

1 Antimicrobial Susceptibilities of Clinical Bacterial Isolates from Urinary Tract Infections to Fosfomycin
2 and Comparator Antibiotics Determined by Agar Dilution Method and Automated Micro Broth Dilution

3

4 ¹Jamie L Dombach, ²Nancy Smith, ²Teresa Kottiri, ¹Alicia Schiller, ^{2,3}Edwin Kamau[#]

5

6 ¹Department of Clinical Investigations, Tripler Army Medical Center, Honolulu, HI, USA

7 ²Department of Pathology and Area Laboratory Services, Walter Reed National Military Medical Center,
8 Bethesda, MD, USA

9 ³Department of Pathology and Area Laboratory Services, Tripler Army Medical Center, Honolulu, HI, USA

10

11 Running Title: Susceptibility of US Clinical Isolates to Fosfomycin

12

13 [#]Address correspondence to Edwin.Kamau.mil@health.mil

14 Abstract word count: 333

15 Text word count:

16

17

18

19

20 **ABSTRACT**

21 Uncomplicated bacteremic urinary tract infections (bUTIs) are common, often caused by *Escherichia coli*,
22 *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, and *Enterococcus faecalis*, with most encounters treated empirically. As rates of
23 antimicrobial resistance increase, available antibiotic treatment options are dwindling. Novel antibiotics
24 approved for treating bUTIs are limited, leading to a resurgence of interest in older antibiotics, including
25 fosfomycin. In this study, clinical urine samples from patients diagnosed with bUTIs from a military
26 hospital on the Eastern Seaboard of the United States were tested for susceptibility to fosfomycin and
27 comparator antibiotics, including levofloxacin, nitrofurantoin, and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole
28 (TMS). A total of 1353 nonduplicate bacterial isolates were tested. The majority were Gram-negative,
29 including 605 non-ESBL and 285 ESBL *E. coli* and 84 non-ESBL and 52 ESBL *K. pneumoniae*. Fosfomycin
30 susceptibility rates were similar for non-ESBL and ESBL *E. coli* (95.9% vs 96.1%) and *K. pneumoniae*
31 (38.1% vs 36.5%). Fosfomycin demonstrated high activity against other Enterobacterales and Gram-
32 positive organisms including *Enterobacter faecalis* and *Staphylococcus aureus*. Interestingly, most
33 fosfomycin non-susceptible isolates were susceptible to other first-line bUTI treatment options, and
34 most isolates that were non-susceptible to other first-line bUTI treatment option were susceptible to
35 fosfomycin. ESBL *K. pneumoniae* isolates were the least susceptible to current first-line treatment
36 options. Fosfomycin Etest demonstrated high sensitivity compared to agar dilution, making it a viable
37 method in resource limited areas. Overall, we demonstrated fosfomycin has high activity against
38 common etiologies that cause bUTIs. Further studies investigating the use of fosfomycin in treating non-
39 *E. coli* bUTI pathogens, as single or combination therapy, is warranted.

40 **IMPORTANCE** (150 words max)

41 Uncomplicated bUTI are often caused by *Escherichia coli*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, and *Enterococcus*
42 *faecalis*, and treated with antibiotics. As rates of antimicrobial resistance increase, the options available

43 for treatment are diminishing. Limited novel antibiotics have entered the market leading to a resurgence
44 of interest in older antibiotics, including fosfomycin. In this study, we investigated the susceptibility of
45 bUTI clinical isolates to fosfomycin and current treatment. Isolates were susceptible to fosfomycin at
46 similar or higher rates compared to comparator antibiotics, especially for isolates that produce
47 extended-spectrum beta-lactamases. In addition to *E. coli* and *E. faecalis*, organisms that fosfomycin is
48 FDA approved for, fosfomycin had high activity against other Enterobacterales and Gram-positive
49 organisms including *Staphylococcus aureus*. Since most uncomplicated cystitis is treated empirically,
50 fosfomycin is a reasonable treatment option, either single agent or in combination, supporting the need
51 for randomized control trials to approve treatment of other etiologies, and harmonizing breakpoints
52 across agencies.

53 INTRODUCTION

54 Bacteremic urinary tract infections (bUTIs) are common, and can present as asymptomatic or
55 symptomatic uncomplicated, or complicated infections. This distinction is important since it helps guide
56 the choice and duration of antimicrobial treatment (1). Asymptomatic bacteriuria may not warrant
57 treatment, especially in women, and is now recognized as an important contributor to inappropriate
58 antimicrobial use and the emergence of drug resistance (1,2). The most common causes of bUTIs are
59 infections by *Escherichia coli*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, and *Enterococcus faecalis*, complicated by the
60 increasing rate of multidrug resistant (MDR) organisms including the extended-spectrum β -lactamase
61 (ESBL) producing strains of *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae* (3,4). For uncomplicated acute bacterial cystitis,
62 preferred treatments include nitrofurantoin and trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole (TMS), and more
63 recently fosfomycin, with fluoroquinolones and beta-lactam agents used as alternative treatment options
64 (1).

65 Fosfomycin is a bactericidal antibiotic agent with a broad spectrum activity against Gram-negative and
66 Gram-positive pathogens, including MDR Gram-negative pathogens, such as ESBL-producing organisms
67 and carbapenem-resistant Enterobacterales (CRE) (5,6). Discovered in 1969 (7), the oral formulation
68 (fosfomycin trometamol) was approved by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in
69 1996, and is one of the recommended first-line treatment options for uncomplicated bUTIs caused by *E.*
70 *coli* or *E. faecalis* (1,2).

71 Due to the limited selection of oral antibiotics to treat bUTIs caused by non-*E. coli* pathogens, especially
72 those that are resistant, fosfomycin usage is increasing (1,6). In a meta-analysis of randomized
73 controlled trials (RCTs) assessing the effectiveness and safety for the treatment of cystitis, fosfomycin
74 trometamol was shown to be as effective with clinical and microbiological cure, relapses, and
75 reinfections as comparator antibiotics including quinolones, β -lactams, aminoglycosides, nitrofurantoin,
76 and sulfonamides (8). Furthermore, observational studies have demonstrated fosfomycin is effective in
77 the treatment of MDR infections (9,10), with oral fosfomycin trometamol having similar clinical and
78 microbiological success with carbapenems in the treatment of ESBL-producing *E. coli* (11). More
79 recently, the FOREST randomized trial showed that fosfomycin trometamol was an effective oral step-
80 down therapy for bUTIs due to MDR *E. coli* compared to other oral drugs (12). With the rates of MDR
81 pathogens increasing worldwide including in the US, the use of fosfomycin for the treatment of bUTIs is
82 on the rise and is likely to increase, warranting additional studies.

83 Given that bacterial susceptibility profiles can differ regionally, we sought to get a better understanding
84 of the *in vitro* activity of fosfomycin and other first-line antibiotics against bUTI pathogens from the mid-
85 Atlantic region of the United States. In this study we determined the efficacy of fosfomycin,
86 nitrofurantoin, levofloxacin, and trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole (TMS) against clinical bUTI isolates
87 from a military hospital on the US Eastern Seaboard. Furthermore, we sought to examine the efficacy of
88 fosfomycin against MDR isolates as well as species other than *E. coli* and *E. faecalis*.

