



**Biological Costs Paid**  
**by Uropathogenic *Escherichia coli***  
**as a Result of Developing Antimicrobial Resistance**

**A Thesis**

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the

**Master degree**

In

Pharmaceutical Sciences

**(Microbiology and Immunology)**

By

**Miran Yousri El Sayed El-Far**

Bachelor of Pharmaceutical Sciences,

Faculty of Pharmacy, Cairo University, 2006

**2013**



**Biological Costs Paid**  
**by Uropathogenic *Escherichia coli***  
**as a Result of Developing Antimicrobial Resistance**  
**A Thesis**

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the

**Master degree**

In

Pharmaceutical Sciences

**(Microbiology and Immunology)**

*By*

**Miran Yousri El Sayed El-Far**

Bachelor of Pharmaceutical Sciences,

Faculty of Pharmacy, Cairo University, 2006

*Under Supervision of*

**Prof. Dr. Osama Mohammad El Tayeb, PhD**

Professor of Microbiology and Immunology  
Faculty of Pharmacy, Cairo University

**Prof. Dr. Mohammad Mabrouk Aboulwafa, PhD**

Professor of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Pharmacy, Ain-Shams University, and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the National Organization for Research and Control of Biologicals

**2013**

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

*First, Special thanks to **Prof. Dr.Ossama Mohammad El-Tayeb**, Professor of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Pharmacy, Cairo University, for being my scientific god father, for his valuable appreciated scientific supervision, constructive advices and continuous guidance throughout the work.*

*Deep gratefulness to **Prof. Dr. Mohammad Mabrook Aboulwafa**, Professor of Microbiology and Immunology Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, Ain Shams University, and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the National Organization for Research and Control of Biologicals, for teaching me his scientific integrity, for his priceless efforts, his valuable scientific suggestions, very important advices and thorough revision of this thesis.*

*Thanks to **Dr. Mohammed M. Hafez**, lecturer of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Pharmacy, Ain Shams University for choosing the point and kindly shared with me some of his practical experience.*

*Special thanks to **Mr. Ahmad Abdel Maksoud**, Technician, Faculty of Pharmacy, Ahram Canadian University for his technical support in preparing media and tools for experimental works.*

*Thanks to all my **colleagues** and all **workers** in the Microbiology and Immunology Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, Ain Shams and Ahram Canadian Universities, for their help and support.*

*Thanking my **husband** and **son**, is not enough for their endless love which was translated into support and sacrifices.*

*All the love for; “**Mother, Father, Sister and Brother**”, for their encouragement which helped me much to concentrate on my study.*

*الحمد لله رب العالمين.....*

**Miran Yousri El-Far**

## **Abstract**

### **Biological Costs Paid by Uropathogenic *Escherichia coli* as a Result of Developing Amikacin Resistance**

*Miran Yousri El-Sayed El-Far*

Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of  
Pharmacy, Ahram Canadian University

It was found that a biological cost due to antimicrobial resistance may be exerted and affect virulence determinants and/or bacterial fitness. This phenomenon was detected in the present study for developed amikacin resistant *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) mutants using some measurable virulence factors as well fitness cost. Fifty-eight mutants were recovered from five selected uropathogenic *E. coli* isolates under stress of high amikacin concentrations. Determining the minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of the recovered mutants and their corresponding parent isolates by microdilution technique showed variable resistance levels to amikacin for the tested strains. There is no relationship between biological cost levels of mutants and their MIC values. About 12-27% of amikacin recovered mutants showed 2- >16 fold increase in MIC values over those of the corresponding parent isolates. Surprisingly, 6.8% of the tested mutants showed no fold increase in their MICs relative to the corresponding parent isolates. About 55% of the collected mutants showed lowered adherence (39.6-99.9% cost), while 64% of the mutants showed lowered abilities of *in vitro* biofilm formation (11.4-100% cost) and 50% of the mutants showed lowered abilities to secrete cell free hemolysins (12.8-100% cost), 2% of the mutants showed lowered invasiveness (18.6-99% cost), and 73% of the selected mutants showed lower cytotoxicity (22-57% cost), all when compared to the corresponding parent isolates. Five out of five mutants tested for their fitness cost showed lowered relative growth rates (0.19-0.92) compared to the corresponding parent isolates when grown separately in monocultures. Four out of five mutants tested for their fitness cost showed lowered competition index values (0.0002-0.03) compared to the corresponding parent isolates, after 4 hours of competition in mixed cultures. Seven out of fifteen mutants tested for their fitness cost showed lowered relative number of generations (0.65-0.92) compared to the corresponding parent isolates, after 10 days of competition in mixed cultures.

