

Identification of CRE Using Techniques That Every Laboratory Can Perform

18th Annual Chicago Infection Control Conference, May 31, 2013 Paul C. Schreckenberger, Ph.D., D(ABMM) Professor of Pathology Director, Clinical Microbiology Laboratory Loyola University Medical Center <u>pschrecken@lumc.edu</u> Presentation and images are used outside of this presentation, add@ Paul C. Schreckenberger, Ph.D.



Financial Disclo	osures
Type of Affiliation/Financial Interest	Name of Commercial Interest
Salaried Employee	Loyola University Medical Center
Stocks/Stock Options (Does not include Mutual Funds)	None
Independent contractor/ Speaker's Bureau	bioMerieux, Cubist, Forest Laboratories, Hardy Diagnostics, Merck, Remel, Siemens
Consultant/Advisory Committees	Abbott Molecular, BioFire, Forest Laboratories, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Quidel
Research Grants	Abbott Molecular, Becton-Dickinson, BioFire, bioMerieux, Cepheid, Siemens



CLSI Guidance on KPC Testing After Implementing New Breakpoints

- Will Tests for carbapenemases (e.g. Modified Hodge Test) be needed with new carbapenem breakpoints for Enterobacteriaceae?
 - CLSI says No. For patient management, tests for carbapenemases are not necessary
 - If requested, tests for carbapenemases may be done for Infection Control purposes

4

5

• I believe that detecting resistance mechanisms is important and necessary for patient reporting and infection control purposes even in the Community Hospital Setting

(CLSI Jan 2011 M100-S21, p. 55)

(4.5

10

Carbapenems In order to demonstrate this point I will use the example of carbapenem resistance and show how various mechanisms can mediate resistance to carbapenems Some of these mechanisms require that patient reports be modified and some require infection control interventions Laboratories should know which mechanism require intervention and which do not





Need to Distinguish Between Mechanisms of Carbapenem Resistance – Why?

Carbapenemase

0.0

- Isolate likely to be resistant to all carbapenems and other β-lactam agents
- May need to change susceptible reports to resistant for β-lactam drugs
- Need to implement infection control measures such as contact precautions and possibly active surveillance testing
- These are an Infection Control Emergency

Need to Distinguish Between Mechanisms of Carbapenem Resistance – Why? • Cephalosporins combined with porin-loss • Class A ESBL's (CTX-M) + reduced permeability Class A ESBL's (CTX-M) + reduced permeability

- Class C High AmpC + reduced permeability
- These hydrolyze ertapenem more than meropenem or imipenem
 - Not necessarily resistant to all carbapenems (i.e., would not need to change susceptible results to resistant reports for βlactam drugs
- These isolates are MDRO and infection control measures are recommended. However, Healthcare institutions may reserve more aggressive measures for carbapenemase-producing isolates

Why labs should continue to perform Modified Hodge Test and EDTA Inhibition Test on isolates that test non-susceptible to carbapenems

- Knowing the resistance mechanism is important
- The following cases demonstrate 5 different mechanisms of carbapenem resistance. Some require changes in antibiotic reporting, some require infection control notification and some require no action
- Can you tell the difference between them by MIC alone?

9

7

8





Type:	Gram Negative	General Susce	ptibility 143 (GNS-143)
Status:	Final			
Elapsed Time:	13 hours			
Organism:	Klebsiella pne	umoniae		
Source:	Manual			
Demographics:				
		MIC	Instrument	Expert
Ampicillin		>=32	R	Carles and the
Ampicillin/Sull	bactam	>=32	R	
Piperacillin/T.	azobactam	>=128	R	
Cefazolin		>=32	R	
Ceftriaxone		>=64	R	
Ceftazidime		>=32	R	
Cefepime		8	S	
Aztreonam		>=32	R	
Imipenen		<=4	5	
Gentamicin		4	S	
Tobramycin		>=16	R	
Ciprofloxacin		>=4	R	
Levofloxacin		>=B	R	
Trimeth-sulfa		>=320	R	
Nitrofurantoin		64	1	
ESBL		1	Negative	
MIC values in a The presence or production.	ncg/ml (M1) W f other Beta-lac	ait for All tamases (e.g.	AmpC, IRT) may	mask ESB





















Patient Report Case 2

Note the susceptibility pattern in Case 2 is identical to susceptibility pattern seen in Case 1, except in this case we have a chromosomal AmpC that is not MDRO, is not an infection control risk, and does not require modification of the susceptibility report. The following comment is added to our patient report:

"This organism is known to possess an inducible ß-lactamase. Isolates may become resistant to all cephalosporins after initiation of therapy. Avoid ß -lactam-inhibitor drugs"

21

Case 3 #227-1 (9-27-10)

- 88 Y.O. female, bed ridden with Alzheimer's
- Urinary incontinence for >10 years
- Foley cath for 1 year
- Gastrostomy tube since 2001
- Admitted for gastrostomy tube replacement
- Patient pulled out foley catheter
- PMH UTI including MRSA
- Urine culture grew >100,000 Serratia marcescens

