The antibiotic susceptibilities of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus Aureus strains isolated from various clinical samples
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ABSTRACT

Objective: In this study, it was aimed to determine the in vitro susceptibilities of Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) strains to fluoroquinolone, linezolid, tigecycline, and quinupristin/dalfopristin as well as the macrolide-lincosamide-streptogramin B (MLSB) resistance phenotype.

Materials and Methods: A total of 94 MRSA strains isolated from various clinical samples in our hospital laboratory between January 2020 and September 2020 were included. The in-vitro susceptibilities of MRSA strains against fluoroquinolone, linezolid, tigecycline, and quinupristin/dalfopristin were determined by Kirby-Bauer disc diffusion assay according to The European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST). The E test assay was used for evaluation of tigecycline susceptibility. The D-zone test was performed with erythromycin (15 μg) and clindamycin (2 μg) discs to determine the MLSB resistance. Besides, bacterial identification, antibiotic susceptibility tests including methicillin resistance and MLSB phenotype determination were performed by using VITEK 2 Gram-positive diagnostic kits (Bio-Mérieux/France).

Results: Among 94 MRSA strains included, resistance rates to ciprofloxacin, moxifloxacin, tigecycline, and quinupristin/dalfopristin were found as 71% (67 isolates) 64% (60 isolates), 17% (16 isolates), and 2% (2 isolates), respectively. Resistance was not detected for linezolid. A total of 36 (49%) isolates showed cMLSB resistance phenotype, while 18(19%) had iMLSB resistance. The methicillin susceptibility (MS) phenotype – strains resistant to erythromycin and susceptible to clindamycin- was not detected.

Conclusion: Very little resistance was found to linezolid, quinupristin/dalfopristin and tigecycline. Therefore, these antibiotics may be beneficial for the proper treatment of infections caused by MLSB-resistant isolates.
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INTRODUCTION

Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) is an important cause of infections caused by multiple resistant microorganisms, which makes treatment difficult and reduces treatment options (1, 2). Resistance to beta-lactam group and fluoroquinolones leads to use of last-option drugs such as vancomycin and teicoplanin, thus increases the resistance rates of these drugs. Therefore, the need for new antimicrobial drugs has come to the fore and various antibiotics have been developed for the treatment of infections caused by this bacterial group (3, 4).

Tigecycline (GAR-936) is a semi-synthetic analogue of classical tetracyclines which has activity against both Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria (5). Tigecycline prevents the aminocyl tRNA from entering its target by binding to the 30S ribosomal subunit. This prevents the bacteria's protein synthesis and stops its growth (6, 7, 8). Linezolid from the oxazolidinone group is another antimicrobial agent used in the treatment of MRSA infections. Linezolid prevents the formation of the initial complex in protein synthesis by binding to the 50S subunit in ribosomes. The absence of intrinsic resistance gene against linezolid is an advantage for Gram-positive bacteria (9, 10).
Quinupristin/dalfopristin is a combination of semisynthetic streptogramins containing 30:70 ratio of quinupristin and dalfopristin. This macrolide-lincosamide-streptogramin B (MLSB) group antibiotic is effective against Gram-positive bacteria. The drug acts by binding to the 50S ribosomal subunit and inhibits protein synthesis (11, 12). Frequent use of MLSB group antibiotics in MRSA infections is important in terms of leading to the increase of the number of resistant strains. Methylase enzymes encoded by methylase genes (erm), which is associated with the development of resistance to erythromycin, play a role in the development of resistance (13). MLSB resistance phenotypes are of two types, structural (cMLSB) and inducible (iMLSB). Strains with inducible MLSB resistance are crucial as erythromycin treatment causes enzyme induction in the bacterium, leading to resistance to macrolides and lincosamides (14). This study aims to investigate in-vitro susceptibilities of MRSA strains isolated from various clinical samples to fluoroquinolone, linezolid, tigecycline, and quinupristin/dalfopristin and to determine the MLSB resistance phenotype.

**MATERIAL and METHODS**

This study is a retrospective study and it was conducted in accordance with ethical principles for medical research with the Declaration of Helsinki. A total of 94 MRSA strains isolated from various clinical samples in the laboratory of our hospital between January 2020 and September 2020 were included.

**Identification:** S. aureus strains were identified by conventional methods - colony morphology, hemolysis type, Gram stain, catalase, and coagulase tests- and VITEK 2 automated system (Bio-Mérieux / France).

**Detection of antibiotic susceptibilities:** Methicillin resistance and antibiotics susceptibility testing (AST) were investigated by the Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion method according to the recommendations of The European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST 2020) (15). Cefoxitin (30 µg) (Oxoid, England) disk was tested for methicillin resistance. Isolates with a cefoxitin inhibition zone diameter of less than 21 mm were defined as methicillin resistant. The MRSA isolates were subjected to the antibiotic susceptibility test with ciprofloxacin (5µg), moxifloxacin (5µg), linezolid (30µg), quinupristin/dalfopristin (15µg) discs (Oxoid, UK) and tigecycline E test strips (Bio-Mérieux / France).

