

## Comparative antimicrobial susceptibility of biofilm versus planktonic forms of strains isolated from children with gastroenteritis

K. Papavasileiou, E. Papavasileiou, A. Tseleni-Kotsovili, S. Bersimis, C.

Nicolaou, A. Ioannidis, S. Chatzipanagiotou

## ▶ To cite this version:

K. Papavasileiou, E. Papavasileiou, A. Tseleni-Kotsovili, S. Bersimis, C. Nicolaou, et al.. Comparative antimicrobial susceptibility of biofilm versus planktonic forms of strains isolated from children with gastroenteritis. European Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, 2010, 29 (11), pp.1401-1405. 10.1007/s10096-010-1015-y. hal-00609055

## HAL Id: hal-00609055 https://hal.science/hal-00609055

Submitted on 18 Jul 2011

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés. Editorial Manager(tm) for European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious

Diseases

Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: EJCMID-D-10-00204R1

Title: Comparative antimicrobial susceptibility of biofilm versus planktonic forms of Salmonella spp. isolated from children with gastroenteritis.

Article Type: Article

Keywords: Antimicrobial resistance; biofilms; planktonic bacteria; Salmonella enterica; gastroenteritis.

Corresponding Author: Prof. Stylianos Chatzipanagiotou, PhD

Corresponding Author's Institution: University of Athens - Medical School

First Author: Konstantina Papavasileiou, MD

Order of Authors: Konstantina Papavasileiou, MD; Eleni Papavasileiou, PhD; Angelina Tseleni-Kotsovili, PhD; Sotiris Bersimis, PhD; Chryssoula Nicolaou, PhD; Anastassios Ioannidis, PhD; Stylianos Chatzipanagiotou, PhD

Abstract: Purpose. In the present study 194 S. enterica strains, isolated from infected children, belonging to various serotypes were investigated for their ability to form biofilms and the biofilm forms of the isolated strains were compared to their corresponding planktonic forms with respect to the antimicrobial susceptibility.

Methods. For the biofilm forming strains the Minimal Inhibitory Concentration for Bacterial Regrowth from the Biofilm (MICBR) of nine clinically applicable antimicrobial agents, was determined, and the results were compared to the respective MIC values of the planktonic forms.

Results. A hundred and nine S. enterica strains out of 194 (56%) belonging to 13 serotypes were biofilm forming. The biofilm forms showed increased antimicrobial resistance versus the planktonic bacteria. The highest resistance rates of the biofilm bacteria were observed with respect to gentamicin (89.9%) and ampicillin (84.4%) and the lowest rates with respect to ciprofloxacin and moxifloxacin (2.8% for both).

Conclusions. A remarkable shift of the MICBR50 and MICBR90 toward resistance was observed in the biofilm forms as compared to the respective planktonic forms. Further studies are required to elucidate the biofilm antimicrobial resistance mechanisms of the bacterial biofilms and their contribution to the therapeutic failure in infections with in vitro susceptible bacteria.

Response to Reviewers: Dear Mr. Alex van Belkum,

we have taken into consderation all the reviewer's comments and we have revised the manuscript acordingly. There is one exception with respect to the introduction comments g. and h. were we rewrote the text, but not in the proposed way because this would alter the essence. We have also corrected the references.

