

UCLA

UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

In Vitro Activity of Tedizolid Compared to Linezolid and Five Other Antimicrobial Agents against 332 Anaerobic Isolates, Including Bacteroides fragilis Group, Prevotella, Porphyromonas, and Veillonella Species.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1mv2f8q9>

Journal

Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy, 64(9)

ISSN

0066-4804

Authors

Goldstein, Ellie JC
Merriam, C Vreni
Citron, Diane M

Publication Date

2020-08-20

DOI

10.1128/aac.01088-20

Peer reviewed



In Vitro Activity of Tedizolid Compared to Linezolid and Five Other Antimicrobial Agents against 332 Anaerobic Isolates, Including *Bacteroides fragilis* Group, *Prevotella*, *Porphyromonas*, and *Veillonella* Species

Ellie J. C. Goldstein,^{a,b} C. Vreni Merriam,^a Diane M. Citron^a

^aR. M. Alden Research Laboratory, Santa Monica, California, USA

^bThe David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, Los Angeles, California, USA

ABSTRACT Tedizolid's anaerobic activity is unappreciated. In this study, it was active against all 332 anaerobic isolates tested at ≤ 2 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ except *Bilophila wadsworthia* and was more active than linezolid against *Bacteroides fragilis* group species (MIC_{90} , 1 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ versus 2 to 4 $\mu\text{g/ml}$). Tedizolid was active against Gram-positive anaerobes (MIC_{90} for clostridia, 0.25 to 1 $\mu\text{g/ml}$; MIC_{90} for anaerobic cocci, ≤ 0.06 to 0.25 $\mu\text{g/ml}$). Our data coupled with clinical reports indicate that clinicians should consider its use in mixed infections where *Staphylococcus aureus* and anaerobes are involved.

KEYWORDS *Bacteroides fragilis*, *Prevotella* spp., *Veillonella* spp., anaerobes, linezolid, tedizolid

Oxazolidinones are primarily thought of as active against Gram-positive aerobes (1, 2). Tedizolid, the newest oxazolidinone, is approved for use in acute bacterial skin and skin structure infections (ABSSSIs) and offers potential advantages of once-a-day dosing, as well as potential decreased toxicities and has activity against linezolid-resistant methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) (3–5). There is a paucity of data about the susceptibility of anaerobic bacteria in general, including susceptibility to tedizolid (6, 7). However, the successful clinical use of linezolid in patients with ABSSSIs due to resistant anaerobic bacteria and cases of resistant *Bacteroides fragilis* wound sepsis has been reported (8, 9). We evaluated the comparative activity of tedizolid against a broad range of clinically isolated anaerobic pathogens, including *Fusobacterium*, *Prevotella*, and *Veillonella* spp.

Organisms tested were recovered from clinical samples (generally obtained from 2015 to 2017) from human infections, identified by standard methods (10, 11), and stored at -70°C . Susceptibility testing was performed using supplemented brucella blood agar dilution according to CLSI methods (12).

The antimicrobial agents tested were tedizolid, linezolid, moxifloxacin, ampicillin-sulbactam, piperacillin-tazobactam, clindamycin, and metronidazole. Drugs were reconstituted according to the manufacturers' instructions or the guidelines in CLSI document M11-A9 (12). Piperacillin-tazobactam was tested from 128 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ to 0.06 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ with tazobactam constant at 4 $\mu\text{g/ml}$; tedizolid was tested at 32 to 0.03 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ and the remainder at 32 to 0.06 $\mu\text{g/ml}$.

Quality control (QC) strains included *Bacteroides fragilis* ATCC 25285 and *Clostridium difficile* ATCC 700057. After 36 to 48 h of incubation in the anaerobic chamber at 36°C , the plates were examined for growth. The MIC was defined as the concentration of drug that completely inhibited growth or resulted in a marked reduction relative to

Citation Goldstein EJC, Merriam CV, Citron DM. 2020. *In vitro* activity of tedizolid compared to linezolid and five other antimicrobial agents against 332 anaerobic isolates, including *Bacteroides fragilis* group, *Prevotella*, *Porphyromonas*, and *Veillonella* species. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 64:e01088-20. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.01088-20>.

Copyright © 2020 American Society for Microbiology. All Rights Reserved.

Address correspondence to Ellie J. C. Goldstein, ejcgmd@aol.com.

