**Comparison of the In-House Made Carba-NP and Blue-Carba Tests:
Considerations for Better Detection of Carbapenemase-producing
*Enterobacteriaceae***

João Pires,^{1,2} Regula Tinguely,¹ Bodmer Thomas,³
Francesco Luzzaro,⁴ and Andrea Endimiani^{1*}

¹ Institute for Infectious Diseases, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland; ² Graduate
School for Cellular and Biomedical Sciences, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland;
³ labormedizinisches zentrum Dr Risch, Department of Medical Microbiology, Bern-
Liebelfeld, Switzerland; ⁴ Laboratory of Microbiology, A. Manzoni Hospital, Lecco,
Italy

Running title: In-house made Carba-NP *versus* Blue-Carba test

Keywords: Carbapenemases, carbapenems, diagnostics, MIC, *Klebsiella*, OXA-48,
NDM, VIM, MBL

***Corresponding authors:**

Prof. Andrea Endimiani MD, PhD
Institute for Infectious Diseases, University of Bern
Friedbühlstrasse 51, CH-3010, Bern, Switzerland
Phone: +41-31-632-8632; Fax: +41-31-632-8766

Emails: andrea.endimiani@ifik.unibe.ch; aendimiani@gmail.com

26

27 **ABSTRACT**

28 The in-house Carba-NP and Blue-Carba tests were compared using 30 carbapenemase-
29 and 33 non-producing *Enterobacteriaceae*. Tests were read by three operators. 100%
30 sensitivity was reported for both tests, but Carba-NP was slightly more specific than
31 Blue-Carba (98.9% vs. 91.7%). We describe potential sources of error during tests'
32 preparation and reading.

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

The continuous worldwide expansion of carbapenemase-producing *Enterobacteriaceae* (CPE) is a serious concern as infections caused by these pathogens have an increased mortality, morbidity, and associated health-care costs (Tängdén and Giske, 2015). Treatment options for CPE infections are often limited, since these organisms usually co-carry resistant determinants to other classes of antibiotics (Tängdén and Giske, 2015). Moreover, the heterogeneity of carbapenemase classes and types leads to a multiplicity of diverse carbapenem hydrolytic efficiencies and resistance phenotypes (Hrabák et al., 2014, Tängdén and Giske, 2015). Since carbapenem resistance mediated by carbapenemase production is continuously rising in *Enterobacteriaceae*, rapid, inexpensive, and reliable methods are urgently needed to identify CPE (Dortet et al., 2014).

Carba-NP and Blue-Carba are recent quick biochemical methods that detect carbapenemase activity when the enzyme breaks imipenem's β -lactam ring, leading to a pH decrease and consequent color shift of the pH-indicator in solution (Nordmann et al., 2012, Pires et al., 2013). Both methods proved to be fast (detection observed ≤ 2 hours), highly sensitive, specific and very cheap. Further studies have evaluated both tests, emphasizing their reproducibility, high sensitivity and specificity (Pasteran et al., 2015, Vasoo et al., 2013). However, others have questioned the utility of these methodologies (Tijet et al., 2013). Moreover, studies comparing the performance of the two tests are still scarce and those evaluating the impact of operators' experience in reading and interpreting results are lacking.

Since commercial tests have been just launched into the market (Novais et al., 2015, Poirel and Nordmann, 2015), we aim to compare the in-house made Carba-NP and Blue-Carba tests using a characterized collection of carbapenemase producing and non-producing *Enterobacteriaceae* in order to further identify potential sources of error.

Sixty-one previously characterized *Enterobacteriaceae* from different sources and countries (CPE, n=30, including 9 NDM, 10 OXA-48, 5 KPC, 3 NDM plus OXA-48, 2 VIM, and 1 IMP producers; non-CPE, n=33) recovered from cation adjusted Mueller-Hinton agar (Becton-Dickinson) were tested using Carba-NP and Blue-Carba, as previously described (Nordmann, Poirel and Dortet, 2012, Pires, Novais and Peixe, 2013). Both assays were executed in parallel two times each in non-consecutive days. Tests were performed and read by two different operators with previous experience in both assays (OP1 and OP2); a third operator (OP3) with no previous experience also read the results. Results were reported after 2 hours. Operators were blind regarding the species and *bla* gene content. Positive results were classified as “+”, weak positive; “++”, positive; and “+++”, strong positive. MICs for imipenem, meropenem and ertapenem were assessed using Etest (bioMérieux) or microdilution ESB1F panels (Trek Diagnostics Systems).

