



### UCC Library and UCC researchers have made this item openly available. Please let us know how this has helped you. Thanks!

Title	Is there potential for repurposing statins as novel antimicrobials?
Author(s)	Hennessy, Emma; Adams, Claire; Reen, F. Jerry; O'Gara, Fergal
Publication date	2016-08-22
Original citation	Hennessy, E., Adams, C., Reen, F. J. and O'Gara, F. (2016) 'Is There Potential for Repurposing Statins as Novel Antimicrobials?', Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy, 60(9), pp. 5111-5121. doi: 10.1128/AAC.00192-16
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	https://aac.asm.org/content/60/9/5111.short http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00192-16 Access to the full text of the published version may require a subscription.
Rights	© 2016, American Society for Microbiology. All Rights Reserved.
Item downloaded from	http://hdl.handle.net/10468/8956

Downloaded on 2019-12-02T14:15:09Z



Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

AAC Accepted Manuscript Posted Online 20 June 2016 Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. doi:10.1128/AAC.00192-16 Copyright © 2016, American Society for Microbiology. All Rights Reserved.

- 1 **Proposed Title:** Statins as next generation anti-microbials: Is there potential for repurposing?
- 2 Short Title: Statins inhibit bacterial growth and virulence
- 3 Authors: Emma Hennessy<sup>1§</sup>, Claire Adams<sup>1§</sup>, F. Jerry Reen<sup>1</sup> and Fergal O'Gara<sup>1,2\*</sup>
- 4
- <sup>5</sup><sup>1</sup>BIOMERIT Research Centre, School of Microbiology, National University of Ireland, Cork,
- 6 Ireland
- <sup>7</sup> <sup>2</sup>School of Biomedical Sciences, Curtin University, Perth, WA, Australia
- 8
- 9 § Both authors contributed equally
- 10
- 11 \*Corresponding author. Address: BIOMERIT Research Centre, Department of Microbiology,
- 12 University College Cork, College Road, Cork, Ireland.
- 13 Email: <u>f.ogara@ucc.ie;</u> Phone: +353 21 4902861; Fax: +353 21 4903101.
- 14

15

Statins are a class of pharmaceutical widely used to treat high serum cholesterol. In addition, statins have so-called "pleiotropic effects", which include the reduction of inflammation, immunomodulation, and anti-microbial effects. An increasing number of studies are emerging which detail the attenuation of bacterial growth and *in vitro* and *in vivo* virulence by statin treatment. In this review, we describe the current information available surrounding the effects of statins on bacterial infections, and provide insight regarding the potential use of these compounds as anti-microbial therapeutic agents.

25

Accepted Manuscript Posted Online

# AAC

## Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy

#### 26 Introduction

One of the major undisputed clinical breakthroughs of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was the discovery of the 27 statin family of drugs. These compounds are renowned for their ability to lower cholesterol 28 29 levels, and are used to treat approximately 40 million individuals with high cholesterol worldwide. Since the discovery of mevastatin as a metabolic product of Penicillium citrinum in 30 1976 (1, 2) a total of nine stating have been characterized, seven of which are approved by the 31 FDA to treat patients with high cholesterol. Structurally, statins are characterized by the presence 32 33 of a conserved lactone ring (3). This structure is present as a hydrolyzed (active) form in all statins except for mevastatin, lovastatin and simvastatin, where the lactone ring is hydrolyzed in 34 35 the liver (4). Statins can be divided into two broad classes (Figure 1). Type 1 statins are lipophilic, and possess a butaryl side chain – they are said to structurally resemble mevastatin 36 37 (3). Lovastatin, pravastatin and simulation are type 1 stating. Type 2 stating are classically lipophobic, and are distinguished from type 1 by the replacement of the butaryl side chain with a 38 39 fluorophenol group and typically possess larger side chains than type 1 statins (3). Atorvastatin, cerivastatin, fluvastatin, pitavastatin and rosuvastatin are type 2 statins. 40

