

Cefoxitin resistant profile of *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from the environment of a tertiary health institution

ABSTRACT

Staphylococcus aureus has a notable ability to acquire resistance to methicillin and other antibiotics, and represents a growing public health challenge globally. This study was aimed at evaluating the cefoxitin resistance profile of *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from the University of Calabar Medical Centre, Calabar. A total of 50 swab specimens were collected from the hospital environment of the University of Calabar Medical Centre and analyzed following standard microbiological techniques. Isolates were subjected to antimicrobial susceptibility testing using commonly used antibiotics. A total of 20 (40%) *S. aureus* strains were isolated and exhibited 80% resistance against cefoxitin, 75% against ampiclox and 65% against amoxyl, confirming their ability to secrete β -lactamases against β -lactam agents. Furthermore, *S. aureus* strains also exhibited varying degrees of resistance to non β -lactam antibiotics including streptomycin (50%) and ciprofloxacin (60%). Considerable susceptibility was however observed with other antibiotics including levofloxacin (75%) and gentamycin (70%), suggesting that these drugs could be employed as combination therapy in the management of CRSA- related infections. This study revealed a high level of resistance of *S. aureus* to cefoxitin. In addition, isolates also exhibited resistance to routinely used antibiotics and makes need for urgent review of antibiotics, hospital sanitation and disinfection policies.

Key words: Cefoxitin, *Staphylococcus aureus*, resistant profile, susceptibility,

INTRODUCTION

Staphylococcus aureus is a common bacterium carried on the skin and/or in the nose of approximately 20 - 40% of otherwise healthy individuals [1]. It has been reported to cause a wide array of infections including minor skin conditions such as furuncles or boils as well as life-threatening conditions usually involving the lungs, blood or other organs and tissues in the body under certain conditions [2]. However, under normal conditions, this organism has been reported to be a normal flora of the skin and surfaces.

Prior to the start of modern era of antibiotics in the early 1940s, Gavin *et al* [3] revealed that *S. aureus* was fully susceptible to penicillin but with its introduction into clinical practice and wide spread use, this organism became penicillin-resistant. This resistant strain of *S. aureus* was first reported in the hospital setting and eventually moved into the community setting [2, 4]. *Staphylococci species* have been reported to possess penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs) used in the synthesis of cell wall which is composed of peptidoglycan in the absence of β -lactam antibiotics [5, 2].

Garvin *et al* [3] revealed that this mechanism of resistance may be brought about by the secretion of β -lactamase enzymes which has the ability of deactivating the active sites of penicillin thus, rendering it inactive. The rapid emergence and spread of β -lactamase producing *S. aureus* led to the production and introduction into clinical practice semi-synthetic penicillins including methicillin, nafcillin, oxacillin and cloxacillin which these β -lactamase enzymes could not destroy. These drugs became known as β -lactamase stable penicillins [6]. However, in the early 60s, this organism developed resistance to these synthetic drugs by acquiring a gene known as *mecA* [7].

Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) also known as Cefoxitin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (CRSA) has been reported as a significant nosocomial pathogen

which emerged immediately after the introduction of semi-synthetic penicillins and was reported first in 1961 in the United Kingdom [3]. This species has been reported as a significant public health challenge globally, being generally incriminated in infections ranging from minor skin infections, catheter-associated bacteraemia and ventilator-associated pneumonia to many other complicated infections among patients [2]. Similar to other major infections, MRSA-related infections are of major public health concerns because they are known to cause increased cost of treatment and prolonged hospital stay [7].

