Emergence of Vibrio cholerae O1 Sequence Type 75, South Africa, 2018–2020

Anthony M. Smith, François-Xavier Weill, Elisabeth Njamkepo, Hlengiwe M. Ngomane, Ntsieni Ramalwa, Phuti Sekwadi, Juno Thomas

We describe the molecular epidemiology of cholera in South Africa during 2018–2020. *Vibrio cholerae* O1 sequence type (ST) 75 recently emerged and became more prevalent than the *V. cholerae* O1 biotype EI Tor pandemic clone. ST75 isolates were found across large spatial and temporal distances, suggesting local ST75 spread.

The seventh cholera pandemic, caused by *Vib*rio cholerae O1 biotype El Tor (7PET), arrived in Africa during 1970 and became endemic in many countries on the continent (1). Cholera was first reported in South Africa in 1974 (2). However, South Africa is not considered a cholera-endemic area; outbreaks typically are associated with importation, particularly from neighboring countries. The last cholera outbreak in South Africa was triggered by imported cases from an outbreak in Zimbabwe during 2008; South Africa reported 12,706 cases during November 2008–April 2009 (3).

Globally, 7PET isolates are genetically homogeneous and linked to the Bay of Bengal in South Asia (4,5). Most 7PET isolates are multidrug-resistant sequence type (ST) 69 (6). Rarely, 7PET has a single-locus variant, ST515, in isolates from Africa belonging to lineage T10 (7). As of September 2021, all cholera isolates from South Africa have been characterized as 7PET ST69 by multilocus sequence typing (MLST).

South Africa actively surveils for cholera. Since the 2008–2009 outbreak, few cases have been identified: 5 during 2010–2014, most of which were imported, and none during 2015–2017. During 2008–2009, large outbreaks occurred in 3 provinces, Mpumalanga,

Limpopo, and KwaZulu-Natal (3), but all were caused by imported cases from neighboring Zimbabwe and Mozambique. Therefore, given their experience, healthcare workers and laboratorians in these provinces typically will test for cholera in all cases of acute watery diarrhea.

In South Africa, the National Institute for Communicable Diseases (NICD) is notified of suspected cholera cases. NICD's Centre for Enteric Diseases supports case investigations and receives all human and environmental *V. cholerae* isolates for further investigation. The case definition for confirmed cholera is isolation of *V. cholerae* O1 or O139 from a person with diarrhea. We investigated the molecular epidemiology of *V. cholerae* in South Africa during 2018–2020.

The Study

During February 2018–January 2020, NICD received 102 *V. cholerae* isolates for testing; 9 were identified as *V. cholerae* O1. We characterized the bacteria by whole-genome sequencing, comparative genomics, and phylogenetic analysis (Appendix 1, https:// wwwnc.cdc.gov/EID/article/27/11/21-1144-App1. pdf). The Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of the Witwatersrand (Johannesburg, South Africa) provided ethics approval for this study (protocol no. M160667).

Of 9 *V. cholerae* O1 isolates tested, we identified 2 ST69 (7PET) and 7 ST75 isolates. The ST69 isolates were collected in October 2018 from 2 cholera patients in a family cluster. The index case-patient had traveled to Zimbabwe, where an outbreak was ongoing (*8*), within the 7-day cholera incubation period before symptom onset. We confirmed these ST69 isolates belonged to the previously described highly antimicrobial-resistant Zimbabwe outbreak strain (*8*). The 7 ST75 isolates originated from KwaZulu-Natal and Limpopo Provinces. Five isolates were collected

DOI: https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2711.211144

Author affiliations: National Institute for Communicable Diseases, Johannesburg, South Africa (A.M. Smith, H.M. Ngomane, N. Ramalwa, P. Sekwadi, J. Thomas); University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa (A.M. Smith, N. Ramalwa); Institut Pasteur, Paris, France (F.-X. Weill, E. Njamkepo)

