

NATIONAL STANDARD METHOD

GUIDANCE NOTE

LABORATORY DETECTION AND REPORTING OF BACTERIA WITH EXTENDED SPECTRUM β - LACTAMASES

QSOP 51

Issued by Standards Unit, Evaluations and Standards Laboratory
Specialist and Reference Microbiology Division

Association of Medical Microbiologists
Association of Medical Microbiologists
Association of Medical Microbiologists



LABORATORY DETECTION AND REPORTING OF BACTERIA WITH EXTENDED SPECTRUM β -LACTAMASES
Issue no: 1.1 Issue date:09.02.05 Issued by: Standards Unit, Evaluations and Standards Laboratory Page 1 of 15
Reference no: QSOP 51i1.1

This SOP should be used in conjunction with the series of other SOPs from the Health Protection Agency

www.evaluations-standards.org.uk

Email: standards@hpa.org.uk

STATUS OF NATIONAL STANDARD METHODS

National Standard Methods, which include standard operating procedures (SOPs), algorithms and guidance notes, promote high quality practices and help to assure the comparability of diagnostic information obtained in different laboratories. This in turn facilitates standardisation of surveillance underpinned by research, development and audit and promotes public health and patient confidence in their healthcare services. The methods are well referenced and represent a good minimum standard for clinical and public health microbiology. However, in using National Standard Methods, laboratories should take account of local requirements and may need to undertake additional investigations. The methods also provide a reference point for method development.

National Standard Methods are developed, reviewed and updated through an open and wide consultation process where the views of all participants are considered and the resulting documents reflect the majority agreement of contributors.

Representatives of several professional organisations, including those whose logos appear on the front cover, are members of the working groups which develop National Standard Methods. Inclusion of an organisation's logo on the front cover implies support for the objectives and process of preparing standard methods. The representatives participate in the development of the National Standard Methods but their views are not necessarily those of the entire organisation of which they are a member. The current list of participating organisations can be obtained by emailing standards@hpa.org.uk.

The performance of standard methods depends on the quality of reagents, equipment, commercial and in-house test procedures. Laboratories should ensure that these have been validated and shown to be fit for purpose. Internal and external quality assurance procedures should also be in place.

Whereas every care has been taken in the preparation of this publication, the Health Protection Agency or any supporting organisation cannot be responsible for the accuracy of any statement or representation made or the consequences arising from the use of or alteration to any information contained in it. These procedures are intended solely as a general resource for practising professionals in the field, operating in the UK, and specialist advice should be obtained where necessary. If you make any changes to this publication, it must be made clear where changes have been made to the original document. The Health Protection Agency (HPA) should at all times be acknowledged.

The HPA is an independent organisation dedicated to protecting people's health. It brings together the expertise formerly in a number of official organisations. More information about the HPA can be found at www.hpa.org.uk.

The HPA aims to be a fully Caldicott compliant organisation. It seeks to take every possible precaution to prevent unauthorised disclosure of patient details and to ensure that patient-related records are kept under secure conditions¹.

More details can be found on the website at www.evaluations-standards.org.uk. Contributions to the development of the documents can be made by contacting standards@hpa.org.uk.

Please note the references are now formatted using Reference Manager software. If you alter or delete text without Reference Manager installed on your computer, the references will not be updated automatically.

INDEX

AMENDMENT PROCEDURE	4
MINIMUM RECOMMENDATIONS.....	5
LABORATORY DETECTION: SCREENING THEN CONFIRMATION.....	8
CONFIRMATORY TESTS FOR ESBLs.....	9
REPORTING FOR ESBL PRODUCERS.....	12
REFERENCES	14

LABORATORY DETECTION AND REPORTING OF BACTERIA WITH EXTENDED SPECTRUM β -LACTAMASES

Issue no: 1.1 Issue date:09.02.05 Issued by: Standards Unit, Evaluations and Standards Laboratory Page 3 of 15

Reference no: QSOP 51i1.1

This SOP should be used in conjunction with the series of other SOPs from the Health Protection Agency

www.evaluations-standards.org.uk

Email: standards@hpa.org.uk

AMENDMENT PROCEDURE

Controlled document reference	QSOP 51
Controlled document title	Laboratory detection and reporting of bacteria with extended spectrum β-lactamases

Each National Standard Method has an individual record of amendments. The current amendments are listed on this page. The amendment history is available from standards@hpa.org.uk.

