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ABSTRACT

Background: Group B streptococcus is one of the most common causes of severe neonatal infections.
Aim: To detect the prevalence of group B. Streptococcus and their antimicrobial susceptibility and to assess the role of PCR as a rapid method of its detection.
Place and Duration of the Study: A cross sectional and prospective cohort study was carried out from September 2019 to February 2020 in Gynaecology and Obstetrics OPD and inpatient units in Al-Quwayiyah General hospital, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
Methodology: Paired rectal/vaginal specimens were collected from 540 pregnant females with gestational age 35 or more, Each swab was inoculated into selective medium, Todd Hewitt, One swab is streaked onto blood agar plates incubated in 5% CO2 for 24h at 36°C, β-hemolytic colonies growth is identified by Gram's stain, colony morphology and CAMP test. The confirmation and antimicrobial susceptibility were done by Vitek II machine, The second swab was used for PCR to identify atr gene.
Results: Out of 540 pregnant women 87 (16.1%) were colonized with GBS isolates. The positive GBS women aged 25 (22-34) and negative GBS women aged 23 (24-35) with no statistical difference. Patients aged more than 35 years old has the higher rate of positive GBS, 46.2%. No significant association detected between GBS and gestational age at delivery, antenal visits, BMI and gravidity. The GBS strains isolated from pregnant women was 100% susceptible to linezolid and vancomycin followed by ampicillin (93.1%) and tobramicin (83.9%) then gentamicin (81.6%) and levofloxacin(78.2%) and showed least antibiotic susceptibility to erythromycin (26.4%). The PCR was positive in 145 (26.9%). Using culture as gold method, PCR sensitivity was 100% (95% CI: 91.62-100), while specificity was 83.2% (95% CI: 82.61-91.02). Negative and positive predictive values were 100% and 61% respectively. Kappa between the two methods was 0.71, which indicate major agreement.

Conclusion: The GBS prevalence among the pregnant females in Al Quwayiyah General Hospital was 16.1%. Detection of GBS using new PCR technique was found to have high sensitivity and faster results, allowing efficient management of GBS and reduction in newborn morbidity and mortality however the cost is high for some laboratories. Further studies should be assessed to be both low cost and accurate rapid screening.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Streptococcus agalactiae, now named as Group B Streptococcus (GBS), present in the gastrointestinal tract of healthy adults as a common normal flora. GBS continues to be the world's most common etiology of neonatal sepsis and meningitis, occurring in 0.5 to 3 newborns per 1000 live births [1]. Moreover Group B Streptococcus also induces maternal chorioamnionitis, preterm labor or even stillbirth [2].

Pregnant women are estimated to be colonized with GBS at a rate of 11 to 35%, and socioeconomic status have a direct effect on the rate of carriers among population [3]. Despite the fact that early neonatal onset of disease has been decreased owing to screening programs and intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis, this pathogen still the leading cause of infections in neonates in the developing countries [4].

CDC's current gold standard procedure for detecting GBS recto-vaginal carriage at 35-37 weeks of pregnancy is based on bacteriological tests, which involves culturing recto-vaginal swabs into selective broth and later streaking on bacteriological medium. The results of culture, take at least 48-72 hours to be completed, which is unacceptable long time for GBS detection [5].

Accurate and rapid screening of GBS carriage in pregnant females, especially those who have got inadequate antenatal care during pregnancy will allow to effectively prevent GBS infections in neonates and mothers [6]. Polymerase chain reaction is a rapid technique with comparable sensitivity and specificity to traditional methods based on culture. Unlike culture-based approaches, this technique can also detect non-hemolytic GBS, which is present in 1 to 4% of pregnant women [7].

The aim of the study:

1. To identify the prevalence of Group B Streptococcus and their antimicrobial susceptibility.
2. To evaluate the role of PCR as a rapid technique for Group B Streptococcus detection.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Study Design

A cross sectional and prospective cohort study was carried out from September 2019 to February 2020 in Gynecology and Obstetrics OPD and inpatient units in Al-Quwayiyah General hospital. 540 pregnant females with gestational age 35 or more weeks, aged 18-48 years were included in the study. Pregnant women who administered antibiotics in the previous week, patients undergoing elective caesarean delivery, and women declined to be enrolled in the study were excluded. Data for demographics age, gestational age at delivery, body mass, antenatal visits, gravidity and antibiotics administration was collected after patient permission.
2.2 Samples Collection
The CDC recommended that combined rectal/vaginal specimens should be obtained. Paired rectal/vaginal specimens were obtained and transported in amies transport media from each pregnant female visited Gynecology and obstetrics OPD or admitted to the obstetric unit [5]. The GBS culture was done with one swab, and the PCR testing was done with the other. Swabs for PCR test were obtained and preserved at 2–8°C and -80°C until used.

