HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2022 October 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2021 October ; 40(10): 2053–2068. doi:10.1007/s10096-021-04296-1.

Treatment for carbapenem-resistant *Enterobacterales* infections: Recent advances and future directions

Kathleen Tompkins, MD[1,*], **David van Duin, MD, PhD**[1]

[1]University of North Carolina, Division of Global Health and Infectious Diseases

Abstract

Carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales (CRE) are a growing threat to human health worldwide. CRE often carry multiple resistance genes that limit treatment options and require longer durations of therapy, are more costly to treat, and necessitate therapies with increased toxicities when compared to carbapenem-susceptible strains. Here, we provide an overview of the mechanisms of resistance in CRE, the epidemiology of CRE infections worldwide, and available treatment options for CRE. We review recentlyapproved agents for the treatment of CRE, including ceftazidime-avibactam, meropenem-vaborbactam, imipenem-relebactam, cefiderocol, and novel aminoglycosides and tetracyclines. We also discuss recent advances in phage therapy and antibiotics that are currently in development targeted to CRE. The potential for the development of resistance to these therapies remains high, and enhanced antimicrobial stewardship is imperative both to reduce the spread of CRE worldwide and to ensure continued access to efficacious treatment options.

Keywords

Carbapenem-resistant; Enterobacterales; CRE; Carbapenemase; Antimicrobial resistance

Introduction

The rise of antimicrobial resistant (AMR) organisms worldwide is considered one of the biggest threats to global health by the World Health Organization (WHO)[1]. Carbapenem resistant *Enterobacterales* (CRE) are defined by the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) as *Enterobacterales* (formerly *Enterobacteriaceae*) with *in vitro* resistance to at least one carbapenem.[2] Carbapenems are a potent class of broad-spectrum antibiotics that inhibit penicillin binding proteins, thereby preventing cell wall synthesis[3] and were once considered the “last resort” antibiotics in many hospitals. Resistance to carbapenems significantly limits the antibiotic armamentarium available to treat challenging infections. CRE have spread substantially in recent years [4–6] and are now endemic in certain regions of North America, Europe and the Mediterranean, and South Asia[7].

[*]Corresponding author: Corresponding author contact: Kathleen Tompkins, Kathleen.tompkins@unchealth.unc.edu, Phone: 919-966-2537, Fax: 919-966-6714.

CRE are typically healthcare-associated infections, although community spread is becoming more common,[8–11] with intestinal colonization and environmental sources as reservoirs of infection[12]. CRE are of particular concern due to the increased mortality[13,14], length of hospital stay, and increased cost when compared to drug-susceptible infections[15]. An economic prediction model from the United States estimated a societal cost of between $59,692 and $86,940 for each CRE infection[16]. Additionally, CRE infections are often found in the most vulnerable patients--the elderly, those with underlying comorbidities, and those with indwelling catheters or permanent hardware in place[4,17–19].

In October 2020, The Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) released guidance for the treatment of multidrug resistant Gram-negative bacterial infections, including CRE, and offers clinicians preferred and alternative treatment strategies for a variety of clinical scenarios[20]. The IDSA guidance is divided into infections inside and outside the urinary tract and assumes the organism and susceptibility profile are known. This guidance provides a current overview of treatment options for these challenging infections, albeit with a focus on variants that predominate in North America.

This review will focus on treatment strategies for infections with carbapenem-resistant *Enterobacterales*, including “traditional” antibiotics that have retained activity against CRE, newly approved antibiotics developed specifically for CRE, phage therapy, and antibiotics that are in development to target multi-drug resistant infections.

Mechanisms of carbapenem resistance in CRE

Resistance to carbapenems can be mediated via alterations to the penicillin binding protein of the bacterial cell wall, an increase in efflux pumps, or a decreases in membrane permeability[21,22] as well as through the production of carbapenemase enzymes. Carbapenemases are a diverse family of β-lactamases that have the ability to hydrolyze and inactivate a variety of antibiotics including penicillins, cephalosporins, monobactams, and carbapenems[23]. These enzymes function by binding to the drug, breaking the amide bond of a four-membered azetidinone ring, and preventing it from binding to the penicillin binding protein of the bacterial cell wall[24]. Carbapenemases are found in approximately 85% of CRE worldwide, with considerable variation between regions, ranging from 76% in Latin America to 90% in the Middle East and Africa found in a recent global survey[25]. Other studies have shown lower rates, with the recent CRACKLE-2 study finding carbapenemases in 59% of CRE from the United States[26]. Using the Ambler classification system, carbapenemases are found within class A, B, and D β-lactamases, with substantial geographic heterogeneity in classes between global regions and with various modes of transmission[7,27] (Table 1).

Ambler class A carbapenemases use a serine residue to hydrolyze beta-lactams[28] and include the bla_{KPC}, bla_{NMC}/bla_{IMI}, and bla_{SME}[29] genes, *with* bla_{KPC} being the most common carbapenemase of the class[30]. It was first discovered in 1996 in a *Klebsiella pneumoniae* isolate from North Carolina, USA[31], is plasmid-mediated, and is now endemic in much of the western hemisphere with the highest rates found in Eastern North America[25,32,33] and outbreaks reported in South America, including Columbia and Ecuador[34,35]. Spread from the United States has led to outbreaks outside the hemisphere as

well. An outbreak in Israel was traced to a strain from New York[36] and KPC enzymes have also been found in a variety of European countries including large outbreaks in Greece[37,38], Portugal[39], and Poland[40] among other countries, where they can significantly impact regional resistance patterns[24,25]. While found primarily in *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, KPC enzymes have also been found in a variety of other *Enterobacterales* including *Citrobacter freundii*, *Enterobacter cloacae*, *Escherichia coli* and *Serratia marcescens* among others, as well as in *Pseudomonas* species[29].

Class B metallo-β-lactamases (MBLs) are zinc-dependent[41] and include the bla_{VIM}, bla_{IMP}, and bla_{NDM} genes[41–43], all found on mobile genetic elements and capable of horizontal spread.[44] MBLs are able to hydrolyze a wide range of beta-lactams but cannot hydrolyze monobactams such as aztreonam.[45] The enzyme IMP was the first enzyme discovered in this class, isolated from an imipenem-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* isolate in Japan in 1991[46] and it now accounts for as much as 15% of the CRE found in Japan, Australia and parts of Southeast Asia[25,47,48]. VIM, for Verona Integron-encoded Metallo-beta-lactamase, was first isolated in Italy in 1997[49] and is responsible for approximately 15% of the CRE isolated from Europe[25], with the highest rates found in Greece, Italy, Spain, and Hungary[50]. More recently, the New Delhi Metallo-β-lactamases (NDM), were discovered in 2007 from a *Klebsiella pneumoniae* isolate of a Swedish patient who had previously been hospitalized in India with a urinary tract infection.[51] The highest burden of NDM remains in South Asia as well as the Middle East, where it accounts for up to a third of detected carbapenemases[25]. NDM is of particular concern given its rapid spread and limited treatment options.[45]

The Class D carbapenemases include members of the OXA-encoding genes and are largely found in *Acinetobacter*, however the plasmid-encoded $bla_{OXA\text{-}48}$-like genes are found in *Enterobacterales*[52–5455] and have been implicated in multiple nosocomial CRE outbreaks[56–59]. OXA-48-like enzymes encompass OXA-48 and related variants, including OXA-181, OXA-162, and OXA-232 among others, with distinct geographic distributions and co-occurring resistance genes[52,54]. OXA-48-like enzymes are most commonly found in the Middle East and Europe, where over 27% of carbapenem-resistant isolates in each region were recently found to harbor OXA-48[25], with endemic levels reported in Turkey, Malta, much of North Africa and the Middle East[54]. OXA-48 remains uncommon in North America, with only 52 cases reported in the United States between 2010–2015[60] and only found in 1% of carbapenemase-producing CRE in the CRACKLE-2 study[26].

Previously approved antibiotics with CRE activity

Therapeutics for CRE are summarized in Table 2. There are several “traditional” antibiotics that have retained activity against some strains of CRE and are being deployed in new ways or in combination with other drugs for the treatment of severe CRE infections.

Aztreonam

The monobactam antibiotic Aztreonam is effective against bacteria producing Class B and D carbapenemases in isolation, however these bacteria often carry concomitant ESBL genes that hydrolyze aztreonam rendering it ineffective and thus it is often of limited clinical utility as monotherapy[61,62]. The combination of aztreonam with the novel β-lactam-

β-lactamase inhibitor ceftazidime-avibactam is a promising treatment option for MBLs and is discussed in detail below. Notably, aztreonam does not have activity against bacteria producing Class A carbapenemases, including bacteria producing the highly prevalent KPC carbapenemases[61].

Polymyxins

The polymyxin antibiotics colistin and polymyxin B have long been used for resistant Gram-negative bacteria, including CRE[63], however there is emerging resistance developing to these drugs. This is notable, as several studies have shown an association between polymyxin resistance and an increase in mortality[64,65], although these studies occurred prior to the development of newer CRE-active agents which are now available. Resistance to polymyxins can occur via chromosomal point mutations leading to changes in the bacterial lipopolysaccharide membrane or an increase in efflux pumps, or it can be plasmid-mediated, via several *mcr* genes that change lipid A present in the lipopolysaccharide membrane and prevent the target drug from binding. [66]. There is also evidence that heteroresistance arising from minor resistant subpopulations in a culture may make colistin resistance difficult to detect *in vitro* and lead to subsequent treatment failure[67,68]. Additionally, polymyxins have significant nephrotoxicity, with several studies having shown their inferiority compared to newer drugs against isolates carrying Class A carbapenemases[69–71], and as such they are not currently recommended for the treatment of CRE by the IDSA[20]. Despite this, they are often the only available antibiotic for CRE infections in certain regions despite increasing resistance levels[72,73], and thus are considered to be a “highest priority” critically important antimicrobial by the WHO[74,75].

Fosfomycin

Fosfomycin, an antibiotic first discovered in 1969, inhibits cell wall synthesis in a variety of Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria[76], including *Enterobacterales*, and has retained activity against some CRE isolates[77]. Resistance to fosfomycin is mediated primarily through the *fosA* genes which encode fosfomycin hydrolases and are found in many *Enterobacterales* with the exception of E. coli[78,79]. Traditionally, fosfomycin has primarily been used as an oral formulation for lower urinary tract infections[76,8080], however there is growing interest in intravenous use for MDR organisms, including CRE[81–83]. Fosfomycin does not have sufficient renal parenchymal penetration, and thus should not be used for upper urinary tract infections[84,85].

