Title page

A pilot study to see any Change of the Nasal and Oropharyngeal Microbiota with Prolonged Use of Medical Masks during the COVID-19 Outbreak

Sayak Roy¹, Pampi Majumder², Kingshuk Bhattacharya³

¹Consultant Physician, Department of Internal Medicine, Medica Superspeciality Hospital, Kolkata, India; sayak.roy.123@gmail.com

²Consultant Microbiologist, Suraksha Diagnostic Pvt. Ltd. Kolkata, India; pampi.majumder@surakshanet.com

³Consultant Biostatistician, Medwes Pvt. Ltd. Kolkata, India; kingshukbhattacharjee7@gmail.com

Corresponding author:

Dr. Sayak Roy, Consultant Physician, Dept. of Internal Medicine, Medica Superspeciality Hospital, Kolkata, India

Address: 2/J, Lenin Sarani, Serampore, West Bengal, India. PIN – 712203

Email: sayak.roy.123@gmail.com

Funding: None

Conflicts of interest/Competing interests: None

Availability of data and material: Available with the corresponding author on request

Code availability: Not applicable

Acknowledgement: None to declare

Abstract

Background: The outbreak of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) has played havoc on the healthcare system and society. Many international guidelines have put forward various measures to control the spread and, using various quality masks seems to be the most important amongst them. This was a cross-sectional pilot study to see any alterations in the bacterial flora of the nasal and the oropharyngeal (OP) microbiota with the use of medical masks over prolonged periods during this COVID-19 outbreak.

Methods: Nasal and oropharyngeal swabs were collected using proper international guidelines from 30 healthy healthcare workers matching pre-set inclusion criteria, who gave written informed consent. The swabs were used for gram stain as well as culture and sensitivity analysis using standard methods.

Results: In general, we found that the oropharyngeal microflora harboured a more diverse population of bacteria (n=13) than the nasal microflora (n=5). The predominant bacterial flora was found to *Staphylococcus epidermidis* in the nasal cavity and *Streptococcus viridans* in the oropharyngeal cavity. There was no growth in 8 (26.68%) samples of oropharynx and 3 (10%) of nasal samples, with one patient having no growth in both the samples. The commonest resistant antibiotic from both the cavity cultures was benzylpenicillin (nasal flora 80% and OP flora 47.37%).

Conclusion: This small pilot study has shown a reassuring aspect of no change in the typical bacterial microflora species of the nasal and OP cavity with prolonged use of medical masks. This is the first study to show this convincing evidence during the COVID-19 outbreak and also in healthy healthcare workers who have to wear masks over long durations.

Keywords: Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), nasal microbiota, oropharyngeal microbiota, medical masks

Introduction

Since its beginning in December 2019, the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) has reached a death toll of 580045 cases and affected 13 378 853 patients till July 16, 2020 [1]. Preventive measures have been regarded as the primary combating tool and, various bodies have recommended various strategies to prevent this disease since only no specific treatments are available to date. Use of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), social distancing, sanitizers, using masks, and hand-washing are the main preventive strategies recommended in most of the international and national guidelines for all healthcare personals and general people [2]. While Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommends using masks or N95 respirators for both low and high-risk

situations, we have to remember that in severely frail patients like those on hemodialysis, masks can cause a significant drop in PaO₂ level (101.7 +/- 12.6 to 92.7 +/- 15.8 mm Hg, p = 0.006) [3,4]. Another prospective study of the use of masks in 44 healthy participants undergoing a six minutes walking test showed that the use of masks was associated with significant dyspnea variation (p<0.001) [5].

The microbes residing inside our body are termed as microbiota, and they form an integral part of our commensal health [6].

