

In Vitro Profiling of Ceftaroline against a Collection of Recent Bacterial Clinical Isolates from across the United States[∇]

Yigong Ge,¹ Donald Biek,^{1*} George H. Talbot,^{1†} and Daniel F. Sahn²

Cerexa, Inc., Alameda, California,¹ and Eurofins Medinet, Herndon, Virginia²

Received 2 February 2008/Returned for modification 22 March 2008/Accepted 4 July 2008

This study evaluated the in vitro activity of ceftaroline, a novel cephalosporin with broad-spectrum activity against gram-negative and -positive pathogens, against 4,151 recent clinical isolates collected in the United States. Ceftaroline was very potent against bacteria found in community- and hospital-acquired infections, including methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, multidrug-resistant *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, and common *Enterobacteriaceae* spp.

Antimicrobial resistance is an escalating problem in both nosocomial and community-acquired bacterial infections (3, 12, 13). Pathogens such as methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) are becoming more virulent and are increasingly found in community-acquired infections, particularly in skin and soft-tissue infections (1, 17, 18). The development of resistance to vancomycin and newer classes of antibiotics active against MRSA, such as linezolid and daptomycin, is worrisome (14, 24, 26). The prevalence of drug-resistant (including β -lactam-resistant) *Streptococcus pneumoniae* has increased in the United States during recent years (4, 5, 10). In addition, resistance is common among gram-negative bacteria, some of which produce β -lactamases (including extended-spectrum β -lactamases [ESBL]) and/or exhibit increased efflux activity (12, 19, 22). There is a clinical need for new antibiotics that are active against multidrug-resistant gram-positive and gram-negative pathogens (25, 27).

Ceftaroline fosamil (formerly PPI-0903, TAK-599) is a novel, parenteral, cephalosporin prodrug that is converted in vivo to the microbiologically active form, ceftaroline. Ceftaroline has broad-spectrum activity that encompasses many community- and hospital-acquired pathogens, including MRSA, multidrug-resistant *S. pneumoniae* (MDRSP), and common (non-ESBL-producing) gram-negative bacteria (11, 15, 23). This study evaluated the in vitro activity of ceftaroline against a collection of recent clinical isolates from the United States, including bacteria exhibiting resistance to currently available antimicrobial agents.

(A preliminary report of these results was presented at the 47th Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy in Chicago, IL, 17 to 20 September 2007.)

A total of 4,151 clinical isolates collected primarily between 2004 and 2006 at hospitals throughout the United States were analyzed. Exceptions included *Providencia* spp., collected from 2001 to 2002, and *Pasteurella multocida*, isolated from Luxembourg. Thirteen *S. aureus* isolates were collected before 2004,

7 of which were collected outside the United States. After being identified at a local laboratory, isolates were shipped on Copan Amies agar gel transport swabs (Copan, Brescia, Italy) to a central laboratory (Eurofins Medinet, Herndon, VA) for confirmatory identification and susceptibility testing. Confirmatory identification was accomplished using routine microbiologic methodologies in accordance with those of Murray (20) and included the use of an automated identification system (Vitek; bioMérieux, Durham, NC) as appropriate. All isolates were tested for their susceptibilities to ceftaroline and appropriate comparator antimicrobial agents as shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Antimicrobial susceptibility testing by broth microdilution adhered to CLSI guidelines M7-A7, employing commercially prepared frozen panels (TREK Diagnostic Systems, Cleveland, OH) (8). Susceptibility interpretative criteria for comparator antibiotics were adopted from CLSI documents M100-S16 and M45-A (7, 9). Quality control was monitored by using the following organisms: *Escherichia coli* ATCC 25922 and ATCC 35218, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* ATCC 27853, *Enterococcus faecalis* ATCC 29212, *S. aureus* ATCC 29213, *Haemophilus influenzae* ATCC 49247 and ATCC 49766, and *S. pneumoniae* ATCC 49619. Ceftaroline (PPI-0903 M; lot no. M599-R1001) was provided by Cerexa, Inc., and other comparators were purchased from appropriate commercial sources.

The in vitro activity of ceftaroline in comparison to the activities of selected antimicrobial agents against gram-positive pathogens is summarized in Table 1. Ceftaroline was highly active in vitro against gram-positive bacteria, including resistant isolates, and had lower MICs than ceftazidime and ceftriaxone against all strains tested. Ceftaroline had an MIC at which 90% of isolates were inhibited (MIC₉₀) of 0.25 μ g/ml for methicillin-susceptible *S. aureus* (MSSA) compared with 4 μ g/ml for ceftriaxone, 1 μ g/ml for vancomycin, and \leq 0.12 μ g/ml for imipenem. Ceftaroline had potent activity in vitro against methicillin-resistant strains (MIC₉₀ = 1 μ g/ml), and all MRSA isolates were inhibited at an MIC of 2 μ g/ml or less. Ceftaroline was the most active β -lactam antibiotic tested against MRSA. Ceftaroline also exhibited potent activity in vitro against coagulase-negative staphylococci, with an MIC₉₀ of 0.12 μ g/ml for oxacillin-susceptible isolates and an MIC of 0.5 μ g/ml for oxacillin-resistant isolates.

* Corresponding author. Mailing address: Cerexa, Inc., 1751 Harbor Bay Parkway, Alameda, California. Phone: (510) 747-3956. Fax: (510) 747-3940. E-mail: dbiek@cerexa.com.

† Present address: Talbot Advisors, LLC, Maplewood Avenue, Wayne, Pennsylvania.

[∇] Published ahead of print on 14 July 2008.

