



## MICROBIAL PROFILE AND ANTIBIOTIC SUSCEPTIBILITY OF BACTERIAL PATHOGENS ISOLATED FROM PAPER CURRENCIES CIRCULATING IN SOME RESTAURANTS AND BUTCHERIES IN HAWASSA, SIDAMA, ETHIOPIA, 2020-21

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| May Tut                  | Dept.of Biology, Gambella University, Ethiopia       |
| Prof. Dr. Abraham Mikru  | Dept.of Biology, Hawassa University, Ethiopia        |
| Tiruha Habte             | Dept.of Biology, Hawassa University, Ethiopia        |
| Prof. Surender Reddy     | Dept.of Public Health, Gambella University, Ethiopia |
| P, Dr. Harshitha Pulluri | Resident, Medicover Hospitals Hyderabad, India       |

### ABSTRACT

Currency notes could play a significant role in transmitting pathogenic microorganisms amongst individuals in the society. This study was aimed to determine the microbial profile and Antibiotic susceptibility of bacterial pathogens isolated from Ethiopian paper notes in circulation. 64 currency paper notes of different denomination were tested for bacterial contamination using standard microbiological methods. Antibiotic susceptibility profiles of the isolates were determined with approved methods. Results were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Overall mean AMBC was 4.08 log units, with the highest 6.58 log units recorded from denomination 5 followed by 4.50, 3.03, 2.20 log units from denominations 10, 50 and 100 respectively. Total Coliforms (TC) displayed the same pattern with the highest mean counts of 6.52 log units, from denomination 5 and lowest counts of 2.19 log units from denomination 100. Out of 64 currency notes, 35 (54.7%) were contaminated with bacteria. The predominant bacteria isolates were *E. coli* (60.5%), *Salmonella* spp. (23.6%) and *Shigella* spp. (13.2%). Each isolate was resistant to four or more antibiotics tested. All isolates were resistant against Cefepime and Tetracycline and sensitive to Ceftriaxone. This study revealed that currency notes are contaminated with pathogenic bacteria and in most cases these bacterial isolates were resistant to commonly prescribed antibiotics. Therefore, contaminated notes are identified as potential public health threat, because pathogens can be spread by circulating the notes and become source of infection. Awareness creation is important among public in this regard.

**KEYWORDS :** Aerobic mesophilic bacteria, *E. coli*, Hawassa, microbial contamination, *Salmonella*, *Shigella*

### INTRODUCTION

#### Background of the Study:

Paper currency is one of the items most frequently passed from hand to hand globally. During passage, money can get contaminated and may play a role in the transmission of microorganisms among people. Microorganisms spread from person to person via the surface of paper currency (Pope *et al.*, 2002; Umeh *et al.*, 2007). The contamination of currencies by pathogenic microorganisms is much of public health concern as they can be sources of transmission of microorganisms.

Currencies are widely used and each currency is exchanged many times. If some of these currency notes are contaminated with pathogenic microorganisms, there is a potential to spread these microbes (Ahmed *et al.*, 2010).

Paper currencies are often contaminated with pathogens through counting using saliva, coughing, sneezing on hands followed by exchanging currency, placement, storage on dirty surfaces, and poor hand washing after using toilet, thus serves as a vehicle to spread microorganisms to the next user (Barolia *et al.*, 2011; Ngwai *et al.*, 2011). Lamichane *et al.*, (2009) reported that microbial contamination rate of currency is variable; handled by butchers (78.0 %) and food sellers (62.1 %).

A study conducted in Nigeria Naira (Nigerian currency) by Umeh *et al.*, (2007) indicated the isolation of *E. coli* (80%), *Aerobacter* (59%), *Salmonella* (31.8%), *Enterococcus faecalis* (31.8%), *S. aureus* (27.3%), and coagulase negative staphylococci (18.2%). Saeed and Rasheed (2011) reported from Pakistan that Rupee currency notes harbored by *Bacillus* spp. (49.3%), *Micrococcus sadentarius* (19.7%), *E. coli* (14.1%), *S. aureus* (4.9%), *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (2.8%), and coagulase negative staphylococci (4.2%).

The problem of spread of pathogenic microorganisms through currency notes is compounded by the emergence of multidrug resistant pathogens. Antibiotics resistance is recently a global issue of disease and death as a result of treatment failures and increased health care costs (WHO, 2018). While antibiotics resistance has steadily been increasing, e.g., with Extended Spectrum of Beta Lactamases producing *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella* spp. contaminated banknotes and coins contribute to the transmission of these multidrug resistant microorganisms (Gedik *et al.*, 2010).

In Ethiopia, few published studies indicated the microbial colonization of currency notes. In one study done in Jimma, Ethiopia, Girma *et al.* (2014) reported that *Staphylococcus* spp. (34.06%), *Bacillus* spp. (31.88%), *Enterobacteriaceae* spp. (13.39%), *Micrococcus* spp. (9.55%) and *Streptococcus* spp. (9.03%) were isolated from Ethiopian paper currency. Solomon (2015) from Debre Marcos town, Ethiopia indicated seven different types of bacterial species such as *Staphylococcus aureus* (26%), *Escherichia coli* (24%), *Enterobacter* spp. (12%), *Salmonella* spp. (10%), *Klebsiella* species (8%), *Pseudomonas* spp. (6%) and *Shigella* spp. (5%). However, studies of the contamination of currency notes with microbial agents is lacking in southern Ethiopia, especially in Hawassa city. Awareness of the microbial diversity of currency notes in circulation can provide the idea of health awareness in people during currency handling and effective control of infection transmission. Hence, this study was initiated with the objective of identifying microbial contamination of currency notes circulating in some restaurants and butcheries and the antibiotics susceptibility profiles of the pathogenic isolates.

#### Statement of the Problem:

Microorganisms are ubiquitous on living and nonliving things including on currency notes that frequently circulating among



recommended procedures according to the manufacturer (Hi media, India depending on the labels on the media packaging bottle).

