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Abstract

Background: In recent years, Extended-spectrum beta-lactamase (ESBL) producing microorganisms have complicated treatment of infections due to resistance of ESBL producing strains to a wide range of antimicrobials. Objective: Target of this study was to determine the prevalence of ESBL producing gram-negative bacteria in neonatal sepsis cases and to reveal the antimicrobial susceptibility pattern of those isolated ESBL producers. Materials and Methods: This cross sectional study was carried out in Dhaka Medical College Hospital (DMCH) over a period of 12 months from January to December in 2016. Following isolation and identification of gram-negative bacteria from blood samples of suspected septicemic neonates, antimicrobial susceptibility test was performed by Kirby Bauer disk-diffusion method and ESBL producers were detected by Double Disk Synergy (DDS) test. Results: Among 52 Gram-negative bacteria isolated from 106 blood samples, 34.61% ESBL producers were detected and Enterobacter spp. (45%) was predominant followed by Klebsiella pneumoniae (33.33%). None of the ESBL producers was resistant to colistin and tigecycline. All ESBL producing Acinetobacter baumannii, 77.78% and 66.67% of ESBL producing Enterobacter spp and Klebsiella spp. respectively showed resistance to meropenem. All ESBL producers were resistant to piperacillin-tazobactam. Conclusion: Appropriate measures should be taken to prevent the spread of ESBL producing strains by combining strategies for infection prevention, control and rational use of antibiotics.
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Introduction

Recently, management of infections caused by gram-negative bacteria has become an international concern due to increasing emergence of extended-spectrum beta-lactamas (ESBLs). ESBLs producing microorganisms confer resistance to penicillin, first, second and third generation cephalosporins and aztreonam (but not cefamycin and carbapenem) and are inhibited by clavulanic acid. ESBL producers were isolated for the first time in Western Europe in mid-1980s and the incidence has been rising since then.

The prevalence and distribution of ESBL producers differ from country to country and from hospital to hospital. An undeniably high prevalence rate of ESBL producers in the Asia-Pacific were reported by several surveillance studies despite incidence vary with geographical area and time. A high rate of ESBL producers has been documented by limited number of studies on prevalence of ESBLs in Bangladesh. ESBLs are present in a variety of enterobacteriaceae and non-enterobacteriaceae including Pseudomonas spp., Acinetobacter spp. Plasmids encoding ESBL enzymes may carry co-resistance genes for other non-beta-lactam antibiotics also. Carbapenems are considered to be the antibiotic of choice in treating infections caused by ESBL producers.
Materials and Methods
Study design and population
This cross-sectional study was performed in Department of Microbiology, in collaboration with Department of Neonatology, Dhaka Medical College Hospital (DMCH), between the periods of January 2016 to December 2016. Neonates of either sex of age 0-28 days, both inborn and out-born, admitted in Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU) of DMCH with suspected clinical features of sepsis at admission or developed such features afterwards when admitted for other indication, irrespective of antibiotic intake were included. Neonates with congenital anomalies, acute bilirubin encephalopathy, perinatal asphyxia, meconium aspiration syndrome, history of prolong rupture of membrane and prolong labor of mother were excluded from this study. The study was approved by Research Review Committee (RRC) and Ethical Review Committee (ERC) of DMC.

Isolation of gram-negative bacteria
Blood samples were collected with all aseptic precaution and were inoculated into BacT/ALERT PF Plus bottle (bioMerieux, Inc, Durham, North Carolina) and these bottles were processed for automated blood culture using BacT/ALERT 3D 60 Microbial Detection System (bioMerieux, Inc, Durham, North Carolina). Subcultures were done on Blood agar and MacConkey agar media. Isolates were identified by colony morphology, hemolytic criteria, pigment production, different biochemical reactions and staining character as per standard techniques.14

