DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.25130/mjotu.28.2.3





ISSN: 1813-1638

## The Medical Journal of Tikrit University

Available online at:<u>www.mjotu.com</u>

MJTU

The Medical Journal of Tikrit University

# Bacteriological study of diarrheal cases in children under 5 years in the Tikrit city

Ala'a A. Jameel<sup>(1)</sup>; Khalid O. Mohammed Ali<sup>(2)</sup>; Ahmed H. Abdlghafoor<sup>(3)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup> Tikrit University; <sup>(2)(3)</sup> Tikrit Medical College

Keywords:

Diarrhea, disc method, Tikrit.

#### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received	09 Aug 2017
Accepted	03 Oct 2017
Available online	31 Sep 2022

© 2022 TIKRIT UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE OF MEDICINE (TUCOM). THIS IS AN OPEN ACCESS ARTICLE UNDER THE CC BY LICENSE

http://tikrit-medicine.tripod.com/ id10.html



**Citation:** Ala'a A. Jameel; Khalid O. Mohammed Ali; Ahmed H. Abdlghafoor. Bacteriological study of diarrheal cases in children under 5 years in the Tikrit city. The Medical Journal of Tikrit University (2022) 28 (2): 30-44

DOI: <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.25130/mjotu.28.2.3</u>

#### ABSTRACT

Diarrheal disease is common among children worldwide, especially developing countries, and common causes of mortality in children under the age of five. One hundred and fifty stool samples were collected from children with diarrhea below five years from the beginning of August 2016 until the end of December 2016. The prevalence of diarrhea was different among males and females: 47.11% of males were collected, while 52.88% of bacterial females. The study revealed that 104 isolates were identified from patients with diarrhea. These bacteria were isolated and diagnosed based on phenotype and biochemical tests. The most isolated bacteria were *Serratia odorifera* (17.30%), followed by *E.coli* (14.42%) *,Salmonella* (9.61%) *, K.pneumoniae* (5.76%) and *S.saprophyticus* (5.76%), the results of the sensitivity test for 13 antibiotics were shown using the disc method and there was a different the levels of resistance to different antimicrobial agents.

Corresponding author E mail: dr. Khalid86@tu.edu.iq

#### Introduction:

The diarrhea in infants is a common cause of death between in children under of age under five years <sup>(1)</sup>.

The causes of diarrhea are different types, may be viral or bacteriological or parasitic. The rotaviruses cause about 40% of cases of acute diarrhea in the first 5 years, while adenoviruses cause 30%. They are found about 20% of the children infected by bacterial of Campylobacter jejuni, Yersinia, Salmonella, Shigella, pathogenic E. coli and Clostridium difficile<sup>(2)</sup>.

The incidence of the diarrhea because of pathogens in the cavity of the intestine of children because the contamination of the food and drinks and hands by pathogens or the changes of some normal flora in the intestines to the pathogens or by changes in the bowel environment by drug of these taking а microorganisms <sup>(3)</sup>. The study aims to: Isolate and diagnose of bacterial causes of diarrhea in children and test the sensitivity of these isolates towards some types of antibiotics.

#### **Material and Methods**

**Preparation** of culture media: Culture media were prepared according manufacturer's to instructions installed on the The circles packagings. were sterilized at a temperature of 121 ° C and pressure of 15 lb / kg for 15 min. After incubation, incubate at 37  $^{\circ}$  C for 24 hours before use to make sure it was not contaminated Until use<sup>(4).</sup>

**Collection of Samples:** One hundred fifty samples were collected from children with diarrhea under five years in the emergency of Salah Aldin General Hospital for the period from the beginning of August 2016 to the end of December 2016. These samples were collected in sterile plastic bottles. Child who had taken antibiotics before entering Hospital emergency was excluded from study.

