

Isolation Of Bacteria Causing Urinary Tract Infections And Their Antibiotic Susceptibility Profile At Saini Diagnostic Viswas Nagar Delhi And Gautam Hospital Salimar Garden Ghaziabad

Ateequr Rehman^{1*} Dr. Vanadana Shrivastva²

¹ Research Scholar

² Professor of ITS Dental College, Mradnagar, Ghaziabad

Abstract – Among hospitalized patients, the most widely recognized nosocomial disease is Urinary tract contamination (UTI). The learning about the kind of pathogens in charge of UTI and weakness and opposition example of the causative operators at a particular territory may assist the specialists with choosing right treatment regimen. This examination was meant to research the anti-infection powerlessness and obstruction example of detached urinary pathogens. This investigation was done at saini diagnostic viswas nagar Delhi, gautam hospital salimar garden Ghaziabad amid January-June, 2017. Out of 498 clinical samples of urine collected, 245 (49.19%) demonstrated critical bacterial development. The most widely recognized pathogens disengaged were Escherichia coli (142, 58.0%), Streptococcus feacalis (38, 15.5%), Pseudomonus (20, 8.2%), Klebsiella species (20, 8.2%) and Staphylococcus epidermidis (14, 5.7%). Individuals from the Enterobacteriaceae were 75%-100% sensitive to Amikacin and Nitrofurantoin while they were discovered dynamically delicate to other normally utilized anti-toxins. Pseudomonas species were discovered 90% delicate to Meropenem and 70% to Amikacin. Strep. feacalis were discovered 94.7% delicate to Amoxicillin, 84.2% to Amoxiclave and 78.9% to Ciprofloxacin, 65.5% to Cephalexin, half to Ceftriaxone. The clinicians should utilize Meropenem and Amikacin specifically in instances of un-responsiveness to usually utilized anti-toxins.

Keywords: UTI, Isolation, Urine, Antibiotic Susceptibility, Bacteria.

-----X-----

INTRODUCTION

Urinary tract contamination (UTI) is a standout amongst the most critical reasons for dismalness in the overall public, and is the second most normal reason for bleakness among doctor's facility guests. Also, UTI was found as the most widely recognized reasons for nosocomial disease among hospitalized patients¹. With propelling age, the rate of UTI increments in men because of prostate augmentation and neurogenic bladder². Intermittent UTI are normal and can prompt irreversible harm to the kidneys, bringing about renal hypertension and renal disappointment in server cases³. In the network, ladies are more inclined to create UTI. It has been watched that around 20% of the ladies encountered a solitary scene of UTI amid their lifetime, and 3% of ladies had in excess of one scene of UTI per year⁴. Pregnancy likewise makes the ladies more powerless to the infection⁵. Catheter-

related UTI is a trenchant issue with around 10% of the patients creating bacteriuria.

It is all around acknowledged that UTI must be discovered based on microscopy and microbial culture of urine. The dunk stick strategy utilized as a part of numerous focuses serves just as a screening technique yet culture is required for last diagnosis⁷. In all instances of nosocomial UTI, there is a need to begin treatment before the last microbiological comes about are accessible. Learning about the sorts of pathogens in charge of UTIs and their opposition example may assist the clinician with choosing the right experimental treatment.

Concentrates from India, Bangladesh and Nepal have detailed an expanded opposition of the urinary pathogens to usually utilized antibiotics 8-10. Any

data from comparable examinations was not accessible in this healing facility. Henceforth, this investigation was embraced to discover the recurrence and anti-toxin powerlessness example of urinary pathogens segregated from urine tests of associated cases with UTIs at Ghaziabad day Restorative School Doctor's facility, India.

METHODOLOGY

This was a cross-sectional investigation led at the branch of Microbiology. The samples of urine were acquired from patients of different clinical wards and outpatients branch of Ghaziabad govt. hospital.

The patients having suggestive manifestations and/or signs were associated as cases with UTI. Urine tests were gathered by standard mid-stream clean-get technique from every one of the cases. Urine tests were additionally gathered from siphoned patients. The samples were vaccinated on the Blood agar and MacConkey agar media by aligned wire circle and hatched at 370C medium-term. The plates were watched for province morphology, Gram-recolor attributes and significant biochemical tests¹¹. Culture comes about were deciphered by the standard criteria and a development of 105 settlement framing units/ml was considered as noteworthy bacteriuria¹². Anti-toxin powerlessness test was done by the Kirby Bauer technique¹³ and elucidations were made for each bacterial disconnect following interpretative criteria suggested by the National Board of trustees for Clinical Lab Principles (NCCLS).