Antimicrobial susceptibility testing and screening of ESBL producers
Antimicrobial susceptibility pattern was determined by Kirby Bauer disk-diffusion method on Muller-Hinton agar media using commercially available antibiotic disks (Oxoid Ltd, UK) following CLSI, 2015. Esch. coli ATCC 25922 was used as control strain. Amoxiclav (amoxicillin 20µg + clavulanic acid 10µg/disk), cefixime (30µg/disk), ceftazidime (30µg/disk), ceftriaxone (30µg/disk), ciprofloxacin (5µg/disk), amikacin (30µg/disk), gentamicin (10µg/disk), meropenem (10µg/disk), colistin sulphate (10µg/disk), piperacillin/tazobactum (100/10µg/disk) antibiotic disks were used. Susceptibility of the gram-negative organism to tigecycline was determined using 15µg tigecycline disk and the criteria of the United States Food and Drug Administration was used for interpretation.16 Gram-negative isolates those showed resistance to any of ceftriaxone and ceftazidime disks, were considered as suspected ESBL producers.2

Detection of ESBL producers by Double-Disk Synergy (DDS) test
Suspected ESBL producers were further confirmed by DDS test.17 Amoxiclav disk was placed at the center of the Muller-Hinton agar plate and third generation cephalosporins (ceftriaxone, ceftazidime and cefotaxime) were placed 20mm apart from the amoxiclav disk. Inoculated plate was incubated at 37°C for 24 hours. A clear extension of the edge of the inhibition zone of cephalosporin disks towards amoxiclav disk was interpreted as ESBLs production of that isolated gram-negative bacteria (Figure 1).

Results
Among the isolated 52 gram-negative bacteria, 18 (34.61%) ESBL producers were identified by DDS test. Nine (45%) of the 20 Enterobacter spp., 6 (33.33%) of the 18 Klebsiella pneumoniae, 2 (25%) of the 8 Pseudomonas aeruginosa and one (25%) of the 4 Acinetobacter baumannii were ESBL producers (Table I).

Table I: Distribution of ESBL producing gram-negative bacteria identified by DDS test (N=52).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gram-negative bacteria</th>
<th>ESBL producers by DDS test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterobacter spp. (N = 20)</td>
<td>9 (45.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klebsiella pneumoniae (N = 18)</td>
<td>6 (33.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudomonas aeruginosa (N = 8)</td>
<td>2 (25.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acinetobacter baumannii (N = 4)</td>
<td>1 (25.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrobacter spp. (N = 2)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N = 52)</td>
<td>18 (34.61)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the ESBL producing Enterobacter spp., Klebsiella pneumoniae, Pseudomonas aeruginosa and A. baumannii were resistant to amoxiclav, cefixime, ceftazidime, ceftriaxone, amikacin, gentamicin, piperacillin-tazobactam and were sensitive to colistin, tigecycline. Among the 9 ESBL producing Enterobacter spp., 66.67% were resistant to ciprofloxacin and 77.78% to meropenem. Fifty percent of the ESBL producing Klebsiella pneumoniae were resistant to ciprofloxacin and 66.67% to meropenem. Among ESBL producing Pseudomonas aeruginosa, all were resistant to ciprofloxacin and 50% to meropenem. All the ESBL producing A. baumannii were resistant to ciprofloxacin and meropenem (Table II).
In this study, resistance to three or more drugs (multi-drug resistant, MDR) was common in ESBL producers. All the ESBL producers were resistant to ceftriaxone, cefazidime, cefixim which is similar to the findings reported by Farzana, Rahman and Shamsuzzaman.

All the ESBL producers were sensitive to tigecycline and colistin in this study. Rahman reported that 33.33% of the ESBL producers were resistant to colistin where as Shamsuzzaman reported that all the ESBL producers were sensitive to colistin. Caniglia and Dowzicky reported that 93.7% of the ESBL producing Klebsiella pneumoniae were sensitive to tigecycline which is almost similar to present findings.

All the ESBL producers were resistant to amoxiclav, amikacin, gentamicin and piperacillin-tazobactam which is similar to the findings of the previous study of Rahman. 66.67% of the ESBL producers were resistant to ciprofloxacin. Previously, Rahman and Shamsuzzaman reported that 100% and 95.55% of the ESBL producers were resistant to ciprofloxacin respectively. Kumar et al. reported that 60% of the ESBL producing E. coli isolated from blood were resistant to ciprofloxacin. ESBL producing bacteria also resistant to non-B-lactam antibiotics was due to plasmids encoding ESBL genes also carry genes encoding resistance to other agents like aminoglycosides, fluoroquinolones and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole.