89 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

90 This study protocol was approved by the appropriate Human subjects regulatory authority. Investigators
91 adhered to the policies for protection of human subjects as prescribed in 45 Code of Federal Regulation
92 46.

93 **Bacterial isolates**

94 A total of 1353 nonduplicate bacterial isolates from urine clinical specimens submitted to the clinical
95 laboratory for bUTI testing in our hospital as routine patient standard-of-care were analyzed in this
96 study. Single bacterial colonies obtained from purity plates prepared while setting up automated
97 identification and susceptibility testing on the BD Phoenix system (Becton Dickinson, New Jersey, US)
98 were used for fosfomycin susceptibility testing, which was performed within 24 hours. Fosfomycin
99 susceptibility testing was performed on select isolates at the request of infectious disease clinicians, or
100 randomly selected from the urine bench on the days when fosfomycin testing was performed.

101 **In vitro susceptibility testing**

102 Susceptibilities of all isolates to fosfomycin (Sigma Chemical Co., St. Louis, MO) was determined by the
103 agar dilution method as described by CLSI, with clinical breakpoints for *E. coli* and *E. faecalis* from the
104 urinary tract set at is ≤ 64 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ (13,14). For fosfomycin susceptibility testing, plates were prepared using
105 Mueller-Hinton agar (MHA, BBL Microbiology Systems, Cockeysville, MD) supplemented with 25 $\mu\text{g/ml}$
106 of glucose-6-phosphate and fosfomycin at one of the three concentrations: 64 $\mu\text{g/ml}$; 128 $\mu\text{g/ml}$; 256
107 $\mu\text{g/ml}$. Bacteria colonies obtained from the purity plates were prepared to 0.5 McFarland and then each
108 isolate spread on four plates; three with fosfomycin (at the three different concentrations) and a control
109 plate that did not contain any antibiotic. Plates were incubated for 16-18 hours at 37°C. The MIC of each
110 antimicrobial agent was defined as the lowest concentration that inhibited visible growth of the
111 organism. Control strains, including *S. aureus* ATCC 29213, *E. coli* ATCC 25922, and *P. aeruginosa* ATCC

112 27853, were included in each set of tests. Fosfomycin Etest was performed on MHA agar following
113 manufacturer's recommendations (bioMérieux, Durham, NC).

114 **Interpretation of susceptibility test results**

115 Interpretive criteria for susceptibility categories by MIC were applied using the CLSI interpretive criteria
116 for urinary tract isolates of *E. coli* and *E. faecalis* for all the isolates as follows: If bacteria grew in the
117 control plate and plate containing 64 µg/ml fosfomycin, but not in 128 and 256 µg/ml fosfomycin, it was
118 considered susceptible; If bacteria grew in the control plate, and in plates containing 64 µg/ml and 128
119 µg/ml fosfomycin but not 256 µg/ml, it was considered intermediate; if bacteria grew in all the plates
120 including those containing 256 µg/ml fosfomycin, it was considered resistant. Etest endpoints were read
121 by following the manufacturer's package insert, which permits ≤5 colonies within the ellipse to be
122 ignored.

123 **Data analysis**

124 MIC data for comparator antibiotics were obtained from the BD Phoenix system and fosfomycin data
125 were obtained from agar dilution and Etest. Isolates that were determined to have intermediate
126 susceptibility were considered non-susceptible for analysis. Descriptive statistics were calculated in Excel
127 and Tableau was used for data representation.

128 **RESULTS**

129 Of the 1353 bUTI isolates tested, 89.7% (n=1,213) were Gram-negative and 10.3% (n= 140) were Gram-
130 positive. Species with more than 10 bacterial isolates made up 98% (n=1,326) of all organisms tested,
131 with *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae*, and *E. faecalis* accounting for the majority (84.0%, n=1,137). The remaining
132 species that composed our results were *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Citrobacter spp*, *Proteus mirabilis*,

133 *Enterococcus faecium*, *Enterobacter cloacae*, *Klebsiella aerogenes*, *Klebsiella oxytoca*, and

134 *Staphylococcus aureus* (Figure 1).

135 **Antibiotic Susceptibility of Bacterial Isolates**

136 Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) values for each antibiotic (fosfomycin, levofloxacin, TMS, and
137 nitrofurantoin) were obtained in 1,326 (of the total 1,353) bacterial isolates (supplementary file 1). Most
138 species exhibited high rates of susceptibility to fosfomycin (92-100%) except for *P. aeruginosa*, *E.*
139 *cloacae*, and *Klebsiella spp* which had fosfomycin susceptibilities of less than 56%.

140 Since *Citrobacter spp* and *P. mirabilis* had high fosfomycin susceptibility rates (96.2% and 92.3%,
141 respectively), and had over 25 isolates, we also evaluated the most common susceptibility patterns in
142 these two species. *Citrobacter spp* overall were more susceptible to the antibiotics tested than *P.*
143 *mirabilis*. While only 50% of isolates were susceptible to amoxicillin, 92.3% were susceptible to
144 levofloxacin, 84.6% were susceptible to nitrofurantoin, and 88.5% were susceptible to TMS
145 (Supplementary Figure 1). All *Citrobacter spp* isolates were susceptible to at least two antibiotics tested.
146 While only 11.5% of *P. mirabilis* isolates were susceptible to nitrofurantoin, 64.5% were susceptible to
147 levofloxacin, 73.1% were susceptible to TMS, and 96.2% were susceptible to amoxicillin (Supp Figure 1).
148 Like the *Citrobacter spp* isolates, all *P. mirabilis* isolates were susceptible to at least two of the
149 antibiotics tested.

150 **Antibiotic susceptibility in ESBL vs non-ESBL isolates**

151 Susceptibility profiles for fosfomycin and comparator antibiotics of *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae* isolates
152 identified as ESBL and non-ESBL strains are represented in Figure 2. There were n=605 non-ESBL and
153 n=285 ESBL *E. coli*, n= 84 non-ESBL and n=52 ESBL *K. pneumoniae* isolates.

154 Fosfomycin susceptibility rates were similar for non-ESBL and ESBL *E. coli* (95.9% vs 96.1%) and *K.*
155 *pneumoniae*, albeit at much lower rates (38.1% vs 36.5%). For the comparator antibiotics, with
156 exception of nitrofurantoin in *E. coli* where susceptibility rates were similar for non-ESBL and ESBL
157 (97.5% vs 95.8%), percentage susceptibility rates for *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae* were about twice or more
158 ($\geq 83.0\%$) for non-ESBL compared to ESBL ($\leq 44.0\%$) isolates. Of note, fosfomycin susceptibility profiles
159 appeared to be similar in all species, except for *K. pneumoniae*. The susceptibility profiles of non-ESBL *K.*
160 *pneumoniae* indicate that levofloxacin and TMS appear to be more effective (Figure 2).

