

JKSUS

by Muhammad Ajmal Muhammad Ajmal

Submission date: 09-Jun-2024 01:25AM (UTC-0400)

Submission ID: 2398523724

File name: Plagiarism.docx (53.86K)

Word count: 6205

Character count: 37693

1 **Bacterial spectrum from Diabetic Foot Ulcers: A study of Antibiotic Resistance Patterns and**
2 **Phylogenetic diversity**

3 Muhammad Idrees¹, Imran Khan², Amin Ullah³, Syed Muhammad Mukarram Shah², Hafiz Ullah⁴,
4 Muhammad Ajmal Khan^{*5}, Rafa Almeer⁶, Zafar Abbass Shah⁷ and Tariq Nadeem⁸

5 ⁷²
6 ¹Department of Biotechnology, University of Swabi, Swabi, Pakistan. midrees@uoswabi.edu.pk
7 (M.I)

8 ²Department of Pharmacy, University of Swabi, Swabi, Pakistan. drimran.khan@uoswabi.edu.pk
9 (I.K); mukaramshah@uoswabi.edu.pk (S.M.M.S)

10 ³Department of Allied Health Sciences, Iqra National University (INU), Peshawar, 25000 Pakistan.
11 aminbiotech7@gmail.com (A-U)

12 ⁴Department Of Mathematics, Abasyn University Peshawar, Peshawar 25000 Pakistan.
13 hafizullah@abasyn.edu.pk (H.U)

14 ⁵School of Medicine, University of Maryland, Baltimore, USA.
15 muhammad.khan@som.umaryland.edu (M.A.K)

16 ⁶Department of Zoology, College of Science, King Saud University, P.O. Box 2455, Riyadh 11451,
17 Saudi Arabia. ralmeer@ksu.edu.sa (R.A)

18 ⁷Department of bioinformatics, Hazara University Mansehra, Mansehra 21300, Pakistan.
19 zafarabbassha92@gmail.com (Z.A.S)

20 ⁸National Center of Excellence in Molecular Biology, University of The Punjab, Lahore 54000,
21 Pakistan. tariq.nadeem@cemb.edu.pk (T.N)

22

23 *Corresponding author's email: muhammad.khan@som.umaryland.edu (MAK)

24

25 Short Title: ¹¹ Diabetic foot ulcers and antibiotic resistance

26

27 **Declarations**

28 **Conflicts of interest/Competing interests**

29 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

30 **Institutional Review Board Statement:** ⁴⁸ The study was approved by institutional review board,
31 University of Swabi, Pakistan.

32 **Informed Consent Statement:** The patient informed consent was obtained at the time of sample
33 collection.

34 **Ethics approval**

35 Not applicable

36 **Consent to participate**

37 All authors consent to participate in the manuscript publication

38 **Consent for publication**

39 All authors approved the manuscript to be published

40 **Availability of data and material**

41 The datasets generated during the current study are available from the corresponding author on
42 reasonable request.

43 **Funding:** This research received no external funding

44 **Acknowledgements**

45 The authors acknowledge the Surgery and Medical Wards of different tertiary-care hospitals and
46 microbiology laboratories of KP, Pakistan. The authors would like to extend their sincere
47 appreciation to the Researchers Supporting Project Number (RSP2024R96), King Saud University,
48 Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

49 **Author contribution:** “Conceptualization, M.I. and A.U.; methodology, M.I.; M.A.K, I.K
50 software, M.A.K, H.U, AU.; validation, M.I, A.A.; formal analysis, M.I, H.U, , Z.A.S, S.M.M.S;
51 investigation, M.I, A.U, M.A.K.; resources, A.U, R.A., S.M.M.S.; data curation, M.A.K, A.U, T.N.;
52 writing—original draft preparation, M.I, A.U.; writing—review and editing, M.A.K, A.U, T.N. and
53 R.A.; supervision, A.U and S.M.M.S; funding acquisition, R.A, Z.A.S, All authors have read and
54 agreed to the published version of the manuscript.”

55

56

57 **Abstract:**

58 Diabetic foot ulcer (DFU) is one of the most detrimental impacts of diabetes mellitus associated
59 with osteomyelitis and gangrene, accounting for at least two-thirds of non-traumatic amputations
60 with a 5-year survival rate. In this perspective, antimicrobial resistance has been a cause for grave
61 concern for the last 50 years and is among the World Health Organization most pressing "calls to
62 action" for the 21st century. The current study aimed to identify bacterial pathogens present in

DFU, their antibiotic resistance profiles, and genetic diversity. A total of 180 samples were collected from DFU patients hospitalized at healthcare institutions in Pakistan. All samples were cultured on three distinct types of media - nutritional agar, McConkey agar, and mannitol salt agar to identify both Gram-negative and Gram-positive bacteria. Biochemical, morphological, and molecular (16s rRNA) investigations were employed to characterize the bacterial species. Out of the 180 samples collected, *Staphylococcus aureus* (*S. aureus*) was isolated from 98 (54%) samples, *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) from 75 (41.6%) samples, *S. epidermidis* from 20 (11.1%) samples, and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (*P. aeruginosa*) from 18 (10%) samples. Furthermore, PCR amplification confirmed the presence of antibiotic resistance genes in the resistant *E. coli* and *S. aureus* isolates. In *S. aureus*, the most commonly found antibiotic resistance genes were *erm*(B) and *aac*(6') *aph* (2') whereas in *E. coli* the prevalent genes were *ampC* (*tetA*) and *erm* (*B*). The distributions of many genes associated with drug resistance differed from those documented worldwide. These findings will aid in guiding the empirical use of antibiotics for treating diabetic foot infections, thereby reducing the risk of inappropriate antibiotic use and the development of antibiotic resistance.

Keywords: Diabetic foot ulcer; *Staphylococcus aureus*; *Escherichia coli*; *Staphylococcus epidermidis* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*; antibiotics; resistance

1. Introduction

Diabetic foot ulcers (DFUs) are one of the most severe problems in diabetes patients. People with diabetes sometimes develop chronic ulcers that lead to amputation. The DFU pertains to an infection in the lower extremities of individuals. This condition is characterized by ischemia and neuropathy in the affected area, resulting in necrosis (Wang, Xuan, *et al.*, 2022). It is estimated that 15–25% of diabetic patients are likely to develop diabetic foot ulcers as disease progression. The mortality risk for those with DFUs is higher than that of diabetic patients. According to the International Diabetes Federation, there is an estimated annual incidence of 9.1-26.1 million cases of DFUs worldwide (Anvarinejad *et al.*, 2015).

