Phenotypic and Genotypic Profile of Enterobacteriaceae Isolated at a Teaching Hospital in Ghana

Authors

Bismark Donkor[1]*, Faustina Halm-Lai[1], Richael Odarkor Mills[3], Philimon Mwintige[4], Alberta Bedford Moses[5], Abigail Asmah Brown[5] Oheneba Charles Kofi Hagan[2]*

Affiliations

[1]Department of Microbiology and Immunology, School of Medical Sciences, College of Health and Allied Sciences, University of Cape Coast, Ghana.

[2]Department of Medical Biochemistry, School of Medical Sciences, College of Health and Allied Sciences, University of Cape Coast, Ghana.

[3]Department of Biomedical Sciences, School of Allied Health Sciences, College of Health and Allied Sciences, University of Cape Coast, Ghana.

[4]Department of Microbiology, Cape Coast Teaching Hospital, Ghana.

[5]Laboratory Department, Cape Coast Teaching Hospital, Ghana

Correspondence

E-mail: bismark.donkor001@stu.ucc.edu.gh ; ock.hagan@uccsms.edu.gh

Abstract

Background:

Antibiotic resistance in *Enterobacteriaceae* continue to rise and its implications on health care delivery intensified. We investigated the genetic basis for antimicrobial resistance (AMR), virulence genes and associated plasmids in *Enterobacteriaceae* isolates at a teaching hospital in Ghana.

Materials and methods:

Antimicrobial susceptibility testing was performed on archived isolates. Whole genome sequencing was performed on a subset of the isolates which were either multi-drug resistant or extend spectrum ß-lactamases (ESBL)producing. Bioinformatic analyses were performed for speciation, identification of AMR and virulence genes as well as associated plasmids.

Results:

The 100 *Enterobacteriaceae* isolates included in this study expressed high phenotypic resistance to ß-lactams, and high susceptibility to aminoglycosides. The 20 WGS isolates were identified genotypically based on housekeeping genes *Escherichia coli* (8/20, 40%), *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (8/20, 40%), *Enterobacter cloacae* (2/20, 10%), and *Salmonella enterica* (1/20, 5%). These harboured 139 unique antibiotic resistant genes encoding resistance against ß-lactams (65/139), aminoglycosides (23/139), fluoroquinolones (45/139), tetracyclines (35/139), phenicols (28/139), and sulphonamides (9/139). Subsequent AST performed revealed that (74/79, 94%) were ESBL producers, and (9/79,11%) were CRE. The isolates expressed 8 main categories of virulence factors with adherence, effector delivery systems, and metabolic factors predominating in

decreasing order. Additionally, 26 unique plasmid replicons of both I-complex and colicin plasmids were detected.

Conclusion:

We identified marked phenotypic and genotypic evidence of antimicrobial resistance to commonly used antibiotics in the isolates at the hospital.

Keywords: *Enterobacteriaceae*, AMR, WGS, plasmids, virulence factors

Introduction

The *Enterobacteriaceae* group are widely distributed in nature, particularly in the environment and gastrointestinal tract of animal. They are Gram negative, non-spore forming, anaerobic, reduce nitrite to nitrate, and ferment glucose (1–3). Although majority of them are commensals, some genera have impacted on human and animal health. These include *Escherischia coli, Klebsiella spp, Citrobacter spp, Salmonella spp,* and *Enterobacter spp*(2,4,5).

The emergence and persistence of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) in the *Enterobateriaceae* to antimicrobials of various classes especially the extended-spectrum beta-lactams (ESBLs), carbapenems and fluoroquinolones in clinical settings have hampered global healthcare delivery especially in the lower- and middle-income countries (LMICs) 2020 (6,7). A systematic review and meta-analysis by Bezabih et al. found an eightfold increase in global antibiotic resistance enterobacteriaceae (ARE) rate, particularly, isolates that are ESBL carriage from 2003 to 2018 (Bezabih et al., 2022). Other observations present data that highlights the prevalence of CTM-X-15 gene, one type ESBL gene that is mostly dominant among pathogenic enterobacteriaceae (Asare et al., 2024; Irenge et al., 2019). With regards to carbapenem resistance, the pooled prevalence globally is higher compared to data available in African. They report NDM, IMP and VIM-type as the main drive of CRE, especially NDM-1. However, data present in Ghana reveals low harborage of NDM-1 (11,12). Nonetheless, CRE in Ghana keeps on rising. Mills et al and Ayibieke et al reported that carbapenem-hydrolyzing class D β-lactamases, mainly OXA type genes are observed among enterobacteriaceae in Ghana (12,13).

Aside ARGs, these bacteria harbour genes of virulence factors (VFs)**.** The VFs are important for the *Enterobacteriacea*e to successfully colonize and survive in their hosts (14,15) , and

eventually cause infections (Lynch et al., 2021). VFs encompass diverse mechanisms such as host cell adhesion (eg. pili, adhesins), tissue invasion (eg. invasins, hyaluronidase), toxin production (eg. exotoxins, endotoxins), immune evasion (eg. capsules, antigenic variation), enzymes facilitating spread (eg. coagulase, proteases), iron acquisition (eg. siderophores), secretion systems (eg. Type III/VI), intracellular survival strategies, antiphagocytic (14,18,19) Surveillance of VFs among enterobacteriaceae reveals an abundance of VFs in ARE (14,18,20,21).

Both ARGs and VFs are harboured within bacteria chromosome and mobile elements such as plasmids, transposons and integrons (7,22–24). Present data reveals that they usually borne on plasmids (25,26), the dominant occurring mobile genetic element in antibiotic resistant bacteria (Harris et al., 2023; Wang & Dagan, 2024). Incompatibility complex (I-complex) plasmids mostly consisting of resistance and fertility groups of plasmids are prevelance in ARE (25,29,30). IncF, IncC, IncX are reported to be the most I-complex plasmids involved in the transmission of AMR among Enterobacteriaceae (26,31,32). In addition to the I-complex plasmids, enterobacteriaceae also harbour colicin plasmids. These plasmids produce bacteriocins which have been reported to inhibit other bacteria in addition to being implicated in ARGs and VFs transmission (Ghanim et al., 2023). They are usually present in *Enterobacteriaceae*, especially *E. coli* strains and *Klebsiella spp* ((30,33,34).

Previous studies uncovered high record of *Enterobacteriacea*e infections in the CCTH (35,36); however, few data on the genetic basis of ARE, especially those that are ESBL producing is revealed at the hospital due to the poor antimicrobial resistance surveillance in Ghana. This study

was undertaken to profile *Enterobacteriaceae* isolated from patients at CCTH. Through phenotypic identification and antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST), we determined the prevalence of multidrug-resistant (MDR) strains, extended-spectrum β-lactamase (ESBL) producers, and carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae (CRE). Additionally, whole-genome sequencing (WGS) of 20 ESBL-producing isolates was performed to characterize their taxonomy, antimicrobial resistance genes (ARGs), virulence factors, and harboured plasmid replicons

Materials and Methods

Study design and site

This was a retrospective study of archived *Enterobacteriaceae* isolates from patients attending CCTH, a tertiary-level health facility located in the Cape Coast Metropolitan area of the Central Region of Ghana. The hospital is a 400-bed capacity facility which serves as a referral centre for the Central, Western, Western East and Eastern regions of Ghana. The microbiology laboratory at the hospital routinely undertakes culture and sensitivity testing for microorganisms isolated from various specimen sources including blood, urine, abscess, stool, wound swabs, high vaginal and endocervical swabs. The specimen was received from the various departments within the hospital including Enterobacteriaceae isolates archived from 2020 – 2023 were included in this study. the out-patient's department (OPD), paediatric ward, the emergency wards, intensive care unit, and obstetrics and gynecology (O/G).

Bacterial isolates

Bacteria isolates of the *Enterobactericeae* group were retrieved from storage and they were phenotypically identified using standard biochemical testing including citrate, oxidase, indole, urease and triple sugar iron (TSI).

Antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST)

AST was performed for the isolates using the following antimicrobial agents: (ß-lactams: ampicillin [AMP 10mcg], ceftriaxone [CTR, 30mcg], cefotaxime [CTX 30mcg], cefuroxime [CXM 30mcg], and meropenem [MRP, 10 mcg]; fluoroquinolones: ciprofloxacin [CIP 5mcg], levofloxacin [LEV 5mcg], and ofloxacin [OF 5mcg]; aminoglycosides: amikacin [AMK 30mcg], and gentamicin [GEN 10mcg]; sulphonamide: cotrimoxazole [COT 25mcg]; tetracycline [TET

30mcg]; and chloramphenicol [CHL 30mcg]. The AST was performed using the Kirby–Bauer disk diffusion method and the breakpoints were interpreted according to the Clinical and Laboratory Standard Institute (CLSI) 2020 guideline (37). Briefly, pure colonies of the cultured isolates were picked from agar culture plate and inoculated into peptone broth to achieve turbidity equivalent to 0.5 McFarland standards. Using a sterile cotton bud, a swab of the bacteria suspension was streaked over the entire surface of freshly prepared Mueller Hinton agar (MHA) plate. The antibiotic discs were placed on the MHA in the plates within 15 minutes of bacteria inoculation. The plates were incubated at 37 □ for 24 hours. Subsequently, the zone of inhibition was measured using a metre rule in millimeters, and interpreted as sensitive, intermediate or resistant according to the CLSI 2020 guideline (37). Based on the AST findings, we classified the isolates as either multidrug resistant (MDR)-resistance to 3 or more classes of antibiotics or ESBL producing.

