POSTER 578 ECCMID 2008

Antimicrobial Activity of Ceftobiprole Tested Against Leading European Bacterial Pathogens: Results From an International Surveillance Program (2005-2006)

Abstract

Objectives: To evaluate potency of ceftobiprole (BPR) against the most serious and commonly occurring Gram-positive and -negative pathogens isolated in Europe. BPR, an investigational parenteral cephalosporin, is currently under regulatory review following completion of Phase 3 clinical trials. This agent is uniquely active against oxacillinresistant (OXA-R) Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA), as well as other Gram-positive and -negative pathogens, making it an attractive candidate for broad-spectrum therapy.

Methods: Consecutive, non-duplicate isolates (17,206) from bloodstream, skin and skin-structure and respiratory tract infections were collected from medical centers in Europe (23), Turkey (2), and Israel (1) participating in the BPR Surveillance Program during 2005-2006. Identifications were confirmed by the central monitoring laboratory and all isolates were susceptibility (S) tested using CLSI methods against BPR and comparator agents.

Results: Results are in the Table. Among SA (27% OXA-R) and CoNS (75% OXA-R) isolates tested, BPR inhibited 100% at \leq 4 and \leq 8 mg/L, respectively. While BPR MIC_{ao} values for OXA-R strains were elevated over those of OXA-S strains (8-fold), MIC₀₀ values for other cephalosporins correspondingly increased \geq 32-fold. BPR was 4-fold more potent when testing β-haemolytic streptococci (BHS) and SPN compared with ceftriaxone (CRO) or cefepime (FEP); all BHS were inhibited at ≤0.25 mg/L and >99% of SPN by 0.5 mg/L. BPR was similar in potency to ceftazidime (CAZ) and FEP (MIC₅₀ values, \leq 1 mg/L) against tested Enterobacteriaceae; coverage against EC was nearly identical for the three agents (94-95% inhibited at \leq 4 mg/L). FEP provided enhanced coverage against KSP (90% at \leq 8 mg/L vs. 78-84% for BPR and CAZ), although BPR and FEP had lower MIC values than CAZ against ESP. Cephalosporins were largely inactive against ESBL-producing EC and KSP. BPR was equal in potency to CAZ (MIC₅₀, 2 mg/L) against PSA and 2-fold more potent than FEP, although % inhibited for these agents at $\leq 2/4/8$ mg/L were similar. None of these agents inhibited >49% of ASP at 8 mg/L.

	MIC ₉₀ (% at ≤2/4/8 mg/L)			
Species (no. tested)	BPR	CRO or CAZ	FEP	
<i>S. aureus</i> (SA; 4028)	1 (>99/100/-)	>32 (39/72/75)ª	>16 (66/76/81)	
Coagulase-negative staphylococci (CoNS; 1840)	2 (93/>99/100)	>32 (22/33/47)ª	>16 (41/62/77)	
S. pneumoniae (SPN; 1528)	0.25 (100/-/-)	1 (>99/>99/100)ª	1 (>99/>99/>99)	
<i>E. coli</i> (EC; 2779)	0.12 (93/94/94)	≤1 (93/94/95) ^b	0.25 (94/95/96)	
Klebsiella spp. (KSP; 883)	>8 (77/78/78)	>16 (80/81/84) ^b	16 (84/87/90)	
Enterobacter spp. (ESP; 571)	>8 (81/84/87)	>16 (66/68/70) ^b	4 (88/92/96)	
P. aeruginosa (PSA; 984)	>8 (54/65/79)	>16 (56/69/76) ^b	16 (49/66/80)	
Acinetobacter spp. (ASP; 320)	>8 (41/41/42)	>16 (15/32/39) ^b	>16 (26/37/49)	

^a ceftriaxone; ^b ceftazidime

Conclusions: Ceftobiprole displays prominent activity against European staphylococci, including OXA-R strains. The compound also displayed activity against Enterobacteriaceae, similar to that of extended-spectrum cephalosporins, as well as against some non-fermentative bacilli. Given the breadth of its spectrum, ceftobiprole may be useful in those European institutions/regions where MRSA and PSA are both prevalent.