Diabetic foot ulcers, often known as DFUs, are severe diabetic complications that significantly affect an individual's social, mental, and financial well-being. The existence of biofilms is one of the primary causes of diabetic foot ulcers' resistance to healing. Biofilms can cause infection development and persistence because they exacerbate wound inflammation and exhibit an apparent absence of response to host defenses or alternative therapies. Foot ulcers are more likely to develop

94 in all of these diabetic problems, and twenty percent of hospital stays among ⁶⁴ people with diabetes
95 are thought to be the outcome of DFUs. Diabetic foot ulcers can result in the spread of infection,
96 gangrene, amputation, and, in cases where appropriate care is not given, even death. ⁴⁹ It has been
97 estimated that approximately fifty to seventy percent of all lower limb amputations (LLAs) are
98 caused by diabetes-related foot ulcers. Furthermore, there is an increased risk of amputation once a
99 diabetic foot ulcer develops. ³⁰ The risk of vascular lower limb amputations in people with diabetes is
100 expected to be eight times greater in the entire population (those over 45) than in people without the
101 disease. In people over 85 years of age, the prevalence in men and women is projected to be fifteen
102 and twelve times higher, respectively, compared to the average prevalence rates across all
103 population groups (Afonso *et al.*, 2021). Pathogenic microorganisms have the ability to colonize
104 diabetic foot ulcers, and the immune deficits associated with diabetes promote infections. Aerobic
105 and anaerobic Pathogenic bacterial species ⁶³ such as *S. aureus*, *P. aeruginosa*, and *Klebsilla*, as well
106 as coliform bacteria, play a role in these diseases. The several microbes in diabetic foot ulcers might
107 be either plankton or sessile. When bacteria create biofilms, they enclose themselves in a self-made
108 polymeric matrix that protects them from both antimicrobial agents and the body's immune
109 response. Thus, even with systemic antibiotic therapy, bacterial biofilms in diabetic foot ulcers
110 might be the cause of the infection's slow recovery and subsequent persistence. A DFU is a
111 significant healthcare and socioeconomic issue, affecting 40–60 million individuals worldwide. An
112 ¹² older age, a male gender, Type 2 diabetes, a lower BMI, hypertension, diabetes, diabetic retinal
113 degeneration, and a history of smoking are the key risk factors for DFUs. Amputations due to
114 diabetic foot ulcers, particularly severe ulcers, can result in a marked decline in life expectancy and
115 a rise in early death (Pouget *et al.*, 2020).

116 The antibiotic-resistant bacteria are considered to pose a serious risk to the health of the public.
117 Excessive and improper use of antibiotics is the main contributor to antibiotic resistance. A number
118 of variables, including prolonged wound healing, repeated hospital stays, and inadequate
119 administration of antibiotics, may increase the incidence of multidrug-resistant microorganisms in
120 individuals with diabetes foot ulcers. Additionally, peripheral artery illnesses might make it difficult
121 for antibiotics to penetrate the tissues of the lower limbs, which encourage the development of
122 resistant strains of bacteria. These conditions are frequently prevalent among individuals with
123 DFUs. While *S. areus* and *Streptococcus* bacteria typically cause bacterial infections in DFUs, other
124 microbial species ³⁷ or mixed bacteria (enteric bacteria spp., Gram-negative bacillus, Gram-positive

125 anaerobic cocci) may also play a role. The most common type of microbe to be isolated is
126 staphylococci. MRSA has been found in 15–30% of diabetic foot ulcer infections, according to
127 various investigations. There are multiple factors contributing to antibiotic resistance, but the two
128 most significant ones are improper use of antibiotics and disregard for personal hygiene. While
129 polymicrobial outbreaks are substantially more prevalent, monomicrobial infections can occur
130 occasionally (Kandemir *et al.*, 2007). The *E. coli* has also the highest prevalence in patients with
131 DFUs in some studies (Sari *et al.*, 2018). In a relevant study, *E. coli* showed the maximum
132 multidrug resistance (81.81%). The maximum of the Gram-negative bacteria was resistant to
133 antibiotic ampicillin (Baral *et al.*, 2024).

134 The effective management of diabetic foot infections requires accurate diagnosis, proper collection
135 of specimens for culture, deliberate selection of antimicrobial therapy, prompt determination of the
136 need for surgical treatment, provision of any additional wound management that may be required,
137 and complete attention to the patient. The management of DFIs through a methodical and evidence-
138 based strategy is likely to yield better results, particularly in terms of illness resolution, and prevent
139 consequences including amputation of the lower extremities. The most effective way to deliver this
140 is through collaborative groups, whose membership should ideally include an expert in infectious
141 disorders or clinical or medical microbiology. Appropriate local wound care (such as cleaning and
142 removing debris), pressure off-loading, vascular evaluation and therapy if necessary, and metabolic
143 (especially glycaemic) regulation should all naturally be prioritized by this team.
144 There are a number of guidelines available to help clinicians manage diabetic foot infections. Since
145 2004, the International Working Group on the Diabetic Foot (IWGDF) has gathered a panel of
146 specialists in infectious diseases to issue widely utilized guidelines every four years (Lipsky *et al.*,
147 2020). More over, the appropriate determination of the causal microorganisms that cause outbreaks
148 is a crucial component in managing diabetes-related foot ulcers. While biopsy specimens, cultures,
149 and swabs are more commonly used traditional diagnosis approaches, new molecular methods are
150 currently investigated for the detection and measurement of bacteria. Understanding antibiotic
151 resistance and the microbiological causes of DFUs is essential for managing and treating these
152 wound infections effectively (Ghotaslou *et al.*, 2018).

153 The lack of the proper screening facilities and expertise in diagnostic microbiology at the grassroots
154 level further impedes the collection, isolation, and characterization of bacterial isolates from DFU
155 patients. Lastly, the lack of digitalized public health system in Pakistan adds another layer of

156 complexity to addressing and catch up this issue effectively. These all factors contribute to the
157 perceived information gap. The current study aimed to describe the predominant multidrug-resistant
158 bacteria in DFU and to elaborate the molecular mechanisms of antibiotic resistance. Here we
159 showed highest prevalence of *S. aureus* in DFU followed by *E.coli*. The findings of the current
160 study highlight the importance of local surveillance and understanding regional patterns of
161 antibiotic resistance. This information will assist healthcare professionals in Pakistan to make
162 informed decisions regarding antibiotic choices, reducing the risk of inappropriate antibiotic use to
163 effectively treat diabetic foot ulcers.

164 **2. Materials and Methods**

165 **2.1. Samples Collection and Processing**

166 A total of 180 DFU samples were collected admitted to the Surgery and Medical Department in
167 different hospitals of Pakistan (Table S1). Ethical approval was acquired from the Ethical
168 Committee of the University of Swabi, KP, Pakistan. Patients with DFU were included in the
169 present study if they have had an infected ulcer. The grading system employed in the current study
170 to assess diabetic foot ulcers was the Wagner Classification System (Mehraj, M., & Shah, I. 2018).
171 The system provides a standardized way to categorize the severity of foot ulcers. It is based on the
172 deepness of the ulcer and the occurrence of infection. The exclusion criteria for the present study
173 were non-diabetic patients with open wound infections or diabetic patients with non-infected open
174 wound. The samples were collected using a standard procedure (Khan *et al.*, 2019). Samples were
175 brought to the Microbiology Laboratory (Biosafety level 2), Department of Microbiology,
176 University of Swabi.

177 **2.2. Culturing**

178 All samples were cultured on three different media types for isolating Gram-negative and Gram-
179 positive i.e. Mannitol Salt Agar (MSA), Nutrient agar, and MacConkey agar (Oxide, United
180 Kingdom). The subculture of all the samples was done on the MacConkey media and MSA media.
181 For sub culturing, a small portion of inoculum was transferred to a fresh culture medium using a
182 loop to pick up a bacterial colony. After 24 h, many colonies were found on the plates.
183 Hemocytometer was used for colony counting. MacConkey agar promotes Gram-negative bacteria
184 growth, particularly those that ferment lactose while inhibiting the growth of Gram-positive
185 bacteria. MSA media is selective for Gram-positive including *S. aureus*.

