Monitoring For Antimicrobial Resistance in North American Haematology-Oncology Centers: Results from the CANCER Resistance Surveillance Program (USA; 2000-2002)

The JONES Group/JMI Laboratories North Liberty, IA, USA www.jmilabs.com 319.665.3370, fax 319.665.3371

ronald-jones@jmilabs.com

IDSA 2004

TR FRITSCHE, J KIRBY, RN JONES; The JONES Group/JMI Laboratories, North Liberty, IA

AMENDED ABSTRACT

Background: The Chemotherapy Alliance for Neutropenics and the Control of Emerging Resistance (CANCER) program monitored susceptibility (S) of pathogens recovered in haematology-oncology centers from 2000-2002. Isolates from 32 hospitals were analyzed for trends in pathogen occurrence and S profiles.

Methods: 3,970 isolates recovered from neutropenic patients were analyzed centrally (JMI Laboratories, IA). MICs were determined using NCCLS methods and interpretive criteria, including those for extended spectrum β-lactamase (ESBL) phenotypes (≥2 µg/ml).

Results: Ranking pathogens (%) included S. aureus (SA; 19.3), coagulase-negative staphylococci (CoNS; 14.1), E. coli (EC; 13.4), enterococci (10.2), Klebsiella spp. (KS; 9.5), P. aeruginosa (PSA; 8.8), Enterobacter spp. (ENT; 3.8), viridans group streptococci (2.5), S. maltophilia (SM; 2.4) and β-haemolytic streptococci (2.2). 35.3 and 78.8% of SA and CoNS were oxacillin-R, respectively. 22% of enterococci were vancomycin-resistant. Among Gram-negatives, EC and KS were >90% S to piperacillin/tazobactam (P/T), third generation cephems, and levofloxacin (LEV) with 4.0 and 2.4% of these species, respectively, expressing ESBL phenotypes. ENT were less susceptible to P/T, ceftazidime (CTZ) and aztreonam (83.7 to 88.2%; Amp C), but EC, KS and ENT were fully S to cefepime (CEF), carbapenems (CRB) and amikacin (AK). PSA were variable with 82.6 to 89.5% S to P/T, CTZ, CEF, CRB, gentamicin and ciprofloxacin. Only AK, tobramycin and polymyxin B were more active (94.9 to 97.7% S). SM were only S to LEV (89.7%) and trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole (100.0%).

Conclusions: R rates seen here do not reflect greater R in neutropenic patients compared with other hospitalized patients. The prevalence of Gram-negative pathogens (46.4%) is worrisome given the potential for more rapid R emergence in this group, warranting continued monitoring for these at-risk patients.

INTRODUCTION

During the previous two decades, significant changes have been documented in the prevalence of bacterial organisms occurring in oncology patients who experience neutropenia. The CANCER (Chemotherapy Alliance for Neutropenics and the Control of Emerging Resistance) surveillance program was developed as a three-year program to monitor the occurrence of bacterial and fungal pathogens and their antibiograms in hematology-oncology centers from diverse regions in North America.

During the initial year (2000-2001) of the study, Staphylococcus aureus, Escherichia coli, coagulasenegative staphylococci, Enterococcus spp., Klebsiella spp. and Pseudomonas aeruginosa represented the most frequently isolated pathogens. While resistance rates were found to generally mimic those found in non-neutropenic hospitalized patients, the continued increase in resistance among the common Gram-positive pathogens and emerging high-level resistance in Gram-negatives via horizontal transfer of genetic elements warranted continued monitoring. Significant age-related variations in pathogen occurrence and species-specific resistance patterns were also documented with isolates from patients \leq 14 years of age displaying greater susceptibility.

This report summarizes the results of an examination of all data collected during 2000-2002, analyzing for pathogen prevalence and susceptibility patterns, including the presence of isolates with extended spectrum beta-lactamase (ESBL) occurring in neutropenic patients.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Specimen Collection. A total of 3,970 non-duplicate bacterial strains were submitted from patients hospitalized in one of the 32 participating oncology treatment centers. Specimens originated from bloodstream infections, pneumonias, urinary tract infections and skin and from soft tissue infections and were either nosocomial- or community-acquired. Isolates were initially identified by the submitting laboratory and subsequently shipped to the monitoring laboratory (The JONES Group/JMI Laboratories, Iowa, USA) where identifications were confirmed using standard biochemical algorithms.

