AAC Accepted Manuscript Posted Online 27 September 2021
Antimicrob Agents Chemother doi:10.1128/AAC.01105-21

Detection and Characterization of Targeted Carbapenem-Resistant Healthcare-Associated Threats: Findings from The Antibiotic Resistance Laboratory Network, 2017–2019

Sarah Sabour[1#], Jennifer Y. Huang[1], Amelia Bhatnagar[1], Sarah E Gilbert[1], Maria Karlsson[1], David Lonsway[1], Joseph D. Lutgring[1], J. Kamile Rasheed[1], Alison Laufer Halpin[1], Richard A. Stanton [1], Stephanie Gumbis[1], Christopher A. Elkins[1], Allison C. Brown[1]

[1]Division of Healthcare Quality Promotion, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA.

#Corresponding Author: Sarah Sabour, SSabour@cdc.gov.

Running Title: Carbapenemase Organisms Detected in The AR Lab Network

Abstract

Carbapenemase gene-positive (CP) Gram-negative bacilli are of significant clinical and public health concern. Their rapid detection and containment are critical to preventing their spread and additional infections they can cause. To this end, CDC developed the Antibiotic Resistance Laboratory Network (AR Lab Network), in which public health laboratories across all 50 states, several cities, and Puerto Rico characterize clinical isolates of carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales (CRE), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (CRPA), and *Acinetobacter baumannii* (CRAB), and conduct colonization screens to detect the presence of mobile carbapenemase genes. In its first three years, the AR Lab Network tested 76,887 isolates and 31,001 rectal swab colonization screens. Targeted carbapenemase genes (bla_{KPC}, bla_{NDM}, $bla_{OXA\text{-}48\text{-}like}$, bla_{VIM}, or bla_{IMP}) were detected by PCR in 35% of CRE, 2% of CRPA, <1% of CRAB, and 8% of colonization screens tested, respectively. bla_{KPC} and bla_{VIM} were the most common CP-CRE and CP-CRPA, respectively, but regional differences in the frequency of carbapenemase genes detected were apparent. In CRE and CRPA isolates tested for carbapenemase production and the presence of the targeted genes, 97% had concordant results; 3% of CRE and 2% of CRPA were carbapenemase production-positive but PCR-negative for those genes. Isolates harboring bla_{NDM} showed the highest frequency of resistance across the carbapenems tested and those harboring bla_{IMP} and $bla_{OXA\text{-}48\text{-}like}$ genes showed the lowest frequency of carbapenem resistance. The AR Lab Network provides a national snapshot of rare and emerging carbapenemase genes, delivering data to inform public health actions to limit the spread of these antibiotic resistance threats.

Introduction

Carbapenems are critically important β-lactam drugs for treating patients with severe infections caused by Gram-negative bacilli, and resistance to this class of antibiotics is an evolving, global public health problem. Many of these carbapenem-resistant pathogens are common in healthcare environments and of particular concern because of high mortality rates and treatment failures among infected patients(1-3). In 2019, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) published its second report on Antibiotic Resistance Threats In the United States and estimated that antibiotic-resistant infections sicken over 2.8 million people each year in the United States, and more than 35,000 people die from these infections(4). The report reconfirmed carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales (CRE) and multidrug resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* as urgent and serious threats to human health and promoted carbapenem-resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii* (CRAB) as an urgent threat(5).

Production of carbapenemase β-lactamases represent one mechanism by which organisms may acquire carbapenem resistance. They are enzymes that can hydrolyze carbapenems and other β-lactam drugs, rendering them ineffective. Some carbapenemase genes may be carried on mobile genetic elements, facilitating transmission among bacterial genera and species, which may also spread between patients and across healthcare facilities(6). In the United States, the five most common carbapenemase genes circulating among healthcare-associated Gram-negative bacilli are *Klebsiella pneumoniae* carbapenemase (bla_{KPC}), New Delhi metallo-β-lactamase (bla_{NDM}), Verona Integron-encoded metallo-β-lactamase (bla_{VIM}), oxacillinase-48-like carbapenemases ($bla_{OXA\text{-}48\text{-}like}$), and active-on-imipenem (bla_{IMP}).

In 2017, CDC outlined a new Containment Strategy that encouraged health care facilities and public health authorities to implement aggressive response activities when new or rare genes and germs are identified so that transmission can be contained(7). For example, colonization screening and contact tracing are important pillars to containing spread. That same year, CDC established the Antibiotic

Resistance Laboratory Network (AR Lab Network) to enhance national laboratory capacity to rapidly identify and characterize such AR threats. This laboratory infrastructure works in conjunction with CDC's Containment Strategy to support faster outbreak detection and response to contain the spread of AR threats. Herein, we summarize findings from the AR Lab Network's first three years of testing CRE, carbapenem-resistant *P. aeruginosa* (CRPA), CRAB, and colonization screens.

Methods

In 2016, CDC began funding the public health laboratories (PHLs) of all 50 states plus several cities and Puerto Rico to enhance their capacity to characterize clinical isolates of CRE and CRPA. Each PHL engages a network of clinical laboratories within their jurisdiction to submit bacterial isolates for phenotypic and molecular testing. The size and coverage of each PHL's network varies based on their jurisdiction's reporting laws and submission criteria for CRE and/or CRPA isolates. For jurisdictions lacking defined submission requirements, CDC recommend testing isolates from skilled nursing facilities with ventilator units, long-term acute-care hospitals, or short-stay acute care hospitals because patients admitted to these facilities typically have multiple comorbidities and are at a higher risk of acquiring infections caused by multidrug-resistant Gram-negative bacilli(8).

In January 2017, testing in the AR Lab Network began. CRE is defined as any clinical Enterobacterales isolate resistant to ertapenem, imipenem, meropenem, or doripenem according to Clinical Laboratory and Standards Institute (CLSI) M100 guidelines (minimum inhibitory concentrations [MIC] of ≥4 µg/ml for imipenem, meropenem, and doripenem or ≥2 µg/ml for ertapenem)(9). The AR Lab Network prioritizes testing of *Escherichia coli, Klebsiella oxytoca, K. pneumoniae*, and *Enterobacter* spp. but encourages testing of additional Enterobacterales where local capacity allowed. CRPA and CRAB are defined respectively, as any clinical isolate of *P. aeruginosa* or *A. baumannii* resistant to imipenem, meropenem, or doripenem according to CLSI M100 guidelines (MIC of ≥8 µg/ml)(9). No isolates are excluded based on specimen source.

