identical to standard next generation matrix calculations [41], except we only considered the colonised individuals in the setting of interest to be colonised for the purposes of the calculation. The reproduction numbers for

hospital and community were the endemic threshold parameters in each setting assuming no external sources of *C. difficile* (movement of patients or animal reservoir).

### Zoonotic and Food-Driven Transmission

The extent of zoonotic or foodborne *C. difficile* exposure is unknown, however we considered the implications of differing amounts transmission from animal reservoirs. For a given force of colonisation, higher human exposure from food or animals implies less person-to-person transmission, and therefore a smaller reproduction number. If a sufficient proportion of exposure originates from food or animals, the reproduction number in the human population is less than one and human disease is sustained by constant exposure to non-human sources of *C. difficile*. In this case we say that *C. difficile* is *animal-driven*.

For each set of modelling assumptions, we calculated the extent of foodborne exposure that implied *C. difficile* was animal-driven. We expressed this *animal-driven threshold* in terms of exposures leading to colonisations per person per year, and as a proportion of all transmission (i.e. foodborne transmission *and* person-to-person transmission).

## Results

### Model Fit

The model fitted the data well, reproducing the observed age profile of colonisation, immunity, reported incidence of infection, and proportion of admissions for CDI (**Supp. Figure 2**). For most scenarios, infant infectiousness did not affect model fit. However the model fit was poor for combinations of low colonisation prevalence amongst adults and high infant infectiousness, and so these scenarios were not considered further. The model was verified by outcomes not used to fit the model such as recurrence proportion for hospital and community cases, the proportion of hospital-based transmission attributable to symptomatic carriers, the duration of colonisation in infants, and the greater proportion of elderly and immune suppressed in hospital-acquired vs community-acquired cases (See supplementary materials for details). In our model, colonisation prevalence was 17% higher (range: 4-55%) at hospital discharge than in the general adult population, agreeing with the common observation that colonisation is more common among those who have been recently discharged from hospital. However, 78% (range: 60-87%) of colonised discharges had acquired the pathogen in the community prior to admission and remained colonised for the duration of their hospital stay. We estimated a mean immune period of 9.4 years (range: 4.0-30.4 years) with the longest immune period when we assumed adult colonisation prevalence was low (2%).

## Reproduction Number and Food-Driven Threshold

Under the assumption of no foodborne transmission, the reproduction number for the whole population was greater than one for all plausible assumptions (default: 1.11 range: 1.03-1.35) (**Figure 3a**). The reproduction number for the hospital was less than one for all plausible assumptions (default: 0.28, range: 0.16-0.46), decreasing with increasing colonisation prevalence of adults in the community and unaffected by assumptions concerning the infectiousness of infants (**Figure 3c**). The reproduction number for the community was close to but lower than reproduction number for the whole population (default: 1.09, range: 0.999-1.34) (**Figure 3b**), and increased with increasing infant infectiousness. The reproduction number was less than one in the community only if infants were not infectious and adult colonisation prevalence was 2%.

The animal-driven threshold (the minimum force of colonisation attributable to food and animals that implies the reproduction number in the human population is less than 1), was 0.046 exposures per person per year (range: 0.006-0.107) or 10.6% of all transmission in the community (range: 3.5-26.0%) (**Figure 4**). This is equivalent to one foodborne or animal exposure leading to colonisation every 21.7 years per person (range 9.4-175.5 years). The food/animal-driven threshold was lowest (once every 175.5 years per person) where infants were not infectious and adult colonisation prevalence was low (2%), and highest (once every 9.4 years per person) where infants were as infectious as adults and adult colonisation prevalence was high (10%). The model had poor model fit at the animal-driven threshold when infant infectiousness was high and adult colonisation prevalence was low.

## Transmission from Infants and Asymptomatic Adults with Intact Gut Flora

In our main analysis, 13-30% of transmission in hospitals was from patients receiving treatment for CDI, but less <10% of all transmission in the community was attributable to symptomatic patients or patients with disrupted gut flora. The remaining transmission was attributable to infants or asymptotically colonised adults with intact gut flora. The proportion of transmission in the community attributable to infants was 17.4% for our conservative default scenario but was highly sensitive to the relative infectiousness of infants and colonisation prevalence in adults (**Supp. Figure 3**). With infants as infectious as symptomatic adults and adult colonisation prevalence in the community at  $\leq 5\%$ ,  $\geq 40\%$  of transmission in the community was attributable to infants. The proportion of transmission attributable to asymptotically colonised individuals with intact gut flora was also highly sensitive to these assumptions (**Supp. Figure 4**). Under default assumptions, this group accounted for 79% of transmission in the community and 25% of transmission in the hospital, but  $\geq 90\%$  of transmission in the community if colonisation prevalence was 10% amongst adults in the community. Patients with CDI and colonised individuals with disrupted gut flora were 6.6 times more infectious (range: 2.8-131.8) than colonised individuals with intact gut flora, but were much less numerous, especially in the community where the antibiotic prescription rate was low. Infants cleared their colonisation 9.2-11.5 times more slowly than adults with intact gut flora. Under most scenarios, infants were also more exposed or susceptible to colonisation (default: factor of 1.4; range: 0.6-4.4) and more infectious (default: factor of 3.3; range: 0-9.8) than asymptomatic adults with intact gut flora (compare **Table 1** and **Supp. Table 1**).

## Underreporting and Misclassification of CDIs

Though we estimated that patients with CDI were admitted to hospital at 59 (range: 53-73) times the rate of the general adult population (**Table 1**), only 48% of adults with community-onset CDIs sought treatment in the community or hospital (**Table 2**) and only 63% (range 56-76%) of CDIs treated in the community were reported (**Table 1**). Therefore, while we assume that 100% of symptomatic hospital-onset infections were reported, we estimate that only 30% (range 27-37%) of all community-onset CDIs were reported. Considering both hospital and community-onset CDIs, only 67% (range 66-70%) of all hospital-acquired CDIs and 35% (range 33-40%) of all community-acquired cases were reported (**Table 2**).

Standard CDI classification schemes misclassified many of the reported community-acquired cases as hospital-acquired in our model: 63% (range: 43-76%) of cases classified as hospital-acquired with the IDSA/SHEA scheme were actually community-acquired (**Table 2**). The classification systems were much more precise but less sensitive for community-acquired cases (**Table 2**). Though total incidence was under-estimated due to under-reporting, the proportion of reported cases that were hospital acquired was over-estimated with both classification schemes (**Figure 5**). A 7.4-day cut-off (range: 5.0-9.5) for recent hospital admission (in hospital-onset cases) and a 2.1-day cut-off (range: 1.3-3.9) for prior hospital discharge were the optimal pair of cut-offs. A 6.6-day cut-off (range: 5.8-7.0) for recent hospital admission and a 12.5-day cut-off (range: 11.8-14.5) for prior hospital discharge were the balanced pair of cut-offs. The optimal cut-off correctly estimated the proportion of cases that were hospital or community acquired, but had poor precision (~50%) to identify hospital-acquired cases (**Figure 5**).

## Discussion

Under all reasonable scenarios and modelling assumptions, transmission between hospitalised adults amplified disease burden (higher force of colonisation and higher colonisation proportion in discharged patients than the general population) but was not the key driver of transmission in the population (hospital reproduction number less than one), in agreement with previous modelling studies [19,42]. When we simultaneously assumed low colonisation prevalence in adults, no infant infectiousness and no transmission from non-human sources, the reproduction number in the community was also less than one. In this unlikely scenario, the movement of colonised individuals between hospital and community was essential for persistence of *C. difficile* in both settings. However, in all other scenarios without transmission from non-human sources, the reproduction number was greater than one in the community, and therefore transmission in the community would persist even in the absence of transmission in hospitals. This is the first time reproduction numbers have been estimated for *C. difficile* in a model including both the hospital and the community.

Symptomatic carriers of *C. difficile* accounted for less than ten per cent of transmission in the community in our model. Despite accounting for less than two per cent of the total population, infants accounted for 17% of transmission in the community for our conservative default assumptions, and  $\geq 40\%$  of transmission if infants were at least as infectious as symptomatic adults and colonisation prevalence was up to five per cent in the community. However, the exact proportion was highly sensitive to the relative



infectiousness of infants (which has not been well quantified) and the colonisation prevalence in adults in the community (which varies considerably between studies and settings [13]). Nevertheless, our results indicate that asymptotically colonised infants are likely to be a substantial source of transmission in the community. This is in agreement with a number of small studies that found CDI was associated with exposure to infants [43,44] and a large study that, despite sampling only 1% of infants in Oxfordshire, was able to determine that 2% of all known CDIs in Oxfordshire could be reasonably attributed to recent direct or indirect transmission from these infants [45].

We investigated how transmission from non-human sources affected estimates of the reproduction number for person-to-person transmission. We demonstrated that the reproduction number in the human population was less than one if over 3.5-26.0% of transmission in the community was from non-human sources such as food or water contaminated by livestock animals. If current transmission from animals is above this threshold, *C. difficile* could not persist in the human population without these non-human exposures. This animal-driven threshold in terms of *C. difficile* exposures per person per year was remarkably low: equivalent to one exposure leading to colonisation per adult every 21.7 years under our default assumptions. For comparison, it has been estimated that Australians have an episode of foodborne gastroenteritis (i.e. not counting asymptomatic exposure) on average once every five years [46]. Given the similarity of strains in animals and humans [12] and the presence of *C. difficile* spores on a wide range of foods [11], it is plausible that exposure exceeds this low threshold.