Received 29 May 2020

Returned for modification 26 June 2020

Accepted 2 July 2020

Accepted manuscript posted online 6 July 2020

Published 20 August 2020

the drug-free growth control. Breakpoints were interpreted according to CLSI document M100-S30 (13).

The comparative *in vitro* activity (MICs) of tedizolid against 332 anaerobes is presented in Table 1. Tedizolid was active against all 332 anaerobic isolates at $\leq 2 \mu\text{g/ml}$, except for *Bilophila wadsworthia* (MIC₉₀, 16 $\mu\text{g/ml}$), which was also resistant to linezolid (MIC₉₀, 16 $\mu\text{g/ml}$), ampicillin-sulbactam, and piperacillin-tazobactam (MIC₉₀, $>64 \mu\text{g/ml}$) but susceptible to moxifloxacin (MIC₉₀, 0.5 $\mu\text{g/ml}$) and metronidazole (MIC₉₀, 1 $\mu\text{g/ml}$). Tedizolid was generally one to four dilutions more active than linezolid, including against *B. fragilis* group species (MIC₉₀, 1 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ versus 2 to 4 $\mu\text{g/ml}$) and most other Gram-negative anaerobes tested. It was active at $<2 \mu\text{g/ml}$ against 13 *B. fragilis* strains, 8 *Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron* strains, 2 *Bacteroides ovatus* strains, and 1 *Bacteroides uniformis* strain with piperacillin-tazobactam MICs of $>16 \mu\text{g/ml}$. Clindamycin resistance was common at $\sim 50\%$ or more for *B. fragilis*, *B. uniformis*, and *B. ovatus* isolates and $\sim 30\%$ for *Bacteroides caccae*, *B. thetaiotaomicron*, and *B. vulgatus* isolates. Tedizolid was especially active against Gram-positive anaerobes (MIC₉₀ for clostridia, 0.25 to 1 $\mu\text{g/ml}$; MIC₉₀ for cocci, ≤ 0.06 to 0.25 $\mu\text{g/ml}$). Moxifloxacin resistance was found in 44% of *B. fragilis* group isolates, including 10% of *B. fragilis* isolates, $\sim 30\%$ of *B. caccae* and *B. thetaiotaomicron* isolates, and $\sim 55\%$ of *B. vulgatus* isolates.

Against *Parabacteroides distasonis*, *P. goldsteinii*, *P. merdae*, and *Veillonella* spp., the tedizolid MIC₉₀ was 2 $\mu\text{g/ml}$. Tedizolid was also active against a variety of *Fusobacterium* spp. (MIC₉₀, $\leq 0.125 \mu\text{g/ml}$) as well as *Porphyromonas* and *Prevotella* (MIC₉₀, $\leq 1 \mu\text{g/ml}$, except for *P. bivia* [MIC₉₀, 4 $\mu\text{g/ml}$]).

Tedizolid is FDA approved for use in ABSSSIs and is active *in vitro* against clindamycin-, tetracycline-, levofloxacin-, daptomycin-, and tigecycline-resistant MRSA isolates (14–16).

Six days of tedizolid therapy was noninferior to 10 days of linezolid, including an early clinical response at 48 to 72 h (5). A study of 433 patients with diabetic foot infections (DFIs), a subset of ABSSSIs, showed that 83% were polymicrobial and 46% involved anaerobes with 2.7 anaerobic isolates per specimen (17). Gram-positive anaerobic cocci, especially *Fingoldia magna* (22.1%), accounted for 48.2% of the anaerobic isolates along with clostridia (4.4%). *B. fragilis* group species were the most common Gram-negative anaerobes (12.1%) isolated.

Zurenko et al. (18) found variable linezolid activity against 4 strains of *B. fragilis* group species (MIC range, 2 to 16 $\mu\text{g/ml}$) and 2 strains of *Prevotella* spp. (MIC, 1 $\mu\text{g/ml}$). Wybo et al. (19) found a linezolid MIC₉₀ of 4 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ for *Bacteroides* spp. and *Parabacteroides* spp., while fusobacteria had an MIC₉₀ of 1 $\mu\text{g/ml}$. We previously noted that linezolid had activity against many anaerobic Gram-positive organisms, including *F. magna*, *Peptostreptococcus anaerobius*, *Parvimonas micra* (MIC₉₀, 2 $\mu\text{g/ml}$; range, 2 to 4 $\mu\text{g/ml}$), and *Peptoniphilus asaccharolyticus* (MIC₉₀, 1 $\mu\text{g/ml}$) (20).

