Title: Urinary Biomarkers and Attainment of Cefepime Therapeutic Targets in Critically Ill Children

Title for running head: Biomarkers and Cefepime Targets in Critically Ill Children

Authors: Kevin J. Downes^{1,4}, Anna Sharova^{2,3}, Lauren Gianchetti^{2,3}, Adam S. Himebauch^{5,6}, Julie C. Fitzgerald^{5,6}, Athena F. Zuppa^{4,5,6}

¹*Department of Pediatrics, Perelman School of Medicine of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.*

²*Division of Infectious Diseases, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA*

³*Center for Pediatric Clinical Effectiveness, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA*

⁴*Center for Clinical Pharmacology, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA*

⁵*Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care, Perelman School of Medicine of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.*

⁶*Division of Critical Care Medicine, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA*

Address for correspondence:

Kevin J. Downes, MD

Division of Infectious Diseases, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia

2716 South Street, Suite 10360

Philadelphia, PA 19146

Email: downeskj@chop.edu

Tel: 215-590-4024

27 Fax: 267-426-6629

28

29 **Keywords:** augmented renal clearance, biomarkers, pediatrics, pharmacokinetics, sepsis

30

31 **Word count (abstract/main):** 250/3,369

32

33 **Abbreviations:** ARC, augmented renal clearance; C_{min} , minimum concentration; eGFR,

34 estimated glomerular filtration rate; FEP, cefepime; $fT>MIC$, fraction of time free concentration is

35 above the minimum inhibitory concentration; KIM-1, kidney injury molecule-1; MIC, minimum

36 inhibitory concentration; NGAL, neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin; PELOD-2 score,

37 Pediatric Logistic Organ Dysfunction-2 score; SCr, serum creatinine

ABSTRACT:

INTRODUCTION: The recommended therapeutic target for cefepime (FEP) is the time above MIC ($fT > MIC$). The frequency of target attainment and risk factors for sub-therapeutic concentrations in children have not been extensively studied.

METHODS: We performed a prospective observational pilot study in children in our PICU receiving standard dosing of FEP for suspected sepsis (≥ 2 SIRS criteria). Three FEP concentrations were measured per subject and a urine sample was collected prior to PK sampling for measurement of urinary biomarkers. We used log linear regression to calculate the $fT > MIC$ for each subject across a range of MIC values (1-16 $\mu g/mL$). We compared clinical factors/biomarkers between patients who did and did not achieve 100% $fT > MIC$ for 8 $\mu g/mL$ (cut-point for *Pseudomonas*) and tested the correlation between covariates and FEP troughs.

RESULTS: 21 subjects were enrolled (median SIRS criteria: 3). PK sampling occurred after a median of 5 doses (range: 3-9). 43% of subjects achieved 100% $fT > MIC$ for an MIC of 8 $\mu g/mL$. Younger age ($p = .005$), higher estimated GFR ($p = .03$), and lower urinary NGAL ($p = .006$) and KIM-1 ($p = .03$) were associated with failure to attain 100% $fT > 8 \mu g/mL$. Age ($r = 0.53$), eGFR ($r = -0.58$), urinary NGAL ($r = 0.42$) and KIM-1 ($r = 0.50$) were significantly correlated with FEP troughs.

CONCLUSIONS: A significant proportion of critically ill children failed to attain target concentrations for treatment of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* with FEP. Younger patients and those with good kidney function (high GFR, low urinary biomarkers) may be at highest risk for subtherapeutic FEP concentrations.

Introduction

Critical illness alters volume of distribution, protein binding and drug clearance, affecting the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics (PK/PD) of antibiotics.^{1,2} β -lactam exposures in critically ill adults are often suboptimal, contributing to poor outcomes.^{3,4} Standard dosing is often also inadequate in critically ill children,^{5,6} especially for treatment of more resistant Gram-negative pathogens.⁷ Pediatric severe sepsis and septic shock have an in-hospital mortality of roughly 6-26%,⁸⁻¹⁰ with delayed antimicrobial administration being associated with increased mortality and organ dysfunction.^{10,11} Thus, early and optimal antibiotic exposures in pediatric sepsis may provide a means to improve patient outcomes.

Cefepime (FEP), a renally excreted 4th-generation cephalosporin, is used as empiric antibiotic coverage in many critically ill children with suspected sepsis. Efficacy of FEP is defined by the fraction of time of the dosing interval for which the free (unbound) concentration is maintained above the MIC ($fT > MIC$) of the infecting pathogen.¹² While the optimal $fT > MIC$ associated with clinical efficacy in critically ill children is unknown, the recommended therapeutic target for critically ill adults of $fT > MIC$ of 100%.¹³ As such, this target is readily extrapolated to children. Meanwhile, microbiological cure and suppression of resistance selection have been associated with a more robust PK/PD target of $C_{min} > 4 \times MIC$,¹⁴ which equates to 100% $fT > 4 \times MIC$. There is a significant gap in knowledge of the FEP exposures achieved in critically ill children as no studies have reported the frequency of FEP PK/PD target attainment in this vulnerable population.

