Clinical Research on Foot & Ankle

Review Article Open Access

Bacterial Infections Associated with Diabetic Foot Ulcers: A Review

Ji Chang Woog*

Clinic of Trauma and Orthopaedic surgery, Leipzig, Germany

Abstract

Diabetic bottom ulcers (DFUs) and diabetic bottom infections (DFIs) are associated with reduced patient quality of life, lower- extremity amputation, hospitalization, and high morbidity and mortality. Different bacterial communities have been linked in DFUs DFIs, playing a significant part in infection prognostic. still, due to the high diversity of bacterial communities settled in DFUs DFIs, culture- grounded styles may not insulate all of the bacterial population or unanticipated microorganisms. Lately, high perceptivity and particularity of DNA (metagenomics) and RNA (metatranscriptomics) technologies have addressed limitations of culture- grounded styles and have taken a step beyond bacterial identification. As a consequence, new advances attained from DNA- and RNA- grounded ways for bacterial identification can ameliorate remedial approaches. This review estimated the current state of play in aetiology of DFUs DFIs on culture and molecular approaches, and bandied the impact of metagenomic and metatranscriptomic styles in bacterial identification approaches.

Keywords: Diabetic foot ulcers; Hospitalization

Preface

The number of people with diabetes is anticipated to increase fleetly from 425 million in 2017 to a prognosticated value of 600 million by 2030. Further than one third of people with diabetes develop diabetic bottom ulcers (DFUs) during their continuance, with half of these getting infected and causing diabetic bottom infections (DFIs). Fifteen percent of cases with DFIs bear lower branch amputation to help progression of the infection [1].

Diabetic bottom care is veritably precious, with an estimated US$ 8659 periodic cost per case, therefore emphasizing the significance of early opinion and treatment of DFUs DFIs [2]. Treatment consists of perfecting patient natural factors, similar as perfecting glucose control, as well as targeting foreign factors, the star being the junking of bacterial impurity/ infection. Still, DFUs DFIs harbor different bacterial communities, which increase the difficulty in treatment choice [3].

There are several laboratory ways available with different perceptivity and particularity to determine the bacterial composition of DFUs DFIs. Nevertheless, the characterization of the entire polymicrobial community at different inflexibility stages ranging from mild to severe is still a major challenge [4].

Although culture- grounded styles are the top system of bacterial identification, they frequently produce false-negative results in cases who have entered antibiotics; fail to identify slow growing, finical, anaerobic, and unknown pathogens; and are time- consuming, hindering proper and early discovery of the bacterial community in DFUs DFIs [5]. Recent advances in molecular technologies overcome numerous of the mentioned crunches and give new perceptivity into the bacterial diversity of DFUs DFIs. These advancements have important counteraccusations for the identification of so far unknown and uncultivable bacteria in DFUs DFIs [6].

This handwriting will review the current state of play in culture and molecular styles to assess the bacterial diversity in DFUs DFIs, and dissect the unborn impact of metagenomics and metatranscriptomic approaches on bacterial identification and treatment [7]. The first and most critical step, not only in culture- grounded styles but also in advanced molecular- grounded approaches, is sample collection. Historically, curettage, necropsies, hearties, and crack bournes have been the top routine samples taken by crack care providers [8]. As the Infection Disease Society of America (IDSA) advises that samples be taken from the base of injuries, towel necropsies have been proposed as a gold standard system [9]. Swab societies of the crack face are also generally used, but due to a high number of commensal microflora inhabiting healthy skin, tar culture results may not be as dependable as towel samples [10]. For case, coagulase-negative staphylococci(CoNS), Micrococcus, Bacillusspp., and Corynebacterium, which are a part of normal skin foliage and have been constantly insulated from DFIs hearties, aren't generally considered as pathogenic bacteria, unless the samples are taken from deep apkins [11]. Indeed though the collection of tar samples is easier than towel samples, some studies have shown that tar culture results are less specific and sensitive.

Although culturing of superficial hearties and deep towel samples from infected ulcers handed identical results in 62 of cases, the hearties only linked 91 of the organisms insulated from towel samples. analogous results were attained by Mutluoglu in 69.2 of injuries, but superficial hearties failing to descry all organisms in 9 of cases. The positive prophetic value of hearties relative to towel was 84.4.