186 **2.3. Biochemical and morphological identification**

187 Microorganisms were identified using biochemical and morphological tests. The choice of specific
188 tests depends on the bacterial species being identified. For identification of Gram-positive bacteria,
189 catalase, coagulase and mannitol fermentation tests were used. Lactose fermentation, indole and
190 oxidase tests were used to identify Gram-negative bacteria. Morphological tests comprised colony
191 morphology, Gram staining, and cell shape which contributed to the identification process. Clinical
192 Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI, 2020) guidelines were followed to ensure accuracy, and
193 reliability in laboratory practices (Grice *et al.*, 2008).

194 **2.4. Antibiotic Susceptibility Testing**

195 Testing for antimicrobial resistance was carried out using Mueller-Hinton agar (MHA). In the
196 current study, eight different antibiotics were utilized according to (CLSI, 2020) against *E. coli*
197 (chloramphenicol (30 µg), sulphamethaxazole (1.25 µg), ceftriaxone (30 µg), tetracycline (30 µg),
198 streptomycin (10 µg), erythromycin (15 µg), ampicillin (10 µg), amoxicillin clavulanate (20 µg)
199 were evaluated to determine their efficacy against *E. coli*. Antibiotics used against *Pseudomonas*
200 *aeruginosa* were amoxicillin (20 µg) clavulanate (20 µg), ceftaxione (30 µg), imipenem (10 µg),
201 ceftazidime (30 µg), meropenem (10 µg), cefepime (30 µg), amikacin (10 µg) and ofloxacin (5 µg).
202 Antibiotics against *S. aureus* and *S. epidermidis* were sulfamethaxazole (1.25 µg), tetracycline (30
203 µg), streptomycin (10 µg), erythromycin (15 µg), chloramphenicol (30 µg), vancomycin (30 µg),
204 daptomycin (3 µg), methicillin (10 µg), and penicillin (30 µg). Bacterial resistance to three or more
205 antibiotic classes is referred to as multidrug resistance (MDR) (Magiorakos *et al.*, 2012).

206 **2.5. Extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing isolates (ESBLs)**

207 Bacterial isolates were screened for ESBLs production using a double disc method (Jarlier *et al.*,
208 1998). The disc amoxiclav was placed in the center of the nutrient agar medium containing the petri
209 dish. Ceftriaxone and ceftazidime and were placed at a distance of 15mm from amoxiclav. The
210 plates were incubated for 24 hours at 37°C. An increase in the inhibition zone around cefotaxime or
211 ceftazidime (>5 mm) toward the disc of amoxicillin-clavulanate) were read as ESBLs positive. A
212 zone of inhibition of 15 mm or more around the cefotaxime disc showed that the bacterium is
213 sensitive to cefotaxime. A zone of inhibition of 15 mm or more around the amoxicillin-clavulanic
214 acid disc showed that the bacterium was susceptible to amoxicillin-clavulanic acid. If the inhibition
215 zone around the cefotaxime of ceftazidime disc was less than 15 mm, but the zone of inhibition
216 around the amoxicillin-clavulanic acid disc was 15 mm or more, then the bacterium was likely
217 producing ESBLs.

218 **2.6. DNA extraction**⁹
219 GeneJET Genomic DNA purification kit (Thermo Scientific, Lithuania, #K0721) was used to
220 extract DNA from *E. coli* and *S. aureus*. Pure 2×10^9 bacterial cells³⁸ were harvested in a 1.5mL
221 microcentrifuge tube and centrifuged for 10 min at 10000 xg²⁹ 4°C. The cell pellet was resuspended³²
222 in 50 µL of lysis buffer. The lysate was incubated at 56°C for 15 minutes. Then, added 10 µL⁴⁰ of
223 proteinase K to the lysate and incubated at 56°C for 15 minutes. Cold ethanol (500 µL) was added
224 to the lysate and mixed well. The lysate was incubated on ice for 15 minutes followed by
225 centrifugation at 12,000 x g for 15 minutes at 4°C. The supernatant was discarded. The DNA pellet
226 was washed with 70% ethanol and centrifuged at 12,000 x g for 5 minutes at 4°C. The supernatant
227 was discarded and air-dried the DNA pellet for 5 minutes. The DNA pellet was resuspended in 100
228 µL of elution buffer. The DNA quality was checked using the nanodrop technique and the elution
229 buffer containing DNA was preserved at -20 °C.

230 **2.7. Molecular Identification and phylogenetic network analysis**

231 **2.7.1. 16S rRNA Gene Amplification**

232 Molecular identification of isolated species was performed by amplifying the 16S rRNA gene using
233 universal primers obtained from MacroGen⁴⁴ Universal primer 785F —5'-
234 GGATTAGATACCCTGGTA -3' and 907R- 5'-: CCGTCAATTCMTTTRAGTTT-3'. There were⁵
235 selected 30 isolates on random basis for amplification to examine antibiotic-resistant genes. The
236 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) profiles were set as suggested by the manufacturer (Solis
237 BioDyne-5X FIREPol® Master mix).

238

239 **2.7.2. Antibiotic Resistance Genes Amplification**

240 The DNA (5µL) was used in PCR. The most prevalent *E. coli* and *S. aureus* isolates were
241 randomly selected for amplification to examine antibiotic-resistant genes using primers already
242 designed. The PCR parameters and conditions used were followed using standard procedure⁵⁴
243 (Abdelgader *et al.*, 2018; Fawzy *et al.*, 2017, Khan *et al.*, 2023). The PCR products were studied in⁵
244 the GelDoc system, and images were captured. PCR products were purified and sequenced through
245 MacroGen (<https://www.macrogen.com>) using both forward and reverse primers, as shown in Table
246 1.

247 **2.7.3. Phylogenetic network analysis**

248 16S rRNA sequencing was achieved for the molecular identification of the isolates. The
249 chromatograms received from MacroGen were refined by removing the redundant reads by
250 employing software (Chromas) 2.6.6 (<http://technelysium.com.au/wp/chromas/>) (accessed on 10
251 January 2023). The refined sequences were used for similarity to 16S reference sequences by using
252 Basic Local Alignment Search Tool from a National Center for Biotechnology Information
253 database. The sequences were submitted to GenBank, and the allotted accession numbers were
254 summarized in table S2. The Maximum Likelihood and Tamura-Nei Model Gamma distributed
255 with invariant sites (G+I) were used in Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis software 7
256 (<http://www.megasoftware.net>) (retrieved on 30 January 2023) to conduct the phylogenetic analysis,
257 and the precision of the results was assessed using bootstrap values obtained from 1000 repeats
258 (Saitou and Nei, 1987, Felsenstein, 1985, Tamura et al., 2004, Kumar et al., 2016).

259 **3. Results**

260 **3.1. Microbiological Assessment of Samples**

261 According to morphology, Gram staining, and biochemical tests, bacterial species were determined
262 from the DFUs patients. in the total samples (180), the frequency distribution of *S. aureus*, *E. coli*,
263 *S. epidermidis* and *P. aeruginosa* were reported 98 (54%), 75 (41.6%), 20 (11.1%) and 18 (10%)
264 respectively.

265 **3.2. Antimicrobial Susceptibility**

266 Antimicrobial sensitivity testing was performed on all bacterial isolates. The overall antibiotic
267 resistance patterns of the bacterial isolates from patients with DFUs are shown in Figures 1-4.