Lee et al. (16) found that tedizolid had MICs 4- to 8-fold lower than those of linezolid. Similarly, Schaadt et al. (21) reported that tedizolid had up to 4-fold better activity than linezolid against *Bacteroides* spp. (MIC₉₀ range, 2 to 8 $\mu\text{g/ml}$).

Previously (7), tedizolid's *in vitro* activity against *B. fragilis* was found to be equivalent to (*B. fragilis*, *B. ovatus*, and *B. vulgatus*) to 2- to 4-fold greater (*B. thetaiotaomicron*) than linezolid's. Our study confirms the improved comparative *in vitro* activity of tedizolid versus linezolid against a broader range of anaerobes with improved activity against Gram-negative anaerobes, including *Fusobacterium* spp., *Prevotella* spp., and *Veillonella* spp. *Prevotella bivia* had an MIC₉₀ of 4 $\mu\text{g/ml}$, which was higher than that of other *Prevotella* spp. (MIC₉₀, 1 $\mu\text{g/ml}$). Schaadt et al. (21) found *Prevotella* to have an MIC₉₀ of 4 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ (range, ≤ 0.016 to 16 $\mu\text{g/ml}$). *Veillonella* spp., emerging pathogens which are not often tested, had a tedizolid MIC₉₀ of 1 $\mu\text{g/ml}$.

A U.S. soldier in Afghanistan injured by an improvised explosive device (IED) developed *B. fragilis* sepsis and a leg infection resistant to all usual anaerobic agents but was treated and cured with a combination of linezolid and moxifloxacin (7). A case of *B. fragilis* sepsis resistant to metronidazole, beta-lactam–beta-lactamase inhibitors, and carbapenems was successfully treated with linezolid (8). These cases suggest a possible

TABLE 1 Comparative *in vitro* activity of tedizolid compared to linezolid and 5 other agents against 332 anaerobic isolates, including *Bacteroides fragilis* group species

Organism (no. of isolates) and agent	MIC ($\mu\text{g/ml}$)		
	Range	50%	90%
<i>Bacteroides caccae</i> (11)			
Tedizolid	0.25–1	1	1
Linezolid	1–4	2	4
Ampicillin-sulbactam	0.5–8	1	4
Piperacillin-tazobactam	0.5–8	2	8
Moxifloxacin	0.25–16	2	16
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –>32	1	>32
Metronidazole	0.25–1	0.5	1
<i>Bacteroides fragilis</i> (46)			
Tedizolid	0.5–2	1	1
Linezolid	2–16	4	4
Ampicillin-sulbactam	0.5–>64	16	64
Piperacillin-tazobactam	≤ 0.03 –>64	4	>64
Moxifloxacin	0.125–>16	0.5	8
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –>32	0.5	>32
Metronidazole	0.25–32	1	1
<i>Bacteroides ovatus</i> (11)			
Tedizolid	1–2	1	1
Linezolid	2–4	2	2
Ampicillin-sulbactam	1–32	4	16
Piperacillin-tazobactam	2–>64	4	32
Moxifloxacin	0.5–>16	1	8
Clindamycin	0.125–>32	2	>32
Metronidazole	0.25–2	1	1
<i>Bacteroides thetaiotaomicron</i> (14)			
Tedizolid	1–1	1	1
Linezolid	2–4	2	4
Ampicillin-sulbactam	1–32	4	16
Piperacillin-tazobactam	8–>64	16	>64
Moxifloxacin	0.5–16	1	16
Clindamycin	0.25–>32	4	>32
Metronidazole	0.25–2	0.5	1
<i>Bacteroides uniformis</i> (11)			
Tedizolid	0.5–1	0.5	1
Linezolid	1–2	2	2
Ampicillin-sulbactam	1–32	8	16
Piperacillin-tazobactam	0.5–>64	2	4
Moxifloxacin	0.25–>16	4	16
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –>32	>32	>32
Metronidazole	0.25–1	0.5	1
<i>Bacteroides vulgatus</i> (15)			
Tedizolid	0.25–2	1	1
Linezolid	1–2	2	2
Ampicillin-sulbactam	0.5–16	4	16
Piperacillin-tazobactam	0.125–4	4	4
Moxifloxacin	0.125–>16	16	>16
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –>32	>32	>32
Metronidazole	0.125–2	0.5	2
<i>Bilophila wadsworthia</i> (11)			
Tedizolid	>16–>16	>16	>16
Linezolid	4–16	16	16
Ampicillin-sulbactam	2–>64	64	>64
Piperacillin-tazobactam	4–>64	>64	>64
Moxifloxacin	0.25–0.5	0.5	0.5
Clindamycin	0.25–>32	0.25	1
Metronidazole	≤ 0.06 – ≤ 0.06	≤ 0.06	≤ 0.06