72.22% of the ESBL producers revealed resistance to meropenem in this study. Contradictory to this, other studies performed previously in DMCH reported that all of the ESBL producers were sensitive to carbapenem. Resistance to carbapenem of ESBL producers might develop spontaneously which is strongly favored by the presence of ESBL encoding plasmid and different mutational spectra. Mainly loss of function mutations in the regulators of porin expression caused reduced influx of antibiotic into the cell and in combination of amplification of B-lactamase genes on the plasmid this led to high resistance level.

Conclusion
Therapeutic options fall into a narrow range due to emergence of ESBLs in gram-negative bacteria. Reporting of ESBL producing organisms is of great concern and these organisms show worrhy resistance to not only beta-lactam antibiotics but also to non-beta lactams. ESBL producing organisms’ sensitivity towards carbapenem and piperacillin-tazobactam which are considered as last resource till now has fallen greatly. In this study, colistin and tigecycline revealed remarkable sensitivity but these drugs should be kept as reserved for cases where most other antimicrobials fail to act. Urgent surveillance of ESBL producing strains in the country need to be focused.

Table II: Antimicrobial drug resistance among different species of ESBL producers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antimicrobial Drugs</th>
<th>Enterobacter spp.</th>
<th>Klebsiella pneumonia</th>
<th>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</th>
<th>Acinetobacter baumannii</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 9) n (%)</td>
<td>(N = 6) n (%)</td>
<td>(N = 2) n (%)</td>
<td>(N = 1) n (%)</td>
<td>(N = 18) n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxiclav</td>
<td>9 (100.00)</td>
<td>6 (100.00)</td>
<td>2 (100.00)</td>
<td>1 (100.00)</td>
<td>18 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftriaxone</td>
<td>9 (100.00)</td>
<td>6 (100.00)</td>
<td>2 (100.00)</td>
<td>1 (100.00)</td>
<td>18 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefazidime</td>
<td>9 (100.00)</td>
<td>6 (100.00)</td>
<td>2 (100.00)</td>
<td>1 (100.00)</td>
<td>18 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefixim</td>
<td>9 (100.00)</td>
<td>6 (100.00)</td>
<td>2 (100.00)</td>
<td>1 (100.00)</td>
<td>18 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amikacin</td>
<td>9 (100.00)</td>
<td>6 (100.00)</td>
<td>2 (100.00)</td>
<td>1 (100.00)</td>
<td>18 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentamicin</td>
<td>9 (100.00)</td>
<td>6 (100.00)</td>
<td>2 (100.00)</td>
<td>1 (100.00)</td>
<td>18 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>6 (66.67)</td>
<td>3 (50.00)</td>
<td>2 (100.00)</td>
<td>1 (100.00)</td>
<td>12 (66.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meropenem</td>
<td>7 (77.78)</td>
<td>4 (66.67)</td>
<td>1 (50.00)</td>
<td>1 (100.00)</td>
<td>13 (72.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colistin</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigecycline</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piperacillin-</td>
<td>9 (100.00)</td>
<td>6 (100.00)</td>
<td>2 (100.00)</td>
<td>1 (100.00)</td>
<td>18 (100.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazobactam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion
In this study, among 52 gram-negative organisms, 34.61% ESBL producers were detected by DDS test. In agreement with this finding, Rahman reported 31.03% ESBL producers among neonatal sepsis cases. Chelliah et al. from India reported a high proportion of ESBL producers among the neonatal sepsis cases which was 67.3%. The reports from different studies are indicative of the fact that ESBL producers among the neonatal sepsis cases vary greatly geographically and rapidly changing over time. This may be due to irrational, repeated or sub-lethal use of antibiotics. The higher prevalence of ESBL producers is increasing in Bangladesh irrespective of age and different samples. ESBL producing Enterobacter spp. (45%) was the predominant ESBL producer detected among Gram-negative bacteria. ESBL producing organisms detected among Gram-negative bacteria from various samples were 29% in 2011 by Islam et al., 25% in 2012 by Farzana et al. and 33% in 2015 by Shamsuzzaman.

