

Full Length Research Paper

Experimental studies on synergism between meropenem and sulbactam

Sayanti Mukherjee,¹ Shaswati Chaki,¹ T.K. Pal,² Musfiqua Mookerjee³, Sukhen Das⁴ and Sujata G. Dastidar^{1*}

¹Department of Microbiology, Herbicare Healthcare Bio-Herbal Research Foundation, 7&8 Metro Garden City, D. H. Road, Pailan, Kolkata-700104, India.

²Bioequivalence Study Centre, Department of Pharmaceutical Technology, Jadavpur University, Kolkata - 700032, India.

³Department of Microbiology, NSHM College of Pharmaceutical Technology, NSHM Knowledge Campus, 124, B.L.Saha Road, Kolkata - 700053, India.

⁴Department of Physics, Jadavpur University, Raja S.C.Mullick Road, Kolkata - 700032, India.

Accepted 5 July, 2013

Meropenem had been successfully used independently against various types of infections when it was first discovered, while sulbactam sodium being much less potent had been given to humans more frequently in combination with ampicillin. Meropenem is now less frequently applied alone in infections caused by virulent multidrug resistant Gram negative organisms. Further, potentiation of action of meropenem is possible by synergism between meropenem and sulbactam. In a study of 30 different Gram positive and Gram negative bacteria, the Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) of meropenem was found to be varying from 1 to 5 µg/ml with respect to 22 organisms as determined by agar dilution technique; however, the MIC of this antibiotic was 25 µg/ml against *Klebsiella pneumoniae* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. The MIC of sulbactam against meropenem sensitive bacteria was 25 µg/ml and was between 50 and 200 µg/ml against the organisms which had higher MIC values in respect of meropenem. A highly significant synergism could be observed between these two antibiotics by following Student's 't' test ($p < 0.001$). The fractional inhibitory concentration (FIC) index value of this combination with the help of checkerboard assessment procedure was found to be 0.375, confirming synergism.

Key words: Meropenem, sulbactam, Gram positive and Gram negative bacteria, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.

INTRODUCTION

The carbapenem antibiotic meropenem had been used primarily for the treatment of complicated skin and skin-structure associated infections, complicated intra-abdominal, chest and urinary tract infections; being more powerful than the third generation β-lactam antibiotics, cephalosporins meropenem had exhibited highly potent action against extended spectrum β-lactamase producing and AmpC chromosomal β-lactamase producing bacteria. Compared with imipenem, meropenem was found to be

more active against most of the deadly pathogenic Gram negative bacteria (Arrieta, 1997). The carbapenems are still used as the last resort for treating multi-drug resistant Gram negative infections in any nosocomial settings, as these antibiotics have a broad spectrum of activity and are stable to hydrolysis by β-lactamases, including ESBLs and AmpC β-lactamases. However, there has been an alarming increase in reports on carbapenems resistance in *Acinetobacter baumannii* during the past

several years (Gupta et al., 2006; Sinha et al., 2007; Vishnu et al., 2011). It is known that different antimicrobial resistance mechanisms are highly prevalent in *A. baumannii* both as constitutive and as acquired resistance (Bonomo and Szabo, 2006). Carbapenemase production is the commonest mechanism of carbapenem resistance by phenotypic screening method; carbapenem hydrolyzing oxacillinase is the most likely mechanism (Vishnu et al., 2011).

The growing threat of antimicrobial resistance in many Gram negative bacteria rely on one hand on its extraordinary capacity to develop resistance to almost any available antibiotic through mutation in chromosomal genes and to the increasing prevalence of transferable resistance determinants, particularly those encoding class B carbapenemases, as the metallo-beta-lactamases and ESBLs are frequently co-transferred while genes encoding aminoglycoside modifying enzymes (Riera et al., 2011). Therefore, in the present scenario to overcome the problem of escalating multi-drug resistance among the highly infective pathogens, the action of meropenem can be successfully accentuated by combining with a suitable drug. In 2004, Ko et al. (2004) reported that the combination of meropenem plus sulbactam had a distinctly better applicability than meropenem alone against *A. baumannii*. The present study describes the suitability of this combination against a large number of pathogenic microorganisms.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Bacteria

A total of 30 strains of bacteria belonging to Gram positive and Gram negative genera were tested. Many of them were received from the National Collection of Type Culture (NCTC, London,) or the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC, USA). The others were isolated as human pathogens in India. All the isolates were identified following standard methods (Collee et al., 1996).

