# Tolerance to disinfectants (chlorhexidine and isopropanol) and its association with antibiotic resistance in clinically-related *Klebsiella pneumoniae* isolates

Jasmine Morante (b<sup>a</sup>, Antonio M. Quispe (b<sup>b</sup>, Barbara Ymaña (b<sup>a</sup>, Jeel Moya-Salazar (b<sup>c,d</sup>, Néstor Luque (b<sup>e,f</sup>, Gabriela Soza (b<sup>9</sup>, María Ramos Chirinos<sup>9</sup> and Maria J Pons (b<sup>a</sup>)

<sup>a</sup>Escuela de Medicina, Universidad Científica del Sur, Lima, Peru; <sup>b</sup>Universidad Continental, Huancayo, Peru; <sup>c</sup>Hospital Nacional Docente Madre Niño San Bartolomé, Lima, Peru; <sup>d</sup>Escuela de Posgrado, Universidad Privada San Juan Bautista, Lima, Peru; <sup>e</sup>Médico asistente de UCI. Hospital Nacional Dos de Mayo, Lima, Peru; <sup>f</sup>Escuela de Medicina Humana. Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud, Universidad Peruana Unión, Lima, Peru; <sup>g</sup>Instituto Materno Perinatal de Lima, Lima, Peru

#### ABSTRACT

Disinfectants play an essential role in controlling the dissemination of bacteria in health care settings, but it may also contribute to the selection of antibiotic resistance bacteria. This study looked at Klebsiella pneumoniae isolates collected from three hospitals in Lima, Peru, in order to evaluate: their susceptibility to chlorhexidine [CHG] and isopropanol [ISP]), and their association with antimicrobial susceptibility. We analyzed 59 K. pneumoniae isolates and assessed their CHG and ISP susceptibility by minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs). Additionally, we performed a regression analysis to assess the association between disinfectant tolerance and antibiotic resistance (measured by the disc diffusion method), colistin resistance (by microdilution), carbapenemases presence (by polymerase chain reaction [PCR]), and clonal relationships (by pulsed-field gel electrophoresis [PFGE]). Eleven K. pneumoniae strains were isolated from fomites, and 48 strains from clinical samples. The MIC range of these isolates was 8–128  $\mu$ g/ml for CHG and 16–256 mg/ml for ISP. We found that resistance to trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole (TMP/SMX) was the main factor associated with CHG log<sub>2</sub> MIC ( $\beta$  = 0.65; 95%CI: 0.03, 1.27; R<sup>2</sup> = 0.07). In the case of ISP, the log<sub>2</sub>(MIC) was associated with the institution of origin, showing lower ISP log<sub>2</sub>(MIC) in fomites compared to clinical samples ( $\beta = -0.77$ ; 95% CI: -1.54, -0.01;  $R^2 = 0.08$ ). Resistance to CHG and ISP among K. pneumoniae isolates found in Peruvian hospitals seems to be elevated and highly variable. Further studies are needed to confirm our results and implement actionable interventions if necessary.

# Introduction

Biocides are routinely used in healthcare settings and play an essential role in infection control [1], one that has been highlighted during the fight against SARS-CoV-2. Two of the most frequently used types of biocides in hospitals are chlorhexidine digluconate (CHG) and isopropyl alcohol (ISP). Chlorhexidine is a bisbiguanide antiseptic used against a wide range of microorganisms. It functions by forming a bridge between phospholipids with subsequent displacement of cations (Mg2+ and Ca2+) [2], resulting in membrane disruption via a reduction in the capacity of the bacterial membrane to osmoregulate and changes in enzymes associated with metabolic membrane capability [2]. Chlorhexidine is often used for procedures such as handwashing, preoperative preparation, and surface disinfection because of its bacteriostatic and bactericidal properties [3,4], as well as its ability to rapidly denature the proteins of microorganisms [5].

In recent decades, infections associated with multidrug-resistant (MDR) pathogens have increased, being *Klebsiella pneumoniae* one of the most resistant species. This is of concern because *K. pneumoniae* has also been associated with high mortality rates and an increased use of last-resort antibiotics, such as carbapenems, colistin, and their combinations [6]. These MDR pathogens are responsible for increasing mortality rates secondary to hospital-acquired infections, readmissions, and emergency department visits after discharge [7].

There is an ongoing debate about whether there is an association between an increased tolerance of this bacteria to disinfectants and its resistance to antibiotics. There is evidence suggesting that hygiene promotion, which includes biocides use, helps prevent bacteria transmission across health care settings, although further research is needed to determine the consequence of biocides uses on the appearance or selection of antibiotic resistance bacteria [8,9]. This study aimed to test the levels of tolerance of *K. pneumoniae* strains to CHG and ISP and determine their association with antimicrobial resistance in Peruvian health care settings before COVID-19.

CONTACT Maria J Pons a ma.pons.cas@gmail.com Duiversidad Científica del Sur, Carr. Panamericana Sur 19, Villa EL Salvador, Lima 15067, Peru 2021 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

#### **KEYWORDS**

Disinfectants; chlorhexidine; alcohol-based disinfectants; *kKebsiella pneumoniae*; crossresistance; antibiotic resistance



Check for updates

# **Materials and methods**

# **Bacterial strains**

The Klebsiella spp. strains evaluated were obtained from bacterial collections at the Molecular Microbiology Laboratory of the Universidad Científica del Sur in Lima, Peru. The K. pneumoniae isolates were from 3 different Institutions in Lima: the Hospital Nacional 2 de Mayo (HN2M) (fomites isolates collected from clinical mobile phones and uniforms), as well as Instituto Nacional Materno Perinatal (INMP) and Hospital Nacional Guillermo Almenara Irigoyen (HNGAI), both of which provided clinical isolates (bacteremia, secretions). The strains were collected in 2018, and the identification was confirmed by matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization time-of-flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF/MS).

This study was approved by the Ethical Committee of the *Universidad Cientifica del Sur* in Lima, Peru.

# Preparation of disinfectant (chlorhexidine and isopropanol) solutions

Stock solutions of CHG (CHG; 40 mg/mL) were prepared in sterile distilled water at a concentration of 768 µg/ml prior to further dilution (256, 128, 64, 32, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1, 0.5, 0.25, 0.125 µg/ml) in Mueller Hinton broth and distributed into 96-well plates. Stock solutions of ISP (ISO; EMSURE<sup>®</sup>) were prepared at 768 mg/L in sterile distilled water and were also diluted (256, 128, 64, 32, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1, 0.5, 0.25, 0.125 mg/ml) in Mueller Hinton broth and placed in 96-well plates. We used the strains ATCC 13883 *Klebsiella pneumoniae* as a control. The disinfectants were added separately to these strains and used as a positive control. For negative control, only the culture media was used to monitor the sterility.

# Disinfectant susceptibility testing

Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) were determined using the Mueller Hinton broth microdilution method established by the Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) [10]. Briefly, bacterial strains were resuspended in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) 0.5x to a 0.5 McFarland concentration. Lecture was done after 18–20 hours of incubation at 37°C. The MIC was defined as the lowest concentration of the disinfectant agents that inhibits the visible growth of the isolate tested observed with the unaided eye. In the absence of an established cutoff, we defined MIC<sub>50</sub> as the MIC necessary to inhibit the growth of 50% of the study isolates, while MIC<sub>90</sub> was considered the MIC necessary to inhibit the growth of 90% of the study isolates.

