

Review article

Bacterial Infections in Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplant Recipients

Elisa Balletto and Małgorzata Mikulska

Division of Infectious Diseases, IRCCS San Martino University Hospital – IST, Genoa, Italy. Department of Health Sciences, University of Genoa, Genoa, Italy

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Abstract. Bacterial infections are major complications after Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplant (HSCT). They consist mainly of bloodstream infections (BSI), followed by pneumonia and gastrointestinal infections, including typhlitis and *Clostridium difficile* infection. Microbiological data come mostly from BSI. Coagulase negative staphylococci and Enterobacteriaceae are the most frequent pathogens causing approximately 25% of BSI each, followed by enterococci, *P. aeruginosa* and viridans streptococci. Bacterial pneumonia is frequent after HSCT, and Gramnegatives are predominant. *Clostridium difficile* infection affects approximately 15% of HSCT recipients, being more frequent in case of allogeneic than autologous HSCT.

The epidemiology and the prevalence of resistant strains vary significantly between transplant centres. In some regions, multi-drug resistant (MDR) Gram-negative rods are increasingly frequent. In others, vancomycin-resistant enterococci are predominant. In the era of increasing resistance to antibiotics, the efficacy of fluoroquinolone prophylaxis and standard treatment of febrile neutropenia have been questioned. Therefore, a thorough evaluation of local epidemiology is mandatory to decide the need for prophylaxis and the choice of the best regimen for empirical treatment of febrile neutropenia. For the latter, individualised approach has been proposed, consisting of either escalation or de-escalation strategy. De-escalation strategy is recommended since resistant bacteria should be covered upfront, mainly in patients with severe clinical presentation and previous infection or colonisation with a resistant pathogen.

Non-pharmacological interventions, such as screening for resistant bacteria, applying isolation and contact precautions should be put in place to limit the spread of MDR bacteria. Antimicrobial stewardship program should be implemented in transplant centres.

Citation: Balletto E., Mikulska M. Bacterial infections in hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients. Mediterr J Hematol Infect Dis 2015, 7(1): e2015045, DOI: <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.4084/MJHID.2015.045</u>

Published: July 1, 2015

Received: April 7, 2015

Accepted: June 30, 2015

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<u>http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0</u>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Correspondence to: Małgorzata Mikulska, M.D., PhD. Division of Infectious Diseases, IRCCS San Martino University Hospital – IST. L.go R. Benzi, 10 – 16132 Genoa, Italy. Tel: +39 010 5554654; Fax: +39 010 3537680. E-mail: <u>m.mikulska@unige.it</u>

Introduction. Bacterial infections are among the major complications of hematopoietic stem cell transplant (HSCT). The most frequent clinical entities are bloodstream infections (BSI), pneumonia and gastrointestinal infections, which include typhlitis and infections due to *Clostridium difficile*. Infections due to Gram-negative rods used to be the main cause of infection-related mortality during neutropenia. Fortunately, over the decades numerous successful

strategies have been developed to limit the negative impact of these infections. In fact, with the universal use of prompt empirical antibiotic therapy in case of fever during neutropenia and, in some settings, antibiotic prophylaxis, the fatality rate dropped significantly.¹

However, the recent emergence and spread of multidrug-resistant (MDR) bacteria, particularly Gramnegatives, threaten to nullify all the progress made in



the field of preventing and treating bacterial infections, since the pathogens that are resistant to all antimicrobials commonly used as empirical treatment are becoming more and more frequent in HSCT recipients worldwide.^{2,3}

This review will focus on recent changes in the epidemiology of bacterial infections, mostly BSI, after HSCT, highlighting the epidemiology of MDR pathogens such as methicillin-resistant staphylococci, vancomvcin resistant enterococci (VRE). Enterobacteriaceae producing extended-spectrum betalactamases (ESBLs), MDR Enterobacteriaceae, mostly carbapenemase-producing K. pneumoniae (KPC - K. *pneumoniae*) and MDR P. aeruginosa. The epidemiology of C. difficile infections will be briefly reviewed. Additionally, advances in the management of the MDR infections, such as a new approach to empirical therapy and antimicrobial stewardship will be discussed.

Epidemiology. The most common bacterial infections after HSCT are BSI, pneumonia and gastrointestinal infections. Urinary tract infections are infrequent and usually associated with the presence of the urinary catheter. The reliable data on the aetiology of bacterial infections in the setting of HSCT come mainly from the results of blood cultures. In fact BSI is the most frequent microbiologically documented infection, whereas microbiological documentation is significantly less frequent in case of pneumonia or typhlitis.

Bloodstream infections. BSI affects approximately 5-10% of autologous and 20-30% of allogeneic HSCT recipients, with significant variations between centres and between patients undergoing different transplantation procedures, e.g. type of conditioning regimen. The incidence of BSI is the highest during the pre-engraftment neutropenia and depends mainly on the extent of oral and enteric mucositis and the presence of a central venous catheter. During later nonneutropenic phases, BSIs are more frequent in case of Graft-versus-Host-Disease (GvHD), the presence of hypoglobulineamia or central venous catheter. The main risk factors associated with BSI due to single bacterial species are reported in **Table 1**.

Following a growing body of data on the emergence of resistant Gram-negative rods, 4th European Conference on the Infections of Leukemia (ECIL-4) in 2011 addressed the issue of bacterial infections in this setting. In order to understand the extent of the problem, a review of the literature was performed and a questionnaire was sent to participating centres focusing of the current epidemiology, resistant patters and recommended empirical therapy.⁴ Additionally, a prospective observational study on Gram-negative BSI in HSCT recipients is ongoing (registered as ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT02257931).

The review of the literature published after 2005 vielded 29 reports from 13 countries concerning autologous (14 reports) and allogeneic (19 reports) HSCT.⁴ The median year of observation was 2001, ranging from 1987 to 2009. The Gram-positive to Gram-negative ratio was 60% vs. 40%, respectively, with some centres reporting the ratio of 85% vs. 15%, while, others 26% vs. 74%. The ECIL-4 questionnaire included answers from 33 centres from 18 countries (autologous HSCT in 32 and allogeneic HSCT in 30 centres), with the median year of observation of 2008 (range, 1998-2010). These more recent data indicated a further decrease in Gram-positive to Gram-negative ratio (55% vs. 45%), with similar huge differences between the centres from 85% vs. 15% in some to 30% vs. 70% in others.

More in detail, Enterobacteriaceae and coagulasenegative staphylococci were the most frequently isolated pathogens (**Figure 1**). Compared to published data, in the ECII-4 questionnaire the incidence of *P*.

Table 1. The main risk factors associated with BSI due to single bacterial species

Risk factor	Bacterial species			
Oral mucositis	Viridans streptococci			
Oral mucosius	Coagulase-negative staphylococci			
	Enterobacteriaceae			
Enteric mucositis	Enterococci			
	Pseudomonas aeruginosa			
Extensive and prolonged use of central venous catheters	Staphylococci			
Lower performance status/comorbidities	Enterococci			
Graft-versus-Host Disease	Gram/negative bacteria, including MDR P. aeruginosa			
Graft-versus-Host Disease	Pneumococci			
Hypogammaglobulinemia				
	Staphylococci			
Fluoroquinolone prophylaxis	Enterococci			
	Viridans streptococci			
Use of cephalosporins	Enterococci, viridans streptococci (ceftazidime)			
Treatment with beta-lactams	Beta-lactam resistant viridans streptococci			
Nasal colonisation due to MRSA	MRSA			
Colonisation with VRE	VRE			

MRSA, methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus; VRE, vancomycin-resistant enterococci.





Figure 1. The aetiology of bloodstream infections according to literature review and questionnaire survey performed for European Conference on Infections in Leukemia (ECIL), reported as median values.⁴

aeruginosa was lower, but the incidence of enterococci was higher.⁴

<u>Staphylococci</u>: Staphylococci are the most frequent pathogens isolated during BSI. They are mostly coagulase-negative (approx. 25 % of all BSI), while *S. aureus*, a species significantly more virulent, is associated only with smaller proportion of infections (approx. 5%).⁴ This high rate might be in part explained by the fact that not all the studies and centres regarded coagulase-negative staphylococci as a true cause of BSI only if isolated in two consecutive blood cultures.

As far as resistance pattern is concerned, in ECIL centres more than half of isolated coagulase-negative staphylococci were resistant to methicillin while the rate of methicillin-resistance in *S. aureus* has been reported lower.⁴ In the literature review, methicillin-resistance was also more frequent among coagulase-negative staphylococci than *S. aureus*, with respective median resistance rates of 80% and 56%.⁴ Of note, the resistance to methicillin has been reported lower in children than in the adult population.

