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The ideal antibiotic ...

the molecule

brilliant and clear solutions

patient’s cure

chemistry microbiology therapy
Will it always be ideal?
Main causes of antibiotic failures...

- **False failures**
  - erroneous diagnosis
  - underlying disease uninfluenced by antibiotics
  - unjustified lack of patience
  - inactivation of the antibiotic

- **Failures related to the patient**
  - compliance failure (broadly speaking)
  - inappropriate administration route (broadly speaking)
  - immunodepressed hosts

- **Pharmacological failures**
  - unsufficient amount or drug inappropriately administered
  - unsufficient attention paid to pharmacodynamic parameters
  - in situ inactivation or lack of drainage

- **Failures related to the micro-organism**
  - wrong pathogen
  - resistance acquired during treatment
  - unsufficient bactericidal activity, bacterial persistence
  - inoculum effect

Adapted from J.C. Pechère (*In Schorderet et coll.*, 1988, 1993, 1998)
PK / PD ...

- **Pharmacokinetics**
  What the body does to the drug …
  - absorption
  - metabolism
  - elimination

- **Pharmacodynamics**
  What the drug does to the body …
  - direct effects
  - post-drug effects
  - selection effects

Adapted from H. Derendorf, 2d ISAP Educational Workshop, 2000
From PK to PD ...

Pharmacokinetics
conc. vs time

Pharmacodynamics
conc. vs effect

PK/PD
effect vs time

Adapted from H. Derendorf, 2d ISAP Educational Workshop, 2000
Pharmacokinetic/Pharmacodynamics in Drug Development and Evaluation of Efficacy

The combination of

- in vitro modelling,
- proper design of animal model experiments,
- pharmacokinetic information on patients in clinical trials

allows an in depth understanding of which aspects of drug exposure are most closely linked to

- therapeutic outcomes (successes as well as failures !!)
- quantifiable/predictable toxicity hazards

1st ISAPDiscussion Workshop with Regulatory Authorities, Rockville, MD, March 1st, 1999 (http://www.isap.org)
PK/PD - Potential Benefits

- Facilitate Early Selection of Lead Drug Candidate (e.g., Pre-Clinical Screening)
- Select Appropriate Dosage Regimen (e.g., Phase 1/2)
- Better Understand Clinical / Microbiological Outcome (e.g., Phase 3)
- More Efficient Drug Development Program

July 1998
Pharmacokinetic/ Pharmacodynamics and antibiotic resistance...

Inadequate dosing of antibiotics is probably an important reason for misuse and subsequent risk of resistance.

A recommendation on proper dosing regimens for different infections would be an important part of a comprehensive strategy.

The possibility to produce such a dose recommendation based on pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic considerations will be further investigated in one of the CPMP working parties...

EMEA discussion paper on Antimicrobial resistance, January 3, 1999 -- EMEA/9880/99
PK/PD and drug development

A view from EMEA

Are PK / PD important in resistance?

- PubMed search on March 25th, 2001 for:
  - pharmacodynamics, and
  - pharmacokinetics, and
  - resistance, and
  - antibiotic*

1756 references...
Just a few of them...

  **Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of fluoroquinolones in the respiratory tract.**
  Wise R, Honeybourne D: “Pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic features are important predictors of the therapeutic efficacy of an antibiotic”.

- J Chemother 1999 Dec;11(6):426-39
  **Antimicrobial action and pharmacokinetics/pharmacodynamics: the use of AUIC to improve efficacy and avoid resistance.**
  Schentag JJ: “Resistance is also predictable from these parameters, fostering a rational means of using dosing adjustments to avoid or minimize the development of resistant organisms”.

  **Clinical efficacy and antimicrobial pharmacodynamics.**
  Wise R: “Changes in the susceptibility of bacterial pathogens and the availability of new antimicrobial drugs mean that physicians need to understand the underlying pharmacodynamics of each antimicrobial therapy”.

PK/PD & resistance April 6th, 2001
Pharmacokinetic/Pharmacodynamics in Drug Development and Evaluation

Who should take these points in consideration?

1. Industry: surely!
   ➔ efficacy both in short (efficacy) and long (emergence of resistance) terms
   this is what they already do at the research level ...

2. Clinicians: more and more
   ➔ optimizing therapy now and protect the future
   but they often feel alone or insufficiently informed ...

3. Regulatory bodies
   ➔ to better appraise new drugs and set guidelines
   but they wish to be certain that this is the correct way!
Pharmacokinetic/ Pharmacodynamics: What are the goals?

