



Characterization and Identification of Bacteria Present in the Bath Towels of Female Students in Rivers State University Hostels

C. J. Ugboma ^{a*} and H. C. Otamiri ^a

^a *Department of Microbiology, Rivers State University, Nkpolu Oroworukwo, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/MRJI/2022/v32i101346

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/85246>

Original Research Article

Received: 02/01/2022

Accepted: 05/04/2022

Published: 20/12/2022

ABSTRACT

Bath towels are an important part of our everyday life, but they often amass a large number of micro-organisms which may sometimes be harmful to us. For the study a total of 10 samples plus a control were collected from bath towels of female students in NDDC hostel, post-graduate hostel and control from Mile 3 market respectively between November 2021 to February 2022. Standard methods were employed for the sampling and determination of microbiological characteristics. Identification of bacteria was carried out using colonial, morphological and biochemical characteristics. Statistical analysis were performed using the T-test method and sensitivity was carried out on the isolates to detect pathogenicity. Range of microbial counts of NDDC hostel were: Total heterotrophic bacteria 2.0×10^4 cfu/ml to 3.17×10^4 cfu/ml, Total coliform count 0.48×10^4 cfu/ml to 2.99×10^4 cfu/ml in the first sampling. Post graduate hostel ranged from: Total heterotrophic bacteria 1.48×10^4 cfu/ml to 0.18×10^4 cfu/ml in the first sampling. For the second sampling, NDDC hostel microbial count ranged from 0.73×10^4 cfu/l to 1.15×10^4 cfu/ml in the total

*Corresponding author: E-mail: donchyhy2007@yahoo.com;

heterotrophic bacteria, and 0.31×10^4 cfu/ml to 0.13×10^4 cfu/ml for total coliform count. Post graduate hostel ranged from 0.27×10^4 cfu/ml to 0.93×10^4 cfu/ml for total heterotrophic bacteria and 0.22×10^4 cfu/ml to 0.18×10^4 cfu/ml for total coliform count. The control microbial count for total heterotrophic bacteria were 0.12×10^4 and 0.16×10^4 cfu/ml for the first and second sampling respectively and for the total coliform count, 0.18×10^4 cfu/ml and 0.17×10^4 cfu/ml for the first and second sampling respectively. Statistical analysis using student's T-test was carried out. The mean test values for total heterotrophic bacteria in the first and second samplings were 2.2750E2 and 57.4000 in NDDC hostel and 1.5060E2 and 66.8000 in post graduate hostel. The mean values for total coliform count for the first and second samplings were 1.6220E2 and 24.5000 in NDDC hostel and 99.8000 and 26.9000 in Post graduate hostel. The test revealed that there was no significant difference in the bacterial load of NDDC hostel and Post graduate hostel from the two samplings. In the antimicrobial susceptibility test carried out, results showed that Ciproflox, Reflacin and Tarrivid were most effective against the isolates, while the isolates mostly showed resistance against Amplicox, Amoxil and Azithromycin. The bacteria species isolated were *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Escherichia coli*, *Staphylococcus spp*, *Bacillus cereus*, *Klebsiella spp*, *Bacillus spp*. The study demonstrated that significant numbers of *E.coli*, and staphylococcus as well as other microbes occur in bath towels.

Keywords: Towels; bathroom; hostel; bacteria; coliforms; pathogenicity.

1. INTRODUCTION

Bath towels are clothes we use to wipe or clean our body after bath. They collect and accumulate microorganisms from the body and surroundings where they are kept creating an avenue for changes in incidence, pathogens and outcome [1].

Commensals as well as mutualistic microorganisms habit the skin preventing pathogens from taking over the skin [2]. At times these normal skin flora cause diseases especially in immune compromised persons (Fedricks, 2007).

As we know the environment is laden with consortium of microorganisms in dust suspensions, bath water bath sponge e.t.c. sometimes bacteria and viruses that habit the intestinal tract of humans can get into bathing water when it gets contaminated with faeces and hence when we clean our body with towels, these organisms are lodged on the bath towels. Some of these organisms include *Escherichia coli*, *Salmonella*, *Rotavirus*, *Enterovirus*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Aeromonas hydrophilia*, *Staphylococcus epidermidis*, and *Staphylococcus aureus* [3,4,5,6].