Introduction

Emergence of resistance among commonly occurring bacterial pathogens has limited the utility of many penicillins, cephalosporins, and other antimicrobial classes, driving increased utilization of carbapenems for Gram-negatives and vancomycin, daptomycin, and linezolid for Gram-positive pathogens. The recent appearance of community-associated methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (CA-MRSA) is especially worrisome given the rapidity of clonal spread that has occurred, enhanced pathogenicity features, and the occurrence of such pathogens in populations without usual risk factors. There is a paucity of broad-spectrum agents in development that are able to simultaneously target resistant subsets of both Gram-positive and -negative species.

Ceftobiprole (previously known as BAL9141), an expanded-spectrum pyrrolidinone-3-ylidene-methyl cephalosporin has completed Phase 3 clinical development for the treatment of complicated skin and skin-structure infections (cSSSI), and is under regulatory review for this indication. This agent demonstrates antimicrobial qualities similar to those of the "third and fourth generation" cephalosporins, by being stable to most commonly-occurring Class A and some Class C β -lactamases and has a strong affinity for penicillin-binding proteins, including PBP2a which mediates resistance to

β-lactams in methicillin-resistant staphylococci, and PBP2x which mediate penicillin resistance in Streptococcus pneumoniae. Ceftobiprole is bacteric against staphylococci, and is associated with a very low frequency of emergent resistance among S. aureus strains. Ceftobiprole is also known display activity against most Enterobacteriaceae, Pseudomonas aeruginos and many other species, including anaerobes. These characteristics make ceftobiprole an attractive therapeutic candidate given this unique spectrum broad safety profile characteristic of most β -lactams, and predominantly bactericidal activities.

Previous in-vitro studies have focused on more limited populations of targe species, including resistant subsets (especially MRSA), and have not pres a systematic overview of a large geographic sampling of isolates. Here we examine the susceptibility profiles and antibiograms of ceftobiprole and comparator agents tested against contemporary European clinical isolates (17,206) collected in a prevalence mode format during 2005-2006 as part of a longitudinal international resistance surveillance protocol.

Materials and Methods

Bacterial Isolates

Consecutive, non-duplicate clinically significant isolates (17,206) were submitted from laboratories in Europe (23), Turkey (2), and Israel (1) as par of a global antimicrobial resistance surveillance network and were tested in central laboratory (JMI Laboratories, North Liberty, IA, USA) using reference methodologies. Isolates originated from patients with documented bloodstream, respiratory and skin and skin-structure infections. The distribution leading species and strains is presented in Table 1.

Susceptibility Test Methods

All strains were tested by the broth microdilution method using validated commercially prepared panels (TREK Diagnostics, Cleveland, OH, USA) in cation-adjusted Mueller-Hinton broth (with 5% lysed horse blood added for testing of streptococci and Haemophilus Test Medium for testing of Haemophilus influenzae) against a variety of antimicrobial agents representir the most common classes and examples of drugs used in the empiric or directed treatment of the indicated pathogen. Interpretation of MIC results was in accordance with published CLSI criteria. Enterobacteriaceae with elevated MICs (≥2 mg/L) for ceftazidime and/or ceftriaxone and/or aztreona were considered as extended-spectrum β -lactamase-producing phenotype Quality control strains utilized included Escherichia coli ATCC 25922 and 35 P. aeruginosa ATCC 27853, H. influenzae ATCC 49247, S. aureus ATCC 29 Enterococcus faecalis ATCC 29213 and S. pneumoniae ATCC 49619.

Results

- Ceftobiprole inhibited 100% and >99% of tested S. aureus and coagulas negative staphylococci (CoNS) at 4 mg/L, respectively, although MIC_{on} values for oxacillin-resistant strains were 4- and 8-fold higher than oxacilli susceptible isolates for the two groups (**Tables 1** and **2**).
- Ceftobiprole was also broadly active against S. pneumoniae and β-haema streptococci, inhibiting 100% of isolates at ≤0.5 mg/L; some viridans grou streptococci that originated from pediatric patients in Turkey had elevated ceftobiprole MIC values (>8 mg/L; 3.8%) and were clonally related.