Although the overall incidence of methicillinresistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) BSI is low in HSCT setting, concerns about increased mortality have been raised. In particular, in two cases of MRSA outbreak, the attributable mortality was very high. In the UK outbreak, it was probably over 20% while in an Australian outbreak in 41 neutropenic patients, the attributable fatality rate was 50%.^{5,6} Hopefully, outside an outbreak setting, the outcome of MRSA infections is more favourable, particularly in centres where methicillin-resistant staphylococci are regularly seen, and glycopeptides are frequently used in empirical therapy. Infection control measures, found effective against MRSA, include alcohol-based hand hygiene, nasal screening, universal or selective decolonization, improvement in central line management, and a reduction in the use of fluoroquinolones, and are all currently recommended by international guidelines.⁷

Good news concerning MRSA infections is that, for reasons that remain yet to be fully investigated, since 2004 a worldwide confirmed decline in MRSA has been noted in the US, and in several European and Far East countries, despite different infection-control approaches undertaken.^{8,9}

Finally, several new therapeutic options active against MRSA have been introduced in the last five years, including anti-MRSA cephalosporins such as ceftaroline or ceftobiprole, lipoglycopeptides such as telavancin, dalbavancin or oritavancin, or a new oxazolidinone: tedizolid.¹⁰ Although none of these drugs has been approved for empirical or targeted treatment of infections in neutropenic patients, they offer much needed alternatives for better management of methicillin-resistant infections. Among them, cephalosporins might be particularly attractive due to their historically known efficacy and safety while some

novel lipoglycopeptides might revolutionise outpatient treatment allowing for once weekly administration.

<u>Enterobacteriaceae</u>: Enterobacteriaceae, and in particular *E. coli*, are the second most common pathogen in BSI, being only slightly less frequent than staphylococci. The mortality associated with infections due to Enterobacteriaceae is directly associated with the time to the onset of an effective antibacterial therapy. As demonstrated in the comparison between ESBL-positive and ESBL-negative BSIs due to *E. coli*, the time to the appropriate empirical therapy was longer, and the outcome was poorer, in case of ESBL-producing strains.¹¹⁻¹³

In most of the European countries, over 10% of all invasive infections caused by *E. coli* in 2012 were due strains unsusceptible to 3rd generation cephalosporins and the prevalence of ESBL producing strains in patients with haematological malignancies varies, being for example 13% in Spain and 48% in Japan.^{11,14} The ECII-4 literature review reported that in median 34% of Enterobacteriaceae were ESBL-positive, ranging from 16% to 44% in different centres; whereas according to ECIL-4 questionnaire over 60% of centres reported that only less than 25% of Enterobacteriaceae were ESBL-producers, including 20% of centres with the prevalence of ESBL-producers of < 5%.⁴

In another experience from Spain in patients with haematological malignancies, MDR Gram-negatives (including ESBL-producing strains) represented 11% of all Gram-negatives, and a significant increase has been observed compared to the previous observation period (11% vs. 3%).^{15,16}

Carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae are the most recent and rapidly spreading threat, and in Europe they consist mainly of carbapenem-resistant K. pneumoniae. In fact, in 29 European countries the mean incidence of carbapenem resistance in K. *pneu*moniae was 6%, ranging from 0 to 61%,⁸ and single-centre outbreaks and national epidemics have been reported in Greece and Italy, which are now considered endemic for KPC - K. pneumoniae.^{8,17} Until recently, few reports focused exclusively on patients with hematologic malignancy and KPC - K. pneumoniae BSI, but the reported attributable mortality rates were 38%, 56% and 67%.¹⁷ Therefore, multidisciplinary intensive programs that address the issue of limiting the spread of these bacteria are warranted.

Last but not least, the issue of resistance of Gramnegatives to fluoroquinolones is worrisome. Interestingly, in several centres, the rate of fluoroquinolone resistance in *E. coli* increased irrespectively of the use of prophylaxis by the transplant centre. For example in Sweden, despite the absence of fluoroquinolone prophylaxis, the resistance in *E. coli* increased significantly from 2% in years 1995-2001 to 16% in 2002-2008.¹⁸ In Japan, there were no E. coli resistant to fluoroquinolones during the years 2003-2005 when the prophylaxis was in place, but in years 2006-2009, when fluoroquinolone prophylaxis was not prescribed, over 60% of E. coli tested were resistant.¹⁹ These results might reflect a worldwide trend in the general increase in fluoroquinolone resistance in Enterobacteriaceae.8 Since fluoroquinolone prophylaxis is recommended and widely used in neutropenic adults receiving allogeneic HSCT, it is not recommended for empirical treatment febrile neutropenia.^{1,20} Thus, the rate of of fluoroquinolone resistance among Gram-negatives does not influence significantly therapeutic choices, but it may have severe implications for the prophylactic strategy in neutropenic HSCT recipients. In fact, the benefit of fluoroquinolone prophylaxis is considered uncertain when the prevalence of fluoroquinoloneresistance in Gram-negative rods exceeds 20%.²¹ Therefore, abolishing any antibiotic prophylaxis might be reasonable in the era of multidrug resistance, despite the fact that an increase in Gram-negative BSI was observed in some centres where prophylaxis was discontinued.14,15

<u>Enterococci</u>: Enterococci have emerged as the third most frequent group of bacterial pathogens in BSI, affecting even 10%-12% of all transplant patients.²²⁻²⁶

Compared to other pathogens, enteroccocal BSI usually occurs later after transplant, for example, the median day for pre-engraftment BSI was day +4 for viridans and +11 for enterococci.²⁷ In many centres, *E. faecium* almost completely replaced *E. faecalis*, with important therapeutic consequences since *E. faecium* is frequently resistant to ampicillin.^{24,28,29}

In some centres, the shift from E. faecalis to E. faecium has been also accompanied by an important increase in the rate of resistance to vancomycin. In a multicentre Australian study VRE increased from approximately 8% in 2001-2004 period to 64% in years 2007-2010.²⁴ The problem of vancomycin-resistance is important in HSCT recipients since few therapeutic options are available, and high mortality in patients infected with VRE has been reported.^{30,31} In general, there is a low incidence of VRE in European centres with less than 5% of enterococci, being VRE in 67% haematology centres in the ECIL-4 questionnaire, in accordance with the general European data reporting low prevalence of VRE in most countries in Western Europe.^{4,8,22,27-29} On the contrary, in the US up to 80% of *E. faecium* are VRE.^{25,26,30} In fact, these are mostly the reports from the US centers that highlight an important mortality in patients with VRE infection.

However, it remains debatable if the resistance to vancomycin is to blame for this poor outcome. In fact, enterococci are low virulence pathogens and numerous concomitant clinical problems are usually present in patients with enterococcal BSI.³² Moreover, evaluating the directly attributable mortality of enterococcal sepsis

in patients with multiple clinical problems is subjective, and arbitrary even if universally high; furthermore the 30-day overall mortality might simply indicate that VRE could be a marker of clinical severity.^{25,26,29,30,33}

This view is supported by several clinical experiences. In one study, a delayed use of adequate antibiotics in case of VRE infection resulted in no difference in 30-day mortality compared to vancomycin-susceptible infections in neutropenic patients, and only underlying severity of medical condition predicted outcome.³⁴ In another study, Brasilian authors found that empirical treatment of neutropenic fever with linezolid had no effect on survival (54% vs. 42%) in 100 haematology patients who were colonised with VRE, while the mortality was associated only with the persistence of neutropenia and GvHD.³⁵

Finally, in our experience in a cohort of 67 adult allogenic HSCT recipients with enterococcal BSI, of whom only 13% had VRE infection, 30-day mortality for vancomycin-susceptible and VRE was respectively, 26% and 11%, whereas 1-year overall survival was 24% for both goups compared to 65% in patients with no enterococcal BSI.³⁶ These results were compared with an experience of a US transplant center, where 66% of patients with enterococcal BSI had VRE; 30day mortality was 38% for both vancomycinsusceptible and resistant enterococci; while 1-year overall survival was 48% for vancomycin-susceptible enterococci, 23% for VRE and 63% for patients with no enterococcal BSI.³⁷

Treatment of VRE is based on the use of linezolid, for which satisfactory efficacy data in this setting have been reported. Of note, hematologic side effects, which are particularly important in HSCT recipients, have not been reported significant; in particular time to neutrophil and platelet engraftment has been not found different in 33 cases who received more than 7 days of linezolid treatment during pre-engraftment phase, compared to controls.³⁸ Resistance of enterococci to linezolid is rare and usually mediated by mutations 23S rRNA target.³⁹ It has been associated with previous linezolid therapy, although nosocomial acquisition of resistant enterococci has been also reported.³⁹⁻⁴¹ Resistance mechanisms were first described for E. faecium and S. aureus, and later also for E. faecalis, but they remain rare, affecting less than 1% of all strains, as documented in a surveillance study of 7608 clinical isolates of enterococci from years 2004-2012 collected in the USA.⁴²

Daptomycin, for which in vitro activity has been documented but clinical data are limited in HSCT setting, is another important therapeutic option against VRE.⁴³ Several meta-analyses and systematic reviews have addressed the comparison of outcomes of VRE BSI treated with linezolid and daptomycin.⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶ With the evident limit of the low quality of studies included (mostly retrospective, no randomised trials), the mortality rates were found slightly higher in case of daptomycin, compared to linezolid.⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶

Other options are quinopristin-dalfopristin, which is active only against *E. faecium*, and not *E. faecalis*, and tigecycline, with the well-known limit of low blood levels.⁴⁷ Novel cephalosporins seem inactive against enterococci while novel glycolipopetides such as telavancin and dalbavancin seem active only against some (VanB) strains.