	Patient				Source of		Linked	Type of	
Isolate		Sample	age,	Clinical	drinking		environmental	environmental	
no.	Province	collection date	y/sex	manifestations	water	Sanitation	samples	sample, isolate no	
YA0008	KwaZulu-	2018 Feb 8	37/F	Acute watery	Untreated	NA	N	NA	
5869	Natal			diarrhea, dehydration	river water				
YA0013	Limpopo	2018 Nov 9	38/M	Acute watery	Untreated	Pit latrine	N	NA	
2994				diarrhea, vomiting, dehydration	borehole water	and open defecation			
YA0013	Limpopo	2018 Nov 20	45/M	Acute watery	Untreated	Flush toilets	Y	Sewage,	
4463				diarrhea, dehydration	borehole water			OA01603367	
YA0019	KwaZulu-	2019 Dec 29	49/M	Acute watery	Untreated	Pit latrine	Y	River water,	
2016	Natal			diarrhea,	river water			CF00214281	
				abdominal cramps,					
				dehydration					
YA0019	KwaZulu-	2020 Jan 12	57/F	Acute watery	NA	NA	N	NA	
3061	Natal			diarrhea,					
				dehydration					

Table 1. Clinical and demographic characteristics of 5 patients hospitalized with *Vibrio cholerae* O1 ST75 diagnosed from stool cultures and risk factors for *V. cholerae* infection, South Africa, 2018–2020*

from patients with cholera, all adults 37-57 years of age; 2 isolates were from environmental samples collected during case investigations, 1 from sewage in Limpopo Province and 1 from river water in KwaZulu-Natal Province (Table 1). The 3 KwaZulu-Natal cases occurred ≈200-600 km apart; the first occurred in February 2018 and the last in January 2020. The 2 Limpopo cases occurred ≈70 km apart in the same district during November 2018. The Limpopo cases were \geq 900 km from the KwaZulu-Natal cases. Epidemiologic investigations involved interviewing case-patients by using a standard case investigation form; visiting case-patients' residences to inspect water and sanitation services and interview other household members; collecting stool samples from household members; and collecting environmental samples when indicated. Investigators found no evidence of importation from another country, epidemiologic links between cases, or secondary transmission.

The 7 ST75 isolates showed notable features (Table 2). In particular, all carried the cholera toxin (CTX) prophage resembling CTX-2 with *ctxB1* geno-

type; *Vibrio* pathogenicity island 1 (VPI-1) encoding the toxin co-regulated pilus; and a variant form of *Vibrio* pathogenicity island 2 (VPI-2). However, isolates did not contain *Vibrio* seventh pandemic island I (VSP-I) and VSP-II. We noted several genomic islands (GIs), including VC-GI 119, but GI-05 was not present (Appendix 2, https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/EID/ article/27/11/21-1144-App2.xlsx).

The only antimicrobial-resistance determinant found in all ST75 isolates was the *qnrVC4* gene, located in the chromosomal superintegron. Various *qnrVC* alleles previously have been reported in the *Vibrionaceae* family and sometimes are associated with fluoroquinolone resistance (10,11). However, all ST75 isolates we analyzed showed fluoroquinolone susceptibility, MIC of ciprofloxacin 0.06 μ g/mL, and susceptibility to all other tested antimicrobial drugs. This pansusceptibility sharply contrasts antimicrobial resistance trends observed in 7PET isolates from Africa, which reportedly became increasingly antimicrobial resistant over time; after the 2000s, none were susceptible to antimicrobial agents (5).