Tigecycline

The tetracycline antibiotic tigecycline has a broad spectrum of activity against gram positive and gram negative infections and global surveillance data from the TEST study shows that the majority of *Enterobacterales* isolates collected worldwide between 2014–2016 remain susceptible (≤1.3% resistance in all regions)[86]. Tigecycline has been used for CRE infections with success, however several recent studies have shown monotherapy to be of limited benefit[87] and combination therapy is likely more efficacious[88,89]. Resistance to tigecycline in *Enterobacterales* can arise from upregulation of the AcrAB efflux pump[90,91] or via the plasmid-mediated *tet*(X4) gene, which encodes a flavin-dependent monooxygenase that modifies tigecycline[92,93]. Using “traditional” CRE-active antibiotics in

combination with antibiotics with other mechanisms of action or with “repurposed” drugs from other classes has also shown some promise for the treatment of CRE infections[94]. For example, there are *in vitro* studies showing synergistic effects of combining colistin with other antibiotics including clarithromycin or rifamycin[95] or the HIV drug azidothymidine (AZT)[96] for the treatment of CRE that are colistin resistant. Other combinations that have shown *in vitro* activity against CRE include AZT and tigecycline[97], pentamidine in combination with rifampicin, tobramycin, tigecycline or amikacin[98] and polymyxin B with citalopram, sertraline, or spironolactone[99]. Animal studies and clinical trials are needed to determine *in vivo* efficacy of these combination treatments in true clinical infections and thus the utility of these combination regimens remain theoretical at this time.

β-lactam-β-lactamase inhibitor combinations

Ceftazidime-avibactam—In the last several years, β-lactam-β-lactamase inhibitor combinations have been developed and approved specifically to target multidrug resistant organisms, including CRE. The first of these, avibactam, was developed in 2011 and is a synthetic diazabicyclooctane (DBO) non-β-lactam that covalently and reversibly binds to serine β-lactamases and has activity against class A (KPC)[100,101] and class D (OXA-48-like)[102,103100,101] carbapenemases, but not MBLs (NDM, VIM, IMP). When compared to polymyxin antibiotics, multiple observational studies have shown ceftazidime/avibactam to be superior for the treatment of CRE infections possessing Class A carbapenemases with fewer side effects and toxicities[71,104–106]. Ceftazidime-avibactam was approved by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) in 2015 for complicated urinary tract infections (cUTI) and for complicated intra-abdominal infections (cIAI) in combination with metronidazole[107]. Approval was granted following the RECLAIM[108] trials, which showed non-inferiority for ceftazidime/avibactam when compared to meropenem for cIAI and the RECAPTURE trial, which showed non-inferiority compared to doripenem for cUTI[109]. Approval has since been expanded to include hospital-acquired and ventilator-associated pneumonia following the REPROVE trial, a phase-III trial conducted across 23 countries which showed non-inferiority of ceftazidime-avibactam compared to meropenem for nosocomial pneumonia[110]. It is important to note all three of these studies leading to approval for ceftazidime-avibactam used clinical inclusion criteria and did not select specifically for CRE. Microbiological analysis showed that 13.5% of patients in the RECLAIM trials, 19.6% of patients in the RECAPTURE trial, and 28% in the REPROVE trial had a ceftazidime-resistant organism at baseline. Only the RECLAIM trials reported the rate of MBL infection, at approximately 3%[108].

In isolates from hospitalized patients collected worldwide during the INFORM global surveillance survey for AMR resistance, in vitro susceptibility to ceftazidime-avibactam has remained high for CRE; among 816 non-MBL CRE isolates collected between 2012–2014, only 19 (2.3%) were resistant and 97.7% were susceptible to ceftazidime-avibactam[111]. Subsequent testing of isolates collected between 2015–2017 showed a similarly high rate of 99.8% susceptibility for ceftazidime-avibactam[112].

Although overall high rates of susceptibility to ceftazidime-avibactam remain, a number of mutations have been seen clinically that confer resistance, primarily in carriers of

KPC-2 and KPC-3 enzymes. The sequence type 258 *Klebsiella pneumoniae* with KPC-3 has been shown to be resistant to ceftazidime-avibactam due to transposition of KPC-3 onto a second plasmid with subsequent alterations in the porin channels OmpK35 and OmpK36 and upregulation of efflux pumps[113–115]. Concerningly, mutations in bla_{KPC-3} conferring resistance to avibactam have been reported in patients while on ceftazidime-avibactam therapy via single amino acid substitutions at D179Y/T243M, D179Y, and V240G leading to alterations in the Ω-loop in KPC-3, however these mutations restore meropenem susceptibility in some isolates[116]. More recently, a KPC-3 variant named KPC-50 was recovered from a *Klebsiella pneumoniae* isolate in a Swedish patient and found to contain a three-amino-acid insertion that conferred increased affinity to ceftazidime and decreased activity of avibactam leading to resistance[117]. KPC-2 variants arising from single amino acid substitutions at the Ω-loop have also been found to confer resistance to ceftazidime-avibactam, likely through increased affinity of the enzyme for ceftazidime, thereby preventing the binding of avibactam[118]. While most of the above resistance mechanisms have been documented in Klebsiella pneumoniae isolates, point mutations leading to insertion of TIPY in penicillin binding protein 3 of an E. coli isolate containing KPC-3 have been documented, which prevents the binding of ceftazidime and cannot be overcome by avibactam[119,120].

Although ceftazidime-avibactam alone does not have activity against MBLs, there is significant *in vitro* synergy between ceftazidime-avibactam and aztreonam that confers activity against these isolates[121]. This is of particular importance, given that although aztreonam is active against class B carbapenemases, it is often hydrolyzed by other β-lactamases that co-occur with MBLs[122]. As a result, only 29.2% of MBLs from a recent global survey were found to retain susceptibility to aztreonam monotherapy[123]. When tested against the combination of aztreonam-avibactam, all MBL isolates in that study were inhibited by the combination[123]. A clinical case series evaluating this combination treatment in 10 patients with infections caused by NDM-producing MBLs during an outbreak found 6 of 10 patients had clinical success at 30 days, suggesting the combination of ceftazidime-avibactam plus aztreonam may be a useful clinical option for extensively drug resistant *Enterobacterales* infections that contain both class B carbapenemases as well as ESBL enzymes[124]. Additional reports of combined ceftazidime-avibactam plus aztreonam treatment have replicated these early findings[125], including in pan-resistant isolates[126]. Given that the combination of aztreonam plus avibactam alone, without the addition of ceftazidime, appears efficacious, this two-drug combination is currently being tested in a Phase III clinical trial for the treatment of complicated infections caused by MBL-containing gram negative bacteria[127]. An earlier Phase II pharmacokinetic trial (the REJUVENATE study) showed the combination of aztreonam-avibactam to have similar safety and tolerability to aztreonam monotherapy[128]. As a result of these findings, the IDSA currently recommends ceftazidime-avibactam alone as the preferred treatment for OXA-48-producing CRE outside the urinary tract and in combination with aztreonam for NDM-producing CRE infections[20].

Meropenem-vaborbactam—Meropenem-vaborbactam was approved by the FDA in 2017 for the treatment of complicated urinary tract infections (cUTI)[129] and by the EMA

in 2018 with an expanded authorization that includes cUTI, cIAI, and hospital acquired or ventilator-associated pneumonia (HAP/VAP)[130]. Meropenem-vaborbactam was designed to target multidrug-resistant organisms, and specifically the class A KPC carbapenemases[131]. The drug combines the carbapenem antibiotic meropenem with a novel β-lactamase inhibitor containing a cyclic boronic acid pharmacophore that restores the activity of meropenem against serine carbapenemases[132]. While it has broad activity against class A carbapenemases (as well as class C β-lactamases conferring cephalosporin resistance), it notably does not have activity against the class B metallo β-lactamases (NDM, VIM, IMP) nor class D (OXA-48-like) carbapenemases[133]. A survey of meropenem-vaborbactam susceptibility against globally-collected CRE showed the lowest MIC values for isolates from the Americas, consistent with the predominance of KPC-producers in this region[134]. Given this, meropenem-vaborbactam may be of more limited utility in regions where MBLs and OXA-48-like enzymes predominate, including parts of Asia, the Middle East, and North Africa.

Approval for meropenem-vaborbactam was obtained following the TANGO I trial which showed non-inferiority of meropenem-vaborbactam for cUTI when compared to piperacillin-tazobactam[135]. TANGO I did not select for patients with CRE organisms and in fact, nearly all baseline uropathogens were susceptible to meropenem. This was later followed by the TANGO II trial to test meropenem-vaborbactam in complicated CRE infections including bloodstream infections (BSI), pyelonephritis, VAP, and cIAI [70]. While a descriptive study, TANGO II evaluated 47 patients across 8 countries and found an increase in clinical and microbiologic cure and reduction in death with fewer adverse events compared to best alternative therapy. Vaborbactam enters cells via the membrane porin channels OmpK35 and OmpK36[133] and resistance to vaborbactam can develop via downregulation or alteration of these porin channels[136–138136,137]

Imipenem-relebactam—The most recent drug combination in this class is imipenem-relebactam, a non-β-lactam bicyclic DBO β-lactamase inhibitor that is structurally similar to avibactam, but with the addition of a piperidine ring[139]. It is believed to reversibly acylate β-lactamases[140]. Imipenem-relebactam is active against class A carbapenemases but not the metallo-β-lactamases and has little to no activity against the class D OXA-48-like enzymes[141]. Information from the SMART surveillance study on *Enterobacterales* isolates collected in Europe showed the addition of relebactam restored imipenem susceptibility in 67% of isolates carrying KPC enzymes, but that nearly all isolates with MBLs or OXA-48-like enzymes remained nonsusceptible, primarily occurring in isolates from countries with endemic levels of these enzymes[142]. This highlights the importance of determining the underlying mechanism of carbapenem resistance and carbapenemase epidemiology when selecting treatment options.

Imipenem-relebactam was approved for use by the US FDA in 2019[143] and is available with the carbapenem imipenem/cilastatin for clinical use[144]. The RESTORE-IMI-1 trial evaluating the safety and efficacy of imipenem-relebactam in a variety of severe imipenem-resistant gram negative infections found higher favorable clinical response rate (71.4% vs 40%), lower 28-day mortality rates (9.5% vs 30%), and lower treatment-associated nephrotoxicity (10.3% vs 56.3%) with imipenem-relebactam compared to imipenem plus

colistin[69]. Notably, most of the isolates in this study were *Pseudomonas* spp. (77.4%) with the remainder *Enterobacterales*. The RESTORE-IMI-II trial was a non-inferiority study of imipenem-relebactam compared to piperacillin-tazobactam for HAP/VAP infection and found imipenem-relebactam was non-inferior for both 28-day mortality and favorable clinical response[145]. When looking specifically at the microbiologic modified intent-to-treat population, mortality rates for intubated patients with HAP/VAP were 12.2% lower for those in the imipenem-relebactam group compared to the piperacillin-tazobactam group. Given the potential for resistance with all of the β-lactam-β-lactamase inhibitor combinations, enhanced antibiotic stewardship will be crucial to ensuring ongoing efficacy of these agents[146].

Novel aminoglycosides

Plazomicin—Plazomicin is a novel semisynthetic aminoglycoside that was derived from the antibiotic sisomicin, a naturally occurring aminoglycoside discovered in 1970, and works by binding to the 30s subunit of bacterial ribosomes, inhibiting protein synthesis[147]. Plazomicin has a broad spectrum of activity against *Enterobacterales*, including those with ESBL enzymes and multiple classes of CRE, including class A (KPC), class B (VIM, IMP), and class D (OXA-48)[148–150]. It has shown variable activity against the metallo-beta lactamase NDM-1, largely because NDM-1 often co-produces 16s ribosomal methyltransferases, which modify the 30s ribosomal subunit and prevent aminoglycoside binding[148]. Given this, it may be of limited clinical utility in regions where NDM-1 are endemic.

