Title

23-year trends of antimicrobial resistance in *Salmonella* Paratyphi A indicates low rates on resistance acquisition

Running Title

AMR trends of *Salmonella* Paratyphi A

Authors and Affiliations

Mohammad S. I. Sajib[1], Arif M. Tanmoy[1], Yogesh Hooda[1], Hafizur Rahman[1], Sira J. Munira[1], Anik Sarkar[1], Dipu Das[1], Md. Asadur Rahman[2], Nazrul Islam[1], Mohammod Shahidullah[3], Md. Ruhul Amin[4], Md. Jahangir Alam[4], Mohammed Hanif[4], Stephen P. Luby[5], Denise O. Garrett[6], Samir K. Saha[1, 7], Senjuti Saha[1]

[1]Child Health Research Foundation, Bangladesh

[2]Popular Diagnostic Center, Dhaka, Bangladesh

[3]Department of Neonatology, Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical University, Dhaka, Bangladesh

[4]Department of Pediatrics, Bangladesh Institute of Child Health, Dhaka, Bangladesh

[5]Division of Infectious Diseases and Geographic Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California, USA

[6] Sabin Vaccine Institute, Washington, DC, USA

[7] Department of Microbiology, Bangladesh Shishu Hospital and Institute, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Abstract

Background: Typhoid and paratyphoid remain common bloodstream infections in areas with suboptimal water and sanitation infrastructure. Paratyphoid, caused by *Salmonella* Paratyphi A, is less prevalent than typhoid and its antimicrobial resistance (AMR) trends are less documented. Empirical treatment for paratyphoid is commonly based on the knowledge of susceptibility of *Salmonella* Typhi, which causes typhoid. Hence, with rising drug resistance in *Salmonella* Typhi, last-line antibiotics like ceftriaxone and azithromycin are prescribed for both typhoid and paratyphoid. Here, we report 23-year AMR trends of *Salmonella* Paratyphi A in Bangladesh.

Methods: From 1999 to 2021, we conducted enteric fever surveillance in two major pediatric hospitals and three clinics in Dhaka, Bangladesh. Blood cultures were performed at the discretion of the treating physicians; cases were confirmed by culture, serological and biochemical tests. Antimicrobial susceptibility was determined following CLSI guidelines.

Results: Over 23 years, we identified 2,725 blood culture-confirmed paratyphoid cases. Over 97% of the isolates were susceptible to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, and cotrimoxazole, and no isolate was resistant to all three. No resistance to ceftriaxone was recorded, and >99% of the isolates were sensitive to azithromycin. A slight increase in minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) is noticed for ceftriaxone but current average MIC is 32-fold lower than the resistance cut-off. Over 99%, of the isolates exhibited decreased susceptibility to ciprofloxacin.

Conclusions: *Salmonella* Paratyphi A has remained susceptible to most antibiotics, unlike *Salmonella* Typhi, despite widespread usage of many antibiotics in Bangladesh. The data can guide evidence-based policy decisions for empirical treatment of paratyphoid fever.

Keywords: *Salmonella* Paratyphi A, paratyphoid fever, antimicrobial resistance, typhoid fever

Introduction

Typhoid and paratyphoid fever, collectively known as enteric fever is estimated to have caused 14 million illnesses and 136 thousand deaths in 2017 [1]. The burden is disproportionately high in low- and middle-income countries in Asia and Africa [1–3]. In 2018, WHO prequalified the first typhoid conjugate vaccine (TCV), Typbar, for routine immunization of children over 6 months. This single-dose conjugate vaccine provides immunity against *Salmonella* Typhi, the causative agent of typhoid fever, and has been recommended by the Strategic Advisory Group of Experts for routine use in countries where typhoid fever is endemic [4,5]. Studies from Nepal, Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Malawi have shown high efficacy of Typbar in preventing typhoid fever [6–10]. In 2020 a second TCV, TYPHIBEV, was prequalified by WHO and clinical trials are ongoing [11,12]. However, both TCVs are specific to *Salmonella* Typhi and provide no cross-protection against *Salmonella* Paratyphi A, a related pathogen that causes the symptomatically similar but less prevalent disease, paratyphoid fever. About 20% of enteric fever cases are are that of paratyphoid [1,2,13,14]. No vaccines are available yet to protect against paratyphoid fever. Therefore, as the number of typhoid fever cases decline substantially in the post-TCV period, the proportions of typhoid and paratyphoid fever cases are expected to change, like seen in certain geographical locations [15].

