



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Safety and effectiveness of fifth generation cephalosporins for the treatment of methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus bloodstream infections: a narrative review exploring past, present, and future

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Bavaro, D.F., Belati, A., Bussini, L., Cento, V., Diella, L., Gatti, M., et al. (2024). Safety and effectiveness of fifth generation cephalosporins for the treatment of methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus bloodstream infections: a narrative review exploring past, present, and future. *EXPERT OPINION ON DRUG SAFETY*, 23(1), 9-36 [10.1080/14740338.2023.2299377].

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/953171> since: 2024-01-15

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1080/14740338.2023.2299377>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Bavaro DF, Belati A, Bussini L, Cento V, Diella L, Gatti M, Saracino A, Pea F, Viale P, Bartoletti M.

Safety and effectiveness of fifth generation cephalosporins for the treatment of methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus bloodstream infections: a narrative review exploring past, present, and future.

Expert Opin Drug Saf. 2024 Jan; 23(1): 9-36.

The final published version is available online at: [10.1080/14740338.2023.2299377](https://doi.org/10.1080/14740338.2023.2299377)

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)

When citing, please refer to the published version.

1 **Safety and Effectiveness of Fifth Generation Cephalosporins for the Treatment of Methicillin-Resistant**
2 **Staphylococcus aureus Bloodstream Infections: a Narrative Review Exploring Past, Present and Future**

3
4 **ABSTRACT**

5 **Introduction:** Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) bloodstream infections (BSIs) is a major
6 issue in healthcare, since it is often associated with endocarditis or deep site foci. Relevant morbidity and
7 mortality associated with MRSA-BSIs forced the development of new antibiotic strategies; in particular, this
8 review will focus the attention on fifth generation cephalosporins (ceftaroline/ceftobiprole), that are the only
9 β -lactams active against MRSA.

10 **Areas covered:** The review discusses the available randomized controlled trials and real-world observational
11 studies conducted on safety and effectiveness of ceftaroline/ceftobiprole for the treatment of MRSA-BSIs.
12 Finally, a proposal of MRSA-BSI treatment flowchart, based on fifth generation cephalosporins, is described.

13 **Expert opinion:** The use of anti-MRSA cephalosporins is an acceptable choice either in monotherapy or
14 combination therapy for the treatment of MRSA-BSIs due to their relevant effectiveness and safety.
15 Particularly, their use may be advisable in combination therapy in case of severe infections (including
16 endocarditis or persistent bacteremia) or in monotherapy in subjects at higher risk of drugs-induced toxicity
17 with older regimens. On the contrary, caution should be used in case of suspected/ascertained central nervous
18 system infections due to inconsistent data regarding penetration of these drugs in cerebrospinal fluid and brain
19 tissues.

20
21
22 **KEYWORDS:** Fifth generation cephalosporins; Ceftriaxone; Cefepime; Staphylococcus aureus;
23 Methicillin-resistance; MRSA; bloodstream infections.

24

25 **1. Staphylococcus aureus bloodstream infections: the state of art**

26 *1.1. Epidemiology and microbiology of Staphylococcus aureus*

27 *S. aureus* was discovered in the 1880s, in a time when infection by this bacterium claimed the life of the 80%
28 of affected individuals [1]. The introduction of penicillin in medical use in 1940, brought about a radical but
29 fleeting change in the prognosis of *S. aureus* infections. Already in 1942, in fact, the first penicillin-resistant
30 *S. aureus* isolate was observed in a hospital, and shortly after in the community. By 1960, the rate of penicillin
31 resistance by acquired β -lactamase enzymes had risen to 80%, and methicillin (a penicillinase-resistant
32 penicillin) was introduced in clinical use. But, again, success was ephemeral. In just a couple of years, *S.*
33 *aureus* developed methicillin-resistance thanks to the acquisition of a large mobile genetic element known as
34 the staphylococcal chromosome cassette *mec* (*SCCmec*), becoming the world-renowned methicillin-resistant
35 *S. aureus* (MRSA). Even today, after decades of research and innovations, MRSA is one of the top pathogens
36 “that keeps clinical infection specialists up at night”, in virtue of its nearly pan- β -lactam resistance profile and
37 association with significant mortality [2].

38 *1.2. General epidemiological features of S. aureus*

39 Staphylococci are ubiquitous gram-positive cocci adapted to be common human commensals on the skin and
40 mucous membranes. All of them have evolved to survive in these harsh environments, being able to tolerate
41 aerobic and anaerobic atmosphere, the presence of a high concentration of salt, and temperatures ranging from
42 18°C to 40°C. What makes *S. aureus* unique compared to other species of the *Staphylococcus* family (e.g.
43 coagulase-negative staphylococci), is the expression of additional virulence determinants that promote tissue
44 colonization, invasion, escape to phagocytosis and tissue damage by toxins production [3].

45 Besides being a common cause of skin, soft tissue and bone infections, *S. aureus* is a leading causes of
46 nosocomial infections, that ranges from surgical site infections (SSIs) - in particular general, orthopedic,
47 cardiac, and neurosurgeries [4,5], to pneumonia, bloodstream infections and sepsis in nonsurgical patients –
48 including dialysis patients, HIV-infected patients and patients in intensive care units (ICUs) – [6-9]. In 2019,
49 the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) reported that the 18.7% of ICU-acquired
50 pneumonia episodes, the 11.1% of ICU-acquired bloodstream infections (BSIs), and the 15.2% of SSIs in
51 Europe were attributable to *S. aureus* [5,10].

52 Nasal colonization is a major risk factor for the development of invasive staphylococcal infections [6,11], and
53 constitute the reservoir for the spread of the pathogen in the population [3]. Approximately 20% of adults are
54 chronic (persistent) nasal carriers of *S. aureus*, while an additional 60% may carry the organism intermittently
55 [3,12,13]. From the nose, the skin (and hands) can become colonized, with intermittent skin carriage rates as
56 high as 40% [14]. The hands of colonized subjects, including health-care workers, are then the main source for
57 *S. aureus* transmission in both household and hospital settings [15,16], along with the less-frequent possibility
58 of airborne transmission [14]. Current estimates report that 25-30% of subjects are colonized with methicillin-
59 sensitive *S. aureus* (MSSA), while 1-3% carry an MRSA [17,18].

60 1.3. Methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (epidemiology, microbiology)

61 Ever since its emergence in the 1960s, MRSA has become an epidemic across the globe and only pathogen-
62 drug combination able to cause more than 100,000 deaths and 3.5 million Disability Adjusted Life Years
63 (DALYs) attributable to resistance in the world [19]. MRSA is one of the six pathogens associated with the
64 higher burden of deaths related to drug resistance worldwide, ranking first in high-income countries [19]. There
65 is marked geographical variation in MRSA burden, probably as a consequence of the circulation of multiple
66 clones generated from the independent acquisition of SCCmec [20]. In Europe, the population-weighted
67 percentage of MRSA isolates in 2021 was of 15.8% [21], and the 11.0% of ICU-acquired *S. aureus* infections
68 were attributable to this resistant pathogen [10].

69 Penicillins are a class of β -lactam antibiotics that bind and inactivate penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs),
70 critical enzymes that cross-link peptidoglycan components and strengthen the cell walls of most bacteria,
71 including gram-positive cocci as *S. aureus*. β -lactam resistance in MRSA originates from the horizontal
72 acquisition of SCCmec, followed by clonal expansion of the resistant isolates. SCCmec contains the *mecA* (or
73 occasionally called *mecC*) resistance gene, coding for an alternative 78-kDa penicillin binding protein PBP2a
74 [2]. PBP2a is able to substitute for the function of the other PBPs, thus preserving bacterial replication
75 capacity in the absence of treatment. Yet, it has low affinity for all β -lactams, thereby strongly reducing clinical
76 efficacy against MRSA. Today only two V-generation cephalosporins — ceftaroline and ceftobiprole—are
77 efficacious against the most highly pathogenic MRSA strains [22,23].

78 1.4. Epidemiology, morbidity, mortality and risk factors for *S. aureus* bloodstream infections

79 *S. aureus* is the second most common pathogen causing bloodstream infections (BSIs) worldwide, head to
80 head with *Escherichia coli* [24], with estimated incidences of 9.3 to 65 cases/100,000 persons per year [25,26]
81 and a case-fatality rate ranging between 15 and 40% [27-30]. Even though mortality due to *S. aureus*
82 bacteremia has gradually decreased over the last 30 years [31], we still observe a huge variability in outcome
83 estimates, that reflects the heterogeneity of clinical settings and patient populations analyzed, with a significant
84 impact of age (extremities in particular), route of acquisition, site of primary clinical focus, presence or absence
85 of indwelling medical devices, pathogen characteristics, and host predisposition (e.g. Charlson co-morbidity
86 index and SOFA score at admission, intravenous drug use, low socioeconomic status) [27,32-35].

87 In recent years, substantial progress has been achieved in preventing MRSA BSIs after widespread introduction
88 of enhanced infection control efforts, including generalization of hand-washing (using hydro-alcoholic
89 solution), mirrored by a generalized decrease in the incidence of MRSA BSIs in US and Europe, as well as in
90 other countries with systematic surveillance [29,36,37]. The prevention of spreading of MRSA strains appears
91 crucial, due to the severity of infections. In particular, community acquired MRSA strains may harbor genes
92 for Panton Valentine leucocidin (PVL); the expression of PVL toxin may cause more severe and complicated
93 skin and soft tissue infections and pneumonia. This characteristic lead to an increase of morbidity and
94 mortality for community acquired MRSA, if compared to hospital acquired MRSA and MSSA infections [38].
95 As for other invasive infections, persistent nasal carriage is an important risk factor for *S. aureus* BSIs, and as
96 high as 80% of *S. aureus* blood isolates in bacteremia events are of endogenous origins, identical to those
97 isolated from the anterior nares of corresponding patients [6,11]. Entryways for *S. aureus* bacteremia can be
98 multiple, and eventually remains undetermined in up to 25% of cases. Yet, several cohort studies agreed in
99 identify contaminated indwelling devices (e.g. intravascular catheters and implantable medical devices),
100 SSTIs, pleuropulmonary and osteoarticular infections as main sources for *S. aureus* bacteremia [34,39].

101 Once in the bloodstream, *S. aureus* can seed and establish metastatic infections in virtually any body site,
102 ensuing complications that may result in significant morbidity and mortality. Metastatic complications,
103 anatomically unrelated to the primary site infection, occur at rates that range from 11% to 53% [35] and include
104 osteomyelitis, deep-seated abscess, septic arthritis and infective endocarditis [40]. Some of them frequently
105 require ICU admission, multiple diagnostic interventions, and therapeutic lines, and carry poor prognosis

106 because of the anatomic site or the difficulty in reaching a timely diagnosis. Notably, early infectious disease
107 consultation (and underlying quality of care process) is one of the few modifiable factors that improves survival
108 to *S. aureus* BSIs [41-44].

109

110 **2. Current approach to Staphylococcus aureus bloodstream infections**

111 *2.1. The complexity of Staphylococcus aureus bloodstream infection.*

112 Due to the virulence mechanisms and the strong biofilm-forming ability [45], *S. aureus* BSI (SA-BSI) are
113 frequently complicated by dissemination of the infection to prosthetic materials, on both natural and prosthetic
114 valves (endocarditis) or on intracardiac devices (ICD), bone and joints, skin and soft tissues (creating
115 abscesses), causing metastatic diseases [34].

116 Particularly, disseminated infections are more frequent in community-acquired (CA) BSI and in association
117 with persistent bacteremia. [46,47].

118 According to its complexity, an infectious disease (ID) specialist consultation has become mandatory for the
119 management of SA-BSI, in order to reduce morbidity, mortality, length of hospital stay by ensuring adherence
120 to several pivotal treatment strategies (bundles) envisaged by current guidelines [48].

121 To uniform clinical management and ensure appropriateness of treatment, SA-BSI are divided in two main
122 types, uncomplicated and complicated BSI.

123 The Infectious Diseases Society of America defines the “uncomplicated bacteraemia” as a bacteraemia with
124 no evidence of IE and absence of implanted prostheses, negative follow-up blood cultures drawn two to four
125 days after the initial set, defervescence within 72 hours after initiating appropriate antibiotic therapy, and no
126 evidence of metastatic infection [49]. On the contrary, “complicated bacteraemia” was defined by Lopez et al.
127 if one of the following criteria is present: persistent bacteraemia, development of endocarditis or metastatic
128 foci, presence of Janeway lesions, Osler nodes, or other cutaneous or mucosal lesions suggestive of acute
129 systemic infection (including petechiae, vasculitis, infarcts, ecchymoses, pustules, Roth spots, or conjunctival
130 hemorrhage) in the absence of a firm alternate explanation, presence of any permanent prosthetic device, any
131 device-related infection where the device could not be removed in the first 3 days, SAB in patients under
132 chronic haemodialysis [50].

133

134 2.2. “Bundles-of-care” approach

135 Since SA-BSI is often complicated and burdened by a great morbidity and mortality, numerous studies have
136 been carried out to identify risk factors of poor outcome and improve the management of these patients.

137 In 2013 Lopez-Cortes *et al.* [50] identified quality of care indicators to implement when facing a SA-BSI
138 (Table 1).

139 The usefulness of the adherence to these bundles has been established in several subsequent works [51-53]
140 and they are now considered a standard of care, along with an ID consultation [54].

141 In detail, these “bundles” included: follow-up blood-culture, early source control, echocardiography, and
142 appropriate antibiotic therapy according to the presence of MSSA or MRSA, in order to quickly identify
143 patients with complicated SA-BSI and provide the optimal management.

144 *Follow-up blood cultures.* The performance of follow-up blood cultures is useful to identify persistent
145 bacteremia and patients at higher risk of complications. Authors suggest performing follow-up blood cultures
146 after 48-96 h after starting of an appropriate antimicrobial therapy. The duration of SA bacteremia represents
147 a risk factor for mortality and is often associated with the presence of a deep site infection and/or poor source
148 control. Complications (risk of death, prolonged hospital stay or admission in Intensive Care Unit) significantly
149 increase after 3 days of bacteremia [50].

150 *Early source control.* It was defined as removal of non-permanent vascular catheter if suspected or confirmed
151 as the source of SA bacteraemia, or drainage of an abscess in <72 h, and represents one of the most important
152 quality indicators. In fact, the presence of an infected catheter or device, or the presence of an undrained
153 abscess are major risk factors for persistence of bacteriemia, recurrence of the infection and death [55].

154 *Echocardiography.* Transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) should be performed in all patients with SA-BSI,
155 since it is a rapid, non-invasive test, that can provide important information about the presence or not of
156 endocarditis. Trans-oesophageal echocardiography (TEE), that is more invasive and could be burdened by
157 more complications, should be reserved to patients with high risk of IE, particularly patients with community-
158 onset of SA-BSI, presence of prosthetic valves or ICD, persistent bacteraemia or disseminated infection with
159 negative TTE. In case of positive TTE, TEE should be also considered since it has a higher sensibility in case
160 of perivalvular abscesses, valve perforation and to define the dimension (and embolization risk) of the
161 vegetation. These characteristics of IE are important to give surgical indication of endocarditis [50].

162 *Appropriate antimicrobial therapy.* *S. aureus* should be considered the potential causative organism in case of
163 sepsis and septic shock, due to the aforementioned mechanism of virulence. Since MSSA is susceptible to β -
164 lactams, an empirical therapy in case of sepsis and septic shock is usually effective against this pathogen,
165 pending for blood-culture results. In addition, in case of sepsis and septic shock, an anti-MRSA coverage
166 should be considered when the patient presents risk factors for MRSA colonization, i.e. recent hospitalization,
167 residence in long-term care facility, recent surgery, hemodialysis, prior antibiotic treatment, and high APACHE
168 score [56]The treatment of MRSA-BSI is still a matter of debate, and the best options seems to be represented
169 by glycopeptides, lipopeptides or new fifth generation cephalosporins. In addition, some may dispute also the
170 usefulness of oxazolidinone such as linezolid, particularly when outpatient therapy is a valid option [57].

171 *Duration of treatment.* The appropriate duration of the treatment represents one of the bundles of the quality
172 of care in the management of SA-BSI. The duration of the treatment is also still controversial.

173 In case of complicated bacteraemia, the suggested minimum duration of therapy is 28 days, but could be longer,
174 depending on the site of infection that requires sterilization. For infective endocarditis (IE), according to
175 different guidelines and depending on if is a native valve endocarditis (NVE) or a prosthetic valve endocarditis
176 (PVE), a treatment of 4-8 weeks is recommended [58].

177 For implantable cardioverter defibrillator (ICD) infections, the treatment duration depends on the presence of
178 endocarditis. If only the pocket is infected, 14 days of antibiotic therapy after the removal of the ICD is
179 recommended. In case of vegetations on TTE after removal, 4-6 weeks is recommended [59].

180 For non-vertebral osteomyelitis a similar duration is recommended while spondylodiscitis could need longer
181 duration of treatment [60]. Osteomyelitis should also be treated surgically in order to be completely eradicated,
182 especially when there is a subperiosteal or soft tissue abscess, an osseous sequestrum, or other evidence of a
183 chronic infection, like a sinus tract infection. Other indications to surgery include infections that do not respond
184 to appropriate antibiotic therapy or concomitant septic joint arthritis [61].