**Culture of Sample :** Samples were planted on the blood agar , Maconkey and Manitol salt agar, incubated at 37 ° C for 24 hours. The developing colonies were then

purified to obtain individual colonies for diagnosis through their phenotypic and chemical properties<sup>(5)</sup>

#### **Diagnosis of bacteria using API 20**

**E:** The tape contains 20 small test tubes for chemical tests. Then, a homogeneous suspension consisting of a saline solution and a bacteria to be diagnosed was then transferred to 0.12 ml of bacterial suspension for each test tube and 0.28 ml of suspension for GEL, VP, CIT and 0.1 ml oil for the ODC, LDC, ADH, URE. H<sub>2</sub>S Provide anaerobic conditions. The reagents were added to the incubator at 37  $^{\circ}$  C for 24 hours. The reagents were added according to the requirements of each test and the results were read, turn the results were turned into numbers and then compare a with the codes in the index supplied by the company (Bio-Merieux / France) to give the name of the species and type of bacteria.

Antibiotic Susceptibility Test of Bacterial Isolates: The antibiotic sensitivity test was conducted on the Muller Hinton agar using the antibiotics prescribed in Table 1.A single colony was transfered into tubes containing 5 mL of the Nutrient broth and incubated at 37°C for 24 hours, and then compared turbid growth with turbid constant solution standard turbid (McFarland solution). In the case of unequal turbidity, the salt was added solution to these tubes so that the turbidity is equal to the McFarland solution. Using Swab Cotton, the bacteria to be tested were spread on the surface of Muller Hinton agar. The discs were placed on the surface of the plate using sterile forceps. Then the inhibition zone was measured<sup>(6).</sup>

#### **Results :**

The results showed that 116 samples gave bacterial growth. Children were classified into four age groups. The highest percentage of diarrhea 81.73% was found in the 12-month age group, followed by 11.53% among the 13-24 month age group.

No.	Antibiotics	Symbol	Concentration
			disc/µg
1	Nitrofurantion	NI	300
2	Cefixime	CFM	5
3	Trimethoprim-	TS	23.75 /1.25
	Sulfamethoxaole		
4	Penicillin-G	P2	10
5	Amoxycillin	AMX	30
6	Nalidixic Acid	NA	30
7	Cepodoxime	CPD	10
8	Cefotaxime/clavulanic acid	CEC	10/30
9	Cloxacillin	CX	5
10	Gentamicin	GM	10
11	Imipenem	IMI	10
12	Ampicillin	SAM	10
13	Cefuroxime	CXM	30

Table 1: Types of antibiotics used in the study and their concentration ( $\mu$  / disc)

Table 2: Distribution of samples by sex and age group of children withDiarrhea

Age in months	Sex		Total	Total
	Male	Female		percentage
Less than12	41	44	85	%81.73
24-13	5	7	12	%11.53
36-25	2	2	4	%3.84
48-37	1	2	3	%2.88
Total	49	55	104	

Isolated Bacteria	No.	%
Serratia odorifera	18	17.30
<b>E.coli</b>	15	14.42
Salmonella	10	9.61
Kpneumoniae	6	5.76
Shigella sonni	4	3.84
Klebsiella oxtoca	5	4.80
S.saprophyticus	6	5.76
Roultella orinithiolytica	5	4.80
Echerichia fergusoni	2	1.92
Serriatia fonticola	4	3.84
Roultella orinithiolytica	5	4.80
Serratia liquefaciens	3	2.88
Hafnia alvei	3	2.88
Raoultella terrigena	1	0.96
Kluyvera crycrescens	1	0.96
Kluyvera ascarbata	1	0.96
S.aureus	5	4.80
Stenotrophomonas	5	4.80
maltophilia		
Serriatia marcessens	2	1.92
Enterobacter sakazakii	2	1.92
Pasteurella pneumotropica	1	0.96
Providencia alcalifaciens	1	0.96
Vibrio parahaemolyticcas	1	0.96
Citrobactera freundii	2	1.92
Burkholderia cepacia	1	0.96
Total	104	100