Susceptibility Testing. All strains were tested by the National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards (NCCLS) reference broth microdilution method in Mueller-Hinton broth (with 5% lysed horse blood added for testing of streptococci) against a variety of antimicrobial agents representing the most common classes and examples of drugs used in the empiric or directed treatment of febrile neutropenia. Interpretation of quantitative MIC results was in accordance with NCCLS methods and criteria. Enterobacteriaceae with elevated MICs (≥2 µg/ml) for ceftazidime and/or ceftriaxone and/or aztreonam were considered as extended-spectrum \(\beta\)-lactamase-producing phenotypes according to NCCLS criteria. Quality control strains utilized included Escherichia coli ATCC 25922 and 35218, Pseudomonas aeruginosa ATCC 27853, S. aureus ATCC 29213, Streptococcus pneumoniae ATCC 49619 and Enterococcus faecalis ATCC 29212. All recorded QC results were within ranges as established by NCCLS.

RESULTS

- The 10 ranking pathogens (Table 1) recovered included S. aureus (19.3), coagulasenegative staphylococci (14.1), E. coli (13.4), enterococci (10.2), Klebsiella spp. (9.5), P. aeruginosa (8.8), Enterobacter spp. (3.8), viridans group streptococci (2.5), Stenotrophomonas maltophilia (2.4) and \(\beta\)-haemolytic streptococci (2.2). Gram-negative pathogens comprised 46.4% of all isolates studied.
- Oxacillin resistance was detected in 35.3% (increase from 29.4% in 2000/2001) and 78.7% of *S. aureus* and coagulase-negative staphylococci, respectively (Table 2).
- 22% of enterococci were resistant to vancomycin, remaining unchanged from the first year of the study.
- Among Gram-negative species, E. coli and Klebsiella spp. were >90% susceptible to piperacillin/tazobactam, third generation cephems, and levofloxacin, with 4.0 and 2.4% of these species, respectively, expressing ESBL phenotypes (Table
- Enterobacter spp. were less susceptible to piperacillin/tazobactam, ceftazidime and aztreonam (83.7 to 88.2%) due to the typical presence of cephalosporinases, but along with E. coli and klebsiellae were fully susceptible to cefepime, carbapenems and amikacin.
- P. aeruginosa was variable in its antibiogram, with 82.6 to 89.5% being susceptible to piperacillin/tazobactam, ceftazidime, cefepime, carbapenems, gentamicin and ciprofloxacin; only amikacin, tobramycin, and polymyxin B were more active (94.9 to 97.7%).
- S. maltophilia, the fifth most prevalent Gram-negative organism, was only susceptible to levofloxacin (89.7%) and trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole (100%).

·	quency of occurrence of bacterial pathogens from medical centers participating he CANCER Program (2000 - 2002).							
Organism	Occurrences, n(%)	Site of infection ^a (% for the top two sites)						
Staphylococcus aureus	768 (19.3)	58.1 BSI; 20.8 SSTI						
Coagulase-negative staphylococci	561 (14.1)	86.1 BSI; 4.5 UTI						
Escherichia coli	531 (13.4)	61.8 BSI; 26.7 UTI						
Enterococcus spp.	405 (10.2)	65.9 BSI; 14.3 UTI						
Klebsiella spp.	377 (9.5)	67.4 BSI; 14.6 UTI						
Pseudomonas aeruginosa	351 (8.8)	48.7 BSI; 19.1 PNEU						
Enterobacter spp.	153 (3.8)	64.1 BSI; 10.5 UTI						
viridans group streptococci	101 (2.5)	84.2 BSI; 1.0 SSTI/1.0 UTI						
Stenotrophomonas maltophilia	97 (2.4)	52.6 BSI; 17.5 PNEU						
ß-haemolytic streptococci	88 (2.2)	53.4 BSI; 12.5 SSTI						
Other species	538 (13.8)	62.5 BSI; 20.6 PNEU						
a. BSI = bloodstream infection; SSTI = skin and soft	tissue infection; UTI = urinary tract infection	on; PNEU = pneumonia.						