On issue of revised or new pages each controlled document should be updated by the copyholder in the laboratory.

Amendment Number/ Date	Issue no. Discarded	Insert Issue no.	Page	Section(s) involved	Amendment
1/ 7/2/05	1	1.1	11	Controls for ESBL tests	Section added
			13	Reporting for ESBL producers	Second bullet point re-worded
			15	Reference no 8	Updated

MINIMUM RECOMMENDATIONS

These guidelines advise on the detection of 'Extended-spectrum β -lactamases' (ESBLs) and are issued at a time when the changing nature and distribution these important enzymes presents clinicians and diagnostic laboratories with new challenges.

There are several ways to recognise ESBL producers, as outlined in the main body of this document; the strategy below is the simplest way to meet these guidelines

Enterobacteriaceae from infections in hospitalised patients

- Test **both** cefotaxime and ceftazidime on first-line panel, or test cefpodoxime.
- Do ESBL confirmatory tests (below) on isolates found resistant to **ANY** of cefotaxime, ceftazidime and cefpodoxime

Enterobacteriaceae from community patients

- Test cefpodoxime as an indicator on first-line panel (one possible first-line panel for community UTI isolates comprises cefpodoxime, nitrofurantoin, trimethoprim, a fluoroquinolone and **two** out of cephalexin, co-amoxiclav and ampicillin/amoxycillin).
- Do ESBL confirmatory tests (below) on isolates found resistant to cefpodoxime.

Identification to genus/species level is highly desirable for the interpretation of resistance patterns and, as a minimum, should be undertaken on all isolates found resistant to cefotaxime, ceftazidime or cefpodoxime in the above tests.

To confirm of ESBL production in isolates found resistant to cefotaxime/ceftazidime or cefpodoxime: use cefpodoxime/clavulanate combination discs or, for *Enterobacter* species. and *C. freundii*, ceftazidime/clavulanate combination discs.

Ceftazidime/clavulanate combination discs cannot be recommended as a single screen for ESBLs in all Enterobacteriaceae at this time. This screening method has poorly defined sensitivity for bacteria other than *Enterobacter* species. and *C. freundii*.

Report ESBL producers resistant to ALL cephalosporins (except cefoxitin).

ESBLs – A CHANGING PROBLEM

These guidelines advise on the detection of 'Extended-spectrum β -lactamases' (ESBLs) and are issued at a time when the changing nature and distribution these important enzymes presents clinicians and diagnostic laboratories with new challenges.

The term ESBLs is used to mean acquired, class A β -lactamases that hydrolyse and confer resistance to oxyimino- '2nd- and 3rd-generation' cephalosporins, eg cefuroxime, cefotaxime, ceftazidime and ceftriaxone.

Those seeking minimum recommendations on ESBL detection are directed to the last page of the document.

ESBLs include:

- Cephalosporin-hydrolysing mutants of TEM and SHV - the common plasmid-mediated penicillinases of Enterobacteriaceae. Well over 100 such variants are known (see <http://www.lahey.org/studies>).
- CTX-M types. These evolved separately, at least some of them via the escape and mutation of chromosomal β -lactamases of *Kluyvera* species. Over 30 variants are known².
- Obscure types, e.g. VEB and PER, not yet of concern in the UK; also OXA (Class D) ESBLs from *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, in Turkey.

ESBLs are not the sole β -lactamases to confer resistance to 2nd and 3rd generation cephalosporins, but are the most important. They occur mostly in Enterobacteriaceae (e.g. *E. coli*, *Klebsiella* species and *Enterobacter* species) and rarely in non-fermenters (e.g. *P. aeruginosa*). They should be distinguished from other important modes of resistance to 2nd and 3rd generation cephalosporins, eg:

- Hyperproduced chromosomal AmpC β -lactamases, especially in *Enterobacter* species.
- Plasmid-mediated AmpC β -lactamases, in *Klebsiella* spp. and *E. coli* (rare)
- Hyperproduced K1 chromosomal β -lactamases in *K. oxytoca* not *pneumoniae*)
- Efflux-mediated resistance in *P. aeruginosa*
- Various ill-defined mechanisms in *Acinetobacter* species.

Guidelines on distinguishing all these resistance mechanisms from strain phenotypes have been updated recently^{3,4}.