# Table 3: types of isolated bacteria from patients with diarrhea









Figure 1: Antibiotic Senstivity testing of

A: E.coli, B: S.saprophyticus

1: Cefotaxime , 2: Amoxycillin · 3 :Cefpodoxime ·4 : Penicillin-G 5:Nalidixic Acid, 6 :Nitrofurantion ·7 : Trimethoprim · 8 :Cefixime 9:Imipenem ·10:Ampicillin ·11: Gentamicin ·12: Cloxacillin

13: Cefuroxime



Figure 2: Result of API tests 20 E for

A: Serratia odorifera B: E.coli

Table 4: Resistance and sensitivity of isolated bacteria from patients with diarrhea to antibiotics used in the study (Nitrofurantion, Cefixime, Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxaole, Penicillin-G)

Pe	nicilliı	n-G		Trimet	hoprin	1-		Cefixir	ne			Nitrofu	Antibiotics				
	-			Sulfan	nethoxa	ole											
%	S	%	R	%	S	%	R	%	S	%	R	%	S	%	R	No.	Isolated Bacteria
0	0	100	18	111	2	88.0	16	22.2	1	77.8	1/	44.4	8	55.6	10	18	Serratia
0	0	100	10	11.1	2	00.7	10	22.2	-	77.0	14		0	55.0	10	10	odorifera
0	0	100	15	13.3	2	867	13	20	3	80	12	93.3	1	67	1	15	E coli
0	U	100	15	15.5	2	00.7	15	20	5	00	12	75.5	4	0.7	1	15	L.com
0	0	100	10	10	1	90	9	10	1	90	9	60	6	40	4	10	Salmonella
0	0	33. 3	2	16.7	1	83.3	5	16.7	1	83.3	5	50	3	50	3	6	K.pneumon jae
0	0	100	5	40	2	60	3	40	2	60	3	80	4	20	1	5	Roultella
																	orinithiolyt
																	ica
0	0	100	2	0	0	100	2	0	0	100	2	50	1	50	1	2	Echerichia
	_			_	_			_	_					-			fergusoni
0	0	100	4	0	0	100	4	0	0	100	4	100	4	0	0	4	Serriatia
	0	100					-	<u>^</u>		100				27			fonticola
0	0	100	4	25	1	75	3	0	0	100	4	75	3	25	1	4	Shigella
	0	100	2	0	0	100	2	0	0	100	2	667	2	22.2	1	2	Sonnatio
0	0	100	3	0	0	100	3	0	0	100	3	00.7	2	55.5	1	5	liquefacien
																	s
0	0	100	3	0	0	100	3	0	0	100	3	667	2	33.3	1	3	Hafnia
Ŭ	Ŭ	100	2	Ű	Ŭ	100	2	Ũ	Ŭ	100	5	0017	-	0010	-	U	alvei
0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	1	Raoultella
																	terrigena
0	0	100	5	20	1	80	4	40	2	60	3	60	3	40	2	5	Klebsiella
																	oxtoca
0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	100	1	0	0	1	Kluyvera
																	crycrescens
0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	1	Kluyvera
	_		_		_		_									_	ascarbata
0	0	100	5	0	0	100	5	20	1	80	4	80	4	20	1	5	S.aureus
0	0	100	6	16.7	1	83.3	5	0	0	100	6	83.3	5	16.7	1	6	S.saprophy ticus
0	0	100	5	40	2	60	3	0	0	100	5	80	4	20	1	5	Stenotroph
																	omonas
																	maltophilia
0	0	100	2	0	0	100	2	0	0	100	2	0	0	100	2	2	Serriatia
																	marcessens
0	0	100	2	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	2	Enterobact
																	er
		100				100	_			100		100					sakazakii
0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	100	1	0	0	1	Pasteurella
																	pneumotro
0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	100	1	0	0	1	pica Drossi donoi
0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	100	1	0	0	1	Providenci
																	a alcalifacien
																	s
0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	100	1	0	0	1	Vibrio
	-		-	-			-	-	ľ		-		1	-		-	parahaemo
																	lyticus

