Healthcare associated infection risk analysis at the obstetrics and gynecology department of a referral hospital in Cameroon

Fabrice Zobel Lekeumo Cheuyem[1*], Emilia Enjema Lyonga[2], Innocent Takougang[1]

[1] Department of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Biomedical Science, The University of Yaounde 1, Yaounde, Cameroon

[2] Department of Microbiology, Hematology and Infectious diseases, Faculty of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, The University of Yaounde I, Yaounde, Cameroon

*Corresponding author's address: Fabrice Zobel Lekeumo Cheuyem, Department of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine & Biomedical Sciences, The University of Yaounde I, Yaounde, Cameroon. Tel: +237 696 57 28 07; E-mail: zobelcheuyem@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) are a major problem in healthcare facilities. In Cameroon, maternal and neonatal mortality remain a concern. The underlying determinants include shortcomings in the quality of care, inadequate infrastructure and inconsistent application of infection control and prevention (ICP) measures. The objective of this study was to identify risks that increase the likelihood of HAIs in the obstetrics-gynecology unit of a referral hospital of Yaoundé.

Methods: A descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted in the obstetrics-gynecology department of referral hospital of Yaoundé from April to July 2024. Exposure data were collected using a self-administered questionnaire with a scoring grid to assess the level of implementation of the ICP framework. Samples were collected from the ward environment for identification of the bacterial flora of the care environment and antibiotic susceptibility testing.

Results: A total of 41 healthcare workers were enrolled in the study. Participants were predominantly female (78%) and aged 20 to 57 (median of 30) years. Hand hygiene knowledge of was average, with a median score of 60%. More than two-thirds of respondents (n=30; 73%) reported that they did not systematically practice hand hygiene before and after patient care. The most common reason for not practicing hand hygiene was the absence of a hand-washing site nearby healthcare post (57%). Face shields were the most reported unavailable equipment (81%). The overall score indicated that the obstetrics-gynecology department had a basic level of implementation of ICP interventions. Microbial analysis revealed that taps and trolleys were the most commonly soiled equipment, harboring bacterial flora of *Staphylococcus aureus* (36%) and other *Staphylococcus spp.* (24%). *Proteus mirabilis* (13%) and *Klebsiella spp.* (7%). The isolated bacterial strains showed varying degrees of resistance to antibiotics, including cephalosporin, methicillin and penicillin.

Conclusions: Suboptimal IPC implementation was observed in this obstetrics-gynecology setting. Comprehensive interventions are needed, including: strengthened IPC adherence, national antibiotic regulation, healthcare worker education, and establishment of antimicrobial resistance surveillance programs.

Keywords: Healthcare associated infections, Risk analysis, Microbial flora, Antibiotic resistance, Gynecology and obstetrics ward, Cameroon

Background

Healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) are common adverse events in healthcare settings [1]. HAIs include infections acquired during care in health facilities, either during admission or after discharge [1,2]. Among the 190 million annual hospital admissions, 9 million HAIs occur, resulting in 1 million fatalities [3]. HAIs contribute to the emergence of antimicrobial-resistant pathogens that complicate infection management and threaten patient safety [4]. Disparities exist in the burden of HAIs, with low- and middle-income countries disproportionately affected, where 63.5% of infections are caused by antimicrobial-resistant bacteria [5,6].

Cameroon has witnessed a significant increase in the number of women seeking antenatal care at health facilities in recent years [7]. Maternal (596 per 100,000 live births) and neonatal (25.6 per 1,000 live births) mortality remain high in the country [8,9]. Maternal mortality has been associated with sepsis, abortion, place of delivery, and quality of care during childbirth [10]. Deficiencies in the quality of delivery service contribute to puerperal infections (9-17%) and post-caesarean wound infections (2-32%) across primary, secondary, and tertiary health facilities [11–13].

Maternal and neonatal sepsis-related mortality highlights wider healthcare determinants and underlying quality of care issues, infrastructure constraints, inconsistent compliance with infection control measures, and diagnostic delays, all of which have been identified as major determinants of HAIs and their complications. Healthcare workers' (HCWs) adherence to standard precautions and the scarcity of infection prevention specialists to support the implementation of infection control and prevention (ICP) measures in low-income countries are significant constraints to reducing infection risk and contribute to poor adherence to ICP measures during labor and delivery [14].

In a context of poor regulation of antibiotic use, an increase in the burden of multi-resistant bacteria has been observed, particularly in healthcare settings [15,16]. Literature on adherence to standard precautions, implementation of ICP, and bacterial carriage in Cameroonian health facilities is limited [16–18]. To support evidence-based decision-making and policy development, an analysis of the situation in health facilities providing maternal and newborn care was needed. The present study was designed to assess the risk of HAIs in the obstetrics and gynecology ward of a referral hospital in Yaoundé.

Methods

The present investigation focused on HCWs and the care environment to determine the microbial flora and assess the risk of exposure. It was a descriptive cross-sectional study carried out from May to July 2024.

The study was conducted in Yaoundé, the capital city of Cameroon, a city of approximately 3.2 million inhabitants served by first, second, third, and fourth-level health facilities. The healthcare setting

studied is ranked as a fourth-level referral center in the healthcare pyramid. It provides both short- and long-term specialized care to the population and plays a key role in the training of satellite HCWs [19,20].

It has a capacity of 138 beds and receives between 500 and 1,000 patients per week. In 2023, it recorded 35,945 outpatient consultations and 4,329 admissions, totaling 21,518 hospital days with an average of 5 hospital days per inpatient [19,21]. For the year 2023, the obstetrics-gynecology department reported approximately 300 deliveries, 8 deaths, 625 prenatal consultations, 77 cesarean sections, and managed 101 obstetric complications and 33 abortion complications [21].

Assessment of exposure

All HCWs operating in the obstetrics-gynecology ward of YUTH were invited to participate. This included residents, nurses, midwives/obstetric nurses, assistant nurses, and students. All consenting HCWs were included in the study.

A pre-tested questionnaire, adapted from the knowledge assessment tool developed by the WHO, was administered to HCWs [22,23]. The questionnaire included items related to demographic characteristics, hand hygiene, availability of personal protective equipment (PPE), waste management, and sterilization. The questionnaire was anonymous and self-administered. A standard form developed by the WHO was adapted to serve as a tool for assessing the ICP implementation framework in the care unit [24,25]. The ICP implementation framework assessment form was administered during interviews with the department's key informants (sub-unit head nurses).

Assessment of microbial flora of the care environment

A total of 30 samples were planned for collection during this study. These samples included medical equipment such as the delivery table, trolley, drip stand, nursing table, and surfaces (tap, door handle). A purposive sampling design was used. Ten samples were collected weekly for three weeks, divided into two phases of five samples, one day apart.

Surface and medical device samples were collected in the early morning hours using sterile swabs premoistened with sterile saline solution. Swabs were moistened with 0.9% sodium chloride solution and passed across the surface in parallel, tight stripes, then repeated perpendicularly. Swabs were placed in labeled cryotubes containing brain heart infusion broth and were immediately sent to the laboratory for bacteriological examination [16,26].

