Rifaximin combined with polymyxins: A potential regimen for selective decontamination of multidrug-resistant bacteria in the digestive tract?

J.W. Betts^{a,*}, L.M. Phee^{a,b}, D.W. Wareham^{a,b}

^a Queen Mary University London, Antimicrobial Research Group, Blizard Institute, Barts & The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, London, UK

^b Division of Infection, Barts Health NHS Trust, London, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 6 October 2015

Received in revised form 20 November 2015

Accepted 21 November 2015

Keywords:

Rifaximin

Rifamycins

Polymyxins

Antimicrobial synergy

Gut decontamination

ABSTRACT

Selective decontamination of the digestive tract (SDD) using combinations of oral non-absorbable antibiotics has been proposed as a means of preventing multidrug-resistant (MDR) infections. The minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of rifaximin (RIFAX) were determined against 262 Gram-negative and Gram-positive bacterial isolates by broth microtitre assay. Rifampicin (RIF) was used as a comparator in the analysis. Synergistic interactions between RIFAX and polymyxin B (PMB) were assessed by using the chequerboard method and calculating the fractional inhibitory concentration index (FICI). The antimicrobial activities of both RIFAX and RIF were similar with little variation in the overall MIC distributions for Gram-negative non-fermenters and Gram-positive bacteria. However, against Enterobacteriaceae higher MICs (>16 mg/L) were observed for RIFAX than for RIF (50% vs 27%). Amongst the 262 isolates tested, 100 could be considered resistant to RIFAX. Overall, the combination of RIFAX and PMB was more active against all of the isolates tested compared with either drug alone, with reductions of 2–11 doubling dilutions in individual MICs. Potent synergy was observed with the RIFAX + PMB combination using FICI criteria (FICI range 0.02–0.5). The data presented here suggest that combination therapy may be significantly more effective against isolates with RIFAX and/or PMB resistance and could be considered as part of a SDD regimen aimed at reducing enteric carriage of MDR pathogens in colonised and infected patients.

© 2015 International Society for Chemotherapy of Infection and Cancer. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Many bacterial infections arise endogenously from the normal flora of the gastrointestinal tract. Acquisition and colonisation of the human gut by multidrug-resistant (MDR) strains either in hospitals, through travel, due to antibiotic exposure or in early life may have significant implications for treatment. Selective decontamination of the digestive tract (SDD) using combinations of oral non-absorbable antibiotics has been proposed as a means of preventing MDR infections [1]. A systematic review concluded that the use of SDD can reduce the incidence of respiratory tract

infections as well as overall in-hospital mortality [2]. Pooled data from 36 clinical trials involving 6914 patients demonstrated that both systemic and topical regimens reduce the rate of respiratory tract infections and lower mortality in patients receiving treatment in intensive care units (ICUs). Other evidence suggests that SDD regimens have the potential to prevent between 2000 and 3000 deaths per annum in individuals hospitalised in the UK alone [3].

Although a number of antimicrobials have been used in SDD trials (polymyxins, glycopeptides, aminoglycosides, amphotericin), there is little consensus on the optimum combination of drugs to use, particularly in individuals colonised with MDR strains. There is a need to identify a regimen that may be effective against those colonised with bacteria belonging to the ESCAPE group of pathogens (*Enterobacter*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Klebsiella*, *Acinetobacter baumannii*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Enterococcus*) [4]. These

* Corresponding author. Present address: Centre for Immunobiology, Queen Mary, University of London, 4 Newark Street, Whitechapel, London E1 2AT, UK. Tel.: +44 20 7882 2317; fax: +44 20 7882 2181.

E-mail address: Jono.betts@btinternet.com (J.W. Betts).

organisms are responsible for the majority of nosocomial infections and display high levels of antimicrobial resistance, including the production extended-spectrum β -lactamases (ESBLs) and resistance to carbapenems [5].