**Aerobic Mesophilic Bacteria Count (AMBC):**

From appropriate serial dilutions prepared in 3.5 above, 0.1ml aliquots were aseptically transferred into plate count agar (PCA, Hi media, India) and spread plated with sterile bent glass rod. The inoculated plates were incubated at 37°C for 48 to 72 hrs. At the end of the incubation, plates having between 30 and 300 colonies were selected to calculate the average AMBC. A digital colony counter with magnifying glass was used to count the colonies.

**Total Coliform Count:**

Appropriate dilutions were inoculated by pour plating on to VRBA plates and incubated at 37 °C for 48 hr. At the end of the incubation plates with typical pink colonies from countable plates were used to calculate the colony forming unit (cfu) using the following formula:

To calculate the average load from multiple plates the following formulae was used:

$$N = \frac{\text{Sum of all colonies from all plates with countable plates}}{(N_1 + 0.1N_2)D}$$

(N<sub>1</sub> + 0.1N<sub>2</sub>)D

**Where:** N<sub>1</sub> is the number of plates with countable colonies in the first dilutions, N<sub>2</sub> is the number of plates with countable colonies in the second dilution; D is the dilution factor corresponding to the first dilution. Final values were transformed into log<sub>10</sub> units for ease of manipulations.

**Screening and Detection of *Escherichia coli*:**

From the plates used for TCC in 3.7 above three to five well isolated colonies were purified by repeated sub-culturing. The pure isolates were then streaked onto plates of Eosin methylene blue agar and MacConkey and also subjected to the IMViC biochemical test. Isolates that showed black colonies with green metallic sheen on EMB agar and pink colonies on MacConkey agar plates, positive for indole and methyl red test but negative for Voges Proskauer and citrate utilization test were identified as *E. coli*.

**Detection of *Salmonella* Species:**

To detect *Salmonella* species a loop full of the rinsate from each sample of currency was directly streaked on to XLD agar plates. In order to resuscitate metabolically injured cells, streaking on the same media was also done after overnight culture of 0.1 ml aliquots of the rinsate into a tube containing 5 ml of sterile nutrient broth. All plates were incubated at 37 °C for 48 h and at the end of the incubation typical colonies (black) were picked and purified by repeated sub-culturing. Purified presumptive *Salmonellae* isolates were subjected to selected biochemical tests for confirmation by inoculation into sulfide – indole – motility (SIM) agar, triple sugar iron (TSI), Urea agar. *Salmonella* species are gram negative small rods, hydrogen sulfide positive, indole negative, motile, and non-lactose fermenters (Andrews, 1992; Aslanzadeh, 2006).

**Determination of Antibiotic susceptibility**

Profiles of Potentially Pathogenic Isolates:Antibiotic susceptibility testing of putative pathogenic isolates was performed using Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion method on Muller Hinton agar plates as per the National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI, 2020).

The antibiotic discs used were: Azithromycin (15µg), Amoxicillin/clavulanic acid (30µg), Cefazolin (30µg), Ampicillin (10µg), Meropenem (10µg), Tetracycline (30 µg), Ertapenem (10µg), Cefotaxime (30µg), Ceftriaxone (30µg), Nalidixic acid (30µg), Cefepime (30µg), Chloramphenicol

(30µg), Erythromycin (15µg), Gentamycin (10µg), Cefuroxime (30µg), and Sulfamethoxazole (5µg).

Each test isolate was refreshed by streaking on nutrient agar plates and incubated overnight at 37°C. Well-isolated single colony was selected and emulsified in 5ml sterile normal saline solution in a sterile test tube. The turbidity of the suspension was adjusted to the density of a barium chloride standard (0.5 McFarland) in order to standardize the size of inoculum. A sterile cotton swab was dipped into the standardized suspension of the bacterial culture, squeezed against the sides of the test tube to remove the excess fluid and inoculated onto Mueller-Hinton agar and allowed to dry the flood. Thereafter, antibiotic discs were placed on the Medium with forceps and gently pressed down to ensure firm contact. The plates were then allowed to stand for 30 minutes for diffusion of active substance of the agents.

Plates were inverted and incubated at 35-37°C for 24 hrs. At the end of the incubation the inhibition zone diameter of each antimicrobial was then measured using graduated ruler and interpreted as 'Resistant', 'Intermediate' and 'Sensitive' by comparing with standard chart (CLSI, 2020).

**Data Analysis:**

All data were recorded and analyzed in Microsoft excel 2010 and SPSS version 23. Data were summarized and presented in tables depicting frequencies and percentages. The average microbial load between currency denominations as well as among the restaurants and butcheries were compared using one-way ANOVA and p values less than 0.05 was used as cut of point to determine statistical significance.

**RESULTS**

**The microbial load of the paper currency samples:**

The average microbial load of the currency samples in general was highest for the lowest denomination both in terms of the average aerobic mesophilic bacterial count (AMBC) and total coliform count (TCC). The overall average microbial load of AMBC and TCC was 3.76 and 3.74 log unit respectively. The mean AMBC of the currency samples from the restaurants ranging from: 6.09 log units for ETB5, 4 log units for ETB10, 3.46 for ETB50 and 1.49 log units for ETB100 (Table 1). The mean TCC of the same samples was also in the order of ETB5 (6.04 log units) > ETB10 (3.99 log units) > ETB50 (3.44 log units) > ETB100 (1.48 log units).

The overall mean AMBC and TCC of the currency samples from butcheries were 4.39 and 4.36 log units respectively (Table 1). These values were higher than that of the currency samples from the restaurants. The same pattern of mean microbial load (both for AMBC and TCC) was detected as before in that: 7.07 log units was recorded from Ethiopian birr five (ETB5), followed by 5.00 log units for ETB10, 2.60 for ETB50 and 2.9 log units for ETB100 respectively (Table 1). Similarly, the mean TCC of the same samples also declined in the directions ETB5 (7.00 log units) > ETB10 (4.98 log units) > ETB50 (2.58 log units) > ETB100 (2.90 log units).

