# Bacteriological profile of chronic suppurative otitis media in a tertiary care hospital: A cross sectional study

# B Hari Krishna Kishore

Associate Professor, Department of ENT, Viswabharathi Medical College, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh, INDIA. **Email:** <u>belagantiharireddy@gmail.com</u>

Abstract Background: Chronic suppurative otitis media (CSOM) is the most commonly noted disease in Otolaryngology practice. Microbial isolation and its antibiotic sensitivity help in appropriate management and planning of treatment protocol. The present study was aimed to assess the bacteriological profile and to study the antibiotic sensitivity in chronic suppurative otitis media among patients visiting a tertiary care hospital. Methods: This cross-sectional study was done in 100 patients diagnosed with chronic suppurative otitis media. samples obtained using sterile swabs were taken and processed. Bacterial isolates were identified and drug susceptibility testing was conducted using Kirby –Bauer disc diffusion method Results: More than half of the patients belonged to 1-to-15-year age group. *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* were the most common organisms isolated in this study. *Staphylococcus aureus* was most sensitive to vancomycin followed by linkomycin. *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* was most sensitive to Ciprofloxacin followed by Cefotaxime. Conclusions: Knowing the etiological agents of CSOM and their antibiogram is important for effective treatment and prevention of complications and antibiotic resistance.

Keywords: Chronic suppurative otitis media (CSOM), Antibiotic susceptibility, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Staphylococcus aureus*.

#### \*Address for Correspondence:

Dr B. Hari Krishna kishore, Associate Professor, Department of ENT, Viswabharathi Medical College, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh, INDIA, Email: <u>belagantiharireddy@gmail.com</u>

Received Date: 23/06/2021 Revised Date: 12/06/2021 Accepted Date: 20/07/2021 DOI: https://doi.org/10.26611/10161912

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.



# **INTRODUCTION**

Chronic suppurative otitis media (CSOM) is a chronic inflammation of middle ear and mastoid cavity that may present with recurrent ear discharges or otorrhoea through a tympanic perforation lasting at least two weeks.<sup>1</sup>

Inadequate and inappropriate treatment of CSOM can result in a wide range of complications. These may be due to the spread of organisms to structures adjacent to the ear or to local damage in the middle ear itself. Such complications range from persistent otorrhoea, mastoiditis, labyrinthitis, facial nerve paralysis to more serious intracranial abscesses or thromboses.<sup>2-4</sup> Chronic suppurative otitis media has received considerable attention not only because of its high incidence, chronicity and complication, but also drug resistance<sup>5</sup> and ototoxicity<sup>6</sup> with both topical and systemic antibiotics. Knowledge of local micro-organism pattern and their antibiotic sensitivity is essential for effective and low cost treatment of this disease. So the present study was done to find the bacterial responsible for CSOM and also to study the antibiotic sensitivity pattern of these bacteria.

# MATERIALS

The cross sectional study was conducted in the Department of Otorhinolaryngology at Viswabharathi General hospital, Kurnool for 10 months from January, 2019 to October 2019. A total of 100 cases were selected from the

How to cite this article: B Hari Krishna Kishore. Bacteriological profile of chronic suppurative otitis media in a tertiary care hospital: A cross sectional study. *MedPulse International Journal of ENT*. July 2021; 19(1): 04-07. <u>https://www.medpulse.in/ENT/</u>

patients who attended ENT OPD on the basis of the following criteria.

**Inclusion criteria:** Ear discharge taken only from those patients who had clinical diagnosis of Chronic Suppurative Otitis Media both tubo-tympanic and attico-antral type of disease. Only patients who had not received parenteral or topical antibiotics 6 weeks previously were taken in the study. All age groups of patients were included in the study.