185 Prosthetic joint infections (PJI) are difficult to manage, and duration of treatment is strongly dependant by
186 surgical strategy adopted. Surgery represents the cornerstone of the therapy to eradicate the infection. Six
187 weeks is the minimum recommended duration of antibiotic therapy, but no clear evidence is available [62].

188 Often a longer duration is needed, depending on the type of surgery performed (Debridement Antibiotics and
189 Implant Retention (DAIR), explantation-reimplantation in 2 or 1 stage). A randomized controlled trial was

190 published on NEJM on 410 patients with PJI. The two groups (205 vs 205 patients) were randomly assigned
191 to receive 6 vs 12 weeks of antibiotic course. The trial failed to show the non-inferiority of 6-weeks antibiotic
192 course, with a higher percentage of patients with unfavourable outcomes [63].

193 Finally, in some cases, chronic suppressive therapy is warrantable when a prosthetic infection (PJI, PVE etc.)
194 cannot be eradicate with surgery [64].

195 On the other side, after a complicated bacteraemia is excluded, the duration of antibiotic therapy should be
196 prolonged for 14 days from the first negative follow-up blood culture, in order to reduce the risk of infection
197 relapse [65]. In fact, a prospective observational study showed that relapse occur more frequently in patients
198 treated < 14 days (8% vs 0%) [66]. Nevertheless, in selected low-risk patients, a shorter duration of therapy
199 could be considered: in a retrospective cohort Danish study, 1005 patients with MSSA-BSI divided in three
200 cohorts were treated with prolonged (714 patients) or short course (291 patients) with no association at the
201 multivariate analysis with higher 90-d mortality and 30-d mortality in patients treated with short course [67].
202 Consequently, a potential short course of therapy is feasible, as suggested by other experiences [68,69], but
203 more studies are still needed.

204

205 **3. Current treatment strategies for MRSA bloodstream infections**

206 *3.1 Backbone of therapy: vancomycin, daptomycin, linezolid*

207 Beta-lactams represent the cornerstone of the antibiotic treatment since their introduction in 1930 and have
208 several clinical indications. Their favourable safety profile and great effectiveness against a great number of
209 infections [70] make them the most prescribed class of antibiotics in the world, sometimes leading to
210 unjustified abuse, with the emergence of antibiotic resistance.

211 For what concern MSSA infections, β -lactams had demonstrated superiority to other antibiotic classes in
212 several studies, making cefazolin and anti-staphylococcal penicillins (ASP) the first-line therapy of choice [–
213 71-73].

214 However, since the spread of MRSA strains β -lactams resulted ineffective, posing a serious treat for the therapy
215 of MRSA infection. In this setting, glycopeptides (vancomycin and teicoplanin) become the only therapeutic
216 choice for many years. According to current guidelines, vancomycin still represents the first line antibiotic
217 therapy for the treatment of MRSA bloodstream infections, along with daptomycin [49, 74]. Indeed, despite

218 newer anti-MRSA drugs, including linezolid or fifth generation cephalosporins, were introduced in recent
219 years, clinical trial demonstrating their superiority over vancomycin are lacking. Nevertheless, some concerns
220 related to vancomycin-based therapy are noteworthy. As first, according to 2020 IDSA Guidelines update
221 concerning therapeutic monitoring of VAN, the latest recommendation advocates for AUC-based dosing and
222 monitoring of VAN, utilizing PK equations or Bayesian modeling. The guidelines propose the maintenance of
223 the AUC within the range of 400 to 600 mcg*h/mL to mitigate the risks of clinical failure and the occurrence
224 of acute kidney injury (AKI). These concentrations are achieved at VAN doses of 15–20 mg/kg (based on
225 actual body weight) administered every 8–12 hours as an intermittent infusion for most patients with normal
226 renal function [75]. , For VAN MIC > 1 mg/L, doses of 15-20 mg/kg administered every 8-12h may fail to
227 achieve the AUC, but higher doses could increase the risk of nephrotoxicity. For that, new guidelines suggest
228 against the use of VAN if MIC is > 1 mg/L. [75]. Moreover, vancomycin has a low bactericidal activity, and
229 its efficacy may be hindered by high inoculum MRSA infection [76]. Finally, nephrotoxicity is a common
230 adverse event complicating therapy with vancomycin in 5%–35% of cases, according to different studies [77].
231 More recently, a lipopeptide antibiotic, daptomycin, was approved for the treatment of complicated skin and
232 skin-structure infections and for treatment of *S. aureus* BSI and right-sided endocarditis, since it showed non-
233 inferiority in mortality if compared to standard of care in randomized controlled trials [78]. In addition, in real-
234 world studies, daptomycin has shown to have a higher bactericidal activity than vancomycin, with a better
235 safety profile [79] and to be associated with a higher clinical cure of MRSA bacteremia, independently from
236 vancomycin MIC [80].
237 Additionally, another anti-MRSA antibiotic belonging to oxazolidinone family, linezolid, was approved for the
238 treatment of community-acquired and nosocomial pneumonias and skin and soft-tissue infections caused by
239 MRSA [81]. Linezolid could be considered as a salvage therapy for persistent MRSA bacteremia [82, 83].
240 Results of a recent meta-analysis showed that linezolid is comparable to glycopeptides and daptomycin in
241 terms of mortality, clinical and microbiological cure and safety [84]. However, its utilization as first line for
242 MRSA BSI treatment has some issues, including the high volume of distribution (50–60 L) and the low protein
243 binding to albumin (from 10.5 to 31%), resulting in a high tissue distribution and lower bloodstream
244 concentration, theoretically limiting its use in the context of BSIs [85]; consequently, therapeutic drug
245 monitoring is warranted to optimize therapy with this drug [86]. Moreover, drug-drug interactions and risk of

246 toxicity (neuropathy and myelosuppressive effect) should not be neglected when linezolid is prescribed.
247 Nevertheless, linezolid can be administered through an oral formulation, giving the chances to perform an
248 early switch in low-risk patients with MRSA BSI, leading to a reduced duration of hospitalization [87]. Another
249 molecule included in oxazolidinone family is tedizolid, which demonstrated the noninferiority compared to
250 linezolid in the early clinical response rate; in addition, tedizolid showed a favorable safety profile in terms of
251 gastrointestinal and hematological side effects [88].

252 Teicoplanin is not recommended as first line regimen for MRSA bacteraemia. Anyway, it could be considered
253 as second-line regimen, when first-line regimens are contraindicated. [89] Evidence on its efficacy are limited,
254 but no inferiority has been documented compared with vancomycin [90], especially using higher maintenance
255 dosing. [91].

256 The current efficacy profile, toxicity and other limitations of VAN\Teicoplanin, DAP, and Linezolid\Tedizolid
257 for MRSA bacteraemia are summarised in a Table 2.

258

259 *3.2 Combination therapy versus monotherapy for Staphylococcus aureus bloodstream infections*The treatment
260 of S.aureus BSI remains challenging for clinicians, despite the availability of different treatment options.
261 Indeed, despite many guidelines suggest monotherapy with VAN or DAP, many clinicians still prefer the use
262 of combination therapy, with two or more drugs, according to site of infection and severity of MRSA BSI. This
263 uncertainty regarding what is the optimal treatment causes a jeopardized management worldwide, even in
264 clinical trial design, where adjunct antibiotic therapy is often allowed [92].

265 The combination therapy based on vancomycin or daptomycin plus a β -lactam has been proposed as a strategy
266 for facing this treat, for both MSSA and MRSA. Other strategies included a combination of two β -lactams; for
267 instance, Ulloa et al. suggest the combination of cefazolin with ertapenem for treatment of refractory MSSA
268 BSI; this combination results successful *in vitro*, since the two drugs bind complementary penicillin binding
269 protein; moreover, the *in vivo* studies show cooperativity with innate immune system [93]. Conversely, studies
270 about combination therapy with β -Lactam and daptomycin for MSSA infections suggest that this combination
271 does not improve the outcome or the duration of bacteremia and mortality [94,95].

272 Nevertheless, it is well described that β -lactam activity improves when vancomycin or daptomycin
273 susceptibility decreases; otherwise, the re-sensitisation to a β -lactam of a daptomycin resistant MRSA strain
274 may also occur; this phenomenon is known as “*seesaw effect*” and involve mutations at the *mprF* locus [96,97].
275 The first trial on combination therapy for MRSA BSI, conducted by CAMERA study group [98], suggested
276 that the addition of an anti-staphylococcal β -lactam to vancomycin may shorten the duration of MRSA
277 bacteremia. A further trial [99] was conducted hypothesizing that vancomycin or daptomycin plus an anti-
278 staphylococcal β -lactam would improve clinical outcomes of patients with MRSA BSI; the study concluded
279 that no significant improvement was obtained in patients treated with combination therapy in term of mortality,
280 persistent bacteremia, relapse, or treatment failure. However, the study was interrupted earlier due to higher
281 risk of kidney failure in the combination group, especially in patients undergoing flucloxacillin. . Conversely,
282 the preliminary result of a study investigating the duration of bacteremia in course of therapy daptomycin plus
283 ceftaroline versus Standard of Care Monotherapy [100] show a significant difference in in-hospital mortality,
284 with higher mortality rate in standard of care group. The study was interrupted early due to safety concerns.
285 However, recent meta-analysis on β -lactams combined with vancomycin or daptomycin for MRSA BSI show
286 that the combination therapy significantly reduced the risk of clinical failure or recurrence of bacteremia, but
287 has not a significant impact on mortality; however, the risk of adverse events, including *C.difficile* infection,
288 is higher with combination therapy [101 - 103]. Similar results emerged from a recent trial on combination
289 therapy based on fosfomycin plus daptomycin versus daptomycin in monotherapy [104].
290 Finally, the combination of daptomycin plus ceftaroline could be considered as an important option in case of
291 persistent bacteremia [105], due to the synergistic effect, the anti-staphylococcal activity of ceftaroline, and
292 the reduction of resistance rate of daptomycin in association with a β -lactam.

293

294 **4. General characteristics of fifth generation cephalosporins**

295 Ceftaroline and ceftobiprole share common pharmacokinetic (PK) features with traditional and novel beta-
296 lactams, showing a low volume of distribution (*Vd*) (36 and 21.7 L for ceftaroline and ceftobiprole,
297 respectively), low protein binding (15-28% for ceftaroline and 16% for ceftobiprole), and predominant renal
298 clearance (>80% for both drugs) [106 - 108].

299 In regard to pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic (PK/PD) relationship, fifth generation cephalosporins exhibit
300 time-dependent bacterial killing similarly to other beta-lactams, being their efficacy associated with the
301 percentage of the dosing interval that the unbound concentration is maintained above the minimum inhibitory
302 concentration (MIC) of the targeted pathogen ($\%T_{>MIC}$) [109].

303 The PK/PD relationship of ceftaroline and ceftobiprole was assessed in both preclinical and clinical studies.
304 Specifically, an *in vitro* PK model investigated the antibacterial effect of ceftaroline at labelled dosing against
305 both methicillin-susceptible (MSSA) and -resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) strains exhibiting a wide
306 range of MICs [110]. The $\%T_{>MIC}$ was found as the best PD parameter describing ceftaroline efficacy, being
307 a 24.5 $\%T_{>MIC}$, 27.8 $\%T_{>MIC}$, and 32.1 $\%T_{>MIC}$ associated with bacteriostatic, 1-log-kill, and 2-log-kill activity,
308 respectively [110]. Notably, changes in ceftaroline population analysis profiles were significantly related to
309 $fT_{>MIC}$, considering that a $fT_{>MIC} < 50\%$ was associated with *S. aureus* regrowth showing four-fold increased
310 MIC to ceftaroline after 96 h of drug exposure. This finding was consistent with current evidence supporting
311 the need of more aggressive beta-lactams PK/PD targets for suppressing resistance emergence [111-113].
312 Similarly, in an *in vitro* hollow-fiber infection model in which MRSA isolates exhibiting high ceftaroline MICs
313 (i.e., 2-4 mg/L), a $fT_{>MIC}$ of 29%, 32%, and 35% was associated with bacteriostatic, 1-log-kill, and 2-log-kill
314 activity, respectively [114]. Furthermore, a ceftaroline dosing of 600 mg q8h allowed a sustained long-term
315 bacterial suppression against MRSA isolated exhibiting high ceftaroline MICs [114]. In regard to clinical
316 studies, the relationship between ceftaroline PK/PD target attainment and clinical/microbiological response
317 was assessed in patients affected by acute bacterial skin and skin structure infections (ABSSSIs) enrolled in
318 pivotal trials [115]. A $fT_{>MIC}$ threshold of 54.2% and 55.0% was significantly associated with microbiological
319 response when all patients were included ($p=0.001$) or only those with *S. aureus* infections were considered
320 ($p=0.023$), respectively [115]. Furthermore, at multivariate analysis the occurrence of a $fT_{>MIC} > 54.2\%$ and
321 55.0% was an independent predictor of microbiological response [115]. Conversely, no significant relationship
322 between ceftaroline $\%T_{>MIC}$ and microbiological and/or clinical outcome was found in patients affected by
323 community-acquired pneumonia (CAP), mainly due to the fact that most patients had a $fT_{>MIC}$ values ranging
324 between 91.7% and 100.0% [116].

325 In regard to ceftobiprole, a preclinical model found that, similarly to ceftaroline, the $\%fT_{>MIC}$ was found as the
326 best PD parameter describing ceftobiprole efficacy, being a 36-45 $\%fT_{>MIC}$, 14-28 $\%fT_{>MIC}$, and 15-22 $\%fT_{>MIC}$

327 associated with bacteriostatic activity against *Enterobacterales*, *S. aureus*, and *S. pneumoniae*, respectively
328 [117]. Higher PK/PD targets were associated with 2-log-kill bactericidal activity, being a $fT_{>MIC}$ values of
329 64.5%, 29.3%, and 25.8% required for *Enterobacterales*, *S. aureus*, and *S. pneumoniae*, respectively [117]. In
330 regard to clinical studies, the relationship between ceftobiprole PK/PD target attainment and
331 clinical/microbiological response was assessed in patients affected by nosocomial pneumonia enrolled in
332 pivotal trials [118]. A $fT_{>MIC}$ threshold of 51.1% and 62.2% was significantly associated with clinical cure
333 ($p=0.0024$) and microbiological eradication ($p<0.0001$), respectively [118]. Furthermore, at multivariate
334 analysis the occurrence of a $fT_{>MIC} > 51.1\%$ was an independent predictor of clinical cure [118].

335 PK/PD relationship of fifth-generation cephalosporins was poorly investigated in special populations,
336 particularly in patients undergoing continuous renal replacement therapy (CRRT) [119–121] and/or those
337 treated with extracorporeal membrane oxygenator (ECMO) support [122]. Notably, a recent retrospective
338 cohort study including 35 patients with suspected ECMO-related cannula infections who received ceftobiprole
339 as empirical treatment (of which seven after ECMO removal) found no significant differences in ceftobiprole
340 PK behaviour between ECMO and non-ECMO patients [122]. Conversely, the occurrence of acute kidney
341 injury requiring CRRT and/or the existence of augmented renal clearance (ARC) were associated with
342 significant decrease in ceftobiprole serum levels [122].

343 Considering their time-dependent activity, both ceftaroline and ceftobiprole may benefit from prolonged and/or
344 continuous infusion for maximizing PK/PD targets [109]. Some studies suggested that in the treatment of
345 critically ill patients affected by ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) and/or exhibiting ARC, continuous
346 infusion may allow the attainment of optimal ceftaroline PK/PD targets against MRSA compared to
347 intermittent infusion [123,124]. Similarly, prolonging ceftobiprole infusion over 4h was found to ensure the
348 attainment of optimal PK/PD targets against pathogens exhibiting a MIC of 4 mg/L (equal to the EUCAST
349 non-species-specific breakpoint) also in critically ill ventilated patients showing augmented renal clearance
350 (ARC) [125].