41 Statins exert their cholesterol lowering effect by binding to the active site of 3-hydroxy-3-42 methylglutaryl-CoenzymeA reductase (HMGR), a rate-limiting enzyme involved in cholesterol biosynthesis (3). HMGR is an integral part of the mevalonate pathway, which is not only 43 essential for cholesterol biosynthesis, but also contributes to the production of isoprenoids, lipid 44 compounds that are essential for cell signaling and structure. As well as the inhibition of 45 cholesterol, statins have also been found to have a number of cholesterol-independent, so-called 46 "pleiotropic" effects. Statins confer anti-inflammatory, 47 have been reported to 48 immunomodulatory and anti-cancer effects on host cells, and these effects are well-characterized

Downloaded from http://aac.asm.org/ on November 5, 2019 at UNIV COLLEGE CORK

Chemotherapy

49 (5–9). Furthermore, several studies have explored the pleiotropic effects of statins in combating 50 multi-system microbial infections, such as sepsis and pneumonia, and a growing number of studies are demonstrating that statins can directly influence the growth and virulence of bacterial 51 pathogens. With the global increase in antibiotic resistance to existing antibiotics and the search 52 for new anti-microbial strategies reaching a critical stage, there is increasing interest in the 53 possibility of repurposing existing drugs that have already been approved to treat different 54 55 clinical conditions but that also possess antimicrobial activity. The repurposing of these drugs would significantly reduce the lead-time from bench to bedside. Given their pleiotropic activities 56 statins are strong potential candidates to be repurposed as novel antimicrobial agents. However, 57 the evidence for this remains controversial owing to the number of apparently contradictory 58 studies. This review evaluates and discusses the effects of individual statins on bacterial growth 59 and virulence and bacterial infections in the context of pathogen-host interactomes (summarized 60 in Figure 2). 61

62

## 63 Clinical evidence that statins influence morbidity and mortality of patients with microbial 64 infections.

The clinical potential of statins as anti-microbial agents has been the subject of several studies and reviews. A number of meta-analyses of cohort studies on the impact of overall statin use on different infection outcomes showed positive findings, albeit while highlighting the limitations and heterogeneity of the studies (10 - 13). These reviews included studies on infections such as bacteraemia, pneumonia, sepsis and some acute infections and patient populations received several different statins. For instance, two single centre retrospective studies showed that patients 71 with bacteraemia who have undergone prior statin treatment have a significant decreased risk of 72 in hospital mortality of 6% vs 28% (p = 0.002) and 13% vs 24% (p = 0.001) respectively (14, 15). The latter study also showed there was an inverse correlation between the length of statin 73 treatment and risk of mortality when they compared statin use  $\geq 12$  and < 12 weeks prior to 74 75 infection (11% vs 14%, p = 0.04) (15). A meta analysis of available published data found that the use of statins was specifically associated with a reduced risk of morbidity and mortality 76 resulting from pneumonia (12). A retrospective study of patients in the UK found that current 77 statin treatment (within last 30 days) reduced pneumonia-associated mortality (adjusted OR 0.47, 78 79 95% CI 0.25-0.88) (16), while prior statin treatment also reduced mortality rates in patients in the USA with community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) (adjusted OR 0.36, 95% CI 0.14–0.92) (17). 80 81 Furthermore, data from the Justification for the Use of Statin in Prevention: An Intervention 82 Trial Evaluating Rosuvastatin (JUPITER), which was initially undertaken to determine whether rosuvastatin could reduce the risk of cardiac disease in people without hyperlidemia (18) were 83 retrospectively analysed in 2012. This analysis suggested that rosuvastatin treatment may 84 decrease the occurrence of pneumonia before (HR 0.81, 95% CI 0.67-0.97) or after a cardiac 85 event (HR 0.83, 95% CI 0.69-1.00) (19). In contrast however, an earlier prospective cohort study 86 87 which examined adults in six Canadian hospitals had concluded that after adjusting for confounding factors such as the 'healthy user effect' prior statin treatment does not yield reduced 88 mortality from pneumonia (20). This latter study encompassed 3415 patients >17 yrs of age with 89 90 pneumonia admitted to hospital, while the JUPITER randomized, double-blind, placebocontrolled trial of 17,802 healthy patients was restricted to men >50yrs and women >60yrs of 91 age. Indeed, the JUPITER study was designed to address the 'healthy user effect' suggesting that 92

AAC

study design in addition to age differences between the cohorts may underpin the contrastingobservations.

