- 1 A comparative study of multidrug resistant bacteria (MDRB) isolated from various patients in
- 2 different wards of a hospital during post Covid-19
- 3
- 4 Abhishek Ojha^{1 \Box}, Dwight Figueiredo¹, Shabnum Khan¹
- ¹ Symbiosis Institute of Health Sciences, Symbiosis International (Deemed University),
- 6 Lavale (Hill Base), Pune 412115, Maharashtra, India.
- ⁷ ^{*}Corresponding author; Abhishek Ojha; Email: ab.ojha@gmail.com
- 8 Dwight Figueiredo; Email: drdwight@sihspune.org
- 9 Shabnum Khan; Email: 42khanshabnum@gmail.com

10

11 Abstract

12 Antibacterial resistance is an alarming global concern and a public health challenge of the 13 twenty-first century for which effective systems are required to track and treat ABR. We 14 performed microbiological and antibiotic susceptibility testing on the samples to detect and 15 characterize Multidrug-Resistant Bacteria (MDRB) isolated from patients segregating MDRB 16 characteristics (types, prevalence and distribution of MDRB) based on time (i.e., during 17 versus post covid-19) and location (i.e., different wards of a tertiary care hospital). We 18 observed an increase of MDRB in 2022 as compared to 2021 and 2023. These MDRB had a Shannon and Simpson index values of 1.138 to 1.508 and 0.643 to 0.775, respectively and an 19 20 observed evenness values of 0.780 to 1.042, which revealed the microbial diversity recovered 21 from the patient samples. In keeping with previous MDR studies, Klebsiella, E. coli, 22 *Citrobacter*, Acinetobacter and Pseudomonas were identified from the patient samples. 23 Moreover, compared to previous reports, the percentage of MDR-bacteria, i.e., Klebsiella (40 %), *E. coli* (28 %), and *Citrobacter* (19 %), populations were higher in this study. We observed that Gamma-proteobacteria were predominant across all the recovered samples, and that *Acinetobacter* and *Klebsiella* isolated from the samples were 100 % resistant to twenty and eleven antibiotics, respectively. Furthermore, the fatality rate was low compared with the available reports suggesting possibilities for effective recovery if given rapid and tailored treatment. Given the challenges faced by MDRB strains more surveillance and tracking is needed to ensure effective and specifically targeted treatment strategies.

31 Keywords: Multi-drug resistant, Microbes, Antimicrobial susceptibility testing, comorbid,

32 Covid-19, Healthcare.

33 **1. Introduction**

34 Over the previous decades, it has been observed that antibiotic resistance is increasing to 35 precariously high levels all over the world as new mechanisms of resistance are looming and 36 spreading worldwide (Alós et al., 2015; Hernando-Amado et al., 2019). Widespread, non-37 specific, and uninterrupted use of antibacterial antibiotics in treating bacterial infections has 38 been well documented in fuelling resistance among the distinct elements of bacterial 39 populations (Klein et al., 2018; Carvalho et al., 2022). Due to the continuous need of 40 antibacterial substances active against resistant gram-negative microflora, gram-positive 41 multi drug resistant (MDR) pathogens have been overwhelmed by gram-negative bacterial 42 infections (Jones, 2001). Among gram-negative microflora, the commonest MDR microbes 43 identified in severe patients are *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, Stenotrophomonas maltophilia, 44 Acinetobacter sp., and Enterobacteriaceae. Staphylococcus aureus (methicillin-resistant) and 45 Enterococci sp. (vancomycin-resistant) are the most common gram-positive isolated, 46 although their occurrence is falling (Jones, 2001; Boucher et al., 2009). Hospital-acquired 47 infections (HAIs) have been known for over a century as a critical clinical issue affecting

48 healthcare quality, and they are the primary source of unfavourable healthcare outcomes (Aly 49 et al., 2008; Memish and El-Saed, 2009; Nannini et al., 2009). The development of MDR 50 microbes (MDRM) in the patient has become a public health issue, emerging as a new 51 concern in many parts of the health system or hospitals (Jindal et al., 2015; Dogru et al., 52 2010; Teng et al., 2009; Aly et al., 2008). There is extensive use of antibiotics as a drug in 53 critical care units, which establishes a selection burden and stimulates the development of 54 MDRM (Teng et al., 2009; Aly et al., 2008). Further, an intensive care unit (ICU) patient is 55 known to have a high risk of infection due to their underlying health conditions, exposure to 56 various invasive devices, and weakened immunity (Dettenkofer et al., 2001; Ylipalosaari et 57 al., 2006). The HAI rate in general wards is lower than that of ICU-HAI (Weinstein, 1998). 58 The ICU-HAI has been associated with higher costs, morbidity, and mortality (Iskandar et al., 59 2021; Neidell et al., 2012; Montassier et al., 2013; Gastmeier et al., 2005). The objective of 60 this research was to investigate HAI in various (ICUs, neonatal ICU (NICU), outpatient 61 departments (OPD), male wards, female wards, pediatric wards, and medicine wards) 62 departments to reveal the MDR microbial community, the anti-microbial resistance 63 descriptions, including their effect on MDRM-related mortality and comorbidity.

64 2. Materials and methods

65 *2.1. Site of study and patients*

The study was performed as single-centre retrospective research at a 900-bed hospital (the Symbiosis University Hospital and Research Centre, SUHRC, Pune, Maharashtra, India), providing quality healthcare to the Pune's surrounding rural and upcoming urban areas. High patient numbers ensure extensive contact with the local community flows daily due to subsidized healthcare facilities and treatment strategies provided. The hospital provides for both inpatient and outpatient patient treatment services. The hospital possesses operation

theatres, ICUs, NICUs, Wards, OPDs. During Covid-19 (Coronavirus disease-2019), the hospital ran with specialized wards assigned to Covid-19-positive patients. The standard infection control measures (PPE, personal protective equipment) and sterilization protocols (https://www.england.nhs.uk/national-infection-prevention-and-control-manual-nipcm-forengland/chapter-1-standard-infection-control-precautions-sicps/) were followed to prevent cross-contamination and spread of Covid-19.