Appropriate first-rate control traces were used to validate the outcomes of the antimicrobial disk. the subsequent were the high-quality manage strains used: *Pseudomonas species* NCTC-10662, *Staphylococcus aureus* NCTC-6571, *Escheichia coli* NCTC-10418.

RESULTS

Out of 300 samples of urine, 245 (49.19%) confirmed considerable growth of uropathogens. considering age distribution of the lifestyle- nice case, 49 (20.zero%) were children aged 10 years of less, and 64 (26.1%) were aged forty one-60 years. In all age groups, women had been greater frequently affected than males. (table I)

Table I. Age and sex distribution of the culture positive urine samples

Age groups	No of samples		
	male	female	Total
0-10	23	26	49 (20.0%)
11-20	4	9	13 (5.3%)
21 -40	15	54	69 (28.2%)
41 -60	25	39	64 (26.1%)
>60	19	31	50 (20.4%)
Total	86	159	245

The most typical organisms remoted were *Escheriachia coli* (142, 58.zero%) and *Str.fea* (38, 15.5%), *Pseudomonas species* (20, 8.2%), *Klebsiella species* (20, eight.2%) and others such as Coagulase-terrible *Staphylococcus* (14, five.7%). (table II)

Table II: Distribution of bacterial isolates positive cases.

Name of isolates	male	female	Total	
(%)	95% CI			
E.Coli	46	96	142 (58.0%)	49.9 - 66.1
Str.fea	14	24	38 (15.5%)	4.0 - 27.0
Ps	11	9	20 (8.2%)	-3.8 - 20.2
Kl.pn	5	15	20 (8.2%)	-3.8 - 20.2
Sta.epi	6	8	14 (5.7%)	-6.4 - 17.8
Proteus	2	2	4 (1.6%)	-10.7 - 13.9
Ace	1	2	3 (1.2%)	-11.1 - 13.5
Citro	1	2	3 (1.2%)	-11.1 - 13.5
Sta.sap	0	1	1 (0.4%)	-12.0- 12.8
Total	86	159	245	

E.coli and *Klebsiella* were observed extraordinarily sensitive to Amikacin and Nitrofurantoin, however almost all have been proof against Amoxiclave, Amoxicillin, Gentamicin and Co-trimoxazole, and variably sensitive to Ceftriaxon, Ceftazidime, Meropenem and Ciprofloxacin.

Proteus species had been 100% sensitive to Ceftriaxon, Ceftazidime, Cefixime,Ciprofloxacin, Amikacin and 75% to Meropenem and Nitrofurantoin, whilst one hundred% of them were proof against Amoxicillin and 50% to Co-trimoxazole, Cephalixin, Cephhradine. (Tables IIIa and IIIb)

Pseudomonas species had been found 90% touchy to Meropenem and 70% to Amikacin, whilst one hundred% of the organism had been immune to Co-trimoxazole,Cephalixin, Cephhradine; 95% to Amoxicillin; eighty% to Carbenicillin; 75% to Ceftriaxone; 60% to Ceftazidim and Cefixime; fifty five% to Nitrofurantoin; 45% to Ciprofloxacin. (Tables IIIa and IIIb) *Stap.saprophyticus* had been 100% sensitive to Co- trimoxazole, Cephhradine, Ciprofloxacin, Amoxiclave whilst 100% were proof against Amoxicillin, Cephalixin, Cefixime, Ceftriaxon.(Tables IIIa and IIIb)

Citrobacter have been a hundred% touchy to Ceftriaxon, Ceftazidim, Ciprofloxacin, Amikacin and 66.7% to Cefixime, Nitrofurantoin at the same time as 100% have been proof against Amoxicillin, Co-trimoxazole, Cephhradine. (Tables IIIa and IIIb)

Strep.feacalis had been found 94.7% sensitive to Amoxicillin, eighty four.2% to Amoxiclave and 78.nine% to Ciprofloxacin, sixty five.5% to Cephalixin, 50% to Ceftriaxone and ninety seven.4% proof against Co-trimoxazole, 92.1% to

Gentamicine, sixty eight.four% to Cephradine, 52.6% to Cefixime.(Tables IIIa and IIIb)