268 **3.3. Phenotypic detection of extended-spectrum β -lactamases**

269 Gram-negative bacterial species for ESBL activity were evaluated. Out of 18 *P. aeruginosa*, 22.2 %
270 (n = 4) were ESBL-positive phenotypically, and 20% isolates of *E. coli* were ESBL-positive, as
271 shown in Figures 5 and 6.

272 **3.4. Molecular identification and phylogenetic network analysis**

273 Molecular identification of isolated species was performed by amplifying the 16S rRNA gene using
274 universal primers, i.e., 785F and 907R. Based upon the sequencing data, the phylogenetic tree for *E.*
275 *coli*, *P. aeruginosa*, and *S. aureus* from the current study gathered with each other and with
276 reference sequences showing their high similarity based on 16S rRNA (Figure 7-8, 9). The
277 sequencing results further validate bacterial identification based on sequence BLAST.

278 The distribution of different antibiotic-resistant genes was reported by polymerase chain reaction,
279 as shown in Table 2. The most commonly detected antibiotic resistance genes (erythromycin and
280 aminoglycoside) in *S. aureus* were *erm(B)* and *aac (6') aph (2')*. The results revealed that *aac (6')*
281 *aph (2')* was detected in 18 isolates (60%), and *erm(B)* was detected in 14 isolates (46.6%) of 30
282 isolates. *blaZ*, *tet (K)*, *msr (A)*, and *erm (C)* were not found in any isolates. In *E. coli*, the most
283 common antibiotic resistance genes (ampicillin, tetracycline, and erythromycin) were *ampC*, *tet (A)*,
284 and *erm(B)*. The results revealed that the *ampC* was detected in twenty-four isolates (80%), and
285 *tet(A)* and *erm(B)* were detected in sixteen isolates (53.3%) out of thirty isolates. *erm(A)*, *erm(C)*,
286 and *aadAI* genes were not found in any isolates. The results showed high antibiotic resistance in *E.*
287 *coli* and *S. aureus* strains. The distributions of genes associated with drug resistance differed from
288 those reported worldwide. The phylogenetic tree for *E. coli*, *P. aeruginosa*, and *S. aureus* from the
289 current study clustered with each other and with reference sequences showing their close similarity
290 based on 16S rRNA (Figure 8-9).

291 4. Discussion

292 Diabetic foot ulcer infection is a serious complication commonly observed in elderly diabetic
293 individuals and is difficult to treat. Pakistan is a high-burden diabetes zone of South Asia; however
294 little evidence is obtainable about the molecular characteristics of the bacterial strains dominant in
295 the region. Current study reports on the molecular characterization of multidrug resistance among
296 bacterial isolates from Pakistan. Unfortunately, diabetic foot ulcers have been largely overlooked in
297 healthcare research and planning. Therefore, clinical practice is often guided more by personal
298 opinion than scientific evidence. Moreover, understanding of the underlying pathological
299 mechanisms is limited and communication between the various specialties involved is often
300 disjointed (Khan *et al.*, 2019).

301 In a study conducted by Ramakant *et al.* (2011), a global estimate of the prevalence of DFUs was
302 determined through a meta-analysis of 67 published articles. The reported prevalence rate ranged
303 from 1.5% to 16.6%. The prevalence rate of 1.5% was observed in the Australian population, while
304 the highest rate of 16.6% was observed in the population in Belgium. The prevalence rate observed
305 in the Indian population was 11.6%. The present study observed that out of 180 samples, the most
306 commonly isolated pathogenic bacteria based on differential media, morphological and biochemical
307 tests were *S. aureus* 98 (54%) and *E. coli* 75 (41.6%). *S. epidermidis* 20 (11.1%) and *P. aeruginosa*
308 18 (10%) were lowest among all isolates. In the current study, we also employed 16S rRNA

309 sequencing to validate bacterial identification. As here, we see most of current study sequences
310 cluster with the sequences reported from Pakistan previously.

311 In some relevant studies, Gram-negative infection is predominant (Ali *et al.*, 2019). In the relevant
312 study, the main organisms isolated were *S. aureus* (16%), *E. coli* (15%), *Klebsiella pneumoniae*
313 (7%), *Proteus mirabilis* (11%), and *P. aeruginosa* (7%) (Mutonga, D. M., *et al.*, 2019). Our study
314 showed high resistance to antibiotics against *S. aureus* and *S. epidermidis*, including tetracycline,
315 erythromycin, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole, daptomycin, chloramphenicol, amoxicillin-
316 clavulanate, methicillin, and tetracycline. High resistance was reported against antibiotics
317 (erythromycin, streptomycin, ampicillin, sulfamethoxazole, ceftriaxone, chloramphenicol, and
318 amoxicillin-clavulanate used to treat *E. coli* infections including. High resistance was also shown
319 against antibiotics used to treat *P. aeruginosa*, i.e., ceftazidime, imipenem, meropenem, cefepime,
320 amikacin, ceftriaxone, ofloxacin, and amoxicillin-clavulanate. In a comparable study, isolated
321 bacteria showed resistance to antibiotics such as ceftazidime, amoxicillin, tetracycline, ampicillin,
322 piperacillin-tazobactam, cefuroxime, cefepime, erythromycin, clindamycin, and trimethoprim-
323 sulfamethoxazole (Mutonga *et al.*, 2019). Previous research has identified *S. aureus*, *S. epidermidis*,
324 and *P. aeruginosa* as common bacteria found in diabetic foot ulcer (DFU) wound fluids. Some
325 studies have suggested that delayed wound healing may be attributed to the involvement of
326 particular pathogenic microorganisms. The presence of polymicrobial organisms in the wound site
327 might lead to delays in wound healing. Although the bacterial load may significantly affect the
328 wound healing process, the antibiotic resistance pattern found in wound fluid could also play a
329 significant role. Despite the limited effectiveness of most β -lactams against *staphylococci*,
330 *enterobacteria*, and *acinetobacter* spp, piperacillin proved to be the most potent antibiotic against
331 *P. aeruginosa* (Khan *et al.*, 2019). In contrast, Paterson *et al.* (2005) found amikacin and
332 piperacillin/tazobactam effective against *Pseudomonas*, and ciprofloxacin was identified as the
333 most effective drug for *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infections. However, 46% of strains from diabetic
334 wounds in this study were resistant to ciprofloxacin. The resistance against most β -lactams is well-
335 documented for *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, the resistance to fourth generation cephalosporins poses
336 major concerns. Gales *et al.* (2001) reported similar findings with *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* strains
337 showing higher susceptibility to ceftazidime than cefepime in the Asia-Pacific region. In a study by
338 Gadepalli *et al.* (2006), enterococci exhibited high levels of resistance to ciprofloxacin,
339 erythromycin, and tetracycline, while showing low levels of resistance to high levels of

340 aminoglycosides. Despite being commonly referred to as commensals, *enterococci* can act as
341 opportunistic pathogens in diabetic individuals, as noted by Citron *et al.* (2007). Various studies
342 have demonstrated the presence of biofilm-forming microorganisms in chronic wounds, as reported
343 by James *et al.* (2008). Multispecies communities in biofilms contribute a critical role in the
344 wound-healing process (Gupta *et al.*, 2023; Tiwari *et al.*, 2012).

