Bacterial Isolates from the Urine of Women in Ilorin and their Antibiotic Susceptibility Patterns.

I. Funsho Abdul and Boaz A. Onile***
Departments of *Obstetrics & Gynaecology and **Medical Microbiology, University of Ilorin Teaching Hospital, P.M.B. 1339, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.

Abstract

Context: Urinary tract infections (UTI) are commonly encountered in women and, often, antibiotics are prescribed before bacteriological results are available. There is therefore a need to determine empirical antibiotics suitable in such situations.

Objective: The aims of the study were to identify the pathogens causing UTI in pregnant and non-pregnant women, determine their antimicrobial sensitivity patterns and suggest appropriate empirical antimicrobial agents for use in such patients.

Study Design and Setting: A cross-sectional study at the Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University of Ilorin Teaching Hospital, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Methods: Urine samples of women suspected to have UTI were sent for microscopy, culture and sensitivity tests. The results were analyzed and the differences between the results of pregnant and non-pregnant patients were assessed, using the chi-square test.

Results: Escherichia coli *was the predominant cause of UTI in both groups of women.* Staphylococcus aureus *(0.05>p>0.01),* Proteus *species (0.05>p>0.01) and* Pseudomonas *(0.05>p>0.01) were more likely to be isolated in non-pregnant women. Sultamicillin, azithromycin, nitrofurantoin, nalidixic acid, gentamycin and cotrimoxazole demonstrated 'good' to 'very good' effectiveness against the organisms. The more recent, expensive antibiotics like ofloxacin, ciprofloxacin, ceftriaxone and cefuroxime demonstrated 'excellent' effectiveness against the organisms. Antibiotics were generally more effective in clearing UTI in pregnancy.*

Conclusions and Recommendation: Antibiotics for empirical treatment of UTI in this environment should be those with good to excellent activities as listed above. Consideration should be given to the severity of the infection, drug safety in pregnancy and cost-effectiveness in making the appropriate choice for each patient.

Key Words: Bacteria; Susceptibility; Urinary Tract Infection; Women. [Trop J Obstet Gynaecol, 2001, 18: 61-65]

Introduction

Urinary tract infections (UTI) are common in women, with the incidence ranging from 5 to 20% [1]. This high incidence is as a result of the proximity of the vagina and urethral orifice to the anus which makes them susceptible to colonization by enteric bacteria [1,2,3,4,5]. The infections range from simple urethritis through cystitis and pyelitis to pyelonephritis. They are more common during pregnancy, labour and the puerperium because of mechanical factors that obstruct urinary flow, causing stasis and promoting bacterial invasion of the urinary tract [2,3,6].

Recent reports have shown that frequent use of broad-spectrum antibiotics has made the bowel commensals to acquire resistance to many antimicrobial agents. These resistance properties are easily transferred between bacteria of different genera through plasmids and other means [7,8,9]. Other reports have shown that the bacteriology of UTI has changed over time, with an increasing presence of gram-positive cocci such as staphylococci and some gram-negative organisms like *Klebsiella* becoming more frequently isolated, even in community acquired UTI, separate and apart from its usual association with hospital-acquired infections [10, 11, 12].

Many times, UTI present acutely or in places remote from reliable laboratories. Empirical antibiotic therapies are often instituted in such situations. It is for this reason that the prevalence of the causative organisms and their antimicrobial sensitivity patterns need to be known, so that appropriate antibiotics will be used. The aims of the study were to identify the bacterial pathogens causing UTI in pregnant and non-pregnant women, determine their antimicrobial sensitivity patterns and suggest appropriate empirical antimicrobial agents for use in such patients.

Correspondence: Dr. I.F. Abdul, Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, University Teaching Hospital, P.M.B. 1339, Ilorin, Nigeria.
e-mail: *abdul@ilorin.skannet.com*

Materials and Methods

Mid-stream samples of 'clean-catch' urine specimens of women presenting with symptoms suggestive of UTI either at the Antenatal or the Gynaecological Clinic, University of Ilorin Teaching Hospital, Ilorin Nigeria, were sent for bacteriological evaluation between January 1997 and December 1997. All patients who were on antibiotics before or at the time of presentation were excluded from the study. Also excluded were patients who previously had urinary tract infection treated in the six months before presentation.

