# RESEARCH



**Open Access** 

# Antibiotics in critically ill patients: a systematic review of the pharmacokinetics of $\beta$ -lactams

Joao Gonçalves-Pereira<sup>1,2\*</sup> and Pedro Póvoa<sup>1,2</sup>

### Abstract

**Introduction:** Several reports have shown marked heterogeneity of antibiotic pharmacokinetics (PK) in patients admitted to ICUs, which might potentially affect outcomes. Therefore, the pharmacodynamic (PD) parameter of the efficacy of <u>B-lactam</u> antibiotics, that is, the <u>time</u> that its concentration is <u>above</u> the bacteria minimal inhibitory concentration (T > MIC), cannot be safely extrapolated from data derived from the PK of healthy volunteers.

**Methods:** We performed a full review of published studies addressing the PK of intravenous  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics given to infected ICU patients. Study selection comprised a comprehensive bibliographic search of the PubMed database and bibliographic references in relevant reviews from January 1966 to December 2010. We selected only English-language articles reporting studies addressing  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics that had been described in at least five previously published studies. Studies of the PK of patients undergoing renal replacement therapy were excluded.

**Results:** A total of 57 studies addressing six different  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics (meropenem, imipenem, piperacillin, cefpirome, cefepirme and ceftazidime) were selected. Significant PK heterogeneity was noted, with a broad, more than twofold variation both of volume of distribution and of drug clearance (Cl). The correlation of antibiotic Cl with creatinine clearance was usually reported. Consequently, in ICU patients,  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotic half-life and T > MIC were virtually unpredictable, especially in those patients with normal renal function. A better PD profile was usually obtained by prolonged or even continuous infusion. Tissue penetration was also found to be compromised in critically ill patients with septic shock.

**Conclusions:** The PK of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics are <u>heterogeneous</u> and largely <u>unpredictable</u> in ICU patients. Consequently, the dosing of antibiotics should be supported by PK concepts, including data derived from studies of the PK of ICU patients and therapeutic drug monitoring.

**Keywords:** administration, dosage,  $\beta$ ? $\beta$ ?-lactam antibiotics, microdialysis, pharmacodynamics, pharmacokinetics, ICU

#### Introduction

Infection and sepsis, whether community- or hospitalacquired, are important causes of morbidity and mortality in ICU patients [1,2]. Despite all of the research, sepsis therapy continues to depend on supportive management of the different organ dysfunctions and failures and on specific therapy for infection with timely and appropriate antibiotics and/or focus control.

The  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics, because of their large antimicrobial spectrum and low toxicity, are among the first-line therapies for critically ill patients, especially

\* Correspondence: joaogpster@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup>Polyvalent Intensive Care Unit, São Francisco Xavier Hospital, Estrada do Forte do Alto do Duque, 1449-005 Lisboa, Portugal when a Gram-negative infection is suspected. However, the efficacy of antibiotics is not easily evaluated, since the clinical <u>response</u> is usually <u>unnoticeable before 48</u> hours of therapy [3]. Moreover, the <u>unavailability</u> of routine therapeutic <u>drug monitoring</u> for the great majority of these drugs makes it difficult to distinguish clinical <u>failure</u> due to <u>underdosing</u> from lack of *in vivo* organism susceptibility.

Considerable evidence demonstrates that free drug time above bacteria minimal inhibitory concentration ( $f \underline{T} > MIC$ ) is the measure of drug exposure most closely linked to the ability of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics to kill the target bacteria [4]. T > MIC is dependent on the half-life ( $\underline{T}_{1/2}$ ) of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics and their serum concentration.



© 2011 Gonçalves-Pereira and Póvoa; licensee BioMed Central Ltd. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

The serum <u>concentration</u> of an antibiotic depends on the <u>dose</u> delivered, its <u>bioavailability</u> and its volume of distribution ( $V_d$ ).  $V_d$  is a mathematical construct and refers to the size of a compartment necessary to account for the total amount of the drug, assuming that its concentration in the whole body is equal to that measured in plasma. Drugs that distribute essentially in the extracellular fluid (mainly <u>hydrophilic</u>) have low  $V_d$ , whilst drugs that have <u>rapid cellular</u> uptake (<u>lipophilic</u>) have <u>high</u>  $V_d$ [5,6].

<u>Both</u>  $V_d$  and drug clearance (<u>Cl</u>) may be <u>increased</u> in ICU patients [7]. Therapeutic <u>procedures</u>, notably large-volume and <u>blood</u> products infusions, <u>positive</u> pressure <u>ventilation</u>, surgical procedures, capillary <u>leak</u> and <u>reduction</u> in <u>albumin</u> serum concentration all contribute to alter the concentration-time relationship of many drugs. A <u>rise</u> in the  $V_d$ , although it <u>reduces</u> drug concentration, might proportionally <u>increase</u>  $T_{1/2}$ , since  $T_{1/2} = V_d/(Cl \times 0.693)$  [7]. On the contrary, a high Cl may reduce the exposure of antibiotics to bacteria (Figure 1).

Renal <u>Cl</u> may be <u>increased</u> in <u>septic</u> patients because of <u>increased</u> renal blood flow. This has recently been shown to be a <u>common finding</u> in ICU patients, particularly surgical and <u>trauma</u> patients [8] but also <u>septic</u> medical patients [9]. Besides, in the study by Baptista *et al.* [9], the authors showed that <u>commonly</u> used <u>formu-</u> las used to <u>calculate</u> glomerular filtration rate usually <u>underestimate</u> creatinine (Cr) Cl. Consequently, these authors recommended <u>direct</u> Cr Cl measurement. Moreover in ICU patients, <u>maldistribution</u> of blood flow in the microcirculation [10], namely, in patients in septic shock, may further <u>decrease</u> the drug concentration in the <u>infected</u> tissue [11]. These pharmacokinetic (PK) changes are sometimes influenced by the clinical course of the infection itself [12]. Consequently, PK parameters measured in <u>healthy</u> volunteers may <u>not</u> correctly predict concentrations in septic ICU patients, particularly <u>early</u> in the course of a severe infection [13,14].

Ideally, individualized dosing strategies should account for the altered PK and pathogen susceptibility in each patient. Despite the fact that some studies addressed this issue, this information had not yet been aggregated. Furthermore,  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotic PK are rarely analysed outside clinical trials. Therefore, we performed a systematic review of studies that addressed the PK parameters of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics in ICU patients to assess the relationship between dose and schedule of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics and their adequacy according to pharmacodynamic (PD) end points. We also reviewed studies assessing the concentrations of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics in different tissues. Our primary intention was to aggregate PK information in this particular population and to contribute to the design of individualized dosing regimens of these drugs.

We also included studies that involved the development of PD models using PK of ICU patients and bacterial MICs. These techniques allow the calculation of the presumed T > MIC and therefore the percentage of patients in which the antibiotic will achieve its PD



**Figure 1 ICU** patients present pharmacokinetic changes of antibiotics that may alter bacterial exposure. Concentration-time curve of antibiotics in healthy volunteers (left panel). A large volume of distribution ( $V_{d}$ ) (middle panel) is often present in ICU patients, leading to decreased maximum concentration ( $C_{max}$ ) but a longer half-life ( $T_{1/2}$ ) and eventually higher time that the antibiotic concentration is above the bacteria minimum inhibitory concentration (T > MIC). The antibiotic area under the concentration time curve (AUC) remains virtually the same. An increase in drug clearance (CI) (right) is associated with decreases in AUC,  $T_{1/2}$  and T > MIC. Straight dotted lines-bacteria minimum inhibitory concentration.

target: that is, the antibiotic's <u>probability</u> of <u>target attain</u>ment (<u>PTA</u>) [15,16]. The <u>cumulative fraction of</u> response (CFR) is calculated by multiplying the PTA obtained for each MIC by the MIC distribution according to a microbiological database [16].

#### Materials and methods

The data for this review were identified by a search of PubMed (January 1966 to December 2010) as well as

bibliographic references from relevant articles, including reviews on this subject and all selected studies. The search terms used were 'antibiotic' or 'carbapenem' or 'penicillins' or 'cephalosporins', and 'intensive care' or 'critically ill' or 'critical care' or 'severe sepsis' or 'septic shock', and 'pharmacokinetics' or 'pharmacodynamics'. All relevant studies in the English-language literature that described antibiotic PK in critically ill patients were assessed (Figure 2).



Only studies that described PK of antibiotics given intravenously to infected patients were selected. Studies referring to prophylactic antibiotics or to PK in patients under any type of renal replacement therapy were excluded. In fact, these studies are mainly directed to the measurement of Cl during renal replacement therapy to determine the ideal antibiotic dose and therefore are not easily compared with studies addressing the intrinsic PK of ICU patients. Furthermore, a full revision of those studies has recently been published [17].

For the purpose of our systematic review, we analysed only studies of antibiotics with at least five published references. This threshold of five referenced studies was arbitrarily chosen so that we could derive more representative and consistent data on the PK of each antibiotic. The weighted mean of the  $V_d$  was calculated so that we could present a graphic representation of each analysed antibiotic (Figure 3).

#### Results

A total of 57 studies assessing an aggregate of six different  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics were selected.

#### Carbapenem Meropenem

Several studies have addressed meropenem PK in ICU septic patients. High  $V_d$  and Cl have usually been reported, as well as a low binding fraction: < 10% [18]. Consequently, a large heterogeneity of PK parameters was found, exceeding a twofold variation (Table 1 and Figure 3). The larger reported  $V_{d}$ , a mean of 34.4 L, was noted on the second day of therapy in eight ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) patients [19] with a mean body weight of 73 kg. In a Thai VAP population (N = 9) with a lower mean body weight (only 54.2 kg), the mean  $V_d$  was 6.0 L despite also being measured after 48 hours of therapy with meropenem [20]. This supports the hypothesis of a potential relationship between body weight and  $V_d$ .

Meropenem Cl ranged from a mean of 4.7 L/hour to a mean of 15.4 L/hour and was generally found to be closely correlated to <u>Cr Cl</u>. In fact, in patients with severe sepsis, the six patients with the <u>lower</u> Cr Cl (< 50 mL/minute) had the <u>higher</u> T > MIC and area under the concentration time curve (AUC) (230.2 mg × hour/L vs.