Staph.epidermidis become 85.7% sensitive to Amoxicillin and Cephradine every, seventy one.4% to Cephalixin, 50% to Amoxiclav, whilst variably proof against Co-trimoxazole, Ceftriaxone, Ciprofloxacin, Cefixime and Gentamicin. (tableIIIa and IIIb)

Table-III (a): Antibiotic sensitivity pattern of bacterial isolates

bacteria	Ity Pattern	Amoxicillin	Carbenicillin	Cotrimoxazol	Cephalexin	Cephadr	Ceftriaxon	Ceftazidime
E. coli	S	3 (2.1)	0 (0)	6 (4.3)	14	10m(7.0)	103 (72.5)	108
(n=142)	IS	2 (1.4)	0 (0)	9 (6.3)	4 (29.89)	5 (3.5)	11 (7.7)	8 (5.6)
ND	R	137	5 (3.50)	122 (85.9)	124 (87.3)	125	23 (16.2)	18 (12.7)
Str. fea	S	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2.6)	23 (60.5)	10	19 (50.0)	4 (10.5)
(n=38)	IS	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (256.3)	0 (0)	1 (2.6)
ND	R	2 (5.3)	2 (5.3)	37 (97.4)	15 (39.5)	26	10 (26.3)	1 (2.6)
Ps	S	1 (5.0)	2 (1904.07)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (23.7)	32 (84.2)
(n=20)	IS	0 (0)	1 (5.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (25.0)	8 (40.0)
ND	R	0 (0)	0 (0)	20 (100.0)	20 (100.0)	20 (100.0)	15 (75.0)	12 (60.0)
Kl.pn	S	0 (0)	1 (850.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
(n=20)	IS	0 (0)	1 (5.0)	1 (5.0)	1 (5.0)	1 (5.0)	12 (60.0)	11 (55.0)
ND	R	0 (0)	0 (0)	18 (90.0)	18 (90.0)	19 (95.0)	8 (40.0)	7 (35.0)
Ace	S	0 (0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)
(n=3)	IS	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (100.0)	3 (100.0)	3 (100.0)	2 (66.7)	2 (66.7)
ND	R	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Citro	S	0 (0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (100.0)	3 (100.0)
(n=3)	IS	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (33.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
ND	R	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (100.0)	2 (66.7)	3 (100.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Sta.epi	S	2 ((1845.37))	0 (0)	5 (35.7)	2 (14.3)	1 (7.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)
(n=14)	IS	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (42.9)	2 (14.3)	1 (7.1)	1 (7.1)	0 (0)
ND	R	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (14.3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (64.3)	13 (92.9)
Sta.sap	S	0 (0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
(n=1)	IS	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
ND	R	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0)
Proteus	S	0 (0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (100.0)
(n=4)	IS	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (100.0)	4 (100.0)
ND	R	4	0 (0)	2 (50.0)	2 (50.0)	2 (50.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
			4	1 (25.0)	1 (25.0)	1 (25.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Table-III (b): Antibiotic sensitivity pattern of bacterial isolates

