# In Vitro Activity of Telavancin against Staphylococcus aureus Causing Pneumonia or Skin and Skin Structure Infections with Concomitant Bloodstream Infections in United States Hospitals (2012-2016)

#### ABSTRACT

Telavancin is approved for the treatment of complicated skin and skin-structure infections (cSSSI) and hospital-acquired ventilator-associated bacterial pneumonia. This study evaluated telavancin activity against Staphylococcus aureus isolates cau pneumonia or SSSI, but recovered from blood in United States (US) hospitals.

A total of 674 S. aureus causing SSSI or pneumonia with concomitant bloodstream infections (BSI) were included. Isola recovered from 22 US sites, bacterial identification was confirmed, and isolates were susceptibility tested by CLSI methods. N interpretations used CLSI/EUCAST criteria. Methicillin-resistant S. aureus (MRSA) displaying a resistance phenotype to 3 or methic classes were considered multidrug-resistant (MDR).

Telavancin inhibited all S. aureus at  $\leq 0.12 \mu g/mL$ , the susceptibility breakpoint, with MIC<sub>50/90</sub> values of 0.03/0.06  $\mu g/mL$ . MICs (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) were obtained for methicillin-susceptible (MSSA), MRSA, and MDR S. aureus. Overall, MSS susceptible to all agents tested (95.9–100.0% susceptible; CLSI), except for erythromycin and levofloxacin (69.2–88.3% susceptible) Telavancin was 8-fold more potent than daptomycin and 16- to 32-fold more potent than vancomycin against MRSA. Ceftaroli 0.5/1 µg/mL; 92.5% susceptible), tetracycline (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, ≤0.5/1 µg/mL; 92.8–95.2% susceptible), and trimethoprim-sulfameth (TMP-SMX; MIC<sub>50/90</sub>,  $\leq$ 0.5/ $\leq$ 0.5 µg/mL; 95.8% susceptible) were also active against MRSA. Telavancin (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>, 0.03/0.06 µg susceptible), daptomycin, and vancomycin were active against MDR MRSA with activities similar to those observed against M however, telavancin MICs were at least 8-fold lower than those of daptomycin and vancomycin. TMP-SMX (MIC<sub>50/90</sub>,  $\leq 0.5/\leq 0.5$ 93.2% susceptible) and linezolid (100.0% susceptible) were also active against MDR MRSA, but other comparators had decr coverage (0.0–89.3% susceptible).

Telavancin (100.0% susceptible) had potent activity against this US collection of S. aureus causing SSSI or pneumonia v concurrent BSI, including those caused by MDR isolates. These in vitro results indicate that telavancin may be a suitable alter treating indicated infections with associated BSI.

#### INTRODUCTION

- Staphylococcus aureus is a highly adaptable pathogen that causes serious health care-associated and community-associated
- S. aureus is a leading cause of bacteremia, which is associated with significant morbidity and mortality and requires careful m
- Skin and skin structure infections (SSSI) and pneumonia are among the most common causes of S. aureus bacteremia, bu itself can also lead to metastatic infections
- Telavancin is a parenteral, bactericidal, lipoglycopeptide agent that has been shown to be non-inferior to vancomycin in Ph clinical trials of adult patients with cSSSI and with hospital-acquired bacterial pneumonia (HABP), including ventilator-asso bacterial pneumonia (VABP), due to susceptible gram-positive pathogens, including S. aureus and methicillin-resistant isol
- Telavancin is approved for clinical use by the Food and Drug Administration to treat (once daily) cSSSI and HABP/VABP wh other alternatives are not suitable
- Telavancin is also approved in Canada to treat cSSSI caused by S. aureus, including methicillin-susceptible S. aureus (MSS) MRSA isolates, and in Europe to treat adult patients with HABP/VABP caused by susceptible MRSA isolates
- This study evaluated the activity of telavancin against a set of S. aureus isolates from the US that caused SSSI or pneumoni concomitant bloodstream infection (BSI) (2012–2016)

### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

#### **Bacterial Strain Collection**

- 674 unique (1 per patient) *S. aureus* isolates from 22 sites in the US were included
- All isolates were deemed responsible for human infections per local guidelines
- The isolates were all derived from SSSI or pneumonia with concomitant BSI (Figure 1)
- Isolates were submitted to a central monitoring laboratory (JMI Laboratories, North Liberty, Iowa USA) as part of the SENTI Antimicrobial Surveillance Program during 2012–2016
- Isolates were initially identified by the participating laboratory with identification confirmed by the central monitoring laborat standard algorithms supported by matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization-time of flight mass spectrometry (Bruker Daltonics, Bremen, Germany)

#### Antimicrobial Susceptibility Test Methods

- Isolates were tested for susceptibility by broth microdilution (BMD), following the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute M07-A10 document
- The telavancin BMD MIC testing followed CLSI-approved methodology, which included supplementation with 0.002% polys
- Bacterial inoculum density was monitored by colony counts to assure an adequate number of cells for each testing event
- MIC values were validated by concurrently testing CLSI-recommended quality control reference strains
- (S. aureus ATCC 29213 and Enterococcus faecalis ATCC 29212)
- MIC breakpoint interpretation used current CLSI and EUCAST criteria
- MRSA isolates displaying a resistance phenotype (CLSI criteria) to at least 3 classes of drugs in addition to oxacillin were co