According to Roth and James, [7] some of these microorganisms are opportunistic especially when there are injuries to the skin or immune compromised persons, they cause severe infections.

Justification of sample size and implication of the study is due to the way female students in those hostels mentioned use and take care of their towels.

1.1 Aim

To characterise and identify difference bacteria in bath towels of female students in Rivers State University.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Study Area

2.1.1 Rivers State University Female hotels (NDDC and POST GRADUATE)

Station I: NDDC Female Hostel

Station II: Post-graduate Female Hostel

Station III: Control Towel Purchased from Mile 3 Market

2.2 Sample Collection

Female bath towels were swabbed from the hostels using sterile swab sticks while wearing sterile gloves. The swab sticks were put in sterile zip lock bags and transported to the laboratory.

2.3 Preparation of Media

All the media used in this work including Nutrient Agar, Eosine Methylene blue and MacConkey

was prepared according to manufacturers description

2.4 Antibiogram (Agar Disk Diffusion Method)

Antibiogram or Antibiotic sensitivity testing is the measurement of the susceptibility of bacteria to antibiotics. A sterile swab stick was dipped into a tube containing, the bacteria suspension and its turbidity is equivalent to 0.5m Mcfarland turbidity standard and the swab stick was pressed against the tube above the fluid level to remove evenly which contained already prepared Mueller hinton agar in three dimension rotating the plate about 60°C each time. The agar plate was allowed to dry for 5 minutes then the antimicrobial disk was impregnated into the agar using a sterile forcep or the surface of the inoculated plate 1.5ml away from the edge of the plate. Using the head of the sterile forcep, the disk is slightly preserved down to ensure good contact with the agar. After applying the disk, the plates were incubated in an inverted position at 35°C for 16 to 18 hrs. After incubation, the test plates were examined to ensure confluence growth or near confluence. The diameter of each zone of inhibition was measured in millimetres using a ruler on the underside of the plate and recorded for reference purposes [8].

2.5 Biochemical Tests

Biochemical tests are one of the traditional methods for the identification of micro-organisms, usually performed with phenotypic identification.

The ability of micro-organism to utilize certain biomolecules resulting in useful organic compound for themselves forms the basis of various biochemical tests. Biochemical tests are different types, where the identification or distinction between different microorganisms is made on various bases.

2.6 Motility Test

The test is used to differentiate between motile and non-motile micro-organisms. Double strength nutrient agar was dispensed into test tubes, autoclaved to sterilize and allowed to solidify using sterilized wire loop, each isolate was inoculated by stabbing to half the depth of media and incubated at room temperature for about 48 hours. Growth away from the inoculation was recorded as evidence of motility.

2.7 Catalase Test (Slide Method)

This test is used to identify organisms that produce the enzyme catalase. This enzyme detoxifies hydrogen peroxide by breaking it down into water and oxygen of as a sterile wire loops used to transfer a loopful of the test organism to a grease free slide emulsified with a drop of distilled water. One drop of hydrogen peroxide (6%) was added and observed for effervescence within 3 seconds. The production of air bubbles indicates a positive result.

2.8 Oxidase Test (Filter Paper Method)

This test is used to identify micro-organisms containing the enzyme, cytochrome oxidase (important in the electron transport chain). A small portion of the isolate was smeared on part of the filter paper impregnated with freshly prepared oxidase reagent. The reaction was observed within 10 seconds to see if there was any colour change. Deep purple colourations appearing within 5-10second, indicate a positive reaction, a weak positive reaction appeared within 70-60 seconds and a negative reactions was indicated by non colour change.

2.9 Indole Test

This test is used to ascertain the ability of some microbes to hydrolyse the amino acid tryptophan to produce indole. Tryptophan is made available by trypton in the medium of 10ml of peptone water and dispensed test tubes and sterilized by autoclaving. It was allowed to 100l before inoculating isolates into the sterile broth. The broth culture was incubated at 37°C for 48hrs after which 0.5ml of Kovac's reagent was added into each of the culture test tube. The test tubes were shaken and allowed to stand for 5minutes. Positive results show a red colour at the surface of the medium and negative result showed no read colour at the surface of the medium.