We estimate that approximately 70% of community-onset cases are not reported, either because the patient does not seek treatment, or the pathogen remains unidentified. This is in agreement with the low treatment-seeking rates reported generally for diarrhoea [5,27], and low testing rates for *C. difficile* in primary care [6]. Because community-onset cases were more likely to be community-acquired this inflated the proportion of cases that appear to be hospital-acquired. This complements research that has found that missed cases of CDI in hospital settings are disproportionately likely to be community-acquired [47]. Standard classification schemes [3,14] overestimate the proportion of cases that are hospital-acquired, misclassifying many community-acquired cases as hospital-acquired. As most hospital stays are short and colonisation can be long lasting, most patients that were colonised at discharge in our model were exposed in the community prior to admission. Therefore, even CDIs in those who have just been discharged are likely to be community-acquired and any scheme based on time since most recent hospital discharge cannot adequately distinguish hospital and community-acquired cases. Even the schemes we identified that reduced this misclassification still had very poor precision for hospital-acquired cases, with half or more of all cases classified as hospital-acquired being incorrectly classified community-acquired cases. The classification scheme recommended by IDSA and SHEA had very high sensitivity for hospital-acquired cases, so may be useful if all hospital-acquired cases need to be identified or excluded.

Our study has several limitations. The data used to fit the model were incomplete and were gathered from many different sources, countries and settings. We addressed this by considering a range of scenarios that reflected the diversity of colonisation prevalence. Nearly all people with CDI received healthcare soon before onset of symptoms if outpatient and primary care are included [3]. This does not imply that most CDIs are healthcare

acquired, since antibiotic exposure is a causative factor for CDI and antibiotics are prescription-only medicines in many countries. However, we were unable to model pathogen acquisition from other sources of healthcare, because the hospital in our model consisted only of admitted patients, with the community including patients receiving all other forms of healthcare (including residents of long-term care facilities). Long-term care facilities contain sub-populations of individuals at high risk for CDI [3]. As we have not modelled long-term care facilities separately, we are likely to have underestimated the heterogeneity and thus the reproduction number in the community. The model population is well mixed and does not capture heterogeneity in the contact rates of infants, adults and the elderly, or hospital admission rates, which may also affect reproduction number estimates. Finally, we did not differentiate between the many strains of *C. difficile* [48], so it is possible the hospital reproduction numbers, community reproduction numbers and animal-driven thresholds differ by strain.

Under-reporting of community onset CDIs and the misclassification of many community-acquired infections obscure and underestimate the extent of transmission in the community. It seems likely that unreported community-onset cases will be less severe while the classification (or misclassification) of individual cases as hospital-acquired or community-acquired will not affect the treatment or outcomes of patients. Therefore, at the level of individual cases, even large-scale under-reporting and misclassification may not be very harmful if those with severe disease receive appropriate care. However, to prevent infections we must understand when, where and how transmission occurs at the level of the population. We have demonstrated that most infections (hospital-onset and community-onset alike) are acquired outside of hospitals, but only a small fraction are reported. Therefore, interventions that prevent acquisition outside hospitals, or prevent patients admitted with asymptomatic colonisation from developing symptoms should be considered and assessed. Merely reducing transmission between hospitalised patients will not be sufficient to prevent the spread of this important pathogen. Further investigation into the relative infectiousness of infants is required before the proportion of transmission from infants can be estimated. However, we have demonstrated that a high degree of transmission from infants is consistent with available data on spore shedding [8] and colonisation prevalence [8,9]. Similarly, though the frequency of food and animal-to-human transmission is unknown for *C. difficile*, we have demonstrated that even very modest and plausible frequencies of exposure may imply that *C. difficile* is sustained in human populations by transmission from animals or contaminated food. If this is the case, *C. difficile* can be eradicated from the human population if and only if animal-to-human transmission is reduced.

## Competing Interests

Declarations of interest: none

## Funding

This work was supported by an Australian National Health and Medical Council Senior Research Fellowship [#1058878 to A.C.A.C.] and an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship to A.M.

## Author Contributions

AM extended an existing model framework to include community, infants and animals; extended the existing method of assessing classification definitions to the new model; conceived the animal-driven threshold; estimated model parameters; produced numerical results and figures and drafted the manuscript. KG contributed to designing the model and parameter estimation. All authors contributed to the interpretation of the results and writing the manuscript. All authors gave final approval for publication.


## Tables and Figures

**Table 1** Definitions, values and references for all parameters fitted with the model. The remaining parameters can be found in **Supp. Table 1**. All rates are in units of  $day^{-1}$ . †Only these parameters were affected by assumptions around infant infectiousness, being estimated under the assumption that  $\beta_{Infant} = k \times \beta_{Disrupt}$  for  $k$  in the range 0-1.

Parameter	Description	Value (Sensitivity Analysis Range)
$\sigma$	Rate at which immunity wanes	$2.9 \times 10^{-4}$ ( $0.9-6.9 \times 10^{-4}$ )
$\vartheta$	Multiplicative factor for colonisation susceptibility of infants	1.4 (0.6-4.4)
$\gamma_{infant}$	Rate at which <i>C. difficile</i> is cleared in infants	$2.0 \times 10^{-3}$ ( $2.0-2.5 \times 10^{-3}$ )
$\rho_{disrupt}$	Proportion of antibiotics that disrupt gut flora	0.22 (0.12-0.48)
$\rho_{report}$	Proportion of all community-treated CDIs that are reported	0.63 (0.57-0.76)
$\nu_{CDI}$	Hospital admission rate for CDI	$1.4 \times 10^{-2}$ ( $1.3-1.7 \times 10^{-2}$ )
$\beta_{Disrupt}$	Transmission rate coefficient for colonised adults with disrupted gut flora (due to recent antibiotic exposure)	$12.8 \times 10^{-2}$ ( $7.1-17.4 \times 10^{-2}$ )†
$\beta_{Intact}$	Transmission rate coefficient for colonised adults with intact gut flora (no recent antibiotic exposure)	$1.9 \times 10^{-2}$ ( $0.1-2.6 \times 10^{-2}$ )†
$\beta_{infant}$	Transmission rate coefficient from infants	$6.4 \times 10^{-2}$ ( $0-17.4 \times 10^{-2}$ )†


**Table 2** Simulated under-reporting and misclassification of CDIs emulating two different classification schemes. The range in parenthesis is the range across all scenarios. Classification sensitivity is amongst reported cases only thus multiplying by the reported proportion will return the sensitivity amongst all cases. HA = hospital-acquired, CA = community-acquired, HO = hospital-onset, CO= community-onset.

	Reported %	Lessa et al. classification		IDSA/SHEA recommendations	
		Precision %	Sensitivity %	Precision %	Sensitivity %
All HA	67 (66-70)	34 (22-53)	94 (93-95)	37 (24-57)	97 (96-97)
All CA	35 (33-40)	99 (97-99)	68 (64-74)	99 (99-100)	65 (61-72)
HO-HA	100	46 (31-67)	93 (91-94)	44 (29-65)	97 (96-97)
HO-CA	100	85 (70-92)	27 (25-33)	89 (77-94)	15 (14-19)
CO-HA	31 (28-37)	18 (11-33)	99 (99-99)	24 (15-42)	96 (95-97)
CO-CA	30 (27-36)	>99.8	78 (76-81)	>99.8	78 (76-81)




**Figure 1** Model structure showing including colonisation, gut flora status, symptoms and treatment. Adults in the immune classes do not have symptoms and therefore not all individuals with overgrowth seek or receive treatment (dashed arrows and box). The details for infants, immunity, demographics and hospital-community structure are summarised in **Supp. Figure 1**. The definitions and values of the parameters associated with each transition can be found in **Supp. Table 1**.  $\dagger$ The force of colonisation depends in the number and type of infectious individuals in the same setting (hospital or community).


### Community-onset cases




### Hospital-onset cases



**Figure 2** The classification of CDI cases based on IDSA and SHEA surveillance recommendations that we assessed with our model. Lessa et al used a similar classification scheme to estimate incidence in the USA. \*Lessa et al used a 12-week cut-off and therefore do not classify any cases as ‘Indeterminate’. ‡Lessa et al used a 3-day cut-off. †We used symptom onset or hospital admission as reference points in our simulations. However the classification system recommended by IDSA and SHEA uses onset of symptoms as the reference point for all cut-offs. Our classification is otherwise identical. Lessa et al used date of positive faecal sample as reference point.




**Figure 3** The reproduction number at the disease-free equilibrium for various plausible assumptions for the colonization prevalence in adults and relative infectiousness of infants for (A) the whole population, (B) the community only and (C) the hospital only. The model had poorer model fit for the combination of high infant infectiousness and low adult colonization prevalence, so these combinations are omitted.



**Figure 4** The food-driven threshold under various plausible assumptions for the *C. difficile* colonisation prevalence in adults, and the relative infectiousness of infants as (A) a proportion of all transmission in the community and (B) as rate of exposure to adults in the community. The reproduction number is less than 1 in the community if transmission from food exceeds the food-driven threshold. The model had poorer model fit at the food-driven threshold for the combination of high infant infectiousness and low adult colonisation prevalence.