351 The attainment of optimal PK/PD targets at site of infection represents a relevant feature that should be taken
352 into account when fifth generation cephalosporins are used for the treatment of secondary bacteremia caused
353 by MRSA. Ceftaroline and ceftobiprole penetration rate and PK/PD target attainment in different infection
354 sites were summarized in **Table 3**. Penetration rate of ceftaroline and ceftobiprole in different sites was similar

355 to those of other cephalosporins [126]. Adequate penetration was found in muscle (approximately 50% and
356 70% for ceftaroline and ceftobiprole, respectively) and soft/adipose tissue (47%-58% for ceftaroline and 49%
357 for ceftobiprole) [127-129], whereas poor/limited penetration rate was reported in deep-seated infections
358 (approximately 25% in epithelial lining fluid [123,130,131], and <10% in bone [132].
359 Cerebrospinal fluid penetration of CPT and BPR are still under investigation. In an animal model, Helfer et al.
360 observed that the brain penetration of CPT was impacted by MRSA infection, rising from 17% in healthy
361 animals to 27% in infected animals. Simulations of a 2-hour intravenous infusion at a dosage of 50 mg/kg
362 every 8 hours resulted in >90% PTA in both plasma and brain for MRSA MIC value of 0.25 mg/L, suggesting
363 that the drug should be considered an option for treating CNS infections.. [133] In a study involving 12 healthy
364 volunteers and 9 neurosurgical patients, Helfer and colleagues conducted simulations considering varying
365 levels of meningeal inflammation. For a CPT MIC of ≤ 1 mg/L, CSF penetration of CPT was 4%. However,
366 this penetration would increase to 19% in the presence of mild meningeal inflammation (reaching PTAs of
367 34% and 9.1% for dosages of 600 mg q8h and q12h, respectively) and further rise to 62% in the case of fully
368 inflamed meninges, reaching PTAs of 99.8% and 97.2% for 600 mg q8h and q12h, respectively. [133]. Clinical
369 data in real life are limited to case reports, documenting the clinical efficacy of CPT for the treatment of CNS
370 infections caused by MRSA, despite the limited penetration of ceftaroline documented into the CSF in those
371 works [134 - 136]. Limited data exists regarding the CSF penetration of BPR. Stucki et al. observed that the
372 penetration of BPR was approximately 16% in inflamed meninges, and 2% in uninflamed meninges in a rabbit
373 meningitis model [137], but clinical data are not available. Optimal PK/PD target attainment at site of infection
374 (i.e., $100\%/T_{>4-8\times MIC}$) was found only with the use of high-dose ceftaroline administered by continuous infusion
375 (i.e., 600 mg q8h over 8h infusion) [123].

376 377 *4.1 Ceftaroline: approved indications and data from randomized controlled trials*

378 Ceftaroline is currently approved for the management of community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) and
379 complicated skin and soft tissue infections (cSSTIs) at the dosage of 600 mg q12h over 1-h infusion [140-144].

380 Features of pivotal trials are summarized in **Table 4**.

381 In regard to CAP, two phase III RCTs (FOCUS 1 and 2) were conducted with ceftaroline in this clinical scenario
382 [140, 142]. In FOCUS 1 trial, 606 patients affected by CAP were randomized to ceftaroline 600 mg q12h

383 (n=298) or ceftriaxone 1 g/day (n=308) [140]. Bacteremia was reported in less than 3% of overall cases,
384 whereas MRSA was isolated in 10 out of 298 patients (3.4%) randomized to ceftaroline. A significant higher
385 clinical cure rate was reported in patients receiving ceftaroline compared to ceftriaxone (86.6% vs. 78.2%;
386 difference 8.4%; 95%CI 1.4%-15.4%), whereas no significant difference between the two groups emerged in
387 terms of microbiological eradication rate in MRSA subgroup (80.0% vs. 64.3%; difference 15.7%; 95%CI -
388 23.0%-48.0%). Similarly, no difference in terms of treatment-emergent adverse events (AEs) were found
389 between groups (39.9% vs. 44.2%) [140]. In FOCUS 2 trial, 622 patients affected by CAP were randomized
390 to ceftaroline 600 mg q12h (n=315) or ceftriaxone 1 g/day (n=307) [141]. Bacteremia was reported in
391 approximately 5% of enrolled patients, whereas MRSA was detected in 15 out of 315 patients (4.8%)
392 randomized to ceftaroline. No significant difference emerged between groups in terms of clinical cure rate
393 (82.1% vs. 77.2%; difference 4.9%; 95%CI -2.5%-12.5%). Similarly, in MRSA subgroup no significant
394 differences were found in microbiological eradication (66.7% vs. 56.3%; difference 10.4%; 95%CI -23.8%-
395 42.2%). The proportion of treatment-emergent AEs was similar between groups (20.3% vs. 16.9%) [32]. In
396 FOCUS and FOCUS 2 trials, ceftaroline resulted non-inferior in clinical response at day 4, end of therapy, and
397 test of cure compared to ceftriaxone for the treatment of bacteremia associated to community acquired
398 pneumonia (CAP), mainly caused by *S. pneumoniae* followed by *S. aureus* [142].

399 Furthermore, a specific phase III RCT comparing ceftaroline and ceftriaxone in CAP scenario was conducted
400 among 847 Asian patients reporting consistent findings with FOCUS 1 and 2 trials, although the proportion of
401 bacteraemic patients and/or those with MRSA isolation was only 1% [143].

402 In regard to cSSTIs, two phase III RCTs (CANVAS 1 and 2) were conducted with ceftaroline in this clinical
403 scenario [144, 145]. In CANVAS 1 trial, 702 patients affected by cSSTIs were randomized to ceftaroline 600
404 mg q12h (n=353) or vancomycin 1 g q12h plus aztreonam 1 g q12h (n=349) [144]. Bacteremia was reported
405 in 4.4% of enrolled patients, whereas MRSA was isolated in 93 out of 353 cases (26.3%) randomized to
406 ceftaroline. No significant difference emerged between groups in terms of clinical cure rate (91.1% vs. 93.3%;
407 difference 2.2%; 95%CI -6.6%-2.1%). Similarly, no significant difference was found in terms of clinical cure
408 between ceftaroline and comparators in MRSA subgroup (95.1% vs. 95.2%). Proportion of treatment-related
409 AEs was similar among groups (47.0% vs. 48.1%) [144]. In CANVAS 2 trial, 694 patients affected by cSSTIs
410 were randomized to ceftaroline (n=348) or vancomycin plus aztreonam (n=346) at the same dosing schedule

411 implemented in CANVAS 1 trial [145]. Bacteremia was found in 3.5% of included cases, whereas MRSA was
412 isolated in 86 out of 348 patients (24.7%) randomized to ceftaroline. No significant difference emerged
413 between groups in terms of clinical cure rate (92.2% vs. 92.1%; difference 0.1%; 95%CI -4.4%-4.5%).
414 Similarly, no significant difference was found in terms of clinical cure between ceftaroline and comparators in
415 MRSA subgroup (91.4% vs. 93.3%). Proportion of treatment-related AEs was similar among groups (42.2%
416 vs. 46.9%) [145].

417 Notably, a small RCT including 40 patients affected by MRSA bloodstream infections, of which 17 were
418 randomized to combination therapy with daptomycin plus ceftaroline and 23 received daptomycin or
419 vancomycin monotherapy, was prematurely interrupted because of significant higher in-hospital mortality rate
420 in monotherapy arm (6/23 vs. 0/17; p=0.029) [141]. A subgroup analysis suggested that the survival benefit
421 may be limited to patients with high-risk endovascular sources and those with IL-10 levels > 5 pg/ml on the
422 day of first positive blood culture [146].

423

424 *4.2 Ceftobiprole: approved indications and data from randomized controlled trials*

425 Ceftobiprole is currently approved for the management of CAP and hospital-acquired pneumonia (HAP) at the
426 dosage of 500 mg q8h over 2-h infusion [1147,148]. Features of pivotal trials are summarized in **Table 4**.

427 Nicholson *et al.* [147] randomized 638 patients affected by CAP to ceftobiprole (n=314) or ceftriaxone plus
428 linezolid (n=324). Bacteremia was detected in 4% of enrolled patients, whereas MRSA was isolated in only
429 one of the patients randomized to ceftobiprole. No significant differences between the two groups were found
430 in terms of clinical cure (86.6% vs. 87.4%) or microbiological eradication (88.2% vs. 90.8%). Conversely, a
431 significant higher proportion of treatment-related AEs were reported in patients receiving ceftobiprole (36%
432 vs. 26%; 95%CI 2.9%-17.2%) [147].

433 Awad *et al.* [148] randomized 781 patients affected by HAP or VAP (26.9% of overall enrolled cases) to
434 ceftobiprole (n=391) or combination therapy including ceftazidime plus linezolid (n=390). 10.5% of patients
435 were bacteraemic, whereas MRSA was isolated in 41 out of 391 cases (10.5%) receiving ceftobiprole. No
436 significant differences between the two groups were reported in terms of overall cure rates both in intention-
437 to-treat (49.9% vs. 52.8%) and clinically evaluable analysis (69.3% vs. 71.3%). Similarly, no significant
438 differences between groups were found in clinical cure (63.0% vs. 64.0%) and microbiological eradication rate

439 (48.0% vs. 57.0%) in MRSA subgroup. Notably, in VAP subgroup, a significant lower clinical cure (23.1% vs.
440 36.8%; 95%CI -26.0% - -1.5%) and microbiological eradication rate (30.4% vs. 50.0%; 95%CI -38.8% -
441 -0.4%) was found in patients treated with ceftobiprole. It is noteworthy that in MRSA subgroup, after
442 excluding VAP, ceftobiprole was associated with a significant clinical improvement at day-4 compared to
443 ceftazidime plus linezolid (94.7% vs. 52.6%; 95%CI 17.5%-66.7%). No difference in treatment-related AEs
444 was reported between the two groups (24.9%-25.4%) [148].

445 Recently, the phase III TARGET trial randomized 679 patients affected by acute bacterial skin and skin
446 structure infections (ABSSSIs) to ceftobiprole (n=335) or vancomycin plus aztreonam (n=344) [149]. MRSA
447 was isolated in 82 out of 335 patients (24.5%) receiving ceftobiprole. No significant difference in early clinical
448 response was found between two groups at intention-to-treat analysis (91.3% vs. 88.1%), whereas a significant
449 higher early clinical response was reported in ceftobiprole group at clinically evaluable analysis (94.3% vs.
450 89.4%; 95%CI 0.6%-9.4%). In MRSA subgroup, no significant difference was found between groups in terms
451 of microbiological eradication (93.9% vs. 91.8%). In regard to safety, no significant difference emerged
452 between patients receiving ceftobiprole or vancomycin plus aztreonam (44.3% vs. 38.6%) [149].

453

454 **5. Safety and effectiveness of fifth generation cephalosporins in “real-world” studies**

455 Even if ceftaroline and ceftobiprole were originally approved only for treatment of pneumonia or acute
456 bacterial skin and skin structure infections (ABSSSI) [106, 125], once entered the clinical practice their
457 sprawling potential immediately emerged so much that currently their use for off-label indications is almost
458 prevailing especially for bacteremic infections.

459 Indeed, between 2015-2016 ceftaroline received the FDA approval for the treatment of *S. aureus* bacteremia
460 associated with ABSSSI in adults and children [106].

461 Real-world studies on ceftaroline and ceftobiprole have been growing, possibly expanding their place in
462 therapy not only as rescue in refractory *S. aureus* infections but also as first-line treatment of primary or
463 complicated disease, in monotherapy or in combination with other drugs.

464 As for safety, ceftaroline and ceftobiprole showed a high tolerability similarly to other cephalosporins.

465

466 *5.1 Safety and effectiveness of ceftaroline in “real-world” studies: focus on bloodstream infections*

467 Thought no targeted RCTs are available, data on effectiveness of use of ceftaroline on BSIs are encouraging,
468 especially for complicated infections. Characteristics and outcomes of studies investigating combination
469 regimens with ceftaroline for *S. aureus* bacteremia are shown in **Table 5**.

470 A recent metanalysis assessed outcomes between patients receiving combination of ceftaroline plus
471 vancomycin or daptomycin versus vancomycin or daptomycin monotherapy for MRSA BSIs. Six of the
472 studies reported in **Table 5** were included, 1 randomized trial and 5 retrospective studies. Rate of in-hospital
473 mortality, duration of bacteremia, and adverse events were similar among the two groups. Bacteremia
474 recurrence was significantly lower with combination treatment (OR = 2.95, 95% CI= 1.22–7.15, p = 0.02, I2
475 = 6%) [150].

476 Data from CAPTURE, namely the US Clinical Assessment Program and Teflaro® Utilization Registry, were
477 related to *S. aureus* bacteremia secondary to CAP, ABSSSI and endocarditis and showed clinical success rate
478 ranging from 58-71% among all patients and 50-77% in MRSA infections [151]. First real-world reports
479 focusing on ceftaroline for *S. aureus* BSIs concerned generally salvage therapy after failure of first-line
480 regimens. Frequently, off-label dosage of 600 mg every 8h was administered.

481 Moreover, many case series described use of ceftaroline alone or in combination as rescue-therapy after
482 emergence of vancomycin or daptomycin resistant strains, persistent BSIs or bacteremic deep-seated
483 infections, demonstrating a notable rate of clinical success overall, both against MSSA [152] and MRSA [152-
484 155].

485 Epidemiological studies enrolling patients treated with ceftaroline for different indications, provided more
486 consistent data on effectiveness of ceftaroline in *S. aureus* BSIs.

487 A retrospective study analyzed a large cohort of 527 hospitalized patients receiving ceftaroline for at least 72
488 hours. One hundred forty-eight patients were treated for *S. aureus* bacteremia, mainly MRSA (92.5%). A
489 combination regimen was used in 30.8% patients, generally with metronidazole. Clinical and microbiological
490 success occurred in 78.3% and 90.8% patients, respectively. However, over-all mortality (7.6%) was mainly
491 attributable to bacteremia which had the highest mortality rate (14.2%) compared to other infections.
492 Moreover, patients with bacteremic *S. aureus* endocarditis and pneumonia had the highest rate of clinical
493 failure and mortality (22.9% and 20%) [156].

494 A multicenter observational study described 211 patients treated with ceftaroline for MRSA BSIs mostly
495 associated with pneumonia and endocarditis. A combination with an anti-MRSA drug (primarily daptomycin)
496 was chosen for 21.8% patients. Clinical cure occurred in 68.3% (69.7% in the monotherapy and 64.9% in the
497 combination group, respectively) and the median BSI durations post-ceftaroline treatment were 2 days (IQR
498 1-4 days) for monotherapy and 3 days (IQR 1.5-5 days) for combination. Independent predictors of failure at
499 multivariable logistic regression analysis were higher acute physiology and chronic health evaluation II
500 (APACHE II) and malignancy [157].

501 In another retrospective population-based study, among 764 patients afferent to the US Veterans Health Care
502 System and treated with ceftaroline for different indications, 87 had bacteremia. In this subset, median in-
503 hospital length of stay of 8 days (IQR, 3-18), in-hospital mortality was 6% while 30-day hospital readmission
504 rate was the highest among all infection types (48% vs 33% overall), however reasons of readmission were
505 unknown [158].

506 Being MRSA bacteremia still considered a serious illness associated with high rate of morbidity and mortality,
507 many comparison studies investigated effectiveness of ceftaroline with respect to other anti-MRSA first-line
508 agents.

509

510 Mootz et al performed a retrospective study on 409 patients treated with ceftaroline (N=67) or daptomycin
511 (N=342) as first-line agent for MRSA sepsis. A partner drug was frequently used in both groups, particularly
512 piperacillin/tazobactam (ceftaroline=1% vs daptomycin=26%), ciprofloxacin (ceftaroline=1% vs
513 daptomycin=9%), and vancomycin (ceftaroline=24% vs daptomycin =11%). Unadjusted hospital readmission
514 rates for ceftaroline and daptomycin, respectively, were: 30-day (25%/37%, p = 0.06), 60-day (27%/44%, p =
515 0.008), and 90-day (28%/46%, p = 0.01). Unadjusted mortality rates were: in-hospital (7%/12%, p = 0.4), 30-
516 day (3%/9%, p = 0.1), 60-day (6%/12%, p = 0.2), and 90-day (7%/15%, p = 0.1). At multivariable analysis,
517 use of ceftaroline was less associated with both 30/60/90-day hospital readmission (OR 0.54, 95% CI 0.29–
518 0.98; OR 0.42, 95% CI 0.23–0.76; OR 0.42, 95% CI 0.23–0.75) and 30/60/90-day mortality (OR 0.23, 95%
519 CI 0.04-0.82; OR 0.34, 95% CI 0.10–0.93; OR 0.34, 95% CI 0.11–0.86) [159].

520 Zasowski et al investigated outcomes of 270 patients with MRSA bacteremia treated with ceftaroline (N=83)
521 or daptomycin (N=187) as single agent. Patients had mainly received vancomycin before starting a study drug

522 but all for <96h from BSI onset. Ceftaroline showed non-inferiority to daptomycin regarding to composite
523 treatment failure defined as 30-day mortality, bacteremia duration ≥ 7 days, and 60-day BSI recurrence (39%
524 daptomycin, 32.5% ceftaroline; weighted risk difference, 7.0% [95% CI, -5 - 19%]). No differences were also
525 found for secondary outcomes including each single component of primary outcome, 60-day readmission
526 related to MRSA bacteremia, BSI duration post-study drug introduction, and length of stay post-study drug
527 initiation. [157].

528 In a cohort study where 30 patients treated with ceftaroline for MRSA bacteremia with a vancomycin MIC
529 >1.0 mg/l were compared with a matched control group of 102 patients with MRSA BSIs treated with
530 daptomycin (N=46) or vancomycin (N=56). Bacteremia was mainly associated with endocarditis, ABSSSI and
531 bone/joint infections. The 30-day mortality rate was 13% (n=4) in the ceftaroline group, 24% (n=11) in the
532 daptomycin group and 11% (n=6) in the vancomycin group (p=0.188) [160].