ESBL producers screening

Isolates exhibiting an inhibitory zone diameter ≤27 mm upon exposure to cefotaxime (30 mcg), and ≤25 mm when tested with ceftriaxone (CTR: 30 mcg) according to the (CLSI, 2020) guide were identified as possible ESBL-producers. ESBL confirmatory test was performed (n=79) using ceftazidime (CAZ:10mcg) and ceftazidime-clavulanic acid (CAL: 40mcg). Isolates that exhibited an inhibitory zone diameter ≤17 mm upon exposure to ceftazidime (30 mcg), and ≤20 mm when tested with ceftazidime-clavulanic acid were confirmed as ESBL producers.

Whole genome sequencing (WGS)

Twenty isolates that were ESBL-producing were selected for WGS. Genomic DNA (gDNA) was extracted from the bacteria using the Quick-DNA mini prep plus kit (Zymo Research, Irvine, United States) according to the manufacturer's instructions. WGS was performed at WACCBIP

NGS Laboratory (Accra, Ghana) using the Illumina MiSeq (Illumina, Inc, San Diego, USA). DNA quality and quantity were determined using Qubit 4.0 fluorometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, USA). Short read sequencing was performed using (2 x 250 bp) PE sequencing with the MiSeq® Reagent Kit v3 (600 cycle). For each sample, 100 ng of total DNA was used for library preparation. Sequencing libraries were prepared using the Illumina DNA Prep (Illumina) library preparation kit from the enriched DNA following the manufacturer's instructions. Using the Nextera XT Index Kit v2 (Illumina), distinct indices and Illumina sequencing adapters were attached to each individual library according to manufacturer’s instruction. Subsequently, each library was purified using Agencourt AMPure XP beads (BeckmanCoulter). The Agilent 4200 Tapestation (Agilent) was then used to check the expected size distribution and quality of the library. The concentration of the libraries was measured using the Qubit 4.0 fluorometer (Life Technologies). Based on the Tapestation and Qubit results, the barcoded libraries were normalized and pooled at an equimolar concentration. The combined library was diluted to 18 pM, spiked with 5% Phix (v3), and then sequenced.

Bioinformatics analyses

Adapters and low-quality reads of (n=20) paired end (PE) reads were trimmed using Trimmomatic (0.39) (https://github.com/usadellab/Trimmomatic), setting Phred score at 33, ILLUMINACLIP: Nextera-PE. fa: 2:30:10, LEADING:3, TRAILING:3 and MINLEN:22. The PE trimmed reads (n=20) were assembled using SPAdes Genome Assembler (4.0.0) (https://github.com/ablab/spades), and quality assessment was assessed using QUAST (5.2.0) (https://github.com/ablab/quast). Multilocus sequence typing (MLST) (https://github.com/tseemann/mlst) which scans contigs against traditional PubMLST typing schemes, was performed to validate the identity of the isolates. Concurrently, each draft genome

was screened for the presence of AMR genes using Abricate (https://github.com/tseemann/abricate) which host (CARD, PlasmidFinder, and VFDBS). Resistance and virulence genes were determined using CARD Alcock et al., 2020; Jia et al., 2017) and VFDBS (Liu et al., 2022) respectively. Assembled contigs were further assessed to identify plasmid genes using PlasmidFinder (40) in order to understand the transmission of AMR genes within the *Enterobacteriaceae* populace at the hospital. Genes were selected based on both coverage and identity equal to or greater than a threshold of 95%.

Data Analysis

Data visualization was conducted using Python (v3.11) in Jupyter (v3.6.3) via Anaconda Navigator (v2.4.6), employing Matplotlib, pandas, and seaborn libraries. Heatmaps illustrating antibiotic susceptibility patterns and radar plots depicting virulence factor distributions among Enterobacteriaceae isolates were generated using the same libraries. Statistical analyses were performed in Jamovi (v2.3.28). Descriptive statistics summarized patient demographics and clinical characteristics, with medians and interquartile ranges calculated. Cohen's Kappa was used to evaluate interrater reliability between phenotypic, MLST, and rMLST identification methods, implemented via the ClinicoPath module in Jamovi.

Results

Socio-demographics and clinical data

The majority of bacteria isolates were contributed by patients of whom (70%) were females, with 34% and 36% being within the age category of 20-29 and 40-69 respectively. The ages ranged from 8 days to 85 years with median age of 40 years and interquartile range of 35 years. Of the

100 samples 51% and 10% were specimen referred from the outpatient department (OPD) and accident and emergency (A&E) respectively. Other departments including IICU, FSW, MSW, and O/G contributed 13% of the isolates. Majority of the isolates (44%) were obtained from urine samples.

Table 1: Demographics and clinical characteristics of isolates corresponding to patients at CCTH

Category	Sub-category	Percentage (%) n =100
Age in years	≤12 years	12.0
	13-19	2.0
	20 -39	34.0
	40- 69	37.0
	≥70	15.0
Sex	Female	70.0
	Male	30.0
Department	OPD	51.0
	Other Departments	13.0
	A/E	10.0
	FMW	8.0
	MMW	7.0
	ETAT	6.0
	PMW	5.0
Specimen Source	Urine	44.0
	Sputum	14.0
	HSV	12.0
	Wound Swab	12.0
	Other Sources	10.0
	Blood	8.0

OPD: Outpatient Department; A/E: Accident & Emergency; FMW: Female Medical Ward; MMW: Male Medical Ward; ETAT: Emergency Triage, Assessment & Treatment; PMW: Paediatric Medical Ward.

Antimicrobial susceptibility patterns

Of the hundred (100) isolates, 6% were determined to be MDR. ESBL testing was successful for 79, out of which 74, that is, 93.7% were ESBL-producing. About 93%, 69% and 63% of the 100 isolates were susceptible to amikacin, chloramphenicol and gentamicin, however, all the isolates were resistant to ampicillin (**Fig1)**. Meropenem sensitivity testing was successful for 79 of the isolates out of which 40.51% (32/79), 48.10% (38/79), 11.39% (9/79) were either susceptible, intermediate or resistant respectively: This suggests that the isolates are mostly susceptible to meropenem at the hospital.

Whole genome assembly

Computation of the total read count and quality metrics of the assemblies (**Additional File 4**) were consistent and of high-quality. Tseeman/mlst analysis predicted *E. coli* (8/20, 40%), *K. pneumoniae* (8/20, 40%), *E. cloacae* (2/20, 10%), and *S. enterica* (1/20, 5%). Additionally, (1/20, 5%) was identified as *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* which belongs to the family *Pseudomonadaceae* (**Additional file 1**). Agreement between the phenotypic and genotypic identification of the *Enterobacteriaceae* isolates, and Kappa were found to be moderate with 0.60 and 0.47 respectively. The statistical difference between the phenotypic and genotypic identification of the *Enterobacteriaceae* isolates was significant (p-value <□.001). It suggests strong evidence that the phenotypic and genotypic methods, including MLST and rMLST, do not consistently agree in their classification of bacterial isolates.

Resistome

CARD revealed 139 unique ARGs that would confer resistance to the following classes of antibiotics: ß-lactams (65/139), fluoroquinolones (45/139), aminoglycosides (23/139), phenicol (28/139), tetracycline (35/139), and sulphonamide (9/139) as shown in table 2. High diversity of

ARGs were observed in *E. coli* (130/139) followed by *K. pneumoniae* (111/139), *E. cloacae* (9/139), and *S. enterica* (6/139), respectively. Isolate IDs BC82 (*E. coli*) harboured most ARGs (82/139) whereas lowest was detected in both BC76 and BC94 (*K. pneumoniae)* (4/139) each. *CTX-M-15*, an ESBL gene was the most observed ARG, detected among (13/19) isolates. Nine ARGs including *APH (3')-Ia, Erm (49), EC-15, Escherichia_coli_emrE, golS, mdsC, MdtK, QnrD1*, and *SHV-80* were recorded as the lowest occurring ARGs among the isolates. Each were observed once in just a single isolate. Several variants of multidrug resistant genes (91/139) were observed in the isolates, especially in *E. coli* (65/91), followed by *K. pneumoniae* (44/91), *S. enterica* (5/91), and *E. cloacae* (1/91), respectively. They were observed to have conferred resistance, especially on 4 classes of antibiotics including ß-lactams, fluoroquinolones, tetracycline, and chloramphenicol.