- Effectiveness
- Lack of adverse effects
- Prevention of resistance
PK/PD and effectiveness: patterns of antimicrobial activity  (after WA. Craig, 2000)

1. Time-dependent killing and minimal to moderate persistent effects
   - Seen with all beta-lactams, clindamycin, macrolides, oxazolidinones and flucytosine
   - Goal of dosing regimen: optimize duration of exposure
   - **Time above MIC** is the major parameter correlating with efficacy
Correlation of Pharmacodynamic Parameters with Efficacy (after W.A. Craig *)

- Use neutropenic murine thigh-and lung-infection models
- Evaluate 20-30 different dosing regimens (5 different total doses given at 4-6 different dosing intervals)
- Measure efficacy from change in $\log_{10}$ CFU per thigh or lung at the end of 24 hours of therapy
- Correlate efficacy with various pharmacodynamic parameters (Time above MIC, peak/MIC, 24-Hr AUC/MIC)

* 2d ISAP Educational Workshop, Stockholm, Sweden, 2000
Relationship Between Peak/MIC Ratio and Efficacy for Cefotaxime against *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in a Murine Pneumonia Model (after W.A. Craig *)

* 2d ISAP Educational Workshop, Stockholm, Sweden, 2000
Relationship Between 24-Hr AUC/MIC and Efficacy for Cefotaxime against *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in a Murine Pneumonia Model (after W.A. Craig *)

* 2d ISAP Educational Workshop, Stockholm, Sweden, 2000
Relationship Between Time Above MIC and Efficacy for Cefotaxime against *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in a Murine Pneumonia Model (after W.A. Craig *)

\[ R^2 = 94\% \]

* 2d ISAP Educational Workshop, Stockholm, Sweden, 2000
Relationship between time above MIC and efficacy
For β-lactams, macrolides and TMP/SFX in otitis media

**Fig. 1.** Relationship between the percentage of time that serum levels exceed the MIC_{90} and the bacteriologic cure in otitis media caused by *S. pneumoniae* (open symbols) and beta-lactamase-positive and -negative *H. influenzae* (closed symbols). Data available for 10 beta-lactams, 2 macrolides and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole. The coefficient of determination was 0.57.

T > MIC must reach 50 %
β-lactams: at least 50% of the time above the MIC...

You must calculate the interval

\[ C_t = C_0 \times e^{-kt} \]

Time between 2 administrations:

- \textit{dir.} proportionnal to the dose
- \textit{inv.} proportionnal to the half-life

Most betalactams have an half-life of approx. 2 h or less
PK / PD in action: what can you do with a model β-lactam *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time (hours)</th>
<th>concentr. (mg/L) for a dose of 0.5 g</th>
<th>1 g</th>
<th>2 g</th>
<th>if given every 12h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 % coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66 % coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100 % coverage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* adult 50 kg; single administration; 2h half-life; $V_d = 0.2$ l/kg
PK / PD in action

β-lactams: 1st practical approach ...

keep the interval but increase the unit dose...

If given every 12 hours (BID) you’ll need the following amounts to get 66% coverage at

| MIC ≤ 1.5 | 250 mg | peak |
| MIC ≤ 3  | 500 mg |
| MIC ≤ 4.5| 750 mg |
| MIC ≤ 6  | 1000 mg|
| MIC ≤ 12 | 2000 mg|
| MIC ≤ 32 | 4000 mg|

NOT OPTIMAL BECAUSE UNNECESSARY PEAKS !!!

25 mg/L

50

75

100

200

400
## Improving β-lactam efficacy by reducing the interval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time (hours)</th>
<th>concentration for</th>
<th>if given every 8 h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5 g</td>
<td>1 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* single administration; 2h half-life; \( V_d = 0.2 \text{ l/kg} \)
PK /PD in action ...

β- lactams: 2d practical approach ...

- keep the dose but decrease the dose interval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>MIC ≤</th>
<th>Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>every 24h</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every 12h</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every 8h</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every 6h</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>every 4h</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66 % of time coverage for 1 g per administration

OPTIMAL BECAUSE NO UNNECESSARY PEAKS !!!
**β-lactams PK / PD and resistance**

- too low doses
- too long intervals
- too high breakpoints

“250 mg” ampicillin... BID schedules...
cefaclor, some C4, ...

lead to suboptimal effects

- delay in eradication
- selection of subpopulations with reduced susceptibility
2. Time-dependent killing and prolonged persistent effects (duration related to AUC)

- Seen with glycopeptides, tetracyclines, azithromycin, streptogramins and fluconazole
- Goal of dosing regimen: optimize amount of drug
- AUC / MIC is the major parameter correlating with efficacy