533 Finally, in another multicenter, case-control study, 32 patients with MRSA infection (vancomycin MICs ≥ 2
534 mcg/mL) were matched 1:1 to receive ceftaroline -empirically or after vancomycin failure- or to receive
535 vancomycin or an alternative antibiotic active against MRSA (excluding ceftaroline). In the ceftaroline group,
536 median duration of previous vancomycin therapy was 5 days (IQR 3–15.8 days). Time to eradication of MRSA
537 BSI was significantly shorter after ceftaroline compared with vancomycin [4 days (IQR, 3–7.5 days) vs 8 days
538 (IQR, 5.8–19.5 days); P = 0.02]. In the ceftaroline group rate of clinical success was higher as well as rate of
539 recurrence at day 7 was lower than in the control group, though difference not statistically significant for both
540 outcomes (81% vs. 44%, p=0.06 and 6% vs 38%, p=0.08, respectively) [161].

541 Treatment with ceftaroline is generally well tolerated, even if some safety concerns emerged in post-marketing
542 period especially associated with off-label higher dosage and duration.

543 Rate of AEs collected from large cohort studies ranged from $<1\%$ to 9% and consisted mainly with rash,
544 nausea/vomiting, acute kidney injury (AKI), neutropenia, eosinophilia, leukocytosis, anemia,
545 thrombocytopenia, and *C. difficile* infection. Myalgia/myositis and elevation of creatine phosphokinase were
546 also described especially in combination with daptomycin [157-162].

547 Neutropenia is the most common hematologic AE associated with ceftaroline. A recent review including 37
548 episodes of ceftaroline-associated neutropenia. The event occurred after a median of 25 (range 8–125) days
549 from antibiotic introduction, with a median duration of neutropenia (range) of 4 (1–16) days. Around half of

550 patients experienced severe neutropenia (absolute neutrophil count [ANC] nadir <100/mm³). The overall
551 incidence of neutropenia when ceftaroline was administered for ≥7–14 days was 12% [163].

552

553 5.2 Safety and effectiveness of ceftobiprole in “real-world” studies: focus on bloodstream infections

554 Recently, the results of the ERIDICATE trial on use of ceftobiprole for *S. aureus* bacteremia have been
555 published. [164]. Overall, 390 patients were enrolled, of these 387 were in the modified intent-to-treat
556 population and received ceftobiprole (N=189) or daptomycin with or without optional aztreonam (N=198).
557 Rate of MRSA BSI was 24.3%. Ceftobiprole was non inferiority to daptomycin at the primary endpoint of 70-
558 day clinical success rate (69.8% vs 68.7% respectively, adjusted difference 2.0%, 95% CI -7.1% to 11.1%)
559 [164].

560 Previously, limited data derived from prior RCTs on pneumonia and ABSSII as well as real-world experiences
561 have already heralded the beneficial outcomes of BSIs treated with ceftobiprole.

562 Rello et al presented at 2016 European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases Congress
563 (ECCMID) an interesting post-hoc analysis of four phase 3 RCTs, including 2 on ABSSSI [165, 166] 1 on
564 CAP [167] and 1 on HAP/VAP [168] assessing outcomes of 95 patients with secondary staphylococcal BSIs
565 treated with ceftobiprole (N=45) or the other comparator treatment that were vancomycin [166], vancomycin
566 plus ceftazidime [165], ceftriaxone plus optional linezolid [167] and ceftazidime plus linezolid [168] (N=50).
567 Patients receiving ceftobiprole or the comparator regimen have similar clinical success rate (48.9% and 44%
568 respectively, difference 4.9%, 95% CI –12.2 to 25.0) and 30-day crude mortality (8.9% and 16%, respectively,
569 difference –7.1%, 95% CI –20.2 to 6.0). Moreover, in a subset of 18 patients with MRSA BSI a trend toward
570 better outcome was observed among patients receiving ceftobiprole (clinical cure, 55.6% [5/9] vs. 22.2% [2/
571 9], respectively, difference 33.3%, 95% CI –9.0 to 77.7; 30-day all-cause mortality, 0.0% [0/9] vs. 22.2% [2/9],
572 respectively, difference –22.2%, 95% CI –49.4 to 4.9) [169].

573 To date, reports on real-world use of ceftobiprole are limited. The well-known clinical effectiveness of
574 combination of daptomycin and other anti-staphylococcal beta-lactams [105, 170] along with the proven in-
575 vitro synergy of daptomycin and ceftobiprole [171] has frequently prompted clinicians to choose this regimen
576 for difficult-to treat *S. aureus* infections.

577 The CEFTO-CURE study explored real-world use of ceftobiprole in 10 Italian centers. Among 195 patients,
578 prevalent indications for using ceftobiprole were pneumonia (151/195, 74%), and BSIs (37/195, 19%).
579 Ceftobiprole was usually administered empirically (127/195, 65%), in combination regimen (129/195, 66%)
580 mostly with meropenem (40/129, 31%), and in case of pneumonia (91/129, 71%) and BSI (26/129, 20%). The
581 others received ceftobiprole alone (66/195, 34%), generally when pneumonia was diagnosis (60/66, 91%). A
582 microbiological diagnosis was achieved in 39% (76/195) of cases; MRSA was more frequently involved (38%,
583 29/76). Excluded 12 patients with diagnosis of microorganisms non susceptible to ceftobiprole, the failure rate
584 was 21% (39/183) and the crude all-cause mortality rate was 19.6% (36/183) and the attributable mortality rate
585 was 6% (11/183). Among 35 patients with bacteremia, 74% had clinical success while 23% died. At the
586 multivariable analysis performed with the multi-level model, main variables related with clinical success were
587 male gender, identification of causative microorganism, diagnosis of pneumonia while diagnosis of sepsis
588 predicted failure. At the multivariable analysis performed with the multi-level model, main variables associated
589 with all-cause mortality was age, higher comorbidities, hospital-acquired infection, mechanical ventilation,
590 sepsis, and clinical failure; survival was associated with COPD, identification of causative pathogen and
591 duration of ceftobiprole therapy. Performing inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) analysis
592 adjusted for baseline characteristics of patients who received ceftobiprole as monotherapy and patients treated
593 with combination regimen, no significant differences were found between these two groups with respect to
594 clinical success (IPTW OR of monotherapy vs combination therapy 1.19, 95% CI 0.40–3.45) or all-cause
595 mortality (IPTW OR of monotherapy vs combination therapy 0.76, 95% CI 0.22–2.69) [172].
596 Another Italian retrospective study compared data on real-world use of ceftaroline (N=75) and ceftobiprole
597 (N=63). Rate of bacteremia/endocarditis was 17% (24/138). Main pathogen isolated from culture was MRSA
598 (29.3%). Combination therapy was the most common strategy among groups, more frequently with
599 daptomycin. Patients treated with ceftobiprole had significantly higher comorbidities; moreover, in this group
600 significant higher rate of multisite, nosocomial, and culture-negative infections was also found. In-hospital
601 mortality, length of stay, and rates of clinical cure, improvement or failure were similar between groups. In
602 multivariable model, *S. aureus* infection was the only significant predictor of outcome [173].
603 Data of 38 patients treated with ceftobiprole were provided from the CLEAR (Canadian LEadership on
604 Antimicrobial Real-life Usage) registry. Overall, 92.1% patients had bacteremia: 2.6% were primary BSIs, the

605 other were associated to endocarditis, osteomyelitis, and HAP. Infections were commonly caused by MRSA
606 (94.7%). Ceftobiprole was generally chosen as second-line therapy owing to failure of (71.1%), resistance to
607 (18.4%) or adverse effects from (10.5%) antibiotics previously administered. Combination regimen with
608 daptomycin (55.3%) or vancomycin (18.4%) was frequently preferred. Clinical and microbiological cure
609 occurred in 84.8% and 97% of patients, respectively [174].

610 Some case report/series shared the successful clinical and microbiological outcomes of patients treated for
611 severe bacteremic infections with ceftobiprole mostly associated with daptomycin or vancomycin: 1 patient
612 with MRSA prosthetic valve endocarditis [175], 6 with MRSA BSI derived from vary deep-seated infections
613 [176] and 12 with endocarditis mainly caused by oxacillin-susceptible and resistant *S. aureus* and coagulase-
614 negative *Staphylococci* (CoNS) [177].

615 Another case series described 21 patients with ampicillin-susceptible *E. faecalis* BSI (61% secondary to left-
616 sided endocarditis) treated with combination of ceftobiprole and ampicillin. Mean duration of this regimen
617 was 20.4 ± 11.1 days, and a subsequent oral treatment was chosen for 6 patients. The majority of patients
618 experienced clinical cure (81%) and blood culture clearance (86%). Only one patient relapse after withholding
619 of the partial oral treatment [178].

620 Safety profile of ceftobiprole observed in phase 3 trials showed a high number of AEs (ranging from 36% to
621 63%) causing 4-6% rate of treatment discontinuation; similar percentage was found for the comparative drugs.
622 Fortunately, most events were classified as mild and consisted with nausea/vomiting, infusion site reaction,
623 diarrhea and headache [165-168]. Observational retrospective studies documented fewer AEs, mainly mild
624 gastrointestinal syndrome or *C. difficile* infection, hematologic alterations like leukopenia, anemia,
625 thrombocytopenia, or mild elevation of liver enzyme. [172,173]. One case report reported ceftobiprole-
626 associated agranulocytosis following prolonged treatment [179].

627

628 **6. Future potential place in therapy of fifth generation cephalosporins**

629 Despite numerous real-world studies and post-hoc analyses conducted in pivotal trials on the use of fifth
630 generation cephalosporins, the quality of evidence produced is compromised by the small patient sample sizes
631 and the absence of specific randomized controlled trials. Concerning real-world observational studies,
632 additional statistical analyses would be necessary in future works to enhance their power and "mimic"

633 randomized trials, such as propensity score matching or inverse probability of treatment adjustment weighting,
634 which unfortunately are lacking in many works. For this reason, although fifth generation cephalosporins
635 appear promising in the context of MRSA bloodstream infections, their use should still be approached
636 cautiously. Nevertheless, the interest in their place in therapy is significantly growing, especially in case of
637 bacteremic MRSA pneumonia, when daptomycin could result a suboptimal therapy, since it is inhibited by
638 surfactant [180]; of note, several potential use of ceftaroline and ceftobiprole for the treatment of MRSA-BSI
639 emerged from published data, opening many research questions.

640 Importantly, studies showed that fifth generation cephalosporins could be a valuable monotherapy for
641 bacteremic patients with similar clinical cure and mortality rate if compared to vancomycin or daptomycin
642 [157-162, 164-169], considered the backbone of MRSA-BSI treatment from decades. This open the question
643 if this paradigm may be challenged.

644 In fact, by looking at treatment rules of MSSA-BSI, data suggest that antistaphylococcal penicillins (ASP) or
645 cefazolin should be preferred over glyco- or lipopeptides [71-73] for definitive antibiotic therapy. Accordingly,
646 it is rational to investigate if ceftaroline or ceftobiprole may be an effective (or even preferable) first-line
647 treatment for MRSA-BSIs.

648 In fact, the hypothesis of placing anti-MRSA cephalosporins as backbone of therapy have been introduced in
649 several hospitals in recent years. Consequently, following initial experiences on MRSA-BSIs as salvage
650 therapies after an initial treatment failure [152-154, 175,176, 176], subsequent works proposed a direct
651 comparison of an anti-MRSA cephalosporins versus vancomycin or daptomycin with encouraging results: fifth
652 generation cephalosporins were associated with a similar outcomes of daptomycin and vancomycin in large
653 retrospective studies [157-162, 164-169], and ceftobiprole resulted non-inferior to daptomycin for the
654 treatment of complicated MRSA-BSI [164].

655 Moreover, fifth generation cephalosporin are broad spectrum antibiotics, and the risk of *C.difficile* colitis
656 should be considered; indeed, in an *in vitro* human gut model, ceftaroline can induce simulated *C.difficile*
657 infection, as well as ceftriaxone [181]. However, the occurrence of this complication is rare in real-world
658 studies [182], despite it is not negligible.

659 Finally, some studies suggested that β -lactams exerted a significant activity in modulating interleukins
660 response to bacteremia, producing a more favorable host response to infection if compared with glyco- or
661 lipopeptide, probably influencing the mortality risk [183].

662 On these bases, times to explore potential place in therapy of these drugs as first line therapy are probably
663 mature.

664 Another important area of investigation is represented by the role of fifth generation cephalosporins in
665 combination therapy for MRSA-BSI. Of note, the use of the combination of daptomycin with an anti-
666 staphylococcal beta-lactam for persistent or unresponsive MRSA infections was first published in 2004 [105,
667 184], and more recent studies confirmed the apparent superiority of this type of regimen against MRSA-BSI
668 if compared with daptomycin monotherapy [185]. However, given the intrinsic activity of
669 ceftaroline/ceftobiprole against MRSA, the association between these drugs and daptomycin may be even
670 superior to other regimens. In this sense, the recent RCT conducted by Geriak and colleagues, as mentioned
671 above, was early stopped due to evident superiority of combination regimen [100], and several other reports
672 suggested that a fifth generation cephalosporins plus daptomycin may have a role in “difficult-to-treat”
673 infections [153, 172, 186, 187]. In addition, also the possible association of an anti-MRSA cephalosporins with
674 fosfomycin may be useful in selected cases, given their *in vitro* synergism [188], PK/PD characteristics of
675 fosfomycin [189] and its *in vivo* efficacy in clinical trials [104].

676 However, a final important aspect should be discussed. Available studies comparing different regimens usually
677 evaluate patients with many different sources of MRSA-BSI, including infective endocarditis, osteomyelitis,
678 low respiratory tract infections, device-related infections, central line associated BSI. Importantly, the outcome
679 of this infections is frequently influenced by other treatments, including the necessity of surgical source
680 control, or by an important diagnostic delay; so, no conclusions can be reached today about the effectiveness
681 of ceftaroline/ceftobiprole based regimens compared with other agents.

682 Similarly, other characteristics of MRSA-BSI should be analyzed, including duration of bacteremia [190] and
683 host immunological state [191] since all these factors contribute to treatment failure and mortality. Indeed, an
684 important area of research is defining patients at high- and low-risk of mortality, in order to define place in
685 therapy of different drugs, risk of adverse events to treatments, and costs [69, 192].

686 Summarizing all these data, a possible approach to MRSA-BSI considering fifth generation cephalosporins as
687 a backbone of therapy is shown in **Figure 1**.

688

689 **7. Expert opinion**

690 Fifth generation cephalosporins represent the first β -lactams which retain activity against MRSA. They were
691 introduced in clinical practice after being tested in non-inferiority RCTs for low-respiratory tract and skin and
692 soft tissue infections, showing to be as effective as older regimens for the treatment of these infections. In
693 addition, they showed to have a remarkable safety profile, that is in line with other cephalosporins and β -
694 lactams and probably superior to other antimicrobial drug classes, including glycopeptides, oxazolidinones,
695 and fluoroquinolones. Sub-analysis conducted on patients with MRSA infections enrolled in RCTs confirmed
696 that ceftaroline and ceftobiprole are non-inferior to vancomycin or linezolid for the treatment of CAP, HAP
697 and ABSSSI, and could be also effective alternative in case of bacteriemic infections.

698 The interest in these preliminary data rapidly led to several exploratory “real-world” studies: fifth generation
699 cephalosporins were initially used as salvage therapy for serious MRSA endocarditis, persistent bacteriemia,
700 or in case of intolerance to other drugs with encouraging results. Subsequently, the interest moved to the use
701 of ceftaroline or ceftobiprole as first line therapies for MRSA-BSIs; of note, fifth generation cephalosporins
702 achieved similar outcomes in comparative studies versus vancomycin or daptomycin in terms of clinical cure,
703 duration of bacteriemia, risk of mortality, risk of recurrence, while a reduced risk of adverse events was noticed
704 in some cases. Finally, some clues suggested that ceftaroline and ceftobiprole may be particularly effective in
705 combination therapy with other drugs, especially daptomycin or fosfomycin, for the treatment of MRSA-BSI
706 in high-risk patients, as defined by current published scores.

707 Summarizing current knowledge, the use of anti-MRSA cephalosporins is an acceptable choice either in
708 monotherapy or combination therapy for the treatment of MRSA-BSIs, especially when associated with
709 CAP/HAP, ABSSSI, endocarditis, or persistent bacteriemia due to their relevant effectiveness and safety;
710 however, data are still inconclusive regarding place in therapy of these drugs and clinical conditions in which
711 they are preferable over glyco- or lipopeptide or oxazolidinones. Probably, their use may be advisable in
712 combination therapy in case of severe infections or in monotherapy in subjects at higher risk of drugs-induced
713 toxicity with older regimens, given the very low incidence of adverse events with anti-MRSA cephalosporins

714 in RCTs and post-market studies; nevertheless, fifth generation cephalosporins could represent a valid
715 alternative to standard of care in case of suspected or ascertained polymicrobial infections by MRSA and gram
716 negative bacteria, in order to reduce the burden of administered antibiotic and decrease selective pressure on
717 gram negative bacteria and microbiota. On the contrary, caution should be used in case of suspected/ascertained
718 central nervous system infections due to inconsistent data regarding penetration of these drugs in cerebrospinal
719 fluid and brain tissues.