MRSA-related infections have been significantly associated with high rates of mortality compared to those caused by methicillin-sensitive *Staphylococcus aureus* (MSSA) and methicillin resistance has been reported to be independently associated with death [8]. In a prospective study of ventilator-associated pneumonia patients, caused by MSSA and MRSA, Francois [8] reported a higher incidence of extremely difficult to treat bacteraemia was associated with MRSA. Many researchers have reported the prevalence of cefoxitin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in developed countries but information in the study area is scarce. The study was aimed at determining cefoxitin resistance profile of *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from the University of Calabar medical centre.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study site

This study was performed in Calabar municipality local government area of Cross River State. Calabar is a city in Southern Nigeria with co-ordinate 4°57'0" North 8°19'0" East. Administratively, the city is made up of Calabar Municipal and Calabar South Local Government areas. It has an area of 406 square kilometers and had a population of 371,022 as at the census conducted in 2006. The city is adjacent to the Calabar and Great Kwa Rivers and Creeks of the Cross River. The University of Calabar (UNICAL) is situated in Calabar municipality, Cross River State, Southern Nigeria [9]. It was a campus of the University of Nigeria until 1975 [10]. It consists of at least 12 faculties and a population ranging from 25,000-49,000 people [10]. The University of Calabar Medical centre is a service department of the University saddled with the responsibility of providing appropriate healthcare for staff, students and others engages in downstream activities within the University of Calabar community and environs.

Materials

A total of 50 swab specimens were collected from the hospital environment of University of Calabar medical centre. The antimicrobial agents employed for this study included: cefoxitin (FOX 30ug) (Oxoid, England), streptomycin (30ug), chloramphenicol (30ug), erythromycin (30ug), Amoxil (20ug), ampiclox (20ug), levofloxacin (20ug), rifampicin (20ug), ciprofloxacin (10ug), norfloxacin (10ug) and gentamycin (10ug) (Optun. Lab. Nig. Ltd.).

Sample Collection and Preparation

All samples were obtained from the hospital environment (table tops, hands and laboratory coats) of the University of Calabar medical centre and immediately taken to the Microbiology laboratory where they were analyzed following standard microbiological procedures contained in Holt *et al* [11] and Murray *et al* [12]. Briefly, samples were inoculated unto already prepared nutrient and blood agar plates and incubated at 37°C for 24 hours. Following incubation, discrete colonies were sub-cultured onto Mannitol salt agar

plates and incubated at 37⁰C for 24 hours. A series of biochemical tests including Gram's reaction, catalase and coagulase tests were carried out to confirm the isolates

Sensitivity testing

This test was carried out following Kirby-Bauer modified disc diffusion technique described by NCCL [13] and CLSI, [14]. Briefly, using a sterile cotton swab, standardized inoculums were inoculated unto plates containing freshly prepared Muller Hinton agar after which standard antimicrobial discs were placed firmly on the surfaces of the inoculated agar plates using sterile forceps. The plates were then incubated at 35⁰C overnight after which zones of inhibition were measured following CLSI interpretive chat.

Minimum inhibitory and minimum bactericidal concentrations (MIC and MBC)

This was performed following procedures described by NCCL [13] and CLSI [14]. Briefly, 2-3 colonies of the test isolate was inoculated into 5ml of sterile peptone broth and incubated for 30 minutes. Antibiotics of various concentrations were dissolved in sterile test tubes containing 5ml of diluents (distilled water) to make stock solutions. Doubling dilutions of the antibiotics in the order of 1:2, 1:4, 1:8, 1:16, 1:32, 1:64, 1:128, 1:256, 1:512 and 1:1024 were carried out, respectively. Standardized *S. aureus* inoculums were added to each of the tubes and incubated overnight. The MIC was then reported as the lowest concentration of antimicrobial required to prevent visible growth. The MBC was determined by sub-culturing tubes which showed no growth (turbidity) during the MIC test into plates containing freshly prepared nutrient agar and incubated over night at 37⁰C.

Data analysis

All data obtained in this study were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as simple percentages with SPSS version 17.0.