able 2. Activity and spect	rum of 10	B-lactam a	ntimicrobial age	ents tested aga	inst the fiv
most prevalent ca of all isolates).	uses of Gra	am-positive	e infection in the	CANCER Prog	ram (48.3
ganism (no. tested)/antimicrobial agent	50%	MIC (µg/ml)	 Range	Categ	gory: % resistant
aureus (768)	30 70	9070	nalige	70 Susceptible	70 1651514111
Oxacillin	0.5	>8	≤0.06->8	64.5	35.5
Penicillin	16	32	≤0.016->32	11.8	88.2
Piperacillin/Tazobactam	2	64	≤0.5->64	_a	-
Cefazolin Ceftazidime	<u>≤</u> 2 8	>16 >16	≤2->16 <2->16	_a _a	-
Ceftriaxone	4	>32	1->32	_a	_
Cefepime	4	>16	0.25->16	_a	-
Imipenem	≤0.06	8	≤0.06->8	_a	-
Ciprofloxacin Gatifloxacin	0.5 0.12	>2 >4	≤0.25->2 ≤0.03->4	61.7 70.2	37.0 17.2
Levofloxacin	0.25	>4	≤0.03->4	63.3	30.6
Clindamycin	0.12	>8	≤0.06->8	68.0	31.7
Erythromycin	>8	>8	≤0.06->8 <0.00-0	48.0	51.5
Quinupristin/Dalfopristin Teicoplanin	0.25 0.5	0.5 1	≤0.06-2 ≤0.12-4	99.9 100.0	0.0 0.0
Vancomycin	1	1	0.25-4	100.0	0.0
Chloramphenicol	8	8	≤2-16	92.6	0.0
Gentamicin	≤2	≤2	≤2->8 0.25.4	95.3	4.2 _b
Linezolid Rifampin	2 ≤0.25	2 ≤0.25	0.25-4 ≤0.25->2	100.0 98.3	-° 1.2
Tetracycline	≥0.23 ≤4	≤0.23 ≤4	≤0.25->2 ≤4->8	94.5	4.8
oagulase-negative staphylococci (561)					
Oxacillin	4	>8	≤0.06->8	21.2	78.8
Penicillin	4	32	≤0.016->32	10.3	89.7
Piperacillin/Tazobactam Cefazolin	2 ≤2	8 >16	≤0.5->64 ≤2->16	_a _a	-
Ceftazidime	_ <u>></u> ∠ 16	>16	2->16	- _a	-
Ceftriaxone	8	>32	≤0.25->32	_a	-
Cefepime	4	16	≤0.12->16	_a _	-
Imipenem Ciprofloxacin	0.5 >2	>8 >2	≤0.06->8 ≤0.25->2	_ª 32.1	- 66.6
Gatifloxacin	>2 2	>2 >4	≤0.25->2 ≤0.03->4	79.3	14.1
Levofloxacin	4	>4	0.06->4	36.5	48.8
Clindamycin	0.12	>8	≤0.06->8	59.9	39.6
Erythromycin Quinupristin/Dalfopristin	>8 0.25	>8	≤0.06->8 ≤0.06-2	24.8 99.5	74.3
Teicoplanin	2	0.5 8	≤0.06-2 ≤0.12->16	99.5 95.7	0.0 0.7
Vancomycin	2	2	0.25-8	99.8	0.0
Chloramphenicol	4	8	≤2->16	95.7	3.0
Gentamicin	≤2	>8	≤2->8 	68.8	19.6 _♭