A suspension of 0.5 McFarland fresh bacterial culture in sterile physiological saline was prepared and spread on two separate Mueller Hinton agar (Oxoid, England) plates. Ciprofloxacin (5µg), moxifloxacin (5µg), linezolid (30µg), quinupristin/dalfopristin (15µg) disks (Oxoid, UK) were placed on one plate, and tigecycline on the other one. After incubation at 35±1°C for 18-24 hours, the minimal inhibitor concentration (MIC) of tigecycline and the inhibition zone diameters of other antibiotics were measured and the results were evaluated according to EUCAST criteria.

In addition, D-test was performed with erythromycin (15 µg) and clindamycin (2 µg) disks adjacent to each other in order to detect MLSB resistance (Figure 1). The flattening of the clindamycin inhibition zone - defined as the (D) zone- facing the erythromycin disk was evaluated as inducible clindamycin resistance (iMLSB).

Strains without an inhibition zone around the clindamycin and erythromycin disks were defined as constitutive clindamycin resistant (cMLSB). AST was also performed by VITEK 2 Gram-positive diagnostic kits (Bio-Mérieux / France) automatically (Figure 2).

**Quality control:** S. aureus ATCC 25923 and S. aureus ATCC 29213 and S. aureus 43300 were used as quality control strains in the study.

**Statistical methods:** The results were evaluated in terms of frequency and percentage, in line with the purpose of the study.

**RESULTS**

Out of 94 MRSA strains included in the study, 67 (71%) were resistant to ciprofloxacin, 60 (64%) to moxifloxacin, 16 (17%) to tigecycline, 2 (2%) to quinopristin/dalfopristin. There was no resistance to linezolid. The sensitivity of MRSA strains to antibiotics is shown in Table-1.

Of all the MRSA strains examined, 46 (49%) had cMLSB resistance, 18 (19%) had iMLSB resistance, and 30 (32%) had no resistance. In the strains included in the study, inducible resistance was found in all strains resistant to erythromycin and susceptible to clindamycin (Table-2).

VITEK 2 (Bio-Mérieux / France) results were 100% concordant with classical microbiological identification tests and antibiotic susceptibility test results.

---

**Figure 1:** Bacterial colonies isolated in sheep blood agar and disk diffusion tests.
In recent years, infections caused by multi-drug resistant MRSA have increased worldwide. MRSA strains resistance to various antimicrobials such as fluoroquinolones have led to use of glycopeptide antibiotics as the first and sometimes the only option (2). With the reporting of glycopeptide resistance in MRSA infections, it has brought the use of antimicrobials such as linezolid, tigecycline and quinupristin/dalfopristin in treatment (16, 17).

In this study, a very high rate of fluoroquinolone resistance was found. 71% of 94 MRSA strains were ciprofloxacin-resistant and 64% to moxifloxacin. The fluoroquinolone resistance rate reported for MRSA strains in our country is between 33% and 85.9%; in other countries it ranges from 9.2% to 85%. Dündar et al.; investigated the antimicrobial susceptibility of S. aureus strains in a 3-year period (2005-2007) and reported ciprofloxacin resistance rates as 87%, 90% and 92%, respectively (18). Similar to this study, in a study in which ciprofloxacin resistance rates as 87%, 90% and 92%, respectively (18). Linezolid and tigecycline are reported to be highly effective in MRSA strains. Linezolid resistance has been reported to be less than 0.1% in various surveillance programs since linezolid resistance, which was first published in 2001 (19-22). In this study, no resistance to linezolid was found among the MRSA strains. Similar results have been obtained in various studies, too.

In a study conducted by Dizbay et al. in 2005 on 120 MRSA strains isolated from various clinical samples, all strains were found to be susceptible to linezolid (23). In another study conducted with 1707 MRSA strains between 1997 and 1999, again, linezolid sensitivity was found to be 100% (24). A study conducted in Korea retrospectively examined antibiotic susceptibility tests of a total of 22,067 MRSA isolates over 4 years, and only 110 (0.5%) were found to be resistant to linezolid (25).

