ADVANCEMENTS IN THE STABILITY AND COMPATIBILITY OF CEFEPIME WITH INTRAVENOUS DILUENTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR CLINICAL PRACTICE

Dheeraj kumar[1*], Hemlata[2], Mohit[3], Parveen Yadav[4], Kamal[5]

ABSTRACT

In clinical practice, it is important to determine the stability of cefepime at ready-to-use concentrations, compatibility with IV diluents and appropriacy of such use. The aim of this review is to outline various pharmacological aspects of cefepime, including pharmacokinetics, mechanism of action and pharmacodynamics that comprise its therapeutic profile. Furthermore, chemical properties like interactions in terms of stability and compatibility with diluents are considered pointing out the significance of the right formulation as well as preparation techniques. Diluents like water, 0.9% sodium chloride injection 5%, 10% dextrose injections, the possible treatment approaches should not only be tailored but also optimized for desired results without causing any harm on patients. Therefore, healthcare providers need to assess stability and compatibility procedures and storage guidelines in order to provide useful direction for practice. Additionally, future research should focus on innovative formulations while standardizing protocols that will determine their applicability in clinical settings and the effect thereof towards the management of bacterial infections by cefepime. There are several challenges to be overcome by embracing emerging technologies and practices if healthcare professionals are to improve patient care and enhance treatment efficacy in the management of bacterial infections.

Keywords: Cefepime, Intravenous, Diluents, Antibacterial, Therapeutic, Stability, Compatibility.

[1*,3,5]SGT college of pharmacy, SGT University, Gurugram, Haryana, India
[2]BM college of Pharmacy, Farrukh Nagar, Gurugram, Haryana, India
[4]Gurugram University, Gurugram, Haryana, India
***Corresponding Author:** Dheeraj Kumar
*SGT college of pharmacy, SGT University, Gurgaon, Haryana, India

DOI: 10.53555/ecb/2023.12.5.539

INTRODUCTION

Cefepime, a fourth-generation cephalosporin, stands as a crucial component in the armamentarium against a spectrum of bacterial infections [1]. Originally introduced in the 1990s, its development responded to the escalating challenge of antibiotic resistance. Unlike its predecessors, cefepime exhibits enhanced activity against Gram-negative bacteria, including Pseudomonas aeruginosa, as well as notable efficacy against Gram-positive organisms. This broad-spectrum coverage, coupled with its relatively low susceptibility to β-lactamases, renders cefepime an invaluable asset in managing severe infections, such as nosocomial pneumonia, complicated urinary tract infections, and intra-abdominal infections [2]. Its pharmacokinetic profile allows for convenient dosing, often administered intravenously for rapid and reliable therapeutic effects. Cefepime's role in clinical practice is underscored by its ability to penetrate various body tissues and fluids, including the central nervous system, making it a valuable option for treating meningitis. Moreover, cefepime's relatively low propensity for inducing antibiotic resistance compared to other β-lactam antibiotics enhances its utility in combating multidrug-resistant bacterial strains, which pose significant challenges in healthcare settings worldwide [3]. Additionally, its favorable safety profile, with minimal adverse effects and low incidence of allergic reactions, contributes to its widespread use in diverse patient populations, including those with compromised renal function. However, the optimization of cefepime therapy is not without challenges. Issues such as dosing adjustments in renal impairment, the potential for drug interactions, and concerns regarding the development of antimicrobial resistance necessitate careful consideration in clinical decision-making [4].

Ensuring the stability and compatibility of medications, particularly when administered intravenously, is paramount in clinical practice. The stability of a drug refers to its ability to maintain its chemical composition and therapeutic efficacy over

time, while compatibility pertains to its ability to be mixed or co-administered with other drugs or diluents without causing adverse reactions or compromising its effectiveness [5]. In the case of cefepime, a vital antibiotic used to combat a range of bacterial infections, understanding its stability and compatibility is crucial for several reasons. Firstly, unstable medications can lead to decreased potency or even toxicity, risking treatment failure or harm to patients [6]. Secondly, compatibility issues may result in physical incompatibilities such as precipitation, or chemical incompatibilities such as drug degradation, potentially causing occlusions in intravenous lines or compromising patient safety [7]. Furthermore, unstable or incompatible medications can disrupt workflow in healthcare settings, leading to delays in treatment administration or necessitating additional resources for managing complications. Therefore, investigating advancements in stability testing methodologies and compatibility assessments is essential for enhancing medication safety, streamlining clinical workflows, and ultimately improving patient care outcomes.

PHARMACOLOGY OF CEFEPIME

Cefepime, classified as a fourth-generation cephalosporin, exerts its bactericidal effects by targeting bacterial cell wall synthesis through inhibition of penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs). This interference disrupts peptidoglycan cross-linking during cell wall assembly, ultimately leading to bacterial cell lysis and death [8]. Notably, cefepime exhibits heightened activity against Gram-negative bacteria, including notorious pathogens like Pseudomonas aeruginosa, attributed to its increased affinity for PBP 3 [9]. Furthermore, its interaction with PBPs 1a and 1b contributes to efficacy against Gram-positive organisms, highlighting its broad-spectrum activity against diverse bacterial strains. Cefepime's pharmacokinetic profile further enhances its clinical utility, characterized by a relatively long half-life of 2 to 3 hours in adults [10]. This prolonged half-life permits extended dosing intervals, simplifying administration and potentially improving patient adherence to treatment regimens. Cefepime demonstrates favorable distribution throughout various body tissues and fluids, including the lungs, kidneys, and cerebrospinal fluid, underscoring its efficacy in treating infections affecting diverse anatomical sites [11]. However, renal excretion plays a significant role in cefepime's elimination, necessitating dosage adjustments in patients with impaired renal function to prevent drug accumulation and potential toxicity. In terms of pharmacodynamics, cefepime's bactericidal activity is concentration-dependent, wherein higher drug concentrations correlate with increased bacterial killing [12]. This characteristic guides dosing strategies aimed at optimizing efficacy while minimizing the risk of resistance development. Cefepime exhibits time-dependent killing kinetics, emphasizing the importance of maintaining therapeutic concentrations above the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) for prolonged durations to achieve maximal bacterial eradication. Cefepime's ability to penetrate various body tissues and fluids, including the cerebrospinal fluid, positions it as a valuable therapeutic option for treating central nervous system infections such as meningitis [13]. Moreover, cefepime's broad-spectrum activity against both Gram-negative and Gram-positive bacteria defines its utility in managing a wide range of infections, from community-acquired pneumonia to complicated intra-abdominal infections. The relative stability of cefepime allows for flexible dosing regimens, accommodating diverse patient populations and clinical scenarios. However, the emergence of antimicrobial resistance poses a persistent challenge to its efficacy, necessitating vigilant surveillance and stewardship efforts to preserve its therapeutic efficacy.