2.10 Methyl Red Test

This test is used to identify bacteria producing stable acid by mechanism of mixed acid fermentation of glucose. 17g of methyl red vogues-proskauer (MRVP) broth was suspended in 100ml distilled water. 5ml MRVP broth were distributed into each text tube and autoclaved at 121°C for 15 minutes. A loopful of the test organism was inoculated into the broth and incubated for 48hrs. After incubation 2-5 drops of methyl red indicator was added to the culture. Red colour changed indicated a positive result

and yellow colour change indicated a negative result.

2.11 Vogues-Proskauer Test

This test is used to detect acetone (an important physiological metabolite excreted by many micro organisms) in a bacteria broth culture. A loopful of the test organisms is inoculated into MRVP broth and incubated for 24hours. After incubation, 0.6ml (9 drops) of α -naphthal and 0.2 (3days) of potassium hydroxide were dropped into the broth culture and was shaken and allowed to stand for 15minuts. A pink or red colour at the surface of the medium indicates a positive result and a copper colour at the surface of the medium indicates a negatives result.

2.12 Sugar Fermentation

This test is used to share the utilization of sugar by bacteria as a sole source of carbon with the production of either acid or gas, or both and colour change. 2.08g of peptone is dissolved in 200ml of distilled water (Peptone water broth). An indicator to indicate the reactivity by colour change (methyl red some) was added to top tone water. Equal quantity of the already prepared peptone was is dispensed into different sterile

conical flasks the available sugars (1.0g) are respectively dissolved into the peptone water and then dispensed in 10ml into test tubes containing inverted Durham tubes and autoclaved. The respective isolates were inoculated aseptically and incubated for 24-48hrs at 37°C. Positive results have colour changes from red to yellow or from yellow to colourless indicating acid production. Gas production was noted by presence of air space in the Durham tubes within the test tubers. Retention of initial colour indicates negative result.

3. RESULTS

The results for the total heterotrophic count of bacteria for the first and second sampling of bath towels were presented in Tables 1 and 2. The results showed that NDDC hostel had the highest count for the first sampling at 3.17×10^4 cfu/ml and post graduate hostel had the highest count for the sample sampling at 1.17×10^4 cfu/ml.

In Tables 3 and 4, results for total coliform are presented and they showed that NDDC hostel had the highest count for first sampling at 2.99×10^4 cfu/ml and post graduate hostel had the highest count for the second sampling at 0.41×10^4 cfu/mu.

Table 1. Total heterotrophic count (first sampling)

Location	Sample	THB1	THB2	Mean	CFU/ml
NDDC Hostel	A	190	210	200	2.0×10^4
	B	113	92	103	1.03×10^4
	C	308	294	301	3.01×10^4
	D	220	215	218	2.18×10^4
	E	315	318	317	3.17×10^4
PG Hostel	F	150	145	148	1.48×10^4
	G	68	42	55	0.55×10^4
	H	207	195	201	2.01×10^4
	I	40	37	39	0.39×10^4
	J	321	301	311	3.11×10^4
	Control	8	15	12	0.12×10^4

Table 2. Total heterotrophic count (second sampling)

Location	Sample	THB1	THB2	Mean	CFU/ml
NDDC Hostel	A	76	69	73	0.73×10^4
	B	40	33	37	0.37×10^4
	C	46	54	50	0.5×10^4
	D	17	10	14	0.14×10^4
	E	117	112	115	1.15×10^4
PG Hostel	F	33	20	27	0.27×10^4
	G	50	28	39	0.39×10^4
	H	66	52	59	0.59×10^4
	I	112	122	117	1.17×10^4
	J	87	98	93	0.93×10^4
Mile 3 Market	Control	10	22	16	0.16×10^4

In Tables 5 and 6, results for occurrences of isolates on the samples were presented. In the first sampling the isolates *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Bacillus cereus*, *E.coli* and *Klebsiella sp* had the highest occurrence at 9.30% and the lowest occurrence at 2.33% for *Staphylococcus sp* & *Bacillus sp*. In the second sampling, the highest occurrence happened in *E.coli* at 21.7%, while the lowest was *Staphylococcus aureus* at 8.7%.

In Tables 7 and 8, results for morphological and Biochemical test were presented. The results showed that about 59% of the isolates were gram positive and 41% gram negative.

