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ABSTRACT

Background: The spread of carbapenem resistance among Enterobacteriaceae have become a problem for healthcare facilities worldwide. Community and hospital-acquired infections caused by these bacteria have been associated with significant morbidity and mortality with limited treatment options. Rapid detection of carbapenem resistant Enterobacteriaceae (CRE) is important for infection control.

Objectives: To detect the prevalence of carbapenem resistant Enterobacteriaceae (CRE) species and determine their antimicrobial susceptibility profile using the Vitek 2 system and the presence of carbapenemases genes using Multiplex PCR.

Methodology: Various clinical samples were collected from 469 patients from Sohag University Hospitals in the period between August 2016 and April 2018. CRE isolates were identified by conventional methods and antimicrobial susceptibility testing using disc diffusion method and also performed by Vitek 2 automated system. Multiplex PCR was used for detection of carbapenemases genes as blaKPC, blaVIM, blaIMP, blaNDM-1 and blaOXA-48.

Results: The prevalence of carbapenem resistant Enterobacteriaceae (CRE) species was 19.9%. Klebsiella pneumoniae was the most common species (51.4%), Enterobacter aerogenes (8.6%) and Acinetobacter baumannii (5.7%). Vitek 2 system identified CRE isolates with 82.7% sensitivity, 98.6 % specificity and 90.6% diagnostic accuracy. 25.7% of CRE strains were isolated from the internal ICU and 20 % from Chest Department, and mostly isolated from urine (40%) and from endotracheal tubes swabs (28.6 %) 77.1 % of CRE isolates contained carbapenemases genes, 62.1 % were blaKPC positive, 20.7 % were blaVIM-positive, 3.4 % were blaNDM-positive, 13.8 % were blaOXA-48-positive and none was blaIMP-positive.

Conclusion: Conventional methods supported by Vitek 2 system is a valuable method for identification of CRE species, the detected carbapenemases genes in this study indicate that carbapenem resistance is spreading in Egypt and support the use of molecular methods for the rapid detection of CRE for successful implementation of infection control measures. We recommend routine testing to determine carbapenem resistance in Enterobacteriaceae in health facilities in Egypt.

INTRODUCTION

Enterobacteriaceae are common human pathogens and colonizers of the intestinal tract which can cause a broad range of diseases including urinary tract infections, pneumonia, bloodstream infections, intraabdominal, skin and soft tissue infections in both community and hospital settings.

The antibiotic resistance among Enterobacteriaceae has become a major problem to public health. Enterobacteriaceae species have been identified as important nosocomial pathogens that can lead to severe morbidity and mortality, particularly in intensive care, internal medicine and surgical units.

Dissemination of infections caused by extended-spectrum β-lactamases (ESBL) and AmpC β-lactamases producing Enterobacteriaceae has compromised susceptibility to cephalosporins worldwide and increase the usage of carbapenems and the emergence of carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae (CRE).

Carbapenem resistance in Enterobacteriaceae resulted from: increased production of ESBL or AmpC enzymes combined with loss of porins or efflux pump upregulation and/or carbapenem-hydrolyzing carbapenemases production, however, acquisition of carbapenemases genes has been reported worldwide as the main cause of emergence of Carbapenem-resistant enterobacteriaceae.
The first carbapenemase producer in enterobacteriaceae (NmcA) was identified in 1993. These enzymes have primarily been described in Klebsiella spp. and Serratia marcescens, and throughout different countries.

While resistance of chromosomal-mediated (intrinsc) carbapenemases is limited, some plasmid-mediated (extrinsic) carbapenemases have emerged in recent years. Plasmid-mediated carbapenemases can hydrolyse β-lactam antibiotics and carbapenems. These are the members of Ambler class A, B and D β-lactamases. The SME, NMC, IMI, KPC, and GES enzymes comprise class A carbapenemases. Moreover, IPM, VIM, GIM, SPM, SIM, and NDM-1 enzymes comprise class B, and OXA enzymes that hydrolyse oxacillins comprise class D.

Molecular diagnostic methods as plasmid profile analysis, restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLPs), restriction endonuclease analysis (REA) of chromosomal DNA, real time and multiplex PCR, ribotyping, pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE) and DNA sequencing are used to detect the presence of carbapenemases genes in Carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriacea.

Although the recent emergence and dissemination of carbapenem resistance in Enterobacteriacea is frequently reported worldwide but a few published data about resistant species are available. Molecular diagnostic methods as plasmid profile analysis, restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLPs), restriction endonuclease analysis (REA) of chromosomal DNA, real time and multiplex PCR, ribotyping, pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE) and DNA sequencing are used to detect the presence of carbapenemases genes using a molecular method.