720 Despite data support the use of ceftaroline and ceftobiprole for MRSA-BSIs, many research questions are still
721 open. At first future studies should explore the correct place in therapy of these drugs in the field of severe
722 MRSA infections, including possible use in monotherapy or combination. Indeed, as explained, clinical
723 pictures associated with MRSA may be very complex, or affect patients with different comorbidities, including
724 immunocompromission or organ(s) failure; all these variables influence the outcomes and should be considered
725 by clinician at the time of antibiotic therapy prescription.

726 Future works should also define appropriate dosing strategies of these cephalosporins, including the need of
727 loading doses, extended/continuous infusions, or any further dosage adjustment according to site of infection.
728 Moreover, future studies should deeper investigate incidence and predictors of adverse events to therapy,
729 especially in those conditions at higher risk of complications, including older age, chronic kidney or liver
730 failure, or need of prolonged antibiotic therapy.

731 Finally, despite data on *in vivo* emergence of resistance to anti-MRSA cephalosporins are scarce, occurrence
732 of microbiological failure was reported and is biologically plausible; accordingly, deeper investigation is
733 needed on this topic.

734 In conclusion, fifth generation cephalosporins are valuable weapons for the treatment of MRSA-BSI, with
735 remarkable effectiveness and safety; in consideration of the epidemiological and clinical relevance of this
736 infections, further studies are warranted to implement at their best these drugs in clinical practice.

737

738

739 **ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS BOX**

- 740
- 741 1. Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) is the leading cause of bloodstream infections,
- 742 causing a significant burden of morbidity and mortality.
- 743 2. The fifth generation cephalosporins (ceftaroline and ceftobiprole) represent the only β -lactams active
- 744 against MRSA.
- 745 3. Ceftaroline and ceftobiprole showed a relevant effectiveness and safety in both randomized controlled
- 746 trials and observational studies involving patients with MRSA bloodstream infections.
- 747 4. Ceftaroline and ceftobiprole can be considered non-inferior to vancomycin or daptomycin for the
- 748 treatment of MRSA bloodstream infections.
- 749 5. Given their pharmacokinetics/pharmacodynamics characteristics, ceftaroline and ceftobiprole may
- 750 represent the backbone of MRSA bloodstream infections in mono- or combination therapy.
- 751 6. Despite many research questions are still open, including the best place in therapy of these drugs, the
- 752 use ceftaroline and ceftobiprole should be considered a valuable treatment option for MRSA
- 753 bloodstream infections.
- 754
- 755
- 756
- 757

758 **DECLARATIONS**

759

760 **Funding**

761 This research was supported by EU funding within the MUR PNRR Extended Partnership initiative on

762 Emerging Infectious Diseases (Project no. PE00000007, INF-ACT).

763

764 **Declaration of interest**

765 The authors have no relevant affiliations or financial involvement with any organization or entity with a

766 financial interest in or financial conflict with the subject matter or materials discussed in the manuscript. This

767 includes employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants, or

768 patents received or pending, or royalties.

769

770 **Author contributions**

771 MB and DFB were involved in the conception and design of the work; DFB, AB, LB, VC, LD, and MG

772 produced the first draft of the manuscript; MB, AS, PV, and FP revised the paper critically for intellectual

773 content. All Authors gave the final approval of the version to be published and agree to be accountable for all

774 aspects of the work.

775

776 **REFERENCES:**

777 **Papers of special note have been highlighted as either of interest (*) or of considerable interest (**)** to
778 **readers.**

779

- 780 1. Skinner D, Keffer CS. SIGNIFICANCE OF BACTEREMIA CAUSED BY STAPHYLOCOCCUS
781 AUREUS: A STUDY OF ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-TWO CASES AND A REVIEW OF
782 THE LITERATURE CONCERNED WITH EXPERIMENTAL INFECTION IN ANIMALS. Archives
783 of Internal Medicine 68, 851-875, doi:10.1001/archinte.1941.00200110003001 (1941).
- 784 2. Hamilton F, MacGowan A. A long history of β -lactams for MRSA. Nat Microbiol. 2019
785 Oct;4(10):1604-1605. doi: 10.1038/s41564-019-0561-z. PMID: 31541207.
- 786 3. Sakr A, Brégeon F, Mège JL, et al. Staphylococcus aureus Nasal Colonization: An Update on
787 Mechanisms, Epidemiology, Risk Factors, and Subsequent Infections. Front Microbiol. 2018 Oct
788 8;9:2419. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2018.02419. PMID: 30349525; PMCID: PMC6186810.
- 789 4. Perl TM, Cullen JJ, Wenzel RP, et al. Mupirocin And The Risk Of Staphylococcus Aureus Study Team.
790 Intranasal mupirocin to prevent postoperative Staphylococcus aureus infections. N Engl J Med. 2002
791 Jun 13;346(24):1871-7. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa003069. PMID: 12063371.).
- 792 5. Control, E. C. f. D. P. a. Healthcare-associated infections: surgical site infections. In: ECDC. Annual
793 epidemiological report for 2018-2020. . (European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, 2021).
- 794 6. Wertheim HF, Vos MC, Ott A, et al. Risk and outcome of nosocomial Staphylococcus aureus
795 bacteraemia in nasal carriers versus non-carriers. Lancet. 2004 Aug 21-27;364(9435):703-5. doi:
796 10.1016/S0140-6736(04)16897-9. PMID: 15325835.
- 797 7. Katneni R, Hedayati SS. Central venous catheter-related bacteremia in chronic hemodialysis patients:
798 epidemiology and evidence-based management. Nat Clin Pract Nephrol. 2007 May;3(5):256-66. doi:
799 10.1038/ncpneph0447. PMID: 17457359.
- 800 8. Nguyen MH, Kauffman CA, Goodman RP, et al. Nasal carriage of and infection with Staphylococcus
801 aureus in HIV-infected patients. Ann Intern Med. 1999 Feb 2;130(3):221-5. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-
802 130-3-199902020-00026. PMID: 10049200.
- 803 9. Honda H, Krauss MJ, Coopersmith CM, et al. Staphylococcus aureus nasal colonization and
804 subsequent infection in intensive care unit patients: does methicillin resistance matter? Infect Control
805 Hosp Epidemiol. 2010 Jun;31(6):584-91. doi: 10.1086/652530. PMID: 20426656; PMCID:
806 PMC4154586.
- 807 10. Control, E. C. f. D. P. a. Healthcare associated infections acquired in intensive care units. In: ECDC.
808 Annual epidemiological report for 2018. (European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, 2020).
- 809 11. von Eiff C, Becker K, Machka K, et al. Nasal carriage as a source of Staphylococcus aureus
810 bacteremia. Study Group. N Engl J Med. 2001 Jan 4;344(1):11-6. doi:
811 10.1056/NEJM200101043440102. PMID: 11136954..

- 812 12. VandenBergh MF, Yzerman EP, van Belkum A, et al. Follow-up of *Staphylococcus aureus* nasal
813 carriage after 8 years: redefining the persistent carrier state. *J Clin Microbiol.* 1999 Oct;37(10):3133-
814 40. doi: 10.1128/JCM.37.10.3133-3140.1999. PMID: 10488166; PMCID: PMC85511.
- 815 13. Kluytmans J, van Belkum A, Verbrugh H. Nasal carriage of *Staphylococcus aureus*: epidemiology,
816 underlying mechanisms, and associated risks. *Clin Microbiol Rev.* 1997 Jul;10(3):505-20. doi:
817 10.1128/CMR.10.3.505. PMID: 9227864; PMCID: PMC172932..
- 818 14. Wertheim HF, Melles DC, Vos MC, et al. The role of nasal carriage in *Staphylococcus aureus*
819 infections. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2005 Dec;5(12):751-62. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(05)70295-4. PMID:
820 16310147.
- 821 15. Muthukrishnan G, Lamers RP, Ellis A, et al. Longitudinal genetic analyses of *Staphylococcus aureus*
822 nasal carriage dynamics in a diverse population. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2013 May 16;13:221. doi:
823 10.1186/1471-2334-13-221. PMID: 23679038; PMCID: PMC3673815.
- 824 16. Reagan DR, Doebbeling BN, Pfaller MA, et al. Elimination of coincident *Staphylococcus aureus* nasal
825 and hand carriage with intranasal application of mupirocin calcium ointment. *Ann Intern Med.* 1991
826 Jan 15;114(2):101-6. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-114-2-101. PMID: 1898585.
- 827 17. del Rio A, Cervera C, Moreno A, et al. Patients at risk of complications of *Staphylococcus aureus*
828 bloodstream infection. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2009 May 15;48 Suppl 4:S246-53. doi: 10.1086/598187.
829 PMID: 19374580.
- 830 18. Gorwitz RJ, Kruszon-Moran D, McAllister SK, et al. Changes in the prevalence of nasal colonization
831 with *Staphylococcus aureus* in the United States, 2001-2004. *J Infect Dis.* 2008 May 1;197(9):1226-
832 34. doi: 10.1086/533494. PMID: 18422434.
- 833 19. Antimicrobial Resistance Collaborators. Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019:
834 a systematic analysis. *Lancet.* 2022 Feb 12;399(10325):629-655. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)02724-
835 0. Epub 2022 Jan 19. Erratum in: *Lancet.* 2022 Oct 1;400(10358):1102. PMID: 35065702; PMCID:
836 PMC8841637.
- 837 20. Enright MC, Robinson DA, Randle G, et al. The evolutionary history of methicillin-resistant
838 *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA). *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2002 May 28;99(11):7687-92. doi:
839 10.1073/pnas.122108599. PMID: 12032344; PMCID: PMC124322.
- 840 21. Control, E. C. f. D. P. a. Antimicrobial resistance in the EU/EEA (EARS-Net) - Annual
841 Epidemiological Report 2021. (European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, 2022).
- 842 22. Talbot GH, Jezek A, Murray BE, et al. The Infectious Diseases Society of America's 10 × '20 Initiative
843 (10 New Systemic Antibacterial Agents US Food and Drug Administration Approved by 2020): Is 20
844 × '20 a Possibility? *Clin Infect Dis.* 2019 Jun 18;69(1):1-11. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciz089. PMID:
845 30715222.
- 846 23. De Oliveira DMP, Forde BM, Kidd TJ, et al. Antimicrobial Resistance in ESKAPE Pathogens. *Clin*
847 *Microbiol Rev.* 2020 May 13;33(3):e00181-19. doi: 10.1128/CMR.00181-19. PMID: 32404435;
848 PMCID: PMC7227449.

- 849 24. Kern WV, Rieg S. Burden of bacterial bloodstream infection-a brief update on epidemiology and
850 significance of multidrug-resistant pathogens. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2020 Feb;26(2):151-157. doi:
851 10.1016/j.cmi.2019.10.031. Epub 2019 Nov 9. PMID: 31712069.
- 852 25. Laupland KB, Lyytikäinen O, Søgaard M, et al. The changing epidemiology of *Staphylococcus aureus*
853 bloodstream infection: a multinational population-based surveillance study. *Clin Microbiol Infect.*
854 2013 May;19(5):465-71. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2012.03903.x. Epub 2012 May 23. PMID:
855 22616816.
- 856 26. Hindy JR, Quintero-Martinez JA, Lee AT, et al. Incidence Trends and Epidemiology of *Staphylococcus*
857 *aureus* Bacteremia: A Systematic Review of Population-Based Studies. *Cureus.* 2022 May
858 29;14(5):e25460. doi: 10.7759/cureus.25460. PMID: 35774691; PMCID: PMC9239286.
- 859 27. Nambiar K, Seifert H, Rieg S, et al. Survival following *Staphylococcus aureus* bloodstream infection:
860 A prospective multinational cohort study assessing the impact of place of care. *J Infect.* 2018
861 Dec;77(6):516-525. doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2018.08.015. Epub 2018 Sep 1. PMID: 30179645.
- 862 28. Thwaites GE, Scarborough M, Szubert A, et al. Adjunctive rifampicin for *Staphylococcus aureus*
863 bacteraemia (ARREST): a multicentre, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet.*
864 2018 Feb 17;391(10121):668-678. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32456-X. Epub 2017 Dec 14. PMID:
865 29249276; PMCID: PMC5820409..
- 866 29. Diekema DJ, Hsueh PR, Mendes RE, et al. The Microbiology of Bloodstream Infection: 20-Year
867 Trends from the SENTRY Antimicrobial Surveillance Program. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2019
868 Jun 24;63(7):e00355-19. doi: 10.1128/AAC.00355-19. PMID: 31010862; PMCID: PMC6591610.
- 869 30. Kaasch AJ, Barlow G, Edgeworth JD, et al. *Staphylococcus aureus* bloodstream infection: a pooled
870 analysis of five prospective, observational studies. *J Infect.* 2014 Mar;68(3):242-51. doi:
871 10.1016/j.jinf.2013.10.015. Epub 2013 Nov 16. Erratum in: *J Infect.* 2014 Sep;69(3):306-7. PMID:
872 24247070; PMCID: PMC4136490.
- 873 31. Tabah A, Laupland KB. Update on *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia. *Curr Opin Crit Care.* 2022 Oct
874 1;28(5):495-504. doi: 10.1097/MCC.0000000000000974. Epub 2022 Aug 4. PMID: 35942696..
- 875 32. Asgeirsson H, Thalme A, Weiland O. *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia and endocarditis -
876 epidemiology and outcome: a review. *Infect Dis (Lond).* 2018 Mar;50(3):175-192. doi:
877 10.1080/23744235.2017.1392039. Epub 2017 Nov 6. PMID: 29105519.
- 878 33. Braquet P, Alla F, Cornu C, et al. Factors associated with 12 week case-fatality in *Staphylococcus*
879 *aureus* bacteraemia: a prospective cohort study. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2016 Nov;22(11):948.e1-
880 948.e7. doi: 10.1016/j.cmi.2016.07.034. Epub 2016 Aug 8. PMID: 27515395.
- 881 34. **Tong SY, Davis JS, Eichenberger E, et al. *Staphylococcus aureus* infections: epidemiology,
882 pathophysiology, clinical manifestations, and management. *Clin Microbiol Rev.* 2015 Jul;28(3):603-
883 61. doi: 10.1128/CMR.00134-14. PMID: 26016486; PMCID: PMC4451395.

- 884 35. Keynan Y, Rubinstein E. Staphylococcus aureus bacteremia, risk factors, complications, and
885 management. *Crit Care Clin*. 2013 Jul;29(3):547-62. doi: 10.1016/j.ccc.2013.03.008. PMID:
886 23830653.
- 887 36. Kourtis AP, Hatfield K, Baggs J, et al. Vital Signs: Epidemiology and Recent Trends in Methicillin-
888 Resistant and in Methicillin-Susceptible Staphylococcus aureus Bloodstream Infections - United
889 States. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2019 Mar 8;68(9):214-219. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm6809e1.
890 PMID: 30845118; PMCID: PMC6421967.
- 891 37. Gagliotti C, Högberg LD, Billström H, et al. Staphylococcus aureus bloodstream infections: diverging
892 trends of methicillin-resistant and methicillin-susceptible isolates, EU/EEA, 2005 to 2018. *Euro Surveill*.
893 2021 Nov;26(46):2002094. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.46.2002094. PMID: 34794536;
894 PMCID: PMC8603406.
- 895 38. Yu F, Chen Z, Liu C, et al. Prevalence of Staphylococcus aureus carrying Panton-Valentine leukocidin
896 genes among isolates from hospitalised patients in China. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2008 Apr;14(4):381-
897 4. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2007.01927.x
- 898 39. Yarovoy JY, Monte AA, Knepper BC, et al. Epidemiology of Community-Onset Staphylococcus
899 aureus Bacteremia. *West J Emerg Med*. 2019 May;20(3):438-442. doi:
900 10.5811/westjem.2019.2.41939. Epub 2019 Apr 16. PMID: 31123543; PMCID: PMC6526880.
- 901 40. Horino T, Hori S. Metastatic infection during Staphylococcus aureus bacteremia. *J Infect Chemother*.
902 2020 Feb;26(2):162-169. doi: 10.1016/j.jiac.2019.10.003. Epub 2019 Oct 30. PMID: 31676266.
- 903 41. Bai AD, Showler A, Burry L, et al. Impact of Infectious Disease Consultation on Quality of Care,
904 Mortality, and Length of Stay in Staphylococcus aureus Bacteremia: Results From a Large Multicenter
905 Cohort Study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015 May 15;60(10):1451-61. doi: 10.1093/cid/civ120. Epub 2015 Feb
906 20. PMID: 25701854.
- 907 42. Goto M, Schweizer ML, Vaughan-Sarrazin MS, et al. Association of Evidence-Based Care Processes
908 With Mortality in Staphylococcus aureus Bacteremia at Veterans Health Administration Hospitals,
909 2003-2014. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2017 Oct 1;177(10):1489-1497. doi:
910 10.1001/jamainternmed.2017.3958. Erratum in: *JAMA Intern Med*. 2017 Oct 1;177(10):1544. PMID:
911 28873140; PMCID: PMC5710211.
- 912 43. Paulsen J, Solligård E, Damås JK, et al. The Impact of Infectious Disease Specialist Consultation for
913 Staphylococcus aureus Bloodstream Infections: A Systematic Review. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2016
914 Mar 1;3(2):ofw048. doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofw048. PMID: 27047985; PMCID: PMC4817315.
- 915 44. **Pérez-Rodríguez MT, Sousa A, López-Cortés LE, et al. Moving beyond unsolicited consultation:
916 additional impact of a structured intervention on mortality in Staphylococcus aureus bacteraemia. *J*
917 *Antimicrob Chemother*. 2019 Apr 1;74(4):1101-1107. doi: 10.1093/jac/dky556. PMID: 30689894.
- 918 45. Moormeier DE, Bayles KW. Staphylococcus aureus biofilm: a complex developmental organism. *Mol*
919 *Microbiol*. 2017 May;104(3):365-376. doi: 10.1111/mmi.13634. Epub 2017 Mar 8. PMID: 28142193;
920 PMCID: PMC5397344.

