



CLINICAL AND
LABORATORY
STANDARDS
INSTITUTE®

4th Edition

M57S

Epidemiological Cutoff Values for Antifungal Susceptibility Testing

This document includes epidemiological cutoff values developed according to the criteria in the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) guideline M57 and generated according to the reference broth dilution methods described in the CLSI standards M7 and M38.

A CLSI supplement for global application.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

Setting the standard for quality in medical laboratory testing around the world.

The Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) is a not-for-profit membership organization that brings together the varied perspectives and expertise of the worldwide laboratory community for the advancement of a common cause: to foster excellence in laboratory medicine by developing and implementing medical laboratory standards and guidelines that help laboratories fulfill their responsibilities with efficiency, effectiveness, and global applicability.

Consensus Process

Consensus—the substantial agreement by materially affected, competent, and interested parties—is core to the development of all CLSI documents. It does not always connote unanimous agreement but does mean that the participants in the development of a consensus document have considered and resolved all relevant objections and accept the resulting agreement.

Commenting on Documents

CLSI documents undergo periodic evaluation and modification to keep pace with advances in technologies, procedures, methods, and protocols affecting the laboratory or health care.

CLSI's consensus process depends on experts who volunteer to serve as contributing authors and/or as participants in the reviewing and commenting process. At the end of each comment period, the committee that developed the document is obligated to review all comments, respond in writing to all substantive comments, and revise the draft document as appropriate.

Comments on published CLSI documents are equally essential and may be submitted by anyone, at any time, on any document. All comments are managed according to the consensus process by a committee of experts.

Appeal Process

When it is believed that an objection has not been adequately considered and responded to, the process for appeal, documented in the *CLSI Standards Development Policies and Processes*, is followed.

All comments and responses submitted on draft and published documents are retained on file at CLSI and are available upon request.

Get Involved—Volunteer!

Do you use CLSI documents in your workplace? Do you see room for improvement? Would you like to get involved in the revision process? Or maybe you see a need to develop a new document for an emerging technology? CLSI wants to hear from you. We are always looking for volunteers. By donating your time and talents to improve the standards that affect your own work, you will play an active role in improving public health across the globe.

For additional information on committee participation or to submit comments, contact CLSI.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

P: +1.610.688.0100

F: +1.610.688.0700

www.clsi.org

standard@clsi.org

Epidemiological Cutoff Values for Antifungal Susceptibility Testing

Gary W. Procop, MD, MS
Philippe J. Dufresne, PhD, RMCCM
Elizabeth Berkow, PhD
Sharon K. Cullen, BS, RAC
Jeff Fuller, PhD, FCCM, D(ABMM)
Kimberly E. Hanson, MD, MHS
Nicole M. Holliday, BA
Shawn R. Lockhart, PhD, D(ABMM), F(AAM)
Audrey N. Schuetz, MD, MPH, D(ABMM)
Paul E. Verweij, MD, FECMM
Nathan P. Wiederhold, PharmD
Adrian M. Zelazny, PhD, D(ABMM)

Abstract

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute document M57S—*Epidemiological Cutoff Values for Antifungal Susceptibility Testing* includes epidemiological cutoff values (ECVs) and quality control tables developed following the guidance in CLSI document M57.¹ These ECVs are valid only when they are developed in accordance with CLSI document M57¹ and when minimal inhibitory concentrations or minimal effective concentrations are generated according to the reference broth dilution methods described in CLSI documents M27² and M38.³ Users should replace previously published tables with these new tables. Changes in the tables since the previous edition was published appear in boldface type.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). *Epidemiological Cutoff Values for Antifungal Susceptibility Testing*. 4th ed. CLSI supplement M57S (ISBN 978-1-68440-158-1 [Print]; ISBN 978-1-68440-159-8 [Electronic]). Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, CLS, 2022.

The Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute consensus process, which is the mechanism for moving a document through two or more levels of review by the health care community, is an ongoing process. Users should expect revised editions of any given document. Because rapid changes in technology may affect the procedures, methods, and protocols in a standard or guideline, users should replace outdated editions with the current editions of CLSI documents. Current editions are listed in the CLSI catalog and posted on our website at www.clsi.org.

If you or your organization is not a member and would like to become one, or to request a copy of the catalog, contact us at:

P: +1.610.688.0100 **F:** +1.610.688.0700 **E:** customerservice@clsi.org **W:** www.clsi.org

Copyright ©2022 Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. Except as stated below, any reproduction of content from a CLSI copyrighted standard, guideline, derivative product, or other material requires express written consent from CLSI. All rights reserved. Interested parties may send permission requests to permissions@clsi.org.