with best regards,

Prof. Stylianos Chatzipanagioto

	1	Concise Article				
1 2	2					
3 4	3	Comparative antimicrobial susceptibility of biofilm versus planktonic forms of				
5 6	4	Salmonella enterica strains isolated from children with gastroenteritis.				
7 8	5					
9 10	6	Konstantina Papavasileiou <sup>1</sup> , Eleni Papavasileiou <sup>1</sup> , Angelina Tseleni-Kotsovili <sup>2</sup> , Sotiris				
11 12	7	Bersimis <sup>3</sup> , Chryssoula Nicolaou <sup>4</sup> , Anastassios Ioannidis <sup>5</sup> , Stylianos Chatzipanagiotou <sup>4</sup> .				
13 14 15	8					
15 16 17	9	1 Department of Clinical Microbiology, Penteli Children's Hospital, Athens, Greece.				
18 19	10	2 Department of Microbiology, University of Athens, Medical School.				
20 21	11	3 Department of Statistics and Insurance Science, University of Piraeus, Greece				
22 22 23	12	4 Laboratory of Biopathology and Clinical Microbiology, Aeginition Hospital,				
23 24 25	13	Medical School, University of Athens.				
26 27	14	5 Department of Nursing, Faculty of Human Movement and Quality of Life Sciences,				
28 29	15	University of Peloponnese, Greece				
30 31	16					
32 33	17	Corresponding author:				
34 35	18	Prof. Dr. Stylianos Chatzipanagiotou				
36 37	19	Athens Medical School – Aeginition Hospital				
38 39	20	Department of Biopathology and Clinical Microbiology				
40 41	21	Vass. Sophias av. 72-74, 115 28 Athens – Greece				
42 43	22	Tel.: 0030 – 2107289192				
44 45	23	Fax : 0030 – 2106004608				
46 47	24	e-mail : chatlouk@hotmail.com, and schatzi@med.uoa.gr				
48 49	25					
50 51	26					
52 53	27					
54 55	28					
56 57	29					
58 59	30					
60 61						
62 63						
64						

31 Abstract

**Purpose.** In the present study 194 *S. enterica* strains, isolated from infected children, belonging to various serotypes were investigated for their ability to form biofilms and the biofilm forms of the isolated strains were compared to their corresponding planktonic forms with respect to the antimicrobial susceptibility.

Methods. For the biofilm forming strains the Minimal Inhibitory Concentration for Bacterial
 Regrowth from the Biofilm (MICBR) of nine clinically applicable antimicrobial agents, was
 determined, and the results were compared to the respective MIC values of the planktonic
 forms.

**Results.** A hundred and nine *S. enterica* strains out of 194 (56%) belonging to 13 serotypes 42 were biofilm forming. The biofilm forms showed increased antimicrobial resistance versus the 43 planktonic bacteria. The highest resistance rates of the biofilm bacteria were observed with 44 respect to gentamicin (89.9%) and ampicillin (84.4%) and the lowest rates with respect to 45 ciprofloxacin and moxifloxacin (2.8% for both).

**Conclusions.** A remarkable shift of the MICBR<sub>50</sub> and MICBR<sub>90</sub> toward resistance was 47 observed in the biofilm forms as compared to the respective planktonic forms. The 48 development of new consensus methods for the determination of the antimicrobial 49 susceptibility of biofilm forms seems to be a major research challenge. Further studies are 50 required in order to elucidate the biofilm antimicrobial resistance mechanisms of the bacterial 51 biofilms and their contribution to the therapeutic failure in infections with in vitro susceptible 52 bacteria.

54 Key words: Antimicrobial resistance; biofilms; planktonic bacteria; Salmonella enterica;
55 gastroenteritis.

58 Introduction

Microbial biofilms are a major concern in human and veterinary medicine. They consist of growing microorganisms intimately associated with each other, producing an extracellular polymeric substance (ESP) consisting of carbohydrate (exopolysaccharide) adhering to synthetic or biological surfaces [1-4]. The encased sessile microorganisms bear quite distinct properties from those growing independently or as planktonic populations in liquid media. One of the most important properties of the biofilm associated bacteria in clinical medicine is the markedly enhanced resistance to antimicrobial agents, through protection by the ESP, leading to multidrug resistance and therapeutic failure.

Although the mechanisms are poorly understood, there is evidence that the biofilm associated resistance should be related to modified nutrient environments, leading to suppression of growth rate within the biofilm, interaction between exopolymer matrices and the antimicrobial, as well as the development of biofilm / attachment specific phenotypes [5-8].