161 **Susceptibility of multiple-drug resistant (MDR) *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae* isolates to fosfomycin**

162 We then grouped isolates as MDR based on susceptibility to comparator drugs. When we grouped
163 isolates based on non-susceptibility to levofloxacin and TMS, there were 30 (5.0%) non-ESBL and 121
164 (42.5%) ESBL *E. coli* MDR isolates, of which all but one non-ESBL and seven ESBL were susceptible to
165 fosfomycin (Figure 3A). For ESBL *K. pneumoniae*, there were 19 (36.5%) MDR isolates, of which 5 (26.3%)
166 were susceptible to fosfomycin. There were only two non-ESBL *K. pneumoniae* MDR isolates, and one
167 was resistant to fosfomycin (Figure 3B). When we grouped isolates based on non-susceptibility to
168 levofloxacin, TMS and nitrofurantoin, there were 5 non-ESBL (0.8%) and 5 (1.8%) ESBL *E. coli* MDR
169 isolates, of which all but one non-ESBL and one ESBL were susceptible to fosfomycin (Figure 3A). For
170 ESBL *K. pneumoniae*, there were 17 (32.7%) MDR isolates, of which 5 (29.4%) were susceptible to
171 fosfomycin. Only one of the non-ESBL *K. pneumoniae* isolates was resistant to all three comparator
172 drugs but it was susceptible to fosfomycin (Figure 3B). Finally, we grouped ESBL *E. coli* and *K.*
173 *pneumoniae* as MDR based on non-susceptibility to the additional antibiotics tested in the automated
174 AST platform including amoxicillin/clavulanate, aztreonam, cefepime and ceftriaxone. Of the 285 ESBL *E.*
175 *coli* isolates, 89 were MDR, of which 83 (93.3%) were fosfomycin susceptible. There were 52 ESBL *K.*
176 *pneumoniae* isolates, 27 were MDR, of which 10 (37.0%) were fosfomycin susceptible.

177 **Susceptibility of fosfomycin-resistant isolates to comparator drugs**

178 Of the 25 *E. coli* non-ESBL isolates that were fosfomycin resistant, 23 (92.0%) were susceptible to
179 nitrofurantoin and TMS, and of the 15 isolates that were nitrofurantoin resistant, 13 (86.7%) were
180 susceptible to fosfomycin (Figure 3A). Of the 11 *E. coli* ESBL isolates that were fosfomycin resistant, 10
181 (90.9%) were susceptible to nitrofurantoin, 3 (27.3%) were susceptible to TMS, and only one (9.1%) was
182 susceptible to levofloxacin. Of the 12 nitrofurantoin-resistant ESBL isolates, 11 (91.7%) were susceptible
183 to fosfomycin, and 6 (50.0%) were susceptible to TMS. Of the 52 fosfomycin resistant non-ESBL *K.*
184 *pneumoniae* isolates, 20 (38.4%) were susceptible to nitrofurantoin, levofloxacin, and TMS, and 43
185 (82.7%) were susceptible to levofloxacin and TMS. Fosfomycin resistant ESBL *K. pneumoniae* isolates did
186 not display a predominant susceptibility pattern to comparator drugs (Figure 3B).

187 **Global susceptibility profiles of *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae* and *E. faecalis***

188 The global susceptibilities of the isolates to the four antibiotics tested in this study were examined.
189 Isolates were grouped based on the number of antibiotics they were susceptible to. ESBL *K. pneumoniae*
190 displayed the lowest susceptibilities, with 23% of isolates pan-resistant to the four antibiotics tested.
191 Conversely, non-ESBL *E. coli* exhibited the highest susceptibilities, with 71% of isolates pan-susceptible
192 to all antibiotics, and only one was pan-resistant to all the antibiotics tested. The other three groups of
193 isolates displayed at least 50% susceptibility to at least three antibiotics tested (Figure 4).

194 **Common susceptibility patterns in *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae* and *E. faecalis***

195 To understand the most common susceptibility patterns, isolates for each species were grouped by
196 identical antibiotic susceptibilities (Figure 5). The most common susceptibility pattern for non-ESBL *E.*
197 *coli* isolates was susceptible to fosfomycin, levofloxacin, TMS, and nitrofurantoin, which was present in
198 430 (71.1%) of the isolates. The most common pattern in ESBL *E. coli* was susceptible to fosfomycin and
199 nitrofurantoin but non-susceptible to levofloxacin and TMS, detected in 110 (38.6%) of the isolates.

200 While three susceptibility patterns were prominent in non-ESBL *K. pneumoniae*, the most common
201 pattern, with 23 (27.4%) isolates, was susceptible to levofloxacin and TMS but non-susceptible to
202 fosfomycin and nitrofurantoin. Interestingly, the susceptibility pattern that was most common in ESBL
203 *K. pneumoniae* was non-susceptible to all four antibiotics tested. ESBL *K. pneumoniae* exhibited the
204 highest number of susceptibility patterns, 14 out of the possible 16 patterns represented (Figure 3). The
205 majority of *E. faecalis* isolates (66 [71.0%]) were susceptible to fosfomycin, levofloxacin, and
206 nitrofurantoin but non-susceptible to TMS.

207 **Comparison of agar dilution and Etest outcomes**

208 Given that agar dilution (AD) is time and material-intensive, we tested if the Etest, which may be more
209 practical for many labs performing surveillance, especially in resource-limited areas, could provide
210 accurate results. Fosfomycin susceptibility profiles were established using the Etest in the following
211 bacterial isolates: 477 *E. coli*, of which 34 were ESBLs; 96 *K. pneumoniae*, of which 11 were ESBLs; and 45
212 *E. faecalis*. There was a dramatic range in MICs (Figure 6), which led to more considerable than expected
213 disparities between the median and average MICs (Table 1). Overall *E. coli* was highly susceptible
214 compared to *K. pneumoniae* for non-ESBLs (99.8% vs. 50.6%) and ESBLs (91.0% vs. 45.5%) and *E. faecalis*
215 had high susceptibility rates (88.9%) (Table 1). Of the 116 isolates tested for fosfomycin susceptibility by
216 both Etest and AD, 116 (100.0%) were identified as susceptible by AD but only 109 (94.0%) were
217 identified as susceptible by Etest. Three misidentified isolates had MICs greater than 256 µg/mL.

218 Table 1. Isolate susceptibility to fosfomycin determined by the Etest

	Non-ESBL		ESBL		
	<i>E. coli</i>	<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	<i>E. coli</i>	<i>K. pneumoniae</i>	<i>E. faecalis</i>
Median	1	96	1.5	64	32

Average	15.2	255.8	8.22	81.8	40.2
Standard Deviation	109.3	372.5	24.1	57.3	28.0
Percent susceptible	99.8	50.6	91.0	45.5	88.9
Percent susceptible (AD)	95.9	36.4	96.4	37.3	98.0

219

220 DISCUSSION

221 In this study, we evaluated fosfomycin activity against common bUTI organisms collected from a military
222 hospital located in the Eastern Seaboard of the United States using CLSI breakpoints for *E. coli* and *E.*
223 *faecalis*. In addition to showing high activity against these two organisms, fosfomycin also displayed high
224 activity against other common bUTI organisms, including Enterobacterales (*Citrobacter spp* and *P.*
225 *mirabilis*) and Gram-positive organisms (*S. aureus* and *E. faecium*). Further, fosfomycin displayed high
226 activity against ESBL and MDR *E. coli* isolates, with similar susceptibility rates as those for non-ESBL
227 isolates. Nitrofurantoin displayed similarly high activity against *E. coli* as fosfomycin. Interestingly, most
228 fosfomycin non-susceptible isolates were susceptible to nitrofurantoin, and most nitrofurantoin non-
229 susceptible isolates were susceptible to fosfomycin. Fosfomycin displayed least activity against *K.*
230 *pneumoniae*, both non-ESBL and ESBL isolates. Fosfomycin non-susceptible non-ESBL *K. pneumoniae*
231 were highly susceptible to levofloxacin and TMS but not nitrofurantoin. Fosfomycin also displayed low
232 activity against *K. aerogenes*, *E. cloacae* and *P. aeruginosa*. The susceptibility rates in our study
233 corroborated a recent study which showed *P. aeruginosa* with susceptibility rate of 40.4% to fosfomycin
234 (15).