LABORATORY DETECTION AND REPORTING OF BACTERIA WITH EXTENDED SPECTRUM β -LACTAMASES

Issue no: 1.1 Issue date:09.02.05 Issued by: Standards Unit, Evaluations and Standards Laboratory Page 6 of 15
Reference no: QSOP 51i1.1

This SOP should be used in conjunction with the series of other SOPs from the Health Protection Agency

www.evaluations-standards.org.uk

Email: standards@hpa.org.uk

ESBLs are clinically important because:

- They destroy cephalosporins, workhorse hospital antibiotics, given as first-line agents to many severely-ill patients, including those with intra-abdominal infections, community acquired pneumonias and bacteraemias.
- Delayed recognition and inappropriate treatment of severe infections caused by ESBL producers with cephalosporins has been associated with increased mortality⁵⁻⁷.
- ESBL-mediated resistance is not always obvious *in vitro* to all cephalosporins³.
- Many ESBL producers are multi-resistant to non- β -lactam antibiotics such as quinolones, aminoglycosides and trimethoprim, narrowing treatment options.
- Some producers achieve outbreak status, spreading among patients and locales, perhaps owing to particular pathogenicity traits.

New guidance on ESBLs is needed because:

- Until 2001/2 most ESBL producers in the UK were *Klebsiella* species with TEM and SHV mutants. They were largely from specialist units, where multi-resistance is anticipated.
- Since 2000, CTX-M ESBLs have emerged in the UK. They are often in *E. coli* from the hospital/community interface, for instance in urinary infections among out-patients with recent hospitalisation, who are catheterised, and who have underlying disease. Some patients with such infections do not appear to have had contact with hospitals. They may be admitted with serious secondary infections, such as bacteraemia, and be treated inappropriately due to delayed recognition that the organism is an ESBL producer, with serious sequelae. High mortality has been observed in these cases.
- ***CTX-M β -lactamase-producing *E. coli* and *Klebsiella* species have been sent to the Antibiotic Resistance Monitoring & Reference Laboratory (ARMRL) from over 100 UK diagnostic labs. About one quarter of all the isolates received belong to one major outbreak *E. coli* strain, with CTX-M-15 enzyme and with a distinctive DNA profile. This strain has been reported from 18 centres and is dominant in 2. At least 4 other outbreak strains occur, also with CTX-M-15; in addition, this enzyme has been found in many sporadic *E. coli* strains^{8,9}. A few isolates have CTX-M-types other than CTX-M-15, principally CTX-M-3, -9 or -14***
- Similar shifts to increased ESBL prevalence, dissemination and towards CTX-M types are occurring widely in Europe¹⁰⁻¹³, Asia¹⁴ and Canada¹⁵: CTX-M types have long been dominant in Argentina¹⁶. The predominant CTX-M types do, however vary

with the country: CTX-M-15 in the UK, Canada and Russia, CTX-M-2 in Argentina and Israel; CTX-M-14 in parts of China and CTX-M-9 and –12 in Spain.

These changes mean that ESBLs must be sought more widely than previously. Moreover CTX-M enzymes present different detection challenges to the TEM and SHV ESBLs.

LABORATORY DETECTION: SCREENING THEN CONFIRMATION

The basic strategy to detect ESBL producers is to **use an indicator cephalosporin to screen** for likely producers, then to **seek cephalosporin/clavulanate synergy**, which distinguishes ESBL producers from, for example, strains that hyperproduce AmpC or K1 enzymes.

SCREENING: CHOICE OF INDICATOR CEPHALOSPORIN

The ideal indicator cephalosporin is one to which all ESBLs confer resistance, even when their production is scanty. Choice is predicated by the following general traits:

TEM & SHV ESBLs – obvious resistance to ceftazidime, variable to cefotaxime

CTX-M ESBLs – obvious resistance to cefotaxime: variable to ceftazidime

All ESBLs – obvious resistance to cefpodoxime

Cefuroxime, cephalexin and cephradine (see below) are unreliable indicators

It follows that the logical indicator is either cefpodoxime or BOTH of cefotaxime and ceftazidime resistance.