**Table 1:** The average microbial load in log<sub>10</sub> CFU ml<sup>-1</sup> of rinsates of paper currencies by type of denominations and sampling sites in Hawassa city, Sidama region, Ethiopia.

| Colony Group          | Samples Sites | Denomination |       |       |        | Average Mean (log CFU/ml) |
|-----------------------|---------------|--------------|-------|-------|--------|---------------------------|
|                       |               | ETB5         | ETB10 | ETB50 | ETB100 |                           |
| AMBC                  | Restaurants   | 6.09         | 4.00  | 3.46  | 1.49   | 3.76                      |
|                       | Butcheries    | 7.07         | 5.00  | 2.60  | 2.90   | 4.39                      |
| Denomination averages |               | 6.58         | 4.5   | 3.03  | 2.20   | 4.08                      |
| TCC                   | Restaurants   | 6.04         | 3.99  | 3.44  | 1.48   | 3.74                      |
|                       | Butcheries    | 7.00         | 4.98  | 2.58  | 2.90   | 4.36                      |
| Denomination averages |               | 6.52         | 4.49  | 3.01  | 2.19   | 4.05                      |

AMBC = aerobic mesophilic bacterial count, TCC= total coliform count, ETB = Ethiopian Birr, CFU = Colony forming unit

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the average microbial load values of the currencies among the different denominations and between the sampling sources (See appendix Table). There was a significant difference in mean microbial loads of currencies samples of the four denominations with regards to mean AMBC [F (3, 60) = 4.853, p = 0.004 as well as mean TCC values [F (3, 6) = 4.490, p = 0.007]]. However, there was no statistically significant difference between the mean microbial loads of currencies samples of all denominations from Restaurants and that of from the Butcheries with regards to both AMBC [F (1, 62) = 0.440), p = 0.510 and TCC [F (1, 62) = 0.351), p = 0.556]].

Post hoc comparisons using Turkey test were carried out. There was a significant difference between ETB5 and ETB50 (p = 0.028) and there was also a significant difference between ETB5 and ETB100 (p = 0.004). Microbial loads of AMBC on ETB5 was on average 3.55 log units more than those on ETB50 and microbial loads of AMBC on ETB5 was on average 4.38 log units more than on ETB100 respectively. Similarly, there was a significant difference between ETB5 and ETB50 (p = 0.031) and there was also a significant difference between ETB5 and ETB100 (p = 0.007). Microbial loads of TCC on ETB5 was on average 3.51 log units more than those on ETB50 and microbial loads of TCC on ETB5 was on average 4.20 log units more than on ETB100 respectively. (see in appendix the SPSS results).

**Common bacterial pathogens isolated from the surface of currency samples :**

Out of the total 64 currency notes analyzed in the present study, 35 (54.7%) were contaminated with different species of bacteria. Of these, 38 bacterial isolates were recovered from currency samples which were putatively identified into 3 different types of bacterial genera or species (Table 3) consisting of 23 (60.5%) *E.coli*, 10 (26.3%) *Salmonella* spp. and 5 (13.2%) *Shigella* Spp. (Table 2). The majority of the isolates were recovered from currencies collected from the butcheries (20 of 38 or 52.6%) while 47.4% (18 of 38) were isolated that from Restaurants. The predominant bacteria recovered from the currencies in the restaurants were isolates related to *E.coli* (13 of 38 or 34.2%), followed by those related to *Salmonella* spp. (3/38 or 7.8%) and *Shigella* spp (2/38 or 5.3%). Likewise, 10(26.3%) *E.coli*, 7(18.4%), *Salmonella* spp., and 3(7.8%) *Shigella* spp. were isolated from the currencies in the butcheries (Table 2).

**Table 2:** Frequency of bacterial Isolates from samples of four denomination currencies with respect to their sampling sources (Restaurants and Butcheries) in Hawassa City.

| Source                 | Denomination          | E. coli   | Salmonella | Shigella | Total     |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------|
| Restaurants            | ETB5                  | 5         | 1          | 1        | 7         |
|                        | ETB10                 | 4         | 1          | 1        | 6         |
|                        | ETB50                 | 3         | 0          | 0        | 3         |
|                        | ETB100                | 1         | 1          | 0        | 2         |
| Total from restaurants |                       | 13(34.2%) | 3(7.8%)    | 2(5.3%)  | 18(47.4%) |
| Butcheries             | ETB5                  | 3         | 3          | 1        | 7         |
|                        | ETB10                 | 2         | 2          | 0        | 4         |
|                        | ETB50                 | 3         | 1          | 1        | 5         |
|                        | ETB100                | 2         | 1          | 1        | 4         |
|                        | Total from butcheries |           | 10(26.3%)  | 7(18.4%) | 3(7.8%)   |
| Grand Total            |                       | 23(60.5%) | 10(26.3%)  | 5(13.2%) | 38(100%)  |

**Antibiotic susceptibility profiles of potentially pathogenic isolates:**

All of the 38 putatively identified bacterial pathogens were subjected to drug sensitivity testing to 16 different antibiotics. All of the isolates showed resistance to four or more of the antibiotics tested (Table 3). Among the 23 *E. coli* isolates tested, 11(47.83%) showed resistance to six of the antimicrobials, five (21.74%) showed to seven antibiotics and four (17.39%) showed to eight antibiotics and one (4.35) isolate to nine antibiotics (Table 3). All of the 23 *E. coli* isolates were resistant to Cefepime (FEP) and Tetracycline (TE) but were sensitive to Ceftriaxone (CRO), Cefotaxime (CTX), Ertapenem (ETP) and Nalidixic acid (Table 4).

With regards to *Salmonella* species, all the isolates were resistant to five or more of the 16 antibiotics tested (Table 3). Half of the ten isolates (50%) related to *Salmonella* species were resistant to five of the drugs, and four (40%) were resistant to seven or more of the drugs tested (Table 3). All of the isolates related to *Salmonella* species were resistant to Erythromycin (ERY), Cefepime (FEP), and Tetracycline (TE), but sensitive to Ceftriaxone (CRO) and Nalidixic acid (NA). More over 90% of the *Salmonella* isolates were also sensitive to Ampicillin (AMP), Augmentin (AUG), Gentamycin (CN), Ertapenem (ETP), Meropenem (MEM) and SXT -Sulfa methoxazole-Trimethoprim (Table 4).

Likewise, all of the five isolates related to *Shigella* species were resistant to seven or more of the antibiotics tested and two showed resistance to eight and 11 of the antibiotics tested (Table 3). All were resistant to AMP, CTX, Cefazolin (CZ), ERY, FEP and TE but sensitive to AUG, CRO, MEM and SXT.