One of the challenges to optimizing β -lactam therapy in children is knowing who is at greatest risk for sub-therapeutic exposures with standard dosing. Traditional methods for estimating renal function and drug clearance in children using serum creatinine (SCr)-based equations¹⁵ do not readily identify children with augmented renal clearance (ARC) or changing glomerular filtration in the setting of acute kidney injury (AKI). Novel urinary biomarkers, such as

neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin (NGAL) and kidney injury molecule-1 (KIM-1), can detect AKI earlier and correlate better with glomerular filtration rate (GFR) and drug clearance than SCr.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ Thus, they could identify patients with impaired renal clearance at risk for supra-therapeutic drug concentrations. Conversely, low biomarkers levels, signifying the absence of kidney injury, may serve as noninvasive screening tests to detect children at highest risk for ARC and sub-therapeutic drug exposures.

This study sought to test the hypothesis that lower urinary biomarker concentrations (good renal function) were correlated with failure to attain therapeutic targets early in the course of FEP therapy in critically ill children with suspected sepsis due to augmented CL of the drug.

Methods

Subjects and Setting

We performed a prospective observational pilot study in children (<19 years of age) admitted to the pediatric intensive care unit (PICU) of the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia. Children were eligible to participate if prescribed standard dosing of FEP (50 mg/kg/dose every 8 hours if <40 kg; 2000 mg/dose every 8 hours if ≥40 kg) and had ≥2 systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS) criteria present within 48 hours prior to initiation of FEP to be eligible;¹⁹ SIRS criteria are described in the Supplemental Materials. Children receiving extracorporeal membrane oxygenation, renal replacement therapy, or plasmapheresis, as well as those unable to provide urine and blood samples, were excluded. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved the study protocol (IRB # 17-014486) with a waiver of documented assent; verbal assent was obtained, as appropriate. Written informed consent was obtained from the subject or parents/legal guardians, as appropriate.

Cefepime PK sampling

Following enrollment and administration of at least 3 FEP doses, 3 blood samples were collected during a single dosing interval. Samples were collected using lithium-heparin tubes at 3 hours (+/- 60 min.), 4.5 hours (+/- 60 min), and 6 hours (+/- 60 min) after completion of a dose. All sampling was completed by 72 hours of therapy in order to reflect drug concentrations early in FEP therapy; subjects had to provide at least 2 blood samples to be considered evaluable.

Each blood sample was promptly centrifuged (3800 RPM for 5 minutes) following collection, and the plasma portion was aliquoted and stored at -80° C. Total FEP concentrations in plasma were determined in the Bioanalytical Core Laboratory of the Center for Clinical Pharmacology using high-performance liquid chromatography and tandem mass spectrometry, as previously described.²⁰ The lower limit of quantification for the assay was 5 ng/mL, with a range of 5-10,000 ng/mL.

Urinary biomarkers

Prior to blood sampling, a single urine sample was collected for measurement of urinary biomarkers. Samples could be collected at any time prior to FEP blood concentration measurement. Fresh urine was collected from the subject using an indwelling urinary catheter, clean intermittent catheterization, or urine bag, as appropriate. Samples were kept on ice or refrigerated at 4°C until centrifugation (3000 RPM at 4°C for 15 minutes). The supernatants were then divided and stored at -80°C. Urine biomarkers were measured at the CHOP Translational Core Lab via Quantkine® ELISA (NGAL, KIM-1, osteopontin, cystatin C; R&D Systems, Inc., Minneapolis, MN) and the Luminex platform (clusterin; R&D Systems, Inc., Minneapolis, MN). Biomarker concentrations that were out of the range of the assay were assigned a value at the maximum or minimum of the assay range, as appropriate; assay ranges are provided in Supplemental Materials. Urine creatinine (UCr) was also measured on each sample by 2-point end enzymatic method (Roche Diagnostics, Indianapolis, IN). Serum

creatinine (SCr) was collected per standard of care and measured in the CHOP Chemistry Laboratory using the 2-point rate spectrophotometric method (Vitros5600™ analyzer, Ortho Clinical Diagnostics, Markham, ON); SCr was rounded to 0.1 if reported as <0.2 mg/dL, which was the limit of quantification for the assay during the study period.