345 In the current investigation, the antibiotic resistance genes frequently detected in *S. aureus* were
346 *erm(B)* and *aac (6') aph (2')*. The results revealed that out of thirty isolates, *aac (6') aph (2')* was
347 detected in 18 isolates (60%), and *erm(B)* was detected in fourteen (46.6%) isolates. The *erm(B)*
348 gene encodes a protein that makes *S. aureus* resistant particularly to erythromycin. The *aac(6') aph*
349 *(2')* gene encodes an enzyme that modifies aminoglycoside antibiotics. Erythromycin is not as
350 commonly used as methicillin to treat *S. aureus* infections, so the *erm(B)* gene is not globally as
351 common as the *mecA* gene which imparts methicillin resistance. *blaZ*, *tet (K)*, *msr(A)*, *erm(C)* were
352 not found in any isolates. In *E. coli*, the most common antibiotic resistance genes (ampicillin,
353 tetracycline, and erythromycin) are *ampC*, *tet (A)* and *erm(B)* in Pakistani population as reported in
354 current investigation. The results revealed that *ampC* was detected in 24 isolates (80%), and *tet(A)*
355 and *erm(B)* were detected in 16 isolates (53.3%) of 30 isolates. *erm (A)*, *erm(C)*, and *aadA1* genes
356 were not found in any isolates. The most common antibiotic resistance gene found in *E. coli* isolates
357 from DFUs worldwide is *blaCTX-M*. It encodes a protein that makes *E. coli* resistant to extended-
358 spectrum beta-lactam antibiotics, such as cefotaxime and ceftazidime which pose a serious global
359 threat. Other common antibiotic resistance genes found in *E. coli* isolates from DFUs worldwide
360 include *ampC*, *qnrB*, and *sul3*. The geographical variation in the distribution of antibiotic resistance
361 genes in DFUs is a complex issue. Many factors contribute to this variation, including the use of
362 antibiotics, the environment, and the genetic makeup of bacteria. In a relevant study, PCR was
363 performed to identify 13 virulence genes in *E. coli* using their specific primers. The distribution of
364 the tetracycline-resistant gene, *tetA*, was higher in Sudan and China isolates by 54% and 84%,
365 respectively, comparable to our study and other studies reported globally (Enne *et al.*, 2008;
366 Abdelgader *et al.*, 2018). In another relevant study, out of 125 samples, 19 *S. aureus* isolates were
367 identified. All the identified isolates were MDR. The isolates resistant to penicillin, tetracycline,
368 erythromycin, and kanamycin were studied for the resistance genes *blaZ* (100%), (*msrA*(100%),
369 *ermB*(0%), and *ermC* (100%), *aac (6') aph (2')* (62.5%) and *tetK* (100%). The distribution of genes
370 is somehow different from those reported in our study (Fawzy *et al.*, 2017).

371 The distributions of genes associated with antibiotic resistance in the studied region differ from
372 those reported worldwide (Mutonga *et al.*, 2019).

373 The findings of the study can help clinicians decide which antibiotics to prescribe as initial empiric
374 therapy. If a patient has a DFU caused by an ESBL-producing *E. coli* strain, choosing an antibiotic
375 that is not affected by the resistance mechanism like carbapenems may prove more effective. The
376 current study provided valuable local data endorsing the revision of treatment guidelines specific to
377 the region. This data can contribute to national surveillance efforts allowing public health
378 authorities to monitor trends, identify emerging resistance patterns, and implement effective
379 infection control strategies. Current investigation also calls to explore alternative approaches
380 including novel antimicrobial peptides to treat DFUs. Comparative studies between different
381 regions can provide valuable insights into the epidemiology of DFUs.

382 This study has certain limitations, including a small sample size. It highlights the need for further
383 research involving a larger patient population to validate the findings. Although the results are
384 preliminary, they provide valuable insights for informing treatment decisions for patients with
385 DFU. The high incidence of *staphylococcus aureus* and extended-spectrum β -lactamase-producing
386 strains highlights the importance of judicious antibiotic use to manage DFUs effectively. The use of
387 antibiotics at an alarming rate in the developing countries such as in Pakistan to treat DFUs causes
388 high resistance and demands for the new antibiotics screenings.

389 **5. Conclusions**

390 The most commonly isolated organisms from DFUs were *S. aureus* and *E. coli*. The lowest among
391 all the isolates were *S. epidermidis* and *P. aeruginosa*. The antibiotic resistance genes most
392 commonly detected in *S. aureus* and *E. coli* were *erm(B)* and *aac(6') aph (2')* and *ampC*, *tetA*,
393 *erm(B)*, respectively. The distributions of genes associated with drug resistance differed from those
394 reported worldwide. These findings will aid in guiding the empirical use of antibiotics for treating
395 diabetic foot infections, thereby reducing the risk of inappropriate antibiotic use and the
396 development of antibiotic resistance. The increase of general awareness programs can help to stop
397 the progression of infection and more importantly, the risk of lower extremity amputation can be
398 decreased with multimodal approaches, improved diagnostic techniques, appropriate antibiotic use,
399 surgical interventions, and routine foot evaluations.

400

401

402 **Figure 1.** Overall antibiotic resistance patterns of *S. aureus* isolated from DFUs patients.
403 **Figure 2.** Overall antibiotic resistance patterns of *S. epidermidis* isolated from DFUs patients.
404 **Figure 3.** Overall antibiotic resistance patterns of *Escherichia coli* Isolated from DFUs patients.
405 **Figure 4.** Overall antibiotic resistance patterns of *P. aeruginosa* Isolated from DFUs patients.
406 **Figure 5.** ESBL activity against *P. aeruginosa*
407 **Figure 6.** ESBL activity against *E. coli*.
408 **Figure 7.** Evolutionary relationships of *E. coli* isolates based on 16 S rRNA gene sequences with
409 reference sequences. The analysis included 21 GenBank sequences to construct phylogenetic tree
410 by using MEGA. 7. Dendrograms were constructed, and genetic diversity was observed in *E. coli*. It
411 can be concluded that high genetic diversity is observed in the isolated strains.
412 **Figure 8.** Evolutionary relationships of *P. aeruginosa* based on 16 S rRNA gene sequences with
413 reference sequences. The analysis included 15 GenBank sequences. Dendrograms were constructed
414 and genetic diversity was observed in *P. aeruginosa* isolates. It can be concluded that high genetic
415 diversity is observed in the isolated *P. aeruginosa* strains as compared to *E. coli*.
416 **Figure 9.** Evolutionary relationships of *S. aureus* based on 16 S rRNA gene sequences with
417 reference sequences. The analysis included 16 GenBank sequences. Dendrograms were constructed
418 and genetic diversity was observed in *S. aureus* isolates. It can be concluded that high genetic
419 diversity is observed in the isolated *S. aureus* strains as compared to *E. coli* and *P. aeruginosa*.
420 **Table 1.** Sequences of oligonucleotide primers of resistance genes.
421 **Table 2.** Distribution of antibiotic-resistant genes in *S. aureus* and *E. coli*.