**Table 3:** The frequency distribution of resistant isolates to multiple antibiotics among three types of bacterial genera recovered from currencies circulating in Hawassa city

| Multiplicity of resistance | E. coli (n = 23) |       | Salmonella sp (n = 10) |    | Shigella sp (n = 5) |    |
|----------------------------|------------------|-------|------------------------|----|---------------------|----|
|                            | Freq             | %     | Freq                   | %  | Freq                | %  |
| 4 antibiotics              | 1                | 4.35  | 0                      | 0  | 0                   | 0  |
| 5 antibiotics              | 1                | 4.35  | 5                      | 50 | 0                   | 0  |
| 6 antibiotics              | 11               | 47.83 | 1                      | 10 | 0                   | 0  |
| 7 antibiotics              | 5                | 21.74 | 2                      | 20 | 3                   | 60 |
| 8 antibiotics              | 4                | 17.39 | 1                      | 10 | 1                   | 20 |
| 9 antibiotics              | 1                | 4.35  | 1                      | 10 | 0                   | 0  |
| > 9 antibiotics            | 0                | 0     | 0                      | 0  | 1                   | 20 |

Freq = Frequency, E. coli = Escherichia coli, sp = species, n = number of isolates

**Table 4:** The percentage distribution and sensitivity pattern of isolates to 16 drugs among three bacterial genera recovered from currencies circulating in Hawassa city

| Type of Antibiotic (n = 16) | E. coli (n = 23) |     |     | Salmonella sp (n = 10) |     |     | Shigella sp (n = 5) |     |     |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-----|-----|------------------------|-----|-----|---------------------|-----|-----|
|                             | R %              | S % | I % | R %                    | S % | I % | R %                 | S % | I % |
| AMP                         | 30               | 70  | 0   | 10                     | 90  | 0   | 100                 | 0   | 0   |
| AZM                         | 74               | 26  | 0   | 20                     | 80  | 0   | 20                  | 80  | 0   |
| AUG                         | 74               | 26  | 0   | 10                     | 90  | 0   | 0                   | 100 | 0   |
| C                           | 13               | 87  | 0   | 20                     | 70  | 10  | 40                  | 20  | 40  |
| CN                          | 74               | 26  | 0   | 10                     | 90  | 0   | 40                  | 60  | 0   |
| CRO                         | 0                | 100 | 0   | 0                      | 100 | 0   | 0                   | 100 | 0   |
| CTX                         | 0                | 100 | 0   | 90                     | 10  | 0   | 100                 | 0   | 0   |
| CXM                         | 22               | 48  | 30  | 20                     | 40  | 40  | 80                  | 20  | 0   |
| CZ                          | 78               | 2   | 0   | 90                     | 10  | 0   | 100                 | 0   | 0   |
| ETP                         | 0                | 100 | 0   | 10                     | 90  | 0   | 0                   | 80  | 20  |
| ERY                         | 83               | 17  | 0   | 100                    | 0   | 0   | 100                 | 0   | 0   |
| FEP                         | 100              | 0   | 0   | 100                    | 0   | 0   | 100                 | 0   | 0   |
| MEM                         | 0                | 96  | 4   | 10                     | 90  | 0   | 0                   | 100 | 0   |
| NA                          | 0                | 100 | 0   | 0                      | 100 | 0   | 20                  | 80  | 0   |

|     |     |    |   |     |    |   |     |     |   |
|-----|-----|----|---|-----|----|---|-----|-----|---|
| SXT | 9   | 91 | 0 | 10  | 90 | 0 | 0   | 100 | 0 |
| TE  | 100 | 0  | 0 | 100 | 0  | 0 | 100 | 0   | 0 |

AMP-ampicillin, AUG-Augmentin, AZM-Azithromycin, C-Chloramphenicol, CN-Gentamycin, CRO-Ceftriaxone, CTX-Cefotaxime, CXM-Cefuroxime, CZ-Cefazolin, ERY-Erythromycin, ETP-Ertapenem, FEP-Cefepime, MEM-Meropenem, NA-Nalidixic acid, SXT-Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole, TE-Tetracycline

## DISCUSSION

Paper Currencies are often handled by various hands with different hygienic level, and could mediate as vectors of various pathogens for the transmission of potential pathogens among people. The isolation of bacteria from currency notes analyzed by this study showed that currency notes could play a potential role in the transmission of pathogenic microorganisms in the community.

Currency samples (notes) analyzed in the present study indicated different level of microbial loads with some denominations showing high counts and others lower counts. Thus, the lower denominations showed higher level of microbial contamination in line with the findings of different researchers (Bhat *et al.*, 2010; Alemayehu and Ashenafi, 2019). This indirectly showed that the currency notes are more frequently passed from different hands among the society.

The overall mean microbial loads for aerobic mesophilic bacterial count of ETB5 was 6.58 log units which was higher than mean microbial loads of other denominations for AMBC. Likewise, mean microbial for AMBC of ETB10 was 4.50 log units. With regard to averages microbial loads for AMBC of ETB50 and ETB100 were 3.03 and 2.20 log units respectively. These mean microbial loads for AMBC of each denomination in this study was higher than the averages aerobic mesophilic bacteria count from similar study conducted in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia by Alemayehu and Ashenafi, (2019) which indicated 1.82 log units for ETB5, 2.35 log units for ETB10, 1.79 log units for ETB50, and 1.57 log units for ETB100 respectively.

This study showed that the average microbial loads for AMBC was much lower than the ones reported from Jimma town, Ethiopia which showed 6.83, 7.68, 4.72, and 4.66 log units for ETBs 5, 10, 50, and 100 respectively (Girma *et al.*, 2014). The presence of high mean aerobic mesophilic bacterial count in this study could be linked to the frequency exchange of these currencies amongst the majority of the people i.e. lower denominations are more frequently passed through more hand during daily activities than the higher denominations.

The average microbial loads for total coliform count of ETB5 was 6.52 log units which was higher than 3.25 log units counted from Ethiopian birr five in Jimma town (Girma *et al.*, (2014) and much higher than the 0.82 log units count for the same currency reported by Alemayehu and Ashenafi, (2019) from Addis Ababa.