LR Duncan, HS Sader, MA Pfaller, M Castanheira, RK Flamm, RE Mendes

#### JMI Laboratories, North Liberty, Iowa, USA

Image: Circle drug       Wound/drainage/ulcor         SA were copuble), time (MICsearch nexazola g/mL; 100.0%, MSSA;       60%         5 µg/mL;       60%         Siskin       60%         with erreative when       RESULTS         A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)       A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)         A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)       A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)         A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)       Telavancin inhibited all isolates (100.0% susceptible) at the susceptibility breakpoint (sC surces (data not shown)         Telavancin inhibited all isolates (100.0% susceptible) at the susceptibility breakpoint (sC surces (data not shown)       Telavancin MIC <sub>50</sub> values (0.03 µg/mL) were identical for S. aureus isolate subsets stratifie shown)         Telavancin MIC <sub>50</sub> values (0.03 µg/mL) were identical for S. aureus isolate subset subset (Table 2)       In contrast, only telavancin, daptomycin, linezolid, teicoplanin, trimethoprim-sulfamethoo (93.2–100.0% susceptible) against the MDR MRSA subset (Table 2)         Isolates (MRSA), then       Table 1. Antimicrobial activity of telavancin tested against S. aureus isolates from th concomitant BSI         Organism / organism group (no. of isolates)       No. of isolates at MIC in µg/mL (cur solates (Table 2)         Telavancin retained activity of telavancin tested against S. aureus isolates from th concomitant BSI         Organism / organism group (no. of isolates)       N	d MRSA MDR su ed by year (2012	ul ole s								
WIC nore drug       L Equivalent SA were copitable). time (MIC <sub>sweet</sub> troxszole g/mL: 100.0% MSSA; 5 µg/mL; reased       Wound/drainage/ulcer 60%         with sernative when sted infections management ut bacteromia       RESULTS         • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)       • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)         • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)       • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)         • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)       • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)         • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)       • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)         • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)       • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)         • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)       • Telavancin inhibited all isolates (100.0% susceptible) at the susceptibility breakpoint ( <co sources (dala not shown)         • Telavancin MIC<sub>so</sub> values (0.03 µg/mL) were identical for <i>S. aureus</i> isolate subset stratific shown)       • No at lessed agents except clindamycin, erythromycin, and levofloxacin were <i>in vitro</i> active subset (Table 2)         • In contrast, only telavancin, daptomycin, linezolid, teicoptanin, trimethoprim-sulfamethoo (93.2 100.0% susceptible) against the MDR MRSA subset (Table 2)         • Telavancin retained activity (MIC range 0.06-0.12 µg/mL) against 5 isolates with elevated nia with         • Table 1. Antimicrobial activity of telavancin tested against <i>S. aureus</i> isolates from th concomi</co 	25% and skin structu 11% ).12 μg/mL; Tab d MRSA MDR su ed by year (2012	ul ole s								
SA were coprible).       Wound/drainage/ulcer         file (MICgasson hoxazole g/mL; 100.0%       SSA;         5 µg/mL; reased       60%         with ernative when ernative when the management       • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)         • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)       • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)         • Telavancin inhibited all isolates (100.0% susceptible) at the susceptiblity breakpoint (sCO = Telavancin inhibited all isolates (100.0% susceptible) at the susceptiblity breakpoint (sCO = Telavancin MICga values (0.03 µg/mL) were identical for <i>S. aureus</i> isolate subsets stratifie shown)         • All tested agents except clindamycin, erythromycin, and levofloxacin were <i>in vitro</i> active subset (Table 2)         • In contrast, only telavancin, daptomycin, linezolid, teicoplanin, trimethoprim-sulfamethox (93.2-100.0% susceptible) against the MDR MRSA subset (Table 2)         • Telavancin (MICgaw 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active comparisolates (Table 2)         • Telavancin (MICgaw 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active comparisolates (Table 2)         • Telavancin relained activity of telavancin tested against 5 isolates with elevated         • Table 1. Antimicrobial activity of telavancin tested against 5. aureus isolates from th concomitant BS1         • Organism / organism group (no. of isolates)       No. of isolates at MIC in µg/mL (cur solate)         • Contrast, organism group (no. of isolates)       0.03       0.06	11% ).12 μg/mL; Tab d MRSA MDR su ed by year (2012	ole ul s								
http://www.interview.org/in	11% ).12 μg/mL; Tab d MRSA MDR su ed by year (2012	ole ul s								