* 2d ISAP Educational Workshop, Stockholm, Sweden, 2000
Evidence is mounting that resistance to
- macrolides
- glycopeptides
- tetracyclines

can be linked to
- their slow and uncomplete bactericidal activity;
- the too low doses;
- their use in situations in which eradication is impossible to achieve.
AUC / MIC - dependent antibiotics and resistance

Examples:

• **glycopeptides**:
  – eradication of MRSA colonization
  – selective decontamination of the digestive tract
  – primary treatment of antibiotic associated colitis (AAC)
  – topical application or irrigation

• **macrolides**
  – otitis media
  – “good for all respiratory tract infections” promotion

• **tetracyclines**
  – low doses for fear of toxicity
  – treatment of acne
PK/PD and effectiveness: patterns of antimicrobial activity (after WA. Craig, 2000)

3. Concentration-dependent killing and prolonged persistent effects (post-antibiotic effect)

- Seen with aminoglycosides, quinolones, daptomycin, ketolides and amphotericin B
- Goal of dosing regimen: maximize concentrations
- **AUC/MIC** and **Peak / MIC** are major parameters correlating with efficacy

* 2d ISAP Educational Workshop, Stockholm, Sweden, 2000*
Aminoglycosides: obtain a peak!

1. **adequate mode of administration**
   - i.v. administration

2. **calculate the peak you need**
   - minimal peak = MIC / 8

3. **calculate the dose you need**
   - dose = peak x Vd
Aminoglycosides:

increase the unit dose to get the appropriate peak!

\[ \text{MIC} = 1 \text{ mg/L} \quad \rightarrow \quad C_{\text{max}} = 8 \text{ mg/L} \quad \rightarrow \quad 3 \text{ mg/kg} \]

\[ \text{MIC} = 2 \text{ mg/L} \quad \rightarrow \quad C_{\text{max}} = 16 \text{ mg/L} \quad \rightarrow \quad 6 \text{ mg/kg} \]

\[ \text{MIC} = 4 \text{ mg/L} \quad \rightarrow \quad C_{\text{max}} = 32 \text{ mg/L} \quad \rightarrow \quad 15 \text{ mg/kg} \]
Aminoglycosides 1st rule of thumb...

- Anything with an MIC < 1 (within the indications) will be treatable.
- Efficacy will become a problem for organisms with MIC’s:
  - > 2 for G, T, N (up to 6 mg/kg)
  - > 4 for A, I (up to 15 mg/kg)

PK/PD “safe” breakpoints for AG:
- G, N, T : 2 μg / ml
- A / I : 4 μg / ml
Aminoglycosides 2d rule of thumb...

give them once-a-day to reduce toxicity
- 1h peaks of 12-18 mg/L for G, T, N
- 1h peaks of 20-30 mg/L for A, I

Increase interval (⇒ 36h, ⇒ 48h)
in case of renal failure
before reducing the unit dose...

Once-daily dosing of aminoglycoside antibiotics
Fisman, DN; Beth Israel Deaconess Med Ctr; Div Infect Dis; Harvard Univ, Sch Publ Hlth, Infectious-Disease-Clinics-of-North-America. Jun 2000
PK/PD of fluoroquinolones

1. role of the 24h-AUC / MIC ratio

Forrest et al., AAC, 1993
24h AUC / MIC ratio

AUC_{24h} = \frac{\text{dose}_{24h}}{\text{clearance}}
24h AUC / MIC and FQ effectiveness: *in vitro* dynamic models

- Antibacterial effect is correlated with drug exposure (AUC);
- AUC / MIC is best predictor in inter- fluoroquinolones comparisons;
- minor influence of the inoculum size;
  - Firsov et al., J Antimicrob Chemother 1999 43:483-90

- log change in viable counts is related to AUC / MIC ratio
  - McGowan et al., Antimicrob Agents Chemother 1999 43:1560-4
Peak / MIC ratio

\[ C_{\text{max}} = \frac{\text{dose}}{V_d} \times \text{bioavail.} \times \text{absorpt. rate} \]
Peak / MIC and FQ effectiveness (animal models)

- **Peak/MIC ratio** becomes predictive at ratios > 10;
  (AUC / MIC is more predictive at peak/MIC < 10)
  no influence of time > MIC
  

- **Dose-dependency** is clearly observed *in vivo*
  Dalhoff, J Antimicrob Chemother 1999 May;43 Suppl B:51-9

- **Penetration** in inflammatory fluids and interstitial fluids is dependent on peak

OBJECTIVE:
To prospectively quantitate the relationship between plasma levels of levofloxacin and successful clinical and/or microbiological outcomes and occurrence of adverse events in infected patients.

