Original Research Article

Antimicrobial susceptibility pattern of gram negative bacilli isolated from Delhi NCR population

K M Sangita¹, Dakshina Bisht^{1,*}, Sameer Singh Faujdar², Varun Goel³¹Dept. of Microbiology, Santosh Medical College & Hospital, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, India²Dept. of Microbiology, Maharishi Markandeshwar Medical College and Hospital, Solan, Himachal Pradesh, India³Dept. of Microbiology, Government Institute of Medical Sciences, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 08.06.2020

Accepted 12.09.2020

Available online 28-10-2020

Keywords:

Antimicrobial

Metallo beta lactamase

Gram negative

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Antibiotic resistance is a worldwide public health problem that requires urgent global attention and Gram-negative bacilli of the *Enterobacteriaceae* family are well-known for demonstrating drug resistance. These drug resistance microorganisms cause recurrent infections in patients in hospital units, limiting treatment alternatives and increasing morbidity and mortality rates.

Material and Methods: A cross sectional study was carried out in the Department of Microbiology, Santosh Medical College and Hospital Ghaziabad. 150 Gram negative bacteria isolated from various clinical samples from both IPD and OPD patients were included in this study.

Results: Among the Gram negative bacterial isolates maximum isolates were identified as *E. coli* (50%), *Klebsiella species* (20%), *Citrobacter species* (12%), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (10%), *Acinetobacter species* (07%) and *Proteus species* (04%). *Enterobacteriaceae* isolate were sensitive to Imipenem (82.2%), Gentamycin (55.5%), Cefepime (42.2%), and resistant to Ampicillin (85.9%), Ceftriaxone (82.9%) and Levofloxacin (62.9%).

Conclusion: Routine surveillance of baseline resistance, expressing of hospital antibiotic policy and compliance with current guidelines will go long way in reducing multi drug resistance among pathogens.

© 2020 Published by Innovative Publication. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

Antimicrobial resistance is a growing problem in the 21st Century and one of the most serious problem to global public health.¹ The number of resistant microbial strains, geographic areas affected by drug resistance and the extent of resistance in each organism are escalating.² Moreover, the percentage of organisms exhibiting antimicrobial resistance, especially resistance to multiple antibiotics, are continually increased.³ Resistant microorganisms lead to an increase in morbidity and mortality since it increases the risk of inappropriate therapy.^{4,5} This resistance may delay and hinder treatment, resulting in complications or even death.^{6,7} Moreover a patient may need more care, as well as the use of alternative and more expensive antibiotics

which may have more severe side effects or may need invasive treatment such as intravenous injection to be given in hospital.^{6,8}

Experiences from surveillance network on antimicrobial use and antimicrobial resistance show that data where ever available, can be put to multiple uses, including orienting treatment choice, understanding antimicrobial trend, informing public health policy, identifying priority areas for interventions and monitoring the impact of interventions to certain resistance.¹ Therefore, the present study involves the screening of the antimicrobial resistant profile of carbapenem drugs that are used in the treatment of infectious diseases.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: dakshinabisht@gmail.com (D. Bisht).

2. Material and Methods

A cross sectional study was conducted in the Department of Microbiology, Santosh Medical College and Hospital, Ghaziabad for a period of one year from October 2017 to 2018. Ethical clearance was obtained from the Institutional Ethical Committee. All specimens including urine, pus, blood, sputum, stool and body fluids such as cerebrospinal fluid and pleural fluid received in the bacteriology laboratory and processed further according to Standard bacteriological procedures for bacterial isolation and identification. Antimicrobial Susceptibility testing was done according to Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute.^{9,10}

3. Result

Of the total 150 isolates, 74 (49%) isolates were from urine samples, 33 (22%) isolates from pus, 11 (7.3%) isolates from sputum, 09 (06%) isolates from blood, 07 (4.66%) isolates from catheter tips, 06 (4%) isolates from ETT & Ear swab and 04 (2.66%) isolates from stool (Figure 1).

