

# ISOLATION AND ANTIBIOGRAM PATTERN OF BACTERIA ISOLATED FROM AUTOMATED TELLER MACHINE (ATM) AT ABUJA CAMPUS, UNIVERSITY OF PORT HARCOURT.

## Abstract

The growing use of automated teller machines (ATMs) has sparked worries about possible microbial contamination on ATM keypads, which might be harmful to the general public's health. This study examines the antibiotic resistance characteristics of the bacterial infections linked to ATM keypads at the University of Port Harcourt's Abuja campus in Nigeria. Tests for antimicrobial susceptibility, bacterial isolation, and identification were carried out on swab samples obtained from different bank ATMs. Common contaminants found in the research were *Staphylococcus*, *Bacillus*, *Enterobacter*, *Aerobacter*, *Photobacterium*, and *Micrococcus* species. With a 40% prevalence, *Bacillus* species predominated, followed by *Staphylococcus* species at 30%. The range of total heterotrophic counts was 3.38–4.69 LogCfu/ml. The necessity for efficient biocides was highlighted by the antimicrobial susceptibility tests, which showed different resistance patterns in Gram-positive and Gram-negative isolates. This study demonstrates the rise of antibiotic-resistant bacteria and emphasizes the importance of microbial contamination on ATM keypads for public health. Advocating for the slowing of the spread of resistant microbes, research promoting frequent surveillance, hygiene education, and the creation of antimicrobial measures is endorsed. All things considered, insightful information on the microbial environment of often-touched surfaces was provided by the results, emphasizing the advocacy for taking preventative measures to reduce the health hazards related to ATMs.

**Keywords:** ATM, Keypads, Antibioqram, microbial, environment

## 1. Introduction

An antibiogram is a data collection that often takes the shape of a table and shows the percentage of different bacterial infections that are susceptible to different antimicrobial treatments [1]. Due to its extensive contact with a wide range of consumers, the ATM is likely to be contaminated with many microorganisms [2]. In Lafia, Nasarawa State, an investigation of bacterial contamination associated with ATM keypads revealed the existence of harmful microorganisms such as *Salmonella* sp., *Bacillus* sp., *Pseudomonas* sp., *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Klebsiella* sp., and *Enterobacter* sp. The findings of this study have implications for public health as ATM keypads may serve as sites for the spread of viruses [3].

Due to public use and the widespread acceptance and increased use of ATMs at the University of Port Harcourt in Nigeria's Abuja campus, electronic technologies are thought to be sources of bacterial contamination [4-5]. The main problem is that more bacterial strains than anticipated have become resistant to antibiotics and other disinfectants. This is because eliminating or restricting the development of dangerous microorganisms, such as bacteria, fungi, and viruses, on inanimate surfaces continues to be of utmost importance on a global scale. These microorganisms may sometimes pose a threat to human life.

Antimicrobial medications have been used for many years to combat harmful germs in a wide range of settings, including homes, workplaces, and hospitals [6]. However, using them for extended periods has resulted in the development of resistant bacteria [6]. The misuse or overuse of antibiotics and biocides, which often results in the establishment of cross-resistance, has led to an increase in the number of antibiotic-resistant bacteria in contemporary times. Therefore, problems associated with microbe remodeling and the emergence of resistant strains often call for the development of innovative, safe, and effective biocides [6-7]. This study aims to isolate an antibiogram pattern of bacterial

contamination of Automated Teller machines (ATM) of such on the University of Port Harcourt.

## **2. Materials and Methods**

### **2.1. Area of Study**

This research was conducted out at the University of Port Harcourt (Abuja Campus), Uniport is situated on latitude  $4^{\circ} 53'14''$  N through  $4^{\circ} 54' 42''$  N and longitude  $6^{\circ} 54' 00''$  E through  $6^{\circ} 55' 50''$  E. It has three campuses -Abuja, Choba, and Delta parks, respectively. The banks include Access Bank, Uba Bank, Zenith Bank, and Fidelity Bank.

### **2.2. Sample collection and processing**

Seven (7) swab samples were taken from the Bank's automated teller machines at the University of Port Harcourt's campus in Rivers State. Before swabbing the ATM buttons, sterile distilled water was used to wet the sterile cotton swab sticks. Within two hours of collection, the swab sticks were sent to the lab for bacteriological examination.

