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**ABSTRACT**

**Background and Objective:** *Escherichia coli* is one of the most common causes of hospital-acquired infections. Extended-spectrum β-lactamase (ESBL)-producing *E. coli* strains are resistant to third-generation cephalosporins. The three main genes involved in ESBL production are TEM, SHV and CTX-M. Detection of ESBL-producing *E. coli* is of importance for infection control, reduction of excessive antibiotic use and epidemiological surveillance. This study aimed to detect ESBL-producing *E. coli* strains isolated from wound infections using phenotypic and molecular methods.

**Methods:** During 2013-2015, 86 strains were collected from three hospitals in Isfahan, Iran. Antibiotic susceptibility testing was done using ceftazidime and ceftazidime + clavulanic acid discs. Polymerase chain reaction was used for the detection of the three resistance genes.

**Results:** The resistance genes SHV, CTX-M and TEM were detected in 49 isolates (56.9%). In addition, 39 isolates (45%) were ESBL-producing strains. According to the results, 5 (5.8%), 14 (16.2%), 19 (22%) and 11 (12.7%) isolates contained the SHV, CTX-M, TEM and CTX-M + TEM genes, respectively. The frequency of CTX and TEM were significantly higher than that of SHV gene (P<0.05). Most of the isolated bacteria were resistant to cefazolin and sensitive to nitrofurantoin.

**Conclusions:** There is a difference between the frequency of ESBL-positive isolates reported in the phenotypic and genotypic methods, which could be due to the lower sensitivity of the phenotypic method and impact of environmental factors on the emergence of antibiotic resistance.
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INTRODUCTION
Bacterial causes of wound infections vary in different geological locations (1). Although *Escherichia coli* is a common commensal gastrointestinal tract bacterium that contributes in the maintenance of human health, it is one of the most common causes of both community- and hospital-acquired infections such as bacteremia, meningitis, wound infection and urinary tract infection (1-3). Indiscriminate use of antibiotics has increased the prevalence of antibiotic resistance among bacteria (4). Factors such as interconnected travel, horizontal gene transfer and bacterial evolution increase the global burden of diseases caused by antibiotic-resistant pathogens (5). B-lactam antibiotics are the most widely used class of antimicrobial agents for treatment of bacterial infections (6). Resistance of pathogenic bacteria and particularly Gram-negative bacteria to β-lactam antibiotics has become a worldwide problem (7). Production of extended-spectrum β-lactamases (ESBLs) is a significant resistance-mechanism that impedes the antimicrobial treatment of infections caused by *Enterobacteriaceae* (6). According to the Ambler scheme, β-lactamases are divided into four classes (A, B, C and D) (8). ESBL-producing *Enterobacteriaceae* causes more severe infections compared to non-ESBL-producing *Enterobacteriaceae* (9). The main mechanism of function in class A ESBLs is hydrolysis penicillins, cephalosporins (except cephemycins) and monobactams (6). *TEM, SHV* and *CTX-M* are the main ESBL-encoding genes. Bacterial cells containing the *SHV* gene are resistant to broad-spectrum penicillins such as piperacillin and ampicillin but not to the oxyimino substituted cephalosporins and tigecycline. Bacteria containing the *TEM* gene are resistant to penicillins and first-generation cephalosporins but sensitive to oxyimino cephalosporin. In addition, the *CTX-M* gene is associated with cefotaxime resistance. There is no direct correlation between the *TEM* or *SHV* β-lactamases and *CTX-M*. *CTX-M*-type β-lactamases hydrolyze cephalothin or cephloridine better than benzyl penicillin, and they preferentially hydrolyze cefotaxime over ceftazidime (8). Detection of ESBL-producing *E. coli* is important for infection control, reduction of excessive antibiotic use and epidemiological surveillance (10). Different phenotypic or genotypic methods are used for the detection of ESBL-producing *E. coli* (11). The aim of this study was to detect antibiotic resistance genes (*TEM, SHV* and *CTX-M*) in *E. coli* strains isolated from wound infections using the phenotypic and genotypic methods.

MATERIAL AND METHODS
Overall, 86 isolates were collected from three hospitals in Isfahan during January 2013-February 2015. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of University of Isfahan, Iran. Basic clinical data for each patient was collected. Wound specimens were collected with sterile swabs and then transferred to laboratory in sterile containers. Pus samples were cultured in blood and BHI agar media, and then incubated aerobically at 37°C for 24 hours.

Biochemical assays (urease, indole, oxidase, citrate, methyl red, Voges-Proskauer, and lactose fermentation on triple sugar iron agar) and motility test were performed on pure clones of the isolates (12).

Antimicrobial susceptibility of the isolates was evaluated against various antibiotics (Table 1) using the Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion method according to guidelines from the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (2012) (13). ESBL production was confirmed by inhibition zone diameter of ≥ 5 mm for the combination disc (ceftazidime + clavulanic acid (30 μg/10 μg) compared with the ceftazidime disc alone (13).

DNA was extracted according to a method described previously (12). Resistance genes (*SHV, TEM,* and *CTX-M*) and maltose/maltodextrin transporter ATP-binding gene (specific for *E. coli* species) were detected by PCR (14-17). Randomly selected PCR products were sequenced (Macrogen, South Korea). The sequences were registered on GenBank with the following accession numbers: KT321529 (*TEM*), KT321528 (*SHV*), KT321527 (*CTX-M*), and KT321531 (*E. coli*).

