### **FRIDAY-**225

# A comparison of Piperacillin-Tazobactam and Colistin ComASP<sup>™</sup> (SensiTest) MIC to CLSI Broth **Microdilution MIC for Gram Negative Challenge Isolates**

### **Abstract**:

**Background:** The ComASP<sup>TM</sup> (previous product name was SensiTest) was recently developed by Liofilchem to provide a manual broth microdilution option for MIC testing of single antimicrobial agents using a 32-well dried (dessicated) panel. The ComASP Piperacillin-Tazobactam (P-T) includes a wide range of concentrations (0.008-128 ug/mL), which provides for testing of 2 isolates/panel. The ComASP Colistin is configured to test 4 isolates/panel (4 rows each containing 0.25-16 ug/mL). There have been challenges in testing piperacillin-tazobactam by some automated and gradient strip methods. There have also been difficulties in testing colistin by gradient strip methods and an overall lack of testing methods available for colistin. This study was performed as an initial evaluation at a single testing site using challenge organisms specific to each of the two agents. Method: Each strain was tested once with frozen panels (CLSI reference) and by ComASP using the same inoculum in cation adjusted Mueller Hinton broth. Incubation conditions (ambient at 33-37°C for 16-20 hrs) and reading of the MIC were similar for both methods. The strains tested included A. baumannii, Enterobacteriaceae, P. aeruginosa and quality control strains. The colistin challenge set consisted of 52 strains, which were from the CDC resistant collections and included characterized strains with a range of colistin MIC results. The P-T challenge set consisted of 28 strains, which were from the LSI collection and were chosen because the majority of MIC results were near the breakpoints (between 16- $\geq$ 128 µg/mL). **Results:** Colistin and P-T agreement rates and error rates are shown in the table.

Antimicrobial Agent	n	EA	СА	Minor Error Rate						
Colistin	52	98.1%	100%	0%						
Piperacillin/tazobactam	28	100%	75%	25%						
EA - essential agreement (within ± 1 dilution); CA - category agreement										

Although essential agreement rate was 100% for P-T, the category agreement was 75% as a result of 7 strains with MICs that differed by one dilution and were near the breakpoints. **Conclusions:** There was excellent correlation of ComASP and reference broth microdilution MIC results for both piperacillin-tazobactam and colistin. Additional testing, with a larger number of isolates and testing sites, is warranted. The ComASP method is a simple broth microdilution MIC method that would provide an option, other than gradient diffusion, for testing of a single agent as a supplement to a clinical laboratory's automated system.

## Introduction

- Compact Antimicrobial Susceptibility Panels (ComASP<sup>TM</sup>) (Liofilchem, Waltham, MA) are available for a select number of antimicrobial agents, including colistin and piperacillin-tazobactam (P-T). ComASP is a 32 well broth microdilution MIC panel which contain dried antimicrobial agents that are reconstituted with the test organisms in cation adjusted Mueller Hinton broth (CAMHB), incubated and read manually.
- This study was performed as an initial evaluation prior to possible further multi-site and/or 510(k) studies. Currently the ComASP products are available in the US for research use only.
- This study compared the piperacillin/tazobactam and colistin ComASP MIC results to broth microdilution MIC for challenge isolates, which included isolates with MIC results near the breakpoint, as well as resistant isolates.

### References

- 1. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. 2015. Methods for Dilution Antimicrobial Susceptibility Tests for Bacteria that Grow Aerobically. 10<sup>th</sup> ed. Approved standard, CLSI M7-10, Wayne, PA.
- 2. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. 2017 Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. Approved Standard – 27th Edition. CLSI document M100-276 Wayne, PA
- 3. https://www.liofilchem.com/images/brochure/ComASP-range.pdf

## **Methods**

### **Piperacillin-Tazobactam**

Reference Method: Broth Microdilution (CLSI)<sup>1</sup> Test Method: ComASP Piperacillin-Tazobactam<sup>3</sup> (catalog no. 75003, Liofilchem (Waltham, MA) Contains piperacillin-tazobactam in concentrations of 0.008/4-128/4 µg/mL, 3.6 mL vials of CAMHB and sealing film. 2 Isolates can be tested/panel (each box contains 4 panels, 8 tests/box).



