

Pattern of Antimicrobial Resistance of *Escherichia coli* from Healthy Adults in Amassoma, South-South Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Aim: To investigate the antimicrobial resistance profile of faecal *Escherichia coli* to common antimicrobial agents in healthy adults of Amassoma, South Southern Nigeria.

Study Design: Cross-sectional study.

Place and Duration of Study: Department of Pharmaceutical Microbiology and Biotechnology, Niger Delta University, Bayelsa State, between February and June 2010.

Methodology: The stool samples collected were inoculated and screened for *E. coli* using standard microbiological protocols. The antimicrobial susceptibility test of the isolates was done using disc diffusion technique.

Results: A total of 110 (84.6%) *E. coli* isolates were obtained from all the samples comprising 38 (34.5%) from the villagers and 72 (65.5%) from the university students. The overall resistance profiles of all the isolates were: ampicillin-95.5%, tetracycline-72.7%, augmentin-70.9%, co-trimoxazole-54.5%, cefuroxime-44.5%, chloramphenicol-39.1%, nalidixic acid-30.0%, nitrofurantoin-28.2%, ceftazidime-15.5%, ciprofloxacin-14.5%, gentamicin-10.0% and ofloxacin-4.5%. The isolates from the villagers exhibited significantly higher resistances to some of the antibiotics than those from the students ($P < 0.05$). The prevalence of multiple drug resistance among all the isolates was 76 (69.1%).

Conclusion: The observed high level of multiple drug resistance among the flora of healthy individuals call for measures to control the sales of antimicrobial agents in this country as a strategy toward the containment of antibiotic resistance.

Keywords: Multi-resistance, Faecal, *Escherichia coli*, Healthy, Adults.

1. INTRODUCTION

Antibiotic resistance is a problem of global health affecting virtually all bacteria which commonly cause human illnesses [1-3]. Antibiotic resistance is a phenomenon that occurs when bacterial progeny emerges by natural selection in the presence of sub-inhibitory concentration of an antimicrobial agent and the growth of the bacteria in this environment confer resistance to the agent [4]. This type of bacterial resistance is not limited to a single class of antimicrobial agents [5].

Antibiotic resistance in many industrialized countries is usually due to heavy use (over-prescription) of antibiotics, excessive use of disinfectants for routine hygiene and use of antibiotics for veterinary medication or growth promoters [6-10]; while in developing countries, it is particularly due to inappropriate use of antimicrobials, misdiagnosis and use of antimicrobials of substandard quality [11, 12].

Escherichia coli, being an important part of the normal flora of the gastrointestinal tract of humans and animals, can also be found in faecally contaminated water, soil and vegetation. Most strains of *E. coli* are non-pathogenic but a few of them are associated with infections such as urinary tract infection, wound infection, bacteremia, neonatal meningitis, diarrhoeal diseases and sepsis [13-14]. The carriage of resistance by commensals has been proposed as an indication of the burden of antibiotic misused and resistance in a population [15-16].

The acquisition of resistance by commensal bacteria is a serious concern, because intestinal flora that had been exposed to sub-therapeutic doses of antibiotics can act as potential reservoir of resistance genes which may be transferred to susceptible pathogenic bacteria within the host, leading to the general increase of bacterial resistance worldwide [17]. Commensal *E. coli* strains can efficiently exchange genetic materials with pathogens such as *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Vibrio cholerae* and other pathogenic *E. coli* [18, 19]. Hence, the study of the resistance profile of faecal *E. coli* species is very important since it is the commonest commensal of the gut and a predominant antimicrobial resistance carrier of the intestinal enterobacteria [20].

