Original Article

Microbial and Antibiotic Susceptibility Profiles among Pleural Effusion Exudative Samples

Alireza Abdollahi¹, Saeed Shoar ^{1, 2}, Hiva Saffar ¹, Hana saffar ¹, Azita Yazdi ¹

 Dept. of Pathology, Imam Khomeini Hospital Complex, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran
 Development Association for Clinical Study (DACS), Student Scientific Research Center (SSCR), Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

Background and Objectives: Infection of pleural fluid is a common disease and because of antibiotic administration, the microbiology of this fluid has changed. The aim of this study was to determine the common bacteria and suitable antibiotics for treatment in pleural effusion (PE).

Materials and Methods: In this cross sectional study, 1210 samples with exudative features were cultured for possible growth of microbial pathogens and then examined for antibiotics sensitivity. Samples' characteristics were then analyzed according to the age and sex difference.

Results: Among 1210 exudative pleural effusions, 38.2% were obtained from females and 61.8% from males. Of 142 pleural fluid samples, 11.7% had a positive culture. Aerobic gram negative organism was the most common type among the other samples with a prevalence of 52% followed by aerobic gram positive (25.3%), non- aerobic gram negative (15.7%), non- aerobic gram positive (6.2%) and fungi (0.8%). *E. coli, Staphylococcus Aureus* and *Acinetobacter baumannii* were the most common types of organism among adult population.

Conclusion: Aerobic gram positive bacteria had the highest prevalence among the pathogens, and cephalosporins, aminopenicillins and β -lactams were the most effective antibiotics for their treatment.

Keywords: Pleural Effusion, Bacterial Infection, Bacterial Sensitivity Test

Accepted: 05/May/ 2013

IRANIAN JOURNAL OF PATHOLOGY

Received: 03/January/2013

Address Communications to: Dr Alireza Abdollahi, Department of Pathology, Imam Hospital Complex, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran. Email: dr p abdollahi@yahoo.com

Introduction

leural disorders usually manifest as pleural effusion (PE) (1). Inflammation of pleura leads to increasing the permeability of pleural vessels and fluid accumulation in the pleura. Pleural effusion is divided in two types of transudate and exudate based on the absolute lactic dehydrogenase (LDH) value, pleural fluid to serum LDH ratio, pleural fluid protein concentration and pleural fluid to serum protein ratio (2-4). Pleural infection which is a common problem, affects 60000 patients in USA and UK each year (4). It does not belong to any specific age groups but is more frequent in childhood and elderly (5-8). Based on the sex, it is two times more frequent in male and diabetes mellitus is another risk factor of the disease occurrence (5-8).

Evaluation of pleural fluid is usually done by Gram staining and culture. After administration of antibiotics for infected PE treatment, the microbiology of this fluid has changed. During 50 years ago, Streptococcus pneumonia was the most common organisms in parapneumonic effusion but today because of Pneumococal conjugate vaccine and penicillin usage the prevalence of this organism in positive cultures decreased to 10-15% (5, 7, 9). The prevalence of cultured pathogens is differs based on the infection of pleural fluid in the hospital or community. In hospital-acquired infections, Staphylococcus aureus specially methicillin resistant type, Enterococcus, Enterobacteriaceae and multi-drug resistant organisms are the most common pathogens but in community-acquired pleural infection, Streptococcus milleri group which is consist of S. anginosus, S. constellatus and S. intermedius are the most frequent organism and after that in order of prevalence, Streptococcus Pneumoniae, Staphylococcus Aureus and Enterobacteriaceae are common. In addition, up to 25% of community-acquired infection is due to anaerobic bacteria (5, 6, 8). For decreasing the morbidity and mortality of infected pleural effusion we should choose the appropriate antibiotics; therefore we need to know the bacteriology of pleural fluid and determine the most common pathogens in this liquid.

We aimed to analyze the PE to establish the common bacteria and suitable antibiotics for treatment.

Materials and Methods

Through a cross sectional study in Central Laboratory of Hematology and Microbiology in Imam Khomeini Hospital affiliated to Tehran University of Medical Sciences (TUMS) in Tehran, Iran, patients with diagnosis of pleural undergoing thoracocentesis effusion were included in this study between 2006 and 2012. Plural tap was performed under sterile conditions with the patients in semi sitting position bending forward. Specimen were collected in a 20 ml tube and transferred to the laboratory for further hematological, biochemistry and microbiological evaluation with conducting microbiologic culture on the predetermined media for 72 hours. Effusion specimens with serous features were excluded

from the study. Simultaneous measurements of blood samples were also performed in association with obtained pleural fluids.