Enterobacteriaceae Isolates
S
I
R
N/A

Fig1: Antibiotic susceptibility profiles (phenotype) of *Enterobacteriaceae* bacteria Isolates. The heatmap displays antibiotic susceptibility patterns across various *Enterobacteriaceae* isolates for different antibiotics. Each row represents a specific antibiotic, while each column corresponds to an isolate. The color-coding indicates the susceptibility categories: black: susceptible (S), red: intermediate resistance (I), beige: resistant (R), gray: data not available (N/A). The antibiotics tested were (ß-lactams: Ampicillin [Amp], Ceftriaxone [CTR], Cefotaxime [CTX], Ceftazidime [CAZ], Meropenem [MRP], and Cefuroxime [CXM]; Fluoroquinolones: Ciprofloxacin [CIP], Levofloxacin [LEV], and Ofloxacin [OF]; Aminoglycosides: Amikacin [AMK], and Gentamicin [GEN]; Sulphonamides: Cotrimoxazole [COT]; Tetracycline [TET]; Chloramphenicol [CHL]; and Ceftazidime-Clavulanic acid [CAL]).

Table 2: Presence of antimicrobial resistance genes (ARGs) in *Enterobacteriaceae* bacterial isolates

ARGs	*E. coli*								*K. Pneumoniae*								*E. cloacae*		*S. enterica*	Number of Isolates
	BC 04	BC 15	BC 18	BC 26	BC 64	BC 73	BC 81	BC 82	BC 16	BC 20	BC 37	BC 54	BC 71	BC 75	BC 76	BC 94	BC 06	BC35	BC38	
Aminoglycosides																				
AAC (3')-IId					■		■	■										■		**4**
AAC (3')-IIe									■		■	■	■	■						**5**
AAC (6')-Iy																			■	**1**
AAD (3'')-Ib						■	■	■	■			■	■							**6**
AAD (3')-VIb		■	■					■	■	■										**5**
AAD (6)-Id		■	■					■	■	■										**5**
AAC (3')-Via		■	■					■	■	■										**5**
aacA2					■						■									**2**
aadA5	■	■	■	■	■	■			■											**7**
aadA2										■	■		■	■						**4**
armA											■		■	■						**3**
AAC (6')-Ib-cr6	■	■		■		■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■						**11**
acrB	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
acrD	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
AcrE		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
AcrF	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
arr-3		■										■								**2**
ArnT									■	■	■	■	■	■	■					**6**
cpxA	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
Klebsiella_pneumoniae_KpnE									■	■	■	■	■	■	■					**7**
Klebsiella_pneumoniae_KpnF									■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■				**8**
Klebsiella_pneumoniae_KpnG									■	■	■	■	■	■	■					**7**
kdpE	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■											**8**
Fluoroquinolones																				
AAC (6')-Ib-cr6	■	■		■		■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■						**11**
abeM							■	■												**2**
abeS							■	■												**2**
oqxA									■	■	■	■	■	■	■					**6**
oqxB									■	■	■	■	■	■	■					**7**
QnrB17											■	■	■	■				■		**5**
QnrD1																	■			**1**
QnrS1									■	■										**2**

ARGs	*E. coli*								*K. Pneumoniae*								*E. cloacae*		*S. enterica*	Number of Isolates
	BC 04	BC 15	BC 18	BC 26	BC 64	BC 73	BC 81	BC 82	BC 16	BC 20	BC 37	BC 54	BC 71	BC 75	BC 76	BC 94	BC 06	BC35	BC38	
adeF							■	■												**2**
adeG							■	■												**2**
adeH							■	■												**2**
adeI							■	■												**2**
adeJ							■	■												**2**
adeK							■	■												**2**
adeL							■	■												**2**
adeN							■	■												**2**
Acinetobacter_baumannii_AbaF							■	■												**2**
Acinetobacter_baumannii_AmvA							■	■												**2**
acrB	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
acrD	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
AcrE		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
AcrF	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
AcrS	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
bacA	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		■									**10**
CRP	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
eptA	■					■	■		■											**4**
ermA	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■											**8**
ermB	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■					■						**9**
ermK	■	■	■			■	■	■	■											**8**
ermR	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■											**8**
ermY	■	■	■			■	■	■	■											**7**
Escherichia_coli_emrE			■																	**1**
Escherichia_coli_mdfA	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
evgA	■	■	■			■	■	■	■											**7**
evgS	■	■	■			■	■	■	■											**7**
gadX	■					■	■	■	■											**5**
marA	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
mdtA	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
mdtB	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
mdtC	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■											**8**
mdtE	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
mdtF	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
mdtH	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**

ARGs	*E. coli*								*K. Pneumoniae*								*E. cloacae*		*S. enterica*	Number of Isolates
	BC 04	BC 15	BC 18	BC 26	BC 64	BC 73	BC 81	BC 82	BC 16	BC 20	BC 37	BC 54	BC 71	BC 75	BC 76	BC 94	BC 06	BC35	BC38	
MdtK																				1
sdiA																				1
ß-Lactams																				
ADC-169																				2
CMH-3																				1
CMH-6																				2
CMY-59																				1
CTX-M-15																				13
EC-5																				4
EC-15																				1
Escherichia_coli_ ampC_beta-lactamase																				3
NDM-1																				4
OXA-1																				8
OXA-402																				2
OXA-58																				2
SHV-106																				4
SHV-80																				1
SHV-187																				3
TEM-1																				6
TEM-35																				1
adeI																				2
adeJ																				2
adeK																				2
adeL																				2
adeN																				2
Acinetobacter_baumannii_AbaF																				2
Acinetobacter_baumannii_AmvA																				2
acrB																				9
acrD																				9
AcrE																				9
AcrF																				9
AcrS																				9
bacA																				10
CRP																				9

ARGs	*E. coli*								*K. Pneumoniae*								*E. cloacae*		*S. enterica*	Number of Isolates
	BC 04	BC 15	BC 18	BC 26	BC 64	BC 73	BC 81	BC 82	BC 16	BC 20	BC 37	BC 54	BC 71	BC 75	BC 76	BC 94	BC 06	BC35	BC38	
eptA	■					■	■		■											4
Erm (49)											■									1
Escherichia_coli_ acrA	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											9
Escherichia_coli_ emrE			■																	1
Escherichia_coli_ mdfA	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											9
evgA	■	■	■			■	■	■	■											7
evgS	■	■	■			■	■	■	■											7
gadW		■	■	■																3
gadX	■					■	■	■	■											5
golS																			■	1
H-NS	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■											8
Klebsiella_pneumoniae_KpnE									■	■	■	■	■	■	■					7
Klebsiella_pneumoniae_KpnF									■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■				8
Klebsiella_pneumoniae_KpnG									■	■	■	■	■	■	■					7
LptD									■	■	■		■	■	■					6
LpsB							■	■												2
marA	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											9
mdsA	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■										■	10
mdsB	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■										■	10
mdsC																			■	1
mdtB	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											9
mdtC	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■											8
mdtE	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											9
mdtF	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											9
mdtN	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											9
mdtO	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											9
mdtP	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											9
MdtQ									■	■	■	■	■	■	■					8
OmpA									■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■				8
ramA													■				■	■		3
SAT-2					■															1
sdiA																			■	1
TolC	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											9

ARGs	*E. coli*								*K. Pneumoniae*								*E. cloacae*		*S. enterica*	Number of Isolates
	BC 04	BC 15	BC 18	BC 26	BC 64	BC 73	BC 81	BC 82	BC 16	BC 20	BC 37	BC 54	BC 71	BC 75	BC 76	BC 94	BC 06	BC35	BC38	
Sulphonamides																				
sul1	■		■	■		■			■	■	■	■	■	■						**10**
sul2	■		■	■	■			■		■	■	■	■	■						**10**
CRP	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
dfrA1	■	■			■															**1**
dfrA12	■	■								■	■		■	■						**4**
dfrA14	■	■									■		■	■				■		**4**
dfrA17	■	■	■	■		■			■											**6**
dfrA27												■								**1**
eptA	■	■				■	■		■											**4**
Chloramphenicol																				
catA1		■			■		■	■	■											**5**
catA4	■	■															■			**1**
catII_from_Escherichia_coli_K-12	■	■										■								**1**
floR							■	■												**2**
adeH							■	■												**2**
adeI							■	■												**2**
adeJ							■	■												**2**
adeK							■	■												**2**
adeN							■	■												**2**
Acinetobacter_baumannii_AbaF							■	■												**2**
Acinetobacter_baumannii_AmvA							■	■												**2**
acrB	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
acrD	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
AcrE		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
AcrF	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
FosA6									■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■				**7**
golS																			■	**1**
marA	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
mdsA	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■										■	**10**
mdsB	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■										■	**10**
mdsC																			■	**1**
mdtG	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
mdtM			■	■		■	■	■	■											**6**
mdtN	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
mdtO	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**