4. DISCUSSION

The analyses in this study were carried out to know the characteristics and identified bacteria in towels of female students in Rivers State University hostels. Counts of total heterotrophic bacteria ranged 2.0×10^4 cfu/ml to 3.17×10^4 cfu/ml in the NDDC hostel and 1.48×10^4 cfu/ml

to 3.11×10^4 cfu/ml in post graduate hostel for the first sampling with the control at 0.12×10^4 cfu/ml. Total heterotrophic count for the second sampling ranged from 0.73×10^4 cfu/ml to 1.15×10^4 cfu/ml in NDDC hostel, 0.12×10^4 cfu/ml to 0.93×10^4 cfu/ml in the post graduate hostel with the control having 0.16×10^4 cfu/ml. Total coliform count for first sampling ranged from 0.48×10^4 cfu/ml to 2.99×10^4 cfu/ml in NDDC hostel and 2.9×10^4 cfu/ml to 0.18×10^4 cfu/ml in the post graduate hostel with the control having 0.18×10^4 cfu/ml. Total coliform count for the second sampling ranged from 0.31×10^4 to 0.13×10^4 cfu/ml in NDDC hostel, 0.22×10^4 to 0.18×10^4 cfu/ml in the post graduate hostel and the control having 0.17×10^4 cfu/ml.

The bacterial isolate identified were *staphylococcus aureus*, *Escherichia coli*, *staphylococcus sp.*, *Bacillus cereus*, *klebsiella spp*, *Bacillus spp*. This agrees with the work of [9] in which *E.coli* and *Staphylococcus aureus* were isolated from towel samples.

Table 3. Total coliform count (first sampling)

Location	Sample	THB1 (10^{-1})	THB2 (10-1)	Mean	CFU/ml
NDDC Hostel	A	50	46	48	0.48×10^4
	B	47	36	42	0.42×10^4
	C	140	210	175	1.75×10^4
	D	281	215	248	2.48×10^4
	E	292	305	299	2.99×10^4
PG Hostel	F	288	292	290	2.9×10^4
	G	15	21	18	0.18×10^4
	H	140	165	153	1.53×10^4
	I	26	16	21	0.21×10^4
	J	18	17	18	0.18×10^4
	Control	17	19	18	0.18×10^4

Table 4. Total coliform count (second sampling)

Location	Sample	THB1 (10^{-1})	THB2 (10^{-1})	Mean	CFU/ml
NDDC Hostel	A	33	29	31	0.31×10^4
	B	31	25	28	0.28×10^4
	C	36	24	30	0.30×10^4
	D	24	17	21	0.21×10^4
	E	16	10	13	0.13×10^4
PG Hostel	F	16	28	22	0.22×10^4
	G	21	32	27	0.27×10^4
	H	32	23	28	0.28×10^4
	I	39	42	41	0.41×10^4
	J	15	21	18	0.18×10^4
Mile 3 Market	Control	13	20	17	0.17×10^4




Fig. 1. % Occurrence of Bacterial Isolates in the Towel Sample

Table 5. Frequency Table (First Sampling)

Isolates	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	Control	Total	Percentage (%)
HO ₁	+			+						+	+	4	9.30%
HO ₂			+			+				+		3	6.97%
HO ₃									+	+	+	3	6.97%
HO ₄	+								+			2	4.65%
HO ₅									+			1	2.33%
HO ₆			+	+					+			4	9.30%
HO ₇						+			+			2	4.65%
HO ₈			+			+			+			3	6.97%
HO ₉	+			+	+						+	4	9.30%
HO _A					+				+			2	4.7%
HO _B									+		+	2	4.7%
HO _C									+			1	2.33%
HO _D			+									1	2.33%
HO _E						+						1	2.33%
HO _F	+					+						2	4.65%
HO _{E1}			+			+				+	+	4	9.30%
HO _{E2}		+			+					+	+	4	9.30%
Total												43	100%

Table 6. Frequency table (second sampling)

Isolates	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Control	Total	Percentage (%)
1	+			+						+		3	13.0%
2			+					+				2	8.7%
3			+			+		+				3	13.0%
4	+								+	+		3	13.0%
5	+				+		+					3	13.0%
6		+		+	+						+	4	17.4%
7	+				+				+	+	+	5	21.7%
Total												23	100%

Table 7.