Data Analysis

Using the measured total FEP concentration, we determined the free FEP concentration assuming protein binding of FEP of 39% (i.e. free FEP = 61% total FEP), based on data from Al-Shaer and colleagues.²¹ We then used log linear regression of free FEP concentrations to estimate the FEP C_{min} and calculate the $fT>MIC$ for each subject across a range of MIC values. For this analysis, calculated free concentrations were log-transformed and linear regression used to generate an individual regression line for each subject. From this, we calculated the C_{min} at 8 hours following the dose preceding FEP concentration sampling, as well as the $fT>MIC$ for MIC values of 1, 2, 4, 8, and 16 µg/mL. The proportion of subjects who attained 100% $fT>MIC$ and 100% $fT>4\times MIC$ for each of these MIC values was determined. A sensitivity analysis was also performed, using 20% protein binding (80 % free), which has traditionally been used in pediatric studies,²² and the above procedures repeated.

Estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) was determined for each subject at FEP initiation and at PK sampling using the bedside Schwartz equation.²³ Augmented renal clearance (ARC) was defined as an eGFR >130 mL/min/1.73 m², which is the most common cut-point used.²⁴ We further dichotomized patients based on an eGFR < 60 mL/min/1.73 m² (renal impairment), as an exploratory analysis.

We tested the association between covariates (clinical characteristics, biomarkers) and 100% $fT>MIC$ for an MIC of 8 µg/mL, the CLSI breakpoint for *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, using chi-squared and Wilcoxon rank sum tests; this cut-point was selected since *Pseudomonas* is an

organism of high concern that is often targeted with empiric antimicrobial therapy in the critical care setting. We also determined the Spearman correlation between covariates and calculated FEP C_{min} at 8 hours (i.e. trough concentrations). Because of our small sample size and non-normal distribution of continuous variables (e.g. biomarker concentrations), non-parametric tests were utilized for all comparative analyses. We additionally performed a subset analysis among subjects <40 kg (i.e. those who received FEP at a dosage of 50 mg/kg/dose rather than 2000 mg/dose).

All data analyses were conducted using R version 3.6.3 (Vienna, Austria). No formal samples size calculations were made *a priori* since this was an unfunded pilot study designed to explore the potential correlation between FEP concentrations and biomarker concentrations and there were no preexisting data to guide sample size estimations.

Results

In total 31 subjects were consented to participate in the study from May 2018 through December 2019. Two subjects became ineligible following consent (one was started on plasmapheresis and the other transferred out of the PICU). Eight additional subjects were withdrawn from the study due to inadequate venous access at the time of scheduled FEP sampling. As a result, 21 subjects fully participated in the study and provided adequate urine and blood samples for analysis.

The characteristics of the study population are shown in **Table 1**. The median number of SIRS criteria met upon initiation of FEP was 3: 6 subjects met 2 criteria, 7 met 3, and 8 met all 4. Eighteen subjects had a primary indication for FEP of suspected sepsis, 2 of fever with a central line, and 1 of neutropenic fever. Ten subjects were clinically diagnosed with a bacterial infection and received a definitive course of antibiotic treatment, including 6 with a lower respiratory tract infection, 3 with bacteremia, and 1 with a urinary tract infection; the remainder

received FEP empirically. Six subjects had gram-negative bacteria isolated on culture during their clinical evaluation for infection: *Serratia marcescens* (blood, FEP MIC ≤ 1 $\mu\text{g/mL}$), *Escherichia coli* (blood, FEP MIC ≤ 1 $\mu\text{g/mL}$), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (3 subjects, all respiratory tract isolates; FEP MIC ≤ 1 , 2 and 16 $\mu\text{g/mL}$), and *Providencia stuartii* (urine, FEP MIC 1 $\mu\text{g/mL}$). Two subjects had MRSA isolated from a respiratory tract culture, one had *Enterococcus faecalis* isolated from a urine culture, one had MSSA bacteremia, and another had MSSA isolated from a respiratory tract culture. No subjects died during FEP treatment or as a complication of their infection.

Nine subjects received the maximum FEP dosage of 2000 mg/dose. Thirteen subjects (62%) had ARC at the time of PK sampling. Blood sampling for FEP concentration measurement occurred following a median of 5 doses (range 3-9). The median time of urine sample collection following FEP start was 25.8 hours (IQR: 22.9 – 38.5 hours); median time from urine sample collection to first PK measurement was 8.9 hours (IQR: 1.0 – 15.6 hours). Three subjects had clusterin concentrations that were below the limit of quantification (BQL) of the assay and 3 had KIM-1 concentrations below that were BQL. Two and one subjects had NGAL and osteopontin concentrations above the upper limits of the assay ranges, respectively.