Rifaximin (RIFAX) is a semisynthetic rifamycin derivative. It is poorly absorbed in the human gut and is licensed to treat travel-associated diarrhoea due to enterotoxigenic strains of *Escherichia coli* and other enteric pathogens [6]. It is effective in reducing bacterial overgrowth in the small intestine [7] and has also been used successfully in the treatment of *Clostridium difficile* infection [8]. It has orphan drug status in the adjunctive treatment of hepatic encephalopathy [7].

Polymyxins, which have activity primarily against Gram-negative bacteria, are also poorly absorbed and have been used in SDD regimens [9]. In SDD, polymyxin E (colistin) in combination with either oral gentamicin or neomycin has been shown to be effective in the eradication of ESBL-producing Enterobacteriaceae and carbapenem-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* [10,11] from colonised patients. There is also evidence that polymyxins significantly enhance the activity of other antimicrobials that have little or no activity alone. Colistin combined with rifampicin (RIF) has also been proposed as a combination therapy for the treatment of systemic MDR *A. baumannii* and *P. aeruginosa* infections [12,13].

In this study, we investigated the in vitro activity of RIFAX combined with polymyxin B (PMB) against a diverse collection of strains that would need to be targeted in any regimen based on exploiting the properties of these drugs in any future SDD therapy aimed at tackling the problem of MDR bacteria.

2. Methods

2.1. Bacterial isolates, antimicrobials and media

Bacterial type strains were obtained from the National Collection of Type Cultures (NCTC), Public Health England (Colindale, UK). Clinical isolates were sourced from Barts Health NHS Trust (London, UK) and the existing collection held at Queen Mary University London (Antimicrobial Research Group). *Staphylococcus aureus* strains with reduced susceptibility to glycopeptides (GISA) were obtained from the Network for Antimicrobial Resistance on *Staphylococcus aureus* (Network for Antimicrobial Resistance in *Staphylococcus aureus*, USA). Identification and routine susceptibility testing of clinical isolates was performed according to standard laboratory protocols. RIFAX was purchased from Santa Cruz Biotechnology Inc. (Heidelberg, Germany), polymyxin B sulphate was from VWR International Ltd. (Leighton Buzzard, UK) and RIF was from Sigma-Aldrich (Dorset, UK). All bacterial culture media were sourced from Oxoid Ltd. (Basingstoke, UK) or Sigma-Aldrich.

2.2. Antimicrobial susceptibility testing

Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of RIFAX were assessed by broth microdilution (BMD) assay in cation-adjusted Mueller–Hinton II broth (CA-MHB) according to European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST) guidelines [14]. The MIC of RIFAX was determined against 262 bacterial isolates, including 200 Gram-negative isolates [*E. coli*, $n = 27$; *K. pneumoniae*, $n = 38$; miscellaneous Enterobacteriaceae (*Serratia marcescens*, *Enterobacter cloacae*, *Enterobacter aerogenes*, *Morganella* spp. and *Citrobacter* spp.), $n = 35$; *A. baumannii*, $n = 36$; *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia*, $n = 32$; and *P. aeruginosa*, $n = 32$] and 62 Gram-positive bacterial strains [*S. aureus* (meticillin-susceptible *S. aureus*, meticillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) and vancomycin-intermediate-resistant *S. aureus*), $n = 28$; *Streptococcus* spp. (*Streptococcus*

pyogenes, *Streptococcus agalactiae* and *Streptococcus sanguinis*), $n = 9$; *Enterococcus faecalis* and glycopeptide-resistant *E. faecium*, $n = 25$].

As no clinical breakpoints have been proposed by either EUCAST or the Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) to infer susceptibility to RIFAX, the MIC of RIF was also determined for each isolate and was used as a comparator in the analysis of RIFAX MIC distributions.

2.3. Rifaximin and polymyxin B synergy studies

The potential for synergy between RIFAX and PMB was investigated against 31 type strains and MDR isolates with defined mechanisms of resistance, including *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae*, *A. baumannii*, *S. marcescens*, *S. maltophilia*, *P. aeruginosa*, *E. cloacae* and *E. aerogenes* producing KPC, VIM-2/4, NDM and OXA-23/48/181 carbapenemases, *S. aureus* (*mecA/vraSR*) and enterococcal isolates (*vanA/B*) with meticillin resistance and reduced susceptibility to glycopeptides, and antibiotic-susceptible strains of *S. pyogenes* (Table 1).

