



Journal Homepage: - www.journalijar.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/17703

DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/17703>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

ASSESSMENT OF SHIFT IN THE ANTIBIOTIC SUSCEPTIBILITY PATTERN OF AEROBIC BACTERIAL ISOLATES FROM MICROBIAL BIOFILMS IN PATIENTS WITH ORAL SQUAMOUS CELL CARCINOMA AND PRECANCEROUS CONDITIONS

Dr. Aditi Agarwal, Dr. Rajni Sharma, Dr. Kopal Sharma and Dr. Navya Sharma

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History

Received: 15 August 2023

Final Accepted: 18 September 2023

Published: October 2023

Key words:-

Antibiotic, Antimicrobial Resistance, Microbiome, Oral Cancer, Precancerous Lesions

Abstract

Background: Antimicrobial resistance is a concerning global health problem in reference to cancer patients as they are more susceptible to drug-resistant microorganisms because of their immunocompromised states.

Aim: The aim of this study was to study the changes in the pattern of aerobic bacterial flora in the patients of oral cancer and precancerous lesions and to identify the susceptibility to commonly used Antibiotics in clinical practice.

Methods: This prospective observational study was carried out in a randomly selected cohort of oral cancer and precancerous patients being treated at tertiary care centre in Rajasthan, for a period of 1 year. Oral swabs were collected from patients presenting with oral cancer and precancerous lesions and subjected to microbiological examination for their colony characters, morphology on Gram stain as well for Antibiotic sensitivity patterns for commonly used drugs.

Results: Of the 100 oral cancer patients, isolated bacterial colonies showed a mixture of Gram-Positive and Gram-Negative organisms. *Staphylococcus* species (n = 15) were seen in high numbers in the case of Gram-positive organisms, while in Gram-negative bacteria *Pseudomonas* species (n = 45) increased in number. Among the precancerous patient group normal commensal (*Micrococci*, n = 24) was the predominant species. In Gram-negative bacteria, all were susceptible to Piperacillin Tazobactam and Imipenem while in Gram-positive bacteria all were susceptible to Linezolid, Gentamicin, and Vancomycin.

Conclusion: This study showed 90% susceptibility to every class of commonly used antibiotics. Multidrug resistance (MDR) was seen in 9.52% of the bacterial isolates. Antimicrobial resistance is emerging among cancer patients. Studies on cultural sensitivity patterns will help clinicians to prescribe antibiotics judiciously and will further decrease the chances of antimicrobial resistance in these patients.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2023., All rights reserved.

Introduction:-

Oral cancers (cancers arising from lips, tongue, floor of the oral cavity) account for 40% of all the cancers in India.^{[1],[2]} There is also an alarming increase in their incidence globally.^[3] Oral carcinogenesis is a complex process

Corresponding Author:- Dr. Aditi Agarwal,

Address:- Senior Demonstrator Department of Microbiology, SMS Medical College, Jaipur. (RUHS)

involving the exposome's impact on keratinocyte cytogenetics and epigenetics. The predominant etiological causes for this disease are often seen as being external exposures such as the use of tobacco and alcohol, poor dental hygiene, and poor eating habits. [4]. It is extensively researched how oral microbiota (internal exposome) affects the development and spread of oral malignancies. [5] Dysbiosis which is defined as an imbalance in the collection of the oral microbes in humans, is often associated with an exposure to certain environmental factors, smoking of tobacco, diet with high sucrose content, and even injudicious use of antimicrobials [6], [7]. The normal microbiota of the oral cavity and oropharynx exhibit predominance of *Streptococcus*, *Bacteroides* species (excluding *Bacteroides fragilis*), *Peptostreptococcus* species, *Prevotella* species, *Fusobacterium* species, *Veillonella* species, Enterobacteriaceae, and *Staphylococci*. [8]

Empiric use of antibiotics in oral cancer patients to treat various diseases can lead to serious complications like antimicrobial drug resistance. This necessitates the need to study the shift in the microbial flora of the patients with the progress in their pre-malignant stage to oral carcinogenesis which will further help in proper selection of appropriate antibiotics and better management of these patients.

