

---

## Intestinal Parasitic Infections in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in Benghazi, Libya

Eman Z. Younis<sup>1\*</sup>, Adela H. Elamami<sup>2,3</sup>, Mona. E. Almnefy<sup>4</sup>, Nesrin A. Alsherif<sup>5</sup>, Hana A.  
Laraibe<sup>6</sup>, Amira I. Burnia<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biology, Faculty of Education-Ghemines, University of Benghazi, Benghazi, Libya.

(Email Id: eman.younis @uob.edu.ly), (Email Id: eman-venous @yahoo.com).

<sup>2</sup>Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Benghazi, Benghazi, Libya.

<sup>3</sup>The Endocrine Unit, Hawari General Hospital, Benghazi, Libya.

(Email Id: elamamiadela@yahoo.com), (Email Id: adela.ebsat@uob.edu.ly).

<sup>4,5,6,7</sup>Department of Medical Laboratory, Higher Institute of Medical Professions, Benghazi, Libya.

\*Corresponding Author E-Mail Id: eman.younis@uob.edu.ly

---

**Abstract:** Diabetes is becoming a major chronic disease burden all over the world. Little is known about the prevalence of intestinal parasitic infections in them. The aim of this study was to determine this prevalence in Type 2 (DM) in Benghazi, Libya. A cross sectional case control study recruited two hundred type 2 diabetics from Benghazi diabetic center and one hundred non-diabetic individuals which served as control group was taken from Benghazi medical center and Elhiaa clinic .Their ages ranged between 18 to 55 years with and without diarrhea between January and December 2016. Socio demographic characteristics were taken during the interview. Fresh stool specimens were collected and processed, and data was analyzed. The prevalence of intestinal parasites was higher among diabetic patients (40.0%) than among non – diabetic patients (16.0%). Specifically, the following intestinal parasites were highly prevalent in diabetic subjects *Entamoeba coli* (10.5%), *Cryptosporidium parvum* (8.5%), while in control group *Entamoeba histolytica* (10 %), *Ascaris lumbricoides* (3 %) were the most isolated parasite. There was a significant relationship between prevalence of parasite and diarrhea (P = 0.001), education (P = 0.000), single and multiple infections (P = 0.001). Relation was not significant between parasitic infections with sex and age in all sample (P = 0.203, P = 0.56) respectively .The present study emphasizes the necessity of increasing awareness among clinicians regarding the occurrence of intestinal parasites at higher prevalence in type 2 diabetic patients.

**Keywords:** Intestinal Parasites, Diabetes Mellitus, Benghazi, Libya.

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

Intestinal parasites are two main types namely helminths and protozoa which are important causes of infections in immune compromised individuals. In healthy individual usually they cause less aggressive disease. Its a public health problem especially in tropical countries. (1) Where poor sanitary conditions and contamination of food and water sources. The developing countries are more prone to intestinal and extra-intestinal parasitic diseases (2). Even in well developed area some of these parasites can cause significant disease in immune compromised patients and young children (3,4). About 340 parasites infect an estimated 3.5 billion persons and cause clinical signs and symptoms in approximately 450 million. (5,6). Any weakness or defect in immune system including chronic internal diseases and metabolic disorders can lead to increases the risk of establishment of the infection, chronic carriage states, and morbidity of the intestinal parasites.

Diabetes mellitus is one of these metabolic diseases which can affect immune system. Diabetic patients have been reported to be immune compromised which predispose them to many of infection including parasitic infection.(7,8,9,10)

The prevalence of the diabetic patients infected with intestinal parasite in our Country is almost undetected and the efficacy of the treatment or preventive methods are obscure that's why we conduct this study to determine the burden of parasitic infection in both diabetic comparing to non diabetic Benghazi.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Study design and patients:

A cross sectional case control study recruited two hundred type 2 diabetics (134 females and 66 males) from Benghazi diabetic center and one hundred non-diabetic individuals (73 females and 27 males) which served as control group was taken from Benghazi medical center and Elhiaa clinic their ages ranged between 18 to 55 years with and without diarrhea between January and December 2016. Socio demographic characteristics were taken during interview. Fresh stool specimens were collected and processed. Glycated haemoglobin (HbA1c) was measured to detect DM in control group.