In comparative antimicrobial susceptibility studies, many common gram-negative and grampositive bacterial pathogens produce biofilms showing significantly higher antimicrobial resistance rates than their planktonic state. Most of these studies have largely focused on *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Staphylococcus epidermidis* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* [9].

Little is known about the response to antimicrobials of the biofilm forms of the Salmonella enterica serotypes, which are worldwide the most common cause of acute, self - limited gastroenteritis, usually not requiring treatment [10,11]. However, the majority of Salmonella enterica strains are able to form biofilms and to synthesize cell surface components, that help them survive in hostile or suboptimal environments [12], and express resistance to multiple antimicrobials. This ability contributes to their persistence in the host after the acute phase of infection (carrier state), the dissemination of the organism over a long period of time in the environment and its transmission to new individuals [13]. Regarding these properties Salmonella enterica could serve as a very good model for the study of the comparative response to antimicrobials between the planktonic and their respective biofilm forms.

86 The present study aimed to detect the production of biofilms by clinical strains of *S. enterica*87 serotypes isolated from children with gastroenteritis and to compare the antimicrobial
88 susceptibility of planktonic versus biofilm forming bacteria.

## 91 Patients and Methods

During a three year period (2006-2008) 194 *S. enterica* strains were collected from children
with gastroenteritis, either hospitalized or attended at the outpatient clinic. The age of the
children balanced from 1-14 years. The isolation and serological identification of *S. enterica*.
was performed by conventional methods.

Biofilm formation was detected by the use of silicone disks (Folio C6 0,25 mm, NOVATECH; new biotechnology for life ZI ATHELIA III-VOIE ANTIOPE 13705 LA CIOTAT CEDEX-FRANCE) modified as described previously [14]. The silicone disks were cut in similar size (4-5 mm) and weight (25-30 mg) through an in-house invented spacer construction and were placed into tubes, weighed at a scale and left overnight under UV irradiation for sterilization. Tubes containing 2,5 ml trypticase soya broth (TSB) were inoculated with Salmonella strains and incubated for 72 hours at 30° C. The content was then poured off and the tubes were washed 3 times with distilled water and air dried in a laminar flow for 24 hours. The tubes containing the silicone disks with the attached bacteria were weighed once more and the difference in weight showed the presence of biofilms.

Antimicrobial susceptibility of the planktonic bacterial forms was perfomed by means of determination of the minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC). MIC was determined using two methods: a) the automatic system VITEK 2 (bioMérieux SA, 69280 Marcy-I Etoile, France) and b) the standard broth dilution method according to guidelines of the Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI)[15]. The antimicrobials included were those of importance in the clinical practice: ampicillin, coamoxiclav, cefuroxime, cefotaxime, gentamicin, imipenem, cotrimoxazole, ciprofloxacin and moxifloxacin.

The strains producing biofilms were further tested for their antimicrobial susceptibility by determination of the Minimal Inhibitory Concentration for Bacterial Regrowth from the biofilm (MICBR) using a modified broth macrodilution method according to the guidelines of the Clinical laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) [15].

Silicone disks coated with the biofilm forming *Salmonella* strains were prepared in tubes as
described above, omitting the last step (air-drying). Serial dilutions of the antimicrobials in

Mueller – Hinton broth, corresponding to the concentrations used for the MIC determination regarding the planktonic bacteria, were prepared and poured into the silicone disk containing tubes. The antimicrobial containing tubes were then incubated at 35° C for 24 h. The growth of planktonic bacteria was visualized by the development of turbidity in the medium. The MICBR was defined as the lowest concentration inhibiting the growth in the medium as observed by a complete clarity. An aliquot of the medium from the tubes with the lowest antimicrobial concentration showing a turbidity indicating bacterial growth, was subcultured in blood and Mc Conkey agar medium in order to check the purity of the grown Salmonella population.

The statistical analysis was performed using the statistical package SPSS for Windows (version 15.0) in order to disclose any significant differences between the percentages of antimicrobial susceptibility of the planktonic and the biofilm bacterial forms. The analysis was done by applying an appropriate hypothesis test concerning the difference between the proportions of two samples. The normal approximation to the binomial distribution was used.

