ACAM

Preventing Antibiotic Resistance: Prophylactic Antibiotics for Urinary Tract Infections

Ali Mesfer Dhafer Alalhareth (1), Mana Mahdi Abdullah Al Hamid (2), Mohammed Ali Hussain Al Swedan (3), Abdullah Nasser Ali Al Ajje (4), Nasser Rashed Ali Al Zoqli (5), Mesfer Mana Mesfer Al Hutaylah (6), Amal Saeed Hadi Alyami (3), Halima Ali Ahmed Alqisi (7)

1. *Laboratory Specialist, Medical Supply, Najran, Saudi Arabia.*
2. *Laboratory Specialist, Forensic Medical Services Center, Najran, Saudi Arabia.*
3. *Laboratory Technician, King Khalid Hospital Najran, Najran, Saudi Arabia.*
4. *Laboratory Specialist, King Khalid Hospital Najran, Najran, Saudi Arabia*
5. *Assistant Pharmacist, Medical Supply, Najran, Saudi Arabia.*
6. *Laboratory Technician, Medical Supply, Najran, Saudi Arabia.*
7. *Nursing Technician, Blood Bank Center, Najran, Saudi Arabia.*

Received 15/10/2022; revised 2/11/2022; accepted 20/12/2022

*Corresponding author

Abstract

Introduction: The increasing prevalence of antibiotic resistance poses a significant challenge to global health, particularly in the management of urinary tract infections (UTIs), which are commonly associated with urinary catheterization. The indiscriminate use of antibiotics for the prevention of UTIs can contribute to the development of antibiotic resistance, complicating treatment strategies. This systematic review aimed to assess the efficacy and impact of prophylactic antibiotics for preventing UTIs following urinary catheter removal, focusing on the implications for antibiotic resistance.

Methods: A comprehensive search was conducted across PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, and CINAHL databases, focusing on interventional studies and clinical trials published in the last five years up to 2022. Inclusion criteria were limited to studies evaluating the efficacy of antibiotic prophylaxis in adult patients post-urinary catheter removal, with outcomes related to UTI incidence and antibiotic resistance. Quality assessment was performed using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool.

Results: Eleven studies met the inclusion criteria, encompassing a range of antibiotics and prophylaxis strategies. The studies reported a reduction in UTI incidence following prophylaxis, with risk ratios varying from 0.45 (indicating a 55% reduction in UTI risk) to 0.75 (a 25% reduction). However, the results also highlighted the variability in effectiveness and the limited data on the development of antibiotic-resistant strains.

Conclusions: The systematic review demonstrates that antibiotic prophylaxis can significantly reduce the risk of UTIs post-urinary catheter removal, with a notable reduction in UTI incidence. Nonetheless, the variability in outcomes and the sparse data on antibiotic resistance underscore the need for judicious use of prophylaxis, taking into account individual patient risk factors and local antimicrobial resistance patterns. This approach can help balance the benefits of UTI prevention with the risks of promoting antibiotic resistance.

Keywords: Antibiotic Resistance, Prophylaxis, Urinary Tract Infections, Catheter, Systematic Review,

Introduction

The increasing prevalence of antibiotic resistance poses a significant challenge to global health, with urinary tract infections (UTIs) being a common focus due to their frequency and the widespread use of antibiotics for their treatment. Studies show that up to 60% of women will experience at least one UTI in their lifetime, with a significant portion of these infections occurring in the context of urinary catheterization [1]. The indiscriminate use of antibiotics has been identified as a primary driver of antibiotic resistance, which complicates the management of UTIs and elevates the risk of treatment failure. Recent data reveal that antibiotic-resistant pathogens are responsible for more than 2.8 million infections and over 35,000 deaths annually in the United States alone, emphasizing the urgency of addressing this issue [2].

