

1 **Profiles of bacteria isolates and their antimicrobial resistance**
2 **pattern among housemaids working in communal living residences**
3 **in Jimma City, Ethiopia**

4

5

6 Tadele Shiwito Ango^{1*}, Tizita Teshome^{2¶}, Tesfalem Getahun^{2¶}; Girma Mamo^{1&}; Negalgn
7 Byadgie^{1&}

8 ¹Department of Public Health, Mizan-Aman Health Sciences College, Mizan-Aman, Ethiopia

9 ²Department of Environmental Health Sciences and Technology, Institute of Health, Jimma
10 University, Jimma, Ethiopia

11

12 *Corresponding author

13 E-mail: shiwitot2350@gmail.com (TSA)

14

15 ¶These authors contributed equally to this work

16 &These authors also contributed equally to this work

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30 Abstract

31 **Background:** Bacterial pathogens continued to be the major causes of foodborne gastroenteritis
32 in humans and remained public health important pathogens across the globe. As regards,
33 housemaids operating inside a kitchen could be the source of infection and may transmit disease-
34 inflicting pathogens through infected hands. Profiles of bacteria isolates and their antimicrobial
35 resistance patterns among housemaids employed in dwellings in Ethiopia; particularly in the
36 study area haven't been underexplored yet.

37 **Objective:** A study aimed to assess the profiles of bacteria isolates and antimicrobial resistance
38 patterns among housemaids working in communal living residences in Jimma City, Ethiopia.

39 **Methods:** Laboratory-based cross-sectional study design was employed among 230 housemaids
40 from April-June 2022. Hand swabs samples from the dominant hand of the study participants
41 were collected under sterile conditions for the segregation of commensal microbes following
42 standard operating procedures. Then in the laboratory, the swabs were inoculated aseptically
43 using streak-plating methods on mannitol salt agar, MacConkey agar, Salmonella-shigella agar,
44 and Eosin Methylene Blue Agar. Then inoculated samples were incubated at 37°C for 24 hours
45 for bacterial isolation. In addition, a set of biochemical tests was applied to examine bacterial
46 species. Data was entered into Epidata version 3.1. All statistics were performed using SPSS®
47 statistics version 26. Descriptive analyses were summarized using frequency and percentage.

48 **Results:** The response rate of respondents was 97.8%. The prevalence of bacterial contaminants
49 in the hands of housemaids who tested positive was 72% (95%CI: 66.2-77.8%). The isolated
50 bacterial were *Staphylococcus aureus* (31.8%), *Coagulase-Negative Staphylococci* (0.9%),
51 *Escherichia coli* (21.5%), *Salmonella* (1.3%), *Shigella* (6.7%), *Klebsiella species* (23.3%) and
52 *Proteus species* (14.8%). The isolation rate of bacteria was significantly associated with the
53 removal watch, ring, and bracelet during hand washing. Most isolated bacteria were sensitive to
54 Chloramphenicol while the majority of them were resistant to Tetracycline, Gentamycin,
55 Vancomycin, and Ceftazidime.

56 **Conclusions:** Hands of housemaids are important potential sources of disease-causing bacterial
57 pathogens that would result in the potential risk of foodborne diseases. Most isolated bacteria
58 were resistant to tested antimicrobial drugs. Everybody responsible should work practice of good
59 hand hygiene.

60 **Keywords:** Bacteria isolate, Antimicrobial resistance, Housemaids, Ethiopia

61 **1. Introduction**

62 Enteric bacterial pathogens are the major causes of foodborne gastroenteritis in humans and
63 remain public health important pathogens worldwide [1]. These enteric bacterial pathogens are
64 common food-borne disease agents and persisted as a major public health worry. A study
65 revealed that food commodities were contaminated by food handlers or housemaids [2].
66 Moreover, the majority of foodborne outbreak causative agents enter the body through the
67 ingestion of contaminated food [3,4]. According to Banik and colleagues, foodborne illnesses
68 occurred after those disease-causing microbes entered the food supply chain [5]. WHO report in
69 2020, showed that there were about 600 million cases and 420,000 deaths related to
70 contaminated food in the world [4]. However, the problem is severe in developing countries
71 including Ethiopia. The summary report of the Ministry of Health revealed that the annual
72 incidences of food-borne illnesses ranged from 3.4 to 9.3% in Ethiopia [6].

73 Fecal-oral route of pathogen transmission is the major among the other methods of infection
74 transmission for heterogeneous pathogens particularly for *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Coagulase-*
75 *Negative Staphylococci*, *Klebsiella species*, *Proteus species*, *E.coli*, *Shigella*, *Salmonella species*,
76 *V.Cholerae*, *Streptococcus pneumonia*, and others bacterial isolates [5,7–14]. Furthermore,
77 studies revealed that bacteria were the most extensively identified infectious agent for the
78 majority of foodborne outbreak types [6,15].

79 Due to the high prevalence of drug resistance pathogens, advances in infection control haven't
80 completely eradicated the problems [10]. In addition, the constant increase in AMR bacterial
81 strains has become an important clinical problem [16,17]. They include the members of
82 Enterobacteriaceae, and continued the increasing concern and lead to the narrowing of available
83 therapeutic options [17,18]. Those AMRs are caused by different reasons. Thus, the microbial
84 evolution and transmission of genetic determinants of resistance between microbes enable the
85 spread of pathogenic bacteria [17–21]. In addition, the widespread and prolonged use of
86 antibiotics leads to the emergence of resistant bacterial pathogens [10,21,22]. In sum, it is an
87 emerging global challenge that results in the spread of infectious diseases that affect human
88 populations [21,23]. Moreover, the problems of infectious diseases were worsened by the
89 improper use of antibiotics by humans and animals which contribute to the rise of AMR globally
90 [10,16–21,23–25].

