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Abstract

A study was undertaken to compare colistin susceptibility using BMD and Vitek in carbapenem resistant gram negative isolates to evaluate the discrepancies and further course of action. The Broth Microdilution (BMD) technique is reliable and is easy to use method for determining the MIC of Colistin. The results correlated with Vitek system except for 2 isolates which showed very major errors which indicates that in case of resistance to Colistin by Vitek, broth dilution method must be used for correlation and to recheck the result. Also in case of Vitek system showing susceptibility to Colistin, we can safely report those isolates without doing micro broth dilution as we did not encounter any isolates which gave susceptible on Vitek and resistant on micro broth dilution method.
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Introduction

Colistin also known as polymyxin E is an antibiotic produced by certain strains of the bacteria Paenibacillus polymyxa. Colistin is a mixture of the cyclic polypeptides colistin A and B and belongs to the class of polypeptide antibiotics known as polymyxins. Colistin is effective against most Gram-negative bacilli.

Colistin is a decades-old drug that fell out of favor in human medicine due to its kidney toxicity. It remains one of the last-resort antibiotics for multidrug-resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Klebsiella pneumoniae, and Acinetobacter [1]. NDM-1 metallo-β-lactamase multidrug-resistant Enterobacteriaceae have also shown susceptibility to colistin [2].

Colistin has been effective in treating infections caused by Pseudomonas, Escherichia, and Klebsiella species. Colistin is an effective antibiotic for treatment of most multidrug-resistant Gram-negative bacteria. It is used currently as a last-line drug for infections due to severe Gram-negative bacteria followed by an increase in resistance among Gram-negative bacteria.

Colistin resistance is considered a serious problem, due to a lack of alternative antibiotics. Some bacteria, including Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Acinetobacter baumannii, Enterobacteriaceae members, such as Escherichia coli, and Klebsiella spp. have acquired resistance against colistin.

Colistin is increasingly needed for the treatment of infections caused by Carbapenem-Resistant Acinetobacter baumannii (CRAB) isolates [3]. The accurate Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (AST) of colistin is of obvious importance; however, considerable discrepancies have been reported between the available assays. To address this issue, EUCAST and CLSI recently formed a Polymyxin. Breakpoints working group for colistin susceptibility testing [4], which recommended that Broth Microdilution (BMD) is the most valid method for colistin AST. Among the diffusion methods, disc diffusion is unacceptable due to the large colistin molecule, while several studies in the literature have reported considerable discrepancies of the MICs produced by gradient tests [5]. The joint EUCAST/ CLSI working group recently confirmed the problems that both of the available colistin gradient tests (manufactured by bioMe´rieux and Liofilchem) exhibit [6]. Colistin has been traditionally reported by all automated systems like VITEK, Phoenix since many years. CLSI guidelines 2018 issued a correction as follows- the only approved MIC method for testing is broth microdilution method. Disc diffusion and gradient diffusion methods should not be performed. Biomerieux and BD have both issued a product correction notice on the same eventually in 2018.
Study

We have undertaken this study to compare colistin susceptibility using BMD and Vitek to evaluate the discrepancies and further course of action.

Colistin susceptibility is done in our lab using MICROLATTEST marketed by Transasia in India. It is a broth microdilution test which is CE=IVD approved for testing for Colistin. The cut offs provide are 0.25, 0.5, 1.0, 2.0, 4.0, 8.0 and 16.0 mcg/ml.

Breakpoints for Colistin to test Pseudomonas and Acinetobacter spp. are as follows per CLSI 2018. Resistant: >=4 mcg/ml; Susceptible: <=2 mcg/ml

Breakpoints for Colistin to test Enterobacteriaceae spp. are as follows per CLSI 2018. Resistant: >=4 mcg/ml; Susceptible: <=2 mcg/ml

Breakpoints for Colistin to test Enterobacteriaceae are as follows per EUCAST 2019. Resistant: >=2 mcg/ml; Susceptible: <=2 mcg/ml

We have followed EUCAST for Enterobacteriaceae and CLSI for Pseudomonas and Acinetobacter spp.

Recommendations for MIC determination of colistin (polymyxin E)

As recommended by the joint CLSI-EUCAST Polymyxin Breakpoints Working Group Published on www.eucastr.org 22 March 2016 [4].