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Organism (no. of isolates) and agent	MIC ($\mu\text{g/ml}$)		
	Range	50%	90%
<i>Parabacteroides distasonis</i> (11)			
Tedizolid	1–2	2	2
Linezolid	2–4	4	4
Ampicillin-sulbactam	4–64	4	32
Piperacillin-tazobactam	4–>64	8	64
Moxifloxacin	0.25–16	0.5	8
Clindamycin	0.25–>32	2	>32
Metronidazole	0.5–1	1	1
<i>Parabacteroides goldsteinii</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	0.5–2	1	2
Linezolid	1–4	4	4
Ampicillin-sulbactam	2–32	8	32
Piperacillin-tazobactam	4–64	8	64
Moxifloxacin	0.25–16	0.5	8
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –>32	4	>32
Metronidazole	0.5–1	0.5	1
<i>Parabacteroides merdae</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	0.25–2	1	2
Linezolid	1–4	4	4
Ampicillin-sulbactam	1–64	8	16
Piperacillin-tazobactam	≤ 0.03 –>64	6	64
Moxifloxacin	0.125–8	1.25	8
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –>32	0.25	>32
Metronidazole	0.25–2	0.5	1
<i>Fusobacterium necrophorum</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	≤ 0.06 –0.125	≤ 0.06	≤ 0.06
Linezolid	0.5–1	0.5	1
Ampicillin-sulbactam	≤ 0.06 –0.125	0.125	0.125
Piperacillin-tazobactam	≤ 0.03	≤ 0.03	≤ 0.03
Moxifloxacin	1–2	1	2
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –>64	≤ 0.06	>64
Metronidazole	0.125–0.5	0.25	0.5
<i>Fusobacterium varium</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	≤ 0.06 –0.25	0.125	0.125
Linezolid	0.25–2	0.5	0.5
Ampicillin-sulbactam	0.5–1	1	1
Piperacillin-tazobactam	1–4	2	4
Moxifloxacin	0.25–>16	4	>16
Clindamycin	0.125–>32	2	>32
Metronidazole	0.25–1	0.5	1
<i>Fusobacterium</i> spp. (10) ^a			
Tedizolid	≤ 0.06 –0.125	≤ 0.06	≤ 0.06
Linezolid	0.25–0.5	0.5	0.5
Ampicillin-sulbactam	≤ 0.06 –0.25	≤ 0.06	≤ 0.06
Piperacillin-tazobactam	≤ 0.03 –0.06	≤ 0.03	≤ 0.03
Moxifloxacin	0.125–2	0.25	2
Clindamycin	$\leq 0.06 = 1$	≤ 0.06	1
Metronidazole	$\leq 0.06 = 0.25$	≤ 0.06	0.125
<i>Porphyromonas</i> spp. (10) ^b			
Tedizolid	≤ 0.06 –1	0.125	0.25
Linezolid	0.5–4	1	2
Ampicillin-sulbactam	≤ 0.06 –2	≤ 0.06	0.5
Piperacillin-tazobactam	≤ 0.03 –2	≤ 0.03	≤ 0.03
Moxifloxacin	0.125–2	0.5	1
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –>64	≤ 0.06	>64
Metronidazole	≤ 0.06 –2	0.125	0.5