There are few studies that have been documented on the resistance patterns of this organism in various regions of Nigeria but this study is the first of such detailed studies on multidrug resistance profile in this region. Thus, we report the carriage of multiple antimicrobial resistant *E. coli* by apparently healthy adults in Amassoma community in the South-South region of Nigeria.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 The Study Population

Stool samples were collected with the aid of sterile swab sticks from 130 apparently healthy adult volunteers comprising of students of the Niger Delta University, Amassoma and the villagers in the community. The volunteers, who were 16-40 years of age, gave informed consent in accordance with the institutional ethical standards on human experimentation and had not taken any antimicrobial agents within the previous one month before the survey. Amassoma is a village in the Wilberforce Island of Bayelsa state in the South-South part of Nigeria. It houses a fast growing state university with students from mostly southern part of Nigeria. The villagers who were basically fishermen, crop farmers and traders, participated poorly in the study by refusing to provide their stool samples. The study was conducted from February to June 2010.

2.2 Isolation and characterization of *E. coli*

The collected 130 stool samples were transported immediately in iced-packs to the laboratory where each of the samples was inoculated separately on MacConkey (Oxoid, UK) and Eosin Methylene Blue (EMB) (Oxoid, UK) agar plates, then streaked and incubated at 37°C for 24 hours. The colonies that gave characteristic greenish metallic sheen on EMB agar plates were further confirmed as *E. coli* using conventional biochemical IMViC (Indole, Methyl red, Voges Proskauer, Citrate, Urease) tests [13]. These isolates were then stored on fresh slants of Nutrient agar (Oxoid, U.K) for antimicrobial susceptibility testing.

2.3 Antimicrobial susceptibility testing

The antimicrobial susceptibility test was carried out with twelve (12) discs (Oxoid, UK) of commonly used antimicrobial agents using modified Kirby-Bauer disc diffusion technique [13]. The standardized suspension of each isolate that was matched with 0.5 McFarland standard was used to swab the surface of Mueller Hinton (Oxoid, UK) agar plate and the following discs were placed on the plates (in duplicates) after 20 minutes of inoculation: ampicillin (10 µg), augmentin (30 µg), chloramphenicol (30 µg), cefuroxime (30 µg), ceftazidime (30 µg), nitrofurantoin (30 µg), gentamicin (10 µg), ciprofloxacin (5 µg), ofloxacin (5 µg), nalidixic acid (30 µg), co-trimoxazole (25 µg) and tetracycline (30 µg). The plates containing the discs were allowed to stand for at least 30 minutes before incubated at 37°C for 24 hours. The diameter of the zone of inhibition produced by each antibiotic disc was measured and interpreted using the CLSI zone diameter interpretative standards [21]. The isolates of *E. coli* that were resistant to at least one antimicrobial agent in at least three classes of antimicrobial agents tested were defined as having multiple antimicrobial resistance in this study [22].

2.4 Statistical Analysis

Frequencies were obtained and percentages were calculated for study variables. Chi square (two tailed) were used for comparing the variables and a p-value of less than or equal to 0.05 is considered to be statistically significant ($p \leq 0.05$).

3. RESULTS

The volunteers in this study comprised 45 (34.6%) villagers and 85 (65.4%) university students, of which the total number of female was 59 (45.4%). One hundred and ten (84.6%) samples from all the screened 130 healthy subjects yielded *E. coli* isolates which were 72 (84.7%) from university students and 38 (84.4%) from the villagers. The patterns of antimicrobial resistance of the isolates in the two groups of subjects are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: The distribution of antimicrobial resistant *Escherichia coli* isolates among the volunteers