**Figure 5** Classification of the origin of reported CDIs by time since hospital discharge or admission, comparing the actual incidence of reported hospital-acquired (HA) and community-acquired (CA) CDIs vs the classification recommended by IDSA and SHEA and three variants. Lessa et al use a 3-day cut-off for recent hospital admission and a 12-week cut-off for recent hospital discharge. The optimal and balanced classifications we have identified use 7.4-day and 6.6-day cut-offs respectively for recent hospital admission and 2.1-day and 12.5-day cut-offs respectively for recent hospital discharge.

## References

1. Jarvis WR, Schlosser J, Jarvis AA, Chinn RY. 2009 National point prevalence of *Clostridium difficile* in US health care facility inpatients, 2008. *Am. J. Infect. Control* **37**, 263–270. (doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2009.01.001)
2. Slimings C *et al.* 2014 Increasing incidence of *Clostridium difficile* infection, Australia, 2011–2012. *Med. J. Aust.* **200**, 272–276. (doi:10.5694/mja13.11153)
3. Lessa FC *et al.* 2015 Burden of *Clostridium difficile* infection in the United States. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **372**, 825–34. (doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1408913)
4. Magill SS *et al.* 2014 Multistate Point-Prevalence Survey of Health Care–Associated Infections. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **370**, 1198–1208. (doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1306801)
5. Scallan E, Jones TF, Cronquist A, Thomas S, Frenzen P, Hoefler D, Medus C, Angulo FJ, FoodNet Working Group. 2006 Factors associated with seeking medical care and submitting a stool sample in estimating the burden of foodborne illness. *Foodborne Pathog. Dis.* **3**, 432–8. (doi:10.1089/fpd.2006.3.432)
6. Hensgens MPM, Dekkers OM, Demeulemeester A, Buiting AGM, Bloembergen P, van Benthem BHB, Le Cessie S, Kuijper EJ. 2014 Diarrhoea in general practice: when should a *Clostridium difficile* infection be considered? Results of a nested case-control study. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **20**, O1067-74. (doi:10.1111/1469-0691.12758)
7. Adlerberth I, Huang H, Lindberg E, Åberg N, Hesselmar B, Saalman R, Nord CE, Wold AE, Weintraub A. 2014 Toxin-producing *Clostridium difficile* strains as long-term gut colonizers in healthy infants. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **52**, 173–9. (doi:10.1128/JCM.01701-13)
8. Kubota H *et al.* 2016 Longitudinal Investigation of Carriage Rates, Counts, and Genotypes of Toxigenic *Clostridium difficile* in Early Infancy. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **82**, 5806–14. (doi:10.1128/AEM.01540-16)
9. Rousseau C, Poilane I, De Pontual L, Maherault A-C, Le Monnier A, Collignon A. 2012 *Clostridium difficile* Carriage in Healthy Infants in the Community: A Potential Reservoir for Pathogenic Strains. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **55**, 1209–1215. (doi:10.1093/cid/cis637)
10. Holst E, Helin I, Mårdh PA. 1981 Recovery of *Clostridium difficile* from children. *Scand. J. Infect. Dis.* **13**, 41–5. (doi:10.1080/00365548.1981.11690365)
11. Hensgens MPM, Keessen EC, Squire MM, Riley TV, Koene MGJ, de Boer E, Lipman LJA, Kuijper EJ. 2012 *Clostridium difficile* infection in the community: a zoonotic disease? *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **18**, 635–645. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-0691.2012.03853.x)
12. Knetsch CW *et al.* 2018 Zoonotic Transfer of *Clostridium difficile* Harboring Antimicrobial Resistance between Farm Animals and Humans. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **56**. (doi:10.1128/JCM.01384-17)
13. Furuya-Kanamori L, Marquess J, Yakob L, Riley T V, Paterson DL, Foster NF, Huber CA, Clements ACA. 2015 Asymptomatic *Clostridium difficile* colonization: epidemiology and clinical implications. *BMC Infect. Dis.* **15**, 516. (doi:10.1186/s12879-015-1258-4)
14. Cohen SH *et al.* 2010 Clinical practice guidelines for *Clostridium difficile* infection in adults: 2010 update by the society for healthcare epidemiology of America (SHEA) and the infectious diseases society of America (IDSA). *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* **31**, 431–55. (doi:10.1086/651706)
15. Lambert PJ, Dyck M, Thompson LH, Hammond GW. 2009 Population-based surveillance of

- Clostridium difficile infection in Manitoba, Canada, by using interim surveillance definitions. *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* **30**, 945–51. (doi:10.1086/605719)
16. Longtin Y *et al.* 2016 Effect of Detecting and Isolating Clostridium difficile Carriers at Hospital Admission on the Incidence of C difficile Infections. *JAMA Intern. Med.* **176**, 796. (doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.0177)
  17. McLure A, Clements ACA, Kirk M, Glass K. 2017 Clostridium difficile classification overestimates hospital acquired infections. *J. Hosp. Infect.* (doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2017.12.014)
  18. Durham DP, Olsen MA, Dubberke ER, Galvani AP, Townsend JP. 2016 Quantifying Transmission of Clostridium difficile within and outside Healthcare Settings. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **22**, 608–16. (doi:10.3201/eid2204.150455)
  19. McLure A, Clements ACA, Kirk M, Glass K. 2017 Healthcare-Associated Clostridium difficile Infections are Sustained by Disease from the Community. *Bull. Math. Biol.* **79**, 2242–2257. (doi:10.1007/s11538-017-0328-8)
  20. Riggs MM, Sethi AK, Zabarsky TF, Eckstein EC, Jump RLP, Donskey CJ. 2007 Asymptomatic Carriers Are a Potential Source for Transmission of Epidemic and Nonepidemic Clostridium difficile Strains among Long-Term Care Facility Residents. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **45**, 992–998. (doi:10.1086/521854)
  21. Freeman J. 2003 Effects of cefotaxime and desacetylcefotaxime upon Clostridium difficile proliferation and toxin production in a triple-stage chemostat model of the human gut. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **52**, 96–102. (doi:10.1093/jac/dkg267)
  22. Sethi AK, Al-Nassir WN, Nerandzic MM, Bobulsky GS, Donskey CJ. 2010 Persistence of Skin Contamination and Environmental Shedding of Clostridium difficile during and after Treatment of C. difficile Infection. *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* **31**, 21–27. (doi:10.1086/649016)
  23. Viscidi R, Laughon BE, Yolken R, Bo-Linn P, Moench T, Ryder RW, Bartlett JG. 1983 Serum Antibody Response to Toxins A and B of Clostridium difficile. *J. Infect. Dis.* **148**, 93–100. (doi:10.1093/infdis/148.1.93)
  24. Foglia G, Shah S, Luxemburger C, Pietrobon PJF. 2012 Clostridium difficile: Development of a novel candidate vaccine. *Vaccine* **30**, 4307–4309. (doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.01.056)
  25. de Bruyn G *et al.* 2016 Defining the optimal formulation and schedule of a candidate toxoid vaccine against Clostridium difficile infection: A randomized Phase 2 clinical trial. *Vaccine* **34**, 2170–2178. (doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.03.028)
  26. Weiss AJ, Elixhauser A. 2006 Overview of Hospital Stays in the United States, 2012: Statistical Brief #180. *Healthc. Cost Util. Proj. Stat. Briefs*, 1–9.
  27. Van Cauteren D, De Valk H, Vaux S, Le Strat Y, Vaillant V. 2012 Burden of acute gastroenteritis and healthcare-seeking behaviour in France: a population-based study. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **140**, 697–705. (doi:10.1017/S0950268811000999)
  28. Leffler DA, Lamont JT. 2009 Treatment of Clostridium difficile-associated disease. *Gastroenterology* **136**, 1899–912. (doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2008.12.070)
  29. Freeman J. 2005 Comparison of the efficacy of ramoplanin and vancomycin in both in vitro and in vivo models of clindamycin-induced Clostridium difficile infection. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **56**, 717–725. (doi:10.1093/jac/dki321)
  30. Khan FY *et al.* 2012 Epidemiological features of Clostridium difficile infection among