Enterobacter spp. (45%) was the predominant ESBL producer in this study followed by 33.33% of Klebsiella pneumoniae and 25% of Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Acinetobacter baumannii each. Rahman reported 34.62% of Klebsiella Pneumoniae, 75% of Pseudomonas Aeruginosa and 16.67% of Acinetobacter baumannii ESBL producers among neonatal sepsis cases. Katereggea et al. reported 25% of ESBL producing Enterobacter cloacae in their study in Uganda. The emergence of ESBL producing Enterobacter spp. and increasing prevalence of ESBL producing Acinetobacter baumannii in neonatal sepsis is clearly evident from this study. However, several studies reported E. coli as most commonly isolated ESBL producers from different clinical samples in Bangladesh. The disparity of the isolation rate of different ESBL producers may be due to varying prevalence of infection causing bacteria from one area to area and hospital to hospital. Different hospital deals with different types of disease and different protocol of antibiotic usage.

In this study, among neonatal sepsis cases, Klebsiella pneumoniae is clearly evident from this study. Katereggea et al. reported 33.33% of the ESBL producers were resistant to colistin where as Chelliah et al. reported 100% and Shamsuzzaman reported that all the ESBL producers were resistant to colistin. Caniglia and Dowzicky reported that 93.7% of the ESBL producing Klebsiella pneumoniae were sensitive to tigecycline which is almost similar to present findings.

The prevalence of ESBL producers is increasing in Bangladesh which is reflected by several studies conducted in DMCH irrespective of age and different samples. ESBL producing organisms detected among Gram-negative bacteria from various samples were 29% in 2011 by Islam et al., 25% in 2012 by Farzana et al. and 33% in 2015 by Shamsuzzaman.

The prevalence of ESBL producers in Asia than in Europe and America was observed in a previous study. Previous studies in Bangladesh revealed 23% to 31% ESBL producers from Gram-negative bacteria. However, 80% ESBL producers was also reported in Bangladesh in another study. The discrepancy of the findings may be due to the varying prevalence of ESBL producers with time as well as from country to country, city to city and even hospital to hospital in one city.

ESBL producers were resistant to amoxiclav, amikacin, gentamicin and piperacillin-tazobactam which is similar to the findings of the previous study of Rahman. 66.67% of the ESBL producers were resistant to ciprofloxacin. Previously, Rahman and Shamsuzzaman reported that 100% and 95.55% of the ESBL producers were resistant to ciprofloxacin respectively. Kumar et al. reported that 60% of the ESBL producing E. coli isolated from blood were resistant to ciprofloxacin. ESBL producing bacteria also resistant to non-B-lactam antibiotics was due to plasmids encoding ESBL genes also carry genes encoding resistance to other agents like aminoglycosides, fluoroquinolones and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole.

72.22% of the ESBL producers revealed resistance to meropenem in this study. Contradictory to this, other studies performed previously in DMCH reported that all of the ESBL producers were sensitive to carbapenem. Resistance to carbapenem of ESBL producers might develop spontaneously which is strongly favored by the presence of ESBL encoding plasmid and different mutational spectra. Mainly loss of function mutations in the regulators of porin expression caused reduced influx of antibiotic into the cell and in combination of amplification of B-lactamase genes on the plasmid this led to high resistance level.

Conclusion
Therapeutic options fall into a narrow range due to emergence of ESBLs in gram-negative bacteria. Reporting of ESBL producing organisms is of great concern and these organisms show worrhy resistance to not only beta-lactam antibiotics but also to non-beta lactams. ESBL producing organisms’ sensitivity towards carbapenem and piperacillin-tazobactam which are considered as last resource till now has fallen greatly. In this study, colistin and tigecycline revealed remarkable sensitivity but these drugs should be kept as reserved for cases where most other antimicrobials fail to act. Urgent surveillance of ESBL producers by cohort study to acquire an exact prevalence of ESBL producers in our country need to be focused.
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