Materials and Methods:-

This prospective observational study was carried out in a randomly selected cohort of oral cancer and precancerous patients at medical oncology department from January 2021 for one year. Ethical clearance was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (Ref. No. 286 MC/EC/2021) before the study. All patients were briefed about the study, counseled, and informed consent was taken.

Sample size:

Sample size of 98 patients of both the study groups will be required at 80% study power, confidence limit upto 95% and alpha error of 0.05, assuming 56.7% prevalence of pathological bacterial flora in oral squamous cell carcinoma patients and 13.3% in control subjects as found in the study of Milos et al [22].

Inclusion criteria

a) Newly diagnosed cases of oral cancers (Group A) and precancerous lesions (Group B) of age above 18 years, b) patients willing to participate in the study.

Exclusion Criteria

a) Patients receiving chemotherapy, radiotherapy or surgical treatment, b) Patients receiving antibiotic treatment currently or who had received antibiotic treatment within the last 4 weeks, and c) Patients diagnosed with HIV, HBV, HCV and tuberculosis infection.

Microbiological Analysis-

1. Sample collection: In the study group, swabs will be taken from all the patients under standardized aseptic conditions. In oral cancer patients, the swabs will be taken from the tumour site and from precancerous patients swabs will be taken from lesion site. All specimens will be collected and transported within a maximum of two hours to the microbiology laboratory of the institute and inoculated immediately.

2. Isolation and identification of bacterial species: For possible isolation of bacterial pathogens, each swab sample will be inoculated onto Blood agar, MacConkey agar and Thioglycollate broth then these plates will be cultured aerobically at 37°C for 24 hr. Each aerobic bacterial isolate will then be identified on the basis of morphology, Gram staining and biochemical tests that is conventional and by advanced VITEK II system as per standard lab protocol.

3. Antibiotic Susceptibility Testing: Antimicrobial susceptibility testing will be performed by Kirby-Bauer disc diffusion technique on Mueller Hinton agar media as recommended by the clinical and laboratory standards institute (CLSI 2021). The antibiotic used for susceptibility testing were selected on the criteria of being regularly used in the hospital for controlling the infection and prophylaxis purpose.

Results:-

In Group A (N=100) 79% were males and 21% were females while in Group B (N=100) 72% were males and 28% were females. The mean age of the patients in both the groups was 46.72±19.61 years. There was a statistically significant difference in tobacco smokers among the two groups (P = 0.008). [Table 1] Microscopic examination of the samples revealed that in Group A; the Gram Negative Bacilli were observed in majority (69.30%), followed by the Gram Positive cocci (22.81%) while in Group B the GPC were in majority (31.37%)

followed by Gram Positive Bacilli (22.55%). According to Gram staining, the difference was statistically significant (P = 0.001) in both the groups as depicted in table 2.

Majority of oral cancer patients (69.3%) in the present study showed Gram Negative bacterial growth compared to Gram Positive bacterial growth which was recorded in majority of the Precancerous patients (82.35%). Most common Gram-Positive bacteria found among oral cancer patients were *Staphylococcus* and *Streptococcus* while in precancerous patients it was *Micrococci* and *Diphtheroids*. These patients were administered with Vancomycin, Teicoplanin, Linezolid, Piperacillin and Tazobactam combination, Ampicillin, Cefepime, Cefoxitin, Ciprofloxacin, Gentamicin, Doxycycline, Clindamycin, and Erythromycin. It was found that most microorganisms were resistant to Clindamycin, Erythromycin, and Ampicillin while Linezolid, Vancomycin and Teicoplanin Antibiotic showed 100% susceptibility as shown in Table:3.

Among the Gram Negative Bacilli, *Pseudomonas* was the most common species found in the oral cancer patients. In this study, *P.aeruginosa* showed highest susceptibility to Colistin (100%), Piperacillin and Tazobactam (93.3%) as shown in Table 4.