# Contents

Title	Page
<b>Introduction</b>	1
<b>Literature Review</b>	3
<b>1. Resistance</b>	5
1.1. Intrinsic resistance	6
1.2. Acquired resistance	7
1.2.1. Mutational resistance	8
1.2.2. Transmissible resistance	9
<b>2. Microbial factors affecting resistance development and stability</b>	10
2.1. Volume of drug use	10
2.2. Rate of formation of resistant mutants	12
2.3. The biological cost of resistance	13
2.3.1. Fitness cost	13
2.3.2. Virulence cost	15
2.4. Compensatory evolution	16
2.4.1. Chromosomal resistance	18
2.4.2. Plasmid resistance	19
<b>3. Virulence of uropathogenic <i>Escherichia coli</i></b>	19
3.1. Adherence to uroepithelial cells	20
3.2. Invasiveness into uroepithelial cells	23
3.3. Biofilm formation on and in urinary tissues	24
3.4. Cytotoxicity to uroepithelial cells	27
3.4.1. Hemolysins	27
3.4.2. Secreted autotransporter toxin (SAT)	27
3.4.3. Cytotoxic necrotizing factor (CNF)	28
3.4.4. Cytotoxic necrotizing factor (CNF)	28
<b>4. Prevalence of antimicrobial resistance among uropathogens</b>	29
4.1. Bacterial resistance to antibiotics	30
4.2. Antibiotic regimens	31
4.3. Antibiotics used specifically for most UTIs	32
4.4. Resistance of UPEC to used antibiotics	33
<b>5. Biological costs of UPEC resistance</b>	35
<b>6. Mechanisms of bacterial resistance to aminoglycosides</b>	37
<b>Materials and Methods</b>	39
<b>1. Microorganisms</b>	39
<b>2. Cell line</b>	39
<b>3. Chemicals</b>	39
<b>4. Media</b>	41
4.1. Ready made media	41
4.2. Blood agar	41
4.3. Tissue culture media	41
4.3.1. Eagles Minimum Essential Medium with Earl's balanced salts (MEM Earl's)	41

<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>5. Buffers and solutions</b>	43
5.1. Phosphate buffered saline (PBS)	43
5.2. Mammalian cell lysis solution	44
5.3. Gentamicin solution	44
5.4. Crystal violet solution	44
5.5. MTT solution	45
5.6. Bouin's fixative solution	45
<b>6. Microtiter plates</b>	45
<b>7. Isolation and maintenance of clinical isolates</b>	45
<b>8. Identification of the selected isolates</b>	46
<b>9. Recovery of amikacin resistant mutants</b>	46
9.1. Preparation of bacterial cell inoculum for mutation	46
9.2. Treatment with amikacin	47
<b>10. Long term preservation of microorganisms</b>	47
<b>11. Measurement of bacterial growth</b>	47
<b>12. Antimicrobial susceptibility testing profiles against four members of aminoglycosides</b>	48
12.1. Preparation of the tested bacterial inoculum	48
12.2. Disc agar diffusion assay	48
<b>13. Determination of minimum inhibitory concentration</b>	49
13.1. Preparation of the tested bacterial inoculum	49
13.2. Broth microdilution assay	49
<b>14. Studying the effect of antimicrobial resistance development on some virulence determinants</b>	50
14.1. Determination of bacterial adherence and invasiveness to <i>Vero</i> cells	50
14.1.1. Preparation of the tested bacterial inoculum	50
14.1.2. Adherence and invasiveness assays	50
14.2. Determination of biofilm formation	51
14.3. Determination of bacterial cytotoxicity to <i>Vero</i> cells	52
14.3.1. MTT cytotoxicity assay	52
14.3.2. Crystal violet cytotoxicity assay	53
14.4. Studying the hemolytic activity of the parent and mutant isolates	54
14.4.1. Preliminary assessment	54
14.4.2. Calibration curve of erythrocyte count	54
14.4.3. Assay procedure	55
14.5. Intracellular survival of bacterial cells	56
14.5.1. Uptake of tested isolates and mutants by <i>Vero</i> cells	57
14.5.2. Fate of intracellular bacterial cells	57
<b>15. Studying the effect of antimicrobial resistance on bacterial fitness</b>	57
15.1. Experimental estimation of fitness cost	58
15.1.1. Monocultures	58
15.1.2. Determination of bacterial fitness by competition of resistant mutant and its corresponding sensitive parent	59

