ID Design Press, Skopie, Republic of Macedonia Open Access Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences. 2019 Jan 30; 7(2):247-249. Special Issue: Vietnamese Dermatology https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2019.062 eISSN: 1857-9655 Clinical Science



Antifungal Susceptibility of Dermatophytes Isolated From **Cutaneous Fungal Infections: The Vietnamese Experience**

Tro Chau Van¹, Khuong Ho Thi Ngoc², Thuong Nguyen Van³, Khang Tran Hau³, Marco Gandolfi^{4*}, Francesca Satolli⁴, Claudio Feliciani⁴, Michael Tirant^{5, 6}, Aleksandra Vojvodic⁷, Torello Lotti⁵

¹Department of Dermatology, Pham Ngoc Thach University of Medicine, Vietnam; ²Hospital of Dermato-Venereology of HCMC, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam; ³National hospital of Dermatology and Venereology, Hanoi, Vietnam; ⁴Unit of Dermatology, University of Parma, Parma, Italy; ⁵University of Rome G. Marconi, Rome, Italy; ⁶Psoriasis Eczema Clinic, Melbourne, Australia; ⁷Department of Dermatology and Venereology, Military Medical Academy of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract

AIM: Evaluate the resistance of dermatophytes to systemic antifungal drugs in the Vietnamese population.

Citation: Chau Van T, Ho Thi Ngoc K, Nguyen Van T, Tran Hau K, Gandolfi M, Satolli F, Feliciani C, Tirant M, Vojvotic A, Lotti T. Antifungal Susceptibility of Dermatophytes Isolated From Cutaneous Fungal Infections: The Vietnamese Experience. Open Access Maced J Med Sci. 2019 Jan 30; 7(2):247-249. https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2019.062

Keywords: Cutaneous dermatophytosis; Dermatophytes; Antifungal resistance

*Correspondence: Marco Gandolfi. Unit of Dermatology, University of Parma, Parma, Italy. E-mail: marco.gandolfi5@gmail.com

Received: 02-Jan-2019; Revised: 16-Jan Accepted: 17-Jan-2019; Online first: 27-Jan-2019 16-Jan-2019;

Copyright: © 2019 Tro Chau Van, Khuong Ho Thi Ngoc Thuong Nguyen Van, Khang Tran Hau, Marco Gandolfi, Francesca Satolli, Claudio Feliciani, Michael Tirant, Aleksandra Vojvodic, Torello Lotti. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

Funding: This research did not receive any financial

Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist

METHODS: We enrolled 101 patients with cutaneous dermatophytosis at the Dermato-Venereology hospital in HCMC from August 2016 to March 2017. All the specimens were subjected to direct examination (10% KOH mount) and culture on Sabouraud dextrose agar. In vitro antifungal sensitivity testing was done on species isolated from a culture with broth microdilution method.

RESULTS: Direct microscopy was positive for dermatophytes in all patients. However this pathogen was found in fungal cultures in only 61.38% of patients. The main causative agent isolated was Trichophyton spp. (90.3%), followed by *Microsporum spp.* (8%) and *Epidermophyton spp.* (1.7%). *Trichophyton spp.* Has shown resistance to fluconazole, griseofulvin, ketoconazole, and itraconazole in 92.9%, 46.4%, 5.4% and 1.8% of strains, respectively. All Microsporum spp. Strains were found resistant to fluconazole and griseofulvin while resistance to ketoconazole was demonstrated in only 20% of strains and none of them was resistant to itraconazole. Epidermophyton spp strains were all resistant to fluconazole, griseofulvin, ketoconazole while none of them was resistant to itraconazole.

CONCLUSION: Based upon our results, Itraconazole shows the greatest probability of efficacy in the treatment of cutaneous dermatophytosis in Vietnamese patients.

Introduction

Dermatophytes are the most common cause of superficial cutaneous mycoses. Dermatophytosis are extremely frequent worldwide, affecting 20 - 25% of the global population [1], [2], [3]. Dermatophytes are divided into three genera: Epidermophyton spp, Trichophyton spp, and Microsporum spp. [2]. The treatment failure rate is increasingly encountered, leading to a prolonged or recurrent infectious status. Until now, studies on dermatophytes resistance to antifungal drugs have not been systemically performed in Vietnam.

Materials and Methods

Study population

This study was performed at the Dermato -Venereology hospital in HCMC where 101 patients with clinical signs and symptoms of dermatophytosis and positive direct wet method for dermatophytes by 10% KOH were enrolled, from August 2016 to March 2017.

Open Access Maced J Med Sci. 2019 Jan 30; 7(2):247-249.

Fungal identification and in-vitro antifungal sensitivity testing

Skin scrapings were collected from the edges of the lesions and transported immediately to the laboratory. All the specimens were subjected to direct examination by 10% KOH mount and culture on Sabouraud dextrose adar (SDA) for fungal determination, using MALDI - ToE technique. Antifungal sensitivity testing was done with Mueller -Hinton sterile agar plates separately containing fluconazole, itraconazole. griseofulvin and ketoconazole, at Mycological Department of Mycology of the Pham Ngoc Thach University of Medicine. Results of the antifungal susceptibility test were analysed according to the National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards (NCCLS).

Statistical analysis

Data were collected, tabulated, and analysed using SPSS version 16.0.