Sepsis is a serious infection-induced whole body inflammatory state, and due to the 95 96 immunomodulatory activity of statins, several studies have been carried out to evaluate the 97 benefit of statin therapy in the prevention or treatment of the disease. While the type, design, size 98 and measured outcomes of the studies have been varied and overall results conflicting, in recent years extensive reviews evaluating these clinical studies have been published (21-27). The 99 100 majority of clinical studies to date have been retrospective cohort studies evaluating the impact 101 of prior treatment with statins on disease progression and mortality. Many of these, plus several 102 meta-analysis reviews, showed promising results whereby prior use of statins significantly reduced disease progression and/or mortality associated with sepsis (25, 28 - 32). For instance, 103 104 studied by Almog et al. and Martin et al. demonstrated a reduced risk of developing severe sepsis in patients pretreated with statins (2.4% vs 19%, P<0.001 and 56% vs 86%, P<0.02 respectively) 105 106 while Mortensen et al. showed a reduced risk of 30 day mortality in patients using statins (OR 107 0.48, 95% CI 0.36-0.64). One of the main limitations attributed to these studies was limited sample size, and against this, a recent population-based, propensity score-matched analysis of the 108 effect of low and high doses of statins on sepsis outcomes involved a cohort of 27,792 statin 109 110 users compared with an equal number of non-users (33). This extensive study demonstrated a 111 significant reduction of 1-year mortality (HR 0.83, 95 % CI 0.81-0.85) and adverse consequences of sepsis such as in-hospital death (OR 0.86, 95 % CI 0.83-0.89) and ICU 112 admission (OR 0.95, 95 % CI 0.92-0.98) in patients pretreated with statins. They also showed 113 that the benefits of pretreatment with statins increased significantly with higher doses. 114

115 Therefore, several studies have shown promising potential for the prior use of statins in the

6

Downloaded from http://aac.asm.org/ on November 5, 2019 at UNIV COLLEGE CORK

116 prevention / progression of infections. Nevertheless, it is difficult to draw conclusions on 117 whether these statins effects were directly anti-bacterial / inflammatory or due to pleitrophic effects on co-morbitities associated with the infections. For example, it is estimated that 118 cardiovascular events account for up to 30% of deaths in patients with CAP and therefore it 119 could be argued that prior statin use could improve cardiovascular health and thus reduce 120 121 mortality rather than having any direct effect on the infection. Against this a study has reported 122 that while prior statin use was significantly associated with decreased 90-day mortality in CAP patients, there was no significant association with cardiocasular events (34). In order to fully 123

understand the mechanistic effects of prior statin use on infections similar studies targeting for
example specific co-morbidities and/or inflammatory markers would be required.
In contrast to prior use of statins, however, studies investigating the benefits of de-novo

In contrast to prior use of statins, however, studies investigating the benefits of de-novo treatment of infections with statins have generally not shown favorable results. A recent randomized control trial (RCT) investigating the effect of rosuvastatin on the clinical outcome of patients with sepsis associated acute respiratory distress syndrome was discontinued because of futility (35). Moreover, a number of recent meta-analyses of RCTs suggest that there is no significant evidence to suggest that statin use improves the mortality outcome of patients with sepsis (25 - 27).

Further large scale RCT research is also recommended to evaluate the efficacy of using de-novo statin therapy to treat specific infections. Of particular note is that the majority of the studies reviewed so far did not adjust for the type of statin used or the type of bacteria causing the infection. An interesting study of the effect of prior statin use on mortality in patients with bloodstream infections found a significant reduction in 90-day mortality in statin users with Gram-negative infections (adjusted OR 0.38, 95 % CI 0.20–0.72, P=0.003) but no significant difference in statin users with Gram-positive infections (adjusted OR 1.22, 95% CI 0.69–2.17,