- 138 Results and Discussion

The distribution of serotypes among the *S. enterica* isolates and their respective ability to form biofilms are shown in table 1. Biofilm formation was detected in 109 out of 194 Salmonella strains (56%) included in the study. For all the positive strains the difference in weight before and after incubation of the silicone disk was >50 mg, while in the negative strains the absence of biofilm formation was indicated by differences of less than 1 mg.

The antimicrobial resistance rates of the planktonic and the biofilm bacteria are given in table 146 2. The biofilm forms showed increased antimicrobial resistance versus the planktonic 147 bacteria. The highest resistance rates of the biofilm bacteria were observed with respect to 148 gentamicin (89.9%) and ampicillin (84.4%) and the lowest rates with respect to ciprofloxacin 149 and moxifloxacin (2.8% for both).

Since the P-value for all antimicrobials was less than 1%, all the differences were assumed to
be statistically significant at 99.0% (at least) confidence level (table 2).

A remarkable shift of the  $MIC_{50}$  and  $MIC_{90}$  toward resistance was observed in the biofilm forms as compared to the respective planktonic forms (table 3). The  $MICBR_{50}$  lay in the upper limit corresponding to susceptibility only for cefotaxime, imipenem and the two quinolones (ciprofloxacin and moxifloxacin), while the  $MICBR_{90}$  was above this limit (intermediate or resistant) for all the antimicrobials tested.

In the present study a significant difference in antimicrobial susceptibility was found between the planktonic and biofilm forms of the S. enterica strains isolated from clinical cases with gastroenteritis, the biofilm forms showing increased resistance rates. Despite this statistically significant increase in resistance, quinolones and the broad spectrum β-lactams cefotaxime and imipenem showed the best antimicrobial activity against the biofilm forms, having MCBR<sub>50</sub>s in the level of susceptibility (table 3). Although the methodology followed regarding the antimicrobial susceptibility testing of the biofilm bacteria is not a standardized consensus one, the results arising are clear and more or less in agreement with previous reports, referring to Salmonella, as well as to other bacterial species (Escherichia coli, Staphylococcus epidermidis, Pseudomonas aeruginosa) using in-house biofilm formation and biofilm antimicrobial susceptibility detection methods [9, 16-19]. However the detection of biofilm formation as such, does not predict in all cases a possible clinical therapeutic failure (or clinical resistance). According to the hitherto reports, this phenomenon seems not to pertain to all bacterial species [9]. In veterinary infections caused by Pasteurella multocida, Mannheimia haemolytica and Haemophilus somnus no difference in susceptibility was found between the planktonic and the biofilm forms, and the treated animals responded well to most antimicrobials. This diversity in biofilm response to antimicrobials demonstrates the complexity in prediction of the therapeutic outcome, the latter probably depending on a variety of factors conditioned by the nature of the antimicrobial, the bacterial species properties and the specific biofilm features.

177 In the present report *Salmonella enterica* served practically as a very good model for the 178 study of biofilm formation and antimicrobial susceptibily, first because about half of the strains 179 (56%) were biofilm producers in vitro, and second because most of the strains in their 180 planktonic forms bore antimicrobial susceptible phenotypes (table 2), thus giving conspicuous 181 differences in the biofilm phenotypes.

Soon after the beginning of the "golden" antibiotic era in 1940, the emergence of the antimicrobial resistance arose, which incited intensive research and major developments in the field of the antimicrobial chemotherapy. However, despite the progress in the revelation of most of the antimicrobial resistance mechanisms, the discovery of new drugs and the improvement and standardization of the antimicrobial susceptibility testing using consensus methodologies, the problem of the antimicrobial "clinical resistance" resulting in many cases in therapeutic failure is still of major concern.