	PK parameters				Study	
Antibiotic drug classes and drugs	V <sub>d</sub> , L	Cl, L/hour	T <sub>1/2</sub> , hours	Patient demographics	Study types [93]	References
Carbapenems						
Meropenem	21.2 ± 4.7 <sup>b</sup>	11.3 ± 4 <sup>b</sup>	$1.4 \pm 0.4^{b}$	N = 11 Age 63.1 years [23 to 81] Mild to severe intraabdominal sepsis	Descriptive	Lovering <i>et al.</i> , 1995 [22]
Meropenem	$26.6 \pm 3.2^{\circ}$	9.4 ± 1.2 <sup>c</sup>	2.0	N = 15 Age 55.3 ± 14.3 years Severe sepsis	Randomized, controlled cross-over	Thalhammer <i>et al.</i> , 1999 [27]
Meropenem	34.4 ± 15.9	11 ± 4.3	0.4 ± 0.12	N = 8 Age 55 ± 8 years VAP	Descriptive	de Stoppelaar <i>et al.</i> , 2000 [19]
Meropenem	19.7 ± 5	7.3 ± 3.1	3.1 ± 1.5	N = 14 Age 73.3 ± 8.1 years Severe sepsis	Descriptive	Kitzes-Cohen <i>et al.,</i> 2002 [21]
Meropenem	16.0 ± 3.7 <sup>d</sup>	8.5 ± 3.2 <sup>d</sup>	$1.4 \pm 0.6^{d}$	N = 9 Age 39.6 ± 15.7 years VAP	Not randomized, controlled cross-over	Jaruratanasirikul <i>et al.,</i> 2005 [20]
Imipenem	lmipenem 17.7 ± 4	lmipenem 7.0 ± 2.5	lmipenem 2 ± 0.3	Imipenem N = 10 Age 65 ± 19 years	Randomized, parallel controlled	Novelli <i>et al.</i> , 2005 [29]
Meropenem	Meropenem 27.1 ± 7.7	Meropenem 11.5 ± 3.1	Meropenem 2.1 ± 0.5	Meropenem N = 10 Age 67 ± 19 years Severe sepsis		
Meropenem	23.8 ± 4.9	6.7 ± 4.2	3.7 ± 1.9	N = 6 Age 65.7 ± 11.2 years Peritonitis	Descriptive	Karjagin <i>et al.</i> , 2008 [25]
Meropenem	22.7	13.6 ± 1.3	NR	N = 10 Age range 48 to 63 years Severe sepsis	Randomized, parallel controlled	Roberts <i>et al.</i> , 2009 [24]
Meropenem	Meropenem 30.1 [21.7 to 53.9] <sup>e</sup>	Meropenem 8 [5 to 10.99 <sup>e</sup>	Meropenem 2.1 [1.7 to 3.4]	Meropenem $N = 16$	Cross-sectional	Taccone <i>et al.</i> , 2010 [23]
Piperacillin	Piperacillin 26.6 [20.3 to 30.1] <sup>e</sup>	Piperacillin 8.4 [5.5 to 18.1] <sup>e</sup>	Piperacillin 2.6 [1.5 to 3.8]	Piperacillin N = 27		
Ceftazidime	Ceftazidime 33.6 [25.2 to 49.7] <sup>e</sup>	Ceftazidime 3.8 [2.5 to 5.5] <sup>e</sup>	Ceftazidime 5.8 [4.1 to 7.4]	Ceftazidime $N = 18$		
Cefepime	Cefepime 25.2 [23.1 to 30.8] <sup>e</sup>	Cefepime 5.5 [4.6 to 8.4] <sup>e</sup>	Cefepime 3.4 [2.3 to 5.3]	Cefepime N = 19 All patients: median age 63 years Severe sepsis or septic shock		
Imipenem	31.4 ± 11.7	14.4 ± 4.5	1.6 ± 1.3	N = 10 Age 44 ± 12.2 years Severe sepsis	Descriptive	McKindley <i>et al.,</i> 1996 [34]
Imipenem	18.5	6.3 ± 0.8	2.0	N = 6 Age 63.5 ± 16.7 years Severe sepsis	Not randomized, parallel, controlled	Tegeder <i>et al.,</i> 2002 [32]
Imipenem	45.5 ± 47.2	12.1 ± 12.0	2.9 ± 1.7	N = 50 Age 45.2 $\pm$ 17 years Presumed Gram- negative sepsis	Cross-sectional	Belzberg <i>et al.</i> , 2004 [28]

### Table 1 Pharmacokinetic parameters of $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics<sup>a</sup>

Imipenem	12.2 ± 9.9 <sup>f</sup>	12.3 ± 4.2	NR	N = 20 Age 60.5 years VAP	Randomized, parallel, controlled	Sakka <i>et al.</i> , 2007 [31]
Imipenem	27.2 ± 6.5	13.3 ± 5.2	1.4 ± 0.2	N = 6 Age 53.3 ± 19.9 years Severe sepsis	Not randomized, parallel, controlled	Dahyot <i>et al.,</i> 2008 [33]
Imipenem	16.7 ± 5.3 <sup>g</sup>	8.7 ± 5.3 <sup>9</sup>	1.5 ± 0.7 <sup>9</sup>	N = 9 Age 63.3 ± 14.9 years VAP	Not randomized, controlled, cross-over	Jaruratanasirikul and Sudsai, 2009 [30]
Penicillins						
Piperacillin	25.0 ± 17.2	23.8 ± 17.2	1.5 ± 2.1	N = 11 Age 43.6 ± 15.9 years Surgical patients	Descriptive	Shikuma <i>et al.</i> , 1990 [36]
Piperacillin	19.5 ± 3.4 <sup>b</sup>	$8.4 \pm 1.4^{b}$	$1.8 \pm 0.3^{b}$	N = 10 Age 37.7 ± 2.8 years Burn patients	Descriptive	Bourget <i>et al.</i> , 1996 [38]
Piperacillin	40.7 ± 8.7	8.2 ± 2	4.1 ± 1.3	N = 6 Age 64 $\pm$ 7 years Septic shock	Not randomized, parallel, controlled	Joukhadar <i>et al.,</i> 2001 [44]
Piperacillin	34.6 ± 6.8 <sup>c</sup>	11.8 ± 4.3 <sup>c</sup>	2.4 ± 1.2 <sup>c</sup>	N = 7 Age range 45 to 76 years Severe sepsis	Not randomized, controlled, cross-over	Langgartner <i>et al.</i> , 2007 [39]
Piperacillin	11.7 <sup>f</sup>	17.2	0.4	N = 13 Age 37.5 ± 19.4 years Severe sepsis	Randomized, parallel, controlled	Roberts <i>et al.,</i> 2009 [45]
Cephalosporins				·		
Cefpirome	23.6 ± 8.0	8.0 ± 3.0	2.2 ± 0.5	N = 9 Age 31 years [19 to 53] Severe sepsis	Not randomized, parallel, controlled	Jacolot <i>et al.</i> , 1999 [47]
Cefpirome	26.4 ± 7.9	8.8 ± 3.4	3.1 ± 1.2	N = 12 Age 41.2 ± 19 years Severe sepsis	Descriptive	Lipman <i>et al.,</i> 2001 [48]
Cefpirome	25.9 ± 7.1	4.5 ± 0.7	3.3 ± 0.5	N = 12 Age 67.2 $\pm$ 8.1 years Severe sepsis or septic shock	Not randomized, parallel, controlled	Joukhadar <i>et al.,</i> 2002 [52]
Cefpirome	21.9 ± 4.5	4.8 ± 1.6	3.1 ± 0.9	N = 11 Age 66 ± 8 years Severe sepsis	Not randomized, parallel, controlled	Sauermann <i>et al.</i> , 2005 [51]
Cefepime	32.6 ± 17.5	7.5 ± 3.1	3.5 ± 1.1	N = 7 Age 73.7 ± 4.9 years Severe sepsis	Descriptive	Kieft <i>et al.,</i> 1993 [53]
Cefepime	21.8 ± 5.1	7.6 ± 2.0	3 ± 1.2	N = 13 Age 55 years Severe sepsis	Descriptive	Lipman <i>et al.,</i> 1999 [56]
Cefepime	36.1 ± 11.8	8.8 ± 2.4	2.8 ± 0.6	N = 12 Age 41 ± 13 years Burn patients	Descriptive	Bonapace <i>et al.,</i> 1999 [57]
Cefepime	26.0 <sup>b</sup>	9.1 ± 1.5 <sup>b</sup>	$2.5 \pm 0.6^{b}$	N = 6 Age 39.8 ± 11.3 years Burn patients	Descriptive	Sampol <i>et al.,</i> 2000 [61]
Cefepime	Cefepime 19.6	Cefepime 7.1 ± 3.6	Cefepime 2.9 ± 3.2	Cefepime N = 13 Age 48.2 ± 21.2 years	Cross-sectional	Conil <i>et al.,</i> 2007 [54]
Ceftazidime	Ceftazidime 28.8	Ceftazidime 7.5 ± 3.8	Ceftazidime 3.1 ± 2.1	Ceftazidime N = 17 Age 62.9 $\pm$ 22.4 years Burn patients		
Cefepime	28.7 ± 13.3 <sup>d</sup>	9.1 ± 5.6 <sup>d</sup>	4.3 ± 4.2	N = 21 Age 55.1 years (median) Nosocomial pneumonia	Cross-sectional	Chapuis <i>et al.</i> , 2010 [55]