	Pattern	Ciprofloxacin	Cefixime	Gentamicin	Nitrofurantoin	Meropenam	Amikacin	Amoxiela
E. coli (n=142)	S	n 90	74	e 3	131	66 (46.8)	136	2 (1.4)
	IS	11	(62.134)	(2.11)	2 (1.4)	8 (6.6)	28 (16.48)	0 (0)
	R	38	(2.482)	(0.74)	2 (1.4)	6 (4.2)	1 (0.7)	1 (0.7)
	ND	3	(29.232)	134	7 (4.9)	63 (44.4)	(1.4)	139
Str. fea (n=38)	S	(2,310)	(16.160)	(094,40)	2 (6.3)	0 (0)	3 (7.9)	32 (8947.29)
	IS	3	(026,30)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (6.3)
	R	3	20	36	0 (0)	3 (7.9)	1 (2.6)	0 (0)
	ND	2	(62.6/8)	(92.1/3)	36 (94.7)	36 (92.1)	34 (89.6)	4 (10.6)
Ps (n=20)	S	(6.131)	1	(7.91)	4 (20.0)	18 (90.0)	14 (70.0)	0 (0)
	IS	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (6.0)	0 (0)	3 (16.0)	0 (0)
	R	9	12	7	11 (66.0)	2 (10.0)	3 (16.0)	0 (0)
	ND	(046,0)	(60,07)	(36,10)2	4 (20.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
K 1 .pn (n=20)	S	12	(36,03)	(600,0)	17 (86.0)	11 (66.0)	19 (96.0)	(100,0)
	IS	1	(106,0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	R	7	13	0 (0)	1 (6.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	ND	(036,0)	(66,04)	20	2 (10.0)	9 (46.0)	1 (6.0)	19 (96.0)
Ace (n=3)	S	1	(200,0)	0 (0)	3 (100.0)	3 (100.0)	3 (100.0)	0 (0)
	IS	(033,30)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	R	2	3	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	ND	0 (0)	(01,00)	3	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (100.0)
Citro (n=3)	S	3	02	0 (0)	2 (66.7)	0 (0)	3 (100.0)	0 (0)
	IS	0 (0)	(066,70)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	R	0 (0)	1	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	ND	0 (0)	(033,30)	3	1 (33.3)	3 (100.0)	0 (0)	3 (100.0)
Sta.epi (n=14)	S	6	3	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (60.0)
	IS	(42,9/8)	(021,40)	02	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (42.9)
	R	(067,10)	2	(14.34)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7.1)	1 (7.1)
	ND	0 (0)	(14,39)	(28,608)	14 (100.0)	13 (92.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Sta.sap (n=1)	S	1	(064,30)	(067,10)	(100,0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (100.0)
	IS	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	R	0 (0)	1	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	ND	0 (0)	(01,0,0)	1	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0)
Proteus (n=4)	S	4	04	0 (0)	3 (76.0)	3 (76.0)	4 (100.0)	1 (26.0)
	IS	0 (0)	(01,0,0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	R	0 (0)	0 (0,00)	0 (0)	1 (26.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	ND	0 (0)	0 (0)	4	0 (0)	1 (26.0)	0 (0)	3 (76.0)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Identity of the uropathogens and their susceptibility pattern is very vital in treating the instances of Urinary Tract Infections (UTI). within the present observe, urine specimens have been cultured to see pattern of uropathogens and some 245 (forty nine.19%) of the

urine showed significant growth of bacteria. So, majority (50.eighty one%) of the cases remaining showed both insignificant bacteriuria or no boom with urine from the suspected instances of UTI. earlier antibiotic remedy earlier than submitting the urine samples, and clinical situations like non-gonococcal urethritis or others that mimic UTI can be that elements responsible for insignificant bacteriuria or no boom of Coagulase-negative Staphylococcus which are speculated to be non-pathogenic. This shows the need for educating the patients approximately the approach of series of smooth trap mid-stream urine specimens.

The age and sex distribution of the sufferers diagnosed with UTI some of the hospitalized patients and people attending the outpatient department followed the herbal epidemiological pattern of UTI. there was a predominance of young and center elderly women, whereas within the children and more youthful age organizations, almost same proportions of male and ladies had UTI.

In the present take a look at, the most commonplace pathogens isolate was Escherichia coli-58.0%, observed by Strep. feacalis-15.5%, Klebsiella & Pseudomonas species-eight.2%, Staphylococcus epidermidis (5.7%), Proteus species (1.6%), Acenatobacter & Citrobacter (1.2%) and Staphylococcus saprophyticus (0.4%). The isolation fee of urinary pathogens of the prevailing have a look at is constant with reports of the studies posted some other place recently.

E. coli become the foremost pathogen isolated showina excessive susceptibility to Amikacin (95.8%), Nitrofurantoin (92.three%), but showed variable sensitivity to different usually used antibiotics. that is regular with reports from distinctive nations who've mentioned an increasing resistance to Amoxicillin, Ciprofloxacin, and Ceftriaxone9,16,17. some other take a look at from Bangladesh suggested and will increase resistance of the uropathogens to Ciprofloxacin within the present study, Klebsiella species also showed excessive susceptibility to Amikacin (95.zero%) and Nitrofurantoin (80.zero%), but have been fantastically proof against commonly used antibiotics. Proteus species have been a hundred% touchy to Ceftriaxon, Ceftazidime, Cefixime, Ciprofloxacin, Amikacin and 75% to Meropenem and Nitrofurantoin. This finding is corresponding to Manjula et al of India,18 who located participants of Enterobacteriaceae variably sensitive to Amoxiclav, Ceftriaxone, Ceftazidime and Ciprofloxacin but observed all isolates sensitive to Imipenem. comparable susceptibility pattern had been additionally reported by other investigators.

