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Extended spectrum β-lactamases in urinary isolates of Escherichia coli - prevalence and susceptibility pattern at a tertiary care hospital
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ABSTRACT

**Introduction:** Urinary Tract infections caused by Escherichia coli have become a significant global public health problem. The resistance to β-lactam antibiotics in these clinically important gram negative bacteria further adds to the problem. Knowledge about their prevalence is essential to guide towards appropriate antibiotic treatment. The study was thus undertaken to know prevalence and susceptibility pattern of Extended spectrum β-lactamase (ESBL) producing Escherichia coli isolates among urinary samples.

**Methods:** A total of 216 E.coli isolates in urinary samples were studied for ESBL production by using CLSI Phenotypic screening and confirmatory tests.

**Results:** 53% of E.coli isolates were ESBL producers. The susceptibility of ESBL producers to Imipenem, Tigecycline and Nitrofurantion was found to be 100%, 100% and 88% respectively. A high degree of associated resistance to Amikacin, Co-trimoxazole and Quinolones was found in ESBL producers. Majority of ESBL producers were detected among patients admitted in various ICUs and surgery ward.

**Conclusion:** Our study shows presence of ESBL producer E.coli in large number of urinary isolates.
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INTRODUCTION

Urinary tract infections (UTIs) having Escherichia coli as etiological agent are common infections with an estimated annual global incidence of at least 250 million cases.¹

This important pathogen has shown an increasing antimicrobial resistance to most antibiotics particularly Extended-Spectrum-Cephalosporins.²,³ Resistance to these antibiotics can occur via production of Extended Spectrum β-lactamases (ESBLs). ESBLs are defined as β-lactamases capable of hydrolyzing oxyimino cephalosporins and are inhibited by beta-lactamase inhibitors.⁴

The incidence of ESBL producing E.coli has been increasing worldwide. It varies according to geographic location and is directly linked to use and misuse of antibiotics.⁵ These enzymes are plasmid borne and confer multiple drug resistance.⁶ Co-resistance to non β-lactam antibiotics is either by the co-transfer of resistance determinants in the same genetic elements (such as aminoglycoside resistance) or simply by the co-relation of both resistance mechanisms, as occur with fluroquinolones.⁷ Since there are limited therapeutic options urinary tract infections become difficult to treat. Hence, the present study was undertaken to estimate the burden of ESBL producing E.coli isolates and also to find out their susceptibility to non-β lactam antibiotics. Moreover the aim of the study was also to compare the antibiotic sensitivity pattern of ESBL producers with that of Non ESBL producers and to delineate the magnitude of the problem and to define appropriate therapeutic options.
METHODS

A prospective study was conducted over a period of six months (January to July 2012) at a tertiary care teaching hospital. Total of 1136 urine samples were processed for significant bacteriuria in the department of microbiology from patients clinically suspected to have UTI. The samples received were inoculated on CLED (Cysteine lactose electrolyte deficient media) and after 24 h of aerobic incubation at 37º C, isolates were identified to the species level using standard biochemical tests. All E.coli (216) isolates were included in the study. Clinico-demographic data of study patients was noted. Chi-square test was used to analyze the susceptibility pattern of non β-lactam antibiotics in ESBL producers and non-producers.

1.1 Antibiotic susceptibility testing

Susceptibility to various antimicrobial agents was determined by Disc diffusion method of Kirby Bauer on Mueller Hinton Agar (Hi-media) as described by Clinical Laboratory and Standard Institute (CLSI) guidelines. The following antibiotic discs (drug concentration in µg) were used: ampicillin (30), gentamicin (30), ceftazidime (30), cefotaxime (30), ceftiraxone (30), co-trimoxazole (25), imipenem (10), ciprofloxacin (5), cefoperoxazone-sulbactam (30), piperacillin-tazobactam (30) and nitrofurantoin (300).

1.2 Test for ESBL production

1.2.1 Screening test

All E.coli isolates were subjected to Screening tests by using cefotaxime (30µg) and ceftriaxone (30µg) discs. Those isolates with cefotaxime zone <=27mm and ceftriaxone zone <=25mm were then subjected to confirmatory tests.