# Table 1 Pharmacokinetic parameters of $\beta$ ? $\beta$ ?-lactam antibiotics<sup>a</sup> (Continued)

Ceftazidime	24.5	7.5	2.1	N = 16 Age range 18 to 70 years Pseudomonas infection	Descriptive	Rondanelli <i>et al.</i> , 1986 [64]
Ceftazidime	49.3 ± 18.2 <sup>e</sup>	15.5 ± 2.5 <sup>e</sup>	1.8 ± 0.5 <sup>e</sup>	N = 5 Age 52.3 years [21 to 69] VAP	Not randomized, controlled, cross-over	Langer <i>et al.</i> , 1991 [76]
Ceftazidime	29.5 ± 8.7	4.2 ± 1.9	6.1 ± 2.5	N = 12 Age 60 ± 13 years VAP	Not randomized, controlled, cross-over	Bressolle <i>et al.</i> , 1992 [77]
Ceftazidime	18.9 ± 9 <sup>c</sup>	5.1 <sup>c</sup>	3.5 ± 1.6 <sup>c</sup>	N = 12 Age 57 ± 12 years Suspected Gram- negative sepsis	Not randomized, controlled, cross-over	Benko <i>et al.,</i> 1996 [67]
Ceftazidime	15.0 ± 4.3	5.2 ± 2.2	1.3 ± 1.2	N = 10 Age 48 ± 15.1 years Severe sepsis	Descriptive	Young <i>et al.</i> , 1997 [65]
Ceftazidime	56.9 ± 25.9	9.1 ± 4.8	4.8 ± 1.9	N = 15 Age 59.3 $\pm$ 14.6 years Severe sepsis	Descriptive	Gómez <i>et al.</i> , 1999 [66]
Ceftazidime	22.9 [11.8 to 28.1]	2.8 [0.2 to 7.8]	7.7 [2 to 44.7]	N = 21 Age range 27 to 73 years Melioidosis	Not randomized, parallel, controlled	Angus <i>et al.</i> , 2000 [71]
Ceftazidime	25.6 ± 11.2 <sup>c</sup>	11.0 ± 5.3 <sup>c</sup>	1.7 ± 0.7 <sup>c</sup>	N = 14 Age 36.1 $\pm$ 12.8 years Gram-negative nosocomial pneumonia	Not randomized, parallel, controlled	Hanes <i>et al.</i> , 2000 [70]
Ceftazidime	19.6 [14 to 28] <sup>c, e</sup>	5.1 [2.3 to 8.9] <sup>c</sup>	4.2 [1.3 to 12.3] <sup>c</sup>	N = 6 Age 64 years [42 to 87] Surgical peritonitis	Not randomized, parallel, controlled	Buijk <i>et al.,</i> 2002 [74]

Table 1 Pharmacokinetic parameters of $\beta$ ? $\beta$ ?-I	-lactam antibiotics <sup>a</sup> (Continued)
---	--

<sup>a</sup>Cl: clearance; NR: not reported; PK: pharmacokinetics; T<sub>1/2</sub>: half-life; VAP: ventilator-associated pneumonia; V<sub>d</sub>: volume of distribution. <sup>b</sup>first-day PK; <sup>c</sup>PK after bolus dosing; <sup>d</sup>PK after 1-g bolus dosing; <sup>e</sup>for 70 kg; <sup>f</sup>central compartment; <sup>g</sup>PK after 500-mg bolus dosing. Except where otherwise indicated, data are means, means ± standard deviations or medians [interquartile ranges].

119.4 mg × hour/L; P = 0.001), <u>despite</u> a <u>reduction</u> in the <u>dose</u> administered, from 1 g every 8 h (tid) to 1 g every 12 h (bid) [21].

One study addressed the variability of individual meropenem PK between the first and fourth days of therapy in 11 surgical patients [22]. Despite an increase in Cr Cl from a mean of 63.9 to 79.1 mL/minute during the study period, meropenem V<sub>d</sub>, Cl and AUC remain unchanged. Nevertheless, in another study, by Taccone et al. [23], predefined targets were reached in only 75% of severe sepsis and septic shock patients after the first dose of 1 g of meropenem (Table 2), despite the inclusion of patients with acute renal failure (22%) who did not receive renal replacement therapy. These authors concluded that PK changes induced by sepsis were largely unpredictable and that none of the evaluated clinical parameters were predictive of PK adequacy: namely, age, severity, presence of shock, use of vasopressors and mechanical ventilation. Also, Roberts et al. [24] showed that the  $V_d$  in patients with severe sepsis had great variability, both in the same patient (especially the central compartment: roughly 45%) and in different patients (nearly 27%). In their study, despite the fact that all patients had a serum Cr < 1.36 mg/dL, the meropenem Cl variability (in the same patient and between patients) still ranged between 10% and 20%.

The <u>time</u> of <u>infusion</u> of meropenem has also been shown to <u>influence</u> its T > MIC. In a cross-over study of nine Thai VAP patients [20], after 48 hours of therapy, 1 g of meropenem tid in 30-minute infusions provided an adequate T > MIC in 74.7% of the patients, for a MIC of <u>1</u> mg/L. However, with a MIC of <u>16</u> mg/L, only the meropenem regimen of 2 g tid given in an <u>extended infusion (two hours) led to a T > MIC > 40%</u> [20].

Meropenem <u>tissue</u> PK have been evaluated by microdialysis in several studies (Table 3). The tissue-to-plasma meropenem mean ratio on the first day of antibiotic therapy was found to be <u>0.74</u> in the <u>peritoneum</u> [25] and <u>0.44</u> in <u>subcutaneous</u> fat [24]. The meropenem <u>CFR</u> was calculated for the 10 patients for whom serum levels were measured in this study according to the <u>Mystic microbiological database</u> [26]. The CFRs were 100% for Enterobacteriaceae and <u>40.6%</u> for *Pseudomonas* 

# Table 2 Pharmacodynamic targets of $\beta\text{-lactam}$ antibiotics $^a$

Antibiotics	PD targets	Percentage of patients achieving targets	References
Meropenem, 1 g tid or 3 g/day Cl	40% $f$ T > MIC, with $f$ assumed to be 98%.	PTA for MIC = 2 mg/L: bolus 100%, CI 100%	Roberts <i>et al.,</i> 2009 [24]
	CFR according to Mystic database	DTA for $MIC = 8 mg/l + balue 70% CI 100%$	
		CER  for EC: bolus 100% CL 100%	
		CER for PA: bolus 40.6%, CI 100%	
Ceftazidime, 2 g	70% T > 4 × EUCAST breakpoint of PA	28%	Taccone <i>et al.,</i> 2010 [23]
Cefepime, 2 g	70% T > 4 $\times$ EUCAST breakpoint of PA	16%	
Meropenem, 1 g	40% T > 4 $\times$ EUCAST breakpoint of PA	75%	
Piperacillin/tazobactam, 4.5 g	50% T > 4 × EUCAST breakpoint of PA	44%	
Imipenem 1 g tid or 2 g/day Cl	40% $f T > MIC$ , with $f$ assumed to be 80%	MIC = 2 mg/L bolus dosing 88%, CI 100%	Sakka <i>et al.</i> , 2007 [31]
		MIC = 4 mg/L bolus 75%, Cl 86%	
Piperacillin/tazobactam 4.5 g qid or 13.5 g Cl	50% $f$ T > MIC. CFR according to Mystic database	PTA for MIC = 0.25 mg/L bolus 79.2%, Cl 100%	Roberts <i>et al.</i> , 2009 [46]
		PTA for MIC = 1 mg/L bolus 60%, CI 100%	
		CFR for 18 g/day: bolus 53.4%, Cl 92.5%	
		CFR for 13.5 g/day: bolus 40%, CI 92.4%	
Cefpirome 2 g bid	60% T > MIC	PTA for MIC = 4 mg/L: bolus 60%, Cl (4 g/day) 100%	Lipman <i>et al.,</i> 2001 [48]
		PTA for MIC = 16 mg/L: bolus 10%, CI (4 g/day) $50\%$	
Cefpirome 2 g tid	60%  T > MIC plasma and tissue	PTA for MIC = 4 mg/L: plasma 100%, tissue 100%	Sauermann <i>et al.,</i> 2005 [51]
		PTA for MIC = 16 mg/L: plasma 87.5%, tissue 75%	
Cefpirome 2 g bid	65% <i>f</i> T > MIC, with <i>f</i> assumed to be 90%. CFR according to EUCAST database	CFR for EC: bolus 99.9%, CI (4 g/day) 100%	Roos <i>et al.,</i> 2007 [50]
		CFR for PA: bolus 56.1%, CI (4 g/day) 84.4%	
Cefepime 2 g	60% T > MIC MIC = 8 mg/L (NCCLS break point of PA)	PTA with 1 g bid 45% PTA with 2 g bid 68%	Bonapace <i>et al.,</i> 1999 [57]
		PTA for MIC = 4 mg/L: 1 g bid 68%, 2 g bid 89%	
Cefepime 2 g	65% <i>f</i> T > MIC, with <i>f</i> assumed to be 90%. CFR according to Queensland Health Pathology Service	CFR for EC: 2 g bid 78.9%, CI (4 g/day) 96.9%	Roos <i>et al.,</i> 2006 [60]
		CFR for PA: 2 g bid 54%, CI (4 g/day) 91.7%	
Ceftazidime 1 g every 4 hours	100% T > 4 × MIC (isolated pathogens; if negative cultures $100\%$ T > 16 mg/l )	Ceftazidime 47.8% PTA with 1 g every 3 hours 88.2%	Conil <i>et al.</i> , 2007 [54]
Cefepime 2 g tid	10070 F 2 TO Hig, E)	Cefepime 20% PTA with 1 g every 4 hours 88.2%	
Cefepime 2 g tid	50% $f T > MIC$ , with $f$ assumed to be 85%	PTA for MIC = 8 mg/L 91.8%	Nicasio <i>et al.,</i> 2009 [59]
		PTA for MIC = 32 mg/L 50.3%	
Cefepime 2 g (each 12 to 36 hours)	50% T > MIC MIC = 8 mg/L	First dose 67%; steady-state 44%	Chapuis <i>et al.,</i> 2010 [55]
Ceftazidime 2 g tid	100% T > 5 $\times$ MIC MIC = 8 mg/L (PA break point)	10%	Young <i>et al.</i> , 1997 [65]
		PTA for CI (6 g/day) 60%	
Ceftazidime 2 g tid or 6 g/day Cl	$100\% \text{ T} > 5 \times \text{MIC}$ MIC = 8 mg/L (PA break point)	Bolus 20%	Lipman <i>et al.,</i> 1999 [68]