422

423 References

424

- 425 1. Abdelgader S. A, Shi D, Chen M, Zhang L, Hejair H, Muhammad U, & Zhang W. (2018):
426 Antibiotics resistance genes screening and comparative genomics analysis of commensal
427 *Escherichia coli* isolated from poultry farms between China and Sudan. *BioMed research*
428 *international*. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/5327450>
- 429 2. Afonso, A. C., Oliveira, D., Saavedra, M. J., Borges, A., & Simões, M. (2021). Biofilms in
430 diabetic foot ulcers: impact, risk factors and control strategies. *International journal of*
431 *molecular sciences*, 22(15), 8278-8290. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms22158278>

- 432 3. Ali M, Gul T, Imran A, Ali A, Gul A, & Mukhtar S. (2019): Microorganism culture and
433 antibiotic sensitivity pattern isolated from diabetic foot infections at tertiary care hospital,
434 Mardan. *Pak J Surg*, 35(3), 220-23.
- 435 4. Anvarinejad M, Pouladfar G, Japoni A, Bolandparvaz S, Satiary Z, Abbasi P, & Mardaneh
436 J. (2015): Isolation and Antibiotic Susceptibility of the Microorganisms Isolated from
437 Diabetic Foot Infections in Nemazee Hospital, Southern Iran. *Journal of Pathogens*, 1-7.
438 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/328796>
- 439 5. Baral P, Afnan N, Ahmad Zahra M, Akter B, Rabia Prapti S, Muazzam Hossan M, &
440 Haque, F. K. M. (2024). Bacteriological analysis and antibiotic resistance in patients with
441 diabetic foot ulcers in Dhaka. *Plos one*, 19(5), e0301767.
- 442 6. Citron D. M, Goldstein E. J, Merriam C. V, Lipsky B. A, & Abramson, M. A. (2007):
443 Bacteriology of moderate-to-severe diabetic foot infections and in vitro activity of
444 antimicrobial agents. *Journal of clinical Microbiology*, 45(9), 2819-2828.
445 <https://doi.org/10.1128/jcm.00551-07>
- 446 7. CLSI, (2020): Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. 30th ed.
447 CLSI supplement M100. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2020
- 448 8. Enne, V. I, Cassar, C, Sprigings, K, Woodward, M. J, & Bennett, P. M. (2008): A high
449 prevalence of antimicrobial resistant *Escherichia coli* isolated from pigs and a low
450 prevalence of antimicrobial resistant *E. coli* from cattle and sheep in Great Britain at
451 slaughter, *FEMS Microbiology Letters*, 278, 2, 193-199. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6968.2007.00991.x)
452 [6968.2007.00991.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6968.2007.00991.x)
- 453 9. Felsenstein, J. (1985). Confidence limits on phylogenies: an approach using the
454 bootstrap. *evolution*, 39(4): 783-791.
- 455 10. Gadepalli R, Dhawan B, Sreenivas V, Kapil A, Ammini A. C, & Chaudhry R. (2006): A
456 clinico-microbiological study of diabetic foot ulcers in an Indian tertiary care
457 hospital. *Diabetes care*, 29(8), 1727-1732. <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc06-0116>
- 458 11. Gales A. C, Jones R. N, Turnidge J, Rennie R, & Ramphal R. (2001): Characterization of
459 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* isolates: occurrence rates, antimicrobial susceptibility patterns,
460 and molecular typing in the global SENTRY Antimicrobial Surveillance Program, 1997-
461 1999. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 32(Supplement_2), S146-S155.
462 <https://doi.org/10.1086/320186>

- 463 12. Ghotaslou, R., Memar, M. Y., & Alizadeh, N. (2018). Classification, microbiology and
464 treatment of diabetic foot infections. *Journal of wound care*, 27(7), 434-441.
465 <https://doi.org/10.12968/jowc.2018.27.7.434>
- 466 13. Grice E. A, Kong H. H, Renaud G, Young A. C, Bouffard G. G, Blakesley R. W, Segre J. A.
467 (2008): A diversity profile of the human skin microbiota. *Genome research*, 18(7), 1043-
468 1050. <http://www.genome.org/cgi/doi/10.1101/gr.075549.107>
- 469 14. Guerra E, Junker A, Schroeter B, Malorny S, Lehmann and R. Helmuth. (2003): Phenotypic
470 and genotypic characterization of antimicrobial resistance in German *Escherichia coli*
471 isolates from cattle, swine and poultry. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*, 52(3), 489-
472 492. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkg362>
- 473 15. Jarlier, V., Nicolas, M.H. and Fourneir, G., 1998. Extended spectrum beta lactamases
474 conferring transferable resistance to newer β -lactam agents in Enterobacteriaceae: Hospital
475 prevalence and susceptibility patterns. *Rev. Infect. Dis.*, 10: 867- 878.
476 <https://doi.org/10.1093/clinids/10.4.867>
- 477 16. Kandemir, Ö., Akbay, E., Şahin, E., Milcan, A., & Gen, R. (2007). Risk factors for infection
478 of the diabetic foot with multi-antibiotic resistant microorganisms. *Journal of Infection*,
479 54(5), 439-445. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2006.08.013>
- 480 17. Khan MA, Rahman AU, Khan B, Al-Mijalli SH, Alswat AS, Amin A, et al (2023):
481 Antibiotic Resistance Profiling and Phylogenicity of Uropathogenic Bacteria Isolated from
482 Patients with Urinary Tract Infections. *Antibiotics*, 12(10):1508.
- 483 18. Khan, Z. A, Ahmad, J, Nasim, O, & Rustam, Z. (2019): Antimicrobial Susceptibility Pattern
484 of Isolates From Diabetic Foot Ulcers. *Journal of Islamic International Medical College*
485 *(JIIMC)*, 14(3), 105-110.
- 486 19. Kumar, S., Stecher, G., & Tamura, K. (2016): MEGA7: molecular evolutionary genetics
487 analysis version 7.0 for bigger datasets. *Molecular biology and evolution*, 33(7): 1870-1874.
- 488 20. Lipsky, B. A., Senneville, É., Abbas, Z. G., Aragón-Sánchez, J., Diggler, M., Embil, J. M., &
489 International Working Group on the Diabetic Foot (IWGDF). (2020). Guidelines on the
490 diagnosis and treatment of foot infection in persons with diabetes (IWGDF 2019 update).
491 *Diabetes/metabolism research and reviews*, 36(7), 32-
492 80. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dmrr.3280>

- 493 21. Magiorakos A. P, Srinivasan A, Carey R. B, Carmeli Y, Falagas M. E, Giske C. G, &
494 Monnet D. L. (2012): Bacteria: an international expert proposal for interim standard
495 definitions for acquired resistance. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, vol. 18, pp. 268–
496 281. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03570.x>
- 497 22. Mehraj, M., & Shah, I. (2018). A review of Wagner classification and current concepts in
498 management of diabetic foot. *Int J Orthop Sci*, 4(1), 933-935.
- 499 23. Mutonga D. M, Mureithi M. W, Ngugi N. N, & Otieno F. C. (2019): Bacterial isolation and
500 antibiotic susceptibility from diabetic foot ulcers in Kenya using microbiological tests and
501 comparison with RT-PCR in detection of *S. aureus* and MRSA. *BMC research notes*, 12(1),
502 1-6.
- 503 24. Paterson D. L. (2006): The epidemiological profile of infections with multidrug-resistant
504 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Acinetobacter* species. *Clinical infectious*
505 *diseases*, 43(Supplement_2), S43-S48. <https://doi.org/10.1086/504476>
- 506 25. Pouget, C., Dunyach-Remy, C., Pantel, A., Schuldiner, S., Sotto, A., & Lavigne, J. P.
507 (2020). Biofilms in diabetic foot ulcers: Significance and clinical relevance.
508 *Microorganisms*, 8(10), 15-80. <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms8101580>
509
- 510 26. Saitou, N., & Nei, M. (1987): The neighbor-joining method: a new method for
511 reconstructing phylogenetic trees. *Molecular biology and evolution*, 4(4): 406-425.
- 512 27. Sari, R, Pratiwi A, and Indira D. P. (2018): Sensitivity of *Escherichia Coli* Bacteria
513 Towards Antibiotics in Patient with Diabetic Foot Ulcer. *Pharmaceutical Sciences and*
514 *Research*, 5(1):19–24. <https://doi.org/10.7454/psr.v5i1.3649>
- 515 28. Schwarzer S, James G. A, Goeres D, Bjarnsholt T, Vickery K, Percival S. L, & Malone M.
516 (2020): The efficacy of topical agents used in wounds for managing chronic biofilm
517 infections: A systematic review. *Journal of Infection*, 80(3), 261-270.
518 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2019.12.017>
- 519 29. Tamura, K., Nei, M., & Kumar, S. (2004): Prospects for inferring very large phylogenies by
520 using the neighbor-joining method. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
521 *Sciences*, 101(30): 11030-11035.
- 522 30. Wang, Xuan, et al. "Diabetic foot ulcers: Classification, risk factors and
523 management." *World Journal of Diabetes* 13.12 (2022): 1049.