In various studies, MRSA strains were found to be highly susceptible to tigecycline and resistance was not reported. Arslan et al. investigated tigecycline and linezolid resistance in 80 MRSA strains isolated from various clinical specimens and found all strains susceptible to linezolid and tigecycline (4). Similarly, Goff et al. found all strains susceptible to tigecycline and linezolid in a study they conducted between January 2004 and September 2005 on 879 MRSA strains (26). Behera et al. found 21 MRSA strains isolated from a hospital in India to be 100% susceptible to tigecycline (27). In a study conducted in Male Malaysia, five isolates (5.6%) were found, tigecycline-resistant, but they were not linezolid resistant in 90 MRSA (28). In this study, 16 (17%) of the MRSA strains were found to be tigecycline-resistant. Similar to this study, in a study by Kaya et al. investigating the in-vitro activity of tigecycline and linezolid in 60 MRSA strains;

Table 1: Antibiotic Sensitivity of MRSA Strains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antimicrobial</th>
<th>CIP</th>
<th>MXF</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>QD</th>
<th>LZD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive (S)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistant (R)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIP: Ciprofloxacin, MXF: Moxifloxacin, TGC: Tigecycline, LZD: Linezolid, QD: Quinupristin/dalfopristin

Table 2: Distribution of MLSB Resistance in MRSA Strains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLSB Resistance</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of strains with cMLS resistance</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of strains with iMLS resistance</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cMLS: Constitutive macrolide-lincosamide-streptogramin B, iMLS: Inducible macrolide-lincosamide-streptogramin B

DISCUSSION
while they found all strains susceptible to linezolid, they found resistance to tigecycline in 1 strain (29). Hoban et al. reported tigecycline susceptibility as 98.9% in a study they conducted with 5348 MRSA strains in 2004 (30). The lower rate of tigecycline resistance in various studies conducted in the past years may be attributed to the resistance of MRSA strains to this antibiotic over time.

In a review article published in 2020, quinupristin/dalfopristin resistance was found as 0.7% (0.3%-1%) in MRSA strains (31). Additionally, in some studies investigating the susceptibility of MRSA to quinupristin/dalfopristin abroad, the rate of resistance was reported to be between 0 and 31% (13, 32, 33). Kim et al. did not find resistance to quinupristin/dalfopristin in any of 439 MRSA strains in Korea (13). Baddour et al. found that all 512 MRSA strains in Saudi Arabia were susceptible to quinupristin/dalfopristine (34). Luh et al. determined this rate as 31% in Taiwan (32). In our country, Baysallar et al. and Yavuz et al. found the quinupristin/dalfopristin resistance to be 1% for MRSA strains and it was found as 2.3% by Tünger et al. (35, 36, 37). Kılç et al. found no resistance in MRSA strains in the study they conducted in 2001 and 2002, while they reported that they found 2% resistance in 2003 (2). In this study, similar to various studies conducted in our country, quinupristin/dalfopristin resistance was 2%.

Although macrolides and lincosamides are used effectively in MRSA infections, they cause problems in treatment due to MLSB resistance recently detected. Among 94 MRSA isolates included in this study, MLSB resistance was determined as 49% and iMLSBS as 19%; no resistance was found in 30 MRSA strains (32%). These rates are similar to various studies conducted in our country. For example, in the study conducted by Dogruman et al. on 63 MRSA strains isolated from various clinical samples in Ankara between 2005 and 2006; 32 (50.8%) had cMLSBS resistance, 13 (20.6%) had iMLSBS resistance and 18 (28.6%) had no resistance (14). In the strains included in the study, no strains resistant to erythromycin, susceptible to clindamycin but not inducible resistance (MS phenotype) were detected. In the study conducted by Azap et al. in Ankara, similar to the results of this study, cMLSBS resistance was found as 45% and iMLSBS resistance was found as 37% (38). Different resistance rates were found in the studies abroad examining MLSB resistance in MRSA infections. Otsuka et al. in Japan, reported that they found iMLSBS resistance is 38.7%, cMLSBS resistance is 61.3%; Fiebelkorn et al. reported that they found iMLSBS resistance as 29.8% and cMLSBS resistance as 34.2% in the USA (39, 40).

**Limitations of this study:** molecular methods were not used in this study due to technical and financial impossibilities.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Aims of antimicrobial susceptibility tests are contributing to prescribed appropriate antibiotics and monitoring resistant pathogens. Researches of antibiotic susceptibility, conducted with genotypic or phenotypic methods, contribute to provide epidemiological data, as well as regulation of correct antibacterial treatment regimens. In addition, by collecting data on regional antibiotic susceptibility test results, the types of resistance detected can guide empirical treatment selection. Determining the resistance to MLSB group antibiotics will be useful in providing appropriate and effective treatment in MRSA infections. Thus, the selection of appropriate and effective drugs before treatment will both prevent the increase in resistance and increase the chance of treatment. Lack of resistance or low rate of resistance to antimicrobial agents such as quinupristin/dalfopristin, linezolid and tigecycline in MLSB-resistant MRSA infections will positively affect the success of the treatment.

Results of this study are shown that there is widespread resistance to other antibiotics besides methicillin resistance in S. aureus strains and it emphasized that to importance of antibiotic susceptibility tests.
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