Title	Page
15.1.2.1. By determining competition index of resistant mutant and its corresponding sensitive parent in mixed culture	59
15.1.2.2. By determining the ratio of number of generations of resistant mutant to its corresponding sensitive parent in a mixed culture	59
<b>Results</b>	61
1. Recovery of microorganisms from clinical specimens	61
2. Identification of the selected isolates	61
3. Recovery of amikacin resistant mutants	61
4. Antimicrobial susceptibility of parent/mutants against four members of aminoglycosides	62
5. Minimum inhibitory concentrations of amikacin for the <i>E. coli</i> parent isolates and their recovered mutants	65
6. Effect of developed resistance to amikacin on some bacterial virulence determinants	67
6.1. Effect on bacterial adherence and invasiveness to <i>Vero</i> cells	67
6.2. Effect on bacterial biofilm formation	74
6.3. Effect on bacterial cytotoxicity to <i>Vero</i> cells	76
6.3.1. As determined by MTT assay	76
6.3.2. As determined by crystal violet cytotoxicity assay	78
6.3.3. Comparison between cytotoxicity measurements using MTT and crystal violet cytotoxicity assay	80
6.4. Effect on bacterial hemolytic activity	82
6.5. Effect on bacterial intracellular survival within <i>Vero</i> cells	90
7. Effect of developed resistance to amikacin on bacterial fitness	96
7.1. As determined by measuring growth rates in monocultures	96
7.2. As determined by measuring competitive performance in co-cultures	99
<b>Discussion</b>	109
1. Effect of developed resistance to amikacin on bacterial adherence and invasiveness to <i>Vero</i> cells.	114
2. Effect of developed resistance to amikacin on bacterial <i>in vitro</i> biofilm formation.	118
3. Effect of developed resistance to amikacin on bacterial hemolytic activities.	122
4. Effect of developed resistance to amikacin on bacterial cytotoxicity to <i>Vero</i> cells.	126
5. Effect of developed resistance to amikacin on bacterial intracellular survival in <i>Vero</i> cells.	134
6. Effect of induced resistance under influence of high amikacin concentrations on bacterial fitness.	135
<b>Limitations discovered during conducting study</b>	140
<b>Conclusions</b>	141

<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Summary</b>	143
<b>References</b>	149



# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure no.	Title	Page
1	Calibration Curve between RBC's count and the amount of hemoglobin released due to hemolysis expressed in terms of absorbance.	54
2	Adherence and invasiveness profiles of <i>E. coli</i> parent isolate E5 and its twelve spontaneous amikacin resistant mutants to <i>Vero</i> cells.	68
3	Adherence and invasiveness profiles of <i>E. coli</i> parent isolate E6 and its eleven spontaneous amikacin resistant mutants to <i>Vero</i> cells.	69
4	Adherence and invasiveness profiles of <i>E. coli</i> parent isolate E7 and its nine spontaneous amikacin resistant mutants to <i>Vero</i> cells.	70
5	Adherence and invasiveness profiles of <i>E. coli</i> parent isolate E8 and its fourteen spontaneous amikacin resistant mutants to <i>Vero</i> cells.	71
6	Adherence and invasiveness profiles of <i>E. coli</i> parent isolate E10 and its twelve spontaneous amikacin resistant mutants to <i>Vero</i> cells.	72
7	Biofilm formation profiles of the five tested <i>E. coli</i> parent isolates (E5, E6, E7, E8 and E10) and their corresponding amikacin resistant mutants.	74
8	Cytotoxicity of the five tested <i>E. coli</i> parent isolates (E5, E6, E7, E8 and E10) and their corresponding amikacin resistant mutants.	76
9	Cytotoxicity profiles of the five tested <i>E. coli</i> parent isolates (E5, E6, E7, E8 and E10) and their corresponding amikacin resistant mutants using crystal violet cytotoxicity assay.	78
10	Comparison between cytotoxicity measurements using MTT and crystal violet cytotoxicity assays for the five <i>E. coli</i> parent isolates and their corresponding selected amikacin resistant mutants.	80
11A	Hemolytic activity of bacterial culture filtrate and culture spent free-bacterial cells suspended in PBS of the parent isolate E5 and its twelve amikacin resistant mutants grown for 4 hours.	83
11B	Hemolytic activity of bacterial culture filtrate and culture spent free-bacterial cells suspended in PBS of the parent isolate E6 and its eleven amikacin resistant mutants grown for 4 hours.	83
11C	Hemolytic activity of bacterial culture filtrate and culture spent free-bacterial cells suspended in PBS of the parent isolate E7 and its nine amikacin resistant mutants grown for 4 hours.	84