		CI 100%	
Ceftazidime 1.5 g tid or 4.5 g/day Cl	T > 4 $\times$ MIC plasma and peritoneum (isolated pathogens)	Plasma: bolus dosing 100%, Cl 100%	Buijk <i>et al.</i> , 2002 [74]
		Peritoneum: bolus 88%, Cl 100%	
Ceftazidime 2 to 6 g/day Cl	100% T > 5 $\times$ MIC MIC = 8 mg/L (PA break point) Target concentration 40 $\pm$ 10 mg/ L	35.9%	Aubert <i>et al.</i> , 2010 [72]
		Percentage of time on target (mean)	
Meropenem 2 g tid or 3 g Cl	T > MIC (isolated susceptible pathogens)	Bolus T = 100%; CI T = 100%	Thalhammer <i>et</i> <i>al.</i> , 1999 [27]
Meropenem 1 g tid	T > MIC (isolated pathogens)	T = 90.8%	de Stoppelaar <i>et</i> <i>al</i> , 2000 [19]
		$T > 4 \times MIC T = 52\%$	
Meropenem 1 g bid or 1 g tid	T > MIC (isolated pathogens)	T = 80.9% (Cr Cl > 50 mL/minute; 1 g tid)	Kitzes-Cohen <i>et al,</i> 2002 [21]
		T = 91.7% (Cr Cl < 50 mL/minute; 1 g bid)	
Imipenem 1 g tid	T > MIC (isolated sensitive [MIC $\leq$ 2 mg/L] pathogens)	$T = 100\%$ ; $T > 4 \times MIC T = 87.5\%$	Novelli <i>et al.</i> , 2005 [29]
Meropenem 1 g tid	T > MIC (isolated sensitive [MIC $\leq$ 2 mg/L] pathogens)	T = 100%; T > 4 $\times$ MIC T = 87.5%	
Meropenem 1 g tid (bolus or 3-hour infusion) or 2 g tid (3-hour infusion)	T > MIC	For MIC = 1 mg/L: 1 g tid bolus T = 74.7%, 1 g tid 3 hours T = 93.6%, 2 g tid 3 hours T = 98.6%s	Jaruratanasirikul <i>et</i> <i>al.</i> , 2005 [20]
		For MIC = 16 mg/L: 1 g tid bolus T = 28.3%, 1 g tid 3 hours T = 37.8%, 2 g tid 3 hours T = 57.9%	
Meropenem 1 g tid	T > MIC	For MIC = 4 mg/L: plasma T = 87%, peritoneum T = 87%	Karjagin <i>et al.,</i> 2008 [25]
		For MIC = 16 mg/L: plasma T = 55%, peritoneum T = 43%	
Imipenem 500 mg qid (30 minutes or 2-hour infusion) or 1 g qid (2-hour infusion)	T > MIC	For MIC = 1 mg/L: 500 mg qid 30 minutes T = 64.7%, 500 mg qid 2 hours T = 76.5%, 1 g qid 2 hours T = 93.4%	Jaruratanasirikul and Sudsai, 2009 [30]
		For MIC = 4 mg/L: 500 mg qid 30 minutes T = 20.3%, 500 mg qid 2 hours T = 17.7%, 1 g qid 2 hours T = 60.3%	
Piperacillin 3 g qid or 8 g/day Cl	T > MIC	For MIC = 16 mg/L: bolus dosing T = 62%, Cl T = 100%	Rafati <i>et al.</i> , 2006 [40]
		For MIC = 32 mg/L: bolus T = 39%, Cl T = 65%	
Cefepime 2 g bid	T > MIC MIC = 7 mg/L (MIC <sub>90</sub> of PA)	T = 80%	Kieft <i>et al.</i> , 1993 [53]
Ceftazidime 2 g tid or 3 g/day Cl	T > MIC MIC = 4 mg/L (MIC of one isolated PA)	Bolus T = 92%; Cl T = 100%	Benko <i>et al.</i> , 1996 [67]
Ceftazidime 2 g tid or 60 mg/kg/day Cl	T > MIC (isolated pathogens)	Bolus T = 92.9%; Cl T = 100%	Hanes <i>et al.</i> , 2000 [70]

#### **Table 2 Pharmacodynamic targets of** $\beta$ ? $\beta$ ?-lactam antibiotics<sup>a</sup> (Continued)

<sup>a</sup>AB: *Acinetobacter baumanii*; bid: dose every 12 hours; CFR: cumulative fraction of response; CI: continuous infusion; Cr CI: creatinine clearance; EC: *Escherichia coli*; EUCAST: European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing; *f*: free drug fraction; KP: *Klebsiella pneumoniae*; MIC: minimal inhibitory concentration; MIC<sub>90</sub>: 90<sup>th</sup> percentileof MIC in a bacteria population; NCCLS: National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards; PA: *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*; PD: pharmacodynamics; PTA: probability of target attainment; qid: dose every 6 hours; SA: *Staphylococcus aureus*; T > MIC: time that antibiotic concentration is above bacteria MIC; tid: dose every 8 hours.

*aeruginosa* after <u>bolus</u> dosing, whilst with <u>continuous</u> <u>infusion</u> they were <u>100%</u> for <u>both</u> bacteria, despite the use of a small daily dose (2 g/day) [27].

#### Imipenem

In ICU patients, increased  $V_d$  and Cl of imipenem have also been reported (Table 1). Therefore, its  $T_{1/2}$  and T >MIC may be difficult to predict, depending on the relative changes of these two parameters. This difficulty was shown by Belzberg *et al.* [28] in a cohort of ICU surgical and trauma patients with presumed Gram-negative sepsis. In this relatively young population (mean age 45.2  $\pm$ 17 years and mean body weight 79.7  $\pm$  17.7 kg), 44% of patients presented trough levels lower than the intended 4 mg/L at steady state. A mean Cr Cl of 103.8 mL/minute was found, but with large variability: two patients had renal failure and nineteen patients had a Cr Cl >

# Table 3 Tissue penetration of $\beta\text{-lactams}^a$

Antibiotics	Samples	Patient demographics	Concentration ratios <sup>b</sup>	References
Muscle and subc	utaneous tissue			
Meropenem	Microdialysis in subcutaneous tissue	N = 10 severe sepsis, 5 continuous infusion	Bolus 0.44 Continuous infusion 0.57 (day 2)	Roberts <i>et al.,</i> 2009 [24]
Imipenem	Microdialysis in muscle and subcutaneous tissue	N = 11 (6 patients) Severe sepsis	Patients	Tegeder <i>et al.,</i> 2002 [32]
			Muscle 0.1	
			Subcutaneous 0.14	
			Volunteers	
			Muscle 0.5	
			Subcutaneous 0.43	
Imipenem	Microdialysis in muscle	N = 12 (6 patients) Severe sepsis	Patients 1 Volunteers 0.97	Dahyot <i>et al.,</i> 2008 [33]
Piperacillin	Microdialysis in muscle and subcutaneous tissue	N = 12 (6 patients) Septic shock	Patients	Joukhadar <i>et al.,</i> 2001 [44]
			Muscle 0.19	
			Subcutaneous 0.1	
			Volunteers	
			Muscle 0.55	
			Subcutaneous 0.31	
Piperacillin	Microdialysis in subcutaneous tissue	N = 13 Severe sepsis	Bolus 0.21 Continuous infusion 0.2	Roberts <i>et al.,</i> 2009 [45]
Cefpirome	Microdialysis in muscle	N = 18 (12 patients) Severe sepsis or septic shock	Patients 0.63 Volunteers 0.83	Joukhadar <i>et al.,</i> 2002 [52]
Cefpirome	Microdialysis in subcutaneous tissue	N = 18 (11 patients) Severe sepsis	Patients 0.43 Volunteers 0.79	Sauermann <i>et al.,</i> 2005 [51]
Burned skin				
Cefepime	Biopsy of burned area	N = 6 Burn patients	Day 3 1.52 (point concentration 3 to 5 hours after dose)	Sampol <i>et al.</i> , 2000 [61]
Peritoneum				
Meropenem	Microdialysis in peritoneum	N = 6 Surgical peritonitis	0.74	Karjagin <i>et al.</i> , 2008 [25]
Ceftazidime	Peritoneal drainage	N = 18 Surgical peritonitis	Day 2 • Continuous infusion 0.56 • Bolus 0.35	Buijk <i>et al.,</i> 2002 [74]
Imipenem	ELF (bronchoscopy)	N = 8 Pneumonia	0.20 (point concentration ratio 2 hours after dose)	Muller-Serieys <i>et al.,</i> 1987 [35]
Imipenem	Bronchial secretions (tracheal aspirate)	N = 10 Trauma patients with VAP	NR	McKindley <i>et al.,</i> 1996 [34]
Piperacillin	ELF (bronchoscopy)	N = 10 VAP	0.57 (point concentration ratio 5 hours after dose)	Boselli <i>et al.</i> , 2004 [41]
Piperacillin	ELF (bronchoscopy)	N = 40 VAP	0.44 (point concentration ratio 4 hours after dose)	Boselli <i>et al.</i> , 2008 [43]
Piperacillin	Bronchial secretions (tracheal aspirate)	N = 8 VAP	0.36	Jehl <i>et al.</i> , 1994 [42]
Cefepime	ELF (bronchoscopy)	N = 20 VAP	1.04 (point concentration ratio)	Boselli <i>et al.</i> , 2003 [63]
Cefepime or ceftazidime	Bronchial secretions (tracheal aspirate)	N = 5 cefepime VAP	Cefepime < 0.02	Klekner <i>et al.</i> , 2006 [62]
		N = 4 ceftazidime VAP	Ceftazidime < 0.05	
Ceftazidime	Bronchial secretions (tracheal aspirate)	N = 5 Pneumonia	0.12	Langer <i>et al.</i> , 1991 [76]
Ceftazidime	Bronchial secretions (tracheal aspirate)	N = 12 Nosocomial pneumonia	0.76	Bressolle <i>et al.</i> , 1992 [77]
Ceftazidime	ELF (bronchoscopy)	N = 15 VAP	0.21 (point concentration ratio at steady state)	Boselli <i>et al.</i> , 2004 [69]

<sup>a</sup>ELF: epithelial lining fluid; NR: not reported. <sup>b</sup>Mean area under the concentration time curve (AUC) tissue-to-plasma ratio unless otherwise stated.

120 mL/minute. Nevertheless, no correlation was found between PK parameters and body weight, severity of disease, blood pressure or renal function [28].

Another study compared meropenem and imipenem first-dose PK in patients with normal renal function (serum Cr < 1.5 mg/dL). Again, both  $V_d$  and Cl were significantly elevated, although more so in the meropenem group [29]. However, their T > MIC for sensitive isolated pathogens were similar. Again, there was a relationship between Cr Cl and T<sub>1/2</sub>: Patients with a Cr Cl < 50 mL/minute had a significantly longer T<sub>1/2</sub> for both antibiotics.

The PD efficacy of imipenem is also influenced by the dose and the time of infusion [30]. Using PK data from a cross-over steady-state study of VAP patients, Jaruratana-sirikul and Sudsai [30] showed by modelling of imipenem PD that, for a MIC of 4 mg/L, a 500-mg dose delivered every 6 hours (qid) for 30 minutes achieved a T > MIC of 64.7% and increased to 76.5% with a 2-hour infusion. However, this study excluded shock and renal failure patients (Cr Cl < 60 mL/minute). With PD modelling of PK data derived from another 20 VAP patients [31], continuous infusion led to improved PTA despite the use of lower dosages (Table 2). In this latter study, all patients had *f* imipenem T > MIC of 100%, but three patients died.