- inpatients at Hamad General Hospital in the state of Qatar, 2006-2009. *Travel Med. Infect. Dis.* **10**, 179–85. (doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2012.06.004)
31. Jangi S, Lamont JT. 2010 Asymptomatic Colonization by *Clostridium difficile* in Infants: Implications for Disease in Later Life. *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **51**, 2–7. (doi:10.1097/MPG.0b013e3181d29767)
  32. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention - National Center for Health Statistics. In press. CDC Wonder: Underlying Cause of Death, Multiple Cause of Death Files, 1999-2016. See <http://wonder.cdc.gov/ucd-icd10.html> (accessed on 18 December 2017).
  33. MacDougall C, Polk RE. 2008 Variability in rates of use of antibacterials among 130 US hospitals and risk-adjustment models for interhospital comparison. *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* **29**, 203–11. (doi:10.1086/528810)
  34. Australian Commonwealth Department of Health - Drug utilisation sub-committee (DUSC). 2015 Antibiotics : PBS / RPBS utilisation.
  35. Rafii F, Sutherland JB, Cerniglia CE. 2008 Effects of treatment with antimicrobial agents on the human colonic microflora. *Ther. Clin. Risk Manag.* **4**, 1343–58.
  36. Dial S, Kezouh A, Dascal A, Barkun A, Suissa S. 2008 Patterns of antibiotic use and risk of hospital admission because of *Clostridium difficile* infection. *CMAJ* **179**, 767–72. (doi:10.1503/cmaj.071812)
  37. Bartlett JG. 1984 Treatment of Antibiotic-Associated Pseudomembranous Colitis. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **6**, S235–S241. (doi:10.1093/clinids/6.Supplement\_1.S235)
  38. Johnson S, Homann SR, Bettin KM, Quick JN, Clabots CR, Peterson LR, Gerding DN. 1992 Treatment of asymptomatic *Clostridium difficile* carriers (fecal excretors) with vancomycin or metronidazole. A randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **117**, 297–302. (doi:10.7326/0003-4819-117-4-297)
  39. Muto CA *et al.* 2005 A Large Outbreak of *Clostridium difficile*–Associated Disease with an Unexpected Proportion of Deaths and Colectomies at a Teaching Hospital Following Increased Fluoroquinolone Use. *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* **26**, 273–280. (doi:10.1086/502539)
  40. Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP). 2014 HCUP National Inpatient Sample (NIS).
  41. Diekmann O, Heesterbeek JAP, Roberts MG. 2010 The construction of next-generation matrices for compartmental epidemic models. *J. R. Soc. Interface* **7**, 873–85. (doi:10.1098/rsif.2009.0386)
  42. Lanzas C, Dubberke ER, Lu Z, Reske KA, Gröhn YT. 2011 Epidemiological Model for *Clostridium difficile* Transmission in Healthcare Settings. *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* **32**, 553–561. (doi:10.1086/660013)
  43. Jamal W, Pauline E, Rotimi V. 2015 A prospective study of community-associated *Clostridium difficile* infection in Kuwait: Epidemiology and ribotypes. *Anaerobe* **35**, 28–32. (doi:10.1016/j.anaerobe.2015.06.006)
  44. Wilcox MH, Mooney L, Bendall R, Settle CD, Fawley WN. 2008 A case-control study of community-associated *Clostridium difficile* infection. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **62**, 388–96. (doi:10.1093/jac/dkn163)
  45. Stoesser N *et al.* 2017 Epidemiology of *Clostridium difficile* in infants in Oxfordshire, UK: Risk factors for colonization and carriage, and genetic overlap with regional *C. difficile* infection

- strains. *PLoS One* **12**, e0182307. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0182307)
46. Kirk M, Ford L, Glass K, Hall G. 2014 Foodborne Illness, Australia, Circa 2000 and Circa 2010. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **20**, 1857–1864. (doi:10.3201/eid2011.131315)
  47. Reigadas E, Alcalá L, Marín M, Burillo A, Muñoz P, Bouza E. 2015 Missed diagnosis of *Clostridium difficile* infection; a prospective evaluation of unselected stool samples. *J. Infect.* **70**, 264–72. (doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2014.10.013)
  48. Knight DR, Elliott B, Chang BJ, Perkins TT, Riley T V. 2015 Diversity and Evolution in the Genome of *Clostridium difficile*. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* **28**, 721–41. (doi:10.1128/CMR.00127-14)

# Modelling diverse sources of *Clostridium difficile* in the community: importance of animals, infants and asymptomatic carriers – Supplementary Material

Angus McLure, Archie C. A. Clements, Martyn Kirk and Kathryn Glass

## Further details of model structure and parameters

### Demographics

The demographic structure of the model is summarised in **Supp. Figure 1**. All individuals are born into the infant class without immunity or colonisation. There is no immigration. The birth rate is chosen to balanced deaths such that the equilibrium population is  $N_{\text{Comm}}$  (100,000). Infants age to become (non-suppressed) adults at rate  $\zeta$  ( $\zeta^{-1} = 1$  year). Non-suppressed adults and infants age slowly to become suppressed adults at rate  $\psi$  such that the median time to age is 65 years ( $\psi = \frac{\ln 2}{65 \times 365} \text{ day}^{-1}$ ).

There are two death rates: one rate for infants and non-suppressed adults ( $\phi$ ) and a much higher rate for suppressed/elderly adults ( $\phi_U$ ). The two death rates are chosen so that proportion in the suppressed class is 13.7% (the proportion of US population over 65 [1]) and proportion of deaths in the suppressed class is 72.4% (proportion of deaths that are in people over 65 in the US [1]):  $\phi_U = \psi \frac{1-0.137}{0.137}$  and  $\phi = \psi \frac{1-0.724}{0.724}$ .

### Immunity

The immune structure of the model is summarised in **Supp. Figure 1**. Non-suppressed adults, being treated for CDI are conferred immunity upon end of treatment. Colonised, non-suppressed, adults not receiving treatment develop immunity at rate  $\delta$  ( $1/\delta = 10$  days) as determined in our previous model from sero-conversion rate in response to *C. difficile* toxoid vaccine trials [2,3]. To simplify the model infants develop immunity immediately on colonisation. All immune individuals have their immunity wane at rate  $\sigma$ , which is estimated with our model.

### Admissions and discharges

The hospital and community structure of the model is summarised in **Supp. Figure 1**. The hospital discharge rate for suppressed/elderly and non-suppressed individuals is the inverse of the mean length of stay in US Hospitals for those over 65 ( $\kappa_U = 1/5.2$  days) and those under 65 ( $\kappa = 1/4.15$  days) respectively (2012 data) [4]. However, those receiving treatment for CDI in hospital are not discharged. Similarly admission rates are determined from US hospital admission rates which are once every 11.4 years for those under 65 ( $\nu$ ) and once every 3.4 years for those over 65 ( $\nu_U$ ) (2012 data) [4]. We assume that those who have symptoms of CDI in the community are admitted at a much faster rate ( $\nu_{\text{CDI}}$ ) estimated with our model.

### Colonisation and Gut Flora

The model structure for gut flora disruption and *C. difficile* colonisation is summarised in **Figure 1** in the main text. Gut flora is disturbed at different rates in the hospitals and communities to reproduce the reported proportion admissions in hospitals [5] or proportion of adults in the community each year [6] that receive antibiotics. In the community those in the suppressed/elderly received antibiotics at a higher rate such that  $\alpha_{\text{Comm}} < \alpha_{U,\text{Comm}} < \alpha_{\text{Hosp}} = \alpha_{U,\text{Hosp}}$ . The time take for the recovery

of gut flora [7], and the duration of heightened risk of *C. difficile* following antibiotic exposure [8] depends on the antibiotic but we chose a single recovery rate  $\lambda = 0.03 \text{ day}^{-1}$  which sits in the middle of the range. As it has been observed that 20% of hospitalised CDIs recover without specific treatment [9], the gut flora recovery rate for those with overgrowth is  $\lambda_o = \frac{\rho_{Hosp}}{1/0.2 - 1}$ .

The colonisation clearance rate is the same ( $\gamma$ ) in all colonised adults and was determined in our previous model of *C. difficile* transmission in a hospital [10] based on the clearance rate in the control group in a trial for treating asymptomatic colonisation with vancomycin and metronidazole [11]. The clearance rate in infants ( $\gamma_{infant}$ ) is estimated in our model to the colonisation profile for infants. The rate at which *C. difficile* overgrows in those with damaged gut flora ( $\omega$ ) is the same in all adults and was determined for our previous model from observations of *C. difficile* overgrowth in a chemostat model of gut flora in human gastrointestinal tract [12].

## Transmission

Transmission is well mixed within each of the hospital and community but there is no transmission between these two locations (only movement of individuals), so there is a separate force of colonisation for the community and hospital. Person-to-person transmission comes from colonised adults with disrupted gut flora ( $\beta_{Disrupt}$ ), colonised adults with intact gut flora ( $\beta_{Intact}$ ) and from infants ( $\beta_{infants}$ ; community only). The transmission parameters from adults are estimated with our model. The base assumption is that infants are half as infectious as disrupted adults ( $\beta_{infants} = 0.5 \beta_{Disrupt}$ ), but we consider  $\beta_{infants}$  in the range  $0 - \beta_{Disrupt}$  in our sensitivity analysis. Contact precautions (for patients receiving treatment) reduces transmission from these individual by factor  $q$ , determined for our previous model from contact precaution adherence rates [13]. (We assume no contact precautions in community, i.e.  $q_{Comm} = 1$ ). Foodborne transmission adds to the force of colonisation in the community. Infants have different susceptibility to colonisation given by the factor  $\theta$ . Therefore the force of colonisation for infants is  $\theta$  times the force of colonisation in the community.

## CDI treatment and outcomes

The rate at which individuals with CDI seek treatment in the community was inferred from studies on treatment seeking behaviour for those with diarrhoea. Van Cauteren et al report that 33% of those who have diarrhoea seek treatment, with mean time to treatment seeking being 1.5 days [14]. Assuming a competing hazards model of treatment seeking and recovery, this means that the treatment seeking rate ( $\rho_{Comm}$ ) is  $0.33/1.5 = 0.22 \text{ day}^{-1}$ . Treatment seeking rate in the hospital is much faster ( $\rho_{Hosp} = 1 \text{ day}^{-1}$ ). Treatment rate ( $\tau$ ) is same in hospital and community (mean time is 10 days) [15]. Treatment success proportion ( $p_t$ ) is the same in hospital and community and was estimated in our previous model [10]. We assume that patients do not have a greater hazard of death with CDI as death due to CDI is sufficiently infrequent so as not to significantly affect population level outcomes.

