

Detection of metallo-beta-lactamase producing enterobacteriaceae from wound infection in Rajshahi Medical College Hospital

Shubhra Kanti Dev Nath^a, Md. Abdullah Siddique^b,
Md. Shah Alam^c, Mirza Md. Washee Parvez^d, Mohsina Alam Shaheede^e,
Shahana Begum^f, Rezwana Sharmin^g, Dr. Intekhab Rahaman^h.

Abstract:

Background: Wound infection is a common problem and a wide range of bacteria including enterobacteriaceae are responsible for it. Multidrug resistant enterobacteriaceae are greatest risk for the management of wound infection as they produce beta-lactamase enzymes which cleaves beta-lactam drugs. Metallo-beta lactamase (MBL) is a member of beta-lactamase enzymes which are produced by gene mutation due to misuse of antibiotics. **Objective:** Detection of metallo-beta-lactamase producing enterobacteriaceae from wound infection. **Methods:** A descriptive type of study was carried out for the detection of MBL in the Departments of Microbiology and Surgery & its allied branches of Rajshahi Medical College and Hospital. A total 233 enterobacteriaceae were isolated and antibiogram were done from wound swabs. The enterobacteriaceae which showed resistant to both meropenem and ceftriaxone were used for the detection of MBL by double disk synergy test. **Results:** Among the enterobacteriaceae, *E. coli* 86(70.49%), *Proteus* spp. 28(51.85%), *Enterobacter* spp. 27(72.97%), *Klebsiella* 8 (57.14%) and *Providentia* spp. 3(50%), were resistant to both meropenem and ceftriaxone. Detected MBL were 66(76.74%), 19(67.85%), 21(77.77%), 7(87.50%) and 1(33.33%) from *E. coli*, *Proteus* spp., *Enterobacter* spp., *Klebsiella* spp. and *Providentia* spp. respectively. **Conclusion:** Multidrug resistant enterobacteriaceae was due to production of MBL as result of mutation of genes for misuse of antibiotics without during antibiogram.

Key words: Metallo-beta-lactamase, Carbapenemase, multidrug resistant, wound Infection.

Introduction

Wound infection is a common problem in hospitals throughout the world and is caused mainly by bacteria. A wide range of bacteria including enterobacteriaceae are responsible for wound infections. Healing needs good healthy environment of the wound which can be provided with regular dressing and antibiotic therapy.¹ But bacteria can develop resistant against antibiotics by different mechanisms. One of the mechanisms is the production of beta-lactamase enzymes which hydrolyze the beta-lactam drugs like penicillins, cephalosporins, monobactam, carbapenems etc. These enzymes present in the periplasmic space of gram-negative bacteria and destroy the drugs before they bind with target structures. Enterobacteriaceae carry genes for beta-lactamase, an enzyme present in their chromosomes, plasmids and transposons.² Many newer beta-lactam drugs have been

developed that act against beta-lactamase producing bacteria. But genes that code for beta-lactamase enzymes have mutated continuously in response to heavy use of antibiotic leading to the development of newer broad spectrum beta-lactamases.³ Besides that intraspecies and interspecies transmission of mutant genes occur by conjugation which also contribute drug resistance.^{2,4-6} These mutation mostly occur within the hospitals and surrounding environment.

Carbapenems, the newer class of beta-lactam drugs which include imipenem, meropenem, doripenem and ertapenem are stable and not destroyed by extended spectrum beta-lactamase and Amp C beta-lactamase.⁷ These drugs are the choice for the management of serious hospital acquired infections caused by multidrug resistant enterobacteriaceae.^{8,9} Unfortunately enterobacteriaceae again

^aAssistant Professor,
Department of Microbiology,
Sirajganj Medical College,
Sirajganj, Bangladesh.

^bProfessor, Department of
Microbiology, Barind Medical
College, Rajshahi, Bangladesh.

^cProfessor, Department of
Microbiology, Rajshahi Medical
College, Rajshahi, Bangladesh.

^dAssistant Professor, Department
of Microbiology, Manikganj
Medical College, Manikganj,
Bangladesh.

^eAssistant Professor,
Department of Microbiology,
Shaheed Ziaur Rahman
Medical College, Bogra,
Bangladesh.

^fProfessor, Department of
Microbiology, Green life
Medical College, Dhaka,
Bangladesh.