On the other hand, mean microbial loads for TCC of Ethiopian birr ten, fifty and hundred were 4.49, 3.01, and 2.19 log units. These results were much higher than the 0.83, 0.60, and 0.71 log units for ETBs 10, 50, and 100, respectively recorded from a similar study in Addis Ababa. Girma *et al.*, (2014) reported mean microbial loads of 4.09, 1.64, and 1.52 log units, for TCC of ETBs 10, 50, and 100, respectively. However, detection of total coliforms on currency notes indicated the lack of proper hand washing practice after using toilet among food handlers.

The mean microbial loads of the currency samples in this study decreased with denominations from ETB5 to ETB100. Similar results were obtained from the study done in Ghana that indicated the decline in the mean microbial loads on

Ghanaian Cedi from Cedi one to Cedi ten (Feglo and Nkanasah, 2010).

The mean microbial loads for AMBC of currency samples collected from both restaurants and butcheries were 3.76 and 4.39 log units respectively. Likewise, the average microbial loads for TCC were recorded as 3.74 and 4.36 log units of all currency samples collected from both restaurants and butcheries respectively. Thus, microbial loads were higher in butcheries than in restaurants of all currency samples analyzed. This study was in agreement with study conducted in Nekemte town, Ethiopia by Olijira and Kenasa, (2018) which indicated the higher microbial loads in Butchers than from restaurant workers.

Statistically significant difference in the microbial loads between currency notes of different denominations was observed between ETB5 and ETB50 as well as between ETB5 and ETB100. But there was no statistically significant difference observed between ETB5 and ETB10, ETB10 and ETB50, ETB10 and ETB100, ETB50 and ETB100 as well as between restaurants and butcheries.

Moreover, various reports showed that each denomination has direct association with degree of contamination as lower denomination notes had showed the most contaminations as reported by Moosavy *et al.*, (2013) from Iran, Girma *et al.*, (2014) from Jimma, Ethiopia, Alemayehu and Ashenafi, (2019) from Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and Sunil *et al.*, (2020) from India. Hence, this study showed that lower denomination of Ethiopian currency notes (ETB5 and ETB10 notes) had the higher contamination than the higher denomination (ETB50 and ETB100 notes). This could be the fact that lower denominations are more frequently passed through more hand during daily activities than the higher denominations.

In the present study, bacterial pathogens such as *E.coli*, *Salmonella* and *Shigella* were isolated on currency samples (ETB) of different denominations (ETBs 5, 10, 50, and 100). Likewise, various types of pathogenic bacteria including *Escherichia coli*, *Staphylococcus* spp., *Bacillus*, *Klebsiella*, *Streptococcus*, *Serratia*, *Salmonella*, *Pseudomonas*, *Citrobacter*, *Shigella*, *Listeria* etc. were reported from Aksum, Northern Ethiopia (Saripalli *et al.*, 2014). Similar pattern of pathogens were also reported from Nekemte town, Ethiopia by Olijira and Kenasa, (2018) which includes *Escherichia coli*, *Staphylococcus* spp., *Bacillus*, *Klebsiella*, *Streptococcus*, *Salmonella*, *Pseudomonas*, *Shigella*. *Bacillus* species, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Enterococcus faecalis*, *Citrobacter freundii*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Shigella dysenteriae* and *Escherichia coli* were recovered from Ghanaian Cedi in Ghana by Feglo and Nkanasah, 2010. Studies on the determination of pathogens on paper currency showed that currency notes are considered as a potential cause of food-borne diseases (Alemlu, 2014).

There are evidences of isolation of food-borne pathogens including *Salmonella* spp. *E. coli* and *S. aureus* from the banknotes of different countries (Vriesekoop *et al.*, 2010). The detection of *salmonella*, *Shigella* and *E.coli* on currency notes could suggest fecal contamination following poor hygienic practice.

The outcome of the present study revealed that 54.7% of the currency samples were contaminated. Based on cultural morphology and biochemical characteristics of the isolates, this revealed three different types of bacteria genera which account for 60.5% *E.coli*, 26.3% *Salmonella* sp., and 13.2% *Shigella* sp. The contamination rates of currency notes with these genera in this study was higher than the contamination rates from study conducted in Debre markos town, Ethiopia which showed 24% *E.coli*, 10% *salmonella*, 5% *Shigella* rates of contamination (Solomon, 2015).

This study was almost similar to study conducted in Dhaka, Bangladesh that showed *E.coli* (58%) and *Salmonella* Sp. (15%) (Ahmed *et al.*, 2010). The contamination rate of *E.coli* (60.5%) in this study was lower than the report from Haramaya, Ethiopia which indicated 75% *E.coli* on currency notes (Hiko *et al.*, 2016).

This study also showed that only 38 bacterial isolates were recovered from surface 64 currency samples analyzed. All the contaminated notes were found to be contaminated with each bacterial isolates. Among these isolates only three different types of bacteria genera or species and Gram-negative bacteria were obtained. Similar results were obtained from study conducted in Nigeria which yielded a total of three different species from Nigerian Naira (Barua *et al.*, 2019 and Ofoedu *et al.*, 2021). However, studies from other parts of Ethiopia had more species with five and nine different species respectively (Girma *et al.*, 2014 and Olijira and Kenasa, 2018). Other studies conducted in different countries such as India (Sulathangam *et al.*, 2016), Bangladesh (Ahmed *et al.*, 2010), and Zambia (Chauwa *et al.*, 2020 showed more species with Six, seven, and eight respectively. The different in the results obtained from this study with other studies could be the factors such as sample size and methods used for isolation of bacteria.

Currently, antimicrobial resistance has become a serious issue throughout the world. Indiscriminate uses of antibiotics leads to treatment failure and augment health cost (Sharma and Dhanashree, 2011). Since currency notes are commonly contaminated with pathogenic microorganisms in circulation, of which most of them are resistant to commonly used antibiotics reported somewhere else (Ayandele and Adeniyi, 2011 and Barua *et al.*, 2019). Transmission of these antibiotic resistance microorganisms from one individual to another through currency notes could leads to public health threats.