Multidrug resistance (MDR) was seen in 9.52% of the bacterial isolates. MDR in Gram-negative and Gram-positive bacteria were 8.64% and 12.5%, respectively. [Table 5] Maximum MDR (25%) was noted with gram negative bacteria *A. baumannii* different antibiotic groups which were Penicillins, Cephalosporins, Aminoglycosides, Carbapenem, Fluoroquinolones as depicted in table 5.

Table 1:- Socio-demographic data of the study participants.

| Independent Variables | Frequency (N) | | P-value |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| | Group A (Oral Cancer) | Group B (Precancerous lesion) | |
| Gender | | | |
| Male | 79 | 72 | 0.324 |
| Female | 21 | 28 | |
| Age in years | | | |
| <20 | 0 | 1 | 0.926 |
| 20-30 | 9 | 11 | |
| 31-40 | 26 | 31 | |
| 41-50 | 33 | 32 | |
| 51-60 | 27 | 20 | |
| >60 | 5 | 5 | |
| Tobacco History | | | |
| 1) Smoking | 26 | 21 | 0.505 |
| 2) Chewing | 84 | 72 | 0.606 |
| 3) Smoking and Chewing | 24 | 9 | 0.008 |

Table 2:- Comparison of the organisms with Gram staining in both the groups.

| Gram Staining | Group A (Oral Cancer) | | Group B (Precancerous lesions) | | p- value |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|------|-----------------------------------|-------|----------|
| | Number | % | Number | % | |
| Gram Negative Bacilli | 79 | 69.3 | 18 | 17.65 | <0.001 |
| Gram Positive Bacilli | 3 | 2.63 | 23 | 22.55 | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|----|-------|----|-------|
| Gram Positive Cocci | 32 | 28.07 | 61 | 59.80 |
|---------------------|----|-------|----|-------|

Chi-square = 69.027 with 3 degrees of freedom;

Table 3:- Comparison of Susceptibility pattern of identified Gram Positive Bacterial isolates.

| Antibiotic | Group A | Group B | P-Value (Fisher's Exact test) |
|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|----------------------------------|
| Staphylococcus aureus (N=27) | | | |
| Vancomycin | 15 | 12 | - |
| Teicoplanin | 15 | 12 | - |
| Linezolid | 15 | 12 | - |
| Piperacillin+Tazobactam | 14 | 12 | 0.909 |
| Ampicillin | 14 | 12 | 0.909 |
| Cefepime | 13 | 12 | 0.565 |
| Cefoxitin | 13 | 12 | 0.565 |
| Ciprofloxacin | 12 | 5 | 0.099 |
| Gentamicin | 12 | 11 | 0.762 |
| Doxycycline | 11 | 10 | 0.877 |
| Clindamycin | 11 | 7 | 0.681 |
| Erythromycin | 7 | 8 | 0.516 |
| Streptococcus (N=27) | | | |
| Ciprofloxacin | 9 | 12 | 0.141 |
| Vancomycin | 9 | 18 | - |
| Teicoplanin | 9 | 18 | - |
| High dose Gentamicin | 9 | 12 | 0.141 |
| Linezolid | 9 | 18 | - |
| Ampicillin | 7 | 10 | 0.481 |
| Doxycycline | 7 | 11 | 0.665 |
| Clindamycin | 5 | 0 | 0.003* |
| Erythromycin | 4 | 9 | 0.892 |

Table 4:- Comparison of Susceptibility pattern of identified Gram Negative Bacterial isolates in both groups.