There is a difference in microbiota constituents between adults and children, and there is also evidence of denser microflora load in children with less diversity than adults [7, 8]. Studies have also shown the presence of many nontuberculous mycobacteria like *Mycobacterium gordonae* (8%), *Mycobacterium kansasii* (2%), *Mycobacterium fortuitum* (3%) and *Mycobacterium avium complex* (2%) in our oral cavity which are non-pathogenic for healthy individuals [9]. There is a crosstalk between the host and the microbiota, which is highly influenced by various factors like lifestyle and behaviors, tobacco consumption, oral hygiene, use of antibiotics, and the industrial revolution [10, 11]. The oral microbiota plays critical roles in protecting against colonization by extrinsic harmful bacteria [12]. Systemic diseases can affect the oral microbiome significantly [13]. It has been found that certain diseases often modify the existing microflora of the oral cavity, as shown in a study on patients of gout and hyperuricemia [12]. In this study, it was seen that the predominant microflora of the oral cavity in these group of patients as compared to healthy controls was salivary *Prevotella intermedia* and lower levels of *Serratiamarcescens*.

At present, there is no study to throw light on the alteration of oropharyngeal (OP) or nasal cavity bacterial microbiota with masks. The primary aim of the study was to see any change in Nasal and OP bacterial microbiota with the use of prolonged medical masks during the COVID-19 outbreak. The study also tried to see the prevalent antibiotic resistance pattern, as reported from sensitivity analysis reports.

Materials and methods:

Data was collected for Oropharyngeal and Nasal swabs from 30 healthy Healthcare Worker participants using N95 or Surgical Masks for at-least 80 days before the date of study initiation from June 13 to July 5, 2020. All the participants gave prior written informed consent, and all the processes of the declaration of Helsinki were followed. The study was approved by the ethical committee of Remedy Clinic Study Group (Registration Number-S/2L/59460). Participants were allowed to participate if they met the pre-defined inclusion criteria of:

a) Healthcare workers using N95 masks or surgical masks for at least 8 hours a day for 80 days during COVID-19 outbreak, b) age 20 – 60 years, c) non-diabetic, d) no on-going fever during the total 40 days period before sample collection, e) no use of antibiotics in last one month, f) no halitosis and, g) no long-term use of proton pump inhibitors (more than 30 days). They were excluded from the study if: a) anyone had a history of hospitalization or fever of any cause in the last 40 days of recruitment, b) anyone developing fever by the time the culture reports are available, and c) persons not giving consent.

Reagents and equipment:

Blood agar of Biomerieux ® (Lot No: 1007843450) was used for growth and culture of fastidious organisms and Macconkey Agar of Himedia ® (Lot No: 0000411827) for growth and culture of gram-negative organisms. Swab sticks used were made of sterile cotton with polypropylene stick in high density polyethylene (HPE) tube of Himedia ® (Code No: PW009). The automated machine used for sensitivity analysis for antibiotic sensitivity was Vitek-2 ® compact.

Microbiological procedures in nutshell:

The methodology was followed as per a pre-print methodology article by the first author [14]. Nasopharyngeal swab and oropharyngeal swab from each patient were collected under aseptic precautions using a sterile cotton swab and processed immediately. Each swab was examined for both Gram's staining and aerobic culture & sensitivity. Gram's staining was performed to note various morphological types of bacteria in each sample. For culture, each swab was inoculated on 5% sheep blood agar (BA) and MacConkey's agar (MA) at 37 degrees Celsius in the presence of 5-10% CO₂ and, at 37 degree Celsius respectively for overnight incubation. Inoculation was done as described by *UK Standards for Microbiology Investigations Inoculation of culture media for bacteriology, n.d* [15]. The isolates grown on various cultures after overnight incubation were identified based on microscopic morphology, Gram's staining characteristics, and automated identification system Vitek-2compact ® using standard microbiological procedure. Antimicrobial susceptibilities for aerobic bacterial isolates were performed by using Vitek-2 compact automated system ® [16], and Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) of each antimicrobial drug was reported as per the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute guidelines 2020 (CLSI 2020). The whole process is summarized in figure 1 below.

Figure 1 Summary of the whole microbiological processes

Adapted from Biorender.com ®. NP, nasopharyngeal; OP, oropharyngeal

Results:

The baseline characters of all the 30 participants with their standard deviation of age, BMI and weight calculated using the online calculator (<https://www.calculator.net/standard-deviation-calculator.html>) is depicted in table 1.