PHLs in the Network perform organism identification, antimicrobial susceptibility testing (AST), carbapenemase production testing, and molecular detection of five targeted carbapenemase genes: *bla*$_{KPC}$, *bla*$_{NDM}$, *bla*$_{OXA-48-like}$, *bla*$_{VIM}$, and *bla*$_{IMP}$. Testing methods vary by PHL (Supplementary Table 1). For organism identification, most PHLs use matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization-time of flight (MALDI-ToF); some use Vitek 2 (BioMérieux, Marcy-l'Étoile, France), and/or biochemical methods. AST is most often performed using commercially available broth microdilution panels, disk diffusion, and/or gradient diffusion strips. Isolates are tested once against a range of drugs, including at least two carbapenems and two third-generation cephalosporins. Interpretations are based on the most updated version of CLSI M100 breakpoints where available; U.S. Food and Drug Administration breakpoints are used when no CLSI breakpoints were set (e.g., tigecycline) (9, 10). All but one PHL conducts carbapenemase production testing using the modified carbapenem inactivation method (mCIM); one lab uses CarbaNP exclusively(9, 11, 12). Molecular detection of targeted carbapenemase genes is conducted using one or more PCR-based protocols and platforms, including CDC's laboratory-developed and validated methods(13-16), Gene Xpert Carba-R (Cepheid, Sunnyvale, CA), ARM-D Kit, β-Lactamase (Streck, Omaha NE), and/or Verigene Gram-Negative Blood Culture System (Nanosphere, Northbrook, IL). Testing is conducted in accordance with CDC guidance and Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA) requirements, when necessary.

Seven state PHLs also serve as "regional laboratories", to conduct sentinel surveillance and colonization screening by testing CRAB isolates and rectal swabs, respectively, from healthcare facilities in their region. For sentinel surveillance, each PHL recruits at least one clinical laboratory from their jurisdiction to submit all CRAB isolates to their regional laboratory for additional characterization. Screening is not limited to specific health facility types and is used to detect silent transmission of the targeted carbapenemase genes among patients and includes testing epidemiologically-linked contacts of patients found to have infections caused by a carbapenemase-positive organism. For rectal swabs collected for

colonization screens, regional laboratories use the Gene Xpert Carba-R (Cepheid, Sunnyvale, CA) in accordance with the manufacturer's guidance to detect the presence of bla_{KPC}, bla_{NDM}, $bla_{OXA\text{-}48\text{-}like}$, bla_{VIM}, and $bla_{IMP\text{-}1}$ genes in rectal swabs collected for colonization screens. Regional laboratories attempt to culture gene-positive screens to identify the organisms carrying the genes detected.

Any testing for which a participating PHL is not validated, including supplemental testing of additional gene targets and drugs, is conducted by a regional laboratory or CDC. Thus, a small subset of isolates tested by state and local PHLs are submitted to their regional laboratory for additional characterization. Regional laboratories also conduct whole genome sequencing to characterize a subset of isolates, including those with discordant carbapenemase production and PCR results (i.e., carbapenemase production positive but negative for the targeted carbapenemase genes), which may indicate the presence of a novel carbapenemase gene.

PHLs report results back to submitting clinical laboratories within two working days of testing completion. Colonization screening results are reported to submitting facilities and jurisdictional public health departments within one working day of completion. Testing results that require immediate public health actions to contain the spread of resistance are reported to jurisdictional public health departments and CDC within one day of completion.

PHLs submit testing results to CDC at least monthly. After each calendar year, data are reconciled to verify the number of isolates tested and the associated testing results. Each isolate is counted once, with testing results from each PHL consolidated with additional results submitted by its regional laboratory into one record. Each targeted carbapenemase gene detected is counted individually; therefore, the number of carbapenemase genes detected exceeds the number of isolates reported because some isolates carried more than one such gene. In all summary reports, organisms reported as *Enterobacter aerogenes* or *Klebsiella oxytoca/Raoultella ornithinolytica* are re-classified as *Klebsiella aerogenes* and *Klebsiella oxytoca*, respectively.

Results

From January 2017 through December 2019, the AR Lab Network tested 76,887 CRE, CRPA, CRAB, and colonization screening specimens. Among the 42,006 CRE isolates tested, the genera identified most frequently were the three prioritized for AR Lab Network testing: *Klebsiella* spp., *E. coli*, and *Enterobacter* spp. (Table 1). Fifty-one PHLs conducted testing of additional Enterobacterales families and genera, accounting for 14% (n=5,804) of all CRE tested in the AR Lab Network. At least one targeted carbapenemase gene was detected in 35% (n=14,562) of CRE tested (Table 1); bla_{KPC} was the most common gene detected (86%; n=12,540), followed by bla_{NDM} (9%; n=1,378). The proportion of carbapenemase gene-positive (CP) CRE and the frequency of specific carbapenemase genes varied by genus (Table 1). The most common genes detected among CP-CRE, by genus, were: bla_{KPC} in *Klebsiella* (92%; n=9,224), *Enterobacter* (88%; n=1,520), *Citrobacter* (92%; n=431) and *Serratia* (98%; n=190), bla_{NDM} in *E. coli* (35%; n=578), and bla_{IMP} in *Providencia* (79%; n=81) and *Proteus* (54%; n=61). More than one targeted gene was identified in 190 (<1%) of CP-CRE tested. The most common combinations were bla_{NDM} with $bla_{OXA\text{-}48\text{-}like}$ (60%; n=114) and bla_{KPC} with bla_{NDM} (26%; n=50). A single isolate harbored bla_{NDM}, bla_{VIM}, and $bla_{OXA\text{-}48\text{-}like}$ genes.

Among 30,390 CRPA isolates tested; 2% (n=672) were CP-CRPA (Table 1). The most frequently detected carbapenemase gene among CP-CRPA was bla_{VIM} (62%; n=414), followed by bla_{KPC} (25%; n=171). No CRPA isolate harboring the $bla_{OXA\text{-}48\text{-}like}$ gene was detected. Fifteen CP-CRPA isolates were positive for more than one targeted gene; these isolates carried bla_{IMP} and bla_{VIM} (n=6), bla_{KPC} and bla_{VIM} (n=4), bla_{NDM} and bla_{VIM} (n=3), or bla_{NDM} and bla_{IMP} (n=2).

Regional sentinel surveillance tested 4,491 CRAB isolates from 41 states. Targeted carbapenemase genes were detected in 39 (<1%) CRAB isolates submitted. Among CP-CRAB, bla_{NDM} (69%; n=27) and bla_{KPC} (31%; n=12) were detected; bla_{IMP}, bla_{VIM} or $bla_{OXA\text{-}48\text{-}like}$ genes were not (Table 1).

Regional laboratories also tested 31,001 colonization screening swabs. Eight percent (n=2,503) of screens were positive for at least one targeted gene and *bla*$_{KPC}$ (84%; n=2,103) and *bla*$_{NDM}$ (11%; n=281) were the most frequently detected (Table 1). More than one carbapenemase gene was detected in 132 colonization screens; nine of these were positive for three carbapenemase genes. The most common gene combination among screens was *bla*$_{KPC}$ and *bla*$_{VIM}$ (37%; 49/132).