# Antimicrobial susceptibility testing

Antimicrobial susceptibility testing was performed by a conventional disc diffusion method. The

antimicrobials included were meropenem, imipenem, piperacillin/tazobactam, chloramphenicol, trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole, nitrofurantoin, levofloxacin, ciprofloxacin, aztreonam, cefotaxime, amoxicillin plus clavulanic acid, gentamicin, and amikacin. The category of resistance was interpreted according to CLSI guidelines [10]. The *Escherichia coli* strain ATCC 25922 was used as a control. Screening for colistin was evaluated by microdilution as recommended by the CLSI-EUCAST Polymyxin Breakpoints Working Group in order to describe MICs [11].

#### Presence of carbapenemases

The presence of carbapenemases was evaluated in isolates with diminished carbapenem susceptibility. Thus, these strains were screened by a multiplex polymerase chain reaction (PCR) test for the  $bla_{\rm KPC}$ ,  $bla_{\rm OXA-48}$ ,  $bla_{\rm VIM}$ ,  $bla_{\rm IMP}$ , and  $bla_{\rm NDM}$  genes [12].

# **Clonality studies**

The isolates' clonal relatedness was determined by pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE), as described previously [13]. Band patterns were analyzed using InfoQuestTM FP v.5.4 software. Bacteria with a similarity > 80% were considered to be clonally related.

# **Statistical analysis**

Descriptive analysis of disinfectant susceptibility was performed using the MICs 50, MIC 90, and CHG and ISP range separately. We conducted a bivariate analysis using the Kruskal Wallis test for means log<sub>2</sub>(MIC) comparisons. We estimated the magnitude of association modeling the log<sub>2</sub>(MIC) using generalized linear models, a Gaussian family, link identity, and robust variances. During this process, we included the following variables as factors potentially associated with CHG and ISP log<sub>2</sub>(MIC), separately: institution and source of isolate origin, carbapenemases positivity, clonality, and resistance to common and last-resort antibiotics. In all cases, we estimated 95% confidence intervals (95% CI), and the STATA MP v14.0 statistical package (Stata Corp LP, College Station, Texas) was used for the statistical analyses. We used a p-value of 0.05 to measure the statistical significance and a p-value of 0,10 for exploratory analysis.

#### Results

#### **Bacterial strains**

A total of 59 *K. pneumoniae* isolates were included in the study. Among these, 11 (18.6%) were isolated from HN2M, 7 (64%) were isolated from mobile phones, and 4 (36%) were isolated from the clothing of health care workers. 23 (38.9%) were clinical isolates from blood samples of bacteremia from the HNGAI, and 25 (42.3%) were from blood and secretions of patients from the INMP. All the isolates belonged to a collection obtained in 2018 and stored at  $-80^{\circ}$ C in the *Universidad Científica del Sur* Microbiology Laboratory.

### Antibiotic susceptibility

The *K. pneumoniae* collection that was studied presented a high rate of resistance to ciprofloxacin, amoxicillin plus clavulanic acid, ceftriaxone, and ceftazidime (86.4, 72.4, 74.6, and 75.8% respectively). Resistance rates of nearly 60% were found to aztreonam, trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole, and nitrofurantoin (60.7%, 60.3%, and 66.1%, respectively), 51.9% to piperacillin/tazobactam, 51.7% to both imipenem and chloramphenicol, 42.1% to levofloxacin, 48.2% to meropenem, and 45.6% to gentamicin. Finally, low resistance levels to amikacin (36.2%) and colistin (8.5%) were reported.

#### Disinfectant susceptibility

When analyzing CHG resistance, we observed high variability of MICs (coefficient of variation [CV] = 0.81), ranging from 8 to 128 µg/ml (Figure 1). The MIC<sub>50</sub> of all the isolates included in the study was 32 µg/ml. In the bivariate analysis, we found marginal MIC differences between CHG isolates testing positive versus negative to carbapenemases and resistant to levofloxacin. In contrast, statistically significant differences were found between those testing positive versus negative to resistance to TMP/SMX (Tables 1 and 2). On the other hand, when analyzing ISP resistance, we also observed a wide range of MICs against ISP (CV = 0.80), 16–256 mg/ml (Figure 1). The ISP MIC<sub>50</sub> of all the isolates was 64 mg/

ml. In the bivariate analysis, we found significant differences among sample sources (p = 0.04), and marginal differences among institutions (p = 0.08). Specifically, we observed a lower MIC<sub>50</sub> and MIC<sub>90</sub> among HN2M isolates (32 and 64 mg/ml, respectively) compared to those obtained from HNGAI (64 and 128 mg/ml, respectively) and INMP (64 and 128 mg/ml, respectively). Likewise, we observed a lower MIC<sub>50</sub> and MIC<sub>90</sub> among isolates from fomites from health workers' mobile phones/clothing (32 and 64 mg/ml, respectively) compared to those from blood and secretions (64 and 128 mg/ml, respectively) (Table 1).

#### Presence of carbapenemases

The isolates that presented a resistance phenotype to carbapenems (either imipenem or meropenem) were tested by PCR, detecting the  $bla_{NDM}$  gene in 23 of them (38.9%). We did not find other carbapenemases genes, such as  $bla_{KPC}$ ,  $bla_{oxa-48}$ ,  $bla_{IMP}$ , or  $bla_{VIM}$ .

#### **Clonality analysis**

When testing PFGE patterns, we observed that all the isolates belonged to different PFGE types, except for 20 strains classified in the same group. Despite these results, we did not observe significant or marginal differences in the MICs of CHG and ISP compared with the rest of the isolates.

# Association of antibiotic resistance with disinfectant susceptibility

In the bivariate regression analysis, a significant direct association was found between the  $CHGlog_2(MIC)$  and resistance to TMP/SMX (p = 0.041). Also, marginal direct associations were observed with positivity to carbapenemases (p = 0.072) and resistance to



Figure 1. Log<sub>2</sub>(MIC) of chlorhexidine and isopropanol in strains of Klebsiella pneumoniae.

Table 1.	MICs of	<sup>c</sup> chlorhexidine	and	isopropanol	by	the	study	sample's	character	istics.

