

Preface

T **T** **T** This work has been carried out to reflect the importance of the antimicrobial sensitivity testing, which has been lost nowadays in Sudan. Most of the medical practitioners give the patients treatment without knowing the sensitivity of the organism and without doing culture to know the pathogen. Not only these, but also the hospitals where sensitivity testing is carried, it is done in a wrong way and the techniques are not standardized, hence, results in different laboratories cannot be compared. Also, some patients who had taken the chemotherapy come to the hospital suffering from repeated infections and complications. For this reasons, this research is done hoping to change this, for a better life.

Dedication

To the queen of my heart, the food of my
soul,
to the soul of my deceased mother,
God bless her.

To my great father, Mohammed for
encouraging
a variety of interests in my life.

To my brothers, sister and to every one
who gave
me encouragement to successfully
finish this study.

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my sincere appreciation & deep gratitude to my supervisor ***Professor Samia Ahmed Gumaa*** for her continuous encouragement and support as well as for her understanding while I was engaged in conducting this study.

My thanks are also extended to ***Dr. Mohamed Baha Eldin*** for his valuable suggestions when reading and revising the manuscript.

Gratitude is also extended to ***Dr. Humodi***, dean collage of medical laboratories Science, Sudan University of Science and Technology and ***Dr. Mohamed Sid Ahmed***, dean faculty of medical laboratories AMLS.

My thanks are also for ***Ustaz Amin M. Ibrahim***, ***Ustaz Sony***, ***Ustaza Ehssan Abbas***, ***Ustaz Salah Shanan***, ***Ustaza Shadia Fathi***, ***Ustaz Mohamed Nejmudin*** and ***Ustaz Samih Mohamed*** for helping me in the technical part of this research.

Appreciation is extended to ***Ustaz Omer*** and all the staff members of Sudan university for their great contribution.

I am indebted also to my family and relatives for their moral support and encouragement during the period of study.

Abstract

The main objectives of this study were to compare the results obtained by different methods carried for detecting the antimicrobial sensitivity testing (NCCLS table diameter method, Stokes and Kirby-Bauer comparative methods) and to compare the results when using two standard media (Muller-Hinton and Diagnostic sensitivity agar).

Fifty organisms were isolated and identified to reach these objectives. They were from two different sites, urine, and wounds. The isolates were: *Escherichia coli*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Proteus vulgaris*, *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Enterococcus faecalis*.

Antimicrobial sensitivity testing was carried out for each organism by the three methods on the two media. The results were recorded and analyzed to detect the differences. According to the statistical analysis, no differences were found to be between the comparative methods Stokes and Kirby-Bauer, while a significant difference was reported between them and NCCLS method. When

comparing the two media, no differences were noted, and the results were found to be similar.

□□□□□□

كانت الاهداف الاساسية من هذه الدراسة هي مقارنة النتائج التي تحصلنا عليها باستعمال طرق مختلفة لمعرفة اختبارات الحساسية ضد مضادات الميكروبات. طريقة جدول NCCLS وطريقتي المقارنة (Stokes and Kirby-Bauer) وكذلك لمقارنة النتائج عند استعمال وسطين قياسيين للبكتريا هما وسط قياس الحساسية ووسط مولر-هنتون (DST and Muller Hinton)).

تم عزل والتعرف على خمسين ميكروب للوصول الى هذه الاهداف وكانت من موقعين مختلفين (البول، الجروح). الميكروبات التي تم عزلها تمثلت في (المكورة العنقودية الذهبية، العقدية البرازية، الاشريكية القولونية، الكليبيسيلا الرئوية، المتقلبات و الزائفة الزنجارية).

تم إجراء اختبارات حساسية مضادات الميكروبات لكل ميكروب بواسطة ثلاثة طرق على وسطي البكتريا . تم تسجيل وتحليل النتائج لمعرفة الفروقات . حسب التحليل الاحصائي لم يتم ملاحظة أية فروقات بين الطرق التي تم مقارنتها بينما وجد أن هناك فرق مميز تم تسجيله بين طريقة NCCLS وبين الطرق الاخرى.

لم يلاحظ أي فرق عند مقارنة الوسطين البكتيرين وأن النتائج كانت متشابهة.

Table of contents

PREFACE	I
DEDICATION	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	III
Abstract (English)	IV
Abstract (Arabic)	V
Table of contents	IX
List of tables	X
List of figures	XI
	1
Chapter 1: Introduction and literature review	4
1.1 Antibiotics	4
1.1.1 Definition	4
1.1.2 Early history	5
1.1.3 Early developments of disc diffusion methods	6
1.1. 3.3 Standardization	6
1.1.3.2 Development of a standard disk diffusion procedure	7
1.1.3.3 Limitations	9
Objectives	1
	0

