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Abstract

Introduction
Combination therapy is increasingly utilized against extensively-drug resistant (XDR) Gram negative bacteria (GNB). However, choosing a combination can be problematic as effective combinations are often strain-specific. An in vitro antibiotic combination testing (iACT) service, aimed to guide the selection of individualized and rationally optimized combination regimens within 48 hours, was developed. We described the role and feasibility of the iACT service in guiding individualized antibiotic combination selection in patients with XDR-GNB infections.

Methods
A retrospective case review was performed in two Singapore hospitals from April 2009–June 2014. All patients with XDR-GNB and antibiotic regimen guided by iACT for clinical management were included. The feasibility and role of the prospective iACT service was evaluated. The following patient outcomes were described: (i) 30-day in-hospital all-cause and infection-related mortality, (ii) clinical response, and (iii) microbiological eradication in patients with bloodstream infections.
Results
From 2009–2014, the iACT service was requested by Infectious Disease physicians for 39 cases (20 P. aeruginosa, 13 A. baumannii and 6 K. pneumoniae). Bloodstream infection was the predominant infection (36%), followed by pneumonia (31%). All iACT recommendations were provided within 48h from request for the service. Prior to iACT-guided therapy, most cases were prescribed combination antibiotics empirically (90%). Changes in the empiric antibiotic regimens were recommended in 21 (54%) cases; in 14 (36%) cases, changes were recommended as the empiric regimens were found to be non-bactericidal in vitro. In 7 (18%) cases, the number of antibiotics used in combination empirically was reduced by the iACT service. Overall, low 30-day infection-related mortality (15%) and high clinical response (82%) were observed. Microbiological eradication was observed in 79% of all bloodstream infections.

Conclusions
The iACT service can be feasibly employed to guide the timely selection of rationally optimized combination regimens, and played a role in reducing indiscreet antibiotic use.

Introduction
The emergence of extensively-drug resistant (XDR) Gram negative bacteria (GNB) is increasingly recognized as one of the greatest threat to healthcare [1]. Infections caused by these organisms have reported mortality rates of over 50%, and have been associated with increased healthcare costs [2, 3]. This is worsened by the fact that the antibiotic pipeline against GNB has dried out. Consequently, physicians are compelled to resort to ‘old’ antibiotics such as the polymyxins for the treatment of these infections [1, 4].

In the recent years, there have been an increasing number of physicians employing combination antibiotic therapy against XDR-GNB, in particularly against Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Acinetobacter baumannii and Klebsiella pneumoniae [5]. The contentions supporting combination antibiotics are aplenty. When two or more antibiotics are combined, there may be potential additive or even synergistic activity. In addition, combination antibiotics may suppress the emergence of resistant subpopulations, which can otherwise be selectively amplified if only one antibiotic was used [6]. On the flipside, irrational use of antibiotic combinations can worsen the already alarming scenario of antimicrobial resistance [6]. This has led experts to conclude that if combination antibiotics are employed, the most appropriate combination scheme should leverage on the latest in vitro and/or animal infection models, and should be individualized depending on organism, susceptibility profile, infection site and the clinical characteristics of each patient [5, 7].

In view of the current antimicrobial landscape, a prospective in vitro antibiotic combination testing (iACT) service, with a rapid turn-around time of 48 hours, was developed. The objective of the iACT service is to guide physicians in the selection of an individualized and rationally optimized combination therapy, taking into account the in vitro combination testing results of each strain and the patient’s clinical and pharmacokinetic (PK) parameters. In this study, we described the role and feasibility of the iACT service in guiding the selection of individualized and rationally optimized combinations in patients with XDR-GNB infections. In addition, the
clinical and microbiological outcomes of patients receiving iACT-guided therapy were described.

**Materials and Methods**

**Study Design**

A retrospective case review was conducted in two Singapore hospitals: Singapore General Hospital, a 1700-bed public hospital and Mount Elizabeth Hospital, a 272-bed private hospital. All adults admitted from 1st April 2009 to 30th June 2014 with microbiologic evidence of XDR-GNB or pan-drug resistant (PDR) GNB isolation causing clinical infections and treated with antibiotic regimen guided by iACT were identified from the service’s electronic database and retrospectively reviewed. The use of iACT to guide antibiotic combination selection in these patients was elected by their attending ID physicians as part of their clinical management strategy, out of desperate measures. Patients with infections due to an XDR-/PDR-GNB requiring iACT-guided therapy that were classified as cured, and then developed a subsequent infection after a 90-day period due to a different GNB requiring iACT-guided therapy were analyzed as two different cases. This study was approved by the ethics review board of Singapore General Hospital (2012/818/D) and Mount Elizabeth Hospital (PIEC/2012/038) prior to study initiation. The ethics review board of both institutions waived the need for informed consent as the study involved only a retrospective clinical notes review, and all data collected was analyzed anonymously.

**Description of the Prospective iACT Service Workflow**

Before the implementation of the iACT service, the service was introduced to the Infectious Diseases (ID) physicians in the hospitals, to increase awareness of and provide education about the service. Prior to request of the iACT service for a patient with an infection caused by an XDR- or PDR-GNB isolate, the attending ID physician informed each patient (or immediate family member if the patient was incapacitated) of (i) the poor prognostic outcomes of such resistant infections which most or all antibiotics were not effective against, (ii) the nature of the in vitro testing method as a last-resort measure to guide treatment, (iii) alternative treatment strategies (e.g. use of polymyxin monotherapy or selecting combinations based on anecdotal experience), iv) the clinical aims of the iACT guided treatment, and (v) the potential toxicities of the treatment. Verbal consent was sought and documented in clinical notes by the attending ID physician before iACT was requested.