		Table 2. Features of Vibrio cholerae O1 ST75 isolates, South Africa, 2018–2020*													
							wbeT								
Serotype	Biotype	AMR phenotype	AMR gene	Plasmids	ctxB allele	tcpA	mutation†	Lineage‡							
Ogawa	El Tor	Pansusceptible	qnrVC4	None	ctxB1	<i>tcpA</i> ^{N16961}	WT	L3b.1							
Inaba	El Tor	Pansusceptible	qnrVC4	None	ctxB1	<i>tcpA</i> ^{N16961}	B08	L3b.1							
Inaba	El Tor	Pansusceptible	qnrVC4	None	ctxB1	<i>tcpA</i> ^{N16961}	B08	L3b.1							
Inaba	El Tor	Pansusceptible	qnrVC4	None	ctxB1	<i>tcpA</i> ^{N16961}	B08	L3b.1							
Ogawa	El Tor	Pansusceptible	gnrVC4	None	ctxB1	<i>tcpA</i> ^{N16961}	WT	L3b.1							
Ogawa	El Tor	Pansusceptible	gnrVC4	None	ctxB1	<i>tcpA</i> ^{N16961}	WT	L3b.1							
Ogawa	El Tor	Pansusceptible	qnrVC4	None	ctxB1	<i>tcpA</i> ^{N16961}	WT	L3b.1							
	Ogawa Inaba Inaba Inaba Ogawa Ogawa	Ogawa El Tor Inaba El Tor Inaba El Tor Inaba El Tor Inaba El Tor Ogawa El Tor Ogawa El Tor	Ogawa El Tor Pansusceptible Inaba El Tor Pansusceptible Ogawa El Tor Pansusceptible Ogawa El Tor Pansusceptible Ogawa El Tor Pansusceptible Ogawa El Tor Pansusceptible	OgawaEI TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4InabaEI TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4InabaEI TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4InabaEI TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4InabaEI TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4OgawaEI TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4OgawaEI TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4OgawaEI TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4OgawaEI TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4	OgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NoneInabaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NoneInabaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NoneInabaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NoneInabaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NoneOgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NoneOgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NoneOgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NoneOgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4None	OgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1InabaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1InabaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1InabaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1InabaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1OgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1OgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1OgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1OgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1	OgawaEl TorPansusceptible $qnrVC4$ None $ctxB1$ $tcpA^{N16961}$ InabaEl TorPansusceptible $qnrVC4$ None $ctxB1$ $tcpA^{N16961}$ OgawaEl TorPansusceptible $qnrVC4$ None $ctxB1$ $tcpA^{N16961}$ OgawaEl TorPansusceptible $qnrVC4$ None $ctxB1$ $tcpA^{N16961}$ OgawaEl TorPansusceptible $qnrVC4$ None $ctxB1$ $tcpA^{N16961}$	SerotypeBiotypeAMR phenotypeAMR genePlasmidsctxB alleletcpAmutation†OgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1tcpA^N16961WTInabaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1tcpA^N16961B08InabaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1tcpA^N16961B08InabaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1tcpA^N16961B08InabaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1tcpA^N16961B08OgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1tcpA^N16961WTOgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1tcpA^N16961WTOgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1tcpA^N16961WTOgawaEl TorPansusceptibleqnrVC4NonectxB1tcpA^N16961WT							

*AMR, antimicrobial resistance; ST, sequence type; WT, wild-type.

†Nomenclature according to F.-X. Weill et al. (5)



DISPATCHES

We further compared the ST75 isolates from South Africa with a larger global collection of 144 ST75, or closely related ST169, ST170, and ST182, genomes (Appendix 2), and constructed a maximum-likelihood phylogeny by using 49,540 SNPs (Figure). Our phylogenetic analysis showed that the 7 isolates from South Africa clustered in the L3b.1 clade, defined by H. Wang et al. (9), with a maximum pairwise distance of 22 SNPs. Isolates from Limpopo Province had a maximum pairwise distance of 1-6, but KwaZulu-Natal Province isolates had no SNP differences. Core-genome MLST showed Limpopo Province isolates differed from the KwaZulu-Natal Province isolates by 4-5 alleles (Appendix 1 Figure). The closest related isolates were collected in Russia from Rostov Oblast in 2005 and Republic of Kalmykia in 2011 and from Turkmenistan in Central Asia in 1965, but none of those isolates contained the CTX prophage. L3b.1 isolates from Taiwan containing the CTX prophage ctxB3 allele were more distant.