Based on log-linear regression, the median estimated FEP $C_{\min}$ was 4.61 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ (range: 0.63 – 62.39 $\mu\text{g/mL}$). **Table 2** displays the fraction of subjects with $C_{\min} \geq \text{MIC}$ and $C_{\min} \geq 4 \times \text{MIC}$ for MICs from 1-16 $\mu\text{g/mL}$. Ninety percent of subjects achieved 100% $fT > \text{MIC}$ for an MIC of 2 $\mu\text{g/mL}$, decreasing to 52% for an MIC of 4 $\mu\text{g/mL}$, 43% for an MIC of 8 $\mu\text{g/mL}$, and 33% for an MIC of 16 $\mu\text{g/mL}$. **Figure 1** displays $fT > \text{MIC}$ for the study population based on varying MIC targets. This figure was recreated assuming 20% protein binding and is shown in Supplemental Materials. The number of subjects attaining a $C_{\min} \geq 8$ $\mu\text{g/mL}$ were the same when protein binding of 20% and 39% were used.

Twelve subjects (57%) had a FEP $C_{\min}$ below 8 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ (i.e. failed to meet the target of 100% $fT > \text{MIC}$ for an MIC of 8 $\mu\text{g/mL}$). These subjects were younger and had a higher eGFR at the time of FEP measurement (**Table 3**). Subjects with ARC more often had a $C_{\min}$ below 8 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ (9/13 [69%] if eGFR $> 130 \text{ mL/min/1.73 m}^2$ vs 3/8 [38%] with eGFR < 130), although this difference was not statistically significant ($p = 0.20$). Subjects with FEP $C_{\min} < 8 \mu\text{g/mL}$ also had lower NGAL and KIM-1 urinary concentrations (both as unadjusted concentrations and when biomarker concentrations were adjusted for urinary creatinine). Higher age and lower eGFR at the time of FEP sampling were significantly correlated with FEP $C_{\min}$ (**Table 4**). Urinary NGAL and KIM-1, as well as urinary NGAL/UCr and KIM-1/UCr, were also significantly correlated with FEP $C_{\min}$.

On subset analysis of subjects $< 40 \text{ kg}$ ($n = 12$), four subjects (33%) had a FEP $C_{\min} \geq 8 \mu\text{g/mL}$. Older age was associated with attainment of this target, although eGFR was not ($p = 0.11$). Urinary NGAL and urinary NGAL/UCr were significantly higher in subjects who met this $C_{\min}$ goal ($p < .001$ for both). KIM-1 and KIM-1/UCr were higher among subjects who attained a $C_{\min} \geq 8 \mu\text{g/mL}$, although not to a statistically significant degree ($p = .07$ and $p = 0.15$, respectively).

Discussion

In our pilot study, a substantial proportion of critically ill children failed to attain therapeutic targets for FEP with standard dosing early in the course therapy. We evaluated a target of 8 $\mu\text{g/mL}$, which is the CLSI breakpoint for *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, a key pathogen often targeted with empiric FEP treatment in the critical care setting.²⁵ Only 43% of subjects in our study maintained free FEP concentrations above 8 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ for 100% of their dosing interval, assuming protein binding of 20-39%. Age, eGFR, and urinary biomarker concentrations (NGAL,

KIM-1) were correlated with FEP C_{min} , with younger age, higher eGFR, and lower urinary biomarkers associated with sub-therapeutic C_{min} .

Delayed administration of effective antimicrobials is associated with a nearly five-fold increased risk of death from sepsis in children.¹¹ It follows that sub-optimal FEP exposures (i.e. sub-therapeutic concentrations) would also negatively impact outcomes, although this has not been explicitly studied in pediatric patients. In adults with gram-negative bacteremia, achievement of $fT>MIC$ of 68-74% was associated with 6-7-fold improved odds of survival, with each 1% increase in $fT>MIC$ associated with a 2% increase in survival.²⁶ Adults with gram-negative pneumonia who had a $C_{min}/MIC \geq 2.1$ had a significantly lower risk of clinical failure.²⁷ And, adults with serious bacterial infections treated with FEP who had $>100\%$ $fT>MIC$ had significantly greater clinical cure and bacterial eradication than those with $<100\%$ $fT>MIC$.¹² While a specific FEP target for use in critically ill children has not been established, it is likely that antibiotic exposures are an important part of successful treatment and outcomes.

Therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) is the practice of measuring drug concentrations to inform dosing in patients. It is typically reserved for drugs with a narrow therapeutic window to optimize safety (primarily), as well as efficacy. β -lactam TDM has become more common among adult patients, particularly those felt to be at-risk for sub-therapeutic concentrations and poor outcomes, such as those who are critically ill.¹³ But, TDM for β -lactam drugs is not routine in pediatric clinical practice. Based on our evaluation, TDM may have utility in critically ill children since a large proportion may fail to attain empiric targets for FEP. This could be achieved by measurement of a single drug concentration as close to the end of the dosing interval as possible, recognizing that mistiming of this single measurement can have a significant impact on interpretability. Alternatively, 2 post-distribution concentrations could be obtained during a single dosing interval and log-linear regression methods used to estimate the elimination rate and C_{min} , similar to how we performed our analyses. This approach would allow

for more specific dose adjustments and individualized tailoring of therapy compared to trough-only TDM.