Plazomicin was approved by the US FDA in 2018 for cUTI[151] following a non-inferiority trial comparing plazomicin to meropenem for cUTI including pyelonephritis caused by *Enterobacterales*[152]. This was later followed by the CARE trial, comparing plazomicin to colistin in combination with adjunctive meropenem or tigecycline in patients with CRE-causing BSI or VAP and found a 26% reduction in death or clinically-significant disease-related complications at 28 days in those who received plazomicin, and with fewer adverse events[153]. The trial was small, however, and the drug was therefore not granted expanded approval for use in BSI[154]. Plazomicin has not been approved by the European Medicines Agency and the application for approval has since been withdrawn due to financial reasons[155], following the parent manufacturer of plazomicin declaring bankruptcy[156].

Resistance to aminoglycosides most often occurs via aminoglycoside modifying enzymes (AMEs) that reduce the binding affinity for the ribosomal target[157]. Plazomicin has several structural modifications that prevent the activity of most AMEs, thereby reducing the risk of AME-mediated resistance[158]. As noted above, plazomicin cannot overcome modifications caused by 16s ribosomal methyltransferases and bacteria that possess these enzymes are resistant to plazomicin, a concerning finding given that these genes can be transferred horizontally via plasmids[159].

Tetracyclines

Eravacycline—Eravacycline is a fully-synthetic tetracycline developed in 2011[160] that is structurally similar to tigecycline and inhibits bacterial protein synthesis by binding to the ribosomal 30s subunit resulting in broad gram positive and gram negative activity against both aerobic and anaerobic organisms, with the exception of *Pseudomonas*[161]. Eravacycline has activity against CRE including Class A (KPC), class B (VIM, NDM-1) and class D (OXA-48) enzymes [162,163] with consistently lower MICs than for tigecycline[162–164]. While it has reasonably high oral bioavailability, only IV formulations are available currently.

A pooled analysis of two phase III trials evaluating eravacycline for cIAI showed non-inferiority compared to ertapenem and meropenem, although with higher levels of nausea, vomiting, and diarrhea compared to the carbapenems[165]. The results of these studies led to approval for the drug in 2018 by both the EMA and the US FDA for use in cIAI[166,167]. While initially promising as a potential option for urinary tract infections given in vitro activity against biofilms of uropathogenic *E. coli*[168], a phase 3 trial comparing eravacycline to levofloxacin for cUTI failed to show noninferiority and thus it was not approved for this indication[166,169].

Resistance to tetracycline antibiotics most often occurs via active drug efflux pumps encoded via *tet* genes, and ribosomal protection proteins[170]. Eravacycline evades these resistance mechanisms via a modified D ring side chain that maintains the drug's efficacy[160,171]. Notably, the enzyme Tet(X) is a tetracycline destructase that enzymatically inactivates tetracyclines and is active against eravacycline[172]. This enzyme can be located on mobile genetic elements and has been shown to confer resistance to eravacycline. It has been found in various organisms, including *E. coli*, and can be found as asymptomatic carriage in human gut flora[92,173], indicating the potential for spread of eravacycline resistance.

Omadacycline—Omadacycline is a semisynthetic tetracycline that most closely resembles tigecycline but with an aminomethyl group at the C9 position[174]. Similar to eravacycline, this substitution results in broad gram positive and gram negative activity and resistance to the activity of the *tet* efflux pumps and ribosomal protection proteins[174,175]. Two phase-3 trials showed IV omadacycline to be noninferior to IV linezolid and IV moxifloxacin for acute bacterial skin and skin structure infection (ABSSSI) and community acquired bacterial pneumonia (CABP), respectively[176,177]. Subsequently, the OASIS-2 trial showed noninferiority of oral omadacycline to oral linezolid for ABSSTI[178]. Approval was obtained from the FDA in 2018 for both oral and IV formulations for ABSSSI and CABP[179]. Approval was sought from the EMA for the same, however the agency requested additional studies for an indication for CABP and the manufacturer of omadacycline subsequently withdrew the application for financial reasons[180].

As with eravacycline, omadacycline is deactivated by the Tet(X) destructase enzyme[172]. A recent study of NDM-producing *Enterobacterales* from the United States found that 59.6% were susceptible to omadacycline, indicating this may be a possible oral treatment option for selected patients infected with CRE[181].

Cephalosporins

Cefiderocol—Cefiderocol is a novel siderophore cephalosporin that acts through a "trojan horse" mechanism that uses the bacterial iron transport system to facilitate antibiotic uptake and evade bacterial defense systems[182]. Once inside the bacterium, cefiderocol has high affinity for several penicillin binding proteins, inhibiting peptidoglycan synthesis and ultimately causing cell death[183]. Modifications in the C3 and C7 side chains of cefiderocol render it highly stable against a variety of β-lactamases, including carbapenemases[184,185]. Cefiderocol has a similar safety profile to other cephalosporins, with the most common adverse reactions being gastrointestinal disturbance, rash, and fever[186].

In vitro studies show activity of cefiderocol against a variety of CRE, including those harboring Class A (KPC), Class B (NDM, VIM, IMP), and Class D (OXA-48-like) enzymes[184,187,188]. Cefiderocol was approved by the FDA in 2019[189] for cUTI and HAP/VAP following a phase 2 non-inferiority trial comparing cefiderocol to imipenem-cilastatin for treatment of cUTI caused by gram negative uropathogens[190] and a phase 3 non-inferiority trial comparing cefiderocol to meropenem for gram negative nosocomial pneumonia[191]. The EMA authorization is broader, and includes gram negative aerobic infections in patients with limited treatment options[192]. The CREDIBLE-CR study was subsequently undertaken to evaluate cefiderocol in serious carbapenem-resistant infections[193]. It found that cefiderocol had comparable clinical and microbiologic effectiveness when compared to the best alternative therapy, however there was an increase in all-cause mortality in the cefiderocol group in those treated for BSI, nosocomial pneumonia, and sepsis[193]. This increase was not seen for cUTI and appeared to be driven largely by *Acinetobacter* infections. The clinical efficacy of cefiderocol against CRE remains to be determined in practice and the FDA approval now includes a warning for increased all-cause mortality as a result of the trial[189].

There is some evidence of emerging resistance to cefiderocol, however it remains rare[194–196]. *In vitro* studies suggest that cefiderocol resistance among *Enterobacterales* is likely due to the co-production of both serine and metallo-beta lactamases, and may be able to be overcome with the addition of avibactam[197].

Phage Therapy—As bacteria become increasingly resistant to chemical antibiotics through mutations and horizontal gene transfer, an area that is gaining increasing attention and promise as a therapeutic option for multidrug resistant organisms is phage therapy. Phage therapy is derived from naturally occurring bacteriophages that use lytic viruses to infect and ultimately lyse bacteria[198]. Phages attach to receptors on the surface of target bacteria and deliver viral genomic material into the bacterial cell. The bacteria then use that genetic material to produce viral copies and package new viral particles which then escape the bacterium via cell lysis. This kills the infected bacterial cell and releases new phage particles to infect other susceptible bacteria, making the process potentially self-amplifying[198], although in clinical practice repeated ongoing dosing is likely required[199].

The use of bacteriophages to treat human infections was first pioneered at the turn of the 20th century and used successfully in several human infections including cholera, plague, and conjunctivitis, however their use was limited and phages soon fell out of

favor with the advent of chemical antibiotics in the mid-twentieth century[200]. Phages have several advantages over antibiotics, including specificity for the infecting organism, self-amplification, self-destruction when the bacterial infection is cleared, ability to penetrate biofilms, and preservation of the commensal human microbiota[201]. However, phages may induce inflammatory immune response[202] and antiviral immunity[203] in humans. The requirement for strain-specific phages may also limit the timely administration and scaling of phage therapy. As antibiotic resistance has increased at an alarming rate, there has been a renewed interest in phage therapy for treatment of multidrug resistant infections.

While use of phage therapy continued in the twentieth century in Georgia, Poland, and Russia[200,204], the first randomized controlled phase I/II trial that met guidelines of good manufacturing practice for phage therapy was the PhagoBurn trial[205]. It was conducted between 2015 and 2017 and enrolled 27 individuals with burn wounds infected with *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* to receive topical therapy with a lytic phage cocktail or standard dressings[205]. The study showed a slower decrease in bacterial burden with phage therapy compared to standard of care, but the study authors note that a low concentration of phage was used. Since then, several case reports have shown efficacy of phages for treating multidrug resistant infections. A case series of 10 patients with highly resistant infections from a single center in the United States showed success with phage therapy in 7 of 10 cases, failure in 2, and uninterpretable results in 1 with few adverse effects[206]. These infections were primarily MDR *Acinetobacter, Pseudomonas*, and *S. aureus*, with one case of a persistent ESBL *E. coli* infection.

Although clinical trials of phage therapy specifically for CRE treatment are lacking, there is promising data from *in vitro* studies. Phages have recently been discovered that show *in vitro* activity against MDR *E. coli* isolates[207], carbapenem-resistant *Citrobacter freundii*[208], and there have been several phages discovered with activity against various strains of carbapenem-resistant *Klebsiella* isolates[209–212]. Additional studies in mouse models show success using phages to treat CRE *Klebsiella* infections[213]. These provide promising options for future studies targeting infections caused by CRE, where few antibiotic options remain or where toxicities preclude their use[198].

As with antibiotics, phages are not immune to the development of bacterial resistance. A variety of resistance mechanisms have been described, including blocking phage attachment and adsorption, cutting phage DNA via the CRISPR system, and mechanisms to block phage transcription, translation, and cell lysis[214]. Combining phages with traditional antibiotics has proven efficacious in some cases[206,215] as a way to overcome these challenges.

Future directions: Antibiotics in the pipeline—The World Health Organization has identified CRE as a critical priority pathogen for prioritizing new drug development[216] and there are several drugs currently undergoing clinical trials that are promising candidates for increasing the armamentarium against CRE. Zidebactam (WCK 5222) is a DBO that functions as both a direct antibacterial and a beta lactamase inhibitor that, when combined with cefepime, has activity against KPC, OXA-48, and several class B carbapenemases[217,218]. Isolates of *Enterobacterales, Acinetobacter spp.*, and *Pseudomonas* spp. collected worldwide showed high levels of susceptibility to the zidebactam/cefepime

combination[219], making this a promising drug for clinical trials. Phase 1 pharmacokinetic studies have shown high plasma concentrations as well as good pulmonary penetration of the drug[220] and it is well-tolerated in individuals with renal impairment, although it requires dose-adjustment[221].

Taniborbactam (VNRX-5133) is a boronic-acid-containing pan-spectrum β-lactamase inhibitor that restores the activity of beta-lactam antibiotics against ESBL and CRE and is considered the first pan-spectrum β-lactamase inhibitor in clinical development[222]. The boronic acids and esters bind to the active-site serine residue of enzymes, including β-lactamases, thereby inhibiting their function, and bicyclic boronates are able to inactivate serine- and metallo-beta lactamases[223]. When combined with the β-lactam drug cefepime, taniborbactam restored *in vitro* activity against all *Enterobacterales* tested, including CRE with class A, B, and D enzymes, as well as ESBL-*Enterobacterales* containing class C enzymes[224]. Studies in animal models showed high *in vitro* activity of cefepime/taniborbactam against *Enterobacterales*[225] and there is currently a phase 3 trial underway testing cefepime/taniborbactam for cUTI (clinical trials.gov NCT03840148).