78 2.2. Clinical data

79 A descriptive retrospective investigation of the occurrence of MDR bacteria in patients 80 treated at the hospital from January 2021 to April 2023, patients' samples were collected from 81 the different hospital departments as a part of routine testing or when infections were 82 suspected /presumed to be the cause underlying diseases (ICU, NICU, OPD, male ward, 83 female ward, paediatric ward, and medicine ward). Clinical data information relevant to this 84 study was collected and extracted from the departments mentioned above, patient medical 85 charts, infection control surveillance forms, and microbiology laboratory results. The clinical 86 data extracted also included - patient symptoms and comorbidities, neoplasm-related data and 87 its treatment, and most importantly, MDR related infectious microorganisms and their 88 resistance pattern (based on sensitivity to antibiotics, which are recorded data from 89 microbiology laboratory culture test blood culture, etc.) MDRs were determined by applying 90 the Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) parameters (Horan et al., 2008).

91 2.3. Bacterial identification and susceptibility testing

Microbial isolates were determined by applying the BD Phoenix Automated Microbiology
System (USA) and Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion technique (Clinical and Laboratory Standards
Institute, 2006.). The protocol detailed, by Caroll et al. (2006) and Hudzicki (2009), were
applied to identification and antimicrobial susceptibility tests. Microorganism cultures were

96 obtained from patient samples from different anatomical locations on the body. We examined 97 body fluids such as pus, urine, swabs (from the foot and near the colon), sputum, stool, BAL 98 (Bronchoalveolar lavage) fluid, and ET (Endotracheal Secretion) secretion to determine the 99 occurrence of antibiotic-resistant microbes or pathogens across the samples. The isolates 100 Escherichia coli, Klebsiella pneumoniae, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Acinetobacter sp., and 101 Citrobacter sp., were examined to be MDR. An infection at many sites in the same patient 102 was revealed as distinct infection events, except that an identical microbe was revealed 103 concurrently. The clinical outcomes were evaluated up to hospital discharge or patient death. 104 For the reasons of this study, patient death was determined concerning the HAIs/ or as non-105 HAIs-associated in agreement with the professional (Medical) who endorsed the patient 106 death, including clinical chart data examined by three of the authors of this study.

107 2.4. Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics were used for categorised variables and expressed in terms of per cent frequency. The normal distribution and diversity (alpha and beta) index were applied to determine the variations in MDR-microbial populations between MDR patient samples (collected from 2021, 2022, and 2023 at SUHRC, Pune) used in this study.

112 **3. Results**

113 *3.1. Overview of patient infection across all the samples*

One hundred patients aged one day to 98 years were included (data not shown). Eighty-five patients (out of 100 patients) were treated successfully and discharged (**Table 1**, data not shown), five patients (out of 100 patients) died (**Table 1**) in the hospital, and there was no clarity in the reporting of 10 patients' data whether they discharged or died. Fifty-three patients (53 %), 38 patients (38 %), and nine patients (9 %) were male, female, and child (female), respectively (**Table 1, Fig. S1**) with various clinical characteristics (data not shown

120 and Table 1). An overall lowest death rate of males were observed among patients (Fig. 1A). 121 Patients with comorbidities or with no comorbidities are shown in Table 1. 18 patients with 122 no co-existing comorbidities were observed (Table 1 and data not shown). The medical 123 conditions at presentation or during the hospital study included; UTI (urinary tract infection, 124 35 % patient), sepsis (16 % patient), foot gangrene (3 % patient), respiratory disease (2 % 125 patient), cancer (1 % patient), hepatic disease (1 % patient), hepatic cyst (1 % patient), 126 asthma (1 % patient), IHD (ischemic heart disease, 1 % patient), CKD (chronic kidney 127 disease,1 % patient), septic shock (1 % patient), post-CAR (chimeric antigen receptors, 1 % 128 patient) T-cell therapy, hyperthyroidism (1 % patient), osteoporosis (1 % patient), 129 hemoperitoneum (1 % patient), multiple vessel (1 % patient), HIE (hypoxic-ischemic 130 encephalopathy, 1 % patient), femur fracture (1 % patient), that were simultaneously present 131 in a patient (**Table 1**). **Table 2** revealed the sample type distribution and predominance of 132 MDR-gram-negative bacteria (MGNB). The sample urine from the patient showed the 133 highest number (61) of MGNB (Table 2). In comparison the lowest number (2) of MGNB 134 was present in stool samples (**Table 2**). In terms of bacterial species identified in the samples, MDR-*Klebsiella pneumoniae* was predominant in urine samples (**Table 2**). 135

136 *3.2. Evaluation of antibiotic resistance*

137 To evaluate antibiotic resistance, an antimicrobial susceptibility test (AST) was performed 138 (**Table S1**). The AST of five GNBs, *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (K. pneumoniae), followed by 139 Escherichia coli (E. coli), Citrobacter sp., Pseudomonas aeruginosa (P. aeruginosa), and 140 Acinetobacter sp., were determined during our investigation (Table S1). Thirty-one 141 antibiotics were used for susceptibility tests to reveal the MDR characteristics of GNBs 142 isolated from patients. All five GNBs (K. pneumoniae, E. coli, Citrobacter sp., P. aeruginosa, 143 and Acinetobacter sp.) showed the highest (100 %) resistance to ampicillin, ceftazidime, and 144 ertapenem (Table S1). K. pneumoniae, E. coli, P. aeruginosa, and Acinetobacter sp. were

145	ampicillin/sulbactum-resistant (100 %) (Table S1). K. pneumoniae, E. coli, Citrobacter sp.,
146	and P. aeruginosa were aztreonam-resistant (100 %) (Table S1). K. pneumoniae, E. coli,
147	Citrobacter sp., and Acinetobacter sp. were ceftriaxone- and cefuroxime-resistant (100 %)
148	(Table S1). K. pneumoniae, Citrobacter sp., and Acinetobacter sp. were cefotaxime- and
149	cefixime-resistant (100 %) (Table S1). Citrobacter sp., P. aeruginosa, and Acinetobacter sp.
150	were cotrimoxazole-, meropenem-, and gentamicin-resistant (100 %) (Table S1). E. coli, P.
151	aeruginosa, and Acinetobacter sp. were ciprofloxacin-resistant (100 %) (Table S1).
152	Citrobacter sp. and Acinetobacter sp. were amikacin-, cefepime-, and tobramycin-resistant
153	(100 %) (Table S1). E. coli and Citrobacter sp. were ceftazidime avibactam-resistant (100
154	%) (Table S1). K. pneumoniae and E. coli were cefazolin-, norfloxacin-resistant (100 %)
155	(Table S1). K. pneumoniae and Acinetobacter sp. were imipenem-, nitrofurantoin-, and
156	piperacillin tazobactam-resistant (100 %) (Table S1). Acinetobacter sp. was amoxicillin
157	clavulanic acid-, ceftazidime clavulanic acid-, cefoxitin-, and minocycline-resistant (100 %)
158	(Table S1). E. coli was doripenem-resistant (100 %) (Table S1). Further, E. coli was
159	tigecycline- and tetracycline-susceptible (100 %) (Table S1).