	Chlorhexidine MIC (µg/mL)			<i>p</i> -value	p-value Isopropanol MIC (mg/mL)			
Characteristic	MIC <sub>50</sub>	MIC <sub>90</sub>	Range		MIC <sub>50</sub>	MIC <sub>90</sub>	Range	
All	32	64	8-128		64	128	16–256	
Institution								
INMP	16	64	8-128	0.123	64	128	32-256	0.084†
HNGAI	64	128	8-128		64	128	16-256	
HN2M	32	64	16–64		32	64	32-64	
Sample source								
Fomite	32	64	16–64	0.541	32	64	32-64	0.038‡
Blood/Secretions	32	128	8-128		64	128	16-256	
Clonality								
Negative	16	64	8-128	0.192	64	128	16–64	0.239
Positive	64		16-256		32		32-64	
Carbapenemases								
Absence	16	64	8-128	0.071†	64	128	32-256	0.455
Presence	64	128	8–128		64	128	16–256	

MIC, Minimal inhibitory concentration; INMP, Instituto Nacional Materno Perinatal; HNGAI, Hospital Nacional Guillermo Almenara Irigoyen; HN2M, Hospital Nacional Dos de Mayo; †, p value <0.10; ‡, p value <0.05

Table 2. MICs of chlorhexidine and	isopropanol by antibiotics.
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Antimicrobial	Chlo	orhexidine MIC (	μg/mL)	<i>p</i> -value	Isop	Isopropanol MIC (mg/mL)		
Colsitin	agents	MIC <sub>50</sub>	MIC <sub>90</sub>	Range		MIC <sub>50</sub>	MIC <sub>90</sub>	Range	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Colistin	50	50			50			
Resistant    32    32    8 - 32    num    80    128    32 - 128    num      Imperme	Sensitive	32	64	8-128	0.329	64	128	16-256	0.609
Imperem      Interm      Interm      Interm      Interm        Sensitive      32      64      8-128      0.105      64      128      12-256        Meropenen      Sensitive      32      128      8-128      64      128      32-256        Sensitive      32      128      8-128      64      128      32-256        Sensitive      32      64      8-128      64      128      32-128      0.647        Sensitive      32      64      8-128      0.165      64      128      32-128      0.815        Resistant      32      128      8-128      0.185      64      128      32-128      0.815        Resistant      32      128      8-128      0.0394      64      128      32-128      0.101        Resistant      32      128      8-128      0.0394      64      128      16-256      0.101        Resistant      32      64      8-128      0.610      128      16-256      0.510        Resistant <td< td=""><td>Resistant</td><td>32</td><td>32</td><td>8-32</td><td>0.525</td><td>80</td><td>128</td><td>32-128</td><td>0.009</td></td<>	Resistant	32	32	8-32	0.525	80	128	32-128	0.009
Sensitive Resistant $32$ $64$ $8-128$ $0.105$ $64$ $128$ $32-128$ $0.675$ Resistant $32$ $128$ $8-128$ $0.158$ $64$ $128$ $16-256$ $0.675$ Meropene Sensitive $32$ $64$ $8-128$ $0.158$ $64$ $128$ $32-956$ $0.677$ Resistant $32$ $128$ $8-128$ $0.158$ $64$ $128$ $32-956$ $0.677$ PIP/T2B $32$ $128$ $8-128$ $0.165$ $64$ $128$ $32-128$ $0.815$ Sensitive $32$ $128$ $8-128$ $0.165$ $64$ $128$ $32-128$ $0.815$ Sensitive $32$ $128$ $8-128$ $0.183$ $32$ $128$ $16-256$ $0.101$ Resistant $16$ $64$ $8-128$ $0.0394$ $64$ $128$ $16-256$ $0.101$ Resistant $32$ $128$ $8-128$ $0.0394$ $64$ $128$ $16-256$ $0.101$ Resistant $32$ $128$ $8-128$ $0.394$ $64$ $128$ $16-256$ $0.610$ Sensitive $32$ $64$ $8-128$ $0.598$ $32$ $128$ $16-256$ $0.510$ Resistant $32$ $64$ $8-128$ $0.598$ $32$ $128$ $16-256$ $0.510$ Resistant $32$ $64$ $8-128$ $0.599$ $64$ $128$ $16-256$ $0.596$ Resistant $32$ $128$ $8-128$ $0.599^2$ $64$ $128$ $16-$	Iminenem	52	52	0 02			.20	52 .20	
Resistant    32    128    8-128    0.100    64    128    16-256    0.000      Meropenen	Sensitive	32	64	8-128	0 105	64	128	32-128	0.675
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Resistant	32	128	8-128	0.105	64	128	16-256	0.075
Sensitive32648–1280.1586412832–2560.647Resistant321288–1286412816–25612832–1280.815Sensitive321288–1286412832–1280.8150.8150.815Resistant321288–1280.1833212816–2560.101Sensitive321288–1280.1833212816–2560.101Sensitive16648-1280.039‡6412832–1280.708Resistant321288–1280.39‡6412816–1280.708Sensitive321648–640.8754812816–1280.610Resistant321288–1280.697412832–2560.510Resistant32648–1280.5983212832–2560.510Resistant32648–1286412816–2560.697CiprofoxacinIncomeIncomeIncomeIncomeIncomeIncomeSensitive321288–1280.599†6412832–2560.596Resistant32648–1280.597†6412832–2560.596Resistant32648–1280.597†6412832–2560.596Resistant32648–1280.597† <td< td=""><td>Meronenem</td><td>52</td><td>120</td><td>0 120</td><td></td><td>04</td><td>120</td><td>10 250</td><td></td></td<>	Meronenem	52	120	0 120		04	120	10 250	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Soncitivo	30	64	8_178	0 158	64	178	32-256	0.647
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Posistant	32	178	0-120 9-179	0.150	64	120	16_256	0.047
Firstlew    32    64    8-128    0.165    64    128    32-128    0.815      Resistant    32    128    8-128    64    128    12-128    0.815      Sensitive    32    128    8-128    0.183    32    128    16-128    0.101      Resistant    16    64    32-256    0.0101    32-128    0.101      Resistant    16    64    32-256    0.101    32-128    0.101      Sensitive    16    64    8-128    0.039‡    64    128    32-128    0.708      Resistant    32    128    8-128    0.039‡    64    128    16-256      Nitrofurantoin    32    128    8-128    0.875    48    128    16-256      Attreonam    32    128    8-128    0.598    32    128    128    16-256      Sensitive    32    64    8-128    0.138    48    256    32-256    0.597      Resistant    32    64    8-128    0.138    48 <t< td=""><td>DID/T7R</td><td>52</td><td>120</td><td>0-120</td><td></td><td>64</td><td>120</td><td>10-250</td><td></td></t<>	DID/T7R	52	120	0-120		64	120	10-250	
Schattive32046412612632-12604.13Resistant321288-1280.1033212816-2560.101Resistant166432-2566412832-1280.708Resistant16648-1280.039‡6412832-1280.708Resistant321288-1280.039‡6412816-2560.708Resistant321288-1280.6412816-2560.610Resistant32648-1280.5983212832-2560.510Resistant32648-1280.5983212832-2560.510Resistant32648-1280.5983212832-2560.510Resistant32648-1280.5983212832-2560.510Resistant32648-1280.5983212816-2560.596CiprofloxcinImage: Signal Si	FIF/IZD Soncitivo	27	61	0 170	0 165	64	1 7 0	22 120	0.015
Nestatint321288-1280.1833212816-128Sensitive321288-1280.1833212816-2560.101Sensitive16648-1280.039‡6412832-2560.101TMP/SMX556412832-2560.039‡6412832-2560.001Sensitive16648-1280.039‡6412816-2560.010Nitrofurantoin556412816-2560.0100.010Sensitive32648-1280.5983212832-2560.510Resistant32648-1280.5983212832-2560.510Resistant32648-1280.1384825632-2560.697Resistant32648-1280.1384825632-2560.697Resistant32648-1280.1384825632-2560.596Resistant16648-1286412816-2560.596LevofixacinSensitive321288-1280.6976412832-2560.596Resistant16648-1280.9796412816-2560.59612816-2560.596Resistant321288-1280.6666422632-2560.991166412816-256 </td <td>Posistant</td> <td>32</td> <td>120</td> <td>0-120</td> <td>0.105</td> <td>64</td> <td>120</td> <td>32-120 16 139</td> <td>0.015</td>	Posistant	32	120	0-120	0.105	64	120	32-120 16 139	0.015
Chronandia de la construcción de la const	Chloromananical	52	120	0-120		04	120	10-120	
Sensitive321288-1280.1633212810-2300.101Resistant1664 $32-256$ 64128 $32-256$ 708Resistant32128 $8-128$ 0.039‡64128 $32-128$ 0.708Resistant32128 $8-128$ 0.8754812816-2561010Resistant32128 $8-128$ 0.8754812816-2561010Resistant32128 $8-128$ 0.59832128 $32-256$ 0.510Resistant3264 $8-128$ 0.59832128 $32-256$ 0.510Resistant3264 $8-128$ 0.59832128 $32-256$ 0.697Resistant3264 $8-128$ 0.6412816-2560.697Resistant32164 $8-128$ 0.699†6412816-2560.596Resistant32128 $8-128$ 0.059†6412816-2560.596Resistant32128 $8-128$ 0.059†6412832-2560.596Resistant32128 $8-128$ 0.9796412832-2560.596Resistant3264 $8-128$ 0.6666422632-2560.991Resistant3264 $8-128$ 0.2666412816-2560.991Resistant3264 $8-128$ 0.26664	Chioramphenicol	22	100	0 100	0 1 0 2	22	120	16 256	0 101