Drugs

Dry powders of meropenem and sulbactam sodium were obtained from VHB Medi Sciences Ltd., India that were soluble in water and stored at 4°C.

Media

Liquid media were peptone water (PW) containing 1.0% peptone (Oxoid) plus 0.5% Analar NaCl, nutrient broth (NB, Oxoid), and Mueller Hinton broth (MHB, Oxoid). Solid media were peptone agar (PA), prepared by solidifying PW with 1.0% agar (Oxoid No 3), nutrient agar (NA, Oxoid), and Mueller Hinton agar (MHA, Oxoid), pH 7.2 to 7.4; PW and PA were used for Gram negative bacteria for large inhibition zones.

Inoculum

All organisms were grown at 37°C on PA/NA/MHA for 24 h, harves-

ted during stationary phase and suspended in 5 ml of sterile distilled water. Turbidity of each suspension was adjusted to match against 0.5 McFarland standard (McFarland, 1907) with a spectrophotometer (Chemito UV 2600 Double Beam UV-Spectrophotometer) at 625 nm that corresponded to 2.4×10^8 colony forming units (CFU)/ml.

Preparation of discs containing meropenem and sulbactam

The discs were punched from the Whatman No. 1 filter paper and were 7.25 mm in diameter. They were sterilized in hot air oven at 160°C for an hour in batches of hundred discs in screw capped Bijou bottles (Dasgupta et al., 2010). The final concentration of meropenem to be present in each disc was either 2 or 5 µg; hence, 2 stock solutions having 200 and 500 µg/ml were prepared. The following procedure was followed to prepare drug-impregnated discs: 1 ml of the stock solution containing 200 and 500 µg/ml of meropenem were added to 2 separate bottles each containing 100 discs. Each disc absorbed 0.01 ml of the solution, so that the entire 1 ml volume was absorbed there by producing discs having 2 and 5 µg of meropenem (Jeyaseeli et al., 2012; Miles et al., 1996; Mukherjee et al., 2011). The same procedure was followed for sulbactam sodium. The final concentration of this drug to be present in a disc was 200 µg for which the stock solution containing 20 mg/ml was prepared; 1 ml of such a stock solution containing 20 mg of sulbactam sodium was added to a bottle of 100 discs. Each disc absorbed 0.01 ml of the solution so that the entire 1 ml volume was absorbed, there by producing discs each having 200 µg of the drug. Two higher concentrations of sulbactam sodium had to be made since 200 µg discs failed to produce distinct zones of inhibition with respect to many organisms; these were 400 and 800 µg/disc. The discs were used in wet condition and maintained at 4°C until needed to retain the potency (Jeyaseeli et al., 2012).

The discs were allowed to warm up in room temperature before being applied on prepared agar plates for determination of inhibition zone (CLSI, 2009b).

Test for detection of minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of antibiotics, meropenem and sulbactam

This was performed by agar dilution method following the guidelines of Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI, 2009a) by spot inoculating 10^5 CFU with a 2 mm loop full of 1/10 dilution of 18 h NB/MHB cultures on NA/MHA plates containing 0 (control), 1, 2, 5, 10, 25, 50 µg/ml of meropenem and 0 (control), 1, 2, 5, 10, 25, 50, 100, 200 µg/ml of sulbactam sodium; plates were incubated at 37°C overnight and observed after 24 h, and up to 72 h for appearance of growth.