| Antibiotic | Group A | Group B | P-Value (Fisher's Exact test) |
|---|---------|---------|----------------------------------|
| Klebsiella (N=32) | | | |
| Polymyxin B | 26 | 6 | - |
| Tigecycline | 24 | 6 | - |
| Imipenem | 23 | 6 | - |
| Ciprofloxacin | 19 | 5 | 0.909 |
| Piperacillin+ Tazobactam | 19 | 6 | 0.909 |
| Ceftazidime + Clavulanic acid | | | 0.565 |
| Cefepime | 17 | 5 | 0.099 |
| Ceftazidime | 16 | 5 | 0.762 |
| Amikacin | 13 | 4 | 0.877 |
| Gentamicin | 10 | 4 | 0.681 |
| Cotrimoxazole (Trimethoprim-sulphamethoxazole) | 8 | 3 | 0.516 |

| <i>Pseudomonas</i> (N=59) | | | |
|---------------------------|----|----|-------|
| Colistin | 45 | 14 | - |
| Piperacillin+ Tazobactam | 42 | 12 | 0.730 |
| Imipenem | 37 | 12 | 0.917 |
| Ciprofloxacin | 36 | 12 | 0.931 |
| Cefepime | 35 | 12 | 0.792 |
| Gentamycin | 32 | 9 | 0.879 |
| Tobramycin | 32 | 10 | 0.753 |
| Ceftazidime | 27 | 8 | 0.903 |
| Amikacin | 35 | 9 | 0.509 |

Table 5:- Frequency of multidrug resistance pattern of bacterial isolates in Group A.

| Bacterial Isolates | MDR (%) | R | Antimicrobial Class |
|----------------------|--------------|---|--|
| <i>S. aureus</i> | 1/15 (6.66%) | AM,P/TZ, GEN, CIP | Penicillins, Aminoglycosides, Fluoroquinolones |
| <i>Streptococcus</i> | 2/9 (22.22%) | AMP, TET, ERY, CLI | Penicillins, Tetracyclines, Fluoroquinolones |
| <i>K. pneumoniae</i> | 2/26 (7.69%) | AMP, CAZ, TOB,CIP, P/TZ, TRM/SXT, AMIK, GEN, TGC, ATM | Penicillins, Cephalosporins, Aminoglycosides, Fluoroquinolones, Tetracyclins, Monobactam, Folate pathway inhibitors. |
| <i>P. aeruginosa</i> | 3/45 (6.67%) | P/TZ, CAZ, IMP, AMIK, GEN, CPM | Penicillins, Cephalosporins, Aminoglycosides, Carbapenem, |
| <i>A. baumannii</i> | 1/4 (25%) | AMP, P/TZ, CAZ, CPM, IMP, AMIK, GEN, CIP, TGC | Penicillins, Cephalosporins, Aminoglycosides, Carbapenem, Fluoroquinolones |
| <i>E. coli</i> | 1/6 (16.67%) | AMP, P/TZ, CAZ, CPM, AMIK, GEN, CIP | Penicillins, Cephalosporins, Aminoglycosides, Fluoroquinolones |

AMIK- Amikacin, AMP- Ampicillin, CAZ- Ceftazidime, CIP- Ciprofloxacin, CLI- Clindamycin, CPM- Cefepime, ERY- Erythromycin, GEN- Gentamycin, IMP- Imipenem, P/TZ – Piperacillin/Tazobactam, TET– Tetracycline, TGC- Tigecycline, TOB-Tobramycin, TRM/SXT-Trimethoprim-sulphamethoxazole

Note:

R- Resistance to tested antimicrobials.

MDR- The isolate is non-susceptible to at least one agent in >3 antimicrobial categories.

Discussion:-

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) has become a global menace which needs to be addressed as soon as possible. The range of infections caused by different microorganisms like the bacteria, parasites, viruses and fungi are now no longer susceptible to the common medicines used to treat them in the recent past. The problem of AMR in relation to bacterial drug resistance is particularly concerning. [9], [10] In cancer patient the second leading cause of death is infection. Loss of effectiveness of antibiotics brought on by bacterial antibiotic resistance is potential threat to the success of cancer treatment. ^[11]