160 *3.3. Identification of MGNB across all the samples*

161 A total of 100 MGNBs belonging to c_Gammaproteobacteria, were identified across all the 162 samples. 28 %, 56 %, and 16 % MGNB were observed in 2021, 2022, and the early part of 163 2023, respectively (Fig. 1B). Further, in the year 2021, 14 adult males, 11 adult females, and 164 3 children (female) were infected with MGNB, while in the year 2022, 29 adult males, 23 165 adult females, and 4 children (female) were found to be diseased with MGNB (Fig. 1C). 166 Furthermore, in 2023, 10 adult males, 4 adult females, and 2 children (female) were infected 167 with MGNB (Fig. 1C). The highest number of adult males, adult female, and children 168 (female) patients with MGNB was revealed in the year 2022 (Fig. 1C), while the lowest

number of adult male, adult female, and children (female) patients with MGNB were
observed in the year 2023 (Fig. 1C).

In 100 MGNB isolates, Pseudomonadota was noticed as the dominant phylum among the patient samples. Pseudomonadota alone shared 28, 56, and 16 of the total MGNB isolates in the patient samples collected in 2021, 2022, and 2023, respectively (**Fig. 1B**). The dominant MGNB isolates belonging to Gammaproteobacteria among the patient samples (**Fig. 1D**) depiced the genera *E. coli* (28 % isolates), *Citrobacter* sp. (19 % isolates), *K. pneumoniae* (40 % isolates), *P. aeruginosa* (7 % isolates), and *Acinetobacter* sp. (7 % isolates) (**Fig. S2**).

178 *3.4. Specific and shared MGNB population*

179 The number of distinct and shared MGNB isolates present in the patient samples were 180 examined applying a Venn diagram (http://bioinformatics.psb.ugent.be/cgi-181 bin/liste/Venn/calculate venn.htpl) (Fig. 1E, Table S2). Five shared MGNB populations were 182 identified across all samples. E. coli, K. pneumoniae, and Citrobacter sp. were shared 183 between three patient samples (2021, 2022, and 2023), while P. aeruginosa and Acinetobacter sp. were shared between only two patient (2021 and 2022) and (2022 and 184 185 2023) samples, respectively (Fig. 1E, Table S2).

186 *3.5. Identification of MGNB in patient (with comorbid) samples*

K. pneumoniae, *E. coli*, and *Citrobacter* sp. were present in the patient (with comorbid medical conditions) samples collected in 2021 (**Fig. S3A**). *E. coli* (in UTI) was highest among the patient (with comorbid) samples (**Fig. S3A**), while *E. coli* (in sepsis and hepatic cyst), *K. pneumoniae* (in foot gangrene, respiratory disease, and Asthma), *Citrobacter* sp. (in femur fracture) were noted lowest in the patient (with comorbid) samples (**Fig. S3A**).

K. pneumoniae, E. coli, P. aeruginosa, Citrobacter sp., and *Acinetobacter* sp. were
identified in patient (with comorbid medical conditions) samples collected in 2022 (Fig.
S3B). *K. pneumoniae* (in UTI) was highest among the patient (with comorbid) samples (Fig.
S3B) while *E. coli* (in sepsis, septic shock, cancer, and hemoperitonen), *Citrobacter* sp. (in
sepsis, post-CAR, and osteoporosis), *K. pneumoniae* (in foot gangrene, respiratory disease,
IHD, CKD, hepatic disease, hyperthyroidism) and *P. aeruginosa* (in foot gangrene) had the
lowest representation in patient (with comorbid) samples (Fig. S3B).

K. pneumoniae, E. coli, Citrobacter sp., and *Acinetobacter* sp. were observed in the
patient (with comorbid medical conditions) samples collected in 2023 (Fig. S3C). *E. coli* (in
UTI) was highest among the patient (with comorbid) samples (Fig. S3C), while *K. pneumoniae* (in sepsis and multiple vessels), *Acinetobacter* sp. (in UTI and in HIE) had the
lowest representation in the patient (with comorbid) samples (Fig. S3C).

204 3.6. Variance indices

205 Normal distribution, alpha and beta-diversity (taxonomic variance) of the MGNB population 206 was determined utilizing data from various patient' samples. The Shapiro-Wilk (S-W) and 207 Anderson-Darling (A-D) normality test were used to determine distributions of MGNB 208 community within the patient samples. (Table S3). The S-W analysis for normality varied 209 from 0.800 to 0.888, with a *P-value* of 0.081 to 0.351. The observed A-D normal distribution 210 differed from 0.343 to 0.511, with a *P-value* of 0.098 to 0.315 (**Table S3**). The Alpha (α)-211 diversity metrics (Shannon, Simpson, Evenness, Brillouin, Fisher alpha, Chao1, and ACE) of 212 the MGNB population were differed notably within the patient samples (Table 3). The values 213 of Shannon diversity (1.138 to 1.508), Simpson diversity (0.643 to 0.775), Evenness diversity 214 (0.780 to 1.042), and Brillouin diversity (0.933 to 1.340) (**Table 3**) revealed community 215 structure with moderate species richness and abundance in patient samples. The values of

216 Fisher alpha and Chao1 ranged from 1.277 to 1.712 and 4 to 5, respectively (**Table 3**). The 217 ACE (abundance-based coverage estimator; a species richness index) varied from 4.000 to 218 5.111, with the increase index in MDR bacteria in 2021 among the patient samples (**Table 3**). 219 Notably, the MDRs in the sample (2022) had more MGNB population than the other samples 220 (**Table 3**). Palaeontological Statistics (PAST, v3) software package was applied to determine 221 the beta (β) diversity of the MGNB population between the patient samples (Fig. 2A) 222 collected in 2021, 2022, and 2023. PCoA (principal coordinate analysis, based on the Bray-223 Kurtis index) was computed using eigenvalues and eigenvectors (coordinates) algorithm from 224 Davis (1986). Before Eigen investigation, PCoA eigen values were produced to the 225 transformation exponent (the power of C), and the definitive index was C = 2. The "Eigen 226 value scaling" measure was applied for each axis, applying the square root of the eigen 227 matrix (value), and the minimum spanning tree preference was based on the picked PCoA 228 matrix. PCoA revealed the existence or absence of MGNB elements between the patient 229 (2021, 2022, and 2023) samples (Fig. 2A). Further, analysis of the data, of pair-wise patient 230 sample, comparisons was determined by applying the Bray-Kurtis similarity and dissimilarity 231 index (**Table S4**). Bray-Kurtis pairwise similarity and distance index of the patient samples 232 varied from 0.444 - 1.000 (Table S4). Moreover, the Whittaker indexes for the resemblance 233 between MGNB population of the patient samples ranged from 0.11 - 0.25 (Table S5).