The process of the iACT service is detailed in Fig 1. In vitro combination testing was carried out immediately upon request of iACT for an individual patient. Simultaneously, a clinical ID pharmacist would review the patient’s clinical records and document all relevant clinical information required to develop rationally optimized combination dosage regimens, based on pharmacokinetics (PK) and pharmacodynamics (PD) principles. At 24h, combinations that were at least bacteriostatic (non-cloudy wells) in vitro were identified and fed back as preliminary results to the ID pharmacist. Preliminary recommendations to change antibiotic combinations were made by the ID pharmacist to the attending ID physician, if the initial empiric regimen was not at least bacteriostatic in vitro. At 48h, combinations with bactericidal activity in vitro were elucidated. Based on these in vitro results, the ID pharmacist would select and recommend the most optimal combination(s), with corresponding dosage regimens, to the attending ID physician. Selection was based on the patient’s clinical characteristics, site of infection, PK/ PD parameter for efficacy of each antibiotic and the probabilities of PK/PD target attainment at infected sites. Clinical ID pharmacist followed-up and reviewed the patient’s case notes.
XDRGNB or PDRGNB isolated in clinical culture and ID physician requests for prospective iACT service

**DAY 1:**
- MICs to antibiotics determined using microbroth dilution
- Molecular mechanisms of resistance tested using PCR
- Isolates added to 96-well plates containing 80 two/three drug combinations at clinically relevant unbound concentrations
- Clinical ID pharmacist reviews patient, noting pertinent PK parameters (e.g. weight, renal and hepatic function, fluid status), site of infection and any empiric antibiotic treatment prescribed by the ID physician (selected based on physician’s preference, past experience, or published studies)
- Preliminary results determined based on presence or absence of visible at 24h
- Well contents sampled and plated to enumerate bacterial counts
- Preliminary recommendations were made if initial empiric combination was not at least bacteriostatic in vitro
- Bacterial count enumerated to determine bactericidal combinations (≥ 3log_{10} reduction from baseline)
- Using the in vitro bactericidal results, the clinical ID pharmacist selects the most optimal combination dosage regimen, taking into account the patient’s clinical profile and PK parameters
- Most optimal combination dosage regimen (antibiotics and corresponding doses) recommended by the clinical ID pharmacist to attending ID physician within 48h from request
- Clinical ID pharmacist reviews the patient 24h post-recommendation, to ensure that the patient is placed on the recommended combination dosage regimen

**Fig 1. Summary of the Work Process of the Prospective iACT Service.** Combination antibiotic regimens recommended by the iACT service take into account both the in vitro bactericidal activity of the combinations and the probability of PK/PD target attainment, and are recommended to the attending ID physician within 48h from request. Abbreviations used in Fig 1: GNB = Gram-negative bacteria, iACT = in vitro antibiotic combination testing, ID = Infectious Diseases, MIC = minimum inhibitory concentration PDR = pan-drug resistant, PK = pharmacokinetic, XDR = extensively-drug resistant.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0158740.g001

within 24h post-recommendation, to ensure that the patient was placed on the recommended antibiotic combination regimens.

**Microbiological Methods**
Genus identity was determined using VITEK GNI+ cards (bioMérieux, Hazelwood, MO). MICs to various antibiotics were determined using commercial microbroth dilution panels (Trek Diagnostics, UK), and susceptibility was defined as per CLSI [8]. All *A. baumannii*
isolates were screened for \textit{bla}_{OXA-23-like}, \textit{bla}_{OXA-24-like}, \textit{bla}_{OXA-51-like}, and \textit{bla}_{OXA-58-like} genes using a multiplex PCR assay [9]. For \textit{P. aeruginosa} and \textit{K. pneumoniae} isolates, PCR was employed to detect genes encoding commonly acquired metallo-\(\beta\)-lactamases (MBLs) (\textit{bla}_{VIM}, \textit{bla}_{IMP}, \textit{bla}_{SIM}, \textit{bla}_{GIM}, \textit{bla}_{SPM}) [10, 11]. Analyses of genes encoding ESBLs, AmpC, OXA, KPC and NDM beta-lactamases were also performed for \textit{K. pneumoniae} [10, 11]. Changes in porin gene expression (OmpK35 and OmpK36) were determined for \textit{K. pneumoniae} using RT-PCR, and presence of efflux pump was determined using efflux pump inhibitor phenyl-arginine-\(\beta\)-naphthylamide (PABN) [8, 12].

\textit{In vitro} combination testing was carried out in clear 96-well microtiter plates, modified from a method by Aaron et al [13]. Briefly, 100\(\mu\)L of bacterial inoculum was added to a microtiter plate containing 11 antibiotics in single, two-drug and three-drug combinations (100\(\mu\)L of antibiotic solution per well) at clinically relevant unbound concentrations (Table 1) [14–25]. This gave approximately \(10^5\) CFU/mL (1 \(\times\) \(10^7\)–5 \(\times\) \(10^8\) CFU/mL) of bacteria in each well. The wells were covered and incubated at 35\(^\circ\)C for 24h. At 24h, bacteriostatic combinations were identified based on presence/absence of visible growth in each well. The contents of each well were then sampled and measured to ensure <10% loss in volume. The measured contents were centrifuged at 10,000 \(\times\) g for 15 minutes and the pellet reconstituted to original volume to minimize drug carry-over. Bacterial count was quantified by depositing serial ten-fold dilutions of the sample onto Mueller-Hinton agar plates (BD, Sparks, MD), incubated at 35\(^\circ\)C for 24h, and enumerated visually to determine presence of bactericidal activity. The lower limit of detection was 3.9 \(\times\) \(10^2\) CFU/ml.

### Data Collection and Outcome Measures

All data were extracted from patients’ inpatient charts and electronic medical records and documented in a structured form. Baseline characteristics collected included basic demographics, length of stay, presence of co-morbidities, APACHE II score at time of XDR-GNB isolation, history of intensive care unit stay or hospital stay within 3 months of XDR-/PDR-GNB isolation, and history of antibiotic use within 3 months of XDR-/PDR-GNB isolation. Details pertaining to the infection (causative organism, site of infection, date of isolation, \textit{in vitro} susceptibility data and concurrent infections) and antibiotic use (type and duration of antibiotics used) was also collected. The following roles of the \textit{iACT} service were documented: (i)
confirmation of bactericidal activity in the empirically selected regimen (i.e. no change in the empirical regimen) (ii) change in empiric therapy, based on iACT results, or (iii) reduction of number of antibiotics empirically employed in combination, based on iACT results. If the iACT service recommended changes in an empiric therapy, the reasons for the recommendations were investigated. The time from culture isolation to request for iACT service, as well time from request for iACT service to time of provision of preliminary and final recommendations by the iACT service for each case was also documented.