### 2.2 Specimen collection and processing:

All individuals in this study were interviewed by using a questionnaire. Stool samples were collected in a dry, clean, leak-proof plastic container were transported to the research laboratory of Institute Medical Professions\_ Benghazi immediately. Half of each sample was stored in 10% formalin to prevent bacterial action and the other half was stored in 10% ethanol. (11)These samples were examined macroscopically by naked eye for appearance, color, consistency and presence of blood mucous and adult or larvae helminths. (12) Microscopically following direct and formalin-ether concentration method (13) Direct microscopy of the smears in a saline (0.85% NaCl solution) to confirm the presence of motile intestinal parasites and trophozoites under light microscope (40 X

magnifications) and Lugol’s iodine was performed for the detection of ova, larvae, trophozoites, and cysts of intestinal parasites. In addition, a concentration procedure was employed that involved mixing the stool samples with formalin, treating with ether, centrifuging afterwards to gnisacrcni the chance of detecting protozoan parasite oocysts. The layers of ether, formalin, and debris were discarded, and the residues were used to investigate for the presence of intestinal parasites, (13,14) .Also, we used modified Ziehl-Neelsen staining technique for detection of oocysts of opportunistic coccidial intestinal parasite- *Cryptosporidium* spp, *Isospora belli* and *Cyclospora cayetanensis* (15). The data was analyzed using SPSS version 17 statistical package. A comparison of the frequency of parasites between cases and controls was performed by chi-square test.

### III. RESULTS

Prevalence of intestinal parasites was 40.0% among diabetic higher than non - diabetic 16.0% with high significance ( $\chi^2 = 37.576$ ,  $df=10$ ,  $p=0.000$ ).

Figure 1 show this prevalence in diabetic and non diabetic participant.

Specifically, the following intestinal parasites were highly prevalent in diabetic subjects *Entamoeba coli*(10.5% of 200 total diabetic / 26.3% of infected diabetic patients ), *Cryptosporidium parvum* (8.5% of 200 total diabetic / 21.3% of infected diabetic), while in control group *Entamoeba histolytica* (10 % of 100 total non diabetic / 63% of infected non diabetic), *Ascaris lumbricoides* (3 % of 100 total non diabetic /19% of infected non diabetic ) were the most isolated parasite .

Table 1 show different types of parasite isolated from diabetic and non diabetic control and their percentage (calculated from total infected number).

**Table.1 show different types of parasite isolated from diabetic and non diabetic control and their percentage (calculated from total infected number).**

Type of parasites	Infection (%)	
	Patients with DM (n=80 )	
<i>Blastocystis hominis</i>	1.3 % (1)	<i>Blastocystis hominis</i>
<i>Entamoeba histolytica</i> / <i>E. dispar</i>	12.5% (10)	<i>Entamoeba histolytica</i> / <i>E. dispar</i>
<i>Giardia lamblia</i>	12.5% (10)	<i>Giardia lamblia</i>
<i>Entamoeba coli</i>	26.3% (21)	<i>Entamoeba coli</i>

<i>Cryptosporidium parvum</i>	21.3% (17)	<i>Cryptosporidium parvum</i>
<i>Entamoeba hartmanni</i>	11.3% (9)	<i>Entamoeba hartmanni</i>
<i>Isospora belli</i>	6.3% (5)	<i>Isospora belli</i>
<i>Dientamoeba fragilis</i>	3.8% (3)	<i>Dientamoeba fragilis</i>
<i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i>	3.8% (3)	<i>Ascaris lumbricoides</i>
<i>Enterobius vermicularis</i>	1.3 % (1)	<i>Enterobius vermicularis</i>

Table (1) Prevalence of different intestinal parasitic infection among infected DM and non DM control.

The relation between the diabetes status and the risk parasitic infection was strongly significant ( $\chi^2 = 17.64$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $P=0.000$ , Odds ratio 3.5, CI = 1.94-6.4).

There was a significant relationship between prevalence of parasite and history of diarrhea ( $\chi^2$

$=26.5$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p=0.000$ , Odds ratio 5.94, CI = 2.84 - 12.4) as general and as separate for diabetic (P-value = 0.001) and non diabetic (P-value = 0.000).

Table 2 show numbers of patients with positive and negative infection as regard to history of diarrhea.

**Table. 2 Show numbers and percentage of patients with positive and negative infection as regard to history of diarrhea.**

Diarrhea	Total examined (n=200)DM	With parasitic infection (n=80)	Total examined (n=100)Non DM	With parasitic infection (n=16)
With diarrhea	34	22 (65.0 %)	4	4 (100%)
Without diarrhea	166	58 (35.0%)	96	12 (12.5%)
Total	200	80	100	16

The effect of education level was remarkable i.e. people with high education level they have less risk of parasitic infection ( $\chi^2 = 117.95$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p$  value = .000) regardless of diabetes status.