### **2.3. Bacterial Culturing, Enumeration and Characterization**

After being incubated for five hours, the swab sticks were used to inoculate tubes filled with sterile 9 ml of normal saline. The inoculum was then utilized for serial dilution. One milliliter (ml) was taken aseptically and put to use for serial dilution. It was then transferred to a test tube that had nine milliliters of normal saline marked 10:1. Following serial dilution, 0.1 ml of the aliquot was plated onto Petri plates marked with the date and sample code source, as well as the newly made nutritional agar, MacConkey agar, and Mannitol salt agar. Following a 24-hour incubation period at  $37^{\circ}\text{C}$  for the streaked sample, the colonies were counted and examined.

### **2.4. Isolation and identification of bacterial isolates**

After incubating for 24 hours, plate growths were checked for different colonies, and plate counts were made. The isolates were subsequently subcultured on new medium plates until pure isolates were visible. The isolates' pure culture was put onto agar slants. Next, the isolates were identified using biochemical characteristics along with their morphological appearance.

### **2.5. AntibioGram Screening**

The approach recommended by the clinical and laboratory standards institutes [8] was used to complete this. A 20 ml molten Mueller Hinton agar was aseptically injected with 0.1 ml of the standardized culture, and the mixture was achieved by gently swirling the agar. After that, the medium was aseptically transferred onto a sterile petri dish and allowed to set. The plate had the proper label. For the remainder of the isolated culture, this was repeated. Following solidification, the commercial multi-antibiotic disc was aseptically implanted into the media's surface using sterile forceps. It was then incubated for 24 hours at  $37^{\circ}\text{C}$  and checked for zones of inhibition.

According to the guidelines of the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute [9], antibacterial susceptibility was assessed for all isolated strains using Mueller Hinton agar (Merk Co., Germany) and the standard Kirby-Bauer disc agar diffusion (DAD) method with discs (Mast Co.UK) containing gentamicin (10  $\mu\text{g}$ ), vancomycin (30  $\mu\text{g}$ ), trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole (25  $\mu\text{g}$ ), amikacin (30  $\mu\text{g}$ ), cephalothin (30  $\mu\text{g}$ ), norfloxacin (5  $\mu\text{g}$ ), and ceftizoxime (30  $\mu\text{g}$ ).

## 2.6. Statistical Analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) software package, version 21.

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1. Total heterotrophic count

The total heterotrophic count of the swab samples gotten from ATMs across the Abuja campus of the University of Port Harcourt ranged from 3.38 to 4.69 LogCfu/ml, ABA bank had the lowest value (3.38 LogCfu/ml) while UBB bank had the highest value (4.69 LogCfu/ml) as presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Total heterotrophic count of ATMs across the University of Port Harcourt**

Sample Code	Count (Cfu/ml)	LogCfu/ml
ZBA	4.7 x 10 <sup>3</sup>	3.67
ABA	2.4 x 10 <sup>3</sup>	3.38
FBA	5.45 x 10 <sup>3</sup>	3.73
UBB	4.0 x 10 <sup>4</sup>	4.6

Key: ZBA = Zenith bank, ABA = Access bank, FBA = Fidelity bank, UBB = United bank of Africa

### 3.2. Total coliform count

The total coliform count of the swab samples obtained from the ATM at Abuja Campus, University of Port Harcourt ranged from 2.85 to 3.90 LogCfu/ml with the sample from Access Bank being the lowest and UBA bank having the highest. The values of the coliform count are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Total coliform count**

Sample Code	Count (Cfu/ml)	LogCfu/ml
ZBA	1.0 x 10 <sup>3</sup>	3.0
ABA	7.0 x 10 <sup>2</sup>	2.85
FBA	7.5 x 10 <sup>3</sup>	3.88
UBB	7.9 x 10 <sup>3</sup>	3.90

### 3.3. Total *Staphylococcal* count

The total *Staphylococcal* count of the swab samples gotten from ATMs across the University of Port Harcourt was observed to range from 3.04 to 4.23 LogCfu/ml with the sample from UBA bank being the lowest with the value of 3.04 LogCfu/ml and zenith bank having the highest with the value of 4.23 LogCfu/ml. The values of the staphylococcal count are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: Total *Staphylococci* count**