An alternative strategy has been proposed for community urines: testing cephalexin or cephradine as the indicator drug, then doing confirmatory ESBL tests on all isolates that are found resistant (these include e.g. all Enterobacter species. and some hyperproducers of classical TEM, as well as the ESBL producers). This is NOT recommended, as some CTX-M-15 producers, principally those belonging to the major UK outbreak strain, appear borderline susceptible⁸.

WHICH SPECIMENS & ISOLATES TO SCREEN

The spread of CTX-M enzymes into out-patient/community *E. coli* means that the indicator cephalosporin(s) should be tested first-line against **ALL Enterobacteriaceae** or, if direct sensitivities are done, on all clinical specimens likely to harbour producers.

HOW TO SCREEN WITH THE INDICATOR

The indicator drugs should be included in primary susceptibility testing done e.g. by the method of the British Society for Antimicrobial Chemotherapy¹⁷. The indicators also work in Stokes' comparative disc method, though this is no longer recommended, owing to its poor standardisation. **Species identification is highly desirable to allow proper interpretation of results. BSAC recommended breakpoints for the cephalosporins advocated are:**

Antibiotic & disc content	Zone breakpoints (mm)		MIC (mg/L)	
	R, \leq	S, \geq	R, >	S, \leq
Cefotaxime, 30 μ g	29	30	1	1
Ceftazidime, 30 μ g <i>E. coli</i> <i>Kleb</i>	21	22	2	2
Ceftazidime, 30 μ g, oth species	27	28	2	2
Cefpodoxime, 10 μ g	25	26	1	1

If NCCLS methodology is followed, attention should be paid to the Standards' low breakpoints for ESBL detection, not only their (much higher) therapeutic breakpoints. Automated systems -e.g. Vitek and Phoenix- incorporate ESBL detection tests or strategies and are an alternative to the present recommendations^{18,19}.

CONFIRMATORY TESTS FOR ESBLs

Enterobacteriaceae isolates resistant to any indicator cephalosporin in the screening tests outlined above should be subjected to confirmatory tests. Confirmation of ESBL production depends on demonstrating synergy between clavulanate and those indicator cephalosporin(s) to which the isolate was initially found resistant. Three methods can be used:

- (i) **Double disc tests.** A plate is inoculated as for a routine susceptibility test. Discs containing cefotaxime and ceftazidime 30 μ g (or cefpodoxime 10 μ g) are applied either side of one with co-amoxiclav 20+10 μ g; and c. 25-30 mm away from it.

ESBL production is inferred when the zone of *either* cephalosporin is expanded by the clavulanate. The method is cheap, but the optimal disc separation varies with the strain and some producers may be missed. **We therefore do not advocate this method.**

- (ii) **Combination disc methods.** (Oxoid or Becton Dickinson 'Combination Discs' and Mast 'MAST DD'). These compare the zones of cephalosporin discs to those of the same cephalosporin plus clavulanate. According to the supplier, either the difference in zone diameters, (Oxoid) or the ratio of diameters, is compared (Mast and BD) with zone diameter increases of ≥ 5 mm²⁰ or $\geq 50\%$ ²¹ in the presence of the clavulanate implying ESBL production. **These tests are cheap and do not require critical disc spacing.**
- (iii) **Etest ESBL strips (AB Biodisk, Solna, Sweden; Bio-Stat, Stockport, UK).** These have a cephalosporin gradient at one end and a cephalosporin + clavulanate gradient at the other. Users should follow the manufacturer's instructions, including for a heavier inoculum than in BSAC disc tests. ESBL production is inferred if the MIC ratio for cephalosporin alone: cephalosporin + clavulanate MIC is ≥ 8 . **These are accurate and precise, but more expensive than combination discs.**

Controls for ESBL tests

Quality Control of the cefpodoxime, cefotaxime and/or ceftazidime discs used in primary screening should be in accordance with standard BSAC or NCCLS recommendations, as appropriate.

Positive controls should be used to ensure the performance of ESBL confirmatory tests. Three ESBL-positive *E. coli* strains are available from the NCTC:

- CTX-M-15 (cefotaximase) NCTC 13353
- TEM-3 (broad-spectrum) NCTC 13351
- TEM-10 (ceftazidimase) NCTC 13352

The NCCLS recommends *K. pneumoniae* ATCC 700603 as an ESBL-producing QC control, as does AB Biodisk (Etest) This strain may be sourced from the ATCC.