Emergence of ST75 L3b.1 clade in South Africa is cause for concern. Recent studies on *V. cholerae* O1 isolated in Taiwan (12) and China (13) reported emerging and potential toxigenic ST75. Genomic signatures of these ST75 isolates closely resembled the US Gulf Coast *V. cholerae* O1 clone that emerged in 1973 (14). In particular, an investigation of *V. cholerae* O1 isolated during 2002–2018 in Taiwan showed that ST75 emerged there in 2009 and now is more prevalent than the ST69 pandemic clone (12). Our findings from South Africa align with the findings from Taiwan, showing that ST75 isolates outnumber ST69 isolates.

One limitation of our study is that we used reference laboratory data and a review of published *V. cholerae* O1 data to conclude that all previous cholera isolates in South Africa characterized by MLST were *V. cholerae* O1 biotype El Tor ST69. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that *V. cholerae* O1 isolates not characterized by MLST, particularly those from environmental samples, could have been non-ST69.

Epidemic 7PET lineage cholera demands an aggressive public health response to prevent outbreaks. In contrast, sporadic *V. cholerae* O1 infections mediated by other lineages, including those carrying toxin co-regulated pilus and CTX genes, typically are not epidemic-prone; most are associated with sporadic cases that rarely lead to secondary transmission (*15*). Tailoring the public health response to the degree of epidemic risk would be invaluable, especially in resource-limited settings.

In countries that are not cholera-endemic but are at high risk for cholera introductions, conventional laboratory determination of *V. cholerae* O1, even complemented by identifying *ctxA* or *ctxB* genes, might be insufficient. Typing resolution of genomics, which distinguishes between 7PET and nonepidemic lineages, can elucidate the local and global epidemiology of cholera and inform public health decisions.

Conclusions

The emergence and dominance of nonepidemic, non-7PET, *V. cholerae* ST75 L3b.1 in South Africa requires close monitoring. The spatiotemporal pattern suggests local spread, possibly indicating a geographically widespread risk for sporadic disease from this strain. South Africa should strengthen its disease and environmental surveillance systems to identify nonpandemic ST75 strains, define local epidemiology, and inform an appropriate public health response.

Acknowledgments

We thank the following departments and divisions for their assistance during our study: the KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Centre for Disease Control and Prevention Directorate; health officials in King Cetshwayo, Ugu, and Umkhanyakude districts in KwaZulu-Natal Province; the Limpopo Province Department of Health; health officials in Capricorn District, Limpopo Province; National Health Laboratory Service laboratories and personnel, KwaZulu-Natal and Limpopo Province; Ampath Laboratories, KwaZulu-Natal Province; and Division of Public Health Surveillance and Response, National Institute for Communicable Diseases.

This study was funded by the United Kingdom Department of Health and Social Care, managed by the Fleming Fund, and performed under the auspices of the SEQAFRICA project. The Fleming Fund is a £265 million aid program supporting ≤24 low- and middle-income countries to generate, share, and use data on antimicrobial resistance. The Fleming Fund works in partnership with Mott MacDonald, the Management Agent for the Country and Regional Grants and Fellowship Programme.

About the Author

Dr. Smith is a principal medical scientist at the Centre for Enteric Diseases, National Institute for Communicable Diseases, Johannesburg, South Africa. He also holds an extraordinary professor appointment at the University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa. His research interests include surveillance and epidemiology of enteric bacterial pathogens in South Africa.

