



## MICROBIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF OFFICE EQUIPMENT AND SURFACES IN SOME OFFICES AT FEDERAL POLYTECHNIC ADO EKITI, EKITI STATE, NIGERIA

<sup>1</sup>ANYANWU, N. O., and <sup>2</sup>ANYANWU, A. U.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Food Technology, The Federal Polytechnic, Ado Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria; <sup>2</sup>Department of Office Technology and Management, The Federal Polytechnic, Ado Ekiti, Ekiti State Nigeria

E-mail: [anyanath@yahoo.com](mailto:anyanath@yahoo.com); Phone No: +234 802 842 5978

### ABSTRACT

Office equipment such as computers, photocopiers, printers, scanners and smartphones have been used almost every day in homes and offices. This study was carried out to reveal the microbial colonization of the surface of these equipment, especially the keyboards and press buttons. A total of 250 office equipment, which included 50 computers, 50 photocopiers, 50 scanners, 50 smartphones and 50 printers were examined for microbial contamination from selected offices in Federal Polytechnic Ado Ekiti. The result showed that computers were infected by 21%, photocopiers by 20%, scanners by 20%, smartphones by 18% and printers by 21%. The highest rate of contamination was by *E. coli* on computers, least was by *Micrococcus* sp. The highest rate of contamination was by *Staphylococcus* sp. on smartphones, *Staph.* sp. was also the highest on printers. Almost all the keyboards were contaminated by one or different microorganisms.

**Keywords:** Equipment, Computers, Microorganisms, Instruments, Keyboard, Contamination.

### INTRODUCTION

This work involves the microbial assessment of office equipment and their surfaces. Office equipment are those materials or instruments that are useful in an office to perform various duties or operations. These equipment are usually essential, and durable goods that are useful in managing and conducting office duties. Some of these equipment are computers and related devices, they are fundamental to modern offices. In the category of computers are desk top computers, laptop, monitor printers, keyboard, mice and servers. Furniture, this include desks, chairs, filing cabinets, conference tables, cubicles and others that can provide good working environment. Office supplies; items of this category include pens, papers, staplers etc. Communication gadgets: These can include cell phones. Other equipment include photo copiers, fax

machines, scanners, shredders, projectors and so on. (Bures *et al.*, 2001; Michael *et al.*, 2001; Dogan *et al.*, 2008). Microorganisms are ubiquitous, they can be found on every environments, such as air, water, soil, food, human body even on solid objects like office equipment like computer, scanner, photocopier and others. All the equipment that have surfaces, keyboards and even door handles can easily harbor microorganisms (Renolds *et al.*, 2005).

Some gram -positive and gram -negative organisms are viable under various environmental conditions. Some of these microbes are very infectious at very low doses. These microbes can survive for hours or weeks on surfaces such as door handles or even computer keyboards (Renolds *et al.*, 2005 & Anderson and Palombo 2009). Bacteria can easily



colonize the surface of computer keyboards, photocopiers, smart phones, scanners (Sinclair *et al.*, 2011). Some microorganisms like *Staphylococcus sp.*, *Enterococci sp.*, *Streptococci sp.* Even *Eschericia coli* have been found to survive in dry environmental conditions. Infectious dose of some of these pathogens may mistakenly be transferred to the mouth after handling (Rusin *et al.*, 2002; Soltan Dallal *et al.*, 2010). Some office workers that operate the computers recently were screened on their hands and even their mobile phones were discovered to be contaminated with different types of microorganisms.

The aim of this study is to create awareness to office workers that office equipment and surfaces can harbor bacteria on them.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Materials:

Fifty (50) pieces of computer keyboards, photocopiers, scanners and smartphones were selected from different offices in Federal Polytechnic Ado Ekiti, Ekiti State Nigeria. A total of 200 swabs were used on the above -mentioned number of equipment.

### Samples Collection:

Samples were collected on computer keyboards, photocopier buttons, scanner press buttons and smart phones keyboards. The moistened swab sticks were rubbed several times on the surface of computer keyboards as well as the photocopier press buttons, likewise the moistened swab was rubbed on scanner press buttons and smart phone keyboards.

## Methods:

### CULTURE MEDIA PREPARATION:

The culture media used in this research are MacConkey and Nutrient agar, these agar were prepared according to the manufacturers' instructions and sterilized by autoclaving at 121 °C for 15 minutes.