Sample Code	Count (Cfu/ml)	LogCfu/ml
ZBA	3.1 x 10 <sup>3</sup>	3.49
ABA	Nil	-
FBA	1.7 x 10 <sup>4</sup>	4.23
UBB	1.1 x 10 <sup>3</sup>	3.04

### 3.4. Frequency of Occurrences of each Bacteria Isolates from Automated Teller Machine

*Enterobacter* spp. was the most predominant (31.6%), followed by *Staphylococcus* spp. (26.3%), *Bacillus* spp. (23.6%) and *Photobacterium* spp. (7.9%). *Aerobacter* spp. and

*Micrococcus* spp. were the least (5.3%, each). *Enterobacter* spp. has similar occurrences in banks ABA and UBB, respectively. While *Aerobacter* spp. has similar occurrences in banks FBA and UBB, respectively (Table 4). A higher prevalence of the isolates occurred in UBA (31.6%), followed by ZBA (26.3%) and ABA (23.6%) while FBA (18.4%) was the least (Table 4). *Micrococcus* was found in ZBA only with a 100.0% prevalence rate (Table 4).

**Table 4. Percentage Occurrences of isolates from different Bank ATM keypads in Abuja campus, University of Port Harcourt**

Bacterial Isolates	FBA	ABA	ZBA	UBB	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Staphylococcus</i> spp.	1	2	3	4	10	26.3
<i>Bacillus</i> spp.	3	2	0	4	9	23.6
<i>Enterobacter</i> spp.	2	3	4	3	12	31.6
<i>Aerobacter</i> spp.	1	0	0	1	2	5.3
<i>Photobacter</i> spp.	0	2	1	0	3	7.9
<i>Micrococcus</i> spp.	0	0	2	0	2	5.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>7 (18.4)</b>	<b>9 (23.6)</b>	<b>10 (26.3)</b>	<b>12 (31.6)</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100.0</b>

### 3.5. Antibiogram Pattern of the Isolates

From the antimicrobial susceptibility test carried out, for the gram-positive organisms, *Staphylococcus* species was observed to be resistant to all discs but APX. *Micrococcus* species was susceptible only to pefloxacin, intermediate to scep trin and Erythromycin but resistant to all other antibiotic discs. *Bacillus* species were susceptible to ciprofloxacin, pefloxacin, Rocephin, streptomycin, Sceptin, and intermediate Erythromycin and resistant to other antibiotics, and *Bacillus* species were susceptible to only pefloxacin and Rocephin but intermediate for ciprofloxacin, scep trin, streptomycin, and Erythromycin.

For the gram-negative isolates, *Enterobacter* species were resistant only to amoxicillin, susceptible to ciprofloxacin, augmenting, gentamicin, pefloxacin, and ciprofloxacin; and intermediate for Tanvid, scep trin, chloramphenicol, and streptomycin.

*Aerobacter* sp was resistant to the following; SXT = Septrin, CH = Chloramphenicol, CPX = Ciprofloxacin, SP = Sporfloxacin intermediate to AM = Amoxicillin and susceptible to AU = Augmentin, CN = Gentamicin, PEF = Pefloxacin, OFX = Tarivid, S = Streptomycin. The last isolate which turned out to be *Enterobacter* spp. was observed to be susceptible only to Tanvid, intermediate only to chloramphenicol, and resistant to the other discs. The antimicrobial susceptibility test is presented in Tables 5 and 6, respectively.