## Details of parameter estimation

We used maximum likelihood estimation to determine the value of eight parameters. The likelihood function was composed of the product of likelihood functions for the colonisation prevalence in infants, the proportion seropositive for *C. difficile* toxin antibodies by age, the incidence of CDIs in hospitals and communities and number of patients admitted to hospital with CDI as a proportion of all admissions.

## Colonisation Prevalence in Infants and Proportion Seropositive by Age

Kubota et al (2016) collected stool samples from 111 Belgian neonates at approximately one, three, eight, 31, 91, 143 and 182 days after birth. Since the exact number of days since birth was not reported for each sample and infant, for the purposes of likelihood calculations we assumed that each set of samples was taken exactly at exactly one, three, eight, 31, 91, 143 and 182 days after birth. Kubota et al. tested each sample for carriage of *C. difficile* and presence of genes for toxins A and B. They reported the sequence of sample results (including missing samples) for the 55 infants who had at least one *C. difficile* positive sample. For the 56 samples that had no positive tests (for which the sequence of negative and absent samples were not reported) we assumed that there were no missing samples and that all samples were negative. Since we are interested only in toxigenic *C. difficile*, we considered all *C. difficile* positive without either toxin genes, as negative samples.

Rousseau et al (2012) collected monthly stool samples from ten French infants in their first year of life starting at approximately one month. The exact number of days since birth were not given for each sample so we assumed that samples were taken (or were missed) at exactly 30-day intervals. They performed strain typing on each positive stool sample, typing either one or five colonies. They reported the sequence of sample results including typing and missing results. Since we are interested only in toxigenic *C. difficile*, we considered all samples with at least one toxigenic strain as positive and all other samples as negative.

Rousseau et al also collected a single stool sample from 85 French children aged 1.5-36.2 months from two day-care centres. They reported the number of samples positive for *C. difficile* and including the number positive for toxigenic strains of *C. difficile*. Again, we considered only the samples with a toxigenic strain to be positive and samples with non-toxigenic strains or no strain of *C. difficile* to be negative.

Holst et al. (1981) collected stool samples from 130 infants aged 1-12 months and 88 children aged 1-15 years (total 218 samples) and tested for *C. difficile* carriage. All *C. difficile* positive samples were for toxigenic strains. The proportion colonised was reported by monthly age brackets for infants under 12 months and larger brackets for older children. For likelihood calculations we assumed that the age of all subjects was exactly in the middle of their age bracket (measured in 30-day months).

Adlerberth et al also reported longitudinal *C. difficile* colonisation data in infants, but did not provide denominator data, so their data were not used for fitting the model. However, they did demonstrate that infants can be long-term carriers toxigenic strains of *C. difficile*, finding that a third of colonised infants were still colonised by the same strain 6 months later

Viscidi et al. (1983) report the age-related prevalence of antibodies to toxin A and toxin B of *C. difficile* in 98 paediatric in-patients and 242 outpatients from a US hospital. The trends for toxins A and B were similar. Since toxin A and B antibodies were measured from the same set of patients, the two trends cannot be considered independent, so we considered only the data for toxin-B prevalence.

The probability that an individual would be in each state (i.e. colonised/non-colonised or seropositive/seronegative) at a given age was calculated for a given set of parameters using the Markov chain approximation for an individual, with the force of colonisation at the equilibrium value. For the cross-sectional datasets, the model likelihood was derived from a product of



binomially distributed random variables with  $n_i$  trials (the number of samples for age group  $i$ ),  $x_i$  successes (i.e. the number of *C. difficile* positive or seropositive samples) and success probability  $p_i$  (the model predicted probability that an individual of that age group would be *C. difficile* positive or seropositive). For the datasets reporting the longitudinal sequence of sample results, the model likelihood a given sequence of results was the model probability that Markov chain of the individual would pass through those states at the sample ages.

The older, cross-sectional study by Holst et al. [16] found much higher prevalence of toxigenic colonisation amongst infants than recent studies [17,18], lead to poor model fit when combined with the recent studies or when used as the only infant colonisation data set and was therefore excluded.

### Incidence of healthcare-associated and community-associated CDI

Lessa et al. (2015) estimated the incidence of CDIs in the United States based on surveillance data from several US counties. They used a three-day cut-off for hospital onset CDIs and a single twelve-week cut-off for community onset CDIs to differentiate healthcare and community acquired CDIs. In their article they further subdivided healthcare associated cases into community-onset healthcare acquired, nursing-home onset and hospital-onset hospital-acquired cases. We simulated the application of the three-day and twelve-week cut-off to determine the model incidence of hospital-onset hospital-acquired CDIs, community-onset hospital acquired CDIs and community acquired CDIs. However, because our model did not differentiate between nursing home and the general community, we included nursing home onset cases in with community acquired cases for the construction of the likelihood function. Recurrent cases – defined as any case with a period of symptoms in the 8 weeks prior to onset of symptoms (community-onset cases) or hospital admission (hospital-onset cases) – were excluded for the purposes of incidence estimation. The likelihood functions for the incidence of each category (e.g. community-onset hospital acquired) of CDI were normal and independent with mean equal to the reported incidence and standard deviation equal to width of the reported confidence interval divided by  $2 \times 1.96$ .

### Proportion of Admissions with CDI

HCUP provide information on hospitalisations in the United States stratified by diagnoses. We extracted the total number of hospital inpatient discharges and the number of hospital inpatient discharged where the principal diagnosis was *C. difficile* infection (Diagnoses--ICD-9-CM Codes (ICD9), Principal Diagnosis: 008.45 Int Inf Clstridium Dfcile) for the year 2014 (the most recent available data at time of extraction) [19]. The likelihood function for the proportion of admissions with CDI was normally distributed with mean equal to the proportion of all discharges where CDI was the primary diagnosis and standard deviation equal to the reported confidence interval divided by  $2 \times 1.96$ .

### Alternate fitting assumptions

We considered multiple sets of assumptions when trying to estimate the transmission rates which are best expressed in terms of the transmission parameters giving the transmission rate from each type of colonised individual by setting (hospital or community):  $\beta_{Comm,Intact}$ ,  $\beta_{Hosp,Intact}$ ,  $\beta_{Comm,Disrupt}$ ,  $\beta_{Hosp,Disrupt}$  and  $\beta_{Infant}$ . Throughout we assumed that  $\beta_{Infant}$  was some fraction 0-1 of  $\beta_{Comm,Disrupt}$  however we considered multiple relations between the other parameters.

We tried assuming  $\beta_{Comm,Intact} = \beta_{Hosp,Intact} = 0$  and  $\beta_{Comm,Disrupt} = \beta_{Hosp,Disrupt}$  with generally poor results. Model fit was reasonable when adult colonisation prevalence was low and infants as infectious as adults, however nearly all transmission came from infants in this scenario. For high colonisation

prevalence and equal infant infectiousness, though the model fit was still good, this could only be achieved with very high transmission rates in the community and very low (~10%) antibiotics disruption probability and still nearly all transmission came from infants. With lower infant infectiousness in the range 0-0.2 times adult infectiousness, the model had a very poor fit with the incidence in the community being very low (<1/3 of data), and infant colonisation rates being high, transmission rates from adults being excessive (>3) and probability that antibiotics disrupt being very low (<10%).

We tried assuming a single transmission rate  $\beta_{\text{Comm,Intact}} = \beta_{\text{Hosp,Intact}} = 0$  with  $\beta_{\text{Comm,Disrupt}}$  and  $\beta_{\text{Hosp,Disrupt}}$  independent. This allowed for arbitrary and independent forces of colonisation in hospital and community and had good model fit for all assumptions. However, in the resulting model nearly all transmission in the community came from infants for most assumed values of infant infectiousness and adult colonisation prevalence. When infant infectiousness was restricted to lower levels (<0.2  $\beta_{\text{Comm,Disrupt}}$ ),  $\beta_{\text{Comm,Disrupt}}$  was up to 50 times greater than  $\beta_{\text{Hosp,Disrupt}}$ , which is highly implausible.

Finally, our default assumptions ( $\beta_{\text{Comm,Intact}} = \beta_{\text{Hosp,Intact}}$  and  $\beta_{\text{Comm,Disrupt}} = \beta_{\text{Hosp,Disrupt}}$ ) resulted in equally good model fit to the previous set of assumptions, but with much more believable transmission rates and proportion of transmission attributable to infants under most combinations of assumptions. However, when infant infectiousness was high and adult colonisation prevalence was low the estimated value of  $\beta_{\text{Comm,Intact}}$  and  $\beta_{\text{Hosp,Intact}}$  were 0, leading to poorer model fit and unbelievably high proportion of transmission from infants and so the result from these extremes were omitted from our sensitivity analyses in the main text and the supplementary figures.