Cultural sensitivity profile of oral cancer and precancerous patients can help the clinician in choosing an effective antimicrobial drug and to decrease the AMR. This is the first study that has compared bacterial sensitivity of precancerous and oral cancer patients. The six important bacterial phyla to which the oral microbiome belong includes *Firmicutes*, *Bacteroides*, *Proteobacteria*, *Actinobacteria*, *Spirochaetes*, and *Fusobacteria*. ^[12] Additionally, oral microbiome may contribute to the emergence of cancer. Patients with oral cancer typically have poor oral hygiene and harbors harmful bacteria, which causes persistent inflammation of the affected location. Large amounts of cytokines and growth factors released by immune and non-immune cells may also have an impact on carcinogenesis. ^{[13],[14],[15]}

The microbiome in the oral cavity appears to differ between healthy, precancerous and the cancerous patients.^[16] Shiga et al. suggested that infection by *S. anginosus* might play an important role in carcinogenesis of squamous cell carcinoma of head and neck.^[17] In this study were observed with majority of bacterial isolates belonging to *Staph. aureus* and *S.lentus* among oral cancer patients.

Mager et al. investigated the difference in the salivary counts of 40 common oral bacteria in patients with an oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC) lesion and their cancer free healthy controls and observed that *Capnocytophaga gingivalis*, *Prevotella melaninogenica*, and *S. mitis* counts were significantly increased in the oral cancer patients.^[18] In the present study, majority of *Pseudomonas* sp. (39.47%) were isolated in oral cancer patients followed by *Klebsiella*.(22.81%) while *Micrococci*(23.53%) and *Diphtheroids* (22.55%) were seen among precancerous patients. In this study, Gram Positive cocci accounted for 28.07% of the total isolates from the swab samples of the oral cancer patients in comparison to 59.8 % in precancerous patients. This is contrary to a recent Chinese study which revealed an increased number of *Bacteroides* in the oral cancer and precancerous patients groups in comparison to healthy patients.^[19] Schmidt reported an abundance of *Streptococcus* and *Actinomyces* in oral squamous cell carcinoma.^[20]

In this study, *P.aeruginosa* showed highest susceptibility to Colistin (100 %), Piperacillin and Tazobactam (93.3%). *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* is the common causative agent responsible for infections in cancer patients, having neutropenia. Even the novel Anti-Pseudomonal antibiotics do not show activity against all strains of *Pseudomonas* so in these patients, preventive strategies such as minimizing resistant strain transmission, active surveillance screening for MDR (multidrug-resistant) strain colonisation, microbiological diagnostics, antimicrobial stewardship, and antibiotic prophylaxis becomes very important. As the resistant strains to pseudomonas are increasing so the need to explore newer antibiotics as first-line drugs in *Pseudomonas* infection in cancer patients becomes essential.

There are a few limitations to this study. In this study only the aerobic bacterial isolates were analyzed and studied for susceptibility pattern so the results cannot be generalized for all the microbial isolates from cancer patients. Also the duration for this study was one year so analysis of temporal trends in the susceptibility patterns could not be studied. The strength of this study was that it provided a key information about the shift in the susceptibility patterns of aerobic bacterial isolates in oral cancers and precancerous patients.

Conclusion:-

In conclusion there is a shift from gram positive to gram negative bacteria in patients with precancerous condition and oral cancer respectively. Multidrug resistance was noted in both the Gram-negative and Gram-positive bacteria. We strongly recommend culture sensitivity testing in precancerous and cancer patients before starting antimicrobial therapy for these patients. This will decrease the antimicrobial drug resistance and the chances of infections in them.

