



Overview about *Candida auris*: what's up 12 years after its first description?

Guillaume Desoubieux, Alix T Coste, Christine Imbert, Christophe Hennequin

► To cite this version:

Guillaume Desoubieux, Alix T Coste, Christine Imbert, Christophe Hennequin. Overview about *Candida auris*: what's up 12 years after its first description?. *Journal of Medical Mycology = Journal de Mycologie Médicale*, 2022, 32 (2), pp.101248. 10.1016/j.mycmed.2022.101248 . hal-03554923

HAL Id: hal-03554923

<https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-03554923>

Submitted on 3 Feb 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Overview about *Candida auris*: what's up 12 years after its first description?**

2 Guillaume Desoubreaux¹, Alix T. Coste², Christine Imbert³, Christophe Hennequin^{4, #}

3 1. Parasitologie – Mycologie – Médecine tropicale, Hôpital Bretonneau, F-37044 CHRU Tours,
4 France

5 2. Institute of Microbiology, University hospital Lausanne, 1011 Lausanne, Switzerland

6 3. Laboratoire Ecologie et Biologie des Interactions, Université de Poitiers, UMR CNRS 7267, F-
7 86073 Poitiers, France

8 4. Sorbonne Université, Inserm, Centre de Recherche Saint-Antoine, CRSA, AP-HP, Hôpital Saint-
9 Antoine, Service de Parasitologie-Mycologie, F-75012 Paris, France

10

11 *Corresponding author: christophe.hennequin@sorbonne-universite.fr

12 Hôpital St-Antoine, laboratoire de Parasitologie - Mycologie

13 184 Rue du Faubourg Saint-Antoine, 75012 Paris - FRANCE

14 Tel.: +33(0)1 49 28 30 30 Fax: +33(0)2 47 47 8082

15 **Abstract**

16 *Candida auris* has been described as an emerging yeast species during the last decade. As many as
17 25% of its strains may naturally exhibit multi-drug resistance to the currently available antifungal
18 drugs. Probably due to its ability to survive more than two weeks on inert surfaces, several large
19 outbreaks have been reported, primarily due to nosocomial transmissions. In addition, due to a
20 rapid worldwide spreading, *C. auris* is now considered as a major public health threat. This review
21 aims at describing the current knowledge about *C. auris*, with specific focuses on its global
22 epidemiology, virulence features, most reliable diagnostic approaches, and the current and future
23 therapeutic options.

24

25 Keywords: *Candida auris*; epidemiology; genetic; diagnosis; resistance

26

27 Number of words: 3105

28

29 Number of figures: 2

30

31 Number of table: 1

Introduction

First described in 2009, *Candida auris* has rapidly been placed in the spotlight, not only of medical journals, but also making the headlines of mass media (1,2) (Figure 1). Indeed, this yeast species causing large hospital outbreaks and characterized by a high level of antifungal resistance has emerged as a major threat for the public health over the last ten years (3,4). *Candida auris* cases have now been reported over all the continents (Figure 2) (5–8). However, the true prevalence of *C. auris* over the world remains partly unknown as the species identification can be challenging, notably in low-income countries. Yet, it is critical that all microbiology laboratories are able to rapidly recognize the species and test the *in vitro* susceptibility for every *C. auris* isolates (9). Indeed, a rapid and reliable detection is of utmost importance to limit the nosocomial transmission. Controlling and preventing the spread of *C. auris* requires the isolation of any colonized/infected individual and the screening of any contact cases. Sampling the medical environment for detecting a source of contamination can complete the investigation. The reinforcement of standard hygiene measures remains also a key-feature to limit outbreaks expansion.

This brief review focuses on the latest scientific data published on *C. auris*, regarding its epidemiology and virulence, the diagnostic approaches, and the preventive and curative strategies.

Epidemiology: history and current trends

The origins of *Candida auris* and its initial ecological niche(s) are still largely unknown to date. The emergence of very different clades in different places of the world in a very short period of time is particularly intriguing. Some have suggested the global warming may have played a role in the selection of this organism (10,11). It is then assumed that spreading may have been ensured

54 thanks to animals with high body temperature, *e.g.* birds, that would have been responsible for
55 distributing the fungus into urban areas where it could subsequently infect humans (10).

56 Soon after the species was first described from an isolate collected from the external ear canal of a
57 Japanese patient in 2009 (1), several clusters of cases were reported from India in 2009-11 ($n=12$
58 patients) and 2010-14 ($n=90$) (12,13). However, it was *a posteriori* shown that *C. auris* had been
59 introduced in some countries, notably France, before the original description of the species (14).

60 Similar conclusions arose from Asia, where retrospective analysis of stored strains have detected
61 the presence of *C. auris* before 2009 in South Korea (15,16). So far, Portugal, Ireland Republic,
62 and Scandinavian countries (except Norway) are the only western European nations having not
63 declared any case (17,18).

64 It clearly appears that *C. auris* has a noticeable propensity to generate outbreaks. Some of the
65 largest ones are summarized in Table 1. However outbreak spreading is not systematic as shown
66 with a single case of colonization reported in France (Tours) in 2020, in a Lebanese patient who
67 visited Iran and India before arriving in Europe (9). To date, the United States of America has been
68 the country with the highest number of cases declared: 1,157 cases of proven or probable infection
69 notified to the Center for Diseases Control (CDC) and more than 3,043 cases of colonization were
70 reported (<https://www.cdc.gov/fungal/candida-auris/tracking-c-auris.html>). However, it is
71 noteworthy that the incidence of *C. auris* infection in the US is actually greatly heterogeneous
72 depending on the geographic areas: more than 285, 242 and 245 deep-seated infections have been
73 reported in the state of New York, Illinois and California, respectively (19,20), while some
74 neighbor states, such as Vermont, Wisconsin or Oregon, are free of *C. auris* detection to date. A 4-
75 cases cluster has also been reported from Canada (Greater Vancouver area) in 2018 (21). More
76 recently, several South American countries have reported *C. auris* outbreaks for the first time in
77 the context of COVID-19 pandemic (22). Similarly, in India, *C. auris* was responsible for 60%

78 cases of candidemia in a single COVID-19 ward (23). Considering the length of stay of such
79 infected patients in ICU, the viral infection may represent an indirect predisposing factor for the
80 (re)emergence of *C. auris* (9,22,23).

81 In the more advanced countries, after the occurrence of large outbreaks, cases became more
82 sporadic and *C. auris* only represent a minority of candidiasis cases, sometimes grouped in small
83 clusters (4,24). In contrast, in some low-income countries such as South Africa, *C. auris* may
84 represent as much as 14% of the causative species for candidemia (25) and has become the fifth
85 most common cause of fungal bloodstream infection in children (26).

86 Thanks to whole genome sequencing (WGS) population genetic studies revealed that *C. auris*
87 species is split into four major clades (27). Genetic distribution follows the geographic origin of
88 the strains with clade I, so-called the South Asian clade, made of strains of Indo-Pakistani origin,
89 clade II, referred to as the East clade, made of Korean and Japanese strains, clade III is the South
90 African clade, and clade IV referenced as the South American clade composed of Colombian and
91 Venezuelan strains. In the USA, the clade I is largely predominant, except in Illinois and Indiana
92 where clades III and IV are the most prevalent (19), suggesting different timing for the introduction
93 of those strains. In Europe, most *C. auris* isolates belong to the clade I (7), although the strains of
94 the Valencia hospital (Spain) were slightly genotypically-distinct from all those previously
95 reported (24). Noteworthy, a strain of the clade II was also found in Austria (28). In 2019, some
96 Iranian authors suggested the existence of a potential fifth clade, separated from the other clades
97 by >200,000 single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP), in a patient who had never traveled outside
98 the country (29).

99

100 **Virulence: is something different from other *Candida* species?**

101 Virulence of *C. auris* is more and more investigated using a wide variety of models, either *in vitro*
102 (30), *in vivo* - mouse (31,32), or invertebrate nematodes like *Caenorhabditis elegans* (33,34), or
103 the wax moth *Galleria mellonella* (34–36) -, or *ex vivo* – oral (31) and skin models (37). As
104 commonly seen with opportunistic fungal pathogens, results greatly vary according to the model,
105 but some results also support difference in virulence according to the tested strains.

106 By studying more than 100 *C. auris* isolates-, Carvajal *et al.* looking at the mortality at day-5 post
107 infection, in a *G. mellonella* model, were able distinguish between a highly pathogenic population
108 (35.5% of the isolates) and a moderately pathogenic one- (36). In a mouse model undergoing
109 cortisone acetate-induced immunosuppression, Abe *et al.* reported that the capability of
110 colonization and dissemination from gastro-intestinal tracts was higher for four strains isolated
111 from pathogenic condition (bloodstream infections) than for two non-invasive strains (isolated
112 from chronic otitis media) (32). The virulence of *C. auris* was also compared to other *Candida*
113 species. Using the *G. mellonella* model, Romera *et al.* concluded on a higher pathogenicity of *C.*
114 *albicans* clinical strains, when considering the larva death rate as primary outcome (35). However,
115 other authors observed that the pathogenicity pattern of a *C. albicans* reference strain (SC5314)
116 was somewhat comparable to that of 38% of their 107 *C. auris* isolates (36).

117 Understanding how *C. auris* invade the epithelial layer, while it does not form hyphae, remains a
118 challenge. Indeed, Ben-Ami *et al.* reported considerable virulence of *C. auris* in mice, more than
119 what could be expected for a *Candida* species that produces no – or only rudimentary, after
120 experimental passages through mammalian hosts (38) – hyphae. Depending on isolates from
121 certain clades, the formation of large yeast cell aggregating in infected tissue, a phenomenon also
122 found in *Galleria* larvae infected (39,40) and in a model of neutropenic mice, may play a role in
123 the virulence (41). Actually, the capacity to form aggregates, referred to as the aggregative

phenotype, is a unique pathogenic feature displayed by some isolates of *C. auris* (30). Recent results suggested that the non-aggregative phenotype of *C. auris* isolates may exhibit some level of immune evasion (30). For instance, Hernando-Ortiz *et al.* recently concluded that the pathogenicity of 11 non-aggregative clinical isolates was higher than that of an aggregative strain in a nematode and the wax moth host models. (34). In contrast, Carvajal *et al.* observed no significant difference in *G. mellonella* mortality induced by either aggregative ($n=35$) or non-aggregative *C. auris* strains ($n=72$) (36), which was consistent with some previous findings (35).