ernative when       RESULTS         • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)         • A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MDR (Table 1)         • Telavancin inhibited all isolates (100.0% susceptible) at the susceptibility breakpoint (≤0         • Telavancin had identical MIC <sub>50000</sub> values (0.03/0.06 µg/mL) against all MSSA, MRSA, and sources (data not shown)         • Telavancin MIC <sub>50</sub> values (0.03 µg/mL) were identical for <i>S. aureus</i> isolate subsets stratified shown)         • All tested agents except clindamycin, erythromycin, and levofloxacin were <i>in vitro</i> active subset (Table 2)         • In contrast, only telavancin, daptomycin, linezolid, teicoplanin, trimethoprim-sulfamethox (93.2–100.0% susceptible) against the MDR MRSA subset (Table 2)         • Telavancin retained activity (MIC range 0.06–0.12 µg/mL) against 5 isolates with elevated for the concomitant BSI         Organism / organism group (no. of isolates)       No. of isolates at MIC in µg/mL (curred) (93.9)         • Methicillin-susceptible (341)       31       263       46	d MRSA MDR su ed by year (2012	u 2 s								
<ul> <li>A total of 49.4% of US isolates were MRSA (Table 1)</li> <li>Among the MRSA collection, 30.9% of isolates were MDR (Table 1)</li> <li>Telavancin inhibited all isolates (100.0% susceptible) at the susceptibility breakpoint (sC Telavancin had identical MIC<sub>5090</sub> values (0.03/0.06 µg/mL) against all MSSA, MRSA, and sources (data not shown)</li> <li>Telavancin MIC<sub>509</sub> values (0.03 µg/mL) were identical for <i>S. aureus</i> isolate subsets stratified shown)</li> <li>All tested agents except clindamycin, erythromycin, and levofloxacin were <i>in vitro</i> active subset (Table 2)</li> <li>In contrast, only telavancin, daptomycin, linezolid, teicoplanin, trimethoprim-sulfamethos (93.2–100.0% susceptible) against the MDR MRSA subset (Table 2)</li> <li>Telavancin (MIC<sub>5090</sub>, 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active compared MDR isolates (Table 2)</li> <li>Telavancin retained activity of telavancin tested against <i>S. aureus</i> isolates with elevated concomitant BSI</li> <li>Drganism / organism group (no. of isolates)</li> <li>Staphylococcus aureus (674)</li> <li>So 526 97 (/4) (89.9)</li> <li>Methicillin-susceptible (341)</li> <li>All 263 46</li> </ul>	d MRSA MDR su ed by year (2012	ul 2 s								
<ul> <li>Among the MRSA collection, 30.9% of isolates were MDR (Table 1)</li> <li>Telavancin inhibited all isolates (100.0% susceptible) at the susceptibility breakpoint (≤C Telavancin had identical MIC<sub>5000</sub> values (0.03/0.06 µg/mL) against all MSSA, MRSA, and sources (data not shown)</li> <li>Telavancin MIC<sub>50</sub> values (0.03 µg/mL) were identical for <i>S. aureus</i> isolate subsets stratified shown)</li> <li>All tested agents except clindamycin, erythromycin, and levofloxacin were <i>in vitro</i> active subset (Table 2)</li> <li>In contrast, only telavancin, daptomycin, linezolid, teicoplanin, trimethoprim-sulfamethor (93.2–100.0% susceptible) against the MDR MRSA subset (Table 2)</li> <li>Telavancin (MIC<sub>5000</sub>, 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active compared MDR isolates (Table 2)</li> <li>Telavancin retained activity (MIC range 0.06-0.12 µg/mL) against 5 isolates with elevated more interval as a statistic st</li></ul>	d MRSA MDR su ed by year (2012	ul 2 s								
<ul> <li>Telavancin had identical MIC<sub>u090</sub> values (0.03/0.06 µg/mL) against all MSSA, MRSA, and sources (data not shown)</li> <li>Telavancin MIC<sub>50</sub> values (0.03 µg/mL) were identical for <i>S. aureus</i> isolate subsets stratifie shown)</li> <li>All tested agents except clindamycin, erythromycin, and levofloxacin were <i>in vitro</i> active subset (Table 2)</li> <li>In contrast, only telavancin, daptomycin, linezolid, teicoplanin, trimethoprim-sulfamethox (93.2–100.0% susceptible) against the MDR MRSA subset (Table 2)</li> <li>Telavancin (MIC<sub>5090</sub>, 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active comparative isolates (Table 2)</li> <li>Telavancin retained activity (MIC range 0.06-0.12 µg/mL) against 5 isolates with elevated more potent than active comparative for subset (Table 2)</li> <li>Telavancin retained activity of telavancin tested against <i>S. aureus</i> isolates from the concomitant BSI</li> <li>Organism / organism group (no. of isolates)</li> <li>Mo. of isolates at MIC in µg/mL (curres)</li> <li>Staphylococcus aureus (674)</li> <li>Sources (26, 97, 0.03, 0.06, 99, 0.03, 0.06, 0.02, 0.03, 0.06, 0.03</li></ul>	d MRSA MDR su ed by year (2012	ul 2 s								
inter intertions       sources (data not shown)         nanagement       Telavancin MIC <sub>50</sub> values (0.03 µg/mL) were identical for <i>S. aureus</i> isolate subsets stratified shown)         • Telavancin MIC <sub>50</sub> values (0.03 µg/mL) were identical for <i>S. aureus</i> isolate subsets stratified shown)         • All tested agents except clindamycin, erythromycin, and levofloxacin were <i>in vitro</i> active subset (Table 2)         • In contrast, only telavancin, daptomycin, linezolid, teicoplanin, trimethoprim-sulfamethox (93.2–100.0% susceptible) against the MDR MRSA subset (Table 2)         • Telavancin (MIC <sub>5090</sub> , 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active comparation isolates (Table 2)         • Telavancin retained activity (MIC range 0.06-0.12 µg/mL) against 5 isolates with elevated main with         • Table 1. Antimicrobial activity of telavancin tested against <i>S. aureus</i> isolates from th concomitant BSI         • Organism / organism group (no. of isolates)       No. of isolates at MIC in µg/mL (cure ≤0.015)         • Staphylococcus aureus (674)       50       526       97         • Wethicillin-susceptible (341)       31       263       46	ed by year (2012	2 s								