FACTORS AFFECTING STABILITY AND COMPATIBILITY

Several critical factors influence the stability and compatibility of cefepime, impacting its efficacy and safety when administered intravenously. Firstly, the chemical stability of cefepime can be affected by the pH of the diluent used for reconstitution and administration. Cefepime is most stable in solutions with a pH range of 4 to 6, and deviations from this range can lead to degradation and loss of potency [14]. Temperature also plays a significant role; cefepime solutions are more stable when stored at cooler temperatures, while exposure to higher temperatures can accelerate degradation processes. The presence of light is another consideration, as cefepime can degrade upon prolonged exposure to light, necessitating proper storage in light-resistant containers. Compatibility with intravenous diluents and other medications is crucial to avoid adverse reactions and ensure therapeutic efficacy. Cefepime may precipitate or lose activity when mixed with certain incompatible drugs or diluents, underscoring the need for thorough compatibility testing before co-administration [15]. Additionally, the concentration of the cefepime solution can

influence its stability; higher concentrations may be more prone to precipitation and require careful handling.

Table 1: Factors affecting Cefepimes activity with different IV diluents.

IV Diluent	Factors Affecting Stability and Compatibility	References
Water	- Cefepime stability can be affected by pH extremes. Ensure pH compatibility if using water as a diluent.	[16]
0.9% Sodium Chloride Injection	- Generally stable with sodium chloride injection. - pH compatibility ensures stability.	[17]
5% and 10% Dextrose Injection	- Compatible with dextrose solutions but may have decreased stability compared to saline solutions. - Monitor for precipitation or changes in appearance.	[18]
M/6 Sodium Lactate Injection	- Stability may be affected by pH differences between cefepime and lactate solution. - Monitor for changes in appearance or precipitation.	[19]
Lactated Ringers with 5% Dextrose Injection	- Compatibility may vary depending on the concentrations of lactate and dextrose. - Monitor for precipitation or changes in appearance.	[20]

CHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF CEFEPIME

The core structure of cefepime includes a beta-lactam ring fused to a dihydrothiazine ring, which is a hallmark of cephalosporins [21]. Attached to this core are side chains that confer unique properties: a positively charged quaternary ammonium group at the 3' position, which enhances its penetration through Gram-negative bacterial outer membranes, and a syn-methoxy imino group at the 7' position, which provides resistance to β-lactamase enzymes produced by many bacteria. This combination of features allows cefepime to inhibit penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs) effectively, disrupting cell wall synthesis and leading to bacterial cell death [22]. Cefepime is highly soluble in water, facilitating its use in intravenous solutions, but it is susceptible to hydrolysis, particularly at extreme pH levels or higher temperatures. Its stability profile is optimal at a neutral pH, and it should be stored in conditions that avoid light and heat to prevent degradation. The stability of cefepime in solution is critical for its clinical efficacy, requiring careful attention to its chemical environment [23]. When reconstituted for intravenous administration, cefepime must be used within specified time frames to ensure its potency, as prolonged exposure to unfavourable conditions can lead to significant degradation. Its susceptibility to hydrolysis, especially in alkaline or acidic environments, necessitates that healthcare providers reconstitute it using diluents that maintain a pH close to neutral. Cefepime's quaternary ammonium group not only aids in its antimicrobial activity but also increases its ionic strength [24]. It can influence interactions with other drugs and diluents, potentially leading to precipitation or reduced activity if mixed improperly. Another aspect of cefepime's chemical properties is its relatively high molecular weight and the presence of the syn-methoxyimino group, which contributes to its stability against a broad range of β-lactamases, including extended-spectrum β-lactamases (ESBLs) [25]. This makes cefepime particularly effective against resistant bacterial strains that are problematic in hospital settings. However, this same structural complexity requires precise manufacturing and quality control processes to ensure consistent drug performance.

INTERACTION WITH INTRAVENOUS DILUENTS

Cefepime's interaction with different intravenous diluents is critical to its clinical administration, affecting its stability, efficacy, and safety. When reconstituted, cefepime is commonly mixed with sterile water, 0.9% sodium chloride (normal saline), or 5% dextrose in water. Each diluent can influence the stability and solubility of cefepime [26]. For example, cefepime is most stable in solutions that maintain a neutral pH; deviations from this pH can accelerate degradation and reduce its antimicrobial potency. Normal saline and sterile water are typically preferred for maintaining an optimal pH environment. In contrast, solutions like lactated Ringer's may alter the pH and reduce stability [27]. The osmolarity and ionic strength of the diluent also play significant roles. Solutions with higher ionic strengths can potentially cause precipitation of cefepime if not properly diluted. Temperature and light exposure further affect cefepime's stability when mixed with these diluents. While cefepime is generally stable for 24 hours at room temperature when mixed with these common diluents, refrigeration can extend its stability up to seven days, which is crucial for batch preparations in hospital pharmacies [28].

Additionally, the material of the IV bags and administration sets can impact cefepime's stability. PVC-free and DEHP-free bags are often recommended to avoid interactions that could lead to leaching or adsorption, which can reduce the effective concentration of the drug administered to the patient [29].