The samples are studied and cultured based on standard instructions. The samples were first centrifuged so that slides were made of their sediments. The slides were then stained with Giemsa and Gram and examined for smearing. The sediment was cultured in three mediums – blood agar with sheep blood, chocolate agar and EMB. A portion of the samples was cultured in thioglycolate medium for enrichment. For nonaerobic culture, three gas-pack plates were used.

Identification

Upon receipt of specimen, within a maximum of one hour, the fluid sample was cultured on blood agar with sheep blood, chocolate agar and EMB (Hi Media Co, India) plates separately. All plates were incubated at 37 °C for 24 hours. All bacteria growing on the culture media were identified by their biochemical reaction profile using Beckton & Dickinson and Mast Diagnostic Group UK identification products. In our study, we also accepted mixed cultures which do not reveal more than two predominant bacteria.

The isolated bacteria were inoculated on Mueller Hinton agar (Mast group Ltd, Merseyside, UK) and antimicrobial susceptibility testing was performed using disk diffusion method (as recommended by CLSI No: M2-A9) (7). The antibiotic disks were provided from Mast diagnostic group Ltd. The antibiotic panels were selected according to CLSI guidelines (as described by Clinical and Laboratory Standard Institute (CLSI) No: M100-S16) (8). The inhibition zone diameter was measured using a scaled ruler (antibiotic zone scale) and reported as resistant, intermediate and susceptible. Standard bacteria (ATCC) were used as control strains and the test results were only accepted when the inhibition zone diameters of the above mentioned control strains were within performance ranges (as described by CLSI No: M100-S16). In case of mixed bacteria, only the major and predominant pathogens were tested.

Demographic and primary clinical characteristics were extracted from patient's medical records and were registered in our data bank in association with other clinical and laboratory findings. Patients signed an informed consent before entering the study and the institutional review board of TUMS approved the study protocol.

Statistical Package for Social Sciences were used to analyze data of the current study with employment of student t-test for quantitative and Chi square test for qualitative variables while the values were considered statistically significant at a P<0.05.

Results

A total of 1210 exudative pleural effusion samples transferred to the central laboratory of our hospital were analyzed of which 463 samples belonged to females (38.2%) while the remainder 747 ones belonged to the male's patients (61.8%). Moreover, 24 samples were obtained from children (1.98%) defined as lower the age of 16 years old compared with 1186 samples taped from adults (97.02%) over the age of 16 years old. Demographic characteristics of patients' population showed in Table I.

Of these, 142 samples were positive in terms of microbiological culture (11.7%) of which 37 specimens belonged to females (7.9%) compared with 105 samples obtained from male patients (14.05%). Furthermore, three samples out of 24 ones in pediatric group results positive for microbiological culture (12.5%) while this proportion was as 139 positive cultures in adult group out of 1186 samples (11.72%). Type and antibiotic sensitivity of microorganisms are summarized in Table 2 and 3 according to sex and age groups. As the tables show, aerobic gram negative organism was the most common type among the others samples with a prevalence of 52% followed by aerobic gram positive (25.3%), non-aerobic gram negative (15.7%), non-aerobic gram positive (6.2%) and fungi (0.8%). On the other hand, E. coli, S. aureus and A. baumannii were the most common types of organism among adult population.

Table 1- Demographic characteristics of patients' population

| | Groups | Count | Percent |
|------------------|------------|-------|---------|
| | Male | 747 | 61.8 |
| Sex group | Female | 463 | 38.2 |
| | Pediatrics | 24 | 1.98 |
| Age group | Adults | 1186 | 97.02 |
| | Pediatrics | 3 | 12.5 |
| Positive culture | adults | 139 | 11.72 |
| | Male | 105 | 14.05 |
| | Female | 37 | 7.9 |