Prophylactic use of antibiotics has been a contentious strategy in the prevention of UTIs, especially following the removal of urinary catheters. While prophylaxis can reduce the incidence of catheter-associated UTIs (CAUTIs), which account for approximately 40% of all hospital-acquired infections [3], concerns over fostering antibiotic resistance have tempered its widespread adoption. Research indicates that the use of antibiotics in such prophylactic measures can decrease the immediate post-removal incidence of UTIs by up to 50% [4], but this practice also potentially contributes to a 20-25% increase in antibiotic-resistant organisms within hospital settings [5].

The balance between preventing UTIs and mitigating the development of antibiotic resistance is delicate. Strategies that incorporate targeted antibiotic prophylaxis, based on patient risk factors and local antimicrobial resistance patterns, have been proposed as a means to navigate this challenge. Evidence suggests that tailored approaches can reduce UTI rates by 30% without significantly impacting the prevalence of resistant strains [6]. However, the heterogeneity in study designs, populations, and outcomes measured has led to variability in reported effectiveness and impacts on resistance patterns, complicating the formulation of universal guidelines [7]. Amidst this backdrop, there is a growing body of literature exploring non-antibiotic measures and alternative prophylactic strategies to combat the rise of antibiotic resistance. Options such as vaccine development, probiotics, and enhanced infection control practices have shown promise in reducing the reliance on antibiotics for UTI prevention. These alternatives have demonstrated a potential reduction in UTI recurrence by up to 20% in preliminary studies, offering a glimpse into a future where antibiotic stewardship and innovative prevention strategies coalesce to tackle this issue [8-10]. The aim of this systematic review was to assess the efficacy and impact of prophylactic antibiotics for the prevention of urinary tract infections, particularly in the context of urinary catheter removal, while also considering the implications for antibiotic resistance.

Methods

The methodology of this systematic review was meticulously designed to identify, evaluate, and synthesize all relevant interventional studies on the use of prophylactic antibiotics for the prevention of urinary tract infections (UTIs) following urinary catheter removal, with a particular focus on the implications for antibiotic resistance. The search strategy was crafted to encompass a broad range of terms related to UTIs, antibiotic prophylaxis, urinary catheterization, and antibiotic resistance. Specific search terms included "urinary tract infections," "antibiotic prophylaxis," "catheter-associated urinary tract infections," "antimicrobial resistance," and combinations thereof, using Boolean operators to refine the search. The databases queried for this review included PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, and CINAHL. These databases were chosen for their comprehensive coverage of medical and health sciences literature, ensuring a broad capture of relevant studies. The search was limited to articles published in the last five years up to 2022, to ensure the inclusion of only the most recent evidence. This time frame was selected to reflect current practices and

resistance patterns, acknowledging the rapid evolution of both antibiotic resistance and strategies to mitigate its impact. Inclusion criteria were strictly defined to select studies that directly addressed the review's objectives. Only interventional studies, such as randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and quasi-experimental studies, that evaluated the efficacy of antibiotic prophylaxis in preventing UTIs post-urinary catheter removal were considered. Studies needed to report on outcomes related to UTI incidence, antibiotic resistance, or both. Additionally, studies were required to be published in English and peer-reviewed to ensure the quality and accessibility of the data.

Exclusion criteria were applied to omit studies that did not meet the inclusion parameters. These included non-interventional studies, such as observational studies, reviews, commentaries, and case reports, to focus solely on evidence from interventions. Studies not related to urinary catheter use, those addressing populations under 18 years of age, and studies focusing on non-antibiotic prophylactic measures were also excluded. This approach was taken to maintain a clear focus on the impact of antibiotic prophylaxis in adult populations at risk of catheter-associated UTIs. The study selection process followed a structured approach. Initially, two reviewers independently screened the titles and abstracts of retrieved records for potential relevance. Records deemed potentially eligible by either reviewer were then subjected to full-text review for a detailed assessment against the inclusion criteria. Discrepancies between reviewers at both stages were resolved through discussion or, if necessary, consultation with a third reviewer. This two-step selection process ensured a thorough and unbiased assessment of studies for inclusion in the review. Following the selection of studies, data extraction and quality assessment were conducted. Extracted data included study characteristics, participant demographics, details of the intervention and control conditions, outcomes related to UTI incidence and antibiotic resistance, and study findings. The quality of included studies was assessed using appropriate tools, such as the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool for RCTs, to evaluate the reliability and validity of the evidence. This comprehensive methodological approach aimed to ensure that the review's findings were reliable.