LYS228 is a monobactam antibiotic, similar to aztreonam, that retains activity against metallo-β-lactamases but with structural changes that also provide activity against the serine β-lactamases[226] by targeting penicillin binding protein 3. *In vitro* studies have shown potent activity against Class A (KPC) and Class B (NDM) carbapenemases[227,228]. Pharmacokinetic studies showed good safety and tolerability[229]. Two phase 2 trials of LYS228 were underway when Novartis, the parent company that developed LYS228, licensed the drug to Boston Pharmaceuticals for further development[230]. The proposed clinical trials were halted and as of publication there are no additional trials for LYS228/BOS228 yet registered with clinicaltrials.gov.

Nacubactam is a bridged diazabicyclooctane β-lactamase inhibitor that inactivates class A and class C β-lactamases and functions both as an independent antibiotic as well as providing “enhancement” when combined with β-lactam antibiotics with potent activity against *Enterobacterales*[231]. When combined with meropenem, nacubactam has shown strong *in vitro* activity against class A and class D carbapenemases as well as class C ESBL enzymes[232] and has shown some activity against the metallo-β-lactamases[233]. Phase 1 pharmacokinetic trials showed it to be well-tolerated without significant adverse reactions[234].

Conclusion

The spread of carbapenem-resistant *Enterobacterales* is an urgent public health issue and represents a threat to antibiotic efficacy worldwide. There are several treatment classes currently available to clinicians to treat these infections including “traditional” antibiotics that have retained anti-CRE-activity, novel β-lactam-β-lactamase inhibitor combinations that have come on the market in the last decade, and novel aminoglycosides, tetracyclines, and cephalosporins. Local resistance patterns and the regional prevalence of specific carbapenemase enzymes are important to consider when selecting therapy, as not all agents have activity against all classes of enzymes. Phage therapy represents a promising alternative

therapy for highly drug-resistant infections, however the applicability of this technology to a broad range of clinical scenarios remains to be seen. With all these treatments, enhanced antimicrobial stewardship will be paramount to ensuring the continued efficacy of these therapies for years to come.

References:

1. The World Health Organization. Antibiotic resistance. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/antibiotic-resistance.
2. United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Clinicians: Information about CRE. https://www.cdc.gov/hai/organisms/cre/cre-clinicians.html (2019).
3. Papp-Wallace KM, Endimiani A, Taracila MA & Bonomo RA Carbapenems: past, present, and future. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 55, 4943–4960 (2011). [PubMed: 21859938]
4. van Duin D & Doi Y The global epidemiology of carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae. Virulence 8, 460–469 (2017). [PubMed: 27593176]
5. Nordmann P & Poirel L The difficult-to-control spread of carbapenemase producers among Enterobacteriaceae worldwide. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 20, 821–830 (2014). [PubMed: 24930781]
6. Nordmann P, Naas T & Poirel L Global spread of Carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 17, 1791–1798 (2011). [PubMed: 22000347]
7. Bonomo RA et al. Carbapenemase-Producing Organisms: A Global Scourge. Clin. Infect. Dis. 66, 1290–1297 (2018). [PubMed: 29165604]
8. Kelly AM, Mathema B & Larson EL Carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae in the community: a scoping review. Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents 50, 127–134 (2017). [PubMed: 28647532]
9. Barbadoro P et al. Carriage of Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacterales in Adult Patients Admitted to a University Hospital in Italy. Antibiotics (Basel) 10, (2021).
10. Hu H et al. Clinical and Microbiological Characteristics of Community-Onset Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae Isolates. Infect. Drug Resist. 13, 3131–3143 (2020). [PubMed: 32982328]
11. van Duin D & Paterson DL Multidrug-Resistant Bacteria in the Community: An Update. Infect. Dis. Clin. North Am. 34, 709–722 (2020). [PubMed: 33011046]
12. Taggar G, Attiq Rheman M, Boerlin P & Diarra MS Molecular Epidemiology of Carbapenemases in Enterobacteriales from Humans, Animals, Food and the Environment. Antibiotics (Basel) 9, (2020).
13. Martin A, Fahrbach K, Zhao Q & Lodise T Association Between Carbapenem Resistance and Mortality Among Adult, Hospitalized Patients With Serious Infections Due to Enterobacteriaceae: Results of a Systematic Literature Review and Meta-analysis. Open Forum Infect Dis 5, ofy150 (2018). [PubMed: 30046639]
14. Kohler PP et al. Carbapenem Resistance, Initial Antibiotic Therapy, and Mortality in Klebsiella pneumoniae Bacteremia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol. 38, 1319–1328 (2017). [PubMed: 28950924]
15. Zilberberg MD, Nathanson BH, Sulham K, Fan W & Shorr AF Carbapenem resistance, inappropriate empiric treatment and outcomes among patients hospitalized with Enterobacteriaceae urinary tract infection, pneumonia and sepsis. BMC Infect. Dis. 17, 279 (2017). [PubMed: 28415969]
16. Bartsch SM et al. Potential economic burden of carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae (CRE) in the United States. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 23, 48.e9–48.e16 (2017).
17. Igbinosa O, Dogho P & Osadiaye N Carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae: A retrospective review of treatment and outcomes in a long-term acute care hospital. Am. J. Infect. Control 48, 7–12 (2020). [PubMed: 31431290]
18. Adar A et al. Clinical and Demographic Characteristics of Patients With a New Diagnosis of Carriage or Clinical Infection With Carbapenemase-Producing Enterobacterales: A Retrospective Study. Front Public Health 9, 616793 (2021). [PubMed: 33614584]

19. Voor In 't Holt AF, Severin JA, Lesaffre EMEH & Vos MC A systematic review and meta-analyses show that carbapenem use and medical devices are the leading risk factors for carbapenem-resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 58, 2626–2637 (2014). [PubMed: 24550343]
20. Tamma PD et al. Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidance on the Treatment of Extended-Spectrum β-lactamase Producing Enterobacterales (ESBL-E), Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacterales (CRE), and Pseudomonas aeruginosa with Difficult-to-Treat Resistance (DTR-P. aeruginosa). Clin. Infect. Dis. (2020) doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1478.
21. Ruppé É, Woerther P-L & Barbier F Mechanisms of antimicrobial resistance in Gram-negative bacilli. Ann. Intensive Care 5, 61 (2015). [PubMed: 26261001]
22. Nordmann P & Poirel L Epidemiology and Diagnostics of Carbapenem Resistance in Gram-negative Bacteria. Clin. Infect. Dis. 69, S521–S528 (2019). [PubMed: 31724045]
23. Queenan AM & Bush K Carbapenemases: the versatile beta-lactamases. Clin. Microbiol. Rev. 20, 440–58, table of contents (2007). [PubMed: 17630334]
24. Bush K & Bradford PA Epidemiology of β-Lactamase-Producing Pathogens. Clin. Microbiol. Rev. 33, (2020).
25. Kazmierczak KM, Karlowsky JA, de Jonge BLM, Stone GG & Sahm DF Epidemiology of Carbapenem Resistance Determinants Identified in Meropenem-nonsusceptible Enterobacterales collected as part of a Global Surveillance Program, 2012–2017. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. (2021) doi:10.1128/AAC.02000-20.
26. van Duin D et al. Molecular and clinical epidemiology of carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales in the USA (CRACKLE-2): a prospective cohort study. Lancet Infect. Dis. 20, 731–741 (2020). [PubMed: 32151332]
27. Nordmann P & Poirel L Emerging carbapenemases in Gram-negative aerobes. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 8, 321–331 (2002). [PubMed: 12084099]
28. Palzkill T Structural and Mechanistic Basis for Extended-Spectrum Drug-Resistance Mutations in Altering the Specificity of TEM, CTX-M, and KPC β-lactamases. Front Mol Biosci 5, 16 (2018). [PubMed: 29527530]
29. Walther-Rasmussen J & Høiby N Class A carbapenemases. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 60, 470–482 (2007). [PubMed: 17595289]
30. Hossain A et al. Plasmid-mediated carbapenem-hydrolyzing enzyme KPC-2 in an Enterobacter sp. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 48, 4438–4440 (2004). [PubMed: 15504876]
31. Yigit H et al. Novel carbapenem-hydrolyzing beta-lactamase, KPC-1, from a carbapenem-resistant strain of Klebsiella pneumoniae. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 45, 1151–1161 (2001). [PubMed: 11257029]
32. Deshpande LM, Jones RN, Fritsche TR & Sader HS Occurrence and Characterization of Carbapenemase-Producing Enterobacteriaceae: Report from the SENTRY Antimicrobial Surveillance Program (2000–2004). Microb. Drug Resist. 12, 223–230 (2006). [PubMed: 17227206]
33. Castanheira M, Farrell SE, Deshpande LM, Mendes RE & Jones RN Prevalence of β-lactamase-encoding genes among Enterobacteriaceae bacteremia isolates collected in 26 U.S. hospitals: report from the SENTRY Antimicrobial Surveillance Program (2010). Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 57, 3012–3020 (2013). [PubMed: 23587957]
34. Villegas MV et al. First detection of the plasmid-mediated class A carbapenemase KPC-2 in clinical isolates of Klebsiella pneumoniae from South America. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 50, 2880–2882 (2006). [PubMed: 16870793]
35. Rada AM et al. Dynamics of blaKPC-2 Dissemination from Non-CG258 Klebsiella pneumoniae to Other Enterobacterales via IncN Plasmids in an Area of High Endemicity. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 64, (2020).
36. Navon-Venezia S et al. First report on a hyperepidemic clone of KPC-3-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae in Israel genetically related to a strain causing outbreaks in the United States. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 53, 818–820 (2009). [PubMed: 19029323]