**Table 5. Antimicrobial susceptibility test for gram-positive bacterial isolates**

Bacteria Isolates	PEF	CN	APX	Z	AM	R	CRX	S	SXT	ERY
<i>Photobacter</i> sp	S	S	S	S	R	R	R	S	S	S
<i>Micrococcus</i> sp	S	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	I	I
<i>Bacillus</i> sp	S	R	R	R	R	S	S	S	S	I
<i>Staphylococcus</i> sp	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
<i>Staphylococcus</i> sp	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
<i>Bacillus</i> sp	S	R	R	R	R	S	I	I	I	I

Key: PEF = Pefloxacin, CN = Gentamicin, APX = Ampliclox, Z = Zinacef, AM = Amoxicillin, R = Rocephin, CRX = Ciprofloxacin, S = Streptomycin, SXT = Septrin, ERY = Erythromycin, R = Resistant, S = Susceptible I = Intermediate

**Table 6: Antimicrobial susceptibility test for gram-negative bacterial isolates**

Bacteria isolates	SXT	CH	CPX	AM	AU	CN	PEF	OFX	SP	S
<i>Enterobacter</i> sp	I	I	S	R	S	S	S	I	S	I

<i>Aerobacter sp</i>	R	R	R	I	S	S	S	S	R	S
<i>Enterobacter sp</i> II	R	I	R	R	R	R	R	S	R	R

Key: SXT = Septrin, CH = Chloramphenicol, CPX = Ciprofloxacin, AM = Amoxicillin, AU = Augmentin, CN = Gentamicin, PEF = Pefloxacin, OFX = Tarivid, SP = Sporfloxacin, S = Streptomycin, R = Resistant, S = susceptible, I = Intermediate

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The goal of this research was to investigate the antibiogram pattern and isolation of bacteria from an automated teller machine (ATM) at the University of Port Harcourt's Abuja Campus. The purpose of the research was to raise public and ATM users' knowledge of the potential illnesses that may be acquired as a result of germs present in ATMs. The study's findings demonstrated bacterial contamination on the copper keypad surfaces of the ATMs at the University of Port Harcourt's Abuja Campus. As of 2011, there has been little information published on bacterial contamination in ATMs or interfaces used in banks and cybercafés. However, several research has confirmed the connection between bacterial contamination and ATMs thanks to the groundbreaking work of Oluduro et al [10].

In this investigation, a total of six bacterial isolates were found near the ATM interface. The abundance of *Staphylococcus spp*, *Bacillus spp*, *Enterobacter spp*, *Aerobacter spp*, *Photobabdusspp*, and *Micrococcusspp* was determined by qualitative analysis of the bacterial isolates. This result is in line with the report of Ejeaba [11], who isolated *Staphylococcus aureus* (82.5%), *Bacillus sp* (62.5%), *Escherichia coli* (22.5%), and *Streptococcussp* (15%).

The most common bacterial isolate, according to the percentage distribution of the isolates, was *Enterobacter spp*. (31.6%), which was followed by *Staphylococcus spp*. (26.3%), *Bacillus spp*. (23.6%), and *Photonabdus spp*. (7.9%). *Micrococcus spp*. and *Aerobacter spp*. were the least frequent (5.3% each). The microorganisms found in this investigation are comparable to those that other researchers have found on surfaces and in items. [4] The outcome of these findings is consistent with the work of Anderson and Palombo's investigation [12], which indicated that *S. aureus* was the most often detected isolate that contaminated keyboards in an academic context. The high prevalence of *S. aureus* infections is likely due to its easy spread through human activities such as talking, sneezing, and contact with moist skin. *Staphylococcus aureus* is a common component of the normal flora of the skin and nostrils [13]. Other significant pollutants such as *Klebsiella sp*, *Bacillus spp.*, and *Enterobacter sp*. have been demonstrated to have the ability to cause illnesses, particularly in a hospital context, which makes their abundance on an electronic device user interfaces concerning. [14]. The result is consistent with the study of Dawodi and Akanbi [14], which identified bacteria from automated teller machines on the Federal Polytechnic Ede campus that are skin commensals (*Staphylococcus* and *Micrococcus*), environmental bacteria (*Serratia* and *Pseudomonas*), and intestinal bacteria (*Salmonella* and *Klebsiella*). This result is also in line with the work of Awua Yuana et al. [15], who isolated *Staphylococcus aureus* (41.6%), *Escherichia coli* (34.4%), and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (24.0%) on the keypads of the ATMs.