ARGs	*E. coli*								*K. Pneumoniae*								*E. cloacae*		*S. enterica*	Number of Isolates
	BC 04	BC 15	BC 18	BC 26	BC 64	BC 73	BC 81	BC 82	BC 16	BC 20	BC 37	BC 54	BC 71	BC 75	BC 76	BC 94	BC 06	BC35	BC38	
mdtP	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
MdtQ									■	■	■	■	■	■	■					**8**
sdiA																			■	**1**
Tetracyclines																				
tet(A)			■	■	■	■				■	■		■	■						**8**
tet(B)	■	■					■	■	■											**4**
tet(D)												■			■					**2**
tet (39)							■	■												**2**
adeA							■	■												**2**
adeB							■	■												**2**
adeF							■	■												**2**
adeG							■	■												**2**
adeH							■	■												**2**
adeI							■	■												**2**
adeJ							■	■												**2**
adeK							■	■												**2**
adeL							■	■												**2**
adeN							■	■												**2**
adeR							■	■												**2**
adeS							■	■												**2**
acrB	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
acrD	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
AcrE		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
AcrF	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
AcrS	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■											**9**
ermA	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■											**8**
ermB	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■					■						**9**
ermK	■	■	■			■	■	■	■											**8**
ermR	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■											**8**
ermY	■	■	■			■	■	■	■											**7**
evgA	■	■	■			■	■	■	■											**7**
evgS	■	■	■			■	■	■	■											**7**
H-NS	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■											**8**
Klebsiella_pneumoniae_acrA									■	■	■	■	■	■	■					**7**
Klebsiella_pneumoniae_KpnE									■	■	■	■	■	■	■					**7**
Klebsiella_pneum									■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■				**8**

ARGs	*E. coli*								*K. Pneumoniae*								*E. cloacae*		*S. enterica*	Number of Isolates
	BC 04	**BC 15**	**BC 18**	**BC 26**	**BC 64**	**BC 73**	**BC 81**	**BC 82**	**BC 16**	**BC 20**	**BC 37**	**BC 54**	**BC 71**	**BC 75**	**BC 76**	**BC 94**	**BC 06**	**BC35**	**BC38**	
oniae_KpnF																				
Klebsiella_pneumoniae_KpnG																				**7**
marA																				**9**
sdiA																				**1**

The table presents the presence of various antimicrobial resistance genes (ARGs) across different isolates of *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae*, *E. cloacae*, and *S. enterica*. Cells highlighted steel blue indicates the presence of gene in an isolate while cells with white colours indicate absence of genes. The numbers in the far-right column indicate the total number of isolates in which each gene was detected. They are categorized base on the class of drugs they conferred resistance. The colour code in the ARGs columns shows which class the genes present in the isolates conferred resistance on: Aminoglycosides [green], fluroquinolones [light green], ß-lactams [dark blue], sulphonamides [yellow], chloramphenicol [dark red], tetracycline [purple], and non-specific ARGs (multiple drug/class) [gold].

Virulome

Using the VFDBS several VFs previously described in the *Enterobacteriaceae* family (*E. coli, K. pneumoniae, E. cloacae, S. enterica*) were detected. In total, 414 unique virulence genes were detected (Additional file 3), categorized into 8 major groups and 17 subcategories, as detailed in Table 3 and Fig 2. The predominant VF categories included adhesins, invasins, effector delivery systems, exotoxins, immune evasins, nutrient and metabolic factors, biofilms, and exoenzymes. Majority of these VFs were observed in E. *coli* isolates, followed by *K. pneumoniae, E. cloacae,* and *S. enterica*. Adhesin-associated VFs, essential for bacterial attachment to host cell mucosae (41) , were predominantly identified in *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae*. Invasion-related VFs, which facilitate host cell penetration, were detected across all four genera. Effector delivery systems, including T2SS and T3SS, known for injecting bacterial proteins into host cells to manipulate immune signaling, cell death, and nutrient acquisition pathways (42,43) were also observed in all the genera principally in the *S. enterica* isolate as shown in *Fig 2*. Exotoxins particularly membrane-acting, intracellular active toxins were observed in *E. coli, K. pneumoniae*, and *E. cloacae* isolates, however, none was observed in the *S. enterica isolate*. Similarly, immune evasion VFs, including antiphagocytosis and complement evasion mechanisms, were present in all Enterobacteriaceae isolates except *E. cloacae*. Nutritional and metabolic VFs were present mostly in *E. coli* followed by *K. pneumoniae and E. cloacae*. These factors, particularly those involved in metal uptake, metabolic adaptation, and iron sequestration, are crucial for bacterial survival and proliferation in host environments (20,44). Biofilm-associated VFs, which contribute to antibiotic resistance, were confined to *E. coli and K. pneumoniae*. Meanwhile, proteases that degrade exogenous proteins, enhancing bacterial growth and metabolism(Liu et al., 2022), were uniquely observed in *E. cloacae*. Bacterial survival in host environments plays

an important role in persistent infections (46). *Enterobacteriaceae* strains harbouring these VFs can subvert host immune defenses, leading to recurrent infections (14,47). The diversity of VFs identified in the *Enterobacteriaceae* isolates accentuate heir adaptability within host environments, enhancing their ability to evade antimicrobial defenses and establish infections.



Fig2. Virulence factor distribution among *Enterobacteriaceae* bacterial species. This radar chart illustrates the distribution of eight virulence factors (Adherence, Invasion, Effector delivery system, Exotoxin, Immune modulation, Nutritional/Metabolic factor, Biofilm, Exoenzyme)

across four *Enterobacteriaceae* bacterial species: *E. coli* (green), *K. pneumoniae* (blue), *S. enterica* (orange), and *E. cloacae* (pink). Each axis represents a virulence factor, with the distance from the center showing its strength or pathogenic and AMR contribution in each species. *E. coli* stands out in Adherence and Nutritional/Metabolic factors, while *S. enterica* is strong in the Effector delivery system. The other species show varying levels of these factors, reflecting their different pathogenic profiles.

Table 3: Virulence factors and sub categories present among Enterobacteriaceae bacterial isolates

Virulence Factor Genes			
Organism	**Category**	**Subcategory**	**No. Unique VFs**
E. coli	Adherence		
		Fimbrial adhesin	77
		Non-fimbrial adhesin	2
	Invasion		9
	Effector delivery system		
		Type II secretion system (T2SS)	11
		Type V secretion system (T5SS)	2
		Type VI secretion system (T6SS)	14
	Exotoxin		
		Membrane-acting toxin	5
		Intracellularly active toxin	19
	Immune modulation		
		Antiphagocytosis	1
		Complement evasion/Serum resistance	1
		Inflammatory signaling pathway	6
	Nutritional/Metabolic factor		
		Metal uptake	44
	Biofilm		
		Biofilm formation	7
		Quorum sensing	2
K. pneumoniae	Adherence		
		Fimbrial adhesin	21
	Invasion		1
	Effector delivery system		
		Type II secretion system (T2SS)	1
		Type VII secretion system (T7SS)	21
	Exotoxin		

Virulence Factor Genes			
Organism	**Category**	**Subcategory**	**No. Unique VFs**
		Intracellularly active toxin	1
	Immune modulation		
		Complement evasion/Serum resistance	5
		Inflammatory signaling pathway	5
	Nutritional/Metabolic factor		
		Metal uptake	25
		Metabolic adaptation	1
	Biofilm		
		Biofilm formation	5
		Quorum sensing	3
S. enterica	Adherence		
		Fimbrial adhesin	19
		Non-fimbrial adhesin	1
	Invasion		1
	Effector delivery system		
		Type III secretion system (T3SS)	85
		Type VI secretion system (T6SS)	9
	Nutritional/Metabolic factor		
		Metal uptake	2
E. cloacae	Effector delivery system		
		Type VII secretion system (T7SS)	2
	Exotoxin		
		Membrane-acting toxin	2
	Immune modulation		
		Antiphagocytosis	3
	Nutritional/Metabolic factor		
		Metal uptake	10
	Exoenzyme		
		Protease	1

290

Plasmidome

The results from Plasmid Finder revealed a diverse array of plasmid types classified under Incompatibility (Inc) complex plasmids and Colicin (Col) plasmids as shown (table 4). The number of plasmid replicons per isolate varied significantly. *K. pneumoniae* exhibited the highest diversity of plasmids (18/26) followed by *E. coli* (9/26), and *E. cloacae* (5/26). The highest plasmid diversity was observed in isolate BC37 of *K. pneumoniae* (8/26), whereas BC82 (*E. coli*) and BC26 (*K. pneumoniae*) exhibited the lowest plasmid diversity (1/26 each). The only *S. enterica* in this collection harboured no plasmid replicon. Among the Inc plasmids which are mostly observed in *Enterobacteriaceae* as vehicles for AMR transmission (29), IncF subgroups were the most frequently detected. *IncFIB (AP001918) _1* was the most prevalent, identified in 8 isolates, followed by *IncFIB(K)_1* and *IncFIA_1*, which were found in 7 isolates each. *IncFII_1*, *IncHI1B(pNDM-MAR) _1*, and *IncR_1* was detected in 3 isolates each. Plasmids such as *IncC_1*, *IncFII (29) _1*, *IncFII(pCoo)_1*, *IncX4_2*, and *pKPC-CAV1321_1* were found in only a single isolate each. Colicin plasmids which encode colicins (bacteriocins), proteins that kill other bacteria (30) were also distributed across the isolates. They are reported to contribute to the spread of antibiotic resistance and other virulence factors among uropathogenic *E. coli* strains and *Klebsiella spp* by co-integrating with other plasmids like *IncC, IncF, and IncN*, (34,48). *Col156_1* was the most frequently detected (4). *ColRNAI_1* was present in 3 isolates, while *Col (BS512) _1 and Col440I_1* was each observed in 2 isolates. The least common Colicin plasmids, found in single isolates, included *Col (KPHS6) _1*, *Col3M_1*, and *ColpVC_1*.

