1	Incidence and prevalence of polymyxin resistant bacterial strains in the
2	clinical and environmental samples in India: a systematic review and meta-
3	analysis
4	
5	Sambit K. Dwibedy ^{1,3} , Indira Padhy ¹ , Aditya K. Panda ^{1,2} , Saswat S. Mohapatra ^{1,2} *
6	
7 8	¹ Department of Biotechnology, Berhampur University, Bhanja Bihar, Berhampur- 760007, Odisha, India
9	² Centre of Excellence on Bioprospecting of Ethno-pharmaceuticals of Southern Odisha
10	(CoE-BESO), Berhampur University, Bhanja Bihar, Berhampur- 760007, India
11	³ Department of Zoology, SBRG Women's College, Berhampur- 760001, Odisha, India
12	
13	For Correspondence- saswatsmohapatra@gmail.com
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28 Abstract

Introduction: Polymyxins, the cationic lipopeptide antibiotics, are the last line of therapeutics against the multi-drug resistant (MDR) pathogenic Gram-negative bacteria. Unfortunately, the rising cases of polymyxin-resistant strains from across the globe have adversely impacted the available treatment options. While the molecular mechanisms responsible for developing polymyxin resistance (Pol^R) are largely understood, the prevalence of Pol^R strains in India is not investigated systematically.

Method: For this study, a systematic search for relevant articles was performed in the applicable databases for the period January 2015 to December 2023. A meta-analysis was performed using the comprehensive meta-analysis software (V.4) to determine the overall prevalence of Pol^R bacterial strains in India. Publication biases were assessed using funnel

39 plots and Egger's regression analysis.

Result: Considering a total of 43 studies selected based on the relevant inclusion and
exclusion criteria, the present meta-analysis found the rate of Pol^R bacteria in India to be at
15.7%, which is higher than the global average. Among the Indian States, Tamil Nadu topped
with the highest prevalence of Pol^R at 32.4%. Investigating the contribution of the mobile
colistin resistance (*mcr*) genes, it was observed that among the Pol^R strains, 8.6% were *mcr*positive. **Conclusion:** The *mcr*-positive strains reported from India could be an underestimation of the

actual numbers due to the non-inclusion of *mcr* screening in many previous studies. Our study provides insight into the state of the Pol^R situation in India, which may be useful to develop a monitoring strategy to contain the spread of such strains and preserve the potency of the polymyxins.

51

52 **Keywords:** Polymyxin resistance, colistin resistance, *mcr*, India, meta-analysis

- 53
- 54

55 **INTRODUCTION**

The significant use of antibiotics in healthcare, and agriculture, and their indiscriminate prophylactic consumption has driven the rise of antibiotic-resistant bacterial pathogens. Infections caused by antibiotic-resistant bacteria are increasingly becoming fatal due to the non-availability of potent antibiotics against them. As per an estimate, drug-resistant pathogens caused 4.95 million deaths in 2019⁻¹, predicted to rise to 10 million deaths annually by 2050⁻². Considering the significant economic consequences of rising drugresistant infections, urgent mitigation measures are warranted.

63 Antibiotic-resistant bacteria belonging to the Gram-negative type pose a significant challenge to treatment as increasing reports of resistance to third and fourth generations of 64 cephalosporins are reported globally³. In this unprecedented situation, polymyxins, a group 65 of cationic peptide antibiotics, remain the last option for treatment ^{4,5}. Polymyxin was 66 initially isolated in 1947 from a soil bacterium Paenibacillus polymyxa⁶ and approved for 67 clinical use in 1959 against Gram-negative bacteria. Due to their nephrotoxic and neurotoxic 68 properties, polymyxins were prohibited for clinical use in the 1970s^{7,8} and were consequently 69 substituted by aminoglycosides, quinolones, and β -lactams. However, with the rising 70 71 infections caused by multi-drug resistant (MDR) Gram-negative bacteria (GNB) such as 72 Klebsiella pneumoniae, Acinetobacter baumannii, and Pseudomonas aeruginosa, and failure of the frontline antibiotics, polymyxins have re-emerged albeit with some modifications in 73 the chemical structure as the last-resort antibiotic option against GNB^{4,9}. 74

75 Polymyxins are of five types (polymyxin A to polymyxin E), of which colistin (polymyxin E) and polymyxin B are approved for clinical use ¹⁰. Structurally, polymyxins are cationic 76 decapeptides consisting of a central cyclic heptapeptide with a tripeptide side-chain acylated 77 at the N-terminus by a fatty acid tail ^{11,12}. The primary target of cationic polymyxin is the 78 negatively charged outer membrane (OM) of GNB. Polymyxin destabilizes the OM 79 lipopolysaccharide (LPS) by displacing the divalent cations Mg^{2+} and Ca^{2+} resulting in 80 81 enhanced permeability of the membrane and leading to leakage of cytoplasmic content that ultimately causes cell death ^{5,13,14}. 82

The extensive use of polymyxins in the preceding decade in both healthcare and animal feeds
has triggered the emergence of polymyxin-resistant (Pol^R) bacterial strains across the globe.
Pol^R bacterial species such as *K. pneumoniae* ^{15–17}, *P. aeruginosa* ^{4,18}, *A. baumannii* ¹⁹, *E. coli*

86 ²⁰, Shigella sonnei ²¹, Salmonella enterica ²², Enterobacter aerogenes and Enterobacter

cloacae ²³ have been reported from different parts of the world that have adversely affected
the healthcare sectors. Moreover, the detection of Pol^R GNB in both clinical and
environmental samples has made the situation alarming.

The primary mechanism responsible for Pol^R development is the remodelling of the OM in 90 GNB making it increasingly positive [by the addition of 4-amino-4-deoxy L-arabinose (L-91 Ara4N) or phosphoethanolamine (pEtN)], leading to the repulsion of cationic polymyxins ^{4,13}. 92 93 The OM remodelling is generally carried out by bacterial two-component signal transduction 94 systems (TCS). TCS generally sense the environmental cues and signal appropriately to 95 modulate the expression of genes involved in the response mechanisms. PhoPQ and PmrAB are the two primary TCSs in the GNB involved in the OM remodelling in response to various 96 stresses including polymyxin treatment ^{5,13}. Apart from PhoPQ and PmrAB TCSs, there are 97 several other such systems reported in various bacterial species ^{14,24,25}. Though organisms can 98 develop resistance to polymyxins via TCS, there are many GNBs like Serratia marcescens, 99 100 Proteus mirabilis, Proteus penneri, Proteus vulgaris, Providencia rettgeri, Providencia 101 stuartii, Vibrio cholerae, Campylobacter spp., Legionella spp., Morganella morganii, 102 Burkholderia spp., Edwardsiella spp., Aeromonas jandaei, Aeromonas hydrophila, Acinetobacter junii, Neisseria spp. that are naturally resistant to polymyxins due to the 103 104 constitutive expression of the *arnBCADTEF* operon and/or the *eptB* gene, which increase the charge of LPS by addition of pEtN and/or L-Ara4N^{4,26}. Moreover, all Gram-positive and 105 106 anaerobic bacteria are also inherently resistant to polymyxins.