### SERIAL DILUTION:

The swab sticks were quickly analyzed by preparing serial dilution of the individual swab stick using distilled water or ringer solution. These serially diluted samples from the swab sticks were plated out on sterilized culture media of Nutrient and Mac Conkey agars. The Mac Conkey agar was used for coliform bacteria and Nutrient agar was used for other bacteria that are not coliform. The plates were incubated for 24 hours at 37 °C or for 48 hours at 37 °C for bacteria organisms and 72 hours at 27 °C for fungi organisms. At the end of incubation, the colonies were counted and expressed as cfu/mL of the sample.

### OBSERVATION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF THE ISOLATES:

### MORPHOLOGICAL OBSERVATION:

The cultured plates were observed for the developed colonies and their arrangement.

**Microbial Count:** This was done to know the microbial load of each equipment, the incubated cultured plates were counted, after which counts were recorded for every sample accordingly.

**Grams staining:** Slides were prepared by cleaning with water and soap, then, a drop of distilled water was placed on the slide. An inoculum was picked from the cultured plate with a sterile inoculating loop and smeared on the drop of distilled water on the slide, different stains; crystal violet,



ISSN:2782-8484

grams iodine, ethanol and safranin were used respectively to flood the smear. All the stain were allowed to stay for 1 minute except ethanol that stayed for only 30 seconds.

**Motility Test:** This test was done to show the organisms that are motile and the ones that are non motile. The test was done using hanging drop method.

Other tests such as Catalase, Coagulase, Oxidase, Starch hydrolysis, Citrate were performed.

#### **SUBCULTURE FOR PURE CULTURE:**

Pure cultures of the colonies were obtained by sub-culturing the colonies on fresh

nutrient agar. Identification tests such as gram-staining technique, motility test, catalase, coagulase, fermentative test and other biochemical tests were used for the identification of the isolates.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:**

The bacterial and fungal counts on the equipment surfaces examined were presented on tables 1 and 2, ranged from  $1.8 \times 10^4$  cfu/mL to  $3.4 \times 10^4$  cfu/mL under 24 hours of incubation at  $37^\circ\text{C}$  and  $2.1 \times 10^4$  cfu/mL to  $3.3 \times 10^4$  cfu/mL under 48 hours of incubation at  $37^\circ\text{C}$  for bacteria. And for fungal counts ranged from  $1.2 \times 10^4$  cfu/mL to  $2.1 \times 10^4$  cfu/mL under 48 hours of incubation at  $27^\circ\text{C}$  and  $2.6 \times 10^4$  cfu/mL to  $3.1 \times 10^4$  cfu/mL under 72 hours of incubation at  $27^\circ\text{C}$ .

**Table 1. Bacterial count on the office equipment examined are presented on table 1.**

| Samples | 24 hrs. cfu/mL    |                   | 48 hrs. cfc/mL    |                   |
|---------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|         | TBC               | CFC               | TBC               | CFC               |
| A       | $3.1 \times 10^4$ | $1.8 \times 10^4$ | $2.8 \times 10^4$ | $2.1 \times 10^4$ |
| B       | $2.6 \times 10^4$ | $2.0 \times 10^4$ | $2.4 \times 10^4$ | $2.4 \times 10^4$ |
| C       | $2.5 \times 10^4$ | $2.2 \times 10^4$ | $2.8 \times 10^4$ | $2.7 \times 10^4$ |
| D       | $3.0 \times 10^4$ | $2.6 \times 10^4$ | $3.2 \times 10^4$ | $2.8 \times 10^4$ |
| E       | $2.8 \times 10^4$ | $2.5 \times 10^4$ | $2.7 \times 10^4$ | $3.0 \times 10^4$ |

Key: A = Computer keyboard, B = Photocopier button, C = Scanner button, D = Smartphone keyboard and E = Printer keyboard.