Recent data also showed the ability of *C. auris* to adhere and to form biofilm. Highlighting the importance of the model, Vila *et al.* showed that *C. auris* avidly adhere to an *ex-vivo* oral tissue (tongue epithelium), but failed *in vivo* to colonize the oral cavity (31). Through *in vitro* tests, Vila *et al.* observed that *C. auris* formed less biofilm than *C. albicans*, despite some substantial variability for the former (31). Using scanning electron microscopy, they also demonstrated the formation in 72 hours of biofilm within catheter lumens implanted subcutaneously in mouse, *C. auris* and *C. albicans* producing comparable levels of biofilm. The influence of the environmental conditions was also highlighted by Horton *et al.* who compared biofilm produced by *C. auris* and *C. albicans* strains in a synthetic sweat medium mimicking axillary skin conditions and in RPMI culture medium (37). Interestingly, *C. auris* produced a significantly denser biofilm than *C. albicans* in the mimicked skin medium, whereas the almost contrary was observed in RPMI medium (32,33). Using an immunosuppressed mouse model, Abe *et al.* found that invasive strains of *C. auris* form more biofilm than non-invasive ones (32). They correlated this difference to the higher capability of the formers to colonize the gastrointestinal tract (32). Hernando-Ortiz *et al.* also suggested that the biofilm formation could be related to the aggregative phenotype, as the strains exhibiting this trait produced more biofilm than the non-aggregative ones (34), a result

147 inconsistent with others previously published (42). Recent analyses suggested that, irrespective of
148 the ability to produce biofilm, the transcriptome of aggregative cells was significantly different
149 from that of non-aggregative ones during the biofilm formation (30). Of note, these data have to be
150 interpreted with caution, because of the low number of strains that were studied and the great
151 variability of their capacity to form biofilm independently of their aggregative/non aggregative
152 phenotype.

153 Despite a dramatic increase in our knowledge in the biology of *C. auris*, altogether, these results
154 highlight how parceled is our understanding of the pathogenicity that is obviously a multifactorial
155 phenomenon. Further studies comparing large groups of strains belonging to the different clades in
156 different models are thus warranted.

157

158 **Diagnosis: steps to reach a reliable identification**

159 Identification of *C. auris* is crucial to initiate adequate treatment and contain hospital outbreaks.
160 As a member of the *Candida/Clavispora* clade, *C. auris* does not have different requirements for
161 growth from other *Candida* species (43). Colonies can be easily obtained after 24 hours incubation
162 at 30-35°C on conventional media, such as Sabouraud dextrose agar or malt extract agar. Of note,
163 *C. auris* is tolerant to temperature up to 42°C (9), which is not the case of many other *Candida*
164 species. On the conventional CHROMagar Candida® chromogenic media (Becton-Dickinson,
165 Rungis, France), *C. auris* colonies appear white, pink, or purple (9). On the CAN2® plates
166 (bioMérieux, Capronne, France), colonies are initially whitish, and then display a light reddish-
167 pink color, very close to that of *Candida kefyr* or *Candida tropicalis* (9). Two specific chromogenic
168 media, so called CHROMagar Candida Plus® (Becton-Dickinson, Rungis, France) and HiCrome
169 *C. auris* MDR® selective agar (HiMedia, Mumbai, India), have been recently set-up to isolate and

presumptively identify *C. auris* with an almost 100% sensitivity and specificity rates after 36-48 h of incubation (44–46). *C. auris* can also grow in blood culture vial, in aerobic flasks or using Fungal IC/F® bottles (Becton-Dickinson, Rungis, France) (personal data). At direct examination, the yeasts appear ovoid and budding without pseudo-hyphae.

When using auxanogram, *C. auris* can be recognized through its capability of assimilation of N-acetylglucosamine, succinic acid and gluconic acid. However, the species is not referenced in most of the databases of former handbooks, thus leading to false negative results or misidentifications (47), notably with strains of the *Candida haemulonii* clade (13).

Nowadays, definitive identification of *C. auris* species can be achieved by the mean of mass spectrometry MALDI-TOF combined with an up-to-date spectra database. This is the case for the Bruker Biotyper® (Palaiseau, France) and the bioMérieux Vitek® systems (Capronne, France), as well as the independent user-made MSI® library (Paris, France).

Several molecular tools have also been developed for the identification and/or detection of *C. auris*. Once colonies are isolated onto agar plates, they can be confidently identified by sequencing either the D1/D2 region of the large subunit (LSU) or the internal transcribed spacer (ITS) of the ribosomal DNA. Interestingly, combining the analysis of these two loci allows the assignation of strains to one of the four major clades without recourse to WGS approaches (48). Otherwise, a few molecular protocols have been proposed to detect *C. auris* directly from swabs (49,50), allowing thus rapid screening of asymptomatic patients. Recently, two commercial kits have been evaluated with noticeable differences in terms of sensitivity and specificity (51).

190

Therapeutic options: multi-resistance and current limits

192 Almost all *C. auris* strains exhibit *in vitro* resistance to fluconazole, with strains from certain clades
193 also showing elevated minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) to the other azole antifungal
194 agents higher than those of other *Candida* species, especially *C. albicans* and even *C. glabrata* (52)
195 (53). Some resistance profiles were found to be clade-dependant (54): for example, fluconazole
196 and voriconazole exhibited significantly higher MICs against isolates of the South African lineage
197 than against isolates of the Southern Asian lineage. In addition, lesser susceptibility to amphotericin
198 B and to echinocandins has been reported in some isolates, and rapid emergence of multidrug
199 resistance (defined by resistance against at least two antifungal classes) has been documented to
200 occur during antifungal treatment. Clinical breakpoints were recently proposed for echinocandins
201 with values set at 2, 4, and 4 µg/mL, for caspofungin, anidulafungin, and micafungin, respectively,
202 at 2 for amphotericin B and at 32 for fluconazole (no data are available for other azole drugs) (55).
203 Using these values, Chowdary *et al.* showed that 90% of 350 Indian strains were resistant to
204 fluconazole, 8% to amphotericin B, and 2% to echinocandins, with 25% of the strains exhibiting a
205 multidrug profile (56). These data were used to propose therapeutic recommendations, suggesting
206 an echinocandin as first line therapy in the case of proven or probable diagnosis of *C. auris* invasive
207 infection (57).

208 The investigation of molecular mechanisms underlying the phenotype of azole resistance in *C.*
209 *auris* first allowed the demonstration of homologues of genes involved directly or not in the
210 ergosterol biosynthesis pathway in *C. albicans*. A limited number of non-synonymous point
211 mutations (F126, Y132, K143 and F444 (3)) were found the *ERG11* homologue that correlates with
212 an increase in azoles MICs (56,58). Moreover, two homologues of the *C. albicans* *TAC1* gene, so
213 called *TAC1a* and *TAC1b*, have also been described. In *C. albicans*, Tac1 is a transcription factor
214 regulating the ABC transporters Cdr1 and Cdr2, two efflux pumps, which overexpression due to

Commenté [CA1]: Ici il y a un probleme avec les ref....

Commenté [CH2]: Manque la ref 54 non ?

Commenté [CH3]: je ne comprends pas ce que fait cette ref ici ?

Mis en forme : Couleur de police : Texte 1

Mis en forme : Couleur de police : Texte 1

215 Tac1 gain of function mutation is responsible for azoles resistance. However, only *TAC1b*
 216 displayed a (moderate) role in azole susceptibility of *C. auris* (59–61): Li *et al.* and Ryback *et al.*
 217 specified the role of two gain-of-function mutations in *TAC1b*, at position S611P and A640V,
 218 respectively (59,61). Thus, some authors clearly pointed out the importance of the Cdr1 protein in
 219 the azole resistance of *C. auris* (61,62), whereas others evidenced a Cdr1-independent pathway of
 220 action for Tac1b, which remains to be elucidated (59–61). Mrr1 is another transcription factor that
 221 regulates the expression of the Major facilitator transporter Mdr1 which overexpression due to
 222 Mrr1 gain of function mutation is responsible for fluconazole resistance. ~~However, up to now, no~~
 223 ~~clear role of the~~Recent data suggest a role of *C. auris* homologue of *MRR1*, ~~has been~~
 224 ~~demonstrated in azole susceptibility. Indeed, deletion of *MRR1a* in clade III strains (60), and N647T mutation~~
 225 ~~(Dr F. Lamothe, personal communication) were shown to be responsible for azoles decrease~~
 226 ~~susceptibility.~~ Regarding the resistance to echinocandins, the role of the S639F mutation in *FKS1*
 227 hot-spot 1 has been highlighted (56). Some strains were shown to exhibit an eagle effect in presence
 228 of high concentration of caspofungin *in vitro*, but with no apparent impact on the *in vivo* efficacy
 229 at human dosage in a murine model of infection (63).