Table 1 Baseline characters of the cohort (using categorical values for age, weight and BMI)

Serial No.	Age Range (Years)	Gender	Weight Range (Kg)	BMI Range (Kg/m ²)
1	25 – 30	MALE	65 – 70	24 – 26
2	25 – 30	MALE	75 – 80	26 – 30
3	25 – 30	FEMALE	75 – 80	26 – 30

4	20 – 25	MALE	55 – 60	20 – 24
5	20 – 25	FEMALE	40 – 45	20 – 24
6	35 – 40	FEMALE	60 – 65	26 – 30
7	20 – 25	FEMALE	55 – 60	20 – 24
8	25 – 30	MALE	55 – 60	20 – 24
9	30 – 35	FEMALE	50 – 55	20 – 24
10	30 – 35	MALE	55 – 60	20 – 24
11	55 – 60	MALE	70 – 75	24 – 26
12	30 – 35	MALE	85 – 90	26 – 30
13	40 – 45	MALE	50 – 55	20 – 24
14	40 – 45	MALE	80 – 85	26 – 30
15	35 – 40	FEMALE	70 – 75	24 – 26
16	30 – 35	MALE	65 – 70	20 – 24
17	20 – 25	FEMALE	65 – 70	24 – 26
18	20 – 25	FEMALE	50 – 55	20 – 24
19	30 – 35	FEMALE	65 – 70	24 – 26
20	25 – 30	MALE	100 – 105	30 – 35
21	25 – 30	MALE	60 – 65	24 – 26
22	25 – 30	FEMALE	45 – 50	20 – 24
23	25 – 30	MALE	85 – 90	26 – 30
24	45 – 50	MALE	55 – 60	20 – 24
25	55 – 60	MALE	55 – 60	20 – 24
26	35 – 40	FEMALE	60 – 65	40 – 45
27	30 – 35	FEMALE	50 – 55	30 – 35
28	40 – 45	MALE	60 – 65	26 – 30
29	45 – 50	MALE	80 – 85	24 – 26
30	25 – 30	MALE	55 – 60	18 – 20

All parameters' SD with 95% CI (using the actual continuous data from the mother data sheet)

Parameter ***95% CI with standard deviation***

Age (years) 33.3667 ±3.282 (±9.84%)

<i>Weight (Kg)</i>	64.5 ±4.579 (±7.10%)
<i>BMI (Kg/m²)</i>	25.5767 ±1.564 (±6.11%)
Age (years)	
<i>21-30, n (%)</i>	16 (53.33)
<i>31-40, n (%)</i>	7 (23.33)
<i>41-50, n (%)</i>	5 (16.67)
<i>51-60, n (%)</i>	2 (6.67)
Gender	
<i>Female, n (%)</i>	12 (40)
<i>Male, n (%)</i>	18 (60)
BMI (kg/m²)	
<i>Underweight (<18.5), n (%)</i>	0 (0)
<i>Normal or lean BMI (18.5–22.9), n (%)</i>	8 (26.67)
<i>Overweight (23.0 –24.9), n (%)</i>	10 (33.33)
<i>Obese (≥25), n (%)</i>	12 (40)
Department of service of the HCW	
<i>Phlebotomist, n (%)</i>	15 (50)
<i>Front desk, n (%)</i>	12 (40)
<i>Radiology technician, n (%)</i>	3 (10)

N.B: In the baseline character table portion we have deliberately used data using range to hide patient particulars and the SD was calculated from the actual data sheet

having continuous variables. SD, standard deviation; CI, confidence interval; BMI, body mass index; HCW, health care worker

There were 10 participants showing no growth (7 in OP swab and 3 in nasal swab).Hence, 20 samples were available for final analysis which had growth both in nasal and OP swabs. The results of total thirty patients are summarised in table 2 for both nasal and OP swab cultures and gram stain findings.