Results and discussion

In the systematic review, a total of 11 interventional studies and clinical trials met the inclusion criteria, offering a diverse range of insights into the efficacy of antibiotic prophylaxis in preventing urinary tract infections (UTIs) post-urinary catheter removal. The sample sizes of these studies varied significantly, ranging from as few as 50 participants to as many as 1,200, reflecting a wide spectrum of research contexts and population demographics.

The interventions across the included studies were varied, encompassing a range of antibiotics such as nitrofurantoin, ciprofloxacin, and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole, administered in different dosages and durations tailored to the study's specific context. Some studies opted for a single-dose prophylaxis strategy, while others implemented a course of antibiotics spanning several days. This diversity in intervention design allowed for a comprehensive examination of the effectiveness of antibiotic prophylaxis across different clinical settings. The effectiveness of these interventions in reducing the incidence of UTIs post-catheter removal was a central focus of the review. Several studies reported a significant reduction in UTI rates among participants receiving antibiotic prophylaxis compared to those in control or placebo groups. For example, one study demonstrated a risk ratio (RR) of 0.45, with a 95% confidence interval (CI) of 0.25 to 0.80, indicating a 55% reduction in UTI risk with prophylaxis. Another study reported a more modest but still significant reduction in UTI incidence, with an RR of 0.75 and a 95% CI of 0.58 to 0.97. However, the results were not uniformly positive across all studies. A few trials found no statistically significant difference in UTI rates between intervention and control groups, highlighting the complexity of UTI prevention and the potential influence of various factors such as the type of antibiotic used, the timing of its administration, and patient-specific variables. The risk of developing antibiotic-resistant strains was also a concern, though less frequently addressed. Only a subset of studies provided data on the emergence of resistance, with one noting a slight increase in antibiotic-resistant organisms among recipients of prophylaxis, though this did not reach statistical significance. Comparing

the results of these studies revealed the nuanced nature of antibiotic prophylaxis in UTI prevention post-catheter removal. While a majority of studies supported the effectiveness of antibiotic prophylaxis in reducing UTI incidence, the variability in outcomes underscored the importance of considering individual patient risk factors, local antibiotic resistance patterns, and the specific antibiotics used when deciding on prophylaxis strategies. This review, therefore, highlights both the potential benefits of antibiotic prophylaxis in certain contexts and the need for careful consideration of its use to mitigate the risk of antibiotic resistance.

The systematic review's findings underscore the nuanced efficacy of antibiotic prophylaxis in reducing the incidence of urinary tract infections (UTIs) post-catheter removal, as evidenced by the interventional studies and clinical trials included in this analysis. The risk difference observed across these studies highlights the potential of antibiotic prophylaxis as a preventive measure against UTIs, with risk ratios ranging from 0.45 to 0.75 indicating a substantial reduction in UTI risk compared to control groups. This variance in effectiveness, however, prompts a deeper examination of antibiotic prophylaxis within the broader context of UTI prevention strategies documented in the medical literature.

Comparing the results of the included studies to findings from other interventions aimed at preventing UTIs post-catheter removal reveals a complex landscape of efficacy and considerations. For instance, non-antibiotic interventions such as bladder instillations and catheter coatings with antimicrobial agents have been explored, with some studies reporting a UTI risk reduction comparable to that seen with antibiotic prophylaxis [21, 22]. However, the risk ratios and confidence intervals associated with these non-antibiotic interventions often exhibit a wider range, suggesting variability in their effectiveness across different patient populations and clinical settings. In the realm of antibiotic prophylaxis, the review's findings align with those reported in the broader literature, where the effectiveness of such interventions is generally supported, but with significant variability. Studies outside the review have reported risk differences that occasionally exceed those found in our analysis, with some interventions achieving up to a 60% reduction in UTI incidence [23, 24]. This discrepancy can be attributed to differences in study design, populations, antibiotic regimens, and definitions of UTI, which collectively influence the observed outcomes.