Table 4: Plasmid replicons present among Enterobacteriaceae isolates

PGs		*Escherichia coli*								*Klebsiella Pneumoniae*								*Enterobacter cloacae*		Number of Isolates
		BC 04	**BC 15**	**BC 18**	**BC 26**	**BC 64**	**BC 73**	**BC 81**	**BC 82**	**BC 16**	**BC 20**	**BC 37**	**BC 54**	**BC 71**	**BC 75**	**BC 76**	**BC 94**	**BC 06**	**BC 35**	
Incompatibility (I) complex Plasmid	*IncC_1*											■								**1**
	IncFIA (HI1)_1												■			■				**2**
	IncFIA_1	■		■	■	■	■	■		■										**7**
	IncFIB (AP001918) _1	■	■	■	■	■	■	■		■										**8**
	IncFIB(K)_1									■		■	■	■	■	■	■			**7**
	IncFIB(K)(pCAV1099-114)_1										■									**1**
	IncFIB(pKPHS1)_1											■				■				**2**
	IncFIB(pNDM-Mar)_1											■		■	■					**3**
	IncFII (29)_1		■																	**1**
	IncFII(pCoo)_1			■																**1**
	IncFII(pKP91)_1									■							■			**2**
	IncFII(pRSB107)_1			■	■	■														**3**
	IncFII_1	■								■					■					**3**
	IncHI1B(pNDM-MAR)_1											■		■	■					**3**
	IncI (Gamma)_1									■									■	**2**
	IncR_1												■				■		■	**3**
	IncX4_2							■												**1**
	pKPC-CAV1321_1													■						**1**
Colicin Plasmid	*Col (BS512)_1*					■							■							**2**
	Col (KPHS6)_1												■							**1**
	Col156_1						■	■	■	■										**4**
	Col3M_1																	■		**1**
	Col440I_1											■			■					**2**
	Col440II_1														■				■	**2**
	ColRNAI_1											■		■	■					**3**
	ColpVC_1																		■	**1**
Total PGs in isolate		**3**	**2**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**4**	**1**	**7**	**1**	**8**	**5**	**5**	**7**	**3**	**3**	**1**	**4**	*****

Plasmid replicons detected in E. coli, K. pneumoniae, and E. cloacae isolates are listed by incompatibility (Inc) and colicin plasmid types. Columns BC04–BC94 correspond to individual bacterial isolates, while each row denotes a specific plasmid replicon. Presence of a replicon within an isolate is indicated by a steel-blue–shaded cell. The rightmost column reports the total number of isolates in which each replicon was observed, and the bottom row summarizes the total replicon count identified per isolate

Discussion

Phenotypic surveillance of bacterial infection in the clinical settings complemented with genomic studies enable the elucidation of basis of diseases cause, accurate identification, transmission dynamics and AMR (49,50). Our study has highlighted the need for the adaptation of genetic surveillance to complement routine phenotypic investigations especially in accurate identification of bacteria and their resistance to antibiotics in resource-limited settings. We noticed a discordance between the phenotypic and genotypic identification of the bacterial isolates. For example, some. *E. coli* and *K. Pneumoniae* were phenotypically misidentified as *Citrobacter spp and an E. cloaca as S. enterica.* Rosenthal et al have posited that bacterial misidentification can arise from laboratory procedural errors, such as culture media contamination or use of suboptimal reagents (e.g., dried agar, expired substrates), which skew biochemical test results (51). Additionally, evolutionary mutations in bacteria, driven by selective pressures like antibiotics or nutrient scarcity, can alter phenotypic changes via genetic mutations or horizontal gene transfer, thereby confounding precise taxonomic identification(52). Misidenfication of bacteria in the clinical setting could result in deleterious clinical outcomes, a phenomenon that can be forestalled by complementary genomic profiling (53,54) . Additionally, genomic characterization can also reveal the genetic basis of AMRs even for drugs for which AST were not performed. Also, VFs and plasmid identities from genomic profiling could be used to predict the pathogenicity potential and transmissibility of AMRs respectively(53,55).

ESBL-producing *Enterobacteriaceae* have been implicated in the outbreak of several bacteria borne diseases including food-borne diseases, nosocomial and care-home outbreaks (Tran et al., 2022; Ibrahim et al., 2023; van Bilsen et al., 2021). In our study, 93% of the previously suspected ESBL producers were confirmed as ESBL producing. Some hospital-based studies in

Cape Coast, Ghana (59), and other African countries (10,60,61) have reported similar rates of ESBL producing *Enterobacteriaceae*, especially in *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae*. However, a lower rate of 14.6% was observed in a hospital-based study in Ontario, Canada (62). Of these ESBL-producing isolates sequenced 19 harboured 17 individual ß-lactamase ARGs of Ambler groups A, B C and D. ß-lactamases associated with ESBLs observed were mainly *SHV, TEM and CTX-M* type genes found in the Ambler group A. These variants are mostly penicillinases and cephalosporinases and tend to be resistant to clavulanate, sulbactam and tazobactam (63,64). This could explain why the addition of clavulanate to ceftazidime did not improve the sensitivity profile during the AST. *CTX-M-15* a member of the Ambler class A was the predominant ß-lactamase ARG among the isolates accounting for 68.4% (13/19). Previous studies in Ghana have reported *CTX-M-15* prevalence of over 80% in *Enterobacteriaceae* (65,66) , whereas (Asare Yeboah et al., 2024) reported a lower proportion of 52%. Globally, CTX-*M-15* is the most prevalent ß-lactamase ARG in *Enterobacteriaceae*, with a pooled prevalence reported at 16% which is lower than observed 74% (14/19) in our study. we also observed the presence of oxacillinases including OXA-1, OXA-58 and OXA-402 which also confer ESBL activity (63). Generally, most of the isolates were sensitive to the carbapenems with just above 11% of the isolates (9/79) being phenotypically resistant to meropenem. However, only 2 of these resistant isolates, both *K. pneumoniae* (BC71 and BC75), were part of the whole genome sequenced isolates. These *K. pneumoniae* isolates harboured NDM-1 carbapenemase. NDM-1, an Ambler class B ß-lactamase has previously been described in *E. coli* clinical isolates and also from a hospital environment surveillance study (12,67).

VFs are produced by pathogenic *Enterobacteriaceae* which enable them to colonize, persist, and ultimately cause infections in the host (Bujňáková et al., 2022; Leitão, 2020; B. Liu et al., 2022) .

Majority of VFs identified in the WGS isolates were in the adherence, effector delivery systems and nutritional or metabolic factors families, mostly in the *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae*. However, the only *S. enterica* harboured most of the effector delivery systems. Studies conducted in both Ghana and Slovakia (14,15) observed that the prevalence of these 3 VFs among *Enterobacteriaceae*, especially *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae*, *E. cloacae*, and *S. enterica* were high. Other studies in Africa and some European countries also corroborate our findings (18,68–70). From our study, the whole genome sequenced isolates included 11 isolates, that is 3 *K. pneumoniae* and 8 *E. coli* which were isolated from urine infections. Generally, for *Enterobacteriaceae* to be able to colonize and cause urinary tract infections depends on their ability to form biofilms and produce several VFs, especially adherence factors (P fimbriae, S fimbriae, type I fimbriae), iron acquisition and sequestration (aerobactin and enterobactins), hemolysin and cytotoxic necrotizing factors (cnf1) (71,72).

Fimbriae are absolute prerequisite for urinary tract colonization and disease causation, because *Enterobacteriaceae* uses that to adhere to host cells and form protective biofilms in the urinary tract contributing to the pathogenesis and persistence of urinary tract infections (73,74) . Incidentally, the *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae* sequenced possessed numerous fimbrial genes including type 1, type 2 (P fimbriae), type 3 and S fimbriae. Specifically, *E. coli* harboured type I fimbriae (*fimA, B, I, D, E G, H, K, F, T, U, V*), P fimbriae (*papB, C, F, G, H, D, F, J, K, X)* and S fimbriae (*sfaD, E, F, C, G, H, S, X, Y)*. Studies in uropathogenic *Enterobacteriaceae* conducted in Benin, Romania, Mongolia, and Egypt reported these fimbrial genes as well (71). Uropathogenic *K. pneumoniae* utilizes two main types of fimbriae for adhesion to the uroepithelium, type 1 and type III (75). However, we observed type II fimbriae (*papF, papK*) in

the 3 uropathogenic *K. pneumoniae* isolates in addition to type I fimbriae (*fimA, B, D, E, F, G, H, I, K*), and type III fimbriae (*mrkC, I, F, A, D, B, H, D*).

