

# Urinary tract infections in pregnant women from the Russian-Ukrainian military conflict regions: A multicenter study (2022-2025)

Aidyn G. Salmanov<sup>1,2</sup>, Anatolii Senchuk<sup>3</sup>, Beraia Dzheneti<sup>3</sup>, Lidiya V. Suslikova<sup>4</sup>, Serhii E. Savchenko<sup>4</sup>, Victor O. Rud<sup>5</sup>, Vitalii S. Strakhovetskyi<sup>6,7</sup>, Svitlana M. Korniyenko<sup>8</sup>, Orusia A. Kovalyshyn<sup>9</sup>, Serhii Yu. Vdovychenko<sup>4</sup>, Andrey P. Prishchepa<sup>4</sup>, Olexandr V. Talko<sup>4</sup>, Oleksandr A. Voloshyn<sup>4</sup>, Andriy I. Chubatyy<sup>10</sup>, Ihor Paliga<sup>11</sup>, Volodymyr V. Artyomenko<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>UKRAINIAN CENTER OF MATERNITY AND CHILDHOOD OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF MEDICAL SCIENCES OF UKRAINE, KYIV, UKRAINE

<sup>2</sup>THE ZARIFA ALIYEVA INTERNATIONAL CENTER OF MEDICAL SCIENCE, KYIV, UKRAINE

<sup>3</sup>KYIV MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, KYIV, UKRAINE

<sup>4</sup>SHUPYK NATIONAL HEALTHCARE UNIVERSITY OF UKRAINE, KYIV, UKRAINE

<sup>5</sup>NATIONAL PIROGOV MEMORIAL MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, VINNYTSIA, UKRAINE

<sup>6</sup>KHARKIV NATIONAL MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, KHARKIV, UKRAINE

<sup>7</sup>MEDICAL CENTRE "ASHERA", KHARKIV, UKRAINE

<sup>8</sup>ODESA NATIONAL MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, ODESA, UKRAINE

<sup>9</sup>LVIV MEDICAL INSTITUTE, LVIV, UKRAINE

<sup>10</sup>BOGOMOLETS NATIONAL MEDICAL UNIVERSITY, KYIV, UKRAINE

<sup>11</sup>ANDREI KRUPYNSKYI LVIV MEDICAL ACADEMY, LVIV, UKRAINE

## ABSTRACT

**Aim:** To estimate the prevalence rate of urinary tract infections (UTIs) in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions and antimicrobial resistance of causing pathogens.

**Materials and Methods:** Retrospective multicenter cohort study was conducted from April, 2022 to May, 2025. The study population consisted of 2,576 pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions. Antibiotic susceptibility was done by the disc diffusion test as recommended by EUCAST guidelines.

**Results:** Among 2,576 pregnant women, 1,002 (38.9%) UTIs were observed. The most frequently reported UTI types were cystitis (48.4%) and asymptomatic bacteriuria (39%). Of all UTI cases, 14.6% were defined as acute pyelonephritis. The most common causative agents of UTIs were *Escherichia coli* (27.6%), *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (13.9%), *Proteus mirabilis* (11.2%), *Coagulase-negative staphylococci* (8.7%), *Enterococcus faecalis* (8.5%), *Enterobacter spp.* (7.2%), and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (6.6%). Methicillin-resistance *S. aureus* (MRSA), vancomycin resistance enterococci (VRE), and extended spectrum beta-lactamases (ESBL) production among Enterobacteriales was found observed in 11.3%, 9.1%, and 29.4% isolates, respectively. Carbapenem resistance was identified in 13.7% of *P. aeruginosa* strains.

**Conclusions:** This study findings demonstrate the high rate of UTIs in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions and many cases are caused by pathogens that are resistant to antibiotics. Strategies for deterrence include optimal hygiene practices to minimize the risk of bacterial colonization and ascending infection.

