Antibiotic sensitivity patterns in cases of pyoderma around Jaipur

Yashdeep Malik^{1*}, Kishor Singh², Sanjay Kanodia³, Arvind Verma⁴, Surendra Singh⁵, Yogender Yadav⁶

Email: robinmalik53@gmail.com, kinstudy@gmail.com, skinstudy@gmail.com, skinstudy@gmailto:skinstudy@gmail.com, skinstudy@gmailto:skinst

Abstract

Introduction: Skin infections are one of the commonest conditions encountered in dermatological practice. These infections are commonly caused by Staphylococcus. aureus and Streptococcus. pyogens. Of late there is a significant change in the pattern of organisms causing pyodermas and their antibiotic sensitivities due to indiscriminate use of topical and systemic antibiotics. The present study was undertaken to find the causative organisms and their pattern of antibiotic susceptibility. Objective: The objective was to isolate and identify various microorganisms and study the antibiotic sensitivity patterns in primary and secondary pyodermas. Methods: 100 consecutive clinically diagnosed and untreated cases of primary and secondary pyoderma were studied over a period of 1 year. All clinically diagnosed cases of pyoderma with positive pus culture report, irrespective of age and sex were included. Cases with history of using topical or systemic antibiotic in the past 2 weeks were excluded. Primary inoculation of the swab was done on MacConkey Agar Plate (M.A), Nutrient Agar Plate (N.A) and Blood Agar Plate (B.A). These samples were incubated aerobically at 37 degree C for 24 hours. Plates showing no growth during the first next 24 hours were further incubated for 24 hours. Various subcultures and standard biochemical tests were performed for identification of organisms. Sensitivity of the organisms to antibiotics was tested on Muller Hinton agar by Kirby-Bauer disc diffusion method. For analysis of data, Chi-Square test was applied. Results: Higher incidence of primary pyodermas were seen in all age groups compared to secondary pyodermas. Lower extremities were involved frequently. In 93 (93%) patients grampositive organisms, while in 6(6%) patients gram-negative organisms were isolated. Staph. aureus was isolated from 84 (84%) samples followed by coagulase negative staphylococcus (5, 5%) E.coli (4;4%), Strept. Haemolyticus (2; 2%), strept. Non-haemolyticus (3, 3%), pseudomonas (1,1%) enterobacter (1,1%). Conclusion: This study yielded some useful epidemiological andclinico-bacterilogical data that might assist clinicians to choose suitable antibiotics for pyodermas, especially in absence of culture and sensitivity report.

Keywords: pyoderma

Dr Yashdeep Malik, Resident, Department Of Dermatology, Venereology and Leprosy, NIMS Medical College, Jaipur-Delhi Highway, Jaipur-303121, Rajasthan, INDIA.

Email: robinmalik53@gmail.com

Received Date: 29/08/2015 Revised Date: 22/09/2015 Accepted Date: 06/11/2015



INTRODUCTION

Pyoderma is defined as the cutaneous bacterial infection that is characterized by polymorphonuclear response from infected host. Primary pyoderma have a characteristic morphology amd caused, by a single organism, and arise on normal skin. In India, skin infections constitute a large percentage of skin diseases among which pyodermas take a very prominent place. Various studies^{1,2} in India from1962-2003 showed the incidence of pyoderma from 7.37% to 10.74% of total skin diseases. Factors like poverty, malnutrition, overcrowding and poor hygiene have been stated to be responsible for its higher incidence. Climatic conditions play an important role with hot and humid seasons being the period of maximum occurrence. These factors prevail in congested industrial cities and slum areas. The skin is sterile at birth for only a

^{1,6}Resident, ²Professor and HOD, ³Professor, ⁴Associate Professor, Department Of Dermatology, Venereology and Leprosy, NIMS Medical College, Jaipur-Delhi Highway, Jaipur-303121, Rajasthan, INDIA.

⁵Pathologist, Department of Pathology, Heart and General Hospital, Jaipur-303121, Rajasthan, INDIA.

^{*}Address for Correspondence:

short period of time thereafter, staphylococcus aureus colonization of the infants on the very first day of life. The organisms that characteristically survive and multiply in various ecologic niches of skin constitute the normal cutaneous flora. Resident flora: Organisms which are found more or less regularly in appreciable number on the skin of most normal individuals, form stable community on the skin and are not easily dislodged. Transient flora: Organisms do not maintain themselves indefinitely on the normal skin. They can be easily removed by scrubbing and disinfectants. Almost any organism may survive temporarily on the cutaneous surface under appropriate conditions. Normal flora defends skin against bacterial infection through bacterial interference. pyoderma includes impetigo, ecthyma, folliculitis, furunculosis, carbuncle, sycosis and cellulitis. Secondary pyoderma includes infection of eczema, infestations, and ulcers etc. If treatment of pyoderma has to be started before the antibiotic sensitivity test result is available. then one should have up to date knowledge about the strains of causative organisms prevalent in the local community, their sensitivity and resistance pattern to various antibiotics. Hence, importance to identify various microorganisms causing pyoderma and their antibiotic susceptibility to various antibiotics needs no emphasis. Streptococci and staphylococci are the most common organisms causing primary and secondary pyoderma. On rare occasions other organisms like Pseudomonas, E. coli and Proteus may be isolated from chronic pyoderma lesions. Universal indiscriminate use of antibiotics is well known and enabled the emergence of increased resistance to antibiotics in clinical practice. Many reports in India highlighted the emergence of methicillinresistant staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) in community well as in communityas acquiredpyodermas^{3,4}. In various studies, it has been observed that there is a significant change in the pattern of organisms causing pyodermas and their antibiotic sensitivities. Many cases do not respond to the antibiotics which were previously very effective for such cases. Perhaps indiscriminate use of topical and systemic antibiotics has contributed largely to this situation. On observing an increasing rate of treatment failures, the present study was undertaken to find out the causative organisms and their latest pattern of antibiotic susceptibility.