RESULTS

Sensitivity test of isolates to cefoxitin and other commonly used antibiotics

Out of a total of 50 samples analyzed, 20 (40%) of organisms recovered were *Staphylococcus aureus* species. Of the 20(40%) of the *S. aureus* strains isolates that were subjected to testing, 16(80%) were resistant while 4(20%) were sensitive to cefoxitin as presented in Table 1. The test isolates when subjected to sensitivity testing using antibiotics other than cefoxitin exhibited varied resistance as shown in Table 1. Out of 20 isolates tested, 60% (12/20) were resistant to ciprofloxacin while 25% (5/20) and 15% (3/20) were intermediate and susceptible, respectively. Similarly, isolates were 45% (9/20) to norfloxacin resistant while 20% (4/20) and 35% (7/20) were intermediate and susceptible, respectively. Furthermore, isolates were 40% (8/20) resistant to chloramphenicol while 20% (4/20) and 40% (8/20) were intermediate and susceptible, respectively. Isolates were further resistant to amoxyl 65% (13/20) and 35% (7/20) were susceptible. Isolates were 50% (10/20) resistant to streptomycin while 25% (5/20) were each intermediate and susceptible, respectively. Consistently, isolates were 35% (7/20) resistant to erythromycin while 35% (7/20) and 30% (6/20) were intermediate and susceptible, respectively. Resistance of 30% (6/20) was exhibited against gentamycin while 35% (7/20) each were intermediate and susceptible, respectively. Isolates were 75% (15/20) resistant to ampiclox while 25% (5/20) were susceptible. A resistance of 25% (5/20) was exhibited against levofloxacin while 40% (8/20)

135 and 35% (7/20) were intermediate and susceptible, respectively. The minimum inhibitory
136 concentration (MIC) of the test isolates was 1:32 while the minimum bactericidal
137 concentration (MBC) was 1:16.

138 Table 1: Susceptibility pattern to Cefoxitin and other antibiotics

Antibiotics	Resistant (%)	Intermediate (%)	Sensitive (%)
CPX	12 (60.0)	5 (25.0)	3 (15.0)
NB	9 (45.0)	4 (20.0)	7 (35.0)
CH	8 (40.0)	4 (20.0)	8 (40.0)
AML	13 (65.0)	3 (15.0)	4 (20.0)
S	10 (50.0)	5 (25.0)	5 (25.0)
E	7 (35.0)	7 (35.0)	6 (30.0)
CN	6 (30.0)	7 (35.0)	7 (35.0)
APX	15 (75.0)	3 (15.0)	2 (10.0)
LEV	5 (25.0)	8 (40.0)	7 (35.0)
RD	9 (45.0)	6 (30.0)	5 (25.0)
FOX	16(80.0)	-	4(20.0)

139 Key: E = erythromycin, CPX = ciprofloxacin, CH = chloramphenicol, APX = ampiclox, CN = gentamycin,
140 NB = norfloxacin, LEV = levofloxacin, S = streptomycin, AML = amoxyl, FOX=cefoxitin
141

142 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

143 The hospital setting according to Anupurba, [15] serves as a reservoir of infections
144 with modes of transmission ranging from cross contamination between healthcare workers,
145 surfaces, patients, water as well as air [16]. Some studies have reported the resistance of *S.*
146 *aureus* to cefoxitin. This study reports the resistance of *Staphylococcus aureus* strains
147 isolated to cefoxitin. Out of the 20 (40%) *S. aureus* strains that were isolated, 16 (80%) were
148 resistant to cefoxitin. The 80% resistance observed in this study is somewhat higher than the
149 43.6% and 52.8% reported by Rongpharpi *et al* [17] and Kakhandki and Peerapur, [18],
150 respectively.

151 The high resistance exhibited by *S. aureus* isolates to cefoxitin shows the all-
152 roundness of this organism; making it the most common pathogen in the hospital setting.
153 This resistance as revealed by Hackbarth, [19] and Byarugaba, [20] could be due in part to
154 the ability of this organism to secrete extracellular enzymes that deactivate the β -lactam ring
155 of this drug, rendering it ineffective. However, this could be due in whole to the ability of the
156 organism to acquire extra chromosomal elements including plasmid and transposons;
157 resulting in the acquisition of *mecA* gene by these organisms [2]. Generally, cefoxitin
158 resistance in *S. aureus* has been reported to be due to PBP2a; a penicillin-binding protein
159 found in the bacterial cell wall with a low binding affinity to β -lactam enzyme encoded by
160 *mecA* gene. This may be suggestive that *mecA* gene not only mediates cefoxitin resistance but
161 also influence resistance of *S. aureus* strains to other antibiotics. This considerable resistance

was further confirmed by the high MIC and MBC of 1:32 and 1:16, respectively. This is in line with the 1:32 reported by Obajuluwa, [21]. However, the mechanism of resistance of these isolates was not investigated in this study.

