Diversity of Virulence Genes in Multidrug Resistant *Escherichia coli* from a Hospital in Western China
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**Background:** *Escherichia coli* strains are the most commonly isolated bacteria in hospitals. The normally harmless commensal *E. coli* can become a highly adapted pathogen, capable of causing various diseases both in healthy and immunocompromised individuals, by acquiring a combination of mobile genetic elements. Our aim was to characterize *E. coli* strains from a hospital in western China to determine their virulence and antimicrobial resistance potential.

**Methods:** A total of 97 *E. coli* clinical isolates were collected from the First Affiliated Hospital of Chengdu Medical College from 2015 to 2016. Microbiological methods, PCR, and antimicrobial susceptibility tests were used in this study.

**Results:** The frequency of occurrence of the virulence genes *fimC, irp2, fimH, fyuA, lpfA, hlyA, sat,* and *cnf1* in the *E. coli* isolates was 93.81, 92.78, 91.75, 84.54, 41.24, 32.99, 28.86, and 7.22%, respectively. Ninety-five (97.9%) isolates carried two or more different virulence genes. Of these, 44 (45.4%) isolates simultaneously harbored five virulence genes, 24 (24.7%) isolates harbored four virulence genes, and 17 (17.5%) isolates harbored six virulence genes. In addition, all *E. coli* isolates were multidrug resistant and had a high degree of antimicrobial resistance.

**Conclusion:** These results indicate a high frequency of occurrence and heterogeneity of virulence genes profiles among clinical multidrug resistant *E. coli* isolates. Therefore, appropriate surveillance and control measures are essential to prevent the further spread of these isolates in hospitals.
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**Introduction**

Most *Escherichia coli* strains that colonize the human intestines rarely cause illness in healthy individuals. However, a number of pathogenic strains can cause intestinal or other diseases in healthy, as well as immunocompromised individuals.1

Commensal *E. coli* strains can evolve into highly adapted pathogens capable of inducing diseases following the acquisition of a combination of mobile genetic elements, including virulence genes.1–3

The occurrence of multidrug resistant (MDR) *E. coli* strains has increased in recent years, leading to a severe problem in healthcare settings, especially in developing countries.4–6 MDR *E. coli* strains complicate treatment, as they require prolonged hospitalization and antibiotic treatment and increase the need of surgery, which eventually increase mortality.7,8

*E. coli* strains have been well documented in healthcare settings in western China; however, their characterization has often been limited to phenotypic tests.
and the identification of resistance genes,\textsuperscript{9-13} with limited information regarding their virulence factors. Previously, we examined the virulence gene profiles of 13 diarrheagenic \textit{E. coli} (DEC) strains isolated from a hospital in western China, as well as the molecular characteristics of their genes.\textsuperscript{14} Here, we characterized \textit{E. coli} strains from a hospital in western China and determined their virulence and antimicrobial resistance potential, to better understand the prevalence of virulence genes and antimicrobial resistance in clinical \textit{E. coli} isolates. This study emphasizes the importance of preventing the spread of \textit{E. coli} isolates that harbor both antimicrobial resistance and virulence genes in the clinical setting.

**Methods**

**Bacterial Isolates**

A total of 97 non-duplicated clinical \textit{E. coli} isolates were collected from 97 different patients in various departments (gastroenterology, urology, endocrinology, neurosurgery, and other wards) of the First Affiliated Hospital of Chengdu Medical College, Chengdu, Sichuan, China from 2015 to 2016. The isolates were identified using standard laboratory methods and the ATB New system (bioMérieux, Lyon, France). Patients who satisfied the following three criteria were included in the analysis: 1) age $>$18 years; 2) suspected of having an infection, based on their clinical symptoms (e.g. fever, abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting, dehydration and tenesmus); and 3) their bacterial culture yielded \textit{E. coli} isolates. \textit{E. coli} isolates were collected from blood and samples including blood, urine, sputum, wound exudates and abscesses. Each isolate was further verified by PCR amplification of a 369-bp internal control region from the \textit{E. coli} marker gene, \textit{alr}.\textsuperscript{15} All bacterial strains were stored at $-80$ °C and were grown on MacConkey Agar (Oxoid, Hampshire, UK).