- 921 46. Tande AJ, Palraj BR, Osmon DR, et al. Clinical presentation, risk factors, and outcomes of
922 hematogenous prosthetic joint infection in patients with *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia. *Am J Med*.
923 (2016) 129:221.e11–20. doi: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2015.09.006.
- 924 47. Østergaard L, Voldstedlund M, Bruun NE, et al. Prevalence and Mortality of Infective Endocarditis in
925 Community-Acquired and Healthcare-Associated *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia: A Danish
926 Nationwide Registry-Based Cohort Study. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2022 Dec 16;9(12):ofac647. doi:
927 10.1093/ofid/ofac647. PMID: 36540385; PMCID: PMC9757695.
- 928 48. Green J, Howard J, Shankar A, et al. Assessing the impact of a 'bundle of care' approach to
929 *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia in a tertiary hospital. *Infect Prev Pract*. 2020 Sep 25;2(4):100096.
930 doi: 10.1016/j.infpip.2020.100096. PMID: 34368726; PMCID: PMC8336039.
- 931 49. **Liu C, Bayer A, Cosgrove SE, et al. Clinical practice guidelines by the infectious diseases society
932 of america for the treatment of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* infections in adults and
933 children. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011 Feb 1;52(3):e18-55. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciq146. Epub 2011 Jan 4. Erratum
934 in: *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011 Aug 1;53(3):319. PMID: 21208910.
- 935 50. **López-Cortés LE, Del Toro MD, Gálvez-Acebal J, et al. Impact of an evidence-based bundle
936 intervention in the quality-of-care management and outcome of *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia.
937 *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013 Nov;57(9):1225-33. doi: 10.1093/cid/cit499. Epub 2013 Aug 8. PMID:
938 23929889.
- 939 51. Green J, Howard J, Shankar A, et al. Assessing the impact of a 'bundle of care' approach to
940 *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia in a tertiary hospital. *Infect Prev Pract*. 2020 Sep 25;2(4):100096.
941 doi: 10.1016/j.infpip.2020.100096. PMID: 34368726; PMCID: PMC8336039.
- 942 52. Nagao M, Yamamoto M, Matsumura Y, et al. Complete adherence to evidence-based quality-of-care
943 indicators for *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia resulted in better prognosis. *Infection*. 2017
944 Feb;45(1):83-91. doi: 10.1007/s15010-016-0946-3. Epub 2016 Oct 5. PMID: 27709434.
- 945 53. Gatley EM, Boyles T, Dlamini S, et al. Adherence to a care bundle for *Staphylococcus aureus*
946 bacteraemia: A retrospective cohort study. *S Afr J Infect Dis*. 2022 Nov 22;37(1):445. doi:
947 10.4102/sajid.v37i1.445. PMID: 36483573; PMCID: PMC9724142.
- 948 54. Hadano Y, Kakuma T, Matsumoto T, et al. Reduction of 30-day death rates from *Staphylococcus aureus*
949 bacteremia by mandatory infectious diseases consultation: Comparative study interventions with and
950 without an infectious disease specialist. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2021 Feb;103:308-315. doi:
951 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.11.199. Epub 2020 Dec 2. PMID: 33278619.
- 952 55. Papadimitriou-Olivgeris M, Caruana G, Senn L, et al. Predictors of mortality of *Staphylococcus aureus*
953 bacteremia among patients hospitalized in a Swiss University Hospital and the role of early source
954 control; a retrospective cohort study. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2023 Mar;42(3):347-357. doi:
955 10.1007/s10096-023-04557-1. Epub 2023 Feb 2. PMID: 36729318; PMCID: PMC9892677

- 956 56. Callejo-Torre F, Eiros Bouza JM, Olaechea Astigarraga P, et al. Risk factors for methicillin-resistant
957 *Staphylococcus aureus* colonisation or infection in intensive care units and their reliability for
958 predicting MRSA on ICU admission. *Infez Med* 2016; 24:201–9.
- 959 57. Yeager SD, Oliver JE, Shorman MA, et al. Comparison of linezolid step-down therapy to standard
960 parenteral therapy in methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* bloodstream infections. *Int J*
961 *Antimicrob Agents*. 2021 May;57(5):106329. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2021.106329
- 962 58. Habib G, Lancellotti P, Antunes MJ, et al. 2015 ESC guidelines for the management of infective
963 endocarditis: the task force for the management of infective endocarditis of the European Society of
964 Cardiology (ESC). Endorsed by: European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS), the
965 European Association of Nuclear Medicine (EANM). *Eur Heart J* 2015;36:3075–128.
966 10.1093/eurheartj/ehv319
- 967 59. Blomström-Lundqvist C, Traykov V, Erba PA, et al. European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA)
968 international consensus document on how to prevent, diagnose, and treat cardiac implantable
969 electronic device infections—endorsed by the Heart Rhythm Society (HRS), the Asia Pacific Heart
970 Rhythm Society (APHRS), the Latin American Heart Rhythm Society (LAHRS), International Society
971 for Cardiovascular Infectious Diseases (ISCVID) and the European Society of Clinical Microbiology
972 and Infectious Diseases (ESCMID) in collaboration with the European Association for Cardio-
973 Thoracic Surgery (EACTS). *Europace*. 2020 Apr 1;22(4):515-549. doi: 10.1093/europace/euz246.
974 PMID: 31702000; PMCID: PMC7132545.
- 975 60. Berbari EF, Kanj SS, Kowalski TJ, et al. 2015 Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) clinical
976 practice guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of native vertebral osteomyelitis in adults. *Clin*
977 *Infect Dis* 61:e26–e46. doi: 10.1093/cid/civ482
- 978 61. Orr HW. 2006. The treatment of acute osteomyelitis by drainage and rest. 1927. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*
979 451:4–9. doi: 10.1097/01.blo.0000238778.34939.66.
- 980 62. Bouji N, Wen S, Dietz MJ. Intravenous antibiotic duration in the treatment of prosthetic joint infection:
981 systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Bone Jt Infect*. 2022 Sep 19;7(5):191-202. doi: 10.5194/jbji-7-
982 191-2022. PMID: 36267262; PMCID: PMC9562697.
- 983 63. Bernard L, Arvieux C, Brunschweiler B, et al. Antibiotic Therapy for 6 or 12 Weeks for Prosthetic
984 Joint Infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2021 May 27;384(21):1991-2001. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2020198.
985 PMID: 34042388.
- 986 64. Pradier M, Nguyen S, Robineau O, et al. Suppressive antibiotic therapy with oral doxycycline for
987 *Staphylococcus aureus* prosthetic joint infection: a retrospective study of 39 patients. *Int J Antimicrob*
988 *Agents*. 2017 Sep;50(3):447-452. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2017.04.019. Epub 2017 Jun 28. PMID:
989 28668689.
- 990 65. **Lam JC, Stokes W. The Golden Grapes of Wrath - *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia: A Clinical
991 Review. *Am J Med*. 2023 Jan;136(1):19-26. doi: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2022.09.017. Epub 2022 Sep 28.
992 PMID: 36179908.

- 993 66. Chong YP, Moon SM, Bang K-M, et al. Treatment duration for uncomplicated *Staphylococcus aureus*
994 bacteremia to prevent relapse: analysis of a prospective observational cohort study. *Antimicrob Agents*
995 *Chemother.* (2013) 57:1150–6. doi: 10.1128/AAC.01021-12
- 996 67. Thorlacius-Ussing L, Sandholdt H, Nissen J, et al. Comparable Outcomes of Short-Course and
997 Prolonged-Course Therapy in Selected Cases of Methicillin-Susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus*
998 Bacteremia: A Pooled Cohort Study. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2021 Sep 7;73(5):866-872. doi:
999 10.1093/cid/ciab201. PMID: 33677515.
- 1000 68. Abbas M, Rossel A, de Kraker MEA, et al. Association between treatment duration and mortality or
1001 relapse in adult patients with *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia: a retrospective cohort study. *Clin*
1002 *Microbiol Infect* 2020; 26:626–31.
- 1003 69. Jensen AG, Wachmann CH, Espersen F, et al. Treatment and outcome of *Staphylococcus aureus*
1004 bacteremia: a prospective study of 278 cases. *Arch Intern Med* 2002; 162:25–3
- 1005 70. Pandey N, Cascella M. Beta-Lactam Antibiotics. [Updated 2022 Sep 26]. In: StatPearls [Internet].
1006 Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2023 Jan-. Available from:
1007 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK545311/>
- 1008 71. Fisher JF, Mobashery S. β -Lactams against the Fortress of the Gram-Positive *Staphylococcus aureus*
1009 Bacterium. *Chem Rev.* 2021 Mar 24;121(6):3412-3463. doi: 10.1021/acs.chemrev.0c01010. Epub
1010 2020 Dec 29. PMID: 33373523; PMCID: PMC8653850.
- 1011 72. La YJ, Kim HR, Oh DH, et al. Comparison of Clinical Outcomes for Glycopeptides and Beta-Lactams
1012 in Methicillin-Susceptible *Staphylococcus Aureus* Bloodstream Infections. *Yonsei Med J.* 2022
1013 Jul;63(7):611-618. doi: 10.3349/ymj.2022.63.7.611. PMID: 35748072; PMCID: PMC9226830.
- 1014 73. Wong D, Wong T, Romney M, et al. Comparative effectiveness of β -lactam versus vancomycin empiric
1015 therapy in patients with methicillin-susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus* (MSSA) bacteremia. *Ann Clin*
1016 *Microbiol Antimicrob.* 2016 Apr 26;15:27. doi: 10.1186/s12941-016-0143-3. PMID: 27112143;
1017 PMCID: PMC4845304.
- 1018 74. **Brown NM, Goodman AL, Horner C, et al. Treatment of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*
1019 *aureus* (MRSA): updated guidelines from the UK. *JAC Antimicrob Resist.* 2021 Feb 3;3(1):dlaa114.
1020 doi: 10.1093/jacamr/dlaa114. PMID: 34223066; PMCID: PMC8210269.
- 1021 75. Rybak M, Lomaestro B, Rotschafer JC, et al. Therapeutic monitoring of vancomycin in adult patients:
1022 a consensus review of the American Society of Health-System Pharmacists, the Infectious Diseases
1023 Society of America, and the Society of Infectious Diseases Pharmacists. *Am J Health Syst Pharm.*
1024 2009 Jan 1;66(1):82-98. doi: 10.2146/ajhp080434. Erratum in: *Am J Health Syst Pharm.* 2009 May
1025 15;66(10):887. PMID: 19106348.

1026 .

1027 76. LaPlante KL, Rybak MJ. Impact of high-inoculum *Staphylococcus aureus* on the activities of nafcillin,
 1028 vancomycin, linezolid, and daptomycin, alone and in combination with gentamicin, in an in vitro
 1029 pharmacodynamic model. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2004; 48: 4665–72

1030 77. Bellos I, Daskalakis G, Pergialiotis V. Relationship of vancomycin trough levels with acute kidney
 1031 injury risk: an exposure-toxicity meta-analysis. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2020 Oct 1;75(10):2725-
 1032 2734. doi: 10.1093/jac/dkaa184. PMID: 32417905.

1033 78. Fowler VG Jr, Boucher HW, Corey GR, et al. Daptomycin versus standard therapy for bacteremia and
 1034 endocarditis caused by *Staphylococcus aureus*. *N Engl J Med.* 2006;355(7):653-665.
 1035 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa053783

1036 79. Maraolo AE, Giaccone A, Gentile I, et al. Daptomycin versus Vancomycin for the Treatment of
 1037 Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Bloodstream Infection with or without Endocarditis: A
 1038 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Antibiotics (Basel).* 2021 Aug 21;10(8):1014. doi:
 1039 10.3390/antibiotics10081014. PMID: 34439067; PMCID: PMC8389004.

1040 80. Claeys KC, Zasowski EJ, Casapao AM, et al. Daptomycin Improves Outcomes Regardless of
 1041 Vancomycin MIC in a Propensity-Matched Analysis of Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus*
 1042 *aureus* Bloodstream Infections. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2016;60(10):5841-5848.
 1043 Published 2016 Sep 23. doi:10.1128/AAC.00227-16

1044 81. Moellering RC., Jr Linezolid: the first oxazolidinone antimicrobial. *Ann Intern Med.*
 1045 2003;138(2):135–142

1046 82. Hong XB, Yu ZL, Fu HB, et al. Daptomycin and linezolid for severe methicillin-resistant
 1047 *Staphylococcus aureus* psoas abscess and bacteremia: A case report and review of the
 1048 literature. *World J Clin Cases.* 2022 Mar 16;10(8):2550-2558. doi:
 1049 10.12998/wjcc.v10.i8.2550. PMID: 35434080; PMCID: PMC8968589.

1050 83. Watkins RR, Lemonovich TL, File TM Jr. An evidence-based review of linezolid for the
 1051 treatment of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA): place in therapy. *Core*
 1052 *Evid.* 2012;7:131-43. doi: 10.2147/CE.S33430. Epub 2012 Dec 11. PMID: 23271985;
 1053 PMCID: PMC3526863.

1054 84. Kawasuji H, Nagaoka K, Tsuji Y, et al. Effectiveness and Safety of Linezolid Versus
 1055 Vancomycin, Teicoplanin, or Daptomycin against Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus*
 1056 *aureus* Bacteremia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Antibiotics* 2023, 12, 697.
 1057 <https://doi.org/10.3390/antibiotics12040697>

- 1058 85. Bandín-Vilar E, García-Quintanilla L, Castro-Balado A, et al. A Review of Population
1059 Pharmacokinetic Analyses of Linezolid. *Clin Pharmacokinet.* 2022 Jun;61(6):789-817. doi:
1060 10.1007/s40262-022-01125-2. Epub 2022 Jun 14. PMID: 35699914; PMCID: PMC9192929.
- 1061 86. Pea F, Cojutti PG, Baraldo M. A 10-Year Experience of Therapeutic Drug Monitoring (TDM)
1062 of Linezolid in a Hospital-wide Population of Patients Receiving Conventional Dosing: Is
1063 there Enough Evidence for Suggesting TDM in the Majority of Patients?. *Basic Clin*
1064 *Pharmacol Toxicol.* 2017;121(4):303-308. doi:10.1111/bcpt.12797.
- 1065 87. Willekens R, Puig-Asensio M, Ruiz-Camps I, et al. Early Oral Switch to Linezolid for Low-
1066 risk Patients With *Staphylococcus aureus* Bloodstream Infections: A Propensity-matched
1067 Cohort Study. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2019;69(3):381-387. doi:10.1093/cid/ciy916
- 1068 88. Lv X, Alder J, Li L, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Tedizolid Phosphate versus Linezolid in a
1069 Randomized Phase 3 Trial in Patients with Acute Bacterial Skin and Skin Structure Infection.
1070 *Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy,* 63(7), e02252-18.
1071 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.02252-18>.
- 1072 89. Brown NM, Goodman AL, Horner C, et al. Treatment of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*
1073 *aureus* (MRSA): updated guidelines from the UK. *JAC Antimicrob Resist.* 2021;3(1):dlaa114.
1074 Published 2021 Feb 3. doi:10.1093/jacamr/dlaa114
- 1075 90. Svetitsky S, Leibovici L, Paul M. Comparative efficacy and safety of vancomycin versus
1076 teicoplanin: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2009
1077 Oct;53(10):4069-79. doi: 10.1128/AAC.00341-09. Epub 2009 Jul 13. PMID: 19596875;
1078 PMCID: PMC2764163.
- 1079 91. Chen-Hsiang Lee, Ching-Yen Tsai, Chia-Chin Li, et al. Teicoplanin therapy for MRSA
1080 bacteraemia: a retrospective study emphasizing the importance of maintenance dosing in
1081 improving clinical outcomes, *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*, Volume 70, Issue 1,
1082 January 2015, Pages 257–263, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dku335>.
- 1083 92. Minter DJ, Appa A, Chambers HF, et al. Contemporary Management of *Staphylococcus*
1084 *aureus* Bacteremia-Controversies in Clinical Practice. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2023 Nov
1085 30;77(11):e57-e68. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciad500. PMID: 37950887.
- 1086 93. Ulloa ER, Singh KV, Geriak M, et al. Cefazolin and Ertapenem Salvage Therapy Rapidly
1087 Clears Persistent Methicillin-Susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia. *Clin Infect Dis.*
1088 2020 Sep 12;71(6):1413-1418. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciz995. PMID: 31773134; PMCID:
1089 PMC7486850.
- 1090 94. Grillo S, Cuervo G, Carratalà J, et al. Impact of β -Lactam and Daptomycin Combination
1091 Therapy on Clinical Outcomes in Methicillin-susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia:

1092 A Propensity Score-matched Analysis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2019 Oct 15;69(9):1480-1488. doi:
1093 10.1093/cid/ciz018. PMID: 30615122.