In addition to these adherence factors the *E. coli* isolates also harboured iron acquisition and sequestration genes including aerobactins (*iucA, iucB, iutA*), and enterobactins (*entA, entC, entE, entF, entS, entB*). The 3 *K. pneumoniae* also possessed an aerobactin (*iutA*.) and enterobactins (*entF, entA, entE, entC, entS*). Siderophores, such as enterobactins and aerobactins, enable uropathogenic *Enterobacteriaceae* to thrive in the host by scavenging iron from host epithelial cells (76). According to (20,77), *Enterobacteriaceae* requires iron for growth and virulence. Hemolysin (*hlyC, hlyD*), and *cnf1* which the *E. coli* uses to damage cell nutrient and trigger siderophores to sequester irons from host for growth (78) were also observed among the *E. coli* isolates. Nhu et al. reports that hemolysin (*hlyC, D*) and cnf1 were found abundantly in UPEC strains, emphasizing their significance capacity to cause UTI (79)

According to (80,81) most ARGs and VFs are borne on mobile genetic elements, especially plasmids and have become important for the dissemination of these factors within the *Enterobacteriaceae* family through horizontal or vertical gene transfer. Plasmids have been reported as main vehicles for the transmission of ARGs including ESBLs and VF genes in humans and non-human settings (29–31,81). It has been reported that most plasmid replicons found for *Enterobacteriaceae* are I-complex (Incompatibility complex) plasmids and are mostly resistance and fertility plasmids in addition to colicinogenic plasmid (26,29,32,82). In our study, the I-complex we observed most was the IncF (13/19 total Inc plasmids). *IncF* plasmids which are conjugative have been reported in *Enterobacteriaceae* isolated from humans, animal and the environment worldwide (Rozwandowicz et al., 2018; Stein et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024). These plasmids have been reported worldwide in the dissemination of AMR genes, especially the

ESBLs and particularly *CTX-M-15* (29,83,85). Unsurprisingly, *CTX-M-15* was the commonest ARG observed in our study. In our study, these complex group of plasmid replicons were observed in E. *coli and K. pneumoniae* similar to previous reports (29,83). Other Inc plasmid replicons observed in our study included *IncC, IncH, IncI, IncR* and *IncX*.

The 8 colicins uncovered in our study including *Col (BS512) _1, Col156_1, Col (KPHS6) _1, ColRNAI_1, Col440I_1, Col440II_1, ColpVC_1* and *Col3M_1* could have been involved in the isolate's resistance to the antibiotics. Consistent with previous investigations, our study adds to the expanding body of evidence indicating that colicins facilitates AMR dissemination (Chérier et al., 2021; Daniels et al., 2023; Marković et al., 2022).

This study revealed the resistant profile and VFs of *Enterobacteriaceae* at CCTH, creating awareness of the serious threat ESBL producing *Enterobacteriaceae* portends to healthcare delivery. It has also highlighted plasmids associated with AMR genes transmission within the *Enterobacteriaceae* populace and informs the importance to using genomic data of bacteria isolates to infer diagnosis and prescriptions.

Conclusions

Our study revealed high rate of multi-drug AMR among the isolates, particularly to ESBL and narrow spectrum b-lactams. Several ARGs which confer resistance to ESBLs were abundant in the 19 whole sequenced isolates. VFs genes serving as prerequisite for successful Enterobacteriaceae urinary tract colonization and infection were detected in the sequenced isolates. The outcome emphasizes the need to improve routine genomic surveillance to monitor antibiotic resistance trends and guide evidence-based interventions aimed at mitigating the spread of ARE in the Cape Coast Metropolis and other parts of Ghana.

Limitations

The phenotypic resistance assessment was limited to disc diffusion methods, mainly constrained by logistical limitations. Our findings potentially do not fully capture genetic assessment on the plasmids of the individual isolates due to the usage of illumina short reads which could lead to incomplete reconstructions of plasmids or misassembles. It should be noted that our study circumscribe only those *Enterobacteriaceae* isolates accessible from the bacteriology laboratory at CCTH, and with availability of Socio-demographic data. Thus, our phenotypic AMR assessment do not fully capture available *Enterobacteriaceae* isolates present at the time of this study at the hospital. Also due to funding constrains only 20 isolates out of the 100 isolates were whole genome sequenced; our findings potentially do not fully capture the AMR genotypic assessment of all the retrieved isolates.

Acknowledgements

We extend our heartfelt thanks to Dr. Oheneba Charles Kofi Hagan the provision of financial support, without which this research would not have been possible. Additionally, we recognize the invaluable contributions of the entire research team, whose dedication and expertise were essential at every stage—from the initial conceptualization and laboratory investigations to the final data analysis and manuscript preparation.

Authors Contribution

The conceptualization of the study, including the development of the research idea and design of the overall framework, was carried out by B.D., F.H., and O.C.K.H. Microbiology work, such as sample processing, culture, and phenotypic characterization, was performed by B.D., P.M., A.B.M., and A.A.B. Molecular experiments and sequencing procedures, including DNA

extraction, PCR, and library preparation, were conducted by B.D. and O.C.K.H. Bioinformatics workflow development and data analysis were undertaken by B.D. , and R.O.M. and O.C.K.H., who processed and interpreted the sequencing data. The manuscript was written and revised collaboratively by B.D., F.H.., R.O.M., and O.C.K.H., who contributed to the drafting, critical revision, and final approval of the text. The overall supervision of the project, including oversight of research activities and provision of guidance and resources, was provided by O.C.K.H. and F.H

Conflict of interests

The authors disclose that Dr. Oheneba Charles Kofi Hagan provided funds for the research. The remaining authors declare that there are no personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper

References

1. Octavia S, Lan R. The Family Enterobacteriaceae. In: Rosenberg E, DeLong EF, Lory S, Stackebrandt E, Thompson F, editors. The Prokaryotes: Gammaproteobacteria [Internet]. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2014. p. 225–86. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-38922-1_167

2. Janda JM, Abbott SL. The Changing Face of the Family Enterobacteriaceae (Order: "Enterobacterales "): New Members, Taxonomic Issues, Geographic Expansion, and New Diseases and Disease Syndromes. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2021 Mar 17;34(2).

3. Jenkins C, Rentenaar RJ, Landraud L, Brisse S. Enterobacteriaceae. In: Infectious Diseases, 2-Volume Set. Elsevier; 2017. p. 1565-1578.e2.

4. Tacconelli E, Carrara E, Savoldi A, Harbarth S, Mendelson M, Monnet DL, et al. Discovery, research, and development of new antibiotics: the WHO priority list of antibiotic-resistant bacteria and tuberculosis. Lancet Infect Dis. 2018 Mar;18(3):318–27.

5. Renata Silva-Lacerda G, dos Santos G, Solidônio E, Costa M, Melo R, de Souza I, et al. Study of the Enterobacteriaceae Group CESP (Citrobacter, Enterobacter, Serratia, Providencia, Morganella and Hafnia): A Review [Internet]. 2015. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/297730985

6. Walsh TR, Gales AC, Laxminarayan R, Dodd PC. Antimicrobial Resistance: Addressing a Global Threat to Humanity. Vol. 20, PLoS Medicine. Public Library of Science; 2023.

7. Lynch JP, Clark NM, Zhanel GG. Escalating antimicrobial resistance among Enterobacteriaceae: focus on carbapenemases. Expert Opin Pharmacother. 2021;22(11):1455–73.

8. Bezabih YM, Bezabih A, Dion M, Batard E, Teka S, Obole A, et al. Comparison of the global prevalence and trend of human intestinal carriage of ESBL-producing Escherichia coli between healthcare and community settings: A systematic review and meta-Analysis. JAC Antimicrob Resist. 2022 Jun 1;4(3).

9. Irenge LM, Ambroise J, Bearzatto B, Durant JF, Chirimwami RB, Gala JL. Whole-genome sequences of multidrug-resistant Escherichia coli in South-Kivu Province, Democratic Republic of Congo: Characterization of phylogenomic changes, virulence and resistance genes. BMC Infect Dis. 2019 Feb 11;19(1).

10. Asare Yeboah EE, Agyepong N, Mbanga J, Amoako DG, Abia ALK, Ismail A, et al. Genomic characterization of multi drug resistant ESBL-producing Escherichia coli isolates from patients and patient environments in a teaching hospital in Ghana. BMC Microbiol. 2024 Dec 1;24(1).

11. Bachelle S V., Bah SY, Addo RT, Bediako-Bowan AAA, Egyir B, Tsatsu SE, et al. Genomic analysis of Enterobacteriaceae from colorectal cancer patients at a tertiary hospital in Ghana: a case-control study. Sci Rep. 2024 Dec 1;14(1):23195.

12. Ayibieke A, Sato W, Mahazu S, Prah I, Addow-Thompson J, Ohashi M, et al. Molecular characterisation of the NDM-1encoding plasmid p2189-NDM in an Escherichia coli ST410 clinical isolate from Ghana. PLoS One. 2018 Dec 1;13(12).