The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of Chengdu Medical College, in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration. In all cases, the patients or their family members were informed and their written consents was obtained.

**Detection of Adherence and Virulence Genes**

All \textit{E. coli} isolates were subjected to PCR to detect 12 adherence (\textit{bfp}, \textit{dadaD}, \textit{dadaE}, \textit{fimC}, \textit{fimH}, \textit{aggA}, \textit{aaA}, \textit{aggA}, \textit{aggA}, \textit{lpfA}, \textit{sfa}, and \textit{pap}) and 27 virulence (\textit{aggR}, \textit{pic}, \textit{astaA}, \textit{stx1}, \textit{stx2}, \textit{eae}, \textit{ipaH}, \textit{est}, \textit{elt}, \textit{ipr2}, \textit{fyuA}, \textit{escL}, \textit{escN}, \textit{escV}, \textit{espP}, \textit{nleB}, \textit{nleE}, \textit{ent/espL2}, \textit{cnf1}, \textit{cnf2}, \textit{cdt-I}, \textit{cdt-II}, \textit{invE}, \textit{hlyA}, \textit{pet}, \textit{sat}, and \textit{subAB}) genes. The primers used to amplify these genes are listed in Table 1.

**Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing**

The minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of 24 antimicrobial agents against the \textit{E. coli} isolates were determined by agar dilution methods, according to the 2019 Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute guidelines.\textsuperscript{16} The following 24 antimicrobial agents were tested: sulfonamide, doxycycline, tetracycline, cefotaxime, ampicillin, ticarcillin, nalidixic acid, cefoperazone, pipercillin, gentamicin, ciprofloxacin, levofloxacin, ofloxacin, tobramycin, cefotaxime, ceftazidime, minocycline, aztreonam, kanamycin, amikacin, polymyxin, meropenem, imipenem, and cefepime. The results were used to classify the isolates as resistant or susceptible to a particular antibiotic using standard reference values.\textsuperscript{16}

**Results**

**Detection of \textit{E. coli} Adherence and Virulence Genes**

The presence of 12 adherence genes and 27 toxin-encoding genes was examined in all \textit{E. coli} strains by PCR. As shown in **Figure 1**, the detection rate of \textit{fimC}, \textit{ipr2}, \textit{fimH}, \textit{fyuA}, \textit{lpfA}, \textit{invE}, and \textit{cnf1} in the isolated \textit{E. coli} strains was 93.81, 24.74, 24.74, 24.74, 24.74, 24.74, and 24.74, respectively. All isolates were negative for the other genes tested (\textit{bfp}, \textit{dadaD}, \textit{dadaE}, \textit{aggA}, \textit{aaA}, \textit{aggA}, \textit{aggA}, \textit{lpfA}, \textit{sfa}, \textit{pap}, \textit{aggR}, \textit{pic}, \textit{astaA}, \textit{stx1}, \textit{stx2}, \textit{eae}, \textit{ipaH}, \textit{est}, \textit{elt}, \textit{escL}, \textit{escN}, \textit{escV}, \textit{espP}, \textit{nleB}, \textit{nleE}, \textit{ent/espL2}, \textit{cnf2}, \textit{cdt-I}, \textit{cdt-II}, \textit{invE}, \textit{pet}, and \textit{subAB}).

Different combinations of multiple virulence genes were detected in the \textit{E. coli} isolates. The number of virulence genes in each isolate and the specific virulence gene combinations are shown in **Table 2**. Two or more different virulence genes were identified in ninety-five (97.94\%) isolates. Of these, 44 (45.37\%) isolates simultaneously harbored five virulence genes, 24 (24.74\%) isolates harbored four virulence genes, 17 (17.53\%) isolates harbored six virulence genes, five (5.15\%) isolates harbored three virulence genes, two (2.06\%) isolates harbored two virulence genes, two (2.06\%) isolates harbored seven virulence genes, and only one (1.03\%) isolate harbored eight virulence genes.