Of the 16 different antibiotic agents tested for susceptibility pattern in this study, a higher level of resistance was recorded to Tetracycline, Cefazolin, Cefepime and Erythromycin. Noting that antibiotic likes Cefepime and Tetracycline were not effective against all isolates (*E. coli* isolates, *Salmonella* spp., isolates and *Shigella* spp., isolates) whereas sensitivity were seen in Ceftriaxone.

Most *E. coli* isolates were 74% resistant to Azithromycin, Augmentin, and Gentamycin, 78% to Cefazolin, 83% to Erythromycin, 100% to Cefepime and Tetracycline but 100% susceptible to Ceftriaxone, Cefotaxime, Ertapenem, and Nalidixic acid, 70% to ampicillin, 87% to chloramphenicol, 96% to Meropenem and 91% to Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole. With regard to resistant of *Salmonella* sp., the highest resistant of 90% was observed in Cefazolin and Cefotaxime, and 100% in Erythromycin, Cefepime and Tetracycline respectively but 90% susceptible to ampicillin, Augmentin, Gentamycin, Ertapenem, Meropenem and Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole, and 100% to Ceftriaxone and Nalidixic acid. Likewise, *Shigella* sp. isolates were 100% resistant to Ampicillin, Cefotaxime, Erythromycin, Tetracycline and 80% resistant to Cefuroxime. However, these isolates were 100% sensitive to Meropenem, Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole, Ceftriaxone and Augmentin, 80% to Azithromycin, and Ertapenem. Similar pattern of antibiotics resistance was observed in Ghana where all isolates showed 100% resistant to Tetracycline (Dekugmen, 2020).

Multidrug resistant pattern in the present study showed that each isolates have a resistant pattern with at least four or more drugs of antibiotics tested. This study was in agreement with the study conducted in Sudan which indicated the resistant pattern of each isolates with at least four or more drugs (Alfadil *et al.*, 2018). This was almost in line with another study done in Nigeria that showed each isolates have a resistant

pattern with at least six or more drugs (Unko *et al.*, 2017). Therefore, currency notes could play an important role in spreading of multidrug resistant pathogens. Multi drug resistant bacteria represent a major risk to human health in linking to bacterial contamination and disease. The results from this study showed that currency notes in circulation are contaminated with potential pathogenic bacteria, as results one or more isolates were resistant to commonly prescribed antibiotics which may signify threats to individuals handling currency notes.

## CONCLUSION

It is generally noted that currency samples are loaded with bacterial groups like aerobic mesophilic bacterial count and total coliform counts. However, the microbial loads were varied based on sample sources and denomination types. Therefore, the overall mean AMBC and TCC were 4.08 log and 4.05 log units, respectively. Moreover, three different genera; *E. coli* species (60.5%), *Salmonella* species (23.6%), and *Shigella* species (13.2%) were isolated from the different denominations, the majority of them from lower denominations which are frequently exchanged from hand to hand. Based on antibiotic susceptibility pattern, most isolates showed resistance to higher level of Tetracycline, Cefazolin, Cefepime and Erythromycin, and were susceptible to Ceftriaxone. In general, the present study demonstrated that currency notes circulating in Hawassa are contaminated with potentially pathogenic bacteria that could transmit different diseases. This contamination could play a vital role in the transmission of disease in the community and may also cause spreading of antibiotic resistance pathogens.

## Recommendations

- Personal hygiene to reduce the risk of contamination is recommended especially for those who simultaneously handle food and money.
- There should be public awareness of the fact that currency notes might be source of infection and could be hazardous for health.
- Replacement of the traditional methods of trading with electronic money transactions would be good for the ease of problem.
- Further investigation of bacteria on the surface of currency notes is needed by employing necessary methods to isolates all types of bacteria that are able to survive on the surface of currency notes, especially Gram-positive bacteria which are not isolated in this study

## REFERENCES

1. Abid H. S. 2012. Bacterial Contamination of Iraqi Paper Currency Notes in Circulation & Resistance of Pathogenic Bacteria to Antibiotics. *Iraqi Journal of Science*, 53(1):245-8.
2. Adem Hiko, Kasahun Abdata, Yimer Muktar, Mezene Woyesa and Abdela Mohammed. 2016. Contamination of Ethiopian paper currency notes from various food handlers with *E. coli*. *Springer Plus*, 5:1065.
3. Ahmed S. U., Parveen S., Nasreen T., and Feroza B. 2010. Evaluation of microbial contamination of Bangladesh paper currency notes (Taka) in circulation. *Advance in Biol. Res.*, 4(5):266-271.
4. Akond M. A., Alam S., Zohora F. T., Mutahara M., Rashed N., and Momena S. 2015. Assessment of bacterial contamination of paper currency notes in Bangladesh. *Env'tal. Sci. an Indian J.*, 10(3):114-120.
5. Alemayehu H. and Ashenafi M. 2019. Microbial load of Ethiopian currency notes collected from various sources. *Int. J. Adv. Res. Biol. Sci.* 6(4): 119-126.
6. Alemu A. 2014. Microbial contamination of currency notes and coins in circulation: a potential public health hazard. *Biomed. Biotechnol.* 2(3):46-53.
7. Alfadil A. N., Mohamed M. S., Ali M. M., and El Nima E. I. 2018. Characterization of Pathogenic Bacteria Isolated from Sudanese Banknotes and Determination of Their Resistance Profile. *International Journal of Microbiology*, 2018:7.
8. Alwakeel S. S., and Nasser L. 2011. Bacterial and fungal contamination of Saudi Arabian paper currency and cell phones. *Asian J. Biol. Sci.*, 4:556-562.
9. Andrews W. 1992. Manuals of food quality control. 4. Microbiological analysis. FAO, Rome 1992; Food and nutrition paper 14/4, Rev. 1
10. Aslanzadeh J. (2006). Biochemical profile-based microbial identification system.in: Tang YW and Stratton CW (ditors). Advanced techniques in diagnostic microbiology. Springer.com USA, pp 84-116.
11. Assefa Getachew, Abinet Alemayehu, and Alemu Tadesse. 2009. Socio-Economic & Geo-Spatial Data Analysis and Dissemination Core Work Process. Socio-Economic Profile. Hawassa, Ethiopia.
12. Awe S., Eniola K. T., Ojo F. T., and Sani A. 2010. Bacteriological quality of some