Either *E. coli* NCTC 10418 or ATCC 25922 should also be used as a **negative** control in ESBL confirmation tests. Use of such controls is especially important when the cephalosporin and cephalosporin + clavulanate combination discs are from different batches, which may vary in original content or retained potency.

Zones of the cephalosporin and cephalosporin + clavulanate discs for ESBL-negative *E. coli* should be equal or, at worst, within ± 2 mm. Any greater difference implies malfunction or deterioration.

Pitfalls and problems for ESBL tests

Species with inducible AmpC β -lactamases: ESBLs are harder to detect in those Enterobacteriaceae with inducible AmpC chromosomal enzymes (e.g. *Enterobacter* species, *Citrobacter freundii*, *Morganella morganii*, *Providencia* species and *Serratia* species). The AmpC enzymes may be induced by clavulanate (which inhibits them poorly) and may then attack the cephalosporin, masking synergy arising from inhibition of the ESBL.

- If ESBL tests are to be done on *Enterobacter* species (**10-20% of cephalosporin resistance in enterobacters is due to ESBLs, not derepressed AmpC**) it is best to use an AmpC-stable cephalosporin (i.e. cefepime or ceftazidime) in the clavulanate synergy tests (though **NOT** as the first indicator compound). **Cefepime/clavulanate Etests (AB Biodisk) and ceftazidime/clavulanate combination discs (Oxoid) are available, and should be used with these genera.**
- Cephalosporin therapy of *Enterobacter* and *C. freundii* infections is anyway not recommended, owing to the risk of selecting AmpC-derepressed mutants; and clinicians should be steered away from the use of these agents^{22,23}.

***K. oxytoca*:** 10-20% of *K. oxytoca* isolates hyperproduce their class A “K1” chromosomal β -lactamase. These are resistant to cefpodoxime and (often) cefotaxime but not ceftazidime.

- They may give positive clavulanate synergy tests with cefotaxime or cefepime (never ceftazidime), so that producers are confused with ESBL producers. K1 hyperproduction resistance should be suspected if a *Klebsiella* isolate is indole-positive and has high-level resistance (growth up to the disc?) to piperacillin/tazobactam and cefuroxime, but has borderline susceptibility to cefotaxime and full susceptibility to ceftazidime.

***Acinetobacter* species, *P. aeruginosa* & *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia*:** ESBL tests were **NOT** developed for these species and should **NOT** be used for them. False positive results with *Acinetobacter* are common owing to inherent susceptibility to clavulanate, whilst *S. maltophilia* may give positive results *via* inhibition of its chromosomal L-2 β -lactamase. ESBLs may occur in these genera (e.g. VEB-1 in *Acinetobacter* species in France), but are not the common cause of cephalosporin resistance in them, and should not be routinely sought.

Enzymes with marginal ESBL activity, those expressed weakly, and those produced alongside other enzymes (e.g. derepressed AmpC) are the hardest to detect. The methods outlined here will never be so precise as the best molecular analysis, but will detect most producers.

REPORTING FOR ESBL PRODUCERS

β-Lactams: Organisms inferred to have ESBLs should be reported resistant to ALL penicillins (except temocillin), cephalosporins (except cefoxitin), and to aztreonam, irrespective of routine susceptibility results. ***Treatment failures and death have occurred when cephalosporins were used against ESBL producers that appeared susceptible in vitro***⁵⁻⁷.

- Carbapenems (imipenem, meropenem and ertapenem) are consistently active and are the treatment of choice in severe infections due to ESBL producers.
- Susceptibilities of ESBL producers to β-lactamase inhibitor combinations vary with the isolate and its amount of enzyme, and are not always consistent between similar tests. These combinations are probably best avoided in severe infections due to ESBL producers.
- Mecillinam often appears active *in vitro*, but its efficacy against ESBL producers remains unproven- we are cautious of advocating its use in severe infection, but further study is needed.
- Combinations of a cephalosporin with co-amoxiclav should work in principle, but have not been formally evaluated in treatment, and may be antagonistic vs. *Enterobacter* species; we are therefore cautious of advocating clinical use.

