CORE Provided by Biblioteca Digital do IPB

## Wild mushroom extracts potentiate the action of standard antibiotics against multi-resistant bacteria

Lourenço, I.<sup>3</sup>; Alves, M.J.<sup>2,3</sup>; Ferreira, I.<sup>2</sup>; Martins A.<sup>2</sup> and Pintado, M. M.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CBQF, Escola Superior de Biotecnologia, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Porto, Portugal <sup>2</sup>CIMO/ESA, Instituto Politécnico de Bragança, Bragança, Portugal <sup>3</sup> Escola Superior de Saúde, Instituto Politécnico de Bragança, Bragança, Portugal



INSTITUTO POLITÉCNICO DE BRAGANÇA

Escola Superior de Saúde

CATÓLICA PORTO

0

NOLOGIA

## INTRODUCTION

us, Mycen

The indiscriminate use of antibiotics and chemotherapeutic agents and the genetic ability of bacteria to transmit and acquire resistance resulted in the development of resistant species. In the last few years, several studies have been conducted in different countries to demonstrate the efficacy of natural products, not only studying their direct antimicrobial activity but also their capacity as resistance-modifying agents. The main objective of the present work was to evaluate the capacity of five wild mushroom extracts to potentiate the action of standard antibiotics, through synergisms that allow a decrease in their therapeutic doses and ultimately contribute to the reduction of resistances.

## **RESULTS & DISCUSSION**

 
 Table 1: Effect of antibiotics individually and in combination with different mushroom extracts in MRSA (Methicillinresistant Suphylococus aureu).

Antibiotic	Antibiotic			Antibiotic 60% with M.	
	100%	Antibiotic $60\%$ with E	Antibiotic 40% with E	rosca	Antibiotic 40% with M. rosea
	MIC	hepatica MIC/FIC (Effect)	hepatica MIC/FIC (Effect)	MIC/FIC (Effect)	MIC/FIC (Effect)
Ampicillin	8	2.4/0.3 (S)	1.6/0.2 (S)	2.4/0.3 (S)	1.6/0.2 (S)
Cefoxitin	4	1.2/0.3 (S)	0.8/0.2 (S)	0.6/0.15 (S)	0.2/0.05 (S)
Ciprofloxacin	2	0.6/0.3 (S)	0.4/0.2 (S)	0.6/0.3 (S)	0.4/0.2 (S)
Levofloxacin	4	1.2/0.3 (S)	0.8/0.2 (S)	2.4/0.6 (I)	0.8/0.2 (S)
Penincillin	8	2.4/0.3 (S)	1.6/0.2 (S)	2.4/0.3 (S)	0.8/0.1 (S)
Antibiotic	Antibiotic	Antibiotic 60% with R.		Antibiotic 60% with S.	Antibiotic 40% with S.
	100%	delica	Antibiotic 40% with R.	imbricatum MIC/FIC	imbricatum
	MIC	MIC/FIC (Effect)	delica MIC/FIC (Effect)	(Effect)	MIC/FIC (Effect)
Ampicillin	8	4.8/0.6 (I)	3.2/0.4 (S)	>4.8	>3.2
Cefoxitin	4	1.2/0.3 (S)	0.4/0.1 (S)	nt	nt
Ciprofloxacin	2	>1.2	>0.8	>1.2	>0.8
Levofloxacin	4	1.2/0.3 (S)	0.8/0.2 (S)	0.6/0.15 (S)	0.4/0.1 (S)

Table 2: Effect of antibiotics individually and in combination with different mushroom extracts in Escher

