

1 Supplementary Text S1. Methods and materials

2 For the gram-negative bacteria, five to ten isolated colonies from blood agar medium were
3 transferred to purified water in a 1.5 ml eppendorf tube and subsequently incubated for 10
4 min at 95 °C, and centrifuged briefly. DNA extraction was carried out with a Magna Pure
5 Compact system (Roche Diagnostics Scandinavia AB, Bromma, Sweden) according to the
6 manufacturer's instructions, and the DNA concentration was measured by use of a UV/Vis
7 spectrophotometer (Tehtum Lab AB, Sweden). The DNA concentration range was kept at
8 100 to 500 ng/μl. For the gram-positive bacteria, an agar plate with confluent growth of an
9 isolate was flooded with 1 mL of PBS. This step was repeated two times. The eluate was
10 centrifuged at 14 000 x g for 10 min. The supernatant was discarded and 800 μl MagNA
11 Pure Bacteria Lysis Buffer (Roche Diagnostics Scandinavia AB, Bromma, Sweden) and 0.8 g
12 of 0.5 mm zirconia/silica beads (BioSpec Products Inc, Bartlesville, Oklahoma, USA) was
13 added. The samples were homogenized in a mini-beadbeater (BioSpec Products Inc,
14 Bartlesville, Oklahoma, USA) for 30 s and centrifuged at 10 000 x g for 3 min after which
15 400 μl supernatant was transferred and DNA extraction was carried out with a Magna Pure
16 Compact system (Roche Diagnostics Scandinavia AB, Bromma, Sweden) according to the
17 manufacturer's instructions. The DNA concentration was measured by use of a UV/Vis
18 spectrophotometer (Tehtum Lab AB, Sweden) and the concentration range was kept at 15 to
19 30 ng/μl. DNA concentration was normalized for all samples and up to 1 μg DNA was used
20 for the cleavage reaction as described previously (1). Subsequent PCR was carried out in a
21 reaction mixture with 2 μl template i.e. ligation mix, as previously described (1). Real-time
22 PCR with HRM (Rotor-Gene 6000; Corbett Research, Tehtum Lab AB, Sweden) was
23 optimized for each species as described in Table S1. Each isolate was analysed in duplicate on
24 at least three different occasions. Following LMqPCR HRMA, the DNA products were
25 analysed by agarose gel electrophoresis (E-gel EX, 2%; LifeTechnologies, Sweden) according

26 to the instructions provided by the manufacturer. DNA banding patterns were analysed by use
27 of GelClust (www.bmsu.ac.ir/Services/Event/View.aspx?Oid=1766). The Dice similarity
28 coefficient and UPGMA were used for cluster analysis. For PFGE, bacterial isolates and
29 control strains were analyzed using the restriction enzyme *XbaI* for *K. pneumoniae* and *E.*
30 *cloacae* (2), *SpeI* for *P. aeruginosa* (3), *ApaI* for *Acinetobacter* spp. (4) and *SmaI* for *S.*
31 *aureus* and *E. faecium* (5, 6). *XbaI*-digested DNA from *Salmonella enterica* serovar
32 Braenderup H9812 (www.cdc.gov/pulsenet) was included as a normalization standard when
33 analyzing *K. pneumoniae*, *E. cloacae* and *P. aeruginosa*, and *S. aureus* NCTC8325 for the
34 gram-positive bacteria and *Acinetobacter* spp. DNA banding patterns were analysed by use of
35 BioNumerics version 6.0 (Applied Maths NV, Belgium). The Dice similarity coefficient and
36 UPGMA were used for cluster analysis; in general, isolates with >97 % similarity were
37 defined as identical, isolates with 90-97 % similarity as being closely related, and isolates
38 with <90 % similarity defined as unrelated.

39

40 *Algorithm for evaluation of the HRMA analysis to discriminate between isolates*

41 Several aspects were evaluated to determine if two or more HRM curves were different within
42 the same run (please see example for *Enterobacter* spp. in Supplementary figure 1-2). First, to
43 determine similarities objectively, an algorithm previously developed (1) was applied.
44 Second, the whole HRM curves (df/dt plotted against temperature) were compared to each
45 other by overlaying them and inspecting them visually. Third, the same approach was used to
46 the normalized curves (normalized fluorescence plotted against temperature). Last, the curve
47 representing the isolate in question was determined as different from another isolate if the
48 difference curve (normalized fluorescence minus isolate of the control plotted against
49 temperature) was beyond ± 3.5 U for *E. faecium* (Fig 1C), ± 5 U for *S. aureus*, ± 3 U *K.*

50 *pneumoniae*, ± 3 U for *A. baumannii* (Fig 1D), ± 5 U *P. aeruginosa* and ± 3 U *E. cloacae*. The
51 definition of U is % difference between the normalized curves calculated by the RotorGene
52 software. The cut-off for the ΔU were determined empirically in a pilot stage before the
53 blinded analysis was initiated. For isolates within these limits, the curve shape was also
54 considered in relation to the reference, i.e. how much the curve differed from the reference at
55 each point along the entire X-axis. There were 11 isolates deviating from the set U-values
56 (data not shown), mostly depending on shifts between identical curves resulting in similar
57 curves lying outside these values, but also isolates with clearly different melting curves that fit
58 within the ΔU cut-off. Such isolates were subjectively evaluated and not subjected to U-value
59 analysis.