**METHODOLOGY**

This work is a cross-sectional laboratory based study conducted in the Infection Control Unit Laboratory of Sohag University Hospitals and included 469 patients admitted to different departments and ICUs who acquired nosocomial infections in the period between August 2016 and April 2018. All patients, diagnosed clinically, were subjected to the following: detailed history of associated risk factors, thorough clinical examination and laboratory investigations, institutional ethical board approval and informed consent were taken from all the patients.

**Phenotypic identification of Carbapenem Resistant Enterobacteriacea (CRE):**

Enterobacteriacea isolates from different clinical samples (urine, pus, sputum, blood and endotracheal tubes swabs, etc) were identified using conventional methods as gram staining, culture on MacConkey's, EMB and MIO agars, and biochemical reactions.

Phenotypic identification of CRE isolates were performed by antimicrobial susceptibility testing using Kirby-Bauer disc diffusion method according to CLSI 2013 M100-S23 breakpoint values. Susceptibilities were determined to imipenem (IPM) (10µg), meropenem (MEM) (10µg), ertapenem (ERT) (10µg), ceftriaxone(30µg), cefotaxime (30µg), ceftazidime (30µg), cefoxitin(30µg), cefepime (30µg), ciprofloxacin(5µg), levofloxacin(5µg), ampicillin (10µg), piperacillin (100µg), amoxicillin/ clavulanic acid (20/10µg), piperacillin/tazobactam (100/10µg), aztreonam (30µg), amikacin(30µg), gentamicin(10µg), tobramycin(10µg) and trimethoprim sulphamethoxazole (1.25/23.75µg) (Oxoid, UK), isolates were considered as CRE if they were found resistant or intermediate susceptible to one or more of the carbapenems (IPM, MEM and ERT).

**Vitek 2 system identification of CRE:**

Identification of the CRE isolates was also performed by Vitek 2 automated system. pure subcultures of Enterobacteriacea isolates were suspended in sterile saline and measured by the DensiChek turbidity meter (bioMérieux) to obtain 0.5 McFarland turbidity, then inoculated to the colorimetric ID-GN cards, the Vitek 2 compact instrument automatically filled, sealed, and incubated the cards, results were compared to the database of the unknown organism. Final identifications listed as “excellent,” “very good,” “good,” “acceptable” or “low discrimination” was considered correct, antibiotics susceptibility tests were done using Vitek 2 AST-GN cards performed according to manufacturer's protocol.

**Multiplex PCR amplification of Carbapenemases genes:**

Multiplex PCR was used for detection of carbapenemases (bla) genes as blaKPC gene, metallo-β-lactamase genes as blaVIM, blaIMP and blaNDM-1, oxacilllase genes as blaOXA-48, DNA extraction for all carbapenem resistant Enterobacteriacea(CRE) isolates was performed using boiling method to obtain bacterial DNA. Primers sequences used for detection of carbapenemases genes are presented in table (1).
Amplification was carried out in T-Gradient thermal cycler (Biometra, Germany) using 50 µL reaction volume containing 5uL of template DNA (50ng/ µL) added to a 45uL mixture containing 200 uM of dNTP mixtures (Roche, Switzerland), 0.4uM of each primer, 2.5U Taq DNA polymerase (Invitrogen, Germany), and appropriate PCR buffer (0.2uM MgCl2, 2.5uM KCL, 0.5uL 10% Tween 20, 1uL of Gelatin, and 3.8uL of pure water). For blaVIM, bla KPC, bla NDM, and bla OXA-48, the programme was denaturation at 94°C for 45 seconds, annealing at 52°C for 1 minute, and elongation at 72 °C for 1 minute. For bla IMP the same programme was used except that the annealing temperature was adjusted to 45°C for 1 minute. A total of 40 cycles were performed. This was followed by a final extension at 72 °C for 10 minutes. PCR amplicons were resolved by electrophoresis on a 1.5% agarose gel stained with ethidium bromide by comparing with 100 base-pairs standard DNA ladder and visualized by gel documentation system.

**Statistical Analysis**

Data were analyzed using computer program SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 10, data were expressed as number and percent. Quantitative data were analyzed using student Mann-Whitney test Qualitative data was compared using Chi square test; P value was considered significant if less than or equal to 0.05.