GraphPad Prism software (version 6.1, GraphPad Software Inc., USA) and Fisher’s exact test were used for statistical analysis.
RESULTS

The SHV, TEM, CTX-M and maltose/maltodextrin transporter ATP-binding genes were detected by PCR (Figure 1). According to the results of the antibiogram test, most bacteria were resistant to cefazolin while sensitive to nitrofurantoin (Table 1). The frequency of CTX-M and TEM were significantly higher than that of SHV (P <0.05). However, there was no statistically significant difference in the frequency of CTX-M and TEM. In addition, no bacteria contained SHV and CTX-M, SHV and TEM or all 3 genes at the same time. The highest frequency for the resistance genes (78.94%) was observed in bacterial strains isolated from surgical wounds (Table 2).

Of 86 E. coli isolates, 39 were ESBL-producing strains (45%) isolated from diabetic foot, bedsore (13), surgical wound (14) and miscellaneous wound (2) samples. Among the 39 ESBL-producing E. coli, 32 (82%) carried one or two ESBL genes. However, seven ESBL-producing isolates contained no resistance genes. Moreover, 17 non-ESBL-producing isolates contained the resistance genes (Table 2).

### Table 1 - Results of antimicrobial susceptibility testing and screening of E. coli/isolates for ESBL production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibiotic disc</th>
<th>Pattern of antimicrobial susceptibility</th>
<th>β-Lactamase inhibitor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitive %</td>
<td>Intermediate %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amikacin (30 µg)</td>
<td>10 / 11.6</td>
<td>16 / 18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefotaxime (30 µg)</td>
<td>44 / 51.1</td>
<td>9 / 10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefuroxime (30 µg)</td>
<td>40 / 46.5</td>
<td>9 / 10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefazolin (5 µg)</td>
<td>43 / 50</td>
<td>3 / 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aztreonam (30 µg)</td>
<td>6 / 6.9</td>
<td>3 / 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetracycline (30 µg)</td>
<td>27 / 31.3</td>
<td>5 / 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrofurantoin (300 µg)</td>
<td>57 / 66.2</td>
<td>8 / 9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftazidime/Clavulanate</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Number of isolates

### Table 2 - Frequency of resistance genes in bacteria isolated from different types of wounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wound</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>SHV</th>
<th>CTX-M</th>
<th>TEM</th>
<th>SHV &amp; CTX-M</th>
<th>SHV &amp; TEM</th>
<th>CTX-M &amp; TEM</th>
<th>SHV &amp; CTX-M &amp; TEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diabetic foot infection</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59-78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedsore</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19-89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical wounds</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30-75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18-61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3 - Frequency of SHV, CTX-Mand TEMin ESBL-producing E. coli in our study and some other studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of isolates tested</th>
<th>SHV</th>
<th>CTX-M</th>
<th>TEM</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Our study)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (North)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Tehran)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This could be due to the difference in the source of samples tested in the two studies. In study of Etok et al. in Nigeria, all E. coli isolates from wound infections were ESBL-producing strains (21). In study of Islam et al. the frequency of ESBL-producing isolates was 55% (22). Based on our findings, the frequency of ESBL-producing E. coli strains isolated from wound infections was 63.7%. The high frequency of these bacterial strains could complicate the treatment of wound infections.

The frequency of the SHV, CTX-M and TEM genes in the ESBL-producing E. coli was 12.8%, 38.4% and 51.3%, respectively. Frequency of CTX-M and TEM was nearly the same, while the frequency of SHV was lower compared to frequency rates reported in study of Rezai et al. on 100 ESBL-producing E. coli strains isolated from wound infections in north of Iran (23). This indicates that the frequency of the genes differs in areas of Iran. Differences in frequencies of these genes in other countries (Table 3), highlights the importance of the study of varied genes in different geographical locations. In addition, international travel may play an important role in worldwide spread of multidrug-resistant E. coli. In the present study, we determined the resistance rate of isolates to amikacin (69.7%), cefepime (38.3%), cefotaxime (81.3%),...
ceftazidime (43%), levofloxacin (46.5%), cefazolin (89.5%), aztreonam (61.6%), tetracycline (62.7%), nalidixic acid (73.2%) and nitrofurantoin (24.4%). A similar study in north of Iran reported that 38.1%, 21.4%, 14% and 19% of the E. coli strains isolated from children with diarrhea were resistant to tetracycline, cefotaxime, ceftazidime and aztreonam, respectively (23).

The lower resistance rates reported by the mentioned study in comparision with our study could be due to the difference in source of sampling. In study of Mendonca et al. in Portugal, 91%, 93% and 89% of isolates were resistant to ceftazidime, quinolones and aminoglycoside, respectively, which are much higher than the resistance rates found in our study. This could be related to different antibiotics use policies (19).
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CONCLUSION

Compared to previous studies, our findings demonstrate that resistance to the third generation cephalosporins may have been increased, especially during last decade. The deference between results of the phenotypic and genotypic methods indicates the higher sensitivity of the genotypic method. It is recommended continuously monitoring antibiotic resistance patterns, and utilizing molecular method for the detection of ESBL-positive strains.
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