2.3 Culture and Identification of GBS
Each swab was inoculated into selective medium, Todd Hewitt (Becton Dickinson, USA) that contain nalidixic acid and gentamicin (8 µg/mL) (15 µg/mL), followed by incubation in 5% CO2 for 24h at 36°C, then streaked onto blood agar medium (BioMérieux, Marcy l’Etoile, France) and kept in 5% CO2 for 24h at 36°C. β-hemolytic colonies growth was picked up to be identified, in absence of β-hemolytic colonies, plates should be re-incubated for 24h. Identification of β-hemolytic colonies by morphology, Gram’s stain and CAMP test. Further confirmation was done by Vitek II machine.

2.4 Testing of GBS Isolates for Antibiotics Susceptibility
Each GBS isolate was tested for antimicrobial susceptibility using Vitek II’s gram-positive susceptibility AST-586 cards, which include penicillin, clindamycin, erythromycin, levofloxacin, linezolid, tetracycline, gentamicin, tobramycin, trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole and vancomycin as proposed by Clinical and Laboratory Standard Institute guidelines in 2017 [8].

2.5 Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) [9]

2.5.1 DNA extraction
Todd Hewitt selective medium was used to incubate the recto-vaginal swabs for 24 hours. The precipitate obtained after broth centrifugation was washed with 1X PBS solution and re-suspended in 500 l of 10 mM Tris-EDTA, pH 7.4 for DNA extraction by using a QIAamp DNA mini kit (Qiagen, USA) as the manufacturer’s guidelines.

2.5.2 Atr gene amplification by Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR)
CA 2 GAA TCT TGG CAG CTT TGT TAA and TAA GAA ATC TCT TGT GCG GAT TTC were used, respectively as forward and reverse primer sequences, to amplify a 779bp sequence of the atr gene, which encodes the S. agalactiae glutamine transporter protein (gbs05380). To verify the isolates, a 780 bp S. agalactiae specific atr gene (GenBank accession number: AF15135) was used as an internal positive control for the PCR assay.

2.6 Statistical Analysis
SPSS® version 14.0 was used to perform the statistical analysis. Z test was used for comparing 2 variables and χ2 (Chi square) test for more than two variables. P value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant. The PCR technique’s sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV were analyzed considering culture as the gold standard. The Kappa coefficient was used to assess the correlation between assays.

3. RESULTS
Out of 540 pregnant women 87 (16.1%) were colonized with GBS isolates, their age were 26 (24-33) years old. The positive GBS women aged 25 (22-34) and negative GBS women aged 23 (24-35) with no statistical difference. Patients aged more than 35 years old has the higher rate
of positive GBS, 46.2%. No significant association detected between GBS and gestational age at delivery, antenatal visits, BMI and gravidity.

The GBS strains isolated from pregnant women was 100% susceptible to linezolid and vancomycin followed by ampicillin (93.1%) and tobramycin (83.9%) then gentamicin (81.6%) and levofloxacin(78.2%) and showed least antibiotic susceptibility to erythromycin (26.4%) as shown in Table 2.

Table 3 showed that out of 540 specimens the culture method were GBS positive in 87 (16.1%) specimens, but the PCR positivity was determined in 145 (26.9%). Using culture as gold method, PCR sensitivity was 100% (95% CI: 91.62-100), all positive culture results were also PCR positive, while of the 453 culture-negative samples for GBS, 58 were PCR positive while 395 showed negativity with the two methods, that revealed a specificity of 83.2% (95% CI: 82.61-91.02) of the PCR method. Negative and positive predictive values were 100% and 61% respectively. Kappa between the two methods was 0.71, which indicate major agreement.

Table 1. Demographic and clinical data of the positive GBS and negative GBS groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ch.ch.</th>
<th>Positive GBS (n=87)</th>
<th>Negative GBS (n=453)</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age, median</td>
<td>25 (22-34)</td>
<td>23 (24-35)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25 years</td>
<td>25 (28.7%)</td>
<td>123 (27.2%)</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years</td>
<td>22 (25.3%)</td>
<td>224 (49.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 35 years</td>
<td>40 (46%)</td>
<td>106 (23.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestational age per weeks, median</td>
<td>38 (37-40)</td>
<td>37 (36-41)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prenatal visits, median</td>
<td>10 (8-11)</td>
<td>10 (9-13)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-pregnancy BMI, median</td>
<td>24.7 (21.5-29.4)</td>
<td>23.8 (21.4-27.9)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravidity, median</td>
<td>3 (2-4)</td>
<td>3 (2-5)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Group B Streptococcus antibiotics susceptibility pattern among studied pregnant women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibiotics</th>
<th>Susceptible strains</th>
<th>Resistant strains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linezolid</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clindamycin</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythromycin</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetracycline</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levofloxacin</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentamicin</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimethoprim</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobramycin</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Comparison between PCR and culture in detecting GBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCR</th>
<th>Todd Hewitt Culture</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pos.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PCR sensitivity was 100% (95% CI: 91.62-100)
PCR specificity of 83.2% (95% CI: 82.61-91.02)
negative predictive value was 100%
positive predictive value was 61%.
4. DISCUSSION

GBS vagino-rectal colonization in the mother is a significant risk factor for invasive neonatal infections. In both developed and developing countries, GBS infection is a major cause of infections in neonates, with high mortality and serious conditions like sepsis and meningitis [5].