3.7. Comparison of MGNB populations between de Souza GHA et al. (2023), Ruegsegger et
al. (2022), and in the present study

In an effort to understand and correlate the MGNB populations of the present study bacterial communities with that present in the study of de Souza GHA et al. (2023), and Ruegsegger et al. (2022) (**Fig. 2B**, **Table 4**). *Pseudomonas* sp. and *Klebsiell* sp. were revealed at 6.0 and 40.0 %, respectively, in the present study, while in the de Souza GHA et al. (2023), they were noted at 11.4 and 40.0 % (**Fig. 2B**, **Table 4**). Further, *E. coli* and *Citrobacter* sp. were

observed at 28.0 and 19.0 %, respectively in the present study, while in the de Souza GHA et
al. (2023) they were noted at 2.8 and 2.8 % (Fig. 2B, Table 4). Furthermore, *Acinetobacter*sp. was present at 7.0 % in the present study, while in the de Souza GHA et al. (2023) they
were revealed at 20.0 % (Fig. 2B, Table 4).

Pseudomonas sp. and *Klebsiella* sp. were present at 6.0 and 40.0 %, respectively, in the
present study, while Ruegsegger et al. (2023), reported 34.0 and 14.0 %, respectively (Fig. **2B**, Table 4). Further, *E. coli* and *Citrobacter* sp. were present at 28.0 and 19.0 %,
respectively, in the present study, while Ruegsegger et al. (2023) reported 7.0 and 7.0 %,
respectively (Fig. 2B, Table 4). Furthermore, *Acinetobacter* sp. was present at 7.0 %, in the
present study, while in the Ruegsegger et al. (2023) study, they were not reported (Fig. 2B,
Table 4).

252 4. Discussion

253 GNB are an important public health issue globally due to their antibiotic resistance 254 characteristic (Oliveira and Reygaert, 2022). The invasion of the host by bacteria and the 255 resulting infection is a versatile mechanism that includes various biological factors, i.e. the 256 host defense mechanism, the prevalence and antibiotic susceptibility pattern of microbial 257 isolates, various bio-physicochemical and genetic attributes (Peterson, 1996). The various 258 virulence factors (persistence, transmissibility (ratio of output to input), cling to host cells, 259 host cells invasion, toxigenicity, and the capability to elude or live the host's defence 260 mechanism) of bacteria have been extensively investigated and have shown to have a 261 negative impact on patient's health, particularly when a patient is immunocompromised due 262 to severe disease (Freeman et al., 2020; Moradi et al., 2021). Moreover, it would be valuable 263 to investigate whether patient genotypes can influence survival by influencing the number of 264 MGNB within them (increased or decreased count of MGNB).

ICU-MDR percentages are maximum than in other hospital wards (Table 1) due to the
multiple associations between the patient's underlying medical conditions, hospital ward
type, LOS (length of stay), and employment of various invasive tools (Erbay et al., 2003;
Inweregbu et al., 2005; Vincent et al., 2009).

269 Among the 100 patients investigated, 85 (85 %) were discharged, while 5 (5 %) expired in 270 the hospital (Fig. 1A). An overall lower mortality rate was found among elderly, severe 271 patients (with comorbidities) admitted to the different units of the hospital. Our outcomes are 272 not in concurrence with the investigations of Juliana et al. (2022) and Boorgula et al. (2022), 273 who revealed a higher death rate in serious patients. Taking this observation into 274 consideration, we speculate that the lower mortality rate, in our study, might be due to the 275 higher immunity of studied patients during their hospitalization (Parohan et al., 2020; Weiss 276 and Murdoch, 2020; Ejaz et al., 2020). However, such intrinsic protective factors have yet to 277 be determined in specific populations to make the above claims regarding mortality.

278 In our investigation, K. pneumoniae, E. coli, Citrobacter sp., Acinetobacter sp., P. 279 aeruginosa were the most frequent isolates (GNB) in various patient' samples (Vijay et al., 280 2021; Sharifipour et al., 2020). GNB isolates were higher in adult males than in adult females 281 and children (female) (Fig. 1C). With this observation in view, we hypothesize that a higher 282 level of an enzyme called carboxypeptidase (ACE 2, angiotensin-converting enzyme 2) in 283 men and the predisposition of adult females (at reproductive age) to autoimmune disorder 284 than infectious diseases might be the two reasons for higher MDR-GNB male than in female. 285 Lifestyles of men (heavy smoking and drinking) make them more susceptible to infections (Ramírez-Soto et al., 2021; Bwire, 2020). Nevertheless, this is yet to be elucidated. 286

Regarding AST, we revealed *Acinetobacter* sp. to be the most (100 %) resistant strain when
measured against twenty antibiotics (**Table S1**), while *Klebsiella* sp., was found to be 100 %

resistant against eleven antibiotics (Table S1). All these five different bacterial species (Table
S1) were resistant to numerous antimicrobial agents, which gives them the title of multidrugresistant bacteria (Giannitsioti et al., 2022). Surprisingly antibacterial resistance, in this study,
is related to a decrease in the mortality rate compared with the previous study (Tanwar et al.,
2014).

294 Our data provides evidence of an increase in antimicrobial resistance post-Covid-19 (Fig. 1C, 295 data collected in 2022). This is in keeping with previous reports that have mentioned a similar 296 pattern of increased antimicrobial resistance in specific locations (Shomuyiwa et al., 2022). 297 Indiscriminate and irrational antimicrobial use and weak antimicrobials regulatory ecosystem, 298 which could be partially attributed to health systems disruption by inadequate access to health 299 services during the Covid-19 pandemic, are suggested causes for the rapid growth of 300 antimicrobial resistance in the community (Lobie et al., 2021; Shomuyiwa et al., 2022). 301 Given the rapid increase in antimicrobial resistance post-Covid-19 in our study, it is 302 important to further analyze how the policies adopted to manage Covid-19 (i.e. widespread 303 antibiotic and disinfectant usage) affect or have a long-lasting consequence on 304 antimicrobial resistance (AMR) (Nieuwlaat et al., 2021). Furthermore, programs at a 305 governmental level need to be adopted widely, particularly in low- and middle-income 306 countries (LMIC), to contain the possible increase in AMR (Lucien et al., 2021).