As shown in Table 1, an overall sensitivity of 100% was obtained for both assays; however, Carba-NP revealed a higher specificity than Blue-Carba (98.9% vs. 91.7%, respectively). These high sensitivity and specificity for both tests are consistent with previous reports (Pasteran, Veliz, Ceriana, Lucero, Rapoport, Albornoz, Gomez and Corso, 2015, Pires, Novais and Peixe, 2013, Vasoo, Cunningham, Kohner, Simner, Mandrekar, Lolans, Hayden and Patel, 2013, Yusuf et al., 2014).

For Carba-NP, interpretation was more homogeneous, with OP1 interpreting correctly all isolates, while OP2 and OP3 identified one false-positive result only in the first assay. Blue-Carba’s interpretation was similar for OP1 and OP2, whereas OP3 interpreted more false-positive results yielding a lower specificity (i.e., 96.9% for OP1 and OP2 vs. 89.4% for OP3). Nevertheless, false-positive results read by OP3 decreased in the second assay (i.e., from 5 to 2). This emphasizes the fact that both tests are easy

to interpret even for less experienced operators and that misinterpretations rapidly decrease over time. Nonetheless, the variability of the intensities reported by the different operators also highlights the increased subjectivity of both methods (Table 1). For both tests, all false-positive results were classified as weak positives (“+”). A false-positive strain was consistently found by all operators with the Blue-Carba assays for an ACT-1-producing *E. coli*. Previous kinetic studies have shown that the plasmid-mediated AmpC (pAmpC) ACT-1 hydrolyzes slowly imipenem (Mammeri et al., 2010). It is to note that kinetic experiments have a much shorter time span compared to both tests. Additionally, we hypothesize that false-positive results can arise when different inoculum amounts are used in the test and the negative control solutions. This could explain the misclassification of the pAmpC MIR-1-producing *K. pneumoniae* as a positive result in the first assay but not in the second (Table 1).

As previously reported, class A and B carbapenemases yielded stronger results compared to class D enzymes regardless of the MICs attained for carbapenems (Table 1) (Österblad et al., 2014, Pasteran, Veliz, Ceriana, Lucero, Rapoport, Albornoz, Gomez and Corso, 2015, Pires, Novais and Peixe, 2013). Nevertheless, OXA-48 producers usually yielded stronger results with Blue-Carba than Carba-NP (e.g., 6 vs. 3 with “+++” for OP1 during the second assay, respectively). This difficult detection of OXA-48-like enzymes with Carba-NP is potentially linked to the B-PERII buffer. β -lactamases with lower imipenem hydrolytic efficiency produce less metabolites to overcome the buffer effect yielding weaker results. This has been reported as “buffer inhibition” which also justifies a different extraction solution used in the CarbaAcineto-NP that is mainly designed to detect OXA-type carbapenemases in *Acinetobacter* spp. (Dortet et al., 2014, Österblad, Hakanen and Jalava, 2014).

125 Interestingly, when comparing the agreement between the two tests considering only
126 positive vs. negative results, the tests exhibit an almost perfect agreement [$\text{Kappa}=0.91$
127 (CI 95% 0.87-0.95)], emphasizing that both can be used to detect CPE given their high
128 sensitivities and specificities. Additionally, this also highlights that the decreased cost of
129 Blue-Carba can be extremely important in low income settings (Yusuf, Van Der
130 Meeren, Schallier and Piérard, 2014).

131 Several potential sources of error have been identified. In our experience: *i*) the lack of
132 standardization of the inoculum; *ii*) improper homogenization of the inoculum in the
133 test solutions (Österblad, Hakanen and Jalava, 2014); and *iii*) improper storage of the
134 test reagents (especially imipenem) can be linked to underperformance of both tests.
135 Moreover, to improve detection, it is also suggested to increase the inoculum in either
136 tests and also to perform them from specific media types and/or brands (Österblad,
137 Hakanen and Jalava, 2014, Pires, Novais and Peixe, 2013, Tijet, Boyd, Patel, Mulvey
138 and Melano, 2013). Despite the strong critics by some authors (Tijet, Boyd, Patel,
139 Mulvey and Melano, 2013), it is undeniable that both methods can prove as an
140 important clinical and epidemiological tool to be implemented in microbiology
141 diagnostic labs. Additionally, the development of Carba-NP has encouraged the
142 scientific community to improve and develop further quick alternative methods (Bakour
143 et al., 2015, Bogaerts et al., 2015, Pasteran et al., 2015).