CLSI hereby grants permission to each individual member or purchaser to make a single reproduction of this publication for use in its laboratory procedures manual at a single site. To request permission to use this publication in any other manner, e-mail permissions@clsi.org.

Suggested Citation

CLSI. *Epidemiological Cutoff Values for Antifungal Susceptibility Testing*. 4th ed. CLSI supplement M57S. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2022.

Previous Editions:

M59: April 2016, January 2018, June 2020

M57-Ed1-S-Ed4
ISBN 978-1-68440-158-1 (Print)
ISBN 978-1-68440-159-8 (Electronic)
ISSN 1558-6502 (Print)
ISSN 2162-2914 (Electronic)

Volume 42, Number 18

Committee Membership

Subcommittee on Antifungal Susceptibility Tests

Gary W. Procop, MD, MS
Chairholder
American Board of Pathology
USA

Sharon K. Cullen, BS, RAC
Beckman Coulter, Inc.
Microbiology Business
USA

Audrey N. Schuetz, MD, MPH,
D(ABMM)
Mayo Clinic
USA

Philippe J. Dufresne, PhD, RMCCM
Vice-Chairholder
Institut national de santé publique
du Québec
Canada

Jeff Fuller, PhD, FCCM, D(ABMM)
London Health Sciences Centre
Canada

Paul E. Verweij, MD, FECMM
Radboud University Medical Center
the Netherlands

Camille Hamula, PhD, D(ABMM)
Committee Secretary
Saskatoon Health Region/
University of Saskatchewan
Canada

Kimberly E. Hanson, MD, MHS
University of Utah and
ARUP Laboratories
USA

Nathan P. Wiederhold, PharmD
University of Texas Health Science
Center at San Antonio
USA

Elizabeth Berkow, PhD
Centers for Disease Control and
Prevention
USA

Nicole M. Holliday, BA
Thermo Fisher Scientific
USA

Adrian M. Zelazny, PhD, D(ABMM)
National Institutes of Health
Department of Laboratory Medicine
USA

Working Group on Antifungal Breakpoints

David Andes, MD
Co-Chairholder
University of Wisconsin-
Madison Medical School
USA

Mariana Castanheira, PhD
JMI Laboratories
USA

Shawn R. Lockhart, PhD, D(ABMM),
F(AAM)
Centers for Disease Control and
Prevention
USA

Andrew M. Borman, BSc, PhD
Co-Chairholder
Public Health England
United Kingdom

Philippe J. Dufresne, PhD, RMCCM
Institut national de santé publique
du Québec
Canada

Gary W. Procop, MD, MS
American Board of Pathology
USA

Nathan P. Wiederhold, PharmD
Committee Secretary
University of Texas Health Science
Center at San Antonio
USA

Kimberly E. Hanson, MD, MHS
University of Utah and
ARUP Laboratories
USA

Working Group on Antifungal Epidemiological Cutoff Values

Shawn R. Lockhart, PhD, D(ABMM),
F(AAM)
Chairholder
Centers for Disease Control and
Prevention
USA

Philippe J. Dufresne, PhD, RMCCM
Vice-Chairholder
Institut national de santé publique
du Québec
Canada

Nathan P. Wiederhold, PharmD
Committee Secretary
University of Texas Health Science
Center at San Antonio
USA

Elizabeth Berkow, PhD
Centers for Disease Control and
Prevention
USA

Jeff Fuller, PhD, FCCM, D(ABMM)
London Health Sciences Centre
Canada

Mahmoud A. Ghannoum, PhD,
FIDSA, MBA
Case Western Reserve University
USA

Kerian K. Grande Roche, PhD
FDA Center for Drug Evaluation and
Research
USA

Kimberly E. Hanson, MD, MHS
University of Utah and
ARUP Laboratories
USA

John D. Turnidge, MD, BS, FRACP,
FASM, FRCPA
The University of Adelaide
Australia

Thomas J. Walsh, MD, PhD(hon),
FIDSA, FAAM, FECMM
Weill Cornell Medicine of Cornell
University and New York
Presbyterian Hospital
USA

Barbara D. Alexander, MD, MHS
Duke University Medical Center
USA

Working Group on Antifungal Reporting

Audrey N. Schuetz, MD, MPH,
D(ABMM)
Co-Chairholder
Mayo Clinic
USA

Vera Tesic, MD, MS, D(ABMM)
Co-Chairholder
University of Chicago
USA

Tanis Dingle, PhD, D(ABMM), FCCM
Alberta Precision Laboratories-
Public Health Laboratory
Canada