**KEYWORDS:** Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions, pregnant women, urinary tract infection, asymptomatic bacteriuria, cystitis, pyelonephritis, antimicrobial resistance

Pol Merkur Lek, 2026;54(2):113-119 doi: 10.36740/Merkur202602102

## INTRODUCTION

Urinary Tract Infections (UTIs) are one of the most common bacterial diseases in women during pregnancy period worldwide. According to the literature, a global estimated prevalence of UTIs in pregnant women of approximately 23.9% (ranging widely from 5% to over 70% depending on region) [1]. It is reported that in developed countries UTIs to affect between 10% [2, 3] and 24.3% [4] of pregnant women. UTIs during pregnancy represent a potentially

serious complication, posing risks to both maternal and fetal health [5]. These infections can lead to complications such as pyelonephritis, preterm birth, low birth weight, and even maternal sepsis [6]. Therefore, prevention and control of urinary tract infections during pregnancy are important to protect the health of both the mother and the developing fetus.

According to the literature, UTIs in pregnancy can arise from a variety of causes, primarily attributed to anatomical

and physiological changes that occur during gestation. These changes often cause urine to become stagnant and make it easier for bacteria to move from the urethra into the bladder and potentially the kidneys [7]. Therefore, early detection and treatment of UTI during pregnancy are crucial to prevent complications that may affect the health of both the mother and the foetus.

In military conflict countries such as Ukraine, there is a high UTIs rate in pregnant women. According to the literature, the prevalence of UTIs in Ukraine was 29.5%. The most frequently reported UTI types were: 36.5% asymptomatic bacteriuria, 51.7% cystitis, and 11.8% pyelonephritis [8]. This work showed that many cases of UTIs are caused by pathogens that are resistant to antibiotics [8]. However, this study did not include pregnant women from regions of Ukraine affected by military action.

Current Ukrainian guidelines for management of UTIs in pregnant women recommend the use of antibiotics for treatment these infections. However, the high-level antimicrobial resistance is limiting antibiotic use for treatment of UTIs in Ukraine. To date, there is limited data describing the prevalence of UTIs in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions and antimicrobial resistance of causing pathogens.

## AIM

The aim of this study was to estimate the prevalence rate of UTIs in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions and antimicrobial resistance of causing pathogens.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### STUDY DESIGN AND PARTICIPANTS

We performed a retrospective multicenter cohort study based on surveillance data for UTIs in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions (Kharkiv, Dnipro, Kherson, Zaporizhzhia, Odessa). A total of 2,576 pregnant women with and without symptoms of urinary tract infection (UTI) were included as a study subject 36 months period from April, 2022 to May, 2025. The selection criterion for the inclusion in this study was above 18 years and no past history related to any sexually transmitted diseases and immunocompromised status was noted.

### DEFINITION

The classifications of UTIs in pregnancy include (a) lower urinary tract infections (Asymptomatic bacteriuria and Cystitis) and (b) upper urinary tract infection (Pyelonephritis) [7]. A UTI in pregnancy is a bacterial infection of the urinary system (bladder, urethra, or kidneys) occurring during pregnancy. It is characterized by significant bacterial growth ( $\geq 10^5$  CFU/mL) and ranges from asymptomatic bacteriuria (ASB) to acute cystitis or pyelonephritis. In this study type of UTIs in pregnant women includes asymptomatic bacteriuria (no symptoms but high bacteria count), cystitis (bladder infection), and pyelonephritis (kidney infection). UTIs in pregnant women is defined as the presence of at least 100,000 organisms per milliliter of urine in an asymptomatic patient, or as more than

100 organisms/mL of urine with accompanying pyuria in a symptomatic patient. A diagnosis of UTI should be supported by a positive culture for a uropathogen, particularly in patients with vague symptoms [9]. ASB is defined as the presence of more than 100,000 organisms/mL in two consecutive urine samples in the absence of declared symptoms. Cystitis involves only the lower urinary tract; it is characterized by inflammation of the bladder as a result of bacterial or nonbacterial causes. Acute pyelonephritis is characterized by fever, flank pain, and tenderness in addition to significant bacteriuria. Other symptoms may include nausea, vomiting, frequency, urgency, and dysuria. In this study two consecutive voided urine specimens with the same bacterial species isolated in quantitative count of  $>10^5$  CFU/ml in pregnant women were considered to be positive for UTIs.