Trained nurses supervised collections of specimen and samples were then sent immediately to the laboratory to prevent multiplication of organisms before examination[13]. A standard platinum loop was used to administer approximately 0.025ml of uncentrifuged urine on to cysteine-lactose-electrolyte-deficient (CLED) media and MacConkey agar plates. After overnight aerobic incubation at 37 °C, samples were identified to species and their antimicrobial sensitivities tested using Stoke's disc diffusion technique [14].

The laboratory results were analysed separately for pregnant and non-pregnant women. The aims of the study was to identify pathogens of UTI in pregnant and non-pregnant women, determine their antimicrobial sensitivity patterns, suggest appropriate empirical antibiotics for the bacteria isolated and compare results between pregnant and non pregnant women. The chi-square test was used to determine significant differences between the two groups of women in the prevalence and the antimicrobial sensitivity patterns of the organisms isolated.

Results

Three hundred and eighteen (318) samples were sent for processing and subsequent analysis during the study period. One hundred and thirteen (113) samples showed significant growth, which amounted to 35.5% of the samples. Pregnant women accounted for 59 (52.2%), while non-pregnant women accounted for 54 (47.8%) of the isolates.

Table 1 shows the prevalence of the various organisms isolated. *Escherichia coli* was the commonest isolated organism, accounting for 43.4 % of cases. It was present in almost equal amounts among the pregnant and the non-pregnant women. Other organisms isolated in order of frequency were *Streptococcus faecalis* (15.9%), *Klebsiella* (12.4%), *Staphylococcus aureus* (10.6%), *Proteus* spec.. (9.7%) and *Pseudomonas* (8.0%). It should be noted, however, that the prevalence of *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Proteus* species and *Pseudomonas* in non-pregnant patients was much higher than in pregnant patients. This difference was statistically significant (0.05>p>0.01).

Table 1

Frequency of Isolation of Various Bacterial Pathogens in Urine

Organism	Pregnant Patients No. (%)	Non-Pregnant Patients No. (%)	Total No. (%)	p
E. Coli	28 (47.5)	21 (38.9)	49 (43.4)	NS
Strep faecalis	11 (18.6)	7 (13.0)	18 (15.9)	NS
Klebsiella	9 (15.3)	5 (9.3)	14 (12.4)	NS
Staph aureus	4 (6.8)	8 (14.8)	12 (10.6)	< 0.05
Proteus sp	4 (6.8)	7 (13.0)	11 (9.7)	< 0.05
Pseudomonas	3 (5.1)	6 (11.1)	9 (8.0)	< 0.05
Total	59 (100)	54 (100)	113 (100)	

NS = *Not Significant*

The antimicrobial susceptibility pattern of pregnant patients is shown in Table 2. The isolates showed varying degrees of resistance to the antimicrobial agents tested. The antibiotics penicillin, ampicillin, cloxacillin, tetracycline and chloramphenicol showed very low effectiveness (less than 20%). Some other, relatively cheap, drugs like cotrimoxazole, nalidixic acid, nitrofurantoin and gentamycin as well as azithromycin showed acceptable good to very good antimicrobial activities. Excellent antimicrobial activities were however observed with ofloxacin, ciprofloxacin, cefuroxime and ceftriaxone.

Table 3 presents the antimicrobial sensitivity pattern of the isolates from non-pregnant patients. The results were similar to the pattern found among pregnant patients, except that the organisms were generally slightly more resistant. Comparisons of the efficacies of the drugs between pregnant and non-pregnant patients are displayed in Table 4. The difference was statistically significant only in the case of gentamycin, which was more effective for pregnant patients (0.05>p>0.001).