Upon arrival at the bacteriology laboratory, each cotton swab was aseptically transferred to a tube containing 2 mL of sterile physiological solution, from which 0.1-0.4 mL aliquots were pipetted into selective culture media (eosin-methylene blue agar for Gram-negative bacteria and mannitol salt agar for *Staphylococcus* spp.). The inoculated media were incubated at 37°C for 24-48 hours for specific pathogens. After incubation, bacterial isolates were identified using standard biochemical methods (Gram-negative

bacilli were identified using reaction to glucose, lactose, citrate, H_2S, lactose, urea, indoles, and gas production).

Antibiotic susceptibility testing was performed using the Müller-Hinton agar disk diffusion technique [16]. Bacterial suspensions were prepared according to the 0.5 McFarland standard. Discs were placed on inoculated agar and incubated at 37°C ± 2°C for 18-24 hours. Selection and susceptibility of the antibiotic discs were interpreted according to the guidelines of the European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST) 2023 [27]. Detected *Staphylococcus aureus* strains were tested for methicillin resistance using a cefoxitin disc. Strains with an inhibition diameter <27 mm were considered methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) [26,28]. To minimize potential bias, we performed rigorous quality control on culture conditions, media preparation, antibiotic authenticity, equipment calibration, and reagent validation to ensure the reliability and accuracy of our findings.

A score of 1 was assigned for each correct response to the hand hygiene knowledge assessment. At the end of this assessment, the results were classified into three categories: good (≥75%), average (50-74%), and poor (<50%) [29]. The professional group variable included medical staff (residents), paramedical professionals (nurses, midwives/obstetric nurses, assistant nurses), and students (medical undergraduates). A score was assigned for each question on the ICP implementation framework assessment grid. Each of the eight components was scored out of 100, resulting in a total score of 800. Data were checked, coded, and analyzed using R Statistics version 4.3.3. Fisher's exact probability test was used to compare proportions. Confidence intervals (CI) were estimated at 95%. A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

The protocol was approved by the Institutional Research Ethics Committee (CIER) of the Faculty of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences of the University of Yaoundé I, and ethical approval was issued under number 1017/UYI/FMSB/VDRC/DAASR/CSD. Research approval was also obtained from the general management of the YUTH. Informed consent was obtained from the participants prior to their inclusion in the study. All procedures were carried out in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

To minimize potential bias, we performed rigorous quality control on culture conditions, media preparation, antibiotic authenticity, equipment calibration, and reagent validation to ensure the reliability and accuracy of our findings.

A score of 1 was assigned for each correct response to the hand hygiene knowledge assessment. At the end of this assessment, the results were classified into three categories: good (≥75%), average (50-74%), and poor (<50%) The professional group variable included medical staff (residents), paramedical professionals (nurses, midwives/obstetric nurses, assistant nurses) and students (medical undergraduates). A score was assigned for each of the questions on the ICP implementation framework assessment grid. Each of the eight components was scored out of 100, resulting in a total score of 800. Data were checked, coded and analyzed using R Statistics version 4.3.3. Fisher's exact probability test was used to compare

proportions. Confidence intervals (CI) were estimated at 95%. A *p*-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

The protocol was approved by the Institutional Research Ethics Committee (CIER) of the Faculty of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences of the University of Yaounde 1, and an ethical approval was issued under number 1017/UYI/FMSB/VDRC/DAASR/CSD. Research approval was also obtained from the general management of the YUTH. Informed consent was obtained from the participants prior to their inclusion in the study. All procedures were carried out in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

Results

Of the 47 HCWs contacted, 46 (98%) agreed to take part in the study. A total of 41 HCWs returned fully completed questionnaires, representing a response rate of (89%).

Socio-professional characteristics of study participants

Participants aged 20 to 57 years, with a median age of 30 [22; 47] years. They were predominantly female (78%) and had higher education (73.2%). Their median work experience was 3 [3; 19] years.

Hand hygiene knowledge

Knowledge of hand hygiene was average, with a median score of 60% [53; 67]. Residents showed the best knowledge of hand hygiene (100% having average or good knowledge; p=0.296). The lowest knowledge levels were observed among midwives (29%) and younger participants, notably medical students (30%). In addition, those who reported having received specific training on hand hygiene were significantly (p=0.019) less knowledgeable on the subject (Table 1).

Table 1 Relationship between socioprofessional characteristics and hand hygiene knowledge among healthcare workers

Variable	Knowledge Assessment *n* (%)			Total	*p*-value[1]
	Poor	**Average**	**Good**		
	9 (22)	29 (71)	3 (7)	41 (100)	
Age (in years)					0.516
□25	11 (73)	4 (27)	0 (0.0)	15	
25 - 44	11 (78)	2 (14)	1 (7)	14	
45 +	7 (58)	3 (25)	2 (17)	12	
Educational level					0.147
Secondary	1 (9)	8 (73)	2 (18)	11	
Higher	8 (27)	21 (70)	1 (3)	30	
Professional status					0.296
Assistant-nurse	1 (33)	1 (33)	1 (34)	3	
Medical student	3 (30)	7 (70)	0 (0)	10	
Nurse	3 (23)	9 (69)	1 (8)	13	
Resident	0 (0)	9 (75)	1 (25)	10	
Midwife/obstetric nurse	2 (29)	5 (71)	0 (0)	7	
Professional group					0.430
Student	3 (30)	7 (70)	0 (0)	10	
Medical	0 (0)	7 (88)	1 (12)	8	
Paramedical	6 (26)	15 (65)	2 (9)	23	
Professional experience (in years)					0.170
□10	17 (71)	6 (25)	1 (4)	24	
10 +	12 (71)	3 (18)	2 (11)	17	
Refresher course on ICP measures					>0.999
No	6 (22)	19 (71)	2 (7)	27	
Yes	3 (21)	10 (72)	1 (7)	14	
Training received on hand hygiene					**0.019**
No	1 (6)	13 (76)	3 (18)	17	
Yes	8 (33)	16 (67)	0 (0)	24	

[1]*Fisher exact probability test; ICP: Infection Control and Prevention*

Over two-thirds of respondents reported not systematically practicing hand hygiene before and after care (*n*=30; 73%). The main reasons mentioned included the absence of a hand-washing site nearby (57%), the perception that patient care was safe (30%) and high workload (20%) (Figure 1).



Fig. 1 Constrains to systematic hand washing among healthcare workers (n=30)

Nearly one-third of HCWs reported (34%, n=14) having received training in ICP measures, with paramedics being the most represented (52%). In contrast, no medical students reported having received this training.

Most of HCWs reported having received hand hygiene training, with a particularly high proportion among medical students (80%). In addition, most of participants (80%) reported having received training two years or more ago (Table 2).

Table 2 Reported follow-up of training sessions by professional group

Variable	Professional group *n* (%)			Total	*p*-value[1]
	Medical	**Paramedical**	**Student**	41 (100)	
	8 (100)	23 (100)	10 (100)		
Hand hygiene training	4 (50)	12 (52)	8 (80)	24 (59)	0.295
ICP measures retraining	2 (25)	12 (52)	0 (0)	14 (34)	**0.006**
Period since last refresher course on ICP measures (in years)	2 (100)	12 (100)	0 (0)	14 (100)	
≤1	2 (100)	1 (8)	0 (0)		**0.033**
□1	0 (0)	11 (92)	0 (0)		

[1]*Fisher exact probability test; ICP: Infection Control and Prevention*

Personal protective equipment

The most reported available hygiene devices included safety boxes (66%) and bleach for disinfection (78%). However, the equipment most frequently reported as unavailable was goggles/face shields (81%) and clean single-use towels (78%) (Figures 2 and 3).