Linezolid Rifampin	1 ≤0.25	2 ≤0.25	0.12-2 ≤0.25->2	100.0 94.7	5.0
Tetracycline	<u>_</u> 0.23 ≤4	<u>_</u> 0.23	<u></u>	83.4	16.0
interococcus spp. (405)					
Ampicillin	2	>16	≤2->16	68.3	31.7
Ciprofloxacin	>2	>2	≤0.25->2	37.1	27.5
Gatifloxacin Levofloxacin	>4 >4	>4 >4	0.06->4 0.25->4	44.3 43.6	53.5 55.0
Erythromycin	>8	>8	≤0.06->8	8.9	65.4
Quinupristin/Dalfopristin	8	8	0.25->8	32.9	62.7
Teicoplanin	0.25	>16	≤0.12->16	80.7	15.1
Vancomycin	1 8	>16	≤0.12->16 ≤2->16	78.0 91.4	22.0 6.7
Chloramphenicol Gentamicin	<500	8 >1000	≤2->16 ≤500->1000	72.8	27.2
Linezolid	2	2	≤0.06-4	99.8	0.0
Rifampin	2	>2	≤0.5->2	35.3	42.0
Streptomycin Tetracycline	≤1000 >8	>2000 >8	≤1000->2000 ≤4->8	56.3 41.5	43.7 56.2
iridans group streptococci (101)	70	70	_T->0	41.5	50.2
Penicillin	0.06	2	≤0.016-8	69.3	7.9
Ceftriaxone	≤0.25	2	≤0.25-4	88.1	5.0
Cefepime	≤0.12	2	≤0.12->16	87.1	5.9
Gatifloxacin	0.25	4	≤0.03->4 <0.03 > 4	86.1	11.9
Levofloxacin Clindamycin	1 ≤0.06	>4 0.06	≤0.03->4 ≤0.06->8	86.1 96.0	12.9 2.0
Erythromycin	0.5	4	≤0.06->8	48.5	46.6
Quinupristin/Dalfopristin	0.5	1	≤0.06-8	99.0	1.0
Vancomycin	0.5	0.5	≤0.12-1 <2.8	100.0	0.0
Chloramphenicol Linezolid	<u>≤</u> 2 1	4 1	≤2-8 0.12-2	99.0 100.0	0.0 _b
Tetracycline	<u>≤</u> 4	>8	≤4->8	70.3°	29.7
-haemolytic streptococci (88)					
Penicillin	0.03	0.06	≤0.016-0.12	100.0	_b
Ceftriaxone	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.25	100.0	_b
Cefepime Catifloxacin	≤0.12 0.25	≤0.12 0.5	≤0.12-0.5 0.06-0.4	100.0	_b
Gatifloxacin Levofloxacin	0.25 0.5	0.5 1	0.06-0.4 0.25-2	100.0 100.0	0.0 0.0
Clindamycin	≤0.06	≤0.06	≤0.06->8	92.0	8.0
Erythromycin	0.06	4	≤0.06->8	78.4	21.6
Quinupristin/Dalfopristin	0.25	0.5	≤0.06-0.5	100.0	0.0
Vancomycin Chloramphenicol	0.5	0.5 <2	≤0.12-1 ≤2-4	100.0 100.0	_ ^ь 0.0
Cniorampnenicoi Linezolid	<u>≤</u> 2 1	<u>≤</u> 2 1	≤2-4 0.5-2	100.0	0.0 _b
Tetracycline	>8		≤4->8	44.3°	