| | | | Organisms and count | |
|--------------|------------|--------|--|--|
| Age group | Adults | | <i>Enterococcus</i> (8), <i>citrobacter freundii</i> (1), <i>Enterobacter aerogenes</i> (3), <i>Staphylococcus_epidermidis</i> (10), <i>Pseudomonas_aeruginosa</i> (7), <i>Alcaligenes-sp</i> (1), <i>Staphylococcus-Aureus</i> (28), <i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i> (24), <i>Streptococcus pneumonia</i> (12), <i>Nonhemolytic streptococcus</i> (1), <i>E.coli</i> (20), other(28) | |
| | Pediatrics | | Staphylococcus haemolyticus (1), Staphylococcus_epidermidis (1), Citrobacter sp (1) | |
| Sex group | Adults | Male | Enterococcus (4), Citrobacter freundii (1), Enterobacter aerogenes (3), Staphylococcus_epidermidis (7), Pseudomonas_aeruginosa (6), Alcaligenes-sp (1), Staphylococcus-Aureus (23), Acinetobacter baumannii (19), E. coli (15), other(28) | |
| | | Female | <i>Enterococcus</i> (4), <i>Staphylococcus_epidermidis</i> (3), <i>Pseudomonas_</i> <i>aeruginosa</i> (1), <i>Staphylococcus-Aureus</i> (5), <i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i> (5), other (22) | |
| | Pediatrics | Male | Staphylococcus haemolyticus (0), Staphylococcus_epidermidis (0), | |
| | | Female | Staphylococcus haemolyticus (1), Staphylococcus_epidermidis (1), Citrobacter sp (1) | |

Table 2- Bacteria Isolated from pleural effusion exudative samples based on age and sex

Table 3- Antimicrobial susceptibility to the most frequent isolated microorganisms ,Isolated from pleural effusion exudative samples

| Antibiotic | Sensitive | Resistant | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Organism | | | | |
| Enterococcus | Co Amoxiclav, Amoxicillin, mpicillin, sulbac- Oxacillin, Imipenem, Clindamycin tam, Chloramphenicol, Tetracycline | | | |
| citrobacter freundii | Gentamicin, Ciprofloxacin, ceftazidim, Ampicil- Cefixim, Co-trimoxazole lin, Ceftriaxone, Imipenem | | | |
| Enterobacter aerogenes | Ceftazidim, Cefixim, Ampicillin, Ampicillin- Cefixim, Carbinicillin sulbactam, Imipenem, Gentamycin, Piperacil- lin_Tazobactam | | | |
| Staphylococcus_ epidermidis | Tetracycline, Chloramphenicol, Cephalotin, Ri- Gentamicin, cloxacillin fampin | | | |
| Pseudomonas_ aeruginosa | Gentamicin, ciprofloxacin, Ampicillin, Piperacillin_tazobactam, Tobramycin | Ampicillin, Cefixim, Piperacillin, Cefepime, Clindamycin, Ampicillin | | |
| Alcaligenes-spp | Penicillin, Ciprofloxacin, Ticarcillin | Gentamicin, Ampicillin, Co-trimoxazole, Ceftriaxone, Carbinicillin, Imipenem continue on next page | | |