### MICROBIOLOGICAL METHODS

In this study midstream urine samples from pregnant women were collected and processed following standard bacteriological tests. Urine of all patients was sampled and subjected to routine and microscopy examination and culture. Colony counts were performed, and confirmatory identification and antibiotic susceptibility tests were completed using a Vitek2 instrument system (BioMérieux, France). The significant bacteriuria was 10<sup>5</sup> CFU/ml was taken into consideration while confirmation as UTI. Bacterial isolates from urine samples were identified using standard microbiological techniques. Antimicrobial susceptibility testing was performed according to EUCAST guidelines at the private laboratories.

### DATA COLLECTION

A standard data collection form was created to extract demographic and clinical data. In this study clinical and microbial data were collected from medical records. Relevant information, including demographic data, baseline comorbidities, obstetrical characteristics, antimicrobial therapy regimens, urine culture results and antibiotic susceptibility testing data, was collected. In this work UTIs were diagnosed using midstream urine culture.

### ETHICS

The study was conducted after getting a full approval by the research unit of The Zarifa Aliyeva International Center of Medical Science (Kyiv, Ukraine). Written informed consent for the study was obtained from the study participants. Confidentiality of results was kept and pregnant women's data were anonymised prior to the analysis.

### STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Statistical data was performed using Excel and SPSS 10.0 Statistical Software Package. Frequencies and percentages were reported for categorical variables. The prevalence of UTIs (asymptomatic bacteriuria, cystitis and pyelonephritis) was reported as the percentage of the total number of pregnant women. All data concerning associated risk factors were collected using structured questionnaires. Descriptive statistics and chi-square tests were used to analyze the data, and  $p < 0.05$  was considered to indicate statistical significance.

## RESULTS

### PREVALENCE OF UTIS

A total of 2,576 pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions were included as a study subject 36 months period (April, 2022 to May, 2025). During the study period, 1,002 of 2,576 pregnant women were found to have UTIs. The overall prevalence of UTIs in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions was 38.9% [95% confidence interval (CI) 37.9-39.9%,  $P < 0.001$ ]. The UTIs cases among pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions varied significantly. In terms of these regions, fluctuations of the indicator values were observed of UTI in pregnant women – from the smallest in the Kharkiv and Odessa while higher percentages were reported in the Dnipro, Kherson and Zaporizhzhia regions of Ukraine.

The most frequently reported UTI types in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions were 39% (95% CI 36.1-37.9) asymptomatic bacteriuria and 48.4% (95% CI 47.4-49.4) cystitis. Among all cases of UTIs, pyelonephritis was 14.6% (95% CI 13.9-15.3).

In all, 2,576 pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions with a mean age of  $27.8 \pm 6.9$  years participated in the study. The majority among pregnant women, 60.5% (1,559), were aged 20 to 29 years, 74.5% (1,918) were self-employed, 52.0% (1,339) had basic education, 97.5% (2,512) were married, and 81.0% (2,087) resided in an urban settlement (Table 1).

The majority, 48.0% (1,236) of all the study participants (pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions), reported for booking in the second trimester of their current pregnancy. The most, 91.5% (2,358) of the