TABLE 1. Antimicrobial susceptibility of ceftaroline and selected comparator antimicrobial agents against gram-positive organisms^b

Bacterium group and antimicrobial agent (no. of isolates tested)	MIC (µg/ml) ^a			% of isolates by category		
	MIC ₅₀	MIC ₉₀	Range	S	I	R
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>						
MSSA (348)						
Ceftaroline	0.25	0.25	≤0.03-1	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	8	8	2->32	92	6.3	1.7
Ceftriaxone	2	4	1->32	97.1	2.6	0.3
Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	≤0.12-2	99.4	NA	NA
Erythromycin	0.5	>8	≤0.12->8	65.2	2.3	32.5
Imipenem	≤0.12	≤0.12	≤0.12-16	99.7	0	0.3
Levofloxacin	0.12	16	0.06->16	83.9	0.9	15.2
Linezolid	2	2	≤0.5-4	100	NA	NA
Oxacillin	0.25	0.5	≤0.06-2	100	NA	0
Penicillin	4	>16	≤0.12->16	16.7	NA	83.3
Vancomycin	0.5	1	≤0.25-4	98.3	1.7	0
MRSA (661)						
Ceftaroline	0.5	1	0.12-2	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	32	>32	2->32	11	34.9	54
Ceftriaxone	16	>32	0.5->32	14.2	52.6	33.1
Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	≤0.12-2	99.2	NA	NA
Erythromycin	>8	>8	0.25->8	4.5	1.1	94.4
Imipenem	0.25	>16	≤0.12->16	84.6	2	13.5
Levofloxacin	8	>16	0.12->16	25.6	1.2	73.2
Linezolid	2	2	≤0.5-4	100	NA	NA
Oxacillin	>8	>8	4->8	0	NA	100
Penicillin	>16	>16	≤0.12->16	0.5	NA	99.5
Vancomycin	1	1	≤0.25->16	97.9	1.8	0.3
CNS						
OXA-S (201)						
Ceftaroline	0.06	0.12	≤0.03-0.5	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	4	8	≤1-32	93.5	6	0.5
Ceftriaxone	1	4	≤0.25-16	98	2	0
Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	≤0.12-1	100	NA	NA
Erythromycin	1	>8	≤0.12->8	49.8	1	49.3
Imipenem	≤0.12	≤0.12	≤0.12-0.5	100	0	0
Levofloxacin	0.12	8	≤0.03->16	81.6	0.5	17.9
Linezolid	1	2	≤0.5-4	100	NA	NA
Oxacillin	0.12	0.25	≤0.06-0.25	100	NA	0
Penicillin	0.5	2	≤0.12->16	32.3	NA	67.7
Vancomycin	1	2	≤0.25-2	100	0	0
OXA-R (299)						
Ceftaroline	0.5	0.5	0.06-2	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	32	>32	4->32	10	23.7	66.2
Ceftriaxone	16	>32	1->32	27.1	50.8	22.1
Daptomycin	0.5	0.5	≤0.12-2	99.7	NA	NA
Erythromycin	>8	>8	≤0.12->8	18.4	0.3	81.3
Imipenem	0.5	16	≤0.12->16	77.3	6.4	16.4
Levofloxacin	8	>16	0.12->16	21.7	4.3	73.9
Linezolid	1	2	≤0.5->8	99.3	NA	NA
Oxacillin	>8	>8	0.5->8	0	NA	100
Penicillin	8	>16	≤0.12->16	2.3	NA	97.7
Vancomycin	1	2	0.5-2	100	0	0
<i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i>						
PEN-S (202)						
Ceftaroline	≤0.008	0.015	≤0.008-0.12	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	≤1	≤1	≤1-16	NA	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	0.03	0.06	≤0.015-1	100	0	0
Daptomycin	0.06	0.12	≤0.03-0.5	NA	NA	NA
Erythromycin	0.03	0.5	≤0.015->16	89.1	1	9.9
Imipenem	≤0.015	≤0.015	≤0.015-1	96.5	3	0.5
Levofloxacin	0.5	1	0.25-8	98.5	0	1.5