230 A very recent *in vitro* study demonstrated by WGS the high potential of *C. auris* to rapidly adapt
 231 to drug pressure whatever the antifungal drug (64). The elevation of MIC resulted from acquisition
 232 of different point mutations in genes already known to be associated with antifungal resistance
 233 (64,65), but also by duplicating part of the genome carrying those genes to further increase MIC,
 234 as previously shown in *C. albicans* (66,67). This was further supported by karyotyping experiments
 235 described by Bravo Ruiz *et al.* (68) who showed how extreme the genomic plasticity of *C. auris* is
 236 when the yeast is confronted to a large range of stresses. It is thus crucial to explore in the near
 237 future innovative therapeutic options. New triazoles or tetrazoles (VT-1598) appeared to be

Commenté [DIH4]: Je pense que tu peux écrire une phrase à ce
 sujet, Alix. Le temps que l'article soit revu et publié, peut-être que le
 tien sera accepté avant (sinon, on mettra unpublished data)

238 efficient on azole-resistant *C. auris* strains (69). The new echinocandin, referred as rezafungin, was
239 also found to be as or more active than other echinocandin drugs both *in vitro* (70–72) and in mouse
240 models (73,74). More interestingly, new antifungals currently under development, such as
241 ibrexafungrep, the first drug of the triterpenoid class, and the fosmanogepix could be available
242 soon. The latter, first member of a new therapeutic class targetting the Gwt1 protein (involved in
243 GPI anchor biosynthesis pathway), exhibits interesting results, including on strains that are multi-
244 resistant to current treatments (69,75).

245 **Prevention: which prophylactic means in healthcare facilities?**

246 While modes of acquisition remain uncertain, the ability to form biofilms and to acquire antifungal
247 resistance points out the need to rapidly implement appropriate prevention measures to limit the
248 spread of *C. auris* in healthcare facilities. In a recent study carried out in a Chicago hospital, 31
249 colonized residents were found to have high *C. auris* burden on their skin, estimated at 1.22×10^5
250 cells/swabbing by culture. This was positively correlated with contamination of their surrounding
251 environment with the demonstration of *C. auris* on all handrails of beds, on doorknobs and
252 windowsills (76). Therefore, every patient suspected to host *C. auris* either because of a history of
253 contact-case or a recent stay in an endemic country should be systematically screened. Serial
254 sampling sessions have to be repeated weekly until hospital discharge (77). All cases of *C. auris*
255 colonization or infection should be clearly identified and notified to a multi-disciplinary staff
256 specialized in hygiene issues and nosocomial infection (4,78). Deployment of subsequent
257 containment measures should expectedly lead to a gradual decline in the incidence of positive cases
258 and prevent further emergence of cluster. Thus, strict isolation of concerned subjects, similar to
259 that set up for patients harboring multi-drug resistant bacteria, is highly recommended.

260 It is considered that *C. auris* can be transmitted either by direct or indirect contact (79). For instance
261 contaminated reusable skin/surface temperature probes have been clearly demonstrated the source
262 of infection in an English hospital outbreak (80). It is thus crucial to recall healthcare givers the
263 importance to thoroughly wash their hands when moving from one patient to another. Gloves, lab-
264 coat must also be changed, and all and medical instruments, like stethoscopes, ultrasound devices,
265 or thermometers, carefully cleaned. For cleaning inert material, quaternary ammonium
266 disinfectants should be avoided because they have been shown to be ineffective against *C. auris*
267 (81). In contrast, sodium hypochlorite, peracetic acid, and hydrogen peroxide have been
268 experimentally proven to reduce the fungal load as measured by CFU counting by 5.0 to 6.0 Log₁₀
269 (81,82). Disposable wipes soaked with sodium hypochlorite must be preferred for cleaning
270 surfaces. Recent reports suggested chlorhexidine- or iodine-povidone-based products to be greatly
271 efficient to reducing the fungal burden on the skin (83–85). Those skin antiseptics should be used
272 for cleaning localized wound or to reduce the cutaneous burden before surgery for example.
273 National guidelines regarding prevention ~~measures~~measures and the optimal care of patients
274 infected or colonized with *C. auris* have been recently published (78,86).

275 Beside the human impact, controlling *C. auris* in healthcare facilities leads to a huge overcosts. In
276 a tertiary care center in London, the cost for implementing specific measures were assessed at £1
277 million (1.332 M€, 1.176 M\$), followed by £58,000/month during the subsequent year (87).

278

279 **Conclusion**

280 In less than 15 years, *C. auris* became of major fungal pathogen, both because of its capability to
281 generate large outbreaks and the possible therapeutic dead-end it represents. Critical advances in

the knowledge of this species have been obtained, but mycologists have to keep staying vigilant for reliably diagnosing the cases during possible advent of outbreaks in their healthcare facilities.

Ethics

Not applicable

Disclosure of conflicts of interest

AC, CI and CH are editors-in-chief of the *Journal of Medical Mycology*; GD serves as a recurrent associate editor.

Funding

Neither grant nor industrial funding was required for this study.

References

1. Satoh K, Makimura K, Hasumi Y, Nishiyama Y, Uchida K, Yamaguchi H. *Candida auris* sp. nov., a novel ascomycetous yeast isolated from the external ear canal of an inpatient in a Japanese hospital. *Microbiol Immunol*. 2009 Jan;53(1):41–4.
2. A Mysterious Infection, Spanning the Globe in a Climate of Secrecy - The New York Times [Internet]. [cited 2021 Aug 9]. Available from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/06/health/drug-resistant-candida-auris.html>
3. Lockhart SR, Etienne KA, Vallabhaneni S, Farooqi J, Chowdhary A, Govender NP, et al. Simultaneous emergence of multidrug-Resistant *Candida auris* on 3 continents confirmed by whole-genomesequencing and epidemiological analyses. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2017 Jan 15;64(2):134–40.
4. Schelenz S, Hagen F, Rhodes JL, Abdolrasouli A, Chowdhary A, Hall A, et al. First hospital outbreak of the globally emerging *Candida auris* in a European hospital. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2016;5:35.

- 308 5. Umamaheshwari S, Neelambike SM, Shankarnarayan SA, Kumarswamy KS, Gopal S, Prakash H, et
309 al. Clinical profile, antifungal susceptibility, and molecular characterization of *Candida auris* isolated
310 from patients in a South Indian surgical ICU. J Med Mycol. 2021 Dec 1;31(4):101176.
- 311 6. Rodriguez JY, Le Pape P, Lopez O, Esquea K, Labiosa AL, Alvarez-Moreno C. *Candida auris*: a
312 latent threat to critically ill patients with COVID-19. Clin Infect Dis. 2020 Oct 18;ciaa1595.
- 313 7. Rhodes J, Fisher MC. Global epidemiology of emerging *Candida auris*. Curr Opin Microbiol. 2019
314 Dec;52:84–9.
- 315 8. Du H, Bing J, Hu T, Ennis CL, Nobile CJ, Huang G. *Candida auris*: epidemiology, biology,
316 antifungal resistance, and virulence. PLOS Pathog. 2020 Oct 22;16(10):e1008921.
- 317 9. Desoubeaux G, Bailly É, Guillaume C, De Kyvon M-A, Tellier A-C, Morange V, et al. *Candida auris*
318 in contemporary mycology labs: a few practical tricks to identify it reliably according to one recent
319 French experience. J Mycol Medecale. 2018 Jun;28(2):407–10.
- 320 10. van Rhijn N, Bromley M. The consequences of our changing environment on life threatening and
321 debilitating fungal diseases in humans. J Fungi Basel Switz. 2021 May 7;7(5):367.
- 322 11. Casadevall A, Kontoyiannis DP, Robert V. Environmental *Candida auris* and the global warming
323 emergence hypothesis. mBio. 2021 Mar 16;12(2):e00360-21.
- 324 12. Chowdhary A, Sharma C, Duggal S, Agarwal K, Prakash A, Singh PK, et al. New clonal strain of
325 *Candida auris*, Delhi, India. Emerg Infect Dis. 2013 Oct;19(10):1670–3.
- 326 13. Kathuria S, Singh PK, Sharma C, Prakash A, Masih A, Kumar A, et al. Multidrug-resistant *Candida*
327 *auris* misidentified as *Candida haemulonii*: characterization by Matrix-assisted laser desorption
328 ionization-time of flight mass spectrometry and DNA sequencing and its antifungal susceptibility
329 profile variability by Vitek 2, CLSI broth microdilution, and Etest method. J Clin Microbiol. 2015
330 Jun;53(6):1823–30.
- 331 14. Desnos-Ollivier M, Fekkar A, Bretagne S. Earliest case of *Candida auris* infection imported in 2007
332 in Europe from India prior to the 2009 description in Japan. J Med Mycol. 2021 Apr 8;31(3):101139.
- 333 15. Kim M-N, Shin JH, Sung H, Lee K, Kim E-C, Ryoo N, et al. *Candida haemulonii* and closely related
334 species at 5 university hospitals in Korea: identification, antifungal susceptibility, and clinical
335 features. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. 2009 Mar 15;48(6):e57-61.
- 336 16. Shin JH, Kim M-N, Jang SJ, Ju MY, Kim SH, Shin MG, et al. Detection of amphotericin B resistance
337 in *Candida haemulonii* and closely related species by use of the Etest, Vitek-2 yeast susceptibility
338 system, and CLSI and EUCAST broth microdilution methods. J Clin Microbiol. 2012
339 Jun;50(6):1852–5.
- 340 17. Chen J, Tian S, Han X, Chu Y, Wang Q, Zhou B, et al. Is the superbug fungus really so scary? A
341 systematic review and meta-analysis of global epidemiology and mortality of *Candida auris*. BMC
342 Infect Dis. 2020 Dec;20(1):1–10.
- 343 18. Plachouras D, Lötsch F, Kohlenberg A, Monnet DL, Group the C auris survey collaborative. *Candida*
344 *auris*: epidemiological situation, laboratory capacity and preparedness in the European Union and
345 European Economic Area*, January 2018 to May 2019. Eurosurveillance. 2020 Mar
346 26;25(12):2000240.