107 Though chromosome-encoded polymyxin resistance is the prevalent mechanism, the 108 detection of the plasmid-borne mobile colistin resistance (mcr) gene from the bacteria E. coli and K. pneumoniae in China has made the situation alarming 20 . The mcr gene encodes a 109 110 pEtN transferase enzyme that catalyses the addition of a pEtN residue to lipid-A moiety 111 which alters the net charge of the LPS reducing the binding of polymyxin. To date, ninety-112 eight mcr alleles have been discovered belonging to ten different classes of mcr genes (mcr-1 113 to mcr-10) among many GNB pathogens. Bacterial plasmids bearing the mcr genes have been 114 reported from across the globe. Moreover, the different mcr classes have shown distinct geographical distribution 27,28 . As the potential of rapid dissemination of plasmid-borne *mcr* 115 genes is significantly high, it is pertinent to conduct periodic surveillance to monitor their 116 117 distribution in the environment and clinic.

118 In the Indian context, *mcr* genes have been reported in several studies conducted using 119 clinical samples ²⁹, hospital sewage ³⁰, urban sewage water ³¹, and food samples ³². However,

120 a comprehensive analysis of the distribution of *mcr* genes across India is lacking. It is 121 important to highlight that the increasing number of carbapenem-resistant pathogenic bacteria 122 has made India one of the top users of polymyxins in the clinic. Furthermore, the use of colistin as a growth promoter in poultry farms has triggered the spread of Pol^R GNB in the 123 environment. Though the Govt. of India has banned the use of colistin in farm animals since 124 125 2019, the impact of their extensive use before 2019 is yet to be assessed. Very few 126 investigations have been carried out in the Indian context, especially using environmental samples to understand the dynamics of Pol^R bacterial strains in the environment and the 127 128 incidence of mcr-positive bacterial strains from across India.

129 The current meta-analysis was performed to determine the pattern and spread of Pol^R 130 bacterial strains in India and to find a correlation between Pol^R and the presence of the *mcr* 131 genes.

132 MATERIALS & METHODS

Using published articles, the present study was conducted to determine the prevalence and spread of Pol^R Gram-negative bacteria (GNB) from clinical and environmental sources in India and the contribution of *mcr* genes in gaining the resistance phenotype. The study was undertaken as per the guidelines of Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) ³³ (Fig. 1).

138 Data collection

Databases like PubMed, Google Scholar, Science Direct, and Scopus were extensively searched using the keywords "polymyxin resistance", "colistin resistance", "mobile colistin resistance gene" and "India". Original research articles with reports of Pol^R bacteria from India, published between January 2015 to December 2023 were included in this study. The last search was performed on January 06, 2024.

144 Inclusion criteria

For the meta-analysis, we only included articles that met the following requirements: 1) the samples used in the studies must hail from India, 2) data on resistance to polymyxin B and/or colistin must be available, 3) broth-microdilution (BMD) method must have been followed to determine Pol^R of the bacterial isolates, 4) the article must mention the total sample size and the number of Pol^R strains isolated or the prevalence frequency, and 5) the article must have been published in English.

151 Exclusion criteria

The following exclusion criteria were strictly followed: 1) studies with no Pol^R isolate were excluded from this analysis; 2) studies conducted outside India were not considered; 3) studies that employed resistance detection methods other than BMD were disregarded; 4) studies that were not published in English, were not peer-reviewed, and were published before 2015 were excluded.

157 **Data extraction**

158 Data were extracted from relevant articles that were qualified based on the study's inclusion 159 and exclusion criteria (Fig. 1). Each report was individually screened and investigated for 160 eligibility by two different authors (SKD and IP). Following a thorough review, the following 161 information was extracted and summarised for each study: first author name, publication year, State, or UT (Union Territories) of occurrence, total sample size, the total number of 162 Pol^R isolates, reported Pol^R bacteria, resistance detection method, genes involved in 163 164 resistance development, and *mcr* gene screening status. For further analysis, the data were 165 tabulated in a Microsoft Excel sheet.

166 Subgrouping of data

The research articles with Pol^R reports were classified into two groups based on criteria such 167 as sample size (more than one) and the involvement of mcr genes in the development of Pol^{R} . 168 Studies reporting a specific number of samples containing both Pol^R and susceptible isolates 169 and a particular number of Pol^R bacteria as events were placed in the first group. This group 170 171 was further subdivided based on the States or UTs from where they were reported. In this 172 classification system, those States were included that have at least four different reports on Pol^R isolates. In the second group, those reports were included where *mcr* gene screening 173 174 status was mentioned clearly in the study.

175 **Quality assessment**

The quality of all eligible reports was determined by the Newcastle–Ottawa Scale (NOS) and only the high-quality reports were considered for the present meta-analysis. According to the NOS guidelines, qualitative scores are given as stars, and a total score of five stars or more for a study is considered a high-quality report.

180 Meta-analysis

To measure relative risk, we included articles reporting the prevalence of Pol^R bacteria and 181 182 the contribution of mcr genes in this meta-analysis. All statistical analyses were performed 183 using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (CMA) software (version 4.0; Biostat Inc. USA). The generated data were visualized using forest plots. Publication bias in the included studies was 184 assessed using funnel plots with visual analysis ³⁴ and Egger regression analysis ³⁵. The 185 heterogeneity of the studies was examined using the Cochrane Q statistics ³⁶ and I² statistics 186 ³⁷. Based on the outcome of the heterogeneity analysis, a fixed-effect model (homogenous) or 187 random-effect model (heterogeneous) was used for the meta-analysis. 188

Overall, 43 articles reporting the prevalence of Pol^R isolates in India were subjected to meta-189 190 analysis, whereas 58 reports were included to decipher the role of *mcr* gene in the polymyxin resistance phenotype. Of the 58 reports of *mcr* contribution to Pol^R, 41 were eligible for the 191 meta-analysis. The combined event rate and 95% confidence interval were calculated to 192 determine the frequency of Pol^R isolates in India and the contribution of mcr to polymyxin 193 resistance. In addition, sensitivity analysis was performed to explore the robustness of the 194 195 meta-analysis by excluding one study at a time, performing the meta-analysis, and comparing it with the results of the parent analysis. 196

197 **RESULT**

198 Literature review and screened results

Overall, 1408 articles were obtained by searching different databases with suitable keywords (PubMed = 802, Google Scholar = 431, Science Direct = 109, Scopus = 66). The article selection approach is presented in a PRISMA flow chart (Fig. 1). A total of 43 eligible articles reporting Pol^R (Supplementary Table 1) and 41 articles reporting the contribution of *mcr* (Supplementary Table 2) were included in the meta-analysis after careful screening according to the stipulated inclusion and exclusion criteria.

205 **Publication bias**

Visual analysis of the funnel plot and Egger's regression analysis showed the absence of publication bias in the analysis of the incidence of Pol^R bacteria in India (intercept: 0.63, 95% CI = -2.38 to 3.65, p = 0.67), as well as in the analysis of the role of *the mcr* gene in Pol^R

209 (intercept: -1.3, 95% CI = -2.69 to 0.08, p = 0.065) (Table 1) (Supplementary Fig. 1).

