

Antibiotic Susceptibility Pattern in a Tertiary Care Institution

Humaira Zafar, Misbah Zaheer, Kausar Izhar, Mobina Dhodhy, Abbas Hayat

Department of Pathology, Rawalpindi General Hospital and Rawalpindi Medical College, Rawalpindi

Abstract

Background: Isolation of different types of organisms from urine, high vaginal swab (HVS), pus and blood and determining their sensitivity and resistance pattern.

Methods: The study was conducted in the Department of Pathology (Microbiology Section) Rawalpindi General Hospital. Four thousand and seventy five (4075) indoor and outdoor patients were analyzed by taking their different samples i.e. Blood, Urine, HVS and Pus, which were then cultured on different media i.e. MacConkey's and Blood agar. CLED media was preferred for urine.

Results: Out of 4075 samples, 515 cultures yielded growth. These included 170 samples of HVS, 163 of pus, 158 of urine and 24 of blood. *Escherichia coli* (29.8%), *Staphylococcus* species (26.52%) and *Pseudomonas* (18.66%) were the most common organisms isolated.

Conclusion: Due to high resistance, antibiotic use policy should, strictly adhere to WHO guidelines and their unnecessary use should be discouraged.

Introduction

When penicillin was first discovered by Fleming, it was considered a magic bullet. It was very effective in most of the infections but with passage of time it has lost its efficacy against major pathogens due to several reasons.

Recent studies reveal that antibiograms are very beneficial as they help the clinicians in selection of proper antibiotics.¹⁻³ Moreover, injudicious use of antibiotics can be checked.

This paper regarding antibiotic susceptibility pattern gives an account of the type of organisms isolated from different samples i.e. blood, urine, HVS and pus and their sensitivity and resistance pattern. This sensitivity pattern and statistical analysis helps a lot when determining the empirical treatment of

various infections

Patients and Methods

The study was conducted in the Department of Pathology (Microbiology Section) Rawalpindi General Hospital over a period of 6 months from June to December 2004. Samples of 4075 indoor and outdoor patients presenting with different complaints were analyzed. Samples studied were of urine, blood, HVS and pus. Culture media preferred were MacConkey's and blood agar while for urine CLED was used.

The specimens were handled in the following manner: Labelling and numbering of the specimens was done. Urine was kept at 4°C. A direct slide of Gram Stain was made and then culture applied. For urine, CLED media was used. For all others i.e. HVS, pus and blood, MacConkey's and blood agar were used.

Results

Out of 4075 cases 2100 samples were of urine, 1400 samples were of HVS, 271 samples of pus and 304 samples were of blood. 515 cultures yielded growth out of the total 4075. These included 170 samples of HVS, 163 of pus, 158 of urine and 24 of blood.

The most common pathogen isolated was *Escherichia coli* (29.8%) while the second most common pathogen was *Staphylococcus* species (26.52%). They were followed by *Pseudomonas* (18.6%), *Klebsiella* (13.9%), *Streptococcus* species (7.2%), *Acinetobacter* (1.96%), *Morganella morganii* (1.7%), and *Proteus* (1.5%). The least common pathogens found were *Candida* and *Diphtheroids* (1.0% each). These results are shown in Tables 1 and 2

Regarding Gram positive organisms, the most sensitive drug found was imipenem which was effective in 100%. It was followed by vancomycin (73%), amikacin (70%), enoxacin (56.4%), ceftriaxone (51.7%), methicillin (50%), cefaclor (49.4%), cephradine (48.8%), erythromycin (42.9%), co-amoxiclav (36.4%), cefoperazone-sulbactam (33%) and ciprofloxacin (31.7%). The least sensitive drugs found were ofloxacin

(26.45%), teicoplanin(24.7%) and ampicillin (24.1%).

Table: 1 Organisms isolated

SPECIMEN		STAPHYL OCOCCUS	STREPTO COCCUS	ESCHER ICHIA	KLEBS IELLA	MORGAN ELLA	PSEUDO MONAS	PROT EUS	ACINETO BACTER	NEISSERIA	TOTAL
HVS	%	15.9	11.8	27.6	7.1	1.8	31.2	1.8	2.9	0	
	Total No.	27	20	47	12	3	53	3	5	0	170
Pus	%	60.7	4.3	0	11.0	1.2	17.8	2.5	2.5	0	
	Total No.	99	7	0	18	2	29	4	4	0	163
Urine	%	1.9	3.2	62.7	19.6	2.5	7.0	0.6	0.6	1.9	
	Total No.	3	5	99	31	4	11	1	1	3	158
Blood	%	20.8	16.7	20.8	41.7	0	0	0	0	0	
	Total No.	5	4	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	24
Total		134	36	151	71	9	93	8	10	3	515

Regarding Gram negative organisms the most sensitive drug found was imipenem(100%), followed by amikacin (83.7%), sparfloxacin (73.9%), ceftazidime (71.5%), enoxacin (64.6%), ceftriaxone (61.1%), cefoperazone-sulbactam (56.6%) ciprofloxacin (44.6%), cefaclor(38.8%),and tazobactam-piperacillin (29.8%).