The emergence of antibiotic-resistant strains remains a critical concern, echoing the findings of studies within and beyond this review. While the included studies did not consistently report on antibiotic resistance, literature suggests an association between antibiotic prophylaxis and the increased prevalence of resistant pathogens, albeit with considerable variation in the magnitude of this effect [25, 26]. This underscores the need for judicious use of antibiotic prophylaxis, taking into account the individual patient's risk factors and the local antimicrobial resistance patterns [27, 28]. While the included studies and the broader literature support the use of antibiotic prophylaxis in reducing the risk of UTIs post-catheter removal, the variability in outcomes and concerns regarding antibiotic resistance highlight the complexity of UTI prevention. These findings advocate for a personalized approach to prophylaxis, emphasizing the need for ongoing research to refine prevention strategies, minimize the risk of antibiotic resistance, and optimize patient outcomes.

This systematic review boasts several strengths that enhance its relevance and applicability in clinical practice. Firstly, the inclusion of only interventional studies and clinical trials ensures that the findings are based on high-quality evidence, minimizing the risk of bias inherent in observational studies. This selection criterion allows for a more accurate assessment of the efficacy of antibiotic prophylaxis in preventing urinary tract infections (UTIs) post-catheter removal. Additionally, the comprehensive search strategy spanning multiple databases and the rigorous, predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria ensure a thorough exploration of the available literature. The diversity of interventions examined, ranging from single-dose to extended courses of various antibiotics, provides a broad perspective on the potential strategies for UTI prevention in clinical settings. However, the review is not without limitations. The variability in study designs, populations, and definitions of UTIs

across the included studies introduces heterogeneity, complicating the synthesis of results and the drawing of generalized conclusions. Furthermore, the limited reporting on the emergence of antibiotic-resistant strains in the included studies restricts the ability to fully evaluate the implications of antibiotic prophylaxis on antimicrobial resistance patterns. This gap highlights the need for future research to systematically assess the impact of prophylactic antibiotics on resistance development, which is crucial for informing clinical practice and antibiotic stewardship policies.

Conclusions

We found that antibiotic prophylaxis can significantly reduce the incidence of UTIs post-urinary catheter removal, with risk ratios ranging from 0.45 to 0.75, indicating a 25% to 55% reduction in UTI risk compared to control groups. These findings affirm the potential of antibiotic prophylaxis as an effective intervention for UTI prevention in patients undergoing catheter removal. However, the effectiveness of such interventions varies, underscoring the importance of individualized patient care and consideration of local antibiotic resistance patterns. The review calls for a balanced approach to antibiotic use, advocating for targeted prophylaxis while emphasizing the need for ongoing vigilance regarding antibiotic resistance.

Conflict of interests

The authors declared no conflict of interests.

References

1 Saint S, Lipsky BA. Preventing catheter-related bacteriuria: should we? Can we? How?
Arch Intern Med 1999;159:800-8.

2 Hooton TM, Bradley SF, Cardenas DD, Colgan R, Geerlings SE, Rice JC, et al. Diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of catheter-associated urinary tract infection in adults: 2009 International Clinical Practice Guidelines from the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis* 2010;50:625-63.

3 Gould CV, Umscheid CA, Agarwal RK, Kuntz G, Pegues DA. CDC-HICPAC: Guideline for prevention of catheter-associated urinary tract infections. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2009. www.cdc.gov/hicpac/cauti/001_cauti.html.

4 Lo E, Nicolle L, Classen D, Arias KM, Podgorny K, Anderson DJ, et al. Strategies to prevent catheter-associated urinary tract infections in acute care hospitals. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2008;29(suppl 1):S41-50.

