

A Study on Antibiotic Resistance in Patients with Nosocomial Infections and its Risk Factors

¹Anisha Sarkar & ²Dr. Neelam Tripathi

¹Research Scholar, Department of Microbiology, Sri Satya Sai University of Technology & Medical Sciences, Sehore, MP

²Research Guide, Sri Satya Sai University of Technology & Medical Sciences, Sehore, MP

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History

Published Online: 15 April 2019

Keywords

Nosocomial Infection, Antibiotic Resistance, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*

ABSTRACT

Introduction: *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (*P. aeruginosa*) is impervious to different anti-toxins and can cause genuine nosocomial diseases with high grimness and mortality. In this clinical examination, we explored the hazard factors in patients who were determined to have *P. aeruginosa*-related nosocomial disease.

Methods: A review case control study incorporating patients with *P. aeruginosa*-related nosocomial disease. Patients who were impervious to any of the six anti-toxins (imipenem, meropenem, piperacillin-tazobactam, ciprofloxacin, amikacin, and ceftazidime) comprised the investigation gathering.

Results: One hundred and twenty disengages were disconnected. Different hazard factors were identified for every anti-infection in the univariate examination. In the multivariate investigation, past cefazolin utilize was found as an autonomous hazard factor for the advancement of imipenem opposition (OR = 3.33; CI 95% [1.11–10.0]; p = 0.03), while past cerebrovascular assault (OR = 3.57; CI 95% [1.31–9.76]; p = 0.01) and past meropenem use (OR = 4.13; CI 95% [1.21–14.07]; p = 0.02) were free factors for the improvement of meropenem obstruction. For the improvement of protection from ciprofloxacin, hospitalization in the nervous system science emergency unit (= 4.24; CI 95% [1.5–11.98]; p = 0.006) and mechanical ventilator application (OR = 11.7; CI 95% [2.24–61.45]; p = 0.004) were free hazard factors.

Conclusion: The fastidious use of contact measures can diminish the pace of nosocomial diseases.

1. Introduction

Nosocomial contaminations (NIs) or emergency clinic procured diseases can be transmitted from the medical clinic condition or social insurance staff to patients admitted to emergency clinics or medicinal services settings (1). NIs generally happen 48 hours after confirmation in the medical clinic or 30 days after release from the emergency clinic (2). Microorganisms are the most significant pathogens causing a wide scope of nosocomial diseases (3). Epidemiological examinations directed by WHO on five medical clinics of fourteen nations in Europe, Eastern Mediterranean, South-East Asia, and Western Pacific (4 WHO locales) demonstrated that at any rate 8.7% of the patients admitted to the emergency clinics had a nosocomial contamination (4). Additionally, more than 1.4 million individuals over the world are entangled with nosocomial contamination (5). As a rule, after the rise of contamination side effects, individuals start the utilization of anti-infection agents self-assertively, while through the trading of hereditary obstruction components by the microbes, the utilization of anti-microbials can grow new multi-medicate safe strains (6). While delicate microscopic organisms murdered by the anti-infection agents, safe ones endure and can be endemic in the emergency clinics and become an issue for the cure of patients and control of sicknesses (7, 8). Clinic contaminations and anti-toxin obstruction are various issues that have been accounted for worldwide throughout the years and lead to expensive and long haul treatment choices. Epidemiological investigations demonstrated that the danger of irresistible maladies had been risen relentlessly (9). Bacterial

operators, for example, *Staphylococcus* Spp., *Enterobacteriaceae*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and *Escherichia coli* are the most predominant microorganisms causing urinary tract disease (UTI) or pneumonia in the emergency clinics (9, 10). Gram-negative microorganisms for the most part represent 70 to 90 percent of the urinary tract diseases, from which *Escherichia coli* is the most predominant one (11). *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Proteus mirabilis*, *Acinetobacter baumannii*, and *Serratia* spp. are other Gram-negative microscopic organisms in this issue. Be that as it may, just 10% of the cases are brought about by gram-positive microscopic organisms, for example, enterococci, staphylococci, and streptococcus agalactiae (12). Bacterial meningitis (BM) is one of the most serious clinical contaminations with high mortality (13). Streptococcus pneumoniae is the most widely recognized reason for BM occurrence in medical clinics (14). *Acinetobacter baumannii*, which is found in soil and water, represents 80% of the detailed contaminations in Intensive Care Units (ICUs) of the educating and treatment emergency clinics (15). Also, *Bacteroides fragilis* is a gastrointestinal tract ordinary verdure, which, in blend with other microorganisms, can cause different diseases (16). Additionally, *Clostridium difficile* starting points colon irritation prompting the runs related with anti-toxins for the most part because of the evacuation of advantageous microscopic organisms (17). In this examination, we assessed the predominance of bacterial NIs and the anti-toxin opposition example of the microbes confined from hospitalized patients in

BO_ALI SINA educating and treatment medical clinic in the north of Iran.

2. Material and methods

Hospital Settings and Study Population

A review case-control study was led at Ankara Training and Research Hospital in Turkey between January 2008 and July 2011. The emergency clinic is a 670-bed referral and tertiary consideration medical clinic. The emergency clinic contains therapeutic and careful ICUs. Nervous system science, neurosurgery, and anesthesia-vivification ICUs with 31 absolute bed limit were remembered for the investigation.