### Further details of model fit

The model fit the data well reproducing the observed age profile of colonisation, immunity, reported incidence of infection, proportion of admissions for CDI (**Supp. Figure 2**). The model was also verified by outcomes not used to fit the model. The reported recurrence proportion is approximately 20% for hospital-acquired cases and approximately 10% of community-acquired cases [20]. We estimated that 18% (range 13-30%) of transmission in hospitals was from patients receiving treatment for CDI. A study using whole genome sequencing to compare isolates from CDI cases in Oxfordshire hospitals estimated that approximately one quarter of cases could be linked to ward-based transmission from another identified symptomatic carrier [21]. Using the same reporting and treatment seeking assumptions used for initial cases and defining a recurrence as a return to symptomatic colonisation within 8 weeks of resolution of symptoms, the model predicted a 19.4% recurrence proportion in hospital-acquired cases (range: 18.5-21.5%) and a 14.0% recurrence proportion in community-acquired cases (range: 13.3-15.8%). Notably, the true recurrence proportions (i.e. without simulating underreporting and misclassification) were higher for both hospital-acquired (24.6-26.8%) and community-acquired (17.8-18.5%) infections. Adlerberth et al [22] found that a third of all infants colonised with *C. difficile* were colonised by the same strain when sampled at least six months later, while the model predicted that 40% (33-42%) of colonised six-month-old infants remain colonised at 12 months of age. A previous estimate of the force of colonisation in a hospital setting [10] derived from the reported risk of colonisation and infection as a function of days of hospital stay [23] was  $0.007 \text{ day}^{-1}$  (95% CI: 0.004-0.011). In this model the estimated force of colonisation was a little lower:  $0.0033 \text{ day}^{-1}$  (range: 0.0031-0.0035  $\text{day}^{-1}$ ). However the previous estimate was drawn from a hospital during a period high incidence. In our model, a higher proportion (89.6%, range: 87.9-90.4%) of those classified as hospital-acquired CDI were elderly/immune-suppressed compared to cases classified as community-acquired CDI (78.4% range: 77.6-78.6%), in agreement with the observation that community-acquired cases are younger, with fewer comorbidities [24].




## Supplementary Tables and Figures


**Supp. Table 1** Definitions, values and references for all parameters used in the model. All rates are in units of  $day^{-1}$ . \*These parameters were fit to the model, with the range indicating values over sensitivity analysis. †Only these parameters were affected by assumptions around infant infectiousness, being estimated under the assumption that  $\beta_{Infant} = k \times \beta_{Disrupt}$  for  $k$  in the range 0-1. ‡ These parameter values are the same as our previous model of hospital transmission [10].

Parameter	Description	Value Hospital/ Admission	Value Community/ Discharge	References
$\alpha$	Rate at which patients begin new antimicrobial treatment (proxy for rate of gut flora disruption)	0.33	$1.5 \times 10^{-3}$	[5,6]
$\alpha_U$	Rate at which patients begin new antimicrobial treatment (proxy for rate of gut flora disruption) for elderly/suppressed	0.33	$2.5 \times 10^{-3}$	[5,6]
$\lambda$	Rate at which damaged commensal gut flora recovers	0.03‡		[7,8]
$\lambda_o$	Rate at which damaged commensal gut flora recovers for those with CDI overgrowth	0.25		[9]
$\gamma$	Rate at which <i>C. difficile</i> is cleared in those with intact gut flora	0.023‡		[11]
$\omega$	Rate of <i>C. difficile</i> overgrowth in patients with disrupted gut flora	0.2‡		[12,25]
$\rho$	Rate at which treatment for CDI is given (hospital) or sought (community)	1	0.22	[14]
$\tau$	Rate at which the treatment of patients with CDI progresses towards resolution	0.1‡		[15,26]
$\rho_t$	Probability that CDI treatment will remove all <i>C. difficile</i>	0.55‡		[10]
$q$	Efficacy and coverage of special contact precautions (0: total prevention of transmission; 1: no reduction in transmission)	0.45‡	1	[13,27]
$\delta$	Rate of development of immunity in adults	0.1‡		[2,3]
$\zeta$	Rate at which infants age to develop adult-like gut-flora	N/A	1/365	[28]


$\psi$	Rate at which people age to suppressed/elderly class	$2.92 \times 10^{-5}$ (Median time: 65 years)		
$\varphi$	Death rate	$1.11 \times 10^{-5}$		[1]
$\varphi_U$	Death rate for elderly/suppressed	$1.84 \times 10^{-4}$		[1]
$N$	Overnight Hospital Beds / Community Size	150	100,000	
$\sigma$	Rate at which immunity wanes	$2.9 \times 10^{-4}$ ( $0.9 \times 10^{-4} - 6.9 \times 10^{-4}$ )		*
$\vartheta$	Multiplicative factor for colonisation susceptibility of infants	N/A	1.4 (0.6-4.4)	*
$\gamma_{infant}$	Rate at which <i>C. difficile</i> is cleared in infants	0.0020 (0.0020-0.0025)		*
$p_{disturb}$	Proportion of antibiotics that disturb gut flora	0.22 (0.12-0.48)		*
$p_{report}$	Proportion of all community-treated CDIs that are reported	0.63 (0.57-0.76)		*
$\beta_{Disrupt}$	Transmission rate coefficient for colonised adults with disrupted gut flora (due to recent antibiotic exposure)	0.128 (0.071-0.174)		*†
$\beta_{Intact}$	Transmission rate coefficient for colonised adults with intact gut flora (no recent antibiotic exposure)	0.019 (0.001-0.026)		*†
$\beta_{infant}$	Transmission rate coefficient from infants	N/A	0.064 (0-0.174)	*†
$\nu / \kappa$	Hospital admission/discharge rate	$2.40 \times 10^{-4}$	0.241	[4]
$\nu_U / \kappa_U$	Hospital admission/discharge rate for elderly	$8.06 \times 10^{-4}$	0.192	[4]
$\nu_{CDI} / \kappa_t$	Hospital admission rate for CDI / discharge rate for those receiving CDI treatment	0.0142 (0.0128-0.0174)	0 (Not discharged)	*



**Supp. Figure 1** Model structure, showing immune states, aging, births, deaths, hospital admission and discharge and infant classes.  $*$ Birth rate matches death rate from whole population.  $\dagger$ The force of colonisation depends on the number of infectious individuals in the population. Infants are  $\theta$  times more susceptible to colonisation than adults.  $\ddagger$ Infants retain their immunity and colonisation status when they age to become non-suppressed adults.  $\S$ Only non-colonised individuals can have their immunity wane.  $\P$ Those with active CDI develop immunity upon recovery. Asymptomatically colonised individuals develop immunity at rate  $\delta$ . Non-colonised individuals do not develop immunity.  $**$ Admission discharge rates vary by immunity and CDI status. Patients receiving treatment for CDI are not discharged and are admitted at a much higher rate.




**Supp. Figure 2** Maximum likelihood model fit to infant colonisation data and immunity prevalence data, assuming 5% colonisation prevalence in adults. Blue crosses indicate *C. difficile* toxin B antibody sero-prevalence [29], green crosses indicate cross-sectional study infants and toddlers in childcare [17]. Red crosses [17] and black crosses [18] indicate longitudinal studies of *C. difficile* colonisation in infants. All error bars are 95% binomial confidence intervals.



**Supp. Figure 3** *C. difficile* transmission in the community from infants under various plausible assumptions for the *C. difficile* colonisation prevalence in adults, and the relative infectiousness of infants as (A) a proportion of all transmission in the community and (B) as rate of exposure to adults in the community.





**Supp. Figure 4** *C. difficile* transmission from colonised adults with intact gut flora under various assumptions for the *C. difficile* colonisation prevalence in adults, and the relative infectiousness of infants as (A) the proportion of all transmission in the community and (B) the proportion of all transmission in the hospital.

## Details of Classifying Cases as Hospital or Community-Acquired

The simulation of CDI classification is a key component of the current study. The definitions used to classify CDIs rely on a knowledge of the patient's history of previous CDI (to rule out recurrent cases) hospital admission and discharge prior to onset of symptoms (to distinguish hospital and community acquired cases). However, standard compartmental epidemiological models are memoryless and do not explicitly model (or record) the events occurring to individuals, only how an event (i.e. infection or recovery) affects the total number of individuals of any given compartment. An individual-based model could be used to simulate these details, but we employ a computationally much simpler approximation that approximates individual in the population as a simple Markov chain.