Includes susceptible and intermediate results.

Organism (no. tested)/antimicrobial agent	MIC (µg/ml)		Category:			MIC (µg/ml)			Category:		
	50%	90%	Range	% susceptible	% resistant	Organism (no. tested)/antimicrobial agent	50%	90%	Range	% susceptible	% resista
				7. 0		Enterobacter spp. (153)					
<u>coli (531)</u>	4	40	.0.40	50.0	40.4	Ampicillin	>16	>16	8->16	3.3	81.0
Ampicillin	4	>16	≤2->16	58.0	40.1	Amoxicillin/Clavulanate	>16	>16	≤2->16	3.9	94.1
Amoxicillin/Clavulanate	4	16	≤2->16	85.1	6.8	Piperacillin	2	64	≤1->128	81.0	7.9
Piperacillin	2	>128	≤1->128	63.8	27.5	Piperacillin/Tazobactam	2	32	≤0.5->64	88.2	2.6
Piperacillin/Tazobactam	2	4	≤0.5->64	97.1	2.1	Ticarcillin	4	>128	≤1->128	74.5 80.4	18.9 15.0
Ticarcillin	8	>128	≤1->128	59.1	38.8	Ticarcillin/Clavulanate Cefazolin	>16	128 >16	≤1->128 ≤2->16	3.3	95.4
Ticarcillin/Clavulanate	4	64	≤1->128	81.0	4.5	Cefuroxime	>10 8	>16	1->16	55.6	26.8
Cefazolin	≤2	16	≤2->16	89.6	7.0	Cefoxitin	>32	>32	≤0.25->32	1.3	96.1
Cefuroxime	4	8	≤0.12->16	93.2	3.8	Ceftazidime	≤2	>16	<u>_</u> 0.20 > 02 ≤2->16	83.7	13.1
Cefoxitin	4	8	1->32	92.7	5.0	Ceftriaxone	_ _ ≤0.25	16	<u></u> 5.0 ≤0.25->32	86.3	5.9
Ceftazidime	≤2	<u>≤</u> 2	≤2->16	97.7	1.1(3.9) ^a	Cefepime	<u>≤</u> 0.12	≤0.12	≤0.12-8	100.0	0.0
Ceftriaxone	<u></u> ≤0.25	<u>_</u> 2 ≤0.25	≤0.25->32	98.3	0.6(2.6) ^a	Aztreonam	≤0.12	>16	≤0.12->16	85.6	10.5
						Imipenem	0.5	1	0.12-4	100.0	0.0
Cefepime	≤0.12	≤0.12	≤0.12->16	99.8	0.2	Meropenem	≤0.06	0.12	≤0.06-4	100.0	0.0
Aztreonam	≤0.12	0.25	≤0.12->16	98.1	1.1(4.0) ^a	Ciprofloxacin	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.25->2	98.7	1.3
Imipenem	0.12	0.25	≤0.06-2	100.0	0.0	Gatifloxacin	≤0.03	0.25	≤0.03->4	98.7	0.7
Meropenem	≤0.06	≤0.06	≤0.06-1	100.0	0.0	Levofloxacin	≤0.03	0.25	≤0.03->4	98.7	0.7
Ciprofloxacin	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.25->2	90.8	8.8	Amikacin	2	2	0.5-16	100.0	0.0
Gatifloxacin	≤0.03	≤0.03	≤0.03->4	91.5	7.2	Gentamicin	≤2	≤2	≤2->8	98.7	1.3
Levofloxacin	≤0.03	0.25	≤0.03->4	91.3	7.5	Tobramycin	0.5	1	0.25->16	97.4	2.0
Amikacin	2	4	≤0.25-16	100.0	0.0	Polymyxin B	≤1	>8	≤1->8	71.6 ^b	28.3b
Gentamicin	<u>≤</u> 2	≤2	≤2->8	95.5	4.5	Tetracycline	≤4	8	≤4->8 	86.3	9.2
						Trimethoprim/Sulfamethoxazole	≤0.5	≤0.5	≤0.5->2	95.4	4.6
Tobramycin	0.5	2	0.25->16	96.6	2.0	P. aeruginosa (351)					
Polymyxin B	≤1	≤1	≤1->8	99.8 ^b	0.2 ^b	Piperacillin	8	>128	≤1->128	86.9	13.1
Tetracycline	≤4	>8	≤4->8	72.9	26.7	Piperacillin/Tazobactam	4	>64	≤0.5->64	88.6	11.4