**Resistance to Antimicrobial Agents**

The 24 most commonly used antimicrobials in Chinese clinical practice were used in this study to test the antibiotic resistance of the 97 \textit{E. coli} isolates,\textsuperscript{14,18-20} including penicillin
| Gene | Primer Sequence (5´-3´) | PCR Product (bp) | Reference |
|------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| alr  | F: CTGGAAAGAGCTAGCCTGGGACGAG  
 R: AAAATGCACCACCGGTTGAGCGAT  | 369  | 15 |
| bfp  | F: GACACCTCATGCTGAAGTCTG  
 R: CCAGAACACCTCCGTTATG  | 324  | 55 |
| daaD | F: TGAAAGGGGAGTATAAGGAGATG  
 R: GTCCGCCCATACCATCAAAA  | 444  | 56 |
| daaE | F: GAACCTTGTGTTAATGTTGGGTTA  
 R: TATTCTTGGGGGTAAATG  | 542  | 57 |
| fimC | F: GGGTAGAAAATGCCGATGGTG  
 R: CGTCATTTTGGGGGTAAATG  | 477  | 58 |
| fimH | F: CGAGTTTACCTCGTTTGTCTG  
 R: ACGCCAAATATCCTGGATG  | 878  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GCTAGCAGCCGCTTGGTTAAGGG  
 R: ACCATTGATCTATCTATCCGCC  | 421  | 59 |
| aggA | F: TCAAGGCTTGAGTATGGCTTGAAGACC  
 R: GGATGATCTATCCTATCCGCC  | 169  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACAGGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 169  | 41 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
| aggA | F: GACGCTGATGTGCTTGACAAA  
 R: CCACCTTGGAATCGATATTCCA  | 462  | 59 |
|aggR | F: AACGGCAGATTCCTGATAAAAG  
 R: AATACGAGATCGACATCAGC  | 400  | 55 |
| pic  | F: CGGTATTGTCCTCCTCCGAT  
 R: ACAATCCACGCGTCCTCCCG  | 1176 | 62 |
| astA | F: CAACACAAGATATCAAGT  
 R: GGTCGCGAGTGGGCCGTTG  | 111  | 59 |
| stx1 | F: CGATGGTTGTTGTTGTTGTTTGTTA  
 R: AATTCGACGCTTCCCATGGGGAGTT  | 244  | 55 |
| stx2 | F: GTTTGACATTGCTCGATTATCAGGC  
 R: AGCGTAAGGCTTCTGCTGTGAC  | 324  | 55 |
| eae  | F: TGACGCGGTGGCATGAGTACAG  
 R: CCGGAGATCATGACACCTTC  | 241  | 63 |
| fpaH | F: GTTCCTTGGACACCGTCTTCCGATACG  
 R: AAAATCCGACCGGTGAGCGAT  | 619  | 64 |
### Table 1 (Continued).