140 P=0.49 (36), suggesting that the type of bacterial infection may be a significant factor.

141

#### 142 Effects of statins on *in vitro* bacterial growth.

There is a large body of evidence demonstrating that statins have direct anti-bacterial effects on 143 144 the in vitro growth of both Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacterial pathogens responsible for 145 a wide range of infections (Table 1), although there have been conflicting reports on MICs 146 (ranging from 15 mg/l to 500 mg/l) and strain specificity may be a factor (Table 1). The growth of the Gram-positive nosocomial pathogens Staphylococcus aureus and Streptococcus 147 148 pneumoniae has been shown to be inhibited by atorvastatin, rosuvastatin and simvastatin (37-149 43), while fluvastatin has also been reported to inhibit the growth of S. aureus (37). In addition, 150 both type 1 (simvastatin) and type 2 (atorvastatin, fluvastatin and rosuvastatin) statins have also demonstrated a bacteriostatic effect against other Gram-positive cocci, notably Streptococcus 151 pyogenes, Staphylococcus epidermidis, Enterococcus and Bacillus spp. (37, 39, 40, 42). 152 153 Promisingly, simvastatin, lovastatin and rosuvastatin have also been shown to have anti-bacterial 154 effects on the growth of antibiotic-resistant species such as methicillin-resistant S. aureus 155 (MRSA), vancomycin-resistant S. aureus (VRSA) and vancomycin-resistant enterococci (VRE), although the MIC concentrations are typically higher than against antibiotic sensitive strains 156 (Table 1) (37, 39 - 43). 157

Both type 1 and type 2 statins have also been found to inhibit the growth of a number of clinically important Gram-negative species including several respiratory pathogens. The growth of the nosocomial respiratory pathogens *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Acinetobacter baumanii* and 161

162 from 15 - 333 mg/l) (39, 40) and simvastatin was reportedly bactericidal against Moraxella 163 catarrhalis (MIC 15 mg/l) (38). In addition to respiratory pathogens, statins have also been reported to inhibit other Gram-negative nosocomial pathogens. Masadeh et al. reported that 164 atorvastatin, rosuvastatin and simvastatin have bacteriostatic effects against a range of pathogens 165 166 including Citrobacter freundii, Enterobacter aerogenes, Haemophilus influenzae and Proteus 167 mirabilis (MICs ranging from 15 - 166 mg/l) (39). Simvastatin and lovastatin (10 mg/l) are also reportedly bactericidal against the spirochete Borrelia burgdorferi (the causative agent of Lyme 168 169 disease) (44) and atorvastatin, rosuvastatin and simvastatin were found to inhibit the growth of 170 Escherichia coli, a prominent cause of gastroenteritis and urinary tract infections (39). In 171 contrast, however, Bergman et al., using a maximum concentration of 250 mg/L observed that 172 simvastatin did not inhibit the growth of H. influenzae (38), while Graziano et al. found that 173 simvastatin, atorvastatin and pravastatin at concentrations up to 250 mg/l did not inhibit the 174 growth of P. aeruginosa, E. coli or Enterococcus faecalis (43). Furthermore, the study by 175 Thangamani et al. (42) reported that while the growth of Gram-positive species was inhibited by 176 statins, the growth of *P. aeruginosa* ATCC 15442 was not inhibited by the statins simvastatin, 177 atorvastatin, fluvastatin, lovastatin, mevastatin, pitavastatin, pravastatin or rosuvastatin. They also reported that simvastatin did not inhibit the growth of a range of other Gram-negative 178 179 pathogens including different strains of P. aeruginosa, K. pneumoniae, A. baumanii, E. coli and Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium. Interestingly, they did show that when combined 180 181 with sub-inhibitory concentrations of colistin, which compromises the outer membrane integrity, 182 simvastatin had anti-bacterial activity against the range of Gram-negative pathogens at MICs of 8 – 32 mg/l. While the activity shown by simvastatin against E. coli ATCC35218 (39) is in direct 183

Klebsiella pneumoniae is inhibited by atorvastatin, rosuvastatin and simvastatin (MICs ranging

AAC

contrast to the lack of activity by simvastatin against *E. coli* ATCC35150, ATCC 700728, ATCC25922, and ATCC10536 (42-43), it is worth noting that the *E. coli* ATCC3218 assays were performed on solid agar while the other studies were performed using the broth microdilution method, perhaps explaining the apparent differences in activity.

