

WCK 5222 (Cefepime-Zidebactam) Antimicrobial Activity Tested against Gram-negative Organisms Producing Clinically Relevant β -LactamasesHS SADER, PR RHOMBERG, RN JONES, M CASTANHEIRA
JMI Laboratories, North Liberty, Iowa, USAHelio S. Sader, MD, PhD
JMI Laboratories
345 Beaver Creek Centre, Suite A
North Liberty, Iowa 52317
Phone: (319) 665-3370
helio-sader@jmlabs.com

Abstract

Background: Zidebactam (ZID) is a β -lactam enhancer with a dual mechanism of action involving binding to Gram-negative (GN) PBP2 and β -lactamase (BL) inhibition. Cefepime (FEP) combined with ZID is under clinical development.

Methods: 193 clinical GN strains producing the most clinically relevant BL types plus 71 wild type (WT) strains were tested for susceptibility (S) by a reference broth microdilution method against FEP-ZID (1:1 and 2:1 ratios tested at 0.06-128 μ g/mL), FEP and ZID. BL encoding genes were evaluated by a microarray-based assay.

Results: FEP-ZID (1:1) was very active against Enterobacteriaceae (ENT) producing CTX-M-15 (21; MIC_{50/90}: 0.25/1 μ g/mL), SHV (20; MIC_{50/90}: 0.12/0.25 μ g/mL), other extended-spectrum BLs (ESBLs; 20, including GES-18; OXA-1/30, OXY-, PER-, TEM- and VEB-like; MIC_{50/90}: 0.25/1 μ g/mL), plasmidic AmpC (10; MIC_{50/90}: \leq 0.06/ \leq 0.06 μ g/mL), derepressed AmpC (23; MIC_{50/90}: 0.12/0.5 μ g/mL), KPC (35; MIC_{50/90}: 0.25/1 μ g/mL), metallo-BL (MBL; 20 including VIM, IMP and NDM; MIC_{50/90}: 0.5/8 μ g/mL; Table). WT ENT had MIC_{50/90} values of \leq 0.06/ \leq 0.06, \leq 0.06/0.12 and 0.25/ \geq 128 μ g/mL for FED-ZID (1:1), FEP and ZID, respectively. FEP-ZID (1:1) was also active against *P. aeruginosa* (PSA) producing derepressed AmpC (21; MIC_{50/90}: 4/8 μ g/mL) and MBL (12 [VIM and IMP]; MIC_{50/90}: 4/8 μ g/mL). FEP-ZID 1:1 ratio was slightly (2-fold) more active than FEP-ZID 2:1 ratio when tested against BL-producing ENT and PSA, and ZID alone exhibited potent *in vitro* activity against some ENT and PSA, including BL-producing strains. FEP-ZID 1:1 ratio (MIC_{50/90}: 32/32 μ g/mL) showed only moderate activity against OXA-23/24-producing *Acinetobacter baumannii* (ASP), but it was \geq 4-fold more active than FEP or ZID tested alone.

Conclusion: FEP-ZID (1:1 and 2:1 ratios) showed potent *in vitro* activities against ENT and PSA producing various clinically relevant BLs, including ESBLs, KPCs, AmpC and MBLs, for which limited treatment options are currently available. These *in vitro* results support further clinical development of FEP-ZID (WCK 5222).

β -lactamase (organism; no. tested)	No. of isolates (cumulative %) inhibited at FEP-ZID (1:1 ratio) MIC (μ g/mL) of:							
	0.12	0.25	0.5	1	2	4	8	16
CTX-M-15 (ENT; 21)	6 (28.6)	8 (66.7)	4 (85.7)	1 (90.5)	1 (95.2)	1 (100.0)	--	--
SHV (ENT; 20)	14 (70.0)	5 (90.5)	0 (100.0)	--	--	--	--	--
Other ESBLs (ENT; 20)	9 (45.0)	6 (75.0)	2 (85.0)	3 (100.0)	--	--	--	--
Plasmidic AmpC (ENT; 23)	10 (65.2)	4 (82.6)	2 (91.3)	2 (100.0)	--	--	--	--
KPC (ENT; 35)	7 (20.0)	12 (54.3)	11 (58.7)	4 (71.4)	--	--	--	--
MBL (ENT; 20)	1 (50.0)	3 (50.0)	5 (50.0)	5 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)
<i>P. aeruginosa</i> (43 isolates)	--	--	1 (1)	4 (4)	7 (7)	6 (6)	2 (2)	--
Cefepime-susceptible (AMPc; 21)	--	--	1 (1)	4 (4)	7 (7)	6 (6)	2 (2)	--
Isolates with overexpression of AmpC and/or efflux pump(s) (21 isolates)	--	--	4 (8)	9 (5)	(28.6)	(61.9)	(90.5)	(100.0)
Metallo- β -lactamase producing (12 isolates, including IMP-13 [1 isolate], IMP-15 [1], VIM-2 [6], VIM-4 [2] and VIM-7 [1])	--	--	1 (1)	0 (2)	6 (2)	2 (1)	1 (1)	--
OXA-23/24 (ASP; 11)	--	--	--	--	1 (1)	3 (3)	6 (6)	--

Introduction

Zidebactam (ZID; molecular formula, $C_{13}H_{21}N_5O_7S$ [see Figure 1 of poster 446]) is a non- β -lactam agent with a dual mechanism of action involving selective and high-affinity Gram-negative PBP2 binding and β -lactamase inhibition. Owing to its PBP2 binding feature, ZID demonstrates antibacterial activity against various Enterobacteriaceae and *Pseudomonas*. Therefore, ZID combined with cefepime (FEP-ZID or WCK 5222) is under clinical development for treatment of Gram-negative infections (NCT02707107 and NCT02674347; www.clinicaltrials.gov).