Antimicrobial Agents	Number of Resistant Isolates (%)			Chi square test		
	Overall Resistance	Students N = 72	Villagers N = 38	Degree of freedom	χ^2 -value	p-value
Ampicillin	105 (95.5)	67 (93.1)	38 100.0)	1	2.765	0.096
Augmentin	78 (70.9)	48 (66.7)	30 (78.9)	1	1.818	0.177
Cefuroxime	49 (44.5)	26 (36.1)	23 (60.5)	1	6.002	0.014*
Ceftazidime	17 (15.5)	10 (13.9)	7 (18.4)	1	0.391	0.532
Gentamicin	11 (10.0)	8 (11.1)	3 (7.9)	1	0.286	0.593
Ciprofloxacin	16 (14.5)	10 (13.9)	6 (15.8)	1	0.072	0.788
Ofloxacin	5 (4.5)	3 (4.2)	2 (5.3)	1	0.069	0.793
Nalidixic acid	33 (30.0)	17 (23.6)	16 (42.1)	1	4.051	0.044*
Nitrofurantoin	31 (28.2)	17 (23.6)	14 (36.8)	1	2.151	0.142
Chloramphenicol	43 (39.1)	20 (27.8)	23 (60.5)	1	11.203	0.001*
Co-trimoxazole	60 (54.5)	33 (45.8)	27 (71.1)	1	6.380	0.012*
Tetracycline	80 (72.7)	49 (68.1)	31 (81.6)	1	2.293	0.130

* = Statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

The multiple antimicrobial resistance which is defined as the resistance of an isolate to at least one antimicrobial agent in at least three (3) classes of antimicrobial agents tested [22] was used in this study to measure multiple drug resistance of each isolate. Tables 3 and 4 show the multidrug resistant and the common antibiogram combination patterns of the *E. coli* isolates respectively.

Table 2: The Multiple Antimicrobial Resistant Profiles of *E. coli* isolates from the healthy subjects

Number of classes of agents resisted	Number of resistant isolates (%)			<i>p</i> –value*
	Overall (N = 110)	Students (N = 72)	Villagers (N = 38)	
0	4 (3.6)	4 (5.6)	0	
1	11 (10.0)	10 (13.9)	1 (2.6)	
2	19 (17.3)	14 (19.4)	5 (13.2)	
3	25 (22.7)	17 (23.6)	8 (21.1)	
4	22 (20.0)	13 (18.1)	9 (23.7)	
5	11 (10.0)	8 (11.1)	3 (7.9)	
6	15 (13.6)	3 (4.2)	12 (31.6)	
7	3 (2.7)	3 (4.2)	0	
8	0	0	0	
≥ 3	76 (69.1)	44 (61.1)	32 (84.2)	0.013

*{Degree of freedom = 1; Chi square value = 6.215; *p*-value = 0.013 (statistically significant)}.

Table 3: The Common Antibiotic Resistance Combination Patterns of the *E. coli* isolates

Number of agents resisted	Number of resistant isolates	Common antibiogram	Number of isolates with common antibiogram
1	7	Amp	7
2	9	Amp, Aug	4
		Amp, Tet	3
3	17	Amp, Aug, Tet	5
		Amp, Tet, Cot	5
		Amp, Nal, Nit	2
4	15	Amp, Aug, Tet, Cot	5
		Amp, Cef, Aug, Tet	4
5	18	Amp, Chl, Aug, Tet, Cot	5
		Amp, Aug, Nal, Tet, Cot	2
		Amp, Cef, Aug, Cez, Tet	2
6	13	Amp, Chl, Cef, Aug, Tet, Cot	2
		Amp, Cef, Aug, Cez, Tet, Cot	2
7	9	Amp, Chl, Cef, Aug, Nit, Tet, Cot	2
8	11	Amp, Chl, Cef, Aug, Nal, Nit, Tet, Cot	4
		Amp, Chl, Cef, Aug, Cez, Nit, Tet, Cot	2
9	7	Amp, Chl, Cef, Aug, Cez, Nal, Nit, Tet, Cot	2
		Amp, Chl, Cef, Aug, Nal, Cip, Nit, Tet, Cot	2

Legend: Amp- ampicillin, Aug- augmentin, Chl- chloramphenicol, Cef- cefuroxime, Cez- ceftazidime, Nal- nalidixic acid, Nit- nitrofurantoin, Cip- ciprofloxacin, Tet- tetracycline Cot- cotrimoxazole

4. DISCUSSION

The normal faecal flora has been shown to be a potential reservoir of antibiotic resistance genes which can be transferred from non-pathogenic commensals to virulent microorganisms [23, 24]. *E. coli*, an important part of the faecal flora is associated with varying humans' infections ranging from urinary tract infection to bacteremia and it has been shown that it is the main carrier of antimicrobial resistance genes among the faecal flora [25, 26].