In this study the prevalence of GBS carriage in pregnant females was 87 (16.1%). This result matched with those of Musleh et al., 2018 [10] who found that GBS colonization rate in Saudi females attending in labor to the King Fahd University Hospital was 19%. A study in Makkah was done by Khan et al., 2015 [11] who reported positive GBS equal to 16.3%. Similar results also reported that the rate of Group B Streptococcus colonization in Kuwait and Iran (14.6% and 16%, respectively) [12, 13]. Higher prevalence rates were obtained in the Saudi Arabian from Riyadh and Jeddah (27.6% and 31.6%, respectively) [14, 15]. The differences in the GBS colonization prevalence was explained by the wide variation according to geographical area, age, parity and socio-economic factors [16].

The positive GBS women aged 25 (22-34) years and negative GBS women aged 23 (24-35) years old, the highest rate were in women older than 35 years 46.2%, which was similar to the previous studies performed [17, 18]. Joachim et al., 2009 [19] reported in a study done in Tanzania that GBS was more generally isolated from females in the 30-34 year old age group (32.1%). Other studies have shown that as people get older, their GBS positivity rises [20, 21]. In this study no significant association detected between GBS and gestational age at delivery, antenatal visits, BMI and gravidity. These findings were in agreement with those from other studies [17, 21, 22] which reported that when socio-demographic and medical obstetric characteristics, such as risk factors for the newborn to acquire infections, were considered, there was no significant differences in GBS carriage rates were found. Salama et al. [23], on the other hand, revealed that GBS carriage was significantly greater among pregnant females in their 37th week of pregnancy who had regular antenatal visits, increased BMI and using the condom for contraception.

Chemoprophylaxis still the most effective ways for prevention of GBS infections in mothers and neonates [24]. In the current work the GBS strains isolated from pregnant women was 100% susceptible to linezolid and vancomycin followed by ampicillin (93.1%) and tobramycin (83.9%) then gentamicin (81.6%) and levofloxacin (78.2%) and showed least antibiotic susceptibility to erythromycin (26.4%). These findings are matched with the CDC clinical recommendations for the efficiency of penicillin and ampicillin as the drugs of choice to prevent and treat the infections related to GBS [5]. Moreover, other studies with increased rates of susceptibility of GBS strains to amoxicillin, linezolid, and vancomycin showed similar findings. [25] It was noticed in this study that there were increased rates of resistance to clindamycin (52.9%) and erythromycin (73.6%), Dashtizade et al., 2020 [24] stated also that Erythromycin and clindamycin resistance rates were 73.7% and 52.6%, respectively. In other published literatures, resistance to erythromycin and clindamycin ranges from 4 to 58.3 percent and 2.3% to 57.9%, respectively [26, 27]. Consequently, erythromycin was excluded from the list of alternative antibiotics recommended by the CDC in 2010 [27].

In the current study PCR technique showed positivity in 145 (26.6%). A study in a Jeddah hospital, GBS carriage rates were 19.7% using culture technique while it was 30.5% when using PCR method [15]. The other studies which used PCR technique to detect GBS strains also showed 21.6% and 20.4% carriage rates [28]. In Brazil, some studies found that the prevalence of GBS ranged from 15.9% to 22.5% by using the culture technique [29, 30], and from 26.9% to 35.9% by using the PCR method [31, 32]. These are quite close to the rates found in this study.

Although the CDC’s guidelines recommend that culture to be used to screen pregnant women for GBS, many medical conditions necessitate a quicker and more effective methods [30]. The use of atr gene as amplification target by PCR method in this study had high sensitivity and high NPP which recommend it as a good screening method. In the current study PCR sensitivity was 100% (95% CI: 91.62-100), while specificity was 83.2% (95% CI: 82.61-91.02) of the PCR method. Negative and positive predictive values were 100% and 61% respectively. Di Renzo et al., 2015 [33] on comparing GBS cultures and PCR, he also revealed better sensitivity and specificity of PCR, ranged from 84.6–100% and 62.5–100%, respectively [33]. The sensitivity of PCR in studies conducted by Gavino & Wang, 2007 [34] and Alfa [35], sensitivity was 95.8%.
and 90.5%, respectively, while in this work it was 100%, this could be explained by the use of selective and enriched broth prior to performing PCR in this study that increased the test sensitivity. Regarding the specificity Gavino & Wang, 2007 [34] reported that specificity of PCR test was 86.88% which is quite similar to the results obtained in this study, 83.2%.

In this study using PCR even with selective broth incubation, needed 24 hours to submit the final report, on the other hand, the culture is a time-consuming process that requires at least 48-72 hours to completely identify GBS. Therefore, GBS PCR is considered as a rapid screening reliable test for detecting GBS in pregnant women [34].

5. CONCLUSION

The GBS prevalence among the pregnant females in Al Quwayiyah General Hospital was 16.1%. Detection of GBS using new PCR technique was found to have high sensitivity and faster results, allowing efficient management of GBS and reduction in newborn morbidity and mortality however the cost is high for some laboratories. Further studies should be assessed to be both low cost and accurate rapid screening.
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