Comparisoon of in vitro antibacterial activity of cefoperazone and levofloxacin against different clinical isolates.
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ABSTRACT

Cefoperazone (a third generation cephalosporin) has effective in vitro activity against majority of pathogens. Levofloxacin (a fluoroquinolone) is one which prescribed more due to its increased antibacterial activity against Gram-positive, Gram-negative, and atypical bacteria. Microbial resistance to antibiotics is now prevalent and poses a serious clinical threat. An attempt has been made to evaluate sensitivity of cefoperazone and levofloxacin against Escherichia coli, Staphylococcus aureus, Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Salmonella typhi. A total of 120 isolates were collected from different pathological laboratories and medical centers in Karachi, Pakistan. The above stated clinical isolates were extracted from urine/stool, skin, blood and sputum samples. Results show least resistance of levofloxacin as compared to cefoperazone against Escherichia coli (32.5% and 42.5%) and Pseudomonas aeruginosa (36% and 48%) while Staphylococcus aureus is still susceptible towards cefoperazone and least sensitive to levofloxacin by showing 26.6% and 50% resistance respectively. Study concluded that the prevalent pathogens are still susceptible towards levofloxacin and cefoperazone but the gradual increase in resistance is alarming to the general practice of prescribing antibiotic which require routine evaluation and surveillance to ensure the effectiveness of the antibacterial agents.
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INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the level of resistance of S. pneumoniae to beta-lactam and/or macrolides has increased around the world. Because of this resistance, it is necessary to test the therapeutic alternatives for treating this pathogen, including the newer quinolones¹. Levofloxacin (a fluoroquinolone), the levorotatory isomer of ofloxacin, possessed antibacterial activity². Fluoroquinolones inhibit the sub-unit of DNA gyrase and topoisomerase IV, the enzyme which catalyze the negative super coiling of DNA in bacteria³. Levofloxacin rated superior in antibacterial activity when compared with ofloxacin, particularly against pathogens isolated from respiratory tract infections⁴. In clinical practice levofloxacin is one which prescribed more due to its antibacterial activity against Gram-positive, Gram-negative, and atypical bacteria⁵. On comparison with non-fluoroquinolone used for respiratory tract infections, Levofloxacin has lower rate of adverse effects⁶. The changes in DNA gyrase can confirm a high degree of resistance specific to the fluoroquinolone⁷. Cefoperazone is highly active against the Enterobacteriaceae. Its activity against Staphylococcus aureus is comparable to that of the other newer cephem antibiotics. Synergy studies with cefoperazone plus β-lactamase inhibitors or aminoglycosides against Enterobacteriaceae and Pseudomonas aeruginosa show enhanced killing⁸. Cefoperazone was found to be most effective
(74%) against *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*\(^9\). Resistance of Gram-negative bacteria to cephalosporins, is due to outer-membrane permeability, affinity and stability to beta-lactamases, and their activity against target sites (penicillin-binding proteins)\(^10\). Cefoperazone/sulbactam showed effective in vitro activity against majority of pathogens and may be considered as a potential drug of choice for empiric therapy of sepsis\(^11\).

The objective of the study was to determine in vitro susceptibility of levofloxacin and cefoperazone against different gram negative and gram positive isolates by disc diffusion method.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

Clinical isolates were collected from different pathological laboratories located in Karachi. Isolates were identified as *Escherichia coli*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Salmonella typhi* and segregated from pus, sputum, blood, urine and stool tabulated in table 1.1. Standard discs of levofloxacin (5μg) and cefoperazone (75μg) were purchased from local market (Oxoid, UK). Mueller Hinton Agar (Merck) and Broth (Merck) were prepared under the guidelines of CLSI\(^12\). Mcfarland turbidity standard (0.5) was used and prepared\(^13\). With the help of sterile forceps the antimicrobial discs of levofloxacin and cefoperazone were placed on the dry inoculated streaked agar plates with light pressure to ensure its contact with the agar. The plates were then incubated at 37°C for 24 hours. After incubation period the plates were examine for the zone of inhibition and measured in mm. The zones of inhibition for *E.coli* and *P.aeruginosa* were set as resistant (≤13), intermediate resistant (14-16mm), and sensitive (≥17mm). Whereas the zones for *S.aureus* were resistant (≤15mm), intermediate resistant (16-18mm), and sensitive (≥19mm)\(^12,14\).