Tissue microdialysis had been used to assess imipenem PK, but with very dissimilar results (Table 3): namely, the tissue-to-plasma ratio. This has been found to be markedly depressed in a cohort of severe critically ill patients compared to healthy volunteers (subcutaneous tissue-to-plasma 0.14 vs. 0.43 and muscle tissueto-plasma 0.11 vs. 0.5, respectively) [32]. However, Dahyot *et al.* [33] disputed these results and found f imipenem in plasma and muscle to be virtually superimposed at any time, both in patients and in healthy volunteers. Some differences exist between these two studies. In the Tegeder et al. study [32], the patients had lower Cr Cl (medians 32.8 mL/minute vs. 156 mL/ minute) and samples were collected at steady state and not after the first dose. Moreover, Dahyot et al. [33] accounted only for the f imipenem in plasma and found higher imipenem  $V_d$  and Cl. Different methods of calculating in vivo microdialysis recovery rates may also explain some of the diverse observed results. Nevertheless, low imipenem penetration ratios, as low as 0.06 [34,35], in bronchial secretions were reported in pneumonia patients (Table 3).

#### Penicillins

#### Piperacillin

Similarly to other  $\beta$ -lactams, piperacillin  $V_d$  and Cl have generally been found to be <u>increased</u> in ICU patients (Table 1). However, most studies have <u>excluded</u> renal failure patients.

Piperacillin Cl and trough concentrations were strongly related to Cr Cl [36-38]. Taccone *et al.* [23] showed that only 15% of patients with high Cr Cl (> 50 mL/minute) maintained piperacillin concentrations  $\geq$ 50% of T > 4 × MIC after the first antibiotic dose, as opposed to 71% of patients with lower Cr Cl (P = 0.03). In contrast, in 10 young burn patients (mean total burned area 40.8 ± 3.1%) with a mean Cr Cl of 119.8 mL/minute and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infection, the authors found a 20% increase in T<sub>1/2</sub> after the first dose of antibiotic compared to the third day of therapy, which was related to a larger  $V_d$  (mean of 19.6 L vs. 16.4 L) [38]. Overall, the piperacillin AUC was similar in the two measurements (mean of 640 mg × hour/L vs. 622 mg × hour/L).

Piperacillin is <u>stable</u> for at <u>least 24 hours</u> at <u>room</u> temperature, making it a <u>suitable</u> choice for <u>continuous</u> infusion. With this strategy, <u>higher steady-state</u> concentrations are <u>expected</u>, theoretically providing a <u>higher T</u>  $\geq$  <u>MIC</u> even with the use of a lower daily dose [39]. A study by Rafati *et al.* [40] also <u>supports</u> this strategy. These authors showed that, for a MIC = 16 mg/L, the T > MIC was higher with <u>continuous</u> infusions (8 g/day) than with bolus dosing (3 g tid) (100% vs. 62%, respectively). However, the <u>mortality</u> rate was <u>similar</u>.

In VAP patients, piperacillin showed good penetration in bronchial secretions [41-43]. Nevertheless, its epithelial lining fluid (ELF) steady-state concentration was lower than the MIC for <u>Pseudomonas</u> aeruginosa after a 4.5-g tid dose [41]. With continuous infusion, an increase in pulmonary concentration was found, at least in the subset of patients with moderate renal failure (measured Cr Cl < 50 mL/minute), about three times higher than in the patients with normal renal function [43]. However, no relationship was found between <u>ELF</u> piperacillin <u>concentration</u> and <u>clinical success</u>. Similar concentrations were found in the eight patients who died or had persistent infections and in those who experienced therapeutic success [43].

Subcutaneous tissue-to-plasma ratio and PK have been assessed in microdialysis studies. In six septic shock patients (mean norepinephrine dose 0.8 µg/kg/minute) [44], the subcutaneous tissue-to-plasma AUC ratio was only 0.1, <u>one-third</u> of that measured in <u>healthy</u> volunteers. Peak tissue concentration was also delayed in patients (122 minutes in patients compared with 27 minutes in healthy volunteers), and  $T_{1/2}$  in tissues was nearly nine times longer. In 13 younger patients with less severe sepsis [45], the AUC tissue-to-plasma ratio was roughly 0.2. In accordance with their serum PK (as well as PK of another five patients) [46], piperacillin/ tazobactam CFR was calculated to be 92.3% with continuous infusion (13.5 g/day) and 53.4% with bolus dosing (4.5 g qid, or 18 g/day). Again, no correlation was found between tissue concentration and outcomes. Despite the low tissue concentration levels, all patients in both groups survived [45].

# Cephalosporins

#### Cefpirome

Cefpirome PK studies have produced heterogeneous results. A 2-g dose was adequate in young trauma patients (Cr Cl  $\geq$  50 mL/minute) and in similar healthy volunteers. After the first dose, the mean T >MIC were 75% and 80%, respectively (with a MIC of 4 mg/L, P = 0.76) [47]. However, in 12 similar patients, a lower T > MIC (60%) was found, which was probably related to higher cefpirome Cl [48]. After four days of therapy, the cefpirome mean PK parameters remained similar (T > MIC 67% and AUC 242 mg  $\times$ hour/L vs. 306 mg  $\times$  hour/L at steady state). Further analyses [49] showed a strong correlation between Cr Cl and either cefpirome or cefepime Cl ( $r^2 = 0.81$ ). Patients with the lower range of T > MIC had a higher Cr Cl, usually above 144 mL/minute [49]. According to these measured PK data, the authors performed a simulation to demonstrate improved CFR of cefpirome given as a continuous infusion to treat Pseudomonas aeruginosa infection, from 56.1% to 84.4% (Table 2) [50].

Cefpirome tissue PK were evaluated on the basis of microdialysis. Sauermann *et al.* [51] found a low subcutaneous tissue concentration in patients with severe sepsis, almost half of healthy volunteers, despite a longer plasma  $T_{1/2}$  (183 minutes vs. 95 minutes; P < 0.05). Similar results were reported by Joukhadar *et al.* [52], who found muscle-to-plasma ratios of 0.63 in patients and 0.83 in healthy volunteers (Table 3).

#### Cefepime

Roughly a twofold variation of cefepime  $V_d$  has been reported in PK studies (Table 1) of severe sepsis and septic shock patients [23], elderly septic patients [53], young burn patients [54] and nosocomial pneumonia patients [55]. Cefepime Cl has also been found to be closely correlated with Cr Cl in this last listed cohort ( $r^2$ = 0.77) [55], in another cohort of septic patients ( $r^2$  = 0.74) [56] and in burn patients ( $r^2$  = 0.58) [57]. Therefore, patients with renal dysfunction may experience toxicity.

In 21 septic patients receiving cefepime at a dose of 2 g bid, more than twofold peak variations and roughly 40-fold trough variations were observed. Again, the cefepime Cl correlated with Cr Cl ( $r^2 = 0.77$ ). Two patients with low Cr Cl (19 and 12 mL/minute) had trough levels > 20 mg/L despite dosage adjustment. They both had neurologic symptoms (namely, confusion and muscle jerks) that were not identified as toxicity but resolved promptly after drug arrest [55].

A cefepime bolus of 2 g bid was found to be insufficient to reach a high PD target after the first dose (Table 2), both in 80% of young burn patients (burn area 21.8%) with high mean Cr Cl (119.2 mL/minute) [54] and in the Taccone *et al.* study [23], in which only 16% of patients achieved the intended target.

Two other studies have evaluated cefepime PK, one of which addressed the first day of therapy for 55 nosocomial pneumonia or bacteraemia patients (67% trauma) [58] and the other of which described the status of 32 VAP patients on the second day of cefepime treatment [59]. Both studies unveiled a relationship between  $V_d$  and total body weight as well as between excretion, either elimination rate constant [59] or Cl [58], and Cr Cl. However, significant interpatient variability was again observed, with regard to both cefepime Cl (58%) and central compartment  $V_d$  (67%) [58].

A PD model was developed with this VAP population PK data: despite a 2-g tid dose, PTA > 90% was achieved only with a MIC  $\leq$  8 mg/L [59]. In another cefepime PD model, the CFR of a 2-g bid dose, used to treat both *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, was 78.9%. However, for *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, CFR was only 53.6% (Table 2) and increased with either 2 g tid or continuous infusion (4 g/day or 6 g/day) to 84.9%, 91.7% and 94.8% respectively. Nevertheless, the CFR for *Acinetobacter baumanii* [60], even with a continuous infusion of 6 g/day, was only 75%, reemphasizing the importance of appropriate dosing and the potential benefit of continuous infusion against difficult-to-treat bacteria.

Also, the cefepime tissue concentration was assessed in biopsy samples collected from the skin of burn patients three to five hours after a bolus dose on day 3 of antibiotic therapy. A mean biopsy-to-plasma cefepime ratio of 1.5 (range 0.4 to 5.1) was found [61]. Klekner et al. [62] were unable to detect cefepime in bronchial secretions from any of the five studied patients six hours after an 80 mg/kg dose. However, using continuous infusion (4 g/day) to treat VAP patients, Boselli et al. [63] found, at steady state, higher and similar plasma and ELF concentrations (mean of 13.5 mg/L and 14.1 mg/L, respectively). Although different sampling methods may have influenced these differences, continuous infusion seems to prolong T > MIC in the lungs. Nevertheless, no correlation with therapeutic outcomes was reported.

#### Ceftazidime

Several studies have shown ceftazidime PK heterogeneity in ICU septic patients with *Pseudomonas* infections (mostly nosocomial pneumonia) [64], severe sepsis [65,66] and burns [54]. Similarly to other  $\beta$ -lactams, the authors noted a large variation of both  $V_d$  and Cl (Table 1) and consequently significant interpatient variability in  $T_{1/2}$  and trough concentrations. Also, a correlation between Cl and Cr Cl was usually reported [65,66].