307 **5.** Conclusion

In conclusion, outcomes achieved from the present investigation revealed that MDRmicrobes present in patients are predominantly elements of the gamma-proteobacteria. Antibacterial resistance has an important impact on therapeutics and the outcome of bacterial infection. In this study, five gram-negative bacteria, *K. pneumoniae*, *E. coli*, *Citrobacter* sp., *Acinetobacter* sp., and *P. aeruginosa*, had increased resistance to the antibacterial agents

. . . .

. .

. .

313	applied. Therefore, it is essential that the public health and drug susceptibility patterns of
314	microorganisms initiating pathogen infection are continually observed to instruct clinical
315	trials and treatment strategies, thereby reducing the appearance of multi-drug-resistant
316	microbial pathogens.

317 Declarations

- 318 Ethics approval and consent to participate
- 319 Patient samples and data were collected from the Symbiosis University Hospital and
- 320 Research Centre (SUHRC), the Symbiosis International University, Pune, Maharashtra, India.

321 Consent to publish

322 Not applicable.

323 Availability of data and materials

- 324 All data is given in the main body of the manuscript; materials are available from the authors.
- All sequence data is added to manuscript as supplementary files (named as Figure S1 to S3,
- and Tables S1 to S6).

327 Competing interests

328 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

329 Funding

330 No funds were used for this study.

331 Authors' contributions

A.O. made substantial contributions to conception, was involved in analysis & interpretation

- of data, writing, revising and drafting the manuscript, and given final approval of the version
- to be published. D.W. made substantial contributions to writing discussion, editing the

335	manuscript, was involved in revising the manuscript, and given final approval of the version
336	to be published. S.K. made substantial contributions to collect the data from SUHRC and
337	given final approval of the version to be published. All authors reviewed the manuscript and
338	given final approval of the version to be published.
339	Authors' Information
340	Symbiosis Institute of Health Sciences, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Lavale
341	(Hill Base), Pune 412115, Maharashtra, India.
342	Acknowledgments
343	We thank director, Symbiosis Institute of Health Sciences (SIHS) and Head, Symbiosis
344	University Hospital and Research Centre (SUHRC), Pune for kind support.
345	References
346	1. Alós, J.I., 2015. Resistencia bacteriana a los antibióticos: una crisis global
347	[Antibiotic resistance: A global crisis]. Enferm Infecc Microbiol Clin. 33(10),
348	692-699. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eimc.2014.10.004. PMID 25475657.

- Hernando-Amado, S., Coque, T.M., Baquero, F., Martínez, J.L., 2019. Defining
 and combating antibiotic resistance from one health and global health
 perspectives. Nat Microbiol. 4(9), 1432-1442. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564019-0503-9.
- Klein, E.Y., Van Boeckel, T.P., Martinez, E.M., Pant, S., Gandra, S., Levin, S.A.,
 Goossens, H., Laxminarayan, R., 2018. Global increase and geographic
 convergence in antibiotic consumption between 2000 and 2015. Proc Natl Acad
 Sci USA. 115(15), E3463-E3470. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1717295115.

357	4.	Carvalho, M.J., Sands, K., Thomson, K., Portal, E., Mathias, J., Milton, R.,
358		Gillespie, D., Dyer, C., Akpulu, C., Boostrom, I., Hogan, P., Saif, H., Ferreira, A.,
359		Nieto, M., Hender, T., Hood, K., Andrews, R., Watkins, W.J., Hassan, B., Chan,
360		G., Bekele, D., Solomon, S., Metaferia, G., Basu, S., Naha, S., Sinha, A.,
361		Chakravorty, P., Mukherjee, S., Iregbu, K., Modibbo, F., Uwaezuoke, S., Audu, L.,
362		Edwin, C.P., Yusuf, A.H., Adeleye, A., Mukkadas, A.S., Zahra, R., Shirazi, H.,
363		Muhammad, A., Ullah, S.N., Jan, M.H., Akif, S., Mazarati, J.B., Rucogoza, A.,
364		Gaju, L., Mehtar, S., Bulabula, A.N.H., Whitelaw, A., Roberts, L., BARNARDS,
365		Group., Walsh, T.R., 2022. Antibiotic resistance genes in the gut microbiota of
366		mothers and linked neonates with or without sepsis from low- and middle-income
367		countries. Nat Microbiol. 7(9), 1337-1347. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-022-
368		01184-у.
369	5.	Jones, R.N., 2001. Resistance patterns among nosocomial pathogens: trends over
370		the past few years. Chest. 119(2 Suppl), 397S-404S. https://doi.org/
371		10.1378/chest.119.2_suppl.397s.
372	6.	Boucher, H.W., Talbot, G.H., Bradley, J.S., Edwards, J.E., Gilbert, D., Rice, L.B.,
373		Scheld, M., Spellberg, B., Bartlett, J., 2009. Bad bugs, no drugs: no ESKAPE! an
374		update from the infectious diseases society of America. Clin Infect Dis. 48(1), 1-
375		12. https://doi.org/10.1086/595011.
376	7.	Aly, N.Y., Al-Mousa, H.H., Al Asarel, S.M., 2008. Nosocomial infections in a
377		medical-surgical intensive care unit. Med Princ Pract. 17(5), 373-377.
378		https://doi.org/10.1159/000141500.
379	8.	Memish, Z.A., and El-Saed, A., 2009. Nosocomial infections in a medical-surgical
380		intensive care unit in Kuwait. Med Princ Pract. 18(4), 342; author reply 342-343.
381		https://doi.org/10.1159/000215737.