A key to TDM is identifying the right patients or patient population in which to perform it. Although FEP neurotoxicity occurs with high C_{min} in adults,²⁸ it is a relatively rare occurrence in children. Therefore, it is more important to identify the subset of patients whose concentrations are most likely to fall below the therapeutic range. In our study, younger patients, those with a higher eGFR, and those with low urinary kidney injury biomarkers (i.e. potentially indicating healthier kidneys and better function) were more likely to fail to attain C_{min} targets. Further, each of these factors (age, eGFR, biomarkers) was also significantly correlated with FEP C_{min} . Augmented renal clearance (ARC) has been associated with sub-therapeutic antibiotic concentrations in critically ill adults.²⁹ But, there has been debate surrounding the specific creatinine clearance (or eGFR) cut point that reflects ARC in children. ARC, defined as a urinary creatinine clearance (CrCl) >130 mL/min/1.73 m², is present in 20-50% of critically ill adults and is associated with subtherapeutic antibiotic concentrations in such patients.²⁹ However, there is no standard definition for ARC in children and measurement of urinary CrCl in children is rarely pursued. In our study, ARC was not significantly associated with failure to attain FEP $C_{min} \geq 8$ µg/mL, nor was an eGFR >130 mL/min/1.73 m². But, the association between higher eGFR and $C_{min} < 8$ µg/mL suggests that drug clearance is the major driver of subtherapeutic FEP concentrations.

This is further supported by the association between higher biomarker (NGAL, KIM-1) concentrations and lower C_{min} . These two biomarkers have been studied extensively and show to have utility in early detection of acute kidney injury.^{30,31} It follows that higher concentrations, reflective of ongoing injury, would be associated with reduced FEP clearance since FEP is a renally eliminated drug. Because our study was small, we did not seek to define a specific biomarker cut-off that was associated with failure to attain FEP C_{min} targets. But, future large-scale studies may be able to do so. While urinary biomarkers hold promise as noninvasive and

sensitive tests for detection of acute kidney injury, they may similarly be useful to identify candidates for β -lactam TDM: those patients at highest risk for therapeutic failure.

It is noteworthy that we used log-linear regression to estimate FEP $fT > MIC$ and C_{min} . This approach assumes first-order kinetics and is not as robust as some other methods, such as use of Bayesian predictions based on population PK models. Unfortunately, our study was not designed to develop a population PK model given the limited sample size and heterogeneity of the population studied. Instead, we chose our approach to mirror what would most often be done clinically to estimate $fT > MIC$ and C_{min} for FEP in children. While Bayesian methods can estimate more accurate PK profiles for individual patients, the use of first order equations is a reasonable and practical alternative to determining target attainment.³² Our sampling times were all during the post-distribution phase, samples were collected at steady-state, and the precise timing of sampling was recorded, minimizing bias of this approach. Further, to our knowledge, no currently available Bayesian dosing software programs incorporate pediatric PK models for FEP. Given our findings, larger-scale PK studies of FEP are warranted in critically ill children. Such studies can promote development of population PK models, potentially incorporating novel urinary biomarkers, to support Bayesian dosing and ensure adequacy of FEP dosing and target attainment in this vulnerable population.

There are additional limitations to our study. First, due to our small sample size, we chose to explore only a limited number of factors that we believed were most likely to influence FEP C_{min} (e.g. renal function, severity of illness indicators, dosing information). It is possible that other unexamined factors could be influential. Further, our small sample size precluded pursuit of multivariable analyses or an evaluation of outcomes. Second, our lab measured total FEP concentrations and we estimated the free fraction based on recent published literature.²¹ Previous pediatric studies have utilized a lower fraction of protein binding (20%),²² which could impact target attainment estimates. Our sensitivity analyses showed that protein binding had a minimal influence on target attainment estimates in our population. Importantly, the fraction of

subjects with a $C_{min} \geq 8 \mu\text{g/mL}$ was the same whether 20% or 39% protein binding was assumed. Finally, we did not specify when urine samples should be collected in relation to FEP concentration sampling, aside from urine sampling occurring before completion of PK sampling. We intentionally permitted variability in this approach in hopes that it would mirror clinical care in the PICU setting. While the association between urinary biomarker concentrations and FEP clearance may be stronger if evaluated at a particular interval, this would not be as practical clinically. Larger future studies may better evaluate the optimal timing of urine sample collection to inform FEP TDM.

In conclusion, a significant proportion of critically ill children failed to attain FEP targets in plasma using standard, intermittent dosing. Although all subjects received recommended dosing for treatment of serious infections, less than half attained targeted goal concentrations. Younger age, higher eGFR, and lower urinary NGAL and KIM-1 were associated with failure to attain C_{min} (i.e. 100% $fT > MIC$) targets. Urinary biomarkers may be a non-invasive means to screen for patients at risk for subtherapeutic FEP concentrations.