In conclusion, enterococci are increasingly frequent in HSCT setting, *E. faecium* is the predominant species, but resistance to vancomycin varies significantly between geographical regions. Enterococcal infections, both due to VRE and vancomycin-susceptible *E. faecium*, could be regarded as a marker of poor clinical status and important comorbidities.²⁹

Pseudomonas aeruginosa: Pseudomonas aeruginosa is a Gram-negative pathogen traditionally associated with the highest mortality rate, both during neutropenia and later after HSCT. Fortunately, currently its prevalence in infections of European haematology centres is lower than reported in published reports (respectively, 5% and 10%), although in some centres it may cause up to 30% of all BSI.⁴ Along with high virulence, P. aeruginosa is characterised by numerous intrinsic or acquired resistance mechanisms, including adaptive mechanisms, which make numerous antibiotic options ineffective.⁴⁸ In particular, it is characterised by high intrinsic resistance due to low outer membrane permeability, which limits antibiotic penetration, betalactamase production and efflux pump overexpression. Additionally, adaptive resistance mechanisms such as genes expression changes lead to further efflux increase and enzyme production. Finally, intrinsic mechanisms can be potentiated by acquired resistance mechanisms which include single or numerous mutations, or, less frequently, horizontal transfer of resistance determinants leading to reduced uptake and efflux pump overexpression.48

In fact, the resistance to carbapenems is high, with the mean value in Europe of 17%, and national estimates between 3% and 51%.⁸ In a multicentre Italian experience from years 2009-2010, 71% of *P. aeruginosa* strains causing BSI were MDR, with 60% of them being resistant to carbapenems.⁴⁹ The 30-day mortality was clearly associated with the resistance: 40% for MDR strains and 9% for susceptible ones.⁴⁹ Similar high resistance rates were reported in India, where 77% of *Pseudomonas* strains were MDR.⁵⁰

Although most of the cases of MDR *P. aeruginosa* infections in HSCT recipients stem from *in vivo* induction of resistance mechanisms, outbreaks of *P. aeruginosa* infections have been reported in HSCT units.^{51,52} These outbreaks, similarly to that occurring in other settings, in particular adult or neonatal

intensive care units (ICU), might have environmental source of infections (e.g. devices, soap or cleaning solutions, etc.), and might be long lasting, difficult to control and burdened with high morbidity and mortality.⁵¹⁻⁵⁴ Along with outbreaks documenting the clonal origin of the infective strains, outbreaks not originating from a common source warrant attention since *P. aeruginosa* may be a water-borne pathogen; thus, such outbreaks may be associated with breaches in proper management of central venous catheters.^{55,56} European guidelines for the management of the infection control measures to reduce transmission of Gram-negative multidrug-resistant bacteria in hospitalized patients have been recently published.⁵⁷

Colistin remains the cornerstone of the treatment of MDR *P. aeruginosa*, with the uncertainties concerning the optimal dosing, the need for combination therapy and the rate of toxicity.⁵⁸

Acinetobacter baumannii: A. baumannii is a nonfermentative coccobacillus that is widely distributed in nature and characterized by frequent MDR due to multiple mechanisms.^{59,60} Recently, BSI due to MDR *A. baumannii* has emerged as a major cause of health care-associated infections, especially in critically ill population, including immunocompromised patients.⁶¹ It is generally associated with a high crude mortality rate, ranging between 17% and 52%.⁶² Risk factors for infections with MDR *A. baumannii* in the immunocompromised include previous colonization, comorbid conditions, recent major surgical procedures, prolonged broad-spectrum antimicrobial therapy, prolonged hospitalization, admission to ICU and mechanical ventilation.⁶³

Little is known regarding the incidence and risk factors for this infection in HSCT recipients.^{60,64} In the aforementioned ECIL-4 literature review and questionnaire, A. baumannii was responsible for a median of 2% of all BSIs, being absent in some centres but rising up to as high as 12% of all BSIs in others.⁴ In a retrospective case-control study Kim et al. found that the total incidence of MDR A. baumannii BSI was 0.52 cases/10,000 patient-days, with a mortality rate of 95%. The interval between admission and HSCT and a history of care in ICU after HSCT were independent risk factors for the development of A. baumannii infection.⁶⁵ These features suggest that this infection affects predominantly patients who require intensive and invasive support, particularly ICU care and mechanical ventilation therapy after HSCT. Of note, in almost 90% of cases BSI developed after engraftment and lungs were the origin of infection in all the patients.65

Antimicrobial agents that are potentially effective against *A. baumannii* include carbapenems, beta-lactam inhibitors such as sulbactam, piperacillin–tazobactam and 3^{rd} generation cephalosporins. New options for MDR *A. baumannii* infections are old polypeptide

antibiotics such as colistin or polymyxin B, minocycline derivatives such as tigecycline, new carbapenems such as doripenem, and new generation cephalosporins such as ceftobiprole and ceftaroline.^{59,63} In uncomplicated infections, the use of a single active beta-lactam may be justified, while definitive treatment of complicated infections in critically ill individuals may require drug combinations such as colistin and rifampicin or colistin and carbapenem.⁶⁰

In conclusion, MDR *A. baumannii* BSI in HSCT recipients is a fatal infectious complication with no controlled trials to guide the therapeutic choices. As in case of others MDR pathogens, an approach which stratifies the risk of developing infection, and a prompt administration of active antimicrobial therapy, chosen on the basis of local epidemiology and previous colonization, may hopefully lead to better clinical outcomes.

<u>Viridans streptococci</u>: Viridans streptococci have been traditionally associated with oral mucositis in course of chemotherapy (see **Table 1**). Although usually susceptible to beta-lactams, the risk of developing septic shock and acute distress respiratory syndrome (ARDS) has been reported as high, varying from 7% to 39%.⁶⁶ Given high mortality rates reported in early studies, administration of corticosteroids to neutropenic patients with viridans streptococci BSI who develop early signs of respiratory failure have been studied with the aim of preventing the progression to ARDS and improving the survival.⁶⁷⁻⁶⁹

Nowadays, viridans streptococci are responsible for approximately 5% of all BSI. *Streptococcus mitis* is the most frequently isolated species, and it is also the species associated more frequently with resistance to penicillin and fluoroquinolones.⁷⁰ The association between high penicillin MIC values, clinical outcome and the need for vancomycin treatment has been elegantly discussed in a recent editorial.⁶⁶

Pneumonia. Most of the studies describing infectious complications in HSCT patients show a high frequency of pneumonia,⁷¹⁻⁷³ with an incidence reported in retrospectives studies ranging between 15% and 25%.^{74,75}

Numerous acute pulmonary complications may occur in this population including both infectious and non-infectious causes, hence it is often difficult to obtain an aetiological diagnosis. The clinical setting and microbiological analyses, such as cultures of blood samples, sputum and bronchoalveolar lavage fluid, can be used to provide clues for interpreting abnormal CT finding but infections with more than one pathogens (e.g. bacterial and viral) and coexistence of infectious and non-infectious processes (e.g. viral and immunological) further hamper the precise description of epidemiology in this setting.

Therefore, the results of a nationwide prospective study referring to data collected by the Spanish Research Network of Transplant (RESITRA) are particularly interesting.⁷⁶ From July 2003 to April 2005 427 HSCT recipients were followed with standardized diagnostic protocol for pneumonia. There were 112 episodes of pneumonia and 72 (64%) of them were microbiologically defined. Bacterial pneumonia (n=32, 44%) was more frequent than fungal (n=21, 29%) and viral pneumonia (n=14, 19%). The most frequent pathogens isolated in each group were: Escherichia coli (n=7, 9%), CMV (n=12, 15%), and Aspergillus spp. (n=12, 15%). Among bacteria, the most common aetiologies were E. coli and P. aeruginosa, as previously reported in other studies, 71,77 whereas S. pneumoniae caused only 5% of pneumonias and this finding was possibly associated with the routine use of immunization and prophylaxis.

The median time of pneumonia diagnosis after transplantation was 66.5 days. Even if bacterial pneumonia is usually reported during the neutropenic phase soon after HSCT, in this study the pneumonias caused by Gram-negative bacilli appeared significantly later than pneumonia caused by moulds (p=0.02), possibly because *P. aeruginosa* pneumonia may occur later in the post-transplant period in patients developing GvHD.⁷⁷

The global mortality rate in allogeneic HSCT recipients that had at least one pneumonia episode was

46% (n=44) compared to 13% (n=43) in those without any pneumonia episode (p<0.01; RR 3.37; 95% CI: 2.43–4.68). Clinical factors increasing the mortality rate in HSCT recipients developing a pulmonary complication were invasive fungal infection, acute or chronic GvHD, developing pneumonia in the first 100 days after transplantation, acute respiratory failure and septic shock.