- 347 19. Chow NA, Gade L, Tsay SV, Forsberg K, Greenko JA, Southwick KL, et al. Multiple introductions
348 and subsequent transmission of multidrug-resistant *Candida auris* in the USA: a molecular
349 epidemiological survey. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2018 Dec;18(12):1377–84.
- 350 20. Adams E, Quinn M, Tsay S, Poirot E, Chaturvedi S, Southwick K, et al. *Candida auris* in healthcare
351 facilities, New York, USA, 2013–2017. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2018 Oct;24(10):1816–24.
- 352 21. Eckbo EJ, Wong T, Bharat A, Cameron-Lane M, Hoang L, Dawar M, et al. First reported outbreak of
353 the emerging pathogen *Candida auris* in Canada. *Am J Infect Control*. 2021 Jun;49(6):804–7.
- 354 22. de Jong AW, Francisco EC, de Almeida JN, Brandão IB, Pereira FM, Dias PHP, et al. Nanopore
355 genome sequencing and variant analysis of the susceptible *Candida auris* strain L1537/2020,
356 Salvador, Brazil. *Mycopathologia*. 2021 Dec;186(6):883–7.
- 357 23. Chowdhary A, Tarai B, Singh A, Sharma A. Multidrug-resistant *Candida auris* infections in critically
358 ill coronavirus sisease patients, India, April–July 2020. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020 Nov;26(11):2694–6.
- 359 24. Ruiz-Gaitán A, Moret AM, Tasiias-Pitarch M, Aleixandre-López AI, Martínez-Morel H, Calabuig E,
360 et al. An outbreak due to *Candida auris* with prolonged colonisation and candidaemia in a tertiary
361 care European hospital. *Mycoses*. 2018 Jul;61(7):498–505.
- 362 25. van Schalkwyk E, Mpembe RS, Thomas J, Shuping L, Ismail H, Lowman W, et al. Epidemiologic
363 shift in candidemia driven by *Candida auris*, South Africa, 2016–2017. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2019
364 Sep;25(9):1698–707.
- 365 26. Shuping L, Mpembe R, Mhlanga M, Naicker SD, Maphanga TG, Tsotetsi E, et al. Epidemiology of
366 culture-confirmed candidemia among hospitalized children in South Africa, 2012–2017. *Pediatr Infect*
367 *Dis J*. 2021 Aug 1;40(8):730–7.
- 368 27. Muñoz JF, Gade L, Chow NA, Loparev VN, Juieng P, Berkow EL, et al. Genomic insights into
369 multidrug-resistance, mating and virulence in *Candida auris* and related emerging species. *Nat*
370 *Commun*. 2018 Dec 17;9(1):5346.
- 371 28. Pekard-Amenitsch S, Schriebl A, Posawetz W, Willinger B, Kölli B, Buzina W. Isolation of *Candida*
372 *auris* from ear of otherwise healthy patient, Austria, 2018. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2018 Aug;24(8):1596–7.
- 373 29. Chow NA, de Groot T, Badali H, Abastabar M, Chiller TM, Meis JF. Potential fifth clade of *Candida*
374 *auris*, Iran, 2018. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2019 Sep;25(9):1780–1.
- 375 30. Brown JL, Delaney C, Short B, Butcher MC, McKloud E, Williams C, et al. *Candida auris*
376 phenotypic heterogeneity determines pathogenicity *in vitro*. *mSphere*. 2020 Jun 24;5(3):e00371-20.
- 377 31. Vila T, Montelongo-Jauregui D, Ahmed H, Puthran T, Sultan AS, Jabra-Rizk MA. Comparative
378 evaluations of the pathogenesis of *Candida auris* phenotypes and *Candida albicans* using clinically
379 relevant murine models of infections. *mSphere*. 2020 Aug 5;5(4):e00760-20.
- 380 32. Abe M, Katano H, Nagi M, Higashi Y, Sato Y, Kikuchi K, et al. Potency of gastrointestinal
381 colonization and virulence of *Candida auris* in a murine endogenous candidiasis. *PloS One*.
382 2020;15(12):e0243223.

33. Lima SL, Rossato L, Salles de Azevedo Melo A. Evaluation of the potential virulence of *Candida haemulonii* species complex and *Candida auris* isolates in *Caenorhabditis elegans* as an *in vivo* model and correlation to their biofilm production capacity. *Microb Pathog*. 2020 Nov;148:104461.
34. Hernando-Ortiz A, Mateo E, Perez-Rodriguez A, de Groot PWJ, Quindós G, Eraso E. Virulence of *Candida auris* from different clinical origins in *Caenorhabditis elegans* and *Galleria mellonella* host models. *Virulence*. 2021 Dec;12(1):1063–75.
35. Romera D, Aguilera-Correa J-J, García-Coca M, Mahillo-Fernández I, Viñuela-Sandoval L, García-Rodríguez J, et al. The *Galleria mellonella* infection model as a system to investigate the virulence of *Candida auris* strains. *Pathog Dis*. 2020 Nov 23;78(9):ftaa067.
36. Carvajal SK, Alvarado M, Rodríguez YM, Parra-Giraldo CM, Varón C, Morales-López SE, et al. Pathogenicity assessment of Colombian strains of *Candida auris* in the *Galleria mellonella* invertebrate model. *J Fungi Basel Switz*. 2021 May 21;7(6):401.
37. Horton MV, Johnson CJ, Kernien JF, Patel TD, Lam BC, Cheong JZA, et al. *Candida auris* forms high-burden biofilms in skin niche conditions and on porcine skin. *mSphere*. 2020 Jan 22;5(1):e00910-19.
38. Yue H, Bing J, Zheng Q, Zhang Y, Hu T, Du H, et al. Filamentation in *Candida auris*, an emerging fungal pathogen of humans: passage through the mammalian body induces a heritable phenotypic switch. *Emerg Microbes Infect*. 2018 Nov 28;7(1):188.
39. Borman AM, Szekely A, Johnson EM. Comparative pathogenicity of United Kingdom isolates of the emerging pathogen *Candida auris* and other key pathogenic *Candida* species. *mSphere*. 2016 Aug;1(4):e00189-16.
40. Garcia-Bustos V, Ruiz-Saurí A, Ruiz-Gaitán A, Sigona-Giangreco IA, Cabañero-Navalon MD, Sabalza-Baztán O, et al. Characterization of the differential pathogenicity of *Candida auris* in a *Galleria mellonella* infection model. *Microbiol Spectr*. 2021 Sep 3;9(1):e0001321.
41. Forgács L, Borman AM, Prépost E, Tóth Z, Kardos G, Kovács R, et al. Comparison of *in vivo* pathogenicity of four *Candida auris* clades in a neutropenic bloodstream infection murine model. *Emerg Microbes Infect*. 2020 Dec;9(1):1160–9.
42. Sherry L, Ramage G, Kean R, Borman A, Johnson EM, Richardson MD, et al. Biofilm-forming capability of highly virulent, multidrug-resistant *Candida auris*. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2017 Feb;23(2):328–31.
43. Du H, Bing J, Hu T, Ennis CL, Nobile CJ, Huang G. *Candida auris*: Epidemiology, biology, antifungal resistance, and virulence. *PLOS Pathog*. 2020 Oct 22;16(10):e1008921.
44. Mulet Bayona JV, Salvador García C, Tormo Palop N, Gimeno Cardona C. Evaluation of a novel chromogenic medium for *Candida* spp. identification and comparison with CHROMagar™ *Candida* for the detection of *Candida auris* in surveillance samples. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2020 Dec 1;98(4):115168.
45. Borman AM, Fraser M, Johnson EM. CHROMagar™ *Candida* Plus: a novel chromogenic agar that permits the rapid identification of *Candida auris*. *Med Mycol*. 2021 Mar 4;59(3):253–8.

46. de Jong AW, Dieleman C, Carbia M, Mohd Tap R, Hagen F. Performance of two novel chromogenic media for the identification of multidrug-resistant *Candida auris* compared with other commercially available formulations. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2021 Mar 19;59(4):e03220-20.
47. Parra-Giraldo CM, Valderrama SL, Cortes-Fraile G, Garzón JR, Ariza BE, Morio F, et al. First report of sporadic cases of *Candida auris* in Colombia. *Int J Infect Dis IJID Off Publ Int Soc Infect Dis*. 2018 Apr;69:63–7.
48. Borman AM, Szekely A, Johnson EM. Isolates of the emerging pathogen *Candida auris* present in the UK have several geographic origins. *Med Mycol*. 2017 Jul 1;55(5):563–7.
49. Leach L, Zhu Y, Chaturvedi S. Development and Validation of a Real-Time PCR Assay for Rapid Detection of *Candida auris* from Surveillance Samples. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2018 Feb;56(2):e01223-17.
50. Sexton DJ, Kordalewska M, Bentz ML, Welsh RM, Perlin DS, Litvintseva AP. Direct Detection of Emergent Fungal Pathogen *Candida auris* in Clinical Skin Swabs by SYBR Green-Based Quantitative PCR Assay. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2018 Dec;56(12):e01337-18.
51. Sattler J, Noster J, Brunke A, Plum G, Wiegel P, Kurzai O, et al. Comparison of Two Commercially Available qPCR Kits for the Detection of *Candida auris*. *J Fungi*. 2021 Feb;7(2):154.
52. Chowdhary A, Sharma C, Meis JF. *Candida auris*: a rapidly emerging cause of hospital-acquired multidrug-resistant fungal infections globally. *PLoS Pathog*. 2017 May;13(5):e1006290.
53. Antifungal Susceptibility Testing and Interpretation | *Candida auris* | Fungal Diseases | CDC [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2021 Jul 21]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/fungal/candida-auris/c-auris-antifungal.html>
54. Szekely A, Borman AM, Johnson EM. *Candida auris* isolates of the Southern Asian and South African lineages exhibit different phenotypic and antifungal susceptibility profiles *in vitro*. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2019 May;57(5):e02055-18.
55. Spivak ES, Hanson KE. *Candida auris*: an emerging fungal pathogen. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2018 Jan 24;56(2):e01588-17.
56. Chowdhary A, Prakash A, Sharma C, Kordalewska M, Kumar A, Sarma S, et al. A multicentre study of antifungal susceptibility patterns among 350 *Candida auris* isolates (2009–17) in India: role of the *ERG11* and *FKS1* genes in azole and echinocandin resistance. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2018 Apr 1;73(4):891–9.
57. Treatment and management of infections and colonization | *Candida auris* | Fungal Diseases | CDC [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Aug 12]. Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/fungal/candida-auris/c-auris-treatment.html>
58. Healey KR, Kordalewska M, Jiménez Ortigosa C, Singh A, Berrío I, Chowdhary A, et al. Limited *ERG11* Mutations Identified in Isolates of *Candida auris* Directly Contribute to Reduced Azole Susceptibility. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* [Internet]. 2018 Oct [cited 2021 Jul 14];62(10). Available from: <https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AAC.01427-18>
59. Li J, Coste AT, Liechti M, Bachmann D, Sanglard D, Lamoth F. Novel *ERG11* and *TAC1b* Mutations Associated with Azole Resistance in *Candida auris*. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* [Internet]. 2021