TBC = Total bacterial count, CFC = Coliform count

**Table 2. The fungal count on the examined equipment are presented on table 2.**

| Samples | cfu/ml 48 hours   | cfu/ml 72 hours   |
|---------|-------------------|-------------------|
| A       | $1.2 \times 10^4$ | $2.4 \times 10^4$ |
| B       | $1.5 \times 10^4$ | $2.6 \times 10^4$ |
| C       | $1.8 \times 10^4$ | $2.8 \times 10^4$ |
| D       | $2.1 \times 10^4$ | $3.0 \times 10^4$ |
| E       | $2.3 \times 10^4$ | $3.2 \times 10^4$ |



ISSN:2782-8484

**FEDPOLAD Journal of Science & Agricultural Technology**  
(FEDPOLADJSAT); Vol. 4, ISSUE 1. OCTOBER, 2024 EditionWebsite: <https://seemjournals.fedpolyado.edu.ng/index.php/fedpoladjsat>

Table 3: Characterization and Identification of Bacterial and fungal isolates

| Isolate<br>s | Gram<br>s | Motil<br>s | Oxida.<br>s | Catala.<br>s | Coagula.<br>s | Starch<br>hydr. | Citra.<br>s | Indol<br>s | Lact.<br>s | Glu.<br>s | Suspected<br>organism      |
|--------------|-----------|------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| a            | +ve       | -ve        | -ve         | +ve          | +ve           | +ve             | +ve         | -ve        | -ve        | +ve       | <i>Staph<br/>auricular</i> |
| b            | +ve       | -ve        | -ve         | +ve          | +ve           | +ve             | +ve         | -ve        | -ve        | -ve       | <i>S. aureus</i>           |
| c            | +ve       | -ve        | -ve         | +ve          | -ve           | +ve             | -ve         | -ve        | -ve        | +ve       | <i>Aeromon</i>             |
| d            | +ve       | -ve        | +ve         | +ve          | -ve           | +ve             | -ve         | -ve        | -ve        | +ve       | <i>Micrococ</i>            |
| e            | -ve       | +ve        | +ve         | +ve          | -ve           | +ve             | +ve         | -ve        | -ve        | +ve       | <i>Pseudom<br/>o</i>       |
| f            | -ve       | +ve        | +ve         | +ve          | -ve           | +ve             | +ve         | +ve        | -ve        | +ve       | <i>E. coli</i>             |
| g            | +ve       | -ve        | +ve         | -ve          | -ve           | -ve             | -ve         | -ve        | +ve        | +ve       | <i>Yeast</i>               |

Table 4: Frequency table of microorganisms isolated from office equipment examined.

| Samples      | Staphylococcus<br>sp. | Aeromonas | Micrococci | Pseudomonas | E. coli | Yeast | Total |
|--------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|---------|-------|-------|
| Computers    | 25                    | 15        | 15         | 20          | 35      | 10    | 120   |
| Photocopiers | 20                    | 15        | 15         | 15          | 25      | 20    | 110   |
| Scanners     | 15                    | 10        | 20         | 25          | 20      | 20    | 110   |
| Smartphones  | 40                    | 15        | 20         | 20          | 20      | 20    | 103   |
| Printers     | 30                    | 10        | 20         | 20          | 20      | 20    | 120   |
| Total        | 130                   | 65        | 80         | 85          | 118     | 85    | 563   |



## CONCLUSION & RECOMMEDATION:

### CONCLUSION:

In conclusion, the result of this work showed that almost all the equipment used for this research had microbial contaminations. It could be assumed that those equipment and some other surfaces can be seen as vehicles for spreading infections and disease among the users of the equipment.

### RECOMMENDATION:

In this aspect, I can recommend that every person that want to operate any equipment should wear a hand glove before operating, to avoid transmission of infection.

### DISCUSSION

This study showed that high level of contamination were found on the office equipment that were examined in the Federal Polytechnic, Ado Ekiti.

The hands of human beings are major sources of microbial contamination on office equipment. Human beings act as vehicles that transmit microorganisms to the surfaces include the keyboards of computer and other office equipment. High bacterial loads were detected on the surfaces of all the equipment examined from the selected offices. Some operators of these equipment do not clean their hands, some operators or processors of the equipment have wounds and carbuncles on their fingers, some pathogenic microorganisms will find their ways from

the wounds to the keyboards (Afunwa *et al.*, 2018).

