RES

INTRODUC

# Comparison of Ceftazidime-Avibactam, Ceftolozane-Tazobactam, and Meropenem-Vaborbactam In Vitro **Activities against Gram-Negative Bacteria Isolated** from Patients Hospitalized with Pneumonia in US Medical Centers in 2020

Helio S. Sader, Cecilia G. Carvalhaes, Dee Shortridge, Rodrigo E. Mendes, Mariana Castanheira JMI Laboratories, North Liberty, Iowa, USA

- Ceftazidime-avibactam (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 2/8 mg/L; 96.3% susceptible) and ceftolozane-tazobactam (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 0.5/2 mg/L; 97.4% susceptible) were the most active  $\beta$ -lactams against *P. aeruginosa* (Table 1 and Figure 1).
  - Meropenem-vaborbactam inhibited 83.9% of *P. aeruginosa* isolates at  $\leq 4 \text{ mg/L}$ , the susceptible breakpoint for *Enterobacterales* (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 0.5/16 mg/L); piperacillin-tazobactam (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 4/128 mg/L) was active against 78.2% of isolates (Table 1 and Figure 1).
  - Ceftazidime-avibactam and ceftolozane-tazobactam retained activity against P. aeruginosa isolates nonsusceptible to piperacillin-tazobactam, meropenem, or ceftazidime; whereas meropenem-vaborbactam exhibited limited activity against these 3 resistant subsets (Table 2).
  - When tested against *P. aeruginosa* isolates nonsusceptible to piperacillintazobactam, meropenem, and ceftazidime (n=64), susceptibility rates for ceftazidime-avibactam, ceftolozane-tazobactam, and meropenemvaborbactam (at  $\leq 4$  mg/L) were 64.1%, 73.4%, and 10.9%, respectively (Table 1 and Figure 1).
  - Ceftazidime-avibactam (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 0.12/0.5 mg/L; 99.8% susceptible) and meropenem-vaborbactam (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 0.03/0.06 mg/L; 99.6% susceptible) were the most active compounds against *Enterobacterales* (Table 3).
  - Ceftazidime-avibactam and meropenem-vaborbactam retained potent activity against ceftriaxone-resistant *Enterobacterales* (99.1% and 98.5% susceptible, respectively), MDR *Enterobacterales* (98.2% and 97.1%) susceptible, respectively), XDR *Enterobacterales* (88.0% and 80.0%) susceptible, respectively), and CRE (90.9% and 84.8% susceptible, respectively; Table 3 and Figure 2)

### Figure 1. Antimicrobial susceptibility of *P. aeruginosa* isolated from patients hospitalized with pneumonia in US medical centers (INFORM) **Program, 2020)**



\* The Enterobacterales susceptible breakpoint of ≤4 mg/L was applied for comparison Abbreviations: BL-NS, nonsusceptible to ceftazidime, meropenem, and piperacillin-tazobactam; MDR, multidrug-resistant; XDR, extensively drug-resistant.

 Rapidly introducing appropriate antimicrobial therapy for patients hospitalized with pneumonia (PHP) is crucial to reduce morbidity and mortality. 0 • Antimicrobial treatment is determined mostly by understanding the causative pathogens

tazobactam (C-T), meropenem-vaborbactam (MEM-VAB), and other

States (US) medical centers in 2020.

We compared the activities of ceftazidime-avibactam (CAZ-AVI), ceftolozanecomparators against Gram-negative bacteria causing pneumonia in United

- The most common *Enterobacterales* species were *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (24.8% of ENT), Escherichia coli (14.8%), Serratia marcescens (14.1%), and Enterobacter cloacae complex (12.4%)
- Enterobacterales susceptibility rates for ceftriaxone and ceftazidime were 74.7% and 79.1%, respectively (Table 3).

#### Table 1. Antimicrobial susceptibility of *P. aeruginosa* isolates from patients hospitalized with pneumonia in US medical centers (2020)

Antimicrobial agont	MIC in mg/L		CLSI <sup>a</sup>				
Antimicrobial agent		MIC <sub>90</sub>	%S	%	%R		
P. aeruginosa (682)							
Ceftazidime-avibactam	2	8	96.3		3.7		
Ceftolozane-tazobactam	0.5	2	97.4	0.9	1.8		
Meropenem-vaborbactam	0.5	16	83.9 <sup>b</sup>				
Piperacillin-tazobactam	4	128	78.2	10.9	11.0		
Meropenem	0.5	16	77.7	5.6	16.7		
Ceftazidime	2	32	83.4	4.5	12.0		
Cefepime	2	16	83.9	10.4	5.7		
Ciprofloxacin	0.12	4	77.1	6.3	16.6		
Levofloxacin	0.5	8	68.1	10.7	21.1		
Tobramycin	0.5	2	95.7	1.2	3.1		
β-lactam-nonsusceptible <i>P. aeruginosa</i> (64) <sup>c</sup>							
Ceftazidime-avibactam	8	>32	64.1		35.9		
Ceftolozane-tazobactam	4	>16	73.4	9.4	17.2		
Meropenem-vaborbactam	16	32	10.9 <sup>b</sup>				
Levofloxacin	4	16	20.3	20.3	59.4		
Tobramycin	1	8	87.5	4.7	7.8		
<sup>a</sup> Criteria as published by CLSL (2021)							