In vitro synergism

The method described by CLSI (CLSI, 2009b) was followed. The test for combined effects of meropenem with sulbactam was carried out by disc diffusion assay with 2 and 5 µg of meropenem and 200 and 400 µg sulbactam. Test organisms were grown in PW/MHB for 18 h, flooded on PA/MHA in triplicates and dried at 37°C for 1 h. Initially, individual inhibitory effects of two agents were determined by measuring the zones of inhibition. Depending on this observation, discs containing the same agents were placed on prepared plates in such a manner that their inhibitory circles would touch each other tangentially. The zones of inhibition due to individual and mutual effects on the same plate were recorded. The increase in surface area (πr^2) due to the combination of effects was evaluated statistically with the help of χ^2 test for the level of significance (Dasgupta et al., 2010).

Table 1. Determination of minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of meropenem and sulbactam.

Bacteria	Number of organism tested	MIC ($\mu\text{g/ml}$)	
		Meropenem	Sulbactam
<i>Shigella flexneri</i> 2b NCTC 559/63, <i>Sh. sonnei</i> NCTC 9774, <i>Escherichia coli</i> C 21, <i>Vibrio cholerae</i> 569B, ATCC 14033	5	1	10
<i>Salmonella enterica</i> serovar Typhimurium 2 NCTC74, <i>S. dysenteriae</i> 2	2	1	25
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i> UC 564, <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> NCTC 6571, NCTC 8531, NCTC 8532, <i>E coli</i> K12 Row, C 600, <i>S. typhi</i> 59, <i>Enterobacter cloaca</i> L1, <i>Arizona</i> spp 45, <i>V. vulnificus</i> NICED1	10	2	25
<i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> MTCC1143, <i>E. coli</i> 3P/SD	2	2	50
<i>B. pumilus</i> NCTC 8241, <i>Enterococcus faecalis</i> 4, <i>Providencia</i> spp 11	3	5	100
<i>Rhodococcus</i> spp M1	1	10	100
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> 1, <i>Pseudomonas. aeruginosa</i> C15, 27853	3	25	100
<i>K. pneumoniae</i> J/1/6, <i>A. baumannii</i> AMRI 8, 536, <i>P. aeruginosa</i> APC	4	25	200

Checkerboard experiment

This was performed in micro-titre trays with MHB. Meropenem was tested at concentrations of 0.2 to 6.4 $\mu\text{g/well}$ and sulbactam at 2 to 64 $\mu\text{g/well}$. The checker board was arranged as follows: in the first row all the wells contained 64 μg of sulbactam and either of 0.2, 0.4, 0.8, 1.6, 3.2 or 6.4 μg of meropenem in a final volume of 1 ml. In the second row all the wells contained 32 μg of sulbactam and increasing amounts of meropenem as described earlier. An identical pattern was followed in all the rows. In the last row the wells had increasing amounts of meropenem only. An inoculum of 0.5 ml McFarland standard (McFarland, 1907) was applied with the help of a multipoint inoculator, incubated aerobically and growth was recorded visually after 24 h incubation at 37°C. The fractional inhibitory concentration (FIC) index was calculated as given as follows: MIC of meropenem tested in combination/MIC of meropenem tested alone + MIC of sulbactam tested in combination / MIC of sulbactam tested alone. The resulting interaction was interpreted as synergistic when the value was ≤ 0.5 (Dasgupta et al., 2010; Jeyaseeli et al., 2012).

RESULTS

MIC of meropenem and sulbactam

Table 1 describes a comparative assessment of the growth inhibitory spectra of 30 bacteria comprising 7 Gram positive and 23 Gram negative types. Primarily, the Gram positive organisms revealed lower MIC values with respect to both the antibiotics, among the sensitive bacteria the MIC of meropenem varied from 1 to 2 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ level and the MIC of sulbactam was between 10 and 25 $\mu\text{g/ml}$. However, of the Gram negative organisms, strains of *Shigella*, *Salmonella*, *E. coli* and even vibrios were more sensitive to these antibiotics than *Klebsiella*, *Acenatobacter* and *Pseudomonas*. The MIC of meropenem was 25 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ and that of sulbactam was 100 to 200 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ in case of Gram negative organisms.