Additionally, the timing of cefepime administration after reconstitution is another vital consideration. Once cefepime is mixed with an intravenous diluent, the solution should be used promptly to ensure maximum efficacy. While refrigeration can extend the stability of the reconstituted solution, it is generally recommended to use it within 24 hours when stored at room temperature to avoid any degradation that could compromise its antibacterial properties. Incompatibilities with other medications administered via the same IV line also necessitate careful planning. For instance, cefepime should not be mixed with aminoglycosides in the same IV solution due to the risk of inactivation and precipitation. Instead, these antibiotics should be administered separately, with flushing of the IV line between drugs to prevent direct contact. Medications like metronidazole and heparin, frequently used in hospital settings, can pose compatibility issues [30]. Therefore, Y-site compatibility checks are essential to ensure that cefepime and other drugs do not interact negatively when administered concurrently.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS OF CEFEPIME IN DIFFERENT DILUENTS

Cefepime, administration typically involves intravenous infusion, ranging from short durations of 30–60 minutes to prolonged infusions lasting 3 hours or continuous administration. The drug exhibits widespread distribution in biological fluids and tissues, with a typical volume of distribution around 0.2 L/kg in healthy adults with normal renal function [31]. Although cefepime has low protein binding (approximately 20%) and is primarily eliminated through renal excretion, its pharmacokinetics may vary significantly in patients with altered renal function or specific pathophysiological conditions, leading to challenges in dosing [32]. Consequently, therapeutic drug monitoring of cefepime may be advisable, particularly in critically ill patients or those infected with more resistant pathogens. Despite its generally favorable safety profile, recent reports have raised concerns about potential neurotoxicity, particularly in patients with impaired renal function. In clinical practice, cefepime vials are compatible with various intravenous infusion fluids, including 0.9% Sodium Chloride Injection, 5% and 10% Dextrose Injection, M/6 Sodium Lactate Injection, and Lactated Ringers with 5% Dextrose Injection [33]. Clinicians must carefully consider these factors when selecting the appropriate diluent and infusion method to optimize patient outcomes.

Table 2: Cefepime activity with different diluents.

Diluent	Mechanism of Action	Activity	References
Water	Cefepime binds to penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs) inhibiting bacterial cell wall synthesis.	Effective against a wide range of Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria.	[34]
0.9% Sodium Chloride Injection	Interferes with bacterial cell wall synthesis by binding to PBPs.	Retains effectiveness against Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria.	[35]
5% and 10% Dextrose Injection	Disruption of bacterial cell wall synthesis by binding to PBPs.	Maintains efficacy against both Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria.	[36]
M/6 Sodium Lactate Injection	Inhibits bacterial cell wall synthesis through PBP binding.	Preserves activity against Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria, but may require higher concentrations for efficacy.	[37]
Lactated Ringers with 5% Dextrose Injection	Inhibits bacterial cell wall synthesis through PBP binding.	Effective against a wide spectrum of Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria.	[38]

CEFEPIME WITH WATER

Cefepime, a broad-spectrum antibiotic, is widely used for treating serious infections such as pneumonia, urinary tract infections, and intra-abdominal infections. When reconstituting cefepime for intravenous administration, it is crucial to use sterile water for injection to ensure its stability and effectiveness [39]. Solutions prepared

with sterile water remain stable for up to 24 hours at room temperature (20-25°C) and can be stored under refrigeration (2-8°C) for up to 7 days. However, it is important to note that solutions with concentrations greater than 50 g/L may exhibit color changes, ranging from light yellow to dark red, within two hours at 37°C [40]. This color change, while noticeable, does not impact the efficacy of the drug but should be monitored. Cefepime's high solubility in water makes it suitable for intravenous administration, and it can be co-administered with other compatible medications through the same IV line. Nonetheless, compatibility with other drugs should always be verified to avoid adverse interactions or precipitation. Clinicians must avoid mixing cefepime with medications that may interact negatively or precipitate, ensuring that the therapeutic efficacy of cefepime is maintained [41]. Given that cefepime is primarily excreted by the kidneys, dose adjustments are necessary for patients with impaired renal function [42]. Regular monitoring of renal function and adjustments based on creatinine clearance are essential to prevent toxicity. This is particularly important because improper dosing in patients with renal impairment can lead to serious adverse effects, including neurotoxicity. Clinical monitoring during cefepime therapy is essential. Patients should be observed for adverse effects such as hypersensitivity reactions, neurotoxicity, and superinfections. Although rare, neurotoxicity, including encephalopathy, can occur, especially in patients with renal impairment. If symptoms of neurotoxicity arise, prompt discontinuation of cefepime is crucial.

CEFEPIME WITH 0.9% SODIUM CHLORIDE INJECTION

When administered intravenously, cefepime is frequently reconstituted with 0.9% Sodium Chloride Injection (normal saline), which is a common and compatible diluent. The compatibility of cefepime with 0.9% Sodium Chloride Injection is well-documented, ensuring that the antibiotic remains stable and effective for use [43]. When reconstituted with 0.9% Sodium Chloride Injection, cefepime maintains its stability for up to 24 hours at room temperature (20-25°C) and up to 7 days under refrigeration (2-8°C). This stability makes it convenient for clinical settings, allowing for preparation in advance and flexibility in administration times. The use of normal saline as a diluent helps in maintaining the isotonicity of the solution, which is crucial for patient comfort and reducing the risk of infusion-related adverse reactions.

From a clinical perspective, using 0.9% Sodium Chloride Injection as a diluent for cefepime offers several advantages [44]. The isotonic nature of normal saline is gentle on veins, reducing the risk of phlebitis or irritation at the injection site, which is particularly important for patients requiring prolonged or repeated infusions [45]. Additionally, normal saline is widely available and inexpensive, making it a practical choice in various healthcare settings, from hospitals to outpatient clinics. The compatibility with 0.9% Sodium Chloride Injection facilitates the administration of cefepime alongside other medications [46]. Many intravenous therapies are administered using normal saline, so the ability to mix cefepime without concerns about compatibility simplifies treatment regimens and reduces the need for additional IV lines, thereby enhancing patient comfort and reducing potential complications associated with multiple access points. Clinicians should, however, remain vigilant regarding the potential for adverse reactions and ensure proper dosing, particularly in patients with renal impairment. Since cefepime is predominantly excreted by the kidneys, dose adjustments based on renal function are critical to avoid toxicity. Regular monitoring of renal function, especially in elderly patients or those with pre-existing renal conditions, is essential to prevent adverse effects such as neurotoxicity.