- Nigerian currencies in circulation. *Afr. J. Microbiol. Res.*, 4:2231-2234.
13. Ayandele, A. A., and Adeniyi, S. A. 2011. Prevalence and antimicrobial resistance pattern of microorganism isolated from Naira notes in Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Biology*, 6:587-593.
  14. Barolia S. K., Verma S., and Verma B. K. 2011. Coliform contamination on different paper currency in Ajmer, Rajasthan, India. *Univrs. J. Environ. Res. Technol.*, 1:552-556.
  15. Barro N., Bello A. R., Savadogo A., Quattara C. A., Ilboudo A. J., and Traore A. S. 2006. Hygienic Status assessment of dish washing waters, utensils, hands and pieces of money from street food processing sites in Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso). *African J Biotechnol.*, 5(11):1107-1112.
  16. Barua N., Sabuj A.A., Haque Z.F., Das M., Hossain M.T., and Saha S. 2019. Survey of bacterial contamination and antibiotic resistance pattern of Bangladeshi paper currency notes in Mymensingh city. *Afr. J. Microbiol. Res.*, 13(10): 206-213.
  17. Bernholtz P. 2003. Monetary Regimes and Inflation: History, Economic and Political Relationships. Basle, Switzerland: Edward Elgar Publishing.
  18. Bhat N, Bhat S, Asawa K, Agarwal A. 2010. An Assessment of Oral Health Risk Associated with Handling of Currency Notes. *International Journal of Dental Clinics*, 2(4):14-6.
  19. Boidya J., Uddin R., and Mandal S. C. 2015. Microbiological analysis of Bangladeshi paper currency circulating in Dhaka city. *BioResearch Communications*, 1(1):53-56.
  20. Chauwa A., Kwenda G., Malama S., Kaonga P., Chimana H.M. 2020. Assessment of Bacteriological Contamination of the Zambian Paper Currency in Circulation in Selected Areas of Lusaka City, Zambia. *IJRSMB*. 6(2):14-21.
  21. Clinical and Laboratory Standard Institute CLSI. 2020. Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. 30<sup>th</sup> ed. CLSI supplements M100. Wayne, PA, USA.
  22. Debajit B., Pratap P., and Tarun K. 2012. Paper currencies, a potential carrier of pathogenic microorganisms. *Introduction to Appl. Biol. Pharm. Technol.*, 3:2325.
  23. Dekugmen D.Y. 2020. Bacterial Contaminants and Antibiogram of Ghana paper currency notes in circulation and its associated Health risks in Asante-Mampong, Ghana. DOI:10.21203/rs.3.rs-77708/v1.
  24. Desalegn Amenu Delesta 2017. Standards related foods and food products. Review Article. *Int. J. Adv. Res. Biol. Sci.*, 4(12):201-206.
  25. El-Dars F. and Hassan W. 2005. A preliminary bacterial study of Egyptian paper money. *Int J Environ Health Res.*, 15:235-40.
  26. Feglo P. and Nkansah M. 2010. Bacterial load on Ghanaian currency notes. *African J. Microbiol. Res.*, 4(22):2375-80.
  27. Firoozeh F., Dadgostar E., Akbari H., Zibaei M., Sadjadian S. S., Moshtaghi M. M., and Shakib A. 2017. Bacterial contamination of Iranian paper currency and their antibiotic resistance patterns. *Int. J. of Enteric Pathogen*, 5(4):106-110.
  28. Gary W. Procop, Deirdre L. Church, Geraldine S. Hall, William M. Janda, Elmer W. Koneman, Paul C. Schreckenberger and Gail L. Woods. 2017. Koneman's Color Atlas and textbook of diagnostic microbiology. 7 Editions. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer Health.
  29. Gedik H., Voss T. A. and Voss A. 2013. Money and transmission of bacteria. *Antimicrobial Resistance and Infection Control*, 2:22.
  30. Gedik H., Yahyaoglu M., Yoruk G., and Fincanci M. 2010. Extended-Spectrum Beta-Lactamase production rates of Klebsiella spp. And E. coli strains isolated from infections and faecal samples of health people. *Infect. Dis. In Clinical pract.*, 18:104-106.
  31. Göktaş P., and Oktay G. 1992. Bacteriological examination of the currency notes. *Microbiol. Bull.*, 26:344-348.
  32. Gosa Girma, Tsige Ketema and Ketema Bacha 2014. Microbial load and safety of paper currencies from some food vendors in Jimma Town, Southwest Ethiopia. *BMC. Res.*, 7:843.
  33. Guyer J. I. and Pallaver K. 2018. Money and Currency in African History. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of African History. DOI:10.1093/acrefore/9780190277734.013.144.
  34. Hanash S., Al-baker S. M., Al-harazi T., Alkadasi M., and Zahid A. A. 2015. Prevalence of pathogenic bacteria from contaminated Yemeni currency notes in Taiz city. *Asian J. Res. in Pharma. Sci.*, 5(1):8-11.
  35. Harikrishna Ramaprasad Saripalli, Lydia Swapna Nandam, Zenebe Tekla, and Haftom Kebede. 2014. Assessment of Microbial Contamination of Ethiopian Currency Notes. *RJPBCS*. 5(5):510-515.
  36. Hobner N. O., Hobner C., Kramer A., and Assadian O. 2011. Survival of Bacterial Pathogens on Paper and Bacterial Retrieval from Paper to Hands: Preliminary Results. *AJN, American Journal of Nursing*, 111(12):30-34.
  37. Igumbor E, Obi C, Bessong P, Potgieter N, Mkasi T. 2007. Microbiological analysis of banknotes circulating in the Venda region of Limpopo province, South Africa. *S Afr J Sci*. 103:9-10.
  38. Johnson T. R., and Case C. L. 2007. Laboratory Experiments in Microbiology. 8<sup>th</sup> edition, San Francisco: Pearson Edu.
  39. Kramer A., Schwebke I., and Kampf G. 2006. How long do nosocomial pathogens persist on inanimate surfaces? A systematic review. *BMC Infect. Dis.* 6(1): 130.