**Table 1.** Characteristics of 2,675 pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions (2022-2025)

| Variable           | Total<br>(n = 2,576)<br>n (%) | UTI                        |                             | P - value |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
|                    |                               | No<br>(n = 1,574)<br>n (%) | Yes<br>(n = 1,002)<br>n (%) |           |
| Age (years)        |                               |                            |                             |           |
| Mean $\pm$ SD      | 27.8 $\pm$ 6.9                | 27.9 $\pm$ 6.8             | 27.7 $\pm$ 5.51             |           |
| $\geq 18$          | 91 (3.5)                      | 52 (57.1)                  | 39 (42.9)                   | 0.63      |
| 20-29              | 1559 (60.5)                   | 979 (62.8)                 | 580 (37.2)                  |           |
| 30-39              | 809 (31.4)                    | 501 (61.9)                 | 308 (38.1)                  |           |
| $\geq 40$          | 117 (4.5)                     | 39 (33.3)                  | 78 (66.7)                   |           |
| Occupation         |                               |                            |                             |           |
| Salaried worker    | 181 (7.0)                     | 129 (71.4)                 | 52 (28.6)                   | 0.76      |
| Self-employed      | 1918 (74.5)                   | 1159 (60.4)                | 759 (39.6)                  |           |
| Unemployed         | 477 (18.5)                    | 284 (59.5)                 | 193 (40.5)                  |           |
| Educational status |                               |                            |                             |           |
| Basic              | 1339 (52.0)                   | 708 (52.9)                 | 631 (47.1)                  | 0.06      |
| Secondary          | 748 (29.0)                    | 554 (74.1)                 | 194 (25.9)                  |           |
| Tertiary           | 489 (19.0)                    | 309 (63.2)                 | 180 (36.8)                  |           |
| Marital status     |                               |                            |                             |           |
| Married            | 2512 (97.5)                   | 1519 (60.5)                | 993 (39.5)                  | 0.65      |
| Single             | 64 (2.5)                      | 52 (81.3)                  | 12 (18.8)                   |           |
| Place of residence |                               |                            |                             |           |
| Rural              | 489 (19.0)                    | 233 (47.6)                 | 256 (52.4)                  | 0.06      |
| Urban              | 2087 (81.0)                   | 1339 (64.2)                | 748 (35.8)                  |           |
| Trimester          |                               |                            |                             |           |
| First              | 1198 (46.5)                   | 811 (67.7)                 | 387 (32.3)                  | 0.15      |
| Second             | 1236 (48.0)                   | 696 (56.3)                 | 540 (43.8)                  |           |
| Third              | 142 (5.5)                     | 64 (45.5)                  | 78 (54.9)                   |           |
| Dysuria            |                               |                            |                             |           |
| Yes                | 218 (8.5)                     | 103 (47.2)                 | 115 (52.9)                  | 0.30      |
| No                 | 2358 (91.5)                   | 1470 (62.3)                | 888 (37.7)                  |           |

**Table 1.** Cont.

| Frequency            |             |             |            |      |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------|
| Yes                  | 168 (6.5)   | 117 (69.6)  | 51 (30.8)  | 0.77 |
| No                   | 2408 (93.5) | 1454 (60.4) | 954 (39.6) |      |
| Urgency              |             |             |            |      |
| Yes                  | 64 (2.5)    | 38 (59.4)   | 26 (40.6)  | 1.00 |
| No                   | 2512 (97.5) | 1533 (61.0) | 979 (39.0) |      |
| Lower abdominal pain |             |             |            |      |
| Yes                  | 451 (17.5)  | 283 (62.7)  | 168 (37.1) | 0.85 |
| No                   | 2125 (82.5) | 1288 (60.6) | 837 (39.4) |      |

UTI, urinary tract infection

Source: compiled by the authors of this study

pregnant women did not experience any dysuria, 93.5% (2,408) had a normal frequency of urination, and 97.5% (2,512) had no urgency to urinate. Regarding pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions experiencing lower abdominal pain, most, 82.5% (2,125) did not experience any pain. There was no statistical association between the study variables and pregnant women obstetric and medical characteristics (Table 1).

#### RESPONSIBLE PATHOGENS AND ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANCE

A total of 3295 isolates were recovered in 1,002 pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions

with UTIs, of which 768 (23.3%), 2494 (75.7%), and 33 (1%) isolates were different Gram-positive cocci, and Gram-negative bacilli species, and Fungi (*Candida albicans*) respectively. In this study of all UTIs in pregnant women 87.8% were reported to be polymicrobial. The most common causative agents of UTIs in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions was *Escherichia coli* (27.6%), *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (13.9%), *Proteus mirabilis* (11.2%), *Coagulase-negative staphylococci* (8.7%), *Enterococcus faecalis* (8.5%), *Enterobacter* spp. (7.2%), and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (6.6%) followed by *Streptococcus* spp. (4.2%), *Klebsiella oxytoca* (2.9%), *Citrobacter* spp. (2.8%), *Serratia*