We evaluated the antimicrobial interaction between FEP and ZID and assessed the feasibility of undertaking MICs with FEP-ZID in two different ratios (1:1 and 2:1) by employing a reference broth microdilution susceptibility testing method.

Methods

Susceptibility testing: MIC values were determined using Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) broth microdilution methodology as described in CLSI document M07-A10 (2015). The combination of FEP-ZID (WCK 5222; two ratio concentrations, 1:1 and 2:1) and both compounds alone were tested in 96-well, frozen-form panels produced by JMI Laboratories (North Liberty, Iowa, USA). Quality control (QC) isolates were tested in each test batch and the inoculum density was monitored by colony counts. QC ranges and interpretive criteria for the comparator compounds were as published in CLSI M100-S26 (2016). The sponsor provided available target MIC information for FEP-ZID and ZID alone tested against the listed QC organisms. The tested QC strains included the following: *Escherichia coli* ATCC 25922, ATCC 35218 and NCTC 13353, *Klebsiella pneumoniae* ATCC 700603 and ATCC BAA-1705, and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* ATCC 27853.

Organism collection: A total of 264 contemporary clinical isolates producing the most clinically relevant β -lactamases were tested, including:

- Enterobacteriaceae (200 isolates)
 - Wild type (cefepime-susceptible) isolates (51 total)
 - E. coli* (10 isolates)
 - Klebsiella* spp. (11 isolates)
 - Enterobacter* spp. (10 isolates)
 - ZID alone exhibited potent *in vitro* activity against some ENT and PSA, including BL-producing strains. FEP-ZID 1:1 ratio (MIC_{50/90}: 32/32 μ g/mL) showed only moderate activity against OXA-23/24-producing *Acinetobacter baumannii* (ASP), but it was \geq 4-fold more active than FEP or ZID tested alone.

Conclusion: FEP-ZID (1:1 and 2:1 ratios) showed potent *in vitro* activities against ENT and PSA producing various clinically relevant BLs, including ESBLs, KPCs, AmpC and MBLs, for which limited treatment options are currently available. These *in vitro* results support further clinical development of FEP-ZID (WCK 5222).

β -lactamase (organism; no. tested)	No. of isolates (cumulative %) inhibited at FEP-ZID (1:1 ratio) MIC (μ g/mL) of:							
	0.12	0.25	0.5	1	2	4	8	16
CTX-M-15 (ENT; 21)	6 (28.6)	8 (66.7)	4 (85.7)	1 (90.5)	1 (95.2)	1 (100.0)	--	--
SHV (ENT; 20)	14 (70.0)	5 (90.5)	0 (100.0)	--	--	--	--	--
Other ESBLs (ENT; 20)	9 (45.0)	6 (75.0)	2 (85.0)	3 (100.0)	--	--	--	--
Plasmidic AmpC (ENT; 23)	10 (65.2)	4 (82.6)	2 (91.3)	2 (100.0)	--	--	--	--
KPC (ENT; 35)	7 (20.0)	12 (54.3)	11 (58.7)	4 (71.4)	--	--	--	--
MBL (ENT; 20)	1 (50.0)	3 (50.0)	5 (50.0)	5 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)
<i>P. aeruginosa</i> (43 isolates)	--	--	1 (1)	4 (4)	7 (7)	6 (6)	2 (2)	--
Cefepime-susceptible (AMPc; 21)	--	--	1 (1)	4 (4)	7 (7)	6 (6)	2 (2)	--
Isolates with overexpression of AmpC and/or efflux pump(s) (21 isolates)	--	--	4 (8)	9 (5)	(28.6)	(61.9)	(90.5)	(100.0)
Metallo- β -lactamase producing (12 isolates, including IMP-13 [1 isolate], IMP-15 [1], VIM-2 [6], VIM-4 [2] and VIM-7 [1])	--	--	1 (1)	0 (2)	6 (2)	2 (1)	1 (1)	--
OXA-23/24 (ASP; 11)	--	--	--	--	1 (1)	3 (3)	6 (6)	--

Results

Wild type (cefepime-susceptible) Enterobacteriaceae (Table 1)

- The highest FEP MIC value among wild type (cefepime-susceptible) Enterobacteriaceae was 1 μ g/mL (MIC_{50/90}: \leq 0.06/ \leq 0.12 μ g/mL), and MIC values for FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: \leq 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: \leq 0.06/ \leq 0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate, an *E. coli* with FEP-ZID at 2:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.12 μ g/mL) and 1:1 (MIC_{50/90}: 0.06/0.06 μ g/mL) ratios were similar to those of FEP. A significant decrease in the FEP MIC value was observed for only one isolate