FUNDING:

This study received no direct funding and was carried out as part of our routine work. KJD is supported by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number K23HD091365. ASH is supported by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute under Award Number K23HL153759. JCF is supported by the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases under Award Number K23DK119463. This project was supported, in part, by the Penn/CHOP Institutional Clinical and Translational Science Award Research Center through NIH/NCATS (National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences) Grant UL1TR001878 (sample collection, processing and storage).

TRANSPARENCY DECLARATIONS:

KJD has received research support from Merck & Co., Inc. unrelated to the current work. AFZ has received research support from Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development (award numbers UG1HD063108, R21HD093369), the U.S. Department of Defense (award number W81XWH-17-1-0668), and Zelda Therapeutics, unrelated to this work. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of any of the above supporting agencies. All other authors: Nothing to declare.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Box-and-whisker plots displaying the fraction of the dosing interval that free FEP concentrations remained above the MIC among study subjects. The free fraction of FEP was calculated based on 39% protein binding.²¹ For each plot, the thick solid line represents the median, the box displays the inter-quartile range (IRQ, 25th-75th percentile), whiskers incorporate 1.5 times the inter-quartile range, and the dots are values outside of 1.5 times the IQR.

REFERENCES

1. Roberts JA, Joynt GM, Choi GY, Gomersall CD, Lipman J. How to optimise antimicrobial prescriptions in the Intensive Care Unit: principles of individualised dosing using pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2012;39(3):187-192.
2. Sime FB, Roberts MS, Peake SL, Lipman J, Roberts JA. Does Beta-lactam Pharmacokinetic Variability in Critically Ill Patients Justify Therapeutic Drug Monitoring? A Systematic Review. *Annals of intensive care*. 2012;2(1):35.
3. Roberts JA, Paul SK, Akova M, et al. DALI: defining antibiotic levels in intensive care unit patients: are current beta-lactam antibiotic doses sufficient for critically ill patients? *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America*. 2014;58(8):1072-1083.
4. Taccone FS, Laterre PF, Dugernier T, et al. Insufficient beta-lactam concentrations in the early phase of severe sepsis and septic shock. *Critical care (London, England)*. 2010;14(4):R126.
5. Hartman SJF, Bruggemann RJ, Orriens L, Dia N, Schreuder MF, de Wildt SN. Pharmacokinetics and Target Attainment of Antibiotics in Critically Ill Children: A Systematic Review of Current Literature. *Clin Pharmacokinet*. 2020;59(2):173-205.
6. Lonsdale DO, Kipper K, Baker EH, et al. Beta-Lactam antimicrobial pharmacokinetics and target attainment in critically ill patients aged 1 day to 90 years: the ABDose study. *The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy*. 2020;75(12):3625-3634.
7. Shoji K, Bradley JS, Reed MD, van den Anker JN, Domonoske C, Capparelli EV. Population Pharmacokinetic Assessment and Pharmacodynamic Implications of Pediatric Cefepime Dosing for Susceptible-Dose-Dependent Organisms. *Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy*. 2016;60(4):2150-2156.

8. Ames SG, Davis BS, Angus DC, Carcillo JA, Kahn JM. Hospital Variation in Risk-Adjusted Pediatric Sepsis Mortality. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2018;19(5):390-396.
9. Tan B, Wong JJ, Sultana R, et al. Global Case-Fatality Rates in Pediatric Severe Sepsis and Septic Shock: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2019;173(4):352-362.
10. Weiss SL, Fitzgerald JC, Pappachan J, et al. Global epidemiology of pediatric severe sepsis: the sepsis prevalence, outcomes, and therapies study. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine*. 2015;191(10):1147-1157.
11. Weiss SL, Fitzgerald JC, Balamuth F, et al. Delayed antimicrobial therapy increases mortality and organ dysfunction duration in pediatric sepsis. *Critical care medicine*. 2014;42(11):2409-2417.
12. McKinnon PS, Paladino JA, Schentag JJ. Evaluation of area under the inhibitory curve (AUC) and time above the minimum inhibitory concentration (T>MIC) as predictors of outcome for cefepime and ceftazidime in serious bacterial infections. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2008;31(4):345-351.
13. Abdul-Aziz MH, Alffenaar JC, Bassetti M, et al. Antimicrobial therapeutic drug monitoring in critically ill adult patients: a Position Paper. *Intensive Care Med*. 2020;46(6):1127-1153.
14. Tam VH, Chang KT, Zhou J, et al. Determining beta-lactam exposure threshold to suppress resistance development in Gram-negative bacteria. *The Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy*. 2017;72(5):1421-1428.
15. Schwartz GJ, Work DF. Measurement and estimation of GFR in children and adolescents. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2009;4(11):1832-1843.
16. Rhodes NJ, Prozialeck WC, Lodise TP, et al. Evaluation of Vancomycin Exposures Associated with Elevations in Novel Urinary Biomarkers of Acute Kidney Injury in Vancomycin-Treated Rats. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2016;60(10):5742-5751.

