

Pathological Role of Biofilm in Fungal Rhinosinusitis

Thesis

Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of Master Degree in **Otorhinolaryngology**

By

Hesham Yehia Falah

M.B.B.CH

Faculty of Medicine Misr University for Science & Technology

Supervised By

Prof. Dr. Waleed Farag Ezzat

Professor of Otorhinolaryngology Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Dr. Anas Mohamed Askoura

Lecturer of Otorhinolaryngology Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Dr. Ahmed Negm El-Shazly

Lecturer of Otorhinolaryngology
Faculty of Medicine Misr University for Science
& Technology

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University 2018



سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I feel always indebted to Allah the Most Beneficent and Merciful.

I wish to express my deepest thanks, gratitude and appreciation to Prof. Dr. Waleed Farag Ezzat, Professor of Otorhinolaryngology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his meticulous supervision, kind guidance, valuable instructions and generous help.

Special thanks are due to Dr. Anas Mohamed Askoura, Lecturer of Otorhinolaryngology, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his sincere efforts, fruitful encouragement.

I am deeply thankful to Dr. Ahmed Negm El-Shazly, Lecturer of Otorhinolaryngology, Faculty of Medicine, Misr University for Science & Technology, for his great help, outstanding support, active participation and guidance.

I wish to express my supreme gratitude to Dr. Yosef Shoukry Abdel All, Assistant Professor of Anatomy, Ain shams university, for his kind supervision, indispensable advice and great help in this work.

I would like to express my hearty thanks to all my family for their support till this work was completed.

Hesham Yehia Falah

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables	5
List of Figures	6
List of Abbreviations	8
Introduction	1 -
Aim of the Work	5
Review of Literature	
Fungal Rhinosinusitis	6
■ Biofilm	32
Biofilms and Fungal Rhinosinusitis	40
Patients and Methods	49
Results	62
Discussion	75
Conclusion	82
Recommendations	83
Summary	84
References	86
Arabic Summary	

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Comparison between study group control group according to main comp	•
Table (2):	Primary/ recurrent distribution of study group.	
Table (3):	Invasive/ non-invasive distribution study group.	
Table (4):	Invasive distribution of the study gro	up66
Table (5):	Comparison between primary recurrent according to all paramet the study group.	ers in
Table (6):	Comparison between invasive and invasive according to all parameters study group.	in the
Table (7):	Comparison between presence and a biofilm according to all parameters study group.	in the
Table (8):	Multivariable regression analysis f relation between biofilm with recu and invasive.	rrence

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 1: Figure 2:	Coronal enhanced CT of AFRS	ws the all with
Figure 3:	Endoscopic appearance of left m sinus filled with fungal material	axillary
Figure 4:	Unenhanced coronal CT scan showing maxillary fungal granuloma invading right orbit	ing the
Figure 5:	Chronic invasive fungal rhinosinusiti MRI T2 image shows fungal grainvading the left orbit	nuloma
Figure 6:	Left proptosis due to intraorbital exte GIFS.	
Figure 7:	Showing palatal necrosis and u uncontrolled diabetic male patient invasive fungal	t with
Figure 8:	Showing periorbital edema and chen presenting symptoms of cavernous thrombosis.	nosis as s sinus
Figure 9:	Coronal CT without contrast showing hyperattenuating soft tissue filling ethmoid air cells.	g mildly the left
Figure 10:	Schematic representation of biofiIm attachment, adhesion, aggregation, graturation and detachment	lifecycle rowth &
Figure 11:	Electron microscopy scanning photofrom frontal sinus mucosa in patie CRS.	o. It is nt with
Figure 12:	Automatic tissue processor (Leica EM	

List of Figures cont...

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 13:	Co ₂ critical point dryer (To Audosamdri-815)	
Figure 14:	Aluminum conducting tape	59
Figure 15:	Gold sputter coater (SPI-Module)	59
Figure 16:	Scanning electron microscopy JSM5500V)	
Figure 17:	Bar chart between study group and group according to main complain	
Figure 18:	Pie chart Primary/ recurrent distributhe study group	
Figure 19:	Bar chart Invasive/ non-invasive distraction of the study group	
Figure 20:	Bar chart Invasive distribution of th group.	=
Figure 21:	Bar chart between primary and re according to headache and biofilm	current
Figure 22:	Bar chart between primary and re according to complications	current
Figure 23:	Bar chart between primary and re according to biofilm.	current
Figure 24:	Bar chart between presence and a biofilm according to all recurrent	
Figure 25:	Bar chart between yes and no according to invasive.	biofilm
Figure 26:	Odds ratio between biofilm with rec	urrence