459 Apr 19 [cited 2021 Jul 14];65(5). Available from: [https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AAC.02663-](https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AAC.02663-20)
460 20

461 60. Mayr E-M, Ramírez-Zavala B, Krüger I, Morschhäuser J. A zinc cluster transcription factor
462 contributes to the intrinsic fluconazole resistance of *Candida auris*. Mitchell AP, editor. mSphere
463 [Internet]. 2020 Apr 29 [cited 2021 Jul 14];5(2). Available from:
464 <https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/mSphere.00279-20>

465 61. Rybak JM, Muñoz JF, Barker KS, Parker JE, Esquivel BD, Berkow EL, et al. Mutations in *TAC1B*: a
466 novel genetic determinant of clinical fluconazole resistance in *Candida auris*. Berman J, editor. mBio
467 [Internet]. 2020 Jun 30 [cited 2021 Jul 14];11(3). Available from:
468 <https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/mBio.00365-20>

469 62. Kim SH, Iyer KR, Pardeshi L, Muñoz JF, Robbins N, Cuomo CA, et al. Genetic analysis of *Candida*
470 *auris* implicates Hsp90 in morphogenesis and azole tolerance and Cdr1 in azole resistance. Kronstad
471 JW, editor. mBio [Internet]. 2019 Feb 26 [cited 2021 Jul 15];10(1). Available from:
472 <https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/mBio.02529-18>

473 63. Kordalewska M, Lee A, Park S, Berrio I, Chowdhary A, Zhao Y, et al. Understanding echinocandin
474 resistance in the emerging pathogen *Candida auris*. Antimicrob Agents Chemother [Internet]. 2018
475 Jun [cited 2021 Jul 14];62(6). Available from: <https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AAC.00238-18>

476 64. Carolus H, Pierson S, Muñoz JF, Subotić A, Cruz RB, Cuomo CA, et al. Genome-wide analysis of
477 experimentally evolved *Candida auris* reveals multiple novel mechanisms of multidrug resistance.
478 Chowdhary A, editor. mBio [Internet]. 2021 Apr 27 [cited 2021 Jul 14];12(2). Available from:
479 <https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/mBio.03333-20>

480 65. Bing J, Hu T, Zheng Q, Muñoz JF, Cuomo CA, Huang G. Experimental evolution identifies adaptive
481 aneuploidy as a mechanism of fluconazole resistance in *Candida auris*. Antimicrob Agents
482 Chemother [Internet]. 2020 Dec 16 [cited 2021 Jul 15];65(1). Available from:
483 <https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AAC.01466-20>

484 66. Coste A, Selmecki A, Forche A, Diogo D, Bougnoux M-E, d'Enfert C, et al. Genotypic evolution of
485 azole resistance mechanisms in sequential *Candida albicans* isolates. Eukaryot Cell. 2007
486 Oct;6(10):1889–904.

487 67. Coste AT, Karababa M, Ischer F, Bille J, Sanglard D. TAC1, transcriptional activator of CDR genes,
488 is a new transcription factor involved in the regulation of *Candida albicans* ABC transporters CDR1
489 and CDR2. Eukaryot Cell. 2004 Dec;3(6):1639–52.

490 68. Bravo Ruiz G, Ross ZK, Holmes E, Schelenz S, Gow NAR, Lorenz A. Rapid and extensive karyotype
491 diversification in haploid clinical *Candida auris* isolates. Curr Genet. 2019 Oct;65(5):1217–28.

492 69. Seiler GT, Ostrosky-Zeichner L. Investigational Agents for the Treatment of Resistant Yeasts and
493 Molds. Curr Fungal Infect Rep [Internet]. 2021 May 28 [cited 2021 Jul 22]; Available from:
494 <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12281-021-00419-5>

495 70. Helleberg M, Jørgensen KM, Hare RK, Datcu R, Chowdhary A, Arendrup MC. Rezafungin *in vitro*
496 activity against contemporary nordic clinical *Candida* isolates and *Candida auris* determined by the
497 EUCAST reference method. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2020 Mar 24;64(4):e02438-19.

498 71. Tóth Z, Forgács L, Locke JB, Kardos G, Nagy F, Kovács R, et al. *In vitro* activity of rezafungin
499 against common and rare *Candida species* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. J Antimicrob Chemother.
500 2019 Dec 1;74(12):3505–10.

501 72. Kovács R, Tóth Z, Locke JB, Forgács L, Kardos G, Nagy F, et al. Comparison of *in vitro* killing
502 activity of rezafungin, anidulafungin, caspofungin, and micafungin against four *Candida auris* clades
503 in RPMI-1640 in the absence and presence of human serum. Microorganisms. 2021 Apr 16;9(4):863.

504 73. Lepak AJ, Zhao M, Andes DR. Pharmacodynamic evaluation of rezafungin (CD101) against *Candida*
505 *auris* in the neutropenic mouse invasive candidiasis model. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2018
506 Nov;62(11):e01572-18.

507 74. Hager CL, Larkin EL, Long LA, Ghannoum MA. Evaluation of the efficacy of rezafungin, a novel
508 echinocandin, in the treatment of disseminated *Candida auris* infection using an
509 immunocompromised mouse model. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2018 Aug 1;73(8):2085–8.

510 75. Giacobbe DR, Magnasco L, Sepulcri C, Mikulska M, Koehler P, Cornely OA, et al. Recent advances
511 and future perspectives in the pharmacological treatment of *Candida auris* infections. Expert Rev Clin
512 Pharmacol. 2021 Jun 26;0(0):1–16.

513 76. Sexton DJ, Bentz ML, Welsh RM, Derado G, Furin W, Rose LJ, et al. Positive correlation between
514 *Candida auris* skin-colonization burden and environmental contamination at a ventilator-capable
515 skilled nursing facility in Chicago. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. 2021 May
516 12;ciab327.

517 77. Sharp A, Muller-Pebody B, Charlett A, Patel B, Gorton R, Lambourne J, et al. Screening for *Candida*
518 *auris* in patients admitted to eight intensive care units in England, 2017 to 2018. Euro Surveill Bull
519 Eur Sur Mal Transm Eur Commun Dis Bull. 2021 Feb;26(8).

520 78. Government of United Kingdom. *Candida auris*: laboratory investigation, management and infection
521 prevention and control [Internet]. [cited 2017 Dec 28]. Available from:
522 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/candida-auris-laboratory-investigation-management-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/candida-auris-laboratory-investigation-management-and-infection-prevention-and-control)
523 [and-infection-prevention-and-control](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/candida-auris-laboratory-investigation-management-and-infection-prevention-and-control)

524 79. Welsh RM, Bentz ML, Shams A, Houston H, Lyons A, Rose LJ, et al. Survival, persistence, and
525 isolation of the emerging multidrug-resistant pathogenic yeast *Candida auris* on a plastic health care
526 surface. J Clin Microbiol. 2017 Oct;55(10):2996–3005.

527 80. Eyre DW, Sheppard AE, Madder H, Moir I, Moroney R, Quan TP, et al. A *Candida auris* outbreak
528 and its control in an intensive care setting. N Engl J Med. 2018 Oct 4;379(14):1322–31.

529 81. Cadnum JL, Shaikh AA, Piedrahita CT, Sankar T, Jencson AL, Larkin EL, et al. Effectiveness of
530 disinfectants against *Candida auris* and other *Candida* species. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2017
531 Oct;38(10):1240–3.

532 82. Zatorska B, Moser D, Diab-Elschahawi M, Ebner J, Lusignani LS, Presterl E. The effectiveness of
533 surface disinfectants and a micellar H₂O₂ based water disinfectant on *Candida auris*. J Med Mycol.
534 2021 Dec 1;31(4):101178.

535 83. Moore G, Schelenz S, Borman AM, Johnson EM, Brown CS. Yeastocidal activity of chemical
536 disinfectants and antiseptics against *Candida auris*. J Hosp Infect. 2017 Dec;97(4):371–5.

537 84. Abdolrasouli A, Armstrong-James D, Ryan L, Schelenz S. *In vitro* efficacy of disinfectants utilised
538 for skin decolonisation and environmental decontamination during a hospital outbreak with *Candida*
539 *auris*. *Mycoses*. 2017 Nov;60(11):758–63.

540 85. Chesnay A, Bailly É, Desoubieux G. Demonstration of the yeasticidal efficacy of povidone-iodine-
541 based commercial antiseptic solutions against *Candida auris*. *J Mycol Medecale*. 2021 Jul
542 2;31(4):101173.

543 86. HCSP. Mesures de prise en charge de patient infecté ou colonisé par *Candida auris* [Internet]. Rapport
544 de l'HCSP. Paris: Haut Conseil de la Santé Publique; 2019 Jun [cited 2021 May 20]. Available from:
545 <https://www.hcsp.fr/explore.cgi/avisrapportsdomaine?clefr=730>

546 87. Taori SK, Khonyongwa K, Hayden I, Athukorala GDA, Letters A, Fife A, et al. *Candida auris*
547 outbreak: mortality, interventions and cost of sustaining control. *J Infect*. 2019 Dec;79(6):601–11.