1094 95. Cheng MP, Lawandi A, Butler-Laporte G, et al. Adjunctive Daptomycin in the Treatment of
1095 Methicillin-susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia: A Randomized, Controlled Trial.
1096 *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021 May 4;72(9):e196-e203. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1000. PMID: 32667982.

1097 96. Yang SJ, Xiong YQ, Boyle-Vavra S, et al. Daptomycin-oxacillin combinations in treatment of
1098 experimental endocarditis caused by daptomycin-nonsusceptible strains of methicillin-
1099 resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* with evolving oxacillin susceptibility (the "seesaw effect").
1100 *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2010 Aug;54(8):3161-9. doi: 10.1128/AAC.00487-10. Epub
1101 2010 Jun 14. PMID: 20547804; PMCID: PMC2916313.

1102 97. Mishra S, Lasek-Nesselquist E, Mathur A, et al. Phenotypic and genetic changes associated
1103 with the seesaw effect in MRSA strain N315 in a bioreactor model. *J Glob Antimicrob Resist*.
1104 2022;28:249-253. doi:10.1016/j.jgar.2022.01.013

1105 98. Davis JS, Sud A, O'Sullivan MVN, et al. Combination of Vancomycin and β -Lactam Therapy
1106 for Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia: A Pilot Multicenter Randomized
1107 Controlled Trial. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;62(2):173-180. doi:10.1093/cid/civ808

1108 99. Tong SYC, Lye DC, Yahav D, et al. Effect of Vancomycin or Daptomycin With vs Without an
1109 Antistaphylococcal β -Lactam on Mortality, Bacteremia, Relapse, or Treatment Failure in
1110 Patients With MRSA Bacteremia: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2020;323(6):527-
1111 537. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.0103

1112 100. Geriak M, Haddad F, Rizvi K, et al. Clinical data on daptomycin plus ceftaroline
1113 versus standard of care monotherapy in the treatment of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*
1114 *aureus* bacteremia. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2019;63(5):e02483-18.
1115 doi:10.1128/AAC.02483-18

1116 101. Wang C, Ye C, Liao L, et al. Adjuvant β -Lactam Therapy Combined with Vancomycin
1117 or Daptomycin for Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia: a Systematic
1118 Review and Meta-analysis. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2020;64(11):e01377-20.
1119 Published 2020 Oct 20. doi:10.1128/AAC.01377-20

1120 102. Grillo S, Puig-Asensio M, Schweizer ML, et al. The Effectiveness of Combination
1121 Therapy for Treating Methicillin-Susceptible *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia: A
1122 Systematic Literature Review and a Meta-Analysis. *Microorganisms*. 2022 Apr 20;10(5):848.
1123 doi: 10.3390/microorganisms10050848. PMID: 35630294; PMCID: PMC9145429.

1124 103. Ye C, Wang C, Li Z, et al. The Effect of Combination Therapy on Mortality and
1125 Adverse Events in Patients with *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteraemia: A Systematic Review

and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Infect Dis Ther.* 2021 Dec;10(4):2643-2660. doi: 10.1007/s40121-021-00539-y. Epub 2021 Oct 1. PMID: 34596881; PMCID: PMC8572899.

104. Pujol M, Miró JM, Shaw E, et al. Daptomycin Plus Fosfomycin Versus Daptomycin Alone for Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia and Endocarditis: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2021 May 4;72(9):1517-1525. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1081. PMID: 32725216; PMCID: PMC8096235.

105. Dhand A, Bayer AS, Pogliano J, et al. Use of antistaphylococcal beta-lactams to increase daptomycin activity in eradicating persistent bacteremia due to methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*: role of enhanced daptomycin binding. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2011 Jul 15;53(2):158-63. doi: 10.1093/cid/cir340. PMID: 21690622; PMCID: PMC3697476.

106. **Kiang TKL, Wilby KJ, Ensom MHH. A critical review on the clinical pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, and clinical trials of ceftaroline. *Clin Pharmacokinet.* 2015;54:915–931.

107. **Azanza Perea JR, Sádaba Díaz de Rada B. Ceftobiprole: pharmacokinetics and PK/PD profile. *Rev Esp Quimioter.* 2019;32 Suppl 3:11–16.

108. Torres A, Mouton JW, Pea F. Pharmacokinetics and Dosing of Ceftobiprole Medocaril for the Treatment of Hospital- and Community-Acquired Pneumonia in Different Patient Populations. *Clin Pharmacokinet.* 2016;55:1507–1520.

109. Gatti M, Pea F. Continuous versus intermittent infusion of antibiotics in Gram-negative multidrug-resistant infections. *Curr Opin Infect Dis.* 2021;

110. MacGowan AP, Noel AR, Tomaselli S, et al. Pharmacodynamics of ceftaroline against *Staphylococcus aureus* studied in an in vitro pharmacokinetic model of infection. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2013;57:2451–2456.

111. Sumi CD, Heffernan AJ, Lipman J, et al. What Antibiotic Exposures Are Required to Suppress the Emergence of Resistance for Gram-Negative Bacteria? A Systematic Review. *Clin Pharmacokinet.* 2019;58:1407–1443.

112. Tam VH, Chang K-T, Zhou J, et al. Determining β -lactam exposure threshold to suppress resistance development in Gram-negative bacteria. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2017;72:1421–1428.

113. Gatti M, Cojutti PG, Pascale R, et al. Assessment of a PK/PD Target of Continuous Infusion Beta-Lactams Useful for Preventing Microbiological Failure and/or Resistance Development in Critically Ill Patients Affected by Documented Gram-Negative Infections. *Antibiotics.* 2021;10:1311.

- 1160 114. Singh R, Almutairi M, Alm RA, et al. Ceftaroline efficacy against high-MIC clinical
1161 *Staphylococcus aureus* isolates in an in vitro hollow-fibre infection model. *J Antimicrob*
1162 *Chemother.* 2017;72:2796–2803.
- 1163 115. Bhavnani SM, Hammel JP, Van Wart SA, et al. Pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic
1164 analysis for efficacy of ceftaroline fosamil in patients with acute bacterial skin and skin
1165 structure infections. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2015;59:372–380.
- 1166 116. Bhavnani SM, Hammel JP, Van Wart SA, et al. Pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic
1167 analyses for efficacy of ceftaroline fosamil in patients with community-acquired bacterial
1168 pneumonia. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2013;57:6348–6350.
- 1169 117. Craig WA, Andes DR. In vivo pharmacodynamics of ceftobiprole against multiple
1170 bacterial pathogens in murine thigh and lung infection models. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.*
1171 2008;52:3492–3496.
- 1172 118. Muller AE, Punt N, Mouton JW. Exposure to ceftobiprole is associated with
1173 microbiological eradication and clinical cure in patients with nosocomial pneumonia.
1174 *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2014;58:2512–2519.
- 1175 119. Gatti M, Pea F. Antimicrobial Dose Reduction in Continuous Renal Replacement
1176 Therapy: Myth or Real Need? A Practical Approach for Guiding Dose Optimization of Novel
1177 Antibiotics. *Clin Pharmacokinet.* 2021;
- 1178 120. Kalaria S, Williford S, Guo D, et al. Optimizing ceftaroline dosing in critically ill
1179 patients undergoing continuous renal replacement therapy. *Pharmacotherapy.* 2021;41:205–
1180 211.
- 1181 121. Cojutti PG, Merelli M, De Stefanis P, et al. Disposition of ceftobiprole during
1182 continuous venous-venous hemodiafiltration (CVVHDF) in a single critically ill patient. *Eur*
1183 *J Clin Pharmacol.* 2018;74:1671–1672.
- 1184 122. Coppens A, Zahr N, Chommeloux J, et al. Pharmacokinetics/pharmacodynamics of
1185 ceftobiprole in patients on extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. *Int J Antimicrob Agents.*
1186 2023;61:106765.
- 1187 123. Edlinger-Stanger M, Al Jalali V, Andreas M, et al. Plasma and Lung Tissue
1188 Pharmacokinetics of Ceftaroline Fosamil in Patients Undergoing Cardiac Surgery with
1189 Cardiopulmonary Bypass: an In Vivo Microdialysis Study. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.*
1190 2021;65:e0067921.
- 1191 124. Chauzy A, Gregoire N, Ferrandière M, et al. Population
1192 pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic study suggests continuous infusion of ceftaroline daily

dose in ventilated critical care patients with early-onset pneumonia and augmented renal clearance. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2022;77:3173–3179.

125. Cillóniz C, Dominedò C, Garcia-Vidal C, et al. Ceftobiprole for the treatment of pneumonia. *Rev Esp Quimioter.* 2019;32 Suppl 3:17–23.

126. Finazzi S, Luci G, Olivieri C, et al. Tissue Penetration of Antimicrobials in Intensive Care Unit Patients: A Systematic Review-Part I. *Antibiotics (Basel).* 2022;11:1164.

127. Helfer VE, Zavascki AP, Zeitlinger M, et al. Population Pharmacokinetic Modeling and Probability of Target Attainment of Ceftaroline in Brain and Soft Tissues. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2022;66:e0074122.

128. Matzneller P, Lackner E, Lagler H, et al. Single- and Repeated-Dose Pharmacokinetics of Ceftaroline in Plasma and Soft Tissues of Healthy Volunteers for Two Different Dosing Regimens of Ceftaroline Fosamil. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2016;60:3617–3625.

129. Barbour A, Schmidt S, Sabarinath SN, et al. Soft-tissue penetration of ceftobiprole in healthy volunteers determined by in vivo microdialysis. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2009;53:2773–2776.

130. Riccobene TA, Pushkin R, Jandourek A, et al. Penetration of Ceftaroline into the Epithelial Lining Fluid of Healthy Adult Subjects. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2016;60:5849–5857.

131. Rodvold KA, Nicolau DP, Lodise TP, et al. Identifying exposure targets for treatment of staphylococcal pneumonia with ceftobiprole. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2009;53:3294–3301.

132. Schmitt-Hoffman A, Engelhardt M, Spickermann J, et al. Bone penetration of the new-generation cephalosporin ceftobiprole in patients following hip replacement surgery [abstract]. Amsterdam. 2016.

133. Helfer VE, Dias BB, Lock GA, et al. Population Pharmacokinetic Modeling of Free Plasma and Free Brain Concentrations of Ceftaroline in Healthy and Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*-Infected Wistar Rats. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2023;67(7):e0038223. Doi:10.1128/aac.00382-23.

134. Roujansky A, Martin M, Gomart C, et al. Multidrug-Resistant *Staphylococcus epidermidis* Ventriculostomy-Related Infection Successfully Treated by Intravenous Ceftaroline after Failure of Daptomycin Treatment. *World Neurosurg.* 2020;136:221-225. Doi:10.1016/j.wneu.2020.01.013.

- 1225 135. Cies JJ, Moore WS 2nd, Enache A, et al. Ceftaroline Cerebrospinal Fluid Penetration in the
1226 Treatment of a Ventriculopleural Shunt Infection: A Case Report. *J Pediatr Pharmacol Ther.*
1227 2020;25(4):336-339. doi:10.5863/1551-6776-25.4.336
- 1228 136. Kuriakose SS, Rabbat M, Gallagher JC. Ceftaroline CSF concentrations in a patient
1229 with ventriculoperitoneal shunt-related meningitis. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2015;70:953–
1230 954.
- 1231 137. Stucki A, Cottagnoud M, Acosta F, et al. Evaluation of ceftobiprole activity against a
1232 variety of gram-negative pathogens, including *Escherichia coli*, *Haemophilus influenzae* (β -
1233 lactamase positive and β -lactamase negative), and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, in a rabbit
1234 meningitis model. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2012;56(2):921-925.
1235 doi:10.1128/AAC.01537-10
- 1236 138. Stein GE, Yasin F, Smith C, et al. A pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic analysis of
1237 ceftaroline prophylaxis in patients with external ventricular drains. *Surg Infect (Larchmt).*
1238 2015;16:169–173.
- 1239 139. Roujansky A, Martin M, Gomart C, et al. Multidrug-Resistant *Staphylococcus*
1240 *epidermidis* Ventriculostomy-Related Infection Successfully Treated by Intravenous
1241 Ceftaroline after Failure of Daptomycin Treatment. *World Neurosurg.* 2020;136:221–225.
- 1242 140. *File TM, Low DE, Eckburg PB, et al. FOCUS 1: a randomized, double-blinded,
1243 multicentre, Phase III trial of the efficacy and safety of ceftaroline fosamil versus ceftriaxone
1244 in community-acquired pneumonia. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2011;66 Suppl 3:iii19-32.
- 1245 141. *Low DE, File TM, Eckburg PB, et al. FOCUS 2: a randomized, double-blinded,
1246 multicentre, Phase III trial of the efficacy and safety of ceftaroline fosamil versus ceftriaxone
1247 in community-acquired pneumonia. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2011;66 Suppl 3:iii33-44.
- 1248 142. *Jandourek A, Smith A, Llorens L, et al. Efficacy of ceftaroline fosamil for bacteremia
1249 associated with community-acquired bacterial pneumonia. *Hosp Pract (1995).* 2014
1250 Feb;42(1):75-8. doi: 10.3810/hp.2014.02.1094. PMID: 24566599.
- 1251 143. *Zhong NS, Sun T, Zhuo C, et al. Ceftaroline fosamil versus ceftriaxone for the
1252 treatment of Asian patients with community-acquired pneumonia: a randomised, controlled,
1253 double-blind, phase 3, non-inferiority with nested superiority trial. *Lancet Infect Dis.*
1254 2015;15:161–171.
- 1255 144. *Corey GR, Wilcox MH, Talbot GH, et al. CANVAS 1: the first Phase III, randomized,
1256 double-blind study evaluating ceftaroline fosamil for the treatment of patients with
1257 complicated skin and skin structure infections. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2010;65 Suppl
1258 4:iv41-51.

- 1259 145. *Wilcox MH, Corey GR, Talbot GH, et al. CANVAS 2: the second Phase III,
1260 randomized, double-blind study evaluating ceftaroline fosamil for the treatment of patients
1261 with complicated skin and skin structure infections. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*.
1262 2010;65:iv53–iv65.
- 1263 146. Geriak M, Haddad F, Rizvi K, et al. Clinical Data on Daptomycin plus Ceftaroline
1264 versus Standard of Care Monotherapy in the Treatment of Methicillin-Resistant
1265 *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2019;63:e02483-18.
- 1266 147. *Nicholson SC, Welte T, File TM, et al. A randomised, double-blind trial comparing
1267 ceftobiprole medocaril with ceftriaxone with or without linezolid for the treatment of patients
1268 with community-acquired pneumonia requiring hospitalisation. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*.
1269 2012;39:240–246.
- 1270 148. *Awad SS, Rodriguez AH, Chuang Y-C, et al. A Phase 3 Randomized Double-Blind
1271 Comparison of Ceftobiprole Medocaril Versus Ceftazidime Plus Linezolid for the Treatment
1272 of Hospital-Acquired Pneumonia. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2014;59:51–61.
- 1273 149. *Overcash JS, Kim C, Keech R, et al. Ceftobiprole Compared With Vancomycin Plus
1274 Aztreonam in the Treatment of Acute Bacterial Skin and Skin Structure Infections: Results of
1275 a Phase 3, Randomized, Double-blind Trial (TARGET). *Clinical Infectious Diseases*.
1276 2021;73:e1507–e1517.
- 1277 150. Huang C, Chen I, Lin L. Comparing the Outcomes of Ceftaroline plus Vancomycin or
1278 Daptomycin Combination Therapy versus Vancomycin or Daptomycin Monotherapy in
1279 Adults with Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia-A Meta-Analysis.
1280 *Antibiotics (Basel)*. 2022 Aug 15;11(8):1104. doi: 10.3390/antibiotics11081104. PMID:
1281 36009973; PMCID: PMC9405305
- 1282
- 1283 151. Destache CJ, Guervil DJ, Kaye KS. Ceftaroline fosamil for the treatment of Gram-
1284 positive endocarditis: CAPTURE study experience. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2019
1285 May;53(5):644-649. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2019.01.014. Epub 2019 Jan 31. PMID:
1286 30711613.
- 1287 152. Sakoulas G, Moise PA, Casapao AM, et al. Antimicrobial salvage therapy for
1288 persistent staphylococcal bacteremia using daptomycin plus ceftaroline. *Clin Ther*. 2014 Oct
1289 1;36(10):1317-33. doi: 10.1016/j.clinthera.2014.05.061. Epub 2014 Jul 10. PMID: 25017183.
- 1290 153. Ho TT, Cadena J, Childs LM, et al. Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*
1291 bacteraemia and endocarditis treated with ceftaroline salvage therapy. *J Antimicrob*