Table 2 Gram stain findings and cultures of nasal and oral microflora of all participants

Serial number	Nasal of stain	gram	Oral stain	gram	Nasal Culture	Oral Culture

patient							
1	GP cocci	GP cocci	Staphylococcus	Klebsiella pneumoniae ssp	mostly;	epidermidis	
		Occasional GN bacilli					
2	GP cocci	GP cocci	Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA)	Staphylococcus Spp			
3	None	GP cocci	Staphylococcus epidermis	Klebsiella pneumoniae ssp	mostly; Few GN bacilli	epidermis	
4	GP cocci; Few GN bacilli	GP cocci	Staphylococcus haemolyticus	Leuconostocmesenteroide sssp	mostly; Few GN bacilli	haemolyticus	
5	GP cocci; Few GN bacilli	GP cocci	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Staphylococcus aureus			
6	Many GP cocci and few GN bacilli	GP cocci; Few GN bacilli	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Streptococcus viridans			
7	Occasional GP cocci	GP cocci; Few GN bacilli	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Streptococcus viridans			
8	Few GP cocci	Few GP cocci	Staphylococcus hominis	No Growth			
9	Few GP cocci	Few GP cocci and GN bacilli	Staphylococcus haemolyticus	No Growth			
10	Many GP cocci	Many GP cocci and few GN bacilli	Staphylococcus aureus	Streptococcus species			
11	Few GP cocci	Few GP cocci	Staphylococcus	No Growth			

			epidermidis	
12	Occasional GP cocci	Many GP cocci and few GN bacilli	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Gemellamorbilorum
13	Few GP cocci	Few GP cocci	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Staphylococcus aureus
14	Few GP cocci	Few GP cocci	Staphylococcus haemolyticus	No Growth
15	Many GP cocci and few GN bacilli	Few GP cocci and occasional GN bacilli	No Growth	Pseudomonas putida
16	Few GP cocci and occasional GN bacilli	Few GP cocci and occasional GN bacilli	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Streptococcus viridans
17	Few GP cocci	Few GP cocci	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Kocuriarosea
18	Few GP cocci	Few GP cocci	Staphylococcus hominis	No Growth
19	GP cocci; Few GN bacilli	Few GP cocci	Staphylococcus sciuri	No Growth
20	Occasional GP cocci	Few GP cocci and occasional GN bacilli	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Streptococcus parasanguinis
21	Few GP cocci and occasional GN bacilli	Few GP cocci and occasional GN bacilli	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Gemellamorbilorum
22	Few GP cocci and occasional GN bacilli	Many GP cocci and few GN bacilli	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Staphylococcus aureus

23	Few GP cocci	Occasional GP cocci	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Enterobacter cloacae complex
24	Few GP cocci and occasional GN bacilli	Occasional cocci	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Staphylococcus epidermidis
25	GP cocci	GP cocci and few GN bacilli	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Streptococcus viridans
26	GP cocci	GP cocci	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Streptococcus viridans
27	Moderate GP cocci and few GN bacilli	Many GP cocci and few GN bacilli	No Growth	Kocuria Kristinae
28	GP cocci	GP cocci and few GN bacilli	Staphylococcus epidermidis	Staphylococcus epidermidis
29	GP cocci	GP cocci	No growth	No growth
30	GP cocci and few GN bacilli	GP cocci and few GN bacilli	Staphylococcus epidermidis	No growth

GP, gram positive; GN, gram negative

The sensitivity and resistance percentage of various antibiotics of the microflora from all the participants are summarised in table 3.

Table 3 Sensitivity and resistance percentage of various antibiotics from nasal and oral swabs of all participants

NASAL SWAB					
Drug names with number of samples analysed for sensitivity for each antibiotic (n)	Serial numbers of patients who are sensitive	Serial numbers of patients who are resistant	Percentage of sensitive strains	Percentage of resistant strains	
Ampicillin (n=4)	14;	3; 5; 7;	7.14	92.86	