Activity of the RIFAX + PMB combination was then assessed in checkerboard assays by BMD in CA-MHB. The MICs of each drug alone and in combination were recorded and interactions were assessed by calculation of the fractional inhibitory concentration index (FICI) [15]. An FICI of ≤ 0.5 was defined as synergy, FICIs of > 0.5 to ≤ 4.0 were deemed intermediate/additive, and an FICI of > 4.0 was considered antagonistic.

As there are no established breakpoints for defining susceptibility to RIFAX, a breakpoint value of ≤ 16 mg/L suggested by the French Society for Microbiology (SFM) [16] for determining susceptibility/resistance of *Acinetobacter* spp. to RIF was used in the interpretation of MICs. For Gram-positive bacteria, the EUCAST RIF staphylococcal/streptococcal species-specific breakpoint of MIC ≤ 0.06 mg/L [14] was used to infer susceptibility. The EUCAST breakpoint of ≤ 2 mg/L for colistin sulfate was used in the interpretation of susceptibility to PMB for all Enterobacteriaceae and other Gram-negative species [14].

3. Results and discussion

The antimicrobial activities of RIFAX and RIF were similar with little variation in the overall MIC distributions for Gram-negative non-fermenters (GNNFs) and Gram-positive bacteria (Figs. 1 and 2). However, against Enterobacteriaceae higher MICs (> 16 mg/L) were observed for RIFAX than for RIF (50% vs 27%). Amongst the 262 isolates tested, 100 could be considered resistant to RIFAX (GNNFs, $n = 23$; Enterobacteriaceae, $n = 50$; and Gram-positives, $n = 27$) based on the breakpoints for *A. baumannii* [16], *S. aureus* and *Streptococcus* spp. [14].

Analysis of MIC distributions revealed that the majority of GNNFs (Fig. 2) had a RIFAX MIC between 1 mg/L and 16 mg/L. This is comparable with current data on the antimicrobial activity of RIF against *A. baumannii* [17]. Both MIC₅₀ and MIC₉₀ values were lowest for *S. maltophilia* isolates (RIF/RIFAX MIC₅₀ = 8/8 mg/L, MIC₉₀ = 16/64 mg/L). The MIC ranges for *P. aeruginosa* (RIF/RIFAX MIC₅₀ = 16/16 mg/L, MIC₉₀ = 32/128 mg/L) were narrower than those for *A. baumannii* (RIF/RIFAX MIC₅₀ = 2/1 mg/L, MIC₉₀ = 256/256 mg/L).

Against Enterobacteriaceae, the MIC distribution was narrower than that observed with GNNFs, with the majority of strains requiring 4–256 mg/L (RIF/RIFAX MIC₅₀ = 16/16 mg/L, MIC₉₀ = 32/256 mg/L). This is not surprising as resistance to both RIF and RIFAX has been previously reported in *E. coli* owing to chromosomal mutations in *rpoB* and active efflux of the antibiotic [18,19].

Table 1

Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of rifaximin (RIFAX) and polymyxin B (PMB) alone and in combination, and fractional inhibitory concentration indices (FICIs) for important potential pathogens of the human gut ($n=31$).