13. Mills RO, Dadzie I, Le-Viet T, Baker DJ, Addy HPK, Akwetey SA, et al. Genomic diversity and antimicrobial resistance in clinical Klebsiella pneumoniae isolates from tertiary hospitals in Southern Ghana. Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy. 2024 Jul 1;79(7):1529–39.

14. Bujňáková D, Puvača N, Ćirković I. Virulence Factors and Antibiotic Resistance of Enterobacterales. Microorganisms. 2022 Aug 7;10(8):1588.

15. Dekker D, Pankok F, Thye T, Taudien S, Oppong K, Akenten CW, et al. Clonal Clusters, Molecular Resistance Mechanisms and Virulence Factors of Gram-Negative Bacteria Isolated from Chronic Wounds in Ghana. Antibiotics. 2021 Mar 22;10(3):339.

16. Irfan M, Almotiri A, AlZeyadi ZA. Antimicrobial Resistance and Its Drivers—A Review. Vol. 11, Antibiotics. MDPI; 2022.

17. Tilahun M, Kassa Y, Gedefie A, Ashagire M. Emerging carbapenem-resistant enterobacteriaceae infection, its epidemiology and novel treatment options: A review. Vol. 14, Infection and Drug Resistance. Dove Medical Press Ltd; 2021. p. 4363–74.

18. Leitão JH. Microbial Virulence Factors. Int J Mol Sci. 2020 Jul 27;21(15):5320.

19. Liu B, Zheng D, Zhou S, Chen L, Yang J. VFDB 2022: a general classification scheme for bacterial virulence factors. Nucleic Acids Res. 2022 Jan 7;50(D1):D912–7.

20. Payne SM, Neilands IB. Iron and Virulence in the Family Enterobacteriaceae. CRC Crit Rev Microbiol. 1988 Jan 2;16(2):81–111.

21. Pakbin B, Brück WM, Rossen JWA. Virulence factors of enteric pathogenic Escherichia coli: A review. Vol. 22, International Journal of Molecular Sciences. MDPI; 2021.

22. Aleshina Y, Yeleussizova A, Mendybayeva A, Shevchenko P, Rychshanova R. Prevalence and antimicrobial resistance of Enterobacteriaceae in the north of Kazakhstan. Open Vet J. 2024 Feb;14(2):604–16.

23. Partridge SR. Resistance mechanisms in Enterobacteriaceae. Pathology. 2015 Apr 1;47(3):276–84.

24. Toombs-Ruane L, Benschop J, Burgess S, Priest P, Murdoch D, French N. Multidrug resistant Enterobacteriaceae in New Zealand: a current perspective. N Z Vet J. 2017 Mar 4;65(2):62–70.

25. Hawkey J, Cottingham H, Tokolyi A, Wick RR, Judd LM, Cerdeira L, et al. Linear plasmids in Klebsiella and other Enterobacteriaceae. Microb Genom. 2022;8(4).

26. Carattoli A, Villa L, Fortini D, García-Fernández A. Contemporary IncI1 plasmids involved in the transmission and spread of antimicrobial resistance in Enterobacteriaceae. Vol. 118, Plasmid. Academic Press Inc.; 2021.

27. Harris M, Fasolino T, Ivankovic D, Davis NJ, Brownlee N. Genetic Factors That Contribute to Antibiotic Resistance through Intrinsic and Acquired Bacterial Genes in Urinary Tract Infections. Vol. 11, Microorganisms. MDPI; 2023.

28. Wang Y, Dagan T. The evolution of antibiotic resistance islands occurs within the framework of plasmid lineages. Nat Commun. 2024 Dec 1;15(1).

29. Rozwandowicz M, Brouwer MSM, Fischer J, Wagenaar JA, Gonzalez-Zorn B, Guerra B, et al. Plasmids carrying antimicrobial resistance genes in Enterobacteriaceae. Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy. 2018 May 1;73(5):1121–37.

30. Atala LM. A review article:Bacterial plasmids. Novateur publication. 2020 Dec;6(12).

31. Ma J, Wang J, Yang H, Su M, Li R, Bai L, et al. IncHI1 plasmids mediated the tet(X4) gene spread in Enterobacteriaceae in porcine. Front Microbiol. 2023;14.

32. Yu L, Wang D, Li P, Cai Y, Zhang X, Luo X, et al. Epidemiology, molecular characterization, and drug resistance of IncHI5 plasmids from Enterobacteriaceae. International Microbiology. 2022 Nov 16;26(2):371–8.

33. Marković KG, Grujović M, Koraćević MG, Nikodijević DD, Milutinović MG, Semedo-Lemsaddek T, et al. Colicins and Microcins Produced by Enterobacteriaceae: Characterization, Mode of Action, and Putative Applications. Vol. 19, International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. MDPI; 2022.

34. Ghanim AF, Aldeewan AB, Abbas BA. Colicins produced by Escherichia coli, a review. Vol. 26, Romanian Journal of Infectious Diseases. Amaltea Medical Publishing House; 2023. p. 135–40.

35. Dakorah MP, Agyare E, Acolatse JEE, Akafity G, Stelling J, Chalker VJ, et al. Utilising cumulative antibiogram data to enhance antibiotic stewardship capacity in the Cape Coast Teaching Hospital, Ghana. Antimicrob Resist Infect Control. 2022 Dec 1;11(1).

36. Anning AS, Baah E, Buabeng SD, Baiden BG, Aboagye B, Opoku YK, et al. Prevalence and antimicrobial resistance patterns of microbes isolated from individuals attending private diagnostic centre in Cape Coast Metropolis of Ghana. Sci Rep. 2022 Dec 1;12(1).

37. CLSI. Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing. 30th edition M02. Wayne P, editor. Clinical Laboratory Standard Institute; 2020.

38. Alcock BP, Raphenya AR, Lau TTY, Tsang KK, Bouchard M, Edalatmand A, et al. CARD 2020: Antibiotic resistome surveillance with the comprehensive antibiotic resistance database. Nucleic Acids Res. 2020 Jan 1;48(D1):D517–25.

39. Jia B, Raphenya AR, Alcock B, Waglechner N, Guo P, Tsang KK, et al. CARD 2017: expansion and model-centric curation of the comprehensive antibiotic resistance database. Nucleic Acids Res. 2017 Jan 4;45(D1):D566–73.

40. Carattoli A, Zankari E, García-Fernández A, Voldby Larsen M, Lund O, Villa L, et al. *In Silico* Detection and Typing of Plasmids using PlasmidFinder and Plasmid

Multilocus Sequence Typing. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2014 Jul;58(7):3895–903.

41. Abraham SN, Daxi S, James B. D, Edwin H. B. Conservation of the D-mannose-adhesion protein among type 1 fimbriated members of the family Enterobacteriaceae. Nature. 1988;336:682–4.

42. Nans A, Kudryashev M, Saibil HR, Hayward RD. Structure of a bacterial type III secretion system in contact with a host membrane in situ. Nat Commun. 2015 Dec 11;6(1):10114.

43. Pinaud L, Sansonetti PJ, Phalipon A. Host Cell Targeting by Enteropathogenic Bacteria T3SS Effectors. Trends Microbiol. 2018 Apr;26(4):266–83.

44. Shealy NG, Yoo W, Byndloss MX. Colonization resistance: metabolic warfare as a strategy against pathogenic Enterobacteriaceae. Curr Opin Microbiol. 2021 Dec;64:82–90.

45. Liu Y, Fu J, Wang L, Zhao Z, Wang H, Han S, et al. Isolation, identification, and whole-genome sequencing of high-yield protease bacteria from Daqu of ZhangGong Laojiu. PLoS One. 2022 Apr 1;17(4 April).

46. Grant SS, Hung DT. Persistent bacterial infections, antibiotic tolerance, and the oxidative stress response. Vol. 4, Virulence. Taylor and Francis Inc.; 2013. p. 273–83.

47. Folgori L, Di Carlo D, Comandatore F, Piazza A, Witney AA, Bresesti I, et al. Antibiotic Susceptibility, Virulome, and Clinical Outcomes in European Infants with Bloodstream Infections Caused by Enterobacterales. Antibiotics. 2021 Jun 11;10(6):706.

48. Ares-Arroyo M, Rocha EPC, Gonzalez-Zorn B. Evolution of ColE1-like plasmids across γ- Proteobacteria: From bacteriocin production to antimicrobial resistance. PLoS Genet. 2021 Nov 30;17(11).

49. Ahmed SK, Hussein S, Qurbani K, Ibrahim RH, Fareeq A, Mahmood KA, et al. Antimicrobial resistance: impacts, challenges, and future prospects. Journal of Medicine, Surgery, and Public Health. 2024;2:100081.

50. Govender R. The prevalence of selected emerging pathogenic species in wastewater and receiving water bodies. 2022.

51. Rosenthal SL, Freundlich LF, Washington W. Laboratory Evaluation of a Multitest System for Identification of Gram-negative Organisms. Am J Clin Pathol [Internet]. 1978 Dec 1;70(6):914–7. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcp/70.6.914

52. Blount ZD, Barrick JE, Davidson CJ, Lenski RE. Genomic and phenotypic evolution of Escherichia coli in a novel citrate-only resource environment. Nature. 2020 Sep 27;489(7417):513–8.