Tar samples are less dependable in segregating Gram-negative bacteria similar as E. coli and Citrobacter. An advanced concordance rate of 80 was set up by Huang etal. In deep ulcers; still, when abscess osteomyelitis or gangrene was present, significantly different results were attained by hearties and towel vivisection with only around 30 concordances. Also, some Gram-negative bacteria, similar as Ralstonia pickettii and Serratia, were only linked in deep towel samples [12].

Deep towel samples also showed advanced perceptivity for the monitoring of bacterial species that have been preliminarily reported as antibiotic- resistant strains. Also, percutaneous bone vivisection linked an advanced number of organisms causing diabetic bottom osteomyelitis compared to tar samples. Significantly more bacteria

***Corresponding author:** Ji Chang Woog, Clinic of Trauma and Orthopaedic surgery, Leipzig, Germany, E-mail: changwoo@edu.au

Received: 01-Jul-2022, Manuscript No: crfa-22-71070, **Editor assigned:** 03-Jul-2022, PreQC No: crfa-22-71070 (PQ), **Reviewed:** 17-Jul-2022, QC No: crfa-22-71070, **Revised:** 24-Jul-2022, Manuscript No: crfa-22-71070 (R), **Published:** 29-Jul-2022, DOI: 10.4172/2329-910X.1000360

Citation: Woog JC (2022) Bacterial Infections Associated with Diabetic Foot Ulcers: A Review. Clin Res Foot Ankle, 10: 360.

were insulated from towel samples compared to 247 paired tar samples with a 42 concordance.

Grounded on the forenamed studies that compared the effectiveness of bacterial culture using towel and tar samples, it can be stated that towel samples give further dependable results for bacterial identification and monitoring of bacterial population in DFIs. According to bacterial culture and molecular approaches, DFUs DFIs can be settled by different aerobes and anaerobes. DFIs of a shorter duration feel to have a simpler microbiota and are substantially settled by Gram-positive cocci(Staphylococcus and Streptococcusspp.). In discrepancy, habitual DFIs may have polymicrobial infections populating by different types of aerobic bacteria, similar as Staphylococcus, Streptococcus, Enterococcus, Pseudomonasspp., and anaerobic pathogens (Figure 1) (15). Bacteroides fragilis has also been reported in several studies as the most abundant anaerobic bacteria in DFIs. Grounded on these studies which were explicitly designed to culture anaerobes, anaerobic bacteria were reported in low cornucopia with low impact on infection progress [13].

Gram-Positive Bacteria

Firmicutes is the main bacterial phylum, comprising Streptococcusspp.(Streptococcus agalactiae, Streptococcus pyogenes, and Streptococcus mitis), Staphylococcusspp.(Staphylococcus aureus), and Enterococcusspp. S. aureus has been reported as the most common pathogenic species in DFIs in several studies. In a study conducted on 342 cases with diabetic bottom infections,S. Aureus (20.2 of isolates) was the most common Gram-positive bacteria. These results are fairly analogous to the number of Gram-positive bacteria in Jneid's study (54.7 of isolates) and Al Benwan's study (32.3 of isolates), which applied culture and culturomic styles to insulate bacterial species, independently. Staphylococcus epidermidis was also insulated in one study conducted on 454 DFIs samples as the most dominant bacterial species. Although Staphylococcus epidermid is part of the normal skin, it can beget severe infections in the presence of foreign bodies, similar as prosthetic bias and crack infection [14].

Gram-Negative Bacteria

The ascendance of the Enterobacteriaceae family (Escherichia coli, Klebsiella pneumoniae, Morganella morganii, and Proteus mirabilis) has lately been reported as the largest group of aerobic Gram-negative rods in DFIs [15]. For case, a normal of 1.8 bacterial pathogens per diabetic crack sample was reported in one study, of which, 51.2 were Gram-negative bacteria, which was relatively high compared to the number of Gram-negative species in Jneid's study (26.4 of isolates). This distinction might be due to former antibiotic use in cases, long duration of hospitalization, and crack regularity. Escherichia coli were also reported as the most common Gram-negative bacteria in 342 cases with diabetic bottom infections. Entrobacter, Pseudomonas, Citrobacter and Provetella spp.

Conclusion

Nonstop evaluation of the bases, proper use of antibiotics, surgical procedures, and multifaceted approaches emphasizing better individual styles can help infection progression, and, more importantly, the threat of lower extremity amputation. Experimenters and clinicians should be over- to- date and have an understanding of new styles of forestallment, opinion, and treatment of DFIs.