The relation of the gender ( $\chi^2 = 1.62$   $df=1$ ,  $p$  value = 0.203, odds ratio 0.7 CI = 0.4-1.2).and age ( $\chi^2 = 1.21$   $df=2$ ,  $p$  value = 0.56) in general to the risk


infection with parasite was not significant except in non diabetic population were the risk increase with age ( $\chi^2 = 13.3$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p$  value = 0.001) and being female sex ( $\chi^2 = 4.1$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p$  value = 0.04). Table 3.

**Table. 3 Illustrate the Prevalence of intestinal parasitic infection in each age group among Diabetic and non diabetics.**

Age groups (years)	DM		Control	
	Examined (n=100)	Infected (%) (n=16)	Examined (n=100)	Infected (%) (n=16)
28	5(17.9%)	(44.4%)28	28	5(17.9%)
37	0(0 %)	41(42.3%)	37	0(0 %)
35	11(31.4%)	11(27.5%)	35	11(31.4%)
100	16(16.0%)	80(40%)	100	16(16.0%)

Single or multiple infections was strongly correlated with diabetes status ( $\chi^2 = 39.46$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p$  value = .000), education level ( $\chi^2 = 147.8$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p$  value = .000) being markedly lower with higher education to get multiple infection, age ( $\chi^2 = 52.37$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p$  value = .000), and gender ( $\chi^2 = 15.45$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p$  value = .000) (female have higher risk of multiple infection) and history of diarrhea ( $\chi^2$

= 33.98,  $df=2$ ,  $p$  value = .000) is highly positive with multiple infection.



**Fig. 1 Show prevalence of parasitic infection in diabetic and non diabetic participant**

#### IV. DISCUSSION:

The prevalence of parasitic infection in our study was 40 % in diabetics which significantly higher than in non diabetic 16%, these results were in concordance with some previous studies.

Mohta, et al., 2015 (16), their study in Iran reveal that the rate of parasitic infection in diabetics was 26.3% which is higher than control 6.8%. Also in agreement with Olusegun et al., 2013(17) which could be explained by the defect in immune response in diabetic patients. (8,9,10). In contrast Fominyam, et al. ,2016 at Cameroon (18), and Nazligul, et al.,2001 at south east turkey (19) , their studies revealed lower prevalence of parasitic infection among diabetic (10%, 47%) comparing to non diabetics (23.5%,55.9%,) respectively. They explained their result by fact that the greater number of physician visits incurred by diabetic patients than the non-diabetic patients where

diabetic patients consult frequently and are treated for possible intestinal parasitic infections. (18,19). Of note both last studies were conducted at areas known to have high parasitic infection rate. While Olusegun et al., 2013 conduct the study at area with lower rate of parasitic infection. So it seems in areas were endemic for parasite the affect of diabetes attenuated.

The relation between the diabetes status and the risk of parasitic infection was strongly significant in our study (OR= 3.5) i.e. the diabetes increases the risk of parasitic infection which in agreement with result of Mohtashamipour M, et al., 2015 (16,18 ) but in contrast with result of Fominyam Boris Tangi et al.,2016 and Nazligul et al.,2001 which show lower risk with diabetes. (19, 20).

Some previous studies showed no difference as regard to sex (21), age (16), and this in

concordance with our result for all sample (p value =0.203) and in diabetics. While many studies show that female (16,18,19), and older ages (17,18,20,21) have higher prevalence of parasitic infection which similar to our result for non diabetic (P value = 0.04 for sex, p value =0.001 for age). So it seems diabetic status attenuate the effect of age and sex on the risk of acquiring parasitic infection.

Lower education level and positive history of diarrhea was strong predictor for parasitic infection especially mixed infection and this in agreement with some of previous studies (16, 20).

## V. CONCLUSION

This is the first research has been done for intestinal parasite among diabetic patients in Libya. In this study we found out that the higher prevalence of intestinal parasitic infection recorded among Type 2 diabetic Patients in Benghazi\_Libya was (40%) than non –diabetic Patients (16%) could be as a result of low immune status of these patients . Immuno compromised individuals have been found to have a high infection rate of intestinal parasite and thus, measures to prevent parasitic infection are recommended.

## VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special and sincere gratitude to participant in our research, without them this could not have been completed. Our special thanks to Department of Medical laboratory at Higher Institute of Medical Professions - Benghazi, for the facilitation

of the work on time. Finally, we would like to thank Prof. Zaid A. Alfageh for his intellectual guidance and moral support.