Figure no.	Title	Page
11D	Hemolytic activity of bacterial culture filtrate and culture spent free-bacterial cells suspended in PBS of the parent isolate E8 and its fourteen amikacin resistant mutants grown for 4 hours.	84
11E	Hemolytic activity of bacterial culture filtrate and culture spent free-bacterial cells suspended in PBS of the parent isolate E10 and its twelve amikacin resistant mutants grown for 4 hours.	85
12A	Hemolytic activity of bacterial culture filtrate and culture spent free-bacterial cells suspended in PBS of the parent isolate E5 and its twelve amikacin resistant mutants grown for 24 hours.	86
12B	Hemolytic activity of bacterial culture filtrate and culture spent free-bacterial cells suspended in PBS of the parent isolate E6 and its eleven amikacin resistant mutants grown for 24 hours.	86
12C	Hemolytic activity of bacterial culture filtrate and culture spent free-bacterial cells suspended in PBS of the parent isolate E7 and its nine amikacin resistant mutants grown for 24 hours.	87
12D	Hemolytic activity of bacterial culture filtrate and culture spent free-bacterial cells suspended in PBS of the parent isolate E8 and its fourteen amikacin resistant mutants grown for 24 hours.	87
12E	Hemolytic activity of bacterial culture filtrate and culture spent free-bacterial cells suspended in PBS of the parent isolate E10 and its twelve amikacin resistant mutants grown for 24 hours.	88
13	Bacterial cells uptake by <i>Vero</i> cells of the five <i>E. coli</i> parent isolates and their corresponding selected amikacin resistant mutants at different time intervals of post-infection.	90
14	Intracellular survival levels of the five <i>E. coli</i> isolates and their corresponding selected amikacin resistant mutants within <i>Vero</i> cells when measured at different time intervals after invasion.	92
15	Total bacterial count associated to <i>Vero</i> cells of <i>E. coli</i> parent isolates and their corresponding selected amikacin resistant mutants at different time intervals of infection.	94
16	Time course of growth of the five <i>E. coli</i> parent isolates and their corresponding selected amikacin resistant mutants in monocultures (EM5.7, EM6.8, EM7.1, EM8.4 and EM10.12).	96

<b>Figure no.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
17	Time course profiles of growth of the five <i>E. coli</i> parent isolates and their corresponding tested amikacin resistant mutants in co-cultures(EM5.7, EM6.8, EM7.1, EM8.4 and EM10.12).	99
18	Number of generations (G) profiles of <i>E. coli</i> parent isolate E5 and its selected amikacin resistant mutants EM5.2, EM5.3 and EM5.7 in mixed cultures of each mutant with the parent. *The mixed culture for each mutant with the parent was successively subcultured daily over the period of 10 days.	102
19	Number of generations (G) profiles of <i>E. coli</i> parent isolate E6 and its selected amikacin resistant mutants EM6.1, EM6.4 and EM6.8 in mixed cultures of each mutant with the parent. *The mixed culture for each mutant with the parent was successively subcultured daily over the period of 10 days.	103
20	Number of generations (G) profiles of <i>E. coli</i> parent isolate E7 and its selected amikacin resistant mutants EM7.1, EM7.2 and EM7.7 in mixed cultures of each mutant with the parent. *The mixed culture for each mutant with the parent was successively subcultured daily over the period of 10 days.	104
21	Number of generations (G) profiles of <i>E. coli</i> parent isolate E8 and its selected amikacin resistant mutants EM8.2, EM8.4 and EM8.7 in mixed cultures of each mutant with the parent. *The mixed culture for each mutant with the parent was successively subcultured daily over the period of 10 days.	105
22	Number of generations (G) profiles of <i>E. coli</i> parent isolate E10 and its selected amikacin resistant mutants EM10.10, EM10.11 and EM10.12 in mixed cultures of each mutant with the parent. *The mixed culture for each mutant with the parent was successively subcultured daily over the period of 10 days.	106