- 1292 Chemother. 2012 May;67(5):1267-70. doi: 10.1093/jac/dks006. Epub 2012 Feb 6. PMID:
1293 22311935.
- 1294 154. Polenakovik HM, Pleiman CM. Ceftaroline for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*
1295 *aureus* bacteraemia: case series and review of the literature. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2013
1296 Nov;42(5):450-5. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2013.07.005. Epub 2013 Aug 11. PMID:
1297 23993067.
- 1298 155. Gritsenko D, Fedorenko M, Ruhe JJ, et al. Combination Therapy With Vancomycin and
1299 Ceftaroline for Refractory Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia: A Case
1300 Series. *Clin Ther*. 2017 Jan;39(1):212-218. doi: 10.1016/j.clinthera.2016.12.005. Epub 2016
1301 Dec 27. PMID: 28038791.
- 1302 156. Casapao AM, Davis SL, Barr VO, et al. Large retrospective evaluation of the
1303 effectiveness and safety of ceftaroline fosamil therapy. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2014
1304 May;58(5):2541-6. doi: 10.1128/AAC.02371-13. Epub 2014 Feb 18. PMID: 24550331;
1305 PMCID: PMC3993242.
- 1306 157. Zasowski EJ, Trinh TD, Claeys KC, et al. Multicenter Observational Study of
1307 Ceftaroline Fosamil for Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Bloodstream Infections.
1308 *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2017 Jan 24;61(2):e02015-16. doi: 10.1128/AAC.02015-16.
1309 PMID: 27895012; PMCID: PMC5278749.
- 1310 158. Britt RS, Evoy KE, Lee GC, et al. Early Use of Ceftaroline Fosamil in the United
1311 States Veterans Health Care System. *Drugs*. 2017 Aug;77(12):1345-1351. doi:
1312 10.1007/s40265-017-0785-2. PMID: 28664412; PMCID: PMC5553123.
- 1313 159. *Mootz ML, Britt RS, Mootz AA, et al. Comparative-effectiveness of ceftaroline and
1314 daptomycin as first-line MRSA therapy for patients with sepsis admitted to hospitals in the
1315 United States Veterans Health Care System. *Hosp Pract (1995)*. 2019 Oct;47(4):186-191. doi:
1316 10.1080/21548331.2019.1676540. Epub 2019 Oct 14. PMID: 31578888; PMCID:
1317 PMC6883169.
- 1318 160. *Arshad S, Huang V, Hartman P, et al. Ceftaroline fosamil monotherapy for
1319 methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia: a comparative clinical outcomes
1320 study. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2017 Apr;57:27-31. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2017.01.019. Epub 2017 Jan 25.
1321 PMID: 28131729.
- 1322 161. Paladino JA, Jacobs DM, Shields RK, et al. Use of ceftaroline after glycopeptide
1323 failure to eradicate methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia with elevated
1324 vancomycin minimum inhibitory concentrations. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2014

1325 Dec;44(6):557-63. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2014.07.024. Epub 2014 Sep 16. PMID:
1326 25282169.

1327 162. Werth BJ, Sakoulas G, Rose WE, et al. Ceftaroline increases membrane binding and
1328 enhances the activity of daptomycin against daptomycin-nonsusceptible vancomycin-
1329 intermediate *Staphylococcus aureus* in a pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic model.
1330 *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2013 Jan;57(1):66-73. doi: 10.1128/AAC.01586-12. Epub
1331 2012 Oct 15. Erratum in: *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2013 Mar;57(3):1565. PMID:
1332 23070161; PMCID: PMC3535972.

1333 .
1334 163. Sullivan EL, Turner RB, O'Neal HR Jr, et al. Ceftaroline-Associated Neutropenia:
1335 Case Series and Literature Review of Incidence, Risk Factors, and Outcomes. *Open Forum*
1336 *Infect Dis*. 2019 Mar 28;6(5):ofz168. doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofz168. PMID: 31123688; PMCID:
1337 PMC6524829.

1338 164. Holland TL, Cosgrove SE, Doernberg SB, et al. Ceftobiprole for Treatment of Complicated
1339 *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia. *N Engl J Med*. 2023;389(15):1390-1401.
1340 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2300220

1341 165. *Noel GJ, Bush K, Bagchi P, et al. A randomized, double-blind trial comparing
1342 ceftobiprole medocaril with vancomycin plus ceftazidime for the treatment of patients with
1343 complicated skin and skin-structure infections. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2008 Mar 1;46(5):647-55. doi:
1344 10.1086/526527. PMID: 18225981.

1345 166. *Noel GJ, Strauss RS, Amsler K, et al. Results of a double-blind, randomized trial of
1346 ceftobiprole treatment of complicated skin and skin structure infections caused by gram-
1347 positive bacteria. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2008 Jan;52(1):37-44. doi:
1348 10.1128/AAC.00551-07. Epub 2007 Oct 22. PMID: 17954698; PMCID: PMC2223887.

1349 167. *Nicholson SC, Welte T, File TM Jr, et al. A randomised, double-blind trial comparing
1350 ceftobiprole medocaril with ceftriaxone with or without linezolid for the treatment of patients
1351 with community-acquired pneumonia requiring hospitalisation. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2012
1352 Mar;39(3):240-6. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2011.11.005. Epub 2012 Jan 9. PMID:
1353 22230331.

1354 168. *Awad SS, Rodriguez AH, Chuang YC, et al. A phase 3 randomized double-blind
1355 comparison of ceftobiprole medocaril versus ceftazidime plus linezolid for the treatment of
1356 hospital-acquired pneumonia. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014 Jul 1;59(1):51-61. doi:
1357 10.1093/cid/ciu219. Epub 2014 Apr 9. PMID: 24723282; PMCID: PMC4305133.

- 1358 169. *Soriano A, Morata L. Ceftobiprole: Experience in staphylococcal bacteremia. Rev
1359 Esp Quimioter. 2019 Sep;32 Suppl 3(Suppl 3):24-28. PMID: 31364338; PMCID:
1360 PMC6755346.
- 1361 170. Moise PA, Amodio-Groton M, Rashid M, et al. Multicenter evaluation of the clinical
1362 outcomes of daptomycin with and without concomitant β -lactams in patients with
1363 *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia and mild to moderate renal impairment. Antimicrob Agents
1364 Chemother. 2013 Mar;57(3):1192-200. doi: 10.1128/AAC.02192-12. Epub 2012 Dec 17.
1365 PMID: 23254428; PMCID: PMC3591880.
- 1366 171. Barber KE, Werth BJ, Ireland CE, et al. Potent synergy of ceftobiprole plus
1367 daptomycin against multiple strains of *Staphylococcus aureus* with various resistance
1368 phenotypes. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2014 Nov;69(11):3006-10. doi: 10.1093/jac/dku236.
1369 Epub 2014 Jul 1. PMID: 24990867.
- 1370 .
- 1371 .
- 1372 172. Gentile I, Buonomo AR, Corcione S, et al. CEFTO-CURE study: CEFTObiprole
1373 Clinical Use in Real-life - a multi-centre experience in Italy. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2023
1374 Jul;62(1):106817. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2023.106817. Epub 2023 Apr 13. PMID:
1375 37061102.
- 1376 173. Zampino R, Gallo R, Salemme A, et al. Clinical results with the use of ceftaroline and
1377 ceftobiprole: real-life experience in a tertiary care hospital. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2023
1378 Aug;62(2):106883. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2023.106883. Epub 2023 Jun 10. PMID:
1379 37302772
- 1380 174. Zhanel GG, Kosar J, Baxter M, et al. Real-life experience with ceftobiprole in Canada:
1381 Results from the CLEAR (Canadian Leadership on Antimicrobial Real-life usage) registry. J
1382 Glob Antimicrob Resist. 2021 Mar;24:335-339. doi: 10.1016/j.jgar.2021.01.014. Epub 2021
1383 Feb 1. PMID: 33540083
- 1384 175. Oltolini C, Castiglioni B, Tassan Din C, et al. Meticillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*
1385 *aureus* endocarditis: first report of daptomycin plus ceftobiprole combination as salvage
1386 therapy. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2016 Jun;47(6):502-4. doi:
1387 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2016.04.006. Epub 2016 Apr 25. PMID: 27211210.
- 1388 176. Mahmoud E, Al Mansour S, Bosaeed M, et al. Ceftobiprole for Treatment of MRSA
1389 Blood Stream Infection: A Case Series. Infect Drug Resist. 2020 Aug 3;13:2667-2672. doi:
1390 10.2147/IDR.S254395. PMID: 32821130; PMCID: PMC7422691.

- 1391 177. Tascini C, Attanasio V, Ripa M, et al. Ceftobiprole for the treatment of infective
1392 endocarditis: A case series. *J Glob Antimicrob Resist*. 2020 Mar;20:56-59. doi:
1393 10.1016/j.jgar.2019.07.020. Epub 2019 Jul 24. PMID: 31351247.
- 1394 178. Giuliano S, Angelini J, D'Elia D, et al. Ampicillin and Ceftobiprole Combination for
1395 the Treatment of Enterococcus faecalis Invasive Infections: "The Times They Are A-
1396 Changin". *Antibiotics (Basel)*. 2023 May 9;12(5):879. doi: 10.3390/antibiotics12050879.
1397 PMID: 37237782; PMCID: PMC10215339.
- 1398 179. Wendland T, Daubner B, Pichler WJ. Ceftobiprole associated agranulocytosis after
1399 drug rash with eosinophilia and systemic symptoms induced by vancomycin and rifampicin.
1400 *Br J Clin Pharmacol*. 2011 Feb;71(2):297-300. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2125.2010.03832.x.
1401 PMID: 21219413; PMCID: PMC3040553.
- 1402 180. Welte T, Kantecki M, Stone GG, et al. Ceftaroline fosamil as a potential treatment
1403 option for Staphylococcus aureus community-acquired pneumonia in adults. *Int J Antimicrob*
1404 *Agents*. 2019 Oct;54(4):410-422. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2019.08.012.
- 1405 181. Baines SD, Chilton CH, Crowther GS, et al. Evaluation of antimicrobial activity of
1406 ceftaroline against Clostridium difficile and propensity to induce C. difficile infection in an in
1407 vitro human gut model. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2013 Aug;68(8):1842-9
- 1408 182. Girish C, Balakrishnan S. (2011). Ceftaroline fosamil: A novel anti-Methicillin-
1409 resistant Staphylococcus aureus cephalosporin. *Journal of pharmacology &*
1410 *pharmacotherapeutics*, 2(3), 209–211. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0976-500X.83298>
- 1411 183. Volk CF, Burgdorf S, Edwardson G, et al. Interleukin (IL)-1 β and IL-10 Host
1412 Responses in Patients With Staphylococcus aureus Bacteremia Determined by Antimicrobial
1413 Therapy. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020 Jun 10;70(12):2634-2640. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciz686. PMID:
1414 31365924; PMCID: PMC7286365
- 1415 184. Rand KH, Houck HJ. Synergy of daptomycin with oxacillin and other beta-lactams
1416 against methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*.
1417 2004;48:2871–5
- 1418 185. Jorgensen SCJ, Zasowski EJ, Trinh TD, et al. Daptomycin Plus β -Lactam Combination
1419 Therapy for Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus Bloodstream Infections: A
1420 Retrospective, Comparative Cohort Study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020 Jun 24;71(1):1-10. doi:
1421 10.1093/cid/ciz746. PMID: 31404468
- 1422 186. Cunha BA, Gran A. Successful treatment of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus
1423 (MRSA) aortic prosthetic valve endocarditis with prolonged high-dose daptomycin plus

- 1424 ceftaroline therapy. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2015 Aug;46(2):225-6. doi:
1425 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2015.04.006. Epub 2015 May 27. PMID: 26058777.
- 1426 187. Hornak JP, Anjum S, Reynoso D. Adjunctive ceftaroline in combination with
1427 daptomycin or vancomycin for complicated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*
1428 bacteremia after monotherapy failure. *Ther Adv Infect Dis*. 2019 Nov
1429 7;6:2049936119886504. doi: 10.1177/2049936119886504. PMID: 31857898; PMCID:
1430 PMC691583
- 1431 188. Saravolatz LD, Pawlak J. In vitro activity of fosfomycin alone and in combination
1432 against *Staphylococcus aureus* with reduced susceptibility or resistance to methicillin,
1433 vancomycin, daptomycin or linezolid. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2022 Dec 23;78(1):238-241.
1434 doi: 10.1093/jac/dkac380. PMID: 36374572.
- 1435 189. Gatti M, Viaggi B, Rossolini GM, et al. Targeted Therapy of Severe Infections Caused
1436 by *Staphylococcus aureus* in Critically Ill Adult Patients: A Multidisciplinary Proposal of
1437 Therapeutic Algorithms Based on Real-World Evidence. *Microorganisms*. 2023 Feb
1438 3;11(2):394. doi: 10.3390/microorganisms11020394.
- 1439 190. Minejima E, Mai N, Bui N, et al. Defining the Breakpoint Duration of *Staphylococcus*
1440 *aureus* Bacteremia Predictive of Poor Outcomes. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020 Feb 3;70(4):566-573.
1441 doi: 10.1093/cid/ciz257. PMID: 30949675; PMCID: PMC7768749
- 1442 191. Greenberg JA, Hrusch CL, Jaffery MR, et al. Distinct T-helper cell responses to
1443 *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia reflect immunologic comorbidities and correlate with
1444 mortality. *Crit Care*. 2018 Apr 25;22(1):107. doi: 10.1186/s13054-018-2025-x. PMID:
1445 29695270; PMCID: PMC5916828.
- 1446 192. Kouijzer IJE, Fowler VG Jr, Ten Oever J. Redefining *Staphylococcus aureus*
1447 bacteremia: A structured approach guiding diagnostic and therapeutic management. *J Infect*.
1448 2023 Jan;86(1):9-13. doi: 10.1016/j.jinf.2022.10.042. Epub 2022 Nov 9. PMID: 36370898.
- 1449 193. Warren EF, Crocker RJ, Tabor B, et al. Successful use of nafcillin and ceftaroline
1450 combination therapy for persistent MSSA bacteraemia and endocarditis: a case series. *JAC*
1451 *Antimicrob Resist*. 2022 Dec 29;5(1):dlac129. doi: 10.1093/jacamr/dlac129. PMID:
1452 36601550; PMCID: PMC9798079.
- 1453 194. Ahmad O, Crawford TN, Myint T. Comparing the Outcomes of Ceftaroline Plus
1454 Vancomycin or Daptomycin Combination Therapy Versus Monotherapy in Adults with
1455 Complicated and Prolonged Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus Aureus* Bacteremia
1456 Initially Treated with Supplemental Ceftaroline. *Infect Dis Ther*. 2020 Mar;9(1):77-87. doi:
1457 10.1007/s40121-019-00277-2. Epub 2019 Nov 28. PMID: 31776844; PMCID: PMC7054513.

- 1458 195. Morrisette T, Lagnf AM, Alosaimy S, et al. A comparison of daptomycin alone and in
1459 combination with ceftaroline fosamil for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*
1460 bacteremia complicated by septic pulmonary emboli. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2020
1461 Nov;39(11):2199-2203. doi: 10.1007/s10096-020-03941-5. Epub 2020 Jun 13. PMID:
1462 32535805.
- 1463 196. Patel D, Brown ML, Edwards S, et al. Outcomes of Daptomycin Plus Ceftaroline
1464 Versus Alternative Therapy for Persistent Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*
1465 (MRSA) Bacteraemia. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2023 Mar;61(3):106735. doi:
1466 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2023.106735. Epub 2023 Jan 20. PMID: 36690124; PMCID:
1467 PMC10023467.
- 1468 197. Fabre V, Ferrada M, Buckel WR, et al. Ceftaroline in Combination With
1469 Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole for Salvage Therapy of Methicillin-Resistant
1470 *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia and Endocarditis. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2014 Jul
1471 8;1(2):ofu046. doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofu046. Erratum in: *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2015
1472 Apr;2(2):ofv058. PMID: 25734118; PMCID: PMC4281789.
- 1473 198. Johnson TM, Molina KC, Miller MA, et al. Combination ceftaroline and daptomycin
1474 salvage therapy for complicated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia
1475 compared with standard of care. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2021 Apr;57(4):106310. doi:
1476 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2021.106310. Epub 2021 Feb 18. PMID: 33609718.
- 1477 199. McCreary EK, Kullar R, Geriak M, et al. Multicenter Cohort of Patients With
1478 Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* Bacteremia Receiving Daptomycin Plus
1479 Ceftaroline Compared With Other MRSA Treatments. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2019 Dec
1480 31;7(1):ofz538. doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofz538. PMID: 31938716; PMCID: PMC6951465.
- 1481 200. Cortes-Penfield N, Oliver NT, Hunter A, et al. Daptomycin and combination
1482 daptomycin-ceftaroline as salvage therapy for persistent methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus*
1483 *aureus* bacteremia. *Infect Dis (Lond)*. 2018 Aug;50(8):643-647. doi:
1484 10.1080/23744235.2018.1448110. Epub 2018 Mar 6. PMID: 29508663; PMCID:
1485 PMC6109258.