	F. hepatica	F. hepatica	L. giganteus	with L. giganteus
				MIC/FIC (Effect)
				0.8/0.05 (S)
16	>9.6	>6.4	>9.6	6.4/0.4 (S)
2	nt	nt	nt	nt
76	nt	nt	nt	nt
ntibiotic	Antibiotic 60% with	Antibiotic 40% with		
100%	R. delica	R. delica MIC/FIC		
MIC	MIC/FIC (Effect)	(Effect)		
16	9.6/0.6 (I)	3.2/0.2 (S)		
16	9.6/0.6 (I)	3.2/0.2 (S)		
2	nt	nt		
76	Nt	nt		
	76 ntibiotic 100% MIC 16 16 2	16         9.6/0.6 (l)           16         >9.6           2         nt           76         nt           100%         R. delica           MIC         MIC/FIC (Effect)           16         9.6/0.6 (l)           16         9.6/0.6 (l)           16         9.6/0.6 (l)           2         nt	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Antibiotic					
Antibiotic	Antibiotic	Antibiotic 60% with	Antibiotic 40% with	Antibiotic 60% with	Antibiotic 40% with
	100%	F. hepatica	F. hepatica	L. giganteus	L. gigantcus
	MIC	MIC/FIC (Effect)	MIC/FIC (Effect)	MIC/FIC (Effect)	MIC/FIC (Effect)
Ampicillin	16	nt	nt	>9.6	>6.4
Amoxicillin/Clavulanic acid	16	nt	nt	nt	nt
Ciprofloxacin	2	nt	nt	>1.2	>0.8
Trimethoprim/Sulfamethoxazole	76	nt	nt	>45.6	>30.4
Antibiotic	Antibiotic	Antibiotic 60% with	Antibiotic 40% with		
Antibiotic	Antibiotic 100%	Antibiotic 60% with <i>R. delica</i>	Antibiotic 40% with <i>R. delica</i> MIC/FIC		
Antibiotic					
Antibiotic Ampicillin	100%	R. delica	R. delica MIC/FIC		
	100% MIC	<i>R. delica</i> MIC/FIC (Effect)	R. delica MIC/FIC (Effect)		
Ampicillin	100% MIC 16	R. delica MIC/FIC (Effect) 4.8/0.3 (S)	<i>R. delica</i> MIC/FIC (Effect) 1.6/ 0.1 (S)		
Ampicillin Amosicillin/Clavulanic acid	100% MIC 16 16	R. delica MIC/FIC (Effect) 4.8/0.3 (S) nt	R. delica MIC/FIC (Effect) 1.6/ 0.1 (S) nt		

Table 4. Effect of antibiotics individually and in combinat

1-	100	and the state of the	April 1		A CONTRACT OF A
Antibiotic	Antibiotic	Antibiotic 60% with E	Antibiotic 40% with E	Antibiotic 60% with L.	Antibiotic 40% with L.
	100%	hepatica MIC/FIC	hepatica MIC/FIC	giganteus	giganteus
	MIC	(Effect)	(Effect)	MIC/FIC (Effect)	MIC/FIC (Effect)
Ampicillin	16	>9.6	>6.4	4.8/0.3 (S)	3.2/0.2 (S)
Amoxicillin/Clavulani					
c acid	16	nt	nt	nt	nt
Ciprofloxacin	2	>1.2	>0.8	1.2/0.6 (I)	0.4/0.2 (S)
Trimethoprim/Sulfam					
ethoxazole	76	>45.6	>30.4	22.8/0.3 (S)	15.2/0.2 (S)
Antibiotic	Antibiotic	Antibiotic 60% with R.			
	100%	delica	Antibiotic 40% with R.		
	MIC	MIC/FIC (Effect)	delica MIC/FIC (Effect)		
Ampicillin	16	4.8/0.3 (S)	1.6/0.1 (S)		
Amoxicillin/Clavulani					
c acid	16	nt	nt		
Ciprofloxacin	2	0.6/0.3 (S)	0.2/0.1 (S)		
Trimethoprim/Sulfam					
ethoxazole	76	22.8/0.3 (S)	7.6/0.1 (S)		