The results of this prospective multicentre study confirm that pneumonia remains a frequent infectious complication after HSCT, contributing to significant mortality.

Clostridium difficile infection. In last decade, there has been a growing interest in Clostridium difficile infection (CDI) because of the increasing rate of this infection. This epidemiological change has been ascribed to the emergence of an epidemic strain of C. difficile known as NAP-1, which has been associated with an increased frequency and severity of the disease. Nowadays CDI is the leading cause of infectious diarrhoea in hospitalized patients, and HSCT recipients appear to be one of the highest risk populations for this infection. In fact, Chopra et al. found that among all hospitalized patients in a non-outbreak setting, CDI rates in HSCT recipients were nine-fold higher than those in general patients and 1.4-fold higher than those in other patients with cancer.⁷⁸ Therefore, a brief review of the available studies on CDI in HSCT

Author (year)	Study period	HSCT type	Patients, no.	Rate of CDI	Median time to diagnosis after HSCT in days	Rate of recurrence
Chopra et al. (2011)	2005-2006	Both	361	14% (Both); 8% (Auto); 18% (Allo)	/	0% (Auto); 5% (Allo)
Willems et al. (2012)	2004-2007	Allo	407	13% (Allo)	25	2,6% (Allo)
Alonso et al. (2012)	2003-2008	Both	999	9,2% (Both); 6,5% (Auto); 12,5% (Allo)	6,5 (Auto); 33 (Allo)	21,7% (Both)
Kamboj et al. (2012)	/	Both (adult and paediatric patients)	/	9% (Auto); 27% (Allo)	/	/
Trifilio et al. (2013)	2004-2008	Both	822	10,3% (Both)	8	12% (Both)
Alonso et al. (2013)	2003-2008	Autologous	873	6% (Auto)	11	15,4% (Auto)
Kamboj et al. (2014)	2005-2010	Allogeneic (adult and paediatric patients)	793	21,3% (Allo)	/	31% (Allo)
Kinnebrew et al. (2014)	2009-2011	allo	94	17% (Allo)	/	/
Huang et al. (2014)	2010-2012	both	711	13,4% (Both); 9,2% (Auto); 18,2% (Allo)	/	22,9% (Auto); 23,3% (Allo)
Bruminhent et al. (2014)	2011-2012	both	150	24,7% (Both); 24,1% (Auto); 25% (Allo)	3,5	8.1% (Both)

Table 2. Studies evaluating *Clostridium difficile* infection in HSCT recipients, 2010 to present.

Allo, Allogeneic HSCT; Auto, Autologous; CDI, Clostridium difficile infection.

recipients has been performed and is outlined in **Table** 2.

Referring to the reviewed literature, CDI affects between 5.7%⁷⁹ and 24.7%⁸⁰ of adult HSCT recipients during the first year after transplant, with the highest rates reported by the most recent studies. The same literature review showed that most CDI cases occur in the early post-transplant period with median time to diagnosis ranging between 3.5 days ⁸⁰ and 33 days after HSCT (**Table 2**).⁸¹ Some authors observed that CDI is more likely to occur in the early phase of HSCT if recipients are pre-colonized with toxigenic C. *difficile*.^{80,82} Many studies reported high rates of infection due to NAP-1 strain, but Alonso et al. found that overall rates of CDI was not significantly different between the two centres involved in the study, despite differences in NAP-1 endemicity.⁷⁹ Risk factors for CDI in hematopoietic transplant recipients are poorly understood. The difficulties in identifying unique risk factors for CDI in HSCT population may arise from the ubiquity of traditional risk factors for CDI in this population. In fact, most patients, if not all, receive broad spectrum antibiotics, have a prolonged hospital stay, have an altered integrity of the intestinal mucosa, and all are severely ill and immunocompromised. Furthermore, the use of allogeneic HSCT has expanded progressively to older patients due to the development of reduced intensity conditioning regimens. Thus, both older age and the presence of comorbidities are increasingly frequent in HSCT setting.

Many studies focused on risk factors for CDI in HSCT population, and several risk factors have been identified. They are reported in Table 3. Some authors found that CDI occurred significantly more often in allogeneic recipients (incidence 12.5%-21.3%) than in the autologous recipients (incidence 5.7%-9.2%).^{78,83} On the contrary, a recent prospective study by Bruminhent et al. showed no difference in the incidence of CDI in patients receiving autologous and allogeneic HSCTs (24% versus 25%, respectively).⁸⁰ Other possible risk factors for developing CDI are use of broad-spectrum antimicrobials,^{79,81,82,84} and acute GvHD,^{81,85} while myeloablative conditioning regimen increased the risk in some,^{81,82,85} but not all cohorts.⁸⁶ The only variable associated with a reduced risk of CDI was the use of growth factors.⁸⁴ Interestingly, Bruminhent et al. analysed the relationship between prior C. difficile colonization and CDI. In this prospective study at least 10.7% of patients admitted for HSCT were colonized with a toxigenic strain and nearly all of them (87.5%) developed CDI, compared to 17.2% of patients with negative colonization status at hospital admission (p < 0.01).⁸⁰

The most controversial issue is a potentially important interplay between CDI and gastrointestinal GvHD. Whereas some studies showed a strong relationship between early CDI and subsequent development of gastrointestinal GvHD in the first year **Table 3.** Risk factors for developing *Clostridium difficile* infectionin HSCT recipients.

Risk factors	Reference	
Allogeneic transplant	78,87	
Cord blood transplant	85	
Age > 60 years	87	
Diabetes	84	
Myeloablative conditioning regimen	81,82,85	
Pre-engraftment period	84	
Clostridium difficile colonization	80,82	
Colonization with vancomycin-resistant enterococci	81,87	
Severe mucositis (>= 2 grade)	79	
Broad spectrum antibiotics	79,81,82,84	
Graft-versus-Host Disease	81,85	

following allogeneic HSCT,^{81,84,87} this association has not been confirmed by other studies.^{80,82,85,86}

As far as clinical course of CDI is concerned, the disease in most studies was uniformly mild, irrespective of the rate of infections due to NAP-1 strain,⁸⁶ and no differences in the mortality rates were observed in patients with or without CDI.^{78,79,81,82,85} The low percentage of complications in this patients population may be due to a decreased inflammation from immunosuppression related to transplantation.⁷⁹ In fact, only one study found that HSCT recipients with CDI were more likely to develop GvHD, BSIs and had lower survival rate when compared to controls.⁸⁴ In contrast to other studies reporting little impact of CDI on mortality in HSCT recipients, a recent Brazilian experience of 64 patients with CDI, including 31 cases after allogeneic and 14 after autologous HSCT, demonstrated a significant impact of CDI on survival. In particular, a severe form of CDI developed in 23% of allogeneic HSCT recipients, and all of them died.⁸⁸ Of note, 89% of patients in this cohort received initial treatment with metronidazole that might have influenced the clinical course of CDI.

One of the main problems of CDI in the immunocompromised is a high rate or recurrent infections. In fact, in HSCT recipients recurrence rates ranged between 2.6%⁸⁵ and 31%,⁸⁶ and they were more frequent in those patients who received metronidazole monotherapy compared to those who received vancomycin-containing regimens.⁸¹ Other risk factors for recurrent disease were neutropenia at the onset of CDI⁸ and infection due to NAP-1 strain.⁸⁶ The frequent use of proton pump inhibits might also contribute to recurrences, as recently demonstrated in a general patient population.⁸⁹

The management of CDI is based on prompt diagnosis, effective treatment and strict application of contact precautions which do not differ between HSCT recipients and other vulnerable.⁹⁰

In conclusion, CDI is one of the most frequent causes of infectious diarrhoea in HSCT recipients, and it occurs early in the post-transplant period. Updated diagnostic and treatment algorithms for CDI should be put in place. Since many of the risk factors for CDI are not easily modifiable in this population, the predisposing role of pre-transplant colonization with *C. difficile* warrants further studies. Although CDI represent an important cause of morbidity for this population, non-severe forms of CDI are predominant, and associated mortality seems low.

Recent advances in the management of bacterial

infections. Since any delay in starting an effective antibiotic therapy for the treatment of bacterial infections (particularly due to Gram-negatives) has been associated with an increased mortality, empirical therapy directed against Enterobacteriaceae and *P. aeruginosa* has been a cornerstone of managing bacterial infections during neutropenia for decades.¹ Ceftazidime, cefepime, piperacillin/tazobactam or carbapenems are listed as suitable options.¹

The only recent trial on empirical therapy reported on the use of oral moxifloxacin in low risk patients with febrile neutropenia, and found it non inferior to the standard oral option of amoxicillin/clavulanate and ciprofloxacin.⁹¹ However, this novel regimen is unsuitable for HSCT recipients since they are usually high risk patients and frequently receive fluoroquinolone prophylaxis during neutropenia.