Colistin (polymyxin E) MIC determination is associated by several methodological issues. The issues have been extensively investigated by the CLSI-EUCAST joint Polymyxin Breakpoints Working Group and the following method for determination of colistin MIC was agreed:

1. Reference testing of Enterobacteriaceae, Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Acinetobacter spp. is by the ISO-standard broth microdilution method (20776-1). Note:
   a) Cation-adjusted Mueller-Hinton Broth is used,
   b) No additives may be included in any part of the testing process (in particular, no polysorbate-80 or other surfactants),
   c) Trays must be made of plain polystyrene and not treated in any way before use,
   d) Sulphate salts of polymyxins must be used (the methanesulfonate derivative of colistin must not be used - it is an inactive pro-drug that breaks down slowly in solution).

2. Susceptibility testing by other methods, including agar dilution, disk diffusion and gradient diffusion, cannot be recommended until historical data have been reviewed or new study data have been generated. Work on these methods is ongoing.

Results

A total of 90 isolates over the 2 months were studied (July-August 2019). All the isolates were carbapenem resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Acinetobacter baumannii and Enterobacteriaceae [7].

1. Carbapenem resistant Enterobacteriaceae are a majority of the isolates which comprises of 71.11% of all the isolates (Table 1).
2. Urine forms the bulk of samples with carbapenem resistant gram negative isolates (67.77%) (Table 2).
3. Klebsiella causing UTI is the predominant isolate-sample wise followed by E. coli and Pseudomonas in urine (Table 3).
4. 1 out of 21 E. coli isolates showed discrepancy, and 1 out of 40 Klebsiella pneumoniae isolates showed discrepancy. 3 Enterobacter isolates showed no discrepancy (Tables 4 and 5).

Details of the discrepancy (Table 6):

- Minor discrepancy is when there are differences in MIC values obtained by both the methods but no change in category of interpretation.
- Major discrepancy is when difference in MIC values cause difference in category of interpretation.

Discussion

1. Carbapenem resistant Enterobacteriaceae are a majority of the isolates. Klebsiella (28.88%) causing UTI is the predominant isolate-sample wise followed by E. coli (18.88%) and Pseudomonas (13.33%) in urine. Study carried out by Zilberberg et al. [8] showed similar findings of Klebsiella being the predominant isolate.
2. Urine forms the bulk of samples with carbapenem resistant gram negative isolates (67.77%). Study by Zilberberg et al. [8] showed similar findings of UTI contributing to carbapenem resistant isolates.
3. In case of Klebsiella pneumoniae out of 40 isolates in our study, only 1 isolate had a discrepancy in MIC values and the MIC given by Vitek was >=16 mcg/ml. We infer that in case of Klebsiella pneumoniae, reconfirmation by BMD needs to be done only in case of MIC >=16 mcg/ml. More number of isolates will have to be studied to corroborate the above inference.
4. In case of Enterobacter aerogenes, only 3 isolates were studied and had no discrepancy. But the low number of isolates does not allow any conclusion to be made.

Table 1: The carbapenem resistant isolate distribution was as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isolate</th>
<th>No. of isolates</th>
<th>% of isolates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enterobacteriaceae</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klebsiella pneumonia</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. coli</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterobacter aerogenes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-fermenters:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acinetobacter baumannii</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The sample distribution for carbapenem resistant gram negative isolates is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample type</th>
<th>No. of isolates</th>
<th>% of isolates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urine</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sputum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.T. secretions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In case of \textit{E. coli}, out of 20 isolates, 3 had discrepancy in the values of MIC, which was minor error as it did not change the category of interpretation. So reporting by Vitek 2 compact for them can be taken into consideration.

In case of \textit{Acinetobacter}, 7 isolates were studied and had no discrepancies. Tan et al. [9] showed similar findings.

But because the outcome of colistin use is dependent on the exact value of colistin MIC, this testing will have to be continued.

Our study is limited by the fact that we do not have a single case of colistin resistance by BMD. We did not find any such study.

The \textit{Broth Microdilution (BMD)} technique is reliable and is easy to use method for determining the MIC of Colistin. The results correlated with Vitek 2 compact except for 2 isolates which showed very major errors which indicates that in case of resistance to Colistin by Vitek, broth dilution method must be used for correlation and to recheck the result.

2. Also in case of Vitek 2 Compact showing susceptibility to Colistin, we can safely report those isolates without doing micro broth dilution as we did not encounter any isolates which gave susceptible on Vitek and resistant on micro broth dilution method.
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