In clinical practice the MIC assay is the gold standard and the best way to select potentially effective antimicrobial agents for the rational treatment of infections [4, 20]. The setting of the antimicrobial breakpoints taking into consideration the pharmacokinetic – pharmacodynamic properties of the drugs, besides clinical trials, is based on the use of planktonic bacterial forms, a fact that does not correspond to the in vivo infectious disease pathogenesis, as in some cases other factors like the formation of biofilms might be involved.

In all the hitherto published antimicrobial susceptibility studies dealing with biofilm bacterial forms, the applied methodology varies, because standardized techniques have not yet been established. However, all reported results are completely in agreement with each other, indicating that human pathogenic biofilm forming bacteria bear significantly increased antimicrobial resistance properties, compared to their corresponding planktonic forms. In the present study, testing of antimicrobial susceptibility (or resistance) referred to the ability of already formed biofilms to grow and generate planktonic forms. In other reports, biofilm resistance was found to be related to the low growth rates within the biofilm mass [21-24]. This versatile reaction of biofilms against the antimicrobials is noticeably impeding the search for novel anti-biofilm acting antimicrobial agents [25].

The development of new consensus methods for the determination of the antimicrobial susceptibility of biofilm forms in biofilm forming bacteria seems to be a major research challenge in infectious disease therapeutics for the management of infections that are difficult to treat. The present study involving *S. enterica*, a biofilm forming microorganism, was conducted to demonstrate the ability of bacterial biofilms to escape in vitro the action of the commonly used antimicrobial agents. Further studies are warranted to elucidate the biofilm

antimicrobial resistance mechanisms and their contribution to therapeutic failure in infections with in vitro susceptible bacteria.

4 5 6	213 214 215	
7 8	216	References
9 10	217	
11 12	218	1. Costerton JW, Stewart PS, Greenberg EP. Bacterial biofilms: a common cause of
13 14 15	219	persistent infections. Science 1999 May 21;284(5418): 1318-322. Review.
$\begin{array}{c} 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 19 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ 22 \\ 23 \\ 24 \\ 25 \\ 26 \\ 27 \\ 28 \\ 29 \\ 30 \\ 31 \\ 32 \\ 33 \\ 34 \\ 35 \\ 36 \\ 37 \\ 38 \\ 9 \\ 40 \\ 41 \\ 42 \\ 43 \\ 44 \\ 45 \end{array}$	220	2. Rosser BT, Taylor PA, Cix PA, Cluland R (1987) Methods for evaluating antibiotics on
	221	bacterial biofilms. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 31: 1502-1506.
	222	3. Mah T-FC, O'Toole GA. Mechanisms of biofilm resistance to antimicrobial agents
	223	(2001) Trends Microbiol 9: 34-39.
	224	4. Costerton JW, Lewandowski Z, Caldwell DE, Korber DR, Lappin-Scott HM (1995)
	225	Microbial biofilms. Ann Rev Microbiol 49: 711-745.
	226	5. Kunin CM, Steele C. Culture of the surfaces of urinary catheters to sample urethral
	227	flora and study the effect of antimicrobial therapy. J Clin Microbiol 1985 Jun; 21(6):
	228	902-8.
	229	6. Nickel JC, Ruseska I, Wright JB, Costerton JW (1985) Tobramycin resistance of
	230	Pseudomonas aeruginosa cells growing as a biofilm on urinary catheter materials.
	231	Antimicrob Agents Chemother 27: 619-624.
	232	7. Gristina AG, Hobgood CD, Webb LX, Myrvik QN. Adhesive colonisation of
	233	biomaterials and antibiotic resistance. Biomaterials 1987; 8: 423-426.
	234	8. Costerton JW, Khoury AE, Ward KH, Anwar H (1993) Practical measures to control
46 47	235	device-related bacterial infections. Int J Artif Org 16: 765-770.
48 49	236	9. Olson ME, Ceri H, Morck DW, Buret AG, Read RR. Biofilm bacteria: formation and
50 51	237	comparative susceptibility to antibiotics (2002) Can J Vet Res 66: 86-92.
52 53	238	10. Fierer J, Swancutt M. Non-typhoid Salmonella: a review (2000) Curr Clin Top Infect
54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63	239	Dis 20: 134-157.
64 65		