Study Design and Data Collection

In the clinic, nosocomial contaminations in ICUs have been controlled by forthcoming, research facility based and quiet based dynamic observation since 2008. In the investigation, the pertinent reconnaissance information has been assessed to decide the hazard factors for safe *P. aeruginosa* related contaminations. Patients who experienced inpatient treatment in these ICUs and were analyzed as having *P. aeruginosa* related disease 48 hours subsequent to being hospitalized were remembered for the investigation. The patients with *P. aeruginosa* impervious to chose anti-infection agents were characterized as case gatherings and the patients with *P. aeruginosa* delicate to the related anti-infection were characterized as control gatherings.

A rundown of potential hazard factors incorporating the hazard factors in the medical clinic settings was shaped predictable with the applicable writing. The hazard factors were as per the following: sexual orientation, age, ICU type, *P. aeruginosa* as a reason for numerous destinations of diseases, being tainted with other safe microorganisms inside 30 days prior or simultaneously with *P. aeruginosa* contamination, presence of comorbid sicknesses, obtrusive methodology, anti-infection use, and different medications inside 30 days before the confinement of *P. aeruginosa*.

Microbiological Examination

All *P. aeruginosa* were separated from different clinical examples in the emergency clinic microbiology research center by traditional biochemical strategies. Intermittent disengages from a similar patient were rejected from the examination. The recognizable proof and anti-microbial susceptibilities of the confines were made by VITEK II computerized framework (Biomérieux, France) and the outcomes were deciphered by measures of Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) [15]. Halfway vulnerable segregates were viewed as helpless.

Definitions

Nosocomial contaminations were characterized by the criteria proposed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) [6]. The patients with nosocomial contamination because of safe (R) strains were contrasted and those with vulnerable (S) strains for the particular antimicrobial protections, that is, imipenem (IMP-R), meropenem (MEM-R), ceftazidime (CAZ-R), piperacillin-tazobactam (TZP-R), ciprofloxacin (CIP-R), and amikacin (AK-R). The hazard factors in nosocomial contaminations for antimicrobial protection from imipenem (IMP), meropenem (MEM), piperacillin-tazobactam (TZP), ceftazidime (CAZ), ciprofloxacin (CIP), and amikacin (AK) were assessed. After the hospitalization of the patients, anti-toxins that were taken 30 days before seclusion of *P. aeruginosa* and utilized for 48 hours and longer were characterized as past anti-microbial use. The passed time between the admission to ICU and disconnection of *P. aeruginosa* was characterized as the "chance period."

Statistical Analysis

The SPSS 15.0 program was utilized for measurable investigation. The Mann–Whitney U test was utilized to analyze two free gatherings. The Chi-square test was utilized to examine the absolute factors. Moreover, the various calculated relapse investigation was performed to decide free hazard factors that were compelling on being impervious to various anti-infection agents. Factors remembered for the model were controlled by utilizing univariate factual strategies in the multivariate examination. Factors with an importance level of $p < 0.05$ were contrasted and various strategic relapse examination. Numerous strategic relapse investigation results were condensed with chances proportions, 95% certainty interim, and p esteems. In the introduction of statistic information as unmistakable measurements, rates and recurrence were given in subjective factors, while medium (least greatest) or potentially mean \pm standard deviation were given in quantitative factors. $p < 0.05$ was viewed as noteworthy.

3. Findings

Out of 517 patients with bacterial positive culture result, 221 (42.7%) of them were male. The normal age of the patients was 45.77 ± 33.96 years (from 1-94-year-old). Most patients (35.4%) had a place with the agegroup of under twenty-year-old. The most widely recognized disconnected microbes in all societies were *Escherichia coli* (48.8%), *Staphylococcus epidermidis* (22.9%), and *Klebsiella pneumonia* (12%). The circulation of different microorganisms disconnected from bacterial societies has been appeared in Table 1.

Table 1: The correlation between the frequency of isolated bacteria and gender and age-groups.

| No. (%) of the isolated organisms | | <i>Escherichia coli</i> | <i>Staphylococcus epidermidis</i> | <i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> | <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> | <i>Staphylococcus saprophyticus</i> | <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> | <i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i> | <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i> | <i>Streptococcus viridans</i> | <i>Proteus mirabilis</i> | <i>Salmonella Spp.</i> | <i>Enterococcus Spp.</i> | <i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i> | Total |
|-----------------------------------|--------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| gender | Male | 95 (43) | 52 (23.5) | 28 (12.7) | 19 (8.6) | 13 (5.9) | 6 (2.7) | 3 (1.4) | 3 (1.4) | - | - | 1 (0.5) | - | 1 (0.5) | 221 (100) |
| | Female | 156 (52.7) | 67 (22.6) | 33 (11.1) | 22 (7.4) | 7 (2.4) | 2 (0.7) | 3 (1) | 1 (0.3) | 2 (0.7) | 2 (0.7) | - | 1 (0.3) | - | 296 (100) |
| Age-groups (years) | ≤20 | 91 (49.8) | 40 (21.9) | 18 (9.8) | 13 (7.1) | 11 (6.1) | 1 (0.5) | 5 (2.7) | 1 (0.5) | 2 (1.1) | - | - | - | 1 (0.5) | 183 (100) |
| | 21-40 | 5 (20.7) | 10 (41.7) | 3 (12.5) | 2 (8.3) | 1 (4.2) | 1 (4.2) | - | 1 (4.2) | - | - | - | 1 (4.2) | - | 24 (100) |
| | 41-60 | 25 (45.5) | 15 (27.3) | 5 (9.1) | 7 (12.7) | 1 (1.8) | 1 (1.8) | - | 1 (1.8) | - | - | - | - | - | 55 (100) |
| | 61-80 | 79 (49.1) | 39 (24.2) | 15 (9.3) | 13 (8.1) | 6 (3.8) | 4 (2.5) | 1 (0.6) | 1 (0.6) | - | 2 (1.2) | 1 (0.6) | - | - | 161 (100) |
| | ≥81 | 51 (54.2) | 15 (15.9) | 20 (21.3) | 6 (6.4) | 1 (1.1) | 1 (1.1) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 94 (100) |