To make the individual Markov assumption, the only non-linear interaction term, the force of colonisation, is fixed as a constant in time (equal to the mean force of colonisation at equilibrium) so the population can be viewed as a large ensemble of independent Markov chains (individual people). The state space of the Markov chains is the union of  $S$ , the set of living states corresponding to the compartments of the model and  $\Delta$  the death state (which is the only absorbing state). New Markov chains are initialised (births and immigration) at the jump times of a Poisson process of rate  $\mu(t)$  (the birth/immigration rate) which we will assume is independent of the individuals in the model and is homogeneous (i.e. a constant birth rate). At birth these Markov chains are randomly assigned to one of the living states in  $S$  (the compartments in the model) according to the vector of probabilities  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ . In our model there is no immigration and all births are in the same state, so  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is the standard basis vector corresponding to the non-immune, non-colonised infant class. If there was immigration in our model,  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  would describe the probability that a new arrival was of any given compartment. These Markov chains then progress through the transient states in  $S$ , before being absorbed into the death state. For each individual Markov chain, the age  $a$  is the time since it was initialised. So if  $Q$  is the transition rate matrix between states in  $S$ , then the vector of probabilities that a given individual is in each state at age  $a$  is

$$[P(X(a) = s)]_{s \in S} = e^{Qa} \boldsymbol{\pi}. \quad (1)$$

In a whole population of these Markov chains starting with  $\mathbf{x}_0$  people in each (living) state at time 0, the expected number of people alive in each state at time  $t$  is given by the vector

$$E[\mathbf{x}(t)] = e^{Qt} \mathbf{x}_0 + \int_0^t \mu(t-a) e^{Qa} \boldsymbol{\pi} da. \quad (2)$$

If the birthrate  $\mu$  is constant over time then

$$E[\mathbf{x}(t)] = e^{Qt} \mathbf{x}_0 + \mu Q^{-1} (e^{Qt} - I) \boldsymbol{\pi}. \quad (3)$$

Since  $Q$  is the transition matrix for transient states (i.e. there are no immortal states), the limit for large  $t$  when the system approaches its equilibrium distribution is

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E[\mathbf{x}(t)] = -Q^{-1} \boldsymbol{\pi} \mu \quad (4)$$

which is independent of  $t$  and  $\mathbf{x}_0$ . The total population is then sum over the vector,  $-\mathbf{1}^T Q^{-1} \boldsymbol{\pi} \mu$ . Note that  $-\mathbf{1}^T Q^{-1} \boldsymbol{\pi}$  is the total of the mean dwelling time in each state (i.e. the total average time each person spends alive) and so is equal to the mean life expectancy of individuals,  $L$ .

We have an expression for the number of individuals of a given type at equilibrium but we need to know the number individuals at equilibrium which have a given history of CDI and hospitalisation. So we are interested in the number of people at equilibrium which have (or have not) been in some set of states  $S_1 \subset S$ , in the past  $T_1$  units of time. For instance we may be interested in the population which haven't been in the hospital states ( $S_1$ ) in the last 12 weeks ( $T_1$ ). So consider the vector of probabilities that a individual Markov chain of age  $a$  is in each state  $s$  but has not been any state in  $S_1$  in the past  $T_1$  units of time:

$$[P(X(a) = s \text{ and } X(\tau) \notin S_1 \text{ for } \max\{0, a - T_1\} \leq \tau \leq a)]_{s \in S}. \quad (5)$$

To derive an expression for these probabilities we consider a modified Markov chain  $X_a$  which until time  $\max\{0, a - T_1\}$  behaves as the original Markov chain, but at time  $\max\{0, a - T_1\}$  individuals in  $S_1$  are moved to the absorbing ‘death’ state, and after  $\max\{0, a - T_1\}$  all state transitions entering states in  $S_1$  are now redirected to the absorbing ‘death’ state. For  $X_a$  the transition rate matrix between states in  $S$  after time  $\max\{0, a - T_1\}$  is  $Q$  with the rows and columns corresponding to states in  $S_1$  set to zero. If we assume, without loss of generality, that the states are ordered such that states in  $S_1$  are last we can write this in block matrix form as  $\begin{bmatrix} Q_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , where  $Q_1$  is the sub-matrix of  $Q$  corresponding to states in  $S \setminus S_1$ . Therefore

$$[P(X(a) = s \text{ and } X(\tau) \notin S_1 \text{ } \max\{0, a - T_1\} \leq \tau \leq a)]_{s \in S} = [P(X_a(a) = s)]_{s \in S} \quad (6)$$

$$= \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}_1^a \boldsymbol{\pi}, & a < T_1 \\ \mathbb{P}_1^{T_1} \mathbb{P}^{a-T_1} \boldsymbol{\pi}, & a \geq T_1, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbb{P} := e^Q$  and  $\mathbb{P}_1 := \begin{bmatrix} e^{Q_1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \exp \begin{bmatrix} Q_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  are matrices the same size as  $Q$ .

Therefore the expected number of people at equilibrium which have not been in some set of states  $S_1 \subset S$ , in the past  $T_1$  units of time is the vector

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t [\mu(t-a) [P(X_a(a)=s)]_{s \in S}] da = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left[ \int_0^{T_1} \mu(t-a) \mathbb{P}_1^a \boldsymbol{\pi} da + \int_{T_1}^t \mu(t-a) \mathbb{P}_1^{T_1} \mathbb{P}^{a-T_1} \boldsymbol{\pi} da \right] \quad (8)$$

If  $\mu$  is constant then this simplifies to

$$\mu \left[ \int_0^{T_1} \mathbb{P}_1^a da + \int_{T_1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_1^{T_1} \mathbb{P}^{a-T_1} da \right] \boldsymbol{\pi} = \mu \left[ \int_0^{T_1} \mathbb{P}_1^a da + \int_0^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_1^{T_1} \mathbb{P}^a da \right] \boldsymbol{\pi} \quad (9)$$

$$= \mu \left[ \mathbb{Q}_1^{-1} (\mathbb{P}_1^{T_1} - I) - \mathbb{P}_1^{T_1} Q^{-1} \right] \boldsymbol{\pi} \quad (10)$$

where by a abuse of notation,  $\mathbb{Q}_1^{-1} := \begin{bmatrix} Q_1^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  is a square matrix the size of  $Q$ .

The same reasoning can be extended to count the individuals at equilibrium which have not been in the sets of states  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n$  in the past  $T_1 > T_2 > \dots T_n$  units of time respectively. The vector of probabilities that an individual of age  $a$  is in each state  $s$  and satisfies these requirements is

$$\left[ P \left( X(a) = s \text{ and } \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{X(\tau) \notin S_i \text{ } \max\{0, a - T_i\} \leq \tau \leq a\} \right) \right]_{s \in S} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}_n^a \boldsymbol{\pi}, & a < T_n \\ \mathbb{P}_n^{T_n} \mathbb{P}_{n-1}^{T_n - T_n} \dots \mathbb{P}_i^{T_i - T_{i+1}} \mathbb{P}_{i-1}^{a - T_i} \boldsymbol{\pi}, & T_i \leq a < T_{i-1} \\ \mathbb{P}_n^{T_n} \mathbb{P}_{n-1}^{T_n - T_n} \dots \mathbb{P}_1^{T_1 - T_2} \mathbb{P}^{a - T_1} \boldsymbol{\pi}, & T_1 \leq a \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

and the expected number of each type of individual in the population at equilibrium (assuming constant birth rate  $\mu$ ) is

$$\begin{aligned} \mu [ & \mathbb{Q}_n^{-1} (\mathbb{P}_n^{T_n} - I) + \mathbb{P}_n^{T_n} \mathbb{Q}_{n-1}^{-1} (\mathbb{P}_{n-1}^{T_{n-1}} - I) + \mathbb{P}_n^{T_n} \mathbb{P}_{n-1}^{T_n - T_n} \mathbb{Q}_{n-2}^{-1} (\mathbb{P}_{n-2}^{T_{n-2}} - I) + \dots \\ & + \mathbb{P}_n^{T_n} \mathbb{P}_{n-1}^{T_n - T_n} \dots \mathbb{P}_2^{T_2 - T_3} \mathbb{Q}_1^{-1} (\mathbb{P}_1^{T_1} - I) - \mathbb{P}_n^{T_n} \mathbb{P}_{n-1}^{T_n - T_n} \dots \mathbb{P}_1^{T_1 - T_2} Q^{-1} ] \boldsymbol{\pi} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{P}_i := \begin{bmatrix} e^{Q_i} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  and  $\mathbb{Q}_i^{-1} := \begin{bmatrix} Q_i^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$  are matrices the same size as  $Q$  with  $Q_i$  being the sub-matrices of  $Q$  corresponding to the states in  $S \setminus \cup_{j=i}^n S_j$ .

Now we have a way to calculate the incidence of (non-recurrent) CDIs which would be classified as hospital or community acquired if standard definitions were used. We will briefly illustrate this for community onset cases for the system recommended by IDSA and SHEA.

First calculate the equilibrium number of people in each class in the community that haven't been in symptomatic states ( $S_1$ ) in the past 8 weeks ( $T_1$ ). At this equilibrium point calculate the rate at which the transitions corresponding to onset of CDIs occur in the community, i.e. the total rate of transitions from asymptotically colonised community states to symptomatic community states. This is the incidence of non-recurrent community-onset CDI.

The rate of non-recurrent CDI classified as community-acquired is the total rate of transitions corresponding to the onset of CDI for the equilibrium number of people who haven't been in the hospital states ( $S_1$ ) in the past 12 weeks ( $T_1$ ) or any symptomatic state ( $S_2$ ) in the past 8 weeks ( $T_2$ ).

The rate of non-recurrent CDI classified as indeterminate is the total rate of transitions corresponding to the onset of CDI for the equilibrium number of people who haven't been in the hospital states ( $S_2$ ) in the past 4 weeks ( $T_2$ ) or any symptomatic state ( $S_1$ ) in the past 8 weeks ( $T_1$ ) minus the rate of non-recurrent CDIs classified as community-acquired.