<ul> <li>Telavancin MIC<sub>50</sub> values (0.03 µg/mL) were identical for <i>S. aureus</i> isolate subsets stratified shown)</li> <li>All tested agents except clindamycin, erythromycin, and levofloxacin were <i>in vitro</i> active subset (Table 2)</li> <li>In contrast, only telavancin, daptomycin, linezolid, teicoplanin, trimethoprim-sulfamethox (93.2–100.0% susceptible) against the MDR MRSA subset (Table 2)</li> <li>Telavancin (MIC<sub>5000</sub>, 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active compared MDR isolates (Table 2)</li> <li>Telavancin retained activity (MIC range 0.06-0.12 µg/mL) against 5 isolates with elevated against <i>S. aureus</i> isolates from the concomitant BSI</li> <li>Organism / organism group (no. of isolates)</li> <li>Mo. of isolates at MIC in µg/mL (cure ≤0.015 0.03 0.06 (7.4) (85.5) (99.9)</li> <li>Methicillin-susceptible (341)</li> <li>31 263 46</li> </ul>		S								
<b>a</b> hase 3 ociated oblates (MRSA) when the subset (Table 2) <b>b</b> All tested agents except clindamycin, erythromycin, and levofloxacin were <i>in vitro</i> active subset (Table 2) <b>b</b> In contrast, only telavancin, daptomycin, linezolid, teicoplanin, trimethoprim-sulfamethos (93.2–100.0% susceptible) against the MDR MRSA subset (Table 2) <b>b</b> Telavancin (MIC <sub>5090</sub> , 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active comparation with a solution (MIC <sub>5090</sub> , 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active comparation with a solution (MIC <sub>5090</sub> , 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active comparation with a solution (MIC <sub>5090</sub> , 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active comparation with a solution (MIC <sub>5090</sub> , 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active comparation with a solution (MIC <sub>5090</sub> , 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active comparation with a solution (MIC <sub>5090</sub> , 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active comparation with a solution (MIC <sub>5090</sub> , 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) against 5 isolates with elevated against the MIC in µg/mL (currest against <i>S</i> and the solution of isolates) <b>b b c c c c c c c c c c</b>	(92.5–100.0% :									
ociated olates (MRSA) vhenIn contrast, only telavancin, daptomycin, linezolid, teicoplanin, trimethoprim-sulfamethox (93.2–100.0% susceptible) against the MDR MRSA subset (Table 2)• Telavancin (MIC 50000, 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active comparation MDR isolates (Table 2)• Telavancin retained activity (MIC range 0.06-0.12 µg/mL) against 5 isolates with elevated concomitant BSI• Table 1. Antimicrobial activity of telavancin tested against S. aureus isolates from th concomitant BSI• Organism / organism group (no. of isolates)• No. of isolates at MIC in µg/mL (cur ≤0.015• Staphylococcus aureus (674)• Staphyl	• All tested agents except clindamycin, erythromycin, and levofloxacin were <i>in vitro</i> active (92.5–100.0% s									
(b)(93.2-100.0% susceptible) against the MDR MRSA subset (Table 2)• Telavancin (MIC $_{50,90}$ , 0.03/0.06 µg/mL) was at least 8-fold more potent than active comparation more potent trained activity (MIC range 0.06-0.12 µg/mL) against 5 isolates with elevated• Telavancin retained activity (MIC range 0.06-0.12 µg/mL) against 5 isolates with elevated• Telavancin retained activity of telavancin tested against <i>S. aureus</i> isolates from the concomitant BSI• Organism / organism group (no. of isolates)• No. of isolates at MIC in µg/mL (curres)• Staphylococcus aureus (674)• 50• 526• 77• 77.4• 85.5• 99.9• Methicillin-susceptible (341)• 31• 26.3• 46	xazole, and vand	C								
<ul> <li>• Telavancin retained activity (MIC range 0.06-0.12 µg/mL) against 5 isolates with elevated mia with</li> <li>• Table 1. Antimicrobial activity of telavancin tested against <i>S. aureus</i> isolates from the concomitant BSI</li> <li>• Organism / organism group (no. of isolates)</li> <li>• Staphylococcus aureus (674)</li> <li>• Staphylococcus</li></ul>	arators tested a	g								
hia with Table 1. Antimicrobial activity of telavancin tested against <i>S. aureus</i> isolates from the concomitant BSI Organism / organism group (no. of isolates) Mo. of isolates at MIC in μg/mL (currest of the second										
Table 1. Antimicrobial activity of telavancin tested against S. aureus isolates from the concomitant BSI         Organism / organism group (no. of isolates)       No. of isolates at MIC in µg/mL (current of solates)         Staphylococcus aureus (674)       50       526       97         (7.4)       (85.5)       (99.9)         Methicillin-susceptible (341)       31       263       46										
Organism / organism group (no. of isolates)No. of isolates at MIC in $\mu$ g/mL (current conditions) $\leq 0.015$ 0.030.06Staphylococcus aureus (674) $50$ $526$ 97(7.4)(85.5)(99.9)Methicillin-susceptible (341)3126346	e US causing S	53								
≤0.015       0.03       0.06         Staphylococcus aureus (674)       50 (7.4)       526 (85.5)       97 (99.9)         Methicillin-susceptible (341)       31       263       46	No. of isolates at MIC in µg/mL (cumulative %)									
(7.4)(85.5)(99.9)Methicillin-susceptible (341)3126346	0.12									
Methicillin-susceptible (341)3126346	<b>1</b> (100.0)									
	1									
<sup>(9.1)</sup> (86.2) (99.7)	(100.0)									
atory using <b>Vancomycin MIC, 2 μg/mL (3)</b> 2 <sup>(66.7)</sup>	<b>1</b> (100.0)									
Vancomycin MIC, <2 μg/mL (338)31 (9.2)263 (87.0)44 (100.0)										
Methicillin-resistant (333)       19       263       51         te (CLSI)       (5.7)       (84.7)       (100.0)										
<b>MDR<sup>b</sup> (103)</b> $4 78 21$										
ysorbate-80 Vancomycin MIC, 2 μg/mL (2) (100.0) (100.0)										
<b>Vancomycin MIC, &lt;2 μg/mL (331)</b> 19 263 49										
<ul> <li>(5.7) (85.2) (100.0)</li> <li><sup>a</sup> Result not available when number of isolates &lt;10</li> <li><sup>b</sup> MDR, multidrug-resistant defined as MRSA (methicillin [oxacillin]-resistant) resistant to 3 or more other structures.</li> </ul>										