91 Therefore, pathogenic microbes continued the challenge for healthcare systems in developing
92 countries including Ethiopia [24]. Evidence from studies revealed an increasing incidence of
93 multidrug resistance in food-borne pathogens particularly to the commonly used antimicrobial
94 medications [24,25]. In the fact, most studies conducted were institution based such as the
95 hospital, mass food processing, and catering establishments [9,10,15,22], still now in Ethiopia,
96 there is no clear data or information that shows profiles of isolated bacteria and antimicrobial
97 resistance among housemaids in dwellings, particularly in the study area. Therefore, the present
98 study aimed to assess the profiles of bacteria isolates and their antimicrobial resistance pattern
99 among housemaids working in communal living residences in Jimma City, Ethiopia.

100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118

119 **2. Materials and Methods**

120 **2.1. Study area, design, and period**

121 The present laboratory-based cross-sectional survey included 230 housemaids engaged in
122 communal living residences in Jimma City, Jimma Zone, Oromia region, Southwest part of
123 Ethiopia during the period from April-June, 2022. The Jimma city is located 352km southwest of
124 Addis Ababa with geographical coordinates between 7°41' N latitude and 36°50' E longitudes,
125 and it has an average altitude of 1780m above sea level. It receives a mean annual rainfall of
126 about 1530 millimeters. The mean annual minimum and maximum temperatures of Jimma city
127 are 14.4°C and 26.7°C respectively [26].

128 **2.2. Data collection techniques**

129 Data was collected by the data collectors after obtaining written informed consent using a pre-
130 tested semi-structured questionnaire and observation designed to obtain socio-demographic data
131 like sex, age and educational status, and other relevant data related to housemaids' hand hygiene
132 practices such as fingernail status, frequent handwashing, how to wash hands, use of soap and
133 water for frequent hand washing, follow five steps to wash hands in the right way, removal of
134 watch, ring, and bracelets during handwashing and time in second to wash hands from the study
135 participants following their written informed consent and ethical approval of the study approved
136 from the Institutional Review Board of the Institute of Health, Jimma University.

137 **2.3. Laboratory data, analysis, and interpretation**

138 Data on the commensal microbes from the hand swabs were collected through laboratory
139 investigation by following the standard operating procedures (SOPs).

140 **2.3.1. Sample collection and transport**

141 Sterile cotton swabs and 10ml saline containing sterile test tubes were prepared to collect and
142 transport the samples. Though for the bacterial isolates from hand swabs, after handwashing
143 participant's dominant hand was sampled by rubbing all over the surface using sterile-moistened
144 cotton-tipped swabs in the moistened state; and then placed/soaked in labeled 0.85% saline
145 solution containing sterile test tubes for microbial culturing. However, notification was not
146 delivered in advance and extra hand hygiene was not allowed during sample collection [22,27].
147 Swabs samples were collected by three well-trained laboratory personnel in standard aseptic

148 procedures. Soon after collection, samples were sent to the Microbiology laboratory at the
149 Department of Medical Microbiology at Jimma University. Then in the laboratory, the samples
150 were enriched in nutrient broth for 24 hours to enhance the recovery of the isolates because the
151 survival of bacteria collected can be affected by handwashing.

152 **2.3.2. Sample culture and identification**

153 The common method to identify bacteria is through the use of selective media which can hinder
154 or suppresses the growth of unwanted commensal microbes or the use of differential media
155 which is easier to distinguish colonies of desired micro-organisms from other colonies growing
156 on the same plate [28,29].

157 The media used in this study were prepared according to the manufacturer's instructions. A loop
158 full of each hand swabs sample enriched on nutrient broth was inoculated aseptically using
159 streak-planting methods on the selective and differential (Mannitol salt agar; MacConkey agar;
160 salmonella-shigella agar and Eosin Methylene Blue Agar) and then incubated at 37°C for 24
161 hours. After an incubation period, the culture plates were examined for the growth of bacteria,
162 and the morphology of the isolates was recorded.

163 **2.3.3. Biochemical tests**

164 The single colony of bacteria grown on selective and differential media was then subcultured
165 into nutrient agar to determine growth patterns and for further biochemical tests. Then after
166 obtaining pure colonies, identification of bacterial isolates was done by using standard
167 microbiology techniques like the morphology of its colonies and a battery (set) of biochemical
168 tests like a response on catalase, coagulase, oxidase, Simon citrate agar (SCA), urease, sulfide
169 indole motility (SIM), Kligler Iron Agar (KIA), gas and hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) generation [14].
170 The isolation and identification of bacteria from hand swabs from the hands of housemaids are
171 shown below (Fig 1).

172

173

174

175

176 **Figure 1: Laboratory flow chart showing bacterial isolations from hand swabs samples.**

177 **2.3.4. Antimicrobial susceptibility tests**

178 Antimicrobial susceptibility tests were performed on Muller Hinton Agar (HIMEDIA, TITAN
179 BIOTECH LTD, Rajasthan, India) by disc diffusion method. The following antimicrobial drugs
180 were used to test susceptibility: Tetracycline (30 μ g), Ceftriaxone (30 μ g), Chloramphenicol
181 (30 μ g), Gentamicin (10 μ g), Vancomycin (30 μ g), and Ceftazidime (30 μ g). The selections of
182 drugs were based on availability and pieces of literature [14,30]. The susceptibility profiles that
183 mean sensitivity, intermediate and resistance of the bacterial isolates were interpreted according
184 to the NCCLSs [30].