# LIST OF TABLES

Table no.	Title	Page
1	Names and sources of different chemicals used in the present study	38
2	Susceptibility profiles of parent isolates and their corresponding recovered mutants for amikacin, gentamicin, streptomycin and neomycin.	61
3	MICs of amikacin against <i>E.coli</i> parent isolates and their corresponding amikacin resistant mutants as determined by broth microdilution method.	64
4	Relative resistance to amikacin of recovered mutants in comparison to their corresponding parent isolates.	65
5	Qualitative detection of hemolytic activity of the five parent isolates and their corresponding amikacin resistant mutants as determined on blood agar plates.	81
6	Growth rates of the five <i>E. coli</i> parent isolates and their corresponding selected amikacin resistant mutants, when grown in monocultures.	97
7	Competition indices of parent isolates and their corresponding tested amikacin resistant mutants at different time intervals in co-cultures.	100
8	Relative fitness values of the five parent isolates and their corresponding selected amikacin resistant mutants in individual mixed cultures of tested mutants and parent isolates at different time intervals.	107
9	Comparison of adherence and invasiveness of amikacin resistant mutants relative to their corresponding parent isolates.	114
10	Comparison of mutant/parent ratios of MIC values, adherence and invasiveness for amikacin resistant mutants.	115
11	Comparison of mutant/parent ratios of adherence, invasiveness and biofilm formation for amikacin resistant mutants.	118
12	Comparison of mutant/parent ratios of MIC values and biofilm formation for amikacin resistant mutants.	119
13	Comparison of mutant/parent ratios of adherence, invasiveness, biofilm formation and hemolytic activity for amikacin resistant mutants.	122
14	Comparison of mutant/parent ratios of MIC values and hemolytic activities for amikacin resistant mutants.	123
15	Comparison of mutant/parent ratios of different virulence determinants* for amikacin resistant mutants.	131

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Definition
ABU	Asymptomatic bacteruria
BMD	Broth microdilution method
CDT	Cytolethal distended toxin
cfu	Colony forming unit
C.I	Competition index
CI	Cytotoxicity index
CLSI	Clinical and laboratory standards institute
CNF-1	Cytotoxic necrotizing factor-1
CV	Crystal violet
D.S	Double strength
E	<i>E. coli</i> parent isolate
EM	<i>E. coli</i> mutant recovered from parent isolate
EMB	Eosin-methylene blue
EUCAST	European committee for antimicrobial susceptibility testing
ESCMID	European society of clinical microbiology and infectious diseases
G	Number of generations
HICPAC	Hospital infection control practices advisory committee
HlyA	Alpha hemolysin
MEM EARL'S	Earls minimum essential medium
MIC	Minimum inhibitory concentration
MOI	Multiplicity of infection
MTT	3-(4,5-Dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide
OD	Optical density
PAIs	Pathogenicity islands
PBS	Phosphate buffered saline
Rpm	Revolution per minute
SAT	Secreted autotransporter toxin
TC	Tissue culture
TCP	Toll domain containing protein
TIR	Toll/interleukin receptor
TMP-SMX	Trimethoprim-sulfamthoxazole
TSB	Tryptic soy broth
UPEC	Uropathogenic <i>Escherichia coli</i>
UTI	Urinary tract infection
VACSERA	The holding company for biological products and vaccines
VF <sub>s</sub>	Virulence factors
WHO	World health organization

# INTRODUCTION

# INTRODUCTION

The excessive use of antimicrobial agents for therapy causes our relationship with microorganisms to be worse more and more. As most pathogenic microbes acquire resistance and many costs should be paid as a result of this bad relationship. The patient will pay one of these costs by consequent suffering poor prognosis, high mortality, and length of hospital stay. The patient, in addition will pay economic burdens due to extra need for procedures, newer medications and imaging (Niederman, 2001). Also, the health care system will suffer an economic crisis due to utilization of other infection control measures like vaccines and other measures. This will lead to more costs for the development of new drugs since drug choices for common infections will increasingly become limited and expensive (Cosgrove, 2006).

It is obvious that this bad relationship is in favor of microorganisms. But hope started to show up recently, when it is found that microbes pay cost to antimicrobial resistance too (Andersson and Levin, 1999, Bjorkman and Andersson, 2000). Since then a new concept emerges which is the biological cost of antimicrobial resistance.

In general, acquisition of bacterial resistance occurs via mutation in chromosomal loci or horizontal transfer of mobile genetics like plasmids. Mechanisms of action of most antimicrobials target majority of metabolic elements e.g. the ribosome, DNA gyrase, cell wall, etc. which are essential for bacterial growth. So any mutation in these genes for antibiotic resistance may incur deleterious effects on vital physiological processes in microorganisms (Normark and Normark, 2002). Either plasmid or chromosomal conferred resistances, both make the bacteria pay a biological cost through carrying loss in fitness and/ or virulence even in the absence of antibiotic selection pressure. The reasons for that loss are not fully understood (Andersson and Levin, 1999).

Fitness cost is defined as reduced growth rate of resistant bacteria in host and environment as well, also reduced transmission between hosts and increased clearance from infected host. It is measured by laboratory experiments in culture media or animal models.

Virulence is another important characteristic of pathogens associated with their fitness, any decrease in the potential of a microbe to cause disease is considered resistance cost (Andersson and Levin, 1999).

What makes the phenomenon of biological cost not universal (Andersson, 2006) is that microbes are refusing to bear cost for being resistant against the enemy. This paid cost can be