The following patient outcomes were collected: (i) 30-day in-hospital all-cause and infection-related mortality, (ii) clinical response, and (iii) microbiological eradication (assessed only in patients with bloodstream infections as repeat cultures were not routinely taken for other sites). Adverse drugs events potentially attributable to iACT-guided therapy were documented.

**Definitions**

XDR and PDR were defined as non-susceptibility to at least one agent in all but two or fewer antibiotic categories and non-susceptibility to all agents in all antimicrobial categories respectively [26]. Bacteriostatic activity was defined as the lack of visible growth in the presence of antibiotics at 24h. Bactericidal activity was defined as ≥99.9% decrease in the colony count on subculture of an organism in the presence of antibiotics compared to initial inoculum [13]. An empirical regimen was defined as any antimicrobial regimen employed after isolation of XDR-/PDR-GNB but prior to iACT-guided therapy, selected by the attending ID physician based on individual preference, anecdotal experience or recommendations from published literature.

Infections were defined in accordance to definitions provided by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) [27]. Patients were considered immunocompromised if they had acquired immune deficiency syndrome, were neutropenic (absolute neutrophil count < 500/mm³) or transplant patients on immunosuppressive agents.

Thirty-day in-hospital all-cause and infection-related mortality was defined as all-cause and infection-related death, as determined by the ID physician, that occurred 30 days from isolation of XDR-/PDR-GNB. Clinical response was defined as partial or complete resolution of infection symptoms as determined by the ID physician, irrespective of GNB eradication, while therapeutic failure was defined as worsening at any time or no improvement of clinical conditions by day 14 of therapy as stated by the ID physician. Microbiologic eradication was only assessed for bloodstream infections, and was defined as the clearance of XDR-/PDR-GNB in all follow-up blood cultures. Nephrotoxicity was defined as per RIFLE criteria [28].

**Data analysis**

Categorical data were presented as numbers and percentages; continuous data were presented as mean ± standard deviation, or median (range), depending on the validity of normality assumption. All data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 21 (IBM Corp., New York).

**Results**

**Study Population**

From April 2009 to June 2014, 40 patients received iACT-guided therapy. Of these, three patients were excluded as medical records were not available. Two patients developed two episodes of XDR-/PDR-GNB infection more than 90 days apart and were each analyzed as two different cases. Hence, a total of 39 cases were included.
Baseline Demographics and Clinical Features

The clinical features of the patients were summarized in Table 2. More than one-third of the cases (14/39, 35.9%) were immunocompromised, with solid and hematological malignancies being the commonest co-morbidity (16/39, 41.0%). Most cases received antimicrobial agents prior to the XDR-/PDR-GNB infection (37/39, 94.9%); of these, carbapenems were most frequently prescribed (29/39, 74.4%). Bloodstream infection was the predominant infection (14/39, 35.9%), followed by pneumonia (12/39, 30.8%). Of the 14 cases of bloodstream infections, six (42.9%) were secondary to pneumonia, three (21.4%) were associated with catheter-related infections and three (21.4%) were secondary to intra-abdominal infections.

The XDR- or PDR-GNB pathogens

Table 3 detailed the resistance mechanisms and in vitro susceptibilities of the pathogens. Of the 39 isolates (20 P. aeruginosa, 13 A. baumannii and 6 K. pneumoniae), 31 (79.5%) were XDR and 8 (20.5%) were PDR (four P. aeruginosa, three A. baumannii and one K. pneumoniae). Of the 31 XDR isolates, 19 (61.3%), were sensitive to polymyxin B only. All A. baumannii harbored blaOXA23 and blaOXA51 carbapenemase genes, while 60% (12/20) of the P. aeruginosa isolates harbored genes encoding MBLs (3 blavIM, 9 blaimp). A large variety of mechanisms mediating carbapenem resistance was observed for K. pneumoniae isolates. Amongst the six K. pneumoniae isolates, four (66.7%) K. pneumoniae isolates harbored both genes encoding NDM as well as OXA-181 carbapenemases. Of these, one isolate also demonstrated reduction in porin gene expression, while another had presence of efflux pump as determined by phenotypic methods.

Antibiotic Combinations and Role of the iACT Combination Testing Service

A delay between the time of culture isolation and request for iACT service (median: 4 days; range: 2–47 days) was observed. This delay was attributed to the fact that several ID physicians elected to use empirically selected combinations first upon culture isolation, and only requested for iACT service after the patients failed to respond to the empirically selected combinations. Upon request and isolate receipt, the iACT service provided all preliminary results (based on well turbidity) to the ID physicians within 24h. All final iACT recommendations were provided to the ID physicians within 48h.

Prior to iACT-guided therapy, most cases were empirically prescribed combination therapy (35/59, 89.7%) (Table 4). More than half (21/39, 53.8%) of the cases were prescribed three or more antibiotics in combination empirically. Against P. aeruginosa, polymyxin B plus a carbapenem plus fluoroquinolones or aminoglycosides were the most common three-antibiotic regimen prescribed empirically, while against A. baumannii, polymyxin B plus a carbapenem plus tigecycline or rifampicin were the most common three-antibiotic regimen prescribed empirically. Empiric therapy was changed by the iACT service in 21 (53.9%) cases (Table 5)—the commonest reasons for change was that empiric antibiotic regimens were not bactericidal in vitro (14/21, 66.7%), or that a more appropriate combination regimen, based on the probabilities of PK/PD target attainment at infected sites, could be used (4/21, 19.0%). In 7 (17.9%) patients, the number of antibiotics used in combination empirically was reduced. The iACT service recommended dose changes in 8 (20.5%) patients; most recommendations involved increasing doses or prolonging infusion time to optimize probability of PK/PD target attainment.