References

- Mintz ED, Tauxe RV. Cholera in Africa: a closer look and a time for action. J Infect Dis. 2013;208:S4–7. https://doi.org/ 10.1093/infdis/jit205
- 2. Küstner HG, Gibson IH, Carmichael TR, Van Zyl L, Chouler CA, Hyde JP, et al. The spread of cholera in South Africa. S Afr Med J. 1981;60:87–90.
- Ismail H, Smith AM, Tau NP, Sooka A, Keddy KH; Group for Enteric, Respiratory and Meningeal Disease Surveillance in South Africa. Cholera outbreak in South Africa, 2008–2009: laboratory analysis of *Vibrio cholerae* O1 strains. J Infect Dis. 2013;208:S39–45. https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jit200
- Mutreja A, Kim DW, Thomson NR, Connor TR, Lee JH, Kariuki S, et al. Evidence for several waves of global transmission in the seventh cholera pandemic. Nature. 2011;477:462–5. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10392
- Weill FX, Domman D, Njamkepo E, Tarr C, Rauzier J, Fawal N, et al. Genomic history of the seventh pandemic of cholera in Africa. Science. 2017;358:785–9. https://doi.org/ 10.1126/science.aad5901
- Ramamurthy T, Mutreja A, Weill FX, Das B, Ghosh A, Nair GB. Revisiting the global epidemiology of cholera in conjunction with the genomics of *Vibrio cholerae*. Front Public Health. 2019;7:203. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2019.00203
- Irenge LM, Ambroise J, Mitangala PN, Bearzatto B, Kabangwa RKS, Durant JF, et al. Genomic analysis of pathogenic isolates of *Vibrio cholerae* from eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (2014–2017). PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2020; 14:e0007642. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0007642
- Mashe T, Domman D, Tarupiwa A, Manangazira P, Phiri I, Masunda K, et al. Highly resistant cholera outbreak strain in Zimbabwe. N Engl J Med. 2020;383:687–9. https://doi.org/ 10.1056/NEJMc2004773
- Wang H, Yang C, Sun Z, Zheng W, Zhang W, Yu H, et al. Genomic epidemiology of *Vibrio cholerae* reveals the regional and global spread of two epidemic non-toxigenic lineages. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2020;14:e0008046. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0008046
- Fonseca EL, Dos Santos Freitas F, Vieira VV, Vicente ACP. New *qnr* gene cassettes associated with superintegron repeats in *Vibrio cholerae* O1. Emerg Infect Dis. 2008;14:1129– 31. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1407.080132
- Fonseca EL, Vicente ACP. Epidemiology of *qnrVC* alleles and emergence out of the *Vibrionaceae* family. J Med Microbiol. 2013;62:1628–30. https://doi.org/10.1099/jmm.0.062661-0
- Tu YH, Chen BH, Hong YP, Liao YS, Chen YS, Liu YY, et al. Emergence of *Vibrio cholerae* O1 sequence type 75 in Taiwan. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020;26:164–6. https://doi.org/10.3201/ eid2601.190934
- Luo Y, Octavia S, Jin D, Ye J, Miao Z, Jiang T, et al. US Gulflike toxigenic O1 Vibrio cholerae causing sporadic cholera outbreaks in China. J Infect. 2016;72:564–72. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jinf.2016.02.005
- Wachsmuth IK, Bopp CA, Fields PI, Carrillo C. Difference between toxigenic *Vibrio cholerae* O1 from South America and US Gulf Coast. Lancet. 1991;337:1097–8. https://doi. org/10.1016/0140-6736(91)91744-F
- Domman D, Quilici ML, Dorman MJ, Njamkepo E, Mutreja A, Mather AE, et al. Integrated view of *Vibrio cholerae* in the Americas. Science. 2017;358:789–93. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao2136

Address for correspondence: Anthony Smith, Centre for Enteric Diseases, National Institute for Communicable Diseases, Private Bag X4, Sandringham, 2131, Johannesburg, South Africa; email: anthonys@nicd.ac.za

EID Podcast Livestock, Phages, MRSA, and People in Denmark



Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, better known as MRSA, is often found on human skin. But MRSA can also cause dangerous infections that are resistant to common antimicrobial drugs. Epidemiologists carefully monitor any new mutations or transmission modes that might lead to the spread of this infection.

Approximately 15 years ago, MRSA emerged in livestock. From 2008 to 2018, the proportion of infected pigs in Denmark rocketed from 3.5% to 90%.

What happened, and what does this mean for human health?

In this EID podcast, Dr. Jesper Larsen, a senior researcher at the Statens Serum Institut, describes the spread of MRSA from livestock to humans.

Visit our website to listen: https://go.usa.gov/x74Jh EMERGING INFECTIOUS DISEASES®