References:-

- 1) Sharma K, Sharma L, Advani U, Jain C, Bansal A, Sharma L, et al. An insight into risk factors profile of oral cavity and oropharyngeal cancer patients attending two tertiary care hospitals in Jaipur, India. *Int J Basic Clin Pharmacol*. 2019; 8(2): 275-79.
- 2) Coelho KR. Challenges of the oral cancer burden in India. *J Cancer Epidemiol*. 2012;2012:701932.
- 3) Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, Bray F. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2021;71(3):209-49.
- 4) Kakabadze MZ, Paresishvili T, Karalashvili L, Chakhunashvili D, Kakabadze Z. Oral microbiota and oral cancer: Review. *Oncol Rev*. 2020;14(2):476.
- 5) Vyhnalova T, Danek Z, Gachova D, Linhartova PB. The Role of the Oral Microbiota in the Etiopathogenesis of Oral Squamous Cell Carcinoma. *Microorganisms*. 2021; 9(8):1549.
- 6) Kilian M. The oral microbiome - friend or foe? *Eur J Oral Sci*. 2018;126 Suppl 1:5-12.
- 7) Stasiewicz M, Karpiński TM. The oral microbiota and its role in carcinogenesis. *Seminars in Cancer Biology* 2022; 86(3):633-42.
- 8) Kanadan A, Bhagwath AA, Sebastian BT, Rudrapathy P, Manickam S. Study on oral microbial flora and antibiotic sensitivity pattern among oral cancer patients in a tertiary cancer care center. *J Orofac Sci* 2019;11:93-99.

- 9) Prestinaci F, Pezzotti P, Pantosti A. Antimicrobial resistance: a global multifaceted phenomenon. *Pathog Glob Health*. 2015;109(7):309-18.
- 10) Aljeldah MM. Antimicrobial Resistance and Its Spread Is a Global Threat. *Antibiotics (Basel)*. 2022;11(8):1082.
- 11) Nanayakkara AK, Boucher HW, Fowler VG Jr, Jezek A, Outterson K, Greenberg DE. Antibiotic resistance in the patient with cancer: Escalating challenges and paths forward. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2021; 71(6):488-04.
- 12) Dewhirst FE, Chen T, Izard J, Paster BJ, Tanner AC, Yu WH, et al. The human oral microbiome. *J Bacteriol*. 2010; 192(19):5002-17.
- 13) Meurman JH, Uittamo J. Oral micro-organisms in the etiology of cancer. *Acta Odontol Scand* 2008;66:321-6.
- 14) Mantovani A, Allavena P, Sica A, Balkwill F. Cancer-related inflammation. *Nature* 2008;454:436-4.
- 15) Fantini MC, Pallone F. Cytokines: from gut inflammation to colorectal cancer. *Curr Drug Targets* 2008;9:375-80.
- 16) Narikiyo M, Tanabe C, Yamada Y, Igaki H, Tachimori Y, Kato H et al. Frequent and preferential infection of *Treponemadenticola*, *Streptococcus mitis*, and *Streptococcus anginosus* in esophageal cancers. *Cancer Sci* 2004; 95:569-74.
- 17) Shiga K, Tateda M, Saijo S, Hori T, Sato I, Tateno H et al. Presence of *Streptococcus* infection in extra-oral head and neck squamous cell carcinoma and its implication in carcinogenesis. *Oncol Rep* 2001; 8:245-8.
- 18) Mager DL, Haffajee AD, Devlin PM, Norris CM, Posner MR, Goodson JM. The salivary microbiota as a diagnostic indicator of oral cancer: a descriptive, non-randomized study of cancer free and oral squamous cell carcinoma subjects. *J Translational Med* 2009;3:27:3-27.
- 19) Li Z, Chen G, Wang P, Sun M, Zhao J, Li A, Sun Q. Alterations of the Oral Microbiota Profiles in Chinese Patient With Oral Cancer. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol*. 2021;11:780067.
- 20) Schmidt BL, Kuczynski J, Bhattacharya A, Huey B, Corby PM, Queiroz EL, Nightingale K, Kerr AR, DeLacure MD, Veeramachaneni R, Olshen AB, Albertson DG. Changes in abundance of oral microbiota associated with oral cancer. *PLoS One*. 2014; 9(6):e98741.
- 21) Paprocka P, Durnaś B, Mańkowska A, Król G, Wollny T, Bucki R. *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Infections in Cancer Patients. *Pathogens*. 2022;11(6):679.
- 22) Milos Cankovic, Marija Bokor-Bratic, Jovana Loncar, et al. Bacterial flora on the surface of oral squamous cell carcinoma. *Arch Oncol* 2013;21(2):62-4.