**Table 2.** Distribution of microorganisms causing of Urinary Tract Infections (UTIs) in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions (2022-2025)

| Microorganisms                | n    | %     |
|-------------------------------|------|-------|
| <i>Gram-positive cocci</i>    | 768  | 23.3  |
| <i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>  | 279  | 8.5   |
| <i>Enterococcus faecium</i>   | 27   | 0.8   |
| <i>Streptococcus</i> spp.     | 138  | 4.2   |
| CoNS                          | 288  | 8.7   |
| <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>  | 36   | 1.1   |
| <i>Gram-negative bacilli</i>  | 2494 | 75.7  |
| <i>Escherichia coli</i>       | 911  | 27.6  |
| <i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>  | 458  | 13.9  |
| <i>Klebsiella oxytoca</i>     | 97   | 2.9   |
| <i>Enterobacter</i> spp.      | 236  | 7.2   |
| <i>Proteus mirabilis</i>      | 369  | 11.2  |
| <i>Serratia</i> spp.          | 68   | 2.1   |
| <i>Citrobacter</i> spp.       | 93   | 2.8   |
| <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> | 219  | 6.6   |
| <i>Acinetobacter</i> spp.     | 43   | 1.3   |
| Fungi                         | 33   | 1.0   |
| <i>Candida albicans</i>       | 33   | 1.0   |
| Total                         | 3295 | 100.0 |

CoNS, Coagulase-negative staphylococci

Source: compiled by the authors of this study

**Table 3.** Resistance profile of the main causative agents of UTIs in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions (2022-2025)

| Pathogen                      | Antibiotic | Total<br>(n=1,957)<br>% | Type of UTIs |               |                     | P value |
|-------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------|---------|
|                               |            |                         | ASB<br>%     | Cystitis<br>% | Pyelonephritis<br>% |         |
| <i>Escherichia coli</i>       | CRO        | 12.4                    | 11.1         | 9.1           | 17.2                | 0.0081  |
|                               | CIP        | 27.2                    | 24.7         | 24.3          | 32.5                | 0.0637  |
|                               | NOR        | 27.6                    | 28.9         | 27.4          | 26.6                | 0.749   |
|                               | TMP-SMX    | 28.4                    | 25.4         | 26.7          | 33.0                | 0.0411  |
|                               | FFM        | 2.3                     | 2.3          | 2.2           | 2.3                 | 0.975   |
|                               | NIT        | 2.2                     | 2.1          | 1.0           | 3.4                 | 0.128   |
|                               | AMC        | 32.3                    | 23.5         | 31.5          | 38.8                | <0.001  |
| <i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>  | CRO        | 10.2                    | 7.5          | 7.2           | 15.5                | 0.0642  |
|                               | CIP        | 19.7                    | 15.5         | 15.0          | 28.6                | 0.0312  |
|                               | NOR        | 15.3                    | 17.8         | 15.0          | 13.2                | 0.565   |
|                               | TMP-SMX    | 13.9                    | 10.1         | 12.4          | 19.1                | 0.0631  |
|                               | FFM        | 30.0                    | 19.6         | 39.8          | 30.7                | 0.001   |
|                               | NIT        | 66.6                    | 70.1         | 63.5          | 66.1                | 0.547   |
|                               | AMC        | 16.8                    | 14.5         | 16.7          | 19.2                | 0.535   |
| <i>Proteus mirabilis</i>      | CRO        | 3.2                     | 1.0          | 0.0           | 8.5                 | 0.0061  |
|                               | CIP        | 20.6                    | 25.0         | 16.3          | 20.5                | 0.487   |
|                               | NOR        | 19.9                    | 25.3         | 15.9          | 18.6                | 0.378   |
|                               | TMP-SMX    | 31.2                    | 27.8         | 28.6          | 37.3                | 0.419   |
|                               | FFM        | 20.5                    | 28.6         | 19.6          | 13.2                | 0.154   |
|                               | NIT        | 100.0                   | 100.0        | 100.0         | 100.0               | -       |
|                               | AMC        | 6.9                     | 7.4          | 4.9           | 8.3                 | 0.654   |
| <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> | CEF        | 12.3                    | 14.8         | 17.0          | 8.0                 | 0.173   |
|                               | CIP        | 10.5                    | 7.6          | 13.8          | 10.1                | 0.311   |
|                               | PIP        | 14.1                    | 16.7         | 15.4          | 10.2                | 0.378   |
|                               | CAZ        | 10.2                    | 11.8         | 10.9          | 8.0                 | 0.614   |
|                               | IMI        | 13.6                    | 14.4         | 14.4          | 11.9                | 0.745   |

ASB, asymptomatic bacteriuria; UTIs, urinary tract infections.