Furthermore, after the categorization of all studies according to the states from which they were reported, the funnel plot and Egger's regression analysis revealed no significant biases

- while analysing the incidence of Pol^R bacteria in states such as Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh,
- 213 Odisha, West Bengal, and Delhi (Table 1) (Supplementary Fig. 2).

214 Heterogeneity analysis

- 215 Cochrane Q and I^2 measurements demonstrated significant heterogeneity among the included
- studies. Hence, a random-effects model was used for all meta-analyses (Table 1).

217 **Prevalence of Pol^R bacteria in India**

After investigating 43 reports, the present meta-analysis found that the rate of Pol^R bacteria in India was 15.7% (Fig. 2). Out of 28 states and eight UTs in India, 12 states and 3 UTs have reported the presence of Pol^R bacterial strains. Among all the states that have reported Pol^R,

221 Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, and Odisha are the top three, where the rate of Pol^{R} is higher than

- the Indian average at 32.4%, 16.3%, and 15.9%, respectively. Upon State-wise analysis,
- 223 Delhi and West Bengal showed significant cases of Pol^R at 13.5%, and 10.9%, respectively,
- though less than the national average (Fig. 3).

225 Role of *mcr* gene in the development of Pol^R

Furthermore, to understand the prevalence of *mcr* genes in Pol^R bacterial isolates in comparison with other possible mechanisms in India, 41 reports with positive *mcr* gene screening status and a sample size of more than one (Pol^R isolate) criterion were considered for the analysis (Supplementary Table 2). The meta-analysis results showed that the contribution of the *mcr* gene to the rise in polymyxin resistance was 8.6% in India (Fig. 4).

231 Sensitivity analysis

232 Sensitivity analysis was performed to measure the robustness of the meta-analysis by 233 excluding a single study each time and relating the results to the parental meta-analysis. As 234 illustrated in Supplementary Fig. 3, no significant deviation was observed in the sensitivity 235 analysis compared with the original meta-analysis results for studying the incidence of Pol^R 236 bacteria in India. Furthermore, a meta-analysis on the contribution of the *mcr* gene to Pol^R 237 also revealed a robust observation, as shown in Supplementary Fig. 4.

238 **DISCUSSION**

The current meta-analysis systematically evaluated the incidence of Pol^{R} bacteria in India, which was higher than the global average. In this study, we found that 15.7% of GNB were Pol^R, whereas the global average remained at 10% ³⁸. A previous study has put the rate of Pol^R among clinical *Enterobacteriaceae* isolates in India at 13.8% ³⁹.

243 The present study revealed that GNB resistant to the last line of therapeutics is spread all over India, and States like Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, and Odisha have a higher incidence of Pol^R 244 245 strains than the national average. The rising incidence of polymyxin resistance in India could 246 be attributed to their indiscriminate use in the healthcare sector, in poultry farms as growth promoters, and the rapid dissemination of *mcr* genes via horizontal gene transfer. Even 247 though India has banned the use of colistin in animal feeds since 2019, its implications on the 248 spread of Pol^R may be revealed a few years down the line. Interestingly, there are no reports 249 of Pol^R in 16 states and 5 UTs in India, which may be due to the lack of surveillance in those 250 States and UTs. The overall spread of Pol^R GNB in India is shown in Fig. 5A. 251

Although most of the reports used in this study indicated Pol^R rates under 20%, there are a 252 few that have reported significantly higher Pol^R rates ^{40–45}. These discrepancies are due to the 253 different methodologies adopted for determining polymyxin resistance. In India, various 254 255 methods such as the Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion test, broth microdilution (BMD), agar 256 dilution, E-test, VITEK-2, gradient diffusion, colistin broth disc elution, rapid polymyxin 257 Nordmann Poirel Test, Mikrolatest kit, BD Phoenix M50, MicroScan WalkAway 96 Plus, 258 Micronaut-S and Modified Stokes DDT, have been used. However, as per the 259 recommendation of the CLSI and EUCAST, BMD is the only approved method for determining colistin susceptibility ^{46,47}, and therefore in this study, the colistin resistance 260 261 reports determined using the BMD method have only been included.

Meta-analysis revealed that in 8.6% of cases, the mcr gene was responsible for spreading the 262 Pol^R phenotype in India. In India, after the first detection of the mcr gene in a clinical E. coli 263 isolate 48 , several reports of *mcr* occurrence have been published $^{30,32,49-51}$. To date, six 264 265 classes of mcr have been reported in India: mcr-1, mcr-2, mcr-3, mcr-4, mcr-5, and mcr-9. Of 266 the 115 mcr variants detected till date, mcr-1 was the predominant variant responsible for 267 driving polymyxin resistance in India. In the current study, the frequency of *mcr*-1 was 72%, whereas the frequencies of mcr-2, mcr-3, mcr-4, mcr-5, and mcr-9 were 3%, 19%, 3%, 1%, 268 and 2%, respectively (Fig. 5C). Considering that mcr-1 was the first plasmid-borne colistin 269 resistance gene to be detected ²⁰ it has spread globally in the last 6-7 years. 270

Unlike the distribution of Pol^R GNB, the spread of *mcr* has been limited to nine states and two UTs in India (Fig. 5B). Among these states, Uttar Pradesh was found to be the hotspot for the spread of *mcr* variants, with 48 reports, followed by Tamil Nadu and Assam with 31 and 15 *mcr* variant reports, respectively. However, several reports on Pol^R have not provided sufficient information on *mcr* gene screening status. The limited screening for *mcr* genes

among these studies may be responsible for the low rate of detection and reporting of *mcr*genes in India.

278 As mentioned previously, mcr genes are largely plasmid-borne, and various types of plasmids are involved in carrying mcr genes in GNB^{27,52}. In India, different mcr variants were found 279 to be linked with plasmids including IncHI2, InCHI2A, IncX1, IncX4, and FIA Inc ^{32,41,53}. 280 281 The association of these plasmids with other antibiotic-resistance genes conferring resistance to carbapenems, cephalosporins, and fosfomycin has also been previously established ^{54,55}. 282 283 Although plasmids are the primary genetic vehicle through which mcr genes disseminate 284 among bacterial species, their chromosomal integration has also been reported in different bacterial species in India $^{56-59}$. The major advantage of chromosomal integration of *mcr* genes 285 could be their reduced chance of loss from the genome, in the absence of polymyxin 286 287 selection. Interestingly, some naturally resistant bacteria also harbour the mcr genes and can potentially spread them to the polymyxin-susceptible species in the environment ⁶⁰. 288 Moreover, few studies have reported the presence of the mcr-1, mcr-3, and mcr-9 genes in 289 bacterial species that are susceptible to polymyxin ^{51,61}. This is primarily due to the 290 insertional inactivation of *mcr*-1 and *mcr*-3 genes 51,61 . However, in the case of *mcr*-9 positive 291 Enterobacter hormaechei strain, gseBC TCS genes were absent downstream ⁶² which has 292 been previously described to induce the colistin resistance phenotype by upregulating the 293 *mcr*-9 gene expression in response to the subinhibitory concentration of colistin 63 . 294

This meta-analysis has certain limitations. First, the current study included articles available in the English language only, as a result, publications in other languages have been excluded. Second, we searched reports from databases including PubMed, Google Scholar, Scopus, and Science Direct, so may have missed publications indexed in other databases. Third, as certain Gram-negative bacterial species are inherently resistant to polymyxins, reports on polymyxin resistance from the environmental strains may have been biased toward such species.