Fig.2 Perception of disinfectant availability among healthcare workers (*n*=41)



Fig. 3 Perception of personal protective equipment availability among healthcare workers (*n*=41)

Waste management and sterilization

Less than one-third of respondents (24%) reported the availability of posters on equipment sterilization protocols. More than half of HCWs (54%) reported having information on the correct preparation of a decontamination solution. There was no significant difference between different professional groups (Table 3).

Table 3 Perception by professional group of the availability of information brochures/poster on infection prevention and control

Variable	Professional group *n* (%)			Total	*p*-value[1]
	Medical 8 (100)	Paramedical 23 (100)	Student 10 (100)	41 (100)	
Sterilization protocol displayed	3 (38)	4 (17)	3 (30)	10 (24)	0,554
Waste management guide available	4 (50)	14 (61)	2 (20)	20 (49)	0,238
Information on decontamination solution preparation available	4 (50)	14 (61)	4 (40)	22 (54)	0,583

[1] *Fisher exact probability test*

Framework for implementing infection control and prevention

The assessment of ICP measure implementation revealed that the maternity subunit was at an intermediate level, while the inpatient sub-unit was at a basic level. The overall score indicated that the service was at a basic level of ICP measure implementation. The highest scores were obtained in components related to workload (58.8%), guidelines (57.6%), and structural aspects of ICP (52.5%). In contrast, the lowest score (5%) was observed in the essential component evaluating multimodal strategies for ICP implementation (Table 4).

Table 4 Assessment of the implementation of the infection control and prevention framework

Essential Component	Sub-unit		Score
	Maternity	Inpatient	Average
Structural aspects of ICP	95.0	10.0	52.5
Guidelines for ICP	44.4	70.8	57.6
ICP education and training	50.0	22.2	36.1
Healthcare-associated infections surveillance	41.0	10.3	25.6
Multimodal strategies for implementing ICP interventions	10.0	0.0	5.0
Monitoring/auditing of serious injury prevention practices and feedback	37.5	10.0	23.8
Tasks, staffing and bed occupancy	58.8	58.8	58.8
Creation of environments and acquisition of care materials and equipment	79.5	72.7	76.1
Total Score	416.3	254.9	335.6

ICP: Infection Control and Prevention

Microbiological analysis of environmental surfaces and medical devices

Fifteen samples were collected from each sub-unit (inpatient and maternity). All 30 samples collected showed bacterial contamination. Fifty-five isolates were identified, most of which were Gram-positive (60%) and from the inpatient subunit and (62%). The tap was the most contaminated surface, with 14 identified isolates (Table 5).

Table 5 Identified isolates by Gram category and surfaces/medical devices

Characteristic	Gram Category *n* (%)		Total	*p*-value[1]
	Negative 22(40)	**Positive** 33(60)	55(100)	
Sub-Unit				0.258
Inpatient	16 (47)	18 (53)	34	
Maternity	6 (29)	15 (71)	21	
Surface & Devices				0.723
Trolley	4 (40)	6 (60)	10	
Door handle	3 (25)	9 (75)	12	
Drip stand	4 (67)	2 (33)	6	
Tap	6 (43)	8 (57)	14	
Delivery table	2 (40)	3 (60)	5	
Nursing table	3 (37)	5 (63)	8	

[1]*Fisher exact probability test*

The most prevalent microbial strains in the department included *Staphylococcus aureus* (36%), other *Staphylococcus spp.* (24%), *Proteus mirabilis* (13%) and *Klebsiella* species (7%). Non-enterobacterial Gram-negative rods were the least represented (Figure 4).



Fig. 4 Profile of bacteria present on environmental surfaces and medical devices (*n*=55)

Most of microorganisms identified (70%) in the maternity ward belonged to the *Staphylococcus spp.*, with *S. aureus* being the most represented species (42%). However, a nearly equivalent distribution was observed between Staphylococci (52%) and Enterobacteria (45%) (Table 6).

Table 6 Bacterial strains isolated in the two sub-units

Isolated bacteria	Sub-unit *n* (%)		Total	*p-value*[1]
	Inpatient	**Maternity**		0.291
	34 (100)	21 (100)	55 (100)	
Staphylococcus				
S. aureus	11 (31)	9 (42)	20	
Others	7 (21)	6 (28)	13	
Total	18 (52)	15 (70)	33	
Enterobacteria				
Proteus mirabilis	7 (21)	0 (0)	7	
Klebsiella spp.	3 (9)	1 (5)	4	
Serratia spp.	1 (3)	2 (10)	3	
Yersinia spp.	2 (6)	1 (5)	3	
Enterobacter aerogenes	1 (3)	1 (5)	2	
Escherichia coli	1 (3)	0 (0)	1	
Total	15 (45)	5 (25)	20	
Other Enterobacteria				
Pseudomonas aeruginosa	1 (3)	0 (0)	1	
Other Gram-negative non-fermenting bacillus	0 (0)	1 (5)	1	
Total	1 (3)	1 (5)	2	

[1]*Fisher exact probability test*

Most microorganisms (74%) identified on door handles belonged to the *Staphylococcus spp.*, with *S. aureus* being the most represented species (57%). In contrast, the trolley was primarily soiled by *Enterobacteriaceae* (66%), with the most isolated germs belonging to *Proteus mirabilis* (33%) and *Klebsiella* (33%) species (Table 6).

Table 6 Classification of bacteria strains isolated from environmental surfaces and medical devices

Isolated bacteria	Surface & Device *n* (%)						Total	*p-value*[1]
	Trolley	**Door handle**	**Drip stand**	**Tap**	**Delivery table**	**Nursing table**		
	10 (100)	12 (100)	6 (100)	14 (100)	5 (100)	8 (100)	55 (100)	
Staphylococcus								0.177
S. aureus	3 (30)	7 (57)	1 (17)	4 (29)	1 (20)	4 (51)	20	
Others	3 (30)	2 (17)	1 (17)	4 (29)	2 (40)	1 (12)	13	
Total	6 (60)	9 (74)	2 (34)	8 (58)	3 (60)	5 (63)	33	
Enterobacteria								
Proteus mirabilis	0 (0)	1 (9)	2 (33)	2 (14)	0 (0)	2 (25)	7	
Klebsiella spp.	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (33)	2 (14)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4	
Serratia spp.	1 (10)	2 (17)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3	
Yersinia spp.	2 (20)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (20)	0 (0)	3	
Enterobacter aerogenes	1 (10)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2	
Escherichia coli	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (12)	1	
Total	4 (40)	2 (26)	4 (66)	5 (35)	1 (20)	3 (37)	20	
Non-Enterobacteria								
Pseudomonas aeruginosa	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1	
Other Gram-negative non-	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (20)	0 (0)	1	

fermenting bacillus							
Total	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (7)	1 (20)	0 (0)	2

[1]*Fisher exact probability test*

Antibiotic susceptibility of isolated staphylococcal strains

Most staphylococci isolated were penicillinase producers (≥ 90%). Significant resistance was also observed for fosfomycin, rifampicin, fusidic acid and cotrimoxazole (≥ 70%). In contrast, the most effective antibiotics against these organisms were ciprofloxacin, erythromycin and vancomycin, which showed low or no resistance (Table 7).