Table 1. Cumulative MIC frequency distributions of ceftobiprole when tested against ranking pathogens (17,206 total isolates) of contemporary isolates originating from patients in European medical centers (2005-2006)								
		Cumulative % inhibited at each MIC (mg/L)						
Organism group (no. tested)	≤0.06	0.12	0.25	0.5	1	2	4	8
<i>S. aureus</i> (4028) Oxacillin-susceptible (2942) Oxacillin-resistant (1086)	<1 <1 <1	2 3 <1	55 75 <1	78 >99 20	92 >99 70	>99 100 97	100 - 100	-
Coagulase-negative staphylococci (1840) Oxacillin-susceptible (468) Oxacillin-resistant (1372)	6 20 <1	19 71 1	30 98 6	55 100 39	83 - 77	93 - 91	>99 - >99	100 - 100
E. faecalis (1062)	<1	12	32	65	75	90	95	98
β-haemolytic streptococci (673)	>99	>99	100	-	-	-	-	-
S. pneumoniae (1528)	78	81	93	>99	>99	100	-	-
Viridans group streptococci (365)	77	86	90	91	93	95	96	96
E. coli (2779)	90	91	92	93	93	93	94	94
<i>Klebsiella</i> spp. (883)	63	68	72	74	76	77	78	78
Enterobacter spp. (571)	67	70	73	75	77	81	84	87
Citrobacter spp. (115)	70	76	77	84	91	96	96	96
Serratia spp. (205)	61	74	83	91	94	94	95	95
Salmonella spp. (59)	97	100	-	-	-	-	-	-
P. mirabilis (203)	92	93	94	95	96	96	96	97
Indole-positive Proteae (146)	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	75
P. aeruginosa (984)	<1	<1	1	6	34	54	65	79
Acinetobacter spp. (320)	9	16	25	35	39	41	41	42
H. influenzae (384)	98	>99	100	-	-	-	-	-

T.R. Fritsche, H.S. Sader, M. Janechek, R.N. Jones IMI Laboratories, North Liberty, Iowa, USA

SENTRY Antimicrobial Surveilland	ce program	(2005-2006		
	MIC (mg/L)		Percentage by category	
Organism/Antimicrobial agent (no. tested)	50%	90%	Susceptible/Resistant	
<i>S. aureus</i> (4028)				
Ceftobiprole	0.25	1	- / _b	
Cetepime	2	>16	81.0 / 17.5	
Ceftriavone	8	>10	71.8722.5	
Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	100.0 / -	
Levofloxacin	≤0.5	>4	70.6 / 28.6	
Linezolid	1	2	>99.9 / -	
Oxacillin	0.5	>2	73.0 / 27.0	
Tetracycline	≤2	≤2	91.4 / 7.8	
Vancomycin	≤0.5 1	≤0.5 1	98.6 / 1.4 100.0 / 0.0	
Coagulase-negative staphylococci (1840)				
Ceftobiprole	0.5	2	- / -	
Cefepime	4	>16	76.8 / 15.2	
Ceftazidime	16	>16	31.6 / 42.2	
	16	>32	47.4 / 18.8	
Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	99.7 / - /2 0 / 50 0	
Linezolid	1	1	99.9 / -	
Oxacillin	>2	>2	25.4 / 74.6	
Tetracycline	≤2	>8	82.0 / 16.5	
Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole	≤0.5	>2	61.7 / 38.3	
Vancomycin	1	2	100.0 / 0.0	
E. faecalis (1062)	0.5	Λ	/	
	0.5 <1	4	- / -	
Daptomycin	0.5	1	100.0 / -	
Gentamicin (HL)	≤500	>1000	70.6 / 29.4	
Levofloxacin	1	>4	66.9 / 32.5	
Linezolid	1	2	100.0 / 0.0	
Teicoplanin	≤2	≤2	99.4 / 0.5	
Vancomycin	1	2	99.3 / 0.6	
S. pneumoniae (1528)	0.00	0.05	1	
Cefenime	≤0.06 <0.12	0.25	- / -	
Ceftriaxone	<0.25	1	98.8 / 0.3	
Clindamycin	≤0.25	>2	78.2 / 21.3	
Ertapenem	≤1	≤1	100.0 / 0.0	
Erythromycin	≤0.25	>2	68.5 / 31.0	
Imipenem	≤0.12	0.25	84.1 / 1.2	
Levofloxacin	1	1	97.8 / 2.0	
LI IEZOIIU Ponicillin	ا ح0.03	1	100.07 -	
Vancomycin	≤0.05 ≤1	∠ ≤1	100.0 / -	
β-haemolytic streptococci (673)				
Ceftobiprole	≤0.06	≤0.06	- / -	
	≤0.12	≤0.12	99.7 / -	
Clindamycin	≤0.25 <0.25	≤0.25 <0.25	99.77-	
Daptomycin	≤0.25	0.25	100.0 / -	
Erythromycin	0.25	>2	79.5 / 20.1	
Levofloxacin	≤0.5	1	99.7 / 0.3	
Linezolid	1	1	100.0 / -	
Penicillin	≤0.015	0.06	100.0 / -	
vancomycin	0.25	0.5	100.07-	
Viridans group streptococci (365)	<u><0 06</u>	05	_ / _	
Cefepime	<u>≤</u> 0.00	2	89.0 / 8.0	
Ceftriaxone	≤0.25	2	89.0 / 8.2	
Clindamycin	≤0.25	1	89.9 / 10.1	
Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	100.0 / -	
Erythromycin	≤0.25	>2	62.7 / 34.5	
Levotioxacin	1	1	98.1 / 1.6	
Linozolid				
Linezolid Penicillin	0.5	1 2	100.0 / - 77 0 / 8 5	