The volume of CRE and CRPA isolates tested and the percent positive for any given targeted carbapenemase gene varied by region (Table 2). For example, the Northeast region detected the highest frequency of CP-CRE (49%; n=2,225) and the Central region detected the lowest (18%; n=599). *bla*$_{VIM}$ (2%; n=79) and *bla*$_{IMP}$ (8%; n=50) genes were most frequently detected in the Midwest and Central regions respectively, whereas *bla*$_{NDM}$ (16%; n=351) was most frequently detected in the Northeast region. Among CRPA, the West region detected *bla*$_{VIM}$ (76%; n=60) most frequently, but *bla*$_{KPC}$ (54%; n=27) and *bla*$_{NDM}$ (17%; n=4) were detected most frequently in the Mid-Atlantic and Central regions, respectively. Among colonization screens, *bla*$_{KPC}$ (91%; n=575) and *bla*$_{IMP}$ (1%; n=5) genes were most frequently detected in the Mid-Atlantic region. In contrast, screens with *bla*$_{VIM}$ (13%; n=69) were most frequently detected from the Southeast region and screens with *bla*$_{NDM}$ (40%; n=27) were most frequently from the Central region.

The carbapenem resistance profile among carbapenemase gene-positive CRE and CRPA is presented in Table 3. Generally, isolates with *bla*$_{NDM}$ showed the highest frequency of resistance across the different carbapenem drugs, whereas isolates with *bla*$_{IMP}$ and *bla*$_{OXA-48-like}$ showed lower frequencies of carbapenem resistance. Apart from imipenem resistance among *bla*$_{IMP}$ isolates, resistance to doripenem was the least predictive of carbapenemase presence among CRE. CRPA isolates harboring the metallo-β-lactamase (MBL) genes, *bla*$_{IMP}$, *bla*$_{NDM,}$ or *bla*$_{VIM}$, showed the highest frequency of resistance across carbapenems tested.

Among isolates tested for carbapenemase production and targeted carbapenemase genes, 97% of both CRE and CRPA had concordant findings between the phenotypic and PCR tests (Table 4). A small subset of CRE (3%, n=443) and CRPA (2%; n=117) isolates were carbapenemase production-positive, but PCR negative. AST phenotypes suggested that 49% (n=219) of these discordant CRE isolates were likely explained by the presence of hyperproduction of AmpC in *Enterobacter* (n=114) or *bla*$_{SME}$ (*Serratia* marcescens enzyme) in *Serratia* (n=105). PCR testing and whole genome sequencing of a subset of additional discrepant CRE and CRPA isolates identified additional mechanisms: two *bla*$_{IMI}$ (Imipenem-hydrolyzing β-lactamase) genes and a variety of beta-lactamase genes were found among 8 CRE; *bla*$_{GES}$ (Guiana extended-spectrum β-lactamase) genes and/or other *bla*$_{OXA}$ variants were detected in all 93 CRPA sequenced. Less than 1% (n=76) of CRE and CRPA isolates tested were carbapenemase production-negative but PCR-positive for the targeted carbapenemase genes. These discrepant PCR-positive isolates were reported from 27 different PHLs and across all targeted genes.

Discussion

CDC established the AR Lab Network to provide nationwide laboratory capacity to rapidly detect antibiotic resistance and inform local responses to help contain the spread of resistance in the United States. By implementing state-of-the-art methods in PHLs, the AR Lab Network has improved our national infrastructure to detect and characterize novel and emerging resistance threats like carbapenemase gene-positive CRE, CRPA and CRAB.

Although carbapenemase gene-positive organisms are not reportable throughout the United States, some systems do collect surveillance data on CRE, CRPA and CRAB. For instance, healthcare settings report healthcare-associated infections caused by these organisms to the National Healthcare and Safety Network (NHSN). In 2018, carbapenem resistance was detected in 39.2%, 14.3% and 2.7% of *A. baumannii*, *P. aeruginosa* and Enterobacterales isolates tested, respectively(17). CDC's Multi-site Gram-negative Surveillance Initiative (MuGSI), an active population- and laboratory-based surveillance

activity that is part of Emerging Infections Program, detected carbapenemase producers in 30% (n=94/312) of CRE tested from January 2011 to January 2014, and <1% (n=1/391) of CRPA tested from August 2016 to July 2017(18, 19). Unlike NHSN and MuGSI, the AR Lab Network was not designed to be a traditional surveillance system; yet the frequency with which the AR Lab Network detected carbapenemase genes was similar to MuGSI, detecting at least one carbapenemase gene in 35% of CRE and 2% of CRPA. Thus, the nationwide testing in the AR Lab Network is not only detecting carbapenemase genes in CRE and CRPA at comparable frequencies as MuGSI, but also testing higher volumes of these relatively rare threats, thereby providing a wealth of data on the targeted mechanisms and these less common organisms spreading domestically.

Data from the AR Lab Network not only substantiate existing literature that *bla*$_{KPC}$ is the most common carbapenemase gene circulating in the United States(20, 21), but also highlight its dissemination into CRPA, CRAB, and the less common CRE genera, like *Citrobacter* and *Serratia*(22-25). Among jurisdictions routinely testing all CRE, 20% of isolates from the less common genera were carbapenemase gene-positive. This finding supports the concern that other genera can harbor and spread carbapenemase genes and highlights that testing less common CRE genera is important for detecting and controlling the spread of resistance(26, 27). As a result of these and other data collected through the AR Lab Network, some states subsequently implemented or updated their reporting laws to include additional CRE genera beyond *E. coli*, *Klebsiella* and *Enterobacter* spp..

The five targeted carbapenemase genes were detected in only 39 of 4,491 CRAB isolates tested. Although still rare, the frequency of these carbapenemases in CRAB has increased annually in the AR Lab Network. Continued vigilance by rapid detection is essential for containing the spread of these genes in these already highly resistant organisms and preventing the difficult-to-treat infections they cause.

Currently, few FDA-approved drugs are available to treat infections caused by MBL-producing Gram-negatives (28-32). MBL genes were detected in only 3% of all isolates tested but their frequency varied by specimen type; they were present in 77% of CP-CRPA, 69% of CP-CRAB, 20% of positive colonization screens, and 11% of CP-CRE detected. This is concerning because in addition to hydrolyzing carbapenems, MBLs are unaffected by newer β-lactamase inhibitors such as avibactam, vaborbactam, and relebactam. MBL-producers do not hydrolyze the monobactam, aztreonam; however, some also co-express extended-spectrum β-lactamases (ESBLs) or AmpC which inactivate monobactams, rendering aztreonam ineffective. This limits the treatment options for these highly resistant infections. Cefiderocol is one such option and aztreonam-avibactam, which is still in Phase 3 clinical trials but can be achieved through administration of two FDA-approved drugs (ceftazidime-avibactam and aztreonam), has also shown potent *in vitro* activity against *bla*$_{NDM}$-producing Enterobacterales(33).