There have been numerous studies on the bacteriology of DFUs DFIs over the once decades with varying, and occasionally inconsistent results. This disagreement might be due to demographical and geographical differences, colorful processes of slice, mortal crimes, sample size, and different bacterial identification styles used.

Indeed though significant advances have been made to manage DFIs, numerous unanswered questions about DFUs DFIs microbiota live. These questions will bear help from new and advanced molecular technologies. A different range of studies has successfully estimated transcriptional pathways involved in intra macrophage survival and revision of the bacterial transcriptomic profile in adaption to mortal cells. Still, the host seditious responses and major bacterial metabolisms involved in DFIs haven't been penciled yet. The affair of binary meta-transcriptomic analysis or profiling of dynamic host- pathogen relations offer strong prospects for farther exploration on DFUs DFIs.

It may be concluded that molecular approaches are more dependable than traditional styles in the study of DFUs DFIs microbiota and can give lesser perceptivity into DFI microbiology. Still, due to the deficit of information, further disquisition is demanded to decide which system should be chosen as the primary identification tool.

References

1. Huang Y, Cao Y, Zou M, Luo X, Jiang Y, et al. (2016) A comparison of tissue versus swab culturing of infected diabetic foot wounds. Int J Endocrinol 2016: 8198714.
2. Senneville E, Melliez H, Beltrand E, Legout L, Valette M, et al. (2006) Culture of percutaneous bone biopsy specimens for diagnosis of diabetic foot osteomyelitis: Concordance with ulcer swab cultures. Clin Infect Dis 42: 57-62.
3. Elamurugan T, Jagdish S, Kate V, Parija SC (2011) Role of bone biopsy specimen culture in the management of diabetic foot osteomyelitis. Int J Surg 9: 214-216.
4. Nelson EA, Wright-Hughes A, Brown S, Lipsky BA, Backhouse M, et al. (2016) Concordance in diabetic foot ulceration: A cross-sectional study of agreement between wound swabbing and tissue sampling in infected ulcers. Health Technol Assess 20: 1-176.
5. Jneid J, Lavigne J, La Scola B, Cassir N (2017) The diabetic foot microbiota: A review. Hum Microbiome J 5: 1-6.
6. Abdulrazak A, Bitar ZI, Al-Shamali AA, Mobasher LA (2005) Bacteriological study of diabetic foot infections. J Diabetes Complicat 19: 138-141.
7. El-Tahawy A (2000) Bacteriology of diabetic foot. Saudi Med J 21: 344-347.
8. Lee JS, Son ST, Han SK (2017) Risk factors of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus and Pseudomonas infection in diabetic foot ulcers in Korea. J Wound Manag Res 13: 29-34.
9. Tascini C, Piaggesi A, Tagliaferri E, Iacopi E, Fondelli S, et al. (2011) Microbiology at first visit of moderate-to-severe diabetic foot infection with antimicrobial activity and a survey of quinolone monotherapy. Diabetes Res Clin Pract 94: 133-139.
10. Jneid J, Cassir N, Schuldiner S, Jourdan N, Sotto A, et al. (2018) Exploring the microbiota of diabetic foot infections with culturomics. Front Cell Infect Microbiol 8: 282.
11. Al Benwan K, Al Mulla A, Rotimi VO (2012) A study of the microbiology of diabetic foot infections in a teaching hospital in Kuwait. J Infect Public Health 5: 1-8.
12. Yao Y, Sturdevant DE, Villaruz A, Xu L, Gao Q, Otto M (2005) Factors characterizing Staphylococcus epidermidis invasiveness determined by comparative genomics. Infect Immun 73:1856-1860.
13. Citron DM, Goldstein EJ, Merriam CV, Lipsky BA, Abramson MA (2007) Bacteriology of moderate-to-severe diabetic foot infections and in vitro activity of antimicrobial agents. J Clin Microbiol 45: 2819-2828.
14. Miyan Z, Fawwad A, Sabir R, Basit A (2017) Microbiological pattern of diabetic foot infections at a tertiary care center in a developing country. Age Years 53: 10-20.
15. Sanchez-Sanchez M, Cruz-Pulido WL, Bladinieres-Camara E, Alcala-Duran R, Rivera-Sanchez G, et al. (2017) Bacterial prevalence and antibiotic resistance in clinical isolates of diabetic foot ulcers in the Northeast of Tamaulipas, Mexico. Int J Low Extrem Wounds 16: 129-134.