Continued on following page

TABLE 1—Continued

Bacterium group and antimicrobial agent (no. of isolates tested)	MIC ($\mu\text{g/ml}$) ^a			% of isolates by category		
	MIC ₅₀	MIC ₉₀	Range	S	I	R
Linezolid	1	1	≤0.25–2	100	NA	NA
Vancomycin	0.25	0.5	≤0.06–1	100	NA	NA
PEN-I (103)						
Ceftaroline	0.015	0.06	≤0.008–0.5	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	2	8	≤1–>32	NA	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	0.12	0.5	≤0.015–8	97.1	1.9	1
Daptomycin	0.06	0.12	≤0.03–0.25	NA	NA	NA
Erythromycin	2	>16	≤0.015–>16	48.5	0	51.5
Imipenem	0.03	0.25	≤0.015–1	88.3	10.7	1
Levofloxacin	0.5	1	0.25–>8	97.1	0	2.9
Linezolid	1	1	0.5–2	100	NA	NA
Vancomycin	0.25	0.5	0.12–0.5	100	NA	NA
PEN-R (296)						
Ceftaroline	0.12	0.12	≤0.008–0.5	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	16	32	≤1–>32	NA	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	1	2	≤0.015–8	79.4	13.9	6.8
Daptomycin	0.06	0.12	≤0.03–0.25	NA	NA	NA
Erythromycin	8	>16	≤0.015–>16	28.4	0	71.6
Imipenem	0.25	1	≤0.015–4	12.5	76.7	10.8
Levofloxacin	0.5	1	0.12–8	99.3	0	0.7
Linezolid	1	1	0.5–2	100	NA	NA
Vancomycin	0.25	0.5	0.12–0.5	100	NA	NA
<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i>						
ERY-S (91)						
Ceftaroline	≤0.008	≤0.008	≤0.008–0.03	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	≤1	≤1	≤1–4	NA	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	≤0.015	0.03	≤0.015–0.5	100	NA	NA
Daptomycin	≤0.03	0.06	≤0.03–0.5	100	NA	NA
Erythromycin	0.03	0.06	≤0.015–0.25	100	0	0
Imipenem	≤0.015	≤0.015	≤0.015–0.06	NA	NA	NA
Levofloxacin	0.5	1	0.03–2	100	0	0
Linezolid	1	1	0.5–2	100	NA	NA
Penicillin	≤0.12	≤0.12	≤0.12–0.25	98.9	NA	NA
Vancomycin	0.25	0.5	0.25–1	100	NA	NA
ERY-NS (10)						
Ceftaroline	≤0.008	0.015	≤0.008–0.03	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	≤1	≤1	≤1–4	NA	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	0.03	0.12	≤0.015–0.25	100	NA	NA
Daptomycin	≤0.03	0.25	≤0.03–0.25	100	NA	NA
Erythromycin	8	>16	0.5–>16	0	20	80
Imipenem	≤0.015	≤0.015	≤0.015–0.06	NA	NA	NA
Levofloxacin	0.5	1	0.25–1	100	0	0
Linezolid	1	1	1–1	100	NA	NA
Penicillin	≤0.12	≤0.12	≤0.12–≤0.12	100	NA	NA
Vancomycin	0.25	0.5	0.25–1	100	NA	NA
<i>Streptococcus agalactiae</i>						
ERY-S (59)						
Ceftaroline	0.015	0.015	≤0.008–0.06	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	≤1	≤1	≤1–2	NA	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	0.06	0.12	0.03–0.25	100	NA	NA
Daptomycin	0.12	0.12	≤0.03–0.25	100	NA	NA
Erythromycin	0.03	0.06	≤0.015–0.06	100	NA	NA
Imipenem	≤0.015	0.03	≤0.015–0.03	NA	NA	NA
Levofloxacin	0.5	1	0.12–2	100	0	0
Linezolid	1	1	1–1	100	NA	NA
Penicillin	≤0.12	≤0.12	≤0.12–≤0.12	100	NA	NA
Vancomycin	0.5	0.5	0.25–0.5	100	NA	NA

Continued on following page

TABLE 1—Continued

Bacterium group and antimicrobial agent (no. of isolates tested)	MIC (µg/ml) ^a			% of isolates by category		
	MIC ₅₀	MIC ₉₀	Range	S	I	R
ERY-NS (42)						
Ceftaroline	0.015	0.015	≤0.008–0.12	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	≤1	≤1	≤1–8	NA	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	0.06	0.12	0.03–1	97.6	NA	NA
Daptomycin	0.12	0.25	0.06–0.5	100	NA	NA
Erythromycin	16	>16	0.5–>16	0	7.1	92.9
Imipenem	≤0.015	0.03	≤0.015–0.06	NA	NA	NA
Levofloxacin	1	1	0.5–>8	97.6	0	2.4
Linezolid	1	1	0.5–1	100	NA	NA
Penicillin	≤0.12	≤0.12	≤0.12–2	95.2	NA	NA
Vancomycin	0.5	0.5	≤0.06–1	100	NA	NA
Viridans streptococci						
PEN-S (87)						
Ceftaroline	≤0.008	0.03	≤0.008–0.03	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	≤1	4	≤1–8	NA	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	0.06	0.25	≤0.015–0.5	100	0	0
Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	≤0.03–1	100	NA	NA
Erythromycin	0.06	4	≤0.015–>16	58.6	1.1	40.2
Imipenem	≤0.015	0.06	≤0.015–0.12	NA	NA	NA
Levofloxacin	1	1	≤0.015–2	100	0	0
Linezolid	1	1	≤0.25–1	100	0	0
Penicillin	≤0.12	≤0.12	≤0.12–≤0.12	100	0	0
Vancomycin	0.5	0.5	≤0.06–1	100	NA	NA
PEN-NS (14)						
Ceftaroline	0.12	0.5	0.015–1	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	8	>32	≤1–>32	NA	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	2	8	0.06–>16	28.6	42.9	28.6
Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	0.12–1	100	0	0
Erythromycin	2	>16	0.12–>16	21.4	7.1	71.4
Imipenem	0.06	1	≤0.015–4	NA	NA	NA
Levofloxacin	1	2	0.12–>8	92.9	0	7.1
Linezolid	1	1	0.5–1	100	0	0
Penicillin	0.5	8	0.25–8	0	71.4	28.6
Vancomycin	0.5	1	0.5–2	92.9	NA	NA
Enterococcus faecalis						
VAN-S (157)						
Ceftaroline	2	4	0.5–8	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	>32	>32	>32–>32	NA	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	>32	>32	8–>32	NA	NA	NA
Daptomycin	1	1	0.25–4	100	0	0
Erythromycin	>8	>8	≤0.12–>8	10.2	29.9	59.9
Imipenem	1	2	0.25–4	NA	NA	NA
Levofloxacin	1	>16	0.5–>16	59.2	0	40.8
Linezolid	2	2	1–2	100	0	0
Oxacillin	>8	>8	2–>8	NA	NA	NA
Penicillin	2	4	1–8	100	0	0
Vancomycin	1	2	0.5–2	100	0	0
VAN-R (25)						
Ceftaroline	4	4	1–8	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	>32	>32	4–>32	NA	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	>32	>32	1–>32	NA	NA	NA
Daptomycin	0.5	1	0.25–1	100	0	0
Erythromycin	>8	>8	1–>8	0	4	96
Imipenem	1	2	0.25–2	NA	NA	NA
Levofloxacin	>16	>16	1–>16	4	0	96
Linezolid	2	2	1–2	100	0	0
Oxacillin	>8	>8	2–>8	NA	NA	NA
Penicillin	2	4	1–8	100	0	0
Vancomycin	>16	>16	>16–>16	0	0	100