Staphylococcus aureus strains employed in this study also exhibited resistance to other β -lactam drugs such as ampiclox (75%) and amoxil (65%). The high level of resistance to these β -lactam agents was further confirmed the ability of these organisms to excrete extracellular enzymes against the β -lactam drugs. This observation is consistent with that of Chambers, [22] who stated that resistance to the β -lactam antibiotic cefoxitin implies resistance to other members of the class.

Ryffel *et al* [23] added that the high resistance exhibited by few populations of cefoxitin-resistant *S. aureus* could also be due to mutation (s) in the organism's chromosome apart from *mecA* gene. This is observable in the resistance pattern exhibited by these *S. aureus* strains to streptomycin (50%), ciprofloxacin (60%) and thus, herald the need for urgent review of antibiotics policy. In an earlier study, Polyzou *et al* [24] specifically stated that susceptibility to antibiotics could be due to lack of specific genes for resistance. These organisms however showed 25% susceptibility to levofloxacin, 30% to gentamycin, 35% to erythromycin, 40% to chloramphenicol and 45% to norfloxacin. Thus, the existence of cefoxitin-resistant *S. aureus* which are susceptible to non β -lactam antibiotics including those mentioned above could present a possibility of these drugs being employed for management of CRSA-related infections.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study revealed a high level of resistance of *S. aureus* to cefoxitin. In addition, isolates also exhibited resistance to routinely used antibiotics. There is therefore, an urgent need for massive education and awareness campaigns against drug abuse, review of antibiotics policies as these may help reduce the selective pressure developed by these pathogens. The isolation and treatment of CRSA positive patients, high risk patients, screening of an index case is advocated. The monitoring of patient contacts with cases, screening of staff especially those with skin lesions in addition to implementing control measures including hand hygiene, proper sanitation, wearing of disposable aprons and gloves among others could help prevent and control the spread of cefoxitin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (CRSA) in the study area.

References

1. Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH) (2007). MRSA: What is *Staphylococcus aureus*? Retrieved from dph.illinois.gov/topics-services/disease-and-conditions/disease-a-z-list/mrsa. Accessed on February 10, 2016.
2. Iyer AP, Baghailab I, Albaik M, Kumosani T. Nosocomial Infections in Saudi Arabia caused by Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA). Clinical Microbiology. 2014; 3:146.
3. Gavin PK, Harrison EM, Holmes MA. The emergence of *mecC* methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. Trends Microbiology. 2014;22: 42-47.
4. Frazee B, Lynn J, Charlebois E, Lambert L, Lowery D, Perdreau-Remington F. High prevalence of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in emergency department