548 88. Arensman K, Miller JL, Chiang A, Mai N, Levato J, LaChance E, et al. Clinical outcomes of patients
549 treated for *Candida auris* infections in a multisite health system, Illinois, USA. *Emerg Infect Dis*.
550 2020 May;26(5):876–80.

551 89. Adam RD, Revathi G, Okinda N, Fontaine M, Shah J, Kagotho E, et al. Analysis of *Candida auris*
552 fungemia at a single facility in Kenya. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2019 Aug 1;85:182–7.

553 90. Chakrabarti A, Sood P, Rudramurthy SM, Chen S, Kaur H, Capoor M, et al. Incidence, characteristics
554 and outcome of ICU-acquired candidemia in India. *Intensive Care Med*. 2015 Feb 1;41(2):285–95.

555 91. Rudramurthy SM, Chakrabarti A, Paul RA, Sood P, Kaur H, Capoor MR, et al. *Candida auris*
556 candidaemia in Indian ICUs: analysis of risk factors. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2017 Jun
557 1;72(6):1794–801.

558 92. Chowdhary A, Anil Kumar V, Sharma C, Prakash A, Agarwal K, Babu R, et al. Multidrug-resistant
559 endemic clonal strain of *Candida auris* in India. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2014 Jun
560 1;33(6):919–26.

561 93. Calvo B, Melo ASA, Perozo-Mena A, Hernandez M, Francisco EC, Hagen F, et al. First report of
562 *Candida auris* in America: clinical and microbiological aspects of 18 episodes of candidemia. *J*
563 *Infect*. 2016 Oct 1;73(4):369–74.

564 94. Magobo RE, Corcoran C, Seetharam S, Govender NP. *Candida auris*—Associated Candidemia, South
565 Africa. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2014 Jul;20(7):1250–2.

566 95. Govender NP, Magobo RE, Mpembe R, Mhlana M, Matlapeng P, Corcoran C, et al. *Candida auris*
567 in South Africa, 2012–2016. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2018 Nov;24(11):2036–40.

568 96. Chatterjee S, Alampalli SV, Nageshan RK, Chettiar ST, Joshi S, Tatu US. Draft genome of a
569 commonly misdiagnosed multidrug resistant pathogen *Candida auris*. *BMC Genomics*. 2015 Sep
570 7;16(1):686.

571 97. Ostrowsky B, Greenko J, Adams E, Quinn M, O'Brien B, Chaturvedi V, et al. *Candida auris* isolates
572 resistant to three classes of antifungal medications - New York, 2019. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly*
573 *Rep*. 2020 Jan 10;69(1):6–9.

574 98. Zhu Y, O'Brien B, Leach L, Clarke A, Bates M, Adams E, et al. Laboratory analysis of an outbreak of
575 *Candida auris* in New York from 2016 to 2018: impact and lessons learned. J Clin Microbiol. 2020
576 Mar 25;58(4):e01503-19.

577 99. Ben-Ami R, Berman J, Novikov A, Bash E, Shachor-Meyouhas Y, Zakin S, et al. Multidrug-resistant
578 *Candida haemulonii* and *C. auris*, Tel Aviv, Israel. Emerg Infect Dis. 2017 Feb;23(1).

579 100. Khan Z, Ahmad S, Al-Sweih N, Joseph L, Alfouzan W, Asadzadeh M. Increasing prevalence,
580 molecular characterization and antifungal drug susceptibility of serial *Candida auris* isolates in
581 Kuwait. PLOS ONE. 2018 Apr 9;13(4):e0195743.

582 101. Berrio I, Caceres DH, Coronell R W, Salcedo S, Mora L, Marin A, et al. Bloodstream infections
583 with *Candida auris* among children in Colombia: clinical characteristics and outcomes of 34 cases. J
584 Pediatr Infect Dis Soc. 2021 Feb 1;10(2):151-4.

585 102. Sayeed MA, Farooqi J, Jabeen K, Awan S, Mahmood SF. Clinical spectrum and factors impacting
586 outcome of *Candida auris*: a single center study from Pakistan. BMC Infect Dis. 2019 May
587 6;19(1):384.

588 103. Sayeed MA, Farooqi J, Jabeen K, Mahmood SF. Comparison of risk factors and outcomes of
589 *Candida auris* candidemia with non*Candida auris* candidemia: a retrospective study from Pakistan.
590 Med Mycol. 2020 Aug 1;58(6):721-9.

591 104. Ahmad S, Khan Z, Al-Sweih N, Alfouzan W, Joseph L. *Candida auris* in various hospitals across
592 Kuwait and their susceptibility and molecular basis of resistance to antifungal drugs. Mycoses. 2020
593 Jan;63(1):104-12.

594 105. Caceres DH, Rivera SM, Armstrong PA, Escandon P, Chow NA, Ovalle MV, et al. Case-case
595 comparison of *Candida auris* versus other *Candida* species bloodstream infections: results of an
596 outbreak investigation in Colombia. Mycopathologia. 2020 Oct;185(5):917-23.

597 106. Farooqi JQ, Soomro AS, Baig MA, Sajjad SF, Hamid K, Jabeen K, et al. Outbreak investigation
598 of *Candida auris* at a tertiary care hospital in Karachi, Pakistan. J Infect Prev. 2020 Sep;21(5):189-
599 95.

600 107. Escandón P, Cáceres DH, Espinosa-Bode A, Rivera S, Armstrong P, Vallabhaneni S, et al. Notes
601 from the field: surveillance for *Candida auris* - Colombia, September 2016-May 2017. MMWR Morb
602 Mortal Wkly Rep. 2018 Apr 20;67(15):459-60.

603 108. Escandón P, Chow NA, Caceres DH, Gade L, Berkow EL, Armstrong P, et al. Molecular
604 epidemiology of *Candida auris* in Colombia reveals a highly related, countrywide colonization with
605 regional patterns in amphotericin B resistance. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. 2019 Jan
606 1;68(1):15-21.

607 109. Ruiz-Gaitán A, Martínez H, Moret AM, Calabuig E, Tacias M, Alastruey-Izquierdo A, et al.
608 Detection and treatment of *Candida auris* in an outbreak situation: risk factors for developing
609 colonization and candidemia by this new species in critically ill patients. Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther.
610 2019 Apr;17(4):295-305.

611 110. Ruiz Gaitán AC, Moret A, López Hontangas JL, Molina JM, Aleixandre López AI, Cabezas AH,
612 et al. Nosocomial fungemia by *Candida auris*: first four reported cases in continental Europe. Rev
613 Iberoam Micol. 2017 Mar;34(1):23-7.

614 111. Garcia-Bustos V, Salavert M, Ruiz-Gaitán AC, Cabañero-Navalon MD, Sigona-Giangreco IA,
615 Pemán J. A clinical predictive model of candidaemia by *Candida auris* in previously colonized
616 critically ill patients. Clin Microbiol Infect Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2020
617 Nov;26(11):1507–13.

618 112. Shastri PS, Shankarnarayan SA, Oberoi J, Rudramurthy SM, Wattal C, Chakrabarti A. *Candida*
619 *auris* candidaemia in an intensive care unit - prospective observational study to evaluate
620 epidemiology, risk factors, and outcome. J Crit Care. 2020 Jun;57:42–8.

621 113. Vallabhaneni S, Kallen A, Tsay S, Chow N, Welsh R, Kerins J, et al. Investigation of the first
622 seven reported cases of *Candida auris*, a globally emerging invasive, multidrug-resistant fungus-
623 United States, May 2013-August 2016. Am J Transplant Off J Am Soc Transplant Am Soc Transpl
624 Surg. 2017 Jan;17(1):296–9.

625 114. Belkin A, Gazit Z, Keller N, Ben-Ami R, Wieder-Finesod A, Novikov A, et al. *Candida auris*
626 infection leading to nosocomial transmission, Israel, 2017. Emerg Infect Dis. 2018 Apr;24(4):801–4.

627 115. Tian S, Bing J, Chu Y, Chen J, Cheng S, Wang Q, et al. Genomic epidemiology of *Candida auris*
628 in a general hospital in Shenyang, China: a three-year surveillance study. Emerg Microbes Infect.
629 2021 Dec;10(1):1088–96.

630 116. Pacilli M, Kerins JL, Clegg WJ, Walblay KA, Adil H, Kemble SK, et al. Regional emergence of
631 *Candida auris* in Chicago and lessons learned from intensive follow-up at 1 ventilator-capable skilled
632 nursing facility. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. 2020 Dec 31;71(11):e718–25.

633 117. Mohsin J, Hagen F, Al-Balushi ZAM, de Hoog GS, Chowdhary A, Meis JF, et al. The first cases
634 of *Candida auris* candidaemia in Oman. Mycoses. 2017 Sep;60(9):569–75.

635 118. Al-Siyabi T, Al Busaidi I, Balkhair A, Al-Muharri Z, Al-Salti M, Al'Adawi B. First report of
636 *Candida auris* in Oman: clinical and microbiological description of five candidemia cases. J Infect.
637 2017 Oct;75(4):373–6.

638 119. Park JY, Bradley N, Brooks S, Burney S, Wassner C. Management of patients with *Candida auris*
639 fungemia at Community Hospital, Brooklyn, New York, USA, 2016–2018. Emerg Infect Dis. 2019
640 Mar;25(3):601–2.

641 120. Morales-López SE, Parra-Giraldo CM, Ceballos-Garzón A, Martínez HP, Rodríguez GJ, Álvarez-
642 Moreno CA, et al. Invasive infections with multidrug-resistant yeast *Candida auris*, Colombia. Emerg
643 Infect Dis. 2017 Jan;23(1):162–4.