| Gene   | Primer Sequence (5´-3´)         | PCR Product (bp) | Reference |
|--------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------|
| est    | F: ATTTTTTTTTTTGTATTTGTCTT  
        | R: CACCCGTTACAGCCAGGATT  | 190        | 65        |
| elt    | F: GGGCAGAGATTATACCGTGC  
        | R: CGGTCTCCTATATTTCCGGTTT | 450        | 65        |
| ipp2   | F: AAGGATTCCGCTGTATACCCGGAC  
        | R: TCGTCCGGCAAGGTTTCTCTT  | 264        | 66        |
| fyuA   | F: TGATTAACCCCGGCCAGGGGA  
        | R: CCGAGTCGCAACAGGATGTA  | 785        | 27        |
| escJ   | F: GACCTAGCCTGATATAGAACC  
        | R: GTCATGTTGTGATGCTATCTAAG | 824        | 60        |
| escN   | F: CGCTTTTAACAGATAGAAGC  
        | R: CATCTAAGAATAGACGGGAC  | 854        | 67        |
| escV   | F: GATGACATCAGATGATCAACTC  
        | R: GCCTCTCAAGTCTGCTGAGAC | 238        | 40        |
| espP   | F: AAACAGCAGGCACCTGGAACG  
        | R: GGAGTCTGCTAGCTAGATGAT | 1830       | 62        |
| nleB   | F: GGAAGTTTTTTCCACAGACG  
        | R: AAAATGCCCTTGTGATACC   | 847        | 68        |
| nleE   | F: GTATAACCGAGGAGTATGC  
        | R: GATCTTCAAACAAATGTCCTT | 860        | 68        |
| ent/espL2 | F: GAATCTACACACTCCCTCACC  
            | R: TTACAGTGCCGGATTAT       | 233        | 68        |
| cnf1   | F: GGGCAGAAATCGTTGAGCCGC  
        | R: GACGGTGTTGCTGCAATGGG   | 552        | 62        |
| cnf2   | F: GTGAGGTACGAGATCCCGACTG  
        | R: CCAGCCTCCCTTCAGTGGTTCCT | 839       | 62        |
| cdt-I  | F: GCATAGTCGCCCAAGGA  
        | R: TATGCTAAGACACACCACCAC | 412        | 69        |
| cdt-II | F: AGTGTAAATCGAATTATAGTCCG  
        | R: TGCTTGTCGCGCGCTGTTGAAA | 556        | 69        |
| invE   | F: CGATGACGATCCCTACGAAATGAGAATATATCCGG  
        | R: TACAGTGGCCGAGAATATATCCGG | 766       | 55        |
| hlyA   | F: GCATCATCAAGCGTGATCTCC  
        | R: AATGGGCAAGCTGTTAGAAGCT | 533        | 66        |
| pet    | F: TTTCACAGCTTCTGGTCC  
        | R: ATTTCCAGCTTCAGCCCAT    | 297        | 70        |
| sat    | F: GCAGCAGAGATATTGATATAC  
        | R: GTGTTGACCCATGCAAGGAA   | 2913       | 40        |
| subAB  | F: TATGGGCTCCTTCATTGCC  
        | R: TATAGTGTGTCTTCTGACG    | 556        | 71        |
(ampicillin, ticarcillin, piperacillin), cephems (cefoxitin, cefoperazone, ceftaxime, ceftazidime), monobactams (aztreonam), carbapenems (meropenem, imipenem, ertapenem), aminoglycosides (tobramycin, kanamycin, gentamicin, amikacin, chloramphenicol), tetracyclines (doxycycline, minocycline, tetracycline, tetracycline), quinolones (levofloxacin, ofloxacin, nalidixic acid, ciprofloxacin).\(^\text{16}\) The resistance profiles of the E. coli isolates against these 24 antibiotics are detailed in Table 3. The isolates exhibited a high degree of resistance, especially against sulfonamides (99.01%), ampicillin (94.85%), ticarcillin (90.72%), nalidixic acid (90.72%), tetracycline (81.44%), doxycycline (88.49%), ciprofloxacin (70.10%), ofloxacin (69.34%), cefotaxime (68.04%), and levofloxacin (60.82%). Furthermore, all E. coli isolates were susceptible to meropenem and imipenem. The sensitivity rate of the E. coli strains to meropenem, amikacin, cefotaxime, ceftazidime, aztreonam and chloramphenicol was 92.79, 88.66, 74.22, 81.44, 88.66, and 64.98%, respectively.

Importantly, all isolates were resistant to at least three different classes of antimicrobial agents and were considered as multidrug resistant.\(^\text{17}\) Of the 97 MDR E. coli isolates, five (5.16%), one (1.03%), one (1.03%), three (3.09%), three (3.09%), six (6.19%), nine (9.28%), six (6.19%), nine (9.28%), twelve (12.37%), nine (9.28%), eight (8.25%), eight (8.25%), four (4.12%), three (3.09%), two (2.06%), three (3.09%), two (2.06%), and three (3.09%) isolates exhibited resistance to 3–21 types of antibiotics, respectively, as shown in Table 4 and Figure 2.