185 **Table 1: Zone diameter interpretive standards for the determination of antimicrobial agent**
186 **sensitivity and resistance test by Disk Diffusion method.**

| Antimicrobial agent | Disk content (μ g) | Interpretive categories and zone diameter breakpoints nearest whole mm | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|--|--------------|-----------|
| | | Sensitive | Intermediate | Resistant |
| Tetracycline | 30 | ≥ 15 | 12-14 | ≤ 11 |
| Ceftriaxone | 30 | ≥ 23 | 20-22 | ≤ 19 |
| Chloramphenicol | 30 | ≥ 18 | 13-17 | ≤ 12 |
| Gentamicin | 10 | ≥ 15 | 13-14 | ≤ 12 |
| Vancomycin | 30 | ≥ 12 | 10-11 | ≤ 9 |
| Ceftazidime | 30 | ≥ 21 | 18-20 | ≤ 17 |

187 Disk Diffusion method [30].

188 **2.4. Data quality management**

189 To control the quality of laboratory data, laboratory tests for the investigation of commensal
190 microbes have strictly adhered to standard operating processing [29]. In addition, the proper
191 functioning of the instruments utilized was checked before processing samples and the known
192 strains of selected organisms (*S.aureus* ATCC12981 and *E.coli* ATCC25922) were used for
193 comparison purposes amid distinguishing proof as far quality

194 **2.5. Data processing and analysis**

195 Data were edited, cleaned, and double-entered into Epidata version 3.1. All statistical
196 calculations were performed using IBM® SPSS® Statistics version 26. Descriptive analyses were
197 summarized using frequency and percentage to present in texts, tables, and figures.

198 **2.6. Ethical consideration**

199 The research was conducted after approval of ethical clearance by the IRB of Jimma University.
200 Both oral and informed consent was sought from each respondent. The overall information
201 obtained from study participants and their privacy was kept strictly confidential using codes. The
202 unusual clinical finding would be linked to concerned bodies including the study participants and
203 households. PPE was applied such as the use of a mask, the use of gloves, rubbing hands with
204 sanitizer or alcohol, and hand washing with soap during data collection to prevent transmission
205 of Covid-19 between the data collector to the study participants and vice-versa.

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226 **3. Results**

227 **3.1. Socio-demographic characteristics**

228 Two hundred and twenty-five study subjects (housemaids) participated in this study. All the
229 respondents were females. The age of study participants ranged from 18 to 36 with a mean age of
230 21.41±SD of (3.961). The majority, 182(81%) and 34(15%) of the study participants were
231 between the age category of 18-30 years and age 18-24years respectively (**Fig 2**).

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240 **Figure 2: Pi chart showing the age category of housemaids (n=225) working in communal**
241 **residences in Jimma City, Southwest Ethiopia, 2022.**

242

243

244

245 More than half, (53%) of study participants attended primary school while 7(3%) of respondents
246 cannot read and write (**Fig 3**).

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254 **Figure 3: Pi chart showing the educational status of housemaids (n=225) working in**
255 **communal residences in Jimma City, Southwest Ethiopia, 2022.**

256 3.2. Bacterial isolates

257 The majority, 162(72%) of study participants tested positive for one or more than one bacterial
258 hand contaminant. The total number of isolated bacteria from hand swab samples was 224.
259 *Staphylococcus aureus* 71(31.6%) was the predominant bacterial species isolated from hand
260 swabs of housemaids followed by *Klebsiella species* 52(23.1%) and *Escherichia coli* 48(21.3%)
261 whereas the least isolated bacteria was *Coagulase-Negative Staphylococci* (0.90%). However,
262 bacteria weren't isolated from the hand swabs of 63(28%) of the study participants (**Table 2**).

263 **Table 2: Types of bacteria isolated from hand swabs of housemaids (n=225) working in**
264 **communal living residences in Jimma City, Southwest Ethiopia, 2022.**

| Bacteria | Frequency | Percent |
|---|-----------|---------|
| <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> | 71 | 31.6 |
| <i>Coagulase-Negative Staphylococci</i> | 2 | 0.90 |
| <i>Escherichia coli</i> | 48 | 21.3 |
| <i>Salmonella</i> | 3 | 1.30 |
| <i>Shigella</i> | 15 | 6.70 |
| <i>Klebsiella species</i> | 52 | 23.1 |
| <i>Proteus species</i> | 33 | 14.7 |
| Total bacteria isolated | 224 | |

265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277

278 **3.2.1. Risk factors of bacteria**

279 In the present study, different relevant factors were assessed for possible association with
280 bacterial isolation rate from hand swabs among the respondents (**Table 3**).

281 The number of positive bacterial cultures from hand swabs was higher among the age group of
282 25-30 years (73.5%) and 18-24 years (73.1%) than their counterparts ($P=.171$). Similarly, the
283 frequency of isolation rate of bacteria from hand swabs of housemaids was higher among those
284 who cannot read and write (85.7%) than those housemaids who attended primary school (74.6%)
285 and secondary school and above (68%) ($P=.399$) (**Table 3**).

286 The frequency of isolation rate of bacteria from hand swabs of housemaids was higher among
287 housemaids who didn't wash their hands frequently (88.9%) than their counterparts ($P=.096$). In
288 addition, the frequency of the isolation rate of bacteria from hand swabs was higher among
289 housemaids who wash hands frequently with soap/other detergents (70.9%) than those
290 housemaids who didn't wash their hands frequently with soap/other detergents (40.0%)
291 ($P=.137$). Furthermore, the isolation rate of bacteria from swabs was higher among housemaids
292 who didn't follow five steps to wash their hands the right way (73.5%) ($P=.190$) and remove
293 watch, ring, and bracelet during hand washing (75.3%) ($P=.019$) than their counterparts (**Table**
294 **3**).

295 The expected risk factors on socio-demographic factors such as age and educational status, and
296 housemaids' hand hygiene practices such as fingernail status, frequent handwashing, how to
297 wash hands, use of soap and water for frequent hand washing, following five steps to wash hands
298 in the right way and time in second to wash hands weren't found to be significantly associated
299 with a bacteria isolation rate of hand swabs. However, removing a watch, ring, and bracelet
300 during hand washing was found to be statistically associated ($P= P=.019$) (**Table 3**).