42 Microbial and Antibiotic Susceptibility Profiles among Pleural ...

| Staphylococcus-Aureus | Vancomycin, Chloramphenicol, Imipenem, Cephalothin | Clindamycin, Penicillin, Ceftriaxone, Cloxacillin, Cephalexin |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Acinetobacter baumannii | Gentamycin, Piperacillin-Tazobactam | Ampicillin, Cefepime, Ceftriaxone, Penicillin, Ceftizoxime, Cefixim, Piperacillin, Ampicil- lin_sulbactam, Amoxicillin, Co_amoxiclav, Ceftazidim, Cip- rofloxacin |
| Klebsiella_pneumonia | Imipenem, Ampicillin_sulbactam, Piperacillin | Ampicillin, Ticarcillin, Co-trimoxazole |
| Streptococcus pneumonia | Amoxicillin, Vancomycin, Ampicillin, Cefazo- lin, Chloramphenicol, Tetracyclin, Rifampin, Clindamycin | Oxacillin, Co-trimoxazole |
| Proteus mirabilis | Gentamicin, Ciprpfloxacin, Imipenem, Pipracil- lin-Tazobactum, Ampicillin-Tazobactum | Cefazolin, ceftazidim, Cefixim, Ceftriaxone, Co_trimoxazole |
| Nonhemolytic streptococcus | Clindamycin, Amoxicillin, Chloramphenicole, Vancomycin, Erythromycin, Ciprofloxacin, Ri- fampin | Ampicillin |
| Citrobacter spp | Gentamicin, Ceftazidim, Ampicillin, Cefepime, Imipenem, Cefixim | Co-trimoxazole |
| Staphylococcus haemolyticus | Ampicillin, Cefazolin, Ceftriaxone, Vancomycin, Tetracyclin, Chloramphenicol | Penicillin, Oxacillin, Clindamycin, Co-trimoxazole |
| Stenotrophomonas maltophilia | Ciprofloxacin | Gentamicin, Ampicillin, cefixim, Piperacillin ,Co_trimoxazole, ceftazidim |
| beta-hemolytic streptococci | Oxacillin, Clindamycin, Vancomycin, Erythro- mycin, Rifampin, Teicoplanin | Co-trimoxazole |
| Streptococcus Group D | Vancomycin | Cefepime, penicillin, Clindamycin, Erythro- mycin |
| Viridans Streptococcus | Ciprofloxacin, Ampicillin, Chlorampheni- col, Vancomycin, Erythromycin, Rifampin, Clindamycin, Teicoplanin | Co-trimoxazole |
| Pseudomonas sp | Ampicillin, Piperacillin-Tazobactam, Ciproflox- acin | Ampicillin, Imipenem, Ceftriaxone, Co-tri- moxazole, Ceftazidim |
| Klebsiella_oxytoca | Ciprofloxacin, Ampicillin, Imipenem, Piperacil- lin, Cefotaxim | Ticarcillin, Ampicillin, Co-trimoxazole |
| Acinetobacter lwoffii | Tobramycin, Tazobactam | Cefixim, Piperacillin |
| Nonhemolytic streptococcus | Ampicillin, Clindamycin, Chloramphenicol, Vancomycin, Erythromycin, Ciprofloxacin, Am- picillin, Imipenem, Rifampin | Ampicillin |
| E.coli | Imipenem, Gentamicin, Piperacillin-Tazobac- tam, Tobramycin | Cefixim, Co-Amoxiclav, Cefotaxime, Penicil- lin, Carbinicillin |
| Streptococcus Pyogenes | Ampicillin, Chloramphenicol, Vancomycin, Erythromycin, Rifampin | Co-trimoxazole, Oxacillin |

Discussion

Our study showed that 3 positive cultures out of 142 belonged to children including 12.5% of children lower the age of 16 years old. Ozol et al. found 40 positive culture samples among 107 children with parapneumonic pleural effusion. Among 1186 adult pleural samples, 39 cultures were positive belong to 11.7% of our samples. Jimenez et al. during their retrospective study on 259 patients with parapneumonic effusion demonstrated that 14 (5.4%) samples were positive for Gram stain and in another study 232 (54%) subjects out of 430 samples had positive cultures (8- 11). This low bacterial detection could be due to antibiotic therapy prior to pleural fluid culture. We found that aerobic gram positive bacteria with prevalence of 52% were the most common cultured pathogen, so E. coli, S. Aureus and A. baumannii were the most prevalent bacteria.

Bacteriology of pleural fluid infection is different among community or hospital- acquired pleural fluid infection. Based on other studies aerobic microorganisms especially gram positive type were most current particularly Streptococci milleri, Streptococcus pneumonia and Staphylococcus aereus. Other streptococci, enterobacteria, Haemophilus influenzae, Pseudomonas spp. tuberculosis and Nocardia were rarely seen in the positive pleural culture. Gram negative organisms like Escherichia coli, Pseudomonas spp, Haemophilus influenzae, and Klebsiella spp were in the second place of prevalence. Prevalence of anerobics pathogens was also increasing in positive pleural effusion cultures and their range was about 12%-34% (12-14), these organisms are cultured among community-acquired pleural fluid but in hospital acquired type, methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus, other staphylococci and enterobacteria are common (14).

All of the patients with pleural infection should be treated with intravenous antibiotics as initial therapy. Antibiotic choosing is depending on various factors like blood and pleural fluid cultures and bacterial sensitivities. As determined in other studies, all the pathogens include of aerobics or anaerobic are resistant to penicillin but for treatment of Pneumococcal or Streptococcus milleri infection antibiotic treatment with β-lactams is recommended (15). In another study, the suitable treatment for aerobic pathogens of pleural fluid was intravenous aminopenicillin or second-generation cephalosporin (e.g. cefuroxime) and the proper antibiotics of anaerobic organisms like metronidazole or clindamycin. This treatment is covering the community acquired pleural fluid pathogens (16-19), but in order to treat the hospital acquired organisms antibiotic should affect the Gram positive and Gram negative aerobic and anaerobic bacteria. Because of their highly antibiotic resistant characteristics, the choice of antibiotics include of third or fourth generation cephalosporin for example: ceftazidime and cefepime, carbapenems or antipseudomonal penicillins like piperacillin/tazobactam with metronidazole. Vancomycine, linezolide or other alternative antibiotics should be added for treatment of methicillin resistant Staphylococcus aureus (16-18). In our study the most frequent organisms were sensitive to β -lactams, vancomycine, aminoglycoside and cephalosporins.