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

- 1. To identify and isolate different microorganisms and study these antibiotic sensitivity patterns in primary and secondary pyodermas.
- 2. To compare the present study with similar studies done by other workers in the past.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A prospective non-randomized study on pyodermas was conducted in the Department of Dermatology at Tertiary Care Hospital at Jaipur. Laboratory procedures were carried out in Central laboratory of the hospital.100 consecutive clinically diagnosed and untreated cases of primary and secondary pyoderma were studied over a period of one year.

Inclusion Criteria

All clinically diagnosed cases of pyoderma with positive pus culture report, irrespective of age and sex.

Exclusion Criteria

- 1. History of using topical or systemic antibiotic in the past 2 weeks.
- 2. All clinically diagnosed cases of pyoderma with sterile culture report. Relevant details regarding the chief complaints, duration, progression of lesions, past history, family history and associated conditions (Diabetes mellitus, HIV infection, etc.) were noted. A complete dermatological examination followed by general physical and systemic examination was done. All these findings were recorded in the proforma.

Sample and culture sensitivity testing

Samples were collected before the antibiotic therapy. Primary inoculation of the swab was done MacConkey Agar Plate (M.A), Nutrient Agar Plate (N.A) and Blood Agar Plate (B.A). After inoculation, these samples were incubated aerobically at 37 degree C for 24 hours. Plates showing no growth during the first 24 hours were further incubated for next 24 hours. Various subcultures and standard biochemical tests were performed for identification of organisms. Sensitivity of the organisms to antibiotics was tested on Muller Hinton agar by Kirby-Bauer disc diffusion method.

Stastical Analysis

For analysis of data, the software 'EPI-INFO' Version 6 was used, and Chi-Square test was applied. The results were considered significant at p-value< 0.05.

OBSERVATION AND RESULTS

The study was conducted on 100 consecutive new cases of pyoderma. 72% were males and 28% females. The youngest patient was a 3 month old male child, and the eldest was 72 year old female. The average age was 24.67 years. Rural patients (54) outnumbered the urban patients (46). Most of the patients (74%) maintained good hygiene, and the others (26%) had poor hygiene. Maximum (78%) patients were averagely nourished, followed by well nourished (15%) and poorly nourished patients (7%). Majority (60%) of patients were schooleducated, followed college-educated (21%), then by illiterate patients (13%), and preschool children (6%).

Table 1

		Table						
F. M.	Age group in years							Total
Entity	Up to 10	>10-20	>20-30	>30-40	>40-50	>50	No	%
		Primary py	oderma					
Folliculitis	2	11	12	2	2	1	30	30
Furuncle	0	8	7	4	1	0	20	20
Impetigo	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Abscess	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	3
Ecthyma	0	3	0	0	1	0	4	4
Cellulitis	0	0	1	1	2	1	5	5
Acute paronychia	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Carbuncle	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	3
Subtotal	8	25	22	7	6	3	71	71
	:	Secondary p	yoderma					
IED	1	0	1	0	1	3	6	6
Infected scabies	2	2	2	0	0	0	6	6
Periporitis	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
Infected dematophytosis	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	3
Infected ulcer	0	0	2	3	0	1	6	6
Miscellaneous secondary pyoderma	0	3	3	1	0	0	7	7
Subtotal	5	5	10	4	1	4	29	29
Total	13	30	32	11	7	7	100	100

IED= infectious eczematoid dermatitis

Higher number of cases of primary pyodermas were seen in all age groups compared to secondary pyodermas, and this difference was statistically significant (p value < 0.05). Among primary pyodermas, folliculitis (30%) was the commonest entity, followed by furuncle (20%), impetigo and cellulitis (5%) each. Infectious eczematoid dermatitis, infected scabies and infected ulcers (6% each) were the most common entities among secondary pyodermas. Folliculitis was found to be more common in 3rd and 4th decades. Furunculosis was seen with least frequency in the 1st decade. Impetigo occurred more commonly in 1st decade; as did infected scabies. Males outnumbered the females in both primary and secondary pyodermas; the male to female ratio being 2.57:1. Lower

extremities were involved most frequently, followed by upper extremities, trunk and face. Groin and genitalia were least commonly involved, followed by head and neck. The time to seek treatment was up to 7 days and 8-15 days in 33% and 29% cases respectively. Most (62%) of the patients sought treatment within a span of 15 days. Those who reported at or after 1 month were mostly the cases of secondary pyoderma. History of recurrence was present in 24% cases i. e. in IED (33.33%), furuncle (25%), folliculitis (46.66%), and ulcer (16.66%). It was found to be statistically significant (p < 0.01). Out of 100 cases, 21 patients had diabetes mellitus and history of recurrence was present in 75% and 100% cases of folliculitis and furunculosis respectively in these cases.