301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308

309 **Table 3: Risks factors related to the presence of bacterial isolation from hand swabs of**
 310 **housemaids (n=225) engaged in communal living residences in Jimma City, Southwest**
 311 **Ethiopia, 2022.**

| Variables | Category | The bacterial culture results from hand swabs | | Association |
|--|---------------------|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | Negative n (%) | Positive n (%) | |
| Age | 18-24 years | 49(26.9) | 133(73.1) | $\chi^2_{(df=2)}= 3.534$ $P=.171$ |
| | 25-30 Years | 9(26.5) | 25(73.5) | |
| | ≥31 Years | 5(55.6) | 4(44.4) | |
| Educational status | Cannot read & write | 1(14.3) | 6(85.7) | $\chi^2_{(df=2)}=1.835$ $P=.399$ |
| | Primary school | 30(25.4) | 88(74.6) | |
| | Secondary & above | 32(32.0) | 68(68) | |
| Fingernail status | Not trimmed | 10(20.4) | 39(79.6) | $\chi^2_{(df=1)}= 1.791$ $P=.181$ |
| | Trimmed | 53(30.1) | 123(69.9) | |
| Wash hands frequently | No | 2(11.1) | 16(88.9) | $\chi^2_{(df=1)}= 2.768$ $P=.096$ |
| | Yes | 61(29.5) | 146(70.5) | |
| How to wash your hands? | Only with water | 8(26.7) | 22(73.3) | $\chi^2_{(df=1)}= .133$ $P=.716$ |
| | Water with soap | 53(29.9) | 124(70.1) | |
| Wash hands frequently with soap/other detergents | No | 3(60.0) | 2(40.0) | $\chi^2_{(df=1)}= 2.216$ $P=.137$ |
| | Yes | 50(29.1) | 122(70.9) | |
| Follow five steps to wash hands the right way | No | 36(26.5) | 100(73.5) | $\chi^2_{(df=1)}= 1.715$ $P=.190$ |
| | Yes | 25(35.2) | 46(64.8) | |
| Remove the watch, ring, and bracelet during hand washing | No | 36(24.7) | 110(75.3) | $\chi^2_{(df=1)}= 5.517$ $P=.019$ |
| | Yes | 25(41.0) | 36(59.0) | |
| Wash hands for 20 seconds | No | 25(23.8) | 80(76.2) | $\chi^2_{(df=1)}= 3.283$ $P=.070$ |
| | Yes | 36(35.3) | 66(64.7) | |

312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321

322 **3.3. Antimicrobial susceptibility pattern of bacterial isolates**

323 The majority, 70(98.6%) of *Staphylococcus aureus* were sensitive to Chloramphenicol followed
324 by 51(71.8%) and 46(64.8%) sensitive to Vancomycin and Gentamycin respectively. *Coagulase-*
325 *Negative Staphylococci* were sensitive to all drugs except a single isolate of *Coagulase-Negative*
326 *Staphylococci* resistant to Ceftriaxone (**Table 4**).

327 More than $\frac{2}{3}$, 36(75%), 38(79.2%), 42(87.5%), and 37(77.1%) of *Escherichia coli* were sensitive
328 to Tetracycline, Vancomycin, Ceftriaxone, Chloramphenicol, and Ceftazidime respectively,
329 while no resistance was recorded on Gentamycin with only 18(37.5%) of *Escherichia coli*, were
330 intermediates (**Table 4**).

331 Thirty-three (100%) and 46(88.5%) of *Proteus species* and *Klebsiella species* were sensitive to
332 Chloramphenicol whereas 16(48.5%) and 24(46.2%) of *Proteus species* and *Klebsiella*
333 *species* were resistant to Ceftriaxone and Vancomycin respectively. Despite three *Salmonella*
334 and 12(80.0%) of *Shigella* being sensitive to Chloramphenicol, two *Salmonella* and 15(100%)
335 of *Shigella* were resistant to Vancomycin respectively (**Table 4**).

336 Antimicrobial susceptibility patterns of different bacteria isolated from swab samples of
337 housemaids working in communal living residences in Jimma City are presented in (**Table 4**).

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352 **Table 4: Antimicrobial susceptibility pattern of bacteria isolated from hand swabs of**
 353 **housemaids working in communal living residences in Jimma City, Southwest Ethiopia,**
 354 **2022.**

| Bacterial isolate | Total | SP | TE[n(%)] | CRO [n(%)] | C[n(%)] | GEN[n(%)] | VA[n(%)] | CAZ[n(%)] |
|---------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| <i>S.aureus</i> | 71 | S | 42[59.2] | 45[63.4] | 70[98.6] | 46[64.8] | 51[71.8] | 30[42.3] |
| | | I | 9[12.7] | 4[5.6] | 1[1.4] | 25[35.2] | 1[1.4] | 25[35.2] |
| | | R | 20[28.2] | 22[31.0] | 0[0.00] | 0[0.00] | 19[26.8] | 16[22.5] |
| <i>CNS</i> | 2 | S | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| | | I | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | R | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <i>E.coli</i> | 48 | S | 36[75.0] | 38[79.2] | 42[87.5] | 30[62.5] | 36[75.0] | 37[77.1] |
| | | I | 0[0.00] | 4[8.30] | 0[0.00] | 18[37.5] | 0[0.00] | 5[10.4] |
| | | R | 12[25.0] | 6[12.5] | 6[12.5] | 0[0.00] | 12[25.0] | 6[12.5] |
| <i>Salmonella</i> | 3 | S | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | I | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | | R | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| <i>Shigella</i> | 15 | S | 3[20.0] | 8[53.3] | 12[80.0] | 12[80.0] | 0[0.00] | 8[53.3] |
| | | I | 5[33.3] | 3[20.0] | 3[20.0] | 0[0.00] | 0[0.00] | 3[20.0] |
| | | R | 7[46.7] | 4[26.7] | 0[0.00] | 3[20.0] | 15[100.0] | 4[26.7] |
| <i>Klebsiella species</i> | 52 | S | 25[48.1] | 28[53.8] | 46[88.5] | 31[59.6] | 5[9.6] | 28[53.8] |
| | | I | 15[28.8] | 14[26.9] | 6[11.5] | 21[40.4] | 23[44.2] | 7[13.5] |
| | | R | 12[23.1] | 10[19.2] | 0[0.00] | 0[0.00] | 24[46.2] | 17[32.7] |
| <i>Proteus species</i> | 33 | S | 23[69.7] | 9[27.3] | 33[100.0] | 27[81.8] | 16[48.5] | 5[15.2] |
| | | I | 1[3.0] | 8[24.2] | 0[0.00] | 5[15.2] | 7[21.2] | 20[60.6] |
| | | R | 9[27.3] | 16[48.5] | 0[0.00] | 1[3.0] | 10[30.3] | 8[24.2] |