The transmission of infectious illnesses may be aided by contaminated hands contacting an ATM keypad since this can transmit bacteria to the keyboard and banknotes [16]. In research on the exterior surface of computer mice and keyboards, Malik and Naeem discovered that all samples were infected with dangerous bacteria [17]. This finding is consistent with studies conducted in Cape Town, Ghana, on bacterial isolates on mice and keyboards for computers [18]. The prevalence among the bacterial loads detected on the examined surfaces may be ascribed to regular skin contact and shared by several users with varying personal hygiene habits and medical conditions. One of the microbe-associated elements that determines the likelihood of an infection is the presence of microbes on a surface. The quantity of bacteria

on a fomite also affects how long the bacteria live, which increases the likelihood that the fomite will take up the microbe from its surroundings [19-20]. The greater the concentration of a microorganism on a fomite, the longer it survives. Furthermore, Neely and Maley [21], have shown that bacteria may last longer on plastic surfaces—the primary material comprising the majority of easily accessible components of user interfaces—than on other surfaces like steel or textiles. Consequently, the prospect that microbes might act as reservoirs and a means of transmission for other germs is suggested by their extended survival on plastic ATMs. Similar findings were obtained by Rutala and Weber [22], from their measurements of germs on keyboards at a university health system.

In their investigations, Barbosa et al. [23], and Aquino et al. [24], also identified almost the same spectrum of bacteria, but this time they linked it to multidrug resistance. The human pathogens that were found during this study are enteric bacteria, and they have been linked to nosocomial infections [25-26]. Similar to bacteria recovered from surfaces and items in hospital and non-hospital environments, the bacterial contaminants were cultured from ATMs. Similar findings have been reported by other investigators for mobile phones, environmental gadgets [27-29], currency notes [30], daycare centers, stethoscope covers [31], computer keyboard and mouse interfaces [32].

Gram-positive bacteria were more common in our research than Gram-negative bacteria [33]. The current study's findings are consistent with those of Honua [34], who discovered *Staphylococcus*, *Aerobacter*, and *Enterobacter spp* on ATM keyboards. Research on ATMs as a whole indicates that they may have a role in the spread of infectious illnesses. It has been noted that bacterial isolates' sensitivity to antibiotics is dynamic, changing with time and environment rather than being constant. It is necessary to routinely check the antibiotic susceptibility profiles of prevalent bacterial infections in various populations [35]. The bulk of the microorganisms in this research are very resistant to common antibiotics, according to the antibiogram finding.

The growing frequency of bacterial strains developing resistance to antibiotics and disinfectants is a cause for worry. To address the issues brought on by microbial adaptability and the rise of resistant strains, the research highlights the critical need for novel, secure, and efficient biocides. The patterns of isolation and antibiograms provide light on the antibiotic susceptibility profiles of the bacterial isolates that were found. *Staphylococcus* species and other gram-positive organisms showed resistance to many antibiotics, but *Enterobacter* species and other gram-negative isolates showed different patterns of susceptibility. The significant level of resistance that has been observed prompts worries about possible public health consequences.

High levels of bacterial contamination are correlated with inadequate hygiene, as shown by Fraser and Girling [36]. In addition to the insightful information provided on the microbiological environment of ATM keypads, the significance of routine observation and education in reducing the spread of infectious illnesses is emphasized by the study. Going ahead, it will be essential to put in place good hygiene procedures, regular cleaning schedules, and maybe the creation of antimicrobial coatings for regularly handled surfaces such as ATM keypads. To reduce the spread of microorganisms resistant to antibiotics, it is also crucial to educate the public about hand cleanliness practices after using ATMs.

## 5. Conclusions

This study clarifies the substantial bacterial contamination found on the keypads of the automated teller machines (ATMs) at the University of Port Harcourt's Abuja Campus. Numerous bacterial pathogens were identified by the investigation, including *Staphylococcus species*, *Bacillus species*, *Enterobacter species*, *Aerobacter species*, *Photobacterium species*, and *Micrococcus species*. The results highlight the importance of ATMs for public health as

possible surfaces for the gathering of pathogens. ATMs are widely accepted and used, and several users are in continual touch with one another, which increases the risk of microbial contamination.