644 121. Theodoropoulos NM, Bolstorff B, Bozorgzadeh A, Brandeburg C, Cumming M, Daly JS, et al.
645 *Candida auris* outbreak involving liver transplant recipients in a surgical intensive care unit. Am J
646 Transplant Off J Am Soc Transplant Am Soc Transpl Surg. 2020 Dec;20(12):3673–9.

647 122. Abdalhamid B, Almaghrabi R, Althawadi S, Omrani A. First report of *Candida auris* infections
648 from Saudi Arabia. J Infect Public Health. 2018 Aug;11(4):598–9.

649 123. Almaghrabi RS, Albalawi R, Mutabagani M, Atienza E, Aljumaah S, Gade L, et al. Molecular
650 characterisation and clinical outcomes of *Candida auris* infection: single-centre experience in Saudi
651 Arabia. Mycoses. 2020;63(5):452–60.

652 124. Sathyapalan DT, Antony R, Nampoothiri V, Kumar A, Shashindran N, James J, et al. Evaluating
653 the measures taken to contain a *Candida auris* outbreak in a tertiary care hospital in South India: an
654 outbreak investigational study. BMC Infect Dis. 2021 May 6;21(1):425.

655 125. Barantsevich NE, Orlova OE, Shlyakhto EV, Johnson EM, Woodford N, Lass-Floerl C, et al.
656 Emergence of *Candida auris* in Russia. J Hosp Infect. 2019 Aug;102(4):445–8.

657 126. Barantsevich NE, Vetokhina AV, Ayushinova NI, Orlova OE, Barantsevich EP. *Candida auris*
658 bloodstream infections in Russia. Antibiot Basel Switz. 2020 Aug 30;9(9):E557.

659 127. Bajpai V, Govindaswamy A, Sagar S, Kumar S, Garg P, Xess I, et al. Multidrug-resistant *Candida*
660 *auris* fungemia in critical care units: experience from a tertiary care hospital in India. Microb Drug
661 Resist Larchmt N. 2020 Feb;26(2):145–9.

662 128. Mulet Bayona JV, Salvador García C, Tormo Palop N, Gimeno Cardona C. Evaluation of a novel
663 chromogenic medium for *Candida* spp. identification and comparison with CHROMagar™ *Candida*
664 for the detection of *Candida auris* in surveillance samples. Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis. 2020 Dec
665 1;98(4):115168.

666 129. García CS, Palop NT, Bayona JVM, García MM, Rodríguez DN, Álvarez MB, et al. *Candida*
667 *auris*: report of an outbreak. Enfermedades Infecc Microbiol Clin Engl Ed. 2020 Jan;38 Suppl 1:39–
668 44.

669 130. Alobaid K, Ahmad S, Asadzadeh M, Mokaddas E, Al-Sweih N, Albenwan K, et al. Epidemiology
670 of xandidemia in Kuwait: a nationwide, population-based study. J Fungi Basel Switz. 2021 Aug
671 20;7(8):673.

672 131. Alfouzan W, Ahmad S, Dhar R, Asadzadeh M, Almerdasi N, Abdo NM, et al. Molecular
673 epidemiology of *Candida auris* outbreak in a major secondary-care hospital in Kuwait. J Fungi Basel
674 Switz. 2020 Nov 21;6(4):E307.

675 132. Alshamrani MM, El-Saed A, Mohammed A, Alghoribi MF, Al Johani SM, Cabanalan H, et al.
676 Management of *Candida auris* outbreak in a tertiary-care setting in Saudi Arabia. Infect Control Hosp
677 Epidemiol. 2021 Feb;42(2):149–55.

678 133. Salah H, Sundararaju S, Dalil L, Salameh S, Al-Wali W, Tang P, et al. Genomic epidemiology of
679 <i>Candida auris</i> in Qatar reveals hospital transmission dynamics and a south Asian origin. J
680 Fungi Basel Switz. 2021 Mar 23;7(3):240.

681 134. Lane CR, Seemann T, Worth LJ, Easton M, Pitchers W, Wong J, et al. Incursions of *Candida*
682 *auris* into Australia, 2018. Emerg Infect Dis. 2020 Jun;26(6):1326–8.

683 135. O'Connor C, Bicanic T, Dave J, Evans TJ, Moxey P, Adamu U, et al. *Candida auris* outbreak on
684 a vascular ward – the unexpected arrival of an anticipated pathogen. J Hosp Infect. 2019 Sep
685 1;103(1):106–8.

686 136. Di Pilato V, Codda G, Ball L, Giacobbe DR, Willison E, Mikulska M, et al. Molecular
687 epidemiological investigation of a nosocomial cluster of *C. auris*: evidence of recent emergence in
688 Italy and ease of transmission during the COVID-19 pandemic. J Fungi Basel Switz. 2021 Feb
689 15;7(2):140.

137. Price TK, Mirasol R, Ward KW, Dayo AJ, Hilt EE, Chandrasekaran S, et al. Genomic characterizations of clade III lineage of *Candida auris*, California, USA. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2021 Apr;27(4):1223–7.
138. Alvarado-Socarras JL, Vargas-Soler JA, Franco-Paredes C, Villegas-Lamus KC, Rojas-Torres JP, Rodriguez-Morales AJ. A cluster of neonatal infections caused by *Candida auris* at a large referral center in Colombia. *J Pediatr Infect Dis Soc*. 2021 May 28;10(5):549–55.
139. Tse H, Tsang AKL, Chu Y-W, Tsang DNC. Draft genome sequences of 19 clinical isolates of *Candida auris* from Hong Kong. *Microbiol Resour Announc*. 2021 Jan 7;10(1):e00308-20.
140. Patterson CA, Wyncoll D, Patel A, Ceesay Y, Newsholme W, Chand M, et al. Cloth lanyards as a source of intermittent transmission of *Candida auris* on an ICU. *Crit Care Med*. 2021 Apr 1;49(4):697–701.
141. Moin S, Farooqi J, Rattani S, Nasir N, Zaka S, Jabeen K. *C. auris* and non-*C. auris* candidemia in hospitalized adult and pediatric COVID-19 patients; single center data from Pakistan. *Med Mycol*. 2021 Dec 1;59(12):1238–42.
142. Prestel C, Anderson E, Forsberg K, Lyman M, de Perio MA, Kuhar D, et al. *Candida auris* outbreak in a COVID-19 specialty care unit — Florida, July–August 2020. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021 Jan 15;70(2):56–7.
143. Hanson BM, Dinh AQ, Tran TT, Arenas S, Pronty D, Gershengorn HB, et al. *Candida auris* invasive infections during a COVID-19 case surge. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 65(10):e01146-21.
144. Allaw F, Kara Zahreddine N, Ibrahim A, Tannous J, Taleb H, Bizri AR, et al. First w*Candida auris* outbreak during a COVID-19 pandemic in a tertiary-care center in Lebanon. *Pathog Basel Switz*. 2021 Feb 3;10(2):157.
145. Nobrega de Almeida J, Brandão IB, Francisco EC, de Almeida SLR, de Oliveira Dias P, Pereira FM, et al. Axillary digital thermometers uplifted a multidrug-susceptible *Candida auris* outbreak among COVID-19 patients in Brazil. *Mycoses*. 2021 Sep;64(9):1062–72.
146. Bacchani D, Rajni E, Garg VK, Sharma R, Mamoria VP. Prevalence, epidemiology and clinical outcome of *Candida auris* infections: experience from a tertiary care hospital in Jaipur. *Trop Doct*. 2021 Oct;51(4):508–13.
147. Lyman M, Forsberg K, Reuben J, Dang T, Free R, Seagle EE, et al. Notes from the field: transmission of pan-resistant and echinocandin-resistant *Candida auris* in health care facilities — Texas and the district of Columbia, January–April 2021. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2021 Jul 23;70(29):1022–3.

Figure legends

Figure 1: Number of publications per year retrieved about “*Candida auris*” in the PubMed database as of August 10th 2021 (including original articles and reviews).

727

728 **Figure 2: Countries from which *Candida auris* cases have been reported, as of February 15,**

729 **2021**

730 <https://www.cdc.gov/fungal/candida-auris/tracking-c-auris.html#historical>.

732 **Table 1 : Listing of the major outbreaks of *Candida auris* cases reported so far.** Were only considered the available articles written
733 in English and those that mentioned original description of ≥ 2 clustered cases.

Reference	Country (city)	Period	Number of cases of colonization or infection (Nb of centers)	Genotypic analysis (clade)
Arensman <i>et al.</i> 2020 (88)	USA (Chicago, IL)	Jan. 2008 – April 2019	28 (8 centers)	NA
Chowdhari <i>et al.</i> 2013 (12)	India (Dehli)	2009-2011	12 (2 centers)	AFLP: 1 clone (I)
Kathuria <i>et al.</i> 2015 (13)	India (Dehli)	2010-2014	90 (5 centers)	NA
Adam <i>et al.</i> 2019 (89)	Kenya (Nairobi)	Sept. 2010 – Dec. 2016	77* (1 center)	PFGE: 1 clone
Chakrabarti <i>et al.</i> 2020 (90)	India (multiple sites)	April 2011 – Sept. 2012	22 (27 centers)	NA
Chakrabarti <i>et al.</i> 2015 (90)	India (multiple places)	April 2011 – Sept. 2012	48* (27 centers)	NA
Rudramurthy <i>et al.</i> 2017 (91)	India (multiple places)	April 2011 – Sept. 2012	74 (19 centers)	AFLP: 88% with similar profiles (I)
Chowdhary <i>et al.</i> 2014 (92)	India (Kochi)	Nov. 2011 - June 2013	7 (1 center)	AFLP: 1 clone (I)
Sarma <i>et al.</i> 2013	India (Gurgaon)	2011	2 (1 center)	NA
Calvo <i>et al.</i> 2016 (93)	Venezuela (Maracaibo)	March 2012 - July 2013	18 (1 center)	AFLP: 1 clone (IV)