235 As a primary or step-down bUTI treatment, fosfomycin has been shown to have high clinical,
236 microbiological, and *in vitro* activity against MDR *E. coli*, including those harboring metallo- β -lactamases
237 (12, 16-26). Oral fosfomycin tromethamine is FDA-approved for single-dose treatment of uncomplicated

238 bUTI (23,27). As the predominant bUTI pathogen, most published studies investigating clinical,
239 microbiological, and *in vitro* activity of fosfomycin have primarily focused on *E. coli* (28). There are
240 however studies that have also investigated activity of fosfomycin against other common bUTI species. A
241 study by Mezzatesta *et al.*, found in addition to having high activity against ESBL *E. coli*, fosfomycin had
242 high *in vitro* activity against ESBL *P. mirabilis* and methicillin-resistant *S. saprophyticus* (5). Other studies
243 have also demonstrated high fosfomycin *in vitro* activity against Enterobacterales, including *Proteus spp*,
244 *Enterobacter spp*, *Serratia spp*, and *Citrobacter spp* (28,29). These studies corroborate part of our data
245 where we demonstrated high fosfomycin *in vitro* activity against *P. mirabilis* and *Citrobacter spp* but not
246 *Enterobacter*. Further, similarly to our study, studies have demonstrated that fosfomycin retains high *in*
247 *vitro* activity against bacterial isolates that are non-susceptible to other first-line treatments for bUTI
248 (28,29).

249 Fosfomycin *in vitro* activity against *K. pneumoniae* seems to vary widely between studies but remains
250 consistently lower than that of most other Enterobacterales (5, 27-30). Interestingly, high clinical and
251 microbiological cures have been attained in patients treated with fosfomycin due to bUTI caused by *K.*
252 *pneumoniae* (31-33). Although the epidemiology and susceptibility of different organisms may vary
253 based on the country and region, these data strongly suggest fosfomycin is a highly active antibiotic
254 against the most common causes of bUTI and has a high clinical cure rate. This is important since most
255 uncomplicated bUTI are treated empirically (34). Therefore, an antibiotic that provides broad-spectrum
256 activity, including activity against MDR organisms with good clinical outcomes, is a reasonable treatment
257 option. Further, fosfomycin is a highly viable option as a step-down treatment (12,18,20). RCTs will be
258 invaluable in investigating fosfomycin effectiveness in treating other common bUTI pathogens including
259 *K. pneumoniae*, especially in regions with high rates of MDR organisms.

260 Fosfomycin tromethamine is an antibacterial phosphonic acid that inhibits bacterial cell wall formation
261 by interfering with peptidoglycan synthesis (35). *In vitro* synergy between fosfomycin and other

262 antibiotics has been demonstrated, which may be useful as an alternative treatment option, especially
263 for MDR organisms including *K. pneumoniae*, *P. aeruginosa*, *Acinetobacter baumannii* and methicillin-
264 resistant *S. aureus* (36). The synergistic effect between fosfomycin and β -lactam antibiotics is proposed
265 to arise from the inhibition of cell wall synthesis at separate steps, and ciprofloxacin is due to
266 ciprofloxacin-mediated damage to the outer membrane, which increases the penetration and activity of
267 fosfomycin (35,37-38). In *P. aeruginosa*, *in vitro* studies demonstrated synergy between fosfomycin and
268 a variety of other antibiotics, including aztreonam, cefepime, meropenem, imipenem, ceftazidime,
269 gentamycin, amikacin, ciprofloxacin, and others (37-40). Further, the synergistic activity of fosfomycin,
270 ciprofloxacin, and gentamicin against *E. coli* and *P. aeruginosa* biofilms has been demonstrated (41),
271 making it a reasonable treatment option for patients with catheters. RCTs investigating fosfomycin as a
272 combination therapy have shown higher clinical and microbiological success rates in many different
273 infections, including sepsis/bacteremia and respiratory tract infections (25, 42,43). However, to the best
274 of our knowledge, RCTs investigating fosfomycin as a combination therapy in treating UTIs have not
275 been conducted (42). In our study, with the exception of one isolate, all fosfomycin-resistant *E. coli* were
276 susceptible to either all or at least one of the comparator UTIs first-line or alternate drugs. Clinical
277 studies have compared the efficacy of fosfomycin to comparator UTI first-line drugs and have shown it
278 to be a valuable alternative option (24, 42, 44-47). In a study investigating treatment patterns and
279 clinical outcomes among females with uncomplicated bUTI in Germany that were empirically treated,
280 the incidence of recurrent infection in the 6-month post-index period was higher in patients with *E. coli*
281 that were resistant to one of the first-line treatments (48). With antimicrobial susceptibility rates and
282 epidemiology of bUTI pathogens different and rapidly changing from one region to another, robust
283 research with well-designed double-blinded RCTs investigating the use of fosfomycin as a combination
284 therapy for the treatment of bUTIs, especially in patients with recurrent infections, is warranted.

285 Similar to the European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST), the Clinical and
286 Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) recognizes AD as the reference method for fosfomycin
287 susceptibility testing for *E. coli* and *E. faecalis* (13,49,50). AD is a labor- and time-intensive methodology,
288 which has led to many laboratories using either disk diffusion, which is only approved for *E. coli* from
289 urine samples by CLSI (50), or Etest, which is only approved by EUCAST (49) but not CLSI. This is further
290 complicated by differences in breakpoints between CLSI and EUCAST, which also varies by specimen
291 types (51). Etests, based on a combination of dilution and diffusion testing, offer valuable solutions since
292 they provide MICs. However, there are concerns about the accuracy of Etest results, which can also be
293 challenging to interpret due to micro- and macro-colonies (51, 52). A recent new formulation of the
294 fosfomycin Etest showed high accuracy, which is vital as an alternative to AD (49-51). In our study, using
295 AD as a reference method, data produced using Etest had sensitivity closer to 95%, making it a viable
296 method for fosfomycin testing in addition to disk diffusion. Etests provide MIC values, which may be
297 helpful in clinical decisions if the recently developed novel Etest formulations perform consistently in
298 other laboratories' hands (51). In that case, CLSI should support studies validating the use of Etest as a
299 susceptibility testing option for fosfomycin, given the numerous challenges of using AD in susceptibility
300 testing and the limitations of disk diffusion.