Chapter 2: Materials and Methods.	10
2.1 Materials.	10
2.1.1 Media	10
2.1.1.1 Mueller Hinton agar	10
2.1.1.2 Diagnostic sensitivity agar	11
2.1.1.3 Blood agar	11
2.1.1.4 Chocolate agar	11
2.1.1.5 MacConkey agar	
2.1.1.6 CLED agar (cystine-lactose-electrolyte deficient medium)	11
2.1.1.7 Mannitol salt agar	12
2.1.1.8 Peptone water	12
2.1.1.9 Aesculin agar slant	12
2.1.1.10 Urea agar base	12
2.1.1.11 Citrate agar	12
2.1.1.12 Motility test medium	13
2.1.1.13 Kligler iron agar (KIA)	13
2.1.1.14 DNase agar	13
2.1.2 Reagents	13
2.1.2.1 Stains used in Gram stain method	13
2.1.2.2 H ₂ O ₂ for catalase test	14
2.1.2.3 Oxidase test (Cytochrome Oxidase)	14
2.1.2.4 Kovac's reagent for indole test	17

2.1.2.5 Plasma for coagulase test	17
2.1.2.6 Antimicrobial discs	18
2.1.2.7 Control organisms	19
2.1.2.8 Turbidity standerd	19
2.1.3 Instruments	19
2.2 Methods	19
2.2.1 Study area	19
2.2.2 Study population	20
2.2.3 Study duration	21
2.2.4 Sample collection	21
2.2.5 Sample processing	21
2.2.6 Culturing of the specimens	22
2.2.7 Colonial morphology	22
2.2.8 Gram stain	23
2.2.9 Biochemical reactions	24
2.2.9.1 Catalase test	24
2.2.9.2 Oxidase test	25
2.2.9.3 Indole test	25
2.2.9.4 Urease test	26
2.2.9.5 Citrate test	26
2.2.9.6 Motility test using semi solid agar	27
2.2.9.7 Kligler iron agar	27
2.2.9.8 DNase test	29
2.2.9.9 Sensitivity testing technique	30

2.2.9.9.1 Disc diffusion techniques	
2.2.9.9.2 Types of disc diffusion methods:	30
2.2.9.9.2.1 Same-plate comparative disc diffusion tests (Stokes method)	30
2.2.9.9.2.2 Kirby-Bauer Method	30
2.2.9.9.2.3 National Committee for Clinical Laboratory standard (NCCLS)	32
2.2.9.9.3 Methods of sensitivity testing	33
2.2.9.9.3.1 Kirby-Bauer methods of sensitivity	33
2.2.9.9.3.2 Stokes method	3
2.2.9.9.3.3 NCCLS method	5
2.2.9.9.4 Interpretation of results	58
Chapter 3: Results	58
	62
Chapter 4:	63
Discussion	64
Conclusions	68
Recommendations	81
References	82
Appendix 1 (media)	
Appendix 2 (reagents)	
Appendix 3 (standard scale)	

List of tables:

Table 3.1: Results of Biochemical reactions of Gram - ve bacilli.

Table 3. 2: Results of Biochemical reactions of Gram + ve cocci.

Table 3.4 a, b, c, d: Sensitivity testing results of *Staphylococcus aureus*.

Table 3.5a, b: Sensitivity testing results of *Enterococcus faecalis*.

Table 3.6a, b, c, d: Sensitivity testing results of *E. coli*.

Table 3.7a, b, c, d: Sensitivity testing results of *Klebsiella pneumoniae*.

Table 3.8a, b, c: Sensitivity testing results of *Proteus vulgaris*.

Table 3.9a, b, c: Sensitivity testing results of *Psuedomonas aeruginosa*.

List of figures:

Figure 2.1: Rotary plating method and Comparative disk diffusion test (Stokes).

Figure 2.2: Diagrammatic representation of the antibiotic concentration gradient produced by diffusion from a paper disc (D) on an agar medium.

Figure 3.1: Sensitivity pattern of the organisms used in the study on the two media by NCCL method.

Figure 3.2: Sensitivity pattern of the organisms used in the study on the two media by Kirby-Bauer method.

Figure 3.3: Sensitivity pattern of the organisms used in the study on the two media by Stokes method.

Figure 3.4: Percentage of the organisms in the samples.

Figure 3.5: Percentage of the organisms in each sample.

Figure (3.6): Culture of *Staphylococcus aureus* on blood agar showing white Colonies.

Figure 3.7: Culture of *Staphylococcus aureus* on CLED Showing Lactose fermenter colonies.

Figure 3.8: Culture of *Enterococcus faecalis* on blood agar showing non haemolytic colonies.

Figure 3.9: Culture of *Enterococcus faecalis* on MacConkey agar showing Lactose fermenter colonies.

Figure 3.10: Culture of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* on MacConkey agar showing large lactose fermenter colonies.

Figure 3.11: Culture of *E. coli* on MacConkey agar showing Lactose fermenter colonies.

Figure 3.12: Culture of *E. coli* on CLED agar showing Lactose fermenter colonies.

Figure 3.13: Culture of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* on MacConkey agar, showing non lactose fermenting colonies with green pigmentation.

Figure 3.14: Susceptibility test of *Staphylococcus aureus*.

Figure 3.15: Susceptibility test of *E. coli* by Kirby- Bauer method.

Figure 3.16: Susceptibility test of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.

Figure 3.17: Susceptibility test of *Enterococcus faecalis*.

Figure 3.18: Susceptibility test by rotary stokes disk diffusion method.

Figure 3.19: Susceptibility test by Comparative Stokes disk diffusion test.