- 208 skin and soft tissue infections. *Annals of Emergency Medicine Journal*. 2005;45: 311-
209 320.
- 210
- 211 5. Goffin C, Guysen JM. Multimodular penicillin-binding proteins: an enigmatic family
212 of orthologs and paralogs. *Microbiology Molecular Biology Revised*. 1998; 62: 1079-
213 1093.
- 214
- 215
- 216 6. Kock R, Becker K, Cookson B, Van Gemert-pijnen JE, Hackbarth S, Kluytmans J,
217 Tacconelli E, Torne AN, Witty W, Friedrich AW. Methicillin-resistant
218 *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA): burden of disease and control of challenges in
219 Europe. *Euro Surveillance*. 2005; 15: 1968.
- 220
- 221 7. Mbim EN, Mboto CI, Agbor BE. A review of nosocomial infections in sub Saharan
222 Africa. *British Microbiology Research Journal*. 2016; 15: 1-11.
- 223
- 224
- 225 8. Francois P. Rapid detection of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* directly
226 from sterile or non-sterile clinical samples by a new molecular assay. *Journal of*
227 *Clinical Microbiology*. 2003; 41: 254-260.
- 228
- 229 9. Wikipedia (2015).Calabar. Retrieved from en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/calabar. Cited on
230 December 15, 2015.
- 231
- 232 10. Afangideh AI, Joseph KU, Atu JE. Attitude of urban dwellers to disposal and
233 management in Calabar, Nigeria. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*.
234 2012;1:22-30
- 235
- 236 11. Holt JG, Kreig PHA, Sneath & Wilkins ST. *Bergey's manual of determinative*
237 *bacteriology*. 9th edition, Maryland, Williams and Wilkins Baltimore USA.;1995
- 238
- 239 12. Murray PR, Baron EJ, Pfaller, MA, Tenover FC, Tenover, RH (Eds.). *Manual of*
240 *Clinical Microbiology* (8th edition). Washington DC: American Society for
Microbiology Press.2003;384 - 404.
- 241
- 242 13. National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards. (NCCL). Performance
243 standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing; fourteenth informational
supplement. M100-S14, NCCLS, Wayne, PA, U.S.A;2002
- 244
- 245 14. Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute CLSI. Performance standards for
246 antimicrobial susceptibility testing, fifteenth informational supplement, document
M100-S15. CLSI, Wayne, PA, USA;2005
- 247
- 248 15. Anupurba S, Sen M, Nath G, Sharma B, Gulati A, Mohapatra T. Prevalence of
249 Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in a tertiary care referral hospital in
Eastern Uttar Pradesh. *Journal of Medical Microbiology*. 2003;21: 49-51.
- 250
- 251 16. Samuel SO, Kayode OO, Musa OI, Nwigwe GC, Aboderin AO, Salami TAT,Taiwo
252 SS. Nosocomial infections and the challenges of control in developing countries.
African Journal of Clinical and Experimental Microbiology. 2010; 11: 102-110.

- 253 17. Rongpharpi SR, Hazarika NK, Kalita H. The prevalence of nasal carriage of
254 *Staphylococcus aureus* among health care workers at tertiary care hospital in Assam
255 with special reference to MRSA. Journal of Clinical Diagnosis Research. 2013; 7:
256 257-260.
- 257 18. Kakhandki LS, Peerapur BV. Study of nasal carriage of MRSA among the clinical
258 staff and healthcare workers at a teaching hospital of Karnataka, India. Al-Ameen
259 Journal of Medical Science. 2012; 5: 367-370.
260
- 261 19. Hackbarth CJ, Drake TA, Rusnak MG, Sande MA. Endocarditis due to MRSA in
262 rabbits: expression of resistance to β -lactam antibiotics in vivo and in vitro. Journal of
263 Infectious Disease. 1984; 149: 894-903.
264
- 265 20. Antimicrobial Resistance in Developing Countries. Sosa ADEJ, Byarugaba DK,
266 AMabile C, Hsueh PR, Kariuki S, Okeke IN (Eds); 2010
267
268
- 269 21. Obajuluwa AF. Characterization of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* from
270 orthopaedic patients in Ahmadu Bello University Teaching Hospital, Zaria, Nigeria.
271 (Unpublished Doctorate Thesis), Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria;2014
272
273
- 274 22. Chambers HF. *Staphylococcus aureus* with heterogeneous resistance to vancomycin:
275 epidemiology, clinical significance and critical assessment of diagnostic methods.
276 Antimicrobial Agents Chemotherapy. 2003; 47: 3040-3045.
277
- 278 23. Ryffel C, Strassle A, Kayser FH, Berger-Bachi B. Mechanisms of hetero-resistance in
279 MRSA. Antimicrobial Agents Chemotherapy. 1994; 38: 724-728.
280
- 281 24. Polyzou A, Slavakis A, Pournaras S, Maniatis AN, Sofianov D. Predominance of
282 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* clone susceptible to erythromycin and
283 several other non- β -lactam antibiotics in a Greek hospital. Journal of Antimicrobial
284 Chemotherapy. 2001; 48: 231-234.

285