- 382 9. Nannini, M., Foddi, F., Murgia, G., Pisci, R., Sanna, F., Testa, M., Accotto, G.P.,
- 2009. An epidemiological survey of TYLCD in southern Sardinia (Italy).
 Commun Agric Appl Biol Sci. 74(3), 831-841. PMID 20222569.
- 10. Jindal, A.K., Pandya, K., Khan, I.D., 2015. Antimicrobial resistance: a public
 health challenge. Med J Armed Forces India. 71(2), 178-181.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mjafi.2014.04.011.
- 11. Dogru, A., Sargin, F., Celik, M., Sagiroglu, A.E., Goksel, M.M., Sayhan, H., 2010.
 The rate of device-associated nosocomial infections in a medical surgical intensive care unit of a training and research hospital in Turkey: one-year outcomes. Jpn J Infect Dis. 63(2), 95-98. PMID 20332569.
- 12. Teng, S.O., Lee, W.S., Ou, T.Y., Hsieh, Y.C., Lee, W.C., Lin, Y.C., 2009. Bacterial
 contamination of patients' medical charts in a surgical ward and the intensive care
 unit: impact on nosocomial infections. J Microbiol Immunol Infect. 42(1), 86-91.
 PMID 19424563.
- 13. Dettenkofer, M., Ebner, W., Els, T., Babikir, R., Lucking, C., Pelz, K., Rüden, H.,
 Daschner, F., 2001. Surveillance of nosocomial infections in a neurology intensive
 care unit. J Neurol. 248(11), 959-964. https://doi.org/10.1007/s004150170048.
- 14. Ylipalosaari, P., Ala-Kokko, T.I., Laurila, J., Ohtonen, P., Syrjälä, H., 2006. 399 400 Intensive care acquired infection is an independent risk factor for hospital 401 mortality: prospective cohort study. Crit Care. 10(2),R66. a 402 https://doi.org/10.1186/cc4902.
- 403 15. Weinstein, R.A., 1998. Nosocomial infection update. Emerg Infect Dis. 4(3), 416404 420. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid0403.980320.
- 405 16. Iskandar, K., Roques, C., Hallit, S., Husni-Samaha, R., Dirani, N., Rizk, R., Abdo,
 406 R., Yared, Y., Matta, M., Mostafa, I., Matta, R., Salameh, P., Molinier, L., 2021.

- The healthcare costs of antimicrobial resistance in Lebanon: a multi-centre
 prospective cohort study from the payer perspective. BMC Infect Dis. 21(1), 404.
 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-021-06084-w.
- 410 17. Neidell, M.J., Cohen, B., Furuya, Y., Hill, J., Jeon, C.Y., Glied, S., Larson, E.L.,
 411 2012. Costs of healthcare- and community-associated infections with
 412 antimicrobial-resistant versus antimicrobial-susceptible organisms. Clin Infect
 413 Dis. 55(6), 807-815. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cis552.
- 18. Montassier, E., Batard, E., Gastinne, T., Potel, G., de La Cochetière, M.F., 2013.
 Recent changes in bacteremia in patients with cancer: a systematic review of
 epidemiology and antibiotic resistance. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 32(7),
 841-850. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10096-013-1819-7.
- 418 19. Gastmeier, P., Sohr, D., Geffers, C., Behnke, M., Daschner, F., Rüden, H., 2005.
 419 Mortality risk factors with nosocomial *Staphylococcus aureus* infections in
 420 intensive care units: results from the German nosocomial infection surveillance
 421 system (KISS). Infection. 33(2), 50-55. https://doi.org/10.1007/s15010-005-3186-
- 422

5.

- 20. Horan, T.C., Andrus, M., Dudeck, M.A., 2008. CDC/NHSN surveillance
 definition of health care-associated infection and criteria for specific types of
 infections in the acute care setting. Am J Infect Control. 36(5), 309-332.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2008.03.002. Erratum in: Am J Infect Control. 36(9),
 655. PMID 18538699.
- 428 21. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, 2006. Performance standards for
 429 antimicrobial susceptibility testing. 13th Informational Supplement, Vol. 25, No.
 430 26. Approved Standard M2-A7. Wayne, PA: CLSI.

- 431 22. Carroll, K.C., Glanz, B.D., Borek, A.P., Burger, C., Bhally, H.S., Henciak, S.,
- 432 Flayhart, D., 2006. Evaluation of the BD phoenix automated microbiology system
- 433 for identification and antimicrobial susceptibility testing of Enterobacteriaceae. J
- 434 Clin Microbiol. 44(10), 3506-3509. https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00994-06.
- 435 23. Hudzicki, J., 2009. Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion susceptibility test protocol.
 436 American Society for Microbiology.
- 437 24. Davis, J.C., 1986. Statistics and Data Analysis in Geology. John Wiley & Sons.
- 438 25. de Souza, G.H.A., de Oliveira, A.R., Dos Santos Barbosa, M., Rossato, L., da
 439 Silva Barbosa, K., Simionatto, S., 2023. Multidrug-resistant gram-negative
 440 bacteria in patients with COVID-19: an epidemiological and clinical study. J
 441 Infect Public Health. 16(8), 1184-1192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2023.05.017.
- 442 26. Ruegsegger, L., Xiao, J., Naziripour, A., Kanumuambidi, T., Brown, D., Williams,
- F., Marshall, S.H., Rudin, S.D., Yen, K., Chu, T., Chen, L., Sozzi, E., Bartelt, L.,
 Kreiswirth, B., Bonomo, R.A., van Duin, D., 2022. Multidrug-resistant gramnegative bacteria in burn patients. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 66(9),
 e0068822. https://doi.org/10.1128/aac.00688-22.
- 27. Oliveira, J., Reygaert, W.C., 2022. Gram-negative bacteria. In: StatPearls
 [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing. PMID 30855801.
- 28. Peterson, J.W., 1996. Bacterial pathogenesis. In: Baron S, editor. Medical
 Microbiology. 4th ed. Galveston (TX): University of Texas Medical Branch at
 Galveston. Chapter 7. PMID 21413346.
- 452 29. Freeman, A.M., Leigh, T.R., 2020. JrViral Pneumonia. In: *StatPearls*. StatPearls
 453 Publishing. Treasure Island (FL) PMID 30020658.
- 454 30. Moradi, N., Kazemi, N., Ghaemi, M., Mirzaei, B., 2021. Frequency and
 455 antimicrobial resistance pattern of bacterial isolates from patients with COVID-19

- 456 in two hospitals of Zanjan. Iran J Microbiol. 13(6), 769-778.
 457 https://doi.org/10.18502/ijm.v13i6.8078.
- 458 31. Erbay, H., Yalcin, A.N., Serin, S., Turgut, H., Tomatir, E., Cetin, B., Zencir, M.,
 2003. Nosocomial infections in intensive care unit in a Turkish university hospital:
 a 2-year survey. Intensive Care Med. 29(9), 1482-1488.

461 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-003-1788-x.