- 24011. Majtánová L, Majtán V (2009) Molecular characterization of the multidrug-resistant1222413phage types Salmonella enterica serovar typhimurium DT104, DT20A and DT12042425strains in the Slovakia. Microbiol Res 164:157-162/ Epub 2007.
- <sup>6</sup> 243
   <sup>7</sup> 243
   <sup>7</sup> 244
   <sup>9</sup> 245
   <sup>10</sup> 245
   <sup>10</sup> 11
   <sup>10</sup> 245
   <sup>10</sup> 12. Zogaj X, Nimtz M, Rohde M, Bokranz W, Romling U (2001) The multicellurar morphotypes of Salmonella typhimurium and Escherichia coli produce cellulose as the second component of the extracellular matrix. Mol Microbiol 39: 1452-1463.

- 246 13. Prouty AM, Schewesinger WH, Gunn JS (2002) Biofilm formation and interaction with
  247 the surfaces of gallstones by Salmonella spp. Infect Immun 70: 2640-2649.
- 248 14. Chandra J, Kuhn DM, Mukherjee PK, Hoyer L.L, Mccormick T, Ghannoum MA (2001)
  249 Biofilm formation by the fungal pathogen Candida albicans: development,
  250 architecture, and drug resistance. J Bacteriol 183: 5385-5394.
- 22<br/>2325115. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. Methods for dilution Antimicrobial24<br/>25252Susceptibility Tests for Bacteria That Grow Aerobically- Eighth edition: Approved26<br/>27253Standard M7-A8; 29:2. CLSI, Wayne, PA, USA, 2009.
  - 254 16. Ashby MJ, Neale JE, Knott SJ, Critchley IA (1994) Effect of antibiotics on non255 growing cells and biofilms of Escherichia coli. J Antimicrob Chemother 33:443-452.
- 32<br/>3325617. Duguid IG, Evans E, Brown MR, Gilbert P. Effect of biofilm culture upon the34<br/>35257susceptibility of Staphylococcus epidermidis to tobramycin. J Antimicrob Chemother36<br/>372581992 Dec;30(6): 803-10.
- 259
   259
   18. Evans DJ, Brown MR, Allison DG, Gilbert P. Susceptibility of bacterial biofilms to tobramycin: role of specific growth rate and phase in the division cycle. J Antimicrob
   261
   Chemother 1990 Apr; 25(4): 585-91.
- 262
   263
   46
   47
   263
   48
   49
   264
   19. Evans DJ, Brown MRW, Allison DG, Gilbert P. Susceptibility of Escherichia coli and Pseudomonas aeruginosa biofilms to ciprofloxacin: effect of specific growth rate
   (1991) J Antimicrob Chemother 27: 177-184.
- 5126520. Prescott JF, Bagott JD. Antimicrobial susceptibility testing and antimicrobial drug5253266dosage (1985) J Am Vet Med Assoc 187: 363-368.
- 267
   21. Gilbert P, Das J, Foley I. Biofilm susceptibility to antimicrobials (1997) Adv Dent Res
   268
   268
   11; 160-167.