301 In conclusion, *in vitro* data from our patient population demonstrate that in addition to *E. coli*,
302 fosfomycin has high activity against several of the most common Gram-negative and Gram-positive bUTI
303 pathogens, including those that are MDR. Furthermore, we've shown that the Etest is a viable
304 alternative for fosfomycin susceptibility testing. However, RCTs investigating fosfomycin for the
305 treatment of bUTIs due to organisms other than *E. coli* are lacking whereas clinical, microbiologic, and *in*
306 *vitro* data strongly suggest this is a viable treatment option. Since bUTIs are among the most common
307 bacterial infections worldwide, occurring in both community and in healthcare settings, and most are
308 usually treated empirically (34), having an effective treatment option against MDR pathogens will play

309 an essential role in managing bUTIs worldwide and antimicrobial stewardship programs. RCTs
310 investigating the use of fosfomycin in treating non-*E. coli* bUTI pathogens and as a combination therapy
311 for treating UTIs, especially in patients with recurrent infections, are long overdue.

312

313 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

314 Disclaimer: The views expressed in this manuscript are those of the authors and do not necessarily
315 reflect the official policy of the Department of Defense, Department of Army, US Army Medical
316 Department, Defense Health Agency, or the US Government. The study protocol was approved by the
317 appropriate Human subjects regulatory authority. Investigators adhered to the policies for protection of
318 human subjects as prescribed in 45 Code of Federal Regulation 46.

319 Conflicts of interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

320 Ethical statement: The institution's ethical review board and the human research protection office at the
321 Defense Health Agency and Tripler Army Medical Center reviewed and approved this study.

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330 REFERENCES

331

- 332 1. Geerlings SE. Clinical Presentations and Epidemiology of Urinary Tract Infections. *Microbiol*
333 *Spectr.* 2016 Oct;4(5). doi: 10.1128/microbiolspec.UTI-0002-2012. PMID: 27780014.
- 334 2. Nicolle LE, Gupta K, Bradley SF, Colgan R, DeMuri GP, Drekonja D, Eckert LO, Geerlings SE, Köves
335 B, Hooton TM, Juthani-Mehta M, Knight SL, Saint S, Schaeffer AJ, Trautner B, Wullt B, Siemieniuk
336 R. Clinical Practice Guideline for the Management of Asymptomatic Bacteriuria: 2019 Update by
337 the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2019 May 2;68(10):e83-e110. Doi:
338 10.1093/cid/ciy1121. PMID: 30895288.
- 339 3. Keepers TR, Gomez M, Celeri C, Krause KM, Biek D, Critchley I. Fosfomycin and Comparator
340 Activity Against Select Enterobacteriaceae, Pseudomonas, and Enterococcus Urinary Tract
341 Infection Isolates from the United States in 2012. *Infect Dis Ther.* 2017 Jun;6(2):233-243. doi:
342 10.1007/s40121-017-0150-5. Epub 2017 Mar 11. PMID: 28285420; PMCID: PMC5446363.
- 343 4. Mosime LB, Newton-Foot M, Nel P. Fosfomycin resistance in community-acquired urinary
344 pathogens from Western Cape, South Africa. *S Afr J Infect Dis.* 2022 Jan 19;37(1):321. doi:
345 10.4102/sajid.v37i1.321. PMID: 35169586; PMCID: PMC8831924.
- 346 5. Mezzatesta ML, La Rosa G, Maugeri G, Zingali T, Caio C, Novelli A, Stefani S. In vitro activity of
347 fosfomycin trometamol and other oral antibiotics against multidrug-resistant uropathogens. *Int J*
348 *Antimicrob Agents.* 2017 Jun;49(6):763-766. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2017.01.020. Epub 2017
349 Apr 5. PMID: 28390962.
- 350 6. Vardakas KZ, Legakis NJ, Triarides N, Falagas ME. Susceptibility of contemporary isolates to
351 fosfomycin: a systematic review of the literature. *Int J Antimicrob Agents.* 2016 Apr;47(4):269-85.
352 doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2016.02.001. Epub 2016 Feb 24. PMID: 27013000.
- 353 7. Hendlin D, Stapley EO, Jackson M, Wallick H, Miller AK, Wolf FJ, Miller TW, Chaiet L, Kahan FM,
354 Foltz EL, Woodruff HB, Mata JM, Hernandez S, Mochales S. 1969. Phosphonomycin, a new
355 antibiotic produced by strains of streptomyces. *Science* 166:122–123. doi:
356 10.1126/science.166.3901.122.
- 357 8. Falagas ME, Vouloumanou EK, Samonis G, Vardakas KZ. Fosfomycin. *Clin Microbiol Rev.* 2016
358 Apr;29(2):321-47. doi: 10.1128/CMR.00068-15. PMID: 26960938; PMCID: PMC4786888.
- 359 9. Pullukcu H, Tasbakan M, Sipahi OR, Yamazhan T, Aydemir S, Ulusoy S. Fosfomycin in the
360 treatment of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing *Escherichia coli*-related lower
361 urinary tract infections. *Int J Antimicrob Agents.* 2007 Jan;29(1):62-5. doi:
362 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2006.08.039. PMID: 17189097.
- 363 10. Rodríguez-Baño J, Alcalá JC, Cisneros JM, Grill F, Oliver A, Horcajada JP, Tórtola T, Mirelis B,
364 Navarro G, Cuenca M, Esteve M, Peña C, Llanos AC, Cantón R, Pascual A. Community infections
365 caused by extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing *Escherichia coli*. *Arch Intern Med.* 2008
366 Sep 22;168(17):1897-902. doi: 10.1001/archinte.168.17.1897. PMID: 18809817.
- 367 11. Senol S, Tasbakan M, Pullukcu H, Sipahi OR, Sipahi H, Yamazhan T, Arda B, Ulusoy S. Carbapenem
368 versus fosfomycin tromethanol in the treatment of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-
369 producing *Escherichia coli*-related complicated lower urinary tract infection. *J Chemother.* 2010
370 Oct;22(5):355-7. doi: 10.1179/joc.2010.22.5.355. PMID: 21123160.
- 371 12. Sojo-Dorado J, López-Hernández I, Rosso-Fernandez C, Morales IM, Palacios-Baena ZR,
372 Hernández-Torres A, Merino de Lucas E, Escolà-Vergé L, Bereciartua E, García-Vázquez E, Pintado
373 V, Boix-Palop L, Natera-Kindelán C, Sorlí L, Borrell N, Giner-Oncina L, Amador-Prous C, Shaw E,
374 Jover-Saenz A, Molina J, Martínez-Alvarez RM, Dueñas CJ, Calvo-Montes J, Silva JT, Cárdenes MA,
375 Lecuona M, Pomar V, Valiente de Santis L, Yagüe-Guirao G, Lobo-Acosta MA, Merino-Bohórquez
376 V, Pascual A, Rodríguez-Baño J; REIPI-GEIRAS-FOREST group. Effectiveness of Fosfomycin for the