Among the all microscopic organisms separated from the clinical examples, E. coli indicated the most noteworthy recurrence as 49.8%, 45.5%, 49.1% and 54.2% in the age-gatherings of under 20, 41-60, 61-80, and over 81 years, separately. Notwithstanding, in the age-gathering of 21-40 years, S. epidermidis was the most incessant pathogen

(41.7%). Point by point data about the recurrence of the detached microorganisms as far as sexual orientation and age-bunches is appear in table 1. The dissemination of urinary tract, circulation system and twisted diseases as far as age-bunches is additionally appeared in table 2.

Table 2: The distribution of urinary tract, bloodstream and wound infections in terms of agegroups.

| Type of infections | Urinary tract infection No. (%) | Bloodstream infection No. (%) | Wound infection No. (%) | Total |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Age-groups | | | | |
| ≤20 | 118 (22.8) | 43 (8.3) | 22 (4.3) | 183 (35.4) |
| 21-40 | 20 (3.9) | 3 (0.6) | 1 (0.2) | 24 (4.6) |
| 41-60 | 51 (9.9) | 2 (0.4) | 2 (0.4) | 55 (10.6) |
| 61-80 | 144 (27.9) | 16 (3.1) | 1 (0.2) | 161 (31.1) |
| ≥81 | 87 (16.8) | 5 (1) | 2 (0.4) | 94 (18.2) |
| Total | 420 (81.2) | 69 (13.3) | 28 (5.5) | 517 (100) |

The most elevated pace of contaminations in the emergency clinic wards (18.4%, 17.2% and 15.7%) were seen in inward medication, nervous system science and serious consideration units, separately. Escherichia coli was the most generally watched pathogen in the majority of the clinic wards,

however Staphylococcus epidermidis was increasingly visit in the oncology, obstetric and ophthalmology units. The recurrence of segregated creatures as far as medical clinic wards is appeared in table 3.

Table 3: The frequency of isolated bacteria in terms of hospital wards.

| No. of isolated organisms | <i>Escherichia coli</i> | <i>Staphylococcus epidermidis</i> | <i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> | <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> | <i>Staphylococcus saprophyticus</i> | <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> | <i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i> | <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i> | <i>Streptococcus viridans</i> | <i>Proteus mirabilis</i> | <i>Salmonella Spp.</i> | <i>Enterococcus Spp.</i> | <i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i> | Total |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|
| Internal medicine | 54 | 26 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| Neurology | 43 | 16 | 10 | 13 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| ICU | 31 | 13 | 20 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 |
| Emergency | 36 | 18 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 66 |
| Pediatric infectious | 30 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Pediatric surgery | 19 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 34 |
| NICU | 6 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Pediatrics | 13 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | | 22 |
| Neonates | 7 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| PICU | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Oncology | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Obstetrics | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| ENT | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| ophthalmology | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Total | 251 | 119 | 61 | 41 | 20 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 517 |

Abbreviations: ICU, Intensive Care Unit; NICU, New-born Intensive Care Unit; PICU, Post Intensive Care Unit; ENT, Ear, Nose & Throat.

Out of 517 bacterial-culture-positivesamples, 420 (81.2%), 69 (13.3%), and 28 (5.5%) of them were identified with urinary tract, circulatory system, and wound diseases. The most widely recognized bacterial pathogen which saw in urinary tract societies was *E. coli* (56.9%). *Staphylococcus epidermidis* was the most widely recognized life form segregated from circulatory system (26.1%) and wound diseases (28.6%). Insights concerning the commonness of microbes detached from various examples are appeared in the table 4.

Table 4: The frequency of bacteria isolated from urinary tract, bloodstream and wound infections

| Bacteria | Type of infections No. (%) | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | Urinary tract infection | Bloodstream infection | Wound infection |
| <i>Escherichia coli</i> | 239 (56.9%) | 7 (10.1%) | 5 (17.9%) |
| <i>Staphylococcus epidermidis</i> | 93 (22.1%) | 25(36.2%) | 11(39.3%) |
| <i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> | 42 (10%) | 15 (21.7%) | 4 (14.3%) |
| <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> | 31 (7.4%) | 9 (13.1%) | 1 (3.6%) |
| <i>Staphylococcus Saprophyticus</i> | 6 (1.4%) | 2 (2.9%) | 2 (7.1%) |
| <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> | 6 (1.4%) | - | 3 (10.7%) |
| <i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i> | - | 4 (5.8%) | 2 (7.1%) |
| <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i> | - | 3 (4.3%) | - |
| <i>Streptococcus viridans</i> | - | 2 (2.9%) | - |
| <i>Proteus mirabilis</i> | 2 (0.5%) | - | - |
| <i>Salmonella Spp.</i> | - | 1 (1.5%) | - |
| <i>Enterococcus faecalis</i> | 1 (0.2%) | - | - |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|----------|----|
| <i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i> | - | 1 (1.5%) | - |
| Total | 420 | 69 | 28 |