17. Gaspari F, Cravedi P, Mandala M, et al. Predicting cisplatin-induced acute kidney injury by urinary neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin excretion: a pilot prospective case-control study. *Nephron Clin Pract.* 2010;115(2):c154-160.
18. Downes KJ, Dong M, Fukuda T, et al. Urinary kidney injury biomarkers and tobramycin clearance among children and young adults with cystic fibrosis: a population pharmacokinetic analysis. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2017;72(1):254-260.
19. Goldstein B, Giroir B, Randolph A. Members of the International Consensus Conference on Pediatric Sepsis. International pediatric sepsis consensus conference: definitions for sepsis and organ dysfunction in pediatrics. *Pediatr Crit Care Med.* 2005;6(1):2-8.
20. Zuppa AF, Zane NR, Moorthy G, et al. A Population Pharmacokinetic Analysis to Study the Effect of Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation on Cefepime Disposition in Children. *Pediatr Crit Care Med.* 2019;20(1):62-70.
21. Al-Shaer MH, Alghamdi WA, Graham E, Peloquin CA. Meropenem, Cefepime, and Piperacillin Protein Binding in Patient Samples. *Ther Drug Monit.* 2020;42(1):129-132.
22. Reed MD, Yamashita TS, Knupp CK, Veazey JM, Jr., Blumer JL. Pharmacokinetics of intravenously and intramuscularly administered cefepime in infants and children. *Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy.* 1997;41(8):1783-1787.
23. Schwartz GJ, Munoz A, Schneider MF, et al. New equations to estimate GFR in children with CKD. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2009;20(3):629-637.
24. Dhont E, Van Der Heggen T, De Jaeger A, Vande Walle J, De Paepe P, De Cock PA. Augmented renal clearance in pediatric intensive care: are we undertreating our sickest patients? *Pediatr Nephrol.* 2020;35(1):25-39.
25. Barreto EF, Webb AJ, Pais GM, Rule AD, Jannetto PJ, Scheetz MH. Setting the Beta-Lactam Therapeutic Range for Critically Ill Patients: Is There a Floor or Even a Ceiling? *Crit Care Explor.* 2021;3(6):e0446.

26. Rhodes NJ, Kuti JL, Nicolau DP, et al. Defining Clinical Exposures of Cefepime for Gram-Negative Bloodstream Infections That Are Associated with Improved Survival. *Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy*. 2015;60(3):1401-1410.
27. Aitken SL, Altshuler J, Guervil DJ, et al. Cefepime free minimum concentration to minimum inhibitory concentration (fCmin/MIC) ratio predicts clinical failure in patients with Gram-negative bacterial pneumonia. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2015;45(5):541-544.
28. Lau C, Marriott D, Schultz HB, et al. Assessment of cefepime toxicodynamics: comprehensive examination of pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic targets for cefepime-induced neurotoxicity and evaluation of current dosing guidelines. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2021;58(6):106443.
29. Bilbao-Meseguer I, Rodriguez-Gascon A, Barrasa H, Isla A, Solinis MA. Augmented Renal Clearance in Critically Ill Patients: A Systematic Review. *Clin Pharmacokinet*. 2018;57(9):1107-1121.
30. Polidori N, Giannini C, Salvatore R, et al. Role of urinary NGAL and KIM-1 as biomarkers of early kidney injury in obese prepubertal children. *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab*. 2020;33(9):1183-1189.
31. Kari JA, Shalaby MA, Sofyani K, et al. Urinary neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin (NGAL) and serum cystatin C measurements for early diagnosis of acute kidney injury in children admitted to PICU. *World J Pediatr*. 2018;14(2):134-142.
32. Fratoni AJ, Nicolau DP, Kuti JL. A guide to therapeutic drug monitoring of beta-lactam antibiotics. *Pharmacotherapy*. 2021;41(2):220-233.