### Table 2 Distribution of Virulence Genes Among E. coli Isolates

| No. of Virulence Genes | Virulence Genes Profile | No. (%) of Bacterial Strain | Total No. (%) |
|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 0 genes                | 2(2.06)                 | 2(2.06)                     |               |
| 2 genes                | fimC, fimH              | 1(1.03)                     | 3(3.09)       |
|                        | ipr2, fyuA              |                            |               |
| 3 genes                | fimC, fimH, lpfA,      | 2(2.06)                     | 5(5.15)       |
|                        | fimC, lpfA, sat,        |                            |               |
|                        | fimC, ipr2, fyuA,      |                            |               |
|                        | ipr2, fyuA, lpfA,      |                            |               |
| 4 genes                | fimC, fimH, ipr2, fyuA | 14(14.44)                   | 24(24.74)     |
|                        | fyuA                    | 4(4.12)                     |               |
|                        | ipr2, fyuA, lpfA,      |                            |               |
|                        | lpfA, hlyA              | 2(2.06)                     |               |
|                        | fimC, fimH, ipr2, fyuA |                            |               |
|                        | fimC, lpfA, hlyA        | 1(1.03)                     |               |
| 5 genes                | fimC, fimH, ipr2, fyuA | 19(19.59)                   | 44 (45.37)    |
|                        | fyuA                    | 12(12.38)                   |               |
|                        | sat                     | 10(10.31)                   |               |
|                        | fimC, fimH, ipr2, fyuA |                            |               |
|                        | sat                     | 2(2.06)                     |               |
|                        | lpfA, hlyA              | 1(1.03)                     |               |
| 6 genes                | fimC, fimH, ipr2, fyuA | 7(7.23)                     | 17(17.53)     |
|                        | fyuA                    | 4(4.12)                     |               |
|                        | hlyA                    | 3(3.09)                     |               |
|                        | sat                     | 2(2.06)                     |               |
|                        | fimC, fimH, ipr2, fyuA |                            |               |
|                        | fyuA                    |                            |               |
|                        | hlyA, cfA               | 1(1.03)                     |               |
| 7 genes                | fimC, fyuA              | 2(2.06)                     | 2(2.06)       |
|                        | hlyA, sat, cfA          |                            |               |
| 8 genes                | fimC, fimH, fyuA        | 1(1.03)                     | 1(1.03)       |
|                        | fyuA                    |                            |               |

## Frequency of Virulence Gene Occurrence in Isolated E. coli Strains Exhibiting Antimicrobial Resistance

The frequencies of virulence gene occurrence in isolated E. coli strains exhibiting antimicrobial resistance are detailed in Table 5. The frequencies for fimC, irp2, and fimH among the resistant E. coli isolates were nearly > 90%, whereas that of fyuA was > 80%. Moreover, the frequencies of lpfA, hlyA, sat,
and cnf1 in the resistant isolates were higher than 40, 30, 20, and 5%, respectively.

**Discussion**

*Escherichia coli* strains are the most commonly isolated bacteria in hospitals.18–20 Although these strains have been frequently reported in hospitals in western China, data regarding the virulence genes present in these strains are limited.9–13 Thus, in this study, we investigated the presence of virulence genes and antimicrobial resistance in *E. coli* strains at a hospital in the western region of China in order to further expand our knowledge of the characteristics of *E. coli* strains prevalent in China.

We first detected 12 adherence and 27 virulence genes in 97 clinical *E. coli* isolates. Our results showed that most of the *E. coli* isolates contained multiple and heterogeneous virulence genes (Table 2). Type 1 fimbriae is an *E. coli* adhesion factor encoded by the *fimC* and *fimH* genes. It enables *E. coli* to bind to intestinal epithelial cells by attaching on mannose-containing receptors. In our study, *fimC* and *fimH* were identified in 93.81 and 91.75% of the strains, respectively. Nuesch-Inderbinen et al21 detected the presence of *fimC* and *fimH* in all human *E. coli* strains isolated in Switzerland, while Malekzadegan and Khashei22 found *fimH* in all isolates from Iranian patients. These reports are in agreement with our findings; the high frequency of occurrence of *fimC* and *fimH* among *E. coli* strains points to their importance in *E. coli* adhesion.

Some *E. coli* strains carried another type of fimbriae, long polar fimbriae (LPF), encoded by the conserved gene *lpfA*.23,24 We found that 41.24% of the *E. coli* isolates carried *lpfA*, which is similar to the frequency (50%) reported in Mexico.25 In situ studies conducted on human biopsy samples have suggested that adherence and the attaching and effacing lesion caused by *E. coli* do not require LPF.24 Therefore, it is possible that LPF are not necessary for *E. coli* pathogenicity.