Table 2

Susceptibility Pattern of Pregnant Patients' Urinary Isolates

Drug	*E Coli*		*Strept faecalis*		*Klebsiella*		*Staph aureus*		*Proteus Sp*		*Pseudomonas*		**Total.**	
	No. Tested	% Sens	No Tested	% Sens	No Tested	% Sens	No Tested	% Sens	No Tested	% Sens	No Tested	% Sens	No Tested	% Sens
P	8	0	5	0	5	0	8	12.5	3	0	3	0	32	3.1
A	20	10	8	12.5	8	0	8	12.5	7	0	4	0	55	7.3
CX	19	15.8	8	15	7	14.3	6	50	8	0	6	0	54	16.7
SAM	22	50	6	66.7	8	25	5	60	5	40	4	25	50	46
E	13	15.4	7	42.8	5	20	5	60	5	0	3	0	38	23.7
AZM	13	61.5	6	66.7	3	33.3	3	100	3	33.3	2	0	30	70
T	6	2	3	0	2	0	3	33.3	3	0	2	0	19	15.8
C	11	18.2	4	25	3	0	8	25	3	0	3	0	32	18.8
S	6	33.3	2	0	3	33.3	3	66.7	5	20	2	0	21	28.7
G	20	75	8	62.5	5	60	4	75	5	60	4	50	46	67.4
OFX	22	81.8	8	75	6	50	5	60	4	50	3	66.7	48	81.2
CIP	19	84.2	7	100	6	50	5	100	5	80	4	50	46	89.1
CXM	19	100	8	100	6	100	5	80	6	83.3	4	100	48	95.8
CRO	18	94.4	9	100	7	85.7	5	100	6	83.3	4	100	49	93.9
COT	16	56.3	5	60.0	3	33.3	6	100	5	60	3	0	38	57.9
NIT	13	76.9	6	66.7	4	50	3	66.7	4	75	3	33.3	33	69.7
NAL	10	70	5	60	3	66.7	3	66.7	4	75	3	33.3	28	64.3

Key : P: Penicillin; A: Ampicillin; CX: Cloxacillin; SAM: Sultamicillin; E: Erythromycin; AZM: Azithromycin; T: Tetracycline; C: Chloramphenicol; S: Streptomycin; G: Gentamycin; OFX: Ofloxacin; CIP: Ciprofloxacin; CXM: Cefuroxime; CRO: Ceftriaxone; COT: Cotrimoxazole; NIT: Nitrofurantoin; NAL: Nalidixic acid. *Sens*: SENSITIVITY

Table 3

Susceptibility Pattern of Non-Pregnant Patients' Urinary Isolates

Drug	*E Coli*		*Strept faecalis*		Klebsiella		*Staph aureus*		*Proteus Sp*		*Pseudomonas*		**Total.**	
	No Tested	% Sens	No Tested	% Sens	No Tested	% Sens	No Tested	% Sens	No Tested	% Sens	No Tested	% Sens	No Tested	% Sens
P	7	0	5	0	4	0	7	28.5	3	0	2	0	28	3.6
A	17	23.5	7	14.3	6	0	5	0	3	0	2	0	40	5
CX	14	0	3	0	2	0	3	66.7	2	0	0	0	24	8.3
SAM	18	44.4	5	40	3	33.3	4	75	3	0	2	0	35	40
E	5	0	4	25	3	0	3	100	2	0	3	0	20	20
AZM	11	27.3	6	33.3	2	0	3	66.7	4	25	2	0	26	61.5
T	5	20	3	0	3	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	15	6.7
C	9	22.2	6	16.7	4	0	4	50	3	0	2	0	28	17.9
S	8	25	5	20	5	20	5	40	2	0	0	0	25	24
G	18	66.7	6	66.7	6	50	4	0	4	50	2	50	40	55
OFX	17	88.2	7	85.7	5	80	4	75	3	100	3	66.7	39	79.5
CIP	19	94.7	6	83.3	6	83.3	3	100	4	75	3	33.3	41	85.4
CXM	20	95	6	100	5	80	4	75	4	75	3	100	42	90.5
CRO	19	89.5	7	85.7	4	100	4	100	4	75	3	66.7	41	87.8
COT	16	62.5	5	60	4	50	4	25	3	33.3	2	0	34	50
NIT	15	66.7	6	66.7	3	33.3	3	66.7	3	66.7	2	50	32	68.8
NAL	14	64.3	5	80	5	40	4	50	3	33.3	1	100	32	59.4