Table 3. In-vitro activity of ceftobiprole in comparison to selected antimicrobial agents tested against ranking Gram-negative pathogens collected from European patients as part of the SENTRY Antimicrobial Surveillance program (2005-2006)

	MIC (mg/L)		Percenta	
Organism/Antimicrobial agent (no. tested) <i>E. coli</i> (2779)	50%	90%	Suscept	
Ceftobiprole	≤0.06	0.12 >16	46	
Cefepime	≤0.12	0.25	96	
Ceftrazidime Ceftriaxone	≤1 ≤0.25	≤1 ≤0.25	95.4 93.6	
Imipenem Levofloxacin	≤0.12 ≤0.5	0.25 >4	10 78	
Piperacillin/tazobactam	2	8	90	
Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole	≤2 ≤0.5	>2	69	
Klebsiella spp. (883) Ceftobiprole	≤0.06	>8		
Ampicillin Cefenime	>16	>16 16	5.	
Ceftazidime	≤1	>16	83.6 /	
Imipenem	≤0.25 0.25	>32 0.5	82.07 98	
Levofloxacin Piperacillin/tazobactam	≤0.5 2	>4 >64	87 82	
Tetracycline Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole	≤2 <0.5	>8	79 79	
Enterobacter spp. (571)	2010	2	10	
Ceftobiprole Ampicillin	≤0.06 >16	>8 >16	6.	
Cefepime	≤0.12 <1	4 >16	96 70	
Ceftriaxone	≤0.25	>32	72	
Levofloxacin	0.5 ≤0.5	2 >4	97 85	
Piperacillin/tazobactam Tetracycline	2 ≤2	64 8	75 83	
Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole	≤0.5	>2	86	
Ceftobiprole	≤0.06	≤0.06		
Ampicillin Cefepime	≤1 ≤0.12	>16 ≤0.12	62 97	
Ceftazidime	≤1 <0.25	≤1 <0.25	96.6	
Imipenem	≤0.25 1	≤0.25 2	90.1	
Levofloxacin Piperacillin/tazobactam	≤0.5 ≤0.5	2 1	90 98	
Tetracycline Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole	>8 <0.5	>8 >2	2. 66	
Indole-positive Proteae (146)	2010			
Ceftobiprole Ampicillin	≤0.06 >16	>8 >16	20	
Cefepime	≤0.12	≤0.12 2	97	
Ceftriaxone	≤0.25	2	97	
Levofloxacin	2 ≤0.5	4	10 84	
Piperacillin/tazobactam Tetracycline	≤0.5 >8	2 >8	99 30	
Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole	≤0.5	>2	80	
Citrobacter spp. (115) Ceftobiprole	≤0.06	1		
Ampicillin Cefepime	>16 ≤0.12	>16 1	8. 98	
Ceftazidime	≤1 <0.25	>16 32	76 74	
Imipenem	0.5	1	99	
Levofloxacın Piperacillin/tazobactam	≤0.5 2	2 64	9 <u>,</u> 8 ⁻	
Tetracycline Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole	≤2 ≤0.5	>8 >2	85 82	
Serratia spp. (205)	-0.06	0.5		
Ampicillin	≤0.06 >16	0.5 >16	4.	
Cefepime Ceftazidime	≤0.12 ≤1	1 2	98 96	
Ceftriaxone	≤0.25 1	16 1	86 10	
Levofloxacin	≤0.5	2	93	
Tetracycline	>8	32 >8	9.	
Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole	≤0.5	>2	89	
Ceftobiprole	2	>8 16	0(
Aztreonam	8	>16	66	
Cefepime Ceftazidime	4 2	16 >16	79 75	
Imipenem Levofloxacin	1 <0.5	>8 >4	76 69	
Piperacillin/tazobactam	8	>64	83	
Polymyxin B Tobramycin	1 0.5	1 >16	99 79	
Acinetobacter spp. (320)	>8	>8		
Amikacin	>32	>32	46	
Cefepime	16	>16	49	
Ceftazidime Imipenem	>16 1	>16 >8	39 68	
Levofloxacin Piperacillin/tazobactam	4 >64	>4 >64	40 40	
Polymyxin B Tobramycin	≤0.5 2	≤0.5 >16	99	
Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole	>2	>2	41	
<i>H. influenzae</i> (384) Ceftobiprole	≤0.06	≤0.06		
Amoxicillin/clavulanate Ampicillin	≤1 <1	≤1 16	10 94	
Cefepime	≤0.12	≤0.12	1	
Imipenem	≤0.25 0.5	≤0.25 1	1	
Levofloxacin Piperacillin/tazobactam	≤0.5 ≤0.5	≤0.5 ≤0.5	1 10	
Tetracycline Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole	≤2 <0.5	≤2 >2	98 70	
^a Breakpoint criteria are those from CLSI [2008]; ^b = no breakpo	int established. °	Percentages in pa	rentheses are tho	
[ULSI, 2008] ESBL screening criteria for MIC values ≥2 mg/L.				