Residuit    10    04    32–250    04    128    128    32–128    0.039‡    64    128    32–128    0.708      Sensitive    16    64    8–128    0.039‡    64    128    32–128    0.708      Resistant    32    128    8–128    0.639‡    64    128    16–128    0.610      Resistant    32    2    64    8–64    0.875    48    128    16–128    0.610      Resistant    32    64    8–128    0.598    32    128    32–256    0.510      Resistant    32    64    8–128    0.598    32    128    32–256    0.510      Resistant    32    64    8–128    0.138    48    256    32–256    0.697      Resistant    32    64    8–128    0.059†    64    128    16–256    0.596      Resistant    32    128    8–128    0.059†    64    128    32–256    0.991      Resistant    32    128    8–128    0.059†	Sensitive	32	128	8-128	0.183	32	128	10-250	0.101
IMP/SMA      Sensitive      16      64      8-128      0.039‡      64      128      32-128      0.708        Resistant      32      128      8-128      64      128      16-256      0.708        Sensitive      32      128      8-128      64      128      16-128      0.610        Resistant      32      128      8-128      64      128      16-256      0.510        Sensitive      32      64      8-128      0.598      32      128      16-256      0.510        Sensitive      32      64      8-128      0.598      32      128      16-256      0.597        Resistant      32      64      8-128      0.138      48      256      32-256      0.697        Resistant      32      64      8-128      0.659†      64      128      16-256      0.596        Resistant      16      64      8-128      0.659†      64      128      32-128      0.991        Resistant      16      64      8-128	Resistant	10	04	32-250		04	128	32-250	
Sensitive    16    64    8-128    0.0397    64    128    32-128    0.008      Resistant    32    128    8-128    64    128    16-256      Nitrofurantoin    5    64    128    16-256    0.009      Resistant    32    128    8-128    0.609    32    128    0.610      Aztreonam	I MP/SMX	16	( )	0 120	0.020+	<i>(</i> <b>)</b>	120	22 120	0 700
Resistant    32    128    8-128    64    128    16-256      Sensitive    32    64    8-64    0.875    48    128    16-128    0.610      Resistant    32    128    8-128    64    128    16-256    0.610      Aztreonam    32    64    8-128    0.598    32    128    32-256    0.510      Resistant    32    64    8-128    0.598    32    128    32-256    0.697      Resistant    32    64    8-128    0.138    48    256    32-256    0.697      Resistant    32    64    8-128    0.138    48    256    32-256    0.697      Resistant    32    64    8-128    0.0591    64    128    16-256    0.596      Resistant    16    64    8-128    0.0591    64    128    32-128    0.991      Resistant    32    128    8-128    0.979    64    128    32-256    0.991      Resistant    32    64	Sensitive	16	64	8-128	0.039 <del>1</del>	64	128	32-128	0.708
Nitrourantoin      Sensitive      32      64      8-64      0.875      48      128      16-128      0.610        Resistant      32      128      8-128      64      128      16-256      0.10        Attreonam          Sensitive      32      64      8-128      0.598      32      128      32-256      0.510        Resistant      32      64      8-128      0.438      48      256      32-256      0.697        Resistant      32      64      8-128      0.138      48      256      32-256      0.697        Resistant      32      64      8-128      0.4591      64      128      16-256      0.596        Resistant      32      128      8-128      0.0591      64      128      12-256      0.596        Resistant      32      128      8-128      0.0591      64      128      32-256      0.991        Resistant      32      64      8-128      0.64      128      32-256	Resistant	32	128	8-128		64	128	16-256	
Sensitive    32    64    8-64    0.875    48    128    16-128    0.610      Aztreonam    Sensitive    32    128    8-128    64    128    16-256      Aztreonam    Sensitive    32    64    8-128    0.598    32    128    32-256    0.510      Resistant    32    64    8-128    0.598    32    128    32-256    0.510      Ciprofloxacin    Sensitive    64    128    16-256    32-256    0.697      Resistant    32    64    8-128    0.138    48    256    32-256    0.697      Resistant    32    64    8-128    0.059†    64    128    16-256    0.596      Resistant    16    64    8-128    0.059†    64    128    32-256    0.991      Resistant    32    128    8-128    0.979    64    128    32-256    0.991      Resistant    32    64    8-128    0.979    64    128    32-256    0.991      Resistant </td <td>Nitrofurantoin</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>10</td> <td>100</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Nitrofurantoin					10	100		
Resistant    32    128    8–128    64    128    16–256      Aztreonam	Sensitive	32	64	8-64	0.875	48	128	16-128	0.610
AztronamSensitive32648–1280.5983212832–2560.510Resistant32648–1280.1384825632–2560.697CiprofloxacinUSensitive641288–1280.1384825632–2560.697Resistant32648–1280.059†6412816–2560.596LevofloxacinUSensitive321288–1280.059†6412816–2560.596Resistant16648–1280.9796412832–2560.991Resistant32648–1280.9796412832–2560.991Resistant32648–1280.9796412832–2560.991Resistant32648–1280.6412816–2560.781Resistant32648–1280.2666425632–2560.199Resistant32648–1280.2666425632–2560.586Resistant32648–1280.2666412832–2560.586Resistant32648–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant32648–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant32648–1280.11564128<	Resistant	32	128	8–128		64	128	16–256	
Sensitive    32    64    8–128    0.598    32    128    32–256    0.510      Resistant    32    64    8–128    64    128    16–256      Ciprofloxacin	Aztreonam								
Resistant    32    64    8–128    64    128    16–256      Ciprofloxacin	Sensitive	32	64	8–128	0.598	32	128	32–256	0.510
CiprofloxacinSensitive641288–1280.1384825632–2560.697Resistant32648–1286412816–2560.596LevofloxacinSensitive321288–1280.059†6412816–2560.596Resistant16648–1280.059†6412832–1280.991CefotximeSensitive321288–1280.9796412832–2560.991Resistant32648–1280.9796412832–2560.991Resistant32648–1280.9796412832–2560.991Resistant32648–1280.9796412832–2560.991Sensitive32648–1280.9796412816–256MCSensitive32648–1280.2666412816–256MCSensitive32648–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant6412816–1286412816–1280.586MaiterinNA-NASensitive32648–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant6412812816–1280.58612816–1	Resistant	32	64	8–128		64	128	16–256	
Sensitive $64$ $128$ $8-128$ $0.138$ $48$ $256$ $32-256$ $0.697$ Resistant $32$ $64$ $8-128$ $64$ $128$ $16-256$ $16-256$ LevofloxacinSensitive $32$ $128$ $8-128$ $0.059†$ $64$ $128$ $16-256$ $0.596$ Resistant $16$ $64$ $8-128$ $0.059†$ $64$ $128$ $32-128$ $0.979$ CefotaximeVSensitive $32$ $128$ $8-128$ $0.979$ $64$ $128$ $32-256$ $0.991$ Resistant $32$ $264$ $8-128$ $0.979$ $64$ $128$ $32-256$ $0.991$ Resistant $32$ $64$ $8-128$ $0.979$ $64$ $128$ $32-256$ $0.991$ Resistant $32$ $64$ $8-128$ $0.666$ $64$ $128$ $16-256$ AMCVSensitive $16$ $64$ $8-128$ $0.266$ $64$ $128$ $16-128$ GentamicinVSensitive $32$ $64$ $8-128$ $0.115$ $64$ $128$ $32-256$ $0.586$ Resistant $64$ $128$ $8-128$ $64$ $128$ $32-256$ $0.586$ Resistant $64$ $128$ $16-256$ $128$ $16-256$ $128$ Sensitive $32$ $64$ $8-128$ $0.115$ $64$ $128$ $32-256$ $0.586$ Resistant $64$ $128$ $8-128$ $64$	Ciprofloxacin								