	0	0	100	2	0	0	100	2	0	0	100	2	50	1	5
Table 5: Resistance and	0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	100	1	0
sensitivity of isolated															

bacteria from patients with diarrhea to antibiotics used in the study

Cl	oxa	cillin		Cefotaxime/clavula				Cefpodoxime					Nalidixic Acid				oxy	cillir		Antibiotics	
0/	G	0/	р	nic a	cid	0/	р	0/	C	0/	р	0/	C	0/	р	0/	C	0/	n	N	Testat
%	5	%	к	%	5	%	К	%	5	%	к	%	8	%	к	%	8	%	к	0.	Isolated Bacteria
0	0	1	1	22	Δ	77	1	16	3	83	1	55	1	44	8	5	1	94	1	1	Serratia
Ŭ	Ŭ	0	8	2	•	8	4	.7	5	.3	5	.6	0	.4	Ŭ	6	1	.4	7	8	odorifera
		0	-			-					-		-							_	
0	0	1	1	6.7	1	93.	1	13	2	86	1	53	8	46	7	0	0	10	1	1	E.coli
		0	5			3	4	.3		.7	3	.3		.7				0	5	5	
		0																			
0	0	1	1	20	2	80	8	10	1	90	9	40	4	60	6	0	0	10	1	1	Salmonella
		0	0															0	0	0	
0	0	0	6	10	1	02	~	10	1	02	~	0	0	22	2	0	0	22	2	6	<i>V</i>
0	0	1	0	10. 7	1	85.	Э	10	1	83 2	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	33 2	2	0	K.pneumo
		0		/		5		./						.5				.5			mae
0	0	1	5	20	1	80	4	40	2	60	3	80	4	20	1	0	0	10	5	5	Roultella
Ŭ	Ŭ	0	5	20	1	00		10	-	00	5	00	•	20	-	Ŭ	Ŭ	0	5	5	orinithiolvt
		0																-			ica
0	0	1	2	0	0	100	2	0	0	10	2	50	1	50	1	0	0	10	2	2	Echerichia
		0								0								0			fergusoni
		0																			
0	0	1	4	0	0	100	4	0	0	10	4	50	2	50	2	0	0	10	4	4	Serriatia
		0								0								0			fonticola
0	0	0	4	0	0	100	4	0	0	10	4	75	2	25	1	0	0	10	4	4	Shizelle
0	0	1	4	0	0	100	4	0	0	10	4	15	3	23	1	0	0	10	4	4	siligena
		0								0								0			somm
0	0	1	3	33.	1	66.	2	0	0	10	3	0	0	10	3	0	0	10	3	3	Serratia
		0	_	3		7		-	_	0	-	-	-	0				0	-	_	liquefacien
		0																			s
0	0	1	3	33.	1	66.	2	0	0	10	3	0	0	10	3	0	0	10	3	3	Hafnia
		0		3		7				0				0				0			alvei
0	0	0		0	0	100		0	0	10		10		0	0	0	0	10			<b>D</b>
0	0	1	I	0	0	100	1	0	0	10	I	10	I	0	0	0	0	10	1	1	Raoultella
		0								0		0						0			terrigena
0	0	1	5	20	1	80	Δ	0	0	10	5	80	4	20	1	0	0	10	5	5	Klebsiella
0	0	0	5	20	1	00	-	U	0	0	5	00	7	20	1	0	U	0	5	5	oxtoca
		Ő								Ŭ								Ŭ			ontoou
0	0	1	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	10	1	1	Kluyvera
		0								0				0				0			crycrescen
		0																			S
0	0	1	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	10	1	1	Kluyvera
		0								0				0				0			ascarbata
0	0	1	F	0	0	100	5	0	0	10	Ę	20	1	00	Δ	0	0	10	5	5	S auraua
0	0	1	3	U	0	100	3	0	0	10	3	20	1	80	4	U	U	10	3	5	s.aureus
		0								0								U			