**MATERIALS & METHODS** 

	rosea, Russula delica, Sarcodon imbricatum) were collected in different ecosystems of the Trás-
	Microorganisms tested: Clinical isolates from patients hospitalized in various departments of the Hospital Center of Trás-os-Montes and Alto Douro – Chaves, Portugal.
	Gram negative bacteria. Escherichia officient different antibiotic resistance profile B, coli 1
	resistant to Ampicillin, Ciprofloxacin and Trimethopnim/ Sulfamethoxazole), E. coli 2 resistant to Amoxicillin/Clavulanic acid and Ampicillin) and E. coli ESBL (resistant to
	Ampicillin, Nalidixic acid, Norfloxacin, Ciprofloxacin, Cephalosporins and
	Frimethoprim/Sulfamethoxazole), isolated from urine.
	Gram positive bacteria: MRSA (resistant to beta-lactams - Penicillin Ampicillin, Cefoxitin,
	out also to Quinolones – Ciptofloxacin and Levofloxacin) isolated from wound exudates; All strains were identified using the MicroScan® planels automated methodology – Siemens,
	An strains were identified using the witcroscarge parters automated methodology colements.
	An imicrobial activity nethology: Microdilution method and
1	o-iodonitrotetrazolium chloride (INT) colorimetric assay.
	Contraction of the second seco
	MIC determination: The MIX of the samples were detected following addition of INT
5	0.2 mg/ml, 40 µl) and incubation at 37°C for 30 min. Viable microorganisms reduced the
1	vellow dye to a pink colour MIC was defined as the lowest sample concentration that
1	prevented the color charge of the medium and exhibited an inhibitor of microbial growth
	Sinergistic Effect: Fractional inhibitory concentration (FIC) was calculated according to
t	the equation: MIC(antibiotic+extract/MICantibiotic). The interpretations were made as
	follows: synergistic (S; <0.5), indifferent (1; 0.5 to 4), or antagonistic (A; >4). All the assays
	were carried out in duplicate.
E ✓	The results obtained showed higher synergistic effects against MRSA (Table 1) than against <i>coli</i> (Tables 2-4). Regarding MRSA (Table 1), <i>Mycena rosea</i> and <i>Fistulina hepatica</i> were the best extracts for
-	nergistic effects Mycena rasea and Fistulina hepatica extracts allowed synergistic effects with quinolones
	profloxacin and levofloxacin)(Table 1).
	It can be observed in all the extracts, an increase of FIC values with the increase of
	ntibiotic percentage, occurring in some cases an increase of FIC higher than 0.5, and sappearing the synergistic effect. Nevertheless, for <i>Fistulina hepatica</i> extract, despite the
	crease of FIC values with higher antibiotic percentage, the synergism still remains (Table 1).
	Sarcidon individual extract gave the worst results and did not show synergisms with the tested
	ntibiones execut for levofloxacin (Table 1).
	The efficiency of <i>Russula delica</i> extract against <i>E. coli</i> (Tables 2 and 3) was notoriously higher an <i>Leucopaxillus giganteus</i> extract; nevertheless the latter extract subvived better synergistic
	fects against ESBL E. coli (Table 4).
	Among the three mushroom species, Fistulina hepatica extract gave the lowest synergistic
	fect against H. <i>coli</i> (Tables 2 and 3).
	The action of cirpofloxacin was potentiated by <i>Journal delica</i> or <i>Leucopascillus giganten</i> excession Fables 3 and 4).
	Russula delica extract was the only one that gave synergistic effects with the antimetricologic
	ntibiotic trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole (Tables 3 and 4)
-	
	CONCLUSIONS
Т	he present study shows that, similarly to plants, some mushroom extracts can
	otentiate the action of antibiotics extensively used in clinical practice for Gram-
P	ositive or Gram-negative bacteria, and might be used against multi-resistant bacteria.
	CIMI

COMPETE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) and COMPETE/QF through the grateful project PTDC/AGR-ALI/110062/2009, and to CHTMAD – Hospital Center of T