Trimethoprim/Sulfamethoxazole	≤0.5	>1	≤0.5->2	76.4°	23.6°	Ticarcillin	32	128	≤1->128	80.3	19.6
ebsiella spp. (377)						Ticarcillin/Clavulanate	32	128	≤1->128	80.6	19.4
	. 16	. 16	<0.16	6.6	70.0	Ceftazidime	2	>16	≤2->16 	85.5	12.3
Ampicillin	>16	>16	≤2->16	6.6	70.3	Ceftriaxone	>32	>32	≤0.25->32 <0.40	8.5	64.4
Amoxicillin/Clavulanate	≤2	8	≤2->16	96.0	1.9	Cefepime	2 8	16	≤0.12->16 <0.10 × 16	84.0	6.3
Piperacillin	4	128	≤1->128	85.1	10.9	Aztreonam	8	>16 8	≤0.12->16 ≤0.06->8	67.0 88.0	19.1
Piperacillin/Tazobactam	2	4	≤0.5->64	97.9	1.3	Imipenem Meropenem	0.5	8	≤0.06->8 ≤0.06->8	89.5	8.0 6.0
Ticarcillin	128	>128	2->128	5.3	69.5	Ciprofloxacin	≤0.25	>2	≤0.00->0 ≤0.25->2	82.6	12.5
Ticarcillin/Clavulanate	4	16	≤1->128	94.2	1.3	Gatifloxacin	0.5	>4	≤0.23->2 ≤0.03->4	78.6	14.3
Cefazolin	≤2	8	≤2->16	93.1	4.8	Levofloxacin	0.5	>4	≤0.03->4	80.6	12.8
Cefuroxime	2	8	_ ≤0.12->16	95.2	2.7	Amikacin	4	8	<u>_</u> 0.00 > 1 ≤0.25->32	97.7	1.7
Cefoxitin	2	8	≤0.25->32	93.4	2.6	Gentamicin	≤2	8	<u>_</u> 5.25 > 52 ≤2->8	88.9	5.7
Ceftazidime		~?	≤2->16	98.4	1.3(2.4) ^a	Tobramycin	0.5	1	≤0.12->16	94.9	4.3
	≤2	≤2				Polymyxin B	≤1	2	 ≤1->8	97.4 ^b	2.6 ^b
Ceftriaxone	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.25-32	99.2	0.0(2.1) ^a	S. maltophilia (97)	_		_		
Cefepime	≤0.12	≤0.12	≤0.12-8	100.0	0.0	Piperacillin	>128	>128	16->128	2.1	78.4
Aztreonam	≤0.12	0.25	≤0.12->16	98.7	1.3(2.4) ^a	Piperacillin/Tazobactam	>64	>64	1->64	15.5	55.7
Imipenem	0.12	0.25	≤0.06-1	100.0	0.0	Ticarcillin	128	>128	2->128	7.2	59.8
Meropenem	≤0.06	≤0.06	≤0.06-0.12	100.0	0.0	Ticarcillin/Clavulanate	32	128	≤1->128	42.3	15.5
Ciprofloxacin	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.25->2	97.9	1.9	Ceftazidime	8	>16	<u>_</u> 1>126 ≤2->16	54.6	37.1
Gatifloxacin	0.06	0.12	≤0.03->4	97.9	0.5	Ceftriaxone	>32	>32	≤0.25->32	1.0	93.8
Levofloxacin	≤0.03	0.25	<u>≤</u> 0.03->4	98.1	0.5	Cefepime	16	>16		33.0	40.2
Amikacin	0.00	2	0.5-8	100.0	0.0	Aztreonam	>16	>16	4->16	4.1	90.7
	•		≤2->8	98.4	1.1	Imipenem	>8	>8	0.12->8	1.0	99.0
Gentamicin	≤2	≤2				Meropenem	>8	>8	4->8	1.0	96.9
Tobramycin	0.5	1	≤0.12->16	98.4	0.8	Ciprofloxacin	2	>2	≤0.016->2	38.5	35.5
Polymyxin B	≤1	2	≤1->8	97.4 ^b	2.6 ^b	Gatifloxacin	1	4	≤0.03->4	89.7	5.2
	≤4	>8	≤4->8	87.5	10.3	Levofloxacin	1	4	≤0.03->4	89.7	5.2
Tetracycline				- 1 1d	E Od	Amikacin	>32	>32	4->32	40.0	00.0
	≤0.5	≤0.5	≤0.5->2	94.1 ^d	5.9 ^d					18.6	68.0
Tetracycline Trimethoprim/Sulfamethoxazole ^d					5.9"	Gentamicin	>8	>8	≤2->8	16.5	78.4
Tetracycline	ing the NCCLS [2004				5.9						