PATIENTS: 313 with clinical signs and symptoms of bacterial infections of the respiratory tract, skin, or urinary tract.

MAIN OUTCOME MEASURES: Clinical response and microbiological eradication of pathogenic organisms.
Peak / MIC of FQ: clinical data


RESULTS:
• 134 / 313 had both PK and MIC
• clinical AND bacterial outcomes were related to peak/MIC (logistic regression; p < 0.001)
• results were favourable if peak / MIC > 12.2

But:
- very few failures (clinical and microbiol. success rates: 95 and 96 %)
- mainly single daily doses (500 mg)
  ➔ always high peak
  ➔ peak and AUC are directly linked
    unless very different schedules are used ...
PK/PD in action ...

Remember:

- 24h-AUC is proportional to the daily dose
- Peak is proportional to the unit dose...
24h-AUC / MIC as a tool to determine acceptable sensitivities to standard doses of FQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Dosage (mg/24h)</th>
<th>24h-AUC (mg/L x h)</th>
<th>PK/PD Bkpt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>norfloxacin</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>14 *, #</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>12 *</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>31 to 66 *, +</td>
<td>0.2 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levofloxacin</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>47 *</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gatifloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>35 *</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moxifloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>48 *</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US prescrib. inf. (adult of 60 kg) of NOROXIN®, CIPRO®, FLOXIN®, LEVAQUIN®, TEQUIN® and AVELOX®; # litterature data; + first dose to equilibrium
Peak concentrations as a tool to determine acceptable sensitivities to standard doses of FQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Dosage (mg/24h)</th>
<th>$C_{\text{max}}$ (mg/L)</th>
<th>PK/PD Bkpt $[C_{\text{max}} / 12]$ (mg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>norfloxacin</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2.4 *</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.4 *</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3-4.5 *, +</td>
<td>0.3 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levofloxacin</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5-6 *, +</td>
<td>0.4 - 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gatifloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4.2 *</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moxifloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4.5 *</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US prescrib. inf. (adult of 60 kg) of NOROXIN®, CIPRO®, FLOXIN®, TEQUIN®, LEVAQUIN®, and AVELOX®

+ first dose to equilibrium
Combining it all ...(Peak and 24h-AUC / MIC) as predictors of efficacy standard doses of FQ ...

PK/PD Bkpts (mg/L)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Dosage (mg/24h)</th>
<th>AUC/MIC (24h)</th>
<th>peak / MIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>norfloxacin</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.2-0.4</td>
<td>0.3 - 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levofloxacin</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4 - 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gatifloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moxifloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US prescrib. inf. (adult of 60 kg) of NOROXIN®, CIPRO®, FLOXIN®, LEVAQUIN®, TEQUIN® and AVELOX®
Combining it all ...(Peak and 24h-AUC / MIC) as predictors of efficacy standard doses of FQ ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Dosage (mg/24h)</th>
<th>AUC/MIC (24h)</th>
<th>peak / MIC</th>
<th>NCCLS Bkpts*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>norfloxacin</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>&lt; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.2-0.4</td>
<td>0.3 - 0.4</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levofloxacin</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4 - 0.5</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gatifloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moxifloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US prescrib. inf. (adult of 60 kg) of NOROXIN®, CIPRO®, FLOXIN®, LEVAQUIN®, TEQUIN® and AVELOX®
Patients may be treatable because AUC (but not $C_{\text{max}}$) increases with decreased drug clearance.

### An example with levofloxacin 500 mg qD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>creatinine clearance (mg/l)</th>
<th>AUC (mgxh/L)</th>
<th>PK/PD Bkpt (mg/L)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $\text{AUC} / \text{MIC} = 125$

But the peak remains unchanged at $\sim 5 \text{ mg/L}$.
Is a 24h AUC / MIC ratio of 125 necessary?

Relationship Between 24 Hr AUC/MIC and Mortality for FQs in Immunocompromised Animal Models with Gram (-) bacilli infection (Craig, 2000) *

* 2d ISAP Educational Workshop, Stockholm, Sweden, 2000
Is a 24h AUC / MIC ratio of 125 necessary?