A small subset of specimens tested in the AR Lab Network were found to carry multiple targeted carbapenemase genes. These specimens may represent novel threats for public health because the presence of more than one gene, and/or more than one plasmid, may provide increased opportunity for spread. And although the clinical implications of these multi-mechanism organisms are not fully known, they could have negative implications for treatment(34). Organisms harboring genes from different Ambler classes of β-lactamases could further limit available treatment options for patients, particularly because most of these multiple-mechanism isolates harbored at least one MBL gene. Additional studies have demonstrated increased MIC values associated with such multi-mechanism isolates and suggest they display increased virulence(35, 36).

Ninety-seven percent of CRE and CRPA had concordant findings for carbapenemase production and targeted gene detection. Most of the observed differences in isolates with discordant findings could be explained by their AST profiles, false-negative carbapenemase production results, variations in mCIM

protocols used, and the presence of other resistance mechanisms. These findings not only support the sensitivity and specificity of mCIM for the detection of CP-CRE and CP-CRPA, including its performance in the presence of weaker carbapenemase genes and variants, but also highlight its potential value in laboratories with limited resources (11, 12, 37). Facilities without molecular platforms to detect carbapenemase genes could use these tests for phenotypic detection of carbapenemase production to inform containment response efforts.

The AR Lab Network data show all CP-CRPA were highly resistant to all carbapenems tested. In contrast, CRE isolates harboring *bla*$_{\text{OXA-48-like}}$ or *bla*$_{\text{IMP}}$ had lower frequencies of resistance across the carbapenems tested. *bla*$_{\text{IMP}}$-positive CRE isolates displayed lower frequencies of resistance to imipenem (46%), particularly *bla*$_{\text{IMP}}$-positive *Enterobacter* spp. and species of the *Morganellaceae* family when compared with other genera tested in the Network. This observation has also been noted by others(38). Together, these findings suggest that performing AST using more than one carbapenem can facilitate detection of CP-CRE more efficiently.

One key aspect of CDC's Containment Strategy is to respond to even a single case of an emerging AR threat to prevent its transmission. A pillar of this strategy is to conduct colonization screening of persons exposed to patients with confirmed cases. Eight percent of patient contacts screened from January 2017 through December 2019 were colonized with at least one carbapenemase gene-positive organism. These colonization screens informed infection control measures and detected potentially unrecognized carriers who could spread highly resistant bacteria to other patients and facilities(39).

The data presented in this report have several limitations. First, isolate testing wase influenced by clinical laboratory network coverage and jurisdictional reporting and isolate submission laws; therefore, the data reported do not represent all clinical isolates of CRE, CRPA, or CRAB in the United States. Second, not all Network PHLs began testing at the same time. Third, specific assays were staggered in timing of deployment, validation, and implementation across the Network. For example, testing for

273 *bla*$_{IMP}$ variants beyond those detected by the Cepheid CarbaR was not initiated until 2018. Thus, the
274 number of *bla*$_{IMP}$-positive isolates reported is likely underrepresented during these years. Staggered test
275 implementation also likely hampered the identification of all multi-mechanism isolates because some
276 PHLs took a stepwise approach to PCR; if one PCR target was positive, no additional PCR targets were
277 tested. Nevertheless, in 2018 CDC recommended comprehensive PCR testing to better detect multi-
278 mechanism isolates and 96% (n=5737) of mCIM-positive isolates from 2019 were tested against all
279 validated targets. Fourth, characterization of CRAB isolates for sentinel surveillance did not include
280 routine testing of additional oxacillinase genes (i.e., *bla*$_{OXA\text{-}23\text{-}like}$, *bla*$_{OXA\text{-}24/40\text{-}like}$, *or bla*$_{OXA\text{-}58\text{-}like}$) that are
281 more common in *Acinetobacter* spp. Finally, our data include specimens collected for clinical diagnosis,
282 surveillance, and outbreak investigations. Because of the confluence of these various public health
283 activities, outbreak-associated testing and screenings likely increase the proportion of specimens that are
284 carbapenemase gene-positive. But this confluence also points to how AR Lab Network testing has
285 helped identify and contain outbreaks that could have gone otherwise undetected. Two well-publicized
286 examples of large investigations facilitated through the AR Lab Network include an outbreak of *bla*$_{VIM}$-
287 CRPA infections associated with medical tourism to Tijuana, Mexico and a regional outbreak of *bla*$_{VIM}$-
288 CRPA infections around Lubbock, Texas(40, 41).

289 Antibiotic resistance is a global threat and resistance mechanisms that were once novel are emerging and
290 spreading rapidly in the United States(42, 43). As an essential component of CDC's Containment
291 Strategy, the AR Lab Network offers flexibility with the capacity to incorporate new resistance targets
292 and detection methods as threats emerge and technologies evolve. In 2019, the AR Lab Network
293 deployed aztreonam-avibactam testing at regional laboratories to bridge the gap between clinical use of
294 this drug combination and the availability of commercial susceptibility testing for this combination(28,
295 44-46). In addition, the Network has incorporated more whole genome sequencing capacity to better
296 detect and understand known and novel AR threats. By establishing national infrastructure for improved

297 detection of carbapenemase gene-positive organisms in the United States, the AR Lab Network is
298 helping healthcare facilities and public health partners identify and respond to AR threats quickly and
299 improve patient safety.

300 **Acknowledgements**

301 The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the author(s) and do not represent the official
302 position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. This work was supported by the Centers for
303 Disease Control and Prevention's internal funding.

304

305

306 **TABLE 1. Carbapenemase genes detected in carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales, carbapenem-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*,**

307 **and carbapenem-resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii*, and colonization screens—Antibiotic Resistance Laboratory Network, 2017–2019**