1.2.2 Confirmatory test

Double disc approximation test. The organism was swabbed on to a Mueller-Hinton agar plate. Antibiotic discs of amoxicillin/clavulanic acid (20/10 µg) and cefotaxime (30 µg) were placed at a distance of 15 mm apart and incubated. Organism that showed a clear extension of cefotaxime inhibition zone towards the disc containing clavulanate was considered as ESBL producer.

CLSI confirmatory test

While performing antibiotic testing, ceftazidime (30 µg) and ceftazidime plus clavulanic acid (30/10 µg) were placed on Mueller-Hinton agar and incubated. Organism was considered as ESBL producer if there was a >= 5mm increase in zone diameter of ceftazidime/clavulanate disc and that of ceftazidime disc alone Escherichia coli ATCC 25922 and Klebsiella pneumonia ATCC 700603 were used as negative and positive controls respectively.

RESULTS

Of the 1136 urine samples processed, 427 samples yielded various bacterial isolates. There were 216 E.coli isolates among them. While 59% (128/216) E.coli were Screening test positive, 53% of E.coli (117/216) were confirmed ESBL by CLSI confirmatory test.

The double disk approximation test failed to detect ESBLs in two isolates. The ESBL positive isolates were obtained from 49 male and 68 female patients with a male to female ratio of 1:1.3. Almost equal percent of ESBL producers were obtained from OPD and IPD. Among IPD maximum ESBL were isolated from ICUs and Surgery wards.

The antimicrobial susceptibility results of ESBL producers are shown in Figure 1. Susceptibility of ESBL producers to imipenem, tigecycline and nitrofurantoin was found to be 100%, 100% and 88% respectively. Sensitivity to non-β-lactam antibiotics varied from 0 to 45%. Statistically significant (p<0.01) co-resistance to non-β-lactam antibiotics was observed with ESBL producers Table 1.

Figure 1: Percentage susceptibility of ESBL producers to various antibiotics (n=117).

Table 1: Antibiotic susceptibility of ESBL producers and non producers to various non β lactam antibiotics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibiotics</th>
<th>ESBL producers (n=117)</th>
<th>Non-producers (n=99)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susceptible No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigecycline</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrofurantoin</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amikacin</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotrimoxazole</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.01
DISCUSSION

ESBLs are now a problem worldwide. Prevalence of ESBL varies across continents, countries and hospitals as demonstrated by large scale studies like SENTRY, SMART, MYSTIC. As per the SMART study conducted in Asian-Pacific in 2007, the prevalence of ESBL production in Enterobacteriaceae was reported to be highest from India. ESBL production among E. coli was 79.0%.10

Table 2 shows different Indian studies conducted over the last 10 years, which demonstrate regional differences in prevalence rates ranging from 24.80% to 87.1% in E. coli.

In our study the overall ESBL production in urinary isolates of E. coli was found to be 53%.

Table 2: ESBL producing E. coli detection rates in different Indian studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year &amp; Place</th>
<th>ESBL Positive E. coli %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trupti Bajpai et al.11</td>
<td>2014 Indore</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeta Sharma et al.12</td>
<td>2013 Jaipur</td>
<td>52.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohamudha et al.13</td>
<td>2012 Pondicherry</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manoharan et al.14</td>
<td>2011 Mumbai</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoorashetty et al.15</td>
<td>2011 Bangalore</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rao et al.16</td>
<td>2010 Davangere</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varaiya et al.17</td>
<td>2010 Mumbai</td>
<td>27.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wani et al.18</td>
<td>2009 Srinagar</td>
<td>52.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goyal et al.19</td>
<td>2009 Lucknow</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsering et al.20</td>
<td>2009 Sikkim</td>
<td>26.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agarwal et al.21</td>
<td>2008 Pune</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsh gupta22</td>
<td>2007 Chandigarh</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART study20</td>
<td>2007 Asia Pacific</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumar et al.23</td>
<td>2006 Hyderabad</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babypadmini et al.24</td>
<td>2004 Coimbatore</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchanda &amp; Singh25</td>
<td>2003 New Delhi</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the ESBL positive isolates, maximum numbers of samples were received from surgery ward (29.4%) and ICUs (18.21%). Like our study Babypadmini et al. and Wani et al., have also detected majority of ESBL producers from ICU and surgical ward.18,24

In vitro, the Carbapenems (including Imipenem, Meropenem, and Ertapenem) have the most consistent activity against ESBL-producing organisms, given their stability to hydrolysis by ESBLs.26 In our study also carbapenems are the most effective with 98.2% ESBL producers sensitive to Meropenem.