**RESULTS**

A total of 469 patients were included in the study, with mean age 51.4 y (range 14–83y), 294 (62.7 %) were males and 175 (37.3 %) were females.

590 pathogens were identified, these consisted of 176 (29.8%) Enterobacteriaceae, 96 (16.4%) non-Enterobacteriaceae gram -ve bacilli, 211(35.8%) gram +ve cocci and 107(18.1%) fungal pathogens.

**Enterobacteriaceae isolates:**

From the 176 Enterobacteriaceae isolates identified, Klebsiella pneumoniae was the most common isolate (38.6%), followed by Escherichia Coli (30.7%), Enterobacter aerogenes (13.6%), Proteus mirabilis (7.4%), Acinetobacter baumannii (6.3%), Enterobacter cloacae complex (1.7%), Klebsiella oxytoca (1.1%), Citrobacter spp (0.6%) (Table 2).

The cumulative antibiogram of Enterobacteriaceae isolates were as follow, resistance rate to imipenem was 21.8%, meropenem was 20.1%, ertapenem was 19.9%, ceftiraxone was 47%, cefotaxime was 50.7%, ceftazidime was 63.9%, cefoxitin was 50%, cefepime was 42.8%, ciprofloxacin was 35.8%, levofloxacin was 29.9%,ampicillin was 93.8%, piperacillin was 80.1%, amoxicillin/clavulanic acid was 83%, piperacillin/tazobactam was 71%, aztreonam was 19.9%, amikacin was 35.9%, gentamicin was 63%, tobramycin was 76.7%, and trimethoprim-sulphamethoxazole was 87.1%.

**CRE isolates:**

Thirty five CRE isolates (19.9%) were identified from the 176 Enterobacteriaceae isolates by the disc diffusion method. The most common CRE species were Klebsiella pneumoniae (51.4%), Escherichia Coli (28.6%), Enterobacter aerogenes (8.6%), Acinetobacter baumannii (5.7%), Proteus mirabilis (2.8%) and Klebsiella oxytoca (2.8%) (Table 2), also Vitek 2 system identified correctly 29 CRE isolates with 82.7% sensitivity, 98.6% specificity and 90.6% diagnostic accuracy. There was no statistically significant differences between percentages of different species of carbapenem resistant and carbapenem sensitive Enterobacteriaceae (P value=0.06) (Tables 2,3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primers sequences used in PCR detection of Carbapenemases genes</th>
<th>Primers sequences</th>
<th>Amplicon size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *bla* KPC | F 5'-CAT TCA AGG GCT TTC TTG CT-3'  
R 5'-AGC ACG GCA TAG TCA TTT G-3' | 521bp |
| *bla* IMP | F 5'-TTG ACA CTC CAT TTA CDG-3'  
R 5'-GAT YGA GAA TTA AGC CAC YC-3' | 139bp |
| *bla* VIM | F 5'-GAT GTT GGT TGG TCG CAT A-3'  
R 5'-CGA ATG CGC AGC ACC AG-3' | 390bp |
| *bla* NDM-1 | F 5'-GGT TTG GCG ATC TGG TTT TC-3' | 339bp |
| *bla* OXA-48 | F 5'-GCT TGA TCG CCC TCG ATT-3  
R 5'-GAT TTG CTC CGT GGC CGA AA-3' | 281bp |
Table 2: Comparison between Carbapenem Resistant and Carbapenem Sensitive Enterobacteriaceae species:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterobacteriaceae species:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Carbapenem resistant Enterobacteriaceae</th>
<th>Carbapenem sensitive Enterobacteriaceae</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Klebsiella pneumoniae</td>
<td>68(38.6%)</td>
<td>18 (51.4%)</td>
<td>50 (35.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Coli</td>
<td>54(30.7%)</td>
<td>10 (28.6%)</td>
<td>44 (31.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterobacter aerogenes</td>
<td>24(13.6%)</td>
<td>3 (8.6%)</td>
<td>21 (14.9%)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acinetobacter baumannii</td>
<td>11(6.3%)</td>
<td>2 (5.7%)</td>
<td>9 (6.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterobacter cloacae</td>
<td>3(1.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (2.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proteus mirabilis</td>
<td>13(7.4%)</td>
<td>1 (2.8%)</td>
<td>12 (8.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klebsiella oxytoca</td>
<td>2(1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (2.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrobacter</td>
<td>1(0.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176(100%)</td>
<td>35(19.9%)</td>
<td>141(80.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Differential diagnostic values of Disc diffusion versus Vitek 2 system in detecting Carbapenem Resistance in Enterobacteriaceae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibiotic sensitivity test</th>
<th>Vitek 2 system AST-GN (Carbapenem)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disc diffusion method (Carbapenem)</td>
<td>Resistant</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibiotic sensitivity test</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>98.6 %</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>95.9 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25.7% of CRE strains were isolated from the internal ICU, 20 % from chest, 17.1 % from surgery, 17.1% from internal medicine, 11.4% from neuropsychiatry, and 8.6% from plastic surgery department. As regard the clinical samples, most of the 35 CRE isolates were collected from urine (14 isolates, 40%), endotracheal tube (10 isolates, 28.6%), sputum (6 isolates, 17.1%), and pus (3 isolates, 8.6%). There was no statistically significant differences regarding percentages of carbapenem resistant and carbapenem sensitive enterobacteriaceae between different departments and clinical samples with non significant values simultaneously (P-values of 0.19 and 0.08, respectively) (Tables 4, 5).