355 **CNS:** Coagulase-Negative Staphylococci, **SP:** Sensitivity pattern; **S:** Sensitivity; **I:** Intermediate;
 356 **R:** Resistant; **TE:** Tetracycline; **CRO:** Ceftriaxone; **C:** Chloramphenicol; **GEN:** Gentamycin;
 357 **VA:** Vancomycin; **CAZ:** Ceftazidime; **n:** Number

358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364

365 4. Discussion

366 Housemaids with poor hand hygiene could be potential sources of infection due to pathogenic
367 bacteria which can cause food contamination, and consequently food-borne diseases that pose a
368 potential risk to public health [22,31]. Due to the scarcity of published information, bacterial
369 contamination level among housemaids in Ethiopia is underexplored. Therefore, the present
370 study was undertaken to assess the profiles of bacteria isolates and associated factors as well as
371 their antimicrobial resistance pattern among housemaids working in communal living residences
372 in Jimma City, Ethiopia.

373 Among 225 respondents who participated in this study, one or more bacterial pathogens were
374 isolated from 162 study subjects with a prevalence of 72% (95%CI: 66.2-77.8%). This result is
375 nearly coherent with the results reported across the globe: Sari city, north of Iran (62.2%) [31],
376 Tripoli, Libya (71.41%) [32], Alexandria, Egypt (60%) [33], Mauritius (91.0%) [12] and
377 Ethiopia (49.6%,70.1%,55.7% & 83.9%) [8–10,34]. On the other hand, the result is higher than
378 the results reported in Eastern India (37.9%) [5], Sudan (23.2%) [7], and Ethiopia (29.5%) [14].
379 The isolation of bacteria from hand swabs could be due to improper handwashing practices such
380 as not removing watches, rings, and bracelets during handwashing. Evidence from a study
381 indicated that jewelry like a watch, rings, and bracelets would lead to bacterial colonization
382 underneath unless removed and rinsed thoroughly during handwashing [35]. In addition,
383 isolation of bacteria illustrates the concept of fecal contamination due to poor hand hygiene [36].
384 On other the hand reason would be likely because of handwashing water quality. Evidences
385 revealed that the bacterial contamination of hands significantly affected by handwashing water
386 [37,38].

387 The following bacteria pathogens were isolated *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Coagulase-Negative*
388 *Staphylococci*, *Escherichia coli*, *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Klebsiella species*, and *Proteus species*.
389 *Staphylococcus aureus* (31.8%) was the predominant bacterial species isolated from hand swabs
390 of housemaids followed by *Klebsiella species* (23.3%) and *E.coli* (21.5%) respectively. This
391 result coincided with the results reported in previous studies [7,8,10,14,31,32,34,39]. The
392 isolation of *Staphylococcus aureus* could be because it is pathogenic bacteria that are normal
393 flora of the skin and other body parts whereas the isolation of *E.coli*, *Salmonella*, *Shigella*,
394 *Klebsiella species*, and *Proteus species* illustrates the concept of fecal contamination due to poor
395 hand hygiene practices. De Alwis and colleagues revealed that contaminated surfaces such as

396 toilets and washrooms could be the sources of contamination of the hands when a person comes
397 into contact [36]. In addition, the microbial contamination of hands could be due to the
398 ineffectiveness of handwashing agents [40]. Moreover, ignorance of handwashing with soap,
399 touching dirty materials, and long fingernails [12,41]. Therefore, the detection of bacteria
400 isolated from the hand of housemaids might pose potential outbreaks for the immediate servant
401 or the community as a whole [9]. Due to this, it's a public health problem of major concern [42].
402 The majority of *Staphylococcus aureus* (98.6%) was sensitive to Chloramphenicol followed by
403 71.8% and 64.8% to Vancomycin and Gentamycin respectively. This result is lower than the
404 result reported at the University of Gondar Referral Hospital, Ethiopia (76.9%, 100%, and 82.1%
405 were sensitive to Chloramphenicol, Vancomycin, and Gentamycin) [10].
406 In this study more than two-thirds, 75%, 79.2%, 87.5%, and 77.1% of *Escherichia coli* were
407 sensitive to Tetracycline, Vancomycin, Ceftriaxone, Chloramphenicol, and Ceftazidime. In
408 addition, nearly 100% and 88.5% of *Proteus species* and *Klebsiella species* were sensitive to
409 Chloramphenicol. This result is higher than the results reported in the University of Gondar
410 Cafeteria, University of Gondar Referral Hospital, and Debre Markos, Ethiopia [9,10,14].
411 Despite three *Salmonella* and 80.0% of *Shigella* being sensitive to Chloramphenicol, two
412 *Salmonella* and 100% of *Shigella* were resistant to Vancomycin. This result is higher than the
413 result reported in the University of Gondar Cafeteria [9]. In addition, single *Salmonella* and
414 46.7% of *Shigella* were resistant to Tetracycline. This result is lower than the result reported at
415 Debre Markos University catering establishments [22].
416 Even though a high rate of bacteria's isolate sensitivity to Chloramphenicol in the present study,
417 a high frequency of drugs resistance to Tetracycline, Vancomycin, Gentamycin, and Ceftriaxone
418 was observed for *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Coagulase-Negative Staphylococci*, *Escherichia coli*,
419 *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Klebsiella species*, and *Proteus species*. Nowadays, antimicrobial
420 resistance is an emerging global challenge that results in the spread of infectious diseases that
421 affect human populations [21,23]. Those drug-resistant microbes can multiply, carry on and
422 produce harm because of a complex set of causes: biological processes, human behaviors, and
423 other social factors [20]. The resistance to drugs could be because they developed mechanisms
424 (evolutionary processes) or be natural phenomena that microbe tends to adapt it [19,20]. Another
425 reason could be the inappropriate use of drugs by the community, the use of antibiotics in