Resistant32648–1286412816–256Levofloxacin $32$ 1288–1280.059†6412816–2560.596Resistant16648–1280.059†6412832–1280.979Cefotaxime $32$ 1288–1280.9796412832–2560.991Resistant32648–1280.9796412832–2560.991Resistant32648–1280.9796412832–2560.991Resistant32648–640.881646432–1280.781Resistant32648–640.881646432–1280.781Resistant32648–1280.2666425632–2560.199Resistant32648–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant641288–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant641288–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant641288–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant641288–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant641288–1280.42816–1280.586Resistant641288–1286412816–128<th Colspan="</td> <td>Sensitive</td> <td>64</td> <td>128</td> <td>8–128</td> <td>0.138</td> <td>48</td> <td>256</td> <td>32–256</td> <td>0.697</td>	Sensitive	64	128	8–128	0.138	48	256	32–256	0.697
LevofloxacinSensitive321288–1280.059†6412816–2560.596Resistant16648–1286412832–12832–128CefotaximeSensitive321288–1280.9796412832–2560.991Resistant32648–1286412816–2560.781CeftazidimeSensitive32648–640.881646432–1280.781Resistant321288–1286412816–2560.799Sensitive32648–1280.2666425632–2560.199Resistant32648–1280.2666412816–1280.199Sensitive16648–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant32648–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant6412816–1286412816–1280.586Resistant6412816–1286412816–1280.586Resistant6412816–1286412816–1280.586Resistant6412816–1286412816–1280.586Resistant6412816–1286412816–1280.586Resistant641286412816–128	Resistant	32	64	8–128		64	128	16–256	
Sensitive    32    128    8–128    0.059†    64    128    16–256    0.596      Resistant    16    64    8–128    64    128    32–128      Cefotaxime	Levofloxacin								
Resistant16648–12864128 $32-128$ Cefotaxime $2$ 128 $8-128$ 0.97964128 $32-256$ 0.991Resistant32648–1280.97964128 $32-256$ 0.991Resistant32648–12864128 $32-128$ 0.979CeftazidimeSensitive32648–640.881646432–1280.781Resistant32648–640.881646432–1280.781Sensitive32648–1280.2666425632–2560.199Resistant32648–1280.2666425632–2560.199Resistant32648–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant32648–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant641288–1280.1156412832–2560.586Sensitive32648–1280.1156412832–2560.586Sensitive $-$ NA $-$ NASensitive $-$ NASensitive $-$ NASensitive $-$ NASensitive $-$ NASensitive $-$ N	Sensitive	32	128	8–128	0.059†	64	128	16–256	0.596
CefotaximeSensitive321288–1280.9796412832–2560.991Resistant32648–1286412816–256CeftazidimeSensitive32648–640.881646432–1280.781Resistant321288–640.881646432–1280.781Resistant321288–1280.2666425632–2560.199Resistant32648–1280.2666425632–2560.199Resistant32648–1280.1156412832–2560.586GentamicinSensitive32648–1280.1156412832–2560.586Resistant6412832–2560.586Resistant6412816–128OPA7NAResistant6412816–128OPA6412816–128Sensitive $-$ NA $-$ NAResistant32648–1280.1156412816–128Sensitive $-$ NA $-$ NAResistant32648–1280.412816–256	Resistant	16	64	8–128		64	128	32-128	
Sensitive  32  128  8–128  0.979  64  128  32–256  0.991    Resistant  32  64  8–128  64  128  16–256    Ceftazidime	Cefotaxime								
Resistant    32    64    8–128    64    128    16–256      Ceftazidime	Sensitive	32	128	8-128	0.979	64	128	32-256	0.991
Ceftazidime      Sensitive      32      64      8–64      0.881      64      64      32–128      0.781        Resistant      32      128      8–128      64      128      16–256      0.781        AMC      Sensitive      16      64      8–128      0.266      64      256      32–256      0.199        Resistant      32      64      8–128      0.266      64      128      16–128        Gentamicin         Sensitive      32      64      8–128      0.115      64      128      32–256      0.586        Resistant      64      128      32–256      0.586      8      8      128      0.115      64      128      32–256      0.586        Resistant      64      128      32–256      0.586      8      128      16–128      16–128        Sensitive      32      64      8–128      0.115      64      128      16–128        Sensitive      -      NA      -      NA      -	Resistant	32	64	8-128		64	128	16-256	
Sensitive      32      64      8–64      0.881      64      64      32–128      0.781        Resistant      32      128      8–128      64      128      16–256      AMC        Sensitive      16      64      8–128      0.266      64      256      32–256      0.199        Resistant      32      64      8–128      0.266      64      128      16–128        Gentamicin      32      64      8–128      0.115      64      128      32–256      0.586        Resistant      64      128      8–128      0.115      64      128      32–256      0.586        Resistant      64      128      8–128      0.115      64      128      16–128        Sensitive      32      64      8–128      0.115      64      128      16–128        Amikacin      Sensitive      -      NA      -      NA        Sensitive      -      NA      -      NA        Resistant      32      64      8–128	Ceftazidime								
Resistant  32  128  8–128  64  128  16–256    AMC  -  -  -  -    Sensitive  16  64  8–128  0.266  64  256  32–256  0.199    Resistant  32  64  8–128  0.266  64  128  16–128    Gentamicin  -  -  -  -  -    Sensitive  32  64  8–128  0.115  64  128  32–256  0.586    Resistant  64  128  8–128  0.115  64  128  32–256  0.586    Resistant  64  128  8–128  0.115  64  128  16–128    Sensitive  -  NA  -  NA  NA  NA    Resistant  32  64  8–128  64  128  16–256	Sensitive	32	64	8-64	0.881	64	64	32-128	0.781
AMC      Sensitive      16      64      8–128      0.266      64      256      32–256      0.199        Resistant      32      64      8–128      64      128      16–128      0.199        Gentamicin	Resistant	32	128	8-128		64	128	16-256	
Sensitive      16      64      8–128      0.266      64      256      32–256      0.199        Resistant      32      64      8–128      64      128      16–128      64      128      16–128      64      128      16–128      64      128      32–256      0.586      0.586      Resistant      64      128      32–256      0.586      0.586      Resistant      64      128      16–128      0.586      16–128      16–128      16–128      1	AMC								
Resistant      32      64      8–128      64      128      16–128        Gentamicin      -        Sensitive      32      64      8–128      0.115      64      128      32–256      0.586        Resistant      64      128      32–256      0.586        Amikacin      -      NA      -      NA        Sensitive      -      NA      -      NA        Resistant      32      64      8–128      64      128      16–256	Sensitive	16	64	8-128	0.266	64	256	32-256	0.199
Gentamicin      Sensitive      32      64      8–128      0.115      64      128      32–256      0.586        Resistant      64      128      8–128      64      128      16–128        Amikacin      NA      -      NA        Sensitive      -      NA        Resistant      32      64      8–128      64      128      16–256	Resistant	32	64	8-128		64	128	16-128	
Sensitive      32      64      8–128      0.115      64      128      32–256      0.586        Resistant      64      128      8–128      64      128      16–128        Amikacin Sensitive      NA      -      NA        Sensitive      -      NA        Resistant      32      64      8–128      64      128      16–256	Gentamicin								
Resistant      64      128      8–128      64      128      16–128        Amikacin      Sensitive      NA      -      NA        Sensitive      -      NA      -      NA        Resistant      32      64      8–128      64      128      16–256	Sensitive	32	64	8-128	0.115	64	128	32-256	0.586
Amikacin      NA      NA      NA        Sensitive      32      64      8–128      64      128      16–256	Resistant	64	128	8-128		64	128	16–128	
Sensitive      -      NA      -      NA        Resistant      32      64      8–128      64      128      16–256	Amikacin								
Resistant 32 64 8–128 64 128 16–256	Sensitive	-			NA	-			NA
	Resistant	32	64	8-128		64	128	16–256	

