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**Analysis the Antibiogram Profiles of Biofilm Forming *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli***

**ABSTRACT**

**Background and Objectives:**Bacteria attach to surfaces and produce polymeric matrix resulting in the formation of biofilms that are involved in a wide range of human infections. Biofilms forming that produced by *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli* are considered to be highly resistant to antibiotics.This study was aimed to analysis

****

 and bacterial biofilm production (*P-value*< 0.05). The rates of antibiotics resistance biofilm *E. coli* were 100%, 91.7%,75%, 70.8%, 66.7%, 62.5% and 33.3%for amoxicillin/clavulanic acid, cefadroxil, cefotaxime, ceftazidime, ceftriaxone, ciprofloxacin and co-trimoxazole respectively with statistically significant correlation of cefadroxil resistance (*P-value* < 0.05).**Conclusion:**TCP method showed that *S. aureus* and *E. coli* isolates have high degree of biofilm forming ability. A high antibiotics resistance was observed in biofilm producers than non-biofilm producers.
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**INTRODUCTION**

 *Staphylococcus aureus* (*S. aureus*) and *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) are the most common etiologicalagent causing bothcommunity and hospital‑acquired infections7,8.*E. coli*infections leading to serioussecondary health issues worldwideand tends to form microcolonies in mucosalining of urinary bladder known as biofilm8. Thesebiofilms make the bacterium to resist the host immuneresponse, more virulent and lead to the evolution ofantibiotics resistance by enclosing them in anextracellular biochemical matrix9.The ability of *S. aureus* to form biofilm is considered to be a major virulence factor influencing its survival and persistence in both the environment and the host10.*S. aureus* biofilms have been associated with a variety of persistent infections which respond poorly to conventional antibiotic therapy 11.





The antibiotics were used in this study included; Ciprofloxacin (….µg), Co-trimoxazole (….µg), Ceftriaxone (….µg), Cefotaxime (….µg), Amoxicillin/clavulanic acid (….µg), Amikacin (….µg), Cefadroxil (….µg), and Ceftazidime (….µg).

**Biofilm formation detection by tissue culture plate (TCP) method**

Quantitative TCP method was performed as described by Yadav et al.14. In briefly, subcultures of the isolates in nutrient agar were inoculated in

10mL of trypticase soy broth with 1% glucose and incubated for 24 hours at 37ºC, then the cultures were diluted 1:100 with fresh medium. The wells of sterile 96 polystyrene microtiter plates were filled with 0.2ml aliquots of the diluted cultures. Negative control wells were maintained by adding broth without culture. After incubation for 24 hours at 37ºC, the wells removed by gentle tapping and washed with 0.2mL phosphate buffer saline (pH 7.3) three times to remove free floating planktonic bacteria. Thewells then were dried for 1 hour and stained with crystal violet (0.1% w/v) and the excess stains removed using deionized water, then the plates were kept for drying. Quantitative analysis of biofilm production was performed by adding 150μl of 95% ethanol to destain each well. After 30 min, optical density (OD) of stained adherent biofilm was obtained by using microtiter plate ELISA reader at wave length 630 nm. The experiment was done in triplicate and repeated three times.Optical density cut-off value (ODc) calculated as average OD of negative control + 3x standard deviation (SD) of negative control.The bacterial species tested were classified into four categories as follows: OD ≤ ODc no biofilm producer; ODc< OD ≤ 2 x ODc weak biofilm producer; 2 x ODc< OD ≤ 4 x ODc moderate biofilm producer; 4 x ODc< OD strong biofilm producer.

**Statistical analysis**

****

**RESULTS**

**Biofilm detection by tissue culture plate (TCP) method**

TCP method detected strong biofilm formation in 33(55%%) as ~~strong~~, 15(25%) as moderate and 12(25%) as weak/non-biofilm producers.Among *S. aureus* isolates, 18 were strong biofilm producers, 6isolates were moderate biofilm producers and 6 isolates were weak/non-biofilm producers. Of *E. coli* isolates showed 15were strong biofilm producers, 9isolates were moderate biofilm producers, and 6 isolates were weak/non-biofilm producers ~~andweak/non-biofilm producers isolates identified in 6 isolates~~. ~~There was no significant statistical analysis of TCP method for screening biofilm production (~~*~~P-value~~* ~~= 1.000) as shown in table (1~~).

**Table (1): Analysis of *S. aureus* and *E. coli* for biofilm formation by TCP method**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Biofilm formation by TCP method | χ² test value | *P-value* |
| Result | No. (%) |
| Strong | 33 (55) | 0.00 | 1.000 |
| Moderate | 15 (25) |
| Weak/None | 12 (20) |
| Total | 60 (20) |

**Relationship theantibiogram profiles with biofilm and non-biofilm producing *S. aureus* and *E. coli***

Among 60 *S. aureus* and *E. coli* isolates, biofilm producers isolates by TCP method showed high resistance rates to antibiotics used compared to non-biofilm producers isolates.*S. aureus* biofilm producing isolates found highly resistant to amoxicillin/clavulanic acid, ceftazidime, cefotaxime, cefadroxil, ciprofloxacin and ceftriaxone in a rate of 100%, 95.8%, 62.5%, 45.8%, 41.7% and 25% respectively. There was significant statistical correlation of antibiotic resistance of amoxicillin/clavulanic acidand ceftazidime and bacterial biofilm production (*P-value*< 0.05)as show in table (2).

**Table (2). Antibiogram profiles of biofilm and non-biofilm producing *S. aureus***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Antibiotic | Biofilm producer24(80%) | Non-biofilm producer6(20%) | χ² test value | P-value |
| S | I | R | S | I | R |
| Ciprofloxacin | 14 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0.139 | 0.709 |
| Co-trimoxazole | 22 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0.536 | 0.464 |
| Ceftriaxone | 8 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0.590 | 0.745 |
| Cefotaxime | 2 | 7 | 15 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4.766 | 0.092 |
| Amoxicillin/clavulanic acid | 0 | 0 | 24 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.138 | 0.042\* |
| Amikacin | 19 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1.500 | 0.472 |
| Cefadroxil | 5 | 8 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2.149 | 0.342 |
| Ceftazidime | 0 | 1 | 23 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 8.704 | 0.013\* |

\**P-value*< 0.05 is considered statistically significant

Biofilm producing *E. coli* isolates had increased resistance profiles of the antibiotics amoxicillin/clavulanic acid, cefadroxil, cefotaxime, ceftazidime, ceftriaxone, ciprofloxacinand co-trimoxazole, 100%, 91.7%, 75%, 70.8%, 66.7%, 62.5% and 33.3% respectively with significant statistical correlation of antibiotic resistance of cefadroxil (*P-value* < 0.05)as show in table (3).

**Table (3). Antibiogram profiles of biofilm and non-biofilm producing *E. coli***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Antibiotic | Biofilm producer24(80%) | Non-biofilm producer6(20%) | χ² test value | *P-value* |
| S | I | R | S | I | R |
| Ciprofloxacin | 8 | 1 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2.304 | 0.316 |
| Co-trimoxazole | 16 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0.00 | 0.694 |
| Ceftriaxone | 6 | 2 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2.222 | 0.329 |
| Cefotaxime | 5 | 1 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1.875 | 0.392 |
| Amoxicillin/clavulanic acid | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 6 | - | - |
| Amikacin | 18 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0.379 | 0.827 |
| Cefadroxil | 2 | 0 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 10.208 | 0.007\* |
| Ceftazidime | 5 | 2 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0.967 | 0.617 |

\**P-value*< 0.05 is considered statistically significant

**DISCUSSION**











**CONCLUSION**
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