In the times when resistant pathogens are seen on a daily basis in many centres, the main advance in the management of bacterial infections in HSCT is a novel individualised approach to the empirical antibiotic therapy.⁹² In fact, ECIL-4 recommendations on the empirical therapy of febrile neutropenia propose two different approaches based on clinical presentation and the risk for infection due to a resistant strain.⁹² The classical escalation strategy is defined as starting an antibiotic which covers susceptible Enterobacteriaceae and P. aeruginosa, but not ESBL-producers, carbapenem-resistant K. pneumoniae or other MDR Then, if patient's clinical conditions strains. deteriorate, or if a resistant pathogen is isolated, therapy is escalated to cover suspected or isolated resistant bacteria. Its advantages include: 1) limiting early use of a combination therapy or a broadest spectrum antibacterial, such as carbapenem, 2) low toxicity, 3) usually lower costs, and 4) hopefully, less selection of resistant strains. Anti-pseudomonal cephalosporins, such as cefepime or ceftazidime, or piperacillin/tazobactam are the most frequently used treatment options. The novelty in approaching empirical antibiotic therapy in neutropenia consists of introducing a strategy that has been used widely so far in the intensive care unit setting. De-escalation approach means starting upfront a regimen covering the most dangerous resistant pathogens, i.e.

ESBL-producers, MDR P. aeruginosa etc.⁹² The main point of using a de-escalation strategy is to start active treatment of a suspected resistant Gram-negative, hopefully resulting in reduced mortality. Its main limit is a frequently unnecessary routine use of broad spectrum molecules or a combination therapy with nephrotoxic agents such as aminoglycosides or colistin.

The most difficult clinical decision is establishing which patients might benefit from a de-escalation approach and which may still be confidently treated with a classical escalation approach. From the review of the literature and personal experience, the most frequent risk factors for infection with resistant bacteria are: prior infection or colonisation with a nonsusceptible strain and being admitted to or coming from a centre where resistant bacteria are frequent.⁹² De-escalation treatment is usually administered to subjects with one of the aforementioned risk factors who develop sepsis or septic shock during neutropenia. The management of infections caused by antibiotic resistant Gram-negative bacteria in HSCT recipients has been recently reviewed.⁹³

Infection control measures. Non-pharmacological management of bacterial infections is of outmost importance in the era of increasing bacterial resistance. It includes screening for resistant bacterial and applying infection control measures in case of transmissible pathogens. Of note, these include not only MDR Gram-negatives or VRE, but also *C. difficile*. Hand hygiene and contact precautions (gloves and gown) are the most effective infection control strategies that apply to the prevention of the spread of any pathogens.

Surveillance cultures for MDR bacteria identify patients colonised with resistant strains. This knowledge, not only allows to avoid actively transmission to other HSCT recipients by applying contact precautions, but may also suggest which antibiotics might be appropriate for empirical treatment. Another theoretical possibility is to pursuit decontamination of the colonised patients, although the data on decolonisation in HSCT setting are almost inexistent, and the results are far from promising. Additionally, the risk of inducing resistance to the last available treatment option in case of MDR Gramnegative rods should be counterbalance with an evident long-term benefit of decontamination.⁹³

Antimicrobial stewardship. Last but not least, the management of bacterial infections in HSCT should include a formal program on antimicrobial stewardship.⁹⁴ Its main objectives are to improve the outcome of infections and to reduce inappropriate use of antimicrobials (e.g. discontinue if not necessary, promote the use of correct dosage). Additional aims include reducing side effects of antibiotic therapies, i.e. direct toxicity or influence on local epidemiology, and

hopefully, but not automatically, reducing costs of antibiotic treatments (by withholding antibiotic treatment if not necessary, de-escalation to narrow spectrum agents if possible, etc.).

Running a successful antimicrobial stewardship program is based on a multidisciplinary approach, with a dedicated team that includes, among others, infectious diseases specialist, microbiologist, clinical pharmacologist and infection control specialist, and on approval and endorsement of hospital authorities, which enable to allocate necessary resources.

One of important points of reviewing antibiotic prescriptions are clinical audits to identify the critical areas for antibiotic use in HSCT unit (e.g. inappropriate indications, incorrect dosage, routine prescriptions off-label, too long therapies, no intravenous to oral switch, etc.) and a thorough knowledge of local epidemiology of the most frequent pathogens, the rate of resistance to various

References:

- Freifeld AG, Bow EJ, Sepkowitz KA, Boeckh MJ, Ito JI, Mullen CA, Raad, II, Rolston KV, Young JA, Wingard JR, Infectious Diseases Society of A. Clinical practice guideline for the use of antimicrobial agents in neutropenic patients with cancer: 2010 update by the infectious diseases society of america. Clin Infect Dis. 2011 52: 4:427-431. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciq147</u> PMid:21205990
- Boucher HW, Talbot GH, Bradley JS, Edwards JE, Gilbert D, Rice LB, Scheld M, Spellberg B, Bartlett J. Bad bugs, no drugs: No eskape! An update from the infectious diseases society of america. Clin Infect Dis. 2009 48: 1:1-12. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/595011</u> PMid:19035777
- Bow EJ. There should be no eskape for febrile neutropenic cancer patients: The dearth of effective antibacterial drugs threatens anticancer efficacy. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2013 68: 3:492-495. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jac/dks512</u> PMid:23299574
- Mikulska M, Viscoli C, Orasch C, Livermore DM, Averbuch D, Cordonnier C, Akova M, Fourth European Conference on Infections in Leukemia Group ajvoEEIELN, Esgich/Escmid. Aetiology and resistance in bacteraemias among adult and paediatric haematology and cancer patients. J Infect. 2014 68: 4:321-331. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2013.12.006</u> PMid:24370562
- Shaw BE, Boswell T, Byrne JL, Yates C, Russell NH. Clinical impact of mrsa in a stem cell transplant unit: Analysis before, during and after an mrsa outbreak. Bone Marrow Transplant. 2007 39: 10:623-629. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.bmt.1705654</u> PMid:17384657
- Quilty S, Kwok G, Hajkowicz K, Currie B. High incidence of methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus sepsis and death in patients with febrile neutropenia at royal darwin hospital. Intern Med J. 2009 39: 8:557-559. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1445-5994.2009.02003.x</u> PMid:19732205
- Liu C, Bayer A, Cosgrove SE, Daum RS, Fridkin SK, Gorwitz RJ, Kaplan SL, Karchmer AW, Levine DP, Murray BE, M JR, Talan DA, Chambers HF, Infectious Diseases Society of A. Clinical practice guidelines by the infectious diseases society of america for the treatment of methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus infections in adults and children. Clin Infect Dis. 2011 52: 3:e18-55.
- ECDC. European centre for disease prevention and control. Antimicrobial resistance surveillance in europe 2012. Annual report of the european antimicrobial resistance surveillance network (ears-net). Stockholm: Ecdc; available at: <u>Http://ecdc.Europa.Eu/en/publications/publications/antimicrobialresistance-surveillance-europe-2012.Pdf</u>. 2013
- Livermore DM. Fourteen years in resistance. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2012 39: 4:283-294. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2011.12.012</u> PMid:22386741

antimicrobials, and clinical outcome of these infections.

Conclusions. Bacterial infections continue to be one of the most frequent complications after HSCT. The incidence of Gram-negative bacteria and the rate of resistance to antibiotics have been steadily increasing in many centres. However, important differences in the epidemiology of bacterial infections exist among centres worldwide. transplant Therefore, the knowledge of local epidemiology is crucial and should guide the approach to antibiotic prophylaxis, empirical therapy and management of infections. Numerous interesting issues such as the role of surveillance cultures for guiding empirical therapy, the benefits of protocols for screening for resistant bacteria, decolonisation and the current role of antibiotic prophylaxis in HSCT setting await to be addressed in future clinical studies.