^gAssistant Professor,
Department of
Microbiology, Barind
Medical College,
Rajshahi, Bangladesh.

^hProfessor, Department of
Microbiology, Enam
Medical College, Dhaka,
Bangladesh.

Correspondence to :
SKD Nath
skdevnath68@gmail.com

Cite this as:
BMJ 2017;3(1): 15-20

Received November 12, 2016;
Accepted January 25, 2017

develop resistant to carbapenems by producing metallo-beta-lactamase and other carbapenemase enzymes. In the recent year worldwide outbreak of carbapenem resistant enterobacteriaceae have been increasingly reported.^{2,10,11} These enterobacteriaceae are also resistant to beta-lactamase inhibitors like clavulanic acid and tazobactam.^{12,13}

Carbapenemase enzymes belong to 3 molecular classes, such as class A, B & D.² Class B carbapenemase enzymes use zinc at their active site and inhibited by EDTA (ethylene diamine tetra acetic acid), known as metallo-beta-lactamase (MBL). Class B carbapenemases are active on imipenem carbapenemase, Verona-Integron encoded metallo-beta-lactamase, Sao Paulo metallo-beta-lactamase, German imipenemase, Seoul imipenemase and New Delhi metallo-beta-lactamase (NDM). MBL enzymes hydrolyze all beta-lactam antibiotics and clavulanic acid except aztreonam.¹⁴ These enzymes mainly present in *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Escherichia coli*, *Serratia* spp. and other enterobacteriaceae species.^{2,15,16}

In a study at international center for diarrhoeal disease and research (ICDDR), Dhaka, Bangladesh showed among 403 isolates, 3.5% were positive for MBL and predominant species were *Klebsiellapneumoniae*, *Acinetobacter* and *Escherichia coli*.¹⁷ Another study in north India, showed out of 780 enterobacteriaceae, 64 isolates were phenotypically MBL producer. They also performed polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and 54 isolates were NDM producers which include 30 *Escherichia coli*, 12 *Citrobacter* spp. and 12 *Klebsiella* spp. with an overall occurrence of 6.9%.¹⁸

Carbapenemase producing bacteria can be detected by molecular or enzyme detection methods. Molecular methods are PCR, isoelectric focusing, spectrophotometry, colonic blot hybridization etc. Among them PCR is the most useful method with 100% sensitivity and specificity and time saving.¹⁹

Enzyme detection methods include modified hodge test or clover leaf test, double disk synergy test, disk test or disk potentiation test, EDTA-imipenem microdilution MIC test, E test MBL strip test etc. Double disk synergy tests (DDST) includes imipenem-EDTA double disk synergy test, ceftazidime-EDTA double disk synergy test, ceftazidime-1,10 phenanthroline double disk synergy test, ceftazidime-mercaptopyruvic acid double disk synergy test, ceftazidime-mercaptoacetic acid double disk synergy test etc. Combined disc test or disk potentiation test includes imipenem and imipenem+EDTA combined disk test, ceftazidime and ceftazidime+EDTA combined disk test, carbapenem disk with and without a polyboronic acid test etc. Among the double disk synergy test imipenem-EDTA double disk synergy test is better and able to distinguish MBL producer from non-MBL producers. It is the most effective method for the detection of MBL producers with 77.9% sensitivity and 96% specificity.²⁰ The Combined disk test with imipenem & imipenem+EDTA is also very useful test and has sensitivity and specificity are 94.7% & 98% respectively.

Now a day multidrug resistant gram negative bacteria are the greatest risk to public health. Gram negative bacteria develop resistant faster than gram positive bacteria.^{21,22} There are few new antibiotics have developed and few are under process of development.²³ But they may not be sufficient against gram negative bacteria to provide therapeutic cover after 10-20 years.^{24,25,26} Thus MBL producing enterobacteriaceae are a challenge for wound infection management.