37. Karampatakis T, Antachopoulos C, Iosifidis E, Tsakris A & Roilides E Molecular epidemiology of carbapenem-resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae in Greece. Future Microbiol. 11, 809–823 (2016). [PubMed: 27206024]
38. Gartzonika K et al. Identification of a KPC-9-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae ST258 cluster among KPC-2-producing isolates of an ongoing outbreak in Northwestern Greece: a retrospective study. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 24, 558–560 (2018). [PubMed: 29274461]
39. Vubil D et al. Outbreak of KPC-3-producing ST15 and ST348 Klebsiella pneumoniae in a Portuguese hospital. Epidemiol. Infect. 145, 595–599 (2017). [PubMed: 27788691]
40. Baraniak A et al. Multiregional dissemination of KPC-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae ST258/ST512 genotypes in Poland, 2010–14. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 72, 1610–1616 (2017). [PubMed: 28333331]
41. Tooke CL et al. β-Lactamases and β-Lactamase Inhibitors in the 21st Century. J. Mol. Biol. 431, 3472–3500 (2019). [PubMed: 30959050]
42. Potter RF, D'Souza AW & Dantas G The rapid spread of carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae. Drug Resist. Updat. 29, 30–46 (2016). [PubMed: 27912842]
43. Walsh TR, Toleman MA, Poirel L & Nordmann P Metallo-beta-lactamases: the quiet before the storm? Clin. Microbiol. Rev. 18, 306–325 (2005). [PubMed: 15831827]
44. Walsh TR The emergence and implications of metallo-β-lactamases in Gram-negative bacteria. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 11, 2–9 (2005).
45. Wu W et al. NDM Metallo-β-Lactamases and Their Bacterial Producers in Health Care Settings. Clin. Microbiol. Rev. 32, (2019).
46. Watanabe M, Iyobe S, Inoue M & Mitsuhashi S Transferable imipenem resistance in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 35, 147–151 (1991). [PubMed: 1901695]
47. Malchione MD, Torres LM, Hartley DM, Koch M & Goodman JL Carbapenem and colistin resistance in Enterobacteriaceae in Southeast Asia: Review and mapping of emerging and overlapping challenges. Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents 54, 381–399 (2019). [PubMed: 31369812]
48. Matsumura Y et al. Global Molecular Epidemiology of IMP-Producing Enterobacteriaceae. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 61, (2017).
49. Lauretti L et al. Cloning and characterization of blaVIM, a new integron-borne metallo-beta-lactamase gene from a Pseudomonas aeruginosa clinical isolate. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 43, 1584–1590 (1999). [PubMed: 10390207]
50. Albiger B et al. Carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae in Europe: assessment by national experts from 38 countries, May 2015. Euro Surveill. 20, (2015).
51. Yong D et al. Characterization of a new metallo-beta-lactamase gene, bla(NDM-1), and a novel erythromycin esterase gene carried on a unique genetic structure in Klebsiella pneumoniae sequence type 14 from India. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 53, 5046–5054 (2009). [PubMed: 19770275]
52. Mairi A, Pantel A, Sotto A, Lavigne J-P & Touati A OXA-48-like carbapenemases producing Enterobacteriaceae in different niches. Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis. 37, 587–604 (2018). [PubMed: 28990132]
53. Poirel L, Potron A & Nordmann P OXA-48-like carbapenemases: the phantom menace. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 67, 1597–1606 (2012). [PubMed: 22499996]
54. Pitout JDD, Peirano G, Kock MM, Strydom K-A & Matsumura Y The Global Ascendency of OXA-48-Type Carbapenemases. Clin. Microbiol. Rev. 33, (2019).
55. Walther-Rasmussen J & Høiby N OXA-type carbapenemases. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 57, 373–383 (2006). [PubMed: 16446375]
56. Nordmann P, Dortet L & Poirel L Carbapenem resistance in Enterobacteriaceae: here is the storm! Trends Mol. Med. 18, 263–272 (2012). [PubMed: 22480775]
57. Guzmán-Puche J et al. Characterization of OXA-48-producing Klebsiella oxytoca isolates from a hospital outbreak in Tunisia. J Glob Antimicrob Resist 24, 306–310 (2021). [PubMed: 33545421]
58. Heireman L et al. Toilet drain water as a potential source of hospital room-to-room transmission of carbapenemase-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae. J. Hosp. Infect. 106, 232–239 (2020). [PubMed: 32707194]

59. Shaidullina E et al. Antimicrobial Resistance and Genomic Characterization of OXA-48- and CTX-M-15-Co-Producing Hypervirulent Klebsiella pneumoniae ST23 Recovered from Nosocomial Outbreak. Antibiotics (Basel) 9, (2020).
60. Lyman M et al. Notes from the Field: Carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae Producing OXA-48-like Carbapenemases--United States, 2010–2015. MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep. 64, 1315–1316 (2015). [PubMed: 26633574]
61. Jean S-S et al. Carbapenemase-producing Gram-negative bacteria: current epidemics, antimicrobial susceptibility and treatment options. Future Microbiol. 10, 407–425 (2015). [PubMed: 25812463]
62. Ract P et al. Synergistic in vitro activity between aztreonam and amoxicillin-clavulanate against Enterobacteriaceae-producing class B and/or class D carbapenemases with or without extended-spectrum β-lactamases. J. Med. Microbiol. 68, 1292–1298 (2019). [PubMed: 31361213]
63. Biswas S, Brunel J-M, Dubus J-C, Reynaud-Gaubert M & Rolain J-M Colistin: an update on the antibiotic of the 21st century. Expert Rev. Anti. Infect. Ther. 10, 917–934 (2012). [PubMed: 23030331]
64. Capone A et al. High rate of colistin resistance among patients with carbapenem-resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae infection accounts for an excess of mortality. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 19, E23–E30 (2013). [PubMed: 23137235]
65. Giacobbe DR et al. Risk factors for bloodstream infections due to colistin-resistant KPC-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae: results from a multicenter case-control-control study. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 21, 1106.e1–8 (2015). [PubMed: 26278669]
66. Kai J & Wang S Recent progress on elucidating the molecular mechanism of plasmid-mediated colistin resistance and drug design. Int. Microbiol. 23, 355–366 (2020). [PubMed: 31872322]
67. Band VI et al. Colistin Heteroresistance Is Largely Undetected among Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacterales in the United States. MBio 12, (2021).
68. Seo J, Wi YM, Kim JM, Kim Y-J & Ko KS Detection of colistin-resistant populations prior to antibiotic exposure in KPC-2-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae clinical isolates. J. Microbiol. 59, 590–597 (2021). [PubMed: 33779958]
69. Motsch J et al. RESTORE-IMI 1: A Multicenter, Randomized, Double-blind Trial Comparing Efficacy and Safety of Imipenem/Relebactam vs Colistin Plus Imipenem in Patients With Imipenem-nonsusceptible Bacterial Infections. Clin. Infect. Dis. 70, 1799–1808 (2020). [PubMed: 31400759]
70. Wunderink RG et al. Effect and Safety of Meropenem-Vaborbactam versus Best-Available Therapy in Patients with Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae Infections: The TANGO II Randomized Clinical Trial. Infect Dis Ther 7, 439–455 (2018). [PubMed: 30270406]
71. van Duin D et al. Colistin Versus Ceftazidime-Avibactam in the Treatment of Infections Due to Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae. Clin. Infect. Dis. 66, 163–171 (2018). [PubMed: 29020404]
72. Olowo-Okere A & Yacouba A Molecular mechanisms of colistin resistance in Africa: A systematic review of literature. Germs 10, 367–379 (2020). [PubMed: 33489952]
73. Osei Sekyere J & Reta MA Genomic and Resistance Epidemiology of Gram-Negative Bacteria in Africa: a Systematic Review and Phylogenomic Analyses from a One Health Perspective. mSystems 5, (2020).
74. World Health Organization. The detection and reporting of colistin resistance. https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/277175/WHO-WSI-AMR-2018.4-eng.pdf (2018).
75. WHO | Highest Priority Critically Important Antimicrobials. (2019).
76. Silver LL Fosfomycin: Mechanism and Resistance. Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Med. 7, (2017).
77. Falagas ME, Vouloumanou EK, Samonis G & Vardakas KZ Fosfomycin. Clin. Microbiol. Rev. 29, 321–347 (2016). [PubMed: 26960938]
78. Ito R et al. Widespread Fosfomycin Resistance in Gram-Negative Bacteria Attributable to the Chromosomal fosA Gene. MBio 8, (2017).
79. Huang L et al. Prevalence and mechanisms of fosfomycin resistance among KPC-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae clinical isolates in China. Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents 57, 106226 (2021). [PubMed: 33212165]

80. Michalopoulos AS, Livaditis IG & Gougoutas V The revival of fosfomycin. Int. J. Infect. Dis. 15, e732–9 (2011). [PubMed: 21945848]
81. Falagas ME, Giannopoulou KP, Kokolakis GN & Rafailidis PI Fosfomycin: use beyond urinary tract and gastrointestinal infections. Clin. Infect. Dis. 46, 1069–1077 (2008). [PubMed: 18444827]
82. Michalopoulos A et al. Intravenous fosfomycin for the treatment of nosocomial infections caused by carbapenem-resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae in critically ill patients: a prospective evaluation. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 16, 184–186 (2010). [PubMed: 19694767]
83. Pontikis K et al. Outcomes of critically ill intensive care unit patients treated with fosfomycin for infections due to pandrug-resistant and extensively drug-resistant carbapenemase-producing Gram-negative bacteria. Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents 43, 52–59 (2014). [PubMed: 24183799]
84. US Food and Drug Administration. MONUROL. US Food and Drug Administration https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2011/050717s007lbl.pdf.
85. Dimitrova EK Fosfomycin-containing medicinal products. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/medicines/human/referrals/fosfomycin-containing-medicinal-products (2018).
86. Seifert H, Blondeau J & Dowzicky MJ In vitro activity of tigecycline and comparators (2014–2016) among key WHO 'priority pathogens' and longitudinal assessment (2004–2016) of antimicrobial resistance: a report from the T.E.S.T. study. Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents 52, 474–484 (2018). [PubMed: 30012439]
87. Ni W et al. Tigecycline Treatment for Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae Infections: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Medicine 95, e3126 (2016). [PubMed: 26986165]
88. Sbrana F et al. Carbapenem-sparing antibiotic regimens for infections caused by Klebsiella pneumoniae carbapenemase-producing K. pneumoniae in intensive care unit. Clin. Infect. Dis. 56, 697–700 (2013). [PubMed: 23155147]
89. Tumbarello M et al. Predictors of mortality in bloodstream infections caused by Klebsiella pneumoniae carbapenemase-producing K. pneumoniae: importance of combination therapy. Clin. Infect. Dis. 55, 943–950 (2012). [PubMed: 22752516]
90. Pournaras S, Koumaki V, Spanakis N, Gennimata V & Tsakris A Current perspectives on tigecycline resistance in Enterobacteriaceae: susceptibility testing issues and mechanisms of resistance. Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents 48, 11–18 (2016). [PubMed: 27256586]
91. Yoon EJ, Oh Y & Jeong SH Development of Tigecycline Resistance in Carbapenemase-Producing Klebsiella pneumoniae Sequence Type 147 via AcrAB Overproduction Mediated by Replacement of the ramA Promoter. Ann. Lab. Med. 40, 15–20 (2020). [PubMed: 31432634]
92. Sun J et al. Plasmid-encoded tet(X) genes that confer high-level tigecycline resistance in Escherichia coli. Nat Microbiol 4, 1457–1464 (2019). [PubMed: 31235960]
93. He T et al. Emergence of plasmid-mediated high-level tigecycline resistance genes in animals and humans. Nat Microbiol 4, 1450–1456 (2019). [PubMed: 31133751]
94. Peyclit L, Baron SA & Rolain J-M Drug Repurposing to Fight Colistin and Carbapenem-Resistant Bacteria. Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol. 9, 193 (2019). [PubMed: 31245302]
95. MacNair CR et al. Overcoming mcr-1 mediated colistin resistance with colistin in combination with other antibiotics. Nat. Commun. 9, 458 (2018). [PubMed: 29386620]
96. Hu Y, Liu Y & Coates A Azidothymidine Produces Synergistic Activity in Combination with Colistin against Antibiotic-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 63, (2019).
97. Ng SMS et al. Repurposing Zidovudine in combination with Tigecycline for treating carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae infections. Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis. 37, 141–148 (2018). [PubMed: 29019016]
98. Cebrero-Cangueiro T et al. In vitro Activity of Pentamidine Alone and in Combination With Aminoglycosides, Tigecycline, Rifampicin, and Doripenem Against Clinical Strains of Carbapenemase-Producing and/or Colistin-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae. Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol. 8, 363 (2018). [PubMed: 30406040]
99. Otto RG et al. An alternative strategy for combination therapy: Interactions between polymyxin B and non-antibiotics. Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents 53, 34–39 (2019). [PubMed: 30240838]
100. Zhanel GG et al. Ceftazidime-Avibactam: a Novel Cephalosporin/b-lactamase Inhibitor Combination. Drugs; Auckland 73, 159–177 (2013).