Polymyxin B-based two- or three-drug combinations were the commonest iACT-guided therapy prescribed (33/39, 84.6%). Nebulized colistin was initiated in all patients with
Table 2. Demographics and Clinical Features of Patients Receiving *in Vitro* Combination Antibiotic Testing Guided Therapy (No. of cases = 39).

| Characteristics                                      | Mean ± s.d. or median (range) or n (%) |
|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| **Basic Demographics**                               |                                        |
| Mean age ± s.d. (yr.)                                | 56.3 ± 18.3                            |
| Gender                                               |                                        |
| Male                                                 | 27 (69.2)                              |
| Female                                               | 12 (30.8)                              |
| Median days of stay (range)                          | 54 (10–363)                            |
| **Past Medical History**                             |                                        |
| Hospitalisation within 3 months                     | 31 (79.5)                              |
| Intensive care unit stay within 3 months             | 22 (56.4)                              |
| Invasive intervention within 3 months                | 29 (74.4)                              |
| XDR or PDR-GNB infection within 3 months             | 16 (41.0)                              |
| Antibiotic use within 3 months                       | 37 (94.9)                              |
| - Broad-spectrum beta-lactams                        | 14 (35.9)                              |
| - 3rd and 4th generation cephalosporins              | 14 (35.9)                              |
| - Carbapenems                                        | 29 (74.4)                              |
| - Fluoroquinolones                                   | 23 (59.0)                              |
| - Polymyxins (B or E)                                | 11 (28.2)                              |
| **Co-morbidities**                                   |                                        |
| No comorbidities                                     | 4 (10.3)                               |
| Ischemic heart disease                               | 6 (15.4)                               |
| Congestive heart failure                             | 6 (15.4)                               |
| Chronic kidney disease                               | 9 (23.1)                               |
| Type II diabetes mellitus                            | 15 (38.5)                              |
| Hepatic disease                                      | 5 (12.8)                               |
| Solid and hematological malignancy                   | 16 (41.0)                              |
| Immunocompromised status                             | 14 (35.9)                              |
| Median Charlson’s comorbidity index (range)          | 5 (0–14)                               |
| **Type of Infection**                                |                                        |
| Bloodstream infection                                | 14 (35.9)                              |
| - Secondary to respiratory source                     | 6 (15.4)                               |
| - Secondary to line infection                         | 3 (7.7)                                |
| - Secondary to complicated intra-abdominal infection  | 3 (7.7)                                |
| - Other bloodstream infections ^a                     | 2 (15.4)                               |
| Hospital/ ventilator-associated pneumonia             | 12 (30.8)                              |
| Complicated intra-abdominal infection                 | 3 (7.7)                                |
| Osteomyelitis                                        | 5 (12.8)                               |
| Others Infections ^b                                  | 5 (12.8)                               |
| Patients with concurrent infections                   | 10 (25.6)                              |
| Median APACHE II score at time of infection (range)  | 13 (4–31)                              |

^a Other causes of bloodstream infections include, skin and soft tissue infections (n = 1), and complicated urinary tract infection (n = 1).

^b Other infections include complicated urinary tract infection (n = 2), skin and soft tissue infections (n = 2) and mastoiditis (n = 1).

Abbreviations used in Table 2: APACHE II = Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II, GNB = Gram-negative bacteria, PDR = pan-drug resistant, XDR = extensively-drug resistant

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0158740.t002
pneumonia who were prescribed intravenous polymyxin B (16/39, 41.0%). The most common combination recommended against *A. baumannii* infections were polymyxin B plus a carbapenem (7/13, 53.8%). Against the *P. aeruginosa* isolates, polymyxin B plus carbapenem plus aminoglycosides were most commonly recommended (5/20, 25.0%). Antibiotic combination regimens recommended for *K. pneumoniae* infections were highly strain-specific; no single regimen was universally effective against all *K. pneumoniae* strains.

### Clinical and Microbiological Outcomes

The outcomes according to infection type and responsible pathogen are detailed in Table 6. Six (15.4%) cases died due to infection; of these, five were critically ill at the time of initiation of iACT-guided therapy (APACHE II score at time of iACT-guided therapy ranged from 17–30 in these patients). For the remaining patient, the initial episode of ventilator-associated pneumonia resolved upon iACT-guided therapy; however, the patient developed a new episode of sepsis within 30 days and died. Clinical response (cure or improvement) was observed in 13 (33.3%) patients. Of note, clinical response was observed for all seven patients in whom the number of antibiotics used in combination was reduced. Out of the 14 patients with bloodstream infections, 11 (78.6%) had documented microbiological eradication. Thirteen (33.3%) patients developed adverse drugs events: 10 (25.6%) developed nephrotoxicity likely secondary

---

### Table 3. Description of In Vitro Antimicrobial Susceptibility and MIC ranges of XDR- or PDR-GNB (20 Strains of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, 13 Strains of *Acinetobacter baumannii* and 6 Strains of *Klebsiella pneumoniae*).

|                              | *P. aeruginosa* (n = 20) | *A. baumannii* (n = 13) | *K pneumoniae* (n = 6) |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| **Mechanisms of Resistance** |                          |                         |                        |
| VIM (n = 3)                  |                          |                         | ESBLs, NDM & OXA-181   |
| IMP (n = 9)                  |                          |                         | ESBLs, AmpC & OXA-48   |
| **Antimicrobial Agents**     |                          |                         | ESBLs, NDM, OXA-181 &  |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)                | efflux pump (n = 1)    |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 32/16→128/64             | ≥256/4                  | ESBLs, NDM, OXA-181 &   |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 6 (100)                 | 6 (100)                 | porin loss (n = 1)     |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | ≥128/64                  | ≥128/64                 |                        |
| **Ampicillin/sulbactam**     | ND                       | ND                      | ND                     |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 13 (100)                | 8 (69)                  | 4 (66.7)               |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 0.5–32                   | 0.5–32                  | 0.5–32                 |
| **Piperacillin/tazobactam**  | 20 (100)                 | 20 (100)                | 20 (100)               |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)               |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 32/4→256/4               | ≥64                     | 8–64                   |
| **Cefepime**                 | 20 (100)                 | 20 (100)                | 20 (100)               |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)               |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 32–256                   | ≥64                     | 8–64                   |
| **Imipenem**                 | 19 (95.0)                | 20 (100)                | 20 (100)               |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)               |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 32–64                    | ≥64                     | 8–64                   |
| **Meropenem**                | 20 (100)                 | 20 (100)                | 20 (100)               |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)               |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 32–64                    | ≥64                     | 8–64                   |
| **Doripenem**                | 20 (100)                 | 20 (100)                | 20 (100)               |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)               |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 32–64                    | ≥64                     | 8–64                   |
| **Aztreonam**                | 18 (90.0)                | 18 (90.0)               | 18 (90.0)              |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)               |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 8–128                    | NAa                    | 8–128                  |
| **Levofloxacin**             | 20 (100)                 | 20 (100)                | 20 (100)               |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)               |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 32–64                    | ≥64                     | 8–64                   |
| **Tigecycline**              | ND                       | ND                      | ND                     |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 10 (76.9)β               | 10 (76.9)β              | 10 (76.9)β             |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 0.5–32                   | 0.5–32                  | 0.5–32                 |
| **Rifampicin**               | ND                       | ND                      | ND                     |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | NAa                     | NAa                    | NAa                    |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 2–64                     | NAa                    | 8–64                   |
| **Gentamicin**               | 19 (95.0)                | 19 (95.0)               | 19 (95.0)              |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)               |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 4–64                     | ≥64                     | 8 (38.3)               |
| **Amikacin**                 | 16 (80.0)                | 16 (80.0)               | 16 (80.0)              |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)                | 13 (100)               |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 1–128                    | ≥128                    | 8–64                   |
| **Polymyxin B**              | 4 (20.0)                 | 4 (20.0)                | 4 (20.0)               |
| No. of Non-susceptible isolates (%) | 3 (23.1)                 | 3 (23.1)                | 3 (23.1)               |
| MIC range (mg/L)             | 0.5–8                    | NAa                    | 0.5–8                  |

