**EXTERNAL ANTIBIOTIC THERAPY: MODERN TREATMENT OPTIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **About the author:** | Ya.F. Kutasevych, S.K. Dzhoraeva, O.I. Oliinyk, G.M. Biliaev |
| **Heading** | CLINICAL OBSERVATIONS |
| **Type of article** | Scentific article |
| **Annotation** | The objective of the work is to set out the principles and improve the antibiotic treatment  of pococcal infections of the skin and soft tissues.  Materials and methods. The study included 43 patients with severe and widespread  dermatoses who were hospitalized in the dermatology department of the SE “IDV NAMS  of Ukraine”. The identification of aerobic gram-positive, aerobic gram-negative fermenting  and non-fermentative bacteria isolated from different skin areas was performed using  routine methods based on the morphological, cultural, and biochemical properties of the  pathogens.  Results and discussion. As a result of bacteriological examination, 59 strains of  microorganisms were isolated from patients. Microorganisms of the genus Staphylococcus,  which weighed down the course of d ermatoses, dominated. In order to increase the  therapeutic efficacy and normalize the microbiocenosis of patients with chronic  dermatoses, external therapy was used in the treatment, which included mupirocin  ointment. As a result of the use of this external treatment scheme for patients with severe  chronic allergic dermatoses during the period of exacerbation, there was a regression of  the clinical signs of picococcal infection in 94.2% of patients. Clinical remission was  achieved in 28.9% of patients, a significant improvement in 53.9%, improvement in 11.4%.  Conclusions. The possibilities of using topical antibacterial agents, the mechanism of  action, pharmacokinetics and the expediency of using mupirocin in the practice of a  dermatologist have been studied, which allows us to recommend mupirocin for the  treatment of patients with chronic dermatoses who have received immunosuppressive  therapy for a long time. |
| **Tags** | external therapy, antibacterial therapy, mupirocin |
| **Bibliography** | * 1.  Masyukova SA, Glad’ko VV,  Ustinov MV, et al. Bakterial’nye infektsii kozhi i ikh znachenie v klinicheskoy praktike dermatologa [Bacterial skin infections and their significance in the clinical practice of a dermatologist]. Consilium medicum. 2004;6(3):180–185. 2.  Kutasevich YaF, Іshcheykіn KE, Zyuban ІV, Mangusheva VYu.  Diferentsіyovaniy pіdkhіd do dіagnostiki ta zovnіshn’oї terapії ekzemi [Differentiated approach to the diagnosis and external therapy of eczema]. Dermatologіya ta venerologіya. 2018;1(79):50–55. 3.  Kukushkin GV, Starostina EG. Infektsii u bol’nykh sakharnym diabetom (lektsiya) (Infections in patients with diabetes mellitus (lecture). RMZh. 2016;20:1327–1333. 4.  Nobl UK, Rybalka VM. Mikrobiologiya kozhi cheloveka monografiya [Microbiology of human skin. Monograph]. Moscow: Meditsina, 1986. 496 p. 5.  Prikaz  MZ  SSSR  № 535  ot  22.04.1985  «Ob  unifikatsii  mikrobiologicheskikh  (bakteriologicheskikh)  metodov  issledovaniya,  primenyaemykh  v  kliniko-diagnosticheskikh  laboratoriyakh lechebno-profilakticheskikh uchrezhdeniy» [The order of the Ministry of Health of the USSR No. 535 dated 04/22/1985 “On the unification of microbiological (bacteriological) research methods used in clinical diagnostic laboratories of medical institutions”]. 6.  