Effects of combination of meropenem and sulbactam

In the disc diffusion assay between these two antibiotics, varying degrees of synergism was observed. For the sensitive organisms, 2 μg meropenem discs and 200 μg discs were used for determining their combined action (Table 2). When the drug discs were placed individually on the culture lawn of *S. aureus* NCTC 6571, the diameters of zone of inhibition due to meropenem was 20.0 mm and the same due to sulbactam was 14.2 mm. These increased to 21.8 and 15.5 mm respectively, when the discs were placed to determine the effect of combination between the two antibiotics. The increase in surface area due to the combination was 18.81% for meropenem and 19.15% for sulbactam. Similarly, the highly sensitive bacterium *S. sonnei* singly produced an inhibition zone of 19.2 mm due to meropenem and 20.1 due to sulbactam discs; that increased to 25.0 and 22.6 mm, respectively, in the test for effect of the combination. Further studies with other bacteria with higher MIC values were carried out with 5 μg meropenem discs and 400 μg sulbactam discs (Table 3). Tests to determine effect of combination between these two antibiotics confirmed synergism. With respect to *L. monocytogenes*, the diameters of the inhibition zone due to meropenem individually was 24.9 mm and combinedly was 28.8 mm, and the % increase was calculated to be 33.78%. The same organism produced 19.8 mm wide zone of inhibition against sulbactam individually, that increased to 23.0 mm when tested in combination with meropenem. The resulting increase % was calculated to be 34.94%.

All the other test bacteria also exhibited substantial increase in the tests for determining the effect of combination between these two antibiotics. All the values were calculated statistically by following Student's 't' test based on the values of standard deviation and standard error

Table 2. Synergism between meropenem and sulbactam in highly sensitive bacteria.

Bacteria	Diameters of inhibition zones in mm					
	Individual drug effect (A)		Combined drug effect (B)		% increase on basis of Πr^2	
	Mp	Sb	Mp	Sb	Mp	Sb
<i>B. subtilis</i> UC 564	17.3	20.4	18.7	21.9	16.84	15.25
<i>S. aureus</i> NCTC 6571	20.0	14.2	21.8	15.5	18.81	19.15
<i>S. aureus</i> NCTC 8531	18.0	16.9	18.5	17.6	5.63	8.46
<i>S. aureus</i> NCTC 8532	31.6	20.9	34.8	22.9	21.28	20.05
<i>E. coli</i> K12 Row	31.6	20.9	34.8	22.9	21.28	20.05
<i>S. sonnei</i> NCTC 9774	19.2	20.1	25.0	22.6	69.54	26.42
<i>V. vulnificus</i> NICED 1	26.5	21.2	27.6	23.0	8.47	17.70

Mp, meropenem (2 µg /disc); Sb, sulbactam (200 µg/disc).

The mean surface area of the inhibition zone (mm)² was calculated as πr^2 on the basis of their mean diameter (2r) and % increase was calculated as (B-A)/A x 100, where A = surface area due to individual effect and B = surface area due to combined effect.

The zones of inhibition formed individually with respect to Mp and Sb and those formed in combination against the same compounds were larger in size. These were calculated statistically by determining Student's 't' test based on the values of standard deviation and standard error obtained which showed the differences to be highly significant (p<0.001) with respect to all the test bacteria.

Table 3. Effect of combination of meropenem and sulbactam in drug resistant bacteria isolated from human infections.