Escherichia coli demonstrated the most noteworthy opposition rate to ampicillin (88.7%) and cephalexin (74.2%). *Staphylococcus epidermidis*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, and *Acinetobacter baumannii* displayed the greatest anti-microbial obstruction rate against ampicillin (90.5%, 80%, 95.1%, 92.7%, and 75%), separately. Additionally, 100% of the clinical detaches of *Staphylococcus saprophyticus* were impervious to cephalexin and co-

trimoxazole. The most elevated affectability pace of *Staphylococcus epidermidis* clinical confines was appeared against amikacin (93.5%) and vancomycin (89.5%), while 93.1% of the *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* clinical detaches were vulnerable to imipenem. The anti-infection defenselessness examples of Gram-negative and Gram-positive disconnected microbes in this examination are appeared in table 5 and 6.

Table 5: Antibiotic susceptibility pattern of gram-negative bacteria

| Isolated organisms | Antibiotic susceptibility pattern | AMK | IMI | NAL | CRO | GEN | AMP | CEX | CAZ | SXT |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <i>E. coli</i> | R | 6.7% | 27.3% | 62.7% | 42.9% | 18.6% | 88.7% | 74.2% | 51.2% | 61.5% |
| | I | 29.3% | 3.6% | - | 2.3% | 8.1% | - | 3.2% | 4.9% | 7.7% |
| | S | 64% | 69.1% | 37.3% | 54.8% | 75.8% | 11.3% | 22.6% | 43.9% | 30.8% |
| <i>P. aeruginosa</i> | R | 3% | 3.4% | 37.9% | 17.1% | 10% | 36.4% | 37.5% | 21.7% | 63.6% |
| | I | - | 3.5% | - | - | 2.5% | 3% | 3.1% | - | - |
| | S | 97% | 93.1% | 62.1% | 82.9% | 87.5% | 60.6% | 59.4% | 78.3% | 36.4% |
| <i>K. pneumoniae</i> | R | 11.9% | 44% | 54% | 45.3% | 28.2% | 92.7% | 82.7% | 60% | 52.4% |
| | I | - | 2% | 2% | 2.7% | 7% | 1.8% | 1.9% | 2.2% | 9.5% |
| | S | 88.1% | 54% | 44% | 52% | 64.8% | 5.5% | 15.4% | 37.8% | 38.1% |
| <i>A. baumannii</i> | R | 4.5% | 22.2% | 47.4% | 25% | 12.9% | 75% | 50% | 35.7% | 4.5% |
| | I | - | - | 5.2% | 3.1% | - | - | - | - | - |
| | S | 95.5% | 77.8% | 47.4% | 71.9% | 87.1% | 25% | 50% | 64.3% | 95.5% |

Abbreviations: R, Resistance; I, intermediate; S, Sensitive; AMK, Amikacin; IMI, Imipenem; NAL, Nalidixic acid; CRO, Ceftriaxone; GEN, Gentamicin; AMP, Ampicillin; CEX, Cephalexin; CAZ, Ceftazidime; and SXT, Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole.

Table 6: Antibiotic susceptibility pattern of gram-positive bacteria.

| Isolated organisms | Antibiotic susceptibility pattern | AMK | CRO | GEN | AMP | CEX | CAZ | VAN | SXT |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <i>S. epidermidis</i> | R | 4.3% | 26.7% | 16.1% | 90.5% | 60% | 39.1% | 10.5% | 46.2% |
| | I | 2.2% | 1.6% | 8.1% | 7.1% | 2.2% | - | - | - |
| | S | 93.5% | 71.7% | 75.8% | 2.4% | 37.8% | 60.9% | 89.5% | 53.8% |
| <i>S. saprophyticus</i> | R | - | 25% | 9.1% | - | 100% | 33.3% | 12.5% | 100% |
| | I | - | - | 9.1% | - | - | - | - | - |
| | S | 100% | 75% | 81.8% | 100% | - | 66.7% | 87.5% | - |
| <i>S. aureus</i> | R | 4.8% | 28.9% | 16.7% | 95.1% | 75.9% | 39.1% | 6.5% | 66.7% |
| | I | - | 2.2% | 7.7% | - | 1.7% | 4.5% | - | 5.5% |
| | S | 95.2% | 68.9% | 75.6% | 4.9% | 22.4% | 56.4% | 93.5% | 27.8% |

Abbreviations: R, Resistance; I, intermediate; S, Sensitive; AMK, Amikacin; CRO, Ceftriaxone; GEN, Gentamicin; AMP, Ampicillin; CEX, Cephalexin; CAZ, Ceftazidime; VAN, Vancomycin; and SXT, Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole.