0	0	1 0 0	6	0	0	100	6	0	0	10 0	6	66 .7	4	33 .3	2	0	0	10 0	6	6	S.saprophy tic
0	0	1 0 0	5	0	0	100	5	0	0	10 0	5	40	2	60	3	0	0	10 0	5	5	Stenotroph omonas maltophili a
0	0	1 0 0	2	0	0	100	2	0	0	10 0	2	0	0	10 0	2	0	0	10 0	2	2	Serriatia marcessen s
0	0	1 0 0	2	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	0	0	10 0	2	2	Enterobact er sakazakii
0	0	1 0 0	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	10 0	1	0	0	10 0	1	0	0	10 0	1	1	Pasteurell a pneumotro pica
0	0	1 0 0	1	100	1	0	0	10 0	1	0	0	10 0	1	0	0	0	0	10 0	1	1	Providenci a alcalifacie ns
0	0	1 0 0	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	10 0	1	0	0	10 0	1	0	0	10 0	1	1	Vibrio parahaem olyticus
0	0	1 0 0	2	0	0	100	2	0	0	10 0	2	50	1	50	1	0	0	10 0	2	2	Citrobacte ra freundii
0	0	1 0 0	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	10 0	1	10 0	1	0	0	0	0	10 0	1	1	Burkholde ria cepacia
																				1 0 4	Total

(Nitrofurantion, Cefixime, Trimethoprim- Sulfamethoxaole, Penicillin-G)

Table 6: Resistance and sensitivity of isolated bacteria from patients with diarrhea to antibiotics used in the study

(Gentamicin, Imipenem, Ampicillin, Cefuroxime)

Cefur	oxin	ne		Ampic	cillin			Imiper	nem			Ger	ntami	cin			Antibiotics
%	S	%	R	%	S	%	R	%	S	%	R	%	S	%	R	No.	Isolated Bacteria
11.1	2	88.9	16	38.9	7	66.7	11	88.9	16	11.1	2	72 .2	13	27.8	5	18	Serratia odorifera
13.3	2	86.7	13	33.3	5	66.7	10	86.7	13	13.3	2	66 .7	10	33.3	5	15	E.coli
20	2	80	8	40	4	60	6	100	10	0	0	10 0	10	0	0	10	Salmonella
33.3	2	66.7	4	16.7	1	83.3	5	83.3	5	16.7	1	66 .7	4	33.3	2	6	K.pneumonia e
40.0	2	60	3	40	2	60	3	60	3	40	2	80	4	20	1	5	Roultella orinithiolytic a
0	0	100	2	0	0	100	2	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	2	Echerichia fergusoni

0	0	100	4	75	3	25	1	100	4	0	0	75	3	25	1	4	Serriatia
																	fonticola
0	0	100	4	50	2	50	2	75	3	25	1	50	2	50	2	4	Shigella
																	sonni
0	0	100	3	33.3	1	66.7	2	100	3	0	0	10	3	0	0	3	Serratia
												0					liquefaciens
0	0	100	3	33.3	1	66.7	2	100	3	0	0	10	3	0	0	3	Hafnia alvei
										_		0					
0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	100	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	1	Raoultella
										_		0					terrigena
0	0	100	5	60	3	40	2	80	4	20	1	80	4	20	1	5	Klebsiella
										-	_						oxtoca
0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	100	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	1	Kluyvera
						_				-	_	0					crycrescens
0	0	100	1	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	1	Kluyvera
										_		0					ascarbata
0	0	100	5	0	0	100	5	80	4	20	1	20	1	80	4	5	S.aureus
16.7	1	83.3	5	0	0	100	6	66.7	4	33.3	2	83	5	16.7	1	6	S.saprophytic
												.3					
0	0	100	5	0	0	100	5	100	5	0	0	60	3	40	2	5	Stenotropho
																	monas
																	maltophilia
0	0	100	2	0	0	100	2	100	2	0	0	10	2	0	0	2	Serriatia
												0					marcessens
50	1	50	1	0	0	100	2	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	2	Enterobacter
																	sakazakii
0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	100	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	1	Pasteurella
												0					pneumotropi
																	са
100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	1	Providencia
												0					alcalifaciens
0	0	100	1	100	1	0	0	100	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	1	Vibrio
												0					parahaemoly
																	ticus
0	0	100	2	0	0	100	2	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	2	Citrobactera
																	freundii
0	0	100	1	0	0	100	1	100	1	0	0	10	1	0	0	1	Burkholderia
												0					cepacia
																104	total