101. Ehmann DE et al. Avibactam is a covalent, reversible, non-β-lactam β-lactamase inhibitor. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 109, 11663–11668 (2012). [PubMed: 22753474]
102. Sousa A et al. Effectiveness of ceftazidime/avibactam as salvage therapy for treatment of infections due to OXA-48 carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 73, 3170–3175 (2018). [PubMed: 30099490]
103. De la Calle C et al. Clinical characteristics and prognosis of infections caused by OXA-48 carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae in patients treated with ceftazidime-avibactam. Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents 53, 520–524 (2019). [PubMed: 30471403]
104. Shields RK et al. Ceftazidime-Avibactam Is Superior to Other Treatment Regimens against Carbapenem-Resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae Bacteremia. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 61, (2017).
105. Tumbarello M et al. Ceftazidime-avibactam use for KPC-Kp infections: a retrospective observational multicenter study. Clin. Infect. Dis. (2021) doi:10.1093/cid/ciab176.
106. Wilson GM et al. Meta-analysis of Clinical Outcomes Using Ceftazidime/Avibactam, Ceftolozane/Tazobactam, and Meropenem/Vaborbactam for the Treatment of Multidrug-Resistant Gram-Negative Infections. Open Forum Infect Dis 8, ofaa651 (2021). [PubMed: 33598503]
107. United States Food and Drug Administration. AVYCAZ safely and effectively. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2019/206494s005,s006lbl.pdf.
108. Mazuski JE et al. Efficacy and Safety of Ceftazidime-Avibactam Plus Metronidazole Versus Meropenem in the Treatment of Complicated Intra-abdominal Infection: Results From a Randomized, Controlled, Double-Blind, Phase 3 Program. Clin. Infect. Dis. 62, 1380–1389 (2016). [PubMed: 26962078]
109. Wagenlehner FM et al. Ceftazidime-avibactam Versus Doripenem for the Treatment of Complicated Urinary Tract Infections, Including Acute Pyelonephritis: RECAPTURE, a Phase 3 Randomized Trial Program. Clin. Infect. Dis. 63, 754–762 (2016). [PubMed: 27313268]
110. Torres A et al. Ceftazidime-avibactam versus meropenem in nosocomial pneumonia, including ventilator-associated pneumonia (REPROVE): a randomised, double-blind, phase 3 non-inferiority trial. Lancet Infect. Dis. 18, 285–295 (2018). [PubMed: 29254862]
111. de Jonge BLM et al. In Vitro Susceptibility to Ceftazidime-Avibactam of Carbapenem-Nonsusceptible Enterobacteriaceae Isolates Collected during the INFORM Global Surveillance Study (2012 to 2014). Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 60, 3163–3169 (2016). [PubMed: 26926648]
112. Spiliopoulou I, Kazmierczak K & Stone GG In vitro activity of ceftazidime/avibactam against isolates of carbapenem-non-susceptible Enterobacteriaceae collected during the INFORM global surveillance programme (2015–17). J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 75, 384–391 (2020). [PubMed: 31742604]
113. Nelson K et al. Resistance to Ceftazidime-Avibactam Is Due to Transposition of KPC in a Porin-Deficient Strain of Klebsiella pneumoniae with Increased Efflux Activity. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 61, (2017).
114. Humphries RM & Hemarajata P Resistance to Ceftazidime-Avibactam in Klebsiella pneumoniae Due to Porin Mutations and the Increased Expression of KPC-3. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 61, (2017).
115. Humphries RM et al. First Report of Ceftazidime-Avibactam Resistance in a KPC-3-Expressing Klebsiella pneumoniae Isolate. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 59, 6605–6607 (2015). [PubMed: 26195508]
116. Shields RK et al. Emergence of Ceftazidime-Avibactam Resistance Due to Plasmid-Borne blaKPC-3 Mutations during Treatment of Carbapenem-Resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae Infections. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 61, (2017).
117. Poirel L et al. KPC-50 Confers Resistance to Ceftazidime-Avibactam Associated with Reduced Carbapenemase Activity. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 64, (2020).
118. Winkler ML, Papp-Wallace KM & Bonomo RA Activity of ceftazidime/avibactam against isogenic strains of Escherichia coli containing KPC and SHV β-lactamases with single amino acid substitutions in the Ω-loop. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 70, 2279–2286 (2015). [PubMed: 25957381]

119. Shields RK et al. Clinical Outcomes, Drug Toxicity, and Emergence of Ceftazidime-Avibactam Resistance Among Patients Treated for Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae Infections. Clin. Infect. Dis. 63, 1615–1618 (2016). [PubMed: 27624958]
120. Zhang Y, Kashikar A, Brown CA, Denys G & Bush K Unusual Escherichia coli PBP 3 Insertion Sequence Identified from a Collection of Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae Tested In Vitro with a Combination of Ceftazidime-, Ceftaroline-, or Aztreonam-Avibactam. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 61, (2017).
121. Maraki S et al. Ceftazidime-avibactam, meropenen-vaborbactam, and imipenem-relebactam in combination with aztreonam against multidrug-resistant, metallo-β-lactamase-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae. Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis. (2021) doi:10.1007/s10096-021-04197-3.
122. Shields RK & Doi Y Aztreonam Combination Therapy: An Answer to Metallo-β-Lactamase-Producing Gram-Negative Bacteria? Clin. Infect. Dis. 71, 1099–1101 (2020). [PubMed: 31802110]
123. Karlowsky JA et al. In Vitro Activity of Aztreonam-Avibactam against Enterobacteriaceae and Pseudomonas aeruginosa Isolated by Clinical Laboratories in 40 Countries from 2012 to 2015. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 61, (2017).
124. Shaw E et al. Clinical outcomes after combination treatment with ceftazidime/avibactam and aztreonam for NDM-1/OXA-48/CTX-M-15-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae infection. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 73, 1104–1106 (2018). [PubMed: 29272413]
125. Falcone M et al. Efficacy of ceftazidime-avibactam plus aztreonam in patients with bloodstream infections caused by MBL- producing Enterobacterales. Clin. Infect. Dis. (2020) doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa586.
126. Alghoribi MF et al. Successful treatment of infective endocarditis due to pandrug-resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae with ceftazidime-avibactam and aztreonam. Sci. Rep. 11, 9684 (2021). [PubMed: 33958683]
127. Efficacy, Safety, and Tolerability of ATM-AVI in the Treatment of Serious Infection Due to MBL-producing Gram-negative Bacteria. https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03580044.
128. Cornely OA et al. Pharmacokinetics and safety of aztreonam/avibactam for the treatment of complicated intra-abdominal infections in hospitalized adults: results from the REJUVENATE study. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 75, 618–627 (2020). [PubMed: 31828337]
129. United States Food and Drug Administration. VABOMERE (meropenem and vaborbactam) for injection. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2017/209776lbl.pdf.
130. European Medicines Agency. Vaborem. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/medicines/human/EPAR/vaborem (2018).
131. Cho JC, Zmarlicka MT, Shaeer KM & Pardo J Meropenem/Vaborbactam, the First Carbapenem/β-Lactamase Inhibitor Combination. Ann. Pharmacother. 52, 769–779 (2018). [PubMed: 29514462]
132. Hecker SJ et al. Discovery of a Cyclic Boronic Acid β-Lactamase Inhibitor (RPX7009) with Utility vs Class A Serine Carbapenemases. J. Med. Chem. 58, 3682–3692 (2015). [PubMed: 25782055]
133. Lomovskaya O et al. Vaborbactam: Spectrum of Beta-Lactamase Inhibition and Impact of Resistance Mechanisms on Activity in Enterobacteriaceae. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 61, (2017).
134. Castanheira M, Huband MD, Mendes RE & Flamm RK Meropenem-Vaborbactam Tested against Contemporary Gram-Negative Isolates Collected Worldwide during 2014, Including Carbapenem-Resistant, KPC-Producing, Multidrug-Resistant, and Extensively Drug-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 61, (2017).
135. Kaye KS et al. Effect of Meropenem-Vaborbactam vs Piperacillin-Tazobactam on Clinical Cure or Improvement and Microbial Eradication in Complicated Urinary Tract Infection: The TANGO I Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA 319, 788–799 (2018). [PubMed: 29486041]
136. Sun D, Rubio-Aparicio D, Nelson K, Dudley MN & Lomovskaya O Meropenem-Vaborbactam Resistance Selection, Resistance Prevention, and Molecular Mechanisms in Mutants of KPC-Producing Klebsiella pneumoniae. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 61, (2017).