Continuous infusion of ceftazidime was compared with bolus dosing in five different studies [67-71]. In all, there was an increase in T > MIC with continuous infusion despite lower daily doses. However, only in severe melioidosis was this strategy associated with lower mortality (3 of 10 patients vs. 9 of 11 patients) [71]. Those patients had low Cr Cl (26.6 mL/minute) and received ceftazidime dosages adjusted to their body weight (4 mg/kg/hour or 40 mg/kg tid, for a mean body weight of 49.4 kg). Ceftazidime steady-state concentration was measured in another cohort of 92 patients receiving continuous infusions [72]. Therapeutic drug monitoring was performed on the second day of therapy. The mean serum concentration was 46.9 mg/L, but again with a very wide range of serum concentrations (7.4 to 162.3) mg/L). Therefore, dosage modification was common because of low serum levels (36.9%) and high serum levels (27.2%), with the latter being associated with lower Cr Cl (mean of 51 mL/minute compared with 103 mL/minute for patients with low serum levels). Similar results were shown in another large ceftazidime PK study assessing a mixed septic population with a higher mean Cr Cl (123 mL/minute) [73]. The lower T > MICwas found in patients with the higher Cr Cl, especially after bolus dosing (Table 2).

Continuous infusion of ceftazidime (4.5 g/day) was also associated with a higher peritoneal AUC at day 2 compared to bolus dosing (1.5 g tid) in surgical patients with peritonitis (522 mg × hour/L vs. 316 mg × hour/L; P = 0.01) [74], despite similar serum AUC (and Cr Cl > 30 mL/minute). Therefore, although serum T > 4 × MIC was > 90% in all patients, peritoneal T > 4 × MIC was still > 90% with continuous infusion but only 44% with bolus dosing. Nevertheless, no difference in mortality was noted (25% vs. 33%; P = 1.0). A PD model of ceftazidime in ICU patients also showed higher PTA with continuous infusion (100% for MIC  $\leq$  8 mg/L) than with bolus dosing [75].

Ceftazidime concentration in bronchial secretions was measured in four studies of VAP patients. Very low concentrations, < 0.5 mg/L and < 0.3 mg/L, were found in two of them [62,76]. Bressole *et al.* [77] found a higher ratio between bronchial secretions and plasma concentration (0.76) in patients infected after abdominal surgery. A longer  $T_{1/2}$  (6.1 hours) and a lower Cl (4.2 L/hour) may explain some of these differences. With continuous infusion, a ratio of 0.21 between ELF and serum was observed [69].

#### Discussion

In our systematic review, we have aggregated information from 57 prospective studies related to the PK of  $\beta$ -

lactam antibiotics, which are among the most often agents used to treat sepsis in ICU patients [78]. Overall, an <u>increased</u>  $V_d$  of all the studied antibiotics was reported (Figure 3), which was <u>related</u> to total body weight [58,73], but with significant <u>variability</u>. Drug <u>Cl</u> was also <u>increased</u> and usually <u>related</u> to <u>Cr Cl</u>. Those changes were largely <u>unpredictable</u>, with important interpatient <u>variability</u>. However, the higher Cl values were noted in studies that <u>excluded</u> patients with <u>renal</u> <u>dysfunction</u>, a common strategy, which may limit the interpretation of the data reported.

Therapeutic drug monitoring was rarely performed. In addition, data on the daily variation of PK parameters in ICU patients, as well as the ideal frequency of this monitoring, are currently limited. Nevertheless, two of the reviewed studies [55,72] showed that inadequate dosing may be common in this population and may jeopardize  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics efficacy or even lead to toxicity [79]. Roberts et al. [80] measured piperacillin/tazobactam concentrations and found that 50.4% of patients first measurement were low. The clinical efficacy of using drug levels to achieve adeguate concentrations had never been properly evaluated. In a recent study, PD modelling was used to empirically treat 94 VAP in critically ill patients at high risk of infection with antibiotic-resistant Pseudomonas aeruginosa [81]. A three-hour infusion regimen of either cefepime or meropenem at a high dosage (2 g tid) was initiated, followed by both antibiotic and dose de-escalation whenever bacteria with a low MIC were identified. The infection-related mortality decreased from 21.6% to 8.5% (P = 0.029).

The PD targets of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics may be different in patients with severe bacterial infections. McKinnon et al. [82] evaluated ceftazidime and cefepime PD by using PK data from previous clinical trials [83]. Maintaining a T > MIC as high as <u>100%</u> was associated with a significantly greater clinical cure and bacteriologic eradication than a shorter time (cefatzidime: 82% vs. 33%, P = 0.002; cefepime: 97% vs. 44%, P = 0.001). Also, in a febrile neutropenia population of 60 patients treated with meropenem, a calculated T > MIC of 83% was found in responders, whilst those with a poor clinical response had a T > MIC of only 60% [84]. It has also been suggested that, at least in vivo, maximum killing of bacteria is achieved at higher concentrations, four to five times MIC [85], accounting for antibiotic penetration in infected tissues. As such, concentrations of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics may need to be maintained well above the MIC for extended periods, especially in patients with life-threatening infections. Accordingly, different PD targets have been proposed in the different studies addressing ICU patients, which sometimes make their comparison difficult.

An <u>improved</u> PD profile of  $\beta$ -lactams may be obtained by promoting a <u>longer</u> exposure with more frequent dosing, <u>extended infusions</u> or <u>continuous</u> infusions [86,87]. Several of the <u>studies</u> that we reviewed reported PD <u>benefits</u> of <u>continuous</u> infusions (even using small daily doses) (Table 2). Also, PD <u>modelling</u> tends to <u>support</u> this strategy. Nevertheless, almost <u>none</u> of the studies addressed reported a <u>decrease</u> in <u>mortality</u>. In addition, a recently published <u>meta-analysis</u> of 14 prospective studies did <u>not</u> show a significant <u>benefit</u> of using this strategy (odds ratio 1.00, 95% confidence interval 0.48 to 2.06; P = 1.00) [88].

An increasing number of studies have addressed  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotic tissue concentration. Despite the theoretical advantage of analysing the drug concentration at the site of infection, there are <u>no data to support</u> a relationship between these <u>concentrations</u> and <u>outcomes</u>. Furthermore, there are still <u>controversial</u> issues involved in interpreting these data, namely, microdialysis [32,33]. Therefore, we think that, at <u>present</u>, <u>no recommendation</u> can be made regarding antibiotic tissue <u>PK</u>.

#### Conclusions

The PK of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics are significantly changed in septic ICU patients. Dosage and schedule regimens based on data from healthy volunteers may be misleading. Therapeutic drug monitoring and PD modelling according to measured PK previously showed promising results. Continuous infusion, although theoretically useful, has not been shown to lead to improved outcomes. The clinical significance of tissue PK monitoring remains to be determined.

#### Key messages

- Among ICU patients, the  $\underline{PK}$  of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics are markedly unpredictable.

• A <u>large volume</u> of <u>distribution</u> is <u>commonly</u> observed in ICU patients and contributes to a <u>lower</u> antibiotic <u>concentration</u>, but also to a <u>greater exposure</u> time.

• An <u>increased</u> glomerular filtration rate is usually associated with a <u>short</u> half-life of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics, whilst <u>renal failure</u> is associated with a <u>greater</u> exposure and increased risk of <u>accumulation</u>.

• Continuous infusion of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics commonly increases the time that the antibiotic concentration exceeds its <u>MIC</u> and may therefore increase efficacy.

• The rapeutic drug monitoring of  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotic concentration may help to improve its efficacy and prevent toxicity, but currently is unavailable in most clinical settings.

#### Abbreviations

AUC: area under the concentration time curve; bid: dose every 12 hours; CFR: cumulative fraction of response; CI: drug clearance; Cr CI: creatinine clearance; ELF: epithelial lining fluid; *f*. free drug fraction; *K*<sub>el</sub>: elimination rate constant; MIC: minimum inhibitory concentration; MIC<sub>90</sub>: 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of MIC in a bacteria population; PD: pharmacodynamics; PK: pharmacokinetics; PTA: probability of target attainment; qid: dose every six hours; T<sub>1/2</sub>: half-life; tid: dose every eight hours; T > MIC: antibiotic concentration time over bacteria MIC; VAP: ventilator-associated pneumonia; *V*<sub>d</sub>: volume of distribution.

#### Author details

<sup>1</sup>Polyvalent Intensive Care Unit, São Francisco Xavier Hospital, Estrada do Forte do Alto do Duque, 1449-005 Lisboa, Portugal. <sup>2</sup>CEDOC, Faculty of Medical Sciences, New University of Lisbon, Campo dos Mártires da Pátria, 130, 1169-056 Lisboa, Portugal.

#### Authors' contributions

Both JGP and PP searched the literature, analysed the data and wrote the manuscript. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript for publication.

#### **Competing interests**

JGP has received honoraria from and served as an advisor for Pfizer, AstraZeneca, Gilead Sciences Inc., Abbott Laboratories, Wyeth Lederle, Janssen-Cilag and Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. JGP also has received an unrestricted research grant from AstraZeneca. PP has received honoraria from and served as an advisor for AstraZeneca, Ely Lilly and Co., Gilead Sciences Inc., Janssen-Cilag, Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., Novartis and Pfizer Inc.

#### Received: 30 May 2011 Revised: 28 June 2011 Accepted: 13 September 2011 Published: 13 September 2011

#### References

- 1. Brun-Buisson C: The epidemiology of the systemic inflammatory response. Intensive Care Med 2000, 26(Suppl 1):S64-S74.
- Vincent JL, Rello J, Marshall J, Silva E, Anzueto A, Martin CD, Moreno R, Lipman J, Gomersall C, Sakr Y, EPIC II Group of Investigators: International study of the prevalence and outcomes of infection in intensive care units. JAMA 2009, 302:2323-2329.
- Póvoa P: Serum markers in community-acquired pneumonia and ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Curr Opin Infect Dis* 2008, 21:157-162.
- 4. Craig WA: Basic pharmacodynamics of antibacterials with clinical applications to the use of  $\beta$ -lactams, glycopeptides, and linezolid. Infect Dis Clin North Am 2003, 17:479-501.
- Estes L: Review of pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of antimicrobial agents. *Mayo Clin Proc* 1998, 73:1114-1122.
- Pea F, Viale P, Furlanut M: Antimicrobial therapy in critically ill patients: a review of pathophysiological conditions responsible for altered disposition and pharmacokinetic variability. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 2005, 44:1009-1034.
- Mehrotra R, De Gaudio R, Palazzo M: Antibiotic pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic considerations in critical illness. *Intensive Care Med* 2004, 30:2145-2156.
- Fuster-Lluch O, Gerónimo-Pardo M, Peyró-García R, Lizán-García M: Glomerular hyperfiltration and albuminuria in critically ill patients. Anaesth Intensive Care 2008, 36:674-680.
- Baptista JP, Udy AA, Sousa E, Pimentel J, Wang L, Roberts JA, Lipman J: A comparison of estimates of glomerular filtration in critically ill patients with augmented renal clearance. *Crit Care* 2011, 15:R139.
- 10. Verdant C, De Backer D: How monitoring of the microcirculation may help us at the bedside. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2005, 11:240-244.
- 11. Levitt DG: The pharmacokinetics of the interstitial space in humans. *BMC Clin Pharmacol* 2003, **3**:3.
- Triginer C, Izquierdo I, Fernandez R, Rello J, Torrent J, Benito S, Net A: Gentamicin volume of distribution in critically ill septic patients. Intensive Care Med 1990, 16:303-306.
- Hansen M, Christrup LL, Jarløv JO, Kampmann JP, Bonde J: Gentamicin dosing in critically ill patients. Acta Anaesthesiol Scand 2001, 45:734-740.