Table 2: Bacterial isolates from cases of pyoderma(n=100)

Gram status	Organism	Primary pyoderma samples		Secondar	Total samples		
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Staph.aureus	62	62	22	22	84	84
Gram positive	Coagulase negative staph.	3	3	2	2	5	5
	Strept.haemolyticus	2	2	0	0	2	2
	Strept.non-haemolyticus	1	1	2	2	3	3
	Subtotal	68	68	26	26	94	94
	E coli	3	3	1	1	4	4
Gram negative	Pseudomonas	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Enterobacter	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Subtotal	3	3	3	3	6	6
	Total samples	71	71	29	29	100	100

A total of 100 samples (71 primary pyoderma; 29 secondary pyoderma) were subjected to culture and sensitivity pattern study. In 94 (94%) patients grampositive organisms, while in 6 (6%) patients gram-

negative organisms were isolated. Staph.aureus was isolated from 84 (84%) samples followed by coagulase negative staphylococcus 5 (5%), E.coli 4(4%), Strept. Haemolyticus 2 (2%), Strept. Non-haemolyticus 3(3%),

pseudomonas 1(1%) enterobacter 1(1%). In both primary and secondary pyoderma groups, grampositive organisms (94/100), mainly Staph.aureus were isolated. Gram-negative organisms, although less frequently grown (6/100) as compared to grampositive organisms, but were equally found in primary

and secondary pyoderma groups (3 each). Antimicrobial susceptibility testing was carried out on all isolates. Sensitivity pattern of 5 most common organisms i. e. Staph. aureus, Strept.haemolyticus, Strept. Nonhaemolyticus, coagulase negative staphylococcus and E. coli is shown in table-3

Table 3: Antibiotic susceptibility pattern (in percent)