301 CONCLUSION

The present study found that the rate of Pol^{R} bacterial strains in India was 15.7%, which is higher than the global average. While Pol^{R} strains have been reported from most of the Indian States and UTs, there are still regions where adequate data are not available, warranting monitoring and surveillance. This study further found that in 8.6% of Pol^{R} strains, the phenotype was determined by *mcr* genes carried on plasmids. This may be grossly underestimated due to the lack of *mcr* surveillance data in many published articles. As

308 polymyxins are one of the last option antibiotics available against Gram-negative bacterial 309 pathogens, preservation of their antibiotic properties is paramount. However, the increasing 310 incidence of polymyxin resistance in clinics and the environment has the potential to limit 311 antibiotic treatment options. Therefore, along with developing better versions of polymyxins 312 and/or their derivatives, it is also important to devise strategies for monitoring the frequency of Pol^R bacterial species and, the prevalence of *mcr* genes in them. Sustained measures need 313 314 to be in place to contain the further spread of the polymyxin resistance phenotype in the near 315 future.

316 Author Contributions

Conceptualization: SKD, AKP, and SSM; Data extraction and analysis: SKD, IP, AKP, and
SSM; Data validation: SKD and IP; Manuscript writing and reviewing: SKD, AKP, and
SSM. All authors agreed to the submitted version.

320 Funding

This work is supported by the funds received from the Science and Technology Department, Govt. of Odisha (Grant no. ST-BT-MISC-0005-2023-2463/ST, dt. 23-05-2023). Infrastructure support from the "Centre of Excellence on Bioprospecting of Ethnopharmaceuticals of Southern Odisha (CoE-BESO)" to the Dept. of Biotechnology, Berhampur University is gratefully acknowledged. Indira Padhy is a recipient of the "Biju Patnaik Research Fellowship (BPRF)" from the Science and Technology Department, Govt. of Odisha.

328 Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

332 Figures



Figure. 1. The PRISMA flow diagram for the selection, inclusion, and exclusion of studies.

Study name		Statistics for	each study		Event rate and 95% Cl	
	Event rate	Lower	Upper limit	Z-Value		Relative weight
Banerjee et al., 2023	0.090	0.047	0.164	-6.621	∰−	2.30
Soni et al., 2023	0.045	0.032	0.062	-17.173		2.48
Kaza et al., 2023	0.167	0.108	0.249	-6.233		2.41
Vasesi et al., 2023	0.068	0.033	0.136	-6.688		2.25
Sharma et al., 2023	0.126	0.096	0.165	-12.121		2.49
Ranjan et al., 2023	0.090	0.047	0.164	-6.621		2.30
Shanthini et al.,2023	0.900	0.732	0.967	3.610		1.93
Rout et al.,2023	0.129	0.121	0.138	-49.615		2.54
Sharma et al.,2022	0.689	0.541	0.806	2.469		2.34
Elizabeth et al., 2022	0.041	0.024	0.071	-10.672		2.37
Bir et al.,2022	0.227	0.158	0.315	-5.379		2.44
Panigrahi et al.,2022	0.196	0.158	0.241	-10.585		2.51
Sharma et al 2022	0.200	0.139	0.279	-6.200		2.44
Reddy et al. 2022	0.017	0.012	0.024	-22.488		2.48
Azam et al. 2021	0.033	0.018	0.058	-11.034		2.36
Nirwan et al. 2021	0.003	0.002	0.004	-25.110		2.43
Bhatia et al. 2021	0.160	0.061	0.357	-3.040		2.03
Kar et al 2021	0.135	0.094	0.190	-8 977		2.46
Das et al. 2021	0.171	0.120	0.238	-7 473		2.45
Sobail at al 2021	0.170	0.117	0.250	-6.008		2.40
Gunalaa et al. 2021	0.1/3	0.083	0.246	-5.305		2.41
Drivanka et al. 2021	0.606	0.505	0.667	2.509		2.55
Privatika et al.,2021	0.000	0.021	0.007	4.058		4.40
Aarthi at al. 2021	0.020	0.007	0.045	11.008		2.26
Reshupati at al. 2020	0.025	0.014	0.045	4 700		2.30
Sharma at al. 2020	0.005	0.150	0.010	10.806		2.20
Bardhan et al. 2020	0.025	0.013	0.047	-10.090		2.52
Khurana et al. 2020	0.0/9	0.572	0.769	3.190		2.43
Meettel et al. 2020	0.215	0.180	0.243	-10.032		2.03
Waattal et al.,2020	0.024	0.200	0.366	-0.100		2.50
Soundari et al.,2020	0.002	0.539	0.766	2.557		2.40
Mitra et al.,2020	0.400	0.205	0.526	-1.539		2.40
Das et al.,2020	0.225	0.163	0.302	-6.074		2.46
Gogry et al., 2019	0.180	0.143	0.239	+9.141		2.49
Mathur et al.,2019	0.040	0.029	0.056	-18.127		2.48
Sundaramoorthy et al.,2019 A	0.444	0.177	0.749	-0.333		1.03
Sundaramoorthy et al., 2019 B	0.333	0.084	0.732	-0.800		1.54
Amiadi et al.,2019	0.093	0.056	0.151	-8.100		2.38
Garg et al.,2019	0.185	0.130	0.256	-8.958		2.45
Ragnupati et al.,2019	0.310	0.222	0.415	-3.446		2.43
Kumar et al.,2018	0.018	0.011	0.029	-16.283		2.42
Manonar et al.,2017	0.326	0.237	0.430	-3.215		2.44
Kumar et al.,2016 B	0.968	0.804	0.995	3.346		1.34
Kumar et al., 2016 C	0.077	0.065	0.092	-26.406		2.53
	0.157	0.118	0.207	-9.781		
					-1.00 -0.50 0.00 0.50 1.00	

Figure. 2. Forest plots demonstrating the event rate of polymyxin-resistant (Pol^R) bacteria in
India. The Comprehensive meta-analysis software V4 (Biostat Inc. USA) was used for the
calculation of the event rate and 95% confidence interval.



Figure. 3. Forest plots representing the event rate of polymyxin-resistant (Pol^R) bacteria in
different states of India (A) Delhi, (B) Odisha, (C) Tamil Nadu, (D) Uttar Pradesh, and (E)
West Bengal.

