

M23-A4

What is different vs. M23-A3

Current status and next steps

Approach to 2015 version

- New order of the chapters
- Follows the order that usually applies when developing a new antibacterial agent; each chapter also considers revisions

Essentially:

- Identify the reference method
- Establish QC ranges
- Identify MIC susceptibility criteria
- Derive disk diffusion criteria

Table of contents

Chapter 1: Scope	9
Chapter 2: Terminology.....	9
2.1 A Note on Terminology.....	9
2.2 Definitions	10
2.3 Abbreviations and Acronyms.....	11
Chapter 3: Development of Susceptibility Test Methods	12
3.1 Establishing the Reference Method.....	12
3.2 Modification to the Reference Methods	13
3.3 Antibacterial Fixed Combination Studies (such as β -lactam/ β -lactamase Inhibitor Combinations)	14
3.4 Developing Disks for Disk Diffusion Tests.....	14
3.5 Validation of Microbiologic Data Derived From Other Than Reference Methods....	15
Chapter 4: Quality Control (QC).....	16
4.1 Selecting Quality Control Strains.....	16
4.2 Procedure for Establishing or Revising Quality Control Strains or Ranges	17
4.3 Presentation and Interpretation of QC Data.....	20

Table of contents

Chapter 5: Procedures for Establishing Interpretive Criteria	22
5.1 New Interpretive Criteria	23
5.2 Revision of Interpretive Criteria	26
5.3 Provisional Interpretive Criteria	31
5.4 Surrogate Testing	31
Chapter 6: MIC Interpretive Criteria	32
6.1 Epidemiologic Cutoff	32
6.2 Nonclinical Pharmacokinetic-Pharmacodynamic Cutoff	37
6.3 Clinical Exposure Response Cutoff	
6.4 Clinical Cutoff	45
6.5 Consideration of the Cutoffs to Determine Interpretive Criteria	47
Chapter 7: Disk Diffusion Interpretive Criteria	48
7.1 Selection of Isolates and Sample Size	48
7.2 Reagent Disks	49
7.3 Error Rate-Bounded Method for Selecting Disk Testing Interpretive Criteria Based on Comparison With Dilution Test Results	50

Major revisions since M23-A3

- New arrangement for setting MIC interpretive criteria for new agents depending on time since FDA approval
 - If agreement with FDA then publish
 - If disagreement then delay publication
- New set up for the Working Groups
 - Implications for handling of requests from sponsors for new or revised interpretive criteria
 - New guidance on submitting requests and details of handling, including appointment of ad hoc working groups

Major revisions since M23-A3

- New section on PK-PD covering nonclinical cutoffs and clinical exposure-response cutoffs
 - Drafted by PK-PD Working Group
- Integrated into a single chapter that also considers epidemiologic, clinical exposure-response and clinical cutoffs
 - Drafted by both groups
- New section that considers how interpretive criteria are then arrived at taking into account all available cutoffs
 - This section does not attempt to be definitive but describes the scenarios that may occur in terms of what is available and the relative strength of evidence that may apply

Topics for discussion at plenary

There were no issues on the Chapters (i.e. the main text) identified during the WG meeting that seem to require specific discussion at plenary

There is a need to do some tidying up in several places but there were no major changes identified

Once these are accomplished the WG considers we could move to the final review and sign off process

Topics for discussion at plenary

There is one issue regarding **Appendix A: Statement of Policy of the AST Standing Subcommittees of the CLSI**

Resolution of discrepancies: CLSI will establish a Microbiology Area Committee Working Group to explore a process, with both a U.S. and global perspective, to manage and resolve discrepancies in breakpoints. This process will include drug sponsors, regulatory agencies, device manufacturers, generic drug sponsors, professions, and other interested parties.

Since this has never actually occurred should we delete this item from the policy statement?

Timeframe for completion

Start Consensus Voting 21. Draft 1 Vote – 60 days <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review/comment by Microbiology Consensus Committee, BOD, and public review Review/comment/vote by SC and CLSI delegates 	January/February 2015
22. Comments received collated by CLSI staff Comments addressed by WG (schedule conference call or webinar if needed) Document revised and responses drafted for comments Approval of resolutions by WG and SC	March/April 2015
23. CLSI Staff prepare document for final vote of the Microbiology Consensus Committee (CC)	May 2015
24. WG develop a checklist that sponsors can use to ensure that they have everything that is required and possibly a PPT template for breakpoint presentations Circulate to SC for approval when completed	May/June 2015
25. Final draft vote of Micro CC – 15 days <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final review and vote to publish by CC If no substantive technical comments, draft is submitted for publication Substantive technical comments require revision and a second 60-day vote 	June 2015
26. Preparation for publication by CLSI Staff	July 2015