Paratyphoid fever can lead to severe morbidity, and even death if treatment is delayed or inappropriate [2]. It is a major cause of febrile illness in South and Southeast Asia, and sub-

Saharan Africa, estimated to cause more than 3.3 million cases a year with 19 thousand deaths globally [1]. To date, *Salmonella* Typhi has been substantially more common and exerted a greater burden of disease than *Salmonella* Paratyphi A [13,16]. In Bangladesh, a country with a very high burden of enteric fever, one out of six enteric fever cases is caused by *Salmonella* Paratyphi A and this proportion of paratyphoid cases has been consistent over the last two decades [13]. The relatively low number of cases of paratyphoid fever compared to typhoid fever has contributed to neglect over the years, resulting in a paucity of data on epidemiology and antimicrobial resistance (AMR) of paratyphoid fever. The empirical treatment for paratyphoid is commonly based on the available antimicrobial susceptibility data of the more prevalent *Salmonella* Typhi [17,18].

In contrast to the plethora of reports on antimicrobial resistance (AMR) in *Salmonella* Typhi, there are only a handful of studies focused exclusively on *Salmonella* Paratyphi A [19,20], and most of them are limited by short study duration, a small number of cases, and a lack of multi-modality surveillance platform [13,21]. In the post-TCV-era, as typhoid fever cases begin to fall, it will be important to adjust empirical treatment regimens based on the data on AMR patterns of *Salmonella* Paratyphi A. In this study, our primary objective was to characterize the prevalence and trends of AMR in *Salmonella* Paratyphi A to commonly used antimicrobials, using quantitative data from disc diffusion and broth microdilution. We analyzed the data of 2,725 *Salmonella* Paratyphi A isolates collected from multiple sites in Dhaka from 1999 through 2021, making this one of the largest studies on trends and patterns of AMR of *Salmonella* Paratyphi A.

Methods

Surveillance settings

The enteric fever surveillance was initiated in Dhaka, Bangladesh in 1999. Considering the different epidemiological characteristics, complex care-seeking and treatment behavior in Bangladesh described earlier [21], we included three types of health care facilities across five sites in Dhaka, where enteric fever burden is estimated to be the highest [14]: (a) Bangladesh Shishu Hospital and Institute (BSHI, previously known as Dhaka Shishu Hospital or DSH), (b) Dr. M R Khan Shishu Hospital & Institute of Child Health (previously known as Shishu Shasthya Foundation Hospital or SSFH), and (c) three branches of an outpatient-based clinic Popular Diagnostic Center (PDC1, PDC2, and PDC3) (**Figure 1B**). PDC3 and PDC3 were added as surveillance sites in October 2016. BSHI is the largest pediatric hospital in the country with 665 beds and provides primary to tertiary care to children from all over the country. This government-aided private hospital treats 37% of patients free of cost. SSFH provides primary care and is the second-largest pediatric hospital in Bangladesh with 200 beds for children, 5% of which are dedicated to those unable to pay for care. Popular Diagnostic Center is one of the largest private consultation centers in Bangladesh and caters to a higher socioeconomic class than the hospitals and patients of all age groups. BSHI and SSF are part of the Global Invasive Vaccine-Preventable Bacterial Disease Surveillance Network [22] and all sites have been described in detail earlier [21]. All blood samples were collected as a part of the diagnostic service and only at the attending physician's discretion.

Isolation, identification, and antimicrobial susceptibility testing

Blood specimens were routinely subjected to standard bacteriological culture [23]. After initial isolation, identification was conducted via standard biochemical tests, followed by

agglutination with *Salmonella* Paratyphi A specific antisera (Thermo Scientific, MA, USA). Available isolates were preserved at -80°C freezer.

Results of antimicrobial susceptibility testing using the Kirby Bauer disk diffusion method for ampicillin, chloramphenicol, cotrimoxazole, ciprofloxacin, ceftriaxone, and azithromycin were abstracted from available electronic records at the Child Health Research Foundation (CHRF), who operate the microbiological diagnostic laboratories in the two hospitals, and store data digitally. Antibiotic susceptibility data and isolates were obtained from PDC branches. If data were not available, available isolates were revived from the biobank and tested. Isolates that were resistant to azithromycin by the disc diffusion method, were retested using MIC strips [bioMérieux, Marcy-l'Étoile, France]. Finally, all isolates that could be revived were re-tested to determine the minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of ciprofloxacin and ceftriaxone using the broth microdilution method [24]. Zone diameter results and MIC were interpreted according to the Clinical Laboratory Standard Institute (CLSI) guidelines [25].