β-Lactam/β-lactamase inhibitor combinations are usually active against organisms possessing a single ESBL. As has been noted previously, many organisms now produce multiple ESBLs, which may reduce the effectiveness of β-lactam/ β-lactamase inhibitor combinations.26 In vitro resistance of ESBL-producing isolates to such combinations is increasing; in our study out of 117 ESBL positive isolates, 54.0% were sensitive to Piperacillin-tazobactam, and 87.0 % to Cefoperazone-sulbactam. Tsering et al. in a similar study have reported that 97.53% and 48.11% of isolates were sensitive to Imipenem and Piperacillin-tazobactam respectively.20 In another study by Mohanty et al. sensitivity of ESBL positive isolates was reported to be 81.37% to Piperacillin-tazobactam, 76.06% for Cefoperazone-sulbactam and 45.48% for Ticarcillin-clavulanic.27 Manoharan et al. reported 89.7% sensitivity to Amikacin and 85.3% to Piperacillin-tazobactam.14 Sharma et al. reported sensitivities to Piperacillin-tazobactam 89%, Amikacin 22%, Gentamicin 56% and Tobramycin 78% (28). Similar kind of resistance pattern was also reported in SMART study (Asia-Pacific) and MYSTIC study group (Europe) in Table 2.10,29

Table 3: Resistance pattern in international studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Antimicrobial</th>
<th>Our Study</th>
<th>Smart Study</th>
<th>Mystic Study Group (Europe)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. coli</td>
<td>Imipenem</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piperacillin-tazobactam</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESBL producers have shown good sensitivity to Tigecycline and Polymyxin B. Nitrofurantoin has also shown good sensitivity among urinary isolates and is a good choice for urinary tract infection, being available orally and cheaper than its alternatives.

Many workers (Table 4) have found that resistance to third generation cephalosporins coexists with resistance to other antibiotics like, Cotrimoxazole, Tetracycline, Ciprofloxacin, Amikacin etc. indicating multidrug resistance pattern. We found such associated resistance with co-trimoxazole -100%, amikacin - 55% and fluoroquinolones - 95% (p<0.01).

Similar findings have been noted by other workers.

CONCLUSION

In the current study a high prevalence of ESBL producing E. coli was detected.
Most of these isolates were from hospitalized patients indicating that these were important nosocomial pathogens. The outpatient presence of ESBL is of concern as it is now come to the alert of the physician that ESBL is spreading fast in the community and responsible for community-acquired ESBLs. Delayed recognition and inappropriate treatment of severe infections caused by ESBL producers with cephalosporin has been associated with increased morbidity.

Significant difference was observed between ESBL producers and non-producers regarding antibiotic sensitivity. Many ESBL producers were found resistant to non-β-lactam antibiotics like Quinolones and to lesser extent to Aminoglycosides. Tigecycline, Meropenem, Polymyxin B were found highly effective. Nitrofurantoin was the only oral drug to which uniform susceptibility was found. Though ESBLs were found susceptible to Piperacillin-tazobactam and Cefoparazone-sulbactam, they should not be given for empirical therapy since co production of Amp C renders these combinations clinically ineffective.

It is important therefore that patients report must state the isolate is a suspected or a proven ESBL producer and should include a note stating that production may predict therapeutic failure with β-lactam antibiotics, irrespective of their in vitro susceptibility.

To reduce the prevalence of antimicrobial resistant pathogens, including ESBL producing E. coli, effective infection control measures like hand washing and barrier precautions are required. Monitoring the judicious use of extended spectrum cephalosporins, periodic surveillance of antibiotic resistance patterns and efforts to decrease empirical antibiotic therapy would go a long way in addressing some of the problems associated with these pathogens.
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