This study revealed that the non-pathogenic faecal *E. coli* isolates in the healthy adults were highly resistant to ampicillin, augmentin and tetracycline. These patterns of resistance have been previously reported in healthy subjects by Bartoloni *et al.* [27] in Bolivia, van de Mortel *et al.* [28] in Venezuela and Okeke *et al.* [29] in Ile-ife, Nigeria. Ampicillin and tetracycline are among the older generations of antibiotics among humans and the observed high resistance to them might be due to selective pressure from their excessive and inappropriate uses in this environment which by cross-resistance affected augmentin, a β -lactam antibiotic. The findings of Onanuga and Temedie in Amassoma, Bayelsa state on the behavioural uses of antibiotics among healthy individuals support this observation [30].

The isolates were moderately resistant to co-trimoxazole, cefuroxime and chloramphenicol. Previous reports by Bartoloni *et al.* [27] in Bolivia and Olowe *et al.* [31] in Osogbo, Nigeria support these findings. The observed rate of resistance to these agents (co-trimoxazole and chloramphenicol) may be as a result of the fact that they are readily available in the country at cheaper rates which favour their excessive and inappropriate uses, thus leading to the development of bacterial resistance. Resistance to cefuroxime, which is usually available in oral and injectable forms at relatively higher prices, might be due to excessive production of β -lactamases which is a common occurrence among some strains of this organism [32]. Thus, these agents may not be suitable for empiric treatment of this organism's infections. The observed isolates' resistance to nalidixic acid and nitrofurantoin might be due to their very low prescription patterns in the country and their uncomfortable side effects might have accounted for their reduced use, hence lower level of resistance when compared to other agents that are equally cheaper to get.

However, relatively low levels of resistance were showed by the isolates to ceftazidime, ciprofloxacin, gentamicin and ofloxacin. The proven activities of ceftazidime and gentamicin which is similar to the findings of Bartoloni *et al.* [27] might be as a result of their availability as only injectables, which need the assistance of experts for their administrations and this can reduce their frequent use. The fluoroquinolones (ciprofloxacin and ofloxacin) still have proven activity on this organism as previously reported by Bartoloni *et al.* [27] and Khan *et al.* [14] but the rate at which this organism in apparently healthy individuals is developing resistance to these agents is alarming. Resistance to ciprofloxacin in this study was observed to be higher than that of ofloxacin which might be due to the over-prescription pattern of ciprofloxacin over ofloxacin in most hospitals in the country and this practice can encourage the influx of substandard brands of ciprofloxacin at varying cheaper prices into the nation's markets thereby leading to the increasing rate of bacterial resistance [11].

The isolates from the villagers were generally more resistant to all the agents than those from the students who have their abode in the urban areas of the region. The observed differences were significant in the resistance to co-trimoxazole, cefuroxime, chloramphenicol and nalidixic acid ($p < 0.05$). This result is similar to the studies of van de Mortel *et al.* [28] and Nys *et al.* [12]. The differences observed might be due to the availability of more standard antibiotics in the urban areas than in the villages and more proper education on the use of antibiotics among urban dwellers than the villagers. Also, crowding together, with poor hygiene and poor sanitary facilities for sewage disposal among the villagers might encourage the exchange of antibiotic-resistant bacteria in the population.

Multiple antimicrobial resistance among isolates of *E. coli* has been widely reported [14, 31, 33]. In this study, 69% of the total isolates from both students and villagers were multi-resistant. This high rate of multiple drug resistance has been attributed to excessive and indiscriminate use of antimicrobial agents in humans and animals thus provide selective pressure that can lead to increase in the development of resistance [19, 26, 31]. The continuous education of people on the proper use of antibiotics in all human endeavours and the control of their sales by the government are pivotal to the strategies of containment of the resistance.