Conclusion

Our study showed that due to high prevalence of aerobic gram positive bacteria, third and fourth generation of cephalosporin, aminopenicillins, β -lactams and vancomycine were the most effective antibiotics for pleural fluid infection treatment.

Acknowledgment

Authors are thankful to Miss Akram Sarbiaee for their kind assistance in statistical analysis. The authors declare that there is no Conflict of interests.

References

1. Light RW, Macgregor MI, Luchsinger PC, Ball WCJ. Pleural effusions: the diagnostic separation of transudates and exudates. Ann Intern Med 1972;77:507-13.

2. Antony VB, Godbey SW, Kunkel SL, Hott JW, Hartman DL, Burdick MD, *et al.* Recruitment of inflammatory cells to the pleural space: chemotactic cytokines, IL-8, and monocyte chemotactic peptide-1 in human pleural fluids. J Immunol 1993;151:7216-23.

3. Sahn SA. State of the art: the pleura. Am Rev Respir Dis 1988;138:184-234.

4. Light RW. Pleural Diseases. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger;1983.

5. Ahmed RA, Marrie TJ, Huang JQ. Thoracic empyema in patients with community-acquired pneumonia. Am J Med 2006;119(10):877-83.

6. Maskell NA, Batt S, Hedley EL, Davies CW, Gillespie SH, Davies RJ, *et al.* The bacteriology of pleural infection by genetic and standard methods and its mortality significance. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2006;174:817-24.

7. Rahman NM, Chapman SJ, Davies RJO. The approach to the patient with a parapneumonic effusion. Clin Chest Med 2006;27:253-66.

8. Schiza S, Siafakas NM. Clinical presentation and management of empyema, lung abscess and pleural effusion. Curr Opin Pulm Med 2006;12(3):205-11.

9. Schultz KD, Fan LL, Pinsky J, Ochoa L, Smith EO, Kaplan SL, *et al.* The changing face of pleural empyemas in children: epidemiology and management. Pediatrics 2004;113:1735-40.

10. Ozol D, Oktem S, Erdinc E. Complicated parapneumonic effusion and empyema thoracis: microbiologic and therapeutic aspects. Respir Med 2006;100:286-91. 11. Jiménez D, Díaz G, García-Rull S, Vidal R, Sueiro A, Light RW. Routine use of pleural fluid cultures. Are they indicated? Limited yield, minimal impact on treatment decisions. Respir Med 2006;100:2048-52.

12. Storm HK, Krasnik M, Bang K, Frimodt-Møller N. Treatment of pleural empyema secondary to pneumonia: thoracocentesis regimen versus tube drainage Thorax 1992;47:821-4.

13. Ashbaugh DG. Empyema thoracis. Factors influencing morbidity and mortality. Chest 1991;99:1162-5.

14. Maskell NA, Davies CW, Jones E, Davies RJ. The characteristics of 300 patients partcipating in the MRC/ BTS multicentre intra-pleural streptokinase vs. placebo trial (ISRCTN-39138989) Presented at the American Thoracic Society Meeting, Atlanta, GA, 2002.

15. Bartlett JG. Antibiotics in lung abscess. Semin Respir Infect 1991;6:103-11.

16. Davies CW, Gleeson FV, Davies RJ. BTS guidelines for the management of pleural infection. Thorax2003;58(2):ii18-28.

17. Davies CWH, Gleeson FV, Davies RJO. Pleural Diseases Group, Standards of Care Committee. British Thoracic Society. BTS guidelines for the management of pleural infection. Thorax 2003;58(II):ii18-28.

18. Hughes CE, Van Scoy RE. Antibiotic therapy of pleural empyema. Semin Respir Infect1991;6:94-102.

19. Hammami S, Saidani M, Ferjeni S, Aissa I, Slim A, Boutiba-Ben Boubaker I. Characterization of Extended Spectramase-Producing *Escherichia coli* in Community-Acquired Urinary Tract Infections in Tunisia. Microb Drug Resist. 2013 Jan 30. [In Press].