Colonial Morphology							Biochemical Reaction							Sugar Fementation				Probable Organism	
Isolates	Margin	Colour	Texture	Shape	Elevation	Surface	Gram reaction	Indole	Citrate	Methyl Red	Vogus-Proskauerr	Motility	Oxidase	Catalase	Lactose	Sucrose	Glucose	Mannitol	
HO ₁	Entire	Yellow Gold	Moist	Cocci	Raised	Smooth	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	A	A	A	-	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>
HO ₂	Entire	Creamy	Moist	Rod	Raised	Smooth	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	A	AG	AG	<i>Escherichia coli</i>
HO ₃	Entire	Creamy	Dry	Rod	Flat	Smooth	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	A	AG	AG	<i>Klebsiella sp</i>
HO ₄	Entire	Creamy	Dry	Rod	Flat	Smooth	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	-	A	-	<i>Bacillus sp</i>
HO ₅	Entire	Yellow Gold	Moist	Cocci	Raised	Smooth	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	A	-	<i>Staphylococcus sp</i>
HO ₆	Entire	Milky	Dry	Rod	Flat	Smooth	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	A	-	<i>Bacillus cereus</i>
HO ₇	Serrated	Creamy	Dry	Cocci	Flat	Smooth	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	A	AG	AG	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>
HO ₈	Entire	Yellow Gold	Moist	Cocci	Raised	Smooth	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	A	A	A	A	<i>Staphylococcus sp</i>
HO ₉	Entire	Creamy	Moist	Rod	Raised	Smooth	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	AG	A	AG	<i>Escherichia coli</i>
HO _A	Serrated	Creamy	Moist	Rod	Raised	Smooth	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	A	AG	A	A	<i>Escherichia coli</i>
HO _C	Entire	Creamy	Dry	Rod	Raised	Smooth	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	A	A	A	-	<i>Bacillus sp</i>
HO _D	Entire	Creamy	Moist	Rod	Raised	Smooth	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	A		<i>Bacillus sp</i>
HO _E	Serrated	Creamy	Moist	Rod	Flat	Smooth	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	A	AG	AG	AG		<i>Escherichia coli</i>
HO _F	Entire	Creamy	Moist	Cocci	Flat	Rough	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	A	A	A	A		<i>Staphylococcus sp</i>
HO _{E1}	Entire	Creamy	Moist	Rod	Raised	Smooth	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	AG	A	AG	AG		<i>Klebsiella sp</i>
HO _{E2}	Entire	HO _B	Entire	Creamy	Dry	Rod	-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	A	A	A		A <i>Bacillus sp</i>

Table 8.

Colonial Morphology							Biochemical Reaction							Sugar Fermentation			Probable Organism		
Isolates	Margin	Colour	Texture	Shape	Elevation	Surface	Gram reaction	Indole	Citrate	Methyl Red	Voges-Proskauer	Motility	Oxidase	Catalase	Lactose	Sucrose	Glucose	Mannitol	
1	Entire	Creamy	Moist	Rod	Raised	Smooth	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	AG	A	AG	<i>Escherichia coli</i>
2	Entire	Yellow Gold	Moist	Cocci	Raised	Smooth	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	A	A	A	-	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>
3	Entire	Yellow Gold	Moist	Cocci	Raised	Smooth	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	A	A	A	-	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>
4	Entire	Creamy	Moist	Rod	Flat	Smooth	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	A	AG	AG	<i>Klebsiella sp</i>
5	Serrated	Creamy	Dry	Cocci	Flat	Smooth	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	A	A	A	-	<i>Staphylococcus sp</i>
6	Entire	Milky	Dry	Rod	Flat	Smooth	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	A	-	-	<i>Bacillus sp</i>
7	Entire	Creamy	Moist	Rod	Flat	Smooth	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	A	AG	AG	AG	<i>Escherichia coli</i>

Table 9. Antibiotic susceptibility pattern of bacterial isolates from bath towels gram positive

Isolates	CPX	S	SXT	E	PEF	CN	APX	Z	AM	R
Bacillus sp.	S	I	R	I	S	S	I	S	S	S
Staphylococcus sp.	S	S	S	I	S	S	R	R	R	I
Bacillus cereus	S	R	R	R	S	R	R	R	R	R
Bacillus sp.	S	R	R	S	S	S	R	R	R	R
Staphylococcus sp.	S	I	R	I	S	R	R	R	R	I
Staphylococcus aureus	S	I	R	I	S	R	R	R	R	I
Bacillus sp.	S	R	R	S	S	I	R	R	R	R
Bacillus sp.	S	I	S	S	S	R	R	R	R	I
Staphylococcus sp.	S	S	R	R	S	R	R	R	R	I
Staphylococcus sp.	S	S	S	I	S	S	R	R	R	I