Ethical Considerations

The protocols were approved by the ethics review committees of the Bangladesh Shishu Hospital and Institute. Blood samples were collected and received at the laboratory as part of routine clinical care.

Results

Between 1999 and 2021, a total of 2,725 *Salmonella* Paratyphi A were isolated across the five different sites in Dhaka, Bangladesh (**Figure 1A)**. Among them, 33.9% (n = 926) were from the hospitals and the remaining 66.1% from out-patient based consultation centers (n = 1,799) (**Figure 1A and 1B**).

For the three first line of drugs, disc diffusion data were available and/or could be generated for ampicillin (2,705, 99.2%), chloramphenicol (2,687, 98.6%), and cotrimoxazole (2,713, 99.5%) isolates. Overall, 97.4% (2,635/2,705) of the strains were susceptible to ampicillin, 99.7% (2,680/2,687) to chloramphenicol and 99% (2,687/2,713) to cotrimoxazole. No single isolate was resistant to all three first-line drugs at the same time, indicating no circulation of multi-drug resistant (MDR) *Salmonella* Paratyphi A isolates in Bangladesh. Disc diffusion data for ceftriaxone could be gathered and generated for 2,391 (87.7%) of the isolates, for 1,556 (57.1%) of the isolates for ciprofloxacin. No resistance to ceftriaxone was detected. However, 98.9% (1,540/1,556) of the isolates were non-susceptible to ciprofloxacin (**Figure 2**).

To probe further into the trend of resistance or susceptibility of ciprofloxacin and ceftriaxone, we attempted to revive the bio-banked isolates and conduct micro broth dilution tests to measure the MIC of these two antibiotics. Decreased ciprofloxacin susceptibility was noted in 1,192 of 1,205 (98.9%) that could be revived and tested. MIC (MIC50 = 0.5 μg/mL, MIC90 = 0.5 μg/mL); 90.6% (1,092/1,205) of them were intermediate resistant (MIC <1 μg/mL) and 8.2% (100/1,205) completely resistant (MIC > 1 μg/mL). Average MIC has remained constant since 2005, ranging between 0.25 to 0.5 μg/mL till 2021 **Figure 3A**). We also tested 1,208 isolates to obtain the MIC (MIC50 = 0.0625 μg/mL, MIC90 = 0.125 μg/mL) of ceftriaxone; all MIC values were much lower than the cut-off for resistance of 4 μg/mL

(**Figure 3B**). A slight increase in MIC is noticed over the years but the average MIC for the last 2 years of the study, 2020 and 2021, is 0.125 μg/mL, which is 32 folds lower than the resistance cut-off. (**Figure 3B**).

The first confirmed case of azithromycin-resistant *Salmonella* Paratyphi A was detected in 2014 from the same surveillance network [26]. Disc diffusion data for azithromycin were available for 1,779 isolates. However, previous work has shown that disc diffusion method can detect azithromycin susceptible strains with 100% specificity and 100% sensitivity, but the sensitivity of detection of resistant strains is much lower [27,28]. Therefore, all isolates interpreted as resistant using disc diffusion were retested using MIC strips. In total, of 1,779 isolates tested, 1,766 (99.3%) were susceptible to azithromycin; only 13 strains (0.7%) were resistant (mean MIC 151.38 μg/mL).

Discussion

This study reports one of the largest series of *Salmonella* Paratyphi A (n = 2,725) isolates collected through multiple surveillance modalities that includes both outpatient and inpatient departments, during a 23-year period between 1999 and 2021. Most studies on paratyphoid fever have been sporadic in South Asia, and the burden of disease and associated AMR depicted by these studies has been variable [3,29]. A reason for this may be that in South Asia most of the enteric fever cases are treated at home, and cases are only admitted in the hospital in case of treatment failure and complications, which leads differences in burden of disease and AMR patterns depending on whether the studies were conducted in hospitals or communities [13,17]. We have previously reported on the importance of including different health facilities to ensure comprehensive data capture [21]. In this study, we have included

paratyphoid cases from both community clinics and hospitals to ensure comprehensive coverage.