Table 4: Comparison between Carbapenem Resistant and Carbapenem Sensitive Enterobacteriaceae according to Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Carbapenem resistance</th>
<th>Carbapenem sensitive</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICUs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9(25.7%)</td>
<td>49 (34.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7 (20%)</td>
<td>35 (24.8%)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal medicine</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6 (17.1%)</td>
<td>25 (17.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuropsychiatry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4 (11.4%)</td>
<td>19 (13.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General surgery</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6 (17.1%)</td>
<td>11 (7.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastic surgery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 (8.6%)</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Comparison between Carbapenem Resistant and Carbapenem Sensitive Enterobacteriaceae according to Clinical samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical samples</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Carbapenem resistance</th>
<th>Carbapenem sensitive</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urine</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>14 (40%)</td>
<td>70 (49.6%)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pus</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3 (8.6%)</td>
<td>19 (13.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sputum</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6 (17.1%)</td>
<td>22 (15.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 (0 %)</td>
<td>5 (3.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinary catheter</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 (5.7%)</td>
<td>5 (3.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endotracheal tube</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10(28.6%)</td>
<td>20(14.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The use of external devices as intravenous cannula, urinary catheter and drainer was the most common risk factor of CRE infections. It was positive in the case for 85.7% of patients, with significant P value (P value=0.02), previous antibiotic treatment, with augmentin and third generation cephalosporins was the commonest antibiotics, was positive in 40% of CRE patients (p value=0.08), diabetes mellitus was positive in 34%, and renal disease in 26% of CRE patients, with non significant P values(0.06 and 0.4) simultaneously. there were no statistically significant differences between patients with CRE and patients without CRE as regard age, sex, liver diseases, duration of hospital stay and duration of antibiotics intake (p values > 0.05)

Carbapenemases genes identified by multiplex PCR:

Twenty seven (77.1%) isolates from a total of 35 CRE isolates contained at least one of the carbapenemases (bla) encoding genes. Of these, 18 (62.1 %) were blaKPC positive, 6 (20.7 %) were blaVIM-positive, 1 (3.4 %) were blaNDM-1-positive, 4 (13.8 %) were blaOX4-8-positive and 0 (0 %) was blaIMP-positive. 2 (7.4 %) of CRE isolates contained both of blaKPC and blaVIM genes. Most of the carbapenemase encoding CRE isolates were Klebsiella pneumoniae (18/18;100 %), Escherichia Coli (8/18;100 %), Enterobacter aerogenes (2/3; 66.7%), Acinetobacter baumannii (1/2; 50 %), in Klebsiella pneumoniae and Escherichia Coli, the predominating bla gene was blaKPC (66.7% & 50 %), simultaneously. (Table 6, Figures 1-5)

**Table 6: Distribution of Carbapenemase (bla) genes in Carbapenem Resistant Enterobacteriacae Species**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRE species</th>
<th>blaKPC</th>
<th>blaVIM</th>
<th>blaNDM</th>
<th>blaOXA48</th>
<th>blaIMP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Klebsiella pneumoniae(n=18)</td>
<td>12(66.7%)</td>
<td>2(11.1%)</td>
<td>1(5.6%)</td>
<td>3(16.7%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>18(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Coli (n=10)</td>
<td>4(50%)</td>
<td>3(37.5%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>1(12.5%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>8(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterobacter aerogenes(n=1)</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>1(50%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>2(66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acinetobacter baumannii (n=2)</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>1(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proteus mirabilis(n=1)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klebsiella oxytoca(n=3)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

18(62.1 %) | 6(20.7 %) | 1 (3.4 %) | 4 (13.8 %) | 0 (0%) | 29 (100%) |
Fig. 5: Agarose gel electrophoresis of multiplex \textit{blaVIM} and \textit{blaKPC} genes (390 bp & 521 bp)

Cumulative Antiibiogram of CRE:
Figure 6 presents the cumulative antibiogram of the 35 CRE isolates studied. There was no statistically significant difference in the resistance rates of CRE to imipenem, meropenem or ertapenem (97%, 97% and 91%); as regard cephalosporins, resistance rate of CRE were 69% to ceftriaxone, 63% to cefotaxime, 80% to cefazidime and 51% to cefoxitin and cefepime.