# Results

- **CLSI** ranges

L. Koeth. J. DiFranco-Fisher Lab. Specialists, Inc., Westlake, OH

### Colistin

**Testing Site:** Laboratory Specialists, Inc.

MIC Method: Each study isolate and QC strain was tested once by Reference and Test Methods

Reference Method: Broth Microdilution (CLSI)<sup>1</sup> Test Methods: ComASP Colistin<sup>3</sup> (catalog no. 75001, Liofilchem (Waltham, MA) Contains colistin in concentrations of 0.25-16 µg/mL, 3.6 mL vials of CAMHB and sealing film. 4 isolates can be tested/panel (each box contains 4 panels, 16 tests/box)

Escherichia coli ATCC 35218 *K. pneumoniae* ATCC 700603 • *P. aeruginosa* ATCC 27853

- P. aeruginosa ATCC 27853

• Quality Control: All P-T and Colistin ComASP and Reference BMD MIC results were within established

Piperacillin/Tazobactam (Figure 1): P-T ComASP MIC results were within +/- one doubling dilution for 28/28 isolates (100% essential agreement). The bias in selecting strains near the breakpoint, resulted in a category agreement of 75%, however, the excellent essential agreement is the best indication of performance in this study. There was no definitive trending of lower or higher MIC results.

Colistin (Figure 2): Colistin ComASP MIC results were within +/-1 one doubling dilution for 51/52 isolates (98.1% essential agreement). Category agreement was 100%. The trending that was observed (slightly higher ComASP results) occurred at lower MICs (≤0.25-1 µg/mL)

(a) Scatter	rplot (frec	quency	of res	sults a	t each	MIC)																		
ComASP						BM	) Refer	rence	Result	S														
Results	≤0.008	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.12	0.25	0.5	1	2	4	8	16 S	321	64 I	≥128 R									
≤0.008	1																							
0.015																								
0.03																(b)	Tren	ding	Anal	ysis				
0.06																Diffe	ComA	SP						
0.12																			and	Refe	rence BMD			- Total
0.25																≤-2	≤-2 -1 0 1 ≥2 Both ≤(						Both ≥128	
0.5																0	7	7	3	0	1		10	28
1								1												•				
2																(c) I	(c) Essential and Category Agreement S							
4									1	2						Ove	rall	Esse	ntial	Agre	eement	28	/ 28	100.0%
8											1					Ess	entia	al Ag	reem	nent	(evaluable)	14	/ 14	100.0%
100											-	1	2			Cate	gor	y Ag	reem	nent		21	/ 28	75.0%
16.5												L	2							N	linor	7	/ 28	25.0%
32 I												2		2		Ca	rrors	lajor	0	/ 7	0.0%			
64 I														2	3					V	ery Major	0	/ 13	0.0%
≥128 R															10									

(a) Scatterplot (f																					
ComASP			BMD	Refere																	
Results	≤0.25	0.5	1	2	4	8	16	>16	5 (b) Trending Analysis												
≤0.25									Difference in the number of wells between												
0.5	8	1							ComASP and Reference BMD												
		-	2						≤-2	-1	0	1	≥2	Both ≤0.25	Both >16	Total					
1	1	/	2						0	3	16	19	1	0	13	52					
2			2	6					(c)	nent Sumr	narv										
4					1	3															
					-				Overall Essential Agreement 51 / 52												
8					1	3			Essential Agreement (evaluable) 29 / 29												
16							3		Category Agreement 52 / 5							100.0%					
										Cate	aorv	Erro	rs	Major	0 / 27	0.0%					
>16							1	13	Very Ma					Very Major	0 / 25	0.0%					

2 P. mirabilis, 1 P. rettgeri, 1 P. stuartii, 2 S. marcescens, 4 A. baumannii, 10 P. aeruginosa Red lines represent CLSI breakpoints for P. aeruginosa and EUCAST breakpoints for Enterobacteriaceae, P. aeruginosa and Acinetobacter spp.

### Conclusions

The ComASP Piperacillin-Tazobactam compared similar to reference BMD against a challenge set of Enterobacteriaceae, P. aeruginosa and A. baumannii isolates. Additional multi-site studies and/or a 510(k) study is warranted.

# asm microbe 2018 07-11 June • Atlanta, GA USA

### Figure 1. Piperacillin/tazobactam ComASP MIC compared to BMD MIC (ug/mL) for 28 Gram negative challenge isolates

Note: MICs displayed with piperacillin concentration only tazobactam concentration was 4 µg/mL \*E. cloacae, 9 E. coli, 2 K. pneumoniae, 1 P. mirabilis, 4 A. baumannii, 10 P. aeruginosa Red lines represent CLSI breakpoints

### Figure 2. Colistin ComASP MIC compared to BMD MIC (ug/mL) for 52 Gram negative challenge isolates\*

\*1 C. freundii, 1 C. koseri, 4 E. aerogenes, 5 E. cloacae, 4 E. coli, K. pneumoniae, 2 M. morganii,

The ComASP Colistin compared similar to reference BMD against a challenge set of Enterobacteriaceae, P. aeruginosa and A. baumannii isolates. Additional multi-site studies and/or a 510(k) study is warranted, however, as a result of the lack of FDA colistin breakpoints, a 510(k) submission is not possible at this time.