Ampicillin 35.71 0 0 0 Amikacin 91.83 NT 33.33 100 33.33 Cotrimoxazole 58 0 0 60 50 Ciprofloxacin 66.12 100 0 50 33.33 Augmentin 51.35 0 66.66 50 0 Vancomycin 91.66 0 0 0 NT Cefotaxime 90.62 NT NT 0 0 Cefuroxime 84.61 100 0 66.66 100 Ceftriaxone 100 NT NT NT 0 Doxycycline 94 50 0 66.66 33.33 Tetracycline 83.33 100 NT NT Ofloxacin 73.33 0 100 NT NT Ampicillin + Subactum 56 0 0 33.33 50 Piperacillin 72.72 NT NT NT<	Antibiotic tested	Staph. Aureus	SH	SNH	CNS	E. coli
Cotrimoxazole 58 0 0 60 50 Ciprofloxacin 66.12 100 0 50 33.33 Augmentin 51.35 0 66.66 50 0 Vancomycin 91.66 0 0 0 NT Cefotaxime 90.62 NT NT 0 0 Cefuroxime 84.61 100 0 66.66 100 Ceftriaxone 100 NT NT NT 0 Doxycycline 94 50 0 66.66 33.33 Tetracycline 83.33 100 0 NT NT Ofloxacin 73.33 0 100 NT NT Ampicillin + Subactum 56 0 0 33.33 50 Piperacillin 72.72 NT NT 0 0 Azithromycin 52.63 100 NT NT 100 Cefoxitin 90 NT	Ampicillin	35.71	0	0	0	0
Ciprofloxacin 66.12 100 0 50 33.33 Augmentin 51.35 0 66.66 50 0 Vancomycin 91.66 0 0 0 NT Ceftaxime 90.62 NT NT 0 0 Cefuroxime 84.61 100 0 66.66 100 Ceftriaxone 100 NT NT NT 0 0 Doxycycline 94 50 0 66.66 33.33 33 33 100 0 NT	Amikacin	91.83	NT	33.33	100	33.33
Augmentin 51.35 0 66.66 50 0 Vancomycin 91.66 0 0 0 NT Cefotaxime 90.62 NT NT 0 0 Cefuroxime 84.61 100 0 66.66 100 Ceftriaxone 100 NT NT NT 0 Doxycycline 94 50 0 66.66 33.33 Tetracycline 83.33 100 0 NT NT Ofloxacin 73.33 0 100 NT NT Ampicillin + Subactum 56 0 0 33.33 50 Piperacillin 72.72 NT NT 0 0 Amoxicillin 33.33 0 66.66 25 0 Azithromycin 52.63 100 NT NT NT 100 Cefoxitin 90 NT NT NT 0 NT Gentamycin	Cotrimoxazole	58	0	0	60	50
Vancomycin 91.66 0 0 0 NT Cefotaxime 90.62 NT NT 0 0 Cefuroxime 84.61 100 0 66.66 100 Ceftriaxone 100 NT NT NT 0 Doxycycline 94 50 0 66.66 33.33 Tetracycline 83.33 100 0 NT NT Ofloxacin 73.33 0 100 NT NT Ampicillin + Subactum 56 0 0 33.33 50 Piperacillin 72.72 NT NT 0 0 Amoxicillin 33.33 0 66.66 25 0 Azithromycin 52.63 100 NT NT NT 100 Cefoxitin 90 NT NT NT 0 NT Linezolid 96.77 100 NT 100 NT Gentamycin	Ciprofloxacin	66.12	100	0	50	33.33
Cefotaxime 90.62 NT NT 0 0 Cefuroxime 84.61 100 0 66.66 100 Ceftriaxone 100 NT NT NT 0 Doxycycline 94 50 0 66.66 33.33 Tetracycline 83.33 100 0 NT NT Ofloxacin 73.33 0 100 NT NT Ampicillin + Subactum 56 0 0 33.33 50 Piperacillin 72.72 NT NT 0 0 Amoxicillin 33.33 0 66.66 25 0 Azithromycin 52.63 100 NT NT 100 Cefoxitin 90 NT NT NT 0 NT Linezolid 96.77 100 NT 100 NT Gentamycin 87.50 NT NT NT 100 Amoxycillin + 86.84<	Augmentin	51.35	0	66.66	50	0
Cefuroxime 84.61 100 0 66.66 100 Ceftriaxone 100 NT NT NT 0 Doxycycline 94 50 0 66.66 33.33 Tetracycline 83.33 100 0 NT NT Ofloxacin 73.33 0 100 NT NT Ampicillin + Subactum 56 0 0 33.33 50 Piperacillin 72.72 NT NT 0 0 Amoxicillin 33.33 0 66.66 25 0 Azithromycin 52.63 100 NT NT 100 Cefoxitin 90 NT NT NT 0 NT Linezolid 96.77 100 NT 100 NT Gentamycin 87.50 NT NT 0 NT Subactum Eevofloxacin 95.65 0 100 NT 100 Tobramyc	Vancomycin	91.66	0	0	0	NT
Ceftriaxone 100 NT NT NT 0 Doxycycline 94 50 0 66.66 33.33 Tetracycline 83.33 100 0 NT NT Ofloxacin 73.33 0 100 NT NT Ampicillin + Subactum 56 0 0 33.33 50 Piperacillin 72.72 NT NT 0 0 Amoxicillin 33.33 0 66.66 25 0 Azithromycin 52.63 100 NT NT 100 Cefoxitin 90 NT NT NT 0 NT Linezolid 96.77 100 NT 100 NT Gentamycin 87.50 NT NT NT 66.66 100 Amoxycillin + 86.84 0 0 100 NT Subactum 100 NT 100 NT 100 Totramycin	Cefotaxime	90.62	NT	NT	0	0
Doxycycline 94 50 0 66.66 33.33 Tetracycline 83.33 100 0 NT NT Ofloxacin 73.33 0 100 NT NT Ampicillin + Subactum 56 0 0 33.33 50 Piperacillin 72.72 NT NT 0 0 Amoxicillin 33.33 0 66.66 25 0 Azithromycin 52.63 100 NT NT NT 100 Cefoxitin 90 NT NT NT 0 NT Linezolid 96.77 100 NT 100 NT Gentamycin 87.50 NT NT NT 66.66 100 Amoxycillin + 86.84 0 0 100 NT Subactum Subactum Userofloxacin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT<	Cefuroxime	84.61	100	0	66.66	100
Tetracycline 83.33 100 0 NT NT Ofloxacin 73.33 0 100 NT NT Ampicillin + Subactum 56 0 0 33.33 50 Piperacillin 72.72 NT NT 0 0 Amoxicillin 33.33 0 66.66 25 0 Azithromycin 52.63 100 NT NT 100 Cefoxitin 90 NT NT NT 0 NT Linezolid 96.77 100 NT 100 NT NT Gentamycin 87.50 NT NT NT 66.66 100 Amoxycillin + 86.84 0 0 100 100 Subactum Evofloxacin 95.65 0 100 NT 100 Tobramycin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT NT	Ceftriaxone	100	NT	NT	NT	0