#### **Discussion:**

A low percentage 3.48% in the 25-36 month age group and 2.88% in the 37 to 48 month age group. In comparison to previous studies, Jameel<sup>(7)</sup> in Salah Aladdin found that the percentage of persistent diarrhea was 45%. Alrifai <sup>(8)</sup> found that the highest incidence of diarrhea in children under 12 months was 67.9%.

The prevalence of diarrhea was different among males and

females. 49 (47.11%) were males, while 55 (52.88%) were females.. Table 2.

The study revealed that 104 isolates from patients with diarrhea reported, the most isolated bacteria were *Serratia odorifera* 18 (17.30%), followed by 15 (14.42%) isolates belonging to *E.coli*, and 10 (9.61%) isolates belonging to *Salmonella*, isolate of *k.pneumoniae* and *S.sapropthyticus* 6(5.76%). As for the distribution of *E. coli*, this study does not agree with obtained by Tawfeeq<sup>(9)</sup> (34.48%), (Table 3).

Bacterial isolates showed different patterns of antibiotic resistance , as shown in Table 4,5,6 .Bacteria were multi-resistant and is difficult to choose the appropriate treatment for the patients<sup>(10)</sup> .Of the 15 strains of *E. coli*, the percentage of resistance was 100% for amoxycillin, penicillin-G and cloxacillin which was agree with Abed Jabuk<sup>(11)</sup> in Babylon, 100% for amoxycillin and penicillin-G Akter<sup>(12)</sup> in Bangladesh 96.93% were resistant to Cloxacillin.

The isolates of *E.coli* were 86.7% resistant to cefuroxime, cefpodoxime and trimethoprim- sulfamethoxaole. This is agree with Jameel<sup>(7)</sup>, who resistance that the found to trimethoprim was 89.5%. Schumacher<sup>(13)</sup> in Denmark, which found the percentage of resistance was 4.4% towards cefuroxime. E.coli was 80% resistant to cefixime and this is not agree with Smith and Eng <sup>(14)</sup> in New York who found the resistance ratio 1% and Akter<sup>(12)</sup> 86.5%. The percentage of resistance to nalidixic Acid 46.7% was agree with Tawfeeq <sup>(9)</sup>, 45% and did not agree with Ahmad and Ali<sup>(16)</sup> 14.3%. The percentage of resistance to gentamicin 33.3% was agree with Tawfeeq<sup>(9)</sup>was 30% and Akter<sup>(12)</sup> was 45.4%.

The percentage of resistance to Imipenem was 13.3% The resistance percentage to nitrofurantion was 5.5%

and the result was agree with Tawfeeq<sup>(9)</sup>12.5% and did not agree with AL-Tayar<sup>(18)</sup>. Libya,(40%). Of the 10 isolates of *Salmonella*, the

percentage of resistance 100% for amoxycillin, penicillin-G and cloxacillin with was agree Tawfeeq<sup>(9)</sup>, which found that the percentage of penicillin-G 100% and the percentage of resistance to amoxycillin 45.8%. In another study, Salmonella sensitive to amoxycillin and this agrees with Lucky<sup>(17)</sup>. The percentage of resistance to cefixime, cefpodoxime and trimethoprimsulfamethoxaole is 90%. This is agrees with Moehario<sup>(18)</sup>98.6%. The percentage of resistance to cefotaxime / clavulanic acid and cefuroxime 80% was not agree with Muthu<sup>(19)</sup>3.75%. The percentage of resistance to ampicillin and nalidixic acid was 60%. Tawfeeq<sup>(9)</sup>found that the percentage of resistance to nalidixic acid was 66.7% and ampicillin 62.5%. The was of nitrofurantion percentage resistance was 40%, which is not agree with result of Al-Sorchee<sup>(20)</sup> who in Erbil, which was sensitive 100%. This study was agreed with Tawfeeq<sup>(9)</sup>, which found the sensitivity of imipenem 100% and was not agree with Patel<sup>(21)</sup> in India,