- 377 Treatment of Multidrug-Resistant *Escherichia coli* Bacteremic Urinary Tract Infections: A
378 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022 Jan 4;5(1):e2137277. doi:
379 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.37277. PMID: 35024838; PMCID: PMC8759008
- 380 13. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. 2013. Performance standards for antimicrobial
381 susceptibility testing; twenty-third informational supplement. M100-S23. Clinical and Laboratory
382 Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
- 383 14. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute 2009. Methods for dilution susceptibility tests for
384 bacteria that grow aerobically; approved standard. M7-A8, 8th ed Clinical and Laboratory
385 Standards Institute, Wayne, PA
- 386 15. Smith EC, Brigman HV, Anderson JC, Emery CL, Bias TE, Bergen PJ, Landersdorfer CB, Hirsch EB.
387 Performance of Four Fosfomycin Susceptibility Testing Methods against an International
388 Collection of Clinical *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* Isolates. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2020 Sep
389 22;58(10):e01121-20. doi: 10.1128/JCM.01121-20. PMID: 32669380; PMCID: PMC7512173.
- 390 16. Sojo-Dorado J, López-Hernández I, Hernández-Torres A, Retamar-Gentil P, Merino de Lucas E,
391 Escolà-Vergé L, Bereciartua E, García-Vázquez E, Pintado V, Boix-Palop L, Natera-Kindelán C, Sorlí
392 L, Borrell N, Amador-Prous C, Shaw E, Jover-Saenz A, Molina J, Martínez-Álvarez RM, Dueñas CJ,
393 Calvo-Montes J, Lecuona M, Pomar V, Borreguero I, Palomo-Jiménez V, Docobo-Pérez F, Pascual
394 Á, Rodríguez-Baño J; CIBERINFEC-GEIRAS-FOREST group. Effectiveness of fosfomycin trometamol
395 as oral step-down therapy for bacteraemic urinary tract infections due to MDR *Escherichia coli*: a
396 post hoc analysis of the FOREST randomized trial. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2023 Jun 1:dkad147.
397 doi: 10.1093/jac/dkad147. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 37260299.
- 398 17. Bakthavatchalam YD, Shankar A, Manokaran Y, Walia K, Veeraraghavan B. Can fosfomycin be an
399 alternative therapy for infections caused by *E. coli* harbouring dual resistance: NDM and four-
400 amino acid insertion in PBP3? *JAC Antimicrob Resist*. 2023 Mar 4;5(2):dlad016. doi:
401 10.1093/jacamr/dlad016. PMID: 36880086; PMCID: PMC9985326.
- 402 18. Burgos J, Hoyos-Mallecot Y, Ferre-Losa C, Arando M, Monforte A, Pumarola T, Los-Arcos I, Falcó V.
403 Oral fosfomycin for treatment of acute bacterial prostatitis caused by multidrug-resistant
404 Enterobacterales. *Microbiol Spectr*. 2023 Sep 22;11(5):e0213623. doi: 10.1128/spectrum.02136-
405 23. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 37737627; PMCID: PMC10580941.
- 406 19. Vahiddastjerdi M, Vaghar ME, Dashtaki SG. Evaluation of Efficacy of Fosfomycin for the
407 Treatment of Patients with Lower Urinary Tract Infections (UTIs). *Maedica (Bucur)*. 2023
408 Dec;18(4):593-597. doi: 10.26574/maedica.2023.18.4.593. PMID: 38348083; PMCID:
409 PMC10859210.
- 410 20. Ten Doesschate T, Kuiper S, van Nieuwkoop C. 2021. FORECAST study team. Fosfomycin versus
411 ciprofloxacin as oral stepdown treatment for *Escherichia coli* febrile urinary tract infection in
412 women: a randomized, placebo-controlled, double blind, multicenter trial. *Clin Infect*
413 *Dis:ciab934*.
- 414 21. Falagas M.E., Kanellou M.D., Karageorgopoulos D.E., Dimopoulos G., Rafailidis P.I.,
415 Skarmoutsou N.D., Papafrangas E.A. Antimicrobial susceptibility of multidrug-resistant Gram
416 negative bacteria to fosfomycin. *Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis*. 2008;27:439–443. doi:
417 10.1007/s10096-007-0456-4. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
- 418 22. Falagas ME, Vouloumanou EK, Togiag AG, Karadima M, Kapaskelis AM, Rafailidis PI, Athanasiou S.
419 Fosfomycin versus other antibiotics for the treatment of cystitis: a meta-analysis of randomized
420 controlled trials. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2010 Sep;65(9):1862-77. doi: 10.1093/jac/dkq237.
421 Epub 2010 Jun 29. PMID: 20587612.

- 422 23. Falagas M.E., Maraki S., Karageorgopoulos D.E., Kastoris A.C., Mavromanolakis E., Samonis G.
423 Antimicrobial susceptibility of multidrug-resistant (MDR) and extensively drug-resistant (XDR)
424 Enterobacteriaceae isolates to fosfomycin. *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents*. 2010;35:240–243. doi:
425 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2009.10.019. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
- 426 24. Falagas M.E., Kastoris A.C., Kapaskelis A.M., Karageorgopoulos D.E. Fosfomycin for the treatment
427 of multidrug-resistant, including extended-spectrum b-lactamase producing, Enterobacteriaceae
428 infections: A systematic review. *Lancet Infect. Dis*. 2010;10:43–50. doi: 10.1016/S1473-
429 3099(09)70325-1. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
- 430 25. Michalopoulos A., Virtzili S., Rafailidis P., Halevelakis G.H., Damala M., Falagas M. Intravenous
431 fosfomycin for the treatment of nosocomial infections caused by carbapenem-resistant *Klebsiella*
432 *pneumoniae* in critically ill patients: A prospective evaluation. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.*
433 2010;16:184–186. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2009.02921.x. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google
434 Scholar]
- 435 26. Dinh A., Salomon J., Bru J.P., Bernard L. Fosfomycin: Efficacy against infections caused by
436 multidrug-resistant bacteria. *Scand. J. Infect. Dis*. 2012;44:182–189. doi:
437 10.3109/00365548.2011.616221.
- 438 27. Lu CL, Liu CY, Huang YT, Liao CH, Teng LJ, Turnidge JD, Hsueh PR. Antimicrobial susceptibilities of
439 commonly encountered bacterial isolates to fosfomycin determined by agar dilution and disk
440 diffusion methods. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2011 Sep;55(9):4295-301. doi:
441 10.1128/AAC.00349-11. Epub 2011 Jun 13. PMID: 21670185; PMCID: PMC3165352
- 442 28. Demir T, Buyukguclu T. Evaluation of the in vitro activity of fosfomycin tromethamine against
443 Gram-negative bacterial strains recovered from community- and hospital-acquired urinary tract
444 infections in Turkey. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2013 Nov;17(11):e966-70. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2013.04.005.
445 Epub 2013 Jun 3. PMID: 23742831
- 446 29. Fajfr M, Louda M, Paterová P, Ryšková L, Pacovský J, Košina J, Žemličková H, Brodčák M. The
447 susceptibility to fosfomycin of Gram-negative bacteria isolates from urinary tract infection in the
448 Czech Republic: data from a unicentric study. *BMC Urol*. 2017 Apr 26;17(1):33. doi:
449 10.1186/s12894-017-0222-6. PMID: 28446177; PMCID: PMC5406914
- 450 30. Linsenmeyer K, Strymish J, Weir S, Berg G, Brecher S, Gupta K. Activity of Fosfomycin against
451 Extended-Spectrum-β-Lactamase-Producing Uropathogens in Patients in the Community and
452 Hospitalized Patients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2015 Nov 23;60(2):1134-6. doi:
453 10.1128/AAC.02614-15. PMID: 26596940; PMCID: PMC4750673
- 454 31. Vahiddastjerdi M, Vaghar ME, Dashtaki SG. Evaluation of Efficacy of Fosfomycin for the
455 Treatment of Patients with Lower Urinary Tract Infections (UTIs). *Maedica (Bucur)*. 2023
456 Dec;18(4):593-597. doi: 10.26574/maedica.2023.18.4.593. PMID: 38348083; PMCID:
457 PMC10859210.
- 458 32. Minassian MA, Lewis DA, Chattopadhyay D, Bovill B, Duckworth GJ, Williams JD. A comparison
459 between single-dose fosfomycin trometamol (Monuril) and a 5-day course of trimethoprim
460 in the treatment of uncomplicated lower urinary tract infection in women. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*.
461 1998 Apr;10(1):39-47. doi: 10.1016/s0924-8579(98)00021-1. PMID: 9624542.
- 462 33. Karimi A, Afrakhteh M, Aghazadeh Naeini A, Amiri Z. A Comparison of Cephalexin with
463 Fosfomycin Trometanol (monurol) in the treatment of pregnant women with lower urinary tract.
464 *Yafteh*. 2012;13:17–22.