Ofloxacin 73.33 0 100 NT NT Ampicillin + Subactum 56 0 0 33.33 50 Piperacillin 72.72 NT NT 0 0 Amoxicillin 33.33 0 66.66 25 0 Azithromycin 52.63 100 NT NT 100 Cefoxitin 90 NT NT 0 NT Linezolid 96.77 100 NT 100 NT Gentamycin 87.50 NT NT 66.66 100 Amoxycillin + 86.84 0 0 100 100 Subactum Evofloxacin 95.65 0 100 NT 100 Tobramycin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT NT NT NT Chloramphenicol 75 100 NT NT NT NT	Doxycycline	94	50	0	66.66	33.33
Ampicillin + Subactum 56 0 0 33.33 50 Piperacillin 72.72 NT NT 0 0 Amoxicillin 33.33 0 66.66 25 0 Azithromycin 52.63 100 NT NT 100 Cefoxitin 90 NT NT 0 NT Linezolid 96.77 100 NT 100 NT Gentamycin 87.50 NT NT 66.66 100 Amoxycillin + 86.84 0 0 100 100 Subactum Levofloxacin 95.65 0 100 NT 100 Tobramycin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT NT NT Chloramphenicol 75 100 NT NT NT Nitrofurantoin 0 NT NT NT NT	Tetracycline	83.33	100	0	NT	NT
Piperacillin 72.72 NT NT 0 0 Amoxicillin 33.33 0 66.66 25 0 Azithromycin 52.63 100 NT NT 100 Cefoxitin 90 NT NT 0 NT Linezolid 96.77 100 NT 100 NT Gentamycin 87.50 NT NT 66.66 100 Amoxycillin + 86.84 0 0 100 100 Subactum Levofloxacin 95.65 0 100 NT 100 Tobramycin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT NT NT Chloramphenicol 75 100 NT NT NT Nitrofurantoin 0 NT NT NT NT Cefpodoxime 100 NT NT NT NT	Ofloxacin	73.33	0	100	NT	NT
Amoxicillin 33.33 0 66.66 25 0 Azithromycin 52.63 100 NT NT 100 Cefoxitin 90 NT NT 0 NT Linezolid 96.77 100 NT 100 NT Gentamycin 87.50 NT NT 66.66 100 Amoxycillin + 86.84 0 0 100 100 Subactum Levofloxacin 95.65 0 100 NT 100 Tobramycin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT NT NT Chloramphenicol 75 100 NT NT NT Nitrofurantoin 0 NT NT NT NT Cefpodoxime 100 NT NT NT 0	Ampicillin + Subactum	56	0	0	33.33	50
Azithromycin 52.63 100 NT NT 100 Cefoxitin 90 NT NT 0 NT Linezolid 96.77 100 NT 100 NT Gentamycin 87.50 NT NT 66.66 100 Amoxycillin + 86.84 0 0 100 100 Subactum Levofloxacin 95.65 0 100 NT 100 Tobramycin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT NT NT Chloramphenicol 75 100 NT NT NT Nitrofurantoin 0 NT NT NT NT Cefpodoxime 100 NT NT NT O	Piperacillin	72.72	NT	NT	0	0
Cefoxitin 90 NT NT 0 NT Linezolid 96.77 100 NT 100 NT Gentamycin 87.50 NT NT 66.66 100 Amoxycillin + 86.84 0 0 100 100 Subactum 100 0 NT 100 NT 100 Tobramycin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT NT NT Chloramphenicol 75 100 NT NT NT Nitrofurantoin 0 NT NT NT NT Cefpodoxime 100 NT NT NT NT	Amoxicillin	33.33	0	66.66	25	0
Linezolid 96.77 100 NT 100 NT Gentamycin 87.50 NT NT 66.66 100 Amoxycillin + 86.84 0 0 100 100 Subactum 100 100 NT 100 NT 100 Tobramycin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT NT NT Chloramphenicol 75 100 NT NT NT NT Nitrofurantoin 0 NT NT NT NT NT NT Cefpodoxime 100 NT NT NT NT 0	Azithromycin	52.63	100	NT	NT	100
Gentamycin 87.50 NT NT 66.66 100 Amoxycillin + 86.84 0 0 100 100 Subactum Levofloxacin 95.65 0 100 NT 100 Tobramycin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT 0 NT Chloramphenicol 75 100 NT NT NT NT Nitrofurantoin 0 NT NT NT NT 0 Cefpodoxime 100 NT NT NT NT 0	Cefoxitin	90	NT	NT	0	NT
Amoxycillin + 86.84 0 0 100 100 Subactum Levofloxacin 95.65 0 100 NT 100 Tobramycin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT 0 NT Chloramphenicol 75 100 NT NT NT NT Nitrofurantoin 0 NT NT NT NT NT Cefpodoxime 100 NT NT NT 0	Linezolid	96.77	100	NT	100	NT
Subactum Jevofloxacin 95.65 0 100 NT 100 Tobramycin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT 0 NT Chloramphenicol 75 100 NT NT 100 Nitrofurantoin 0 NT NT NT NT Cefpodoxime 100 NT NT NT 0	Gentamycin	87.50	NT	NT	66.66	100
Levofloxacin 95.65 0 100 NT 100 Tobramycin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT 0 NT Chloramphenicol 75 100 NT NT 100 Nitrofurantoin 0 NT NT NT NT Cefpodoxime 100 NT NT NT 0	Amoxycillin +	86.84	0	0	100	100
Tobramycin 71.42 100 NT 100 NT Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT 0 NT Chloramphenicol 75 100 NT NT 100 Nitrofurantoin 0 NT NT NT NT Cefpodoxime 100 NT NT NT 0	Subactum					
Ticarcillin+Clavulanate 100 NT NT 0 NT Chloramphenicol 75 100 NT NT 100 Nitrofurantoin 0 NT NT NT NT NT Cefpodoxime 100 NT NT NT NT 0	Levofloxacin	95.65	0	100	NT	100
Chloramphenicol75100NTNT100Nitrofurantoin0NTNTNTNTCefpodoxime100NTNTNT0	Tobramycin	71.42	100	NT	100	NT
Nitrofurantoin 0 NT NT NT NT Cefpodoxime 100 NT NT NT 0	Ticarcillin+Clavulanate	100	NT	NT	0	NT
Cefpodoxime 100 NT NT NT 0	Chloramphenicol	75	100	NT	NT	100
·	Nitrofurantoin	0	NT	NT	NT	NT
Ceftazidime 0 NT NT NT 0	Cefpodoxime	100	NT	NT	NT	0
	Ceftazidime	0	NT	NT	NT	0