Thomas R. Fritsche, MD, PhD **IMI Laboratories** 345 Beaver Kreek Centre, Suite A North Liberty, IA 52317 Tel: (319) 665-3370 Fax: (319) 665-3371 e-mail: thomas-fritsche@jmilabs.com

ge by category ible/Resistant

_ / _b 1 / 53.2 0/3.1 / 2.7 (8.0)° / 5.8 (7.3) 0.0 / 0.0 9 / 17.4 .8 / 2.6 0 / 36.3 0/31.0

- / -5.0 / 79.2 89.6 / 7.8 / 13.5 (22.2) 12.5 (22.9) 98.9 / 0.6 7.4 / 10.5 2.1 / 13.7 9.6 / 18.5 9.8 / 20.2

> / 85.6 6.0 / 3.2 0 / 25.3 2 / 16.5 4/1.1 3 / 12.3 .3 / 9.5 .7 / 9.5 3 / 13.7

- / -2.6 / 37.4 7.5 / 2.5 3.0 (5.9) / 3.0 (5.9) 9.5 / 0.5 0.6 / 7.9 98.5 / 0.0 0 / 97.5 6.0 / 34.0

5 / 78.1 9/1.4 8/2.1 3/2.1 0.0 / 0.0 9/8.9 3/0.73 / 53.4).1 / 19.9

8.7 / 77.4 98.3 / 0.9 6.5 / 20.9 '5.7 / 7.8 9.1 / 0.0 92.2 / 7.0 .7 / 6.1 5.2 / 13.9 .6 / 17.4

- / -

/ 86.8 .0 / 2.0 5.1 / 3.4 .8 / 4.4 0.0 / 0.0 7/2.0 .4 / 2.0 3 / 54.6 3 / 10.7

- / -90.1 / 6.0 6.9 / 19.6 '9.9 / 9.2 5.9 / 18.7 6.1 / 15.9 9.2 / 26.5 3.4 / 16.6 9.5 / 0.5 9.7 / 19.3

> 3 / 50.6 4 / 40.6 4 / 33.1 4 / 51.9 1 / 28.4 6 / 45.6 0 / 52.5 .4 / 0.6 0/41.9 6 / 58.4

- / -0.0 / 0.0 4.6 / 14.1 100.0 / -100.0 / -100.0 / -100.0 / -0.0 / 0.0 98.2 / 1.0 2.7 / 23.4 se meeting CLSI