- 465 34. Mancuso G, Midiri A, Gerace E, Marra M, Zummo S, Biondo C. Urinary Tract Infections: The
466 Current Scenario and Future Prospects. *Pathogens*. 2023 Apr 20;12(4):623. doi:
467 10.3390/pathogens12040623. PMID: 37111509; PMCID: PMC10145414.
- 468 35. Dijkmans AC, Zacarías NVO, Burggraaf J, Mouton JW, Wilms EB, van Nieuwkoop C, Touw DJ,
469 Stevens J, Kamerling IMC. Fosfomicin: Pharmacological, Clinical and Future Perspectives.
470 *Antibiotics (Basel)*. 2017 Oct 31;6(4):24. doi: 10.3390/antibiotics6040024. PMID: 29088073;
471 PMCID: PMC5745467.
- 472 36. Kastoris AC, Rafailidis PI, Vouloumanou EK, Gkegkes ID, Falagas ME. Synergy of fosfomicin with
473 other antibiotics for Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol*. 2010
474 Apr;66(4):359-68. doi: 10.1007/s00228-010-0794-5. Epub 2010 Feb 26. PMID: 20186407.
- 475 37. Samonis G., Maraki S., Karageorgopoulos D.E., Vouloumanou E.K., Falagas M.E. Synergy of
476 fosfomicin with carbapenems, colistin, netilmicin, and tigecycline against multidrug-resistant
477 *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Escherichia coli*, and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* clinical isolates. *Eur. J.*
478 *Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis*. 2012;31:695–701. doi: 10.1007/s10096-011-1360-5.
- 479 38. Yamada S., Hyo Y., Ohmori S., Ohuchi M. Role of ciprofloxacin in its synergistic effect with
480 fosfomicin on drug-resistant strains of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Chemotherapy*. 2007;53:202–
481 209. doi: 10.1159/000100811.
- 482 39. Okazaki M., Suzuki K., Asano N., Araki K., Shukuya N., Egami T., Higurashi Y., Morita K., Uchimura
483 H., Watanabe T. Effectiveness of fosfomicin combined with other antimicrobial agents against
484 multidrug-resistant *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* isolates using the efficacy time index assay. *J.*
485 *Infect. Chemother*. 2002;8:37–42. doi: 10.1007/s101560200004.
- 486 40. Tessier F., Quentin C. In vitro activity of fosfomicin combined with ceftazidime, imipenem,
487 amikacin, and ciprofloxacin against *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis*.
488 1997;16:159–162. doi: 10.1007/BF01709477
- 489 41. Wang L, Di Luca M, Tkhalishvili T, Trampuz A, Gonzalez Moreno M. Synergistic Activity of
490 Fosfomicin, Ciprofloxacin, and Gentamicin Against *Escherichia coli* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*
491 Biofilms. *Front Microbiol*. 2019 Nov 6;10:2522. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2019.02522. PMID:
492 31781056; PMCID: PMC6853019.
- 493 42. Grabein B, Graninger W, Rodríguez Baño J, Dinh A, Liesenfeld DB. Intravenous fosfomicin-back to
494 the future. Systematic review and meta-analysis of the clinical literature. *Clin Microbiol Infect*.
495 2017 Jun;23(6):363-372. doi: 10.1016/j.cmi.2016.12.005. Epub 2016 Dec 9. PMID: 27956267.
- 496 43. Shaw E, Miró JM, Puig-Asensio M, Pigrau C, Barcenilla F, Murillas J, Garcia-Pardo G, Espejo E,
497 Padilla B, Garcia-Reyne A, Pasquau J, Rodriguez-Baño J, López-Contreras J, Montero M, de la
498 Calle C, Pintado V, Calbo E, Gasch O, Montejo M, Salavert M, Garcia-Pais MJ, Carratalà J, Pujol M;
499 Spanish Network for Research in Infectious Diseases (REIPI RD12/0015); Instituto de Salud Carlos
500 III, Madrid, Spain; GEIH (Hospital Infection Study Group). Daptomycin plus fosfomicin versus
501 daptomycin monotherapy in treating MRSA: protocol of a multicentre, randomised, phase III
502 trial. *BMJ Open*. 2015 Mar 11;5(3):e006723. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006723. PMID:
503 25762232; PMCID: PMC4360784.
- 504 44. Hassan MM, Malik M, Saleem R, Saleem A, Zohaib K, Malik AY, Javid M. Efficacy of Single Dose
505 of Fosfomicin Versus a Five-Day Course of Ciprofloxacin in Patients With Uncomplicated Urinary
506 Tract Infection. *Cureus*. 2022 May 9;14(5):e24843. doi: 10.7759/cureus.24843. PMID: 35702450;
507 PMCID: PMC9177222

