

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 Ojha¹□, Dwight Figueiredo¹, Shabnum Khan¹

5 ¹Symbiosis 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
19 Shannon and Simpson index values of 1.138 to 1.508 and 0.643 to 0.775, respectively and an
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

24 %), *E. coli* (28 %), and *Citrobacter* (19 %), populations were higher in this study. We
25 observed that Gamma-proteobacteria were predominant across all the recovered samples, and
26 that *Acinetobacter* and *Klebsiella* isolated from the samples were 100 % resistant to twenty
27 and eleven antibiotics, respectively. Furthermore, the fatality rate was low compared with the
28 available reports suggesting possibilities for effective recovery if given rapid and tailored
29 treatment. Given the challenges faced by MDRB strains more surveillance and tracking is
30 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*

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

72 theatres, ICUs, NICUs, Wards, OPDs. During Covid-19 (Coronavirus disease-2019), the
73 hospital ran with specialized wards assigned to Covid-19-positive patients. The standard
74 infection control measures (PPE, personal protective equipment) and sterilization protocols
75 ([https://www.england.nhs.uk/national-infection-prevention-and-control-manual-nipcm-for-](https://www.england.nhs.uk/national-infection-prevention-and-control-manual-nipcm-for-england/chapter-1-standard-infection-control-precautions-sicps/)
76 [england/chapter-1-standard-infection-control-precautions-sicps/](https://www.england.nhs.uk/national-infection-prevention-and-control-manual-nipcm-for-england/chapter-1-standard-infection-control-precautions-sicps/)) were followed to prevent
77 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*

92 Microbial isolates were determined by applying the BD Phoenix Automated Microbiology
93 System (USA) and Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion technique (Clinical and Laboratory Standards
94 Institute, 2006.). The protocol detailed, by Carroll et al. (2006) and Hudzicki (2009), were
95 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*

108 Descriptive statistics were used for categorised variables and expressed in terms of per cent
109 frequency. The normal distribution and diversity (alpha and beta) index were applied to
110 determine the variations in MDR-microbial populations between MDR patient samples
111 (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*

114 One hundred patients aged one day to 98 years were included (data not shown). Eighty-five
115 patients (out of 100 patients) were treated successfully and discharged (**Table 1**, data not
116 shown), five patients (out of 100 patients) died (**Table 1**) in the hospital, and there was no
117 clarity in the reporting of 10 patients' data whether they discharged or died. Fifty-three
118 patients (53 %), 38 patients (38 %), and nine patients (9 %) were male, female, and child
119 (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,
135 MDR-*Klebsiella pneumoniae* was predominant in urine samples (**Table 2**).

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/sulbactam-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 ceftazidime avibactam-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

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

171 In 100 MGNB isolates, Pseudomonadota was noticed as the dominant phylum among
172 the patient samples. Pseudomonadota alone shared 28, 56, and 16 of the total MGNB isolates
173 in the patient samples collected in 2021, 2022, and 2023, respectively (**Fig. 1B**). The
174 dominant MGNB isolates belonging to Gammaproteobacteria among the patient samples
175 (**Fig. 1D**) depicted the genera *E. coli* (28 % isolates), *Citrobacter* sp. (19 % isolates), *K.*
176 *pneumoniae* (40 % isolates), *P. aeruginosa* (7 % isolates), and *Acinetobacter* sp. (7 %
177 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-](http://bioinformatics.psb.ugent.be/cgi-bin/liste/Venn/calculate_venn.html)
181 [bin/liste/Venn/calculate_venn.html](http://bioinformatics.psb.ugent.be/cgi-bin/liste/Venn/calculate_venn.html)) (**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
184 *Acinetobacter* sp. were shared between only two patient (2021 and 2022) and (2022 and
185 2023) samples, respectively (**Fig. 1E, Table S2**).

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

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

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

199 *K. pneumoniae*, *E. coli*, *Citrobacter* sp., and *Acinetobacter* sp. were observed in the
200 patient (with comorbid medical conditions) samples collected in 2023 (**Fig. S3C**). *E. coli* (in
201 UTI) was highest among the patient (with comorbid) samples (**Fig. S3C**), while *K.*
202 *pneumoniae* (in sepsis and multiple vessels), *Acinetobacter* sp. (in UTI and in HIE) had the
203 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**).

234 *3.7. Comparison of MGNB populations between de Souza GHA et al. (2023), Ruegsegger et* 235 *al. (2022), and in the present study*

236 In an effort to understand and correlate the MGNB populations of the present study bacterial
237 communities with that present in the study of de Souza GHA et al. (2023), and Ruegsegger et
238 al. (2022) (**Fig. 2B, Table 4**). *Pseudomonas* sp. and *Klebsiell* sp. were revealed at 6.0 and
239 40.0 %, respectively, in the present study, while in the de Souza GHA et al. (2023), they were
240 noted at 11.4 and 40.0 % (**Fig. 2B, Table 4**). Further, *E. coli* and *Citrobacter* sp. were

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

245 *Pseudomonas* sp. and *Klebsiella* sp. were present at 6.0 and 40.0 %, respectively, in the
246 present study, while Ruegsegger et al. (2023), reported 34.0 and 14.0 %, respectively (**Fig.**
247 **2B, Table 4**). Further, *E. coli* and *Citrobacter* sp. were present at 28.0 and 19.0 %, ,
248 respectively, in the present study, while Ruegsegger et al. (2023) reported 7.0 and 7.0 %, ,
249 respectively (**Fig. 2B, Table 4**). Furthermore, *Acinetobacter* sp. was present at 7.0 %, in the
250 present study, while in the Ruegsegger et al. (2023) study, they were not reported (**Fig. 2B,**
251 **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).