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
AFIFS	Acute fulminant invasive fungal sinusitis
<i>APRS</i>	Allergic fungal rhinosinusitis
BHI	Brain heart infusion
<i>BMP</i>	Bilateral nasal polypi
CLSM	Confocallaser scanning microscopy
CIFS	Chronic invasive fungal sinusitis
<i>C1</i>	Confedence interval
CRS	Chronic rhinosinusitis
CT scan	Computed topography
<i>EM</i>	Electron microscope
<i>ENT</i>	Ear, nose & throat
<i>EPS</i>	Extracellular polymeric substance
FESS	Functional endoscopic sinus surgery
FISH	Fluorescence in Situ Hybridization
G-CSF	Granulocyte colony-stimulating factor
<i>GERD</i>	Gastro -esophageal reflux disease
GIFS	Granulomatous invasive fungal rhinosinusitis
<i>GMS</i>	Modified Gomori Methenamine-Silver Nitrate Stain
HSE	Hematoxylin and eosin
MRI	Magnetic resonance imaging
OCT	Optical coherence tomography
<i>OSA</i>	Obstructive sleep apnea

List of Abbreviations cont...

Abb.	Full term
PAS	Periodic acid Schiff
	Polysaccharide intracellular adhesion
PNS	Paranasal sinus
ROC	Rhino-orbito-cerebral
S. aureus	Staphylococcus aureus
SD	Standard deviation
SE	Standard error
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscope
SFB	Sinus fungus ball
<i>TEM</i>	Transmission electron microscopy

ABSTRACT

Background: The first case of fungal sinusitis was reported in 1885. This fungal disease occurred rarely until the past decade, when a worldwide increase in its incidence occurred. Till one decade back bacteria was implicated as pathogen in most form of chronic rhinosinusitis (CRS). Fungi were thought to be responsible for few specific forms, sine 1999, when ponikau and associates claimed that fungi were responsible for nearly all cases of CRS. Their study demonstrated the presence of fungi & eosinophils from nose & paranasal sinuses from ~96 % cases of CRS. Aim of the Work: The aim of the work was to detect the presence of fungal biofilm, in patients with fungal sinusitis trying to find its role in recurrence of fungal sinus infection, resistance to medical treatment and occurrence of intra orbital and intracranial complications. Patients and **Methods:** The study consisted of 20 different cases of fungal sinusitis controlled by 10 cases of non fungal sinusitis. Control cases were divided into 5 cases of chronic sinusitis with nasal polyposis and 5 cases of deviated septum with no evidence of sinusitis undergoing nasal surgery. Results: Using statistical analysis, there was evidence of pressure of fungal biofilm in different cases of fungal sinusitis whether primary or recurrent, also whether invasive or non invasive. Comparing cases with controls, There was statistically significant difference between them as regard Biofilm (p-value: < 0.001) with incidence reaching (70 %) in cases while (0%) in controls. By applying risk analysis for biofilm, we used relative risk (p value = 0.0001) which is statistically significant indicating higher risk of positive biofilm in cases of fungal sinusitis, also by Using odds ratio (p value= 0.0002) which is statistically significant indicating higher risk of positive biofilm in cases of fungal sinusitis. Conclusion: The study showed the presence of fungal biofilm in different cases of fungal siunsitis whether primary or recurrent, also whether invasive or non invasive.

Keywords: Pathological Role, Fungal Rhinosinusitis, chronic rhinosinusitis

Introduction

The first case of fungal sinusitis was reported in 1885. This fungal disease occurred rarely until the past decade, when a worldwide increase in its incidence occurred (*Lund et al.*, 2000). Till one decade back bacteria was implicated as pathogen in most form of chronic rhinosinusitis (CRS). Fungi were thought to be responsible for few specific forms. Since 1999, when ponikau and associates claimed that fungi were responsible for nearly all cases of CRS. Their study demonstrated the presence of fungi & eosinophils from nose & paranasal sinuses from ~96 % cases of CRS (*Ponikau et al.*, 1999).