Table 7 Antibiotic resistance profile of isolated staphylococci (n=33)

Tested antibiotic	*Staphylococcus* ***n*** (%)	
	S. aureus 20 (100)	***Others*** 13 (100)
Penicillin		
Penicillin G	20 (100)	13 (100)
Ampicillin	18 (90)	12 (92)
Oxacillin	18 (90)	13 (100)
Cephalosporin		
Cefoxitin	6 (30)	5 (38)
Aminoglycoside		
Gentamicin	3 (15)	4 (31)
Quinolone		
Ofloxacin	3 (15)	1 (8)
Ciprofloxacin	1 (5)	0 (0)
Norfloxacin	1 (5)	1 (8)
Cycline		
Tetracycline	8 (40)	4 (31)
Fusidanine		
Fusidic acid	15 (75)	9 (69)
Glycopeptide		
Vancomycin	1 (5)	0 (0)
Sulfonamide and Diamino-Pyrimidine		
Sulfamethoxazole + Trimethoprim	15 (75)	9 (69)
Macrolide		
Erythromycin	5 (25)	0 (0)
Streptogramin (synergistin)		
Pristinamycin	4 (20)	1 (8)
Phosphonic acid		
Fosfomycin	18 (90)	13 (100)
Rifamycin		
Rifampicin	17 (85)	13 (100)

Methicillin resistance was observed in 70% of isolated *Staphylococcus* strains, with no significant difference between department sub-units (p=0.722). The primary contaminated medical devices were trolleys (100%), delivery tables (100%), and door handles (78%) (Table 8).

Table 8 Prevalence and distribution of methicillin-resistant staphylococci (n=33)

Variable	Count (n)	Frequency (%)	Total	p-value[1]

Staphylococcus				>0.999
S. aureus	14	70	20	
Others	9	69	13	
Sub-Unit				0.722
Inpatient	12	67	18	
Maternity	11	73	15	
Surface & Device				0.667
Trolley	3	50	6	
Door handle	7	78	9	
Drip stand	2	100	2	
Tap	5	62	8	
Delivery table	3	100	3	
Nursing table	3	60	5	

[1]*Fisher exact probability test*

Antimicrobial susceptibility of gram-negative bacterial strains

Most identified Gram-negative bacteria produced penicillinases (≥70%) and cephalosporinases (≥80%), particularly against cefuroxime, cefepime, and cefoxitin. in contrast, cefotaxime and quinolone antibiotics (nalidixic acid, ciprofloxacin, and levofloxacin) were the most effective against these bacteria.

High resistance (near 100%) was observed among gram-negative bacteria for aztreonam, fosfomycin, and trimethoprim used alone. however, combination with sulfonamides (cotrimoxazole) overcame this resistance. The bacteria were highly susceptible to carbapenems (imipenem and meropenem) and vancomycin (Table 9)

Multidrug resistance assessment

Multidrug resistance was observed in 100% of the bacteria isolated from the inpatient sub-unit. Nearly all environmental surfaces and medical devices harbored multidrug-resistant bacteria (Table 11).

Table 11 Phenotype and location of multidrug-resistant bacteria (*n*=55)

Variable	Characteristic	Count (*n*)	Frequency (%)	Total	*p*-value[1]
Location					
	Sub-Unit				0.051
	Inpatient	34	100	34	
	Maternity	18	86	21	

	Surface & Device				0.725
	Tap	13	93	14	
	Trolley	10	100	10	
	Door handle	10	83	12	
	Nursing table	8	100	8	
	Drip stand	6	100	6	
Phenotype					
	Staphylococcus				0.726
	S. aureus	17	85	20	
	Others	13	100	13	
	Enterobacteria				
	Proteus mirabilis	7	100	7	
	Klebsiella spp.	4	100	4	
	Yersinia spp.	3	100	3	
	Serratia spp.	3	100	3	
	Enterobacter aerogenes	2	100	2	
	Escherichia coli	1	100	1	
	Non-Enterobacteria				
	Pseudomonas aeruginosa	1	100	1	
	Other non-fermenting Gram-negative bacillus	1	100	1	

[1]*Fisher exact probability test*

Discussion

Healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) represent a significant threat to patient safety, resulting in serious complications, additional costs, and increased mortality [5]. These infections affect a substantial number of admitted patients, underscoring the need for effective prevention and control measures [3]. The One Health approach emphasizes the role of the environment in the development and transmission of infectious agents, including emerging and re-emerging pathogens. In Cameroon, maternal and neonatal mortality rates remain alarmingly high [8,9]. To address this, the country has committed to implementing universal health coverage [30–32].

Knowledge of hand hygiene

Our study revealed alarmingly poor knowledge among midwives (29%) and younger participants, especially medical students (30%). Notably, those who reported receiving specific hand hygiene training did not demonstrate satisfactory knowledge of this topic. Given that most of those trained were medical students (80%), this raises concerns about their willingness to retain information about hygiene practices to ensure safe care. This highlights the need for refresher training on ICP, particularly hand hygiene, before clinical internships begin. In fact, no student reported recent refresher training on this topic. In addition, 80% of respondents reported that their last hand hygiene training was two or more years ago. These knowledge gaps contribute to poor practice, putting both patients and HCWs at risk of acquiring multidrug-resistant hospital-acquired pathogens. Therefore, implementing ongoing education and training programs for HCWs, especially medical students, is critical to improving their hand hygiene knowledge and skills and ultimately reducing the risk of HAIs.

Personal protective equipment

The most commonly reported unavailable items were goggles/face shields and clean disposable towels. Studies conducted in Buea, Bertoua, and Yaoundé reported similar proportions in both primary and secondary referral hospitals [33–35]. These shortages are concerning, given that HCWs in maternity wards are regularly exposed to splashes on the mucous membranes of the face during childbirth [36–38]. These findings suggest that health facilities need to intensify their efforts to ensure the availability and accessibility of hygiene and personal protection equipment. This may include the procurement and regular maintenance of equipment, as well as comprehensive staff training on the importance of hygiene and personal protection. Finally, these findings highlight the need for regular monitoring and evaluation of hygiene and personal protection practices in health facilities to identify gaps and areas for improvement [36,39].

Infection prevention and control assessment framework

The overall score indicated that the ward was at a basic level of implementation of ICP measures. This suggests that while some key elements of infection control are in place, their implementation remains inadequate. Additional efforts are necessary to strengthen these components and ensure effective infection control. This score was similar to that of the third reference hospital in Bangladesh (355.0 [Q1-Q3: 252.5 - 397.5] out of 800) and was consistent with the results of assessments reported in global analyses, which found the lowest scores (100 - 450 out of 800) in low- and middle-income countries [24,40]. The lowest scores were recorded in the core components assessing ICP education and training (36.1%), surveillance of HAIs (25.6%), multimodal strategies for implementing ICP interventions (5%), and monitoring/auditing of serious injury prevention practices and feedback (23.8%). These results corroborated observations made in 68 referral hospitals in Turkey and were lower than those obtained in 1442 referral hospitals in the Republic of Korea, likely because previous legislative and multimodal measures had been implemented in most of the hospitals surveyed [41,42]. This finding highlights a significant gap in the education and training of HCWs in ICP. A lack of knowledge can lead to poor practice and medical errors that are detrimental to both patient health and HCW safety [43–45].