*a* No breakpoints recommended by Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI)

*b* Susceptibility defined as ≤2mg/L, according to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) breakpoints for Enterobacteriaceae

Abbreviations used in Table 3: GNB = Gram negative bacteria, I = intermediate, MIC = minimum inhibitory concentration, NA = not applicable, ND = not done, PDR = pan-drug resistant, R = resistant, XDR = extensively-drug resistant

**doi:**10.1371/journal.pone.0158740.t003
to polymyxin B (n = 8) or polymyxin B plus amikacin (n = 2), two (5.1%) developed non-Clostridium difficile-associated-diarrhea, and one (2.6%) developed confusion secondary to levofloxacin. No death related to the adverse events was observed. Adverse events resolved in all patients who survived (7/10, 70.0%).

### Discussion

This study explored the role and feasibility of a prospective \textit{in vitro} combination testing service in our local setting. We found that the iACT service could provide individualized recommendations

### Table 5. Role of Prospective iACT Service in Guiding Antibiotic Combination Therapy.

| Role of iACT Service | Role of Prospective iACT Service (%) |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Confirmation of empiric therapy | 11 (28.2) |
| Change in empiric therapy | 21 (53.9) |
| - Initial antibiotic regimen not bactericidal \textit{in vitro} | 14 (35.9) |
| - Need for polymyxin-sparing regimen | 3 (7.7) |
| - Optimize therapy based on PK/PD | 4 (10.3) |
| Reduction of no. of antibiotics used empirically in combination | 7 (17.9) |
| Change in doses or dosing regimen | 8 (20.5) |

Abbreviations used in Table 4: iACT = \textit{in vitro} antibiotic combination testing, PK/PD = pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic parameters

---

Abbreviations used in Table 4: iACT = \textit{in vitro} antibiotic combination testing, prior to \textit{in vitro} combination testing were based on personal preference, physician’s past experience or published literature

Abbreviations used in Table 4: iACT = \textit{in vitro} antibiotic combination testing

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0158740.t004
doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0158740.t005
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Table 6. 30-day In-Hospital All-Cause and Infection-Related Mortality, Clinical Response, and Microbiological Eradication Associated with the Type of Infections and Responsible Pathogens.

| Type of infection or pathogen responsible | No. with outcome of interest/ totala (%) | No. without outcome of interest/ totala (%) |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| **30-day in-hospital all-cause mortality** |                                        |                                          |
| All infections and pathogens             | 8/39 (20.5)                           | 31/39 (79.5)                              |
| Based on type of infections              |                                        |                                          |
| - Hospital/ ventilator-associated pneumonia | 4/12 (33.3)                        | 8/12 (66.7)                              |
| - Bloodstream infections                 | 3/14 (21.4)                          | 11/14 (78.6)                             |
| - Complicated intra-abdominal infections | 0/3 (0)                              | 3/3 (100)                                |
| - Osteomyelitis                          | 0/5 (0)                              | 5/5 (100)                                |
| - Other infectionsb                      | 1/5 (20.0)                           | 4/5 (80.0)                               |
| Based on infecting pathogen:             |                                        |                                          |
| - P. aeruginosa                          | 5/20 (25.0)                          | 15/20 (75.0)                             |
| - A. baumannii                           | 3/13 (23.1)                          | 10/13 (76.9)                             |
| - K. pneumoniae                          | 0/6 (0)                              | 6/6 (100)                                |
| **30-day in-hospital infection-related mortality** |                                        |                                          |
| All infections and pathogens             | 6/39 (15.4)                           | 33/39 (84.6)                             |
| Type of infections                       |                                        |                                          |
| - Hospital/ ventilator-associated pneumonia | 4/12 (33.3)                        | 8/12 (66.7)                              |
| - Bloodstream infections                 | 1/14 (7.1)                           | 13/14 (92.9)                             |
| - Complicated intra-abdominal infections | 0/3 (0)                              | 3/3 (100)                                |
| - Osteomyelitis                          | 0/5 (0)                              | 5/5 (100)                                |
| - Other infectionsb                      | 1/5 (20.0)                           | 4/5 (80.0)                               |
| Pathogen responsible                     |                                        |                                          |
| - P. aeruginosa                          | 4/20 (20.0)                          | 16/20 (80.0)                             |
| - A. baumannii                           | 2/13 (15.4)                          | 11/13 (84.6)                             |
| - K. pneumoniae                          | 0/6 (0)                              | 6/6 (0)                                  |
| **Clinical response at end of therapy**  |                                        |                                          |
| All infections and pathogens             | 32/39 (82.1)                          | 7/39 (17.9)                              |
| Type of infections                       |                                        |                                          |
| - Hospital/ ventilator-associated pneumonia | 8/12 (66.7)                        | 4/12 (33.3)                              |
| - Bloodstream infections                 | 12/14 (85.7)                         | 2/14 (14.3)                              |
| - Complicated intra-abdominal infections | 3/3 (100)                            | 0/3 (0)                                  |
| - Osteomyelitis                          | 5/5 (100)                            | 0/5 (0)                                  |
| - Other infectionsb                      | 4/5 (80.0)                           | 1/5 (20.0)                               |
| Pathogen responsible                     |                                        |                                          |
| - P. aeruginosa                          | 16/20 (80.0)                         | 4/20 (25.0)                              |
| - A. baumannii                           | 11/13 (84.6)                         | 2/13 (15.4)                              |
| - K. pneumoniae                          | 6/6 (100)                            | 0/6 (0)                                  |
| **Microbiological eradication at end of therapy** |                                        |                                          |
| Type of infections                       |                                        |                                          |
| - Bloodstream infections                 | 11/14 (78.6)                         | 3/14 (21.4)                              |
| Pathogen responsible                     |                                        |                                          |
| - P. aeruginosa                          | 3/5 (60.0)                           | 2/5 (40.0)                               |
| - A. baumannii                           | 5/6 (83.3)                           | 1/6 (16.7)                               |
| - K. pneumoniae                          | 3/3 (100)                            | 0/3 (0)                                  |