524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539

540 **Table 1.** Sequences of oligonucleotide primers of resistance genes.

Bacterial Isolate	Antibiotic	Gene	Primer Sequence	Product size
	Penicillin	<i>blaZ</i>	(F)ACTTCAACACCTGCTGCTTTC	173
			(R)TGACCACTTTTATCAGCAACC	
<i>S. aureus</i>	Tetracycline	<i>tet(K)</i>	(F)GTAGCGACAATAGGTAATAGT	360
			(R)GTAGTGACAATAAACCTCCTA	
	Erythromycin	<i>msr(A)</i>	(F)GCAAATGGTGTAGGTAAGACAAC	400
			T	(R)ATCATGTGATGTAAACAAAAT

	<i>erm(C)</i>		425
		(F)ATCTTTGAAATCGGCTCAGG	
		(R)CAAACCCGTATTCCACGATT	
	<i>erm(B)</i>		
		(F)CATTTAACGACGAAACTGGC	
		(R)GGAACATCTGTGGTATGGCG	
		(F)GAAGTACGCAGAAGAGA	
Aminoglycoside	<i>aac (6') aph (2')</i>	(R)ACATGGCAAGCTCTAGGA	491
		(F)AATGGGTTTTCTACGGTCTG	
Ampicillin	<i>ampC</i>	(R)GGGCAGCAAATGTGGAGCAA	191
		(F)GGTTCACTCGAACGACGTCA	
Tetracycline	<i>tet(A)</i>	(R)CTGTCCGACAAGTTGCATGA	577
<i>Escherichia coli</i>			
	<i>erm(B)</i>	(F)GAAAAAGTACTCAACCAAATA	
Erythromycin		(R)AATTTAAGTACCGTTAC	642
	<i>erm(A)</i>	(F)TCTAAAAAGCATGTAAAAGAAA	533
		(R)CGATACTTTTTGTAGTCCTTC	642
		(F)TCAAAACATAATATAGATAAA	
	<i>erm(C)</i>	(R)GCTAATATTGTTTAAATCGTCAAT	

Streptomycin	<i>aadA1</i>	(F) TATCCAGCTAAGCGCGAACT (R) ATTTGCCGACTACCTTGGTC	286
--------------	--------------	--	-----

541

542

543

544

545 **Table 2.** Distribution of antibiotic-resistant genes in *S. aureus* and *E. coli*.

	Antibiotic	Gene	Distribution/Percentage	Total Isolates
<i>S. aureus</i>	Erythromycin	erm(B)	18 (60%)	30
	Aminoglycosideaac(6')aph (2'')		14 (46.6%)	30
	Penicillin	blaZ,	0	30
	Tetracycline	tet(K)	0	30
	Erythromycin	msr(A),	0	30
	Erythromycin	erm(C)	0	30
<i>E. coli</i>	Ampicillin,	ampC	24 (80%)	30
	Tetracycline	tet(A)	(53.3%)	30
	Erythromycin	erm(B)	(53.3%)	30
	Erythromycin	erm(A)	0	30
	Erythromycin	erm(C)	0	30
	Streptomycin	aadA1	0	30

546

ORIGINALITY REPORT

19%

SIMILARITY INDEX

12%

INTERNET SOURCES

12%

PUBLICATIONS

5%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Submitted to Manipal University Student Paper	1%
2	d-nb.info Internet Source	1%
3	www.jstage.jst.go.jp Internet Source	1%
4	pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov Internet Source	1%
5	jpma.org.pk Internet Source	<1%
6	Fang Du, Jing Ma, Hongping Gong, Raju Bista, Panpan Zha, Yan Ren, Yun Gao, Dawei Chen, Xingwu Ran, Chun Wang. "Microbial Infection and Antibiotic Susceptibility of Diabetic Foot Ulcer in China: Literature Review", Frontiers in Endocrinology, 2022 Publication	<1%
7	bmcrenotes.biomedcentral.com Internet Source	<1%

8	doaj.org Internet Source	<1 %
9	pdfs.semanticscholar.org Internet Source	<1 %
10	researchonline.federation.edu.au Internet Source	<1 %
11	Poulomi Baral, Nafisa Afnan, Maftuha Ahmad Zahra, Baby Akter et al. "Bacteriological analysis and antibiotic resistance in patients with diabetic foot ulcers in Dhaka", PLOS ONE, 2024 Publication	<1 %
12	Submitted to Republic of the Maldives Student Paper	<1 %
13	Submitted to Sophia University Student Paper	<1 %
14	Carla Vignaroli, Giada Zandri, Lucia Aquilanti, Sonia Pasquaroli, Francesca Biavasco. "Multidrug-Resistant Enterococci in Animal Meat and Faeces and Co-Transfer of Resistance from an Enterococcus durans to a Human Enterococcus faecium", Current Microbiology, 2011 Publication	<1 %
15	Klibi, N., S. Gharbi, A. Masmoudi, K. Ben Slama, P. Poeta, M. Zarazaga, C. Fendri, A.	<1 %

Boudabous, and C. Torres. "Antibiotic Resistance and Mechanisms Implicated in Clinical Enterococci in a Tunisian Hospital", *Journal of Chemotherapy*, 2006.

Publication

16

Mojtaba Anvarinejad, Gholamreza Pouladfar, Aziz Japoni, Shahram Bolandparvaz, Zeinab Satiary, Pejman Abbasi, Jalal Mardaneh. "Isolation and Antibiotic Susceptibility of the Microorganisms Isolated from Diabetic Foot Infections in Nemazee Hospital, Southern Iran", *Journal of Pathogens*, 2015

Publication

<1 %

17

C. Wildemauwe, C. Godard, R. Vanhoof, E. Van Bossuyt, E. Hannecart-Pokorni. "Changes in major populations of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in Belgium", *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 1996

Publication

<1 %

18

"13th European Congress of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases", *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 2003

Publication

<1 %

19

Ahmed Mahmoud, Wafaa Zahran, Ghada Hindawi, Aza Labib, Rasha Galal. "Prevalence of Multidrug-Resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in Patients with Nosocomial Infections at a University Hospital in Egypt,

<1 %

with Special Reference to Typing Methods",
Journal of Virology & Microbiology, 2013