Key : P: Penicillin; A: Ampicillin; CX: Cloxacillin; SAM: Sultamicillin; E: Erythromycin; AZM: Azithromycin; T: Tetracycline; C: Chloramphenicol; S: Streptomycin; G: Gentamycin; OFX: Ofloxacin; CIP: Ciprofloxacin; CXM: Cefuroxime; CRO: Ceftriaxone; COT: Cotrimoxazole; NIT: Nitrofurantoin; NAL: Nalidixic Acid. *Sens*: SENSITIVITY

References

1. Cattell WR. Urinary tract infections in women. *J.R.Coll. Physicians. Lond,* 1997, 31: 130-133.

2. Hurly R. Microbiology. In Philippe, Barnes J and Newton M (eds), *Scientific Foundations of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*. London: Heinemann Medical Books. 1990: 513-537.

3. Weissenbacher ER, Reisenderger K. Uncomplicated urinary tract infections in pregnant and non-pregnant women. *Curr. Opin. Obstet. Gynecol.* 1993, 513-516.

4. Ali M B. Bacteriuria. Incidence, causative micro-organisms and susceptibility pattern at Quatif Central Hospital, *Ann. Saudi Med.* 1991; 11: 429-434.

5. Ahmed TE, Raga MF. Urinary tract infection at a university hospital in Saudi Arabia: incidence, microbiology and antimicrobial susceptibility. *Ann. Saudi Med.* 1988, 8: 961-966.

6. Patterson TF, Andriole VT. Detection, significance and therapy of bacteriuria in pregnancy. *Infect Dis Cln North Am.* 1997, 11: 593-608.

7. Rotimi VO, Emina HA, Eke PI. Transferable antibiotic resistance in E. coli isolated from UTI. *Afr J. Med. Med Sci.* 1984, 13: 47-53.

8. Hooton TM, Stamm WE. Diagnosis and treatment of uncomplicated urinary tract infection. *Infect Dis Clin North Am.* 1997, 11: 551-581.

9. Mitchell L. Epidemiology of drug resistance. implications for a post–antimicrobial era. *Science.* 1992; 257: 1050-1055.

10. Onyemenem TN, Ekweozor CC. Urinary tract infection in Ibadan: causative organisms and antimicrobial sensitivity patterns. *Afr. J. Med. Med. Sci.* 1996; 25: 165-169.

11. Alausa KO, Montefiore D. Sensitivity of urinary pathogens from hospitalized patients in Ibadan to oxolinic acid and other chemotherapeutic agents. *Ghana Med. J.* 1979, 18:73-75.

12. Alausa KO, Montefiore D, Sobayo E. Problems in the diagnosis of urinary tract infections. *Nig Med J,* 1979; 9: 107- 111.

13. Ascher AW, Sussman M, Weiser R. Bacterial growth in human urine. In: Grady TO and Brumfitt W (eds). *Urinary Tract Infection.* Oxford. Oxford Med. Pub. 1968: 3.

14. Cheesbrough M. *Medical Laboratory Manual for Tropical Countries. Vol. 11: Microbiology.* Cambridge, University Press. 1991: 146-155; 199-205.

15. Medean A B. Urinary tract infections in pregnancy. *Br, J Urol.* 1997, 80 suppl 1:10-13.

16. Griumberg R N. Antibiotics sensitivities of urinary pathogens. *Antimicrob Chemother.* 1984; 14: 17-23.

17. Bailey B B. Management of lower urinary tract infections. *Drugs.* 1993, 45 Suppl 3: 139-144.

18. British National Formulary (BNF), Appendix 4: Pregnancy. London. Pharmaceutical Press. No 31, 1996. 575-584.