a The denominator reflects the number of patients with the stated infection or infecting pathogen.

b Other infections include complicated urinary tract infection, skin and soft tissue infections and mastoiditis.

c Microbiological eradication was only assessed for patients with bloodstream infections (n = 14).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0158740.t006
for the most optimal combination within a rapid turn-around time of 48h and provided an attractive alternative to selecting antibiotic combinations merely based on individual physician’s anecdotal experience. In addition, we observed promising rates of clinical response and infection-related mortality in patients prescribed iACT-guided combination therapy.

The emergence of XDR-GNB worldwide and in Singapore has caused several paradigm shifts in antibiotic therapy [1]. In addition to the revival of old antibiotics, combination therapy has been increasingly accepted as common practice in the treatment of XDR-GNB infections [6]. Unfortunately, choosing an effective combination can be difficult due to several reasons. Traditional single-antibiotic susceptibility results have limited utility in the guiding the selection of combination therapy against XDR-/PDR-GNB. As a result, the vast majority of combinations can only be chosen empirically, based on individual’s physician’s preference [7]. However, selecting a combination based on anecdotal experience is often counter-productive in our local setting, as resistance is often mediated by more than one mechanism, resulting in strain-specific differences in combinations that are bactericidal, even within a single species. Hence, selecting combinations based merely on anecdotal experience can result in the prescription of an ineffective combination, potentially compromising patient outcomes. In addition, such irrational use of combination antibiotics may perpetuate the cycle of increasing resistance, as well as subject the patients to increased risk of adverse events [7].

The prospective iACT service was developed to guide physicians in managing patients with XDR-/PDR-GNB infections. The service employed a bench-to-bedside approach to design rationally optimized and individualized antibiotic combination regimens based on PK and PD principles. An in vitro combination testing method, designed to systematically test 80 two- and three-drug combinations within 48h, was first employed to prospectively determine the bactericidal activity of antibiotic combinations in vitro against individual strains [13]. Leveraging on the in vitro results, clinical ID pharmacists then selected the most appropriate antibiotic combination, taking into consideration all relevant PK parameters, such as the patient’s comorbidity status, patient’s renal and hepatic function and distribution of the antibiotics to the site of infection. Recommendations made by the ID pharmacists do not merely consist of specific antibiotic combinations; instead, individualized dosage regimens (doses, route and infusion time), optimized to achieve PK/PD targets at the site of infection, were recommended to best maximize efficacy and decrease risk of resistance emergence.

In this study, we observed that most physicians empirically prescribed combination therapy prior to iACT-guided therapy, selected based on previously published literature or based on individual physicians’ past experience [9, 29]. Unfortunately, of these, less than half of these empirically prescribed combinations were found to be bactericidal in vitro, highlighting the inadequacy of selecting combinations based on anecdotal experience in our local setting. Considerable delay was noted between isolation of XDR-GNB and request for iACT service. This is mainly attributable to the fact that the iACT service was not mandatory; as such, several physicians opted to request for iACT service only after patients failed to respond to the initial empiric combination. This can result in the potential benefits conferred by the iACT-guided combination therapy being negated by the delay in time to appropriate therapy, especially in the critically-ill patients. Moving forward, continued education will be required to reinforce the importance of early referral to the iACT service, to ensure the timely prescription of the most appropriate antibiotic combinations.

Our iACT service employed an in vitro combination testing method to guide the selection of antibiotic combinations against each XDR-GNB strain. This can reveal any increased or decreased killing brought about by potential synergy (e.g. mechanistic or subpopulation synergy) or antagonism respectively when two or more antibiotics are combined [30]. In addition to guiding the selection of individualized and rationally optimized combinations in patients
with XDR-GNB infections, we found that the iACT service potentially provided other functionalities. In 20% of the patients, the iACT service reduced the number of antibiotics initially used in combination. This suggests that the iACT service plays a role in antimicrobial stewardship, reducing unnecessary or indiscreet antibiotic use.

Overall, we observed an all-cause mortality rate of 21% in our study patients, which compared favorably to mortality rates reported in other studies. In a study by Crusio et al, all-cause in-hospital mortality was 47% in patients infected with carbapenem-resistant GNB and treated with polymyxin B-based combinations [31]. Similar rates of 30-day all-cause mortality (43%) were observed in study by Durante-Mangoni et al [32]. We acknowledged that the observed differences in observed mortality rates may be contributed by a multitude of factors, such as differences in severity of illness. However, it must be highlighted that the combinations employed for patients in these previously published studies were selected based on anecdotal experience or based on results from previously published studies, and not based on strain-specific in vitro combination testing results as per our study. More than 80% of patients receiving iACT guided combination therapy had documented clinical response in our study. Of note, clinical response was observed for all patients, in whom the number of combination antibiotics used empirically was reduced, suggesting that reducing the number of antibiotics in combination based on iACT did not compromise patients’ outcomes.

To date, only one study explored the use of prospective combination testing to guide therapy in non-cystic fibrosis patients. In a case series by Nakamura et al, a break-point checkerboard plate technique was employed to guide combination selection against multi-drug resistant P. aeruginosa [33]. The study, however, selected combinations based solely on the results of in vitro testing, and did not take into account patient’s PK/PD parameters. Furthermore, the study only reported patients with clinical improvement. In contrast, our study assessed all patients whose antibiotic regimen was prospectively guided by iACT service; in addition to in vitro testing, PK/PD principles were applied as the basis for rational selection of antibiotic combinations and dosing regimens.