Publication

20 Submitted to University of New England <1 %
Student Paper

21 dora.dmu.ac.uk <1 %
Internet Source

22 H. Momtaz, E. Rahimi, S. Moshkelani. <1 %
" Molecular detection of antimicrobial
resistance genes in E. coli isolated from
slaughtered commercial chickens in Iran",
Veterinárni Medicína, 2012
Publication

23 repositories.lib.utexas.edu <1 %
Internet Source

24 v3r.esp.org <1 %
Internet Source

25 westminsterresearch.westminster.ac.uk <1 %
Internet Source

26 www.nexusacademicpublishers.com <1 %
Internet Source

27 Asegdew Atlaw, Habtamu Biazin Kebede, <1 %
Abdurezak Ahmed Abdela, Yimtubezinash
Woldeamanuel. "Bacterial isolates from
diabetic foot ulcers and their antimicrobial
resistance profile from selected hospitals in

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia", Frontiers in
Endocrinology, 2022

Publication

28

Lin Yang, Xin-Shan Ye. "Development of Aminoglycoside Antibiotics Effective Against Resistant Bacterial Strains", Current Topics in Medicinal Chemistry, 2010

Publication

<1 %

29

discovery.ucl.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1 %

30

"Diabetic Foot Ulcer", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2021

Publication

<1 %

31

C Schroeder. "Isolation of antimicrobial-resistant Escherichia coli from retail meats purchased in Greater Washington, DC, USA", International Journal of Food Microbiology, 2003

Publication

<1 %

32

Submitted to The University of Texas at Arlington

Student Paper

<1 %

33

www.banglajol.info

Internet Source

<1 %

34

Submitted to Rutgers University, New Brunswick

Student Paper

<1 %

35	Submitted to rdia Student Paper	<1 %
36	recentscientific.com Internet Source	<1 %
37	Kandemir, O.. "Risk factors for infection of the diabetic foot with multi-antibiotic resistant microorganisms", Journal of Infection, 200705 Publication	<1 %
38	acikbilim.yok.gov.tr Internet Source	<1 %
39	topsecretapiaccess.dovepress.com Internet Source	<1 %
40	www.biorxiv.org Internet Source	<1 %
41	Mark A Kosinski, Benjamin A Lipsky. "Current medical management of diabetic foot infections", Expert Review of Anti-infective Therapy, 2014 Publication	<1 %
42	Yaqoob, M., L. P. Wang, S. Wang, S. Hussain, J. Memon, J. Kashif, and C.-P. Lu. "Associations Between Anti-Microbial Resistance Phenotypes, Anti-Microbial Resistance Genotypes and Virulence Genes of <i>Escherichia coli</i> Isolates from Pakistan and China : Anti-	<1 %

Microbial Resistance and Virulence Genes in", Transboundary and Emerging Diseases, 2012.

Publication

43 core-cms.prod.aop.cambridge.org <1 %
Internet Source

44 scienceon.kisti.re.kr <1 %
Internet Source

45 www.science.gov <1 %
Internet Source

46 Abdullah Riaz, Zeeshan Taj, Dalal Sulaiman Alshaya, Muhammad Saqalein et al. <1 %
"Immunohistochemistry and molecular detection of Helicobacter pylori infection and their virulent genes in gastric biopsies from Pakistan", Research Square Platform LLC, 2024
Publication

47 Submitted to Brunel University <1 %
Student Paper

48 acamedicine.org <1 %
Internet Source

49 lib.dr.iastate.edu <1 %
Internet Source

50 mbsresearch.com <1 %
Internet Source

onlinelibrary.wiley.com

51

Internet Source

<1 %

52

ourarchive.otago.ac.nz

Internet Source

<1 %

53

repository.sustech.edu

Internet Source

<1 %

54

wiredspace.wits.ac.za

Internet Source

<1 %

55

www.scielo.br

Internet Source

<1 %

56

www.slpk.sk

Internet Source

<1 %

57

"Advanced Protocols in Oxidative Stress III",
Springer Science and Business Media LLC,
2015

Publication

<1 %

58

AL WARREN. "Multi-drug resistant Escherichia coli with extended-spectrum β -lactamase activity and fluoroquinolone resistance isolated from clinical infections in dogs",
Australian Veterinary Journal, 9/2001

Publication

<1 %

59

Chang, Yanzi, Hong Gao, Zhenhua Zhu, Shuo Ye, Yuanbin Yang, Xuanyi Shen, Danyang Zhang, and Qifa Song. "High Prevalence and Properties of Enterotoxin-Producing

<1 %

Staphylococcus aureus ST5 Strains of Food Sources in China", Foodborne Pathogens and Disease, 2016.

Publication

60

Marlon Yovera-Aldana, Paola Sifuentes-Hermenegildo, Martha Sofia Cervera-Ocaña, Edward Mezones-Holguin. "Association of multidrug-resistant bacteria and clinical outcomes in patients with infected diabetic foot in a Peruvian hospital: A retrospective cohort analysis", PLOS ONE, 2024

Publication

<1 %

61

Parisa Behruznia, Mehrzad Sadredinamin, Ali Hashemi, Bahareh Hajikhani et al. "Decreased Susceptibility of Shigella Isolates to Azithromycin in Children in Tehran, Iran", Canadian Journal of Infectious Diseases and Medical Microbiology, 2022

Publication

<1 %

62

Reza Ghanbarpour, Mojtaba Kiani. "Characterization of non-O157 shiga toxin-producing Escherichia coli isolates from healthy fat-tailed sheep in southeastern of Iran", Tropical Animal Health and Production, 2012

Publication

<1 %

63

Ruchi Roy, Raj Singh, Sasha H. Shafikhani. "Chapter 17 Infection in Diabetes:

<1 %

Epidemiology, Immune Dysfunctions, and
Therapeutics", Springer Science and Business
Media LLC, 2024

Publication

64 digital.library.adelaide.edu.au <1 %
Internet Source

65 medicopublication.com <1 %
Internet Source

66 orca.cf.ac.uk <1 %
Internet Source

67 sifisheressciences.com <1 %
Internet Source

68 westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk <1 %
Internet Source

69 www.baker.edu.au <1 %
Internet Source

70 www.nejm.org <1 %
Internet Source

71 Carlota Gudiol, Josefina Ayats, Mariana Camoez, M. Ángeles Domínguez et al. "Increase in Bloodstream Infection Due to Vancomycin-Susceptible Enterococcus faecium in Cancer Patients: Risk Factors, Molecular Epidemiology and Outcomes", PLoS ONE, 2013 <1 %
Publication

72

Ihsan Ullah, Fazal Subhan, Javaid Alam, Muhammad Shahid, Muhammad Ayaz. "Suppression of Cisplatin-Induced Vomiting by Cannabis sativa in Pigeons: Neurochemical Evidences", *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, 2018

Publication

<1 %

73

L. Zainab, K. Ibrar, A. Sadiq, A.K. Hamid, Midrar Ullah, R. Noor. "Extended spectrum beta lactamases-producing *Escherichia coli* in retail chicken meat from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan", *Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences*, 2022

Publication

<1 %

74

"R1885 - R2270", *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 4/2006

Publication

<1 %

75

Burcin Ozer. "Characteristics of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* isolates from intensive care unit", *Central European Journal of Medicine*, 06/2009

Publication

<1 %

76

Catarina M. Marinho, Tiago Santos, Alexandre Gonçalves, Patrícia Poeta, Gilberto Igrejas. "A Decade-Long Commitment to Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance in Portugal", *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 2016

Publication

<1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On