NT= not tested; SH= Streptococcus haemolyticus; SNH=Streptococcus non-haemolyticus; CNS= Coagulase Negative Staphylococcus.

Staph. Aureus was most susceptible to cefpodoxime (100%), ceftriaxone (100%), ticarcillin+ clavulanate (100%) followed by linezolid (96.77%), levofloxacin (95.65%), doxycycline (94%), vancomycin (91.66%), amikacin (91.83%), cefoxitim (90%), cefotaxime (90.62%), cefoxitin (90%), gentamycin (87.50%), amoxicillin+ sulbactum (86.84%), cefuroxime (84.61%), tetracycline (83.33%). Least susceptibility was noted to nitrofurantoin (0%), amoxicillin (33.33%), ampicillin (35.71%), augmentin (51.35%). Strept. Haemolyticus was most susceptible (100%) to ciprofloxacin, cefuroxime, tetracycline, azithromycin, tobramycin chloramphenicol. Susceptibility to doxycycline was found to be low (50%). Strept.non haemolyticus was found to be most susceptible to ofloxacin and levofloxacin (100%) followed by augmentin and amoxicillin (66.66%) and amikacin (33.33%). Coagulase negative staphylococcus

susceptible to amikacin, linezolid, was most amoxicillin+sulbactum, tobramycin (100%), followed by cefuroxime, doxycycline and gentamycin (66.66%), cotrimoxazole (60%), ciprofloxacin and augmentin (50%), ampicillin+sulbactum (33.33%), amoxicillin (25%). E coli was most susceptible to cefuroxime, levofloxacin, azithromycin, gentamycin, amoxicillin+sulbactum and chloramphenicol, followed by cotrimoxazole, ampicillin+sulbactum (50%), amikacin, ciprofloxacin and doxycycline (33.33%).

DISCUSSION

Infective conditions, especially bacterial skin infections, constitute a large number of cases seen in dermatological practice. Knowledge of the causative pathogens of pyodermas facilitates the planning and provision of health care needs. Because of the high prevalence of pyoderma,

changing pattern of causative microorganisms and altered antibiotic susceptibility pattern, there is a constant need to obtain more information about aetiological agents, predisposing factors, modes of transmission and effective methods to control The index study was undertaken to find out the antibiotic sensitivity pattern among 100 consecutive untreated patients of pyoderma attending the dermatology OPD at a tertiary care center in jaipur. The highest number of cases were in 3rd (32.32%) and 2nd (30.30%) decades of life, followed by (14.14%) 1st decade. A study by Ghadage5also revealed highest number of pyoderma cases in 2nd and 3rd decades (62.36%) as compared to 1st decade (37.64%). Similar high frequency of pyodermas in 2nd and 3rddecades has been observed in many other studies^{6,7} although Bhaskaran ET AL5 and Khare ET AL6 reported maximum cases of pyoderma in age group of 21- 30 years. High incidence of pyoderma in first 3 decades may be consequent to more active life in their study. Our study showed a distinct male predominance, in all age- group the male-female ratio being 2.5:1; though the malefemale ratio of general population of Jaipur district in census-2008 is almost equal (0.90:1).preponderance has also been observed in many other studies 9,10,11,5,12,13,14,15,3,16,17. However, in one study 18 female preponderance has also been reported. The disproportionately high number of males in our study as well as other studies could be because of greater involvement of males in outdoor activities, thus exposing them to trauma and infection. The largest group was of school-educated patients (60; 60%), followed by 21 (21%) college educated and illiterates (13: 13%). This points towards the inverse relationship between level of education and occurrence of pyoderma. Out of 100 patients, 33% patients were employed, followed by students 25%, housewives 14%, preschool/other children not yet enrolled in school 6.6%, farmers 13%, labourers 5.5% and pensioners 3.3%. Combined together, preschool/other children not yet enrolled in school and students formed the largest group. These findings are partially supported by Belcher ET AL19, who reported highest rate of pyoderma in school-age children, particularly 5-9 year old. This could be due to the fact that they injure themselves frequently during play and thus are more prone to bacterial contamination of wounds. Employed patients were next in order, which may be consequent to their active-life style and more exposure to the external environmental factors. Of 100 pyoderma patients, 74 (74%) maintained good hygiene. Even among the 24 cases gave history of recurrence, 19 (79.16%) maintained good hygiene. Most^{9,11,5,12,20,21,16} of the previous studies have not commented upon the relationship between hygiene and prevalence of pyoderma. However, Masawe et al²², in a study, concluded that the socioeconomic and hygienic standards do not appreciably influence the prevalence of pyoderma. Some other studies 23,24 have, however, reported high prevalence of pyoderma in people with poor standards of hygiene. Status of nourishment didn't reveal significant relationship with bacterial skin infections, as 78 (78%) patients were average-nourished, followed by wellnourished patients15 (15%). Only 7 (7%) patients were poorly nourished. In our study, primary pyodermas 71(71%) outnumbered the secondary pyodermas 29(29%). These findings are consistent with various other studies 9,25,5,3,26,19,27. Most studies 9,25,5,13,14,28,26,17 recorded impetigo as the most commonly occurring primary pyoderma. In the index study, folliculitis 30(30%) was the commonest entity among primary pyodermas, followed by furuncle 20 (20%), impetigo 5 (5%) and cellulitis 5 (5%). A similar study3 carried out on pyoderma, in the past, reported folliculitis (36.5%) as the commonest primary pyoderma, followed by furuncle (31.8%), cellulitis (5%) and impetigo (4.5%). Among secondary pyodermas, infectious eczematoid-dermatits (IED)(6;6%), infected scabies and infected ulcer 6 (6%) each were common entities in our study. IED was the commonest secondary pyoderma in some other studies 11,13,29,19,24 have studies^{10,12,26,21} also. Several reported infected scabies as the most common presentation. Impetigo was predominantly seen in children. All 5 cases of impetigo, presented in 1st decade. Many other studies have also reported impetigo, as most common pyoderma during childhood18,19,24. In the index study, lower extremities were the most frequently involved sites, followed by upper extremities, Genital region was least commonly affected, followed by head and neck, trunk and face. Predilection for lower limbs has been reported in many other studies 14,30,31,22,32. Contrary to our study, Nagmoti et al³³ reported face, scalp and upper limbs as the commonly involved sites. History of recurrence was revealed by 24% patients. A recurrence rate of 45% was reported by Mathew et al. Recurrence was the highest among patients of folliculitis, followed by IED, furuncle, ecthyma and infected ulcer, in that order. Twenty one patients in our study had diabetes mellitus, in whom furunculosis (n=5) was the most frequent pyoderma, followed by folliculitis (n=4). A total of 100 samples (71-primary pyoderma; 29-secondary pyoderma) were sent for culture and sensitivity. Single organism was isolated in all samples. Gram positive organisms were cultured from 94 (94%) patients, while from 6 (6%) patients gram negative organisms were isolated. Most of the studies^{2,5,3,24,34,6,36,14,25,32,11} also documented gram positive organisms to be the commonest isolates from pyoderma. Staph. aureus was isolated from 84 (84%)