Despite our promising findings, this study had several limitations. While we observed promising rates of clinical success and infection-related mortality in our study, we acknowledged that the study was not designed to examine outcomes, as no control group was employed for outcome comparison. Hence, no conclusion could be made with regards to the impact of the iACT service on patient outcomes. Moving forward, a randomized trial will be required to fully evaluate the utility of the service in improving patient outcomes. In addition, given that the iACT service was not mandatory, physicians may be inclined to request iACT service only for certain subset of patients with XDR-GNB infections (e.g. those who did not respond to the initial empiric therapy), which can result in selection bias.

Conclusion

We found that the prospective iACT service can be feasibly implemented to guide the timely selection of rationally optimized combination regimens against XDRGNB, and played an additional role in reducing indiscreet antibiotic use. While further randomized trials will be required to fully evaluate the utility of the service, it is hoped that the prospective iACT service can be continually employed to guide the rational selection of antibiotic combinations, and to reduce indiscreet use of antibiotic combinations.

Acknowledgments

The authors thanked the staff of the SGH Pharmacy Research Laboratory in their support of the study.
Author Contributions
Conceived and designed the experiments: YC TPL JT WL AK TTT ALK THK. Performed the experiments: YC NGC TPL JT. Analyzed the data: YC NGC WL ALK. Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: AK TTT ALK THK. Wrote the paper: YC NGC ALK.

References
1. Boucher HW, Talbot GH, Bradley JS, Edwards JE, Gilbert D, Rice LB, et al. Bad bugs, no drugs: no ESKAPE! An update from the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Clin Infect Dis. 2009; 48(1):1–12. Epub 2008/11/28. doi:10.1086/595011 PMID: 19035777.
2. Nq E, Earnest A, Lye DC, Ling ML, Ding Y, Hsu LY. The excess financial burden of multidrug resistance in severe gram-negative infections in Singaporean hospitals. Ann Acad Med Singapore. 2012; 41(5):189–93. Epub 2012/07/05. PMID: 22760715.
3. Patel SJ, Oliveira AP, Zhou JJ, Alba L, Furuya EY, Weisenberg SA, et al. Risk factors and outcomes of infections caused by extremely drug-resistant gram-negative bacilli in patients hospitalized in intensive care units. American journal of infection control. 2014; 42(6):626–31. doi:10.1016/j.ajic.2014.01.027 PMID: 24725516; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4083852.
4. Zavascki AP, Goldani LZ, Li J, Nation RL. Polymyxin B for the treatment of multidrug-resistant pathogens: a critical review. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2007; 60(6):1206–15. doi:10.1093/jac/dkm357 PMID: 17878146.
5. Kollef MH, Golan Y, Micek ST, Restrepo MI. Appraising contemporary strategies to combat multidrug resistant gram-negative bacterial infections—proceedings and data from the Gram-Negative Resistance Summit. Clin Infect Dis. 2011; 53 Suppl 2:S33–55; quiz S6-8. doi:10.1093/cid/cir475 PMID: 21866447; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3161517.
6. Ahmed A, Azim A, Gurjar M, Baronia AK. Current concepts in combination antibiotic therapy for critically ill patients. Indian journal of critical care medicine: peer-reviewed, official publication of Indian Society of Critical Care Medicine. 2014; 18(5):310–4. doi:10.4103/0972-5229.132495 PMID: 24914260; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4047693.
7. Zavascki AP, Bullita JB, Landersdorfer CB. Combination therapy for carbapenem-resistant Gram-negative bacteria. Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther. 2013; 11(12):1333–53. Epub 2013/11/07. doi:10.1586/14787210.2013.845233 PMID: 24191943.
8. Kitchel B, Rasheed JK, Endimiani A, Hujer AM, Anderson KF, Bonomo RA, et al. Genetic factors associated with elevated carbapenem resistance in KPC-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae. Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy. 2010; 54(10):4201–7. doi:10.1128/AAC.00008-10 PMID: 20660684; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2944623.
9. Lim TP, Tan TY, Lee W, Sasikala S, Tan TT, Hsu LY, et al. In-vitro activity of polymyxin B, rifampicin, tigecycline alone and in combination against carbapenem-resistant Acinetobacter baumannii in Singapore. PloS one. 2011; 6(4):e18485. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0018485 PMID: 21533030; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3080872.
10. Voets GM, Fluit AC, Scharringa J, Cohen Stuart J, Leverstein-van Hall MA. A set of multiplex PCRs for genotypic detection of extended-spectrum beta-lactamases, carbapenemases, plasmid-mediated AmpC beta-lactamases and OXA beta-lactamases. International journal of antimicrobial agents. 2011; 37(4):356–9. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2011.01.005 PMID: 21353487.
11. Teo J, Ngan G, Balm M, Jureen R, Krishnan P, Lin R. Molecular characterization of NDM-1 producing Enterobacteriaceae isolates in Singapore hospitals. Western Pacific surveillance and response journal: WPSAR. 2012; 3(1):19–24. doi: 10.5365/WPSAR.2011.2.4.010 PMID: 23908693; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3729072.
12. Roy S, Datta S, Viswanathan R, Singh AK, Basu S. Tigecycline susceptibility in Klebsiella pneumoniae and Escherichia coli causing neonatal septicemia (2007–10) and role of an efflux pump in tigecycline non-susceptibility. The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy. 2013; 68(5):1036–42. doi: 10.1093/jac/dks535 PMID: 23395112.
13. Aaron SD, Ferris W, Henry DA, Speert DP, Macdonald NE. Multiple combination bactericidal antibiotic testing for patients with cystic fibrosis infected with Burkholderia cepacia. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2000; 161(4 Pt 1):1206–12. Epub 2000/04/14. doi: 10.1164/ajrccm.161.4.9907147 PMID: 10764313.
14. Tod M, Lortholary O, Seytre D, Semaoun R, Uzzan B, Guillervin L, et al. Population pharmacokinetic study of amikacin administered once or twice daily to febrile, severely neutropenic adults. Antimicrobial Agents Chemother. 1998; 42(4):849–56. Epub 1998/04/29. PMID: 9559795.
15. Rebuck JA, Fish DN, Abraham E. Pharmacokinetics of intravenous and oral levofloxacin in critically ill adults in a medical intensive care unit. Pharmacotherapy. 2002; 22(10):1216–25. PMID: 12389872.
16. Conte JE Jr, Golden JA, McIver M, Little E, Zurfluh E. Intrapulmonary pharmacodynamics of high-dose levofloxacin in subjects with chronic bronchitis or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2007; 30(5):422–7. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2007.05.023 PMID: 17716873.