5. CONCLUSION

The results of this study suggest that high levels of multi-drug resistant *E. coli* isolates are prevalent among healthy individuals in the study area. This signifies that most of the tested commonly used agents may not be suitable for empiric therapies of this organism's infections. Thus, there is need for routine monitoring of antimicrobial susceptibility testing of pathogens so as to guide effective treatment of infections.

REFERENCES

1. Levy SB. Antibiotics resistance, consequences of in action. Clin Infect Dis 2001; 33:S124-9.
2. Cizman M. The use and resistance to antibiotics in the community. Inter J Antimicrob Agents 2003; 21: 297-307.
3. Livermore DM. Bacterial resistance: origins, epidemiology and impact. Clin Infect Dis 2003; 36: S11-23.
4. Gold HS, Moellering RC. Antimicrobial-Drug Resistance. N Engl J Med 1996; 335:1445-53.
5. Swartz MN. Use of antimicrobial agents and drug resistance. N Engl J Med 1997; 337:491-92.
6. Guillemot D. Antibiotic use in humans and bacterial resistance. Curr Opin Microbiol 1999; 2:494-8.
7. Watson RL, Dowell SF, Jayaraman M, Keyserling H, Kolczak M, Schwartz B. Antimicrobial use for pediatric upper respiratory infections: reported practice, actual practice, and parent beliefs. Pediatrics 1999; 104:1251-7.
8. Wegener HC, Aarestrup FM, Jensen LB, Hammerum AM, Bager F. Use of antimicrobial growth promoters in food animals and *Enterococcus faecium* resistance to therapeutic antimicrobial drugs in Europe. Emerg Infect Dis 1999; 5:329-35.
9. Tong D, Rothwell BR. Antibiotic prophylaxis in dentistry: a review and practice recommendations. J Amer Dental Ass 2000; 131:366-74.
10. Wegener HC. Antibiotics in animal feed and their role in resistance development. Curr Opin Microbiol 2003; 6:439-45.
11. Okeke IN, Lamikanra A, Edelman R. Socioeconomic and behavioral factors leading to acquired bacterial resistance to antibiotics in developing countries. Emerg Infect Dis 1999; 5:18-27.
12. Nys S, Okeke IN, Kariuki S, Dinanat GJ, Driessen C, Stobberrigh EE. Antibiotic resistance of faecal *Escherichia coli* from healthy volunteers from eight developing countries. J Antimicrob Chemother 2004; 54:952-5.
13. Cheesbrough M. District Laboratory Practice in Tropical countries. Part 2; 2002. Cambridge University Press, Edinburgh building, Cambridge CB2 3RU, UK.
14. Khan NA, Saba N, Samad A, Qazilbash AA. Incidence and Antibigram Patterns of *Escherichia coli* isolated from various clinical samples from various Patients at N.I.H Islamabad. Pakistan J Biol Sci 2002; 5:111-3.
15. Caprioli A, Busani L, Martel JL. Monitoring of antibiotic resistant in bacteria of animal origin: epidemiology and microbiological methodologies. Inter J Antimicrob Chemother 2000; 14:295-301.