Isolate	Characteristics	MIC alone (mg/L)		MIC in combination (mg/L)		FICI
		RIFAX	PMB	RIFAX	PMB	
<i>Escherichia coli</i> 12241	NCTC type strain	4	0.5	0.13	0.06	0.16
<i>E. coli</i> EC98 (2014)	VIM-4 producer (ST131)	32	0.06	8	0.03	0.75
<i>E. coli</i> EC172 (2014)	OXA-181 producer (ST410)	64	0.13	0.13	0.03	0.25
<i>E. coli</i> EC204	NDM-1 producer	32	0.13	0.25	0.03	0.26
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> 9633	NCTC type strain	8	0.25	0.5	0.06	0.31
<i>K. pneumoniae</i> KP7	KPC-2 producer (ST258)	128	0.25	2	0.03	0.14
<i>K. pneumoniae</i> KP50	NDM-1 producer	256	0.25	16	0.03	0.19
<i>K. pneumoniae</i> KP52	OXA-48 producer	64	0.25	1	0.03	0.14
<i>Enterobacter aerogenes</i> 9735	NCTC type strain	8	0.5	2	0.03	0.31
<i>E. aerogenes</i> EA1	CTX-M-1, hAmpC and PL	8	0.13	2	0.03	0.5
<i>E. aerogenes</i> EA2	ESBL: CTX-M-1 producer	16	0.13	2	0.03	0.38
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i> 13380	NCTC type strain	128	0.25	0.5	0.06	0.25
<i>E. cloacae</i> Encl102	VIM-4 producer	128	0.13	4	0.03	0.28
<i>Serratia marcescens</i> 13382	NCTC type strain	32	128	0.5	0.06	0.02
<i>S. marcescens</i> 156	NDM-1 producer	128	128	2	0.5	0.02
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> 27853	ATCC type strain	32	0.5	2	0.06	0.19
<i>P. aeruginosa</i> PA30	VIM-2 producer	32	0.5	8	0.13	0.5
<i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i> 19606	ATCC type strain	2	0.25	0.5	0.06	0.5
<i>A. baumannii</i> AB12	MDR: hAmpC producer (UK South East clone)	4	0.13	0.13	0.03	0.28
<i>A. baumannii</i> AB14	OXA-23 producer (UK OXA-23 clone 1)	8	0.25	2	0.03	0.38
<i>A. baumannii</i> AB306	NDM-1 producer	1	0.25	0.13	0.03	0.25
<i>Stenotrophomonas maltophilia</i> 10258	NCTC type strain	32	0.25	0.13	0.06	0.25
<i>S. maltophilia</i> SMB02	MDR clinical isolate	32	1	0.13	0.03	0.03
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> 12493	MRSA (<i>mecA</i>)	0.02	128	0.004	0.5	0.26
<i>S. aureus</i> 25923	ATCC type strain	0.06	64	0.015	0.03	0.24
<i>S. aureus</i> Mu50	GISA (<i>vraSR</i>)	128	128	0.5	16	0.13
<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i> 29212	ATCC type strain	2	64	0.5	1	0.27
<i>Enterococcus faecium</i> OEF42	GRE	16	128	4	0.06	0.25
<i>E. faecium</i> OEF65	GRE	64	128	16	32	0.38
<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i> SPY1	Clinical isolate	0.06	8	0.008	0.5	0.19
<i>S. pyogenes</i> SPY2	Clinical isolate	0.03	16	0.008	0.03	0.25

NCTC, National Collection of Type Cultures; hAmpC, hyperproduction of chromosomal AmpC; PL, porin loss; ESBL, extended-spectrum β -lactamase; ATCC, American Type Culture Collection; MDR, multidrug-resistant; MRSA, methicillin-resistant *S. aureus*; GISA, glycopeptide-intermediate-resistant *S. aureus*; GRE, glycopeptide-resistant *Enterococcus*.

Fig. 1. Distribution of rifampicin minimum inhibitory concentrations against Gram-positive, Enterobacteriaceae and non-fermenting isolates.

Amongst the small number of Gram-positive bacteria tested, two populations could be defined. One group contained the streptococcal and *S. aureus* type strains (RIF/RIFAX MIC = 0.00375–0.063 mg/L), comparable with existing EUCAST data for RIF [17]. The second group had MICs ranging from 1 to 128 mg/L and contained the enterococcal (RIF/RIFAX MIC₅₀ = 64/64 mg/L, MIC₉₀ = 128/128 mg/L), GISA and clinical MRSA isolates.