Table 1 of this result showed the microbial count based on 24 hours of incubation and 48 hours of incubation for Total Bacterial Count (TBC) cfu/mL, and Coliform Count (CFC) cfu/mL. The highest count of  $3.2 \times 10^4$  TBC on smart-phone for 48 hours cfu/mL and  $3.0 \times 10^4$  cfu/mL TBC for 24 hours cfu/mL. The count on computer keyboard at 24 hours incubation was  $3.1 \times 10^4$  cfu/mL and the least count of all was  $1.8 \times 10^4$  cfu/mL coliform count on computer keyboard, this was in agreement with the report of Steffen *et al.*, 2008. Table 2 showed the result of fungal count, based on 48 hours and 72 hours incubation. The highest count was  $3.2 \times 10^4$  cfu/mL at 72 hours on printer and the least count was  $1.2 \times 10^4$  cfu/mL on computer keyboard, The result was in accordance to reports of Bensch *et al.*, 2012 and Afunwa *et al.*, 2018.

The ability of microorganisms to survive on plastic materials is another thing that enhanced the survival of some of these organisms to grow on most of these office equipment especially computer keyboards. Rutala and David (2004).

Many different bacterial species were found to coexist on the surface of office equipment and on the hands of the users or operators. Surfaces of office equipment are found to harbor a community of bacteria with varying virulence and pathogenicity, as well increasing the risk of infection and severity of infections (Oluduro *et al.*, 2011)

### REFERENCE:

Afunwa, R.A., Igwe, G.O., Afunwa, E.C. Ezebialu, C. U., Unachukwu, M. N. and Okoli, C. E. (2018): Bacteriological Examination of Utensils and Hands of Food

Vendors in a University Cafeteria in Enugu. *Journal of Biology and Life Science*. Vol. 10 (1): 98 – 106.

Anderson, G. and Palombo, E. A. (2009): Microbial contamination of





ISSN:2782-8484

- computer keyboard in a University setting. *American Journal of Infection Control*. 37: 507 – 516.
- Bensch, K., Braun, U., Groenewald, J. Z. and Grous, P. W. (2012): The genus *Cladosporium*. *Studies in Mycology*. 72 (1): 1 – 40.
- Bures, S., Fishbain, J. T., Uyehara, C. F. Parker, J. M. and Berg, B. W. (2001): Computer Keyboards and faucet handle as reservoirs of nosocomial pathogens in the intensive care unit. *American Journal of Infect. Control*. 29 (2): 131-134.
- Dogan, M., Feyzioglu, B., Ozdemi, M. and Baysal, B. (2008): Hastane Vehastane disi Ortamlarda kullanilan bilgisayarlarin klavyelerinde mikrobiyal kolonizasyonun Arastirilmesi (Investigation of microbial colonization of computer keyboards used inside and outside hospital environments). *Mikrobiyol Bul*. 42(2): 331-336.
- Michael, W.M., Melanie, H., Teri, P. and Kay, B. (2001): Bacterial Contamination of Fabric Stethoscope covers. The Velveteen Rabbit of Health Care? *Infect Control Hospital Epidemiol*. 22 (10): 653-658.
- Oluduro, O., Ubani, K., Ofoezie, E. (2011): Bacterial Assessment of Electronic Hardware User interfaces in Ile-ife, Nigeria. *Revista de Ciencias Farmaceuticas Basica e Aplicada* 32 (3): 323-334.
- Renolds, K.A., Watt, P. M., Boone, S. A. and Gerba, C.P. (2005): Occurrence of bacteria and biochemical markers on public surfaces. *Int. J. Environ. Health Res*. 15: 225-234.
- Rusin, P., Maxwell, S. and Gerba, C. (2002): Comparative Surface – to hand and fingertip – to – Mouth transfer efficiency of gram positive bacteria, gram negative bacteria and phase. *Journal of Appl. Microbiol*. 93: 583 – 592.
- Rutala W.A., David W. J. (2004): The benefits of surface disinfection. *American Journal of infect. Control*. 32 (4): 226-231.
- Sinclair, R. G. Gerba C. P. (2011): Microbial contamination in kitchens and bathroom of rural Cambodia village households. *Journal of Microbio*. 52: 142 – 149.
- Soltan, D. M. M., Fazelifard, P., Tabatabaei, B. A., Rashidi, S. and Zarrin, M. (2010): Determination of the rate of microbial contamination of cream pastry from confectionaries in south of Tehran. *Journal of Microbiol. Biotech*. 2(6): 7 – 12.
- Steffen E., Edith, F., Arne, S., Jorgen, G., Stefanie, B. and Martin, E. (2008): microbial contamination of computer user interfaces (keyboard, mouse) in tertiary care centre under conditions of practice. *Journal of Trop. Med. Hyg*. 33(12): 504-507.