samples followed by E. Coli (4;4%), Stept. Haemolyticus (2; 2%), coagulase negative staphylococcus (5; 5%) and Strept. Non haemolyticus (3;3%). Alike our study, Staph.aureus was the commonest isolate in other studies 9,10,25,12,20,13,14,33,22,26,19,17. Among gram-negative organisms, E. coli was isolated most frequently, followed by Klebsiella and Enterobacteriae. Most of the cases of impetigo (5/5), furunculosis (17/20) and folliculitis (27/30) were caused by Staph.aureus, and this is in accordance with several other studies 10,25,5,12,13. Staph. Aureus was found to be most susceptible to cefopodoxime (100%), ceftriaxone (100%), ticaricillin+ clavulanate(100%) followed by linezolid (96.77%), levofloxacin (95.65%), doxycycline (94%), vancomycin (91.66%), amikacin (91.83%), cefoxitim (90%), cefotaxime (90.62%), cefoxitin (90%), gentamycin (87.50%), amoxicillin+sulbactum (86.84%), cefuroxime (84.61%), tetracycline (83.33%). Least susceptibility was noted nitrofurantoin (0%), amoxicillin (33.33%),ampicillin(35.71%), augmentin(51.35%). Many other studies 9,10,25,12,19 have reported that Staph. aureus to behighly susceptible to aminoglycosides, around 90% sensitivity particularly to gentamicin along with fluroquinolones as in several studies^{21,16} done in the past. Linezolid, considered as the drug of choice for Staph. aureus, also doesn't seem to have escaped the resistance this bacterium (96.77%susceptibility). haemolyticus and coagulase negative Staphylococcus were most susceptible (100%) to linezolid and amoxicillin+sulbactum. E. coli was most susceptible (100%) to levofloxacin, cefuroxime, azithromycin, gentamycin, amoxicillin+sulbactum and chloramphenicol. followed by cotrimoxazole, ampicillin+sulbactum (50%). amikacin, ciprofloxacin and doxycycline (33.33%); though sample size was very small(n=4).

CONCLUSION

The index study on pyoderma cases, highlighted the following findings-

- 1. The highest number of cases (32%) was observed in 3rd decade. Lower extremities were the commonest site of predilection.
- 2. Primary pyodermas outnumbered the secondary pyodermas, folliculitis (30%) and furuncle (20%) were the commonest entities.
- 3. Staph.aureus was the commonest causative agent in both primary (61/70) and secondary pyodermas (23/30).
- 4. Staph. aureus showed high susceptibility to cefopodoxime, ceftriaxone, ticarcillin+clavulanate. Low susceptibility was observed to amoxicillin, ampicillin and augmentin. Strept. Haemolyticus was highly

- susceptible to ciprofloxacin, cefuroxime, tetracycline, azithromycin, tobramycin and chloramphenicol.
- 5. E. coli showed high susceptibility to levofloxacin, amikacin, linezolid, amoxicillin+sulbactum and tobramycin.

In conclusion, this study yielded some useful epidemiological and clinic-bacterilogical data about pyodermas that might assist clinicians to choose suitable antimicrobials for pyodermas, especially in absence of culture and sensitivity report. The changing trend of causative agents of pyodermas and their susceptibility pattern needs constant monitoring through prospective studies in future also.