resistance gentamicin 20%. Among the four isolates of Shigella sonni found the percentage of resistance 100% for each of cefixime and penicillin-G and amoxycillin and cepodoxime and cefotaxime / clavulanic acid and cloxacillin and cefuroxime This result is agree with Tawfeeq<sup>(9)</sup> in the percentage of resistance to the penicillin-G 66.7% and do not agree with Trivedi<sup>(22)</sup> in the United States of America who found most of the isolates were to cefotaxime. The sensitive percentage of resistance to the gentamicin and ampicillin was 50% are not agree with and these Pourakbari<sup>(23)</sup> in Iran who have found the most isolates were sensitive to gentamicin. The percentage of resistance was 25% for both imipenem and nitrofurantion and nalidixic acid this is agreed with Lestari<sup>(24)</sup> in Indonesia, who revealed that isolates were sensitve to nalidixic acid, but agree with the Tawfeeq<sup>(9)</sup>, which found the resistance to nitrofurantion was 33.3%.

which found the percentage of

#### Conclusion

The most common isolated bacteria were *Serratia odorifera* (17.30%), followed by *E.coli* (14.42%),followed by Salmonella (9.61%),followed by *K.pneumoniae* (5.76%).

The results of the sensitivity tests showed that the optimal antibiotics for diarrhea in children were Imipenem and Nitrofurantion while Amoxycillin, Penicillin-G and Cloxacillin were not effective against all bacterial isolates

#### References

- King, C.K., Glass, R., Bresee, J.S., Duggan, C.,and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Managing acute gastroenteritis among children: oral rehydration, maintenance, and nutritional therapy. MMWR Recomm (2003), Rep.52(RR-16):1.
- Sibylle,K., Med. and Stephanie, O..
   Acute Infectious Diarrhea in Children. <u>Dtsch Arztebl Int</u>,( 2009).106(33): 539–548.
- Jawetz, Melnick, and Adelberg's . Medical Microbiology.26<sup>th</sup> ed. The

McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.(2013), 171-172.

- Prescott, L.M.(2002). Prescott-Harely-Klein Microbiology.5<sup>th</sup> ed. McGrow-Hill companies
- Atlas, M.R. Handbook of Media for Invironmental Microbiology.2<sup>nd</sup> ed .Taylor & Francis publisher.New York.U.S.A(2005).
- Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) . Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing, 24th informational supplement,(2014). 34 (1), Pennsylvania U.S.A
- Jameel, Z. J. In Vitro Effects of Coliphage and Probioti against Phenotypic and Genotypic Diarrheal *E. coli* in Children Under Five Years.(2014) Ph.D. Thesis, University of Tikrit.
- Alrifai. S.B. , Alsaadi, A., Mahmood, Y.A., Ali, A.A. and Al-Kaisi, L.A. Prevalence and etiology of nosocomial diarrhoea in children < 5 years in Tikrit teaching hospital , Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal, (2009)15 (5): 111-118.
- Tawfeeq, S.M. Determination of the Activity of the Green Synthesized Silver Nanoparticles against Multidrug Resistance

Bacteria Isolated from Children with Diarrhoea under Five Years.(2014) M.Sc. Thesis College of Science, Tikrit University.

10. Rivera-Tapia, J.A. (2003).

Antibiotic resistance, public health problem. Anales Medical Hospital ABC(2003).48(1) :42-47.