426 animals, and the external environment [21–23]. In addition, a global connection of a large human
427 population allows microbes into the environment to which all of humanity has access to it [23].
428 In advance, there are many infection control strategies to cope with the results from pathogenic
429 bacteria and their AMR at an individual level as well as at the community level suggested by
430 many scientific communities. Thus, classic communicable disease control methods particularly
431 hand-hygiene remain the cornerstone to curb such public health issues [43]. Proper handwashing
432 minimizes the expansion of fecal-oral pathogenic microbes from hands and other sources of the
433 environment [44]. Moreover, to prevent and control antimicrobial drug-resistant microbes,
434 washing hands regularly and an improvement in hand hygiene are up to date [45]. Therefore,
435 practicing good hand hygiene can reduce outbreaks of pathogen transmission and minimize the
436 spread of antibiotic resistance micro-organisms [46].

437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456

457 **5. Conclusions**

458 This study revealed that 72% of housemaids engaged in dwellings tested positive for one or more
459 than one bacterial contaminant of the hands. The following bacterial pathogens were identified
460 from hand swabs of study subjects: *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Coagulase-Negative Staphylococci*,
461 *Escherichia coli*, *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Klebsiella species*, and *Proteus species*. Thus, the hands
462 of housemaids could be very important potential sources of disease-causing bacterial pathogens
463 that would result in the potential risk of foodborne diseases. The presence of bacterial pathogens
464 from hand swabs was significantly associated with removing a watch, ring, and bracelet during
465 hand washing. Moreover, most of the isolated bacteria were sensitive to Chloramphenicol while
466 the majority of them were resistant to Tetracycline, Gentamycin, Vancomycin, and Ceftazidime.
467 In advance, there are many infection control strategies to cope with the results from such
468 pathogenic bacteria at an individual level as well as at the community level. In resource-limited
469 settings, regular handwashing and improvement in the hand-hygiene are up to date to prevent
470 and control antimicrobial-resistant microbes. Therefore, housemaids should practice proper hand
471 hygiene to reduce/remove pathogenic bacteria, and minimize the spread of antibiotic-resistant
472 micro-organisms. In addition, any community health worker, regional, national, and stakeholders
473 who are engaged in community health should create awareness about regular handwashing and
474 its relevance in the prevention and reduction of pathogenic micro-organisms from hands in the
475 wider community.

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488 **Acknowledgment**

489 We would like to thank the study participants for being part of the study. In addition, we also
490 gratefully acknowledge the households of study participants, Jimma city municipality, and
491 Jimma University community service directives for their collaboration. Our heartfelt thanks go to
492 data collectors Mr. Dawit Abera, Mr. Bizuwerk Sharew, and Mr. Soressa Gershe. Finally, we are
493 joyful to thank Jimma University, Institute of Health for financial support for the completion of
494 the study.

495 **Lists of Abbreviations**

496 **AMR**: Antimicrobial Resistance, **EMB**: Eosin Methylene Blue, **IRB**: Institutional Review
497 Board, **KIA**: Kliger Iron Agar, **MSA**: Mannitol Salt Agar, **NCCLS**: National Committee for
498 Clinical Laboratory Standards, **SCA**: Simon Citrate Agar, **SIM**: Sulfide Indole Motility, **SOP**:
499 Standard Operating Procedure, **SPSS**: Statistical Package for Social Science, **SSA**: Salmonella-
500 Shigella Agar, **PPE**: Personal protective equipment

501 **Author contributions**

502 **Conceptualization**: Tadele Shiwito Ango

503 **Data curation**: Tadele Shiwito Ango

504 **Formal analysis**: Tadele Shiwito Ango

505 **Investigation**: Tadele Shiwito Ango

506 **Methodology**: Tadele Shiwito Ango

507 **Software**: Tadele Shiwito Ango

508 **Visualization**: Tadele Shiwito Ango, Tizita Teshome, Tesfalem Getahun, Girma Mamo,
509 Negalign Biyadgie

510 **Writing-original draft**: Tadele Shiwito Ango, Girma Mamo, Negalign Biyadgie

511 **Writing, reviewing & editing**: Tadele Shiwito Ango, Tizita Teshome, Tesfalem Getahun,
512 Girma Mamo, Negalign Biyadgie