MIC, Minimal Inhibitory Concentration; Me, Median; IQR, Interquartile range; Pip/tzb, piperacillin/tazobactam; TMP/SMX, trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole; AMC, amoxicillin/clavulanate; †, p value <0.10; ‡, p value <0.05

imipenem (p = 0.094) and levofloxacin (p = 0.061) (Table 3). However, in the multivariate regression analysis, the only resistance to TMP/SMX was observed as the main predictor of the CHG log<sub>2</sub>(MIC) ( $\beta$  = 0.65; 95%)

CI: 0.03, 1.27;  $R^2 = 0.1127$ ). On the other hand, when modeling the ISP  $log_2(MIC)$ , we observed a significant association with the institution of origin of the sample, with HN2M samples showing a lower ISP  $log_2(MIC)$ 

Table 3. Regression analysis for log<sub>2</sub>(MIC) of chlorhexidine and isopropanol.

	Chlorhexidine MIC		Isopropanol MIC	
	(Log <sub>2</sub> µg/mL)		(Log <sub>2</sub> mg/mL)	
Associated Factor	ß (95% Cl)	<i>p</i> -value	ß (95% Cl)	<i>p</i> -value
Institution				
INMP	Ref.		Ref	
HNGAI	0.66 (-0.01, 1.32)	0.054†	-0.23 (-0.76, 0.29)	0.375
HN2M	0.53 (-0.31, 1.37)	0.210	-0.77 (-1.54, -0.01)	0.048‡
Fomites source	-0.22 (-1.01, 0.58)	0.588	-0.22 (-1.01, 0.58)	0.588
PFGE Type 4	0.51 (-0.26, 1.28)	0.191	-0.11 (-0.63, 0.41)	0.680
Carbapenemases	0.66 (-0.06, 1.38)	0.072†	-0.23 (-0.79, 0.32)	0.400
Colistin	-0.56 (-1.68, 0.56)	0.321	0.29 (-0.67, 1.25)	0.543
Imipenem	0.52 (-0.09, 1.13)	0.094†	-0.10 (-0.41, 0.61)	0.703
Meropenem	0.44 (-0.17, 1.06)	0.158	-0.15 (-0.66, 0.36)	0.547
PIP/TZB	0.45 (-0.16, 1.07)	0.147	-0.04 (-0.55, 0.48)	0.889
Chloramphenicol	-0.46 (-1.14, 0.23)	0.186	0.43 (-0.12, 0.98)	0.122
TMP/SMX	0.65 (0.03, 1.27)	0.041‡	-0.07 (-0.59, 0.44)	0.779
Nitrofurantoin	0.09 (-0.55, 0.75)	0.764	0.16 (-0.37, 0.69)	0.547
Aztreonam	-0.51 (-0.51, 0.81)	0.645	0.09 (-0.46, 0.63)	0.741
Ciprofloxacin	-0.68 (-1.56, 0.21)	0.132	-0.32 (-1.11, 0.47)	0.422
Levofloxacin	-0.60 (-1.23, 0.03)	0.061†	0.11 (-0.42, 0.64)	0.678
Cefotaxime	-0.02 (-0.74, 0.69)	0.946	-0.07 (-0.66, 0.52)	0.814
Ceftazidime	0.07 (-0.66, 0.81)	0.840	-0.03 (-0.63, 0.58)	0.934
AMC	0.38 (-0.30, 1.05)	0.270	-0.49 (-1.03, 0.06)	0.078
Gentamicin	0.48 (-0.15, 1.11)	0.129	-0.25 (-0.77, 0.27)	0.339

MIC, Minimal Inhibitory Concentration; INMP, Instituto Nacional Materno Perinatal; HNGAI, Hospital Nacional Guillermo Almenara Irigoyen; HN2M, Hospital Nacional Dos de Mayo; PFGE, pulsed field gel electrophoresis; PIP/TZB, piperacillin/tazobactam; TMP/SMX, trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole; AMC, amoxicillin/clavulanate; β, linear regression coefficient; 95% CI, 95% confidence interval; †, p value <0.01; ‡, p value <0.05</p>

compared to isolates from the INMP (p = 0.048). No association was observed between the ISP log2(MIC) and any antibiotic resistance tested in the study.

# Discussion

The main findings of our study include elevated and highly variable levels of resistance to CHG and ISP among clinically-related *K. pneumoniae* isolates from Peru. Additionally, we observed an association between CHG resistance and TMP/SMX resistance plus a significant variability of ISP resistance according to institution source. These results are important because both CHG and ISP are two of the main disinfectants used in health care facilities and because their use has increased substantially during COVID-19 pandemic.