Methods

A total of 233 (79.79) enterobacteriaceae were isolated from 292 wound swabs in the microbiology laboratory of Rajshahi medical college during the period of January, 2014 to December, 2014. Standard method was employed for collection of swabs and cultured on nutrient agar and MacConkey's agar media. Enterobacteriaceae were

identified by their colonial morphology, gram staining, motility, oxidase, indole & urease production and citrate utilization tests. Sugars fermentation and H₂S production were done in triple sugar iron media. The sensitivity test was performed by modified Kirby Bauer disk diffusion method on Muller-Hinton agar media with meropenem (10g) and ceftriaxone (30g) disks. The resistant enterobacteriaceae were expressed by CLSI, 2012 recommendation.²⁷ The identified isolates which showed resistant to both meropenem and ceftriaxone were further tested for Metallo-beta-lactamase (MBL) production.^{27,28} Metallo-beta-

lactamase production was detected by double disk synergy test by putting imipenem (10g) and 10l of 0.5M-EDTA disks. The disks were placed 20 mm apart from each other on nutrient agar media and incubated aerobically at 37°C for 24 hours. The synergistic inhibition of zone indicate the production of MBL.^{7,20,29}

Result

Two hundred and thirty three enterobacteriaceae were isolated from 292 wound infections by culture and antibiogram was carried out to find meropenem and ceftriaxone resistant enterobacteriaceae. These resistant enterobacteriaceae were further studied for detection of metallo-beta-lactamase production which is responsible for resistant.

Table I shows resistance pattern of enterobacteriaceae against meropenem (MEM), ceftriaxone (CTR) alone and both meropenem & ceftriaxone. Out of 122 *E.coli*, 88(72.13%) & 113(92.62%) were resistant to MEM & CTR alone and 86(70.49%) were both MEM & CTR. Similarly among 54 *Proteus* spp., 37 *Enterobacter* spp, 14 *Klebsiella* spp. and 06 *Providentia* spp 30(55.55%), 44(81.48%) and 28(51.85%) ; 27(72.97%) , 33(89.19%), and 27 (72.97%); 08(57.14%) , 13(92.86%) and 08 (57.14%); 03(50.00%) , 04(66.67%) and 3(50.00%) respectively. MEM resistant was less than CTR resistant when tested alone.

Table 2 shows the detection of metallo-beta-lactamase production from enterobacteriaceae isolates by double disc synergy test. Metallo-beta-lactamase production was detected in 66(57.89%) species out of 86 resistant (MEM & CTR) isolates of *E.coli*. Similarly 19(16.67%) , 21(18.42%), 7(6.14%) and 1(0.88%) were detected from 28 *Proteus* spp., 27 *Enterobacter* spp., 08 *Klebsiella* spp. and 03 *Providentia* spp. A total of 152(100%) different species enterobacteriaceae, 114(75.00%) species had produced MBL which was detected by DDST.

Table 1. Resistant pattern of enterobacteriaceae against meropenem (10 µg) and ceftriaxone (30 µg) disks. (N=233)

Species	MEM resistant N(%)	CTR resistant N(%)	Both MEM & CTR N(%)
<i>E.coli</i> N=122	88(72.13)	113(92.62)	86(70.49)
<i>Proteus</i> spp. N=54	30(55.55)	44(81.48)	28(51.85)
<i>Enterobacter</i> spp. N=37	27(72.97)	33(89.19)	27(72.97)
<i>Klebsiella</i> spp. N=14	8(57.14)	13(92.86)	8(57.14)
<i>Providentia</i> spp. N=6	3(50.00)	4(66.67)	3(50.00)
Total 233(100)	156(66.95)	207(88.84)	152(65.23)

C=meropenem; CTR =Ceftriaxone. Figures in parenthesis represent percentage.

Table 2. Detection of metallo-beta-lactamase production among isolates resistant to both MEM and CTR by double disk synergistic test.(N= 152).

Species resistant to both MEM & CTR	DDST N (%)
<i>E.coli</i> (N=86)	66(76.76)
<i>Proteus</i> spp. (N=28)	19(67.85)
<i>Enterobacter</i> spp. (N=27)	21(77.77)
<i>Klebsiella</i> spp. (N=8)	7(87.50)
<i>Providentia</i> spp. (N=3)	1(33.33)
Total 152(100)	114(75.00)

Note: N=Number, DDST= Double disk synergy test, MEM = meropenem, CTR =Ceftriaxone