513

514

515

516 **References**

- 517 [1] Getie M, Abebe W, Tessema B. Prevalence of enteric bacteria and their antimicrobial
518 susceptibility patterns among food handlers in Gondar town, Northwest Ethiopia.
519 *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control* 2019;11:1–6. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-019-0566-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-019-0566-7)
520 [7](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-019-0566-7).
- 521 [2] Grace D. Food Safety in Low and Middle-Income Countries. *Int J Environ Res Public*
522 *Heal* 2015;12:10490–507. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph120910490>.
- 523 [3] Grace D. Food safety in developing countries: An overview. A learning resource for
524 Department for International Development (DFID) Livelihoods Advisers. Crown 2015.
525 https://doi.org/10.12774/eod_er.oct2015.graced.
- 526 [4] WHO. Food safety 30. [https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/food-](https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/food-safety)
527 [Safety](https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/food-safety) 2020:1–9.
- 528 [5] Banik S, Chakrabarty S, Das N. Hand hygiene in food handlers working in canteens of an
529 educational institution in Eastern India. *Int J Community Med Public Heal* 2020;7:2602–
530 6. <https://doi.org/10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20202983>.
- 531 [6] Kalekidan T, Behailu K, Rediet H. The Ethiopian perception on food safety system. *Adv*
532 *Food Sci Technol* 2014;2:260–8.
- 533 [7] Ahmed H, Hassan H. Bacteriological and Parasitological Assessment of Food Handlers in
534 the Omdurman area of Sudan. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect* 2010;43:70–3.
535 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1684-1182\(10\)60010-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1684-1182(10)60010-2).
- 536 [8] Assefa T, Tasew H, Wondafrash B, Beker J. Contamination of Bacteria and Associated
537 Factors among Food Handlers Working in the Student Cafeterias of Jimma University-
538 Main Campus, Jimma, South West Ethiopia. *Altern Integr Med* 2015;4:185.
539 <https://doi.org/10.4172/2327-5162.1000185>.
- 540 [9] Dagne M, Tiruneh M, Moges F, Gizachew M. Bacterial Profile and Antimicrobial
541 Susceptibility Pattern among Food Handlers at Gondar University Cafeteria, Northwest
542 Ethiopia. *J Infect Dis Ther* 2013;01:2–7. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2332-0877.1000105>.
- 543 [10] Mohammed A, Seid ME, Gebrecherkos T, Tiruneh M, Moges F. Bacterial Isolates and
544 Their Antimicrobial Susceptibility Patterns of Wound Infections among Inpatients and
545 Outpatients Attending the University of Gondar Referral Hospital, Northwest Ethiopia. *Int*
546 *J Microbiol* 2017;2017. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/8953829>.

- 547 [11] Nasrolahei M, Mirshafiee S, Kholdi S, Salehian M, Nasrolahei M. Bacterial assessment of
548 food handlers in Sari City, Mazandaran Province, north of Iran. *J Infect Public Health*
549 2016;10:1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2016.03.006>.
- 550 [12] Padaruth SK, Biranjia-Hurdoyal SD. Hygiene practices and fecal contamination of the
551 hands of children attending primary school in Mauritius. *Int Health* 2015;7:280–4.
552 <https://doi.org/10.1093/inthealth/ihu080>.
- 553 [13] Pickering AJ, Boehm AB, Mwanjali M, Davis J. Efficacy of waterless hand hygiene
554 compared with handwashing with soap: A field study in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. *Am J*
555 *Trop Med Hyg* 2010;82:270–8. <https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2010.09-0220>.
- 556 [14] Mengist A, Aschale Y, Reta A. Bacterial and Parasitic Assessment from Fingernails in
557 Debre Markos, Northwest Ethiopia. *Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol* 2018;2018:1–7.
558 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/6532014>.
- 559 [15] Worku T, Jejaw A, Kannan S, Wondafrash B. Isolation and Antimicrobial Sensitivity
560 Patterns of Enteric Bacterial Pathogens from Asymptomatic Food Handlers, Jimma,
561 Ethiopia. *Am J Heal Res* 2015;3:399–406. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajhr.20150306.24>.
- 562 [16] Adamus-Bialek W, Zajac E, Parniewski P, Kaca W. Comparison of antibiotic resistance
563 patterns in collections of *Escherichia coli* and *Proteus mirabilis* uropathogenic strains. *Mol*
564 *Biol Rep* 2013;40:3429–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11033-012-2420-3>.
- 565 [17] Kamil TD, Jarjes SF. Isolation, Identification, and Antibiotics Susceptibility
566 Determination of *Proteus* Species Obtained from Various Clinical Specimens in Erbil
567 City. *Polytech J* 2019;9:86–92. <https://doi.org/10.25156/ptj.v9n2y2019.pp86-92>.
- 568 [18] Boucher HW, Talbot GH, Bradley JS, Edwards JE, Gilbert D, Rice LB, et al. Bad bugs, no
569 drugs: No ESCAPE! An update from the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin*
570 *Infect Dis* 2009;48:1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1086/595011>.
- 571 [19] Giubilini A, Savulescu J. Moral Responsibility and the Justification of Policies to Preserve
572 Antimicrobial Effectiveness, 2020, p. 141–54. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-27874-8_9.
- 573
- 574 [20] Littmann J, Viens AM, Silva DS. Ethics and Drug Resistance: Collective Responsibility
575 for Global Public Health. Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland: Springer; 2020.
576 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-27874-8_26.
- 577 [21] Nijsingh N, Larsson DGJ, de Fine Licht K, Munthe C. Justifying Antibiotic Resistance