Non-β-lactams: Many ESBL producers, including community isolates with CTX-M enzymes are multi-resistant to fluoroquinolones and aminoglycosides, but susceptibilities vary, and these are good options where a strain is susceptible. **The predominant CTX-M-15 producing *E. coli* strains disseminating in the UK are resistant to fluoroquinolones, trimethoprim, co-trimoxazole, tetracyclines and amikacin; gentamicin resistance is variable and is absent from the predominant strain.**

Oral therapies: Among oral agents suitable for community use in UTI, nitrofurantoin and fosfomycin (not readily available in the UK) are active vs. many ESBL producers including most of the present CTX-M-15 producing *E. coli*. See above comments on mecillinam and on clavulanate combinations.

Empirical treatment: Empirical treatment strategies may need to be re-thought in settings where ESBLs producers are prevalent and/or where there is a significant perceived risk (e.g. for a patient with a history of UTI, admitted from the community with an overspill bacteraemia). **It may be appropriate to use a carbapenem until the infection has been proved NOT to involve an ESBL producer, then to step down to a narrower-spectrum antibiotic. Ertapenem may, arguably, be the preferred agent, as applying the least selection pressure for resistance in colonising non-fermentative bacteria.**

Which ESBL producers to send to ARMRL?

ARMRL does not seek every ESBL producer, least of all every nosocomial *Klebsiella* species isolate believed to harbour an ESBL. We do, however, seek:

- Representatives from major outbreaks
- ESBL-positive *E. coli* from any laboratory where these have not been encountered previously (we will then advise on which further isolates to send).
- ANY suspected producers from a patient without recent hospital contact.
- ANY ESBL producer also resistant to carbapenems

If in doubt, please phone to ask 020-8327-7223 (David Livermore) or 020-8327-7255 (Neil Woodford). Even where we do not seek the isolates themselves we are always happy to provide advice.

REFERENCES

1. Department of Health NHS Executive: The Caldicott Committee. Report on the review of patient-identifiable information. London. December 1997.
2. Bonnet R. Growing group of extended-spectrum beta-lactamases: the CTX-M enzymes. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2004;48:1-14. PM:14693512
3. Livermore DM, Brown DF. Detection of beta-lactamase-mediated resistance. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2001;48 Suppl 1:S59-S64. Updated version available via BSMT website. <http://www.bsac.org.uk/uploads/06.%20Detection%20of%20b-lactamase%20mediated%20resistance.pdf>.
4. Livermore DM, Winstanley TG, Shannon KP. Interpretative reading: recognizing the unusual and inferring resistance mechanisms from resistance phenotypes. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2001;48 Suppl 1:87-102. Updated version available via BSMT website. <http://www.bsac.org.uk/uploads/11.%20Interpretative%20reading.pdf>
5. Paterson DL, Ko WC, Von Gottberg A, Casellas JM, Mulazimoglu L, Klugman KP, et al. Outcome of cephalosporin treatment for serious infections due to apparently susceptible organisms producing extended-spectrum beta-lactamases: implications for the clinical microbiology laboratory. *J Clin Microbiol* 2001;39:2206-12. PM:11376058
6. Brun-Buisson C, Legrand P, Philippon A, Montravers F, Ansquer M, Duval J. Transferable enzymatic resistance to third-generation cephalosporins during nosocomial outbreak of multiresistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae*. *Lancet* 1987;2:302-6. PM:2886766
7. Paterson DL, Ko WC, Von Gottberg A, Mohapatra S, Casellas JM, Goossens H, et al. International prospective study of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* bacteremia: implications of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase production in nosocomial Infections. *Ann Intern Med* 2004;140:26-32. PM:14706969
8. Woodford N, Ward E, Kaufmann ME, Turton J, Fagan EJ, James D. Community and hospital spread of *Escherichia coli* producing extended-spectrum β -lactamases in the UK. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2004;54:735-43.
9. Warren RE, Doroshenko A, Carr R et al . A simultaneous, bi-clonal outbreak of urinary tract infection with *E. coli* O25 with extended-spectrum β -lactamase CTXM-15: Community and Hospital consequences in two English Health Districts. Abstracts of the 14th European Congress of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, Prague, Czech Republic 10, Abstract . http://www.hpa.org.uk/srmd/div_nsi_armrl/ARMRL_posters/ECCMID.ppt. p. 756.
10. Rodriguez-Bano J, Navarro MD, Romero L, Martinez-Martinez L, Muniain MA, Perea EJ, et al. Epidemiology and clinical features of infections caused by extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing *Escherichia coli* in nonhospitalized patients. *J Clin Microbiol* 2004;42:1089-94. PM:15004058
11. Edelstein M, Pimkin M, Palagin I, Edelstein I, Stratchounski L. Prevalence and molecular epidemiology of CTX-M extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in Russian hospitals. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2003;47:3724-32. PM:14638473