265 ICU-MDR percentages are maximum than in other hospital wards (**Table 1**) due to the
266 multiple associations between the patient's underlying medical conditions, hospital ward
267 type, LOS (length of stay), and employment of various invasive tools (Erbay et al., 2003;
268 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
286 (Ramírez-Soto et al., 2021; Bwire, 2020). Nevertheless, this is yet to be elucidated.

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

289 resistant against eleven antibiotics (**Table S1**). All these five different bacterial species (**Table**
290 **S1**) were resistant to numerous antimicrobial agents, which gives them the title of multidrug-
291 resistant bacteria ([Giannitsioti et al., 2022](#)). Surprisingly antibacterial resistance, in this study,
292 is related to a decrease in the mortality rate compared with the previous study ([Tanwar et al.,](#)
293 [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**

308 In conclusion, outcomes achieved from the present investigation revealed that MDR-
309 microbes present in patients are predominantly elements of the gamma-proteobacteria.
310 Antibacterial resistance has an important impact on therapeutics and the outcome of bacterial
311 infection. In this study, five gram-negative bacteria, *K. pneumoniae*, *E. coli*, *Citrobacter* sp.,
312 *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.
325 All sequence data is added to manuscript as supplementary files (named as Figure S1 to S3,
326 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**

332 A.O. made substantial contributions to conception, was involved in analysis & interpretation
333 of data, writing, revising and drafting the manuscript, and given final approval of the version
334 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.
- 349 2. Hernando-Amado, S., Coque, T.M., Baquero, F., Martínez, J.L., 2019. Defining
350 and combating antibiotic resistance from one health and global health
351 perspectives. *Nat Microbiol*. 4(9), 1432-1442. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-019-0503-9)
352 [019-0503-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-019-0503-9).
- 353 3. Klein, E.Y., Van Boeckel, T.P., Martinez, E.M., Pant, S., Gandra, S., Levin, S.A.,
354 Goossens, H., Laxminarayan, R., 2018. Global increase and geographic
355 convergence in antibiotic consumption between 2000 and 2015. *Proc Natl Acad*
356 *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-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-022-01184-y)
368 [01184-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-022-01184-y).
- 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/](https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.119.2_suppl.397s)
371 [10.1378/chest.119.2_suppl.397s](https://doi.org/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.,
383 2009. An epidemiological survey of TYLCD in southern Sardinia (Italy).
384 *Commun Agric Appl Biol Sci.* 74(3), 831-841. [PMID 20222569](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20222569/).
- 385 10. Jindal, A.K., Pandya, K., Khan, I.D., 2015. Antimicrobial resistance: a public
386 health challenge. *Med J Armed Forces India.* 71(2), 178-181.
387 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mjafi.2014.04.011>.
- 388 11. Dogru, A., Sargin, F., Celik, M., Sagioglu, A.E., Goksel, M.M., Sayhan, H., 2010.
389 The rate of device-associated nosocomial infections in a medical surgical
390 intensive care unit of a training and research hospital in Turkey: one-year
391 outcomes. *Jpn J Infect Dis.* 63(2), 95-98. [PMID 20332569](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20332569/).
- 392 12. Teng, S.O., Lee, W.S., Ou, T.Y., Hsieh, Y.C., Lee, W.C., Lin, Y.C., 2009. Bacterial
393 contamination of patients' medical charts in a surgical ward and the intensive care
394 unit: impact on nosocomial infections. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect.* 42(1), 86-91.
395 [PMID 19424563](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19424563/).
- 396 13. Dettenkofer, M., Ebner, W., Els, T., Babikir, R., Lucking, C., Pelz, K., Rüden, H.,
397 Daschner, F., 2001. Surveillance of nosocomial infections in a neurology intensive
398 care unit. *J Neurol.* 248(11), 959-964. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004150170048>.
- 399 14. Ylipalosaari, P., Ala-Kokko, T.I., Laurila, J., Ohtonen, P., Syrjälä, H., 2006.
400 Intensive care acquired infection is an independent risk factor for hospital
401 mortality: a prospective cohort study. *Crit Care.* 10(2), R66.
402 <https://doi.org/10.1186/cc4902>.
- 403 15. Weinstein, R.A., 1998. Nosocomial infection update. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 4(3), 416-
404 420. <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.