CRO, Ceftriaxone; CIP, Ciprofloxacin; NOR, Norfloxacin; TMP-SMZ, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole; FFM, fosfomicin; NIT, Nitrofurantoin; AMC, Amoxicillin/clavulanic acid; CEF, cefepime; PIP, piperacillin-tazobactam; CAZ, ceftazidime; IMI, Imipenem

Source: compiled by the authors of this study

*spp.* (2.1%), *Acinetobacter spp.* (1.3%), and *Staphylococcus aureus* (1.1%) (Table 2).

In this study antimicrobial susceptibility tests (AST) were performed on a total of 3262 bacterial isolates (Gram-positive cocci and Gram-negative bacilli). In this study, many of isolates displayed a high resistance to antimicrobials, although there were some differences depending on the species and type of UTI (Table 3).

## DISCUSSION

The aim of present study was to estimate the prevalence rate of UTIs in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions and antimicrobial resistance of major causing pathogens. The results presented in this study are based on multicentre retrospective surveillance

data. According to the literature, many studies have already described resistance of responsible pathogens of UTIs in pregnant women, Ukrainian data are limited. This study expands upon the previous reports in Ukraine [4, 8] and is the first study to publish the prevalence of UTIs in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions and antimicrobial resistance of responsible pathogens of UTIs.

This study identified a high prevalence of UTIs (38.9%) in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions. The most frequently reported UTI types in pregnant women were 39% ASB and 48.4% Cystitis. Among all cases of UTIs, Pyelonephritis was 14.6%. A previous study in Ukraine conducted in 2020-2022 found that prevalence of UTIs among pregnant women from without Ukrainian-

Russian military conflict regions were 29.5%. Of these cases of UTIs, ASB, Cystitis, and Pyelonephritis was observed in 36.5%, 51.7%, and 11.8% in pregnant women, respectively [8]. According to the literature, overall global prevalence of UTIs (both symptomatic and asymptomatic) in pregnant women to be 23.9% [1]. Other studies report that prevalence of UTIs among pregnant women was 10% [2, 11] to 26% [12]. The prevalence of ASB and Cystitis occurs varied in 2% to 10% and 1% to 2% of pregnant women, respectively [7, 10]. Other studies report an UTI prevalence rate of ASB in pregnant women were 2-13% [13, 14] and acute cystitis in 1-4% [13, 15]. It is estimated, the prevalence of acute pyelonephritis in pregnant women were 0.5-4% [16].

In this study the most common causative agents of UTIs in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions was *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae*, *P. mirabilis*, *Coagulase-negative staphylococci* (CoNS), *E. faecalis*, *Enterobacter spp.*, and *P. aeruginosa*. This is consistent with the results of previous studies conducted in Ukraine [4, 8] and other studies [17, 18]. In our study many of isolates displayed a high resistance to antimicrobials, although there were some differences depending on the species and type of UTI. *Methicillin-resistance S. aureus* (MRSA), *vancomycin resistance enterococci* (VRE), and *extended spectrum beta-lactamases* (ESBL) production among Enterobacteriales was observed in 11.3%, 9.1%, and 29.4% strains, respectively. ESBL production among *E. coli* isolates was higher than in *K. pneumoniae*. Resistance to third generation cephalosporins was observed in 12.4% *E. coli* and in 10.2% *K. pneumoniae* isolates, respectively. In this study carbapenem resistance was identified in 13.7% of *P. aeruginosa* strains, isolated from pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions with UTIs. Our findings correlate with various other studies [4, 8, 14, 17-19] where multidrug resistant uropathogens were isolated from pregnant women with UTIs.

The most common risk factors of UTIs in pregnant women was lack of healthcare facilities, lack of essential medication, lack of personnel and equipment. Medical clinics across the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions are depleted and under immense strain. This has led to a decline in the quality of healthcare services and main reason for the high rate of UTIs in pregnant women.

## STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

The main strength of this study was the first study to publish the prevalence of UTIs in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions and antimicrobial resistance of responsible pathogens of UTIs. We believe our findings are a solid representation of the current prevalence of UTIs in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions and antimicrobial resistance of major causing pathogens. Our data, together with other papers in the literature, complement the picture of antimicrobial resistance of major causing pathogens isolated from pregnant women. The limitations of this study include the retrospective nature of this analysis. The results were dependent on accurate and complete documentation in the medical records. The health status of our cohort may have been inadequately powered to detect significant findings and other associated risk factors for UTIs.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study findings demonstrate the high rate (38.9%) of UTIs in pregnant women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions and many cases are caused by pathogens that are resistant to antibiotics. The most common risk factors of UTIs in pregnant women was lack of healthcare facilities, lack of essential medication, lack of personnel and equipment. Medical clinics across the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions are depleted and under immense strain. This has led to a decline in the quality of healthcare services and main reason for the high rate of UTIs in pregnant women. Untreated UTIs in pregnant women can lead to severe complications. Early detection and treatment of UTIs during pregnancy are crucial to prevent complications. Prevention of UTIs in women during pregnancy are essential to safeguard the health of both the mother and the fetus. Strategies for deterrence include optimal hygiene practices to minimize the risk of bacterial colonization and ascending infection. Preventive measures also involve screening for ASB during prenatal visits and promptly treating to symptomatic UTI. Preventive strategies and patient education, healthcare workers (physicians, advanced care practitioners, nurses, pharmacists, and other health professionals) can mitigate the prevalence of UTIs in pregnancy in women from the Ukrainian-Russian military conflict regions and promote optimal maternal and fetal outcomes.

## REFERENCES

1. Salari N, Khoshbakht Y, Hemmati M et al. Global prevalence of urinary tract infection in pregnant mothers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Public Health*. 2023;224:58-65. doi: 10.1016/j.puhe.2023.08.016.
2. Szweda H, Jóźwik M. Urinary tract infections during pregnancy - an updated overview. *Dev Period Med*. 2016;20(4):263-272.
3. Souza RB, Trevisol DJ, Schuelter-Trevisol F. Bacterial sensitivity to fosfomycin in pregnant women with urinary infection. *Braz J Infect Dis*. 2015;19(3):319-323. doi:10.1016/j.bjid.2014.12.009.
4. Salmanov AG, Gorbunova O, Leshchova O et al. Urinary tract infections in pregnant women and antimicrobial resistance of responsible pathogens in Ukraine: results of a multicenter study (2016-2018). *GinPolMedProject*. 2020;3(57):014-019.
5. Barry R, Houlihan E, Knowles SJ et al. Antenatal pyelonephritis: a three-year retrospective cohort study of two Irish maternity centres. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2023;42(7):827-833. doi: 10.1007/s10096-023-04609-6.
6. Habak PJ, Carlson K, Griggs Jr RP. *Urinary Tract Infection in Pregnancy*. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing. 2025. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK537047/>. [Accessed 20 October 2025]