## References

1. Merriam-Webster. (2016). *Merriam-Webster medical dictionary*. Merriam Webster.
2. Abban, S.& Tano-Derah, .(2011). Automatic teller machines (ATMs) are a potential source of Food-borne Pathogens- a case from Ghana. *Nature Sci.*, 9; 63-67.
3. Aquino S, de Lima JE, da Silva MO, &de Sousa GF (2021). Multidrug-resistant bacteria isolated from automated teller machine in metropolitan area of São Paulo, Brazil. *World Journal of Biology Pharmacy and Health Sciences*. 2021;5(1):027–36.
4. Okoro, J., Oloninefa, S. D., Ojonigu, A. F., & Sani, M. (2018). Assessment of some selected automated teller machines in Kaduna metropolis for pathogenic bacteria contamination. *British Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 6(1), 19-35.
5. Adedoyin, A. B. (2019). A Study Investigating Bacterial Colonization on Automated Teller Machines in Ibadan Metropolis, South-West Nigeria. *Acta Scientific Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 3(6): 119-132.
6. Odeyemi, A. T., Sulaimon, A. M., Odunmbaku, E., &Afolabi, I. E. (2018). Bacteriological Contamination of User Interface of Automated Teller Machines (ATM) of Banks in Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti. *International Journal of Research Studies in Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 4(3): 18-25
7. Hamouda, T. &Baker Jr., J.R. (2000) Antimicrobial Mechanism of Action of Surfactant Lipid Preparations in Enteric Gram-Negative Bacilli. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 89, 397-403.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2672.2000.01127>.
8. CLSI (2012) Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing; Twenty-Second Informational Supplement. CLSI Document M 100-S22. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne
9. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (2015) Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing; 25th Informational Supplement. CLSI Document M100-S25, Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
10. Oluduro AO, Ubani AO, Ofoezie IE. Bacterial assessment of electronic hardware user interfaces in Ilife, Nigeria. *Journal of Basic Applied Pharmaceutical Science*. 2011; 32:323–334.
11. EJEAGBA, M (2020). Isolation And Identification Of Microorganisms Associated With The Use Of Automated Teller Machine (Atm) In Michael Okpara University Of Agriculture, Umudike (Mouau) And Its Environs . Repository.mouau.edu.ng: Retrieved Dec 07, 2023, from <https://repository.mouau.edu.ng/work/view/isolation-and-identification-of-microorganisms-associated-with-the-use-of-automated-teller-machine-atm-in-michael-okpara-university-of-agriculture-umudike-mouau-and-its-environs>.
12. Anderson G & Palombo EA. (2009). Microbial contamination of computer keyboards in a university setting. *American Journal of Infectious Control.*, 37(6):507–509.
13. Lamichhane J, Adhikary S, Gautam P, Maharjan R & Dhakal B. (2009). Risk of Handling Paper Currency in Circulation Chances of Potential Bacterial Transmittance. *Nepal Journal of Science and Technology*, 10:161–166.
14. Dawodu OG,& Akanbi RB (2021) Isolation and identification of microorganisms associated with automated teller machines on Federal Polytechnic Ede campus. *PLoS ONE* 16(8): e0254658. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0254658>
15. Awua Yuana, Tsekaa Emmanuel Terkimbi, Atu Bernard Ortwer, Adikwu Peter, Gberikon Grace Mwuese&Odo Joel Inya. (2022). Isolation and Identification of Bacteria on Automated Teller Machines (ATMs) in Makurdi Metropolis. *Frontiers in Environmental Microbiology*. 8(1): 1-5. doi: 10.11648/j.fem.20220801.11.
16. Sun, X., Lei, C., Guo, L., & Zhou, Y. (2016). Separable detecting of *Escherichia coli* O157H: H7 by a giant magneto-resistance-based bio-sensing system. *Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical*, 234, 485-492.