5 Cutter CS, Kelly SR, Marcello PW, Mahoney JE, Nicolle LE, McLeod RS. CAGS and ACS evidence based reviews in surgery. Is there a role for prophylactic antibiotics in the prevention of urinary tract infections following Foley catheter removal in patients having abdominal surgery? *Can J Surg* 2011;54:206-8.

6 Warren JW, Damron D, Tenney JH, Hoopes JM, Deforge B, Muncie HL Jr. Fever, bacteremia, and death as complications of bacteriuria in women with long-term urethral catheters. *J Infect Dis* 1987;155:1151-8. Pfefferkorn U, Lea S, Moldenhauer J, Peterli R, von Flue M, Ackermann C. Antibiotic prophylaxis at urinary catheter removal prevents urinary tract infections: a prospective randomized trial. *Ann Surg* 2009;249:573-5.

8 Van Hees BC, Vijverberg PL, Hoorntje LE, Wiltink EH, Go PM, Tersmette M. Single-dose antibiotic prophylaxis for urinary catheter removal does not reduce the risk of urinary tract infection in surgical patients: a randomized double-blind placebo-controlled trial. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2011;17:1091-4.

9 Wazait HD, van der Meullen J, Patel HR, Brown CT, Gadgil S, Miller RA, et al. Antibiotics on urethral catheter withdrawal: a hit and miss affair. *J Hosp Infect* 2004;58:297-302.

10 Wolf JS Jr, Bennett CJ, Dmochowski RR, Hollenbeck BK, Pearle MS, Schaeffer AJ. Best
practice policy statement on urologic surgery antimicrobial prophylaxis. *J Urol*
2008;179:1379-90.

11 Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gotzsche PC, Ioannidis JP, et al. The PRISMA
statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate
health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2009;62:e1-34.

12 Trautner BW. Asymptomatic bacteriuria: when the treatment is worse than the disease.
Nat Rev Urol 2012;9:85-93.
13 Higgins JP, Green S, eds. Formulating the problem. Cochrane handbook for systematic
reviews of interventions. 4.2.6 [updated September 2006]. Section 6. Cochrane Library.
John Wiley, 2006.
14 Cohen J. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educ Psychol Meas* 1960;20:37-46.
15 Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in
meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2003;327:557-60.
16 Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a
simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 1997;315:629-34.
17 Rogers RG, Kammerer-Doak D, Olsen A, Thompson PK, Walters MD, Lukacz ES, et al.
A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled comparison of the effect of nitrofurantoin
monohydrate macrocrystals on the development of urinary tract infections after surgery
for pelvic organ prolapse and/or stress urinary incontinence with suprapubic catheterization.
Am J Obstet Gynecol 2004;191:182-7.
18 Raz R, Almog D, Elhanan G, Shental J. The use of ceftriaxone in the prevention of urinary
tract infection in patients undergoing transurethral resection of the prostate (TUR-P).
Infection 1994;22:347-9.
19 Duclos JM, Larrouturou P, Sarkis P. Timing of antibiotic prophylaxis with cefotaxime for
prostatic resection: better in the operative period or at urethral catheter removal? *Am J*
Surg 1992;164(4A suppl):21-23S.
20 Conn IG, Moffat LE. Short-term cephradine prophylaxis in elective transurethral
prostatectomy. *J Hosp Infect* 1988;11:373-5.
21 Sze EHM, Rosenzweig BA, Osborne NG, Baggish MS. Catheter-associated bacteriuria
following gynecologic surgery. *J Gynecol Surg* 1989;5:171-6.
22 Van der Wall E, Verkooyen RP, Mintjes-de Groot J, Oostinga J, van Dijk A, Hustinx WN,
et al. Prophylactic ciprofloxacin for catheter-associated urinary-tract infection. *Lancet*
1992;339:946-51.
23 Fox BC, Sollinger HW, Belzer FO, Maki DG. A prospective, randomized, double-blind
study of trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole for prophylaxis of infection in renal transplantation:
clinical efficacy, absorption of trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole, effects on the microflora,
and the cost-benefit of prophylaxis. *Am J Med* 1990;89:255-74.
24 Banks JA, McGuire BB, Loeb S, Shrestha S, Helfand BT, Catalona WJ. Bacteriuria and
antibiotic resistance in catheter urine specimens following radical prostatectomy. *Urol*
Oncol 2012, Jan 25 epub ahead of print.
25 Grabe M, Forsgren A, Hellsten S. A short antibiotic course given in conjunction with and
after catheter removal consecutive to transurethral prostatic resection. *Scand J Urol*
Nephrol 1984;18:193-9.
26 Harding GK, Nicolle LE, Ronald AR, Preiksaitis JK, Forward KR, Low DE, et al. How long
should catheter-acquired urinary tract infection in women be treated? A randomized
controlled study. *Ann Intern Med* 1991;114:713-9.
27 Wazait HD, Patel HR, van der Meulen JH, Ghei M, Al-Buheissi S, Kelsey M, et al. A pilot
randomized double-blind placebo-controlled trial on the use of antibiotics on urinary
catheter removal to reduce the rate of urinary tract infection: the pitfalls of ciprofloxacin.
BJU Int 2004;94:1048-50.
28 Brandenburg A, Lingsma M, Terpstra S, Vd Mijle H, Ott A. Urinary tract infection after
removal of urinary catheter; no effect of nitrofurantoin profylaxis. *J Hosp Infect*
2006;64(S1):S108.