**RESULTS**

The resistance pattern of *Escherichia coli* (32.5% and 42.5%), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (36% and 48%), *Staphylococcus aureus* (50% and 26.6%) and *Salmonella typhi* (20% and 16%) towards levofloxacin and cefoperazone respectively. Levofloxacin is found to be more effective against *E.coli* and *P.aeruginosa* as compared to cefoperazone. In table 1.2 isolates referred as resistant are those which are not inhibited by normal dose of the anti-microbial agent or show insignificant zone of inhibition around experimental disc, intermediately resistant isolates are with smaller diameter zones around the experimental disc and require higher doses for the treatment of infections and susceptible isolates show significant zone around the experimental disc, normal dose is sufficient for their killing.

**TABLE 1.1 SOURCES OF CLINICAL ISOLATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Pathogens</th>
<th>Blood</th>
<th>Stool/ Urine</th>
<th>Skin pus</th>
<th>Sputum</th>
<th>Sample size (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><em>Escherichia coli</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><em>Pseudomonas Aeruginosa</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><em>Staphylococcus Aureus</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><em>Salmonella Typhi</em></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1.2 SENSITIVITY OF LEVOFLOXACIN AGAINST CLINICAL ISOLATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathogens</th>
<th>Levofloxacin</th>
<th>Cefoperazone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Escherichia coli</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Staphylococcus aureus</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salmonella typhi</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

R - Resistance
IR - Intermediate Resistance
DISCUSSION
Microbial resistance to antibiotics is now prevalent and poses a serious clinical threat. The responsible factors of bacterial resistance to antimicrobial agents are: over prescription of antibiotics, use of under dose, prescriber’s irrational attitudes, patient’s demands, inappropriate advertisements and use of antibiotics in agriculture\textsuperscript{15}. In recent years, the level of resistance to beta-lactam and/or macrolides has increased around the world, because of this resistance, it is necessary to test the therapeutic alternatives\textsuperscript{2}. In the present study the antibacterial activity of levofloxacin and cefoperazone were tested against \textit{Escherichia coli} (n=40), \textit{Staphylococcus aureus} (n=30), \textit{Pseudomonas aeruginosa} (n=25) and \textit{Salmonella typhi} (n=25).

Intracellular bacteria are responsible for the relapsing and refractory infections which can be treated by levofloxacin as it have increased bactericidal activity against intracellular bacteria\textsuperscript{7}. It is reported that levofloxacin is a good antibiotic against \textit{Escherichia coli} and is supported by the published reports\textsuperscript{16,17,18} however the current study showed that levofloxacin has started producing resistance (32.5%). Fluoroquinolones have good activity against many Gram-negative microorganisms, including \textit{Pseudomonas aeruginosa}\textsuperscript{19} however; resistance to these antibiotics had been also reported in recent years\textsuperscript{20} as well as in the present study where 36% resistance showed by \textit{Pseudomonas aeruginosa} against levofloxacin. Levofloxacin causes enhanced killing of cell associated \textit{Pseudomonas aeruginosa} and \textit{Staphylococcus aureus}\textsuperscript{2} and is more bactericidal as compare to ofloxacin against all strains of \textit{Staphylococcus aureus} which were tested\textsuperscript{21} but in the current study 50% antibacterial activity of \textit{staphylococcus aureus} against levofloxacin were observed. The resistance is produced by multiple resistance mechanisms against fluoroquinolones\textsuperscript{22}.

Studies showed that cefoperazone produce more eradication of \textit{Escherichia coli} as compared to \textit{Pseudomonas aeruginosa}\textsuperscript{23} however cefoperazone /salbactum was found to be highly effective against \textit{Pseudomonas aeruginosa} in wound infections\textsuperscript{9}. In US 1% resistance of cefoperazone reported among 652 isolates of \textit{Escherichia coli}\textsuperscript{24}, whereas the documented range of susceptibility of cefoperazone is (63.9% to 99.1% against nosocomial gram negative bacilli including \textit{Escherichia coli} and \textit{Pseudomonas aeruginosa}\textsuperscript{25} however the present study showed 42.5% and 48% resistance respectively. These results describe the increasing pattern of resistance of mentioned clinical isolates against cefoperazone and levofloxacin and make the clinical practioners to realize that the choice of antibiotics is not only based on its antibacterial activity but also on its potential to select resistance\textsuperscript{26}. Microbial resistance to antibiotics can be minimized through proper enlightenment, more rational antibiotic selection during treatment and proper legislation\textsuperscript{15}.

CONCLUSION
The current study revealed that levofloxacin is comparatively more susceptible to the infections cause by \textit{Escherichia coli} and \textit{Pseudomonas aeruginosa} while the other antibiotic cefoperazone is found to be effective against \textit{Staphylococcus aureus} and \textit{Salmonella typhi}. Authors suggested
that the periodic surveillance of commonly prescribed antibiotics must be done to evaluate the status of resistance against prevalent microbes.
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