Specimen Type and Organism	Specimens Tested (N)	Specimens with ≥1 Carbapenemase Detected n (%)*	Carbapenemase Gene Detected†,‡				
			bla$_{KPC}$ n (%)	*bla*$_{NDM}$ n (%)	*bla*$_{VIM}$ n (%)	*bla*$_{IMP}$ n (%)	*bla*$_{OXA-48-like}$ n (%)
Carbapenem-Resistant Clinical Isolates	**76,887**	**15,273 (20)**	**12,723 (83)**	**1,452 (10)**	**531 (3)**	**225 (1)**	**549 (4)**
Enterobacterales	**42,006**	**14,562 (35)**	**12,540 (86)**	**1,378 (9)**	**117 (<1)**	**169 (1)**	**549 (4)**
Enterobacteriaceae	**37,418**	**13,883 (37)**	**12,064 (87)**	**1,342 (10)**	**105 (<1)**	**19 (<1)**	**534 (4)**
Klebsiella spp.	16,753	10,004 (60)	9,224 (92)	573 (6)	40 (<1)	4 (<1)	289 (3)
Enterobacter spp.	12,191	1,734 (14)	1,520 (88)	173 (10)	39 (2)	13 (<1)	2 (<1)
Escherichia coli	7,258	1,641 (23)	865 (53)	578 (35)	8 (<1)	0 (0)	226 (14)
Citrobacter spp.	1,136	468 (41)	431 (92)	17 (4)	18 (4)	2 (<1)	6 (1)
Other§	80	36 (45)	24 (67)	1 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (31)
Yersiniaceae							
Serratia spp.	1,101	194 (18)	190 (98)	1 (<1)	3 (2)	0 (0)	1 (<1)
Morganellaceae	**2,291**	**239 (10)**	**62 (26)**	**22 (9)**	**7 (3)**	**149 (62)**	**2 (<1)**
Proteus spp.	1,181	113 (10)	42 (37)	7 (6)	2 (2)	61 (54)	1 (<1)
Providencia spp.	482	103 (21)	6 (6)	11 (11)	5 (5)	81 (79)	1 (<1)
Morganella spp.	628	23 (4)	14 (61)	4 (17)	0 (0)	7 (33)	0 (0)
Hafniaceae							
Hafnia spp.	104	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Erwiniaceae							
Pantoea spp.	18	4 (22)	4 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Unknown/blank¶	**1,021**	**243 (24)**	**220 (91)**	**13 (5)**	**2 (<1)**	**1 (<1)**	**12 (5)**
Pseudomonas aeruginosa	**30,390**	**672 (2)**	**171 (25)**	**47 (7)**	**414 (62)**	**56 (8)**	**0 (0)**
Acinetobacter baumannii	**4,491**	**39 (<1)**	**12 (31)**	**27 (69)**	**0 (0)**	**0 (0)**	**0 (0)**
Colonization Screens	**31,001**	**2,503 (8)**	**2,103 (84)**	**281 (11)**	**205 (8)**	**5 (<1)**	**51 (2)**

308

309 *Carbapenemase gene detected if PCR-positive for ≥1 of the five targeted carbapenemase

genes tested.

[†]Specimens with multiple carbapenemase genes detected were counted once in each gene category.

[‡]Arranged by carbapenemase class; class B metallo-β-lactamase genes include bla_{NDM}, bla_{VIM} and bla_{IMP}.

§Other genera included *Cronobacter*, *Kosakonia*, *Kluyvera*, *Leclercia*, *Pluralibacter*, *Raoultella* and *Yokenella*

[¶]Isolates submitted to the public health laboratory as Enterobacterales, but genus and species not reported to CDC.

TABLE 2. Regional distribution of carbapenemase genes detected in carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales, carbapenem-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa,* and carbapenem-resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii* isolates, and colonization screens— Antibiotic Resistance Laboratory Network, 2017–2019

Specimen Type and Region*	Specimens Tested (N)	Specimens with a Carbapenemase Detected n (%)†	Carbapenemase Genes Detected‡,§§				
			bla$_{KPC}$ n (%)	*bla*$_{NDM}$ n (%)	*bla*$_{VIM}$ n (%)	*bla*$_{IMP}$ n (%)	*bla*$_{OXA-48-like}$ n (%)
Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacterales	**42,006**	**14,562 (35)**	**12,540 (86)**	**1,378 (9)**	**117 (<1)**	**169 (1)**	**549 (4)**
Central	3,419	599 (18)	457 (76)	61 (10)	(0)	50 (8)	36 (6)
Mid-Atlantic	7,941	3,427 (43)	3,079 (88)	238 (7)	7 (<1)	18 (<1)	139 (4)
Midwest	10,724	3,231 (30)	2,786 (86)	229 (7)	79 (2)	73 (2)	85 (3)
Mountain	4,318	1,322 (31)	1,111 (83)	150 (11)	9 (<1)	9 (<1)	59 (4)
Northeast	4,539	2,225 (49)	1,794 (81)	351 (16)	1 (<1)	4 (<1)	114 (5)
Southeast	6,166	2,209 (36)	2,035 (91)	143 (6)	16 (1)	6 (<1)	39 (2)
West	4,899	1,550 (32)	1,279 (81)	206 (13)	5 (<1)	9 (<1)	77 (5)
Carbapenem-Resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*	**30,390**	**672 (2)**	**171 (25)**	**47 (7)**	**414 (62)**	**56 (8)**	**0 (0)**
Central	3,370	23 (<1)	4 (17)	4 (17)	12 (50)	4 (17)	0 (0)
Mid-Atlantic	3,122	50 (2)	27 (54)	7 (14)	13 (26)	3 (6)	0 (0)
Midwest	5,445	49 (<1)	10 (20)	6 (12)	33 (66)	1 (2)	0 (0)
Mountain	6,667	194 (3)	19 (10)	12 (6)	132 (67)	33 (17)	0 (0)
Northeast	3,890	129 (3)	51 (40)	10 (8)	67 (52)	1 (<1)	0 (0)
Southeast	3,838	154 (4)	58 (36)	3 (2)	97 (61)	2 (1)	0 (0)
West	4,058	73 (2)	2 (3)	5 (6)	60 (76)	12 (15)	0 (0)
Carbapenem-Resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii*	**4491**	**39 (<1)**	**12 (31)**	**27 (69)**	**0 (0)**	**0 (0)**	**0 (0)**
Central	272	1 (<1)	1 (100)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Mid-Atlantic	708	19 (3)	2 (11)	17 (89)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Midwest	781	7 (<1)	2 (29)	5 (71)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Mountain	1,369	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Northeast	320	3 (<1)	2 (67)	1 (33)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Southeast	702	5 (<1)	2 (40)	3 (60)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
West	339	4 (1)	3 (75)	1 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Colonization Screens	**31,001**	**2,503 (8)**	**2,103 (84)**	**281 (11)**	**205 (8)**	**5 (<1)**	**51 (2)**
Central	3,301	68 (2)	41 (60)	27 (40)	2 (3)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Mid-Atlantic	4,998	632 (13)	575 (91)	37 (6)	11 (2)	5 (<1)	22 (3)
Midwest	5,741	720 (13)	605 (84)	106 (15)	76 (11)	0 (0)	13 (2)
Mountain	2,504	144 (6)	119 (83)	4 (3)	16 (11)	0 (0)	5 (3)
Northeast	2,191	211 (10)	149 (71)	63 (30)	10 (5)	0 (0)	5 (2)
Southeast	9,923	543 (5)	457 (84)	34 (6)	69 (13)	0 (0)	5 (<1)
West	2,343	185 (8)	157 (85)	10 (5)	21 (11)	0 (0)	0 (0)

*Antibiotic Resistance Laboratory Network Regions are as follows: Central (AR, IA, KS, MN, MO, ND, NE, OK, SD), Mid-Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, NC, PA, Philadelphia, SC, VA, WV), Midwest (IL, IN, KY, MI, OH, WI), Mountain (AZ, CO, Houston, ID, MT, NM, TX, UT, WY), Northeast (CT, MA, ME,

NH, NJ, NY, New York City, RI, VT), Southeast (AL, FL, GA, LA, MS, Puerto Rico, TN) and West (AK, CA, HI, LA County, NV, OR, WA).