The High-Pathogenicity Island (HPI) marker genes, *irp2* and *fyuA*, were detected in 92.78 and 84.54%, respectively, of *E. coli* isolates in this study. The *irp2* and *fyuA* genes have been detected in a number of studies examining pathogenic *E. coli* isolated from humans,26–28 similar to the results of the present study. The iron-uptake system of highly pathogenic strains is mediated via yersiniabactin, which is encoded by *irp2* and *fyuA* and is associated with strain virulence.29,30 A considerable number of bacteria isolated from food harbor *irp2* and *fyuA* (involved in iron capture systems).31,32 This could be the reason for the frequent detection of *irp2* and *fyuA* in pathogenic *E. coli* isolated from humans.

The *hlyA* gene was detected in 32.99% of the *E. coli* isolates. In Iran, Malekzadegan and Khashei22 reported

---

**Table 3** Antimicrobial Susceptibility of *E. coli* Clinical Isolates

| Antimicrobial Agent | Resistant n (%) | Intermediate n (%) | Susceptible n (%) |
|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Sulfonamide       | 95 (97.94)     | —                 | 2 (2.06)         |
| Ampicillin        | 92 (94.85)     | 0(0)              | 5 (5.15)         |
| Ticarcillin       | 88 (90.72)     | 2 (2.06)          | 7 (7.23)         |
| Nalidixic acid    | 88 (90.72)     | —                 | 9 (9.28)         |
| Tetracycline      | 76 (81.41)     | 1 (1.03)          | 20 (21.56)       |
| Doxycycline       | 77 (81.94)     | 4 (4.12)          | 20 (21.56)       |
| Ciprofloxacin     | 68 (70.10)     | 2 (2.06)          | 27 (29.84)       |
| Ofloxacin         | 66 (68.04)     | 2 (2.06)          | 29 (31.90)       |
| Cefotaxime        | 66 (68.04)     | 4 (4.12)          | 37 (39.84)       |
| Levofloxacin      | 59 (60.82)     | 10 (10.83)        | 28 (29.35)       |
| Piperacillin      | 59 (59.79)     | 19 (19.59)        | 20 (21.56)       |
| Cefoperazone      | 51 (52.58)     | 18 (18.55)        | 28 (29.87)       |
| Gentamicin        | 51 (52.58)     | 4 (4.12)          | 42 (45.30)       |
| Kanamycin         | 39 (40.21)     | 1 (1.03)          | 57 (60.76)       |
| Tobramycin        | 39 (40.21)     | 17 (17.53)        | 41 (44.26)       |
| Chloramphenicol   | 33 (34.02)     | 1 (1.03)          | 63 (67.94)       |
| Minocycline       | 33 (34.02)     | 13 (13.40)        | 51 (55.58)       |
| Aztreonam         | 28 (28.87)     | 4 (4.12)          | 65 (70.01)       |
| Cefazidime        | 21 (21.65)     | 11 (11.34)        | 65 (70.01)       |
| Cefotaxin         | 17 (17.53)     | 8 (8.25)          | 72 (77.22)       |
| Amikacin          | 8 (8.25)       | 3 (3.09)          | 86 (88.66)       |
| Ertaopenem        | 3 (3.09)       | 4 (4.12)          | 90 (92.79)       |
| Meropenem         | 0(0)           | 0(0)              | 97 (100)         |
| Imipenem          | 0(0)           | 0(0)              | 97 (100)         |

---

**Table 4** Number of *E. coli* Isolates Resistant to Different Classes of Antibiotics

| Different classes of antibiotics | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  | 20  | 21  |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Isolates                        | 5   | 1   | 1   | 3   | 3   | 6   | 9   | 6   | 9   | 12  | 9   | 8   | 8   | 4   | 3   | 2   | 3   | 2   | 3   |
| %                               | 5.16| 1.03| 1.03| 3.09| 3.09| 6.19| 9.28| 6.19| 9.28| 12.37| 9.28| 8.25| 8.25| 4.12| 3.09| 2.06| 3.09| 2.06| 3.09|
that 28.6% of the E. coli strains were positive for hlyA, whereas Dale et al\textsuperscript{33} found that 26% of E. coli strains in the UK carried hlyA, and Bozcal et al\textsuperscript{34} identified this gene in 15.4% of E. coli strains in Turkey. The percentage of E. coli harboring hlyA in our study was higher than detected in the above-mentioned studies. α-hemolysin (HlyA) belongs to a group of pore-forming leukotoxins containing RTX repeats, and is thus considered a virulence factor in E. coli.\textsuperscript{35–37} Depending on its concentration and the type of cell affected, HlyA either displays cytolytic activity or hijacks innate immune signaling pathways.\textsuperscript{37–39} The high percent of hlyA in this study suggests that HlyA is involved in the mechanisms underlying E. coli pathogenicity in 32 (32.99%) patients.