- Rodvold KA, McConeghy KW. Methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus therapy: Past, present, and future. Clin Infect Dis. 2014 58 Suppl 1: S20-27. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/cit614</u> PMid:24343828
- Gudiol C, Calatayud L, Garcia-Vidal C, Lora-Tamayo J, Cisnal M, Duarte R, Arnan M, Marin M, Carratala J, Gudiol F. Bacteraemia due to extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing escherichia coli (esbl-ec) in cancer patients: Clinical features, risk factors, molecular epidemiology and outcome. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2010 65: 2:333-341. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkp411</u> PMid:19959544
- Trecarichi EM, Tumbarello M, Spanu T, Caira M, Fianchi L, Chiusolo P, Fadda G, Leone G, Cauda R, Pagano L. Incidence and clinical impact of extended-spectrum-beta-lactamase (esbl) production and fluoroquinolone resistance in bloodstream infections caused by escherichia coli in patients with hematological malignancies. J Infect. 2009 58: 4:299-307. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2009.02.002 PMid:19272650
- Kang CI, Chung DR, Ko KS, Peck KR, Song JH, Korean Network for Study of Infectious D. Risk factors for infection and treatment outcome of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing escherichia coli and klebsiella pneumoniae bacteremia in patients with hematologic malignancy. Ann Hematol. 2012 91: 1:115-121. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00277-011-1247-7 PMid:21556875
- 14. Chong Y, Yakushiji H, Ito Y, Kamimura T. Clinical impact of fluoroquinolone prophylaxis in neutropenic patients with hematological malignancies. Int J Infect Dis. 2011 15: 4:e277-281. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2010.12.010 PMid:21324723
- Gudiol C, Bodro M, Simonetti A, Tubau F, Gonzalez-Barca E, Cisnal M, Domingo-Domenech E, Jimenez L, Carratala J. Changing aetiology, clinical features, antimicrobial resistance, and outcomes of bloodstream infection in neutropenic cancer patients. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2013 19: 5:474-479. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2012.03879.x</u> PMid:22524597
- Gudiol C, Tubau F, Calatayud L, Garcia-Vidal C, Cisnal M, Sanchez-Ortega I, Duarte R, Calvo M, Carratala J. Bacteraemia due to multidrug-resistant gram-negative bacilli in cancer patients: Risk factors, antibiotic therapy and outcomes. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2011 66: 3:657-663. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkq494</u> PMid:21193475
- Satlin MJ, Jenkins SG, Walsh TJ. The global challenge of carbapenem-resistant enterobacteriaceae in transplant recipients and patients with hematologic malignancies. Clin Infect Dis. 2014 58: 9:1274-1283. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciu052</u> PMid:24463280 PMCid:PMC4038783
- 18. Kjellander C, Bjorkholm M, Cherif H, Kalin M, Giske CG. Hematological: Low all-cause mortality and low occurrence of antimicrobial resistance in hematological patients with bacteremia receiving no antibacterial prophylaxis: A single-center study. Eur J



Haematol. 2012 88: 5:422-430. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0609.2012.01768.x</u> PMid:22335785

- Chong Y, Yakushiji H, Ito Y, Kamimura T. Clinical impact of fluoroquinolone prophylaxis in neutropenic patients with hematological malignancies. Int J Infect Dis. 2009 15: 4:e277-281. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2010.12.010</u> PMid:21324723
- Tomblyn M, Chiller T, Einsele H, Gress R, Sepkowitz K, Storek J, Wingard JR, Young JA, Boeckh MJ, Center for International B, Marrow R, National Marrow Donor p, European B, MarrowTransplant G, American Society of B, Marrow T, Canadian B, Marrow Transplant G, Infectious Diseases Society of A, Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of A, Association of Medical M, Infectious Disease C, Centers for Disease C, Prevention. Guidelines for preventing infectious complications among hematopoietic cell transplantation recipients: A global perspective. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant. 2009 15: 10:1143-1238. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2009.06.019 PMCid:PMC3103296
- 21. Bow EJ. Fluoroquinolones, antimicrobial resistance and neutropenic cancer patients. Curr Opin Infect Dis. 2011 24: 6:545-553. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/QCO.0b013e32834cf054</u> PMid:22001945
- 22. Cappellano P, Viscoli C, Bruzzi P, Van Lint MT, Pereira CA, Bacigalupo A. Epidemiology and risk factors for bloodstream infections after allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantion. New Microbiol. 2007 30: 2:89-99. PMid:17619251
- 23. Mikulska M, Del Bono V, Prinapori R, Boni L, Raiola AM, Gualandi F, Van Lint MT, Dominietto A, Lamparelli T, Cappellano P, Bacigalupo A, Viscoli C. Risk factors for enterococcal bacteremia in allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients. Transpl Infect Dis. 2010 12: 6:505-512. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-3062.2010.00544.x</u> PMid:20636482
- 24. Macesic N, Morrissey CO, Cheng AC, Spencer A, Peleg AY. Changing microbial epidemiology in hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients: Increasing resistance over a 9-year period. Transpl Infect Dis. 2014 16: 6:887-896. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/tid.12298 PMid:25298044
- Kamboj M, Chung D, Seo SK, Pamer EG, Sepkowitz KA, Jakubowski AA, Papanicolaou G. The changing epidemiology of vancomycin-resistant enterococcus (vre) bacteremia in allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplant (hsct) recipients. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant. 2010 16: 11:1576-1581. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2010.05.008 PMid:20685257 PMCid:PMC3670412
- Tavadze M, Rybicki L, Mossad S, Avery R, Yurch M, Pohlman B, Duong H, Dean R, Hill B, Andresen S, Hanna R, Majhail N, Copelan E, Bolwell B, Kalaycio M, Sobecks R. Risk factors for vancomycin-resistant enterococcus bacteremia and its influence on survival after allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation. Bone Marrow Transplant. 2014 49: 10:1310-1316. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/bmt.2014.150 PMid:25111516
- Blennow O, Ljungman P, Sparrelid E, Mattsson J, Remberger M. Incidence, risk factors, and outcome of bloodstream infections during the pre-engraftment phase in 521 allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantations. Transpl Infect Dis. 2014 16: 1:106-114. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/tid.12175 PMid:24372809
- Mikulska M, Del Bono V, Raiola AM, Bruno B, Gualandi F, Occhini D, di Grazia C, Frassoni F, Bacigalupo A, Viscoli C. Blood stream infections in allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients: Reemergence of gram-negative rods and increasing antibiotic resistance. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant. 2009 15: 1:47-53. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2008.10.024</u> PMid:19135942
- 29. Gudiol C, Ayats J, Camoez M, Dominguez MA, Garcia-Vidal C, Bodro M, Ardanuy C, Obed M, Arnan M, Antonio M, Carratala J. Increase in bloodstream infection due to vancomycin-susceptible enterococcus faecium in cancer patients: Risk factors, molecular epidemiology and outcomes. PLoS One. 2013 8: 9:e74734.
- Ävery R, Kalaycio M, Pohlman B, Sobecks R, Kuczkowski E, Andresen S, Mossad S, Shamp J, Curtis J, Kosar J, Sands K, Serafin M, Bolwell B. Early vancomycin-resistant enterococcus (vre) bacteremia after allogeneic bone marrow transplantation is associated with a rapidly deteriorating clinical course. Bone Marrow Transplant. 2005 35: 5:497-499. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.bmt.1704821 PMid:15640812
- DiazGranados CA, Jernigan JA. Impact of vancomycin resistance on mortality among patients with neutropenia and enterococcal bloodstream infection. J Infect Dis. 2005 191: 4:588-595. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/427512</u> PMid:15655783

- Caballero-Granado FJ, Becerril B, Cuberos L, Bernabeu M, Cisneros JM, Pachon J. Attributable mortality rate and duration of hospital stay associated with enterococcal bacteremia. Clin Infect Dis. 2001 32: 4:587-594. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/318717</u> PMid:11181122
- 33. Dubberke ER, Hollands JM, Georgantopoulos P, Augustin K, DiPersio JF, Mundy LM, Khoury HJ. Vancomycin-resistant enterococcal bloodstream infections on a hematopoietic stem cell transplant unit: Are the sick getting sicker? Bone Marrow Transplant. 2006 38: 12:813-819. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.bmt.1705530</u> PMid:17057724
- 34. Cho SY, Lee DG, Choi SM, Kwon JC, Kim SH, Choi JK, Park SH, Park YJ, Choi JH, Yoo JH. Impact of vancomycin resistance on mortality in neutropenic patients with enterococcal bloodstream infection: A retrospective study. BMC Infect Dis. 2013 13: 504. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2334-13-504</u> PMid:24164924 PMCid:PMC3870976
- 35. Lisboa LF, Miranda BG, Vieira MB, Dulley FL, Fonseca GG, Guimaraes T, Levin AS, Shikanai-Yasuda MA, Costa SF. Empiric use of linezolid in febrile hematology and hematopoietic stem cell transplantation patients colonized with vancomycin-resistant enterococcus spp. Int J Infect Dis. 2015 33: 171-176. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2015.02.001</u> PMid:25660090
- 36. Mikulska M, Del Bono V, Raiola AM, Signori A, Prinapori R, Ghiso A, Bacigalupo A, Viscoli C. Enterococcal bloodstream infection after hematopoietic stem cell transplant: Experience of a center with a low prevalence of vancomycin-resistant enterococci. Clin Infect Dis. 2012 55: 12:1744.
- Vydra J, Shanley RM, George I, Ustun C, Smith AR, Weisdorf DJ, Young JA. Enterococcal bacteremia is associated with increased risk of mortality in recipients of allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. Clin Infect Dis. 2012 <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/cis550</u> PMid:22693346 PMCid:PMC3657510
- 38. Cohen N, Mihu CN, Seo SK, Chung D, Chou J, Heller G, Papanicolaou GA. Hematologic safety profile of linezolid in the early periengraftment period after allogeneic stem cell transplantation. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant. 2009 15: 10:1337-1341. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2009.05.021</u> PMid:19747643
- Ager S, Gould K. Clinical update on linezolid in the treatment of gram-positive bacterial infections. Infection and drug resistance. 2012 5: 87-102. PMid:22787406 PMCid:PMC3392139
- Pogue JM, Paterson DL, Pasculle AW, Potoski BA. Determination of risk factors associated with isolation of linezolid-resistant strains of vancomycin-resistant enterococcus. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2007 28: 12:1382-1388. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/523276 PMid:17994519
- Dobbs TE, Patel M, Waites KB, Moser SA, Stamm AM, Hoesley CJ. Nosocomial spread of enterococcus faecium resistant to vancomycin and linezolid in a tertiary care medical center. Journal of clinical microbiology. 2006 44: 9:3368-3370. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00850-06</u> PMid:16954275 PMCid:PMC1594671
- 42. Mendes RE, Deshpande LM, Jones RN. Linezolid update: Stable in vitro activity following more than a decade of clinical use and summary of associated resistance mechanisms. Drug resistance updates: reviews and commentaries in antimicrobial and anticancer chemotherapy. 2014 17: 1-2:1-12.
- 43. Barber KE, King ST, Stover KR, Pogue JM. Therapeutic options for vancomycin-resistant enterococcal bacteremia. Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther. 2015 13: 3:363-377. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1586/14787210.2015.1001839</u> PMid:25661903
- 44. Balli EP, Venetis CA, Miyakis S. Systematic review and metaanalysis of linezolid versus daptomycin for treatment of vancomycin-resistant enterococcal bacteremia. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2014 58: 2:734-739.
 <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AAC.01289-13</u> PMid:24247127 PMCid:PMC3910884
- Chuang YC, Wang JT, Lin HY, Chang SC. Daptomycin versus linezolid for treatment of vancomycin-resistant enterococcal bacteremia: Systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Infect Dis. 2014 14: 687. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12879-014-0687-9</u> PMid:25495779 PMCid:PMC4269951
- 46. Whang DW, Miller LG, Partain NM, McKinnell JA. Systematic review and meta-analysis of linezolid and daptomycin for treatment of vancomycin-resistant enterococcal bloodstream infections. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2013 57: 10:5013-5018. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00714-13</u> PMid:23896468