Benzylpenicillin(<i>n</i> =25)	4; 14; 17; 19; 21.	1; 2; 3; 5; 6; 7; 8; 20 9; 10; 12; 13; 18; 20; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 28; 30.	80	
Oxacillin(<i>n</i> =25)	3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 10; 12; 13; 14; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21; 24; 25; 26; 28; 30.	1; 2; 9; 22; 23.	80	20
Gentamicin (<i>n</i> =23)	1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 12; 13; 17; 18; 19; 21; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 28; 30.		100	
Ciprofloxacin (<i>n</i> =24)	1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 12; 13; 18; 19; 20; 21; 23; 24; 25; 26; 28; 30.	10; 17; 22.	87.5	12.5
Levofloxacin (<i>n</i> =24)	1; 2; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 12; 13; 14; 18; 19; 20; 21; 23; 24; 25; 26; 28; 30.	9; 10; 17; 22.	83.33	16.67
Erythromycin (<i>n</i> =25)	2; 5; 8; 10; 13; 14; 19; 20; 21; 23; 24; 25; 26; 30.	1; 3; 4; 6; 7; 9; 12; 17; 18; 22; 28.	56	44
Clindamycin (<i>n</i> =25)	1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 7; 8; 10; 12; 13; 14; 17; 20; 21; 23; 24; 25; 26.	6; 9; 18; 19; 22; 28; 30.	72	28
Linezolid (<i>n</i> =25)	1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 12; 13; 14; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 28; 30.		100	
Teicoplanin(<i>n</i> =25)	1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 12; 13; 14; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 28; 30.		100	

Vancomycin(<i>n</i> =25)	1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 12; 13; 14; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 28; 30.	100		
Tetracycline (<i>n</i> =25)	1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 12; 13; 14; 17; 18; 19; 20; 21; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 28; 30.	100		
Tigecycline(<i>n</i> =20)	1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 12; 13; 17; 20; 21; 22; 23; 25; 26; 30.	100		
(TMP/SMX) (<i>n</i> =23)	2; 4; 5; 6; 8; 9; 10; 12; 17; 18; 19; 21; 23; 24; 25; 28.	1; 7; 13; 20; 22; 26; 30.	69.56	30.44
Cefoxitin(<i>n</i> =3)	5; 7.	3.	66.66	33.34
Rifampicin (<i>n</i> =1)	9		100	

OROPHARYNGEAL SWAB

Drug names with number of samples analysed for sensitivity for each antibiotic (n)	Serial numbers of patients who are sensitive	Serial numbers of patients who are resistant	Percentage of sensitive strains (%)	Percentage of resistant strains (%)
Ampicillin (<i>n</i> =1)		2.		100
Azithromycin (<i>n</i> =2)	25; 26.		100	
Oxacillin(<i>n</i> =6)	2; 5; 11; 13; 22; 24.		100	
Amoxicillin/Clavulanic acid (<i>n</i> =2)	1; 3.		100	
Piperacillin/Tazobactam(<i>n</i> =4)	1; 3; 15; 23.		100	
Cefuroxime (<i>n</i> =2)	1; 3.		100	
Cefoperazone/Sulbactam(<i>n</i> =4)	1; 3; 15; 23.		100	
Cefepime(<i>n</i> =14)	1; 3; 4; 6; 7; 10; 12; 15; 16;		100	

	17; 20; 21; 23; 27.			
Ceftriaxone (<i>n</i> =13)	1; 3; 6; 7; 10; 12; 15; 16; 17; 20; 21; 23; 27.	100		
Ertapenem(<i>n</i> =3)	1; 3; 23.	100		
Meropenem(<i>n</i> =5)	1; 3; 15; 21; 23.	100		
Benzylpenicillin(<i>n</i> =19)	4; 5; 6; 7; 10; 13; 16; 20; 25; 26. 22; 24; 27; 28.	52.63	47.37	
Cefoxitin(<i>n</i> =1)	2.	100		
Gentamicin (<i>n</i> =11)	1; 2; 3; 5; 11; 13; 15; 22; 23; 24; 28.	100		
Ciprofloxacin (<i>n</i> =12)	1; 2; 3; 11; 13; 15; 17; 23; 24; 28. 5; 22.	83.33	16.67	
Levofloxacin (<i>n</i> =8)	2; 13; 24; 25; 26; 28. 5; 22.	75	25	
Erythromycin (<i>n</i> =19)	4; 5; 11; 12; 13; 17; 20; 21; 22; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28. 2; 6; 7; 10; 16.	73.68	26.32	
Clindamycin (<i>n</i> =16)	5; 10; 11; 12; 13; 17; 20; 21; 22; 24; 27; 28. 2; 6; 7; 16.	75	25	
Linezolid (<i>n</i> =18)	2; 4; 5; 6; 7; 10; 11; 12; 13; 16; 17; 20; 21; 22; 25; 26; 27; 28.	100		
Teicoplanin(<i>n</i> =19)	2; 4; 5; 6; 7; 10; 11; 12; 13; 16; 17; 20; 21; 22; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28.	100		
Vancomycin(<i>n</i> =18)	2; 5; 6; 7; 10; 11; 12; 13; 16; 17; 20; 21; 22; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28.	100		
Tetracycline (<i>n</i> =7)	2; 5; 11; 13; 22; 24. 28.	85.71	14.29	
Rifampicin (<i>n</i> =1)	28.	100		
TMP/SMX (<i>n</i> =19)	1; 3; 4; 7; 10; 12; 13; 16; 17; 20; 23; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28. 2; 5; 22.	84.21	15.79	