[†]Carbapenemase gene detected if PCR-positive for ≥1 of the five targeted carbapenemase genes tested.

[‡]Specimens with multiple carbapenemase genes detected were counted once in each gene category.

[§]Arranged by carbapenemase class; class B metallo-β-lactamase genes include *bla*$_{NDM}$, *bla*$_{VIM}$ and *bla*$_{IMP}$.

TABLE 3. Carbapenem susceptibility testing data for carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales and carbapenem-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* isolates, characterized by carbapenemase genes detected* — Antibiotic Resistance Laboratory Network, 2018-2019

	Carbapenemase Gene Detected †															
	bla$_{KPC}$			*bla*$_{NDM}$			*bla*$_{VIM}$			*bla*$_{IMP}$			*bla*$_{OXA-48-like}$			
Organism and Drug	**Tested (N)**	**R, n (%)**	**I, n (%)**	**Tested (N)**	**R, n (%)**	**I, n (%)**	**Tested (N)**	**R, n (%)**	**I, n (%)**	**Tested (N)**	**R, n (%)**	**I, n (%)**	**Tested (N)**	**R, n (%)**	**I, n (%)**
Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacterales‡																
Ertapenem	7,279	6501 (89)	615 (8)	796	789 (99)	6 (1)	69	55 (80)	12 (17)	106	88 (83)	11 (10)	279	224 (80)	47 (17)
Meropenem	7,160	5868 (82)	605 (8)	803	787 (98)	9 (1)	73	63 (86)	2 (3)	95	67 (71)	9 (9)	273	124 (45)	36 (13)
Imipenem	6,026	4,806 (80)	859 (14)	714	694 (97)	15 (2)	71	65 (92)	2 (3)	91	42 (46)	35 (38)	236	95 (40)	53 (22)
Doripenem	4,140	2,097 (51)	1,091 (26)	345	321 (93)	17 (5)	19	11 (58)	2 (11)	49	28 (57)	11 (22)	200	54 (27)	30 (15)
Carbapenem-Resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*§																
Meropenem	121	114 (94)	1 (1)	29	28 (97)	0 (0)	231	223 (97)	5 (2)	39	39 (100)	0	ND	ND	ND
Imipenem	111	104 (94)	1 (1)	28	28 (100)	0 (0)	228	225 (99)	2 (1)	37	36 (97)	0	ND	ND	ND
Doripenem¶	55	48 (87)		21	21 (100)		131	128 (98)		33	33 (100)		ND	ND	ND

Abbreviations: ND – not detected; R – resistant; I – intermediate.

*Excludes isolates with >1 carbapenemase gene detected. Not all isolates were tested for all drugs listed.

†Arranged by carbapenemase class; class B metallo-β-lactamase genes include *bla*$_{NDM}$, *bla*$_{VIM,}$ and *bla*$_{IMP}$.

[‡]Carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales tested at public health laboratories were defined as any clinical isolate of Enterobacterales resistant to ertapenem, imipenem, meropenem, or doripenem (minimum inhibitory concentrations of ≥4 µg/ml for imipenem, meropenem, and doripenem or ≥2 µg/ml for ertapenem) at the submitting clinical laboratory. Interpretations were based on Clinical Laboratory and Standards Institute breakpoints.

[§]Carbapenem-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* tested at public health laboratories were defined as any clinical isolate of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* resistant to imipenem, meropenem, or doripenem (minimum inhibitory concentrations of ≥8 µg/ml) at the submitting clinical laboratory. Interpretations were based on Clinical Laboratory and Standards Institute breakpoints.

[¶]Excludes data from laboratories using commercial broth microdilution panels where intermediate and resistant doripenem interpretations could not be distinguished.

354 **TABLE 4. Comparison of carbapenemase production and molecular testing results for**
355 **carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales and carbapenem-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa***

Isolate Characteristics	Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacterales Isolates, n (%)*	Carbapenem-Resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Isolates, n (%)
Total*	16,980	4,759
Carbapenemase production+/PCR+	9,638 (57)	468 (10)
Carbapenemase production-/PCR-	6,841 (40)	4,156 (87)
Carbapenemase production+/PCR-	443 (3)	117 (2)
Carbapenemase production-/PCR+	58 (<1)	18 (<1)

356 **isolates— Antibiotic Resistance Laboratory Network, 2017–2019**

357
358
359
360

361 *Excludes *Serratia* isolates with AST phenotypes consistent with the presence of bla_{SME} (*Serratia*
362 marcescens enzyme) (defined as resistant to carbapenems and susceptible to 3rd generation
363 cephalosporins), *Enterobacter* spp. isolates with AST phenotypes suggestive of hyperproduction of
364 AmpC (defined as resistant to cefotaxime, ceftriaxone, and ceftazidime and susceptible to cefepime),
365 and isolates with missing modified carbapenem inactivation method (mCIM) or PCR testing results.