PMCid:PMC3811395

- 47. Bradley JS. Which antibiotic for resistant gram-positives, and why? Infect 2014 68 Suppl 1: S63-75 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2013.09.016 PMid:24188585
- 48. Breidenstein EB, de la Fuente-Nunez C, Hancock RE. Pseudomonas aeruginosa: All roads lead to resistance. Trends in microbiology. 2011 19: 8:419-426.
- http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2011.04.005 PMid:21664819
- 49. Trecarichi EM, Tumbarello M, Caira M, Candoni A, Cattaneo C, Pastore D, Fanci R, Nosari AM, Vianelli N, Busca A, Spadea A, Pagano L. Multidrug resistant pseudomonas aeruginosa bloodstream infection in adult patietns with hematological Haematologica. 2011 96: malignancies. 1:e1-3. http://dx.doi.org/10.3324/haematol.2010.036640 PMid:21193424 PMCid:PMC3012771
- 50. Sood P, Seth T, Kapil A, Sharma V, Dayama A, Sharma S, Kumar S, Singh AK, Mishra P, Mahapatra M. Emergence of multidrug resistant acinetobacter blood stream infections in febrile neutropenia patients with haematological cancers and bone marrow failure syndromes. Journal of the Indian Medical Association. 2012 110: 7:439-444. PMid:23520666
- 51. Fanci R, Bartolozzi B, Sergi S, Casalone E, Pecile P, Cecconi D, Mannino R, Donnarumma F, Leon AG, Guidi S, Nicoletti P, Mastromei G, Bosi A. Molecular epidemiological investigation of an outbreak of pseudomonas aeruginosa infection in an sct unit. Marrow Transplant. 2009 43: 4:335-338. Bone http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/bmt.2008.319 PMid:18850015 52. Mudau M, Jacobson R, Minenza N, Kuonza L, Morris V,
- Engelbrecht H, Nicol MP, Bamford C. Outbreak of multi-drug resistant pseudomonas aeruginosa bloodstream infection in the haematology unit of a south african academic hospital. PLoS One. 2013 8: 3:e55985.
- 53. Nagao M, Iinuma Y, Igawa J, Saito T, Yamashita K, Kondo T, Matsushima A, Takakura S, Takaori-Kondo A, Ichiyama S. Control of an outbreak of carbapenem-resistant pseudomonas aeruginosa in a haemato-oncology unit. J Hosp Infect. 2011 79: 1:49-53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2011.04.018 PMid:21722990
- 54. Knoester M, de Boer MG, Maarleveld JJ, Claas EC, Bernards AT, de Jonge E, van Dissel JT, Veldkamp KE. An integrated approach to control a prolonged outbreak of multidrug-resistant pseudomonas aeruginosa in an intensive care unit. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2014 20: 4:O207-215. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1469-0691.12372 PMid:24707852
- 55. Rasmussen BS, Christensen N, Sorensen J, Rosenvinge FS, Kolmos HJ, Skov MN. Outbreak of pseudomonas aeruginosa bacteraemia in a haematology department. Danish medical journal. 2015 62: 4:A5040.
- 56. Dobbs TE, Guh AY, Oakes P, Vince MJ, Forbi JC, Jensen B, Moulton-Meissner H, Byers P. Outbreak of pseudomonas aeruginosa and klebsiella pneumoniae bloodstream infections at an outpatient chemotherapy center. American journal of infection control. 2014 42: 7:731-734.
- http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ajic.2014.03.007 PMid:24969124
- 57. Tacconelli E, Cataldo MA, Dancer SJ, De Angelis G, Falcone M, Frank U, Kahlmeter G, Pan A, Petrosillo N, Rodriguez-Bano J, Singh N, Venditti M, Yokoe DS, Cookson B. Escmid guidelines for the management of the infection control measures to reduce transmission of multidrug-resistant gram-negative bacteria in hospitalized patients. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2014 20 Suppl 1: 1-55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1469-0691.12427 PMid:24329732
- 58. Martis N, Leroy S, Blanc V. Colistin in multi-drug resistant pseudomonas aeruginosa blood-stream infections: A narrative review for the clinician. J Infect. 2014 69: 1:1-12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2014.03.001 PMid:24631777
- 59. Karageorgopoulos DE, Kelesidis T, Kelesidis I, Falagas ME. Tigecycline for the treatment of multidrug-resistant (including carbapenem-resistant) acinetobacter infections: A review of the scientific evidence. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2008 62: 1:45-55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkn165 PMid:18436554
- 60. Al-Anazi KA, Al-Jasser AM. Infections caused by acinetobacter baumannii in recipients of hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. Frontiers in oncology. 2014 4: 186. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2014.00186
- 61. Fournier PE, Richet H. The epidemiology and control of acinetobacter baumannii in health care facilities. Clin Infect Dis. 2006 42: 5:692-699. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/500202 PMid:16447117
- 62. Cisneros JM, Rodriguez-Bano J. Nosocomial bacteremia due to acinetobacter baumannii: Epidemiology, clinical features and

treatment. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2002 8: 11:687-693. http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1469-0691.2002.00487.x PMid:12445005