The biofilm confers considerable protection for the organisms including resistance to host defenses and antifungal treatments. It acts as a physical barrier between the embedded fungal cells and clinically useful antifungal agents, thus leading to ongoing colonization of fungi in the sinuses despite maximal treatment. Biofilm may allow for chronic persistence of fungi in the nose and sinuses and make treatments more difficult and make the efficacy of antifungal treatments questionable (*Ramage et al.*, 2012).

Biofilm is a three-dimensionally structured specialized community of adherent microorganisms surrounded by an extracellular polymeric substance (EPS). Biofilm communities in most environments including human disease, tend to be

1

polymicrobial. By including multiple bacterial and/or fungal species in a single community; biofilms obtain numerous advantages, such a passive resistance, metabolic cooperation, by-product influence, quorum sensing systems, an enlarged gene pool with efficient DNA sharing, and many other synergies, the more robust the biofilm is in terms of its survivability (*Wolcott et al.*, 2013).

Even though only a few reports are available about the role of biofilms in chronic rhinosinusitis, the evidence seems to be convincing that such a role exists. Why do some patients form biofilms, what triggers biofilm formation and how can we prevent them from forming are questions that need to be answered (*Ramadan*, 2006).

There is a growing body of evidence suggesting that fungal biofilm colonization of host surfaces may be an important factor in chronic disease in the absence of foreign bodies and fungal biofilms have been discovered on the sinonasal mucosa of CRS patients (*Healy et al.*, 2008).

Foreman and coworkers presented conclusive evidence that biofilms are present on the mucosa of chronic rhinosinusitis (CRS) patients. Less is known about the species constituting these biofilms. Staph.aureus was the most common biofilm-forming organism. Eleven out of 50 CRS patients had characteristic fungal biofilms present (*Foreman et al.*, 2009).

Fungi are increasingly recognized by their ability to adopt a biofilm phenotype both on live and abiotic surfaces. Much of the work in the fungal biofilm research has focused on Candida species involved in indwelling medical device infection (*Ramage et al.*, 2006). Although vast ranges of fungal species are isolated from CRS patients, Candida species are rarely seen (*Collins et al.*, 2003).

However, Aspergillus fumigatus, is a frequent sinonasal pathogen and is known to form biofilms on bronchial epithelium (*Seidler et al.*, 2008). Aspergilloma is a localized infection has been shown to consist of highly agglutinated hyphae encased in an extracellular matrix. A similar exopolysaccharide matrix is also produced at the surface of fungal hyphae during invasive pulmonary aspergillosis (*Loussert et al.*, 2010).

There is an apparent interaction and possible synergy between bacteria and fungi in biofilm development and survival. In a sheep model, bacteria appear to induce epithelial damage that promotes fungal biofilm formation by A.fumigatus. Co-inoculation of Staphylococcus aureus (S.aureus) and A. fumigatus into sheep sinuses resulted in 80% formation of biofilms versus 10% with A.fumigates inoculation alone (*Boase et al., 2013*).

Fungi belonging to the class zygomycetes and the order Mucorales, including Rhizopus, Rhizomucor, Mucor,

Lichtheimia, Apophysomyces, Cunninghamella and Saksenaea often cause opportunistic infections which are similar to those caused by Aspergillus and are characterized by Angio-invasion and fungal-ball formation. Mucormycosis is categorized into rhino-orbito-cerebral (ROC), pulmonary, gastrointestinal, cutaneous and disseminated types depending upon the clinical presentation and the anatomical sites involved. The incidence of mucormycosis has increased globally over the last decades, with a phenomenal rise in the number of cases reported from India (*Chakrabarti et al.*, 2009).

Singh and his colleagues study results revealed the biofilm-forming potential of Rhizopus oryzae, Lichtheimia corymbifera and Rhizomucor pusillus, but not Apophysomyces elegans. At appropriate seeding densities, theses fungi produced robust, highly intertwined, filamentous, adherent structures that were encased in an extra cellular matrix (*Singh et al.*, 2011).

Fungal biofilms are poorly understood compared with their bacterial counterparts and represent and expanding area of research, both within otorhinolaryngology and the wider microbiological community. The more the understanding of bacterial and fungal biofilms the more the etiopathogenesis of CRS will improve (*Foremen et al.*, 2009).

AIM OF THE WORK

This study aims to detect the presence of fungal biofilm in cases of fungal sinusitis through scanning by electron microscopy and trial of detection its role in:

- 1) Recurrence of fungal infection in different cases of fungal sinusitis.
- 2) Resistance to medical treatment
- 3) Development of complications in postoperative period