144 In conclusion, we demonstrated that both in-house Carba-NP and Blue-Carba
145 tests are high sensitive and specific and thus suitable for rapid detection of CPE with an
146 almost perfect agreement between the two tests. The simplicity of both tests makes
147 them suitable for unexperienced operators readily identify carbapenemase production.
148 Increasing the awareness of the possible errors on the test preparation and the

149 improvement of the protocol by standardizing the inoculum could be very important for
150 increased sensitivity and specificity values.

151

152

153 This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF; grant
154 number 32003B_153377 to AE). João Pires is a PhD student (2014-2017) supported by
155 the SNF. We thank Nadia Wohlgend and Lea Hirzberger for the technical help.

156

157 REFERENCES

- 158 Bakour, S., Garcia, V., Loucif, L., Brunel, J.M., Gharout-Sait, A., Touati, A., Rolain,
 159 J.M., 2015. Rapid identification of carbapenemase-producing *Enterobacteriaceae*,
 160 *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Acinetobacter baumannii* using a modified Carba NP test.
 161 New Microbes and New Infections. 7, 89-93.
- 162 Bogaerts, P., Yunus, S., Massart, M., Huang, T., Glupczynski, Y., 2015. Validation of a
 163 new electrochemical assay (BYG test) for the rapid laboratory detection of
 164 carbapenemase-producing *Enterobacteriaceae*, 25th European Congress of Clinical
 165 Microbiology and Infectious Diseases (ECCMID), Copenhagen, Denmark.
- 166 Dortet, L., Bréhard, L., Cuzon, G., Poirel, L., Nordmann, P., 2014. Strategy for Rapid
 167 Detection of Carbapenemase-Producing *Enterobacteriaceae*. Antimicrobial Agents and
 168 Chemotherapy. 58, 2441-2445.
- 169 Dortet, L., Poirel, L., Errera, C., Nordmann, P., 2014. CarbAcineto NP Test for Rapid
 170 Detection of Carbapenemase-Producing *Acinetobacter* spp. Journal of Clinical
 171 Microbiology. 52, 2359-2364.
- 172 Endimiani, A., Rossano, A., Kunz, D., Overesch, G., Perreten, V., 2012. First
 173 countrywide survey of third-generation cephalosporin-resistant *Escherichia coli* from
 174 broilers, swine, and cattle in Switzerland. Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious
 175 Disease. 73, 31-38.
- 176 Giani, T., Conte, V., Mandalà, S., D'Andrea, M.M., Luzzaro, F., Conaldi, P.G., Grossi,
 177 P., Rossolini, G.M., 2014. Cross-Infection of Solid Organ Transplant Recipients by a
 178 Multidrug-Resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* Isolate Producing the OXA-48
 179 Carbapenemase, Likely Derived from a Multiorgan Donor. Journal of Clinical
 180 Microbiology. 52, 2702-2705.
- 181 Hrabák, J., Chudáčková, E., Papagiannitsis, C.C., 2014. Detection of carbapenemases in
 182 *Enterobacteriaceae*: a challenge for diagnostic microbiological laboratories. Clinical
 183 Microbiology and Infection. 20, 839-853.
- 184 Mammeri, H., Guillon, H., Eb, F., Nordmann, P., 2010. Phenotypic and Biochemical
 185 Comparison of the Carbapenem-Hydrolyzing Activities of Five Plasmid-Borne AmpC
 186 β -Lactamases. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy. 54, 4556-4560.
- 187 Nordmann, P., Poirel, L., Dortet, L., 2012. Rapid Detection of Carbapenemase-
 188 producing *Enterobacteriaceae*. Emerging Infectious Disease journal. 18, 1503.
- 189 Novais, Â., Brilhante, M., Pires, J., Peixe, L., 2015. Evaluation of the Recently
 190 Launched Rapid Carb Blue Kit for Detection of Carbapenemase-Producing Gram-
 191 Negative Bacteria. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 53, 3105-3107.
- 192 Österblad, M., Hakanen, A.J., Jalava, J., 2014. Evaluation of the Carba NP Test for
 193 Carbapenemase Detection. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy. 58, 7553-7556.