The sat gene was detected in 28.86% of E. coli isolates. Sat is frequently detected in pathogenic E. coli strains.\textsuperscript{5,40,41} As demonstrated by Guignot et al,\textsuperscript{42} Sat can cause tight junction lesions between epithelial cells, which may lead to an increase in their permeability. These findings indicate that Sat probably plays a role in E. coli pathogenesis in 28 (28.86%) of the patients.

The cnf1 gene was found in seven (7.22%) E. coli isolates, similar to the 7.2% reported in Turkey.\textsuperscript{43} Moreover, Bouzari et al\textsuperscript{43} reported that 29.8% of E. coli strains harbor cnf1 genes. Cytotoxic necrotizing factor type 1 (CNF1) is a monomeric protein previously shown to affect rabbit skin cell necrosis and multinucleation of various cultured eukaryotic cells.\textsuperscript{44–46} Our results are in agreement with the low occurrence of cnf1 in E. coli strains.

We next examined the antimicrobial resistance of the 97 E. coli isolates. The E. coli isolates were insensitive to first-line antibiotics such as nalidixic acid, sulfonamide, ticarcillin,

### Table 5 Frequency of Virulence Genes Among Antibiotic Resistant E. coli Isolates

| Antibiotic (n) | Virulence Genes, n (%) |
|---------------|-----------------------|
|               | fimC                  | epB                  | fyuA | lpfA | hlyA | sat | cnf1 |
| Sulfonamide (95) | 89 (93.68) | 88 (92.63) | 88 (92.63) | 80 (84.21) | 39 (41.05) | 32 (33.68) | 27 (28.42) | 7 (7.37) |
| Ampicillin (92) | 87 (94.68) | 85 (92.39) | 85 (92.39) | 77 (83.69) | 38 (41.30) | 32 (34.78) | 25 (27.17) | 7 (7.61) |
| Ticarcillin (88) | 84 (94.45) | 83 (93.88) | 83 (93.88) | 81 (90.48) | 37 (45.02) | 32 (36.36) | 25 (28.57) | 7 (7.61) |
| Nalidixic acid (88) | 71 (95.45) | 82 (98.82) | 84 (95.45) | 74 (85.40) | 38 (43.18) | 32 (36.36) | 27 (30.68) | 7 (7.61) |
| Tetracycline (79) | 62 (94.45) | 74 (93.88) | 74 (93.88) | 67 (84.09) | 30 (41.47) | 23 (31.51) | 20 (27.05) | 7 (9.59) |
| Doxycycline (73) | 58 (98.53) | 65 (95.93) | 67 (95.93) | 63 (86.30) | 30 (41.10) | 23 (31.51) | 20 (27.05) | 6 (8.82) |
| Ciprofloxacin (68) | 66 (98.48) | 63 (95.45) | 65 (95.45) | 57 (86.36) | 26 (39.39) | 24 (36.36) | 21 (31.82) | 6 (9.09) |
| Doxycycline (66) | 66 (98.48) | 63 (95.45) | 65 (95.45) | 57 (86.36) | 26 (39.39) | 24 (36.36) | 21 (31.82) | 6 (9.09) |
| Levofloxacin (59) | 70 (96.31) | 56 (94.92) | 58 (98.31) | 50 (84.75) | 24 (40.68) | 21 (35.59) | 15 (25.42) | 6 (10.17) |
| Piperacillin (51) | 56 (96.55) | 55 (94.82) | 55 (94.82) | 53 (91.37) | 26 (44.82) | 17 (29.31) | 16 (25.00) | 5 (8.21) |
| Cefoperazone (44) | 51 (100) | 50 (98.04) | 49 (96.07) | 45 (88.24) | 25 (49.02) | 14 (27.45) | 12 (23.53) | 3 (5.88) |
| Gentamicin (54) | 49 (96.08) | 47 (92.16) | 48 (92.16) | 45 (88.24) | 25 (49.02) | 14 (27.45) | 12 (23.53) | 3 (5.88) |
| Kanamycin (39) | 37 (94.87) | 36 (92.31) | 35 (89.74) | 32 (82.05) | 19 (48.72) | 9 (23.08) | 8 (20.51) | 3 (7.69) |
| Tobramycin (39) | 38 (94.74) | 36 (92.31) | 35 (89.74) | 36 (92.31) | 19 (48.72) | 5 (12.82) | 8 (20.51) | 3 (7.69) |
| Chloramphenicol (33) | 32 (96.97) | 30 (90.91) | 29 (87.88) | 27 (81.82) | 13 (39.39) | 8 (24.24) | 10 (30.30) | 2 (6.06) |
| Minocycline (33) | 31 (93.94) | 32 (96.97) | 30 (90.91) | 31 (93.94) | 17 (51.52) | 8 (24.24) | 11 (33.33) | 2 (6.06) |
| Azezagomet (28) | 28 (100) | 28 (100) | 27 (96.43) | 26 (88.24) | 12 (42.86) | 7 (25.00) | 7 (25.00) | 2 (7.14) |
| Ceftazidime (21) | 21 (100) | 21 (100) | 21 (100) | 19 (90.98) | 9 (45.02) | 6 (28.57) | 7 (33.33) | 1 (4.76) |
| Cefoxitin (17) | 15 (88.23) | 15 (88.23) | 12 (70.59) | 13 (76.47) | 9 (52.94) | 6 (35.29) | 2 (11.76) | 2 (11.76) |
| Amikacin (8) | 7 (87.50) | 6 (75.00) | 7 (87.50) | 4 (50.00) | 5 (62.50) | 1 (12.50) | 1 (12.50) | 0 (0) |
| Ertapenem (3) | 3 (100) | 3 (100) | 3 (100) | 2 (66.67) | 1 (33.33) | 1 (33.33) | 2 (66.67) | 1 (33.33) |
ampicillin, tetracycline, doxycycline, oxolinic acid, cefotaxime, ciprofloxacin, and levofloxacin (Table 3). The antibiotic resistance rates of the E. coli isolates exceeded those reported in developing countries such as Brazil, Turkey, and Ghana.\textsuperscript{5,34,47} Moreover, the resistance rates observed in our study were higher than noted in the CHINET project.\textsuperscript{18–20} Unexpectedly, we found that all E. coli isolates were MDR and over half of them were resistant to > 12 classes of antibiotics (Table 4 and Figure 2). These results highlight the increasing severity of antibiotic misuse in clinical practice in western China.

Carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae (CRE) are highly prevalent in China, the United States, Italy, Israel, Colombia, Greece, the Indian subcontinent, North Africa, and Turkey.\textsuperscript{48,49} China (especially the regions of Beijing, Changsha, Chongqing, Fuzhou, Guangzhou, Hangzhou, Hebei, Hong Kong, and Zhengzhou) is thought to be one of main endemic regions of these bacteria around the world.\textsuperscript{50,51} In our study, we found that three (3.0%) CRE among the 97 E. coli isolates were resistant to ertapenem (Table 3). Carbapenem-resistant E. coli have been frequently reported in western China in recent years,\textsuperscript{52–54} most probably owing to the use of carbapenems as antimicrobial agents in this region.

Lastly, but most importantly, we found that the E. coli strains harbor a high rate of virulence genes in addition to high antimicrobial resistance (Table 5). These findings explain how the E. coli isolates are able to successfully invade the human body and evade antibiotic treatment. Our findings indicate that clinical MDR E. coli isolates harbor a high frequency of virulence genes and that the virulence gene profiles are highly heterogeneous. Therefore, surveillance and control measures need to be enhanced to prevent these isolates from spreading further in hospitals.

Conclusions
This study demonstrates a high frequency of occurrence and heterogeneity of virulence gene profiles among clinical multidrug-resistant E. coli isolates. We conclude that appropriate surveillance and control measures are essential to prevent the further spread of these isolates in hospitals. However, further investigations are needed including additional hospitals in western China and a greater number of E.coli isolates to better understand the prevalence of virulence genes and antimicrobial resistance of the E.coli in western China.
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