Study name	Statistics for each study					
	Event rate	Lower	Uppe r limit	Z-Value		Relative weight
Talat et al., 2023	0.167	0.023	0.631	-1.469		2.61
Pathak et al., 2023	0.071	0.004	0.577	-1.748		2.04
Shanthini et al., 2023	0.018	0.001	0.230	-2.808		2.09
Rout et al., 2023	0.001	0.000	0.010	-5.196		2.11
Elizabeth et al. 2022	0.417	0.185	0.692	-0.575		3.49
Bir et al. 2022	0.040	0.006	0 235	-3.114		274
Naha et al. 2022	0.050	0.003	0.475	-2 029		2.06
Sharma et al. 2022	0.019	0.001	0 244	-2 753		2.09
Reddy et al. 2022	0.065	0.016	0 224	-3.658		3.24
Das et al 2022	0.018	0.001	0 230	-2.808		2.09
Aram at al 2021	0.042	0.003	0.425	-2.170		2.00
Nieves et al. 2021	0.036	0.003	0.310	2.510		2.07
Sinch et al., 2021	0.020	0.002	0.010	2.071		2.09
Singh et al., 2021	0.004	0.052	0.355	2.971		3.43
Enzabelli et al., 2021	0.333	0.004	0.752	-0.000		3.01
Rar et al., 2021	0.010	0.001	0.230	-2.008		2.00
Bandyopadnyay et al., 2021	0.167	0.010	0.606	-1.039		1.93
Snarma et al., 2021	0.050	0.003	0.475	-2.028		2.06
Aarthi et al., 2021	0.042	0.003	0.425	-2.170		2.07
Pathak et al., 2020	0.100	0.038	0.238	-4.169		3.58
Raghupati et al., 2020	0.100	0.014	0.467	-2.084		2.68
Roy et al., 2020	0.875	0.266	0.993	1.287		1.98
Bardhan et al., 2020	0.009	0.001	0.123	-3.341	—	2.10
Khamari et al., 2020	0.167	0.010	0.806	-1.039		1.93
Soundari et al., 2020	0.047	0.012	0.168	-4.171		3.26
Mitra et al., 2020	0.083	0.021	0.279	-3.247		3.23
Das et al., 2020	0.016	0.001	0.206	-2.907		2.10
Gogry et al., 2019	0.106	0.045	0.231	-4.499		3.66
Shankar et al., 2019	0.008	0.000	0.110	-3.434	⊨	2.11
Mathur et al., 2019	0.014	0.001	0.191	-2.973	I I 🖛 I	2.10
Sundaramoorthy et al., 2019 B	0.167	0.010	0.806	-1.039		1.93
Subramaniam & Muthukrishnan, 2019	0.833	0.194	0.990	1.039		1.93
Amladi et al., 2019	0.033	0.002	0.366	-2.341		2.08
Rahman & Ahmad., 2019	0.976	0.713	0.999	2.594		2.09
Ghafur et al., 2019	0.042	0.014	0.123	-5.290		3.48
Kumar et al., 2018	0.028	0.002	0.322	-2.479		2.08
Singh et al., 2018	0,190	0.073	0.412	-2.604		3.54
Apparwal et al., 2018	0.063	0.004	0.539	-1.854		2.05
Mathur et al. 2018	0.056	0.003	0.505	-1.947		2.06
Manohar et al. 2017	0.017	0.001	0.217	-2.859		2.10
Pranasam et al. 2017	0.056	0.003	0.505	-1.947		2.06
Bernasconi et al 2016	0 200	0.027	0.691	-1 240		2.57
2010 0000 01 01 01 01 010	0.086	0.050	0 144	-7 941		2.07
	0.000	0.000	0.144			
				-1	-0.50 0.00 0.50	1.00

343

Figure. 4. Forest plots demonstrating the contribution of the *mcr* genes in the development

345 of polymyxin resistance in India.



Figure. 5. (A) Distribution of polymyxin-resistant (Pol^R) bacteria across different States and
Union Territories (UTs) of India from 43 studies, (B) Spread of *mcr* genes across different
States and UTs of India, and (C) Pie chart showing the percentage of reported *mcr* variants in
India.

352	Study Name	Egger's Regression Analysis			Heterogeneity Analysis			Model
353 354	(Incidence of Pol ^R bacteria)	Intercept	95% Confidence Interval	P Value (2 tailed)	Q value	P- Heterogeneity	I ² (%)	- Used
355	India	0.63	-2.38 to 3.65	0.67	1603.03	0.00	97.38	Random
356	Delhi	-6.54	-21.94 to 8.86	0.30	166.14	0.00	96.99	Random
357	Odisha	2.05	-5.52 to 9.62	0.49	83.95	0.00	94.04	Random
358	Tamil Nadu	1.84	-8.4 to 12.07	0.68	169.16	0.00	95.27	Random
359	Uttar Pradesh	0.72	-13.49 to 14.93	0.9	102.7	0.00	94.16	Random
360	West Bengal	-5.63	-26.41 to 15.15	0.36	81.70	0.00	96.33	Random
362	mcr gene involvement in Pol ^R	-1.3	-2.69 to -0.08	0.06	129.71	0.00	69.93	Random

Table 1. Statistics to test the publication bias and heterogeneity.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.04.23296553; this version posted January 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Table 2 . Detailed information on the <i>mcr</i> gene reported from 1	India.
--	--------

<i>mcr</i> gene	Plasmid/	Bacteria	Source	References	
	Chromosomal				
mcr-9	Chromosomal	Enterobacter hormaechei	Clinical isolates	#Seethalakshmi et al., 2024 ⁶²	
<i>mcr</i> -1.1	IncHI2	<i>E. coli</i> (10)	Clinical isolates	Naha et al., 2023 ⁶⁴	
mcr-4	Not determined	Proteus vulgaris	Poultry meat	Premnath et al., 2023 ⁶⁰	
mcr-2	Not determined	P. vulgaris, Proteus mirabilis	Poultry meat	Premnath et al., 2023 ⁶⁰	
mcr-3	Not determined	Morganella morganii (8), P. vulgaris (3), P. mirabilis (2), Providencia rettgeri (4)	Poultry meat	Premnath et al., 2023 ⁶⁰	
<i>mcr</i> -9.1	IncHI2	E. hormaechei	Broiler faeces	Sreejith et al., 2023 ⁵³	
<i>mcr</i> -5.1	IncX1	E. coli	Hospital sewage water	Talat et al., 2022 ³⁰	
mcr-1	FIA Inc	E. coli	Clinical isolates	Elizabeth et al., 2022 ⁶⁵	
mcr-1	Not determined	Klebsiella pneumoniae	Clinical isolates	Bir et al., 2022 ⁶⁶	
<i>mcr</i> -1 (2)	Plasmid	$E. \ coli \ (COL^{S})^{*}, \ E. \ coli \ (COL^{R})^{R}$	Clinical isolates	Reddy et al., 2022 ⁶¹	
<i>mcr</i> -1 (19)	Chromosomal, Plasmid	Klebsiella pneumoniae (19)	Clinical isolates	Singh et al., 2021 ⁶⁷	
<i>mcr</i> -1 (2)	Not determined	<i>E. coli</i> (2)	Clinical isolates	Elizabeth et al., 2021 ⁶⁸	