**Exclusion criteria:** Patients who had treatment with antibiotics within 6 weeks, Patients having intra or extra cranial complications, Pregnant and lactating women

Prior approval from the institutional ethical committee was obtained. Written consent was obtained from the patients before taking ear swabs. Ear discharge was collected from the selected patients under strict aseptic precautions using two sterile cotton swabs with the assistance of aural speculum and processed immediately in the microbiology laboratory. The first swab was used for direct Gram stain and the second swab was cultured in nutrient agar, blood agar and Mac conkey agar plates and incubated at 37°C for 24-48 hrs. The isolates grown were identified by their cultural characteristics, morphology and biochemical reactions. Antibiotic susceptibility testing of the organisms diagnosed was done by Kirby Bauer method<sup>7</sup> in Muller Hinton agar. The plates were read after overnight incubation at 37°C by measuring the zone of inhibition around the antibiotic discs as per CLSI (Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute) guidelines.<sup>8</sup>

#### RESULTS

A total of 100 patients with CSOM were enrolled in the study. out of 100 patients 60 were male and 40 were female. (Table 1). They are in an age group varying from 1-70 years with the maximum patients in the age group of 1-15 years (55%) (Table 2). In our study 87% were suffering from tubo-tympanic type of chronic suppurative otitis media and 13% from attico-antral type (fig 1).

|                                   | Та         | Table 1: Gender distributed |                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|                                   | Sex        | No. ofCases                 | Percentage (%)     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   | Male       | 60                          | 60                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   | Female     | 40                          | 40                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   |            |                             |                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Table 2: Showing age distribution |            |                             |                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ag                                | e in Years | Number of cas               | ses Percentage (%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   | 1-15       | 55                          | 55                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   | 16 - 30    | 25                          | 25                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   | 31-45      | 06                          | 06                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   | 46- 60     | 8                           | 8                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                                   | 61 75      | 06                          | 06                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 1: Type of CSOM

Out of 100 tested, 95 (74.7%) samples had at least one organism was isolated and 5 (17.9%) samples had no isolates (Table - 3)

| Table 3: Summary of culture results of 105 samples tested |                       |               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|-----------------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | No. of cases<br>(100) | Percentage(%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Atleast one organism<br>isolated                          | 95                    | 95            |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No organism   | 5                     | 5             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Among the bacterial isolates, *Staphylococcus* (44%) was the commonest, followed by *Pseudomonas* 24%, *Escherichia coli* 7%, *Enterococcus* 6%, *Proteus* 6%, *Klebsiella* 5%, *Citrobacter* 2% and cornnebacterium 2%.( Table-4)

 Table 4: Details of organisms isolated among the culture positive samples (N=105)

|                            | ( )          |              |  |
|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| Organisms isolated (n=100) | No. of cases | Percentage % |  |
| Staphylococcus aureus      | 44           | 44           |  |
| Pseudomonas Aeruginosa     | 24           | 24           |  |
| E.Coli                     | 7            | 7            |  |
| Enterococcus               | 6            | 5            |  |
| Proteus                    | 5            | 6            |  |
| Klebsiella                 | 5            | 5            |  |
| Citrobacter                | 2            | 1            |  |
| Corynebacterium            | 2            | 1            |  |
| No growth                  | 5            | 5            |  |

On observing the bacterial sensitivity pattern of *Staphylococcus aureus*, we found that Vancomycin was 100% sensitive. linkomycine 84% Cefotaxime 80%, Ceftriaxone 77%, Amikacin 75%, Ofloxacin 63%, Cephalexin 52%, Erythromycin 52%, Ciprofloxacin 48%,Norfloxacin 34%, Gentamycin 34%, Amoxcillin 30%, Ceftazidime 20%. *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* was most sensitive to Ciprofloxacin 75% followed by Cefotaxime 64%, Amikacin 64%, Ceftazidime 62%, Ceftriaxone 60%,Ofloxacin 58%, Gentamycin 58%, , Norfloxacin 37%, Cephalexin 4%. It was observed that most of the isolates were sensitive to Cefotaxime followed by Amikacin and Ceftriaxone and least sensitive to Amoxicillin (Table:5)