- While the majority of *E. faecalis* strains (94.8%) were inhibited by ceftobiprole at ≤ 4 mg/L, the agent was generally inactive against *Enterococcus faecium*.
- Ceftobiprole was similar in potency to the "third- and fourth-generation" cephems (MIC₅₀ values, ≤ 0.06 mg/L) for the tested Enterobacteriaceae but, similar to these other agents, was generally inactive against ESBL-producing strains (up to 8.0% of *E. coli* and 22.9% of *Klebsiella* spp. based upon phenotype; Table 3).
- Whereas cefepime provided enhanced coverage against *Klebsiella* spp. (89.6% at ≤8 mg/L vs. 78.1-83.6% for ceftobiprole and ceftazidime, respectively), ceftobiprole and cefepime were superior to ceftazidime against Enterobacter spp. and Citrobacter spp.
- Against *P. aeruginosa*, ceftobiprole was equal in potency to ceftazidime $(MIC_{50}, 2 \text{ mg/L})$ and 2-fold more active than cefepime; the percentages inhibited at $\leq 2/4/8$ mg/L were similar among the three agents (54/65/79, 56/69/76 and 49/66/80, respectively; **Table 3**).
- None of these agents inhibited greater than 49% of *Acinetobacter* spp. at 8 mg/L; among comparator agents, only polymyxin B was uniformly active (>99% susceptible).
- H. influenzae were inhibited by all (100%) tested agents at current breakpoints except for ampicillin (84.6% susceptible; β -lactamase-negative, ampicillin-resistant strains were not detected), tetracycline (98.2%) and trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole (72.7%). Ceftobiprole inhibited all strains at ≤0.25 mg/L.

Conclusions

- Among Gram-positive bacterial pathogens recovered from patients hospitalized in European medical centers (2005-2006), ceftobiprole inhibited all (100%) of tested S. aureus at ≤4 mg/L and CoNS at \leq 8 mg/L; and all S. pneumoniae, all β -haemolytic streptococci and 91% of viridians group streptococci at ≤0.5 mg/L.
- Ceftobiprole also maintained activity against the most commonly occurring Enterobacteriaceae (exception, ESBL-positive strains) and many *P. aeruginosa*, being equal in potency to ceftazidime (MIC₅₀, 2 mg/L) and 2-fold more active than cefepime against this species.
- Ceftobiprole is unique among currently utilized cephalosporins in retaining activity against leading European pathogens responsible for skin and skin-structure, bloodstream, and community-associated respiratory tract infections, including those pathogens routinely resistant to other β -lactams such as MRSA and *E. faecalis* (Table 2).
- These characteristics warrant continued evaluation of the agent as empiric therapy, especially in those institutions/regions where MRSA and *P. aeruginosa* may be prevalent.

Selected References

- 1. Anderegg, T. R., R. N. Jones, and H. S. Sader. 2004. J. Clin. Microbiol. 42:3356-3358.
- 2. Azoulay-Dupuis, E., J. P. Bedos, J. Mohler, A. Schmitt-Hoffmann, M. Schleimer, and S. Shapiro. 2004. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 48:1105-1111.
- 3. Bogdanovich, T., L. M. Ednie, S. Shapiro, and P. C. Appelbaum. 2005. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. **49**:4210-4219.
- 4. Bush, K., M. Heep, M. J. Macielag, and G. J. Noel. 2007. Expert Opin. Investig. Drugs. 16:419-429. 5. Chambers, H. F. 2006. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 12 Suppl 2:17-22.
- 6. CLSI. 2006. Methods for Dilution Antimicrobial Susceptibility Tests for Bacteria That Grow Aerobically M7-A7. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute.
- 7. CLSI. 2008. Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing; 18th informational supplement M100-S18. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute.
- 8. Deshpande, L., P. R. Rhomberg, T. R. Fritsche, H. S. Sader, and R. N. Jones. 2004. Diagn. Microbiol. Infect. Dis. 50:73-75.
- 9. Deshpande, L. M., and R. N. Jones. 2003. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 9:1120-1124. 10. Kosowska, K., D. B. Hoellman, G. Lin, C. Clark, K. Credito, P. McGhee, B. Dewasse, B. Bozdogan, S. Shapiro, and P. C. Appelbaum. 2005. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 49:1932-1942.
- 11. Noel, G. J., R. S. Strauss, K. Amsler, M. Heep, R. Pypstra, and J. S. Solomkin. 2008. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 52:37-44.