CEFEPIME WITH 5% AND 10% DEXTROSE INJECTION

Cefepime compatibility with different intravenous fluids is essential for ensuring safe and effective administration. Both 5% dextrose (D5W) and 10% dextrose (D10W) solutions are compatible with cefepime when considering its use with dextrose injections [47]. This compatibility means that cefepime can be reconstituted and administered using either of these solutions without significant stability issues. Specifically, when reconstituted with 5% dextrose, cefepime typically remains stable for at least 24 hours at room temperature and up to 7 days if refrigerated. Similar stability is observed with 10% dextrose, although the exact stability times can vary slightly depending on the manufacturer's guidelines [48]. The compatibility of cefepime with both 5% and 10% dextrose injections has several important clinical implications. First, it provides healthcare providers with the flexibility to choose the appropriate diluent based on patient needs and clinical scenarios. For instance, in situations where patients require higher caloric intake or specific fluid management, 10% dextrose might be preferred [49]. Additionally, ensuring compatibility helps prevent the risk of

precipitation or degradation of the antibiotic, which could lead to ineffective treatment or adverse reactions. Properly mixed cefepime solutions maintain the drug's efficacy and safety, which is crucial for successful treatment outcomes. This compatibility simplifies the preparation process in hospital settings, where pre-mixed bags of dextrose solutions are often used for intravenous medications. By reducing the risk of errors and ensuring timely administration, the compatibility of cefepime with common diluents supports efficient clinical practices. For specific patient populations, such as those with diabetes, the glucose content of the diluent must be considered to avoid affecting blood glucose control. Paediatric and critically ill patients, who may have different fluid and caloric requirements, also benefit from the flexibility provided by these compatible solutions.

CEFEPIME WITH M/6 SODIUM LACTATE INJECTION

Regarding M/6 sodium lactate injection, a buffered solution commonly used for fluid and electrolyte replenishment, compatibility with cefepime ensures that the antibiotic can be safely reconstituted and administered. M/6 sodium lactate, with a molarity of approximately 0.167 M, provides a buffering effect that helps maintain the stability of cefepime [50]. This means cefepime can be mixed with M/6 sodium lactate without significant degradation or precipitation, maintaining its efficacy during administration. The compatibility of cefepime with M/6 sodium lactate injection has several important clinical implications. Firstly, it offers healthcare providers additional flexibility in choosing diluents for cefepime administration [51]. This is particularly beneficial in clinical scenarios where patients need specific electrolyte management or buffering, which sodium lactate provides. Ensuring the stability and efficacy of cefepime when mixed with M/6 sodium lactate is crucial for patient safety. It prevents the risk of antibiotic degradation or precipitation, which could lead to ineffective treatment and potential treatment failures [52]. Stable solutions ensure the therapeutic dose is accurately delivered, maintaining the intended antibacterial effect. This compatibility is advantageous in various clinical settings where careful fluid and electrolyte balance is necessary, such as in critical care, surgery, and for patients with metabolic acidosis. The ability to use cefepime with M/6 sodium lactate expands its applicability, allowing for comprehensive infection management alongside fluid and electrolyte therapy. This is particularly relevant for specific patient populations, such as those with renal impairment or those undergoing major surgery, who may benefit from the combined use of cefepime and sodium lactate for both infection control and fluid management.

CEFEPIME WITH LACTATED RINGERS WITH 5% DEXTROSE INJECTION

Regarding the use of cefepime with Lactated Ringer's with 5% dextrose injection, understanding the specific compatibility issues is essential. Lactated Ringer's solution contains electrolytes, including calcium, which can interact with cefepime. Although cefepime is generally stable in simpler solutions like dextrose or Lactated Ringer's alone, combining them introduces complexity that requires careful consideration. The clinical implications of cefepime's compatibility with Lactated Ringer's with 5% dextrose are significant. First, while cefepime's compatibility with dextrose and Lactated Ringer's separately is beneficial, combining these solutions can lead to potential instability [53]. This might necessitate using separate administration lines or staggered intervals to avoid interactions that could reduce the antibiotic's effectiveness. Ensuring the stability of cefepime when mixed with complex solutions is vital for maintaining its efficacy and preventing adverse reactions. Incompatibility can lead to precipitation or degradation of cefepime, resulting in ineffective treatment and potential complications for the patient. In critical care and surgical settings, where Lactated Ringer's with 5% dextrose is often used for fluid and electrolyte management, careful planning is required when administering cefepime [54]. This could involve using alternative compatible solutions or administering cefepime and the electrolyte solution through separate lines. Such practices help ensure that both the antibiotic treatment and the fluid management therapy remain effective. This approach is especially important for maintaining the therapeutic benefits of cefepime without compromising the patient's fluid and electrolyte balance. For specific patient populations who need both cefepime and fluid/electrolyte management with Lactated Ringer's with 5% dextrose, healthcare providers must balance these needs carefully. This might involve frequent monitoring and adjustments to the administration techniques to ensure both therapies are delivered safely and effectively. By adhering to compatibility guidelines and considering individual patient needs, clinicians can prevent potential complications and ensure optimal treatment outcomes.

METHODS FOR ASSESSING STABILITY AND COMPATIBILITY

ANALYTICAL TECHNIQUES

High-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) stands out as a primary method due to its precision in quantifying cefepime concentrations and identifying degradation products over time. This technique allows for detailed monitoring of cefepime's chemical stability when mixed with various diluents, stored at different temperatures, and exposed to light. Alongside HPLC, spectrophotometric methods can be used to detect changes in absorbance that indicate chemical degradation or interactions with diluents [55]. Additionally, pH meters are employed to measure the acidity or alkalinity of cefepime solutions, as deviations from the optimal pH range can accelerate degradation. Visual inspection under standardized conditions helps identify physical changes such as precipitation, turbidity, or color shifts, which are immediate indicators of incompatibility [56]. Moreover, Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) and mass spectrometry (MS) can provide insights into the molecular structure and any potential chemical modifications of cefepime when in solution with different diluents [57]. Combining these analytical techniques ensures a comprehensive assessment, enabling healthcare professionals to make informed decisions about the preparation, storage, and administration of cefepime, thereby maximizing its therapeutic effectiveness and patient safety.

STABILITY STUDIES DESIGN

Cefepime hydrochloride, an effective antibiotic for intravenous administration, offers a range of formulations tailored to diverse clinical needs. The choice of diluent plays a pivotal role in maintaining its stability. For intramuscular injections, healthcare providers may opt for sterile water for injection, sodium chloride 0.9%, dextrose 5%, or lidocaine hydrochloride 0.5% or 1%, aiming for a cefepime concentration of 280 mg/mL [58]. In contrast, intravenous injections demand compatible diluents to achieve concentrations of 100 mg/mL (for 500-mg and 1-g vials) or 160 mg/mL (for 2-g vials). After reconstitution, these solutions are seamlessly integrated into compatible intravenous solutions for intermittent infusion [59]. Notably, cefepime hydrochloride is also available in ADD-vantage vials and dual-chamber flexible containers, offering versatility in administration methods. Although reconstituted solutions may exhibit a range of colours from pale yellow to amber and may darken over time, their stability remains intact under recommended storage conditions [60]. Reconstituted solutions boast stability for 24 hours at room temperatures (20–25°C) and up to 7 days when refrigerated (2–8°C). For dual-chamber flexible containers with dextrose solution as the diluent, optimal usage occurs within 12 hours post-activation at room temperature or within 5 days if refrigerated [61].