<i>mcr</i> -1 (4)	Chromosomal	Pseudomonas aeruginosa	Clinical isolates	Pathak et al., 2020 69
<i>mcr</i> -3.30	Chromosomal	Aeromonas veronii (COL ^S)*	Clinical isolates	Ragupati et al., 2020 ⁵¹
<i>mcr</i> -1 (2)	Not determined	E. coli	Clinical isolates	Roy et al., 2020 ⁷⁰
mcr-1	Not determined	K. pneumoniae	Clinical isolates	Roy et al., 2020 ⁷⁰
<i>mcr</i> -1 (2)	IncX4	E. coli	Clinical isolates	Soundari et al., 2020 ⁴¹
<i>mcr</i> -1 (2)	Not determined	Enterobacter cloacae	Clinical isolates	Mitra et al., 2020 ⁵⁰
<i>mcr</i> -2 (3)	Not determined	Burkholderia cepacia	Clinical isolates	Mitra et al., 2020 ⁵⁰
mcr-2	Not determined	Pseudomonas aeruginosa	Clinical isolates	Mitra et al., 2020 ⁵⁰
mcr-1	Not determined	Not mentioned	Clinical isolates	Pathak et al., 2020 ⁵⁸
<i>mcr</i> -1(5)	Plasmid	E. coli, A. veronii, A.	Sewage water	Gogry et al., 2019 ³¹
		dhakensis		
mcr-1	Not determined	E. coli	Clinical isolates	Subramaniam & Muthukrishnan, 2019 ⁷¹
mcr-1 (20)	Chromosomal	Acinetobacter baumannii	Clinical isolates	Rahman & Ahmad., 2019 57
<i>mcr</i> -1 (3)	IncX1, InCHI2,	E. coli	Poultry and	Ghafur et al., 2019 ³²
	InCHI2A		mutton meat	
<i>mcr</i> -1 (4)	Chromosomal	K. pneumoniae	Clinical isolates	Singh et al., 2018 ⁵⁶
mcr-1	Not determined	Not mentioned	River sediment	Marathe et al., 2017 ⁴⁹
mcr-1	Plasmid	E. coli	Clinical isolates	Kumar et al., 2016 ⁴⁸
mcr-1	InCHI2	E. coli	Human Stool	Bernasconi et al., 2016 ⁷²
			sample	
1				

Species denoted with * mark indicate insertional inactivation of the *mcr* gene, which leads to polymyxin susceptibility. The number mentioned in the brackets represents the number of *mcr* reported. # This paper was published in 2023 as an online early version and therefore included in the study.

376 **REFERENCES**

- Murray CJ, Ikuta KS, Sharara F, *et al.* Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance
 in 2019: a systematic analysis. *The Lancet* 2022: S0140673621027240.
- 2. O'Neill J. An audience with Jim O'Neill. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 2016; **15**: 526–526.
- 380 3. Darby EM, Trampari E, Siasat P, *et al.* Molecular mechanisms of antibiotic resistance 381 revisited. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 2023; **21**: 280–95.
- 4. Poirel L, Jayol A, Nordmann P. Polymyxins: Antibacterial Activity, Susceptibility Testing,
- and Resistance Mechanisms Encoded by Plasmids or Chromosomes. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2017; 30: 557–96.
- 5. Mohapatra SS, Dwibedy SK, Padhy I. Polymyxins, the last-resort antibiotics: Mode of action, resistance emergence, and potential solutions. *J Biosci* 2021; **46**: 85.
- 387 6. Benedict RG, Langlykke AF. Antibiotic activity of Bacillus polymyxa. *J Bacteriol* 1947;
 388 54: 24.
- 389 7. Koch-Weser J, Sidel VW, Federman EB, Kanarek P, Finer DC, Eaton AE. Adverse effects
- of sodium colistimethate. Manifestations and specific reaction rates during 317 courses of
 therapy. *Ann Intern Med* 1970; **72**: 857–68.
- 8. Nation RL, Li J. Colistin in the 21st century: *Curr Opin Infect Dis* 2009; **22**: 535–43.
- 393 9. Vaara M. Polymyxins and Their Potential Next Generation as Therapeutic Antibiotics.
 394 *Front Microbiol* 2019; **10**: 1689.
- 10. Hamel M, Rolain J-M, Baron SA. The History of Colistin Resistance Mechanisms in
 Bacteria: Progress and Challenges. *Microorganisms* 2021; 9: 442.
- 397 11. Kwa A, Kasiakou SK, Tam VH, Falagas ME. Polymyxin B: similarities to and
 differences from colistin (polymyxin E). *Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther* 2007; 5: 811–21.
- 12. Nang SC, Azad MAK, Velkov T, Zhou Q (Tony), Li J. Rescuing the Last-Line
 Polymyxins: Achievements and Challenges Barker E, ed. *Pharmacol Rev* 2021; **73**: 679–728.
- 13. Olaitan AO, Morand S, Rolain J-M. Mechanisms of polymyxin resistance: acquired and
 intrinsic resistance in bacteria. *Front Microbiol* 2014; **5**. Available at:
 http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fmicb.2014.00643/abstract. Accessed December
- 403 http://journal.frontic
 - 405 14. Yu Z, Qin W, Lin J, Fang S, Qiu J. Antibacterial Mechanisms of Polymyxin and Bacterial
 406 Resistance. *BioMed Res Int* 2015; **2015**: 1–11.
 - 407 15. Antoniadou A, Kontopidou F, Poulakou G, *et al.* Colistin-resistant isolates of Klebsiella
 408 pneumoniae emerging in intensive care unit patients: first report of a multiclonal cluster. J
 409 Antimicrob Chemother 2007; 59: 786–90.
 - 16. Lim LM, Ly N, Anderson D, *et al.* Resurgence of Colistin: A Review of Resistance,
 Toxicity, Pharmacodynamics, and Dosing. *Pharmacotherapy* 2010; **30**: 1279–91.
 - 412 17. Elemam A, Rahimian J, Doymaz M. *In Vitro* Evaluation of Antibiotic Synergy for
 413 Polymyxin B-Resistant Carbapenemase-Producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae*. *J Clin Microbiol*414 2010; 48: 3558–62.
 - 18. El-Baky RMA, Masoud SM, Mohamed DS, *et al.* Prevalence and Some Possible
 Mechanisms of Colistin Resistance Among Multidrug-Resistant and Extensively DrugResistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa. *Infect Drug Resist* 2020; **13**: 323.

418 19. Hejnar P, Kolář M, Hájek V. CHARACTERISTICS OF ACINETOBACTER STRAINS
419 (PHENOTYPE CLASSIFICATION, ANTIBIOTIC SUSCEPTIBILITY AND
420 PRODUCTION OF β-LACTAMASES) ISOLATED FROM HAEMOCULTURES FROM
421 PATIENTS AT THE TEACHING HOSPITAL IN OLOMOUC. 1999; 142.

20. Liu Y-Y, Wang Y, Walsh TR, *et al.* Emergence of plasmid-mediated colistin resistance
mechanism MCR-1 in animals and human beings in China: a microbiological and molecular
biological study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2016; 16: 161–8.