31/35 isolates (89%) were resistant to ciprofloxacin and 24/35 isolates (69%) to levofloxacin. As regards penicillins, resistance rates of CRE were 97% to ampicillin, 77% to piperacillin, 71% to amoxicillin/ clavulanic acid and 63% to piperacillin/tazobactam. 33/35 of isolates (94%) were resistant to trimethoprim- sulfamethoxazole. no significant difference was noted in resistance rates to amikacin (51%) compared to gentamicin (51%) or tobramycin (69%) (Figure 6)

Fig. 6: Cumulative Antiibiogram of CRE

DISCUSSION

Carbapenem resistance in Enterobacteriaceae, in particular \textit{Klebsiella pneumoniae} and \textit{Escherichia coli}, is an increasing problem worldwide; production of carbapenemases is the main mechanism of this resistance, rapid detection of carbapenemase producing Enterobacteriaceae strains is crucial for preventing hospital infections and outbreaks.\textsuperscript{16}

In this study, 590 pathogens from 469 patients were identified; 176 (29.8%) Enterobacteriaceae isolates. \textit{Klebsiella pneumoniae} was the most common species (38.6%), followed by \textit{Escherichia Coli} (30.7%), and \textit{Enterobacter aerogenes} (13.6%), these results were in agreement with the results reported by \textit{Eraghya et al.} who found that \textit{E. coli} (48.4%) and \textit{K. pneumonia} (18.3%) were the two most common Enterobacteriaceae species, followed by \textit{Enterobacter spp.} (13.3%) \textsuperscript{17} this also correlates with the findings of \textit{Shaaban et al.} and \textit{AbdEl-Mongy and Reyad et al.} \textsuperscript{18-19}

The rate of CRE among Enterobacteriaceae species in our hospital during this study was found as 19.9 %., the most common CRE species were \textit{Klebsiella pneumoniae} (51.4%), \textit{Escherichia Coli} (28.6%), \textit{Enterobacter aerogenes} (8.6%), \textit{Acinetobacter baumannii} (5.7%), \textit{Proteus mirabilis} (2.8%) and \textit{Klebsiella oxytoca} (2.8%).

These results correlate with the study performed by \textit{El-Rehewy} and his colleagues\textsuperscript{20} who found that carbapenem resistance rate among gram negative bacilli in nosocomially infected patients from Assuit University Hospitals is 27.17 %, and in other two different Egyptian studies performed by \textit{Eraghya et al.} \textsuperscript{17} in Menoufia university hospitals and by \textit{El-Kazzaz and Abou El-khier}\textsuperscript{21} in Mansoura university hospitals, who found that the rates of CRE were 45% and 47%, simultaneously, it is also in accordance with \textit{Wattal et al.} who reported high prevalence of resistance to carbapenems, ranging from 13 to 51% in \textit{E.coli} and \textit{Klebsiella spp.} from ICUs and wards from tertiary care hospital in Delhi.\textsuperscript{22}
In controversy to our results, a low rate of carbapenem resistance among Enterobacteriaceae (2.82 %) was found in a Turkish study performed by Irmak and Neriman23, also in the United States, the prevalence of CRE was found to be between 1.4 and 4.2 %.24, similar low CRE isolation rates have been reported in Lebanon 1.2% and in Malaysia 4.05%25-26.