7. Urinary Tract Infections in Pregnant Individuals. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2023;142(2):435-445. doi: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000005269.
8. Salmanov AG, Artyomenko V, Susidko OM et al. Urinary tract infections in pregnant women in Ukraine: results of a multicenter study (2020-2022). *Wiad Lek.* 2023;76(7):1527-1535. doi: 10.36740/WLek202307103.
9. Kalinderi K, Delkos D, Kalinderis M et al. Urinary tract infection during pregnancy: current concepts on a common multifaceted problem. *J Obstet Gynaecol.* 2018;38(4):448-453. doi: 10.1080/01443615.2017.1370579.
10. Chu CM, Lowder JL. Diagnosis and treatment of urinary tract infections across age groups. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2018;219(1):40-51. doi: 10.1016/j.ajog.2017.12.231.
11. Souza RB, Trevisol DJ, Schuelter-Trevisol F. Bacterial sensitivity to fosfomycin in pregnant women with urinary infection. *Braz J Infect Dis.* 2015;19(3):319-323. doi:10.1016/j.bjid.2014.12.009.
12. Johnson CY, Rocheleau CM, Howley MM et al. Characteristics of Women with Urinary Tract Infection in Pregnancy. *J Womens Health (Larchmt).* 2021;30(11):1556-1564. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2020.8946.
13. Matuszkiewicz-Rowińska J, Małyszko J, Wieliczko M. Urinary tract infections in pregnancy: old and new unresolved diagnostic and therapeutic problems. *Arch Med Sci.* 2015;11(1):67-77. doi:10.5114/aoms.2013.39202.
14. Lumbiganon P, Laopaiboon M, Thinkhamrop J. Screening and treating asymptomatic bacteriuria in pregnancy. *Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol* 2010;22(2):95-99. doi:10.1097/GCO.0b013e3283374adf.
15. Sabharwal ER. Antibiotic susceptibility patterns of uropathogens in obstetric patients. *N Am J Med Sci.* 2012;4(7):316-319. doi: 10.4103/1947-2714.98591.
16. Thomas AA, Thomas AZ, Campbell SC et al. Urologic emergencies in pregnancy. *Urology* 2010;76(2):453-460. doi:10.1016/j.urology.
17. D'Incau S, Atkinson A, Leitner L et al. Bacterial species and antimicrobial resistance differ between catheter and non-catheter-associated urinary tract infections: Data from a national surveillance network. *Antimicrob Steward Healthc Epidemiol.* 2023;3(1):e55. doi: 10.1017/ash.2022.340.
18. Mancuso G, Midiri A, Gerace E et al. Urinary Tract Infections: The Current Scenario and Future Prospects. *Pathogens.* 2023;12(4):623. doi: 10.3390/pathogens12040623.
19. Denoble A, Reid HW, Krischak M et al. Bad bugs: antibiotic-resistant bacteriuria in pregnancy and risk of pyelonephritis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM.* 2022;4(2):100540. doi: 10.1016/j.ajogmf.2021.100540.

We thank The Zarifa Aliyeva International Center of Medical Science (Kyiv, Ukraine) and the participating clinics, and physicians for their diligent efforts in performing the prevalence surveys of UTIs in pregnant women in Ukraine. The findings and conclusions in this study are those of the authors.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The Authors declare no conflict of interest

## CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Aidyn G. Salmanov  
 Ukrainian Center of Maternity and childhood of the  
 National Academy of Medical Sciences of Ukraine  
 8 P. Mayborody St., 04050 Kyiv, Ukraine  
 e-mail: mozsago@gmail.com

## ORCID AND CONTRIBUTIONSHIP

Aidyn G. Salmanov: 0000-0002-4673-1154 **A C E F**  
 Anatolii Senchuk: 0000-0002-1093-2886 **B C D F**  
 Beraia Dzheneti: 0000 0001-5449-6791 **B C D F**  
 Lidiya V. Suslikova: 000-0002-3039-6494 **B C D F**  
 Serhii E. Savchenko: 0000-0003-3802-2187 **B C D F**  
 Victor O. Rud: 0000-0002-0768-6477 **B C D F**  
 Vitalii S. Strakhovetskyi: 0000-0002-7528-1498 **B C D F**  
 Svitlana M. Korniyenko – 0000-0003-3743-426X **B C D F**  
 Orusia A. Kovalyshyn: 0000-0002-9710-0694 **B C D F**  
 Serhii Yu. Vdovychenko: 0000-0002-9205-510X **B C D F**  
 Andrey P. Prishchepa: 0009-0008-0246-581X **B C D F**  
 Olexandr V. Talko: 0009-0003-7012-8034 **B C D F**  
 Oleksandr A. Voloshyn: 0000 0002- 6586- 5449 **B C D F**  
 Andriy I. Chubatyy: 0000-0003-0375-5556 **B C D F**  
 Ihor Paliga: 0000-0001-8130-4185 **B C D F**  
 Volodymyr V. Artyomenko: 0000-0003-2490-375X **B C D F**

**A** – Work concept and design, **B** – Data collection and analysis, **C** – Responsibility for statistical analysis, **D** – Writing the article, **E** – Critical review, **F** – Final approval of the article

RECEIVED: 10.11.2025  
 ACCEPTED: 03.03.2026