425 21. Ma Q, Huang Y, Wang J, *et al.* Multidrug-resistant Shigella sonnei carrying the plasmid426 mediated mcr -1 gene in China. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2018; **52**: 14–21.

427 22. Borowiak M, Fischer J, Hammerl JA, Hendriksen RS, Szabo I, Malorny B. Identification
428 of a novel transposon-associated phosphoethanolamine transferase gene, mcr-5, conferring
429 colistin resistance in d-tartrate fermenting Salmonella enterica subsp. enterica serovar
430 Paratyphi B. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2017; **72**: 3317–24.

23. Zeng K, Doi Y, Patil S, Huang X, Tian G-B. Emergence of the Plasmid-Mediated *mcr-1*Gene in Colistin-Resistant Enterobacter aerogenes and Enterobacter cloacae. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2016; **60**: 3862–3.

434 24. Fernández L, Gooderham WJ, Bains M, McPhee JB, Wiegand I, Hancock REW.
435 Adaptive Resistance to the "Last Hope" Antibiotics Polymyxin B and Colistin in
436 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Is Mediated by the Novel Two-Component Regulatory System
437 ParR-ParS. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2010; **54**: 3372–82.

438 25. Fernández L, Jenssen H, Bains M, Wiegand I, Gooderham WJ, Hancock REW. The Two-

- Component System CprRS Senses Cationic Peptides and Triggers Adaptive Resistance in
 Pseudomonas aeruginosa Independently of ParRS. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2012; 56:
 6212–22.
- 26. Yin W, Li H, Shen Y, *et al.* Novel Plasmid-Mediated Colistin Resistance Gene *mcr-3* in *Escherichia coli* Bush K, ed. *mBio* 2017; 8: e00543-17.
- 444 27. Nang SC, Li J, Velkov T. The rise and spread of *mcr* plasmid-mediated polymyxin 445 resistance. *Crit Rev Microbiol* 2019; **45**: 131–61.
- 446 28. Gogry FA, Siddiqui MT, Sultan I, Haq QMohdR. Current Update on Intrinsic and
 447 Acquired Colistin Resistance Mechanisms in Bacteria. *Front Med* 2021; 8: 677720.
- 29. Singh S, Pathak A, Rahman M, *et al.* Genetic Characterisation of Colistin Resistant
 Klebsiella pneumoniae Clinical Isolates From North India. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 2021;
 11: 666030.
- 30. Talat A, Usmani A, Khan AU. Detection of *E. coli* IncX1 Plasmid-Mediated *mcr-5.1*Gene in an Indian Hospital Sewage Water Using Shotgun Metagenomic Sequencing: A First
 Report. *Microb Drug Resist* 2022; 28: 759–64.
- 454 31. Gogry FA, Siddiqui MT, Haq. QMohdR. Emergence of mcr-1 conferred colistin
 455 resistance among bacterial isolates from urban sewage water in India. *Environ Sci Pollut Res*456 2019; 26: 33715–7.
- 457 32. Ghafur A, Shankar C, GnanaSoundari P, *et al.* Detection of chromosomal and plasmid-458 mediated mechanisms of colistin resistance in Escherichia coli and Klebsiella pneumoniae 459 from Indian food samples. *J Glob Antimicrob Resist* 2019; **16**: 48–52.

- 460 33. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, *et al.* The PRISMA Extension Statement for 461 Reporting of Systematic Reviews Incorporating Network Meta-analyses of Health Care
- 461 Interventions: Checklist and Explanations. *Ann Intern Med* 2015; **162**: 777–84.
- 463 34. Sterne JA, Egger M. Funnel plots for detecting bias in meta-analysis: guidelines on choice of axis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2001; **54**: 1046–55.
- 35. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple,
 graphical test. *BMJ* 1997; **315**: 629–34.
- 467 36. Higgins JPT, Green S eds. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*.
 468 The Cochrane Collaboration; 2011. Available at: www.handbook.cochrane.org.
- 469 37. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-470 analyses. *BMJ* 2003; **327**: 557.
- 38. Silva KED, Rossato L, Leite AF, Simionatto S. Overview of polymyxin resistance in
 Enterobacteriaceae. *Rev Soc Bras Med Trop* 2022; 55: e0349-2021.
- 39. Turnidge JD, Bell JM, Jones RN. Emergence of Colistin-Resistant Klebsiella spp., and
 Enterobacter spp. in the Asia-Pacific (APAC) Region: A SENTRY Antimicrobial
 Surveillance Program Report (2006). In: Washington DC: American Society for
 Microbiology, 2007.
- 477 40. Bardhan T, Chakraborty M, Bhattacharjee B. Prevalence of Colistin-Resistant,
 478 Carbapenem-Hydrolyzing Proteobacteria in Hospital Water Bodies and Out-Falls of West
 479 Bengal, India. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020; **17**: 1007.
- 480 41. Palani GS, Ghafur A, Krishnan P, Rayvathy B, Thirunarayan M. Intestinal carriage of
 481 colistin resistant Enterobacteriaceae in hospitalized patients from an Indian center. *Diagn*482 *Microbiol Infect Dis* 2020; **97**: 114998.
- 483 42. Priyanka, Meena PR, Meghwanshi KK, Rana A, Singh AP. Leafy greens as a potential
 484 source of multidrug-resistant diarrhoeagenic Escherichia coli and Salmonella. *Microbiol*485 *Read Engl* 2021; 167.
- 486 43. Rohilla R, Raina D, Singh M, Pandita AK, Patwal S. Evaluation of Sphingomonas
 487 paucimobilis as an emerging nosocomial pathogen in a teaching hospital in Uttarakhand. *Iran*488 *J Microbiol* 2021; 13: 617–23.
- 489 44. Shanthini T, Manohar P, Hua X, Leptihn S, Nachimuthu R. Detection of Hypervirulent
 490 Klebsiella pneumoniae from Clinical Samples in Tamil Nadu. 2023: 2023.02.19.23286158.
- 491 Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.02.19.23286158v1. Accessed
 492 September 28, 2023.
- 493 45. Shekhar C, Joshi N, Singh A. Prevalence of Multidrug-Resistant Escherichia coli in
 494 Drinking-Water in and around Ayodhya (U.P.), India. *Indian J Vet Sci Biotechnol* 2023; 19:
 495 112–5.
- 496 46. Satlin MJ, Lewis JS, Weinstein MP, *et al.* Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute and
 497 European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing Position Statements on
 498 Polymyxin B and Colistin Clinical Breakpoints. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020: ciaa121.
- 499 47. CLSI. Colistin Breakpoints for Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Acinetobacter spp. In:
- 500 Wayne PA, ed. *CLSI Rationale Document MR01*. 1st ed. Clinical and Laboratory Standards 501 Institute, 2018.
- 48. Kumar M, Saha S, Subudhi E. More Furious Than Ever: Escherichia coli -Acquired Co-
- resistance Toward Colistin and Carbapenems. *Clin Infect Dis* 2016: ciw508.