- 578 Interventions: Uncertainty, Precaution and Ethics, 2020, p. 357–75.
579 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-27874-8_22.
- 580 [22] Mengist A, Mengistu G, Reta A. Prevalence and antimicrobial susceptibility pattern of
581 Salmonella and Shigella among food handlers in catering establishments at Debre Markos
582 University, Northwest Ethiopia. *Int J Infect Dis* 2018;75:74–9.
583 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2018.08.008>.
- 584 [23] Michael CA, Dominey-Howes D, Labbate M. The antimicrobial resistance crisis: causes,
585 consequences, and management. *Front Public Heal* 2014;2:1–8.
586 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2014.00145>.
- 587 [24] Okeke IN, Laxminarayan R, Bhutta ZA, Duse AG, Jenkins P, Brien TFO, et al.
588 Antimicrobial resistance in developing countries. Part I : recent trends and current status.
589 *Lancet Infect Dis* 2005;5:481–93.
- 590 [25] Woodward DL, Rodgers FG. Surveillance of antimicrobial resistance in salmonella,
591 shigella and Vibrio cholerae in Latin America and the Caribbean: A collaborative project.
592 *Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol* 2000;11:181–6.
- 593 [26] Tadesse T, Deneke Y, Deresa B. Seroprevalence of bovine viral diarrhea virus and its
594 potential risk factors in dairy cattle of Jimma town, southwestern Ethiopia. *J Dairy, Vet
595 Anim Res* 2019;8:11–7. <https://doi.org/10.15406/jdvar.2019.08.00235>.
- 596 [27] Bargellini A, Ferranti G, Santangelo M, Venturelli F. Hand Hygiene Knowledge, Hand
597 Contamination and Practice of Italian Nursing and Medical Students. *Epidemiol Biostat
598 Public Heal* 2014;11:e9971. <https://doi.org/10.2427/9971>.
- 599 [28] American Type Culture Collection. Introduction to microbiology. Manassas, Virginia
600 20110-2209: 2022.
- 601 [29] Cheesbrough M. *District Laboratory in Tropical Practice Countries: Part 2*. 2 edition.
602 Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK: Cambridge University Press; 2006.
- 603 [30] CLSI. *Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility*. vol. 40. 30th ed. CLSI
604 Supplement M100. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2020.
- 605 [31] Nasrolahei M, Mirshafiee S, Kholdi S, Salehian M, Nasrolahei M. Bacterial assessment of
606 food handlers in Sari City, Mazandaran Province, north of Iran. *J Infect Public Health*
607 2017;10:171–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2016.03.006>.
- 608 [32] Alsagher MR, Soudah SA, Khsheba AE, Fadel SM, Dadiesh MA, Houme MA, et al. Hand

- 609 Washing Before and After Applying Different Hand Hygiene Techniques in Places of
610 Public Concern in Tripoli-Libya. *Open Microbiol J* 2018;12:364–75.
611 <https://doi.org/10.2174/1874285801812010364>.
- 612 [33] EL-Kady H. Efficacy of Different Alcohol-based Hand Disinfectants in Reduction of
613 Hand Contamination among Food Handlers in Alexandria, Egypt. *JAMB* 2018;13:1–13.
614 <https://doi.org/10.9734/JAMB/2018/45345>.
- 615 [34] Gashaw A, Afework K, Feleke M, Moges T, Kahsay H. Prevalence of bacteria and
616 intestinal parasites among food-handlers in Gondar Town, Northwest Ethiopia. *J Health*
617 *Popul Nutr* 2008;26:451–5.
- 618 [35] Kampf G, Löffler H. Hand disinfection in hospitals – benefits and risks. *JDDG*
619 2010;2010:978–83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1610-0387.2010.07501.x>.
- 620 [36] De Alwis WR, Pakirisamy P, Wai San L, Xiaofen EC. A Study on Hand Contamination
621 and Hand Washing Practices among Medical Students. *ISRN Public Health* 2012;2012:1–
622 5. <https://doi.org/10.5402/2012/251483>.
- 623 [37] Berhanu L, Mereta ST, Gume B, Kassa T, Berihun G, Dadi LS, et al. Effect of microbial
624 quality of washing water on hand hygiene status of food handlers in Jimma town:
625 Implication for food hygiene and safety. *J Multidiscip Healthc* 2021;14:1129–34.
626 <https://doi.org/10.2147/JMDH.S306359>.
- 627 [38] Burton M, Cobb E, Donachie P, Judah G, Curtis V, Schmidt WP. The effect of
628 handwashing with water or soap on bacterial contamination of hands. *Int J Environ Res*
629 *Public Health* 2011;8:97–104. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph8010097>.
- 630 [39] Ogba OM, Asukwo PE, Otu-Bassey IB. Assessment of bacterial carriage on the hands of
631 primary school children in Calabar municipality, Nigeria. *Biomed Dermatology* 2018;2:1–
632 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41702-017-0017-0>.
- 633 [40] Gizaw Z, Yalew AW, Bitew BD, Lee J, Bisesi M. Effects of local handwashing agents on
634 microbial contamination of the hands in a rural setting in Northwest Ethiopia: a cluster
635 randomized controlled trial. *BMJ Open* 2022;12:e056411.
636 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-056411>.
- 637 [41] Allam H, Al-Batanony M, Seif A, Awad E. Hand Contamination among Food Handlers.
638 *BMRJ* 2016;13:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.9734/bmrj/2016/24845>.
- 639 [42] HEAT in Africa. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia-Ministry of Health.

- 640 Communicable Diseases. Part 4: Other Diseases of Public Health Importance and
641 Surveillance. Blended Learning Module for the Health Extension Programme. Addis
642 Ababa: 2011.
- 643 [43] Bonten MJM. Controlling Transmission of Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria in ICU Settings.
644 Fourth Edi. Elsevier Ltd; 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-7020-6285-8.00077-0>.
- 645 [44] USFDA. Employee Health and Personal Hygiene Handbook. 2020.
- 646 [45] World Health Organization. Antibiotic resistance. Prev Control 2020.
647 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance>.
- 648 [46] Amegah KE, Addo HO, Ashinyo ME, Fiagbe L, Akpanya S, Akoriyea SK, et al.
649 Determinants of Hand Hygiene Practice at Critical Times among Food Handlers in
650 Educational Institutions of the Sagnarigu Municipality of Ghana: A Cross-Sectional
651 Study. Environ Health Insights 2020;14:1–10.
652 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1178630220960418>.
- 653





Figure 1: Laboratory flow chart showing bacterial isolations from hand swabs samples.


Age category of study participants in frequency vs percent



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.03.23.23287624>; this version posted March 24, 2023. 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 4.0 International license](#).

Figure 1: Pi chart showing the age category of housemaids (n=225) working in communal residences in Jimma City, Southwest Ethiopia, 2022.

Educational status of study participants in frequency vs percent



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.03.23.23287624>; this version posted March 24, 2023. 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 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 1: Pi chart showing the educational status of housemaids (n=225) working in communal residences in Jimma City, Southwest Ethiopia, 2022.