CONCLUSIONS

- Bacterial resistance rates seen in neutropenic patients are comparable to those of other hospitalized patients.
- Among all Gram-positive pathogens reported here, linezolid was the most active (99.8) to 100.0% susceptible); with the exception of enterococci, vancomycin and quinupristin/dalfopristin also provided near-complete coverage.
- Among the four most common Gram-negative pathogens, the carbapenems, cefepime piperacillin/tazobactam and the aminoglycosides provided the most comprehensive
- Continued monitoring of this at-risk and ever-increasing patient population is warranted given the changes in species trends and antibiograms.
- Guidelines for empiric regimens of antimicrobics in hematology/oncology patients must consider pathogen frequency, contemporary resistance rates and age factors when being established.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Del Favero A, Menichetti F, Martino P, Bucaneve G, Micozzi A, Gentile G, Furno P, Russo D, D'Antonio D, Ricci P, Martino B, Mandelli F; Gruppo Italiano Malattie Ematologiche dell'Adulto (GIMEMA) Infection Program. (2001) A multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial comparing piperacillin-tazobactam with and without amikacin as empiric therapy for febrile neutropenia. Clinical Infectious Disease. 33:1295-301. Diekema DJ, Coffman SL, Marshall SA, Beach ML, Rolston KV, Jones RN. (1999) Comparison of Activities of Broad Spectrum

ß-Lactam Compounds against 1,128 Gram-Positive Cocci Recently Isolated in Cancer Treatment Centers. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy. 43:940-943.

Diekema DJ, Jones RN, Rolston KV. (1999) Antimicrobial activity of gatifloxacin compared to seven other compounds tested against gram-positive organisms isolated at 10 cancertreatment centers. Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease. 34:37-43.

Diekema DJ, Pfaller MA, Jones RN; SENTRY Participants Group. (2002) Age-related trends in pathogen frequency and antimicrobial susceptibility of bloodstream isolates in North America: SENTRY Antimicrobial Surveillance Program, 1997-2000. *International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents*. 20:412-418.

Hughes WT, Armstrong D, Bodey GP, Bow EJ, Brown AE, Calandra T, Feld R, Pizzo PA, Rolston KV, Shenep JL, Young LS (2002) 2002 guidelines for the use of antimicrobial agents in neutropenic patients with cancer. Clinical Infectious Disease. 34:730-751. Jones RN. (1999) Contemporary antimicrobial susceptibility patterns of bacterial pathogens commonly associated with febrile patients with neutropenia. Clinical Infectious Disease.

Koll BS, Brown AE. (1993) The changing epidemiology of infections at cancer hospitals. Clinical Infectious Disease. 17(Suppl 2):S322-8

Mutnick AH, Kirby JT, Jones RN; CANCER Study Group (2003) CANCER resistance surveillance program: initial results from hematology-oncology centers in North America. The lational Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards. Methods for dilution antimicrobial susceptibility tests for bacteria that grow aerobically, sixth edition; Approved standard

National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards. Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing, 14th informational supplement M100-S14. Wayne, PA:NCCLS,

Sader HS. Kirbv JT. Fritsche TR, Jones RN. Influence of Patient Age on the Occurrence and Antimicrobial Resistance Trends of Isolates from Haemotology/Oncology Patients: Second Report from the CANCER Program (2001-2002). Abstract A-027, 104th General Meeting of the American Society for Microbiology, New Orleans, 2004.

Wisplinghoff H, Seifert H, Wenzel RP, Edmond MB. (2003) Current trends in the epidemiology of nosocomial bloodstream infections in patients with hematological malignancies and solid neoplasms in hospitals in the United States. Clinical Infectious Disease. 36:1103-1110.