REFERENCES

- Bhalla KK. Patterns of skin diseases in a semiurbancommunity of Delhi. Indian J.Derm. Venerol. Leporol.V.50,P.213,1984
- Sharma N k, Garg B.K. and Goel. M. Patterns of skin diseases in urban school children. Indian J. Derm.Venerol.Leprol V.52,P 330, 1986
- 3. Tan HH, Tay YK, Goh CL. Bacterial skin infections at a tertiary dermatological centre. Singapore Med J. 1998 Aug; 39(8):353-56
- Nagaraju U, Bhat G, Kuruvila M, Pai GS, Javalakshmi, Babu RP. Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus in acommunity-acquired pyoderma. Int J Dermatol. 2004 Jun; 43(6): 412-4
- Ghadage DP, Sali YA. Bacteriological study of pyoderma with special reference to antibiotic susceptibility to newer antibiotics. Indian J Dermatol Venerol Leprol 1999; 65:177-181.
- Watson. Lectures on the principles and practice of physics, P 856. London 1848
- 7. Somerville-Miller DA, Noble WC. Resident and transient bacteria of the skin. J Cutan Pathol 1974; 1:260-64.
- Denton M, O Connell B, Bernard P, ET AL. Antimicrobial susceptibility of Staphylococcus aureus causing primary or secondary skin and soft tissue infectins in the community in France, the UK and Ireland. J Antimicrob Chemother 2008 March; 61(3): 586-588.
- 9. Chopra A, Puri R, and Mittal RR. Correlation of isolates from pyoderma and carrier sites. Indian J Dermatol Venerol Leprol 1995; 61: 273-275.
- Bhaskaran CS, Rao PS, Krishnamurthy T, ET AL. Bacteriological Study of pyoderma. Indian J Dermatol Venerol Leprol 1979; 45(3): 162-169.
- Parikh DA, Fernandez RJ, Wagle UD. Clinical and bacteriological aspects of pyoderma. J Postgrad Med 1987; 33: 189-92.
- 12. Khare AK, Bansal NK, Dhruv AK. A clinical and bacteriological study of pyodermas. Indian J Dermatol Venerol Leprol 1988; 54:192-195.
- 13. Baslas RG, Arora SK, Mukhija RD, ET AL. organisms causing pyoderma and their susceptibility patterns. Indian J Dermatol Venerol Leprol 1990; 56: 127-129.

- Nagmoti MJ, Patil CS, Metgud SC. A bacterial study of pyoderma in Belgaum. Indian J Dermatol Venerol Leprol 1999; 65: 69-71.
- Kandhari KC, Prakash O, Singh G. Bacteriology of pyodermas. Indian J Dermatol Venerol Leprol 1962; 28:125-133.
- Sugeng MW, Ang P, Tan HH, ET AL. Characteristics of bacterial skin infections in children compared to adults at a tertiary dermatologic center. Int J Dermatol. 1999 Aug; 38(8): 582-86.
- Fatani MI, Bukhari SZ, Al-Afif KA, ET AL. Pyoderma among Hajj pilgrims in Makkah. Saudi Med J 2002 Jul; 23(7): 782-85.
- Mathew SM, Garg BR, Kanungo R. AClinicobacteriological study of primary pyodermas of children in Pondicherry. Indian J Dermatol Venerol Leprol 1992; 58:183-187.
- Kar PK, Sharma NP, Shah BH. Bacteriological study of pyoderma in children. Indian J Dermatol Venerol Leprol 1985; 51: 325-327.
- Ghosh B, Gupta M, Bhattacharya SR. Clinicobacteriological study of pyoderma. Indian J Dermatol 1974; 19(2):35-38.
- Ahmed K, Batra A, Roy R, ET AL. clinical and bacteriological study of pyoderma in Jodhpur- western Rajasthan. Indian J Dermatol Venerol Leprol 1998; 64(3):156-157.
- Masawe A, Herbert N, Mhalu F. Bacterial skin infections in preschool and school children in coastal Tanzania. Arch Dermatol 1975; 111: 1312-1316.
- 23. Taplin D, Landsdell L, Allen AM, ET AL. Prevalence of streptococcal pyodermas in relation to climate and hygiene. Lancet 1973;I:501-503.
- 24. Kakar N, Kumar V, Mehta G, Sharma RC, Koranne RV.Clinico-bacteriological study of pyodermas in children. J Dermatol. 1999 May; 26(5):288-93.

- Ramani TV, Jayakar PK. Bacteriological study of 100 cases of pyodermas with special reference to staphylococci, their antibiotic sensitivity and phage pattern. Indian J Dermatol, Venerol Leprol 1980; 46 (5): 282-286
- 26. Park SH, Kim JH. Bacteriological study of pyodermas. Korean J Dermatol 1981; 19(3): 285-92.
- Bari AU. Pattern of skin infections in black Africans of Sierra Leone (west Africa). Indian J Dermatol 2007; 52(1):30-34.
- Jasuja DK, Gupta SK, Arora DR. ET AL. Bacteriology of primary pyodermas and comparative efficacy of topical application of mupirocin and sodium fusidate ointments in their treatment. Indian J Dermatol Venerol Leprol 2001; 67: 132-34.
- Raghunath D, Ramkrishnan KR, Chopra TR. Bacteriology and Serology of streptococcal pyoderma. Indian J Med Res 1985; 82: 495-97.
- Allen AM, Taplin D, Miami, ET AL. Cutaneous streptococcal infections in Vietnam. Arch Dermatol 1971; 104 271-80.
- 31. Dajani AS, Ferrieri P, Wannamaker L. Endemic superficial pyoderma in children. Arch Dermatol 1973 Oct; 108 (4):517-22.
- 32. Nelson KE, Bisno AL, Brunt J, ET AL. The epidemiology and natural history of streptococcal pyoderma: an endemic disease of the rural southern United states. Am J Epidemiol 1976; 103 (3): 270-83.
- Nagmoti MJ, Patil CS, Metgud SC. A bacterial study of pyoderma in Belgaum. Indian J Dermatol Venerol Leprol 1999; 65: 69-71.
- 34. Noble WC. Dispersal of skin microorganisms. Br J. Dermatol 93: 477-83, 1975.
- 35. Somerville-Millar DA, Noble WC. Resident and transient bacteria of the skin. J Culton Pathol 1974; 1: 260-64.

Source of Support: None Declared Conflict of Interest: None Declared