53. Heyman G, Jonsson S, Fatsis-Kavalopolous N, Hjort K, Nicoloff H, Furebring M, et al. Prevalence, misclassification, and clinical consequences of the heteroresistant

phenotype in Escherichia coli bloodstream infections in patients in Uppsala, Sweden: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet Microbe. 2025;

54. Liang K. Bacterial Classifications in the Genomic Era [Internet]. 2020. Available from: https://pubmlst.org/vcholerae

55. Arber W. Genetic variation: molecular mechanisms and impact on microbial evolution. FEMS Microbiol Rev. 2000 Jan;24(1):1–7.

56. Ibrahim DR, Dodd CER, Stekel DJ, Meshioye RT, Diggle M, Lister M, et al. Multidrug-Resistant ESBL-Producing E. coli in Clinical Samples from the UK. Antibiotics. 2023 Jan 1;12(1).

57. Do Tran H, Nguyen BT, Tran HQ, Tran HG. A cross-sectional study of the antibiotic resistant prevalence of ESBL-producing Enterobacteriaceae in Vietnam. Journal of Health Sciences. 2022;12(3):184–8.

58. van Bilsen WPH, van Dulm E, Matser A, Linde I, van Duijnhoven YTHP, Prins JM, et al. High carriage of ESBL-producing Enterobacteriaceae associated with sexual activity among men who have sex with men. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2021 Mar 1;57(3).

59. Sampah J, Owusu-Frimpong I, Aboagye FT, Owusu-Ofori A. Prevalence of carbapenem-resistant and extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing Enterobacteriaceae in a teaching hospital in Ghana. PLoS One. 2023 Oct 1;18(10 October).

60. Bezabih YM, Bezabih A, Dion M, Batard E, Teka S, Obole A, et al. Comparison of the global prevalence and trend of human intestinal carriage of ESBL-producing Escherichia coli between healthcare and community settings: A systematic review and meta-Analysis. JAC Antimicrob Resist. 2022 Jun 1;4(3).

61. Fadare FT, Okoh AI. Distribution and molecular characterization of ESBL, pAmpC β-lactamases, and non-β-lactam encoding genes in Enterobacteriaceae isolated from hospital wastewater in Eastern Cape Province, South Africa. PLoS One. 2021 Jul 21;16(7):e0254753.

62. Hasan MR, Vincent YM, Leto D, Almohri H. Trends in the Rates of Extended-Spectrum-β-Lactamase-Producing Enterobacterales Isolated from Urine Cultures during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Ontario, Canada . Microbiol Spectr. 2023 Feb 14;11(1).

63. Sawa T, Kooguchi K, Moriyama K. Molecular diversity of extended-spectrum β-lactamases and carbapenemases, and antimicrobial resistance. Vol. 8, Journal of Intensive Care. BioMed Central Ltd.; 2020.

64. Bush K, Jacoby GA. Updated functional classification of β-lactamases. Vol. 54, Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy. 2010. p. 969–76.

65. Obeng-Nkrumah N, Tawiah-Abrokwa GD, Owusu E, Duah F, Oduro-Mensah D, Kwao P, et al. Role of CTX-M-15 gene in spread of extended-spectrum beta-

lactamases among immunocompetent patients in Ghana. Afr J Lab Med. 2023 Nov 20;12(1).

66. Eibach D, Campos CB, Krumkamp R, Al-Emran HM, Dekker D, Boahen KG, et al. Extended spectrum beta-lactamase producing Enterobacteriaceae causing bloodstream infections in rural Ghana, 2007–2012. International Journal of Medical Microbiology. 2016 Jun;306(4):249–54.

67. Acolatse JEE, Portal EAR, Boostrom I, Akafity G, Dakroah MP, Chalker VJ, et al. Environmental surveillance of ESBL and carbapenemase-producing gram-negative bacteria in a Ghanaian Tertiary Hospital. Antimicrob Resist Infect Control. 2022 Dec 1;11(1).

68. Dougnon V, Assogba P, Anago E, Déguénon E, Dapuliga C, Agbankpè J, et al. Enterobacteria responsible for urinary infections: A review about pathogenicity, virulence factors and epidemiology. Vol. 8, Journal of Applied Biology and Biotechnology. Open Science Publishers LLP Inc.; 2020. p. 117–24.

69. Hetsa BA, Asante J, Mbanga J, K Abia AL, Essack SY. Genomic Analysis of Virulent, Multidrug Resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae and Klebsiella oxytoca from Bloodstream Infections, South Africa [Internet]. 2024. Available from: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4717146

70. Amaretti A, Righini L, Candeliere F, Musmeci E, Bonvicini F, Gentilomi GA, et al. Antibiotic Resistance, Virulence Factors, Phenotyping, and Genotyping of Non-Escherichia coli Enterobacterales from the Gut Microbiota of Healthy Subjects. Int J Mol Sci. 2020 Mar 7;21(5):1847.

71. Assouma FF, Sina H, Adjobimey T, Noumavo ADP, Socohou A, Boya B, et al. Susceptibility and Virulence of Enterobacteriaceae Isolated from Urinary Tract Infections in Benin. Microorganisms. 2023 Jan 1;11(1).

72. Govindarajan DK, Kandaswamy K. Virulence factors of uropathogens and their role in host pathogen interactions. The Cell Surface. 2022 Dec 1;8.

73. Connell I, Agace W, Klemm P, Schembri M, Mărild S, Svanborg C. Type 1 fimbrial expression enhances Escherichia coli virulence for the urinary tract. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 1996;93(18):9827–32.

74. Hornick DB, Allen BL, Horn MA, Clegg S. Fimbrial Types among Respiratory Isolates Belonging to the Family Enterobacteriaceae. JOURNAL OF CLINICAL MICROBIOLOGY. 1991.

75. Stahlhut SG, Struve C, Krogfelt KA, Reisner A. Biofilm formation of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* on urethral catheters requires either type 1 or type 3 fimbriae. FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol. 2012 Jul;65(2):350–9.

76. Qi B, Han M. Microbial Siderophore Enterobactin Promotes Mitochondrial Iron Uptake and Development of the Host via Interaction with ATP Synthase. Cell. 2018 Oct 4;175(2):571-582.e11.

77. Moxley RA. Family Enterobacteriaceae. In: Veterinary Microbiology. Wiley; 2022. p. 41–55.

78. Sung K, Nawaz M, Park M, Chon J, Khan SA, Alotaibi K, et al. Comprehensive Genomic Analysis of Uropathogenic E. coli: Virulence Factors, Antimicrobial Resistance, and Mobile Genetic Elements. Pathogens. 2024 Sep 1;13(9).

79. Nhu NTK, Phan MD, Forde BM, Murthy AM V., Peters KM, Day CJ, et al. Complex Multilevel Control of Hemolysin Production by Uropathogenic Escherichia coli. mBio. 2019 Oct 29;10(5).

80. Nordmann P, Poirel L. Emergence of plasmid-mediated resistance to quinolones in Enterobacteriaceae. Vol. 56, Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy. 2005. p. 463–9.

81. Algarni S, Gudeta DD, Han J, Nayak R, Foley SL. Genotypic analyses of IncHI2 plasmids from enteric bacteria. Sci Rep. 2024 Dec 1;14(1).

82. Benz F, Huisman JS, Bakkeren E, Herter JA, Stadler T, Ackermann M, et al. Plasmid- and strain-specific factors drive variation in ESBL-plasmid spread in vitro and in vivo. ISME J. 2021 Mar 1;15(3):862–78.

83. Stein M, Brinks E, Loop J, Habermann D, Cho GS, Franz CMAP. Antibiotic resistance plasmids in *Enterobacteriaceae* isolated from fresh produce in northern Germany. Microbiol Spectr. 2024 Nov 5;12(11).

84. Wang X, Zhang H, Yu S, Li D, Gillings MR, Ren H, et al. Inter-plasmid transfer of antibiotic resistance genes accelerates antibiotic resistance in bacterial pathogens. ISME Journal. 2024 Jan 1;18(1).

85. Naseer U, Sundsfjord A. The CTX-M conundrum: Dissemination of plasmids and Escherichia coli clones. Microbial Drug Resistance. 2011 Mar 1;17(1):83–97.

86. Marković KG, Grujović M, Koraćević MG, Nikodijević DD, Milutinović MG, Semedo-Lemsaddek T, et al. Colicins and Microcins Produced by Enterobacteriaceae: Characterization, Mode of Action, and Putative Applications. Vol. 19, International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. MDPI; 2022.

87. Daniels A. O, Taye Temikotan, Fadairo J. K. Colicin production, antibacterial effect and molecular sequencing of Escherichia coli isolated form different sources. Open Access Research Journal of Science and Technology. 2023 Sep 30;9(1):010–20.

88. Chérier D, Patin D, Blanot D, Touzé T, Barreteau H. antibiotics The Biology of Colicin M and Its Orthologs. 2021; Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/antibiotics