Of the 150 Gram negative isolates bacteriological profile showed that 50% isolates were *E. coli*, 21% *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, 15% *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, 08% *Citrobacter* species, 07% *Acinetobacter baumannii* and 04% *Proteus* species (Figure 2). Antibiotic susceptibility patterns of *Enterobacteriaceae*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Acinetobacter baumannii* have been shown in the (Figures 3, 4 and 5) respectively.

Fig. 1: Distribution of Clinical Samples

4. Discussion

Originating in a hospital setting, carbapenems are used as the last resort for treatment of Drug resistance Gram negative bacterial infection. However, since last 15 years acquired resistance to these life saving antimicrobials has been increasingly reported not only in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Acinetobacter species*,¹¹ but also among other members of *Enterobacteriaceae* family. *E.coli* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* are the most common pathogens

Fig. 2: Bacteriological Profile of Clinical Isolates

Fig. 3: Antibiotic Susceptibility Pattern of Enterobacteriaceae

Fig. 4: Antibiotic Susceptibility Pattern of Pseudomonas

Fig. 5: Antibiotic Susceptibility Pattern of *Acinetobacter Spp*

in Enterobacteriaceae family.¹² These carbapenemas producing bacteria were found in many countries such as China¹³ Jaipur,¹⁴ China,¹⁵ Brazil,¹⁶ This resistance is mainly mediated by MBLs.

Antibiotic sensitivity of Enterobacteriaceae family showed maximum sensitivity to imipenem (82.2%), gentamicin (55.5%), cefepime (42.2%) and levofloxacin (37.0%). A study by Kholy Amani et al,¹⁷ showed somewhat similar pattern with maximum sensitivity to gentamicin (42%), cefepime (40%), levofloxacin (30%). Whereas other studies have reported maximum sensitivity to imipenem (80%), gentamicin (45%), levofloxacin (42.2%), and cefepime (36.6%).

Present study showed maximum resistance to Ampicillin (85.9%), Ceftriaxone (82.9%), Levofloxacin (62.9%), Cefepime (57.7%). Vemula Sarojamma et al., reported high resistance to imipenem (84%), gentamicin (40%) in their study whereas Tanaja et al. reported high resistance to ampicillin (80%) and imipenem (86%).

In our study *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* showed maximum sensitivity to piperacillin/ tazobactam (80%), toberamycin and levofloxacin (66.6%), and imipenem (60%) respectively. Resistance pattern of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* was maximum by Cefazidime (55.5%), Aztreonam 46.6%, Imipenem and Levofloxacin 33.3%, Toberamycin and Piperacillin/Tazobactam 33.3% respectively. Irfan et al.¹⁷ reported sensitivity to piperacillin/tazobactam 40% and were resistance to Aztreonam 66.6%, Attal et al.,¹⁸ EL Koly Amani et al.,¹⁹

Metallo beta lactamase has become a major problem worldwide and the situation is worrisome to the community. These enzymes are becoming increasingly expressed by many strains of pathogenic bacteria with a potential for dissemination.¹² They compromise the activity of wide spectrum antibiotics creating major therapeutic difficulties with significant impact on the outcome of patient by appropriate antimicrobial selection, surveillance system and effective infection control procedures being the key factor in their control.

5. Conclusion

The spread of drug-resistant Gram negative bacilli in the hospital is seen as a worldwide problem. In the majority of hospitalized patients, those in ICUs are exposed to the risk. Routine surveillance of baseline resistance, guidelines of hospital antibiotic policy and compliance with existing guidelines will go long way in reducing multi drug resistance among pathogens. Early detection is crucial for the treatment with alternative antimicrobial and timely implementation of strict infection control practices. There is no standardized method for Metallo beta lactamase detection, although detection by polymerase chain reaction is highly accurate and reliable, thus, laboratory methods including culture and antimicrobial susceptibility testing with routine screening for MBL production should be done for proper diagnosis and management of all infection.

6. Source of Funding

None.

7. Conflicts of Interest

None.

