ABSTRACT

In order to investigate the epidemiological investigation of human intestinal parasitic infestation in rural and urban population of Khurja, Bulandshahr. Parasitic infestation of gastrointestinal tract is a major cause of morbidity and mortality. Despite the existence of effective parasitic infections remain a major public health problem. In rural and urban communities, continuing infection is often reinforced by dietary habits. The intestinal parasitism is common in developing countries. Their distribution is mainly associated with poor personal hygiene, environmental sanitation and socio – economic conditions. This study present a survey of the prevalence of intestinal parasitic infection. A stool examination was performed on 223, randomly selected persons from rural and urban populations of Khurja, Bulandshahr. The present study was carried out from 2009 to 2011. The collected stool specimens were examined microscopically for the presence eggs, cysts and trophozoits of intestinal parasites, using simple smear in saline method. Epidemiological data were analyzed using Chi –Squared test. The prevalence of intestinal parasites was significantly higher ($\chi^2 = 25.95$, df = 2, $P = 5.99$ at 0.05 level) in low age group, ($\chi^2 = 31.1$, df = 2, $P = 5.99$ at 0.05 level) in low income group, ($\chi^2 = 6.23$, df = 1, $P = 0.46$ at 0.05 level) in rural population and ($\chi^2 = 1.58$, df = 1, $P = 0.46$ at 0.05 level) in males as compared to females. The present study indicates that a nationwide parasite control project is necessary to reduce the possibility of morbidity and mortality due to parasitic diseases in the country.
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INTRODUCTION

Human intestinal parasites occur throughout the world but it is in the west tropics and sub-tropics where they are found in their greatest numbers. A basic requirement for the continued survival of these organisms is an inadequate and unhygienic method of disposal of faecal material. The intestinal parasitic infections caused by intestinal parasites are among the most prevalent infections in human in developing countries. Intestinal parasitic infections such as amoebiasis, ascariasis, hookworm infection and trichiuriasis are among the ten most common infections in the world [WHO, 1987]. Human intestinal parasites can be present in any disease, in any person, at any age. People with intestinal parasitic infections are usually under nourished and weak, infected with viral, fungal, or bacteria, and have various types of chemical and metal poisoning. Intestinal parasites cause a significant morbidity and mortality in endemic countries. These infections are the most prevalent in tropical and sub – tropical regions of the developing world where adequate water, sanitation facilities and
poor economic conditions are lacking. The worldwide prevalence of intestinal parasites is estimated in more than 3.5 billion with around 4.5 million clinical cases. [Okey, et al 2004]. It is observed that about 60 – 80 percent population of certain areas of West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, Punjab, East Coast of Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh is infected with parasites [Dutta, 1962]. Intestinal parasitoses are common both in general population and in people residing in institutions in tropical and sub – tropical regions. [Grandle et al, 2011 and Melo et al, 2010] The conditions required for transmission and aquisition of intestinal parasitism are favored in institutions where large number grouped together for a long period of time and poor sanitary conditions prevail. This is evidenced by studies on the prevalence of intestinal parasites in school, day care centers and institutions. Local conditions such as quality of domestic and village infrastructure, economic, occupation and social factors such as education influence the risk of infections, diseases transmission and associated morbidity and mortality. The objective of this study was to perform an epidemiological survey to determine the prevalence of intestinal parasitic infections in the populations of Khurja, Bulandshahr.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