Results

Patients' mean age was 32.4 ± 16.7 ; males constituted 58.4% of participants.

Table 1: Fungal culture results from 101 patients with cutaneous dermatophytosis

	N	Percentage
Trichophyton spp.	56	90.3%
Microsporum spp.	5	8%
Epidermophyton spp.	1	1.7%

Clinical presentations consisted of itching (77.2%) usually in combination with scaly, welldefined, polygonal erythematous plaques. Culture results showed in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 2: Identification of Trichophyton spp.

Trichophyton spp.	N	Percentage
Trichophyton rubrum	22	39.2%
Trichophyton tonsurans	18	32.1%
Trichophyton mentagrophytes	11	19.6%
Trichophyton equinum	1	1.8%
Trichophyton Sudanese	1	1.8%
Trichophyton violacecum	2	3.6%
Trichophyton schoenleinnii	1	1.8%
Total	56	100%

Antifungal susceptibility of *Trichophyton spp.* Showed in Table 3.

Table 3: In vitro antifungal susceptibility testing forTrichophyton spp.

Antifungal drugs	Sensitive (%)	Resistant (%)	Intermediate (%)
Itraconazole	98.2	1.8	0
Ketoconazole	91.1	5.4	3.6
Griseofulvin	50.6	46.4	0
Fluconazole	5.4	92.9	1.8

All *Microsporum spp.* Strains were found resistant to fluconazole and griseofulvin while resistance to ketoconazole was demonstrated in only 20% of strains and none of them was resistant to itraconazole. *Epidermophyton spp.* strains were all resistant to fluconazole, griseofulvin, ketoconazole while none of them was resistant to itraconazole.

Discussion

In our study, KOH mount was positive in all patients (100%) whereas culture was positive with *dermatophytes* in only 62 patients (61.38%). Ilkit's study found 94% of positive direct microscopy and 76% of positive culture [4]. The positive culture rate in Silva's study was lower (45.3%) [5]. In the species of *dermatophytes* in this study as results of Teklebirhan, Rezaei – Matehkolaei and Chadeganipour, *Trichophyton spp* and *T. rubrum* accounted for the highest proportion in dermatophytosis [6], [7], [8], [9], [10].

Our study showed that Trichophyton spp. resisted to fluconazole (92.9%), griseofulvin (46.4%), ketoconazole (5.4%), and itraconazole (1.8%), Microsporum spp. resisted to fluconazole and griseofulvin (100%), ketoconazole (20%). Non of them had itraconazole. resistance to All the fluconazole. Epidermophyton spp. resisted to griseofulvin and ketoconazole. None of them had resistance to itraconazole. No similar data exist in the medical literature for comparision with our study.

In conclusion, *Trichophyton spp.* are the most common cause of cutaneous dermatophytic infections (90.3%). Itraconazole is recommended in the treatment of skin dermatophytosis because of its excellent sensitivity to almost dermatophytic species.

References

1. Goldstein AO, Goldstein BG. Dermatophyte (tinea) infections. Walthman, MA: UpToDate, 2017.

2. Schiek SM, et al. Superficial fungal infections. Fitzpatrick's Dermatology in general medicine. McGraw-Hill, 2012:2277-2297.

3. Vandeputte P, Ferrari S, Coste AT. Antifungal Resistance and New Strategies to Control Fungal Infections. International Journal of Microbiology Switzerland. 2012; 26.

4. Ilkit M, Durdu M. Tinea pedis: the etiology and global epidemiology of a common fungal infection. Critical reviews in microbiology. 2015; 41(3):374-88. https://doi.org/10.3109/1040841X.2013.856853 PMid:24495093

5. Silva LB, De Oliveira DB, Da Silva BV, De Souza RA, da Silva PR, Ferreira-Paim K, Andrade-Silva LE, Silva-Vergara ML, Andrade AA. Identification and antifungal susceptibility of fungi isolated from dermatomycoses. Journal of the European Academy

of Dermatology and Venereology. 2014; 28(5):633-40. https://doi.org/10.1111/jdv.12151 PMid:23556501

6. Chadeganipour M, Mohammadi R, Shadzi S. A 10-year study of dermatophytoses in Isfahan, Iran. Journal of clinical laboratory analysis. 2016; 30(2):103-7. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/jcla.21852</u> PMid:25902908

7. Rezaei-Matehkolaei A, Rafiei A, Makimura K, et al. Epidemiological Aspects of Dermatophytosis in Khuzestan, southwestern Iran, an update. Mycopathologia. 2016; 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11046-016-9990-x

8. Teklebirhan G, Bitew A. Prevalence of dermatophytic infection and the spectrum of dermatophytes in patients attending a tertiary hospital in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. International journal of microbiology. 2015; 2015.

9. Chokoeva AA, Wollina U, Lotti T, Maximov GK, Lozev I, Tchernev G. Psoriasiform Dermatophytosis in a Bulgarian Child. Open Access Maced J Med Sci. 2018; 6(1):118-119. <u>https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2018.009</u> PMid:29484004 PMCid:PMC5816278

10. Bakardzhiev I, Chokoeva A, Tchernev G, Wollina U, Lotti T. Tinea profunda of the genital area. Successful treatment of a rare skin disease. Dermatologic therapy. 2016; 29(3):181-3. https://doi.org/10.1111/dth.12311 PMid:26555874