Table: 2 Positive Patients

Specimens	Total No. of Cases	Positive Cases (Sensitive & Resistant)
HVS	1400	34.36% 170 12.14%
Urine	2100	51.53% 158 7.52%
Pus	271	6.65% 163 60.15%
Blood	304	7.46% 24 7.89%

Total 4075 515

The least sensitive ones were cephradine (19.7%), ofloxacin (18.5%), co-amoxiclav (18.2%), gentamycin(13.3%) and cefotaxime(10.4%).The most and least effective drugs are summarised in table 3

Discussion

The antibiograms are very beneficial as they help the clinicians for selection of proper antibiotics. Moreover, the injudicious use of antibiotics can be checked³.The spectrum of bacteria isolated in this study showed a predominance of Staphylococcus species (60.3%) in pus, Escherichia coli (62.0%) in urine, Pseudomonas (30.9%) in HVS and Staphylococcus and Escherichia coli (20.8 % each) in case of blood.The study shows that the organisms are becoming resistant to commonly used antibiotics and gaining more and more resistance to newer antibiotics.

This has also been shown in other studies⁴⁻⁸. This is due to indiscriminate and injudicious use of these antibiotics even in expert hands of clinicians.

Table 3: Antibiotics Showing Maximum and Minimum Efficacy

Organisms	Most Effective Drugs	Least Effective Drugs
Staphylococcus species	Amikacin	Co-amoxiclav
	Vancomycin	Erythromycin
	Imipenem	Cephadrine
	Sparfloxacin	Doxycycline
	Enoxacin	
Streptococcus species	Ceftriaxone	
	Sparfloxacin	Erythromycin
	Imipenem	Ceftazidime
	Vancomycin	Gentamycin
	Amikacin	
Proteus species	Co-amoxiclav	
	Ampicillin	
	Enoxacin	Cephadrine
	Imipenem	Co-amoxiclav
	Sulzone	Cotrimoxazole
Pseudomonas	Sparfloxacin	Amikacin
	Amikacin	Ciprofloxacin
	Enoxacin	Cephadrine
	Imipenem	Cefaclor
	Sparfloxacin	Co-amoxiclav
Klebsiella	Imipenem	Cephadrine
	Amikacin	Co-amoxiclav
	Sparfloxacin	Cefaclor
	Ceftazidime	Enoxacin
	Imipenem	Cephadrine
Escherichia coli	Amikacin	Enoxacin
	Ceftriaxone	Sparfloxacin
Morganella morganii	Imipenem	Enoxacin
	Amikacin	Cefaclor
	Ceftazidime	Cephadrine
	Sparfloxacin	
	Enoxabid	
Acinetobacter	Imipenem	Cephadrine
	Amikacin	Cefaclor
	Sparfloxacin	Enoxacin
		Ciprofloxacin
		Ceftazidime
Neisseria species		Pipereidic acid
	Ampicillin	Ofloxacin
	Cotrimoxazole	
	Chloramphenicol	
	Cefotaxime	
Brannhamella catarrhalis	Imipenem	Cefaclor
	Amikacin	Cephadrine
	Sparfloxacin	Cotrimoxazole
	Enoxacin	

Ceftazidime

This practice should be balanced and importance of bacterial culture and sensitivity testing should be realized. Furthermore, it is the need of the hour that antibiotic policies should be formulated and implemented to resist and overcome this emerging problem.

Some of the reasons regarding poor yield of growth on culture media in our study were:

- Quantity of blood sent for culture and sensitivity was not sufficient (Normally 15–20 cc is actually required to yield growth on culture media)
- Negative results were often seen because the patients had been partially treated with antibiotics.

In conclusion, the organisms isolated from indoor patients are usually hospital pathogens and acquired nosocomially and show a very resistant pattern as there is no antibiotic policy and use of expensive antibiotics ultimately results in the bacteria acquiring resistance.

Regarding antibiotic use policy, strict adherence to WHO guidelines must be encouraged and unnecessary use should be discouraged.

Reference

1. Norby R. Short term treatment of complicated urinary tract in women. Rev Infect Dis 1990;12:458–67
2. Irvant A. Efficacy of lomefloxacin as compared to norfloxacin in the treatment of uncomplicated urinary tract infections in adults. Am J Med 1992;92 (Suppl.4A): 75–81
3. Cheesbrough M. Biochemical testing of micro-organisms in: Medical laboratory manual for tropical countries. Vol.II, Microbiology. Oxford Butterworth–Heinmann Ltd. 1989:58–70
4. Akhtar N, Khan AA, Khan HH, Khan IA. Antibiotic susceptibility pattern of 196 strains of Staphylococcus aureus isolated from wound and abscesses of patients at Bahawalpur. JAMC 1997;9(2):29–33
5. Dahar M Y, Hafiz A. Khari SA. Antibiotic sensitivity pattern of Staphylococcus aureus strains isolated from patients at Karachi. Specialist 1996;12(4): 339–44
6. Qadri SMH, Ueno Y, Postle A, Cunha BA. Antibacterial activity of Tazocin (piperacillin/Tazobactam) against 1296 clinical cases isolated from a tertiary care center. Ann Saudi Med 1996;16(4):337–38
7. Rab F, Akhtar M, Akhtar T. Rapidly changing antibiograms of bacteria causing common infections. KMJ 1989;7:9–13
8. Uppal TB. Antibiograms of pathogenic organisms isolated from clinical materials and changes in their pattern. J Postgrad Med. Institute 1996;16(4):377–80.