- Roberts JA, Lipman J: Antibacterial dosing in intensive care: pharmacokinetics, degree of disease and pharmacodynamics of sepsis. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 2006, 45:755-773.
- 15. Drusano GL: Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of antimicrobials. *Clin Infect Dis* 2007, **45(Suppl 1)**:S89-S95.
- Mouton JW: Impact of pharmacodynamics on breakpoint selection for susceptibility testing. Infect Dis Clin North Am 2003, 17:579-598.
- Choi G, Gomersall CD, Tian Q, Joynt GM, Li AM, Lipman J: Principles of antibacterial dosing in continuous renal replacement therapy. *Blood Purif* 2010, 30:195-212.
- 18. Shah PM: Parenteral carbapenems. Clin Microbiol Infect 2008, 14:175-180.
- de Stoppelaar F, Stolk L, van Tiel F, Beysens A, van der Geest S, de Leeuw P: Meropenem pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia. J Antimicrob Chemother 2000, 46:150-151.
- Jaruratanasirikul S, Sriwiriyajan S, Punyo J: Comparison of the pharmacodynamics of meropenem in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia following administration by 3-hour infusion or bolus injection. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2005, 49:1337-1339.
- Kitzes-Cohen R, Farin D, Piva G, De Myttenaere-Bursztein SA: Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of meropenem in critically ill patients. Int J Antimicrob Agents 2002, 19:105-110.
- Lovering AM, Vickery CJ, Watkin DS, Leaper D, McMullin CM, White LO, Reeves DS, MacGowan AP: The pharmacokinetics of meropenem in surgical patients with moderate or severe infections. J Antimicrob Chemother 1995, 36:165-172.
- Taccone FS, Laterre PF, Dugernier T, Spapen H, Delattre I, Witebolle X, De Backer D, Layeux B, Wallemacq P, Vincent JL, Jacobs F: Insufficient βlactam concentrations in the early phase of severe sepsis and septic shock. Crit Care 2010, 14:R126.
- Roberts JA, Kirkpatrick CM, Roberts MS, Robertson TA, Dalley AJ, Lipman J: Meropenem dosing in critically ill patients with sepsis and without renal dysfunction: intermittent bolus versus continuous administration? Monte Carlo dosing simulations and subcutaneous tissue distribution. J Antimicrob Chemother 2009, 64:142-150.
- Karjagin J, Lefeuvre S, Oselin K, Kipper K, Marchand S, Tikkerberi A, Starkopf J, Couet W, Sawchuk RJ: Pharmacokinetics of meropenem determined by microdialysis in the peritoneal fluid of patients with severe peritonitis associated with septic shock. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2008, 83:452-459.
- Rhomberg PR, Jones RN: Contemporary activity of meropenem and comparator broad-spectrum agents: MYSTIC program report from the United States component (2005). *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis* 2007, 57:207-215.
- Thalhammer F, Traunmüller F, El Menyawi I, Frass M, Hollenstein UM, Locker GJ, Stoiser B, Staudinger T, Thalhammer-Scherrer R, Burgmann H: Continuous infusion versus intermittent administration of meropenem in critically ill patients. J Antimicrob Chemother 1999, 43:523-527.
- Belzberg H, Zhu J, Cornwell EE, Murray JA, Sava J, Salim A, Velmahos GC, Gill MA: Imipenem levels are not predictable in the critically ill patient. J Trauma 2004, 56:111-117.
- Novelli A, Adembri C, Livi P, Fallani S, Mazzei T, De Gaudio AR: Pharmacokinetic evaluation of meropenem and imipenem in critically ill patients with sepsis. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 2005, 44:539-549.
- Jaruratanasirikul S, Sudsai T: Comparison of the pharmacodynamics of imipenem in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia following administration by 2 or 0.5 h infusion. J Antimicrob Chemother 2009, 63:560-563.
- Sakka SG, Glauner AK, Bulitta JB, Kinzig-Schippers M, Pfister W, Drusano GL, Sörgel F: Population pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of continuous versus short-term infusion of imipenem-cilastatin in critically ill patients in a randomized, controlled trial. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2007, 51:3304-3310.
- Tegeder I, Schmidtko A, Bräutigam L, Kirschbaum A, Geisslinger G, Lötsch J: Tissue distribution of imipenem in critically ill patients. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2002, 71:325-333.
- Dahyot C, Marchand S, Bodin M, Debeane B, Mimoz O, Couet W: Application of basic pharmacokinetic concepts to analysis of microdialysis data: illustration with imipenem muscle distribution. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 2008, 47:181-189.

- McKindley DS, Boucher BA, Hess MM, Croce MA, Fabian TC: Pharmacokinetics of aztreonam and imipenem in critically ill patients with pneumonia. *Pharmacotherapy* 1996, 16:924-931.
- Muller-Serieys C, Bergogne-Berezin E, Rowan C, Dombret MC: Imipenem penetration into bronchial secretions. J Antimicrob Chemother 1987, 20:618-619.
- Shikuma LR, Ackerman BH, Weaver RH, Solem LD, Strate RG, Cerra FB, Zaske DE: Effects of treatment and the metabolic response to injury on drug clearance: a prospective study with piperacillin. Crit Care Med 1990, 18:37-41.
- Conil JM, Georges B, Mimoz O, Dieye E, Ruiz S, Cougot P, Samii K, Houin G, Saivin S: Influence of renal function on trough serum concentrations of piperacillin in intensive care unit patients. *Intensive Care Med* 2006, 32:2063-2066.
- Bourget P, Lesne-Hulin A, Le Reveillé R, Le Bever H, Carsin H: Clinical pharmacokinetics of piperacillin-tazobactam combination in patients with major burns and signs of infection. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 1996, 40:139-145.
- Langgartner J, Lehn N, Glück T, Herzig H, Kees F: Comparison of the pharmacokinetics of piperacillin and sulbactam during intermittent and continuous intravenous infusion. *Chemotherapy* 2007, 53:370-377.
- Rafati MR, Rouini MR, Mojtahedzadeh M, Najafi A, Tavakoli H, Gholami K, Fazeli MR: Clinical efficacy of continuous infusion of piperacillin compared with intermittent dosing in septic critically ill patients. Int J Antimicrob Agents 2006, 28:122-127.
- Boselli E, Breilh D, Cannesson M, Xuereb F, Rimmelé T, Chassard D, Saux MC, Allaouchiche B: Steady-state plasma and intrapulmonary concentrations of piperacillin/tazobactam 4 g/0.5 g administered to critically ill patients with severe nosocomial pneumonia. Intensive Care Med 2004, 30:976-979.
- Jehl F, Muller-Serieys C, de Larminat V, Monteil H, Bergogne-Berezin E: Penetration of piperacillin-tazobactam into bronchial secretions after multiple doses to intensive care patients. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 1994, 38:2780-2784.
- Boselli E, Breilh D, Rimmelé T, Guillaume C, Xuereb F, Saux MC, Bouvet L, Chassard D, Allaouchiche B: Alveolar concentrations of piperacillin/ tazobactam administered in continuous infusion to patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Crit Care Med* 2008, 36:1500-1506.
- 44. Joukhadar C, Frossard M, Mayer BX, Brunner M, Klein N, Siostrzonek P, Eichler HG, Müller M: Impaired target site penetration of β-lactams may account for therapeutic failure in patients with septic shock. *Crit Care Med* 2001, 29:385-391.
- Roberts JA, Roberts MS, Robertson TA, Dalley AJ, Lipman J: Piperacillin penetration into tissue of critically ill patients with sepsis: bolus versus continuous administration? *Crit Care Med* 2009, 37:926-933.
- 46. Roberts JA, Kirkpatrick CM, Roberts MS, Dalley AJ, Lipman J: First-dose and steady-state population pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of piperacillin by continuous or intermittent dosing in critically ill patients with sepsis. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2009, **35**:156-163.
- Jacolot A, Incagnoli P, Edouard AR, Tod M, Petitjean O, Samii K, Mimoz O: Pharmacokinetics of cefpirome during the posttraumatic systemic inflammatory response syndrome. *Intensive Care Med* 1999, 25:486-491.
- Lipman J, Wallis SC, Rickard CM, Fraenkel D: Low cefpirome levels during twice daily dosing in critically ill septic patients: pharmacokinetic modelling calls for more frequent dosing. *Intensive Care Med* 2001, 27:363-370.
- Lipman J, Wallis SC, Boots RJ: Cefepime versus cefpirome: the importance of creatinine clearance. *Anesth Analg* 2003, 97:1149-1154.
- 50. Roos JF, Lipman J, Kirkpatrick CM: Population pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of cefpirome in critically ill patients against Gramnegative bacteria. *Intensive Care Med* 2007, **33**:781-788.
- Sauermann R, Delle-Karth G, Marsik C, Steiner I, Zeitlinger M, Mayer-Helm BX, Georgopoulos A, Müller M, Joukhadar C: Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of cefpirome in subcutaneous adipose tissue of septic patients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2005, 49:650-655.
- Joukhadar C, Klein N, Mayer BX, Kreischitz N, Delle-Karth G, Palkovits P, Heinz G, Müller M: Plasma and tissue pharmacokinetics of cefpirome in patients with sepsis. *Crit Care Med* 2002, 30:1478-1482.
- Kieft H, Hoepelman AI, Knupp CA, van Dijk A, Branger JM, Struyvenberg A, Verhoef J: Pharmacokinetics of cefepime in patients with the sepsis syndrome. J Antimicrob Chemother 1993, 32(Suppl B):117-122.