Microbial flora profile of surfaces and equipment

Most of the isolates identified originated from the inpatient unit, which can be attributed to the greater interaction among HCWs, patients, their families, and the healthcare environment compared to the maternity unit, where access is restricted to HCWs and patients. Furthermore, the implementation of ICP measures such as hygiene sessions and regular cleaning of medical equipment in the maternity unit could also contribute to these results.

The tap was found to be the most contaminated surface, while the trolley exhibited the highest contamination rate relative to the number of samples analyzed. Hand-washing areas, frequently used by

HCWs for hand and equipment hygiene, are prime sites for bacterial colonization, particularly in the absence of regular and appropriate cleaning by cleaning staff. Bacterial contamination of these areas can seriously compromise hand hygiene and facilitate the transmission of pathogens to patients. Similarly, trolleys used to transport drugs and nursing equipment can act as vehicles for the transmission of germs from one patient to another if hand hygiene precautions such as hand washing, wearing gloves, and the use of hydro-alcoholic gel are not systematically followed. Our findings corroborate observations made at Treichville University Hospital in Côte d'Ivoire and the Centre Médical le Jourdain in Cameroon, where wash stations and trolleys were also the most contaminated sites [16,26].

The most common microbial strains in the department belonged to the species *Staphylococcus aureus*. These bacteria have developed a remarkable ability to adapt to the healthcare environment and their human host. *S. aureus* is part of the commensal microbiota of the nasal mucosa in approximately 20 to 40% of the general population but is also responsible for the transient colonization of the nasal mucosa in at least 60% of the remaining population. This may explain its predominance in this study [46,47]. It is the most clinically relevant staphylococcal species due to its involvement in HAIs and is the second most common pathogen responsible for this type of infection after *E. coli* [47]. *S. aureus* infects humans when skin and mucosal barriers are disrupted, for example, as a result of chronic skin conditions, wounds, or surgical procedures, allowing access to underlying tissues or the bloodstream and causing infection. Individuals with invasive medical devices or weakened immune systems, including pregnant women and premature newborns, are particularly susceptible to *S. aureus* infection [46–48]. Study reports have identified this bacterium as responsible for HAIs of the skin and soft tissues at Yaoundé University Teaching Hospital [19]. Our results were similar to those obtained at the Douala General Hospital, where *S. aureus* was the most frequently isolated bacterium [18].

Proteus mirabilis and *Klebsiella* spp. were the main pathogenic enterobacteria isolated in the department. These infectious agents are responsible for HAIs, especially in obstetrics-gynecology wards [3,19,49]. *Proteus* is found in abundance in soil and water and, although part of the normal human intestinal flora [49–51]. It is frequently responsible for infections of the human urinary tract, where it causes urinary tract infections and catheter-associated infections [52]. This is of concern given that the obstetrics-gynecology department regularly performs cesarean sections requiring the use of urinary catheters in parturient women. The circulation of this pathogen in the department increases the risk of women developing iatrogenic urinary tract infections after delivery [51,53].

Bacteria from *Klebsiella* spp. are responsible for infections characterized by high morbidity and mortality and by their ability to metastasize within the infected organism to cause sepsis. Risk factors for this infection include local healthcare practices, antibiotic misuse, and compliance with infection control procedures [54,55]. Poor compliance with standard precautions in the obstetrics-gynecology department could lead to contamination, as this bacterium has also been implicated in severe neonatal sepsis [56]. In

addition, *K. pneumoniae* is one of the most commonly isolated pathogens in healthcare settings and is responsible for HAIs in Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, and Mali [3,16–19].

Susceptibility profile of isolated staphylococcal strains

Antimicrobial resistance analysis revealed that most staphylococci isolates were penicillinase producers (≥ 90%). In addition, significant resistance rates were observed for fosfomycin, rifampicin, fusidic acid, and cotrimoxazole (≥ 70%).

This proportion of penicillin-resistant strains was similar to that observed in studies conducted in Cameroon and higher than that found at the University Hospital of Treichville, Côte d'Ivoire (28%) [16,17,39]. This difference could indicate a less rational use of antibiotics in Cameroon, which explains the resistance to common antibiotics, thereby limiting their effectiveness in the treatment of staphylococcal infections. Penicillin resistance is a major public health problem because it complicates the treatment of infections and increases the risk of complications and mortality [57].

Most *Staphylococcus* strains isolated (70%) were resistant to methicillin. Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) is a major cause of morbidity and mortality in neonates admitted to neonatal intensive care units. Neonatal MRSA colonization is attributed to various sources, including mothers, HCWs, and environmental surfaces. It can lead to life-threatening infections, prolonged hospital stays, and significant economic costs [48,58].

A meta-analysis of the worldwide distribution of MRSA revealed varying prevalence rates depending on the populations studied, ranging from 0.3 to 5.1% for mothers of newborns, from 3.1 to 18.4% for HCWs, with the highest rates (3.5 to 36.0%) observed in environmental samples, confirming the results of our study [58]. In addition, MRSA is a common cause of HAIs in many countries, including Cameroon and Côte d'Ivoire, where methicillin-resistant strains have been identified in 71-81% of staphylococci isolated from hospitals [16,17,59]. It is therefore essential to monitor antibiotic resistance and develop new strategies to combat penicillin-resistant staphylococcal infections.

Susceptibility profile of Gram-negative bacterial strains

Most of the Gram-negative bacteria identified were penicillinase and cephalosporinase producers. A similar bacterial resistance profile was observed at the Centre Médical le Jourdain in Yaoundé [16].

The majority of the bacteria identified (85-100%) exhibited multidrug resistance. This remains a significant concern for the vulnerable patients in obstetrics-gynecology departments, particularly pregnant women, women in the immediate postpartum period, and their newborns. A meta-analysis conducted in Cameroon on human and environmental samples showed lower rates of multidrug resistance compared to those observed in our study [60,61]. The specific characteristics of the samples analyzed in our study could potentially explain these differences.

Focus on multidrug resistance to antibiotics

Resistance to the most commonly prescribed antimicrobials leads to a significant increase in mortality, length of hospital stays, and healthcare costs. Faced with these multidrug-resistant infections and delays in obtaining microbiological results, broad-spectrum antibiotics are often used as empirical therapy. This practice can lead to the overuse and misuse of antibiotics, contributing to the development of resistance [62].

The high prevalence of multidrug-resistant bacterial strains underscores the existence of facilitating factors. These factors include poor compliance with regulations and a lack of control over the sale and use of antibiotics by HCWs and the general public [63,64]. In addition, the scarcity of accurate epidemiological data on antibiotic use and bacterial resistance in Cameroon complicates the development of effective strategies [15,65].

Limitations

It is important to recognize that the evaluation model used was tailored to a specific health setting. Consequently, the results obtained may not accurately reflect the situation in the whole health facility. In addition, the sample size did not provide sufficient power to detect statistical significance for certain variables that were not considered significant. These limitations highlight the need for a more comprehensive study with a larger sample size.