- 194 Pasteran, F., Tijet, N., Melano, R.G., Corso, A., 2015. A simplified protocol of the
195 Carba NP test for enhanced detection of carbapenemase producers direct from bacterial
196 cultures. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*.
- 197 Pasteran, F., Veliz, O., Ceriana, P., Lucero, C., Rapoport, M., Alborno, E., Gomez, S.,
198 Corso, A., 2015. Evaluation of the Blue-Carba Test for Rapid Detection of
199 Carbapenemases in Gram-Negative Bacilli. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*. 53, 1996-
200 1998.
- 201 Pilo, P., Vogt, D., Origgi, F.C., Endimiani, A., Peterson, S., Perreten, V., 2015. First
202 report of a multidrug-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* of sequence type 11 causing
203 sepsis in a free-ranging beaver (Castor fiber). *Environmental Microbiology Reports*. 7,
204 351-353.
- 205 Pires, J., Novais, Â., Peixe, L., 2013. Blue-Carba, an Easy Biochemical Test for
206 Detection of Diverse Carbapenemase Producers Directly from Bacterial Cultures.
207 *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*. 51, 4281-4283.
- 208 Poirel, L., Nordmann, P., 2015. Rapidec Carba NP Test for Rapid Detection of
209 Carbapenemase Producers. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*. 53, 3003-3008.
- 210 Principe, L., Bracco, S., Conte, V., Mauri, C., Giani, T., Pini, B., Rossolini, G.M.,
211 Luzzaro, F., 2015. *Klebsiella pneumoniae* produttore di NDM-1: primi casi di
212 importazione dall'Africa, XLV Congresso Nazionale AMCLI, Associazione
213 Microbiologi Clinici Italiani, Rimini, Italy.
- 214 Seiffert, S.N., Perreten, V., Johannes, S., Droz, S., Bodmer, T., Endimiani, A., 2014.
215 OXA-48 Carbapenemase-Producing *Salmonella enterica* Serovar Kentucky Isolate of
216 Sequence Type 198 in a Patient Transferred from Libya to Switzerland. *Antimicrobial
217 Agents and Chemotherapy*. 58, 2446-2449.
- 218 Seiffert, S.N., Tinguely, R., Lupo, A., Neuwirth, C., Perreten, V., Endimiani, A., 2013.
219 High Prevalence of Extended-Spectrum-Cephalosporin-Resistant *Enterobacteriaceae* in
220 Poultry Meat in Switzerland: Emergence of CMY-2- and VEB-6-Possessing *Proteus
221 mirabilis*. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy*. 57, 6406-6408.
- 222 Tängdén, T., Giske, C.G., 2015. Global dissemination of extensively drug-resistant
223 carbapenemase-producing *Enterobacteriaceae*: clinical perspectives on detection,
224 treatment and infection control. *Journal of Internal Medicine*. 277, 501-512.
- 225 Tijet, N., Boyd, D., Patel, S.N., Mulvey, M.R., Melano, R.G., 2013. Evaluation of the
226 Carba NP Test for Rapid Detection of Carbapenemase-Producing *Enterobacteriaceae*
227 and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy*. 57, 4578-
228 4580.
- 229 Vasoo, S., Cunningham, S.A., Kohner, P.C., Simner, P.J., Mandrekar, J.N., Lolans, K.,
230 Hayden, M.K., Patel, R., 2013. Comparison of a Novel, Rapid Chromogenic
231 Biochemical Assay, the Carba NP Test, with the Modified Hodge Test for Detection of
232 Carbapenemase-Producing Gram-Negative Bacilli. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*.
233 51, 3097-3101.