Pseudomonas species, a not unusual motive of health facility-received UTI, was observed much less sensitive to the common antibiotics however

sensitive to Meropenem (ninety%) and Amikacin (70%).

Similar effects had been mentioned by means of investigators from different countries^{16,20}. *Pseudomonas* species were enormously at risk of the second one line of anti-pseudomonas pills and maximum of these have been related to excessive-level resistance to the primary- line antibiotics investigated namely Amoxiclav, Ceftriaxone, Ciprofloxacin and Gentamicin. This will be because of good sized use of commonplace antibiotics in the medical institution and pass-resistance amongst exceptional bacteria.

The effects of the prevailing examine showed that sensitivity price of the ruopathogens have been low for Co-trimoxazole and Amoxicillin. This low sensitivity might be due to widespread use of the antibiotics within the network. it's far possible that the low sensitivity is gift among uropathogens of the nosocomial in addition to community-obtained UTI. The patients attending outpatient department and some of the hospitalized sufferers may be having network- obtained UTI. in the gift examine, community-acquired UTI. in the gift study, network- acquired UTI and nosocomial UTI had been now not been distinguished. This was the main hindrance of the study.

A high isolation charge of pathogens from urine samples of clinically suspected UTI shows a terrific correlation among medical findings and microbiological techniques. Gram-terrible microorganism had been the most common organism remoted, amongst which *E.coli* became the principal urinary.

REFERENCES

- Abu Shaqra Q. (2000). incidence and antibiotic sensitivity of Enterobacteriaceae isolated from a collection of Jordanian patients with network obtained urinary tract infections. *Cytobios* 2000; 101: 15-21
- Bauer A.W., Kirby W.M.M., Sherris J.C., Turch M. (1966). Antibiotic susceptibility testing by a standardized single disk approach. *Am J ClinPathol* 1966; 45: pp. 493-499.
- Countrywide Committee for scientific Laboratory standards. authorisedwellknown M2A7: overall performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility checking out. 8th informational complement. Villanova, PA: NCCLS; 2000. 11.
- Gebre-Selassie S. (1998). Asymptomatic bacteriuria in being pregnant: epidemiological, medical and microbiological technique. *Ethiop Med J* 1998; 36: pp. 185-192
- Iqbal J., Ahman M., Kabir M.S., Rahman M. increasing ciprofloxacin resistance amongst normal

urinary tract bacterial isolates in Bangladesh, *Jpn J Med SciBiol* 1997; 50: pp. 241-250.

- Jones R.N., Jugler K.C., Pfaller M.A., Winkur P.L. (1999). characteristics of pathogens causing urinary tract infections in hospitals in north the united states. outcomes from the SENTRY Antimicrobial Surveillance application, 1997, *Diagn Microbial Infect Dis* 1999; 35: pp. 55-63.
- Kahlmeter G. (2003). ECO. SENS. An international survey of the antimicrobial susceptibility of pathogens from simple urinary tract infections: The ECO. SENS venture. *J AntimicrobChemother*, 2003; 51: pp. 69-76.
- Liperky B.A. (1989). Urinary tract infection in mem: epidemiology, pathophysiology, diagnosis and treatment. *Ann Intern Med* 1989; 111: pp. 138-150.
- Navaneeth B.V., Belwadi S., Suganthi N. (2002). Urinary pathogens, resistance to commonplace antibiotics: a retrospective evaluation. *Trop Doct* 2002; 32: 20.
- New C.H. (1992). Urinary tract contamination. *Am J Med* 1992; 4A (supp 1): pp. 63-7.
- Round A.R., Puttulo M.S. (1991). The herbal history of urinary contamination in adults. *Med Clin North Am* 1991; 75: pp. 299-312.
- Srinivassa H., Parija S.C., Bhattacharya S., Sehgal R. (1999). Incidence of ciprofloxacin resistant in urinary isolates. *jap Nepal J Comm Dis* 1999; 31: pp. 45-47.
- Van Nostrand J.D. (2000). Junki is Ad, Bartholdi R.K. poor predictive ability of urinalysis and microscopic examination to discover urinary tract infection. *Am J ClinPathol* 2000; 1113: pp. 709-713.

Corresponding Author

Ateequr Rehman*

Research Scholar

E-Mail – ateequrrehman100@gmail.com