- 462 32. Inweregbu, K., and others., 2005. Nosocomial infections, continuing education in
 463 anaesthesia critical care & pain. 5(1), 14464 17, https://doi.org/10.1093/bjaceaccp/mki006.
- 33. Vincent, J.L., Rello, J., Marshall, J., Silva, E., Anzueto, A., Martin, C.D., Moreno,
 R., Lipman, J., Gomersall, C., Sakr, Y., Reinhart, K., 2009. EPIC II group of
 investigators. International study of the prevalence and outcomes of infection in
 intensive care units. JAMA. 302(21), 2323-2329.
 https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2009.1754.
- 470 34. Juliana, A., Ramya, S., Leela, K.V., 2022. Prevalence and antimicrobial
 471 susceptibility pattern of secondary gram-negative bacteria isolated from severe
 472 acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus disease 2 patients in a tertiary care
 473 hospital. J Pure Appl Microbiol. 16(4), 2514-2520.
 474 https://doi.org/10.22207/JPAM.16.4.13.
- 35. Boorgula, S.Y., Yelamanchili, S., Kottapalli, P., Naga, M.D., 2022. An update on secondary bacterial and fungal infections and their antimicrobial resistance pattern
 (AMR) in Covid-19 confirmed patients. J Lab Physicians. 14(3), 260-264.
 https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0041-1741438.
- 479 36. Parohan, M., Yaghoubi, S., Seraji, A., Javanbakht, M.H., Sarraf, P., Djalali, M.,
 480 2020. Risk factors for mortality in patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-

481	19) infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies.
482	Aging Male. 23(5),1416-1424. https://doi.org/10.1080/13685538.2020.1774748.

- 483 37. Weiss, P., Murdoch, D.R., 2020. Clinical course and mortality risk of severe
 484 Covid-19. Lancet. 395(10229), 1014-1015. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140485 6736(20)30633-4.
- 486 38. Ejaz, H., Alsrhani, A., Zafar, A., Javed, H., Junaid, K., Abdalla, A.E., Abosalif,
 487 K.O.A., Ahmed, Z., Younas, S., 2020. Covid-19 and comorbidities: deleterious
 488 impact on infected patients. J Infect Public Health. 13(12), 1833-1839.
 489 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2020.07.014.
- 490 39. Vijay, S., Bansal, N., Rao, B.K., Veeraraghavan, B., Rodrigues, C., Wattal, C.,
- 491 Goyal, J.P., Tadepalli, K., Mathur, P., Venkateswaran, R., Venkatasubramanian, R.,
- Khadanga, S., Bhattacharya, S., Mukherjee, S., Baveja, S., Sistla, S., Panda, S.,
 Walia, K., 2021. Secondary infections in hospitalized Covid-19 patients: Indian
 experience. Infect Drug Resist. 14, 1893-1903.
 https://doi.org/10.2147/IDR.S299774.
- 496 40. Sharifipour, E., Shams, S., Esmkhani, M., Khodadadi, J., Fotouhi-Ardakani, R.,
 497 Koohpaei, A., Doosti, Z., Ej Golzari, S., 2020. Evaluation of bacterial co498 infections of the respiratory tract in Covid-19 patients admitted to ICU. BMC
 499 Infect Dis. 20(1), 646. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-020-05374-z.
- 41. Ramírez-Soto, M.C., Arroyo-Hernández, H., Ortega-Cáceres, G., 2021. Sex
 differences in the incidence, mortality, and fatality of Covid-19 in Peru. PLoS
 One. 16(6), e0253193. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253193.
- 503 42. Bwire, G.M., 2020. Coronavirus: Why men are more vulnerable to Covid-19 than
 504 women? SN Compr Clin Med. 2(7), 874-876. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42399-020 505 00341-w.

21

506	43. Giannitsioti, E., Salles, M.J., Mavrogenis, A., Rodriguez-Pardo, D., Los-Arcos, I.,
507	Ribera, A., Ariza, J., Del Toro, M.D., Nguyen, S., Senneville, E., Bonnet, E.,
508	Chan, M., Pasticci, M.B., Petersdorf, S., Benito, N., O' Connell, N., Blanco
509	García, A., Skaliczki, G., Tattevin, P., Kocak Tufan, Z., Pantazis, N.,
510	Megaloikonomos, P.D., Papagelopoulos, P., Soriano, A., Papadopoulos, A., 2022.
511	The Esgiai collaborators Study Group. Osteosynthesis-associated infection of the
512	lower limbs by multidrug-resistant and extensively drug-resistant Gram-negative
513	bacteria: a multicentre cohort study. J Bone Jt Infect. 7(6), 279-288.
514	https://doi.org/10.5194/jbji-7-279-2022.
515	44. Tanwar, J., Das, S., Fatima, Z., Hameed, S., 2014. Multidrug resistance: an
516	emerging crisis. Interdiscip Perspect Infect Dis. 2014, 541340.
517	https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/541340.
518	45. Shomuyiwa, D.O., Lucero-Prisno, D.E. 3 rd ., Manirambona, E., Suleman, M.H.,
519	Rayan, R.A., Huang, J., Zaw, T.N., Babatunde, Y., Denkyira, S.A., Musa, S.S.,
520	2022. Curbing antimicrobial resistance in post-Covid Africa: challenges, actions
521	and recommendations. Health Sci Rep. 5(5), e771.
522	https://doi.org/10.1002/hsr2.771.
523	46. Lobie, T.A., Roba, A.A., Booth, J.A., Kristiansen, K.I., Aseffa, A., Skarstad, K.,
524	Bjørås, M., 2021. Antimicrobial resistance: a challenge awaiting the post-Covid-
525	19 era. Int J Infect Dis. 111, 322-325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2021.09.003.
526	47. Nieuwlaat, R., Mbuagbaw, L., Mertz, D., Burrows, L.L., Bowdish, D.M.E., Moja,
527	L., Wright, G.D., Schünemann, H.J., 2021. Coronavirus disease 2019 and
528	antimicrobial resistance: parallel and interacting health emergencies. Clin Infect
529	Dis. 72(9), 1657-1659. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa773.

530	48. Lucien, M.A.B., Canarie, M.F., Kilgore, P.E., Jean-Denis, G., Fénélon, N., Pierre,
531	M., Cerpa, M., Joseph, G.A., Maki, G., Zervos, M.J., Dely, P., Boncy, J., Sati, H.,
532	Rio, A.D., Ramon-Pardo, P., 2021. Antibiotics and antimicrobial resistance in the
533	Covid-19 era: Perspective from resource-limited settings. Int J Infect Dis.104,
534	250-254. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jjid.2020.12.087.

535 **Figure legends**

536 Fig. 1 Overview of study. (A) Outcomes of patients with MDR-gram negative bacterial 537 pathogens. (B) Percentage overview of patients with MDR-gram negative bacterial 538 pathogens. (C) Distribution of MDR-gram negative bacterial pathogens in adult male, adult 539 female, and children (female). (D) Relative abundance of different MDR-gram negative 540 bacterial pathogens among all patient samples at the level of genus. (E) Identification of 541 specific and shared MDR-gram negative bacterial pathogens among the patient samples.