<sup>•</sup> For comparison, the *Enterobacterales* susceptible breakpoint of ≤4 mg/L was applied

B-lactam-nonsusceptible was defined as nonsusceptible to ceftazidime, meropenem, and piperacillin-tazobactam

## Table 2. Cross-resistance among β-lactams and β-lactamase inhibitor combinations tested against *P. aeruginosa* isolates from United States medical centers (2020)

Antimiershiel	% Susceptible by resistant subset (no. of isolates)							
Antimicropiai	CAZ-NS (113)	PIP-TAZ-NS (149)	MEM-NS (152)	MEM-VAB-NS (110) <sup>a</sup>	C-T-NS (18)	CAZ-AVI-NS (25)		
Ceftazidime	0.0	26.2	57.2	48.2	0.0	0.0		
Piperacillin-tazobactam	2.7	0.0	40.8	26.4	6.2	4.0		
Meropenem	42.5	39.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0		
Meropenem-vaborbactam	49.6	45.6	27.6	0.0	22.2	16.0		
Ceftolozane-tazobactam	84.1	88.6	88.2	87.3	0.0	48.0		
Ceftazidime-avibactam	77.9	83.9	84.2	80.9	27.8	0.0		

<sup>a</sup> Isolates with a meropenem-vaborbactam MIC of ≥8 mg/L. Abbreviations: CAZ, ceftazidime; MEM, meropenem; VAB, vaborbactam; PIP-TAZ, piperacillin-tazobactam; C-T, ceftolozane-tazobactam; AVI, avibactam; NS, nonsusceptible.

#### Bacterial isolates

- The isolate number was updated since the submission of the abstract as additional isolates were tested.
- A total of 1,388 Enterobacterales and 682 P. aeruginosa isolates were
- consecutively collected from patients hospitalized with pneumonia (1/patient) in 60 US medical centers in 2020.
- Only isolates determined to be significant by local criteria as the reported probable cause of infection were included in the program.

#### **Resistant subsets**

- Carbapenem-resistant *Enterobacterales* (CRE) isolates were defined as displaying imipenem and/or meropenem MIC values at  $\geq$ 4 mg/L (CLSI, 2021). - Imipenem was not applied to *Proteus mirabilis* and indole-positive Proteeae due to their intrinsically elevated MIC values.
- Multidrug-resistant (MDR) and extensively drug-resistant (XDR) Enterobacterales and P. aeruginosa strains were classified according to recommended guidelines (Magiorakos et al., 2012) as follows:



• Ceftolozane-tazobactam was active against 88.7% of *Enterobacterales* 

 Ceftazidime-avibactam demonstrated potent activity against a large US collection of contemporary (2020) P. aeruginosa (n=682) and Enterobacterales (n=1,388) isolates from patients with pneumonia, including organisms resistant to most currently available agents, such as meropenemnonsusceptible *P. aeruginosa* and CRE.

**USIONS** 

CONCL

 Ceftazidime-avibactam and ceftolozane-tazobactam showed similar coverage (%S) against *P. aeruginosa* (96.3% and 97.4% susceptibility, respectively).

#### Table 3. Antimicrobial susceptibility of *Enterobacterales* isolates from patients hospitalized with pneumonia in US medical centers (2020)

(MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 0.25/4 mg/L) and 91.6% of *K. pneumoniae* (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 0.25/2 mg/L), but showed limited activity against ceftriaxone-resistant (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 2/>16 mg/L; 54.2% susceptible), MDR (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 2/>16 mg/L; 52.8% susceptible), XDR  $(MIC_{50/90}, >16/>16 \text{ mg/L}; 8.0\% \text{ susceptible}), and CRE isolates (MIC_{50/90}, >16/>16 \text{ mg/L}; 8.0\% \text{ susceptible})$ >16/>16 mg/L; 15.2% susceptible; Table 3 and Figure 2).

• Meropenem was active against 97.5% of *Enterobacterales* (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 0.03/0.06 mg/L), 90.5% of ceftriaxone-resistant Enterobacterales (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 0.06/1 mg/L), 81.2% of MDR Enterobacterales (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 0.06/8 mg/L), and only 20.0% of XDR *Enterobacterales* (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 8/>32 mg/L; Table 3 and Figure 2).

## Figure 2. Antimicrobial susceptibility of *Enterobacterales* isolated from patients hospitalized with pneumonia in US medical centers (INFORM **Program**, 2020)



Abbreviations: R, resistant; MDR, multidrug-resistant; XDR, extensively drug-resistant; CRE, carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales

- MDR = nonsusceptible (NS; CLSI breakpoints) to at least 3 antimicrobial classes.
- XDR = susceptible (S) to 2 or fewer antimicrobial classes. • Ceftriaxone-resistant *Enterobacterales* isolates were defined as displaying ceftriaxone MIC values of  $\geq 4 \text{ mg/L}$  (CLSI, 2021).