STRATEGIES FOR ENSURING STABILITY AND COMPATIBILITY

Healthcare professionals should strictly follow manufacturer guidelines for reconstitution and dilution, including recommended diluents and proper mixing techniques [62]. The choice of IV diluent should be based on compatibility data and the specific needs of the patient, considering factors such as osmolarity, pH, and potential interactions with other medications [63]. Regularly reviewing compatibility charts and consulting with pharmacists or infectious disease specialists can aid in making informed decisions. Additionally, proper storage conditions, including temperature and light exposure, must be maintained to prevent degradation of the reconstituted solution [64]. Routine monitoring of the reconstituted solution for any signs of instability, such as color changes or precipitation, is crucial. Finally, close patient monitoring for any adverse reactions or changes in clinical status during cefepime infusion is essential for ensuring safety and efficacy [65]. By implementing these strategies, healthcare providers can optimize the stability and compatibility of cefepime with different IV diluents, thereby enhancing patient care and treatment outcomes.

FORMULATION APPROACHES

Formulation approaches aimed at enhancing the compatibility of cefepime with various intravenous (IV) diluents are pivotal in optimizing its therapeutic efficacy and patient safety. One strategy involves utilizing advanced pharmaceutical techniques to develop cefepime formulations with improved solubility and stability profiles [66]. For instance, nanoemulsions or lipid-based formulations can enhance cefepime's solubility, enabling compatibility with a wider range of diluents while mitigating the risk of precipitation or drug interactions [67]. Additionally, pH adjustment or buffering agents may be incorporated into the formulation to maintain the drug's stability and prevent degradation when mixed with different diluents [68]. Moreover, the use of innovative drug delivery systems, such as liposomes or nanoparticles, can encapsulate cefepime molecules, protecting them from chemical degradation and

enhancing their compatibility with diverse IV diluents [69]. Furthermore, pharmaceutical companies may invest in research to develop ready-to-use cefepime formulations that are pre-mixed with compatible diluents, simplifying the preparation process for healthcare providers and reducing the likelihood of medication errors [70]. By employing these formulation approaches, researchers and pharmaceutical manufacturers can address the challenges associated with cefepime compatibility, ultimately improving treatment outcomes and patient care in clinical settings.

In addition to advanced formulation techniques, pharmaceutical scientists are exploring innovative approaches such as co-solvents or complexation methods to enhance the compatibility of cefepime with different IV diluents. Co-solvents can improve the solubility of cefepime by altering the physicochemical properties of the drug, thereby facilitating its dissolution and compatibility with a broader range of diluents [71]. Furthermore, complexation strategies involving the use of cyclodextrins or other complexing agents can encapsulate cefepime molecules, shielding them from degradation and enhancing their stability when mixed with various IV fluids [72]. Another promising approach involves the development of lyophilized formulations, where cefepime is freeze-dried with compatible excipients to form a stable powder that can be reconstituted with different diluents before administration. Researchers are also investigating the use of novel excipients or additives that can improve the dispersibility and compatibility of cefepime in IV solutions, thereby minimizing the risk of particle aggregation or precipitation. By combining these formulation approaches with rigorous compatibility testing and quality assurance measures, pharmaceutical companies can deliver safe, effective, and convenient cefepime formulations that meet the diverse needs of healthcare providers and patients alike.

STORAGE AND HANDLING RECOMMENDATIONS

To enhance the compatibility of cefepime with various intravenous (IV) diluents, strict attention to storage and handling recommendations is needed. Proper storage conditions play a crucial role in maintaining the stability and efficacy of cefepime formulations [73]. Healthcare facilities should store cefepime vials in a controlled environment, adhering to recommended temperature and humidity levels to prevent degradation of the drug. Additionally, protecting cefepime from exposure to light can help preserve its chemical integrity. During reconstitution and dilution processes, healthcare providers should strictly adhere to manufacturer instructions, ensuring accurate measurement of diluents and proper mixing techniques to prevent inconsistencies in concentration or potential drug interactions. Furthermore, maintaining aseptic techniques during preparation and administration is essential to minimize the risk of contamination and preserve the sterility of the solution [74]. Regular monitoring of reconstituted cefepime solutions for signs of instability, such as color changes or precipitation, is imperative to ensure patient safety and treatment efficacy. By implementing stringent storage and handling practices, healthcare providers can optimize the compatibility of cefepime with different IV diluents, thereby enhancing medication safety and improving patient outcomes.

Healthcare providers should prioritize the segregation of cefepime vials from other medications to prevent mix-ups or administration errors. Labelling of reconstituted solutions with the date and time of preparation, as well as the concentration and expiration date, aids in the proper identification and tracking of medications, ensuring timely use and minimizing the risk of administering expired or improperly prepared solutions [75]. Additionally, regular education and training sessions for healthcare staff on proper storage, handling, and administration procedures for cefepime can reinforce best practices and reduce the likelihood of medication errors. Further, ongoing quality assurance measures, including routine inspection of storage conditions, expiration dates, and adherence to protocol, are essential to uphold medication safety standards and mitigate risks associated with compatibility issues. By integrating these comprehensive storage and handling recommendations into clinical practice, healthcare facilities can ensure the optimal compatibility of cefepime with different IV diluents, ultimately improving patient care and treatment outcomes.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