Of the 31 isolates assessed in the checkerboard analysis, 16 were considered resistant to RIFAX (MIC > 16 mg/L) and 9 were considered resistant to PMB (MIC > 2 mg/L). These included all of the *S. marcescens*, *S. aureus* and *Enterococcus* spp. and one *S. pyogenes* isolate (Table 1). Surprisingly, both *S. pyogenes* isolates appeared relatively susceptible to PMB. Although polymyxins are thought to have no therapeutic utility in the treatment of

Fig. 2. Distribution of rifaximin minimum inhibitory concentrations against Gram-positive, Enterobacteriaceae and non-fermenting isolates.

streptococcal infections [17], they have been shown to bind and disrupt the integrity of the ExPortal protein secretion organelle in streptococci, rendering them susceptible to killing [20].

Overall, the combination of RIFAX + PMB was more active against all of the isolates tested compared with either drug alone, with reductions of 2–11 doubling dilutions in individual MICs. With the exception of a single VIM-4-producing strain of *E. coli* (FICI = 0.75), the RIFAX + PMB combination resulted in potent synergy using FICI criteria (FICI range 0.02–0.5).

Concentrations of both drugs required for synergy to be preserved in vivo are likely to be achievable in an oral SDD regimen. RIFAX concentrations of 4–8 mg/g of stool have been measured in the gut following oral administration, without toxicity [21,22]. The combination of RIFAX + PMB could therefore still be a viable option for decolonisation therapy, even when significant synergy is not observed with the drugs in combination. A recent analysis of the cost effectiveness of SDD regimens for patients in ICUs found that SDD was beneficial in reducing length of patient stay and treatment costs by as much as €1508 per patient [23].

The results of this study support previous work with RIF and colistin suggesting a role in the treatment of *E. coli*, *P. aeruginosa* and *S. maltophilia* infections [24,25]. Although RIFAX alone has been shown previously to be effective in gut decolonisation [7], the data presented here suggest that combination therapy may be significantly more effective against isolates with RIFAX and/or PMB resistance. Combinations of licensed non-absorbable agents are seldom used systemically and could be considered as part of a SDD regimen aimed at reducing enteric carriage of MDR pathogens in colonised and infected patients.

Funding

None.

Competing interests

None declared.

Ethical approval

Not required.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge Public Health England (Colindale, UK) for supplying some of the clinical isolates used in this study.

References

- [1] Silvestri L, van Saene HKF. Selective decontamination of the digestive tract: an update of the evidence. *HSR Proc Intensive Care Cardiovasc Anesth* 2012;4:21–9.
- [2] Liberati A, D'Amico R, Pifferi S, Torri V, Brazzi L, Parmelli E. Antibiotic prophylaxis to reduce respiratory tract infections and mortality in adults receiving intensive care. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009;4:CD000022.
- [3] Francis JJ, Duncan EM, Prior ME, MacLennan GS, Dombrowski SU, Bellingan GU, et al. Selective decontamination of the digestive tract in critically ill patients treated in intensive care units: a mixed-methods feasibility study (the SuD-DICU study). *Health Technol Assess* 2014;18:1–170.
- [4] Rice LB. Federal funding for the study of antimicrobial resistance in nosocomial pathogens: no ESKEPE. *J Infect Dis* 2008;197:1079–81.
- [5] Pendleton JN, Gorman SP, Gilmore BF. Clinical relevance of the ESKEPE pathogens. *Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther* 2013;11:297–308.
- [6] Sierra JM, Ruiz J, Navia MM, Vargas M, Vila J. In vitro activity of rifaximin against enteropathogens producing traveler's diarrhea. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2001;45:643–4.
- [7] Scarpellini E, Gabrielli M, Lauritano CE, Lupascu A, Merra G, Cammarota G, et al. High dosage rifaximin for the treatment of small intestinal bacterial overgrowth. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2007;25:781–6.
- [8] Mattila E, Arkkila P, Mattila PS, Tarkka E, Tissari P, Anttila VJ. Rifaximin in the treatment of recurrent *Clostridium difficile* infection. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2013;37:122–8.
- [9] van Saene JJM, van Saene HKF, Tarko-Smit NJ, Beukeveld GJ. Enterobacteriaceae suppression by three different oral doses of polymyxin E in human volunteers. *Epidemiol Infect* 1988;100:407–17.
- [10] Saidel-Odes L, Polachek H, Peled N, Riesenberk K, Schlaeffer F, Trabelsi Y, et al. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of selective digestive decontamination using oral gentamicin and oral polymyxin E for eradication of carbapenem-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* carriage. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2012;33:14–9.
- [11] Huttner B, Haustein T, Uçkay I, Renzi G, Stewartson A, Schaerrer D, et al. Decolonization of intestinal carriage of extended-spectrum β -lactamase-producing Enterobacteriaceae with oral colistin and neomycin: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2013;68:2375–2382.
- [12] Lee HJ, Bergen PJ, Bulitta JB, Tsuji B, Forrest A, Nation RL, et al. Synergistic activity of colistin and rifampin combination against multidrug-resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii* in an in vitro pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic model. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2013;57:3738–45.
- [13] Giamarellos-Bourboulis EJ, Sambatakou H, Galani I, Giamarellou H. In vitro activity of colistin and rifampin on multidrug-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *J Chemother* 2003;15:235–8.
- [14] European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. Breakpoint tables for interpretation of MICs and zones of diameters. Version 5.0. 2015. EUCAST; 2015. <http://www.eucast.org> [accessed 2 December 2015].