The present study was conducted on human intestinal parasitic patients and few healthy subjects as control. In this study, a survey was carried out for human parasitic diseases, from rural and urban populations of Khurja, Bulandshahr for two years from 2009 to 2011. For this study, an interview technique was performed to collect the information of subjects regarding their age, sex and family background. For the present study, a total of 223, samples of stool for both rural and urban populations were collected for microscopic investigations in laboratory. The Simple Smear in Saline method [Who 1991] was used to determine the stool samples. The persons having any cyst/ova/trophozoit/whole parasite were treated as parasitic positive patients. During the Demographic study of persons, the age group, sex, socio-economic and literacy status were included in this study. The Chi –Squared tests were performed to the test for an association between all possible pairs of parasitic infections and between the genders of each age group. The calculated \( \chi^2 \) value was more than \( P – value \) (at 0.05 level).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overall 223, stool samples were examined by Simple Smear in Saline method on the population of Khurja, Bulandshahr. The age combination shows that 52 (23.31%) persons were in 0-15 age group and 91 (40.80%) in 15-35 age group while, 80 (35.87%) were above the age of 35 years. The sex based distribution shows that out of 223 samples, the 120 (53.81%) were collected from males and 103 (46.18%) from female. According to socio-economic status 71 (50.70%) to low (5001 to 15000), 112 (17.85%) to medium (15001 to 25000) and 40 (12.5%) persons to high (<25000) income group. The literacy status shows that 103 (33.98%) were belongs to illiteracy, 85 (37.93%) to high school, 20 (15.0%) to intermediate and 15 (6.66%) to graduate and above. In these 223 samples, 61 were found parasitic positive patient in which 54.1% positive parasitic patients were from 0 - 15, 27.9% from 15-35 and 18.0% from the age above 35. Further, sex wise distribution shows that 60.7% positive parasitic patients were male and 39.3% females. Their economic status shows that 59.02%, 32.79%, and 8.20% positive parasitic patients were in low, medium and high income group respectively, while the literacy status shown that 57.38% positive parasitic patients were illiterate, 36.07% at high school level and 4.92% at intermediate, while the 1.63% positive parasitic patients were at graduate or above level. The results of present study shows that the gastrointestinal parasitic infection was found statistically more significant higher (\( \chi^2 = 25.95, df = 2, P = 5.99 \) at 0.05 level) in low age group, (\( \chi^2 = 31.1, df = 2, P = 5.99 \) at 0.05 level) in low income group, (\( \chi^2 = 6.23, df = 1, P = 0.46 \) at 0.05 level) in rural population and (\( \chi^2 = 1.58, df = 1, P = 0.46 \) at 0.05 level) in males as compared to females.
In the univariate analysis, no statistically significant association were observed between educational levels. Our findings are the consonance with socio-economic indicators [Ichukwu, et. al. 2010 and Lee, et. al. 2000]. The unsanitary conditions and low age group increased the risk factors for developing intestinal parasitic infections. [Adamu, et al. 2006, Gatt, et. al. 2000 and Heidan, et. al. 2003]

In other study revealed that the prevalence of intestinal parasites was high in low age group as compared to other age group. [Aschalaw, et. al. 2013, Kumar et. al. 2013 and Kumar et. al. 2015]) In the continuation of this study, another study also revealed that the high prevalence of intestinal helminthes shown in the low socio-economic group. [Bhandari, et. al. 1985].

### Table 1: Prevalence analysis for positive patients According to residence

| Characteristic Gender | Total Number | Positive (+) | Negative (-) | Prevalence (%) |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Urban                 | 98           | 19           | 79           | 31.15          |
| Rural                 | 125          | 42           | 83           | 68.85          |

\*χ² = 6.23, df = 1, P = 0.46 at 0.05 level

### Table 2: Prevalence analysis for positive patients according to age group.

| Characteristic Age Group | Total Number | Positive (+) | Negative (-) | Prevalence (%) |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| 0 – 15                   | 52           | 33           | 19           | 54.1           |
| 15 – 35                  | 91           | 17           | 74           | 27.9           |
| Above 35 Years           | 80           | 11           | 69           | 18.0           |

\*χ² = 25.95, df = 2, P = 11.345 at 0.05 level

### Table 3: Prevalence analysis for positive patients according to gender.

| Characteristic Gender | Total Number | Positive (+) | Negative (-) | Prevalence (%) |
|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Male                  | 120          | 37           | 83           | 60.7           |
| Female                | 103          | 24           | 79           | 39.3           |

\*χ² = 1.58, df = 1, P = 0.46 at 0.05 level
Table: 4 Prevalence analysis for positive patients According to economic status

| Characteristic Economic Status       | Total Number | Positive (+) | Negative (-) | Prevalence (%) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Low Income (5001 to 15000) group   | 71           | 36           | 66           | 59.02          |
| Medium Income (15001 to 25000) group | 112         | 20           | 61           | 32.79          |
| High Income (<25000) group         | 40           | 05           | 35           | 8.20           |

*χ² = 33.64, df = 3, P = 11.34 at 0.01 level

Table: 5 Prevalence analysis for positive patients according to education status.

| Characteristic Education Level     | Total Number | Positive (+) | Negative (-) | Prevalence (%) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Illiterate                          | 103          | 35           | 68           | 57.38          |
| High School level                   | 85           | 22           | 63           | 36.07          |
| Intermediate                        | 20           | 03           | 17           | 4.92           |
| Graduate & Above                    | 15           | 01           | 14           | 1.63           |

Figure 1: Prevalence of gastrointestinal parasitic infection according to residence
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Figure 2: Prevalence of gastrointestinal parasitic infection according to age group

Figure 3: Prevalence of gastrointestinal parasitic infection according to gender

Figure 4: Prevalence of gastrointestinal parasitic infection according to economic status
CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the prevalence of gastrointestinal parasitic diseases appears to be high due to poverty, low literacy status, standards of living, social norms and customs. The present study indicates that a nationwide parasite control project is necessary to reduce the possibility of morbidity and mortality due to parasitic diseases in the country.
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