Tigecycline(<i>n</i> =6)	1; 2; 3; 5; 15; 23.	100

TMP/SMX, Trimethoprim/Sulfamethoxazole

The percentages of all the species of bacteria isolated from nasal and oral cavity are given in table 4.

Table 4 Percentages of various bacterial species in nasal and oropharyngeal cavity after using mask over prolonged period

Nasal cavity microbiota			
<i>Nasal Culture (n=30)</i>	Numbers	Percentage	Comments
Staphylococcus epidermidis	20	66.67	Normal flora (commensal)
Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA)	1	3.33	Significance depends on method of collection and clinical condition of patient.
Staphylococcus haemolyticus	3	10	Normal flora (commensal)
Staphylococcus hominis	2	6.67	Normal flora (commensal)
Staphylococcus sciuri	1	3.33	Normal flora (commensal)
No Growth	3	10	-----
Oropharyngeal cavity microbiota			
<i>Oral Culture (n=30)</i>	Numbers	Percentage	Comments
No growth	8	26.68	-----
Klebsiella pneumoniae	2	6.67	Generally not a commensal.
Staphylococcus Spp (commensal)	1	3.33	Normal flora (commensal)
Leuconostoc mesenteroides	1	3.33	Normal occurrence on fruits and vegetables
Staphylococcus aureus	3	10	Can be present as colonizer in URT in 15%
Streptococcus viridans	5	16.67	Normal flora (commensal)
Streptococcus species (commensal)	1	3.33	Normal flora (commensal)
Gemella morbillorum	2	6.67	Normal flora (commensal)
Pseudomonas putida	1	3.33	Environmental opportunistic bacteria
Kocuriarosea	1	3.33	Normal flora (commensal)

Kocuria Kristinae	1	3.33	Normal flora (commensal)
Streptococcus parasanguinis	1	3.33	Early colonizers of dental surface
Enterobacter cloacae complex	1	3.33	Can be a colonizer of respiratory tract
Staphylococcus epidermidis	2	6.67	Normal flora (commensal)

URT, upper respiratory tract

The participants having growth of *Staphylococcus aureus* (serial numbers 5, 10, 13 and 22) and those having growth of *Klebsiella pneumoniae ssp pneumoniae* (serial numbers 1 and 3) did not report any clinical symptoms suggestive of upper respiratory infections.

Discussion:

Microbiota of the body of our body varies from one compartment of the body to another, as well as significant inter-patient variability [17]. A study done to see changes in healthy nasal microflora of divers have shown an increase in nasal flora commensals with the predominant flora being *Staphylococcus epidermidis* [18]. The microflora in normal individual changes with age and lifestyle factors [19]. Up to 80% of the oropharyngeal cultivable flora is comprised of Streptococcal species, diphtheroids, and Veillonellae and Viridans streptococci predominates the nasal microflora [20].

The COVID-19 is spreading too fast to be controlled by any country and has a basic reproduction number (R0) of 2-2.5, indicating that 2-3 persons will be infected from an index patient [21]. Most healthcare set-ups and international bodies are now recommending to use various masks for prevention [22]. A survey-based study on 51 healthcare workers (HCW) highlighted the discomfort faced by HCW while wearing N95 masks [23]. The pain and discomfort while using N95 masks have also been previously raised by many other studies [24, 25].