Our study findings coincide with previous studies that reported a lower susceptibility of bacteria to CHG and ISP [14], which are commonly used to control the spread of *K. pneumoniae* and other bacteria and viruses in most health care settings around the world. Disinfectants are crucial to correct infection control and are extensively used in hospitals, veterinary medicine, the food industry, farms, and homes [14], but their use could associate antimicrobial resistance increase [8]. Surveillance studies are needed to evaluate the microorganisms' tolerance to disinfectants at an institutional level to establish adequate disinfection programs.

Although there are no cutoffs by international organizations such as CLSI or EUCAST to guide the interpretation of susceptibility to these substances, epidemiological cutoff values have been proposed to indicate CHG resistance in *Klebsiella* (64 µg/ml) [15]. In our study, we found a wide range of MICs of CHG in *Klebsiella* isolates, with MIC<sub>50</sub> of the HNGAI samples being the highest (64  $\mu$ g/ml), and according to the cutoff, they were resistant to this disinfectant. In short, our results showed 21 (35,6%) samples with MIC≥64  $\mu$ g/ml, which, according to the epidemiological cutoff, is considered resistant. Although not statistically significant, we observed higher CHG resistance levels in the HNGAI sample compared to those from INMP, as well as among fomites (HN2M). This finding could be related to greater use of CHG in intensive care units in which patients receive daily CHG bathing, exerting selection pressure on microorganisms previously related to bacteria more tolerant to CHG [16].

We found a significant association between TMP/ SMX resistance and higher levels of CHG MIC values. This association has been described in bacterial species such as Pantoea spp. and Salmonella spp., but to our knowledge, not in K. pneumoniae [17]. In addition, the present data demonstrate that other antibiotics have shown this association. Thus, the presence of carbapenemases is directly associated with higher CHG MIC values, and the resistance to levofloxacin has a negative association since higher CHG MIC values are related to the presence of strains susceptible to levofloxacin. Our results correlate with a previous study performed in China that suggested decreased sensitivity against commonly used disinfectants, including CHG, in carbapenem-resistant strains. Furthermore, Chen et al. [18] reported the presence of carbapenem-resistant K. pneumoniae with decreased susceptibility to CHG (MIC 32  $\mu$ g/ml, which is the limit of the ecological cutoff of 64  $\mu$ g/ml). It is important to mention that only six phylogenetically related strains were included in the study and all carbapenemases that were found were

*bla*<sub>NDM</sub> [19]. Our data showed a negative association between fluoroquinolones and CHG resistance, while a positive association has been previously described in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* [19]. Thus, *in vitro* exposure to CHG has been related to the selection of quinoloneresistant *P. aeruginosa* due to over-expression of the efflux pumps MexAB-OprM, MexCD-OprJ, and MexXY-OprM [20], none of which are related to *K. pneumoniae*.

We found no relationship between colistin resistance and increased tolerance to CHG compared to the study by Wand et al. (2017), which found that the MICs of CHG were the same in both colistin-susceptible and colistin-resistant K. pneumoniae strains [6]. Likewise, it has been described that the adaptation to CHG led to resistance against colistin in K. pneumoniae and, instead, the adaptation to colistin does not lead to resistance against CHG [6]. In K. pneumoniae, in vitro exposure to CHG increased the colistin resistance likely by induction of point mutations in pmrBA and phoPQ related to colistin resistance and/or smvR [21]. SmvA is an efflux pump belonging to the major facilitator superfamily (MFS), which has been suggested to play a major role in CHG resistance in K. pneumoniae strains [6].

Increasing CHG resistance has been related to the over-expression of efflux pumps involved eliminating CHG [22]. Notably, different MDR efflux systems can export both antibiotics and biocides, contributing to the co-selection of resistance to different agents. There is a gene family related to diminished CHG susceptibility called qac (quaternary ammonium compound) (e.g., qacA/B and qacC, among others) [23]. Of note, some qac genes have been shown to contribute to the increasing resistance to specific antibiotics; for instance, QacA and QacBIII contribute to the final norfloxacin and ciprofloxacin MIC levels [23]. These gac genes encode for Qac efflux proteins belonging to the MFS and SMR efflux pump families. While the role of these proteins is well known in Gram-positive strains, previous findings have led to controversy about the role and frequency of the cepA, qacA, and qacE genes in Gram-negative strains, with more or less importance being given depending on the study [18, 21, 24, 25].

Moreover, it has been described that the *qacE* $\Delta 1$  gene is located in an integron class 1 structure upstream of the *sul1* gene that confers sulfonamide resistance and is often flanked by the dihydrofolate reductase gene *dfrA1* related to trimethoprim resistance [18]. These gene cassette structures are related to the CHG tolerance, and TMP/SMX resistance found in our study (p < 0.05), with both genes likely being disseminated together in the same mobile structure within the same plasmid. This relationship could be associated with the described propriety of CHG that could stimulate the horizontal transfer of antibiotic resistance [26], leading to the potential to coand cross-select antibiotic resistance mechanisms [27]. Future studies are needed to determine the gene content in integrons inside plasmids and relate their frequency with the MIC of the biocides and diminished antimicrobial susceptibility strains.

Regarding ISP-based disinfectants, the present study found lower resistance in isolates from fomites compared to clinical isolates. This may be because strains found in potential fomites (mobile devices, health workers' clothing, etc.) are less exposed to these disinfectants than hospital surfaces.

It is worth noting that there are studies that reported cases of disinfectant-induced antibiotic resistance in bacterial strains [8,17]. This may have contributed to the antibiotic resistance in our strains if previously exposed to disinfectants in hospital settings.

No relation was found between antibiotic resistance and alcohol tolerance, which supports a previous report evidencing that no cross-resistance to antibiotics after low-level exposure to alcohol-based disinfectants has so far been described [17]. This might occur because the mechanisms of action of alcohol-based disinfectants are not related to mechanisms causing antibiotic resistance, such as inhibition and uncoupling of messenger ribonucleic acid (RNA) and protein synthesis through specific effects on RNA polymerase and ribosomes [28], or interference with cellular metabolism, disruptions of cytoplasmic integrity and cell lysis [29].

Our results showed a high proportion of CHG and ISP resistant strains. However, the clinical importance of these findings is not yet evident, since the concentrations of disinfectants used in clinical settings are, at present, greater than the highest MICs found in the study. Globally, very few studies have discussed and analyzed MIC rates of biocides together with antibiotics and their molecular mechanisms [31–33]. Antimicrobial resistance genotypes vary among different countries, regions, and hospital settings, and the same could occur with disinfectant-tolerant bacteria and their mechanisms [16]. Therefore, it is important to highlight that these results provide a baseline for measuring disinfectant susceptibility to assist in future surveillance studies in Peru.

This study evaluated pre-pandemic levels of CHG and ISP resistance. Considering the wide-scale use of biocides for personal and environmental disinfection during the COVID-19 pandemic, the current levels of resistance may be a global public health threat. Future surveillance studies are essential to understand the effect of disinfectant use and observe the possible emergence of microorganisms that can survive exposure to disinfectants.