References

1. Schwaber MJ, Klarfeld-Lidji S, Navon-Venezia S, Schwartz D, Leavitt A, Carmeli Y. 2008. Predictors of carbapenem-resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae acquisition among hospitalized adults and effect of acquisition on mortality. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 52:1028-33.
2. Akova M, Daikos GL, Tzouvelekis L, Carmeli Y. 2012. Interventional strategies and current clinical experience with carbapenemase-producing Gram-negative bacteria. Clin Microbiol Infect 18:439-48.
3. Weiner LM, Webb AK, Limbago B, Dudeck MA, Patel J, Kallen AJ, Edwards JR, Sievert DM. 2016. Antimicrobial-Resistant Pathogens Associated With Healthcare-Associated Infections: Summary of Data Reported to the National Healthcare Safety Network at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011-2014. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 37:1288-1301.
4. CDC. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: 2019 AR Threat Report. https://www.cdc.gov/drugresistance/pdf/threats-report/2019-ar-threats-report-508.pdf Accessed
5. CDC. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: 2013 AR Threat Report https://www.cdc.gov/drugresistance/threat-report-2013/pdf/ar-threats-2013-508.pdf. Accessed
6. de Man TJB, Yaffee AQ, Zhu W, Batra D, Alyanak E, Rowe LA, McAllister G, Moulton-Meissner H, Boyd S, Flinchum A, Slayton RB, Hancock S, Spalding Walters M, Laufer Halpin A, Rasheed JK, Noble-Wang J, Kallen AJ, Limbago BM. 2021. Multispecies Outbreak of Verona Integron-Encoded Metallo-ss-Lactamase-Producing Multidrug-Resistant Bacteria Driven by a Promiscuous Incompatibility Group A/C2 Plasmid. Clin Infect Dis 72:414-420.
7. CDC. 2017. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Interim Guidance for a Public Health Response to Contain Novel or Targeted Multidrug-resistant Organisms (MDROs) https://www.cdc.gov/hai/pdfs/containment/Health-Response-Contain-MDRO-H.pdf. Accessed
8. Patolia S, Abate G, Patel N, Patolia S, Frey S. 2018. Risk factors and outcomes for multidrug-resistant Gram-negative bacilli bacteremia. Ther Adv Infect Dis 5:11-18.
9. Institute CaLS. 2017-2019. M100 Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing- 27-29th Edition, Wayne, PA.
10. Administration USFD. Antibacterial Susceptibility Test Interpretive Criteria. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/development-resources/antibacterial-susceptibility-test-interpretive-criteria. Accessed
11. Pierce VM, Simner PJ, Lonsway DR, Roe-Carpenter DE, Johnson JK, Brasso WB, Bobenchik AM, Lockett ZC, Charnot-Katsikas A, Ferraro MJ, Thomson RB, Jr., Jenkins SG, Limbago BM, Das S. 2017. Modified Carbapenem Inactivation Method for Phenotypic Detection of Carbapenemase Production among Enterobacteriaceae. J Clin Microbiol 55:2321-2333.
12. Simner PJ, Johnson JK, Brasso WB, Anderson K, Lonsway DR, Pierce VM, Bobenchik AM, Lockett ZC, Charnot-Katsikas A, Westblade LF, Yoo BB, Jenkins SG, Limbago BM, Das S, Roe-Carpenter DE. 2018. Multicenter Evaluation of the Modified Carbapenem Inactivation Method and the Carba NP for Detection of Carbapenemase-Producing Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Acinetobacter baumannii. J Clin Microbiol 56.
13. Lutgring JD, Zhu W, de Man TJB, Avillan JJ, Anderson KF, Lonsway DR, Rowe LA, Batra D, Rasheed JK, Limbago BM. 2018. Phenotypic and Genotypic Characterization of Enterobacteriaceae Producing Oxacillinase-48-Like Carbapenemases, United States. Emerg Infect Dis 24:700-709.
14. Rasheed JK, Kitchel B, Zhu W, Anderson KF, Clark NC, Ferraro MJ, Savard P, Humphries RM, Kallen AJ, Limbago BM. 2013. New Delhi metallo-beta-lactamase-producing Enterobacteriaceae, United States. Emerg Infect Dis 19:870-8.

15. Lonsway DR TT, Kongphet-Tran T, Anderson KF, Limbago BM, Rasheed JK. Evaluation of phenotypic screening methods to detect metallo-beta-lactamase production in Pseudomonas aeruginosa, p. *In* (ed),
16. Campbell D DJ, Rasheed JR and Karlsson M Development of a Multiplex TaqMan Probe-Based Real-Time PCR Assay for Detection of blaIMP Variants p.*In* (ed),
17. Prevention CfDCa. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Antibiotic Resistance Patient Safety Portal https://arpsp.cdc.gov/. Accessed
18. Julian Grass SB, Wendy Bamberg, Sarah J. Janelle, Patrick Stendel, Jesse T. Jacob, Chris Bower, Stephen Sukumaran, Lucy E. Wilson, Elisabeth Vaeth, Linda Li, Ruth Lynfield, Paula Snippes Vagnone, Ginette Dobbins, Erin C. Phipps, Emily B. Hancock, Ghinwa Dumyati, Rebecca Tsay, Rebecca Pierce, P. Maureen Cassidy, Nicole West, Marion A. Kainer, Daniel Muleta, Jacquelyn Mounsey, Davina Campbell, Richard Stanton, Maria S. Karlsson, and Maroya Spalding Walters. 2018. Epidemiology of Carbapenem-Resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa Identified Through the Emerging Infections Program (EIP), United States, 2016–2017. Open Forum Infectious Disease:2.
19. Chea N, Bulens SN, Kongphet-Tran T, Lynfield R, Shaw KM, Vagnone PS, Kainer MA, Muleta DB, Wilson L, Vaeth E, Dumyati G, Concannon C, Phipps EC, Culbreath K, Janelle SJ, Bamberg WM, Guh AY, Limbago B, Kallen AJ. 2015. Improved Phenotype-Based Definition for Identifying Carbapenemase Producers among Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae. Emerg Infect Dis 21:1611-6.
20. Bratu S, Landman D, Haag R, Recco R, Eramo A, Alam M, Quale J. 2005. Rapid spread of carbapenem-resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae in New York City: a new threat to our antibiotic armamentarium. Arch Intern Med 165:1430-5.
21. Kitchel B, Rasheed JK, Patel JB, Srinivasan A, Navon-Venezia S, Carmeli Y, Brolund A, Giske CG. 2009. Molecular epidemiology of KPC-producing Klebsiella pneumoniae isolates in the United States: clonal expansion of multilocus sequence type 258. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 53:3365-70.
22. Margate E, Magalhaes V, Fehlberg LC, Gales AC, Lopes AC. 2015. KPC-PRODUCING Serratia marcescens IN A HOME-CARE PATIENT FROM RECIFE, BRAZIL. Rev Inst Med Trop Sao Paulo 57:359-60.
23. Silva KE, Cayo R, Carvalhaes CG, Patussi Correia Sacchi F, Rodrigues-Costa F, Ramos da Silva AC, Croda J, Gales AC, Simionatto S. 2015. Coproduction of KPC-2 and IMP-10 in Carbapenem-Resistant Serratia marcescens Isolates from an Outbreak in a Brazilian Teaching Hospital. J Clin Microbiol 53:2324-8.
24. Dong D, Mi Z, Li D, Gao M, Jia N, Li M, Tong Y, Zhang X, Zhu Y. 2020. Novel IncR/IncP6 Hybrid Plasmid pCRE3-KPC Recovered from a Clinical KPC-2-Producing Citrobacter braakii Isolate. mSphere 5.
25. Babiker A, Evans DR, Griffith MP, McElheny CL, Hassan M, Clarke LG, Mettus RT, Harrison LH, Doi Y, Shields RK, Van Tyne D. 2020. Clinical and Genomic Epidemiology of Carbapenem-Nonsusceptible Citrobacter spp. at a Tertiary Health Care Center over 2 Decades. J Clin Microbiol 58.
26. Walters MS, Witwer M, Lee YK, Albrecht V, Lonsway D, Rasheed JK, Anacker M, Snippes-Vagnone P, Lynfield R, Kallen AJ. 2018. Notes from the Field: Carbapenemase-Producing Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacteriaceae from Less Common Enterobacteriaceae Genera - United States, 2014-2017. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 67:668-669.
27. Shugart A, Mahon G, Huang JY, Karlsson M, Valley A, Lasure M, Gross A, Pattee B, Vaeth E, Brooks R, Maruca T, Dominguez CE, Torpey D, Francis D, Bhattarai R, Kainer MA, Chan A, Dubendris H, Greene SR, Blosser SJ, Shannon DJ, Jones K, Brennan B, Hun S, D'Angeli M,

Murphy CN, Tierney M, Reese N, Bhatnagar A, Kallen A, Brown AC, Spalding Walters M. 2021. Carbapenemase production among less-common Enterobacterales genera: 10 US sites, 2018. JAC Antimicrob Resist 3:dlab137.