Table 5: Antibiogram

| Organism                  | No.of patients | amikacin | amoxycilin | cephalexin | cefotaxime | ceftazidime | ceftriaxone | chloramphenical | ciprolox | erythromycin | gentamycin | lincomycin | norflox | oflax | vancomycin |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|------------|------------|---------|-------|------------|
| Staphylococcus Aureu      | 44             | 33       | 13         | 23         | 35         | 9           | 34          | 30              | 21       | 23           | 15         | 37         | 15      | 28    | 44         |
| Pseudomonas<br>Aeruginosa | 24             | 16       | -          | 1          | 17         | 15          | 13          | 7               | 18       | -            | 14         | -          | 9       | 14    | -          |
| E.Coli                    | 7              | 5        | -          | 2          | 2          | 3           | 4           | 4               | 4        | -            | 3          | -          | -       | 3     | -          |
| Enterococcus              | 6              | 6        | -          | 2          | 5          | 4           | 3           | 1               | 4        | -            | 2          | -          | 3       | 3     | -          |
| Proteus                   | 5              | 5        | -          | -          | 5          | 5           | 5           | 2               | 4        | -            | 3          | -          | 3       | 4     | -          |
| Klebsiella                | 5              | 3        | -          | 2          | 4          | 3           | 3           | 2               | 3        | -            | 3          | -          | 3       | 3     | -          |
| Citrobacter               | 2              | -        | -          | -          | -          | -           | -           | 1               | 1        | -            | -          | -          | -       | 1     | -          |
| Corynebacterium           | 2              | -        | -          | -          | 2          | 1           | -           | -               | -        | -            | -          | -          | -       | -     | -          |
| Total                     | 95             |          |            |            |            |             |             |                 |          |              |            |            |         |       |            |

# DISCUSSION

The CSOM is defined as a longstanding infection of a part of whole of middle ear cleft characterized by ear discharge and a permanent perforation<sup>10</sup> Gender wise, relatively high proportion of males (60%) had CSOM compared to females (40%). These findings are resembling the previous study<sup>11</sup> in which 51.54% of males and 48.46% of females were affected and Chirwa, et al.<sup>12</sup> observed a higher prevalence among males (61.5%) compared to females (38.5%). Among the study participants prevalence of CSOM was particularly high among children accounting for more than 50% among those aged between 1 and 15 years. The same findings are reported by the previous studies.<sup>13-16</sup> Among the organisms *Staphylococcus aureus* formed the predominant isolates as reported by the previous studies.<sup>17-20</sup> Due to the wide spread nature and resistant strain in the external auditory canal and upper respiratory tract, there is high presence of Staphylococcus aureus in middle ear.<sup>21</sup> Antibiotic susceptibility testing was carried out for all the microorganisms isolated. Staphylococcus aureus isolates were most sensitive to vancomycin and Pseudomonas isolates were most sensitive to ciproflaxaiin. It was observed that most of the organisms were sensitive to Cefotaxime, the same results are reported by the previous studies.<sup>22-24</sup>

## CONCLUSION

The most common organisms isolated were *Staphylococcus aureus* and *P. aeruginosa* and. *Staphylococcus aureus* is most sensitive to Vancomycin followed by Lincomycin and Cefotaxime. *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* was most sensitive to Ciprofloxacin followed by Cefotaxime. Having the knowledge of etiological

agents causing CSOM and their antibiogram is important for effective treatment and prevention of complications and antibiotic resistance.

## REFERENCES

- 1. 1.Acuin J. Global burden of disease due to chronic suppurative otitis media: Disease, deafness, deaths and DALYs Chronic Suppurative Otitis MediaBurden of Illness and Management Options. Geneva: World Health Organisation, 2004, p. 9-23.
- 2. Healy GB, Rosbe KW (2003) Otitis media and middle ear effusion in snow. In: Ballenger JJ (Ed.), Ballenger's otorhinolaryngology head neck surgery. BC Decker inc, Canada.
- 3. JLOY AHC, Tan AL, Lu PKS (2002) Microbiology of chronic supurative otitis media in Singapore. Singapore Med J 43(6): 296-299.
- 4. 4.Sweeney G, Piccozi GL, Browning GG (1982) A quantitative study of aerobic and anaerobic bacteria in chronic suppurative otitis media. J Infect 5(1): 47-55.
- 5. S.Rupa V, Raman R, Chronic suppurative otitis media complicated versus uncomplicated disease. Acta otolaryngology. 1991;111:530-535.
- Malkappa KS, Kandapaneni S, Supam BR, Chakvaverti KT, Study of bacterial isolates and their antibiotic susceptibility pattern in Chronic Suppurative Otitis Media, Indian Journal of otology. 2012;18(3):136-139
- 7. Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute. 2006. Performance standards for antimicrobial disk susceptibility tests; approved standard-9 th ed. CLSI document M2-A9. 26:1. Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
- 8. Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing; Twenty-Fifth Informational Supplement. M100-S25. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2015.