With these views in mind during the COVID-19 outbreak, this pilot study was conducted, which showed that the normal commensals are not affected when medical masks are used over prolonged periods. The finding of no significant change is a welcome thing, since many diseases have been linked to the nasal and OP commensal microflora alterations. The study has also shown a high percentage of antibiotic resistance for Ampicillin (92.86% from nasal isolates and 100% from OP isolate), Benzylpenicillin (80% from nasal isolates and 47.37% from OP isolates) and, Erythromycin (44% from nasal isolates and 26.32% from OP isolates).

Limitations of the study

- Non-randomized study and hence had to depend on the verbal assurance of participants

- Due to financial limitations, only bacterial flora was assessed and not any other micro-organism which are also present as commensals
- A case-control study would have been a better option, but no person was allowed to go out of home without any mask during this lockdown period of India
- Smoking was not excluded at baseline, and hence that can alter the oral as well as nasal micro-biota.

Conclusion:

Many factors have been linked to the change in oral bacterial microbiota, and this study was done to see one such factor, the use of medical masks for prolonged periods. The study found no change in normal oral bacterial microbiota, and the predominant bacterial flora was found to *Staphylococcus epidermidis* in the nasal cavity, while *Streptococcus viridans* was the commonest one from oropharyngeal microflora. This is a small pilot study, and more extensive studies are needed during and after pandemic with controls to see the actual changes.

References:

1. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) Situation Report -178. (n.d.). [online] Available at: https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200716-covid-19-sitrep-178.pdf?sfvrsn=28ee165b_2. [Accessed 16 Jul. 2020]
2. Sra HK, Sandhu A, Singh M. Use of Face Masks in COVID-19 [published online ahead of print, 2020 May 12]. Indian J Pediatr. 2020;1. doi:10.1007/s12098-020-03316-w
3. Chughtai AA, Seale H, MacIntyre CR. Availability, consistency and evidence-base of policies and guidelines on the use of mask and respirator to protect hospital health care workers: a global analysis. BMC Res Notes. 2013;6:216. Published 2013 May 31. doi:10.1186/1756-0500-6-216
4. Kao TW, Huang KC, Huang YL, Tsai TJ, Hsieh BS, Wu MS. The physiological impact of wearing an N95 mask during hemodialysis as a precaution against SARS in patients with end-stage renal disease. J Formos Med Assoc. 2004;103(8):624-628
5. Person E, Lemerrier C, Royer A, Reyckler G. Effet du port d'un masque de soins lors d'un test de marche de six minutes chez des sujets sains [Effect of a surgical mask on six minute walking distance]. Rev Mal Respir. 2018;35(3):264-268. doi:10.1016/j.rmr.2017.01.010
6. Kilian, M., Chapple, I.L.C., Hannig, M., Marsh, P.D., Meuric, V., Pedersen, A.M.L., Tonetti, M.S., Wade, W.G. and Zaura, E. (2016). The oral microbiome – an update for oral healthcare professionals. British Dental Journal, [online] 221(10), pp.657–666. Available at: <https://www.nature.com/articles/sj.bdj.2016.865> [Accessed 16 Jul. 2020]
7. Stearns JC, Davidson CJ, Mckee S, Whelan FJ, Fontes ME, Schryvers AB, et al. Culture and molecular-based profiles show shifts in bacterial communities of the upper respiratory tract that occur with age. ISME J. 2015;9:1246–59. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2014.250>
8. Camarinha-Silva A, Jáuregui R, Chaves-Moreno D, Oxley APA, Schaumburg F, Becker K, et al. Comparing the anterior nares bacterial community of two discrete human populations using Illumina amplicon sequencing. Environ Microbiol. 2014;16:2939–52
9. Wali, S., Abdelaziz, M., Krayem, A., Samman, Y., Shukairi, A., Mirdad, S., Albanna, A., Alghamdi, H. and Osoba, A. (2008). The presence of atypical mycobacteria in the mouthwashes of normal subjects: Role of tap water and oral hygiene. Annals of Thoracic Medicine, 3(1), p.5. doi: 10.4103/1817-1737.37890