	Oroun <sup>2</sup> (no tootod) ( oront			CLSI <sup>b</sup>			<b>EUCAST</b> <sup>b</sup>		
	Group <sup>a</sup> (no. tested) / agent	<b>MIC</b> <sub>50</sub>	<b>MIC</b> <sub>90</sub>	%S	%	% <b>R</b>	%S	%	% <b>R</b>
	All isolates (674)								
	Telavancin	0.03	0.06	100.0			100.0		0.0 <sup>c</sup>
	Ceftaroline	0.5	1	95.9	4.1	0.0	95.9		4.1
	Clindamycin	≤0.25	>2	82.9	0.1	16.9	82.5	0.4	17.1
	Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	100.0			100.0		0.0
	Erythromycin	>8	>8	40.4	4.2	55.5	40.8	1.3	57.9
	Gentamicin	$\leq 1$	$\leq 1$	97.8	0.0	2.2	96.9		3.1
	Levofloxacin	0.25	>4	59.2	1.5	39.3	59.2		40.8
	Linezolid	1	1	100.0		0.0	100.0		0.0
	Oxacillin	2	>2	50.6		49.4	50.6		49.4
	Teicoplanin	≤2	≤2	100.0	0.0	0.0	99.9		0.1
	Tetracycline	 ≤0.5	 ≤0.5	96.4	0.7	2.8	93.8	1.2	5.0
	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole		_0.5	97.5	-	2.5	97.5	0.3	2.2
	Vancomycin	1	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0		0.0
	MSSA (341)	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<b>-</b>					
		<u> </u>							
	Telavancin	0.03	0.06	100.0	$\sim \sim$	$\sim \sim$	100.0		
	Clindomyoin	0.25	0.25	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	$\sim \sim$	0.0
	Clindamycin	≤0.25 0.25	≤0.25 Ω.5	95.9	0.0	4.1	95.3	0.6	4.1
	Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	100.0		~ — _	100.0	~ 4	0.0
Table 1) and infection	Erythromycin	0.25	>8	69.2	5.3	25.5	69.8	2.1	28.2
	Gentamicin	≤1	≤1	99.4	0.0	0.6	98.5		1.5
h 2016; data not	Levofloxacin	0.25	4	88.3	0.9	10.9	88.3		11.7
12010, which has	Linezolid	1	1	100.0		0.0	100.0		0.0
La) against the MARSA	Teicoplanin	≤2	≤2	100.0	0.0	0.0	99.7		0.3
ble) against the MRSA	Tetracycline	≤0.5	≤0.5	97.7	0.3	2.1	94.7	0.3	5.0
	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	≤0.5	≤0.5	99.1		0.9	99.1	0.0	0.9
were in vitro active	Vancomycin	0.5	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	-	0.0
	MRSA (333)								
RSA and MRSA	Telavancin	0.03	0.06	100.0			100.0		0.0
			U.UU 1		フム	$\cap \cap$			
s (2 µg/mL) (Table 1)	Clindamycin	0.5		92.5	7.5	0.0	92.5 60 /	$\land$ $\land$	7.5
	Clindamycin	≤0.25 0.25	>2	69.7	0.3	30.0	69.4	0.3	30.3
	Daptomycin Frythramycin	0.25	0.5	100.0	$\sim$		100.0		0.0
oneumonia with	Erythromycin	>8	>8	10.8	3.0	86.2	11.1	0.6	88.3
	Gentamicin	$\leq 1$	$\leq 1$	96.1	0.0	3.9	95.2		4.8
	Levofloxacin	4	>4	29.4	2.1	68.5	29.4		70.6
S <sub>50</sub> MIC <sub>90</sub>	Linezolid	1	1	100.0		0.0	100.0		0.0
	Teicoplanin	≤2	≤2	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0		0.0
	Tetracycline	≤0.5	1	95.2	1.2	3.6	92.8	2.1	5.1
3 0.06	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	≤0.5	≤0.5	95.8		4.2	95.8	0.6	3.6
	Vancomycin	1	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0		0.0
3 0.06	MDR MRSA (103)								
	Telavancin	0.03	0.06	100.0			100.0		0.0
6 _a	Ceftaroline	1	0.00 0	77.6	22.4	0.0	77.6		22.4
		1 >2	Z >2	9.7	22.4 0.0	90.3	9.7	0.0	22.4 90.3
3 0.06	Clindamycin Dantomycin				U.U	30.0		U.U	
3 0.00	Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	100.0	$\sim \sim$		100.0	$\sim \sim$	0.0
	Erythromycin	>8	>8	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100
3 0.06	Gentamicin	$\leq 1$	>8	89.3	0.0	10.7	88.3		11.7
	Levofloxacin	>4	>4	5.8	0.0	94.2	5.8		94.2
3 0.06	Linezolid	1	1	100.0		0.0	100.0		0.0
	Teicoplanin	≤2	≤2	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0		0.0
6 _a	Tetracycline	≤0.5	8	88.3	1.9	9.7	83.5	3.9	12.6
5	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	≤0.5	≤0.5	93.2		6.8	93.2	1.0	5.8
	Vancomycin	1	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0		0.0