17. Malik K. & Naeem N. (2014). Study of bacteria on Computer Mice and keyboards, *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Science*, 3, (4), pp. 813-823
18. Tagoe, D. N. A. & Kumi-Ansah, F. (2010). Computer keyboard and mouse: Potential sources of disease transmission and infections. *Int. J. Public Health*. 1: 2.
19. Neely AN & Sittig DF. (2002). Basic microbiologic and infection control information to reduce the potential transmission of pathogens to patients via computer hardware. *Journal of American Medical Information Association*. 9:500–508. <https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.m1082> PMID: 12223502 39.
20. French GL, Otter JA, Shannon KP, Adams NMT, Watling D & Parks MJ. (2004). Tackling contamination of the hospital environment by Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA): A comparison between conventional terminal cleaning and hydrogen peroxide vapor decontamination. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 2004; 57:31–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2004.03.006> PMID: 15142713
21. Neely AN, & Maley MP. (2000). Survival of Enterococci and Staphylococci on hospital fabrics and plastic. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*. 2000; 38:724–726. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.38.2.724-726.2000> PMID: 10655374
22. Rutala WA, & Weber DJ. (2004). Disinfection and sterilization in health care facilities: what clinicians need to know. *Clinical infectious diseases*. 39(5):702–9. <https://doi.org/10.1086/423182> PMID: 15356786
23. Barbosa JI, Da Conceição Pereira Albano H, Silva FF & Teixeira PC (2020). Microbial contamination of main contact surfaces of Automated Teller Machines from the Metropolitan Area of Porto. *International Journal of Environmental Studies*, 77(2):208–21.
24. Aquino S, de Lima JE, da Silva MO, & de Sousa GF (2021). Multidrug-resistant bacteria isolated from automated teller machine in metropolitan area of São Paulo, Brazil. *World Journal of Biology Pharmacy and Health Sciences*.; 5(1):027–36.
25. Kramer A, Schwebke I & Kampf G. (2006). How long do nosocomial pathogens persist on inanimate surfaces? A systematic review. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 6:130. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2334-6-130> PMID: 16914034
26. Ulger F, Esen S, Dilek A, Yanik K, Gunaydin M, & Leblebicioglu H. (2009) “Are We Aware How Contaminated Our Mobile Phones with Nosocomial Pathogens?” *Annals of Clinical Microbiology and Antimicrobials*, 8(7):7–11
27. Fatma U, Saban E, Ahmet D, Yanik K, Murat G, Hakan L. Are we aware how contaminated is our mobile phones with nosocomial pathogens? *Annals of Clinical Microbiology and Antimicrobes*. 2009; 8(7):1–4. 51.
28. Gholamreza S, Nooshin T, Ali M, Touraj-Reza MS & Ehsan S. (2009). Bacterial contamination and resistance to commonly used antimicrobials of healthcare workers' mobile phones in teaching hospitals, Kerman, Iran. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*. 6:806–810.
29. Osuala O.J, Edet E.A & Anagboso M.O (2023). Prevalence of bacteria isolates from cell phone surfaces in Madonna University Elele Rivers State Nigeria. *Magna Scientia Advance Biology and Pharmacy*, 9(2), 24-32
30. Umeh EU, Juluku JU & Ichor T. (2007). Microbial Contamination of 'Naira' Nigerian Currency Notes in Circulation. *Research Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 1(6):336–339.
31. Itah AY & Ben AE. (2004). Incidence of enteric bacteria and *Staphylococcus aureus* in daycare centers in Akwalbom State, Nigeria. *Southeast Asian Journal of Tropical Medicine and Public Health*. 35(1):202– 9. PMID: 15272770
32. Mabel JC, Subathra M, Shyamala M, & Padma S, Rekha. (2014). Automated teller machine (ATM) A “pathogen city”—A surveillance report from locations in and around Madurai city, Tamil Nadu, India. *Int J Pub Health Sci*; 3(1): 51–56
33. Kim, J., Kim, M., Kim, S., & Ryu, S. (2017). Sensitive detection of viable *Escherichia coli* O157: H7 from foods using a luciferase-reporter phage phiV10lux. *International journal of food microbiology*, 254, 11-17.

34. Honua, M. H. M. (2017). The hygienic and microbial status of Sudanese banknotes, Khartoumstate, Sudan. *International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health*, 4(4), 923-927.
35. Ozkan VK. (2016). Determination of Microfungal Contamination on Automated Teller Machines and Bank Cards in Marmaris, Turkey. *Journal of Pharmaceutical, Chemical and Biological Sciences*. 3(4):528–534
36. Frazer MA & Girling SJ. (2009). Bacterial Carriage of Computer Keyboards in Veterinary Practices in Scotland. *Veterinary Record*. 169:26–27.

UNDER PEER REVIEW