Magobo <i>et al.</i> 2014 (94)	Republic of South Africa (Johannesburg)	Oct. 2012 – Oct. 2013	4 (1 center)	NA
Govender <i>et al.</i> (95)	Republic of South Africa (multiple places)	Oct. 2012 – Nov. 2016	1692 (≥ 94 centers) including 1087 cases in 20 centers	NA
Chatterjee <i>et al.</i> 2015 (96)	India (Bengaluru)	2012-14	34* (1 center)	PFGE: 1 clone
Adams <i>et al.</i> 2018 (20), Ostrowsky <i>et al.</i> 2020 (97) and Zhu <i>et al.</i> 2020 (98)	USA (New York, NY)	May 2013 - April 2017	112 (19 centers)	WGS: 2 clones (I)
Chow <i>et al.</i> 2018 (19)	USA (multiple places)	May 2013 – Aug. 2017	133 (not specified)	WGS (mostly I)
Parra-Giraldo <i>et al.</i> 2015 (47)	Colombia (Bogotá)	Nov. 2013 – Feb. 2015	3 (1 center)	MALDI-TOF: 2 clones
Borman <i>et al.</i> 2016 (39)	United Kingdom (multiple places)	2013	12* (6 centers)	NA
Lockhart <i>et al.</i> 2017 (3)	Pakistan (not specified)	2014-2015	18 (2 centers)	WGS: 1 clone (I)
Ben-Ami <i>et al.</i> 2017 (99)	Israel (Tel Aviv)	May 2014 - April 2015	6 (2 centers)	NA
Khan <i>et al.</i> 2018 (100)	Kuweit (not specified)	May 2014 – Sept. 2017	56 (not specified)	PCR fingerprinting 1 clone (6 strains only)
Berrio <i>et al.</i> 2020 (101)	Colombia (Barranquilla and Cartagena)	July 2014 – Oct.	34 (2 centers)	Not specified: 2 clones
Sayeed <i>et al.</i> 2019 and 2020 (102,103)	Pakistan (Karachi)	Sept. 2014 – March 2017	92 (1 center)	WGS: 1 clone (I)

Ahmad <i>et al.</i> 2020 (104)	Kuwait (multiple places)	2014-2018	126 (8 centers)	ITS sequencing (I)
Caceres <i>et al.</i> 2020 (105)	Colombia (multiple places)	Jan. 2015 – Sept. 2016	40 (4 centers)	NA
Eyre <i>et al.</i> 2019 (80)	United Kingdom (Oxford)	Feb. 2015 - August 2017	60 (1 center)	WGS (mostly III)
Farooqi <i>et al.</i> 2020 (106)	Pakistan (Karachi)	April 2015 – Jan. 2016	30 (1 center)	NA
Escandón <i>et al.</i> 2018 (107,108)	Colombia (multiple places)	Feb. 2015 - July 2016	45* (6 centers)	NA
		Sept. 2016 - May 2017	78* (24 centers)	NA
Schelenz <i>et al.</i> 2016 (4)	United Kingdom (London)	April 2015 - July 2016	50 (1 center)	AFLP: 1 clone
Ruiz-Gaitán <i>et al.</i> 2017-19 (24,109–111)	Spain (Valencia)	April 2016 - January 2017	140 (1 center)	AFLP: 1 clone (I)
Shastri <i>et al.</i> 2020 (112)	India (Dehli)	April 2016 – Sept. 2017	42 (1 center)	AFLP and ITS/28S rDNA sequencing: 1 clone (I)
Vallabhaneni <i>et al.</i> 2017 (113)	USA (multiple places)	May 2016 – Aug. 2016	7 (6 centers)	NA
Belkin <i>et al.</i> 2018 (114)	Israel (Tel Hashomer)	July 2016 – Jan. 2017	2 (1 center)	WGS (III)
Taori <i>et al.</i> 2019 (87)	United Kingdom (London)	July 2016 – Feb. 2017	34 (1 center)	WGS (I)
Tian <i>et al.</i> 2021 (115)	China (Shenyang)	April 2016 – March 2018	93* (1 center)	WGS (III)

Pacilli <i>et al.</i> 2020 (116)	USA (Chicago, IL)	Aug. 2016 – Dec. 2018	490 (4 centers)	NA
Mohsin <i>et al.</i> 2017 (117)	Oman (Muscat)	Aug. 2016 – Jan. 2017	2 (1 center)	AFLP: 2 clones
Al-Siyabi <i>et al.</i> 2017 (118)	Oman (Muscat)	Dec. 2016 – Feb. 2017	5 (1 center)	NA
Park <i>et al.</i> 2019 (119)	USA (New York, NY)	2016-2018	9 (1 center)	NA
Morales-López <i>et al.</i> 2017 (120)	Colombia (multiple places)	Feb. 2017 – July 2017	17 (6 centers)	NA
Theodoropoulos <i>et al.</i> 2020 (121)	USA (Worcester, MA)	May 2017 – Oct. 2017	5 (1 center)	WGS: 1 clone (I)
Abdalhamid <i>et al.</i> 2018 (122) and Almaghrabi <i>et al.</i> 2020 (123)	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (Dammam and Riyadh)	June 2017 – Oct. 2018	10 (2 center)	WGS: 2 clones (I)
Sathyapalan <i>et al.</i> 2021 (124)	India (Kochi)	Sept. 2017 - 2019	15 (1 center)	NA
Barantsevith <i>et al.</i> 2019 (125,126)	Russian federation (Moskow and Siberian region)	Oct. 2017 – Dec. 2017	49 (1 center) and 38 (2 centers)	ITS and D1/D2 sequencing (I)
Bajpai <i>et al.</i> 2020 (127)	India (Dehli)	NA	5 (1 center)	NA
Mulet Bayona <i>et al.</i> 2020 (128,129)	Spain (Valencia)	Nov. 2017 – May 2020	334 (1 center)	Not specified (III)
Alobaid <i>et al.</i> 2021 (130)	Kuweit (multiple places)	Jan. 2018 – Dec. 2018	33 (12 centers)	NA

Alfouzan <i>et al.</i> 2020 (131)	Kuweit (Farwaniya)	Jan. 2018 - June 2019	71 (1 center)	ITS sequencing and microsatellite typing (I)
Alshamrani <i>et al.</i> 2020 (132)	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (Riyadh)	March 2018 – June 2019	23 (1 center)	NA
Salah <i>et al.</i> 2021 (133)	Qatar (Doha)	April 2018 – Nov. 2020	40 (2 centers)	WGS: 2 clones (I)
Eckbo <i>et al.</i> (21)	Canada (Vancouver, BC)	Spring 2018	4 (1 center)	WGS: 1 clone (I)
Lane <i>et al.</i> 2020 (134)	Australia (Melbourne)	July 2018 – Dec. 2018	4 (1 center)	Not specified (I)
Sexton <i>et al.</i> 2021 (76)	USA (Chicago)	December 2018	31 (1 center)	NA
O'Connor <i>et al.</i> 2019 (135)	United Kingdom (London)	Dec. 2018 – Jan. 2019	4 (1 center)	NA
Umamaheshwari <i>et al.</i> 2021 (5)	India (Karnataka)	Dec. 2018– March 2019	8 (1 center)	ITS and 26S sequencing (I)
Di Pilato <i>et al.</i> (136)	Italy (Genoa)	July 2019 – May 2020	10 (1 center)	WGS: 1 clone for 9 isolates (I)
Price <i>et al.</i> 2021 (137)	USA (Los Angeles, CA)	Sept. 2019– Sept. 2020	6 (2 centers)	WGS: 3 clones (mostly III)
Alvarado-Socarras <i>et al.</i> 2021 (138)	Colombia (Bucaramanga)	NA	8 (1 center)	NA

Tse <i>et al.</i> 2021 (139)	Hong Kong	2019	15 (1 center)	WGS: 1 clone (I)
Patterson <i>et al.</i> 2020 (140)	United Kingdom (London)	April 2020 – Sept. 2020	7 (2 centers)	MALDI-TOF (I)
Moin <i>et al.</i> 2021 (141)	Pakistan (Karachi)	April 2020 – Dec. 2020	6 (1 center)	NA
Chowdhary <i>et al.</i> 2020 (23)	India (Dehli)	April–July 2020	10 (1 center)	NA
Piatti G <i>et al.</i> 2021	Italy (Genoa)	June 2020 – Jan. 2021	77 (1 center)	NA
Prestel <i>et al.</i> 2021 (142)	USA (FL)	July 2020 – Aug. 2020	6 (1 center)	NA
Hanson <i>et al.</i> 2021 (143)	USA (Miami, FL)	Summer 2020	15 (1 center)	WGS: 1 clone (III)
Allaw <i>et al.</i> 2021 (144)	Lebanon (Beirut)	Oct. 2020 – Dec. 2020	14 (1 center)	NA
Nobrega de Almedia <i>et al.</i> 2021 (145)	Brazil (Savaldor de Bahia)	December 2020	7 (1 center)	Microsatellite typing (I)
Bacchani <i>et al.</i> 2021 (146)	India (Jaipur)	NA	24 (1 center)	NA
Lyman <i>et al.</i> 2021 (147)	USA (TX and Washington, DC)	Jan. 2021 – April 2021	22 (not specified)	NA

734 Abbreviations: *number of isolates (not specified whether each one corresponded to a distinct patient); AFLP amplified fragment length
735 polymorphism; BC British Columbia; CA California; DC district of Columbia; Dec. December; Feb. February; FL Florida; IL Illinois;
736 Jan. January; MA Massachusetts; MALDI-TOF matrix-associated LASER desorption ionization – time of flight; NA not available; Oct.
737 October; PFGE pulsed-field gel electrophoresis; Sept. September; Nov. November; NY New York; TX Texas; USA United States of
738 America; WGS whole genome sequencing