Bel’kova YuA, Strachunskiy LS, Krechikova OI, et al. Sravnitel’naya effektivnost’ 0,75% mazi khloramfenikola i 2% mazi mupirotsina pri lechenii v ambulatornykh usloviyakh vzroslykh patsientov s infektsiyami kozhi i myagkikh tkaney [Comparative efficacy of 0.75% chloramphenicol ointment and 2% mupirocin ointment in outpatient treatment of adult patients with infections of the skin and  soft tissues]. Klinicheskaya mikrobiologiya i antimikrobnaya khimioterapiya. 2007;9(1):57–65. 7.  Rist  T,  Parish  LC,  Capin  LR,  et  al.  A  comparison  of  the  efficacy  and  safety  of  mupirocin cream and cephalexin in the treatment of secondarily infected eczema. Clin Exp Dermatol.  2002;27(1):14–20. 8.  Booth JH,  Benrimoj SI. Mupirocin  in  the  treatment  of  impetigo.  Int.  J. Dermatol. 1992;31(1):1–9. 9.  Bradley SF. Effectiveness of mupirocin in the control of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus. Infect. Med. 1993;10:23–31. 10.  Chain EB, Mellows G. Pseudomonic acid. Part I. The structure of pseudomonic acid A, a novel antibiotic produced by Pseudomonas fluorescens. J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Transactions.1977;1:294–309. 11.  D’souza AA, Shegokar R. Polyethylene glycol (PEG): A versatile polymer for pharmaceutical applications. Expert Opinion on Drug Delivery. 2016;13(9):1257–1275. 12.  Dux PH, Fields L, Pollock D. 2% topical mupirocin versus systemic erythromycin and cloxacillin in primary and secondary skin infections. Curr Ther Res. 1986;40:933–940. 13.  Edge R, Argáez C. Topical antibiotics for impetigo: a review of the clinical effectiveness and guidelines. Ottawa: CADTH, 2017. 21 p. 14.  Gould JC,  Smith JH,  Moncur  H. Mupirocin  in  general  practice:  a  placebo-controlled trial. Wilkinson DS, Price JD, eds. Mupirocin – a novel topical antibiotic. London: Royal Society of Medicine International Congress and Symposium Series. 1984;80:85–93. 15.  Gratton D. Topical mupirocin versus oral erythromycin in the treatment of primary and secondary skin infections. Int J Dermatol. 1987;26:472–473. 16.  Hughes  J,  Mellows  G. Inhibition  of  isoleuciyl  transfer  ribonucleic  acid  synthetase in Escherichia coli by pseudomonic acid. Biochem. J. 1978;176:305–318. 17.  Hughes J, Mellows G. On the mode of action of pseudomonic acid: inhibition of protein synthesis in Staphylococcus aureus. J. Antibiot. 1978;31:330–335. 18.  Koning  S,  R  vander  Sande,  Verhagen  AP, et  al.  Interventions  for  impetigo.  Cochrane  Database of Systematic Reviews. 2012. Iss. 1. Art. No.: CD003261. DOI: 10.1002/14651858. CD003261.pub3. 19.  Kennedy CTC, Watts JA, Speller DCE. Mupirocin in the treatment of impetigo: a controlled trial against neomycin. Wilkinson DS, Price JD, eds. Mupirocin – a novel topical antibiotic. London:  Royal Society of Medicine International Congress and Symposium Series. 1984;80:79. 20.  McLinn S. Topical mupirocin vs. systemic erythromycin treatment for pyoderma. Paediatr Infect Dis J. 1988;7:785–790. 21.  Pappa KA. The clinical development of mupirocin. J. Amer. Acad. Dermatol. 1990;22:873–879. 22.  Fuller AT,   Mellows G,   Woodford M, et al. Pseudomonic acid: an antibiotic produced by Pseudomonas fluorescens. Nature. 1971;234:416–417. 23.  Sesso R, Barbosa D, Leme IL, et al. Staphylococcus aureus prophylaxis in hemodialysis patients using central venous catheter, effect of mupirocin ointment. J. Amer. Soc. Nephrol. 1998;9(6):1085–1092. 24.  Trilla A, Miro JM. Identifying high-risk patients for Staphylococcus aureus infections: skin and soft tissue infections. J Chemother. 1995;7:27–33. |
| **Publication of the article** | «DERMATOLOGY AND VENEREOLOGY» №3(85), 2019 year,24-30 pages,  index UDK *616.5–002.3–085* |
| **DOI** | 10.33743/ 2308-1066-2019-3-24-30 |