- 63. Maragakis LL, Perl TM. Acinetobacter baumannii: Epidemiology, antimicrobial resistance, and treatment options. Clin Infect Dis. 2008 8:1254-1263. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/529198 46: PMid:18444865
- 64. Al-Anazi KA, Abdalhamid B, Alshibani Z, Awad K, Alzayed A, Hassan H, Alsayiegh M. Acinetobacter baumannii septicemia in a recipient of an allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. Case reports in transplantation. 2012 2012: 646195.
- 65. Kim SB, Min YH, Cheong JW, Kim JS, Kim SJ, Ku NS, Jeong SJ, Han SH, Choi JY, Song YG, Kim JM. Incidence and risk factors for carbapenem- and multidrug-resistant acinetobacter baumannii bacteremia in hematopoietic stem cell transplantation recipients. Scandinavian journal of infectious diseases. 2014 46: 2:81-88. http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/00365548.2013.857042 PMid:24325335
- 66. Freifeld AG, Razonable RR. Viridans group streptococci in febrile neutropenic cancer patients: What should we fear? Clin Infect Dis. 2014 59 2:231-233. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciu264 PMid:24755859
- 67. Shenep JL. Viridans-group streptococcal infections in immunocompromised hosts. Int J Antimicrob Agents. 2000 14: 2:129-135. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0924-8579(99)00172-2
- 68. Yacoub AT, Mojica L, Jones L, Knab A, Alrabaa S, Greene J. The role of corticosteroids in adult respiratory distress syndrome caused by viridans group streptococci bacteremia in neutropenic patients. Mediterranean journal of hematology and infectious diseases. 2014 6: 1:e2014055
- 69. Dompeling EC, Donnelly JP, Raemaekers JM, De Pauw BE. Preemptive administration of corticosteroids prevents the development of ards associated with streptococcus mitis bacteremia following chemotherapy with high-dose cytarabine. Ann Hematol. 1994 69: 2:69-71. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01698484 PMid:8080881
- 70. Han XY, Kamana M, Rolston KV. Viridans streptococci isolated by culture from blood of cancer patients: Clinical and microbiologic analysis of 50 cases. Journal of clinical microbiology. 2006 44: 1:160-165. http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/JCM.44.1.160-165.2006 PMid:16390964 PMCid:PMC1351950
- 71. Yoo JH, Lee DG, Choi SM, Choi JH, Park YH, Kim YJ, Kim HJ, Lee S, Kim DW, Lee JW, Min WS, Shin WS, Kim CC. Infectious complications and outcomes after allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation in korea. Bone Marrow Transplant. 2004 34: 6:497-504. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/sj.bmt.1704636 PMid:15286689
- 72. Dettenkofer M, Wenzler-Rottele S, Babikir R, Bertz H, Ebner W, Meyer E, Ruden H, Gastmeier P, Daschner FD. Surveillance of nosocomial sepsis and pneumonia in patients with a bone marrow or peripheral blood stem cell transplant: A multicenter project. Clin Infect Dis. 2005 40: 7:926-931. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/428046 PMid:15824981
- 73. Yamasaki S, Heike Y, Mori S, Fukuda T, Maruyama D, Kato R, Usui E, Koido K, Kim S, Tanosaki R, Tobinai K, Teshima T, Takaue Y. Infectious complications in chronic graft-versus-host disease: A retrospective study of 145 recipients of allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation with reduced- and conventional-intensity conditioning regimens. Transpl Infect Dis. 4:252-259. 2008 10: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-<u>3062.2007.00291.x</u> PMid:18194371
- 74. Forslow U, Mattsson J, Ringden O, Klominek J, Remberger M. Decreasing mortality rate in early pneumonia following hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. Scandinavian journal of infectious diseases. 2006 38: 11-12:970-976.
- 75. Gentile G, Micozzi A, Girmenia C, Iori AP, Donati PP, Capria S, Martino P. Pneumonia in allogenic and autologous bone marrow recipients. A retrospective study. Chest. 1993 104: 2:371-375. http://dx.doi.org/10.1378/chest.104.2.371 PMid:8339620
- 76. Aguilar-Guisado M, Jimenez-Jambrina M, Espigado I, Rovira M, Martino R, Oriol A, Borrell N, Ruiz I, Martin-Davila P, de la Camara R, Salavert M, de la Torre J, Cisneros JM, Spanish Network for Research in Infectious D. Pneumonia in allogeneic stem cell transplantation recipients: A multicenter prospective study. Clinical transplantation. 2011 25: 6:E629-638. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-0012.2011.01495.x PMid:22150886
- 77. Alangaden GJ, Wahiduzzaman M, Chandrasekar PH, Bone Marrow Transplant G. Aspergillosis: The most common community-acquired pneumonia with gram-negative bacilli as

copathogens in stem cell transplant recipients with graft-versushost disease. Clin Infect Dis. 2002 35: 6:659-664. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/342061 PMid:12203161

- Chopra T, Alangaden GJ, Chandrasekar P. Clostridium difficile infection in cancer patients and hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients. Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther. 2010 8: 10:1113-1119. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1586/eri.10.95</u> PMid:20954878
- Alonso CD, Dufresne SF, Hanna DB, Labbe AC, Treadway SB, Neofytos D, Belanger S, Huff CA, Laverdiere M, Marr KA. Clostridium difficile infection after adult autologous stem cell transplantation: A multicenter study of epidemiology and risk factors. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant. 2013 19: 10:1502-1508. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2013.07.022</u> PMid:23916741 PMCid:PMC3806308
- Bruminhent J, Wang ZX, Hu C, Wagner J, Sunday R, Bobik B, Hegarty S, Keith S, Alpdogan S, Carabasi M, Filicko-O'Hara J, Flomenberg N, Kasner M, Outschoorn UM, Weiss M, Flomenberg P. Clostridium difficile colonization and disease in patients undergoing hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant. 2014 20: 9:1329-1334. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2014.04.026 PMid:24792871
- Alonso CD, Treadway SB, Hanna DB, Huff CA, Neofytos D, Carroll KC, Marr KA. Epidemiology and outcomes of clostridium difficile infections in hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients. Clin Infect Dis. 2012 54: 8:1053-1063. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/cir1035</u> PMid:22412059 PMCid:PMC3309884
- 82. Kinnebrew MA, Lee YJ, Jenq RR, Lipuma L, Littmann ER, Gobourne A, No D, van den Brink M, Pamer EG, Taur Y. Early clostridium difficile infection during allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. PLoS One. 2014 9: 3:e90158.
- Huang AM, Marini BL, Frame D, Aronoff DM, Nagel JL. Risk factors for recurrent clostridium difficile infection in hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients. Transpl Infect Dis. 2014 16: 5:744-750. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/tid.12267</u> PMid:25040545
- Dubberke ER, Reske KA, Srivastava A, Sadhu J, Gatti R, Young RM, Rakes LC, Dieckgraefe B, DiPersio J, Fraser VJ. Clostridium difficile-associated disease in allogeneic hematopoietic stem-cell transplant recipients: Risk associations, protective associations, and outcomes. Clinical transplantation. 2010 24: 2:192-198. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-0012.2009.01035.x PMid:19624693 PMCid:PMC3390201
- Willems L, Porcher R, Lafaurie M, Casin I, Robin M, Xhaard A, Andreoli AL, Rodriguez-Otero P, Dhedin N, Socie G, Ribaud P, Peffault de Latour R. Clostridium difficile infection after allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation: Incidence, risk factors, and outcome. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant. 2012 18: 8:1295-1301. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2012.02.010</u> PMid:22387347
- 86. Kamboj M, Xiao K, Kaltsas A, Huang YT, Sun J, Chung D, Wu S, Sheahan A, Sepkowitz K, Jakubowski AA, Papanicolaou G. Clostridium difficile infection after allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplant: Strain diversity and outcomes associated with

nap1/027. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant. 2014 20: 10:1626-1633. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2014.06.025 PMid:24973628

- Trifilio SM, Pi J, Mehta J. Changing epidemiology of clostridium difficile-associated disease during stem cell transplantation. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant. 2013 19: 3:405-409. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bbmt.2012.10.030</u> PMid:23219779
- Spadao F, Gerhardt J, Guimaraes T, Dulley F, Almeida Junior JN, Batista MV, Shikanai-Yasuda MA, Levin AS, Costa SF. Incidence of diarrhea by clostridium difficile in hematologic patients and hematopoietic stem cell transplantation patients: Risk factors for severe forms and death. Revista do Instituto de Medicina Tropical de Sao Paulo. 2014 56: 4:325-331. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0036-46652014000400010

PMid:25076434 PMCid:PMC4131819

- McDonald EG, Milligan J, Frenette C, Lee TC. Continuous proton pump inhibitor therapy and the associated risk of recurrent clostridium difficile infection. JAMA internal medicine. 2015 175: 5:784-791. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.42</u> PMid:25730198
- 90. Surawicz CM, Brandt LJ, Binion DG, Ananthakrishnan AN, Curry SR, Gilligan PH, McFarland LV, Mellow M, Zuckerbraun BS. Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of clostridium difficile infections. The American journal of gastroenterology. 2013 108: 4:478-498; quiz 499. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ajg.2013.4 PMid:23439232
- 91. Kern WV, Marchetti O, Drgona L, Akan H, Aoun M, Akova M, de Bock R, Paesmans M, Viscoli C, Calandra T. Oral antibiotics for fever in low-risk neutropenic patients with cancer: A double-blind, randomized, multicenter trial comparing single daily moxifloxacin with twice daily ciprofloxacin plus amoxicillin/clavulanic acid combination therapy--eortc infectious diseases group trial xv. J Clin Oncol. 2013 31: 9:1149-1156.
- http://dx.doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2012.45.8109 PMid:23358983
 92. Averbuch D, Orasch C, Cordonnier C, Livermore DM, Mikulska M, Viscoli C, Gyssens IC, Kern WV, Klyasova G, Marchetti O, Engelhard D, Akova M, Ecil ajvoEEIEE, Eln. European guidelines for empirical antibacterial therapy for febrile neutropenic patients in the era of growing resistance: Summary of the 2011 4th european conference on infections in leukemia. Haematologica. 2013 98: 12:1826-1835.

http://dx.doi.org/10.3324/haematol.2013.091025 PMid:24323983 PMCid:PMC3856957 PMid:24323983

- 93. Mikulska M. How to manage infections caused by antibiotic resistant gram-negative bacteria - ebmt educational meeting from the severe aplastic anaemia and infectious diseases working parties, naples, italy, 2014. Current drug targets. 2015 <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/1389450116666150223162138</u> PMid:25706258
- 94. Gyssens IC, Kern WV, Livermore DM, Ecil ajvoEEI, ESCMID Eo. The role of antibiotic stewardship in limiting antibacterial resistance among hematology patients. Haematologica. 2013 98: 12:1821-1825. http://dx.doi.org/10.3324/haematol.2013.091769 PMid:24323982 PMCid:PMC3856956