Conclusions

This study highlights significant risks that increase the likelihood of HAIs in neonates and mothers on the unit. Such deficiencies included inadequate staff knowledge of hand hygiene, unsystematic compliance with proper hand hygiene, inadequate availability of certain essential PPE and limited implementation of ICP measures by the unit, which was rated at a basic level of implementation. The presence of pathogenic and multi-resistant bacteria in the healthcare environment underscores the need to not only improve compliance with ICP measures but also develop a national policy to regulate the use of antibiotics, promote their rational use, build the capacity of HCWs to diagnose and treat infections appropriately, and finally to establish programs to monitor bacterial resistance and antibiotic use to track changes in the situation.

Abbreviations

HAI: Healthcare Associated Infection

HCW: Healthcare Worker

ICP: Infection Control and Prevention

Declaration

Authors' Contribution: Drafting of the study protocol, data collection, analysis and interpretation: F.Z.L.C.; Drafting and editing of manuscript: F.Z.L.C.; Critical revision of the manuscript: E.E.L.; Conception, design and supervision of research protocol and implementation, data analysis plan, revision, editing and final validation of the manuscript: I.T.

Ethical Approval Statement: The protocol was approved by Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the Faculty of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences of Yaoundé 1 and the ethical clearance: N°1017/UYI/FMSB/VDRC/DAASR/CSD issued. Informed consent was obtained from participants prior to inclusion in the study. All methods were performed according to relevant guidelines and regulations.

Consent for publication: Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials: All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article.

Competing interests: All authors declare no conflict of interest and have approved the final version of the article.

Funding Source: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Acknowledgements: Our gratitude goes to the health staff who agreed to participate in this study and to the manager of the referral hospital general manager who gave an authorization to conduct the study.

References

1. Schwendimann R, Blatter C, Dhaini S, Simon M, Ausserhofer D. The occurrence, types, consequences and preventability of in-hospital adverse events – a scoping review. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2018;18(1):521.

2. Opollo MS, Otim TC, Kizito W, Thekkur P, Kumar AMV, Kitutu FE, *et al.* Infection Prevention and Control at Lira University Hospital, Uganda: More Needs to Be Done. *Trop Med Infect Dis.* 2021;6(2):69.

3. Bocoum A, Fané S, Traoré Y, Sanogo SA, Kanté I, Kouma A, *et al.* Bacteriology of Healthcare-Associated Infections in the Gynecology and Obstetrics Department of CHU Gabriel Touré. *Open J Obstet Gynecol.* 2019;9(10):1336–46.

4. Shaw D, Abad R, Amin-Chowdhury Z, Bautista A, Bennett D, Broughton K, *et al.* Trends in invasive bacterial diseases during the first 2 years of the COVID-19 pandemic: analyses of prospective surveillance data from 30 countries and territories in the IRIS Consortium. *Lancet Digit Health.* 2023; S2589750023001085.

5. Cassini A, Högberg LD, Plachouras D, Quattrocchi A, Hoxha A, Simonsen GS, *et al.* Attributable deaths and disability-adjusted life-years caused by infections with antibiotic-resistant bacteria in the EU and the European Economic Area in 2015: a population-level modelling analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2019;19(1):56–66.

6. Allegranzi B, Bagheri Nejad S, Combescure C, Graafmans W, Attar H, Donaldson L, *et al.* Burden of endemic health-care-associated infection in developing countries: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Lond Engl.* 2011;377(9761):228–41.

7. Appiah F. Individual and community-level factors associated with early initiation of antenatal care: Multilevel modelling of 2018 Cameroon Demographic and Health Survey. *PLOS ONE.* 2022 6;17(4): e0266594.

8. Alkema L, Chou D, Hogan D, Zhang S, Moller AB, Gemmill A, *et al.* Global, regional, and national levels and trends in maternal mortality between 1990 and 2015, with scenario-based projections to 2030: a systematic analysis by the UN Maternal Mortality Estimation Inter-Agency Group. *The Lancet.* 2016;387(10017):462–74.

9. Mah Mungyeh E, Chiabi A, Tchokoteu Pouasse F, Nguefack S, Bogne J, Siyou H, *et al.* Neonatal mortality in a referral hospital in Cameroon over a seven-year period: trends, associated factors and causes. *Afr Health Sci.* 2014;14(3):517–25.

10. Meh C, Thind A, Terry AL. Ratios and determinants of maternal mortality: a comparison of geographic differences in the northern and southern regions of Cameroon. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2020;20(1):194.

11. Tebeu PM, Kamdem A, Ngou-Mve-Ngou JP, Meka E, Antaon JSS, Loic MT, *et al.* Risk factors for surgical site infections after caesarean section at Yaounde, Cameroon. *Int J Reprod Contracept Obstet Gynecol.* 2021;10(11):4048–51.

12. Tsatedem FA, J F, D BA, Donfack JH, Djokam J, Temgoua S, *et al.* Bacteriological Profile of Surgical Site Infection: A Descriptive Study at Deido District Hospital in Douala, Cameroon. *Adv Res.* 2023;24(6):30–8.

13. Ngunyi YL, Halle-Ekane G, Tendongfor N, Mbivnjo EL, Evouna Mbarga A, Nembulefack D, *et al.* Determinants and aetiologies of postpartum pyrexia; a retrospective analysis in a tertiary health facility in the Littoral Region of Cameroon. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2020;20(1):167.

14. de Barra M, Gon G, Woodd S, Graham WJ, de Bruin M, Kahabuka C, *et al.* Understanding infection prevention behaviour in maternity wards: A mixed-methods analysis of hand hygiene in Zanzibar. *Soc Sci Med* 1982. 2021; 272:113543.

15. Yopa DS, Anya P, Mendjime P, Elouga T, Nnanga-Nga E, Nguefack-Tsague G. Evaluation of the Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance System in Sentinel Sites in Cameroon. *Cureus.* 2023;15(6): e40779.

16. Amvomo NLD, Sama CKK, Bouopda R, Minkeza FCN, Mbopda LP, Tchoumi CLY, *et al.* Bacterial ecology and antibiotic susceptibility profile of isolated strains from surfaces and medical devices in some departments of the Jordan Medical Services, Cameroon: a descriptive cross-sectional study. *PAMJ-One Health.* 2023;11(6). doi: 10.11604/pamj-oh.2023.11.6.38513.

17. Ango PD, Konan KD, Kouamé KA, Sai SS, Tchimou AY, Adingra SC, *et al.* Écologie Microbienne des Surfaces et Dispositifs Médicaux au Service de Réanimation du Centre Hospitalier et Universitaire (CHU) de Treichville. *Health Sci Dis.* 2020;21(1):23–7.

18. Luma HN, Doualla MS, Ebongue CO, Temfack E, Wouafo M, Belley-Priso E. Bacterial reservoirs in a health care environment: case of the douala general hospital, cameroon. *Health Sci Dis.* 2012;13(1.

19. Nouetchognou JS, Ateudjieu J, Jemea B, Mesumbe EN, Mbanya D. Surveillance of nosocomial infections in the Yaounde University Teaching Hospital, Cameroon. *BMC Res Notes.* 2016;9(1):505.

20. Cheuyem FZL, Lyonga EE, Takougang I. Standard precautions perception and practice among health workers in the obstetrics-gynecology department of a referral hospital in Cameroon . medRxiv; 2025. doi: 10.1101/2025.04.21.25326141v2.

21. Rapport Mensuel d'Activité I - Grands Hôpitaux | DHIS2. Ministère de la Santé Publique, Yaoundé, Cameroun. 2024. https://dhis-minsante-cm.org/dhis-web-reports/index.html#/data-set-report. Accessed2024 Aug 20.