There is a need for continued exploration of novel formulation approaches aimed at optimizing the compatibility of cefepime with a wider range of IV diluents, particularly in complex clinical scenarios or with newer drug delivery systems. This may involve investigating innovative drug delivery

technologies, such as nanoparticles or liposomes, to improve drug solubility and stability in various diluents while minimizing the risk of adverse reactions. Additionally, future research should prioritize the development of standardized protocols and guidelines for the storage, handling, and administration of cefepime to ensure consistent practice and mitigate the risk of medication errors. Ongoing studies should focus on elucidating the impact of cefepime compatibility on clinical outcomes, including treatment efficacy, patient safety, and healthcare resource utilization. Longitudinal studies examining the incidence of adverse events associated with incompatible cefepime formulations and the economic implications of medication errors can provide valuable insights into the real-world implications of stability and compatibility issues. Ultimately, by addressing these future directions, researchers and healthcare professionals can further optimize the use of cefepime in clinical practice, ultimately improving patient care and treatment outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Advancements in the stability and compatibility of cefepime with intravenous diluents hold significant implications for clinical practice. Understanding the pharmacology of cefepime, including its mechanism of action, pharmacokinetics, and pharmacodynamics, lays the foundation for safe and effective therapeutic use. Factors affecting stability and compatibility, such as chemical properties and interaction with diluents, underscore the importance of meticulous formulation and preparation practices. Clinical implications across various diluents highlight the need for tailored approaches to optimize treatment outcomes while ensuring patient safety. Methods for assessing stability and compatibility, alongside strategies for formulation and storage, provide essential guidance for healthcare providers. Moving forward, future research should focus on developing innovative formulations, standardizing protocols, and evaluating the impact on clinical outcomes to further enhance the use of cefepime in clinical practice.

REFERENCES

1. Page MG. Emerging cephalosporins. Expert opinion on emerging drugs. 2007 Nov 1;12(4):511-24.
2. Nicolau DP. Carbapenems: a potent class of antibiotics. Expert opinion on pharmacotherapy. 2008 Jan 1;9(1):23-37.
3. Cerceo E, Deitelzweig SB, Sherman BM, Amin AN. Multidrug-resistant gram-negative bacterial infections in the hospital setting: overview, implications for clinical practice, and emerging treatment options. Microbial Drug Resistance. 2016 Jul 1;22(5):412-31.
4. Rawson TM, Wilson RC, O'Hare D, Herrero P, Kambugu A, Lamorde M, Ellington M, Georgiou P, Cass A, Hope WW, Holmes AH. Optimizing antimicrobial use: challenges, advances and opportunities. Nature Reviews Microbiology. 2021 Dec;19(12):747-58.
5. Póvoa P, Moniz P, Pereira JG, Coelho L. Optimizing antimicrobial drug dosing in critically ill patients. Microorganisms. 2021 Jun 28;9(7):1401.
6. Maranchick NF, Peloquin CA. Role of therapeutic drug monitoring in the treatment of multi-drug resistant tuberculosis. Journal of Clinical Tuberculosis and Other Mycobacterial Diseases. 2024 Apr 24:100444.
7. Garcia JH, Crespo JC, Handa AY, Padilha KG, Secoli SR. In (compatibility) of intravenous drugs in critical units: adult cohort. Revista Brasileira de Enfermagem. 2021 May 28;74:e20200501.
8. Mueller EA, Levin PA. Bacterial cell wall quality control during environmental stress. MBio. 2020 Oct 27;11(5):10-128.
9. Giovagnorio F, De Vito A, Madeddu G, Parisi SG, Geremia N. Resistance in Pseudomonas aeruginosa: A Narrative Review of Antibiogram Interpretation and Emerging Treatments. Antibiotics. 2023 Nov 12;12(11):1621.
10. Pais GM, Chang J, Barreto EF, Stitt G, Downes KJ, Alshaer MH, Lesnicki E, Panchal V, Bruzzone M, Bumanglag AV, Burke SN. Clinical pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of cefepime. Clinical pharmacokinetics. 2022 Jul;61(7):929-53.
11. Kaplan JE, Benson C, Holmes KK, Brooks JT, Pau A, Masur H, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Institutes of Health, HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Guidelines for prevention and treatment of opportunistic infections in HIV-infected adults and adolescents. MMWR Recomm Rep. 2009 Sep 4;58(4):1-207.
12. Sy SK, Derendorf H. Pharmacokinetics I: PK-PD approach, the case of antibiotic drug development. Clinical pharmacology: current topics and case studies. 2016:185-217.
13. Haddad N, Carr M, Balian S, Lannin J, Kim Y, Toth C, Jarvis J. The blood–brain barrier and pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic optimization of antibiotics for the treatment of