234 Yusuf, E., Van Der Meeren, S., Schallier, A., Piérard, D., 2014. Comparison of the
235 Carba NP test with the Rapid CARB Screen Kit for the detection of carbapenemase-
236 producing *Enterobacteriaceae* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Eur J Clin Microbiol
237 Infect Dis. 33, 2237-2240.
238
239

240

241

Table 1. Results obtained for the Carba NP and Blue-Carba tests performed using a collection of well-characterized strains (30 CPE and 33 non-CPE)

Acquired β-lactamases	Species (No. of strains with the same assay results)	Carba NP test						Blue-Carba test						MIC (μg/ml)			Reference or ATCC strain
		Assay 1			Assay 2			Assay 1			Assay 2						
		OP1	OP2	OP3	OP1	OP2	OP3	OP1	OP2	OP3	OP1	OP2	OP3	IMP	ERT	MEM	
Carbapenemase producers ^a																	
Class A (n=5)																	
KPC-2	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=3)	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	≥8	≥64	≥64	This study
	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	++	+++	1	16	4	This Study
	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	++	++	1	8	2	ATCC BAA-1705
Class B (n=11)																	
IMP-1	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	16	64	32	This Study
NDM-1	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=5)	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	≥1	≥4	≥2	This Study, (Principe et al., 2015)
	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	++	+++	++	≥64	≥64	≥64	This Study
	<i>E. coli</i> (n=1)	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	16	≥64	≥64	This study
	<i>E. coli</i> (n=1)	++	++	++	++	++	++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	8	≥64	≥64	ATCC BAA-2452
	<i>E. cloacae</i> (n=1)	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	16	64	64	This Study
VIM-1	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	8	0.5	1	This Study
VIM-2	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	++	64	≥64	≥64	This Study
Class D (n=10)																	
OXA-48	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	4	32	16	This Study
	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	++	++	++	++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	++	4	64	4	This Study
	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	+	++	+	++	+	++	++	++	+++	++	+++	++	4	≥8	≥16	This study
	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	+++	+++	++	+++	+++	++	+++	+++	+++	+++	++	+++	4	≥8	2	This Study
	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	++	++	+	++	++	+	+++	+++	+++	++	++	++	0.5	0.5	≤0.5	This Study
	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	++	++	++	+	++	+	++	+++	++	+++	+++	++	8	≥8	2	(Giani et al., 2014)
	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	++	++	++	++	+++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	4	≥8	2	(Giani et al., 2014)
	<i>E.coli</i> (n=1)	+++	+++	++	+++	+++	++	+++	+++	+++	++	++	++	0.5	4	4	This Study
	<i>E.coli</i> (n=1)	+	+	+	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+++	+++	1	4	1	This Study
	<i>Salmonella</i> Kentucky (n=1)	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	≤0.25	1	≤0.5	(Seiffert et al., 2014)
Class B + class D (n=3)																	
NDM-1 + OXA-48	<i>C. freundii</i> (n=1)	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	++	4	≥8	2	This Study
	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=2)	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	≥4	≥4	≥16	This Study
Non-carbapenemase																	
Class A (n=9)																	
CTX-M-1	<i>E. coli</i> (n=2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	(Endimiani et al., 2012)
CTX-M-1-like	<i>E. coli</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	This Study
CTX-M-15-like	<i>K. oxytoca</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	This Study
SHV-12	<i>E. coli</i> (n=2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	(Endimiani et al., 2012)
TEM-52	<i>E. coli</i> (n=2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	
VEB-6	<i>P. mirabilis</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	(Seiffert et al., 2013)
Class C (n=10)																	
ACT-1	<i>E. coli</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	b
CMY-2	<i>E. coli</i> (n=4)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	(Endimiani et al., 2012)
	<i>P. mirabilis</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	≤0.25	≤0.5	This Study
DHA-1	<i>E. coli</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	This Study
	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	0.5	≤0.5	(Pilo et al., 2015)
FOX-1	<i>E. coli</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	b
MIR-1	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	b
Class A + class C (n=1)																	
CTX-M-15-like + CMY-2	<i>E. coli</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	This Study
No Acquired β-lactamases																	
	<i>C. koseri</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	This Study
	<i>C. koseri</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	0.5	≤0.5	This Study
	<i>E. coli</i> (n=2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	ATCC 25922, (Endimiani et al., 2012)
	<i>E. coli</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	This Study
	<i>E. aerogenes</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	1	0.75	≤0.5	This Study
	<i>E. cloacae</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	≤0.25	2	≤0.5	This Study
	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=5)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤1	≤8	≤0.5	ATCC BAA-1706, This Study
	<i>K. pneumoniae</i> (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	≤0.25	≤0.25	≤0.5	This Study

Note. "+++", strong positive; "++", positive; "+", weak positive; "--", negative; IMP, imipenem; ERT, ertapenem; MEM, meropenem