- 261 16. van de Bogaard AE, Stobberingh E. Epidemiology of resistance to antibiotics: Links between animals
262 and humans. *Inter J Antimicrob Agents* 2000; 14:327-35.
- 263 17. Summers AO. Generally overlooked fundamentals of bacterial genetics and ecology. *Clin Infect Dis*
264 2002; 34:85-92.
- 265 18. Tauxe RV, Cavanagh TR, Cohen ML. Interspecies transfer in vivo producing an outbreak of multiply
266 resistant Shigellosis. *J Infect Dis* 1989; 160:1067-70.
- 267 19. Levy SB. Antibiotic resistance: an ecological imbalance. *Ciba Foundation Symposium* 1997; 207:1-9;
268 discussion 9-14.
- 269 20. Österblad M, Leistevuo T, Huovinen P. Screening for Antimicrobial Resistance in Fecal Samples by
270 the Replica Plating Method. *J Clin Microbiol* 1995; 33:3146-9.
- 271 21. Clinical and Laboratory Standard Institute. Performance standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility
272 Testing Eighteenth informational supplement. 2008; M100-S18 28:34-8.
- 273 22. Magiorakos AP, Srinivasan A, Carey RB, Carmeli Y, Falagas ME, Giske CG, Harbarth SJ, Hindler JF,
274 Kahlmeter G, Olsson-Liljequist Paterson BDL, Rice LB, Stelling J, Struelens MJ, Vatopoulos A, Weber
275 JT, Monnet DL. Multidrug-resistant, extensively drug-resistant and pandrug-resistant bacteria: an
276 international expert proposal for interim standard definitions for acquired resistance. *Clin Microbiol*
277 *Infect* 2011; doi: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03570.x.
- 278 23. Shanahan PMA, Thomson CJ, Amyes SGB. β -lactam resistance in normal faecal flora from South
279 Africa. *Epidemiological Infections* 1995; 115:243-53.
- 280 24. Levin B, Lipsitch M, Perrot V, Schrag S, Antia R, Simonsen L, Walker NM, Stewart FM. The population
281 genetics of antibiotic resistance. *Clin Infect Dis* 1997; 24:S9-16.
- 282 25. Levy S, Marshall B, Schleuderberg S, Rowe B, Davis J. High frequency of antibiotic resistance in
283 human fecal flora. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 1998; 32:1801-6.
- 284 26. Infante B, Grape M, Larsson M, Kristiansson C, Pallecchi L, Rossolini GM, Kronvall G. Acquired
285 sulphonamide resistance genes in faecal *Escherichia coli* from healthy children in Bolivia and Peru.
286 *Inter J Antimicrob Agents* 2005; 25:308-12.
- 287 27. Bartoloni A, Cutts F, Leoni S, Austin CC, Mantella A, Guglielmetti P, Roselli M, Salazar E, Paradisi F.
288 Patterns of antimicrobial use and antimicrobial resistance among healthy children in Bolivia. *Trop Med*
289 *Inter Health* 1998; 3:116-23.
- 290 28. van de Mortel HJ, Jansen EJ, Dinant GJ, London N, Palacios PE, Stobberingh EE. The prevalence of
291 antibiotic-resistant faecal *Escherichia coli* in healthy volunteers in Venezuela. *Infection* 1998; 26:292-
292 7.
- 293 29. Okeke IN, Fayinka ST, Lamikanra A. Antibiotic resistance in *Escherichia coli* from Nigerian students,
294 1986-1998. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2000; 6:393-395.
- 295 30. Onanuga A, Temedie TC. Multidrug-resistant Intestinal *Staphylococcus aureus* among Self-medicated
296 Healthy Adults in Amassoma, South-South, Nigeria *J Health Popul Nutr* 2011; 29:446-453.
- 297 31. Olowe OA, Okanlawon BM, Olowe RA, Olayemi A. Antimicrobial resistant pattern of *Escherichia coli*
298 from human clinical samples in Osogbo, south western Nigeria. *Afr J Microbiol Res* 2008; 2:8-11.
- 299 32. Franiczek R, Sobieszczanska B, Grabowski M, Mowszet K, Pytrus T. Occurrence of extended-
300 spectrum β -lactamases among *Escherichia coli* isolates from hospitalized and healthy children. *Folia*
301 *Microbiol* 2003; 48:243-7.

302 33. Umolu PI, Omigie O, Taffeng Y, Omorogbe FI, Aisabokhale F, Ugbodagah OP. Antimicrobial
303 Susceptibility and Plasmid Profiles of *Escherichia coli* Isolates obtained from different Human clinical
304 specimens in Lagos, Nigeria. J Amer Sci 2006; 2:70-76.