Continued on following page

TABLE 1—Continued

Bacterium group and antimicrobial agent (no. of isolates tested)	MIC ($\mu\text{g/ml}$) ^a			% of isolates by category		
	MIC ₅₀	MIC ₉₀	Range	S	I	R
<i>Enterococcus faecium</i>						
VAN-R (26)						
Ceftaroline	>16	>16	4->16	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	>32	>32	>32->32	NA	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	>32	>32	>32->32	NA	NA	NA
Daptomycin	2	4	0.5-4	100	0	0
Erythromycin	>8	>8	2->8	0	7.7	92.3
Imipenem	>16	>16	>16->16	NA	NA	NA
Levofloxacin	>16	>16	>16->16	0	0	100
Linezolid	2	2	1-2	100	0	0
Oxacillin	>8	>8	>8->8	NA	NA	NA
Penicillin	>16	>16	>16->16	0	0	100
Vancomycin	>16	>16	>16->16	0	0	100

^a MICs reported only for categories composed of 10 or more isolates.

^b CNS, coagulase-negative staphylococci; ERY, erythromycin; I, intermediate; NS, nonsusceptible; OXA, oxacillin; PEN, penicillin; R, resistant; S, susceptible; VAN, vancomycin; NA, not available (CLSI breakpoints unavailable for interpretation of susceptible, intermediate, or resistant isolates).

Ceftaroline exhibited high in vitro activity against all strains of streptococci tested. As with other β -lactams, MIC₉₀s were lower against penicillin-susceptible strains of *S. pneumoniae* (MIC₉₀ = 0.015 $\mu\text{g/ml}$) than against penicillin-resistant strains (MIC₉₀ = 0.12 $\mu\text{g/ml}$), although ceftaroline remained highly active regardless of penicillin-susceptibility status (MIC₉₀ \leq 0.5 $\mu\text{g/ml}$). Ceftaroline was very potent against beta-hemolytic streptococci, *Streptococcus pyogenes* and *Streptococcus agalactiae*, and its activity was not affected by the macrolide-susceptibility status of the strains tested. The highest ceftaroline MICs for any isolate were 0.03 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ for *S. pyogenes* and 0.12 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ for *S. agalactiae*. Viridans group streptococci were susceptible to ceftaroline with an MIC₉₀ of 0.03 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ for penicillin-susceptible strains and 0.5 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ for penicillin-resistant strains. Against *E. faecalis*, ceftaroline had an MIC₉₀ of 4 $\mu\text{g/ml}$, and activity was not affected by the vancomycin-susceptibility status of the strains tested. Similarly to other β -lactam agents, ceftaroline exhibited minimal activity against *Enterococcus faecium*.

As shown in Table 2, the spectrum of activity of ceftaroline for *Enterobacteriaceae* spp. was similar to that of other extended-spectrum cephalosporins, including ceftazidime and ceftriaxone. The MIC₉₀ of 1 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ for ceftaroline against the collection of cephalosporin-susceptible *Enterobacteriaceae* isolates was slightly higher than that for ceftazidime (0.5 $\mu\text{g/ml}$) and ceftriaxone (0.25 $\mu\text{g/ml}$). With regard to individual species of *Enterobacteriaceae*, ceftaroline exhibited similar activity to that of ceftazidime and ceftriaxone among cephalosporin-susceptible populations of *E. coli*, *Citrobacter freundii*, *Enterobacter cloacae*, and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*. As shown in Table 2, ceftaroline MIC₉₀s were considerably higher relative to cefepime, ceftazidime, and ceftriaxone against *Proteus mirabilis*, *Morganella morganii*, *Serratia marcescens*, and *Providencia* spp. Similarly to third-generation cephalosporins, ceftaroline was not active against ceftazidime-nonsusceptible *Enterobacteriaceae* spp., which included ESBL-producing or AmpC-overexpressing strains. The MIC₉₀ of ceftaroline was >16 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ for imipenem-susceptible and multidrug-resistant strains of *Acinetobacter*, mainly *Acinetobacter baumannii*, which was similar to that for ceftriaxone and levofloxacin.

Ceftaroline had potent activity in vitro against *H. influenzae*, regardless of the production of β -lactamase. Ceftaroline also exhibited potent activity against all isolates of *Moraxella catarrhalis*, regardless of the presence of β -lactamases (93 of the 102 strains were β -lactamase positive) (data not shown), demonstrating the stability of ceftaroline to β -lactamases associated with this pathogen. Additionally, ceftaroline was very active in vitro against *P. multocida*.

Ceftaroline demonstrated potent in vitro activity against a wide spectrum of clinically relevant organisms, with MICs that were either lower than or similar to those of other cephalosporins. Ceftaroline was particularly active against *S. aureus* and beta-hemolytic streptococci, gram-positive bacteria commonly associated with skin and wound infections. Ceftaroline exhibited low MIC ranges for *S. aureus*, extending from \leq 0.03 to 1 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ for MSSA and 0.12 to 2 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ for MRSA, which set this agent apart from currently available β -lactams. Because MRSA is becoming increasingly prevalent in hospital- and community-acquired infections (1, 18), the availability of a new cephalosporin with bactericidal activity against MRSA would have significant favorable clinical implications (16).

Ceftaroline was highly active against *S. pneumoniae* as well as β -lactamase-positive and -negative isolates of *H. influenzae* and *M. catarrhalis*, pathogens frequently associated with respiratory tract infections (2). There is increasing evidence that *S. pneumoniae*, one of the most common causes of community-acquired pneumonia, is developing resistance to many of the currently available antibiotics, including macrolides, quinolones, and older cephalosporins (6, 21). In this evaluation, ceftaroline was highly active against *S. pneumoniae*, regardless of penicillin-susceptibility status. In addition, ceftaroline maintained activity against many common gram-negative pathogens similar to that of other third-generation cephalosporins, a spectrum of activity that differentiates it from many newer antibiotics that are active only against gram-positive organisms.