Bacteria	Diameters of inhibition zones in mm					
	Individual drug effect (A)		Combined drug effect (B)		% increase on basis of Πr^2	
	Mp	Sb	Mp	Sb	Mp	Sb
<i>L. monocytogenes</i> MTCC 1143	24.9	19.8	28.8	23.0	33.78	34.94
<i>K. pneumoniae</i> 1	23.1	21.8	25.8	23.4	24.74	15.22
<i>P. aeruginosa</i> ATCC 27853	20.9	18.2	24.8	22.5	40.8	52.83
<i>P. aeruginosa</i> APC	24.8	14.2	25.4	14.5	4.9	4.27
<i>A. baumannii</i> AMRI 8	22.5	20.3	25.3	23.4	26.44	32.87

Mp, meropenem (5 µg /disc); Sb, sulbactam (400 µg/disc).

The mean surface area of the inhibition zone (mm)² was calculated as πr^2 on the basis of their mean diameter (2r) and % increase was calculated as (B-A)/A x 100, where A = surface area due to individual effect and B = surface area due to combined effect.

The zones of inhibition formed singly with respect to Mp and Sb and those formed combinedly against the same compounds were larger in size. These were calculated statistically by determining Student's 't' test based on the values of standard deviation and standard error obtained which showed the differences to be highly significant (p<0.001) with respect to all the test bacteria.

obtained which showed the differences to be highly significant (p < 0.001) with respect to all the test bacteria (Tables 2 and 3).

Checkerboard test for the determination of FIC index

The MIC of meropenem with respect to *E. coli* K12 Row in MHB was 3.2 µg, while that of sulbactam was 32 µg. In combination, the MIC values decreased substantially, being 0.4 and 8 µg, respectively. These data on the combined effect of meropenem + sulbactam revealed a significant synergistic action between the two as the FIC index was calculated to be 0.375.

DISCUSSION

Ever since its discovery, meropenem was found to be

highly active against Gram negative organisms, and had been applied regularly for a variety of systemic infections including septicaemia throughout the world. However, even this wonder drug started showing development of drug resistance. In view of its efficacy, meropenem was combined with a less potent antibacterial agent sulbactam to determine if a synergistic combination could be achieved. Ko et al. (2004) reported that such a combination had produced encouraging result against *A. baumannii*, a bacterium that can be responsible for many types of acute infective conditions. In this study, the preliminary data on the independent effect of meropenem and sulbactam on various organisms, it was observed that the MICs of both the antibiotics were much higher in recent isolates of *K. pneumoniae*, *P. aeruginosa* and *A. baumannii*. The quantitative estimation using the percentage increase in the surface area of inhibition zones formed in combined tests compared to those formed by individual zones distinctly showed

augmentation of action of both drugs. This *in vitro* action was statistically significant. Finally, the checkerboard test provided a more definite enhancement of antibacterial action of this combination. In fact, in this test for synergistic action by the FIC index, it was evident that the actual amount of each antibiotic in the test pair was much lower than that required for the individual tests, implying that a suitable combination is likely to allow a reduction in the doses of both the antibiotics. In this way the problem of break-point concentrations of these drugs may be overcome.

In an elaborate study on the mechanism of drug resistance conferred by meropenem in pathogenic isolates of *P. aeruginosa*, Shashikala et al. (2006) had emphasized on the over expression of multi-drug efflux pumps. Esterly et al. (2011) observed that patients infected with carbapenem resistant *A. baumannii* blood stream infections were more critically ill and had greater incidences of morbidity since the inactive therapy became the predictor of death. The results suggested difficulties in treating such patients due to challenges of optimizing antimicrobial therapy in the setting of highly resistant pathogens. Combination of a carbapenem like meropenem with another antibacterial drug sulbactam, may, in all probability, turn out to be highly active against the virulent threats caused by a large number of extremely virulent Gram negative pathogens as is evident from the present study. This synergistic combination of meropenem and sulbactam would hopefully open up a prospective path in the selection of antimicrobial therapeutic regimens for the continuing fight against multi-drug resistant microorganisms.