22



						F	anel [ata						
Biotype: Organis	m.		70	405346 marcescer	15									
Biochem GLU + SUC + SOR +	RAF - RHA - ARA -	IND + ADO - MEL -	emicals t URE - H2S - INO -	hat are bold LYS + TI ARG - E ORN + V	led and un DA - C SC • M P • Q	nderlined a ST + CL WL - CF INPS - CR	re atypica A AC B CE C - FD	I for the st E - K4 T - NIT 64 • OFF	tored organ - P4 - TAR G • TO4	iism) • •				
MIC Res AM >18	AS >16/8	P/T c=18	CFZ >16	CAX CAX	CAZ ca1	CPE cn4	MER KET	OM cn4	Ø TE	TO <ne< th=""><th>CP ert</th><th>T/S <=2/38</th><th>FD +64</th><th>8A</th></ne<>	CP ert	T/S <=2/38	FD +64	8A
CAZICA	OFT 412	OFTICA	ETP en2 s	amp 1=P	0 AUG >168	8 CRM >16 R	ØLVX eng	8 M07	8 TM	1				
Extra Te	ets.	ESBL												



















Diagnosis: UTI	cens
amikacin ampicillin cefazolin ceftriaxone ciprofloxacin gentamicin imipenem piper-tazobactam	Mic (ug/mi) Report comment: 1 S "Imipenem-R is due to >32 R carbapanemase >32 R production (but not KPC ≤0.5 S The effectiveness of ≤0.5 S other β-lactams (that tessents) ≤0.5 S due to carbapenemase >16 R -producing S. marcescents ≤8 S has not been established
tobramycin trimeth-sulfa	1 S consult suggested."
	Courtesy Janet Hindle























IMI/NMC-A Enzymes

- Class A imipenemase/non -metallocarbapenemase
- Forms two subgroups; IMI and NMC-A
- Found sporadically in clinical isolates of Enterobacter cloacae and environmental isolates from rivers in USA

Pottumarthy S et al. Emerg Infect Dis. 2003 Aug;9(8):999-1002

 NMC-A enzyme is inducible by cefoxitin and imipenem; and the expression of NMC-A is co -regulated with AmpC by the AmpD gene

Patient Report Case 4

In this case resistance to carbapenems is due to a chromosomal carbapenemase. The organism is not MDRO, is not an infection control risk, and does not require modification of the susceptibility report. The following comment is added to report: "Imipenem-R is due to a chromosomal carbapenemase production but not KPC. The effectiveness of other β -lactams (that test "S) in treating infections due to carbapenemase -producing *E. cloacae* has not been established. Infectious Disease consult is recommended"

39

38

Case 5. (5-12-10)

• Patient is a 40 Y.O. male paraplegic who traveled to New Dehli India for a surgical procedure. 3-4 months after returning to the U.S. patient presents to outpatient center in Chicago with multiple decubitus ulcers and urinary tract infection. Urine collected from foley cath is submitted for culture.

40

|--|

						P	anel [Data				1		
Biotype	ĸ		7	3115012										
Organis	sm Identif	cation:												
0	ganism				% Proba	bility Fo	otnotes	Sp	ecial Char	acteristic	5			_
1.1.1	A/S	PIT	CFZ	CAX >32	CAZ >16	CPE >16	MER >8	GM >8	@ TE >8	TO >8	с x о	T/S ≻2/38	@ FD <=32	AP N
>16 R	>16/8 R	R	R	R	R	R	R	к	n .	к	n	n .		
AZ/CA	>15/8 R CFT	R CFT/CA	R ETP	R	R Ø AUG	R Ø CRM	R Ø LVX	Ø MXF	ØTM	к	~	~		
>16 R CAZ/CA >2	>16/8 R CFT >32 R	R CFT/CA	R ETP >4 R	R IMP 4 S	R Ø AUG >16/8 R	R ØCRM ≻16 R	R ØLVX H R	R 20 MDXF >4 R	071M ≫64 8	ĸ				ĥ

	_















Molecular Class	Carbapenemase	Found in:
А	KPC	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> and other Enterobacteriaceae
	SME	S. marcescens
	also IMI, NMCA, GES	Enterobacteriaceae
В	Metallo beta-lactamases IMP, VIM, GIM, SPM,	P. aeruginosa, Enterobacteriaceae, Acinetobacter,
	NDM-1	S. maltophilia
D	OXA	Acinetobacter baumannii, Enterobacteriaceae
Adapted fro	om Queenan & Bush. 2007	Clin Microbiol Rev. 20:440.









Susc	Int	Res	• • • •		
			Susc	Int	Res
-	-	-	≤1	2	≥4
≤2	4	≥8	≤0.5	1	≥2
≤4	8	≥16	≤1	2	≥4
≤4	8	≥16	≤1	2	≥4
ance Sta entieth In SI docun	andards formation nent M10	or Antimic al Supple 0-S20-U.	robial Sus ement (Jur Wayne, P	ceptibilit ne 2010 A; 2010	у
n e	≤2 ≤4 ≤4 ance Sta entieth In SI docur	≤2 4 ≤4 8 ≤4 8 ance Standards for still document M10	≤2 4 ≥8 ≤4 8 ≥16 ≤4 8 ≥16 ance Standards for Antimic entieth Informational Supple SI document M100-S20-U. CLSI M1	≤2 4 ≥8 ≤0.5 ≤4 8 ≥16 ≤1 ≤4 8 ≥16 ≤1 ance Standards for Antimicrobial Susplement (Jur SI document M100-S20-U. Wayne, P CLSI M100-S20-U.	≤2 4 ≥8 ≤0.5 1 ≤4 8 ≥16 ≤1 2 ≤4 8 ≥16 ≤1 2 ance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibilit entieth Informational Supplement (June 2010 SI document M100-S20-U. Wayne, PA; 2010 CLSI M100-S20-U. Table 2





6



50