4. Discussion

The present examination is noteworthy as it is an extensive report that researches the hazard factors in safe *P. aeruginosa* contaminations in ICUs. Past investigations on carbapenem-safe *P. aeruginosa* (CR-Pa) contaminations have indicated that hospitalization in ICU is a significant hazard factor [16–18]. In the present examination, all patients were chosen from ICUs. Since the mean ICU remain was 112.7 ± 87.8 days, remaining in the ICU > 60 days was assessed as a hazard factor. ICU stay > 60 days was essentially higher in patients with MEM-RPa or with IMP-RPa when contrasted with patients with MEM-SPa or IMP-SPa. There was no huge connection between carbapenem opposition and kind of ICU. The univariate examination demonstrated a noteworthy relationship between's numerous disengagement of *P. aeruginosa* in a similar patient (repetitive contamination) just as polymicrobial disease and imipenem or meropenem obstruction. Anyway in multivariate investigations these factors were not distinguished as free hazard factors. Concentrates on carbapenem-safe Pa diseases have not regularly centered around these two hazard factors. The methods for time in danger (until the segregation of *P. aeruginosa*) were higher in both the imipenem and meropenem-safe gathering. Longer hazard periods increment the proportions of disease with safe microorganisms. The high pace of contamination history with another microorganism further supports this probability. Drawn out introduction to anti-infection agents in intermittent contaminations and the utilization of expansive range anti-infection agents in polymicrobial diseases were considered to lead the choice of safe microorganisms. Comparative investigations have demonstrated that the mean hazard time frame is fundamentally high in the imipenem-safe gathering [18, 19].

At the point when we assessed the connection between's hidden sicknesses and obstruction advancement, we didn't distinguish any critical comorbid maladies in imipenem-safe contaminations. In any case, the pace of cardiovascular maladies and history of SVO were essentially higher in the meropenem-safe gathering. History of SVO was recognized as an autonomous hazard factor for meropenem-safe *P. aeruginosa* diseases. We accept that the frequency of meropenem-safe strains expanded, since imipenem isn't favored because of its potential convulsive impact in patients with a focal sensory system (CNS) malady. Nonetheless, further investigations are required to help this connection. At the point when we analyzed the obtrusive methodology, TPN and NG catheterization were altogether higher in the imipenem-safe gathering, and TPN was fundamentally higher in the meropenem-safe gathering. Be that as it may, it was not recognized as an autonomous hazard factor in the multivariate investigation. As far as we could possibly know, there have been no investigations that have distinguished TPN and NG as free hazard factors for meropenem-or imipenem-safe *P. aeruginosa* diseases. Then again, a few investigations have connected hemodialysis, tracheostomy, blood vessel way, SVK, and MV to meropenem or imipenem obstruction [16–18, 20, 21].

In the assessment of past anti-infection use, the utilization of cefazolin, ceftazidime, meropenem, and amikacin inside 30 days before segregation was higher in the imipenem-safe

gathering. Then again, the multivariate investigation demonstrated that just cefazolin utilize was a free hazard factor. Univariate investigation in the meropenem-safe gathering demonstrated higher use paces of ceftazidime, meropenem, and amikacin; in any case, the multivariate examination indicated that just meropenem utilize was an autonomous hazard factor. Past examinations have distinguished past imipenem use as a free hazard factor for IMP-RPa contamination [16, 18, 21]. As indicated by an examination by Juan et al., the impacts of essential opposition rates in ICU and endemic clones are low, though optional obstruction rates (obstruction improvement during treatment) are high [22]. This condition features the significance of anti-toxin use and its viability in obstruction improvement. Cefazolin was favored all the more every now and again for careful prophylaxis in careful ICUs, contrasted with nonsurgical ICUs, and the distinctions in complete patient numbers (87 patients in AR-ICU and NRS-ICU and 30 patients in the NR-ICU) are believed to be liable for this result. Furthermore, MEM is favored more much of the time than IMP in NR-ICU. Comparable examinations on emergency clinic contaminations that are found by and large medical clinic populaces have not distinguished original cephalosporin use as a hazard factor for carbapenem opposition [18, 19]. Furtado et al. dissected the hazard factors in pneumonia cases with IMP-RPa and distinguished third-age cephalosporin use as an autonomous hazard factor [17]. Comparable investigations have likewise distinguished piperacillin-tazobactam use as a free hazard factor for the advancement of imipenem opposition, and this discovering was credited to the determination of strains with smothered beta-lactamase generation [16, 17, 19]. In the present investigation, ceftazidime and piperacillin-tazobactam use were essentially higher in both imipenem-safe and meropenem-safe gatherings, yet these components were not distinguished as free hazard factors.

The frequency of piperacillin-tazobactam safe *P. aeruginosa* (TZP-RPa) contaminations has expanded because of insufficient restraint of chromosomal beta lactamases by tazobactam; in any case, the frequency is lower contrasted with carbapenem-safe diseases [23]. In the United States, somewhere in the range of 1998 and 2004, TZP-RPa was recognized as a reason for disease in ICUs (17.5%), non-ICU offices (11.6%), and patients who get therapeutic consideration outside medical clinics (6%) [24]. TZP-RPa strains are answerable for 40% of all reasons for medical clinic contaminations in Turkey [25]. Like the past examinations in Turkey, we found that 44 of 120 *P. aeruginosa* strains (36.7%) strains were impervious to piperacillin-tazobactam. Various investigations on safe *P. aeruginosa* diseases have indicated that ICU stay is a significant hazard factor [26–28]. In the present investigation we grouped our patients as for the sort of ICU. We confirmed that remaining in the NR-ICU as an autonomous hazard factor for (TZP-RPa) diseases. The mean time of patients in NR-ICU was 67.9 ± 14.3 years and was higher contrasted with different ICUs. The mean APACHE II scores (at the hour of *P. aeruginosa* separation) and the mean hazard time frame (63.3 ± 49.1 days) were higher contrasted with different ICUs; in any case, the mean remain in NR-ICU patients (96.8 ± 61.8 days) was shorter. CVD as the essential conclusion of greater part of the patients and the higher