## VII. REFERENCES

- [1] Stark, D., Barratt, J.L.N., Van, H.S., Marriott, D., Harkness, J., and Ellis, J.T.,(2009). Clinical significance of enteric protozoa in the immunosuppressed human population. *ClinMicrobiol Rev* . 22(4): 634-50.
- [2] Zagloul, D.A., Khodari ,Y.A., Gazzaz, Z.J., Dhafar, K.O.,Shaker, H.A., and Farooq, M.U.,(2011) . Prevalence of intestinal parasites among patients of Al-Noor Specialist Hospital, Makkah, Saudi Arabia . *Oman medical journal* .26(3):182.
- [3] Fantry ,L.,(2002) . Gastrointestinal infections in the immunocompro- mised host. *CurrOpinGastroenterol*. 18: 34-39.
- [4] Ferreira , M.S.,(2000) . Infections by Protozoa in immunocompromised hosts. *MemInstOswaldo Cruz*. 95(1 1) :159-62.
- [5] Barsoum, R.S.,(2007) . Parasitic infections in organ transplantation. *ExpClin Transplant*. 2: 258-267.
- [6] WHO. Infectious Diseases Home Page. Intestinal parasites.
- [7] Gil, F.F., Barros, M.J., and Macedo, N.A.,(2013). Prevalence of intestinal parasitism and associated symptomatology among hemodialysis patients. *Rev. Inst. Med. Trop. Sao Paulo*. 55(2): 69-74.
- [8] Bessman, A.N., and Sapico, F.L.,(1992). Infections in the diabetic patient: the role of immune dysfunction and pathogen virulence factors. *Journal Diabetes Complications*. 6: 258-262.
- [9] Prasad, C.E.,(1999) . Immunodeficiencies in diabetes and mycobacterial infections. *Int J Diabetes Dev Countries*. 19: 52-55.

- [10] Moutschen, M.P., Scheen, A.J., Lefebvre, P.J.(1992) . Impaired immune responses in diabetes mellitus: analysis of the factors and mechanisms involved: relevance to the increased susceptibility of diabetic patients to specific infections. *DiabetesMetab.* 18: 187-201.
- [11] Mohandas ,K. ,Sehgal ,R. , Sud ,A., and Malla, N. (2002) : Prevalence of intestinal parasitic pathogens in HIV-seropositive individuals in Northern India . *Japanese Journal of Infectious Disease* ,55(3) :83-84 .
- [12] Chessbrough, M., (2004) . Parasitological tests in district laboratory practice in tropical countries. *tropical health technology*, World Health Organization , Geneva ,184-235.
- [13] World Health Organization.(1991). *Basic laboratory methods in medical parasitology*. World Health Organization, Geneva.
- [14] Markell, E.K. , Vog's, M., and John, D . (1986). *Medical Parasitology* 6th ed. W.B. Sandeas Company, London.
- [15] Current ,W.L., and Garcia, L.S.,(1990) : Cryptosporidiosis. *Clinical MicrobiolgyRev*, 4:(3) 25-58.
- [16] Mehdi ,M ., Shervin, G. H., Nader, P., Hoseinali,Y., Esmaeel ,F., and Teimour ,H.,(2015) .Intestinal parasitic infections in patients with Diabetes Mellitus: A case-control study. *Anal Res Clin Med*, 3(3), 157-63.
- [17] Akinbo, F., Olujobi, O., Omoregie, R., and Egbe, C.,(2013). Intestinal parasitic infections among diabetes mellitus patients. *Biomarkers and Genomic Medicine*. 5: 44-47.
- [18] Fominyam, B. T., Eric, B.F., Njunda, A. L., and Enoh J. E.,(2016) . Intestinal Parasites in Diabetes Mellitus Patients in the Limbe and Buea Municipalities, Cameroon. *Diabetes Res Open J*. 2(1): 1-7.
- [19] Nazligul, Y., Sabuncu, T., Ozbilge , H.,(2001) . Is there a predisposition to intestinal parasitosis in diabetic patients? *Diabetes Care*. 24: 1503-1504.
- [20] Hamed ,K., Ali ,H., (1), Ali, R., Eznollah ,A., Seyyed ,J.S.T., Abbas ,S., and Nozhat, Z., (2016). Prevalence, risk factors and symptoms associated to intestinal parasite infections among patients with gastrointestinal disorders in nahavand, western Iran. *Rev. Inst. Med. Trop. Sao Paulo*. 58:42.
- [21] Kabiru, M., Mohamed R. A., Julia, O. I .,and Aziah I.,(2015) . Intestinal Parasitic Infection and Assessment of Risk Factors in North-Western, Nigeria : A Community Based Study. *International Journal of Pharma Medicine and Biological Sciences*. 4 ( 2).