  40. Lamichane J., Adhikari S., Gautam P., Maharjan R., and Dhakal B. 2009. Risk of handling paper currency in circulation chances of potential bacterial transmittance. *Nepal J. Sci.* 10:161-166.
  41. Moosavy M. H., Shavisi N., Warriner K., and Mostafavi E. 2013. Bacterial contamination of Iranian paper currency. *Iranian Journal of Public Health* 42(9):1067-1070.
  42. Neel R. 2012. Multidrug Resistance of Isolates of Methicillin Resistant *Staphylococcus Aureus* (MRSA) in Paper Currency Notes from Meat Sellers in Tanga, Tanzania. *Int J Life Sc. Bt. and Pharm. Res.* 1(4):9-13.
  43. Neel R. 2013. Multidrug Resistance of Isolates of Methicillin Resistant *Staphylococcus Aureus* (MRSA) in Paper Currency Notes from Restaurants and Hotels in Lusaka in Zambia. *Int. J. of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sci.* 5(1):363-6.
  44. Ngwai Y. B., Ezenwa F. C., and Ngadda N. 2011. Contamination of Nigerian currency notes (Naira) by *E. coli* in Nasarawa state university, kiffi, Nigeria. *Asian J. Pharm Health Sc.* 1:163-166.
  45. Ofoedu C.E., Iwouno J.O., Agunwah I.M., Obodoechi P.Z., Okpala C.O.R., and Korzeniowska M. 2021. Bacterial contamination of Nigeria currency notes: A comparative analysis of different denominations recovered from local food vendors. *PeerJ*. DOI:10.7717/peerj.10795.
  46. Olijira B., and Kenasa G. 2018. Abundance and Antibiotic Resistance of Cultivable Bacteria and Fungi on Ethiopian Cash-Money in Nekemte Town. Fishes from Red Sea, Egypt. *Appl Microbiol Open Access* 4(3): 148.
  47. Oyero O. G., and Emikpe B. O. 2007. Preliminary investigation on the microbial contamination of Nigerian currency. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.*, 2(2):29-32.
  48. Pal K., Das N. S., and Bhattacharya S. 2013. Bacteriological profile of Indian currency circulating in a tertiary care hospital in rural Bengal. *IJRRMS*. 3(2):234-236.
  49. Pope T. W., Ender P. T., Woelk W. K., Koroscil M. A., and Koroscil T. M. 2002. Bacterial contamination of currency. *Southern Med. J.* 95:1406-1410.
  50. Pradeep N. V., Marulasiddaiah B. S., and Chetana M. 2012. Microbial Contamination of Indian Currency Notes in circulation. *Journal of Research in Biology* 2(4):377-382.
  51. Rote R. B., Deogade N. G., and Kawale M. 2010. Isolation, characterization and antibiotic sensitivity of organism from Indian currency. *Asiatic J. Biotechnol. Resources* 3:255-60.
  52. Saadabi A. M., Ali L. F., Omer A. B., Ahmed G. A., and Asa R. K. A. 2010. Isolation and Identification of Pathogenic Bacteria and Fungi from Some Sudanese Banknote Currency. *Res. J. Med. Sci.*, 4(5):315-8.
  53. Saeed S., and Rasheed H. 2011. Evaluation of bacterial contamination of Pakistan paper currency notes (rupee) in circulation in Karachi. *Europ. J. Biol. Sc.* 3(3):94-98.
  54. Shahram S. S., Khajehali E., and Zareei M. 2009. Evaluation of the bacterial contamination of the Iranian currency notes. *Iranian Journal of Health and Environment Winter*, 1(2):81-8.
  55. Sharma A. and Dhanashree B. 2011. Screening of currency in circulation for bacterial contamination. *Current Sci.* 100(6):822-825.
  56. Solomon Mekuria. 2015. Assessment of microbial flora of Ethiopian currency notes as obtained from debere markos town in Ethiopia. PP.21-22.
  57. Suciathangam G., Reventh A.M, Velvizhi G., and Revathy C. 2016. Assessment of Microbial Contamination of Paper Currency Notes in Circulation. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci.* 5(2): 735-741.
  58. Sunil S., Panchmal G. S., Shenoy R. P., Kumar V., Jodalli P., and Somaraj V. 2020. Assessment of microbial contamination of Indian currency notes in circulation-An in vitro study. *J Indian Assoc Public Health Dent*, 18:179-82.
  59. Tagoe D. N. A., Baidoo S. E., Dadzie I., and Athor D. 2010. A study of Bacterial Contamination of Ghanaian Currency Notes in Circulation. *Int. J. Microbiol.* 8(2):1-5.
  60. Taylor J., Davies M., Canales M., and Lai K. M. 2013. The persistence of foodborne pathogens on building surfaces under drying conditions. *Int. J. Hyg. Environ. Health* 216(1):91-99.
  61. Uddin G. N., Larsen M. H., Guardabassi L., and Dalsgaard A. 2013. Bacterial flora and antimicrobial resistance in raw frozen cultured seafood imported to Denmark. *Journal of Food Protection*, 76(3):490-499.
  62. Uko, M.P., Uko I.C., Umama S.L., and Basse M.p., 2017. Microbial load, prevalence and antibiotics susceptibility of bacteria isolated from Naira notes. *Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology* 1(4):1-8.
  63. Umeh E. U., Juluku J. U., and Ichor T. 2007. Microbial contamination of Naira' (Nigerian currency) notes in circulation. *RJES*. 1(6):336-339.
  64. Vrieskoop F., Russell C., Alvarez-Mayorga B., Aidoo K., Yuan Q., and Scannell A. 2010. Dirty money: an investigation into the hygiene status of some of the world's currencies as obtained from food outlets. *Foodborne Pathogens and Disease* 7(12):1497-502.
  65. World Health Organization. 2015. Estimates of the Global Burden of Foodborne Diseases. Foodborne Diseases Burden Epidemiology Reference Group 2007-2015. Geneva: World Health Organization.
  66. World Health Organization. 2018. Antimicrobial Resistance. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibioticresistance> . [accessed on 28 Nov 2019].