Kimberly E. Hanson, MD, MHS
University of Utah and
ARUP Laboratories
USA

Stephanie L. Mitchell, PhD,
D(ABMM)
Cepheid
USA

Natasha N. Pettit, PharmD,
BCPS(AQ-ID)
University of Chicago Medicine
USA

Thomas J. Walsh, MD, PhD(hon),
FIDSA, FAAM, FECMM
Weill Cornell Medicine of Cornell
University and New York
Presbyterian Hospital
USA

Nathan P. Wiederhold, PharmD
University of Texas Health Science
Center at San Antonio
USA

Michelle A. Wikler, MD, FIDSA, MBA
ID-CD Consulting
USA

Yanan (Nancy) Zhao, PhD
Center for Discovery and
Innovation, Hackensack Meridian
Health
USA

Staff

Clinical and Laboratory Standards
Institute
USA

Christine M. Lam, MT(ASCP)
Project Manager

Laura Martin
Editorial Manager

Catherine E.M. Jenkins, ELS
Editor

Kristy L. Leirer, MS
Editor

Lisa M.W. Walker, MS, ELS
Editor

Contents

Abstract i

Committee Membership..... iii

Foreword vii

Overview of Changes viii

Abbreviations and Acronyms xiii

References xiv

Table 1. Epidemiological Cutoff Values for *In Vitro* Susceptibility Testing of *Candida* spp. and Other Ascomycete Yeasts With No Breakpoints 1

Table 2. Epidemiological Cutoff Values for *In Vitro* Susceptibility Testing of *Cryptococcus* spp. and Other Basidiomycete Yeasts With No Breakpoints 5

Table 3. Epidemiological Cutoff Values for *In Vitro* Susceptibility Testing of *Aspergillus* spp. With No Breakpoints 7

Table 4. Epidemiological Cutoff Values for *In Vitro* Susceptibility Testing of *Candida* spp. With Breakpoints 9

Table 5. Epidemiological Cutoff Values for *In Vitro* Susceptibility Testing of *Aspergillus fumigatus* With Breakpoints 11

Table 6. Summary of Available Epidemiological Cutoff Values and/or Breakpoints by Fungal Species 12

Glossary. Antifungal Agent Abbreviations, Routes of Administration, and Drug Class..... 16

The Quality Management System Approach 17

Currently in preview, click buy full version

Foreword

With the development of standard methodologies for testing the susceptibility of fungal species to several antifungal agents, minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) and minimal effective concentration (MEC) distributions are available to determine epidemiological cutoff values (ECVs) for ascomycete yeasts (*Candida* spp. and *Saccharomyces* spp.), basidiomycete yeasts (*Cryptococcus* spp., *Rhodotorula* spp., *Trichosporon* spp.), and *Aspergillus* spp. of clinical importance. The ECVs provided in this document were established using the guidance in CLSI document M57.¹ **The ECV, which is the MIC or MEC that separates fungal populations into those with and without acquired and/or mutational resistance based on their phenotypes (wild-type [WT] or non-wild-type [NWT]),** is useful for distinguishing between WT isolates without acquired resistance mechanisms and NWT isolates harboring acquired resistance mechanisms. Unlike breakpoints, ECVs do not classify isolates as treatable (susceptible) or untreatable (resistant). In lieu of breakpoints, clinicians can use ECVs alone when deciding whether to treat a patient with a certain agent (see CLSI document M57¹). However, ECVs do not predict therapeutic response. For ECVs to be clinically useful, the MIC or MEC should be determined using the broth microdilution procedure for yeasts (see CLSI document M27²) or the broth microdilution procedure for filamentous fungi (see CLSI document M38³).

NOTE: Current fungal taxonomy is under revision. Many genera have both a teleomorph (sexual state) and an anamorph (asexual state) name. In this document, the traditional *Candida* anamorph names are used to provide continuity with both past procedures and associated documents such as CLSI document M27² and others.⁴⁻⁶

NOTE: When serial twofold dilution MICs are being prepared and tested, the actual dilution scheme is, eg, 128, 64, 32, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1, 0.5, 0.25, 0.125, 0.0625, 0.03125 µg/mL, etc. For convenience only and not because these are the actual concentrations tested, it was decided to use the following values in M57S: 128, 64, 32, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1, 0.5, 0.25, 0.12, 0.06, 0.03 µg/mL, etc. The values that appear in the tables are equivalent to the actual values tested, eg, 0.12 µg/mL = 0.125 µg/mL, and laboratories should report an ECV of ≤0.125 µg/mL as ≤0.12 µg/mL.