Table 10. Antibiotic susceptibility pattern of bacterial isolates from bath towels gram negative

Isolates	OFX	S	SXT	CH	SP	CPX	AM	AU	CN	PEF
E. coli	S	S	S	S	S	S	R	R	R	S
Klebsiella sp.	S	R	S	R	S	S	R	R	R	S
E. coli	S	I	S	I	S	S	R	I	R	I
E. coli	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
E. coli	S	S	I	R	S	S	R	R	I	S
E. coli	S	R	R	R	S	S	R	R	R	S
Klebsiella	S	R	S	R	S	S	R	R	R	S

Key:
 CPX -Ciproflox, PEF - Reflacine
 S - Streptomycin, CN - Gentamycin, S - Sensitive
 E - Erythromycin, AM - Amoxil, I - Intermediate
 APX -Ampiclox, SXT - Septrin, R - Resistant
 Z - Azithromycin, R - Rifampicin
 AU -Augmentin, SP - Spectinomycin
 CH -Chloramphenicol, OFX - Tarrivid

The NDDC hostel recorded the highest heterotrophic bacteria count at 3.17×10^4 for the first sampling while post graduate hostel had the highest heterotrophic bacteria count for the second sampling at 1.17×10^4 . For the total coliform count, NDDC hostel recorded the highest count at 2.99×10^4 cfu/ml for the first sampling and post graduate hostel had the highest count for the second sampling at 0.41×10^4 cfu/ml. The controls for both total heterotrophic bacteria and total coliform counts for the first and second sampling were significantly low compared to these of NDDC hostel and post graduate hostel. This may be attributed to it being a new towel that had not been used for cleaning purposes.

The significant differences in bacterial counts between the two hostels may be due to variations in hostel conditions, water supply/quality and general handling by females in the different hostels. This is in agreement with the work of [10,11]. The differences also in

counts between the first and second sampling may be attributed to the week interval between the samplings. The students were told to wash the towels and use for a few days prior to the second sampling.

Based on this study, it was observed that *E.coli* occurred in about 57% of the samples. This can be attributed to the fact that bathrooms of all hostels sampled for this study were close to toilets. Toilets are very likely sources of *E.coli* contamination [9]. *Staphylococcus aureus* also occurred in about 36% of the samples. This is attributed to *S. aureus* being a normal flora of the skin. This agrees with the work of [12] that *S. aureus* occurs in cotton towels. It also agrees with the work of [13] that observed that *Staphylococcus* could survive for 19-21 days on cotton fabrics, which can be attributed to the significant occurrence of *Staphylococcus* species in the second sampling even after they were washed [12].

The results were analyzed using student's T test to compare bacterial loads in the samples from the two hostels and the mean values were: Total heterotropic bacteria 2.2750E2 for NDDC hostel and 1.5060E2 for PG hostel in the first sampling, 57.4000 for NDDC hostel and 66.8000 for post graduate hostel in the second sampling. Total coliform counts were 1.6220E2 for NDDC hostel and 99.8000 for post graduate hotel in the first sampling and 24.5000 for NDDC hostel and 26.9000 for post graduate hostel in the second sampling. It showed that there was no significant difference in the bacterial loads of NDDC hostel and post graduate hostel in the first and second sampling in our study, we have tested isolated bacterial species for their sensitivity pattern against the commonly prescribed antibiotics according to the CLSI guideline Antibiotic Susceptibility of *Staphylococcus* sp was tested against 10 commonly prescribes and available antibiotics (Ciproflox, Reflacine, Streptomycin, Gentamycin, Septrin, Erythromycin, Ampiclox, Amoxil, Rifampicin and Azithromycin), using agar diffusion method [14].

The results show that the susceptibility of *Staphylococcus* sp was higher Ciproflox, and Reflacine (100%) followed by Septrin (60%) and Gentamycin (40%). *Staphylococcus* sp showed higher resistance to Ampiclox and Amoxil with 100% for each of them.

For *Bacillus* species isolates, Ciproflox and Reflaxine also had the highest susceptibility rates at 100% each, followed by Erythromycin and Gentamycin with 40% sensitivity each Septrin had the highest resistance rate with 100% resistance followed by Ampiclox with 80% resistance.