central nervous system infections in adults. Antibiotics. 2022 Dec 19;11(12):1843.
14. Fubara JO, Notari RE. Influence of pH, temperature and buffers on cefepime degradation kinetics and stability predictions in aqueous solutions. Journal of pharmaceutical sciences. 1998 Dec;87(12):1572-6.
15. Bakrey H, Shivgotra R, Abdu A, Soni B, Shahtaghia NR, Jain SK, Thakur S. Use of Total Parenteral Nutrition (TPN) as a Vehicle for Drug Delivery. Current Drug Targets. 2024 Apr 1;25(5):306-29.
16. Tomczak S, Gostyńska A, Nadolna M, Reisner K, Orlando M, Jelińska A, Stawny M. Stability and compatibility aspects of drugs: the case of selected cephalosporins. Antibiotics. 2021 May 9;10(5):549.
17. Nissen KB, Jorgensen LB, Berg DL, Andersen G. Stability study of methotrexate in 0.9% sodium chloride injection and 5% dextrose injection with limit tests for impurities. American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy. 2017 May 1;74(9):e211-23.
18. Kamat M, DeLuca PP. Formulation development of small and large volume injections. InPharmaceutical Dosage Forms-Parenteral Medications 2016 Apr 19 (pp. 90-147). CRC Press.
19. Lalwani D. An oral dosage form of ceftriaxone sodium using enteric coated sustained release calcium alginate beads. The University of Toledo; 2015.
20. Kamat M, DeLuca PP. Formulation development of small and large volume injections. InPharmaceutical Dosage Forms-Parenteral Medications 2016 Apr 19 (pp. 90-147). CRC Press.
21. Costa MÂ. *Computational Studies for the Discovery of Novel Inhibitors of Metallo Beta-Lactamases as Therapeutic Targets for Antibiotic Resistance* (Doctoral dissertation, Universidade de Coimbra (Portugal)).
22. Dabhi M, Patel R, Shah V, Soni R, Saraf M, Rawal R, Goswami D. Penicillin-binding proteins: the master builders and breakers of bacterial cell walls and its interaction with β-lactam antibiotics. Journal of Proteins and Proteomics. 2024 Apr 6:1-8.
23. Al Kamaly O. Review on Characterization, Properties, and Analytical Methods of Cefepime. International Journal of Analytical Chemistry. 2022 Jun 29;2022:6909528-.
24. Ferraboschi P, Ciceri S, Grisenti P. Applications of lysozyme, an innate immune defense factor, as an alternative antibiotic. Antibiotics. 2021 Dec 14;10(12):1534.
25. Ramphal R, > PG. Extended-spectrum β-lactamases and clinical outcomes: current data. Clinical infectious diseases. 2006 Apr 15;42(Supplement_4):S164-72.
26. Tomczak S, Gostyńska A, Nadolna M, Reisner K, Orlando M, Jelińska A, Stawny M. Stability and compatibility aspects of drugs: the case of selected cephalosporins. Antibiotics. 2021 May 9;10(5):549.
27. Cairo Consensus Group. 'There is only one thing that is truly important in an IVF laboratory: everything'Cairo Consensus Guidelines on IVF Culture Conditions. Reproductive BioMedicine Online. 2020 Jan 1;40(1):33-60.
28. Jenkins A, Jamieson C, Santillo M. Systematic review of room temperature stability of key beta-lactam antibiotics for extended infusions in inpatient settings. European Journal of Hospital Pharmacy. 2024 Jan 1;31(1):2-9.
29. Smith SE, Halbig Z, Fox NR, Bland CM, Branan TN. Outcomes of intravenous push versus intermittent infusion administration of cefepime in critically ill patients. Antibiotics. 2023 Jun 1;12(6):996.
30. Paul DiMondi V, Townsend ML, Johnson M, Durkin M. Antifungal catheter lock therapy for the management of a persistent Candida albicans bloodstream infection in an adult receiving hemodialysis. Pharmacotherapy: The Journal of Human Pharmacology and Drug Therapy. 2014 Jul;34(7):e120-7.
31. Benet LZ, Kroetz D, Sheiner L, Hardman J, Limbird L. Pharmacokinetics: the dynamics of drug absorption, distribution, metabolism, and elimination. Goodman and Gilman's the pharmacological basis of therapeutics. 1996;3:e27.
32. Van Der Auwera P, Santella PJ. Pharmacokinetics of cefepime: a review. Journal of antimicrobial chemotherapy. 1993 Nov 1;32(suppl_B):103-15.
33. Martin Mena A, Masse M, Négrier L, Nguyen TH, Ladam B, Storme L, Barthélémy C, Odou P, Genay S, Décaudin B. Optimising an Infusion Protocol Containing Cefepime to Limit Particulate Load to Newborns in a Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. Pharmaceutics. 2021 Mar 8;13(3):351.
34. Dabhi M, Patel R, Shah V, Soni R, Saraf M, Rawal R, Goswami D. Penicillin-binding proteins: the master builders and breakers of bacterial cell walls and its interaction with β-

lactam antibiotics. Journal of Proteins and Proteomics. 2024 Apr 6:1-8.
35. Rahman MS, Koh YS. A novel antibiotic agent, cefiderocol, for multidrug-resistant Gram-negative bacteria. Journal of Bacteriology and Virology. 2020 Dec 31;50(4):218-26.
36. Nair DR, Monteiro JM, Memmi G, Thanassi J, Pucci M, Schwartzman J, Pinho MG, Cheung AL. Characterization of a novel small molecule that potentiates β-lactam activity against Gram-positive and Gram-negative pathogens. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy. 2015 Apr;59(4):1876-85.
37. Lin CK, Chen KT, Hu CM, Yun WY, Cheng WC. Synthesis of 1-C-Glycoside-Linked Lipid II Analogues Toward Bacterial Transglycosylase Inhibition. Chemistry–A European Journal. 2015 May 11;21(20):7511-9.
38. Dauner DG, Nelson RE, Taketa DC. Ceftobiprole: a novel, broad-spectrum cephalosporin with activity against methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus. American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy. 2010 Jun 15;67(12):983-93.
39. Loeuille G, D'Huart E, Vigneron J, Nisse YE, Beiler B, Polo C, Ayari G, Sacrez M, Demoré B, Charmillon A. Stability studies of 16 antibiotics for continuous infusion in intensive care units and for performing outpatient parenteral antimicrobial therapy. Antibiotics. 2022 Mar 29;11(4):458.
40. Gurunathan S, Han JW, Dayem AA, Eppakayala V, Kim JH. Oxidative stress-mediated antibacterial activity of graphene oxide and reduced graphene oxide in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. International journal of nanomedicine. 2012 Nov 30:5901-14.
41. Rhodes NJ, Kuti JL, Nicolau DP, Van Wart S, Nicasio AM, Liu J, Lee BJ, Neely MN, Scheetz MH. Defining clinical exposures of cefepime for Gram-negative bloodstream infections that are associated with improved survival. Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy. 2016 Mar;60(3):1401-10.
42. Pais GM, Chang J, Barreto EF, Stitt G, Downes KJ, Alshaer MH, Lesnicki E, Panchal V, Bruzzone M, Bumanglag AV, Burke SN. Clinical pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of cefepime. Clinical pharmacokinetics. 2022 Jul;61(7):929-53.
43. Abdelkader A, Fathi HA, Hamad MA, Elsabahy M. Nanomedicine: a new paradigm to overcome drug incompatibilities. Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology. 2020 Oct;72(10):1289-305.
44. Jenkins A, Jamieson C, Santillo M. Systematic review of room temperature stability of key beta-lactam antibiotics for extended infusions in inpatient settings. European Journal of Hospital Pharmacy. 2024 Jan 1;31(1):2-9.
45. Chamley C, Wilson M. Intravenous therapy. Foundation Skills for Caring: Using Student-Centred Learning. 2018 Dec 7:245.
46. Berlana D, Llop JM, Fort E, Badia MB, Jodar R. Use of colistin in the treatment of multiple-drug-resistant gram-negative infections. American journal of health-system pharmacy. 2005 Jan 1;62(1):39-47.
47. Marsh K, Ahmed N, Decano A, Dubrovskaya Y, Jen SP, Siegfried J, Chen XJ, Merchan C. Safety of intravenous push administration of beta-lactams within a healthcare system. American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy. 2020 May 1;77(9):701-8.
48. Bardin C, Astier A, Vulto A, Sewell G, Vigneron J, Trittler R, Daouphars M, Paul M, Trojniak M, Pinguet F. Guidelines for the practical stability studies of anticancer drugs: a European consensus conference. InAnnales pharmaceutiques francaises 2011 Jul 1 (Vol. 69, No. 4, pp. 221-231). Elsevier Masson.
49. Mundi MS, Nystrom EM, Hurley DL, McMahon MM. Management of parenteral nutrition in hospitalized adult patients. Journal of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition. 2017 May;41(4):535-49.
50. Organ O, Deutsche AI. European Journal of Medical Research. Eur J Med Res. 2008;13(7):309-54.
51. Cattaneo D, Corona A, De Rosa FG, Gervasoni C, Kocic D, Marriott DJ. The management of anti-infective agents in intensive care units: The potential role of a 'fast'pharmacology. Expert Review of Clinical Pharmacology. 2020 Apr 2;13(4):355-66.
52. Mora-Gamboa MP, Rincón-Gamboa SM, Ardila-Leal LD, Poutou-Piñales RA, Pedroza-Rodríguez AM, Quevedo-Hidalgo BE. Impact of antibiotics as waste, physical, chemical, and enzymatical degradation: use of laccases. Molecules. 2022 Jul 11;27(14):4436.
53. Polo C, D'Huart E, Lesperlette G, Vigneron J, Meyer F, Demoré B. Compatibility of injectable posaconazole with drugs commonly used in a hematology care unit. Pharmaceutical Technology in Hospital Pharmacy. 2020 May 26;5(1):20200011.