- 407 The healthcare costs of antimicrobial resistance in Lebanon: a multi-centre
408 prospective cohort study from the payer perspective. *BMC Infect Dis.* 21(1), 404.
409 <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>.
- 414 18. Montassier, E., Batard, E., Gastinne, T., Potel, G., de La Cochetière, M.F., 2013.
415 Recent changes in bacteremia in patients with cancer: a systematic review of
416 epidemiology and antibiotic resistance. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis.* 32(7),
417 841-850. <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-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s15010-005-3186-5)
422 5.
- 423 20. Horan, T.C., Andrus, M., Dudeck, M.A., 2008. CDC/NHSN surveillance
424 definition of health care-associated infection and criteria for specific types of
425 infections in the acute care setting. *Am J Infect Control.* 36(5), 309-332.
426 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2008.03.002>. Erratum in: *Am J Infect Control.* 36(9),
427 655. 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,
443 F., Marshall, S.H., Rudin, S.D., Yen, K., Chu, T., Chen, L., Sozzi, E., Bartelt, L.,
444 Kreiswirth, B., Bonomo, R.A., van Duin, D., 2022. Multidrug-resistant gram-
445 negative bacteria in burn patients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 66(9),
446 e0068822. <https://doi.org/10.1128/aac.00688-22>.
- 447 27. Oliveira, J., Reygaert, W.C., 2022. Gram-negative bacteria. In: *StatPearls*
448 [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing. PMID 30855801.
- 449 28. Peterson, J.W., 1996. Bacterial pathogenesis. In: Baron S, editor. *Medical*
450 *Microbiology*. 4th ed. Galveston (TX): University of Texas Medical Branch at
451 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.,
459 2003. Nosocomial infections in intensive care unit in a Turkish university hospital:
460 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), 14-
464 17, <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjaceaccp/mki006>.
- 465 33. Vincent, J.L., Rello, J., Marshall, J., Silva, E., Anzueto, A., Martin, C.D., Moreno,
466 R., Lipman, J., Gomersall, C., Sakr, Y., Reinhart, K., 2009. EPIC II group of
467 investigators. International study of the prevalence and outcomes of infection in
468 intensive care units. *JAMA.* 302(21), 2323-2329.
469 <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>.
- 475 35. Boorgula, S.Y., Yelamanchili, S., Kottapalli, P., Naga, M.D., 2022. An update on
476 secondary bacterial and fungal infections and their antimicrobial resistance pattern
477 (AMR) in Covid-19 confirmed patients. *J Lab Physicians.* 14(3), 260-264.
478 <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/S0140-6736\(20\)30633-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30633-4).
- 485
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.,
492 Khadanga, S., Bhattacharya, S., Mukherjee, S., Baveja, S., Sistla, S., Panda, S.,
493 Walia, K., 2021. Secondary infections in hospitalized Covid-19 patients: Indian
494 experience. Infect Drug Resist. 14, 1893-1903.
495 <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 co-
498 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>.
- 500 41. Ramírez-Soto, M.C., Arroyo-Hernández, H., Ortega-Cáceres, G., 2021. Sex
501 differences in the incidence, mortality, and fatality of Covid-19 in Peru. PLoS
502 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/s42399-020-00341-w>.
- 505

- 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. 3rd., 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.ijid.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
557 patients from investigation of de Souza GHA et al., 2023, Ruegsegger et al., 2022, and in this
558 study.

559 **Supplementary material**

560 **Fig. S1**| Overview of MDR-gram negative bacterial pathogens collected from the gender
561 wise patients.

562 **Fig. S2**| Relative abundance of different MDR-gram negative bacterial pathogens among all
563 patient samples at the level of species.

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

567 **Table S1**| Antimicrobial susceptibility tests. Antimicrobial susceptibility tests of MGNB
568 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
571 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
574 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. 1


A




B



C



D



E





Fig. 2

A



B




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

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 %)
c.	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 %)
l.	Septic shock	1 (1 %)
m.	Post-compensatory anti-inflammatory response (CAR)	1 (1 %)
n.	Hyperthyroidism	1 (1 %)
o.	Osteoporosis	1 (1 %)
p.	Hemoperitoneum	1 (1 %)
q.	Multiple vessel	1 (1 %)
r.	Hypoxic-ischemic encephalopathy (HIE)	1 (1 %)
s.	Femur fracture	1 (1 %)

Table 2| Dominancy of MDR bacterial isolates from different types of patient's sample.

Isolates	Sample types						
	Pus	Urine	SWAB	Sputum	Stool	BAL	ET
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	7	20	3	2	2	2	3
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	2	18	4	1	0	0	1
<i>Citrobacter</i>	2	16	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	1	6	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Acinetobacter</i>	2	1	2	1	0	1	0
Total	14	61	9	4	2	3	4

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

Table 3| Alpha-diversity metrics of MDR bacterial population in the patient samples.

Sample name	Shannon	Simpson	Evenness	Brilloom	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 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	<i>Pseudomonas</i>	6.0	11.4	34.0
2	<i>Klebsiella</i>	40.0	40.0	14.0
3	<i>Escherichia coli</i>	28.0	2.8	7.0
4	<i>Citrobacter</i>	19.0	2.8	7.0
5	<i>Acinetobacter</i>	7.0	20.0	ND