In the case of *E.coli* isolates, the results showed that the susceptibility was higher for Tarrivid (100%), followed by Ciproflox with 80% sensitivity. The highest percentage of resistance was recorded against Ampiclox (100%) and Augmentin and Gentamycin at 80% sensitivity each.

For the *Klebsiella* species isolates, the results showed the susceptibility was 100% for Tarrivid, Septrin, Ciproflox and Reflacine while it recorded 100% resistance against Septrin, chloramphenicol, Augmentin, Amoxil and Gentamycin. In general, the results show that Ciproflox and Reflacine were most effective against the isolates. All the isolates showed high level of resistance against Ampiclox, Amoxil and

Azithromycin. *E. coli* and *Klebsiella* sp. were also highly sensitive to Tarrivid.

5. CONCLUSION

The study on the characterization and identification of bath towels of female students in Rivers State University hostels revealed that micro organisms are present in baths towels in various varieties and degrees. The morphological and biochemical identification of bacterial isolates revealed the presence of *Escherichia coli*, *Klebsiella* spp, *Staphylococcus* spp and *Bacillus* sp. Some of the genera (*Staphylococcus* spp, *Klebsiella* spp, *Bacillus* spp etc) were observed to be capable of being opportunistic pathogens under the right conditions.

Towels are necessary and useful items, but can also be a breeding ground for bacteria. This however can be greatly reduce if these items and kept clean at all times.

CONSENT

As per international standard or university standard, Participants' written consent has been collected and preserved by the author(s).

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Martin GS. Sepsis, severe sepsis and septic shock: changes in incidence, pathogens and outcomes." Expert Review of Anti-Infective Therapy. 2012;10(6): 701-6.
2. Hadaway LC. Skin flora and infection. J. Infus Nurs. 2002;4(2):3-9.
3. Corazza M, Carla E, Rossi MR, Pedna MF, Olgili A. Face and body sponges : Beauty aids or Potential Microbiological Reservoir? Eur J Dermatol. 2002;13(6): 511-3. PMID: 14721777.
4. Botone ES, Perez AA. Pseudomonas aeruginosa folliculitis acquired through use of a contaminated loofah sponge: an unrecognized potential public health problem. J. Clin Microbiol. 1993;31(3):480-483.

5. Madigan MM, Martinko J, Parker J. Brock Biology of Microorganisms. 8th ed Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall; 2000.
6. Chapelle FH. Ground water Microbiology and Geochemistry. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 2000;97-107.
7. Roth RR, James WD. Microbial ecology of the skin. *Anna Rev Microbiol.* 1988;42(1): 4441-64.
8. Clinical and Laboratory Standard Institute Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing twenty-five information supplement. CLSI document M100-S21 (ISBN 1-56238-742-1) Clinical and Laboratory Standard Institute, 940 West Valley road, Suite 1400, wayne, Pennsylvania 19087 USA. 2017;30(1): 68-70.
9. Hannah T, Asumang ZA, Imoro ST, Kporde. Toothbrush and Towel Handling and their Microbial Quality. The case of students of University for Development Studies, Nyankpala Campus, Ghana. *Afr, J. Infect Dis.* 2020;15(1): 41-46.
10. Sturt K. How often you should actually be washing your towels and streets [Online]; 2015. Available:<https://m.huffpost.com/us/entr/us-55cb927e4boflcbfle72> [Accessed: 20th June, 2019].
11. Bradford A. How often should you wash bath towels? It depend: Online; 2018. Available:https://www.inet-com.cdn.ampproject.org/v/s/www.cnet-com/google-amp/news/how-often-should-you-wash-bath-towels-heres-the-answers/?amp_js_v=a2&usqp=mp331AQAreferrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com&_tf=From%20%251%24s&sampshare Accessed: 20th June, 2019.]
12. Oller AR, Mitchell A. Staphylococcus aureus recovery from cotton towels. *J infect Developing Countries.* 2008;3(3): 224-228.
13. Neely AN, Maley M.P. Survival of Enterococci and Staphylococci on hospital fabrics and plastics. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2000;38:724-726.
14. Fredricks DN. Microbial ecology of human skin in health and disease. *J. Investing Dermatol Symp Proc.* 2001;6:167-167.

© 2022 Ugboma and Otamiri; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/85246>