137. Wilson WR et al. Effects of KPC Variant and Porin Genotype on the In Vitro Activity of Meropenem-Vaborbactam against Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 63, (2019).
138. Dulyayangkul P, Wan Nur Ismah WAK, Douglas EJA & Avison MB Mutation of kvrA Causes OmpK35 and OmpK36 Porin Downregulation and Reduced Meropenem-Vaborbactam Susceptibility in KPC-Producing Klebsiella pneumoniae. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 64, (2020).
139. Olsen I New promising β-lactamase inhibitors for clinical use. Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis. 34, 1303–1308 (2015). [PubMed: 25864193]
140. Zhanel GG et al. Imipenem–Relebactam and Meropenem–Vaborbactam: Two Novel Carbapenem-ß-Lactamase Inhibitor Combinations. Drugs; Auckland 78, 65–98 (2018).
141. Campanella TA & Gallagher JC A Clinical Review and Critical Evaluation of Imipenem-Relebactam: Evidence to Date. Infect. Drug Resist. 13, 4297–4308 (2020). [PubMed: 33268997]
142. Lob SH et al. In vitro activity of imipenem-relebactam against resistant phenotypes of Enterobacteriaceae and Pseudomonas aeruginosa isolated from intraabdominal and urinary tract infection samples - SMART Surveillance Europe 2015–2017. J. Med. Microbiol. 69, 207–217 (2020). [PubMed: 31976856]
143. United States Food and Drug Administration. RECARBRIO. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2019/212819s000lbl.pdf.
144. Smith JR, Rybak JM & Claeys KC Imipenem-Cilastatin-Relebactam: A Novel β-Lactam-β-Lactamase Inhibitor Combination for the Treatment of Multidrug-Resistant Gram-Negative Infections. Pharmacotherapy 40, 343–356 (2020). [PubMed: 32060929]
145. Titov I et al. A Randomized, Double-blind, Multicenter Trial Comparing Efficacy and Safety of Imipenem/Cilastatin/Relebactam Versus Piperacillin/Tazobactam in Adults With Hospital-acquired or Ventilator-associated Bacterial Pneumonia (RESTORE-IMI 2 Study). Clin. Infect. Dis. (2020) doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa803.
146. van Duin D & Bonomo RA Ceftazidime/Avibactam and Ceftolozane/Tazobactam: Second-generation β-Lactam/β-Lactamase Inhibitor Combinations. Clin. Infect. Dis. 63, 234–241 (2016). [PubMed: 27098166]
147. Armstrong ES & Miller GH Combating evolution with intelligent design: the neoglycoside ACHN-490. Curr. Opin. Microbiol. 13, 565–573 (2010). [PubMed: 20932796]
148. Livermore DM et al. Activity of aminoglycosides, including ACHN-490, against carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae isolates. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 66, 48–53 (2011). [PubMed: 21078604]
149. Eljaaly K, Alharbi A, Alshehri S, Ortwine JK & Pogue JM Plazomicin: A Novel Aminoglycoside for the Treatment of Resistant Gram-Negative Bacterial Infections. Drugs 79, 243–269 (2019). [PubMed: 30723876]
150. Walkty A et al. In vitro activity of plazomicin against 5,015 gram-negative and gram-positive clinical isolates obtained from patients in canadian hospitals as part of the CANWARD study, 2011–2012. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 58, 2554–2563 (2014). [PubMed: 24550325]
151. United States Food and Drug Administration. Zemdri. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2018/210303orig1s000lbl.pdf.
152. Wagenlehner FME et al. Once-Daily Plazomicin for Complicated Urinary Tract Infections. N. Engl. J. Med. 380, 729–740 (2019). [PubMed: 30786187]
153. McKinnell JA et al. Plazomicin for Infections Caused by Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae. N. Engl. J. Med. 380, 791–793 (2019). [PubMed: 30786196]
154. Theuretzbacher U & Paul M Developing a new antibiotic for extensively drug-resistant pathogens: the case of plazomicin. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 24, 1231–1233 (2018). [PubMed: 30076976]
155. Dimitrova EK Zemdri: Withdrawn application - European Medicines Agency. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/medicines/human/withdrawn-applications/zemdri (2020).
156. Mullard A Achaogen bankruptcy highlights antibacterial development woes. Nat. Rev. Drug Discov. 18, 411 (2019).

157. Shaeer KM, Zmarlicka MT, Chahine EB, Piccicacco N & Cho JC Plazomicin: A Next-Generation Aminoglycoside. Pharmacotherapy 39, 77–93 (2019). [PubMed: 30511766]
158. Zhanel GG et al. Comparison of the next-generation aminoglycoside plazomicin to gentamicin, tobramycin and amikacin. Expert Rev. Anti. Infect. Ther. 10, 459–473 (2012). [PubMed: 22512755]
159. Roch M et al. Vertical and horizontal dissemination of an IncC plasmid harbouring rmtB 16S rRNA methylase gene, conferring resistance to plazomicin, among invasive ST258 and ST16 KPC-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae. J Glob Antimicrob Resist 24, 183–189 (2020). [PubMed: 33373732]
160. Xiao X-Y et al. Fluorocyclines. 1. 7-fluoro-9-pyrrolidinoacetamido-6-demethyl-6-deoxytetracycline: a potent, broad spectrum antibacterial agent. J. Med. Chem. 55, 597–605 (2012). [PubMed: 22148514]
161. Zhanel GG et al. Review of Eravacycline, a Novel Fluorocycline Antibacterial Agent. Drugs 76, 567–588 (2016). [PubMed: 26863149]
162. Zhang Y, Lin X & Bush K In vitro susceptibility of β-lactamase-producing carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae (CRE) to eravacycline. J. Antibiot. 69, 600–604 (2016).
163. Livermore DM, Mushtaq S, Warner M & Woodford N In Vitro Activity of Eravacycline against Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae and Acinetobacter baumannii. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 60, 3840–3844 (2016). [PubMed: 27044556]
164. Clark JA, Kulengowski B & Burgess DS In vitro activity of eravacycline compared with tigecycline against carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae. Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents 56, 106178 (2020). [PubMed: 32980393]
165. Solomkin JS et al. Eravacycline: a new treatment option for complicated intra-abdominal infections in the age of multidrug resistance. Future Microbiol. 14, 1293–1308 (2019). [PubMed: 31570004]
166. United States Food and Drug Administration. XERAVA (eravacycline) for injection. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2018/211109lbl.pdf.
167. European Medicines Agency. Xerava, INN-eravacycline. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/product-information/xerava-epar-product-information_en.pdf.
168. Grossman TH, O'Brien W, Kerstein KO & Sutcliffe JA Eravacycline (TP-434) is active in vitro against biofilms formed by uropathogenic Escherichia coli. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 59, 2446–2449 (2015). [PubMed: 25624334]
169. Efficacy and Safety Study of Eravacycline Compared With Levofloxacin in Complicated Urinary Tract Infections. https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01978938.
170. Heaney M, Mahoney MV & Gallagher JC Eravacycline: The Tetracyclines Strike Back. Ann. Pharmacother. 53, 1124–1135 (2019). [PubMed: 31081341]
171. Grossman TH et al. Target- and resistance-based mechanistic studies with TP-434, a novel fluorocycline antibiotic. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 56, 2559–2564 (2012). [PubMed: 22354310]
172. Park J et al. Plasticity, dynamics, and inhibition of emerging tetracycline resistance enzymes. Nat. Chem. Biol. 13, 730–736 (2017). [PubMed: 28481346]
173. Ding Y et al. Emergence of tigecycline- and eravacycline-resistant Tet(X4)-producing Enterobacteriaceae in the gut microbiota of healthy Singaporeans. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 75, 3480–3484 (2020). [PubMed: 32853333]
174. Honeyman L et al. Structure-activity relationship of the aminomethylcyclines and the discovery of omadacycline. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 59, 7044–7053 (2015). [PubMed: 26349824]
175. Zhanel GG et al. Omadacycline: A Novel Oral and Intravenous Aminomethylcycline Antibiotic Agent. Drugs 80, 285–313 (2020). [PubMed: 31970713]
176. O'Riordan W et al. Omadacycline for Acute Bacterial Skin and Skin-Structure Infections. N. Engl. J. Med. 380, 528–538 (2019). [PubMed: 30726689]
177. Stets R et al. Omadacycline for Community-Acquired Bacterial Pneumonia. N. Engl. J. Med. 380, 517–527 (2019). [PubMed: 30726692]
178. O'Riordan W et al. Once-daily oral omadacycline versus twice-daily oral linezolid for acute bacterial skin and skin structure infections (OASIS-2): a phase 3, double-blind, multicentre,

randomised, controlled, non-inferiority trial. Lancet Infect. Dis. 19, 1080–1090 (2019). [PubMed: 31474458]

179. United States Food and Drug Administration. NUZYRA (omadacycline). https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2018/209816_209817lbl.pdf.
180. Francisco EM Nuzyra: Withdrawn application - European Medicines Agency. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/medicines/human/withdrawn-applications/nuzyra (2019).
181. Lutgring JD et al. Antibiotic Susceptibility of NDM-Producing Enterobacterales Collected in the United States in 2017 and 2018. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 64, (2020).
182. Möllmann U, Heinisch L, Bauernfeind A, Köhler T & Ankel-Fuchs D Siderophores as drug delivery agents: application of the 'Trojan Horse' strategy. Biometals 22, 615–624 (2009). [PubMed: 19214755]
183. El-Lababidi RM & Rizk JG Cefiderocol: A Siderophore Cephalosporin. Ann. Pharmacother. 54, 1215–1231 (2020). [PubMed: 32522005]
184. Ito-Horiyama T et al. Stability of Novel Siderophore Cephalosporin S-649266 against Clinically Relevant Carbapenemases. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 60, 4384–4386 (2016). [PubMed: 27139465]
185. Poirel L, Kieffer N & Nordmann P Stability of cefiderocol against clinically significant broad-spectrum oxacillinases. Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents 52, 866–867 (2018). [PubMed: 30415004]
186. Katsube T, Echols R & Wajima T Pharmacokinetic and Pharmacodynamic Profiles of Cefiderocol, a Novel Siderophore Cephalosporin. Clin. Infect. Dis. 69, S552–S558 (2019). [PubMed: 31724042]
187. Kohira N et al. In Vitro Antimicrobial Activity of a Siderophore Cephalosporin, S-649266, against Enterobacteriaceae Clinical Isolates, Including Carbapenem-Resistant Strains. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 60, 729–734 (2016). [PubMed: 26574013]
188. Zhanel GG et al. Cefiderocol: A Siderophore Cephalosporin with Activity Against Carbapenem-Resistant and Multidrug-Resistant Gram-Negative Bacilli. Drugs 79, 271–289 (2019). [PubMed: 30712199]
189. United States Food and Drug Administration. FETROJA (cefiderocol) for injection, for intravenous use. https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2020/209445s002lbl.pdf.
190. Portsmouth S et al. Cefiderocol versus imipenem-cilastatin for the treatment of complicated urinary tract infections caused by Gram-negative uropathogens: a phase 2, randomised, double-blind, non-inferiority trial. Lancet Infect. Dis. 18, 1319–1328 (2018). [PubMed: 30509675]
191. Wunderink RG et al. Cefiderocol versus high-dose, extended-infusion meropenem for the treatment of Gram-negative nosocomial pneumonia (APEKS-NP): a randomised, double-blind, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. Lancet Infect. Dis. 21, 213–225 (2021). [PubMed: 33058798]
192. Dimitrova EK Fetcroja. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/medicines/human/EPAR/fetcroja (2020).
193. Bassetti M et al. Efficacy and safety of cefiderocol or best available therapy for the treatment of serious infections caused by carbapenem-resistant Gram-negative bacteria (CREDIBLE-CR): a randomised, open-label, multicentre, pathogen-focused, descriptive, phase 3 trial. Lancet Infect. Dis. 21, 226–240 (2021). [PubMed: 33058795]
194. Yamano Y In Vitro Activity of Cefiderocol Against a Broad Range of Clinically Important Gram-negative Bacteria. Clin. Infect. Dis. 69, S544–S551 (2019). [PubMed: 31724049]
195. Hackel MA et al. In Vitro Activity of the Siderophore Cephalosporin, Cefiderocol, against a Recent Collection of Clinically Relevant Gram-Negative Bacilli from North America and Europe, Including Carbapenem-Nonsusceptible Isolates (SIDERO-WT-2014 Study). Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 61, (2017).
196. Hackel MA et al. In Vitro Activity of the Siderophore Cephalosporin, Cefiderocol, against Carbapenem-Nonsusceptible and Multidrug-Resistant Isolates of Gram-Negative Bacilli Collected Worldwide in 2014 to 2016. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 62, (2018).
197. Kohira N et al. Reduced susceptibility mechanism to cefiderocol, a siderophore cephalosporin, among clinical isolates from a global surveillance programme (SIDERO-WT-2014). J Glob Antimicrob Resist 22, 738–741 (2020). [PubMed: 32702396]
198. Kortright KE, Chan BK, Koff JL & Turner PE Phage Therapy: A Renewed Approach to Combat Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria. Cell Host Microbe 25, 219–232 (2019). [PubMed: 30763536]