- Conil JM, Georges B, Lavit M, Seguin T, Tack I, Samii K, Chabanon G, Houin G, Saivin S: Pharmacokinetics of ceftazidime and cefepime in burn patients: the importance of age and creatinine clearance. *Int J Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2007, 45:529-538.
- Chapuis TM, Giannoni E, Majcherczyk PA, Chioléro R, Schaller MD, Berger MM, Bolay S, Décosterd LA, Bugnon D, Moreillon P: Prospective monitoring of cefepime in intensive care unit adult patients. *Crit Care* 2010, 14:R51.
- Lipman J, Wallis SC, Rickard C: Low plasma cefepime levels in critically ill septic patients: pharmacokinetic modeling indicates improved troughs with revised dosing. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 1999, 43:2559-2561.
- Bonapace CR, White RL, Friedrich LV, Norcross ED, Bosso JA: Pharmacokinetics of cefepime in patients with thermal burn injury. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 1999, 43:2848-2854.
- Georges B, Conil JM, Seguin T, Dieye E, Cougot P, Decun JF, Lavit M, Samii K, Houin G, Saivin S: Cefepime in intensive care unit patients: validation of a population pharmacokinetic approach and influence of covariables. Int J Clin Pharmacol Ther 2008, 46:157-164.
- Nicasio AM, Ariano RE, Zelenitsky SA, Kim A, Crandon JL, Kuti JL, Nicolau DP: Population pharmacokinetics of high-dose, prolongedinfusion cefepime in adult critically ill patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2009, 53:1476-1481.
- Roos JF, Bulitta J, Lipman J, Kirkpatrick CM: Pharmacokineticpharmacodynamic rationale for cefepime dosing regimens in intensive care units. J Antimicrob Chemother 2006, 58:987-993.
- Sampol E, Jacquet A, Viggiano M, Bernini V, Manelli JC, Lacarelle B, Durand A: Plasma, urine and skin pharmacokinetics of cefepime in burns patients. J Antimicrob Chemother 2000, 46:315-317.
- Klekner A, Bágyi K, Bognár L, Gáspár A, Andrási M, Szabó J: Effectiveness of cephalosporins in the sputum of patients with nosocomial bronchopneumonia. J Clin Microbiol 2006, 44:3418-3421.
- Boselli E, Breilh D, Duflo F, Saux MC, Debon R, Chassard D, Allaouchiche B: Steady-state plasma and intrapulmonary concentrations of cefepime administered in continuous infusion in critically ill patients with severe nosocomial pneumonia. *Crit Care Med* 2003, 31:2102-2106.
- Rondanelli R, Dionigi RV, Regazzi MB, Maurelli M, Calvi M, Mapelli A: Ceftazidime in the treatment of Pseudomonas infections in intensivecare patients. Int J Clin Pharmacol Ther Toxicol 1986, 24:457-459.
- Young RJ, Lipman J, Gin T, Gomersall CD, Joynt GM, Oh TE: Intermittent bolus dosing of ceftazidime in critically ill patients. J Antimicrob Chemother 1997, 40:269-273.
- Gómez CM, Cordingly JJ, Palazzo MG: Altered pharmacokinetics of ceftazidime in critically ill patients. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 1999, 43:1798-1802.
- Benko AS, Cappelletty DM, Kruse JA, Rybak MJ: Continuous infusion versus intermittent administration of ceftazidime in critically ill patients with suspected gram-negative infections. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 1996, 40:691-695.
- Lipman J, Gomersall CD, Gin T, Joynt GM, Young RJ: Continuous infusion ceftazidime in intensive care: a randomized controlled trial. J Antimicrob Chemother 1999, 43:309-311.
- Boselli E, Breilh D, Rimmelé T, Poupelin JC, Saux MC, Chassard D, Allaouchiche B: Plasma and lung concentrations of ceftazidime administered in continuous infusion to critically ill patients with severe nosocomial pneumonia. Intensive Care Med 2004, 30:989-991.
- Hanes SD, Wood GC, Herring V, Croce MA, Fabian TC, Pritchard E, Boucher BA: Intermittent and continuous ceftazidime infusion for critically ill trauma patients. Am J Surg 2000, 179:436-440.
- Angus BJ, Smith MD, Suputtamongkol Y, Mattie H, Walsh AL, Wuthiekanun V, Chaowagul W, White NJ: Pharmacokineticpharmacodynamic evaluation of ceftazidime continuous infusion vs intermittent bolus injection in septicaemic melioidosis. Br J Clin Pharmacol 2000, 50:184-191.
- Aubert G, Carricajo A, Coudrot M, Guyomarc'h S, Auboyer C, Zeni F: Prospective determination of serum ceftazidime concentrations in intensive care units. *Ther Drug Monit* 2010, 32:517-519.
- Georges B, Conil JM, Seguin T, Ruiz S, Minville V, Cougot P, Decun JF, Gonzalez H, Houin G, Fourcade O, Saivin S: Population pharmacokinetics of ceftazidime in intensive care unit patients: influence of glomerular filtration rate, mechanical ventilation, and reason for admission. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2009, 53:4483-4489.

- Buijk SL, Gyssens IC, Mouton JW, Van Vliet A, Verbrugh HA, Bruining HA: Pharmacokinetics of ceftazidime in serum and peritoneal exudate during continuous versus intermittent administration to patients with severe intra-abdominal infections. J Antimicrob Chemother 2002, 49:121-128.
- Mouton JW, Punt N, Vinks AA: A retrospective analysis using Monte Carlo simulation to evaluate recommended ceftazidime dosing regimens in healthy volunteers, patients with cystic fibrosis, and patients in the intensive care unit. *Clin Ther* 2005, 27:762-772.
- Langer M, Cantoni P, Bellosta C, Boccazzi A: Penetration of ceftazidime into bronchial secretions in critically ill patients. J Antimicrob Chemother 1991, 28:925-932.
- Bressolle F, de La Coussaye JE, Ayoub R, Fabre D, Gomeni R, Saissi G, Eledjam JJ, Galtier M: Endotracheal and aerosol administrations of ceftazidime in patients with nosocomial pneumonia: pharmacokinetics and absolute bioavailability. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 1992, 36:1404-1411.
- Fridkin SK, Steward CD, Edwards JR, Pryor ER, McGowan JE Jr, Archibald LK, Gaynes RP, Tenover FC, Project Intensive Care Antimicrobial Resistance Epidemiology (ICARE) Hospitals: Surveillance of antimicrobial use and antimicrobial resistance in United States hospitals: Project ICARE Phase 2. Clin Infect Dis 1999, 29:245-252.
- Chatellier D, Jourdain M, Mangalaboyi J, Ader F, Chopin C, Derambure P, Fourrier F: Cefepime-induced neurotoxicity: an underestimated complication of antibiotherapy in patients with acute renal failure. *Intensive Care Med* 2002, 28:214-217.
- Roberts JA, Ulldemolins M, Roberts MS, McWhinney B, Ungerer J, Paterson DL, Lipman J: Therapeutic drug monitoring of β-lactams in critically ill patients: proof of concept. Int J Antimicrob Agents 2010, 36:332-339.
- Nicasio AM, Eagye KJ, Nicolau DP, Shore E, Palter M, Pepe J, Kuti JL: Pharmacodynamic-based clinical pathway for empiric antibiotic choice in patients with ventilator-associated pneumonia. J Crit Care 2010, 25:69-77.
- McKinnon PS, Paladino JA, Schentag JJ: Evaluation of area under the inhibitory curve (AUIC) and time above the minimum inhibitory concentration (T > MIC) as predictors of outcome for cefepime and ceftazidime in serious bacterial infections. Int J Antimicrob Agents 2008, 31:345-351.
- Gentry LO, Rodriguez-Gomez G: Randomized comparison of cefepime and ceftazidime for treatment of skin, surgical wound, and complicated urinary tract infections in hospitalized subjects. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 1991, 35:2371-2374.
- Ariano RE, Nyhlén A, Donnelly JP, Sitar DS, Harding GK, Zelenitsky SA: Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of meropenem in febrile neutropenic patients with bacteremia. Ann Pharmacother 2005, 39:32-38.
- Mouton JW, Vinks AA, Punt NC: Pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic modeling of activity of ceftazidime during continuous and intermittent infusion. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 1997, 41:733-738.
- Nicolau DP: Pharmacodynamic optimization of β-lactams in the patient care setting. Crit Care 2008, 12:S2.
- Kasiakou SK, Sermaides GJ, Michalopoulos A, Soteriades ES, Falagas ME: Continuous versus intermittent intravenous administration of antibiotics: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2005, 5:581-589.
- Roberts JA, Webb S, Paterson D, Ho KM, Lipman J: A systematic review on clinical benefits of continuous administration of β-lactam antibiotics. *Crit Care Med* 2009, 37:2071-2078.
- Ljungberg B, Nilsson-Ehle I: Pharmacokinetics of meropenem and its metabolite in young and elderly healthy men. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 1992, 36:1437-1440.
- Drusano GL, Standiford HC, Bustamante C, Forrest A, Rivera G, Leslie J, Tatem B, Delaportas D, MacGregor RR, Schimpff SC: Multiple-dose pharmacokinetics of imipenem-cilastatin. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 1984, 26:715-721.
- Paradis D, Vallée F, Allard S, Bisson C, Daviau N, Drapeau C, Auger F, LeBel M: Comparative study of pharmacokinetics and serum bactericidal activities of cefpirome, ceftazidime, ceftriaxone, imipenem, and ciprofloxacin. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 1992, 36:2085-2092.
- 92. Barbhaiya RH, Forgue ST, Gleason CR, Knupp CA, Pittman KA, Weidler DJ, Movahhed H, Tenney J, Martin RR: Pharmacokinetics of cefepime after

single and multiple intravenous administrations in healthy subjects. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 1992, **36**:552-557.

93. Dawson-Saunders B, Trapp RG: *Basic & Clinical Biostatistics.* 2 edition. Chicago: Appleton & Lange; 1994.

#### doi:10.1186/cc10441

Cite this article as: Gonçalves-Pereira and Póvoa: Antibiotics in critically ill patients: a systematic review of the pharmacokinetics of  $\beta$ -lactams. *Critical Care* 2011 15:R206.

# Submit your next manuscript to BioMed Central and take full advantage of:

- Convenient online submission
- Thorough peer review
- No space constraints or color figure charges
- Immediate publication on acceptance
- Inclusion in PubMed, CAS, Scopus and Google Scholar

**BioMed** Central

• Research which is freely available for redistribution

Submit your manuscript at www.biomedcentral.com/submit