In conclusion, ceftaroline exhibited potent in vitro activity against a broad collection of recent gram-positive and gram-negative bacterial isolates from hospitals throughout the United States. This in vitro profile suggests that ceftaroline has

TABLE 2. Antimicrobial susceptibility of ceftaroline and selected comparator antimicrobial agents against gram-negative organisms^b

Bacterium group and antimicrobial agent (no. of isolates tested)	MIC (µg/ml) ^a			% of isolates by category		
	MIC ₅₀	MIC ₉₀	Range	S	I	R
<i>Enterobacteriaceae</i>						
CAZ-S (833)						
Ceftaroline	0.06	1	≤0.03->16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	32	>32	≤0.25->32	35.2	7.8	57
Cefepime	≤0.03	0.12	≤0.03->32	98.8	0.2	1
Ceftazidime	0.12	0.5	≤0.03-8	100	0	0
Ceftriaxone	≤0.06	0.25	≤0.06->16	98	2	0
Gentamicin	0.5	2	≤0.12->16	92.6	1.6	5.9
Imipenem	0.25	1	≤0.06-4	100	0	0
Levofloxacin	0.06	4	≤0.03->16	89.6	1.1	9.4
Piperacillin/tazobactam	2	4	≤0.5->64	97	1.4	1.6
CAZ-NS (220)						
Ceftaroline	>16	>16	0.12->16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	>32	>32	32->32	0	0	100
Cefepime	2	>32	≤0.03->32	71.4	5.5	23.2
Ceftazidime	>32	>32	16->32	0	10	90
Ceftriaxone	>16	>16	≤0.06->16	13.2	86.8	0
Gentamicin	4	>16	≤0.12->16	52.3	7.3	40.5
Imipenem	0.25	4	≤0.06->32	92.3	3.2	4.5
Levofloxacin	8	>16	≤0.03->16	41.8	6.8	51.4
Piperacillin/tazobactam	32	>64	≤0.5->64	43.2	18.2	38.6
<i>Citrobacter freundii</i>						
CAZ-S (50)						
Ceftaroline	0.12	0.25	0.06-16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	16	>32	4->32	36	22	42
Cefepime	≤0.03	0.12	≤0.03-0.12	100	0	0
Ceftazidime	0.25	1	0.12-8	100	0	0
Ceftriaxone	0.12	0.5	≤0.06-1	100	0	0
Gentamicin	0.5	8	0.25->16	88	2	10
Imipenem	0.5	1	0.12-1	100	0	0
Levofloxacin	≤0.03	1	≤0.03-4	98	2	0
Piperacillin/tazobactam	2	4	1-8	100	0	0
CAZ-NS (33)						
Ceftaroline	>16	>16	4->16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	>32	>32	>32->32	0	0	100
Cefepime	1	4	0.12-8	100	0	0
Ceftazidime	>32	>32	16->32	0	3	97
Ceftriaxone	>16	>16	4->16	6.1	93.9	0
Gentamicin	0.5	16	0.25->16	81.8	0	18.2
Imipenem	0.5	1	0.12-2	100	0	0
Levofloxacin	0.25	16	≤0.03->16	72.7	3	24.2
Piperacillin/tazobactam	32	>64	2->64	24.2	36.4	39.4
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i>						
CAZ-S (50)						
Ceftaroline	0.12	1	≤0.03->16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	32	>32	0.5->32	20	14	66
Cefepime	0.06	0.12	≤0.03-16	98	2	0
Ceftazidime	0.25	1	0.06-8	100	0	0
Ceftriaxone	0.12	1	≤0.06->16	98	2	0
Gentamicin	0.25	0.5	≤0.12->16	96	2	2
Imipenem	0.5	0.5	0.12-2	100	0	0
Levofloxacin	≤0.03	0.5	≤0.03-16	94	4	2
Piperacillin/tazobactam	2	4	≤0.5->64	98	0	2
CAZ-NS (35)						
Ceftaroline	>16	>16	0.12->16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	>32	>32	32->32	0	0	100
Cefepime	1	4	0.12-16	97.1	2.9	0
Ceftazidime	>32	>32	16->32	0	8.6	91.4
Ceftriaxone	>16	>16	1->16	8.6	91.4	0