# Susceptibility testing

- Organisms were tested for susceptibility by reference broth microdilution methods in a central laboratory according to the current Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) documents.
- Frozen-form MIC panels were manufactured at JMI Laboratories.
- Susceptibility percentages were based on CLSI and/or US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) guidelines.
- The meropenem-vaborbactam susceptible breakpoint of  $\leq 4$  mg/L for Entrobacterales was applied for comparison purposes to P. aeruginosa.

#### Antimic

Enterob Ceftazi Ceftolo Merope Pipera Merope Ceftria Ceftazi Cefepi Levoflo Gentar Amikad Ceftriaxo Ceftazi Ceftolo Merope Piperad Merope Ceftazi Cefepi Levoflo Gentar Amikad CRE (33 Ceftazi Ceftolo Merope Levoflo Gentar Amikad K. pneul Ceftazi Ceftolo Merope Piperad Merope Ceftria Ceftazi Cefepi Levoflo Gentar Amikad <sup>a</sup> Criteria as published by CLSI (2021)

Ó DISCL

JMI Laboratories

- Ceftazidime-avibactam and meropenem-vaborbactam were the most active compounds against Enterobacterales (99.8% and 99.6% susceptibility, respectively) and retained activity against CRE (90.9% and 84.8% susceptibility, respectively).
- Ceftazidime-avibactam demonstrated a broad spectrum of activity against both *P. aeruginosa* and Enterobacterales and represents a valuable option for treating patients hospitalized with pneumonia caused by Gram-negative organisms in US medical centers.

robial agent	mg/L		CLSIª		
	MIC <sub>50</sub>	MIC <sub>90</sub>	%S	%	%R
acterales (1,388)					
dime-avibactam	0.12	0.5	99.8		0.2
zane-tazobactam	0.25	4	88.7	2.9	8.4
enem-vaborbactam	0.03	0.06	99.6	0.1	0.3
cillin-tazobactam	2	64	84.5	7.5	8.0
enem	0.03	0.06	97.5	0.3	2.2
xone	0.12	>8	74.7	1.1	24.2
dime	0.25	>32	79.1	2.2	18.7
me	0.06	16	84.6	4.4 <sup>b</sup>	11.0
oxacin	0.06	4	82.3	4.4	13.3
nicin	0.5	2	91.5	1.6	6.9
cin	2	4	98.6	0.9	0.5
one-resistant Enterobacteral	es (336)				
dime-avibactam	0.25	1	99.1		0.9
zane-tazobactam	2	>16	54.2	11.1	34.7
enem-vaborbactam	0.03	0.06	98.5	0.3	1.2
cillin-tazobactam	32	>128	42.4	27.8	29.9
enem	0.06	1	90.5	1.2	8.3
dime	>32	>32	16.7	7.4	75.9
me	8	>32	37.5	17.9 <sup>b</sup>	44.6
oxacin	0.5	16	54.2	9.6	36.2
nicin	0.5	>16	74.6	3.6	21.8
cin	2	16	94.9	3.6	1.5
8)					
dime-avibactam	1	8	90.9		9.1
zane-tazobactam	>16	>16	15.2	0.0	84.8
enem-vaborbactam	0.03	>32	84.8	3.0	12.1
oxacin	2	32	27.3	12.1	60.6
nicin	2	>16	60.6	9.1	30.3
cin	4	32	78.8	12.1	9.1
moniae (344)					
dime-avibactam	0.12	0.5	99.7		0.3
zane-tazobactam	0.25	2	91.6	2.0	6.4
enem-vaborbactam	0.03	0.03	99.1	0.3	0.6
cillin-tazobactam	4	32	87.5	5.5	7.0
enem	0.03	0.06	95.1	0.6	4.4
xone	≤0.06	>8	75.9	0.9	23.3
dime	0.25	>32	76.5	2.9	20.6
me	0.06	>32	77.3	1.5 <sup>b</sup>	21.2
oxacin	0.06	4	77.9	7.8	14.2
nicin	0.25	>16	86.0	2.3	11.6
cin	1	4	97.7	1.5	0.9

<sup>b</sup> Intermediate is interpreted as susceptible-dose dependent.

#### Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all participants of the International Network for Optimal Resistance Monitoring (INFORM) Program for providing bacterial isolates This study was supported by AbbVie. AbbVie was involved in the design and decision to present these results, and JMI aboratories received compensation for services related to preparing the poster. AbbVie had no involvement in the collection analysis, or interpretation of data.

#### Contact Information Helio S. Sader, MD, PhD, FIDSA 345 Beaver Kreek Centre, Suite A North Liberty, IA 52317 Phone: (319) 665-3370 Fax: (319) 665-3371 Email: helio-sader@jmilabs.com





Scan QR code for an electronic copy of this poster presentation QR code expires May 13, 2022