No isolate of *Salmonella* Paratyphi A exhibited multi-drug resistance, i.e., resistance to all three first-line drugs, amoxicillin, cotrimoxazole, and chloramphenicol. Individual resistance to any of these drugs individually was also very rare, and 96.7% of isolates were sensitive to all three. These findings are concordant with other smaller reports from South Asia [30–32]. Resistance to these drugs is usually carried in plasmids, and a recent large-scale genomic analysis of *Salmonella* Paratyphi A showed that the bacterium does not commonly carry such plasmids [33]. In contrast, more than 98% of the *Salmonella* Paratyphi A isolates were non-susceptible to fluoroquinolone. This was likely driven by overtreatment and irrational use of quinolones to treat enteric fever all over South Asia and is often mediated by single point mutations in quinolone-resistance determining region (QRDR) [33–37].

Most endemic countries lack the facility or the resources to conduct blood culture and antimicrobial susceptibility testing. Majority (> 90%) of enteric fever patients are treated in the community empirically, and previous work has shown that for each confirmed case of typhoid fever, 3–25 patients without a confirmed detection of typhoidal *Salmonella* are treated with antimicrobials [17]. Prescriptions commonly include a newer generation of drugs like ceftriaxone and azithromycin. In our study, no resistance was detected against third-generation cephalosporin and ceftriaxone. To date, there is only one published report of a ceftriaxone resistant Paratyphi A isolate and that was detected in the UK from a Bangladeshi traveler [38]. Other studies also found no ceftriaxone resistance in *Salmonella* Paratyphi A [29,32,34,36]. Examination of minimum inhibitory concentration depicted a slightly

increasing trend, but the average MIC is still 32 folds lower than the MIC required to render it completely resistant to ceftriaxone. As of 2019, <1% of the isolates exhibited resistance to azithromycin in Bangladesh. The first azithromycin resistance isolate was detected in 2014; resistance to azithromycin is caused by spontaneous point mutations in the *acrb* gene [26,39]. This is concordant with reports from other countries in the regions [40–44].

Taken together these findings suggest that empirical treatment of paratyphoid fever with ceftriaxone and azithromycin will continue to be effective. However, our findings also suggest that the rollout of the highly effective TCVs, and increased availability of rapid diagnostics to detect paratyphoid fever [45] could allow for shifting of the empirical treatment of paratyphoid fever to the first line of drugs – ampicillin, cotrimoxazole, or chloramphenicol without affecting the efficacy of treatment. This would allow us to reserve ceftriaxone and azithromycin to the treatment of other severe bacterial infections and greatly benefit antimicrobial stewardship efforts in Bangladesh.

The findings of the analysis presented here should be considered in the context of a few limitations. The cases presented here represent only a small proportion of the people with enteric fever who come into health facilities for blood culture. In addition, blood culture sensitivity is 61% in detected cases, indicating, many cases were missed [46]. This is also illustrated by the detection of the ceftriaxone resistant case in UK from a traveler to Bangladesh [38] that even the large surveillance system presented here is not comprehensive. Finally, the unavailability of data of total blood cultures done at all sites prohibit analysis of trends on overall blood culture positivity of *Salmonella* Paratyphi A.

In summary, this study presents a systematic surveillance of paratyphoid fever in Bangladesh over 23 years in multiple health care facilities and highlights that barring fluoroquinolones, *Salmonella* Paratyphi A has remained sensitive to most classes of antibiotics including the first line of antimicrobials. However, it is imperative to remain vigilant and monitor patterns of resistance through surveillance systems. Evidence-based rational use of antibiotics to treat paratyphoid fever, in addition to continued improvements of water sanitation and hygiene could interrupt increase in AMR while simultaneously reducing the burden of paratyphoid in endemic countries.

Conflict of interest: Authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank all past and present members of the clinical microbiology and epidemiology team of the Child Health Research Foundation.

Financial support: The work presented here was supported by the Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, through the World health Organization-supported Invasive Bacterial Vaccine Preventable Diseases study (grant numbers 201588766, 201233523, 201022732, 200749550) and by leveraging Pneumococcal Vaccines Accelerated Development and Introduction Plan (PneumoADIP), by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation through SEAP (grant number INV-008335) and by the Child Health Research Foundation (CHRF).