REFERENCES

- Arrieta A (1997). Use of meropenem in the treatment of serious infection in children. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 24: Supplement 2, pp. S207 – S212.
- Bonomo RA, Szabo D (2006). Mechanisms of multi-drug resistance in *Acinetobacter* species and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 43: Supplement 2, pp. S49 – S56.
- Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI, 2009a). Methods for dilution antimicrobial susceptibility testing of bacteria that grow aerobically. 7th ed. approved standard M7-A7. Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
- Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI, 2009b). Performance Standards for antimicrobial disk susceptibility tests. 10th (ed), approved standard M02-A10. Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
- Collee FG, Miles RS, Watt B (1996). Mackie & McCartney's Practical Medical Microbiology, 14th ed., Chapter. 7 (ed) By Collee J G, Fraser A G, Marmion B P, Simmons A, Churchill Livingstone, New York, pp. 131-150.
- Dasgupta A, Chaki S, Mukherjee S, Jeyaseeli L, Mazumdar K, Dutta NK, Dastidar S G (2010). Experimental analyses of synergistic combinations of antibiotics with a recently recognized antibacterial agent, lacidipine. *Eur. J. Clin. Microb. Infect. Dis.* 29: 239-243.
- Esterly JS, Griffith M, Chao Q, Malczynski M, Postelnick MJ, Scheetz MH (2011). Impact of carbapenem resistance and receipt of active antimicrobial therapy on clinical outcomes of *Acinetobacter baumannii* bloodstream infections. *Antimicrob. Agents. Chemother.* doi:10.1128/AAC.01728-10.
- Gupta E, Mohanty S, Sood S, Dhawan B, Das BK, Kapil K (2006). Emerging resistance to carbapenems in a tertiary care hospital in North India. *Indian. J. Med. Res.* 124:95 – 98.
- Jeyaseeli L, Dasgupta A, Dastidar SG, Amaral L (2012). Evidences of significant synergism between antibiotics and the antipsychotic antimicrobial drug flupenthixol. *Eur. J. Clin. Microb. Infect. Dis.* 31:1243–1250.
- Ko WC, Lee HC, Chiang SR, Yan JJ, Wu JJ, Lu CL, Chuang YC (2004). *In vitro* and *in vivo* activity of meropenem and sulbactam against a multidrug-resistant *Acinetobacter baumannii* strain. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 53(2): 393-395.
- McFarland J (1907). Nephelometer: an instrument for estimating the number of bacteria in suspensions. *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* 14: 1176-1178.
- Miles RS, Amyes SGB (1996). Laboratory control of antimicrobial therapy. In: Collee J G, Fraser A G, Marmion B P, Simons A (eds) Mackie & McCartney's Practical Medical Microbiology, Churchill Livingstone, New York, pp. 151-177.
- Mukherjee S, Chaki S, Das S, Sen S, Dutta SK, Dastidar SG (2011). Distinct synergistic action of piperacillin and methylglyoxal against *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Indian. J. Exp. Biol.* 49: 547-551.
- Riera E, Cabol G, Mulet X, Garcia-Castillo M, Del Campo R, Juan C, Canton R, Oliver A (2011). *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* carbapenem resistance mechanisms in Spain: impact on the activity of imipenem, meropenem and doripenem. *J. Anti. Chemother.* doi: 10.1093/jac/dkr232.
- Shashikala KR, Srinivasan S, Sheela D (2006). Emerging resistance to carbapenems in hospital acquired *Pseudomonas* infection. *Indian. J. Pharmacol.* 38 (4): 287-288.
- Sinha M, Srinivasa H (2007). Mechanism of resistance to carbapenems in meropenem-resistant *Acinetobacter* isolates from clinical samples. *Indian J. Med. Microbiol.* 25: 121 – 125.
- Vishnu AK, Pillai S, Kavita RD, Karim S (2011). The phenotypic detection of carbapenemase in meropenem resistant *Acinetobacter Calcoaceticus-Baumannii* complex in a tertiary care hospital in South India. *J. Clin. Diagnos. Res.* 5: 223-226.