22. Dehghan Manshadi SA, Sedaghat M, Mohammad Hashem F, Salehi M, Mohammadnejad E, Seifi A, *et al.* Knowledge and perception of hand hygiene: A survey using WHO standardized tools in Tehran, Iran. *Casp J Intern Med.* 2022;13(1):122–6.

23. Mahfouz AA, Abolyazid A, Al-Musa HM, Awadallah NJ, Faraheen A, Khalil S, *et al.* Hand hygiene knowledge of primary health care workers in Abha city, South Western Saudi Arabia. *J Fam Med Prim Care.* 2017;6(1):136–40.

24. Tomczyk S, Twyman A, de Kraker MEA, Coutinho Rehse AP, Tartari E, Toledo JP, *et al.* The first WHO global survey on infection prevention and control in health-care facilities. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2022;22(6):845–56.

25. Infection prevention and control assessment framework at the facility level . OMS, Genève. 2018 [Accessed2024 Jul 23]. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-HIS-SDS-2018.9

26. Ango PD, Konan KD, Kouamé KA, Sai SS, Tchimou AY, Adingra SC, *et al.* Écologie Microbienne des Surfaces et Dispositifs Médicaux au Service de Réanimation du Centre Hospitalier et Universitaire (CHU) de Treichville. *Health Sci Dis.* 2020;21(1):23–7.

27. Breakpoint tables for interpretation of MICs and zone diameters, version 13.1. The European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. EUCAST, Växjö, Sweeden. 2023. Available from: http://www.eucast.org/clinical_breakpoints/. Accessed 2023 Nov 22.

28. Felten A, Casin I. Détection simple des staphylocoques résistants à la méticilline grâce à un disque de céfoxitine ou de latamoxef. *Rev Fr Lab.* 2003;2003(352):27–30.

29. Zia I, Cheema SS, Sheikh NS, Ashraf H. Hand hygiene knowledge, attitudes, and self-reported practices among medical and nursing staff of a tertiary-care military hospital: a cross-sectional study. *Int J Infect Control.* 2022 ;18 :10.3396/ijic.v18.21469.

30. Couverture Santé Universelle. HERE WE ARE ! Ministère de la Santé Publique, Yaoundé, Cameroun. 2023. https://www.minsante.cm/site/?q=en/node/4567. Accessed2024 Aug 12.

31. Cameroon | Universal Health Coverage Partnership. OMS, Genève. 2021. https://extranet.who.int/uhcpartnership/country-profile/cameroon. Accessed 2024 Aug 12.

32. Cynthia AN, Kilic B. Management of Universal Health Coverage in Cameroon. *J Basic Clin Health Sci.* 2022; 6:673–81.

33. Takougang I, Cheuyem FZL, Lyonga EE, Ndungo JH, Mbopi-Keou FX. Observance of Standard Precautions for Infection Prevention in The Covid-19 Era: A Cross-Sectional Study in Six District Hospitals in Yaounde, Cameroon. *Am J Biomed Sci Res.* 2023;19(5):590–8.

34. Takougang I, Cheuyem FZL, Ze BRS, Tsamoh FF, Moneboulou HM. Awareness of standard precautions, circumstances of occurrence and management of occupational exposures to body fluids among healthcare workers in a regional level referral hospital (Bertoua, Cameroon). *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2024;24(1):424.

35. Takougang I, Cheuyem FZL, Changeh BA, Nyonga ND, Moneboulou HM. Accidental Exposure to Body Fluids Among Healthcare Workers in a Referral Hospital in the Security-Challenged Region of South West Cameroon. *J Nurs Healthc.* 2024;9(2):1–13.

36. Takougang I, Mbognou ZF, Cheuyem FZL, Nouko A, Lowe M. Occupational Exposure and Observance of Standard Precautions Among Bucco-Dental Health Workers in Referral Hospitals (Yaoundé, Cameroon). *Am J Biomed Sci Res.* 2023;20(5):623–30.

37. Vincent A, Cohen M, Bernet C, Parneix P, L'Hériteau F, Branger B, *et al.* Accidental exposure to blood by midwives in French maternity units: results of the national surveillance 2003. *J Gynecol Obstet Biol Reprod (Paris).* 2006;35(3):247–56.

38. Gondo D, Effoh N, Adjoby R, Konan J, Koffi S, Diomande F, *et al.* Connaissances, attitudes et pratiques (CAP) du personnel soignant sur les accidents d'exposition au sang (AES) dans 4 maternités d'Abidjan. *Rev Afr Anesth Med Urgences.* 2016;21(1):16–20.

39. Nouetchognou JS, Ateudjieu J, Jemea B, Mbanya D. Accidental exposures to blood and body fluids among health care workers in a Referral Hospital of Cameroon. *BMC Res Notes.* 2016;9(1):94.

40. Asgedom AA. Status of infection prevention and control (IPC) as per the WHO standardised Infection Prevention and Control Assessment Framework (IPCAF) tool: existing evidence and its implication. *Infect Prev Pract.* 2024;6(2):100351.

41. Azak E, Sertcelik A, Ersoz G, Celebi G, Eser F, Batirel A, *et al.* Evaluation of the implementation of WHO infection prevention and control core components in Turkish health care facilities: results from a WHO infection prevention and control assessment framework (IPCAF)—based survey. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control.* 2023;12(1):11.

42. Jeong Y, Joo H, Bahk H, Koo H, Lee H, Kim K. A nationwide survey on the implementation of infection prevention and control components in 1442 hospitals in the Republic of Korea: comparison to the WHO Infection Prevention and Control Assessment Framework (IPCAF). *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control.* 2022;11(1):71.

43. Takougang I, Cheuyem FZL, Ndungo JH, Lyonga EE, Mbopi-Keou FX. Infection Risk Perception, Reporting and Post-Exposure Management of Occupational Injuries among Healthcare Workers in District Hospitals. *J Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2023;7(4):1–7.

44. Opoku SY, Yeboah C, Ampon-Wireko S, Hinneh RK. Occupational Health and Safety Hazards Experienced by Healthcare Workers at Two Hospitals in Suyani, Bono Region, Ghana. *Occup Dis Environ Med.* 2023;11(2):122–36.

45. Ilo IJ, Uchenwoke CI, Umeh UA, Nwankwo UN, Ede SS, Nwankwo CE. Knowledge and practice of preventive measures for occupational health hazards among nurses working in a teaching hospital in Enugu. *Ann Clin Biomed Res.* 2022;3(1). doi: 10.4081/acbr.2022.182.

46. Lee AS, de Lencastre H, Garau J, Kluytmans J, Malhotra-Kumar S, Peschel A, *et al.* Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus. *Nat Rev Dis Primer.* 2018 ;4(1):1–23.

47. Vincenot F, Saleh M, Prévost G. Les facteurs de virulence de Staphylococcus aureus. *Rev Francoph Lab.* 2008 ;2008(407):61–9.

48. Turner NA, Sharma-Kuinkel BK, Maskarinec SA, Eichenberger EM, Shah PP, Carugati M, *et al.* Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus: an overview of basic and clinical research. *Nat Rev Microbiol.* 2019;17(4):203–18.