riteria as published by CLSI [2017] and EUCAST [2017]

<sup>c</sup> Breakpoint applied to all *S. aureus*, but approved for MRSA isolates only



## CONCLUSIONS

- Telavancin demonstrated potent *in vitro* activity against this US collection of S. aureus isolates (100.0% susceptible) regardless of methicillin and MDR-resistance phenotype or infection source
- The telavancin *in vitro* activity was consistently more potent than all tested comparators against each isolate subset, including MDR MRSA
- These data indicate that telavancin may be an attractive option for treating SSSI and pneumonia with concomitant BSI that are caused by S. aureus, regardless of resistance phenotype

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research and publication process was supported by Theravance Biopharma R&D, Inc. Poster production support was coordinated by AlphaBioCom, funded by Theravance Biopharma R&D, Inc.

### REFERENCES

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (2015). M07-A10. Methods for dilution antimicrobial susceptibility tests for bacteria that grow aerobically; approved standard-tenth edition. Wayne, PA: CLSI.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (2017). M100-S27. Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing: 27th informational supplement. Wayne, PA: CLSI.

Corey GR (2009). Staphylococcus aureus bloodstream infections: definitions and treatment. Clin Infect Dis 48 Suppl 4: S254-S259.

Cosgrove SE, Fowler VG, Jr. (2008). Management of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus bacteremia. Clin Infect Dis 46 Suppl 5: S386-S393. EUCAST (2017). Breakpoint tables for interpretation of MICs and zone diameters. Version 7.0, January 2017. Available at:

http://www.eucast.org/clinical\_breakpoints/. Accessed January 2017. Holland TL, Arnold C, Fowler VG, Jr. (2014). Clinical management of Staphylococcus aureus bacteremia: a review. JAMA 312: 1330-1341.

Keynan Y, Rubinstein E (2013). Staphylococcus aureus bacteremia, risk factors, complications, and management. Crit Care Clin 29: 547-562.

Rubinstein E (2008). *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia with known sources. Int J Antimicrob Agents 32 Suppl 1: S18-S20.

VIBATIV Package Insert (2016). Available at http://www.vibativ.com. Accessed August 2016.