Discussion

Wound infection is a major problem in daily practice due to the emergence and spread of multidrug resistant bacteria specially enterobacteriaceae which gaining more and more importance day by day. In this study the member of enterobacteriaceae which resistant to both meropenem and ceftriaxone were studied for metallo-beta-lactamase production by double disc synergy test and found *E.coli* was 66(57.89%), *Proteus* spp. 19(16.67%), *Enterobacter* spp. 21(18.42%), *Klebsiella* spp. 7(6.14%) and *Providential*spp. 1 (0.88%). Our study is dissimilar with the report by Haider *et al.* (2014)³⁰ in Uttar Pradesh, India where they found *E.coli* was 36%, *Klebsiella* spp. 20%, *Proteus* spp. 8%, *Serratia* spp. 16% and *Citrobacter* spp. 20%. Dissimilarity was also reported by Naveenkumar *et al.*(2014)²⁹ in India where *E.coli* were 100% resistant to carbapenem. The dissimilarities may be due to the prevalence of MBL producing enterobacteriaceae varies from country to country and also in different institution within the same country³¹. The dissimilarities may also be due to defective culture & sensitivity test, inadequate dose and duration of antibiotic used, sometimes the concentration of antibiotics may not be same as said by the pharmaceutical companies etc. Beside that other factors such as presence of genitically resistant strain, different geographical locations, environment, sanitation, habit of the patient and variation of antibiotics use in different hospitals.

We may conclude that multidrug resistant enterobacteriaceae was due to production of MBL as result of mutation of genes for misuse of antibiotics without during antibiogram. Enterobacteriaceae are the gut flora. So proper sewerage management may reduce wound infection caused by them. Antibiotic sensitivity test is mandatory before starting treatment. Every hospitals should have their own antibiotic policy, national guideline and some antibiotics should keep reserve for future use.

References

1. Al-Waili NS, Salom K, Al-Ghamdi AA. Honey for wound healing, ulcers and burns. *The ScientificWorld Journal* 2011; 11: 766-87.
2. Quennan AM, Bush K. Carbapenemases: the versatile β -Lactamases. *Clin Microbial Rev.* 2007; 20(3): 440-58.
3. Datta S, Wattal C. Carbapenemase producing Gram-negative bacteria in tertiary health care setting: Therapeutic challenges. *JIMSA* 2010; 23(1): 17-20.
4. Nordmann P, Naas T, Poirel L. Global spread of carbapenemase-producing enterobacteriaceae. *Emerg Infect. Dis.* 2011; 17(10): 1791-98.
5. Schwaber MJ, Carmeli Y. Carbapenem-resistant enterobacteriaceae: A potential threat. *JAMA* 2008; 300(24): 2911-13.
6. Sidjabat HE, Silveira FP, Potoski BA, Abu-Elmagd KM, Adams-Haduch JM, Paterson DL, Doi Y. Interspecies spread of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* carbapenemases gene in a single patient. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2009; 49: 1736-38.
7. Lee k, Lim YS, Yong D, Yum JH, Chong Y. Evaluation of the Hodge test and the imipenem- EDTA double disk synergy test for differentiating metallo-beta-lactamases producing isolates of *Pseudomonas* Spp. and *Acinetobacter* Spp. *Journal of clinical Microbiology* 2003; 41: 4623-29.
8. Amjad A, Mirza LA, Abbasi SA, Farwa U, Malik N, Zia F. Modified Hodge test: A simple and effective test for detection of carbapenemase production. *Iranian Journal of Microbiology* 2011; 3(4): 189-93.
9. Brink AJ, Feldman C, Grolmen DC, Muckart D, Pretorius I, Richard GA, Senekal M, Sielinn W. Appropriate use of the carbapenems. *S Afr Med J* 2004; 94: 857-61.
10. Nordmann P, Doret L, Poirel L. Carbapenem resistance in enterobacteriaceae; here is the story. *Trends Mol Med.* 2012; 18: 268-72.
11. Schwaber MJ, Klarfeld-Lidji S, Navon-Venezia S, Schwartz D, Leavitt A, Carmeli Y. Predictor of carbapenem