Relationship Between 24 Hr AUC/MIC and Mortality for FQs in Immunocompetent Animal Models with Str. pneumoniae infection (Craig, 2000) *

* 2d ISAP Educational Workshop, Stockholm, Sweden, 2000
### PK / PD bkpt for AUC / MIC

#### An example with levofloxacin 500 mg qD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creatinine clearance (mg/l)</th>
<th>AUC (mg/L X h)</th>
<th>PK/PD Bkpt (mg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**But the peak remains unchanged at ~ 5 mg/L**

\[
\text{AUC} / \text{MIC} = 125 \\
\text{AUC} / \text{MIC} = 25
\]
To increase both AUC and peak ... increase the unit dose ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dosage qD</th>
<th>AUC * mg*h/L</th>
<th>PK/PD Bkpt**</th>
<th>Peak * mg /L</th>
<th>PK/PD Bkpt***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* based on normal half-lifes; CL ~ 100 mg/dl; doses for an adult of 65 kg
** for a 24h AUC / MIC = 25
*** for a peak / MIC = 10

MIC S. pneumoniae ~ 1-2 mg/L

An example with levofloxacin (qD)
Classical breakpoints of older FQs and of levofloxacin are probably set too high and correspond to PK/PD breakpoints only if:
- clearance is lower than in normal subjects
- accepting an AUC / MIC ratio of 25 as being sufficient...

Classical FQ breakpoints almost never correspond to a peak / MIC ratio of 10!
Why would too high breakpoints favour the emergence of resistance to FQs?

- cell killing occurs too slowly
  - acquisition / improvement of mechanisms of resistance
- subpopulations with decreased susceptibility are not affected
  - selection and spreading
Resistance to fluoroquinolones: the basics

- Increased permeability
- Efflux pump
- Mutation of enzymes
- DNA gyrase
- Topoisomerase

Gram (-)

Gram (+)
The "Mutant Prevention Concentration" *

When Mycobacterium bovis BCG and Staphylococcus aureus were plated on agar containing increasing concentrations of fluoroquinolone, colony numbers exhibited a sharp drop, followed by a plateau and a second sharp drop.

The plateau region correlated with the presence of first-step resistant mutants. Mutants were not recovered at concentrations above those required for the second sharp drop, thereby defining a mutant prevention concentration (MPC).

The MPC / MIC ratio is usually 10, but a C8-methoxy group lowers it to ~ 3 for N-1-cyclopropyl-fluoroquinolones.

Dong et al; AAC 43:1756-1758
PK/PD and point mutation in DNA gyrase...

Bactericidal activity of FQs against *Mycobacterium bovis*

**MIC (99)**

**MPC (10)**

---

**PD160793**

**PD161148**

R = OCH₃  R = H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MIC 99</th>
<th>MPC 90</th>
<th>MPC/MIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD160793</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD161148</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Dong et al; AAC 43:1756-1758
### $C_{max}$ and MPC of FQ’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Dosage (mg/24h)</th>
<th>$C_{max}$ (mg/L)</th>
<th>MPC$^a$ (mg/L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>norfloxacin</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2.4 *</td>
<td>~ 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.4 *</td>
<td>~ 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3-4.5 * , +</td>
<td>~ 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levofloxacin</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5-6 * , +</td>
<td>~ 9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gatifloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>~ 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moxifloxacin</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4.5 *</td>
<td>~ 1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ in *Str. Pneumoniae* (Blondeau et al., A.A.C. 45:433-438, 2001)

* US prescrib. inf. (adult of 60 kg) of NOROXIN®, CIPRO®, FLOXIN®, LEVAQUIN®, TEQUIN®, and AVELOX®

+ first dose to equilibrium
If

- the MPC concept is correct, and
- first mutants can appear in vivo during therapy,

then,

- older FQ’s have been used under conditions favouring the development of resistance
- we should use present and future FQ’s only with doses which allow $C_{\text{max}} > \text{MPC}$ ...
PK/PD and antibiotic efflux pumps...

Efflux pumps are

- ubiquitous (procaryotes, eucaryotes, …) probably conferring significant advantages
- largely unspecific for their substrates may transport several classes of antibiotics
- responsible for both “intrinsic” and acquired resistance
Efflux pumps...

- are unspecific but also very “picky” in substrate recognition
  - large variations among related drugs
- show rapidly increased effectiveness by point mutations
  - easy adaptation to new environment
- cooperate with other mechanisms of resistance
  - high level resistance phenotypes
- are under control of regulatory genes
  - multiantibiotic resistance phenotype
Efflux pumps and first mutation may cooperate ...
Efflux pumps may bring intrabacterial concentrations of FQ < MPC ...

Van Bambeke et al., 2000
PK/PD and resistance?

- **Efficacy**
  - certainly yes

- **Reduced toxicity**
  - yes (if related to a PK parameter)

- **Prevention of resistance**
  - probably

  But we have still a long way to go...
A long way indeed ...

Triptych with the Miracles of Christ
Flemish painting (1470-1495)
But closer than you thought ...

The National Gallery of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia (http://www.ngv.vic.gov.au)
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