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Organism (no. of isolates) and agent	MIC ($\mu\text{g/ml}$)		
	Range	50%	90%
<i>Prevotella bivia</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	0.25–4	2	4
Linezolid	2–8	4	4
Ampicillin-sulbactam	0.125–2	1	2
Piperacillin-tazobactam	≤ 0.03 –0.06	≤ 0.03	≤ 0.03
Moxifloxacin	0.125–8	4	4
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 = >32	≤ 0.06	>32
Metronidazole	0.25–8	1	8
<i>Prevotella buccae</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	0.5–1	1	1
Linezolid	2–2	2	2
Ampicillin-sulbactam	0.125–1	1	1
Piperacillin-tazobactam	≤ 0.03	≤ 0.03	≤ 0.03
Moxifloxacin	0.5–>16	0.5	>16
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –>32	>32	>32
Metronidazole	0.25–0.5	0.5	0.5
<i>Prevotella melaninogenica</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	0.5–1	1	1
Linezolid	2–4	2	4
Ampicillin-sulbactam	0.25–2	1	2
Piperacillin-tazobactam	≤ 0.03	≤ 0.03	≤ 0.03
Moxifloxacin	0.5–>16	1	16
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –>64	≤ 0.03	>64
Metronidazole	0.25–1	0.5	0.5
<i>Prevotella oralis</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	0.125–1	0.25	0.25
Linezolid	0.5–4	2	2
Ampicillin-sulbactam	≤ 0.06 –1	≤ 0.06	0.5
Piperacillin-tazobactam	≤ 0.03	≤ 0.03	≤ 0.03
Moxifloxacin	0.5–16	1	8
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –>32	≤ 0.06	>32
Metronidazole	≤ 0.06 –1	≤ 0.06	0.25
<i>Veillonella</i> spp. (10) ^c			
Tedizolid	1–2	2	2
Linezolid	2–8	2	4
Ampicillin-sulbactam	0.125–16	0.5	4
Piperacillin-tazobactam	0.125 = 64	8	64
Moxifloxacin	0.125–8	4	8
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –64	≤ 0.06	4
Metronidazole	0.5–4	2	4
<i>Clostridioides difficile</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	0.25–0.5	0.25	0.25
Linezolid	2–2	2	2
Ampicillin-sulbactam	1–4	2	2
Piperacillin-tazobactam	8–64	8	16
Moxifloxacin	1–16	1	2
Clindamycin	4–16	4	8
Metronidazole	0.25–0.5	0.5	0.5
<i>Clostridium clostridioforme</i> group (10) ^d			
Tedizolid	0.125–0.2	0.25	0.25
Linezolid	2–16	4	16
Ampicillin-sulbactam	0.5–16	1	1
Piperacillin-tazobactam	0.125–>64	4	8
Moxifloxacin	4–16	8	16
Clindamycin	0.25–>32	1	>32
Metronidazole	≤ 0.06 –0.25	≤ 0.06	0.25
<i>Clostridium innocuum</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	0.5–1	0.5	1
Linezolid	2–>16	4	4

(Continued on next page)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Organism (no. of isolates) and agent	MIC ($\mu\text{g/ml}$)		
	Range	50%	90%
Ampicillin-sulbactam	0.125–0.5	0.25	0.5
Piperacillin-tazobactam	0.5–2	1	2
Moxifloxacin	1–16	2	2
Clindamycin	0.25–>32	0.5	>32
Metronidazole	0.5–0.5	0.5	0.5
<i>Clostridium perfringens</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	0.125–0.25	0.125	0.25
Linezolid	1–16	2	2
Ampicillin-sulbactam	≤ 0.06 –0.5	0.125	0.25
Piperacillin-tazobactam	≤ 0.03 –1	0.25	1
Moxifloxacin	0.25–0.5	0.5	0.5
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –>32	0.25	1
Metronidazole	0.25–2	0.5	1
<i>Clostridium ramosum</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	0.5–0.5	0.5	0.5
Linezolid	8–16	8	8
Ampicillin-sulbactam	≤ 0.06 –0.25	0.125	0.125
Piperacillin-tazobactam	0.06–0.5	0.06	0.25
Moxifloxacin	2–>16	2	>16
Clindamycin	0.5–>32	2	4
Metronidazole	0.5–8	1	1
<i>Eggerthella lenta</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	0.25–0.25	0.25	0.25
Linezolid	1–2	1	2
Ampicillin-sulbactam	1–2	1	2
Piperacillin-tazobactam	16–32	16	32
Moxifloxacin	0.125–>16	0.25	4
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –32	0.125	16
Metronidazole	0.125–0.25	0.25	0.25
<i>Finegoldia magna</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	0.125–0.25	0.25	0.25
Linezolid	1–2	2	2
Ampicillin-sulbactam	≤ 0.06 –0.25	0.125	0.125
Piperacillin-tazobactam	0.06–0.125	0.06	0.125
Moxifloxacin	0.06–8	0.125	8
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –>32	0.25	1
Metronidazole	≤ 0.06 –0.5	0.25	0.5
<i>Parvimonas micra</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	≤ 0.06	≤ 0.06	≤ 0.06
Linezolid	0.5–1	0.5	1
Ampicillin-sulbactam	≤ 0.06 – ≥ 0.06	≤ 0.06	≤ 0.06
Piperacillin-tazobactam	≤ 0.03	≤ 0.03	≤ 0.03
Moxifloxacin	0.25–2	0.25	2
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –8	≤ 0.06	0.125
Metronidazole	≤ 0.06 –0.125	0.125	0.125
<i>Peptostreptococcus anaerobius</i> (10)			
Tedizolid	≤ 0.06 –0.125	≤ 0.06	0.125
Linezolid	0.5–1	0.5	0.5
Ampicillin-sulbactam	0.125–8	0.125	0.25
Piperacillin-tazobactam	0.125–16	0.25	2
Moxifloxacin	0.125–8	0.125	8
Clindamycin	≤ 0.06 –0.5	0.125	0.25
Metronidazole	0.25–1	0.5	0.5