199. Dedrick RM et al. Engineered bacteriophages for treatment of a patient with a disseminated drug-resistant Mycobacterium abscessus. Nat. Med. 25, 730–733 (2019). [PubMed: 31068712]
200. Gordillo Altamirano FL & Barr JJ Phage Therapy in the Postantibiotic Era. Clin. Microbiol. Rev. 32, (2019).
201. Rehman S, Ali Z, Khan M, Bostan N & Naseem S The dawn of phage therapy. Rev. Med. Virol. 29, e2041 (2019). [PubMed: 31050070]
202. Reindel R & Fiore CR Phage Therapy: Considerations and Challenges for Development. Clinical infectious diseases: an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America vol. 64 1589–1590 (2017). [PubMed: 28329182]
203. Sweere JM et al. Bacteriophage trigger antiviral immunity and prevent clearance of bacterial infection. Science 363, (2019).
204. Chanishvili N Phage therapy--history from Twort and d'Herelle through Soviet experience to current approaches. Adv. Virus Res. 83, 3–40 (2012). [PubMed: 22748807]
205. Jault P et al. Efficacy and tolerability of a cocktail of bacteriophages to treat burn wounds infected by Pseudomonas aeruginosa (PhagoBurn): a randomised, controlled, double-blind phase 1/2 trial. Lancet Infect. Dis. 19, 35–45 (2019). [PubMed: 30292481]
206. Aslam S et al. Lessons Learned From the First 10 Consecutive Cases of Intravenous Bacteriophage Therapy to Treat Multidrug-Resistant Bacterial Infections at a Single Center in the United States. Open Forum Infect Dis 7, ofaa389 (2020). [PubMed: 33005701]
207. Amarillas L et al. Isolation and Characterization of phiLLS, a Novel Phage with Potential Biocontrol Agent against Multidrug-Resistant Escherichia coli. Front. Microbiol. 8, 1355 (2017). [PubMed: 28785246]
208. Oliveira H et al. Characterization and genome sequencing of a Citrobacter freundii phage CfP1 harboring a lysin active against multidrug-resistant isolates. Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 100, 10543–10553 (2016). [PubMed: 27683211]
209. Li M et al. Characterization and genome analysis of Klebsiella phage P509, with lytic activity against clinical carbapenem-resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae of the KL64 capsular type. Arch. Virol. 165, 2799–2806 (2020). [PubMed: 32989574]
210. Li M et al. Isolation and Characterization of Novel Lytic Bacteriophages Infecting Epidemic Carbapenem-Resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae Strains. Front. Microbiol. 11, 1554 (2020). [PubMed: 32793133]
211. Horváth M et al. Identification of a newly isolated lytic bacteriophage against K24 capsular type, carbapenem resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae isolates. Sci. Rep. 10, 5891 (2020). [PubMed: 32246126]
212. Ciacci N et al. Characterization of vB_Kpn_F48, a Newly Discovered Lytic Bacteriophage for Klebsiella pneumoniae of Sequence Type 101. Viruses 10, (2018).
213. Anand T et al. Phage therapy for treatment of virulent Klebsiella pneumoniae infection in a mouse model. J Glob Antimicrob Resist 21, 34–41 (2020). [PubMed: 31604128]
214. Labrie SJ, Samson JE & Moineau S Bacteriophage resistance mechanisms. Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 8, 317–327 (2010). [PubMed: 20348932]
215. Guo D et al. Genetic and Chemical Engineering of Phages for Controlling Multidrug-Resistant Bacteria. Antibiotics (Basel) 10, (2021).
216. World Health Organization. ANTIBACTERIAL AGENTS IN CLINICAL DEVELOPMENT An analysis of the antibacterial clinical development pipeline, including tuberculosis. (2017).
217. Livermore DM, Mushtaq S, Warner M, Vickers A & Woodford N In vitro activity of cefepime/zidebactam (WCK 5222) against Gram-negative bacteria. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 72, 1373–1385 (2017). [PubMed: 28158732]
218. Thomson KS, AbdelGhani S, Snyder JW & Thomson GK Activity of Cefepime-Zidebactam against Multidrug-Resistant (MDR) Gram-Negative Pathogens. Antibiotics (Basel) 8, (2019).
219. Sader HS, Castanheira M, Huband M, Jones RN & Flamm RK WCK 5222 (Cefepime-Zidebactam) Antimicrobial Activity against Clinical Isolates of Gram-Negative Bacteria Collected Worldwide in 2015. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 61, (2017).

220. Rodvold KA et al. Plasma and Intrapulmonary Concentrations of Cefepime and Zidebactam following Intravenous Administration of WCK 5222 to Healthy Adult Subjects. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 62, (2018).

221. Preston RA et al. Single-Center Evaluation of the Pharmacokinetics of WCK 5222 (Cefepime-Zidebactam Combination) in Subjects with Renal Impairment. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 63, (2019).

222. Liu B et al. Discovery of Taniborbactam (VNRX-5133): A Broad-Spectrum Serine- and Metallo-β-lactamase Inhibitor for Carbapenem-Resistant Bacterial Infections. J. Med. Chem. 63, 2789–2801 (2020). [PubMed: 31765155]

223. Krajnc A et al. Bicyclic Boronate VNRX-5133 Inhibits Metallo- and Serine-β-Lactamases. J. Med. Chem. 62, 8544–8556 (2019). [PubMed: 31454231]

224. Hamrick JC et al. VNRX-5133 (Taniborbactam), a Broad-Spectrum Inhibitor of Serine- and Metallo-β-Lactamases, Restores Activity of Cefepime in Enterobacterales and Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 64, (2020).

225. Abdelraouf K, Almarzoky Abuhussain S & Nicolau DP In vivo pharmacodynamics of new-generation β-lactamase inhibitor taniborbactam (formerly VNRX-5133) in combination with cefepime against serine-β-lactamase-producing Gram-negative bacteria. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 75, 3601–3610 (2020). [PubMed: 32862218]

226. Reck F et al. Optimization of novel monobactams with activity against carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae - Identification of LYS228. Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 28, 748–755 (2018). [PubMed: 29336873]

227. Blais J et al. In Vitro Activity of LYS228, a Novel Monobactam Antibiotic, against Multidrug-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 62, (2018).

228. Dean CR et al. Mode of Action of the Monobactam LYS228 and Mechanisms Decreasing In Vitro Susceptibility in Escherichia coli and Klebsiella pneumoniae. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 62, (2018).

229. Osborn M et al. A First-in-Human Study To Assess the Safety and Pharmacokinetics of LYS228, a Novel Intravenous Monobactam Antibiotic in Healthy Volunteers. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 63, (2019).

230. Novartis licenses three novel anti-infective programs to Boston Pharmaceuticals. https://www.novartis.com/news/media-releases/novartis-licenses-three-novel-anti-infective-programs-boston-pharmaceuticals.

231. Barnes MD et al. Nacubactam Enhances Meropenem Activity against Carbapenem-Resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae Producing KPC. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 63, (2019).

232. Davies DT et al. Discovery of ANT3310, a Novel Broad-Spectrum Serine β-Lactamase Inhibitor of the Diazabicyclooctane Class, Which Strongly Potentiates Meropenem Activity against Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacterales and Acinetobacter baumannii. J. Med. Chem. 63, 15802–15820 (2020). [PubMed: 33306385]

233. Mushtaq S, Vickers A, Woodford N, Haldimann A & Livermore DM Activity of nacubactam (RG6080/OP0595) combinations against MBL-producing Enterobacteriaceae. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 74, 953–960 (2019). [PubMed: 30590470]

234. Mallalieu NL et al. Safety and Pharmacokinetic Characterization of Nacubactam, a Novel β-Lactamase Inhibitor, Alone and in Combination with Meropenem, in Healthy Volunteers. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 64, (2020).

Table 1:

Major carbapenemase enzymes

Ambler class	Major enzymes	Active site	Primary geographic distribution	Treatment notes
A	KPC	Serine	United States, Colombia, Greece	Inhibited by clavulanate, tazobactam
	NMC, SME		Rare	
B	VIM	Zinc	Spain, Italy, Greece	Do not hydrolyze monobactams *
	IMP		Japan, Taiwan	
	NDM		India, Pakistan, Romania, Poland	
D	OXA-48	Serine	Turkey, Mediterranean, Morocco	Low-level resistance against cephalosporins *

* Are often co-occurring with ESBL enzymes that confer resistance to these classes

Table 2:

Spectrum of Activity anti-CRE therapeutics

Agent	Therapeutic Class	Activity against Class A	Activity against Class B	Activity against Class D	Notes
Aztreonam	Monobactam	−	+	+	Not recommended. CRE often have co-occurring ESBL enzymes which render aztreonam ineffective.
Colistin, Polymyxin B	Polymyxin	+/−	+/−	+/−	Limited efficacy, significant toxicities.
Fosfomycin	Phosphoenolpyruvate analogue	+	+	+	Primarily used for urinary tract infections.
Tigecycline	Tetracycline	+/−	+/−	+/−	Typically used as combination therapy.
Ceftazidime-avibactam	β-lactam-β-lactamase inhibitor	+	−	+	Approved for cUTI, cIAI (with metronidazole), HAP/VAP. Can be used with aztreonam for treatment of NDM-producing infections.
Meropenem-vaborbactam	β-lactam-β-lactamase inhibitor	+	−	−	Approved for cUTI, cIAI, HAP/VAP.
Imipenem-relebactam	β-lactam-β-lactamase inhibitor	+	−	−	Approved for cUTI, cIAI by FDA. Approved for HAP/VAP, BSI, resistant GN infections by EMA.
Plazomicin	Aminoglycoside	+	+	+	NDM-carrying CRE often resistant due to 16s ribosomal methyltransferases. Approved for cUTI by FDA. Not approved by EMA.
Eravacycline	Tetracycline	+	+	+	Approved for cIAI by FDA and EMA.
Omadacycline	Tetracycline	+	+	+	Oral and IV formulations. Approved by FDA for ABSSSI and CABP. Not approved by EMA.
Cefiderocol	Cephalosporin	+	+	+	Approved for cUTI and HAP/VAP by FDA. Approved for resistant GN infections by EMA. CREDIBLE-CR study showed increased all-cause mortality.
Phage therapy	N/A	+	+	+	Few clinical trials showing efficacy for CRE at this time. Require specificity for infecting organism, often leading to significant lag time to start treatment.
Zidebactam *	β-lactamase inhibitor	+	+/−	+	Combined with cefepime. Clinical trials pending.
Taniborbactam *	β-lactamase inhibitor	+	+	+	Combined with cefepime. Currently in phase 3 trials for cUTI.
LYS228 *	Monobactam	+	+	+/−	No clinical trials currently underway
Nacubactam *	β-lactamase inhibitor	+	+/−	+	Combined with meropenem. Completed phase 1 clinical trials.

cUTI=complicated urinary tract infection; cIAI=complicated intraabdominal infection; HAP/VAP=hospital acquired pneumonia/ventilator-associated pneumonia; GN=gram negative; ABSSSI=acute bacterial skin and skin structure infection; CABP=community acquired bacterial pneumonia; FDA= United States Food and Drug Administration; EMA= European Medicines Agency.

* antibiotic currently in development