# **Acknowledgments**

We thank the members of the Microbiology Laboratory team of the three hospitals involved for their kind collaboration. The authors thank Donna Pringle for editorial assistance.

#### **Disclosure statement**

The authors reported no potential competing interests.

#### Funding

This work was supported by the Universidad Cientifica del Sur, 'Semilla 2019-01 grant'.

# ORCID

Jasmine Morante b http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3665-1924 Antonio M. Quispe b http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2100-7423 Barbara Ymaña b http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6482-9243 Jeel Moya-Salazar b http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7357-4940 Néstor Luque b http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6192-4392 Gabriela Soza b http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5159-2817 Maria J Pons b http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8384-2315

#### References

- Rutala WA. APIC guideline for selection and use of disinfectants. Am J Infect Control. 1996 Aug;24 (4):313–342.
- [2] Hugo WB, Longworth AR. The effect of chlorhexidine on the electrophoretic mobility, cytoplasmic constituents, dehydrogenase activity and cell walls of *Escherichia coli* and *Staphylococcus aureus*. J Pharm Pharmacol. 1966 Sep;18(9):569–578.
- [3] Denny J, Munro CL. Chlorhexidine bathing effects on health-care-associated infections. Biol Res Nurs. 2017 Mar;19(2):123–136.
- [4] Lakhani N, Vandana KL. Department of periodontics, college of dental sciences, Davangere, Karnataka, India. Chlorhexidine – An insight. Int J Adv Res. 2016 Jul 31;4(7):1321–1328.
- [5] Boyce JM. Alcohols as surface disinfectants in healthcare settings. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2018 Mar;39(3):323–328.
- [6] Wand ME, Bock LJ, Bonney LC, et al. Mechanisms of increased resistance to chlorhexidine and cross-resistance to colistin following exposure of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* clinical isolates to chlorhexidine. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2017 Jan;61(1):e01162–16.
- [7] Barrasa-Villar JI, Aibar-Remón C, Prieto-Andrés P, et al. Impact on morbidity, mortality, and length of stay of hospital-acquired infections by resistant microorganisms. Clin Infect Dis. 2017 Aug 15;65 (4):644–652.
- [8] Caselli E, Brusaferro S, Coccagna M, et al. Reducing healthcare-associated infections incidence by a probiotic-based sanitation system: A multicentre, prospective, intervention study. PLoS One. 2018;13(7): e0199616.
- [9] Sanchez P, Moreno E, Martinez JL. The biocide triclosan selects *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia* mutants that overproduce the SmeDEF multidrug efflux pump. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2005;49 (2):781–782.
- [10] M100-S11. Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing. Clin Microbiol Newsl. 2001;23 (6):49.
- [11] Turlej-Rogacka A, Xavier BB, Janssens L, et al. Evaluation of colistin stability in agar and comparison

of four methods for MIC testing of colistin. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2018;37(2):345–353.

- [12] Bogaerts P, Rezende de Castro Ŗ, de Mendonc R, et al. Validation of carbapenemase and extended-spectrum b-lactamase multiplex endpoint PCR assays according to ISO 15189. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2013;68:1576–1582.
- [13] Durmaz R, Otlu B, Koksal F, et al. The optimization of a rapid pulsed-field gel electrophoresis protocol for the typing of *Acinetobacter baumannii, Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella* spp. Jpn J Infect Dis. 2009;62 (5):372–377.
- [14] Fraise AP. Choosing disinfectants. J Hosp Infect. 1999;43(4):255–264.
- [15] Morrissey I, Oggioni MR, Knight D, et al. Evaluation of epidemiological cut-off values indicates that biocide resistant subpopulations are uncommon in natural isolates of clinically-relevant microorganisms. Manganelli R, editor. PLoS ONE. 2014 23;9(1):e86669.
- [16] Suwantarat N, Carroll KC, Tekle T, et al. High prevalence of reduced chlorhexidine susceptibility in organisms causing central line-associated bloodstream infections. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2014;35 (9):1183–1186.
- [17] Kampf G. Biocidal agents used for disinfection can enhance antibiotic resistance in gram-negative species. Antibiotics (Basel). 2018;7(4):110.
- [18] Chen Y, Liao K, Huang Y, et al. Determining the susceptibility of carbapenem resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* and *Escherichia coli* strains against common disinfectants at a tertiary hospital in China. BMC Infect Dis. 2020;20(1):88.
- [19] Stein C, Vincze S, Kipp F, et al. Carbapenem-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* with low chlorhexidine susceptibility. Lancet Infect Dis. 2019;19(9):932–933.
- [20] Kawamura M, Sato T, Fujimura S. In vitro exposure of chlorhexidine induce quinolone resistance in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. J Infect Public Health. 2020;13(2):317–318.
- [21] Zhang Y, Zhao Y, Xu C, et al. Chlorhexidine exposure of clinical *Klebsiella pneumoniae* strains leads to acquired resistance to this disinfectant and to colistin. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2019;53(6):864–867.
- [22] Rossi L, Bertoncelli A, Tomi ED, et al. Susceptibility to chlorhexidine of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* strains: KPC producers and potential role of efflux pumps. 29th ECCMID (P2631) 2019.
- [23] Nakaminami H, Noguchi N, Sasatsu M. Fluoroquinolone efflux by the plasmid-mediated multidrug efflux pump QacB variant QacBIII in *Staphylococcus aureus*. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2010;54(10):4107–4111.
- [24] Guo W, Shan K, Xu B, et al. Determining the resistance of carbapenem-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* to common disinfectants and elucidating the underlying resistance mechanisms. Pathog Glob Health. 2015;109(4):184–192.
- [25] Vijayakumar R, Sandle T, Al-Aboody MS, et al. Distribution of biocide resistant genes and biocides susceptibility in multidrug-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae, Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Acinetobacter baumannii* — A first report from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. J Infect Public Health. 2018;11(6):812–816.
- [26] Jutkina J, Marathe NP, Flach C-F, et al. Antibiotics and common antibacterial biocides stimulate horizontal transfer of resistance at low concentrations. Sci Total Environ. 2018;616–617:172–178.
- [27] Webber MA, Whitehead RN, Mount M, et al. Parallel evolutionary pathways to antibiotic resistance

selected by biocide exposure. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2015;70(8):2241–2248.

- [28] Haft RJF, Keating DH, Schwaegler T, et al. Correcting direct effects of ethanol on translation and transcription machinery confers ethanol tolerance in bacteria. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2014 24;111 (25):E2576–85.
- [29] Block SS. Disinfection, sterilization, and preservation. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2001.
- [30] Abuzaid A, Hamouda A, Amyes SGB. *Klebsiella pneumoniae* susceptibility to biocides and its association

with cepA, qac $\Delta$ E and qacE efflux pump genes and antibiotic resistance. J Hosp Infect. 2012 Jun;81 (2):87–91.

- [31] Vijayakumar R, Aboody M, AlFonaisan M, et al. Determination of minimum inhibitory concentrations of common biocides to multidrug-resistant gram-negative bacteria. Appl Med Res. 2016;2(3):56.
- [32] Lambert RJW, Joynson J, Forbes B. The relationships and susceptibilities of some industrial, laboratory and clinical isolates of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* to some antibiotics and biocides. J Appl Microbiol. 2001;91 (6):972–984.