^a*Fusobacterium nucleatum* (6 isolates), *F. nucleatum* subsp. *animalis* (2), *F. nucleatum* subsp. *funduliforme* (1), and *F. nucleatum* subsp. *vincentii* (1).

^b*Porphyromonas asaccharolytica* (4 isolates), *Porphyromonas somerae* (3), *Porphyromonas* species (3).

^c*Veillonella* species (7 isolates), *Veillonella parvula* (3).

^d*Clostridium aldenense* (4 isolates), *Clostridium bolteae* (3), *Clostridium clostridioforme* (2), and *Clostridium hathewayi* (1).

clinical use of tedizolid for infections with mixed Gram-positive aerobic and anaerobic bacteria, resistant infections with anaerobic bacteria, and/or infections in patients with multiple drug allergies.

The marrow toxicity of longer-duration oxazolidinone therapy has been of clinical concern; however, a recent retrospective study of patients who received tedizolid for a median duration of 28 days (interquartile range, 14 to 59 days), including patients with prosthetic joint infections and osteomyelitis, found it to be well tolerated and showed only an 8.7% discontinuation rate (22).

Tedizolid has good and underappreciated *in vitro* activity against a wide variety of anaerobes, including those typically isolated from ABSSSIs, such as diabetic foot infections. Clinicians might consider its use as a potential therapeutic partner in mixed infections where *S. aureus* and anaerobes are involved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was partially supported by an educational grant from the Bayer Corp., Leverkusen, Germany.

We thank Eliza Leoncio for technical help.