54. TURNER K, MOORE F. ■ PREOPERATIVE PREPARATION OF THE EMERGENCY GENERAL SURGERY PATIENT. Andrew B. Peitzman, MD, FACS. 2012:92.
55. Scheeren LE, Nogueira-Librelotto DR, Fernandes JR, Macedo LB, Marcolino AI, Vinardell MP, Rolim CM. Comparative study of reversed-phase high-performance liquid chromatography and ultraviolet–visible spectrophotometry to determine doxorubicin in pH-sensitive nanoparticles. Analytical Letters. 2018 Jul 3;51(10):1445-63.
56. Clemente Bautista S, Jiménez Lozano I, Castellote Belles L, Parramón-Teixidó CJ, Garcia Esquerda C, Puertas Sanjuan A, Daina Noves C, Segura Encinas V, Cabañas Poy MJ. Physical Compatibility Between Intravenous Magnesium Sulfate and Potassium or Sodium Phosphate in a Pediatric Intensive Care Unit. Hospital Pharmacy. 2024 Apr 15:00185787241247133.
57. IM RR, Nevmerzhytskyi VV, Povolokina IV, Ivannik VY, Makarenko VD. of scientific conference "ACHIEVEMENTS AND PROSPECTS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST INFECTIOUS DISEASES (MICROBIOLOGY, VETERINARY, PHARMACY), May 18, 2017, Kharkov, Ukraine.
58. Cetinkaya S. Administration and dose of the most frequently used drugs in paediatrics. InComplementary Pediatrics 2012 Mar 16 (p. 289). IntechOpen.
59. Unluturk MS, Tamer O, Utku S. A robotic system to prepare IV solutions. International Journal of Medical Informatics. 2018 Nov 1;119:61-9.
60. Newton DW. Physicochemical determinants of incompatibility and instability in injectable drug solutions and admixtures. American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy. 1978 Oct 1;35(10):1213-22.
61. Boullata JI, Mirtallo JM, Sacks GS, Salman G, Gura K, Canada T, Maguire A, ASPEN Parenteral Nutrition Safety Committee. Parenteral nutrition compatibility and stability: a comprehensive review. Journal of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition. 2022 Feb;46(2):273-99.
62. Kohler DR, Montello M, Goldspiel BR, DeChristoforo R, Huntley C, High J, Fallavollita Jr A, Shalabi A, Meadows B, Green L, Ignoffo RJ. ASHP guidelines on preventing medication errors with antineoplastic agents. American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy. 2002 Sep 1;59(17):1648-68.
63. Gahart BL, Nazareno AR, Ortega M. 2017 Intravenous Medications-E-Book: A Handbook for Nurses and Health Professionals. Elsevier Health Sciences; 2016 Jun 14.
64. Tønnesen HH. Formulation and stability testing of photolabile drugs. International journal of pharmaceutics. 2001 Aug 28;225(1-2):1-4.
65. Drago L, Vecchi ED. The safety of cefepime in the treatment of infection. Expert opinion on drug safety. 2008 Jul 1;7(4):377-87.
66. Al Kamaly O. Review on Characterization, Properties, and Analytical Methods of Cefepime. International Journal of Analytical Chemistry. 2022 Jun 29;2022:6909528-.
67. Bakrey H, Shivgotra R, Abdu A, Soni B, Shahtaghia NR, Jain SK, Thakur S. Use of Total Parenteral Nutrition (TPN) as a Vehicle for Drug Delivery. Current Drug Targets. 2024 Apr 1;25(5):306-29.
68. Pramanick S, Singodia D, Chandel V. Excipient selection in parenteral formulation development. Pharma Times. 2013 Mar 1;45(3):65-77.
69. Wenzler E, Fraidenburg DR, Scardina T, Danziger LH. Inhaled antibiotics for gram-negative respiratory infections. Clinical microbiology reviews. 2016 Jul;29(3):581-632.
70. University of Illinois at Chicago College of Pharmacy, Drug Information Group. Light-sensitive injectable prescription drugs. Hospital Pharmacy. 2014 Feb;49(2):136-63.
71. Gadgil PS. A comparative study between high potency dry powder inhalation and nebulized solution of vancomycin hydrochloride for lung delivery. Creighton University; 2011.
72. Saha P, Rafe MR. Cyclodextrin: A prospective nanocarrier for the delivery of antibacterial agents against bacteria that are resistant to antibiotics. Heliyon. 2023 Sep.
73. Żandarek J, Binert-Kusztal Ż, Starek M, Dąbrowska M. The Stability Study of Cefepime Hydrochloride in Various Drug Combinations. Processes. 2023 Feb 16;11(2):602.
74. Kastango ES, Bradshaw BD. USP chapter 797: establishing a practice standard for compounding sterile preparations in pharmacy. American journal of health-system pharmacy. 2004 Sep 15;61(18).
75. Lee H, Jin M, Jeon WJ, Kim H, Jung M, Yoo H, Won JH, Cho CW. Regulatory and safe-use

considerations related to stability after opening of nonsterile dosage forms. Journal of Pharmaceutical Investigation. 2022 May;52(3):319-29.