	269	22. Brown MRW, Allison DG, Gilbert P (1988) Resistance of bacterial biofilms to
1 2	270	antibiotics: A growth rate related effect. J Antimicrob Chemother 22: 777-789.
3 4	271	23. Gilbert P, Collier PJ, Brown MRW. Influence of growth rate on susceptibility to
5 6	272	antimicrobial agents: biofilms, cell cycle and dormancy, and stringent response.
8	273	Antimicrob Agents Chemother.1990 Oct; 34(10): 1865-8. Review.
9 10	274	24. Prosser BT, Taylor B, Dix BA, Cleeland R. Method of evaluating effects of
11 12	275	antimicrobials upon bacterial biofilms (1987). Antimicrob Agents Chemother 31: 1502-
13 14 15	276	1506.
16 17	277	25. Gilbert P, Brown MRW. Screening for novel antimicrobial activity/compounds in the
18 19	278	pharmaceutical industry. In: Microbial quality assurance: a guide towards relevance
20 21	279	and reproducibility of inocula. Brown MRW, Gilbert P, editors. Boca Raton, FL: CRC
22 23	280	Press 1995; pp. 247-260.
24 25	281	
26 27	282	
28 29	283	
30 31	284	
32 33	285	
34 35	286	
36 37	287	
38 39	288	
40 41	289	
42 43	290	
44 45	291	
46 47	292	
48 49	293	
50 51	294	
52 53	295	
54 55 56	296	
50 57 58	297	
59 60 61 62 63 64	298	

	299			
1 2	300			
3 4	301			
5 6	302			
/ 8 0	303	Table 1. Distribution of serovars and biofilm	production among the Salmo	nella enterica
10	304	strains isolated from children with gastroente	ritie	
11	304	Strains isolated from children with gastroente		
12 13 14	305 306			
15 16		Salmonella enterica serovar	number of strains	biofilm positive
10 $17$		S. enteritidis	143	78
18		S. typhimurium	27	17
20		S. abony	3	0
21		S. oranienburg	3	3
22 23		S. II	2	1
24		S. muenchen	1	1
25 26		S. montevideo	1	1
27		S. Jagos	1	1
28 29		S goldcoast	1	0
30		S. blockley	1	1
31 32		S. thempson	1	1
33		S. mompson	1	1
34 35		S. newport	1	1
36		S. virchow	1	1
37 38		S. bardo	1	0
39		S. stanley	1	0
40 41		S. miami	1	1
42		S. haifa	2	1
43 44		S. bovismorbificans	1	0
45		rough strains	1	0
46 47		total	194	109
48	307			
49 50	308			
51 52	309			
53 54	310			
55 56	311			
57 58 59	312			
60 61 62 63 64 65	313			

Table 2. Antimicrobial resistance rates of planktonic and biofilm forms of Salmonella enterica strains isolated from children with gastroenteritis. P-values refer to the results of performing a hypothesis test concerning the difference between the two proportions

(using normal approximation).

Antimicrobial	Planktonic	Biofilm	Р
Ampicillin	12,8%	84,4%	0.000
Gentamicin	0%	89,9%	0.000
Coamoxiclav	0%	51,4%	0.000
Cotrimoxazole	0,9%	63,3%	0.000
Cefuroxime	7,4%	63,3%	0.000
Cefotaxime	0,9%	23,8%	0.000
Imipenem	0%	7,3%	0.004
Ciprofloxacin	0%	2,8%	0.008
Moxifloxacin	0%	2,8%	0.008

54	
55	
56	

Table 3.  $MIC_{50}$  and  $MIC_{90}$  of the antimicrobials for the planktonic and  $MICBR_{50}$  and MICBR<sub>90</sub> of the biofilm forms of Salmonella enterica isolates.

Antimicrobial	mg/l		mg/l		Breakpoints (susceptible)
	planktonic MIC₅₀	biofilm MICBR <sub>50</sub>	planktonic MIC <sub>90</sub>	biofilm MICBR <sub>90</sub>	
Ampicillin	≤ 2	≥ 64	≥ 32	≥ 64	≤ 8
Coamoxiclav	≤ 2	32	4	64	≤ 8
Cefuroxime	4	32	8	64	≤ 8
Cefotaxime	≤ 1	8	≤ 1	64	≤ 8
Gentamicin	≤ 1	16	≤ 1	32	≤ 4
Imipenem	≤1	4	≤ 1	8	≤ 4
Cotrimoxazole	≤ 20	160	≤ 20	320	<b>≤ 40</b>
Ciprofloxacin	≤ 0,25	1	≤ 0,25	2	≤ 1
Moxifloxacin	≤ 0,25	1	1	2	≤ 1