References

1. Essential drug monitor: Antimicrobial drug resistance: A Global Threat World Health Organization; 2000. Geneva, Switzerland.
2. Pfeifer Y, Cullik A, Witte W. Resistance to cephalosporins and carbapenems in Gram-negative bacterial pathogens. *Int J Med Microbiol.* 2010;300(6):371–9.
3. Mehrishi P, Faujdar SS, Kumar S, Solanki S, Sharma A. Antibiotic susceptibility profile of uropathogens in rural population of Himachal Pradesh, India: Where We are heading? *Biomed Biotechnol Res J.* 2019;3:171–5.
4. Kapil A. The challenge of antibiotic resistance: need to contemplate. *Indian J Med Res.* 2005;121(2):83–91.
5. Ventola CL. The antibiotic resistance crisis- part 1: causes and threats. *P T.* 2015;40(4):277–83.
6. Fair RJ, Tor Y. Antibiotics and Bacterial Resistance in the 21st Century. *Perspect Medicin Chem.* 2014;6:25–64.
7. Prestinaci F, Pezzotti P, Pantosti A. Antimicrobial resistance: a global multifaceted phenomenon. *Pathog Glob Health.* 2015;109(7):309–18.
8. Friedman ND, Temkin E, Carmeli Y. The negative impact of antibiotic resistance. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2016;22(5):416–22.
9. Faujdar SS, Bisht D, Sharma A. Antibacterial potential of neem (*Azadirachta indica*) against uropathogens producing beta-lactamase enzymes: A clue to future antibacterial agent? *Biomed Biotechnol Res J.* 2020;4(3):232–8.
10. Bauer AW, Kirby WM, Sherris JC, Turck M. Antibiotic susceptibility testing by a standardized single disk method. *Am J Clin Pathol.* 1996;45(4):493–6.
11. Gupta V, Datta P, Chander J. Prevalence of metallo beta lactamase Producing *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Acinetobacter* species in a tertiary care hospital in India. *J.* 2006;52(5):311–4.
12. Polk HC. Consensus summary of infection. *J Trauma.* 1979;19:894–5.
13. Wang J, Yao X, Luo J, Lv L, Zeng Z, Liu JH, et al. Emergence of *Echerichia coli* coproducing NDM-1 and KPC-2 carbapenamase from a retail vegetable. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2018;73(1):252–4.
14. Stood M. S phenotypic test for detecting incidence of metallo beta lactamase producing *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in Jaipur. *Nat J Lab*

- Med.* 2014;3:22–73.
15. Wu W, Feng Y, Tang G, Qiao F, McNally A, Zong Z, et al. NDM Metallo beta-Lactamase and Their Bacterial producers in Health Care Setting. *Clin Microbial Rev.* 2019;32(2):115–8.
 16. Goncalves LR, Ferreira L, Araujo BF, Campos PA, Royer S, Batistão DWF, et al. Outbreak of colistin resistance colistin susceptible KPC-producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in Brazilian, intensive care unit. *J Hosp Infect.* 2016;94(4):322–9.
 17. Irfan S, Zafar A, Ghauri D, Ahsan T, Hassan R. Metallo beta lactamase producing clinical isolates of *Acinetobacter* species and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* from intensive care unit patients of a tertiary care hospital. *Indian J Med Microbiol.* 2008;26(3):243–5.
 18. Attal RO, Basak S, Mallick SK, Bose S. metallo beta lactamase producing *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*; a emerging threat to clinicians. *J Clin Diagn Res.* 2010;4(4):2691–6.
 19. Amin A, Ghumro PB, Hussain S, Hameed A. Prevalence of antibiotic resistance among clinical isolates of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* isolated from a Tertiary Care Hospital in Pakistan. *Malays J Microbiol.* 2009;5(2):81–6.

Author biography

K M Sangita PG Student

Dakshina Bisht Professor & Head

Sameer Singh Faujdar Assistant Professor

Varun Goel Assistant Professor

Cite this article: Sangita KM, Bisht D, Faujdar SS, Goel V. Antimicrobial susceptibility pattern of gram negative bacilli isolated from Delhi NCR population. *Indian J Microbiol Res* 2020;7(3):218-221.