49. Fox-Moon SM, Shirtliff ME. Urinary Tract Infections Caused by Proteus mirabilis. In: Tang YW, Sussman M, Liu D, Poxton I, Schwartzman J, editors. Molecular Medical Microbiology (Second Edition). Boston: Academic Press; 2015. p. 1389–400.

50. Jamil RT, Foris LA, Snowden J. Proteus mirabilis Infections. In: StatPearls . Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2024. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK442017/. Accessed 2024 Aug 20.

51. Chakkour M, Hammoud Z, Farhat S, El Roz A, Ezzeddine Z, Ghssein G. Overview of Proteus mirabilis pathogenicity and virulence. Insights into the role of metals. *Front Microbiol.* 2024 ;15. doi : 10.3389/fmicb.2024.1383618.

52. Trautner BW, Kaye KS, Gupta V, Mulgirigama A, Mitrani-Gold FS, Scangarella-Oman NE, *et al.* Risk Factors Associated With Antimicrobial Resistance and Adverse Short-Term Health Outcomes Among Adult and Adolescent Female Outpatients With Uncomplicated Urinary Tract Infection. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 2022;9(12): ofac623.

53. Wanke-Rytt M, Sobierajski T, Lachowicz D, Seliga-Gąsior D, Podsiadły E. Analysis of Etiology of Community-Acquired and Nosocomial Urinary Tract Infections and Antibiotic Resistance of Isolated Strains: Results of a 3-Year Surveillance (2020–2022) at the Pediatric Teaching Hospital in Warsaw. *Microorganisms.* 2023;11(6):1438.

54. Abbas R, Chakkour M, Zein El Dine H, Obaseki EF, Obeid ST, Jezzini A, *et al.* General Overview of Klebsiella pneumonia: Epidemiology and the Role of Siderophores in Its Pathogenicity. *Biology.* 2024;13(2):78.

55. Li Y, Kumar S, Zhang L, Wu H, Wu H. Characteristics of antibiotic resistance mechanisms and genes of Klebsiella pneumoniae. *Open Med.* 2023;18(1):20230707.

56. Mukherjee S, Bhadury P, Mitra S, Naha S, Saha B, Dutta S, *et al.* Hypervirulent Klebsiella pneumoniae Causing Neonatal Bloodstream Infections: Emergence of NDM-1-Producing Hypervirulent ST11-K2 and ST15-K54 Strains Possessing pLVPK-Associated Markers. *Microbiol Spectr.* 2023;11(2):e04121-22.

57. Lemaoui CE, Layaida H, Badi A, Foudi N. Stratégies actuelles de lutte contre la résistance aux antibiotiques. *J Anti-Infect.* 2017;19(1):12–9.

58. Keneh NK, Kenmoe S, Bowo-Ngandji A, Akoachere JFTK, Kamga HG, Ndip RN, *et al.* Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus Carriage among Neonate Mothers, Healthcare Workers, and Environmental Samples in Neonatal Intensive Care Units: A Systematic Review. *BioMed Res Int.* 2024;2024(1):5675786.

59. Maddiboyina B, Roy H, Ramaiah M, Sarvesh CN, Kosuru SH, Nakkala RK, *et al.* Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus: novel treatment approach breakthroughs. *Bull Natl Res Cent.* 2023;47(1):95.

60. Mouiche MMM, Moffo F, Akoachere JFTK, Okah-Nnane NH, Mapiefou NP, Ndze VN, *et al.* Antimicrobial resistance from a one health perspective in Cameroon: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19(1):1135.

61. Massongo M, Ngando L, Pefura Yone EW, NZouankeu A, Mbanzouen W, Fonkoua MC, *et al.* Trends of Antibacterial Resistance at the National Reference Laboratory in Cameroon: Comparison of the Situation between 2010 and 2017. *BioMed Res Int.* 2021; 2021:9957112.

62. Kalin G, Alp E, Chouaikhi A, Roger C. Antimicrobial Multidrug Resistance: Clinical Implications for Infection Management in Critically Ill Patients. *Microorganisms.* 2023;11(10):2575.

63. Geest SV der. Les médicaments sur un marché camerounais. Anthropol Santé Rev Int Francoph Anthropol Santé. 2017;(14). doi : 10.4000/anthropologiesante.2450.

64. Castro-Sánchez E, Moore LSP, Husson F, Holmes AH. What are the factors driving antimicrobial resistance? Perspectives from a public event in London, *England. BMC Infect Dis.* 2016;16(1):465.

65. Infections I of M (US) F on E, Knobler SL, Lemon SM, Najafi M, Burroughs T. Factors Contributing to the Emergence of Resistance. In: The Resistance Phenomenon in Microbes and Infectious Disease Vectors: Implications for Human Health and Strategies for Containment: Workshop Summary. National Academies Press (US); 2003.

Table 9 Resistance profile to standard antibiotics of Gram-negative bacilli circulating in the care unit (n=22)

Tested antibiotic	*Enterobacteria* *n* (%)						*Non-Enterobacteria* *n* (%)	
	Proteus mirabilis	***Klebsiella spp.***	***Yersinia spp.***	***Serratia spp.***	***Enterobacter aerogenes***	***Escherichia coli***	***Pseudomonas aeruginosa***	***Other Gram-negative non-fermenting bacillus***
	7 (100)	4 (100)	3 (100)	3 (100)	2 (100)	1 (100)	1 (100)	1 (100)
Penicillin								
Amoxicillin	5 (71)	3 (75)	2 (67)	3 (100)	2 (100)	0 (0)	1 (100)	1 (100)
Amoxicillin + Clavulanate	5 (71)	3 (75)	2 (67)	3 (100)	2 (100)	0 (0)	1 (100)	1 (100)
Aminoglycoside								
Kanamycin	3 (43)	3 (75)	3 (100)	1 (33)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (100)	0 (0)
Cephalosporin								
Ceftazidime	4 (57)	1 (25)	2 (67)	2 (67)	1 (50)	0 (0)	1 (100)	0 (0)
Cefuroxime	7 (100)	4 (100)	3 (100)	3 (100)	2 (100)	1 (100)	1 (100)	1 (100)
Cefepime	6 (86)	4 (100)	3 (100)	3 (100)	2 (100)	0 (0)	1 (100)	1 (100)
Cefotaxime	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Ceftriaxone	2 (29)	3 (75)	2 (67)	3 (100)	2 (100)	1 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Cefoxitin	6 (86)	4 (100)	3 (100)	3 (100)	1 (50)	1 (100)	1 (100)	1 (100)
Quinolone								
Nalidixic acid	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (50)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Ciprofloxacin	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Levofloxacin	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Carbapenem								
Meropenem	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (33)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (100)
Imipenem	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Glycopeptide								
Vancomycin	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Phosphonic acid								
Fosfomycin	6 (86)	3 (75)	3 (100)	2 (67)	2 (100)	1 (100)	1 (100)	1 (100)
Diamino-Pyrimidine								
Trimethoprim	7 (100)	3 (75)	2 (67)	2 (67)	2 (100)	1 (100)	1 (100)	1 (100)
Sulfonamide and Diamino-Pyrimidine								
Sulfamethoxazole + Trimethoprim	1 (14)	0 (0)	1 (33)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (100)	0 (0)
Monobactam								
Aztreonam	4 (57)	3 (75)	2 (67)	3 (100)	1 (50)	0 (0)	1 (100)	1 (100)