Continued on following page

TABLE 2—Continued

Bacterium group and antimicrobial agent (no. of isolates tested)	MIC ($\mu\text{g/ml}$) ^a			% of isolates by category		
	MIC ₅₀	MIC ₉₀	Range	S	I	R
Gentamicin	0.5	>16	≤0.12->16	71.4	11.4	17.1
Imipenem	0.25	1	0.12->32	97.1	0	2.9
Levofloxacin	0.12	16	≤0.03->16	62.9	11.4	25.7
Piperacillin/tazobactam	>64	>64	1->64	25.7	20	54.3
<i>Escherichia coli</i>						
CAZ-S (345)						
Ceftaroline	0.06	0.5	≤0.03->16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	4	>32	≤0.25->32	58.3	0.9	40.9
Cefepime	≤0.03	0.12	≤0.03->32	98.3	0	1.7
Ceftazidime	0.12	0.25	≤0.03-8	100	0	0
Ceftriaxone	≤0.06	0.12	≤0.06->16	97.4	2.6	0
Gentamicin	0.5	2	≤0.12->16	91.9	0.6	7.5
Imipenem	0.12	0.25	≤0.06-1	100	0	0
Levofloxacin	≤0.03	16	≤0.03->16	86.4	0	13.6
Piperacillin/tazobactam	1	4	≤0.5->64	96.5	1.2	2.3
CAZ-NS (63)						
Ceftaroline	>16	>16	2->16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	>32	>32	>32->32	0	0	100
Cefepime	2	>32	0.25->32	57.1	7.9	34.9
Ceftazidime	>32	>32	16->32	0	12.7	87.3
Ceftriaxone	>16	>16	1->16	9.5	90.5	0
Gentamicin	16	>16	0.5->16	46	3.2	50.8
Imipenem	0.25	1	≤0.06->32	96.8	0	3.2
Levofloxacin	>16	>16	≤0.03->16	14.3	0	85.7
Piperacillin/tazobactam	16	>64	2->64	68.3	14.3	17.5
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>						
CAZ-S (210)						
Ceftaroline	0.06	0.25	≤0.03->16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	>32	>32	1->32	5.2	14.8	80
Cefepime	≤0.03	0.12	≤0.03-0.5	100	0	0
Ceftazidime	0.12	0.25	≤0.03-8	100	0	0
Ceftriaxone	≤0.06	0.12	≤0.06-16	99.5	0.5	0
Gentamicin	0.25	0.5	≤0.12->16	97.1	1	1.9
Imipenem	0.12	0.5	0.12-2	100	0	0
Levofloxacin	0.06	0.25	≤0.03->16	98.1	0.5	1.4
Piperacillin/tazobactam	2	8	≤0.5->64	97.1	2.4	0.5
CAZ-NS (66)						
Ceftaroline	>16	>16	1->16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	>32	>32	32->32	0	0	100
Cefepime	8	>32	≤0.03->32	57.6	7.6	34.8
Ceftazidime	>32	>32	16->32	0	1.5	98.5
Ceftriaxone	>16	>16	≤0.06->16	12.1	87.9	0
Gentamicin	8	>16	≤0.12->16	43.9	12.1	43.9
Imipenem	0.12	16	≤0.06->32	80.3	9.1	10.6
Levofloxacin	8	>16	≤0.03->16	37.9	7.6	54.5
Piperacillin/tazobactam	>64	>64	≤0.5->64	24.2	13.6	62.1
<i>Morganella morganii</i>						
CAZ-S (34)						
Ceftaroline	0.06	16	≤0.03->16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	>32	>32	1->32	8.8	5.9	85.3
Cefepime	≤0.03	0.06	≤0.03-0.06	100	0	0
Ceftazidime	0.06	4	≤0.03-8	100	0	0
Ceftriaxone	≤0.06	1	≤0.06-4	100	0	0
Gentamicin	0.5	4	0.25->16	91.2	0	8.8
Imipenem	2	2	0.25-4	100	0	0
Levofloxacin	≤0.03	8	≤0.03->16	76.5	2.9	20.6
Piperacillin/tazobactam	≤0.5	1	≤0.5-4	100	0	0

Continued on following page

TABLE 2—Continued

Bacterium group and antimicrobial agent (no. of isolates tested)	MIC ($\mu\text{g/ml}$) ^a			% of isolates by category		
	MIC ₅₀	MIC ₉₀	Range	S	I	R
<i>Proteus mirabilis</i>						
CAZ-S (58)						
Ceftaroline	0.06	4	≤ 0.03 –>16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	1	>32	0.5–>32	72.4	0	27.6
Cefepime	0.06	0.5	≤ 0.03 –16	98.3	1.7	0
Ceftazidime	0.06	0.12	≤ 0.03 –4	100	0	0
Ceftriaxone	≤ 0.06	0.12	≤ 0.06 –>16	96.6	3.4	0
Gentamicin	1	8	0.5–>16	84.5	6.9	8.6
Imipenem	2	4	≤ 0.06 –4	100	0	0
Levofloxacin	0.06	16	≤ 0.03 –>16	75.9	3.4	20.7
Piperacillin/tazobactam	≤ 0.5	1	≤ 0.5 –2	100	0	0
<i>Providencia</i> spp.						
CAZ-S (27)						
Ceftaroline	1	>16	≤ 0.03 –>16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	32	>32	4–>32	22.2	11.1	66.7
Cefepime	0.06	1	≤ 0.03 –4	100	0	0
Ceftazidime	0.25	4	≤ 0.03 –8	100	0	0
Ceftriaxone	≤ 0.06	2	≤ 0.06 –8	100	0	0
Gentamicin	2	>16	0.25–>16	74.1	11.1	14.8
Imipenem	1	2	0.25–2	100	0	0
Levofloxacin	0.25	>16	≤ 0.03 –>16	66.7	7.4	25.9
Piperacillin/tazobactam	2	16	≤ 0.5 –>64	92.6	3.7	3.7
<i>Serratia marcescens</i>						
CAZ-S (59)						
Ceftaroline	0.5	16	0.12–>16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	>32	>32	8–>32	3.4	13.6	83.1
Cefepime	0.06	0.5	≤ 0.03 –32	96.6	0	3.4
Ceftazidime	0.12	1	≤ 0.03 –8	100	0	0
Ceftriaxone	0.25	4	≤ 0.06 –>16	93.2	6.8	0
Gentamicin	0.5	1	0.25–>16	98.3	0	1.7
Imipenem	0.5	1	0.25–2	100	0	0
Levofloxacin	0.12	1	≤ 0.03 –8	98.3	0	1.7
Piperacillin/tazobactam	2	16	≤ 0.5 –>64	93.2	3.4	3.4
<i>Acinetobacter</i> spp.						
MDR (16)						
Ceftaroline	>16	>16	8–>16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	>32	>32	>32–>32	NA	NA	NA
Cefepime	16	32	4–>32	31.3	31.3	37.5
Ceftazidime	>32	>32	16–>32	0	6.3	93.8
Ceftriaxone	>16	>16	>16–>16	0	100	0
Gentamicin	>16	>16	0.25–>16	18.8	6.3	75
Imipenem	0.5	32	0.25–32	68.8	0	31.3
Levofloxacin	16	>16	2–>16	6.3	6.3	87.5
Piperacillin/tazobactam	>64	>64	32–>64	0	12.5	87.5
IMI-S (47)						
Ceftaroline	4	>16	≤ 0.03 –>16	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	16	>32	≤ 0.25 –>32	NA	NA	NA
Cefepime	4	32	0.12–>32	78.7	6.4	14.9
Ceftazidime	4	>32	0.5–>32	63.8	4.3	31.9
Ceftriaxone	16	>16	≤ 0.06 –>16	44.7	55.3	0
Gentamicin	1	>16	≤ 0.12 –>16	74.5	4.3	21.3
Imipenem	0.25	0.5	≤ 0.06 –2	100	0	0
Levofloxacin	0.5	>16	≤ 0.03 –>16	51.1	12.8	36.2
Piperacillin/tazobactam	8	>64	≤ 0.5 –>64	68.1	10.6	21.3
<i>Haemophilus influenzae</i>						
β -lactamase negative (199)						
Ceftaroline	≤ 0.008	0.015	≤ 0.008 –1	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	≤ 0.25	0.5	≤ 0.25 –16	99	NA	1