References

1. Stanaway JD, Parisi A, Sarkar K, et al. The global burden of non-typhoidal salmonella invasive disease: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. Lancet Infect Dis **2019**; 19:1312–1324.

2. Crump JA, Mintz ED. Global trends in typhoid and paratyphoid fever. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am **2010**; 50:241–246.

3. Arndt MB, Mosites EM, Tian M, et al. Estimating the burden of paratyphoid a in Asia and Africa. PLoS Negl Trop Dis **2014**; 8:e2925.

4. Burki T. Typhoid conjugate vaccine gets WHO prequalification. Lancet Infect Dis **2018**; 18:258.

5. Meeting of the Strategic Advisory Group of Experts on Immunization, April 2019: conclusions and recommendations. Available at: https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/WER9422. Accessed 31 January 2023.

6. Shakya M, Colin-Jones R, Theiss-Nyland K, et al. Phase 3 Efficacy Analysis of a Typhoid Conjugate Vaccine Trial in Nepal. N Engl J Med **2019**; 381:2209–2218.

7. Qadri F, Khanam F, Liu X, et al. Protection by vaccination of children against typhoid fever with a Vi-tetanus toxoid conjugate vaccine in urban Bangladesh: a cluster-randomised trial. The Lancet **2021**; 398:675–684.

8. Hoffman SA, LeBoa C, Date K, et al. Programmatic Effectiveness of a Pediatric Typhoid Conjugate Vaccine Campaign in Navi Mumbai, India. 2022; :2022.10.26.22281529. Available at: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.10.26.22281529v1. Accessed 12 November 2022.

9. Yousafzai MT, Karim S, Qureshi S, et al. Effectiveness of typhoid conjugate vaccine against culture-confirmed Salmonella enterica serotype Typhi in an extensively drug-resistant outbreak setting of Hyderabad, Pakistan: a cohort study. Lancet Glob Health **2021**; 9:e1154–e1162.

10. Patel PD, Patel P, Liang Y, et al. Safety and Efficacy of a Typhoid Conjugate Vaccine in Malawian Children. N Engl J Med **2021**; 385:1104–1115.

11. World Health Organization. Comparison table of WHO prequalified typhoid conjugate vaccines (TCV). World Health Organization, 2021. Available at: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/345367. Accessed 31 January 2023.

12. Thuluva S, Paradkar V, Matur R, Turaga K, Gv SR. A multicenter, single-blind, randomized, phase-2/3 study to evaluate immunogenicity and safety of a single intramuscular dose of biological E’s Vi-capsular polysaccharide-CRM197 conjugate typhoid vaccine (TyphiBEVTM) in healthy infants, children, and adults in comparison with a licensed comparator. Hum Vaccines Immunother **2022**; 18:2043103.

13. Saha S, Islam MS, Sajib MSI, et al. Epidemiology of Typhoid and Paratyphoid: Implications for Vaccine Policy. Clin Infect Dis **2019**; 68:S117–S123.

14. Garrett DO, Longley AT, Aiemjoy K, et al. Incidence of typhoid and paratyphoid fever in Bangladesh, Nepal, and Pakistan: results of the Surveillance for Enteric Fever in Asia Project. Lancet Glob Health **2022**; 10:e978–e988.

15. WHO | Trends and disease burden of enteric fever in Guangxi province, China, 1994–2004. World Health Organization, Available at: https://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/88/9/09-069310/en/. Accessed 25 February 2021.

16. Buckle GC, Walker CLF, Black RE. Typhoid fever and paratyphoid fever: Systematic review to estimate global morbidity and mortality for 2010. J Glob Health **2012**; 2:010401.

17. Andrews JR, Baker S, Marks F, et al. Typhoid conjugate vaccines: a new tool in the fight against antimicrobial resistance. Lancet Infect Dis **2019**; 19:e26–e30.

18. Parry CM, Ribeiro I, Walia K, Rupali P, Baker S, Basnyat B. Multidrug resistant enteric fever in South Asia: unmet medical needs and opportunities. BMJ **2019**; 364:k5322.

19. Chandel DS, Chaudhry R, Dhawan B, Pandey A, Dey AB. Drug-resistant Salmonella enterica serotype paratyphi A in India. Emerg Infect Dis **2000**; 6:420–421.

20. Ochiai RL, Wang X, von Seidlein L, et al. Salmonella paratyphi A rates, Asia. Emerg Infect Dis **2005**; 11:1764–1766.