28. Bhatnagar A, Ransom EM, Machado MJ, Boyd S, Reese N, Anderson K, Lonsway D, Elkins CA, Rasheed JK, Patel JB, Karlsson M, Brown AC, Lutgring JD. 2021. Assessing the in vitro impact of ceftazidime on aztreonam/avibactam susceptibility testing for highly resistant MBL-producing Enterobacterales. J Antimicrob Chemother 76:979-983.
29. Chew KL, Tay MKL, Cheng B, Lin RTP, Octavia S, Teo JWP. 2018. Aztreonam-Avibactam Combination Restores Susceptibility of Aztreonam in Dual-Carbapenemase-Producing Enterobacteriaceae. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 62.
30. Marshall S, Hujer AM, Rojas LJ, Papp-Wallace KM, Humphries RM, Spellberg B, Hujer KM, Marshall EK, Rudin SD, Perez F, Wilson BM, Wasserman RB, Chikowski L, Paterson DL, Vila AJ, van Duin D, Kreiswirth BN, Chambers HF, Fowler VG, Jr., Jacobs MR, Pulse ME, Weiss WJ, Bonomo RA. 2017. Can Ceftazidime-Avibactam and Aztreonam Overcome beta-Lactam Resistance Conferred by Metallo-beta-Lactamases in Enterobacteriaceae? Antimicrob Agents Chemother 61.
31. Suay-Garcia B, Perez-Gracia MT. 2019. Present and Future of Carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae (CRE) Infections. Antibiotics (Basel) 8.
32. Biedenbach DJ, Kazmierczak K, Bouchillon SK, Sahm DF, Bradford PA. 2015. In vitro activity of aztreonam-avibactam against a global collection of Gram-negative pathogens from 2012 and 2013. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 59:4239-48.
33. Lutgring JD, Balbuena R, Reese N, Gilbert SE, Ansari U, Bhatnagar A, Boyd S, Campbell D, Cochran J, Haynie J, Ilutsik J, Longo C, Swint S, Rasheed JK, Brown AC, Karlsson M. 2020. Antibiotic Susceptibility of NDM-Producing Enterobacterales Collected in the United States in 2017 and 2018. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 64.
34. Contreras DA, Fitzwater SP, Nanayakkara DD, Schaenman J, Aldrovandi GM, Garner OB, Yang S. 2020. Coinfections of Two Strains of NDM-1- and OXA-232-Coproducing Klebsiella pneumoniae in a Kidney Transplant Patient. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 64.
35. Kazi M, Shetty A, Rodrigues C. 2015. The carbapenemase menace: do dual mechanisms code for more resistance? Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 36:116-7.
36. Meletis G, Chatzidimitriou D, Malisiovas N. 2015. Double- and multi-carbapenemase-producers: the excessively armored bacilli of the current decade. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis 34:1487-93.
37. Tijet N, Boyd D, Patel SN, Mulvey MR, Melano RG. 2013. Evaluation of the Carba NP test for rapid detection of carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae and Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 57:4578-80.
38. Karlowsky JA, Lob SH, Kazmierczak KM, Badal RE, Young K, Motyl MR, Sahm DF. 2017. In Vitro Activity of Imipenem against Carbapenemase-Positive Enterobacteriaceae Isolates Collected by the SMART Global Surveillance Program from 2008 to 2014. J Clin Microbiol 55:1638-1649.
39. Woodworth KR, Walters MS, Weiner LM, Edwards J, Brown AC, Huang JY, Malik S, Slayton RB, Paul P, Capers C, Kainer MA, Wilde N, Shugart A, Mahon G, Kallen AJ, Patel J, McDonald LC, Srinivasan A, Craig M, Cardo DM. 2018. Vital Signs: Containment of Novel Multidrug-Resistant Organisms and Resistance Mechanisms - United States, 2006-2017. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 67:396-401.
40. Prevention HIC. CDC Investigators Report Pseudomonas Superbug - VIM CRPA. https://www.reliasmedia.com/articles/144501-cdc-investigators-report-ipseudomonasi-superbug. Accessed

41. Kracalik I, Ham C, Smith AR, Vowles M, Kauber K, Zambrano M, Rodriguez G, Garner K, Chorbi K, Cassidy PM, McBee S, Stoney R, Brown AC, Moser K, Villarino ME, Walters MS. 2019. Notes from the Field: Verona Integron-Encoded Metallo-beta-Lactamase-Producing Carbapenem-Resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa Infections in U.S. Residents Associated with Invasive Medical Procedures in Mexico, 2015-2018. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 68:463-464.

42. Munoz-Price LS, Poirel L, Bonomo RA, Schwaber MJ, Daikos GL, Cormican M, Cornaglia G, Garau J, Gniadkowski M, Hayden MK, Kumarasamy K, Livermore DM, Maya JJ, Nordmann P, Patel JB, Paterson DL, Pitout J, Villegas MV, Wang H, Woodford N, Quinn JP. 2013. Clinical epidemiology of the global expansion of Klebsiella pneumoniae carbapenemases. Lancet Infect Dis 13:785-96.

43. Patel G, Bonomo RA. 2013. "Stormy waters ahead": global emergence of carbapenemases. Front Microbiol 4:48.

44. Ransom E, Bhatnagar A, Patel JB, Machado MJ, Boyd S, Reese N, Lutgring JD, Lonsway D, Anderson K, Brown AC, Elkins CA, Rasheed JK, Karlsson M. 2020. Validation of Aztreonam-Avibactam Susceptibility Testing Using Digitally Dispensed Custom Panels. J Clin Microbiol 58.

45. Tamma PD, Aitken SL, Bonomo RA, Mathers AJ, van Duin D, Clancy CJ. 2020. Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidance on the Treatment of Extended-Spectrum beta-lactamase Producing Enterobacterales (ESBL-E), Carbapenem-Resistant Enterobacterales (CRE), and Pseudomonas aeruginosa with Difficult-to-Treat Resistance (DTR-P. aeruginosa). Clin Infect Dis doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa1478.

46. Bhatnagar A BS, Sabour S, Bodnar J, Nazarian E, Peinovich N, Wagner C, Craft B, Snippes Vagnone P, Simpson J, Stone VN, Therrien M, Bateman A, Lower D, Huang JY, Gumbis S, Lonsway D, Lutgring JD, Karlsson M, Brown AC. 2021. Pilot Program for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing of Aztreonam-Avibactam in the Antibiotic Resistance Laboratory Network.