49. Marathe NP, Pal C, Gaikwad SS, Jonsson V, Kristiansson E, Larsson DGJ. Untreated urban waste contaminates Indian river sediments with resistance genes to last resort antibiotics. *Water Res* 2017; **124**: 388–97.

- 507 50. Mitra S, Basu S, Rath S, Sahu SK. Colistin resistance in Gram-negative ocular infections:
 508 prevalence, clinical outcome and antibiotic susceptibility patterns. *Int Ophthalmol* 2020; 40:
 509 1307–17.
- 510 51. Ragupathi NKD, Sethuvel DPM, Anandan S, et al. First hybrid complete genome of
- 511 Aeromonas veronii reveals chromosome-mediated novel structural variant mcr-3.30 from a

at:

- 512 human clinical sample. Access Microbiol 2020; 2. Available
- 513 https://www.microbiologyresearch.org/content/journal/acmi/10.1099/acmi.0.000103.
- 514 Accessed August 17, 2023.
- 515 52. Li Z, Cao Y, Yi L, Liu J-H, Yang Q. Emergent Polymyxin Resistance: End of an Era?
 516 *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2019; 6: ofz368.
- 517 53. Sreejith S, Manjusha P, Prathuish P, et al. Predicting human risk with multidrug resistant 518 Enterobacter hormaechei MS2 with MCR 9 gene isolated from the feces of healthy broiler 519 through whole genome sequence based analysis. 2023. Available at: 520 https://www.researchsquare.com. Accessed September 28, 2023.
- 521 54. Carattoli A, Villa L, Feudi C, et al. Novel plasmid-mediated colistin resistance mcr-4
- 522 gene in Salmonella and Escherichia coli, Italy 2013, Spain and Belgium, 2015 to 2016.
- 523Eurosurveillance2017;22.Availableat:
- 524 https://www.eurosurveillance.org/content/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2017.22.31.30589.
- 525 Accessed August 24, 2023.
- 526 55. Zurfluh K, Treier A, Schmitt K, Stephan R. Mobile fosfomycin resistance genes in
 527 Enterobacteriaceae—An increasing threat. *MicrobiologyOpen* 2020; 9. Available at:
 528 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/mbo3.1135. Accessed September 2, 2023.
- 529 56. Singh S, Pathak A, Kumar A, *et al.* Emergence of Chromosome-Borne Colistin
 530 Resistance Gene *mcr-1* in Clinical Isolates of Klebsiella pneumoniae from India. *Antimicrob*531 *Agents Chemother* 2018; **62**: e01885-17.
- 532 57. RAHMAN M, Ahmad S. 549. First Report for Emergence of Chromosomal Borne
 533 Colistin Resistance Gene mcr-1 in a Clinical Acinetobacter Baumannii Isolates from India.
 534 *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2019; **6**: S261–2.
- 535 58. Pathak A, Singh S, Kumar A, Prasad KN. Emergence of chromosome borne colistin
 536 resistance gene, mcr-1 in clinical isolates of Pseudomonas aeruginosa. *Int J Infect Dis* 2020;
 537 101: 22.
- 538 59. Seethalakshmi PS, Prabhakaran A, Kiran GS, Selvin J. First Report on the Circulation of
 539 *mcr-9* Bearing *Enterobacteriaceae* Isolated in a Rural Environmental Water Body of India.
 540 *SSRN Electron J* 2022. Available at: https://www.ssrn.com/abstract=4280949. Accessed
- 541 August 17, 2023.
- 60. Premnath MAC, Prabakaran K, Sivasankar S, Boppe A, Sriramajayam L, Jeyaraj S.
 Occurrence of mcr genes and alterations in mgrB gene in intrinsic colistin- resistant
 Enterobacterales isolated from chicken meat samples. *Int J Food Microbiol* 2023; 404:
 110323.
- 61. Reddy BRC, Geetha RV, Singh M, Rani RU, Nekkanti KN. Mcr-1 expression in
 progression of colistin resistance gram negative bacilli of clinical specimens derived from

Intensive Care Units, wards and hospital setting of Deccan Eco Region of Southern India. J *Pharm Negat Results* 2022; 13.

- 550 62. Seethalakshmi PS, Ru VPN, Prabhakaran A, et al. Genomic investigation unveils high-
- risk ESBL producing Enterobacteriaceae within a rural environmental water body. *Curr Res Microb Sci* 2024; **6**: 100216.

Kieffer N, Royer G, Decousser J-W, *et al. mcr-9*, an Inducible Gene Encoding an
Acquired Phosphoethanolamine Transferase in Escherichia coli, and Its Origin. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2019; **63**: e00965-19.

- 556 64. Naha S, Basak P, Sands K, *et al.* Carriage and within-host diversity of *mcr-1.1*-557 harbouring *Escherichia coli* from pregnant mothers: inter- and intra-mother transmission 558 dynamics of *mcr-1.1*. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 2023; **12**: 2278899.
- 559 65. Elizabeth R, Baishya S, Kalita B, *et al.* Colistin exposure enhances expression of eptB in colistin-resistant Escherichia coli co-harboring mcr-1. *Sci Rep* 2022; **12**: 1348.

561 66. Bir R, Gautam H, Arif N, *et al.* Analysis of colistin resistance in carbapenem-resistant
562 *Enterobacterales* and XDR *Klebsiella pneumoniae*. *Ther Adv Infect Dis* 2022; 9:
563 204993612210806.

- 564 67. Singh S, Pathak A, Rahman M, *et al.* Genetic Characterisation of Colistin Resistant
 565 Klebsiella pneumoniae Clinical Isolates From North India. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 2021;
 566 11: 666030.
- 567 68. Elizabeth R, Wangkheimayum J, Singha KM, Chanda DD, Bhattacharjee A.
 568 Subinhibitory concentration stress of colistin enhanced PhoPQ expression in *Escherichia coli*569 harboring *mcr* □ 1. *J Basic Microbiol* 2021; **61**: 1029–34.

69. Pathak A, Singh S, Prasad N, Prasad KN. SAT-423 EMERGENCE OF blaNDM AND
mcr-1 POSITIVE PAN- AND EXTREMELY- DRUG RESISTANT BACTERIAL
INFECTIONS IN PATIENTS WITH RENAL DISEASES. *Kidney Int Rep* 2020; 5: S176–7.

- 70. Roy S, Das P, Das S, *et al.* Detection of the emergence of *mcr-1* –mediated colistinresistant *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* through a hospital-based surveillance in
 an oncology center in eastern India. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2020; **41**: 378–80.
- 576 71. Subramaniam N, Muthukrishnan A. Oral mucositis and microbial colonization in oral
 577 cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy and chemotherapy: A prospective analysis in a
 578 tertiary care dental hospital. *J Investig Clin Dent* 2019; 10. Available at:
 579 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jicd.12454. Accessed August 17, 2023.
- 72. Bernasconi OJ, Kuenzli E, Pires J, *et al.* Travelers Can Import Colistin-Resistant
 Enterobacteriaceae, Including Those Possessing the Plasmid-Mediated *mcr-1* Gene. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2016; **60**: 5080–4.
- 583