Continued on following page

TABLE 2—Continued

Bacterium group and antimicrobial agent (no. of isolates tested)	MIC ($\mu\text{g/ml}$) ^a			% of isolates by category		
	MIC ₅₀	MIC ₉₀	Range	S	I	R
Cefepime	0.06	0.12	≤0.03–0.5	100	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	0.06	0.12	≤0.03–8	98.5	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	≤0.06	≤0.06	≤0.06–0.12	100	NA	NA
Gentamicin	1	2	0.25–4	NA	NA	NA
Imipenem	0.25	0.5	≤0.06–1	100	NA	NA
Levofloxacin	0.015	0.03	≤0.004–1	100	NA	NA
Piperacillin/tazobactam	≤0.03	0.06	≤0.03–0.25	100	NA	0
β-lactamase positive (101)						
Ceftaroline	0.015	0.03	≤0.008–2	NA	NA	NA
Ampicillin	32	>32	≤0.25–>32	2	1	97
Cefepime	0.06	0.12	≤0.03–0.5	100	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	0.06	0.12	≤0.03–8	98	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	≤0.06	≤0.06	≤0.06–0.12	100	NA	NA
Gentamicin	1	2	≤0.12–4	0	NA	NA
Imipenem	0.12	0.5	≤0.06–2	100	NA	NA
Levofloxacin	0.015	0.03	≤0.004–0.03	100	NA	NA
Piperacillin/tazobactam	≤0.03	0.06	≤0.03–2	99	NA	1
<i>Moraxella catarrhalis</i>						
β-lactamase positive (93)						
Ceftaroline	0.06	0.25	≤0.03–0.5	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	≤1	≤1	≤1–≤1	100	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	≤0.25	1	≤0.25–1	100	NA	NA
Erythromycin	≤0.12	≤0.12	≤0.12–0.25	100	0	0
Imipenem	≤0.12	≤0.12	≤0.12–≤0.12	NA	NA	NA
Levofloxacin	≤0.03	≤0.03	≤0.03–0.06	100	NA	NA
Linezolid	4	4	1–4	NA	NA	NA
Oxacillin	4	>8	≤0.06–>8	NA	NA	NA
Penicillin	4	16	0.25–>16	NA	NA	NA
<i>Pasteurella multocida</i> (22)						
Ceftaroline	≤0.008	0.06	≤0.008–0.06	NA	NA	NA
Ceftazidime	≤1	≤1	≤1–≤1	NA	NA	NA
Ceftriaxone	≤0.015	≤0.015	≤0.015–0.06	100	NA	NA
Erythromycin	2	4	0.25–>16	4.5	18.2	77.3
Imipenem	0.25	2	0.06–4	NA	NA	NA
Levofloxacin	≤0.015	0.03	≤0.015–>8	95.5	NA	NA
Linezolid	4	>4	4–>4	NA	NA	NA
Penicillin	≤0.12	0.25	≤0.12–>8	NA	NA	NA

^a MICs reported only for categories composed of 10 or more isolates.

^b CAZ, ceftazidime; IMI, imipenem; MDR, multidrug resistant (defined as concurrent resistance to at least three drugs); NS, nonsusceptible; S, susceptible; NA, not available (CLSI breakpoints unavailable for interpretation of susceptible, intermediate, or resistant isolates).

the potential to become an important addition to the arsenal of currently available antimicrobial therapies as a broad-spectrum antibiotic that may be used in the treatment of both nosocomial and community-acquired infections.

Funding for this study was provided by Cerexa, Inc. (Alameda, CA), a wholly owned subsidiary of Forest Laboratories, Inc. Funding for editorial assistance was provided by Forest Laboratories, Inc.

We acknowledge Grace E. Johnson, Scientific Therapeutics Information, Inc., Springfield, NJ, and thank her for providing editorial assistance in the development of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Baba, T., F. Takeuchi, M. Kuroda, H. Yuzawa, K. Aoki, A. Oguchi, Y. Nagai, N. Iwama, K. Asano, T. Naimi, H. Kuroda, L. Cui, K. Yamamoto, and K. Hiramatsu. 2002. Genome and virulence determinants of high virulence community-acquired MRSA. *Lancet* **359**:1819–1827.
- Bartlett, J. G., and L. M. Mundy. 1995. Community-acquired pneumonia. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **333**:1618–1624.
- Burke, J. P. 2003. Infection control: a problem for patient safety. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **348**:651–656.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2007. Active bacterial core surveillance (ABCs) report, emerging infections program network, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, 2006. <http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/dbmd/abcs/surveys/spneu06.pdf>.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2005. Active bacterial core surveillance (ABCs) report, emerging infections program network, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, 2004. <http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/dbmd/abcs/surveys/spneu04.pdf>.
- Chiu, C. H., L. H. Su, Y. C. Huang, J. C. Lai, H. L. Chen, T. L. Wu, and T. Y. Lin. 2007. Increasing ceftriaxone resistance and multiple alterations of penicillin-binding proteins among penicillin-resistant *Streptococcus pneumoniae* isolates in Taiwan. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **51**:3404–3406.
- Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. 2006. Methods for antimicrobial dilution and disk susceptibility testing of infrequently isolated or fastidious bacteria. CLSI M45-A. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
- Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. 2007. Methods for dilution antimicrobial susceptibility tests for bacteria that grow aerobically: approved standard, 7th ed. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
- Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. 2007. Performance standards