Table 1. Characteristics of the study population.	
Characteristics	n = 21
Female sex, n (%)	8 (38)
Age in years, median (range)	10.6 (0.7 – 18.7)
Weight in kg, median (range)	30.9 (6.6 – 127.5)
Height in cm, median (range)	129.0 (62.2 – 180.0)
Indication for PICU admission, n (%)	
Respiratory distress/failure	8 (38)
Cardiac arrest	2 (10)
Fever/shock	4 (19)
Central nervous system pathology ^a	5 (24)
Post-operative care	1 (5)
Electrolyte disturbance	1 (5)
Underlying comorbidities, n (%)	
Neurologic disorder	8 (38)
Lung disease	3 (14)
Cancer	7 (33)
Neutropenia	3 (14)
Stem cell transplant	1 (5)
Solid organ transplant	0
Initial FEP dosing in mg/kg/dose, median (IQR)	44.4 (15.7 – 51.3)
Receipt of maximum FEP dose (2000 mg), n (%)	9 (43)
PELOD-2 score at start of FEP, median (range)	7 (4-13)
Mechanical ventilation at start of FEP, n (%)	17 (81)
On vasopressor support:	
at FEP start, n (%)	8 (38)
at time of FEP sampling, n (%)	6 (29)
eGFR at cefepime initiation, in mL/min/1.73 m ² , median (IQR)	147 (54 – 520)
Renal impairment (eGFR < 60 mL/min/1.73 m ²), n (%)	1 (5)
ARC (eGFR > 130 mL/min/1.73 m ²), n (%)	13 (62)
eGFR at PK sampling, in mL/min/1.73 m ² , median (IQR)	147 (37 – 520)
Renal impairment (eGFR < 60 mL/min/1.73 m ²), n (%)	2 (10)
ARC (eGFR > 130 mL/min/1.73 m ²), n (%)	13 (62)
Cefepime doses prior to PK sampling, median (range)	5 (3-9)
Cefepime dose prior to PK sampling given as a bolus infusion ^a , n (%)	5 (24)
^a Includes seizures (n=3), cerebellar hemorrhage (n=1), shunt malfunction (n=1), altered mental status (n=1)	
^b Bolus infusion defined by infusion time <15 minutes	
Abbreviations: ARC, augmented renal clearance; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; FEP, cefepime; KIM-1, kidney injury molecule-1; NGAL, neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin	

459

460

Table 2. Target attainment for subjects treated with cefepime^a		
MIC (µg/mL)	Cmin ≥ MIC, n (%)	Cmin ≥ 4xMIC, n (%)
1	20 (95.2)	11 (52.3)
2	19 (90.4)	9 (42.9)
4	11 (52.3)	7 (33.3)
8	9 (42.9)	4 (19.0)
16	7 (33.3)	0
^a Target attainment determined by performance of log-linear regression of unbound cefepime concentrations on time. Plasma protein binding assumed to be 39% for all calculations (based on data by Al-Shaer MH, et al. <i>Ther Drug Monit</i> , 2020).		

461
462
463

Table 3. Comparison between clinical factors and cefepime $C_{min} > 8 \mu\text{g/mL}$			
Factor	$C_{min} < 8$ (n = 12)	$C_{min} \geq 8$ (n = 9)	p-value
Age in years, median	2.6	16.6	.005
Weight in kg, median	16.3	45	.11
Dosage in mg/kg/dose, median	45.0	40.9	.48
eGFR at FEP sampling, in mL/min/1.73 m ² , median	193	109	.03
ARC at FEP sampling (eGFR > 130 mL/min/1.73 m ²), %	75%	44%	.20
SCr at PK sampling, in mg/dL, median	0.2	0.6	.01
PELOD-2 score at start of FEP, median	7.5	7	.37
Receipt of vasopressors at FEP sampling, %	25%	33%	.91
Receipt of FEP as bolus infusion, %	25%	22%	1.0
Urinary biomarkers, median, ng/mL, median			
Cystatin C	24	376	.11
Clusterin	51	437	.21
NGAL	12	350	.006
Osteopontin	991	1949	.31
KIM-1	0.4	1.6	.03
Urinary biomarkers, ng/mg urine creatinine, median			
Cystatin C	141.0	863.9	.08
Clusterin	204.2	814.1	.19
NGAL	57.1	826.7	.004
Osteopontin	5075.2	3728.8	.65
KIM-1	1.9	8.9	.05
Wilcoxon rank sum tests used for comparisons of continuous variables; Fisher's exact tests used for comparisons of categorical variables.			
Abbreviations: ARC, augmented renal clearance; C_{min} , minimum concentration; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; FEP, cefepime; KIM-1, kidney injury molecule-1; NGAL, neutrophil gelatinase-associated lipocalin; PELOD-2, Pediatric Logistic Organ Dysfunction-2; SCr, serum creatinine			

464

465

Table 4. Spearman correlation analyses between covariates and cefepime C _{min} (i.e. trough).	
Factor	r (p-value)
Age	.53 (.01)
Weight	.40 (.07)
Dose in mg/kg/dose	-.29(.21)
eGFR at cefepime initiation	-.32 (.16)
eGFR at PK sampling	-.58 (.006)
Urinary biomarkers, ng/mL	
Cystatin C	.29 (.20)
Clusterin	.32 (.15)
NGAL	.42 (.056)
Osteopontin	.37 (.10)
KIM-1	.50 (.02)
Urinary biomarkers, ng/mg urine creatinine	
Cystatin C	.34 (.13)
Clusterin	.39 (.08)
NGAL	.47 (.03)
Osteopontin	.18 (.42)
KIM-1	.49 (.02)