frequency of >2 comorbid illnesses bolster the finding that NR-ICU stay is an autonomous hazard factor. Among the intrusive mediations, TPN application had higher recurrence. The utilization of TZP, MEM, and CIP inside 30 days before disconnection was fundamentally higher in the TZP-RPa gathering. Until this point, considers have distinguished past utilization of piperacillin-tazobactam, imipenem, aminoglycosides, vancomycin, and third-age cephalosporins as autonomous hazard factors [27, 28]. Comparable investigations of emergency clinic diseases in similar settings have recognized the utilization of expansive range cephalosporins, ciprofloxacin, and fluoroquinolones inside 30 days before segregation as an autonomous hazard factor [26, 29, 30].

Concentrates on fluoroquinolone-safe *P. aeruginosa* (FQ-RPa) diseases have indicated that ICU stay is a significant hazard factor [26, 31, 32]. In the present investigation, we distinguished NR-ICU remain as a free hazard factor for the advancement of CIP-RPa diseases. As per the Medline database, there are no examinations that explore these hazard factors in fluoroquinolone-safe *P. aeruginosa* diseases [32, 33]. In the present examination, the univariate investigation indicated a critical connection between'spolymicrobial contaminations with different microorganisms at the hour of *P. aeruginosa* confinement and CIP-RPa. Two examinations have demonstrated that polymicrobial bacteremia isn't a hazard factor for antipseudomonal FQ-RPa related bacteremia [26, 29]. Among the obtrusive intercessions, specialist ventilation was recognized as a free hazard factor. Two investigations have distinguished urinary catheterization and obtrusive methods inside 72 hours before bacteremia advancement as free hazard factors for the improvement of CIP-RPa bacteremia [26, 29]. In another examination, tracheostomy and chemotherapy have been distinguished as autonomous hazard factors for the advancement of ciprofloxacin-and imipenem-safe diseases [32]. In this investigation, earlier utilization of MEM inside 30 days before segregation was distinguished as a hazard factor. Ciprofloxacin utilize was higher in the safe gathering, however this discovering was not measurably critical. Comparable examinations have distinguished past utilization of fluoroquinolones as an autonomous hazard factor for the improvement of CIP-RPa contaminations [29–31, 34]. Lee et al. discovered that past levofloxacin use is a free hazard factor for *P. aeruginosa* emergency clinic contaminations, however they didn't decide a huge relationship between's past ciprofloxacin use [35]. Then again, two unique examinations distinguished a critical connection between's past carbapenem and fluoroquinolone use and obstruction advancement [26, 36]. In the present examination, ciprofloxacin utilize was higher in the safe gathering, yet this discovering was not measurably noteworthy.

As per the Medline database, there are just a predetermined number of epidemiological examinations on aminoglycoside obstruction of *P. aeruginosa*. In the present examination, the univariate investigation of hazard factors that favored AK-RPa contaminations demonstrated that ICU stay > 60 days, thoracotomy tube, and earlier meropenem use were essentially higher in the safe gathering. Among these hazard factors, we distinguished the thoracotomy tube as a free hazard factor. As far as we could possibly know, there are no past examinations that explored the use of a thoracotomy tube as a potential hazard factor. As indicated by an examination on

chance factors in AK-RPa related bacteremia, the utilization of fluoroquinolones inside 90 days before seclusion, urinary catheterization, and percutaneous catheterization are free hazard factors [29]. Another examination demonstrated that hazard factors that lead to gentamicin obstruction in *P. aeruginosa*, past gentamicin use, and different anti-microbial use are free hazard factors [37]. Another investigation demonstrated that past utilization of meropenem and amikacin is autonomous hazard factors for AK-RPa [37]. Past utilization of first and third-age cephalosporins and piperacillin is free hazard factors for CAZ-RPa contaminations in a comparative report [35]. Fortaleza et al. discovered that past amikacin use is a free hazard factor for the advancement of CAZ-RPa diseases [18]. In the present examination NR-ICU stay was the main free hazard factor for the improvement of CAZ-RPa. The hidden reasons for NR-ICU stay being an autonomous hazard factor were referenced in the area of TZP-RPa. Similar causes are additionally free hazard factors for the advancement of CAZ-RPa. Also, we found a critical relationship between'spolymicrobial diseases before disengagement of *P. aeruginosa* and the improvement of CAZ-RPa. In a comparable report, polymicrobial disease isn't a hazard factor for the advancement of CAZ-RPa; be that as it may, it is an autonomous hazard factor for mortality [29]. Comorbid cardiovascular illnesses and decubitus ulcer were critical for the advancement of CAZ-RPa diseases. Cardiovascular maladies (92.1%) were the most well-known comorbid illness in the safe gathering. Two examinations on chance factors that influence the improvement of protection from antipseudomonal anti-infection agents in *P. aeruginosa* related bacteremia have distinguished strong tumors as the most widely recognized basic infection; be that as it may, this was not distinguished as a hazard factor [26, 29]. A portion of the past examinations have shown that urinary catheterization, percutaneous catheterization, and intrusive mediation inside 72 hours before seclusion are free hazard factors [34] despite what might be expected of this investigation. We discovered that obtrusive methods and therapeutic mediations were not chance components for the advancement of ceftazidime obstruction. A portion of the past examinations have exhibited that urinary catheterization, percutaneous catheterization, and intrusive intercession inside 72 hours before disengagement are free hazard factors [29]. The recurrence of careful tasks in the ceftazidime-delicate gathering was essentially higher contrasted with the ceftazidime-safe gathering.