- 508 45. Huttner A, Kowalczyk A, Turjeman A, Babich T, Brossier C, Eliakim-Raz N, Kosiek K, Martinez de
509 Tejada B, Roux X, Shiber S, Theuretzbacher U, von Dach E, Yahav D, Leibovici L, Godycki-Cwirko
510 M, Mouton JW, Harbarth S. Effect of 5-Day Nitrofurantoin vs Single-Dose Fosfomycin on Clinical
511 Resolution of Uncomplicated Lower Urinary Tract Infection in Women: A Randomized Clinical
512 Trial. *JAMA*. 2018 May 1;319(17):1781-1789. doi: 10.1001/jama.2018.3627. PMID: 29710295;
513 PMCID: PMC6134435.
- 514 46. Grant R, Büchler A, Flight W, Huang C, Ferrinho D, Janmohamed S, Mulgirigama A, Godycki-
515 Cwirko M, Leibovici L, Huttner A, Harbarth S. Impact of the 2019 Food and Drug Administration
516 Guidance for Uncomplicated Urinary Tract Infection on Treatment Response Rates: A Reanalysis
517 of a Clinical Trial of Nitrofurantoin vs Fosfomycin. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2023 Nov
518 4;10(11):ofad557. doi: 10.1093/ofid/ofad557. PMID: 38023546; PMCID: PMC10661658.
- 519 47. Porreca A, D'Agostino D, Romagnoli D, Del Giudice F, Maggi M, Palmer K, Falabella R, De
520 Berardinis E, Sciarra A, Ferro M, Artibani W, Mirone V, Busetto GM. The Clinical Efficacy of
521 Nitrofurantoin for Treating Uncomplicated Urinary Tract Infection in Adults: A Systematic Review
522 of Randomized Control Trials. *Urol Int*. 2021;105(7-8):531-540. doi: 10.1159/000512582. Epub
523 2021 Feb 3. PMID: 33535221.
- 524 48. Naber KG, Wagenlehner F, Kresken M, Cheng WY, Catillon M, Duh MS, Yu L, Khanal A,
525 Mulgirigama A, Joshi AV, Ju S, Mitrani-Gold FS. *Escherichia coli* resistance, treatment patterns
526 and clinical outcomes among females with uUTI in Germany: a retrospective physician-based
527 chart review study. *Sci Rep*. 2023 Jul 26;13(1):12077. doi: 10.1038/s41598-023-38919-8. PMID:
528 37495602; PMCID: PMC10372039.
- 529 49. European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. 2022. Breakpoint tables for
530 interpretation of MICs and zone diameters; version 12.0. <http://www.eucast.org>
- 531 50. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. 2022. Performance standards for antimicrobial
532 susceptibility testing; thirty-second informational supplement. M100-S32. Clinical and
533 Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
- 534 51. Goer A, Blanchard LS, Van Belkum A, Loftus KJ, Armstrong TP, Gatermann SG, Shortridge D, Olson
535 BJ, Meece JK, Fritsche TR, Pompilio M, Halimi D, Franceschi C. Multicenter Evaluation of the
536 Novel ETEST Fosfomycin for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing of Enterobacterales,
537 *Enterococcus faecalis*, and *Staphylococcus* Species. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2022 Jul 20;60(7):e0002122.
538 doi: 10.1128/jcm.00021-22. Epub 2022 Jun 23. PMID: 35736011; PMCID: PMC9297813.
- 539 52. van Mens SP, Ten Doesschate T, Kluytmans-van den Bergh MFQ, Mouton JW, Rossen JWA,
540 Verhulst C, Bonten MJM, Kluytmans JAJW. Fosfomycin Etest for Enterobacteriaceae:
541 Interobserver and interlaboratory agreement. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2018 Nov;52(5):678-681.
542 doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2018.06.014. Epub 2018 Jun 27. PMID: 29958976.


543

544

545

546

547 FIGURES



548

549 **Figure 1.** Susceptibility of bacteria isolates from urinary tract infections to fosfomycin. Bacterial isolates

550 (n=1,326) were tested for susceptibility to fosfomycin. *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae* and *E. faecalis* represented


551 the majority of isolates. Species with more than 10 isolates are displayed (note, different *Citrobacter*

552 species are combined); data shows species, number of isolates tested, and percent susceptible to

553 fosfomycin. EC *Enterobacter cloacae*; KA *Klebsiella aerogenes*; SA *Staphylococcus aureus*; KO *Klebsiella*

554 *oxytoca*.

555




556

557 **Figure 2. Clinical isolates of *E. coli* and non-ESBL *K. pneumoniae* are susceptible to fosfomycin at**
 558 **similar, or higher rates, than comparator antibiotics.** The agar dilution method was used to test
 559 whether clinical isolates were susceptible to fosfomycin. Comparator antibiotic susceptibilities were
 560 tested using broth dilution. UTI isolates of *E. coli* (n=890), *K. pneumoniae* (n= 136), and *E. faecalis*
 561 (n=93) were tested for susceptibilities to fosfomycin and comparator antibiotics. Isolates of *E. coli* and *K.*
 562 *pneumoniae* were separated by ESBL and non-ESBL to observe antibiotic susceptibilities.

563

564

565



566

567 **Figure 3. Numerical breakdown of the susceptibility patterns for all isolates tested.** Columns depict the

568 number of isolates that are fosfomycin susceptible. Rows further delineate susceptibility to

569 nitrofurantoin, levofloxacin and TMS for *E. coli*, n=890 (A), *K. pneumoniae*, n=136 (B), and *E. faecalis*


570 n=93 (C). fos (fosfomycin susceptible), lev (levofloxacin susceptible), tms (trimethoprim and

571 sulfamethoxazole susceptible), nitro (nitrofurantoin susceptible). RFOS (fosfomycin non-susceptible),

572 RLEV (levofloxacin non-susceptible), RTMS (trimethoprim and sulfamethoxazole non-susceptible),

573 RNITRO (nitrofurantoin non-susceptible).

574



575

576 **Figure 4. Global susceptibility of isolated strains to the antibiotics tested.** Isolates were organized into
577 groups based on the number of antibiotics they were susceptible to. Non-ESBL *E.coli* strains were the
578 most susceptible to the antibiotics tested while ESBL *K. pneumoniae* strains were the least susceptible.
579 Dark purple indicates susceptibility to none of the antibiotics tested and gray indicates strains that were
580 susceptible to four antibiotics.


581

582

583


584

585



586

587 **Figure 5. Most common antibiotic susceptibility profiles of tested isolates.** Antibiotic susceptibility
588 profiles of all isolates (n=1,119) tested were examined and profiles that had 10 or more isolates are
589 depicted here. The larger the circle the more isolates were in that group. fos (fosfomycin susceptible),
590 lev (levofloxacin susceptible), tms (trimethoprim and sulfamethoxazole susceptible), nitro
591 (nitrofurantoin susceptible). RFOs (fosfomycin non-susceptible), RLEV (levofloxacin non-susceptible),
592 RTMS (trimethoprim and sulfamethoxazole non-susceptible), RNITRO (nitrofurantoin non-susceptible).
593 Number of isolates for each profile included.



594

595 **Figure 6.** Distribution of fosfomycin MICs. MICs for fosfomycin were determined by E test for (A) *E. coli*,

596 (B) *K. pneumoniae*, and (C) *E. faecalis*.

597

598


599

600

601

602

603 Supplementary Figures



604

605 **Supplementary figure 1. Susceptibilities of clinical isolates to fosfomycin and comparator antibiotics.**

606 The agar dilution method was used to test whether clinical isolates were susceptible to fosfomycin.

607 Comparator antibiotic susceptibilities were tested using broth dilution. UTI isolates of *E. coli* (n=890), *K.*

608 *pneumoniae* (n= 136), and *E. faecalis* (n=93), *P. aeruginosa* (n=28), *Citrobacter* (n=26), *P. mirabilis*

609 (n=25), *E. faecium* (n=22), *E. cloacae* (n=20), *K. aerogenes* (n=19) were tested for susceptibilities to

610 fosfomycin and comparator antibiotics. *E. faecalis* was not tested for amoxicillin susceptibility and *E.*

611 *faecium* was not tested for nitrofurantoin, TMS, or amoxicillin susceptibilities.