LABORATORY DETECTION AND REPORTING OF BACTERIA WITH EXTENDED SPECTRUM β -LACTAMASES

Issue no: 1.1 Issue date:09.02.05 Issued by: Standards Unit, Evaluations and Standards Laboratory Page 14 of 15
Reference no: QSOP 51i1.1

This SOP should be used in conjunction with the series of other SOPs from the Health Protection Agency

www.evaluations-standards.org.uk

Email: standards@hpa.org.uk

12. Baraniak A, Fielt J, Sulikowska A, Hryniewicz W, Gniadkowski M. Countrywide spread of CTX-M-3 extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing microorganisms of the family Enterobacteriaceae in Poland. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2002;46:151-9. PM:11751126
13. Eckert C, Gautier V, Saladin-Allard M, Hidri N, Verdet C, Ould-Hocine Z, et al. Dissemination of CTX-M-type beta-lactamases among clinical isolates of Enterobacteriaceae in Paris, France. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2004;48:1249-55. PM:15047527
14. Munday CJ, Xiong J, Li C, Shen D, Hawkey PM. Dissemination of CTX-M type beta-lactamases in Enterobacteriaceae isolates in the People's Republic of China. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2004;23:175-80. PM:15013044
15. Muller M, McGeer A, Willey BM, Reynolds D, Malanczyj R, Silverman M, et al. Outbreaks of multi-drug resistant *Escherichia coli* in long-term care facilities in the Durham, York and Toronto regions of Ontario, 2000-2002. *Can Commun Dis Rep* 2002;28:113-8. PM:12132385
16. Radice M, Power P, Di Conza J, Gutkind G. Early dissemination of CTX-M-derived enzymes in South America. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2002;46:602-4. PM:11796390
17. Andrews JM. BSAC standardized disc susceptibility testing method (version 3). *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2004;53:713-28. PM:15028662
18. Livermore DM, Struelens M, Amorim J, Baquero F, Bille J, Canton R, et al. Multicentre evaluation of the VITEK 2 Advanced Expert System for interpretive reading of antimicrobial resistance tests. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2002;49:289-300. PM:11815570
19. Leverstein-van Hall MA, Fluit AC, Paauw A, Box AT, Brisse S, Verhoef J. Evaluation of the Etest ESBL and the BD Phoenix, VITEK 1, and VITEK 2 automated instruments for detection of extended-spectrum beta-lactamases in multiresistant *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella* spp. *J Clin Microbiol* 2002;40:3703-11. PM:12354869
20. Carter MW, Oakton KJ, Warner M, Livermore DM. Detection of extended-spectrum beta-lactamases in klebsiellae with the Oxoid combination disk method. *J Clin Microbiol* 2000;38:4228-32. PM:11060096
21. M'Zali FH, Chanawong A, Kerr KG, Birkenhead D, Hawkey PM. Detection of extended-spectrum beta-lactamases in members of the family enterobacteriaceae: comparison of the MAST DD test, the double disc and the Etest ESBL. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2000;45:881-5. PM:10837444
22. Chow JW, Fine MJ, Shlaes DM, Quinn JP, Hooper DC, Johnson MP, et al. Enterobacter bacteremia: clinical features and emergence of antibiotic resistance during therapy. *Ann Intern Med* 1991;115:585-90. PM:1892329
23. Livermore DM, Brown DF, Quinn JP, Carmeli Y, Paterson DL, Yu VL. Should third-generation cephalosporins be avoided against AmpC-inducible Enterobacteriaceae? *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2004;10:84-5. PM:14706093

LABORATORY DETECTION AND REPORTING OF BACTERIA WITH EXTENDED SPECTRUM β -LACTAMASES

Issue no: 1.1 Issue date:09.02.05 Issued by: Standards Unit, Evaluations and Standards Laboratory Page 15 of 15
Reference no: QSOP 51i1.1

This SOP should be used in conjunction with the series of other SOPs from the Health Protection Agency

www.evaluations-standards.org.uk

Email: standards@hpa.org.uk