- [15] Gordon NC, Png K, Wareham DW. Potent synergy and sustained bactericidal activity of a vancomycin–colistin combination versus multidrug-resistant strains of *Acinetobacter baumannii*. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2010;54:5316–5322.
- [16] Société Française de Microbiologie Comité de l'Antibiogramme de la Société Française de Microbiologie. Recommandations 2012 (Edition de Janvier 2012). SFM; 2012. http://www.sfm-microbiologie.org/UserFiles/files/casfm/CASFM_2012.pdf [accessed 2 December 2015].
- [17] European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST). Antimicrobial wild type distributions of microorganisms. <http://mic.eucast.org/Eucast2/SearchController/search.jsp?action=performSearch&BeginIndex=0&Midif=mic&NumberIndex=50&Antib=242&Specium=-1> [accessed 17 February 2015].
- [18] Pons MJ, Mensa L, Gascon J, Ruiz J. Fitness and molecular mechanisms of resistance to rifaximin in in vitro selected *Escherichia coli* mutants. *Microb Drug Resist* 2012;18:376–9.
- [19] Kothary V, Scherl EJ, Bosworth B, Jiang Z-D, DuPont HL, Harel J, et al. Rifaximin resistance in *Escherichia coli* associated with inflammatory bowel disease correlates with prior rifaximin use, mutations in *rpoB*, and activity of Phe-Arg- β -naphthylamide-inhibitable efflux pumps. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2013;57:811–7.
- [20] Port GC, Vega LA, Nylander AB, Caparon MG. Streptococcus pyogenes polymyxin B-resistant mutants display enhanced ExPortal integrity. *J Bacteriol* 2014;196:2563–77.
- [21] Scarpignato C, Pelosini I, Rifaximin. a poorly absorbed antibiotic: pharmacology and clinical potential. *Chemotherapy* 2005;51:36–66.
- [22] Adachi JA, DuPont HL. Rifaximin: a novel nonabsorbed rifamycin for gastrointestinal disorders. *Clin Infect Dis* 2006;42:541–7.
- [23] Oostdijk EA, de Wit GA, Bakker M, de Smet AM, Bonten MJ. Selective decontamination of the digestive tract and selective oropharyngeal decontamination in intensive care unit patients: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *BMJ Open* 2013;3:e002529. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2012-002529>.
- [24] Betts JW, Phee LM, Woodford N, Wareham DW. Activity of colistin in combination with tigecycline or rifampicin against multidrug-resistant *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia*. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 2014;33:1565–72.
- [25] Petrosillo N, Ioannidou E, Falagas ME. Colistin monotherapy vs. combination therapy: evidence from microbiological, animal and clinical studies. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2008;14:816–27.