In our study, there was no statistically significant difference in the resistance rates of CRE isolates to imipenem, meropenem or ertapenem (97%, 97% and 91%) and this in agreement with the study performed by Kazem and his colleagues on 43 CRE strains: 100% were ertapenem-resistant, 95.3% were meropenem-resistant and 83.7% were imipenem-resistant.16

The antibioticogram of the CRE isolates of our study showed variable degrees of resistance to different antibiotics. As regard cephalosporins, the resistance rate of CRE were 69% to ceftriaxone, 63% to cefotaxime, 80% to ceftazidime and 51% to cefotin and ceftipime. 89% were resistant to ciprofloxacin and 69% to levofloxacin. Similar resistance rates were detected by Kucukates and Kocazeybek who reported that resistance of gram negative enteric bacilli to ciprofloxacin and ceftriaxone ranged from 50-100% and 25-83.3%, respectively.27

25.7% of CRE strains were isolated from the internal ICU, 20% from chest and 17.1% from surgery departments, these results are in agreement with these obtained by Irmak and Neriman that showed that the majority of CRE strains were isolated from ICUs (27%).23

As regards the clinical samples, most of the CRE isolates were collected from urine (40%), from sputum (17.1%), from pus (8.6%) and from endotracheal tubes swabs (28.6%), these results correlate with the study performed by El-Rehewy et al.28 who found that the highest numbers of isolates were collected from the endotracheal aspirate (24.5%), followed by sputum samples (20%), urine samples (17.75%), blood samples (16.06%), wound swabs (15.77%), and throat swabs (5.92%).

Certain risk factors were found to be related to the acquisition of CRE infections, the use of external devices was positive in 85.7%, previous antibiotic treatment, especially augmentin and third generation cephalosporins was present in 40%, diabetes mellitus in 34% and renal disease was positive in 26% of CRE infected patients. 2 previous studies reported that staying in the ICU, surgical procedures, using catheter, length of hospitalization and using of cephalosporins and aminoglycosides are risk factors for carbapenem-resistant K. pneumoniae infections.28-29

In the current study, 77.1% of CRE isolates contained at least one of the carbapenemases genes identified by multiplex PCR, 62.1% were blaKPC-positive, 20.7% were blaVIM-positive, 3.4% were blaNDM-positive, 13.8% were blaOXA-48-positive and non was blaIMP-positive. In Klebsiella pneumoniae and Escherichia Coli, the predominating bla gene was blaKPC (66.7% & 50%) simultaneously.

As regard blaKPC gene, a study performed in Menoufia university hospitals on multidrug-resistant enterobacteriacea nosocomial uropathogens showed that 24.07% of carbapenem resistant isolates were positive for blaKPC using real time PCR,37 and also in agreement with a study by Girgis et al.30 in Ain Shams university hospitals, they reported that 21% of isolates were blaKPC gene positive using PCR.

Two previous studies evaluated carbapenem resistance in ESBL-producing carbapenem-resistant K. pneumoniae strains. of the 14 strains examined, the OXA-1 gene was detected in all, the OXA-48 gene in two, and the NDM-1 gene in two31-32, a multi-central surveillance study performed at a Turkish university hospital showed that more than 96% of K. pneumoniae isolates harbored blaOXA-48 gene33, blaNDM-1 gene in a previous study was observed in 6.5% of the resistant K.pneumoniae isolates recovered from infection sites and rectal swab.34

In controversy to our results, some studies reported that blaKPC, blaIMP, and blaVIM genes were not determined from any of the K.pneumoniae isolates.2, two recent studies were performed on carbapenem-resistant K. pneumoniae clinical isolates from different hospitals of Turkey detected that no positive results for blaKPC, blaIMP, and blaVIM genes.16,33 also, an Egyptian study performed by Hassan et al.36 on 30 Acinetobacter baumannii carbapenem resistant clinical isolates reported that none of the isolates was positive for blaNDM-1 gene using real time PCR.

Our results create a useful benchmark for future CRE surveillance and infection control measures in different wards of our hospitals. Limitations of our study were the small number of patients and the CRE isolates were not tested for their susceptibility to other antibiotics such as colistin, tigecycline, and fosfomycin. These drugs can open a new gate to the medical personnel for treating CRE infections.

CONCLUSIONS

The detected carbapenemases genes as blaKPC, blaVIM, blaNDM-1 and blaOXA-48 in this study indicate that carbapenem resistance is spreading in our locality and Egypt and support the use of molecular methods for the rapid detection of CRE, successful implementation of infection control measures is a must to solve the problem of bacterial resistance, and to prevent its spread, we recommend routine testing to determine carbapenem resistance among Enterobacteriaceae isolates in our hospital and other health facilities in Egypt, in addition, antibiotics such as colistin, tigecycline and fosfomycin should be tested to provide alternative treatment to CRE.
Conflicts of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare in relation to this article. The authors are responsible for the content and the writing of the paper.

REFERENCES


21. El-Kazzaz S, Abou El-khier N. AmpC and metallo beta-lactamas producing Gram negative bacteria