17. Gumbo T, Louie A, Deziel MR, Liu W, Parsons LM, Salfinger M, et al. Concentration-dependent Mycobacterium tuberculosis killing and prevention of resistance by rifampin. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2007; 51(11):3781–8. Epub 2007/08/29. AAC.01533-06 [pii] doi: 10.1128/AAC.01533-06 PMID: 17724157.

18. Kwa AL, Lim TP, Hou J, Kurup A, Prince RA, et al. Pharmacokinetics of polymyxin B1 in patients with multidrug-resistant Gram-negative bacterial infections. Diagnostic microbiology and infectious disease. 2008; 60(2):163–7. doi: 10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2007.08.008 PMID: 17916420.

19. Rodvold KA, Gofried MH, Cwik M, Korth-Bradley JM, Dukart G, Ellis-Grosse EJ. Serum, tissue and body fluid concentrations of tigecycline after a single 100 mg dose. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2006; 58(6):1221–9. Epub 2006/10/03. dkk403 [pii] doi: 10.1093/jac/dkk403 PMID: 17012300.

20. Tam VH, McKinnon PS, Akins RL, Drusano GL, Rybak MJ. Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of cefepime in patients with various degrees of renal function. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2003; 47(6):1853–61. Epub 2003/05/23. PMID: 12760858; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC155813.

21. Jaruratanasirikul S, Sriviriyaajan S, Punyo J. Comparison of the pharmacodynamics of meropenem in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia following administration by 3-hour infusion or bolus injection. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2005; 49(4):1337–9. Epub 2005/03/29. 49/4/1337 [pii] doi: 10.1128/AAC.49.4.1337–1339.2005 PMID: 15793108.

22. Jaruratanasirikul S, Wongpoowarak W, Kositpanawong N, Aeinlang N, Jullangkoon M. Pharmacodynamics of doripenem in critically ill patients with ventilator-associated Gram-negative bacilli pneumonia. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2012; 40(5):434–9. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2012.07.014 PMID: 22959555.

23. Sakk A, Glauer AK, Bulitta JB, Kinzig-Schippers M, Pfister W, Drusano GL, et al. Population pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of continuous versus short-term infusion of imipenem-cilastatin in critically ill patients in a randomized, controlled trial. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2007; 51(9):3304–10. doi: 10.1128/AAC.01318-06 PMID: 17623971; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC204318.

24. LaPlante KL, Sakoulas G. Evaluating aztreonam and ceftazidime pharmacodynamics with Escherichia coli in combination with daptomycin, linezolid, or vancomycin in an in vitro pharmacodynamic model. Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy. 2009; 53(10):4549–55. doi: 10.1128/AAC.00180-09 PMID: 19620335; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2764192.

25. Shea KM, Cheatham SC, Wack MF, Smith DW, Sowinski KM, Kays MB. Steady-state pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of piperacillin/tazobactam administered by prolonged infusion in hospitalized patients. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2009; 34(5):429–33. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2009.07.004 PMID: 19726163.

26. Magiorakos AP, Srinivasan A, Carey RB, Carmeli Y, Falagas ME, Giske CG, et al. Multidrug-resistant, extensively drug-resistant and pandrug-resistant bacteria: an international expert proposal for interim standard definitions for acquired resistance. Clinical microbiology and infection: the official publication of the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases. 2012; 18(3):268–81. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03570.x PMID: 21793988.

27. Horan TC, Andrus M, Dudeck MA. CDC/NHSN surveillance definition of health care-associated infection and criteria for specific types of infections in the acute care setting. American journal of infection control. 2008; 36(5):309–32. doi: 10.1016/j.ajic.2008.03.002 PMID: 18538699.

28. Kellum JA, Bellomo R, Ronco C. Definition and classification of acute kidney injury. Nephron Clinical practice. 2008; 109(4):c182–7. doi: 10.1159/000142926 PMID: 18802365.

29. Lim TP, Lee W, Tan TY, Sasikala S, Teo J, Hsu LY, et al. Effective antibiotics in combination against extreme drug-resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa with decreased susceptibility to polymyxin B. PloS one. 2011; 6(12):e28177. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0028177 PMID: 22162759; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3230594.

30. Yahav D, Farbman L, Leibovici L, Paul M. Colistin: new lessons on an old antibiotic. Clinical microbiology and infection: the official publication of the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases. 2012; 18(1):18–29. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03734.x PMID: 22168320.

31. Crispo R, Rao S, Changawala N, Paul V, Tiu C, van Ginkel J, et al. Epidemiology and outcome of infections with carbapenem-resistant Gram-negative bacteria treated with polymyxin B-based combination therapy. Scandinavian journal of infectious diseases. 2014; 46(1):1–8. doi: 10.3109/00365548.2013.844350 PMID: 24206450.

32. Durante-Mangoni E, Signoriello G, Andini R, Mattei A, De Cristofofo M, Murino P, et al. Colistin and rifampicin compared with colistin alone for the treatment of serious infections due to extensively drug-resistant Acinetobacter baumanii: a multicenter, randomized clinical trial. Clin Infect Dis. 2013; 57(3):349–58. doi: 10.1093/cid/cit253 PMID: 23616495.
33. Nakamura I, Yamaguchi T, Tsukimori A, Sato A, Fukushima S, Mizuno Y, et al. Effectiveness of antibiotic combination therapy as evaluated by the Break-point Checkerboard Plate method for multidrug-resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa in clinical use. Journal of infection and chemotherapy: official journal of the Japan Society of Chemotherapy. 2014; 20(4):266–9. doi: 10.1016/j.jiac.2013.12.005 PMID: 24486172.