542 Fig. 2 Principal coordinate analysis and comparative overview of MGNB communities 543 identified in patients. (A) Analysis of MDR-gram negative bacterial pathogens diversity in 544 the patient samples collected in different, 2021, 2022, and 2023, years. MDR-gram negative 545 bacterial pathogens diversity in the patient samples using principal coordinate analysis 546 (PCoA-Bray-Kurtis index). (B) Comparative overview of MDR-gram negative bacterial 547 communities identified in patient samples of the Hospital-acquired infection (in this study), 548 de Souza GHA et al (2023), and Ruegsegger et al (2022).

549 **Table legends**

550 Table 1 | Representation and clinical traits in patients with hospital-acquired infections (HAI, 551 2021-2023).

552 Table 2| Predominance of MDR-gram negative bacterial pathogens from different sample 553 types of patients.

554 Table 3 Alpha-diversity indices and the estimated richness of MDR-gram negative bacterial

- 555 population in the patient samples.
- 556 Table 4 Comparative overview of MDR-gram negative bacterial populations identified in
- patients from investigation of de Souza GHA et al., 2023, Ruegsegger et al., 2022, and in this
- 558 study.

559 Supplementary material

- Fig. S1| Overview of MDR-gram negative bacterial pathogens collected from the genderwise patients.
- Fig. S2| Relative abundance of different MDR-gram negative bacterial pathogens among all
 patient samples at the level of species.

Fig. S3 Description of MDR-gram negative bacterial pathogens among the patient with comorbid condition collected in different, (A) 2021, (B) 2022, and (C) 2023, years from hospital.

Table S1 Antimicrobial susceptibility tests. Antimicrobial susceptibility tests of MGNB
pathogens collected from patient samples.

- 569 Table S2 Labeling of specific and shared MGNB communities among the patient samples
- 570 during Covid-19 and post-Covid-19 year. (A) Specific MGNB communities (specific and

shared) in patient samples. (B) Shared MGNB communities in patient samples.

572 **Table S3** Statistics of MGNB collected different years from the patient samples.

- 573 Table S4| Bray-Kurtis pairwise similarity and distance (dissimilarity) index of MGNB
- population among the patient samples collected in 2021, 2022, and 2023.

- 575 Table S5 Beta-diversity, Whittaker indexes, and pair-wise comparisons between the patient
- 576 samples based on MGNB populations.

577

- 578
- 579

580







Fig. 2



S. No.	Characteristic	Patients (N=100)
1	Age (range)	1 day - 98 years
2	Discharged	85 (85 %)
3	Death	5 (5 %)
4	Male (adult)	53 (53 %)
5	Female (adult)	38 (38 %)
6	Children (female)	9 (9 %)
7	Male ward	27 (27 %)
8	Female ward	25 (25 %)
9	Intensive care unit (ICU) admission	29 (29 %)
10	Outpatient department (OPD)	12 (12 %)
11	Pediatric ward	4 (4 %)
12	Neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) admission	1 (1 %)
13	Comorbidities	
a.	no comorbidities	18 (18 %)
b.	Urinary Tract Infection (UTI)	35 (35 %)
с.	Sepsis	16 (16 %)
d.	Foot gangrene	3 (3 %)
e.	Respiratory disease	2 (1 %)
f.	Cancer	1 (1 %)
g.	Hepatic disease	1 (1 %)
h.	Hepatic cyst	1 (1 %)
i.	Asthma	1 (1 %)
j.	Ischemic heart disease (IHD)	1 (1 %)
k.	Chronic kidney disease (CKD)	1 (1 %)
1.	Septic shock	1 (1 %)
m.	Post-compensatory anti-inflammatory response (CAR)	1 (1 %)
n.	Hyperthyroidism	1 (1 %)
0.	Osteoporosis	1 (1 %)
р.	Hemoperitoneum	1 (1 %)
q.	Multiple vessel	1 (1 %)
r.	Hypoxic-ischemic encephalopathy (HIE)	1 (1 %)
s.	Femur fracture	1 (1 %)

Table 1| Characteristics of hospital stay of patients with or without comorbidities, 2021-2023 (Covid-19/ or post Covid-19) period.

	not cer
ET	tifie:
3	d by
1	pee
1	g/10 er re
0	.11
0	
4	s the
	e au ts re
	thouse
evice used for the	243 Ved
	0,576 re≰6
	no h use
	allc
	rsio grar owe
	n pa d w
	itho
	erm
	a lic iissi
	00, 00,
	202 e to
	dis
	;pla
	y cor th

Table 21 Dominancy of MDR bacterial isolates from different types of patient's sample.

Urine

Pus

Isolates

Klebsiella pneumoniae

Pseudomonas aeruginosa

Escherichia coli

Citrobacter

Acinetobacter

Total

Note# Pus; A thick, whitish-yellow fluid of WBCs (white blood cells), cellular debris, and liquefied tissue. SWAB; a medical debris and liquefied tissue. collection of biological samples from the patient body. BAL; Bronchoalveolar lavage, ET; Endotracheal secretion.

SWAB

Sample types

Sputum

Stool

BAL

Sample name	Shannon	Simpson	Evenness	Brilloium	Fisher-alpha	Chao1	ACE	Observed species
2021 (Covid-19)	1.138	0.643	0.780	0.933	1.277	4	5.111	28
2022 (post Covid-19)	1.508	0.755	0.903	1.340	1.328	5	5.000	56
2023 (post Covid-19)	1.427	0.775	1.042	1.077	1.712	4	4.000	16
Total	4.073	2.173	2.725	3.350	4.317	13	14.111	100

Table 31 Alpha-diversity metrics of MDR bacterial population in the patient samples.

Table 4| Comparative synopsis of MDR bacteria observed in present study patient' samples (during Hospital stay), de Souza GHA et al., 2023, and Ruegsegger et al., 2022. (ND; Not determined).

S. No.	MDR microbes	Present study (%)	de Souza GHA et al., 2023, (%)	Ruegsegger et al., 2022, (%)
1	Pseudomonas	6.0	11.4	34.0
2	Klebsiella	40.0	40.0	14.0
3	Escherichia coli	28.0	2.8	7.0
4	Citrobacter	19.0	2.8	7.0
5	Acinetobacter	7.0	20.0	ND