21. Saha S, Islam M, Saha S, et al. Designing Comprehensive Public Health Surveillance for Enteric Fever in Endemic Countries: Importance of Including Different Healthcare Facilities. J Infect Dis **2018**; 218:S227–S231.

22. Saha S, Saha SK. Invasive Bacterial Vaccine-Preventable Disease Surveillance: Successes and Lessons Learned in Bangladesh for a Sustainable Path Forward. J Infect Dis **2021**; 224:S293–S298.

23. Saha S, Islam M, Uddin MJ, et al. Integration of enteric fever surveillance into the WHO-coordinated Invasive Bacterial-Vaccine Preventable Diseases (IB-VPD) platform: A low cost approach to track an increasingly important disease. PLoS Negl Trop Dis **2017**; 11:e0005999.

24. Andrews JM. Determination of minimum inhibitory concentrations. J Antimicrob Chemother **2001**; 48 Suppl 1:5–16.

25. M100Ed32 | Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing, 32nd Edition. Available at: https://clsi.org/standards/products/microbiology/documents/m100/. Accessed 31 January 2023.

26. Hooda Y, Sajib MSI, Rahman H, et al. Molecular mechanism of azithromycin resistance among typhoidal Salmonella stains in Bangladesh identified through passive pediatric surveillance. PLoS Negl Trop Dis **2019**; 13:e0007868.

27. Shoaib M, Satti L, Hussain A, Khursheed N, Sarwar S, Shah AH. Disc Diffusion Testing of Azithromycin Against Clinical Isolates of Typhoidal Salmonellae: A Diagnostic Conundrum. Cureus 13:e16777.

28. Skittrall JP, Levy D, Obichukwu C, et al. Azithromycin susceptibility testing of Salmonella enterica serovar Typhi: Impact on management of enteric fever. Clin Infect Pract **2021**; 10:100069.

29. Dutta S, Das S, Mitra U, et al. Antimicrobial Resistance, Virulence Profiles and Molecular Subtypes of Salmonella enterica Serovars Typhi and Paratyphi A Blood Isolates from Kolkata, India during 2009-2013. PLOS ONE **2014**; 9:e101347.

30. Ahmed D, Nahid MA, Sami AB, et al. Bacterial etiology of bloodstream infections and antimicrobial resistance in Dhaka, Bangladesh, 2005–2014. Antimicrob Resist Infect Control **2017**; 6:2.

31. Qamar FN, Azmatullah A, Kazi AM, Khan E, Zaidi AKM. A three-year review of antimicrobial resistance of Salmonella enterica serovars Typhi and Paratyphi A in Pakistan. J Infect Dev Ctries **2014**; 8:981–986.

32. Zellweger RM, Basnyat B, Shrestha P, et al. A 23-year retrospective investigation of Salmonella Typhi and Salmonella Paratyphi isolated in a tertiary Kathmandu hospital. PLoS Negl Trop Dis **2017**; 11:e0006051.

33. Tanmoy AM, Hooda Y, Sajib MSI, et al. Paratype: a genotyping tool for Salmonella Paratyphi A reveals its global genomic diversity. Nat Commun **2022**; 13:7912.

34. Veeraraghavan B, Pragasam AK, Ray P, et al. Evaluation of Antimicrobial Susceptibility Profile in Salmonella Typhi and Salmonella Paratyphi A: Presenting the Current Scenario in India and Strategy for Future Management. J Infect Dis **2021**; 224:S502–S516.

35. Rahman SIA, Nguyen TNT, Khanam F, et al. Genetic diversity of Salmonella Paratyphi A isolated from enteric fever patients in Bangladesh from 2008 to 2018. PLoS Negl Trop Dis **2021**; 15:e0009748.

36. Britto CD, Dyson ZA, Duchene S, et al. Laboratory and molecular surveillance of paediatric typhoidal Salmonella in Nepal: Antimicrobial resistance and implications for vaccine policy. PLoS Negl Trop Dis **2018**; 12:e0006408.

37. Chattaway MA, Gentle A, Nair S, et al. Phylogenomics and antimicrobial resistance of Salmonella Typhi and Paratyphi A, B and C in England, 2016–2019. Microb Genomics **2021**; 7:000633.