- 9. WHO NET –world health organization, WHO software (internet) 2013 available from http//; WHO,int/ last cited on 2013 Apr-30.
- 10. 10.Dhingra PL, Dhingra S. Diseases of Ear, Nose and Throat. 5th edition, Elsevier India; 2010.
- 11. Deb T, Ray D. A study of the bacteriological profile of chronic suppurative otitis media in agartala. Indian journal of otolaryngology and head and neck surgery: official publication of the Association of Otolaryngologists of India, 2012; 64(4): 326-9
- 12. Chirwa M, Mulwafu W, Aswani JM, Masinde PW, Mkakosya R, Soko D. Microbiology of chronic suppurative otitis media at Queen Elizabeth Central Hospital, Blantyre, Malawi: A crosssectional descriptive study. Malawi Med J., 2015; 27(4): 120-4.
- 13. Rajat Prakash ,Deepak Juyal, Vikranta Negi, Shekhar Pal, Shamanth Adekhandi, MuneshSharma and Neelam Sharma. – Microbiology of Chronic Suppurative Otitis Media in a Tertiary Care Setup of Uttarakhand state, India - North American Journal of Medical Sciences –Apr.2013: 5(4) 282 -287.
- 14. J. Gulati, P.L.Tandon, Waryansingh- Study of Bacterial flora in chronic Otitis media Indian Journal of Otolaryngology and Head and Neck surgery – 1969:21;4:198
- P.C.Baruah, S.C. Agarwal, M.M.L. Arora, Y.N.Mehra, -Indian Journal of otolaryngology and Head and neck surgery -1972:24:4:157

- AtanuNandy,P.S Mallya,K.Sivarajan Indian Journal of otolaryngology and Head and Neck surgery -1991:43:3:136
- 17Prakash R, Juyal D, Negi V, Pal S, Adekhandi S, Sharma M, *et al.* Microbiology of Chronic Suppurative Otitis Media in a Tertiary Care Setup of Uttarkhand State, India. N Am J Med Sci. 2013;5(4):282-7.9.
- 18. 18Kumar S, Sharma R, Saxena A, Pandey A, Gautam P, Taneja V. Bacterial flora of infected unsafe CSOM. Indian J Otol. 2012;18:208-11.
- Kulkarni G, Damle A. Bacteriology of chronic suppurative otitis media and its complications. MRIMS J Health Sciences. 2015;3(2):125-9.
- Bhan C, Purohit K, Purohit JP, Kumar V, Yadav HS. Clinical vs Bacteriological and Mycological Evaluation in Chronic Suppurative Otitis Media. Int J Contemporary Med Res. 2016;3(5):1443-7.
- 21. 21.Michales Glonscock III George Shamburgh JR. Surgery of ear, fourth edition, 1990 W.B saunelevs company PP: 107-168
- 22. Gulati sudesh kumar. Investigative profile in patients of chronic suppurative otitis media. Indian Journal of otology Vol-3 No.2. 1997;(6):59-62.
- 23. Varshey Saubh, Gupta Pratima. Bacteriology study of chronic suppurative otitis media. Indian journal of Otology. 1999;(6):87-91.
- Sinha A, Kapil A, Gupta V. Aerobic microbiological study of Chronic suppurative otitis media. Indian journal of otology Vol5; No4. 1999;(12):203-206.

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