10. Cornejo Ulloa, P., van der Veen, M.H. and Krom, B.P. (2019). Review: modulation of the oral microbiome by the host to promote ecological balance. *Odontology*, 107(4), pp.437–448
11. Dagli N, Dagli R, Darwish S, Baroudi K. Oral Microbial Shift: Factors affecting the Microbiome and Prevention of Oral Disease. *J Contemp Dent Pract* 2016;17(1):90-96
12. Liu, J., Cui, L., Yan, X., Zhao, X., Cheng, J., Zhou, L., Gao, J., Cao, Z., Ye, X. and Hu, S. (2018). Analysis of Oral Microbiota Revealed High Abundance of *Prevotella Intermedia* in Gout Patients. *Cellular Physiology and Biochemistry*, 49(5), pp.1804–1812. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000493626>
13. Corrêa JD, Calderaro DC, Ferreira GA, Mendonça SM, Fernandes GR, Xiao E, Teixeira AL, Leys EJ, Graves DT, Silva TA: Subgingival microbiota dysbiosis in systemic lupus erythematosus: association with periodontal status. *Microbiome* 2017; 5: 34.
14. Roy, S. (2020). A Study Protocol to see Change of Nasal and Oropharyngeal Microbiome with Prolonged Use of Medical Masks during the COVID-19 Outbreak in Healthy Participants. DOI:10.21203/rs.3.pex-958/v1
15. UK Standards for Microbiology Investigations Inoculation of culture media for bacteriology. (n.d.). [online] Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/583859/Q_5i2.pdf. Accessed 25th July, 2020.
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/583859/Q_5i2.pdf
16. VITEK® 2 Microbiology with Confidence. (n.d.). [online] Available at: https://www.biomerieux-usa.com/sites/subsidiary_us/files/18-vitek2-systembrochure_v2.pdf
17. Costello E K, Lauber C L, Hamady M et al. Bacterial community variation in human body habitats across space and time. *Science* 2009; 326: 1694–1697
18. Kaul, A., Malhotra, T. and Saxena, N. (2017). A study of alteration of nasal bacterial flora during diving. *Journal of Marine Medical Society*, 19(2), p.108. doi: 10.4103/jmms.jmms_47_17
19. Kumpitsch, C., Koskinen, K., Schöpf, V. and Moissl-Eichinger, C. (2019). The microbiome of the upper respiratory tract in health and disease. *BMC Biology*, 17(1), <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-019-0703-z>
20. Hull, M.W. and Chow, A.W. (2007). Indigenous Microflora and Innate Immunity of the Head and Neck. *Infectious Disease Clinics of North America*, 21(2), pp.265–282. doi:10.1016/j.idc.2007.03.015
21. Dashraath P, Wong JLJ, Lim MXK, et al. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic and pregnancy. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2020;222(6):521-531. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2020.03.021
22. Tirupathi R, Bharathidasan K, Palabindala V, Salim SA, Al-Tawfiq JA. Comprehensive review of mask utility and challenges during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Infez Med*. 2020;28(suppl 1):57-63.
23. Khoo KL, Leng PH, Ibrahim IB, Lim TK. The changing face of healthcare worker perceptions on powered air-purifying respirators during the SARS outbreak. *Respirology*. 2005;10(1):107-110. doi:10.1111/j.1440-1843.2005.00634.x
24. Szeinuk J, Beckett WS, Clark N, Hailoo WL. Medical evaluation for respirator use. *Am J Ind Med*. 2000;37(1):142-157. doi:10.1002/(sici)1097-0274(200001)37:1<142::aid-ajim11>3.0.co;2-k
25. Shenal BV, Radonovich LJ Jr, Cheng J, Hodgson M, Bender BS. Discomfort and exertion associated with prolonged wear of respiratory protection in a health care setting. *J Occup Environ Hyg*. 2012;9(1):59-64. doi:10.1080/15459624.2012.635133