- 11. Abed Jabuk, S. I. Study of Some Virulence Factor of Enteropathogenic *Escherichia coli* Isolated From Infants With Acute Diarrhea in Babylon Province. (2010)M.Sc. Thesis,University of Babylon, Iraq.
- 12. Akter .F, M. Mahboob Hossain, Arifur Rahman, Mukta Shaha and Amani El Abd Abu Amo Amani. Antimicrobials Resistance Pattern of *Escherichia coli* Collected from Various Pathological Specimens. Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences,(2012), 15: 1080-1084.
- Schumacher.H , U. Skibsted, Robert Skov and J. Scheibel . Cefuroxime resistance in *Escherichia coli*. Apmis (2009) 104(7-8):531 – 538.
- 14. Smith S.M. Eng R.H. Activity of Cefixime (FK 027) for Resistant Gram-Negative Bacilli. Chemotherapy (1988),34:455–461.

- 15. Ahmad S. S. and Ali, F.A. Detection of ESBL, AMPC and metallo beta-lactamase mediated resistance in gram- negative bacteria isolated from women with genital tract infection, European Scientific Journal, (2014)10(9): 1857-7431.
- 16. AL-Tayar, M.A., Thokar , M.A. and Mohammad , M.A.Extended spectrum β-lactamase -producing Escherichia coli in clinical isolates in Benghazi , Libya :Phenotypicdetection and antimicrobial susceptibillty pattern , Medical Journal of Islamic World Academy of Sciences, (2012) 20(2) : 49-56.
- 17. Lucky H. Moehario, Enty Tjoa, Veronica N. K. D. Kalay and Angela Abidin .Antibiotic of Susceptibility Patterns Salmonella Typhi in Jakarta and Surrounding Areas, Salmonella - A Diversified Superbug, Mr.Yashwant Kumar (Ed.), InTech(2012).
- Moehario L. H., Tjoa, E., Kalay,
   V.N.K. and Abidin A. Antibiotic
   Susceptibility Patterns of
   Salmonella Typhi in Jakarta and
   Surrounding Areas, Salmonella A
   Diversified Superbug, Mr.
   Yashwant Kumar(Ed)(2010)

.<u>http://www.intechopen.com/books</u> /salmonella-a diversifiedsuperbug/antibioticsusceptibility-patterns ofsalmonella-typhi-in-jakartaandsurrounding-areas.

- Muthu G., Suresh,A., Sumathy, G., Sumathy, G. and Srivani, R. Studies on antimicrobial susceptibility pattern of salmonella isolates from chennal, India, International Journal of Pharma and Bio Sciences ,(2011), 2(2) :0975-6299.
- 20. Al-Sorchee S. M. A., Rabat, A.A. and Juma, I.M. Microbial Causatives of Diarrhea in Children in Erbil City, Journal of Al-Nahrain University,(2013), 16 (3): 19-29.
- 21. Patel N. D., Rajat, R.M. and Katara, R.S. In-vitro antibiotic sensitivity pattern of *Salmonella typhi*, International Archives of Integrated Medicine,(2015). 2 (5) : 2394-0026.
- 22. Trivedi, M. K., Branton, A., Trivedi, D., Nayak, G., Gangwar, M. and Jana, S. Improved Susceptibility Pattern of Antimicrobials Using Vital Energy Treatment on Shigella sonnei, American Journal of Internal Medicine,(2015). 3(6): 231-237.
- 23. **Pourakbari** B., Mamishi, S. MD., Mashoori, N., Mahboobi, N.,

Ashtiani, M.H., Afsharpaiman, S. and Abedini, M. Frequency and antimicrobial susceptibility of *Shigella* species isolated in Children Medical Center Hospital, Tehran, Iran, 2001-2006, Braz J (2010),14(2):153-157.

24. Lestari E. S. and Severin, J.A.
Antimicrobial Resistance in Indonesia Prevalence, determinants and genetic basis(2009).
Ph.D.thesis, University Rotterdam.