Finally, the rate of non-recurrent CDI classified as hospital-acquired is the rate of non-recurrent CDI minus the rate of non-recurrent CDIs classified as community-acquired or indeterminate.

The first steps of classifying of hospital-onset is similar, however the history of recurrence and previous hospitalisation is considered from the point of hospital admission. In other other words, we determine the proportion of admission which have or have not been in a hospital in the past 12 weeks etc. Given the history of patients at the point of admission, one can simply simulate the course of hospitalisations going forward and (e.g. how many CDIs occur within the first 2 days) and classify all cases as hospital or community acquired to the history at admission and what occurs during the hospital stay.

To account for possible unreported cases of CDI in the community, once we calculate the incidence of community-onset CDIs, we then calculate (using standard Markov chain calculations for absorption probabilities) the number of community-onset cases that seek treatment in the community or in the hospital. A fraction  $p_{Report}$  of patients that seek treatment in the community and all patients that do not seek treatment in the community but are admitted to hospital are considered 'reported' and count towards the incidence calculation when fitting the model to Lessa et al. A small number patients seek treatment in the community and then are also admitted to hospital before recovery; for simplicity only  $p_{Report}$  of these are considered reported. Patients that do not seek any form of treatment before recovering are not counted towards the 'reported' incidence calculation. Note that this adjustment for 'reporting' is not made when we determine whether a case is recurrent or not; that is any CDI (even if didn't seek treatment) in the patient's recent history excludes the current CDI as recurrent. This close approximation greatly simplifies the calculations for excluding recurrent cases.

To see the true (not classified) location of acquisition for each CDI, we use a modified model which splits every *C. difficile*-positive compartment into separate compartments for hospital and community-acquired. The incidence of community-acquired CDI is then the equilibrium transition rate from community-acquired, asymptotically colonised states to the corresponding community-acquired, symptomatically colonised states.

To compare the classification system to the true incidence, we use the methods described above on the modified model. For instance, we can calculate the incidence of community-acquired, community-onset CDI that is incorrectly classified as hospital-acquired, community-onset CDI: the rate at which people in community-acquired asymptotically colonised states (that have been in any of the hospital states in the past 4 weeks) transition into symptomatic states in the community. Note, we assume that the time and place of the onset of symptoms is always known accurately, i.e. community-onset cases are never misclassified as hospital-onset or vice versa.

## References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention - National Center for Health Statistics. In press. CDC Wonder: Underlying Cause of Death, Multiple Cause of Death Files, 1999–2016. See <http://wonder.cdc.gov/ucd-icd10.html> (accessed on 18 December 2017).
2. Foglia G, Shah S, Luxemburger C, Pietrobon PJF. 2012 Clostridium difficile: Development of a novel candidate vaccine. *Vaccine* **30**, 4307–4309. (doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.01.056)
3. de Bruyn G *et al.* 2016 Defining the optimal formulation and schedule of a candidate toxoid vaccine against Clostridium difficile infection: A randomized Phase 2 clinical trial. *Vaccine* **34**, 2170–2178. (doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.03.028)
4. Weiss AJ, Elixhauser A. 2006 Overview of Hospital Stays in the United States, 2012: Statistical Brief #180. *Healthc. Cost Util. Proj. Stat. Briefs*, 1–9.
5. MacDougall C, Polk RE. 2008 Variability in rates of use of antibacterials among 130 US hospitals and risk-adjustment models for interhospital comparison. *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* **29**, 203–11. (doi:10.1086/528810)
6. Australian Commonwealth Department of Health - Drug utilisation sub-committee (DUSC). 2015 Antibiotics : PBS / RPBS utilisation.
7. Rafii F, Sutherland JB, Cerniglia CE. 2008 Effects of treatment with antimicrobial agents on the human colonic microflora. *Ther. Clin. Risk Manag.* **4**, 1343–58.
8. Dial S, Kezouh A, Dascal A, Barkun A, Suissa S. 2008 Patterns of antibiotic use and risk of hospital admission because of Clostridium difficile infection. *CMAJ* **179**, 767–72. (doi:10.1503/cmaj.071812)
9. Bartlett JG. 1984 Treatment of Antibiotic-Associated Pseudomembranous Colitis. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **6**, S235–S241. (doi:10.1093/clinids/6.Supplement\_1.S235)
10. McLure A, Clements ACA, Kirk M, Glass K. 2017 Healthcare-Associated Clostridium difficile Infections are Sustained by Disease from the Community. *Bull. Math. Biol.* **79**, 2242–2257. (doi:10.1007/s11538-017-0328-8)
11. Johnson S, Homann SR, Bettin KM, Quick JN, Clabots CR, Peterson LR, Gerding DN. 1992 Treatment of asymptomatic Clostridium difficile carriers (fecal excretors) with vancomycin or metronidazole. A randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Ann. Intern. Med.* **117**, 297–302. (doi:10.7326/0003-4819-117-4-297)
12. Freeman J. 2003 Effects of cefotaxime and desacetylcefotaxime upon Clostridium difficile proliferation and toxin production in a triple-stage chemostat model of the human gut. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **52**, 96–102. (doi:10.1093/jac/dkg267)
13. Muto CA *et al.* 2005 A Large Outbreak of Clostridium difficile–Associated Disease with an Unexpected Proportion of Deaths and Colectomies at a Teaching Hospital Following Increased Fluoroquinolone Use. *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.* **26**, 273–280. (doi:10.1086/502539)
14. Van Cauteren D, De Valk H, Vaux S, Le Strat Y, Vaillant V. 2012 Burden of acute gastroenteritis and healthcare-seeking behaviour in France: a population-based study. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **140**, 697–705. (doi:10.1017/S0950268811000999)
15. Leffler DA, Lamont JT. 2009 Treatment of Clostridium difficile-associated disease. *Gastroenterology* **136**, 1899–912. (doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2008.12.070)
16. Holst E, Helin I, Mårdh PA. 1981 Recovery of Clostridium difficile from children. *Scand. J.*

- Infect. Dis.* **13**, 41–5. (doi:10.1080/00365548.1981.11690365)
17. Rousseau C, Poilane I, De Pontual L, Maherault A-C, Le Monnier A, Collignon A. 2012 Clostridium difficile Carriage in Healthy Infants in the Community: A Potential Reservoir for Pathogenic Strains. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **55**, 1209–1215. (doi:10.1093/cid/cis637)
  18. Kubota H *et al.* 2016 Longitudinal Investigation of Carriage Rates, Counts, and Genotypes of Toxigenic Clostridium difficile in Early Infancy. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **82**, 5806–14. (doi:10.1128/AEM.01540-16)
  19. Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP). 2014 HCUP National Inpatient Sample (NIS).
  20. Gerding DN, Lessa FC. 2015 The epidemiology of Clostridium difficile infection inside and outside health care institutions. *Infect. Dis. Clin. North Am.* **29**, 37–50. (doi:10.1016/j.idc.2014.11.004)
  21. Walker AS *et al.* 2012 Characterisation of Clostridium difficile hospital ward-based transmission using extensive epidemiological data and molecular typing. *PLoS Med.* **9**, e1001172. (doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001172)
  22. Adlerberth I, Huang H, Lindberg E, Åberg N, Hesselmar B, Saalman R, Nord CE, Wold AE, Weintraub A. 2014 Toxin-producing Clostridium difficile strains as long-term gut colonizers in healthy infants. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **52**, 173–9. (doi:10.1128/JCM.01701-13)
  23. Loo VG *et al.* 2011 Host and Pathogen Factors for Clostridium difficile Infection and Colonization. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **365**, 1693–1703. (doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1012413)
  24. Khanna S, Pardi DS, Aronson SL, Kammer PP, Orenstein R, St Sauver JL, Harmsen WS, Zinsmeister AR. 2012 The Epidemiology of Community-Acquired Clostridium difficile Infection: A Population-Based Study. *Am. J. Gastroenterol.* **107**, 89–95. (doi:10.1038/ajg.2011.398)
  25. Freeman J. 2005 Comparison of the efficacy of ramoplanin and vancomycin in both in vitro and in vivo models of clindamycin-induced Clostridium difficile infection. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **56**, 717–725. (doi:10.1093/jac/dki321)
  26. Khan FY *et al.* 2012 Epidemiological features of Clostridium difficile infection among inpatients at Hamad General Hospital in the state of Qatar, 2006–2009. *Travel Med. Infect. Dis.* **10**, 179–85. (doi:10.1016/j.tmaid.2012.06.004)
  27. Jarvis WR, Schlosser J, Jarvis AA, Chinn RY. 2009 National point prevalence of Clostridium difficile in US health care facility inpatients, 2008. *Am. J. Infect. Control* **37**, 263–270. (doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2009.01.001)
  28. Jangi S, Lamont JT. 2010 Asymptomatic Colonization by Clostridium difficile in Infants: Implications for Disease in Later Life. *J. Pediatr. Gastroenterol. Nutr.* **51**, 2–7. (doi:10.1097/MPG.0b013e3181d29767)
  29. Viscidi R, Laughon BE, Yolken R, Bo-Linn P, Moench T, Ryder RW, Bartlett JG. 1983 Serum Antibody Response to Toxins A and B of Clostridium difficile. *J. Infect. Dis.* **148**, 93–100. (doi:10.1093/infdis/148.1.93)