38. Nair S, Day M, Godbole G, et al. Genomic surveillance detects Salmonella enterica serovar Paratyphi A harbouring blaCTX-M-15 from a traveller returning from Bangladesh. PLOS ONE **2020**; 15:e0228250.

39. Sajib MSI, Tanmoy AM, Hooda Y, et al. Tracking the Emergence of Azithromycin Resistance in Multiple Genotypes of Typhoidal Salmonella. mBio **2021**; 12. Available at: https://mbio.asm.org/content/12/1/e03481-20. Accessed 28 March 2021.

40. Sharma P, Dahiya S, Manral N, et al. Changing trends of culture-positive typhoid fever and antimicrobial susceptibility in a tertiary care North Indian Hospital over the last decade. Indian J Med Microbiol **2018**; 36:70–76.

41. Joshi S, Adhikary R, Beena HB, Bhavana MV, Bhalwar R. Trends in antibiotic susceptibility of enteric fever isolates from South India, 2002–2013. Med J Armed Forces India **2019**; 75:81–85.

42. Khanal PR, Satyal D, Bhetwal A, et al. Renaissance of Conventional First-Line Antibiotics in Salmonella enterica Clinical Isolates: Assessment of MICs for Therapeutic Antimicrobials in Enteric Fever Cases from Nepal. BioMed Res Int **2017**; 2017:2868143.

43. Kuijpers LMF, Le Hello S, Fawal N, et al. Genomic analysis of Salmonella enterica serotype Paratyphi A during an outbreak in Cambodia, 2013–2015. Microb Genomics **2016**; 2. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5320704/. Accessed 25 August 2019.

44. Okanda T, Haque A, Ehara T, et al. Characteristics of Resistance Mechanisms and Molecular Epidemiology of Fluoroquinolone-Nonsusceptible Salmonella enterica Serovar Typhi and Paratyphi A Isolates from a Tertiary Hospital in Dhaka, Bangladesh. Microb Drug Resist Larchmt N **2018**; 24:1460–1465.

45. Aiemjoy K, Seidman JC, Saha S, et al. Estimating typhoid incidence from community-based serosurveys: a multicohort study. Lancet Microbe **2022**; 3:e578–e587.

46. Mogasale V, Ramani E, Mogasale VV, Park J. What proportion of Salmonella Typhi cases are detected by blood culture? A systematic literature review. Ann Clin Microbiol Antimicrob **2016**; 15:32.

Figure legends

Figure 1. (A) Number of *Salmonella* Paratyphi A isolates collected between 1999 and 2021 from the study sites. **(B)** A map of Dhaka, Bangladesh showing all the study sites**.**

Figure 2. Antimicrobial susceptibility pattern of *Salmonella* Paratyphi A against ampicillin (n = 2,705), chloramphenicol (n = 2,687), cotrimoxazole (n = 2,713), ciprofloxacin (n = 1,556), ceftriaxone (n= 2,391), and azithromycin (n = 1,779) using disc diffusion**.**

Figure 3. Minimum inhibitory concentration of *Salmonella* Paratyphi A to **(A)** ciprofloxacin (n = 1,205) and **(B)** ceftriaxone (n = 1,208) isolated from 1999 to 2021 in Bangladesh. The colored dots [red (resistant), blue (intermediate), and green (susceptible)] represent the MIC value of an isolate during a specific period. Local polynomial regression (black line) with a 95% confidence interval (blue and green shades) is describing the changes in MICs against these antimicrobials over time. The horizontal dotted lines (red; resistant, green: susceptible) are the antibiotic cut-off limits according to CLSI-2022.


A
Study sites
BSHI
SSFH
PDC 1
PDC 2
PDC 3
Frequency
0
50
100
150
200
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
B
Bangladesh
Dhaka
PDC 3
SSFH
BSHI
PDC 2
PDC 1
Latitude
23.90
23.85
23.80
23.75
23.70
0km
5km
10km
90.35
90.40
90.45
90.50
Longitude

Interpretation-Disk diffusion (DD)




A
Ciprofloxacin MIC (μg/mL)
8.00
4.00
2.00
1.00
0.50
0.25
0.12
0.06
0.03
0.01
Resistant
Intermediate
Susceptible
2000
2005
2010
2015
2020
B
Ceftriaxone MIC (μg/mL)
8.00
4.00
2.00
1.00
0.50
0.25
0.12
0.06
0.03
0.01
Resistant
Intermediate
Susceptible
2000
2005
2010
2015
2020