

Assignment: Detection of Vancomycin-resistant Enterococci (VRE)

Answers



Clinical case 1

- A 36 year-old male patient with myeloid leukemia presents in the ER with severe symptoms of pneumonia. He is admitted in the ICU. The sputum sample yields *E. faecium*.
- What AB treatment would you recommend?
- Would you consider recommending Daptomycin?
- Why? Why not?

Case 1

- What AB treatment would you recommend?
- **Answer:** A 36-year-old immunocompromised male with myeloid leukemia and severe pneumonia caused by *E. faecium* should receive empirical treatment with linezolid

Case 1

- Would you consider recommending Daptomycin?
- **Answer:** No, daptomycin is not recommended for this patient's *E. faecium* pneumonia.

Case 1

- Why? Why not?
- **Answer:**
- **Poor Lung Penetration:** Daptomycin is inactivated by pulmonary surfactant, achieving subtherapeutic levels in lung tissue.
- **Lack of Evidence:** No proven efficacy for VRE pneumonia in clinical studies.

Case 2

antibiotic	MIC (mg/L)	CLSI	EUCAST
Ampicillin	> 16	R	R
Gentamicin	> 64	R	R
Gentamicin 120	> 500	R	R
Erythromycin	> 16	R	NA
Ciprofloxacin	> 16	R	NA
Moxifloxacin	> 8	R	NA
Linezolid	2	S	S
Tetracycline	8	I	NA
Teicoplanin	> 64	R	R
Vancomycin	> 64	R	R
Daptomycin	1	S	NA

- What is the type of resistance to vancomycin?

What is the type of resistance to vancomycin?

Answer:

Type of Vancomycin Resistance:

- High-level resistance (MIC >64 mg/L for both vancomycin and teicoplanin).
- Pattern: Resistant to vancomycin (MIC >64) + teicoplanin (MIC >64) → Consistent with vanA-mediated resistance.

Responsible Gene: *vanA*

- Why?
 - *vanA* confers high-level resistance to both vancomycin and teicoplanin (as seen here).
 - *vanB* would show vancomycin resistance (MIC >4) but teicoplanin susceptibility (MIC ≤2), which is not the case here.
 - *vanC* (intrinsic in *E. gallinarum/casseliflavus*) causes low-level resistance (MIC 4–32) and is species-specific.

Case 3

- E. gallinarum* was isolated from a rectal swab with the following AB pattern:

antibiotic	MIC (mg/L)	CLSI	EUCAST
Ampicillin	1	S	S
Gentamicin	2	S	S
Gentamicin 120	< 128	S	S
Erythromycin	0.5	S	NA
Ciprofloxacin	1	S	NA
Moxifloxacin	0.5	S	NA
Linezolid	2	S	S
Tetracycline	1	S	NA
Teicoplanin	< 0.5	S	S
Vancomycin	8	I	R
Daptomycin	1	S	NA

What is the type of resistance to vancomycin?

Case 3

- What is the type of resistance to vancomycin?

Answer:

Type of Vancomycin Resistance:

- Low-level resistance (Vancomycin MIC = 8 mg/L, intermediate per CLSI, resistant per EUCAST).
- Teicoplanin susceptibility (MIC <0.5 mg/L) → Rules out vanA/vanB.

Responsible Gene: *vanC1*

Why?

- *E. gallinarum* carries intrinsic *vanC1*, which confers low-level vancomycin resistance (MIC typically 4–32 mg/L) but teicoplanin susceptibility.
- vanA/vanB are acquired and cause high-level resistance (MIC ≥64 mg/L to both drugs).
- Cannot be *vanC2/C3* since they are found in *E. casseliflavus* (pigmented, motile).

Case 4

- An *Enterococcus* isolate is vancomycin-resistant (MIC = 32 µg/mL), L-arabinose (–), and non-motile.
- What is the MOST likely species?
- Why?
- What additional test is MOST useful to confirm Species?
- Why is PCR for *vanA/vanB* recommended after biochemical tests?

- What is the MOST likely species?

Answer:

Most Likely Species: *Enterococcus faecium*

- **Rationale:**
 - *E. faecium* is **L-arabinose (–)** and **non-motile**.
 - Other species (e.g., *E. faecalis*) are typically vancomycin-susceptible unless acquired resistance is present.

Case 4

- Why?
- **Answer: Rationale:**
 - *E. faecium* is L-arabinose (–) and **non-motile**.
 - Other species (e.g., *E. faecalis*) are typically vancomycin-susceptible unless acquired resistance is present.

Case 4

- What additional test is **MOST** useful to confirm Species?

Answer:

Some examples of additional tests are as below

- **PCR for *vanA/vanB*** to identify the resistance gene.
- **Teicoplanin MIC:**
 - If resistant → *vanA* likely.
 - If susceptible → *vanB* likely.
- **MALDI-TOF**
- **WGS**

- Why is PCR for *vanA/vanB* recommended after biochemical tests?

Answer

1. Definitive Identification of Resistance Mechanism:

1. Biochemical tests (e.g., L-arabinose, motility) only identify the **species** (*E. faecium* vs. *E. gallinarum/casseliflavus*).
2. **PCR detects the specific resistance genes** (*vanA/vanB*), confirming whether resistance is:
 1. **Acquired** (high-risk, transferable via plasmids/transposons).
 2. **Intrinsic** (low-risk, chromosomal *vanC* in *E. gallinarum/casseliflavus*).

2. Clinical and Infection Control Implications:

1. ***vanA/vanB***: Requires **strict contact precautions** (risk of nosocomial outbreaks).
2. ***vanC***: No special isolation needed (intrinsic, non-transferable).
3. Misidentification can lead to unnecessary precautions or missed outbreaks.

3. Guides Treatment Decisions:

1. ***vanA***: Resistant to **both vancomycin and teicoplanin**.
2. ***vanB***: Resistant to vancomycin but **may respond to teicoplanin**.
3. Biochemical tests cannot predict these differences.

4. Limitations of Biochemical Tests:

1. **False Negatives**: Rare *vanA/vanB* strains may phenotypically resemble *vanC*.
2. **False Positives**: Some *E. gallinarum/casseliflavus* may appear resistant on agar but lack epidemic potential.

5. Gold Standard for Surveillance:

1. PCR/WGS tracks **outbreak strains** (e.g., *vanA*-positive *E. faecium* ST117).
2. Biochemical tests cannot assess clonality or plasmid spread.