- resistant *klebsiella pneumonia* acquisition among hospital adults and effect of acquisition on mortality. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2008; 52: 1028-33.
12. Nishio H, Komatsu M, Shibata N, *et.al*. Metallo-beta-lactamase producing gram negative bacilli: laboratory-based surveillance in cooperation with 13 clinical laboratories in the kinki region of Japan. *J.Clin. Microbiol.* 2004; 42:5256-63.
 13. Walsh TR, Pay DJ, MacGowan AP, Bennett PM. A Clinical isolates *Aeromonas sorbia* with three chromosomally mediated inducible beta lactamases a cephalosporinase, a penicillinase and a third enzyme displaying carbapenemase activity. *J.Antimicrob Chemother* 1995; 37:423-31.
 14. Walsh TR, Toleman MA, Piorrel L, Nordmann P. Metallo-beta-lactamases; the quiet before the storm? *ClinMicrobiol Rev.*2005; 18: 306-25.
 15. Kumar S, Bondyopadhyay M, Mondal S, Paul N, Ghosh T, Bondyopadhyay M, Banerjee P. Tigecycline activity against metallo-beta-lactamase producing bacteria. *Avicenna Journal of Medicine* 2013; 3(4): 92-6.
 16. Kumarasamy K, Toleman MA, Walsh TR, *et al*. Characterization of a new antibiotic resistance mechanism in India, Pakistan and UK: a molecular, biological and epidemiological study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2010; 10(9): 597-602.
 17. Islam MA, Talukdar PK, Haque A, Haq M, Nabi A, Ahmed D, Talukder KA, Pietrone MAC, Hays JP, Cravioto A, Endtz HP. Emergence of Multidrug Resistant NDM-1-Producing Gram-negative bacteria in Bangladesh. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases* 2012; 31(10): 2593-2600.
 18. Seema K, Sen MR, Upadhyay S, Bhattacharjee A. Dissemination of the New Delhi metallo- beta- lactamase-1 (NDM-1) among enterobacteriaceae in a tertiary referral hospital in north India. *J.Antimicrob Chemother* 2011; 66: 1646-47.
 19. Doyle D, Peirano G, Lascol C, Lloyd T, Church DL, Pitout JDD. Laboratory Detection of Enterobacteriaceae That Produce Carbapenemase. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 2012; 50(12): 3877-80.
 20. Galani I, Rekatsina PD, Hatzaki D, Souli M, Giamarellou. Evaluation of different laboratory test for the detection of metallo β -lactamase production in enterobacteriaceae. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* 2008; 61(3): 548-53.
 21. Cornaglia G. Fighting Infections due to multidrug-resistant Gram-positive pathogens. *Clin. Microbiol Infect.* 2009; 15: 209-11.
 22. Tan TT. "Future" threat of Gram-negative resistance in Singapore. *Ann Acad Med Singapore* 2008; 37: 884-90.
 23. Baiden F, Owusu-Agyei S, Webster J, Chandramohan D. The need for new antibiotics. *Lancet* 2010; 375: 637-38.
 24. Baucher HW, Talbot GH, Bradley JS, *et al*. Bad bugs, no drugs: no ESKAPE! An update from the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin infect Dis.* 2009; 48: 1-12.
 25. Page MG, Heim J. Prospects for the next anti-pseudomonas drug. *Curr Opin Pharmacol.* 2009; 9: 558-65.
 26. Rice LB. The Clinical consequences of antimicrobial resistance. *Curr Opin Microbiol.* 2009; 12: 476-481.
 27. Clinical and Laboratory Standards institute. Performance standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility testing; Twenty-second informational supplement. CLSI document, M100-S-22. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards institute, 2012.
 28. Miriagou V, Cornaglia G, Edelstein M, Galani I, Giske CG, Gniadkowski M. Acquired carbapenemases in Gram-negative bacteria pathogens: detection and surveillance issues. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2010; 16:112-22.

29. Naveenkumar C, Swathi S, Srikumar R. Metallo-Beta-Lactamase (MBL) detection in multidrug resistant gram negative bacilli (MDR-GNB) isolates. *Journal of Innovative Research and Solutions* 2014; 1(1): 1-7.
30. Haider M, Rizvi M, Fatima N, Shukla I, Malik A. Necessity of detection of Extended spectrum, AmpC and metallo-beta-lactamases in Gram-negative bacteria isolated from clinical specimens. *Muller J Med Sci Res.* 2014; 5:23-8.
31. Balan K, Sireesha P, Setty CR, Study to detect incidence of carbapenemase among Gram-negative clinical isolates from tertiary care hospital, *IOSR. Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences* 2012; 1(6): 8-12.