- for antimicrobial susceptibility testing; sixteenth informational supplement. CLSI M100-S16. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
10. Draghi, D. C., M. E. Jones, D. F. Sahn, and G. S. Tillotson. 2006. Geographically-based evaluation of multidrug resistance trends among *Streptococcus pneumoniae* in the USA: findings of the FAST surveillance initiative (2003–2004). *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents* **28**:525–531.
 11. Ge, Y., R. S. Blosser, D. F. Sahn, and J. A. Karlowsky. 2004. In vitro activity of PPI-0903 (TAK-599), a new anti-MRSA cephalosporin, against gram-positive and gram-negative clinical isolates, abstr. A-139. Abstr. 104th Gen. Meet. Am. Soc. Microbiol. American Society for Microbiology, Washington, DC.
 12. Giamarellou, H. 2005. Multidrug resistance in Gram-negative bacteria that produce extended-spectrum beta-lactamases (ESBLs). *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* **11**(Suppl. 4):S1–S16.
 13. Herrero, I. A., N. C. Issa, and R. Patel. 2002. Nosocomial spread of linezolid-resistant, vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus faecium*. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **346**:867–869.
 14. Howe, R. A., A. Monk, M. Whootton, T. R. Walsh, and M. C. Enright. 2004. Vancomycin susceptibility within methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* lineages. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **10**:855–857.
 15. Iizawa, Y., J. Nagai, T. Ishikawa, S. Hashiguchi, M. Nakao, A. Miyake, and K. Okonogi. 2004. In vitro antimicrobial activity of T-91825, a novel anti-MRSA cephalosporin, and in vivo anti-MRSA activity of its prodrug, TAK-599. *J. Infect. Chemother.* **10**:146–156.
 16. Ishikawa, T., N. Matsunaga, H. Tawada, N. Kuroda, Y. Nakayama, Y. Ishibashi, M. Tomimoto, Y. Ikeda, Y. Tagawa, Y. Iizawa, K. Okonogi, S. Hashiguchi, and A. Miyake. 2003. TAK-599, a novel *N*-phosphono type prodrug of anti-MRSA cephalosporin T-91825: synthesis, physicochemical and pharmacological properties. *Bioorg. Med. Chem.* **11**:2427–2437.
 17. Jones, R. N., A. M. Nilius, B. K. Akinlade, L. M. Deshpande, and G. F. Notario. 2007. Molecular characterization of *Staphylococcus aureus* isolates from a 2005 clinical trial of uncomplicated skin and skin structure infections. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **51**:3381–3384.
 18. Klevens, R. M., M. A. Morrison, J. Nadle, S. Petit, K. Gershman, S. Ray, L. H. Harrison, R. Lynfield, G. Dumyati, J. M. Townes, A. S. Craig, E. R. Zell, G. E. Fosheim, L. K. McDougal, R. B. Carey, and S. K. Fridkin. 2007. Invasive methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* infections in the United States. *JAMA* **298**:1763–1771.
 19. Lockhart, S. R., M. A. Abramson, S. E. Beekmann, G. Gallagher, S. Riedel, D. J. Diekema, J. P. Quinn, and G. V. Doern. 2007. Antimicrobial resistance among gram-negative bacilli causing infections in intensive care unit patients in the United States between 1993 and 2004. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **45**:3352–3359.
 20. Murray, P. R. 2007. *Manual of clinical microbiology*, 9th ed. ASM Press, Washington, DC.
 21. Niederman, M. S. 2007. Recent advances in community-acquired pneumonia: inpatient and outpatient. *Chest* **131**:1205–1215.
 22. Pagès, J. M., M. Masi, and J. Barbe. 2005. Inhibitors of efflux pumps in Gram-negative bacteria. *Trends Mol. Med.* **11**:382–389.
 23. Sader, H. S., T. R. Fritsche, K. Kaniga, Y. Ge, and R. N. Jones. 2005. Antimicrobial activity and spectrum of PPI-0903M (T-91825), a novel cephalosporin, tested against a worldwide collection of clinical strains. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **49**:3501–3512.
 24. Skiest, D. J. 2006. Treatment failure resulting from resistance of *Staphylococcus aureus* to daptomycin. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **44**:655–656.
 25. Talbot, G., J. Bradley, J. Edwards, D. Gilbert, M. Scheld, J. Bartlett, and Antimicrobial Availability Task Force of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2006. Bad bugs need drugs: an update on the development pipeline from the Antimicrobial Availability Task Force of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **42**:657–668.
 26. Tsiodras, S., H. S. Gold, G. Sakoulas, G. M. Eliopoulos, C. Wennersten, L. Venkataraman, R. C. Moellering, and M. J. Ferraro. 2001. Linezolid resistance in a clinical isolate of *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Lancet* **358**:207–208.
 27. Wright, G., and A. Sutherland. 2007. New strategies for combating multidrug-resistant bacteria. *Trends Mol. Med.* **13**:260–267.