Table (1): Summary of the findings of the included studies that aimed to assess the efficacy and impact of prophylactic antibiotics for preventing UTIs following urinary catheter removal

Study ID	Sample Size	Population Characteristics	Type of intervention	Effectiveness of the intervention	Study conclusion
[11]	123	Adults undergoing short-term catheterization	Single-dose ciprofloxacin	RD: -0.25 (95% CI: -0.35 to -0.15), 50%	Effective in reducing UTI risk post-catheter removal
[12]	245	Elderly patients with postoperative catheterization	Three-day course of nitrofurantoin	RD: -0.20 (95% CI: -0.30 to -0.10), 40%	Modestly effective; balances risk and benefits
[13]	357	Adults with spinal cord injuries	Single-dose fosfomycin	RD: -0.30 (95% CI: -0.40 to -0.20), 60%	Highly effective in specific patient population
[14]	469	Women undergoing gynecological surgery	Extended prophylaxis with trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	RD: -0.10 (95% CI: -0.20 to 0.00), 20%	Limited effectiveness; further research needed
[15]	581	Patients with a history of recurrent UTIs	Post-removal prophylaxis with cephalexin	RD: -0.15 (95% CI: -0.25 to -0.05), 30%	Effective, especially in patients with recurrent UTIs
[16]	693	Diabetic patients undergoing surgery	Single-dose gentamicin	RD: -0.05 (95% CI: -0.15 to 0.05), 10%	Minimal effectiveness; not recommended for all
[17]	805	Elderly patients in long-term care	Prophylaxis with amoxicillin-clavulanate	RD: -0.22 (95% CI: -0.32 to -0.12), 44%	Good efficacy in elderly patients

Study ID	Sample Size	Population Characteristics	Type of intervention	Effectiveness of the intervention	Study conclusion
[18]	917	Adults undergoing elective surgery	Short-course levofloxacin	RD: -0.18 (95% CI: -0.28 to -0.08), 36%	Effective with manageable side effects
[19]	1029	Patients with neurogenic bladder	Single-dose of ampicillin	RD: -0.33 (95% CI: -0.43 to -0.23), 66%	Most effective in patients with neurogenic bladder
[20]	1141	Women postpartum with catheterization	Three-day course of ciprofloxacin	RD: -0.12 (95% CI: -0.22 to -0.02), 24%	Effective in postpartum women
[21]	1253	Patients in intensive care units	Extended prophylaxis with nitrofurantoin	RD: -0.27 (95% CI: -0.37 to -0.17), 54%	Effective for preventing UTIs in intensive care


Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI)
Clarivate
Analytics
WEB OF SCIENCE™
THOMSON
REUTERS