The powerful treatment of diseases brought about by *P. aeruginosa* incorporates counteractive action whenever the situation allows and source control quantifies as important and brief organization of suitable antimicrobial operators. In the event that antimicrobial susceptibilities are known, deescalation ought to be sought after in patients particularly with a suitable clinical reaction. Hand cleanliness and obstruction safety measures are imperative to keep the spread of disease in ICUs. Along these lines observation is significant in giving helpful data to doctors in picking exact anti-toxins [38–40].

5. Conclusion:

Nosocomial diseases become a difficult issue for the medicinal services framework everywhere throughout the world. Data about an alternate part of NIs can assist emergency clinic with staffing and doctors to better disease

control. Early acknowledgment of diseases with legitimate contamination control methods can altogether diminish the occurrence of nosocomial contaminations. Different investigations have indicated that anti-infection obstruction designs are diverse in divergent districts, and by knowing the

best choice for defeating pathogens, we can strikingly lessen the pervasiveness of NIs. Expanding the anti-infection obstruction can be an indication of ill-advised utilization of anti-toxins, showing the requirement for more thoughtfulness regarding it.

References

- Garner JS, Jarvis WR, Emori TG, Horan TC, Hughes JM. CDC definitions for nosocomial infections, 1988. *American journal of infection control*. 1988;16(3):128-40.
- Yesilbağ Z, Karadeniz A, Başaran S, Kaya FÖ. Nosocomial infections and risk factors in intensive care unit of a university hospital. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Investigations*. 2015;6(3).
- Eickhoff TC. Airborne nosocomial infection: a contemporary perspective. *Infection Control & Hospital Epidemiology*. 1994;15(10):663-72.
- Mulu W, Abera B, Yimer M, Hailu T, Ayele H, Abate D. Bacterial agents and antibiotic resistance profiles of infections from different sites that occurred among patients at DebreMarkos Referral Hospital, Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. *BMC research notes*. 2017;10(1):254.
- Mayon-White R, Duce G, Kereselidze T, Tikomirov E. An international survey of the prevalence of hospital-acquired infection. *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 1988;11:43-8.
- Jepsen OB, Mortensen N. Prevalence of nosocomial infection and infection control in Denmark. *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 1980;1(3):237-44.
- deFreireBastosMdC, Coelho MLV, da Silva Santos OC. Resistance to bacteriocins produced by Gram-positive bacteria. *Microbiology*. 2015;161(4):683-700.
- Mak S, Xu Y, Nodwell JR. The expression of antibiotic resistance genes in antibiotic-producing bacteria. *Molecular microbiology*. 2014;93(3):391-402.
- Hormozi SF, Vasei N, Aminianfar M, Darvishi M, Saeedi AA. Antibiotic resistance in patients suffering from nosocomial infections in Besat Hospital. *European journal of translational myology*. 2018;28(3).
- Frieri M, Kumar K, Boutin A. Antibiotic resistance. *Journal of infection and public health*. 2017;10(4):369-78.
- Kliegman R, Behrman, RE, Jenson, HB Stanton, BMD Nelson's Text Book of Pediatrics. 2004.
- Shaikh N, Morone NE, Bost JE, Farrell MH. Prevalence of urinary tract infection in childhood: a meta-analysis. *The Pediatric infectious disease journal*. 2008;27(4):302-8.
- Mirecka A. Etiological agents of bacterial meningitis in adults and antibiotic susceptibility of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* isolated between 2009-2016 from patients of Regional Specialist Hospital of DrWł. Biegański in Łódź. *Przegląd epidemiologiczny*. 2018;72(3):313-24.
- Darvishi M. Antibiotic resistance pattern of uropathogenic methicillin resistant staphylococcus aureus isolated from immunosuppressive patients with pyelonephritis. *Journal of Pure and Applied Microbiology*. 2016;10(4):2663-8.
- Joshi SG, Litake GM. Acinetobacterbaumannii: An emerging pathogenic threat to public health. *World Journal of Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2013;3(3):25-36.
- Tolera M, Abate D, Dheresa M, Marami D. Bacterial Nosocomial Infections and Antimicrobial Susceptibility Pattern among Patients Admitted at HiwotFana Specialized University Hospital, Eastern Ethiopia. *Advances in medicine*. 2018;2018.
- Khan HA, Baig FK, Mehboob R. Nosocomial infections: Epidemiology, prevention, control and surveillance. *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Biomedicine*. 2017;7(5):478-82.
- Koneman E, Allen S, Janda W, Schreckenberger P, Winn Jr W. Antimicrobial susceptibility testing. *Color atlas and textbook of diagnostic microbiology*. 1997;5:787-856.
- Wayne P. Clinical and laboratory standards institute. Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing. 2011.
- Horan T. C., Andrus M., Dudeck M. A. CDC/NHSN surveillance definition of health care-associated infection and criteria for specific types of infections in the acute care setting. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2008;36(5):309-332. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2008.03.002. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
- National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards. *Approved Standard*. M100-S20. National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards; 2010. Methods for the dilution antimicrobial susceptibility tests for bacteria that grow aerobically. [Google Scholar]
- Onguru P., Erbay A., Bodur H., et al. Imipenem-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*: risk factors for nosocomial infections. *Journal of Korean Medical Science*. 2008;23(6):982-987. doi: 10.3346/jkms.2008.23.6.982. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
- Furtado G. H. C., Bergamasco M. D., Menezes F. G., et al. Imipenem-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infection at a medical-surgical intensive care unit: risk factors and mortality. *Journal of Critical Care*. 2009;24(4):625.e9-625.e14. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2009.03.006. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
- Fortaleza C. M. C. B., Freire M. P., Filho D. C. M., Ramos M. C. Risk factors for recovery of imipenem- or ceftazidime-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* among patients admitted to a teaching hospital in Brazil. *Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology*. 2006;27(9):901-906. doi: 10.1086/507288. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
- Harris A. D., Smith D., Johnson J. A., Bradham D. D., Roghmann M.-C. Risk factors for imipenem-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* among hospitalized patients. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2002;34(3):340-345. doi: 10.1086/338237. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
- Eagye K. J., Kuti J. L., Nicolau D. P. Risk factors and outcomes associated with isolation of meropenem high-level-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Infection Control and Hospital Epidemiology*. 2009;30(8):746-752. doi: 10.1086/603527. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
- Zavascki A. P., Cruz R. P., Goldani L. Z. Risk factors for imipenem-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*: a comparative analysis of two case-control studies in hospitalized patients. *Journal of Hospital Infection*. 2005;59(2):96-101. doi: 10.1016/j.jhin.2004.09.007. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
- Juan C., Gutierrez O., Oliver A., Ayestarán J. I., Borrell N., Pérez J. L. Contribution of clonal dissemination and selection of mutants during therapy to *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* antimicrobial resistance in an intensive care unit setting. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*. 2005;11(11):887-

892. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2005.01251.x. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
29. Djordjevic Z., Gajovic O., Mijailovic Z., Ilic A., Stolic R. Risk factors of nosocomial infections caused by piperacillin-tazobactam resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Srpski Arhiv za Celokupno Lekarstvo*. 2013;141(9-10):640–647. doi: 10.2298/sarh1310640d. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
30. National Nosocomial Infections Surveillance (NNIS) System Report, data summary from January 1992 through June 2004, issued October 2004. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2004;32(8):470–485. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2004.10.001. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
31. Gençer S., Ak Ö., Benzonana N., Batirel A., Özer S. Susceptibility patterns and cross resistances of antibiotics against *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in a teaching hospital of Turkey. *Annals of Clinical Microbiology and Antimicrobials*. 2002;1, article 2 doi: 10.1186/1476-0711-1-2. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
32. Kang C.-I., Kim S.-H., Park W. B., et al. Risk factors for antimicrobial resistance and influence of resistance on mortality in patients with bloodstream infection caused by *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Microbial Drug Resistance*. 2005;11(1):68–74. doi: 10.1089/mdr.2005.11.68. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
33. Harris A. D., Perencevich E., Roghmann M.-C., Morris G., Kaye K. S., Johnson J. A. Risk factors for piperacillin-tazobactam-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* among hospitalized patients. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy*. 2002;46(3):854–858. doi: 10.1128/aac.46.3.854-858.2002. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
34. Patel N., McNutt L.-A., Lodise T. P. Relationship between various definitions of prior antibiotic exposure and piperacillin-tazobactam resistance among patients with respiratory tract infections caused by *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy*. 2008;52(8):2933–2936. doi: 10.1128/aac.00456-08. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
35. Joo E.-J., Kang C.-I., Ha Y. E., et al. Risk factors for mortality in patients with *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* bacteremia: clinical impact of antimicrobial resistance on outcome. *Microbial Drug Resistance*. 2011;17(2):305–312. doi: 10.1089/mdr.2010.0170. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
36. López-Dupla M., Martínez J.-A., Vidal F., et al. Previous ciprofloxacin exposure is associated with resistance to β -lactam antibiotics in subsequent *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* bacteremic isolates. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2009;37(9):753–758. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2009.02.003. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
37. Gasink L. B., Fishman N. O., Weiner M. G., Nachamkin I., Bilker W. B., Lautenbach E. Fluoroquinolone-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*: assessment of risk factors and clinical impact. *The American Journal of Medicine*. 2006;119(6):526.e19–526.e25. doi: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2005.11.029. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
38. Mueller M. R., Hayden M. K., Fridkin S. K., et al. Nosocomial acquisition of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* resistant to both ciprofloxacin and imipenem: a risk factor and laboratory analysis. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*. 2008;27(7):565–570. doi: 10.1007/s10096-008-0475-9. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
39. Hsu D. I., Okamoto M. P., Murthy R., Wong-Beringer A. Fluoroquinolone-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*: risk factors for acquisition and impact on outcomes. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*. 2005;55(4):535–541. doi: 10.1093/jac/dki026. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
40. Gasink L. B., Zaoutis T. E., Bilker W. B., Lautenbach E. The categorization of prior antibiotic use: impact on the identification of risk factors for drug resistance in case control studies. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 2007;35(10):638–642. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2007.01.011. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]