REFERENCES

- Kisgen JJ, Mansour H, Unger NR, Childs LM. 2014. Tedizolid: a new oxazolidinone antimicrobial. *Am J Health Syst Pharm* 71:621–633. <https://doi.org/10.2146/ajhp130482>.
- FDA. 2016. FDA tedizolid package insert. <https://www.iodine.com/drug/sivextro/fda-package-insert#S1>. Accessed 4 May 2020.
- Stevens DL, Bisno AL, Chambers HF, Dellinger P, Goldstein EJC, Gorbach SL, Hirschmann JV, Kaplan S, Montoya JG, Wade JC. 2014. Practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of skin and soft-tissue infections; 2014 update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis* 59:e10–e52. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciu444>.
- Moran GJ, Fang E, Corey GR, Das AF, De Anda C, Prokocimer P. 2014. Tedizolid for 6 days versus linezolid for 10 days for acute bacterial skin and skin structure infections (ESTABLISH-2): a randomized, double-blind, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Infect Dis* 14:696–705. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(14\)70737-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(14)70737-6).
- Prokocimer P, De Anda C, Fang E, Mehra P, Das A. 2013. Tedizolid phosphate vs linezolid for treatment of acute bacterial skin and skin structure infections: the ESTABLISH-1 randomized trial. *JAMA* 309:559–569. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2013.241>.
- Goldstein EJC, Citron DM, Goldman PJ, Goldman RJ. 2008. National hospital survey of anaerobic culture and susceptibility methods III. *Anaerobe* 14:68–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anaerobe.2008.01.001>.
- Goldstein EJC, Citron DM, Tyrrell KL, Leoncio ES, Merriam CV. 2017. The underappreciated *in vitro* activity of tedizolid against *Bacteroides fragilis* species, including strains resistant to carbapenems. *Anaerobe* 43:1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anaerobe.2016.09.008>.
- Sherwood JE, Fraser S, Citron D, Wexler H, Blakely G, Jobling K, Patrick S. 2011. Multi-drug resistant *Bacteroides fragilis* recovered from blood and severe leg wounds caused by an improvised explosive device (IED) in Afghanistan. *Anaerobe* 17:152–155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anaerobe.2011.02.007>.
- Wareham DW, Wilks M, Ahmed D, Brazier JS, Millar M. 2005. Anaerobic sepsis due to multi-resistant *Bacteroides fragilis*: cure and clinical response with linezolid therapy. *Clin Infect Dis* 40:e67–e68. <https://doi.org/10.1086/428623>.
- Jousimies-Somer HR, Summanen P, Citron DM, Baron EJ, Wexler HM, Finegold SM. 2002. Wadsworth-KTL anaerobic bacteriology manual. Star Publishing, Belmont, CA.
- Versalovic J, Carroll KC, Jorgensen JG, Funke G, Landry ML, Warnock DW (ed). 2011. Manual of clinical microbiology, 10th ed, vol 2. ASM Press, Washington, DC.
- CLSI. 2018. Methods for antimicrobial susceptibility of anaerobic bacteria. Approved standard, 9th ed. CLSI document M11-A9. CLSI, Wayne, PA.
- CLSI. 2020. Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing, 30th ed. CLSI supplement M100. CLSI, Wayne, PA.
- Moellering RC. 2014. Tedizolid: a novel oxazolidinone for Gram-positive infections. *Clin Infect Dis* 58(Suppl 1):S1–S3. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cit658>.
- Thomson KS, Goering RV. 2013. Activity of tedizolid (TR-700) against well-characterized methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* strains of diverse epidemiological origins. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 57:2892–2895. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00274-13>.
- Lee Y, Hong SK, Choi S, Im W, Yong D, Lee K. 2015. *In vitro* activity of tedizolid against gram-positive bacteria in patients with skin and skin structure infections and hospital-acquired pneumonia: a Korean multicenter study. *Ann Lab Med* 35:523–530. <https://doi.org/10.3343/alm.2015.35.5.523>.
- Citron DM, Goldstein EJC, Merriam CV, Lipsky B, Abramson MA. 2007. Bacteriology of moderate to severe diabetic foot infections and *in vitro* activity of antimicrobial agents. *J Clin Microbiol* 45:2819–2828. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00551-07>.
- Zurenko GE, Yagi BH, Schaadt RD, Allison JW, Kilburn JO, Glickman SE, Hutchinson DK, Barbachyn MR, Brickner SJ. 1996. *In vitro* activities of U-100592 and U-100766, novel oxazolidinone antibacterial agents. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 40:839–845. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.40.4.839>.
- Wybo I, Van den Bossche D, Soetens O, Vekens E, Vandoorlaer K, Claeys G, Glupczynski Y, Ieven M, Melin P, Nonhoff C, Rodriguez-Villalobos H, Verhaegen J, Piérard D. 2014. Fourth Belgian multicentre survey of antibiotic susceptibility of anaerobic bacteria. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 69:155–161. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkt344>.
- Citron DM, Merriam CV, Tyrrell KL, Warren YA, Fernandez H, Goldstein EJC. 2003. Comparative *in vitro* activity of ramoplanin, teichoplanin, vancomycin, linezolid, bacitracin, and four other antimicrobials against intestinal anaerobic bacteria. 2003. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 47:2334–2338. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.47.7.2334-2338.2003>.
- Schaadt R, Sweeney D, Shinabarger D, Zurenko G. 2009. *In vitro* activity of TR-700, the active ingredient of the antibacterial prodrug TR-701, a novel oxazolidinone antibacterial agent. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 53:3236–3239. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00228-09>.
- Mensa Vendrell M, Tasiás Pitarch M, Salavert Lletí M, Calabuig Muñoz E, Morata Ruiz L, Castells Lao G, López Suñé E, Mensa Pueyo J, Oltra Sempere MR, Pedro-Botet Montoya ML, Isernia V, Reynaga Sosa EA, Moreno Nuñez L, Pasquau Liaño J, Sequera Arquelladas S, Yuste Ara JR, Soriano Viladomiu A. 2020. Safety and tolerability of more than 6 days of tedizolid treatment. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 64:e00356-20. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00356-20>.