188 Taken together, the data suggest that the anti-bacterial activity of statins may be both statin 189 specific and / or strain/species specific. Simvastatin and atorvastatin generally appear to be more effective against S. aureus, S. pneumoniae and enterococci than other statins (37-40), while three 190 distinct simvastatin MICs were reported against S. aureus clinical isolates from the UK and 191 Jordan as well as typed reference strains (Table 1) (37, 39, 42, 43). It is also noteworthy that 192 193 while the MICs of statins varied according to statin and pathogen tested, the in vitro MICs ranged from circa 15 to 400 mg/l, which far exceeds the typical peak plasma concentrations of 194 195 patients on oral stating, which generally ranges from circa 10 to 300 µg/l. Moreover, in the 196 majority of cases the *in vitro* statin MICs against multi-drug resistant pathogens were even 197 greater than those against equivalent antibiotic susceptible strains. As such, at these MIC concentrations, it is unlikely that they would qualify as lead molecules in drug discovery 198 programs. This variability in MICs could be considered somewhat unexpected for what is 199 essentially a novel antibiotic compound being administered to a naive population. However, 200 201 recent studies have reported significant phenotypic and genotypic diversity within clinical 202 populations suggesting that adaptation to environmental or host related factors may be widespread (45 - 47). While the mechanism of action of statin antimicrobial and anti-virulence 203 204 activity remains to be elucidated, some reports suggest the involvement of isoprenoids and 205 membrane integrity (48). Further deciphering the interaction between statins and the microbial

206 membrane may provide answers to this apparent heterogeneity, although other targets within the207 microbial cell must also be considered.

208 However, two studies have recently demonstrated the *in vivo* clinical efficacy of locally high concentrations of statins whereby topical applications of simvastatin at MIC / sub-MIC 209 concentrations significantly enhanced bacterial clearance and healing of MSSA and MRSA S. 210 211 aureus-contaminated wounds in mice wound models (41, 42). Wang et al. showed that application of simvastatin (62.5 mg/l) reduced the MSSA wound size by over 50% at day seven 212 and significantly reduced (>60% reduction) the bacterial load visible in the wound histology 213 (41), while Thangamani et al. showed that topical simvastatin at concentrations of 1% and 3% 214 215 significantly reduced the bacterial load in MRSA wounds by 75% and 90% respectively (42). The latter study also showed that this topical application of simulation had an additive healing 216 217 effect and it reduced the production of pro-inflammatory cytokines (IL-6, TNF- $\alpha$  and IL-1 $\beta$ ) in MRSA infected wound lesions. 218

219 The mechanism by which statins inhibit bacterial growth is unclear. As previously described, 220 statins inhibit the mevalonate pathway in human cells. This pathway is present in higher 221 eukaryotes, as well as several bacterial species including staphylococci and streptococci. 222 However, not all bacteria possess a mevalonate pathway, and in these species (and in plants) isoprenoid metabolism is mediated through the 2-C-methyl-D-erythritol 4-phosphate/1-deoxy-D-223 xylulose 5-phosphate (MEP-DOXP) pathway, which is mevalonate-independent (49, 50). The 224 225 MEP-DOXP and mevalonate pathways both feed into the production of isoprenoid intermediates. Generally, it appears that Gram-positive bacteria tend to possess a mevalonate pathway, while 226 227 Gram-negative species utilize mevalonate-independent isoprenoid biosynthesis, although there 228 are some exceptions to this observation. Statins have been shown to inhibit the growth of S.

Chemotherapy

*aureus* by binding to and inhibiting the activity of its HMGR enzyme (51) and this may to some extent explain why Gram-positive bacteria tend to be more sensitive to statins. However, statins can attenuate the growth of bacteria irrespective of the presence of HMGR, although the mechanism is unknown and studies have reported equivalent statin MICs in species with and without HMGR (39, 40).

234

#### 235 Effects of statins on intracellular growth of bacteria

The effect of statins on the intracellular growth of pathogens has also been studied and, at drug 236 concentrations closer to physiological levels, they have been shown to reduce the growth of 237 several obligate intracellular bacterial pathogens. Recent reports demonstrated that lovastatin at 238 239 0.4 mg/l (52) and both atorvastatin and simulation in a dose-dependent fashion (0.08 - 0.8)240 mg/l), reduced the survival of the leprosy-causing species Mycobacterium leprae (by up to 90% 241 and 75% respectively) in *in vitro* macrophage models, but in a cholesterol-dependent manner (53), suggesting an indirect effect on cholesterol levels as the intracellular growth of these 242 pathogens requires cholesterol. Prior but not concomitant treatment of murine fibroblast (L929) 243 cells with lovastatin at 0.4 mg/l also reduced both the intracellular growth of the respiratory 244 245 pathogen Coxiella burnetti (which causes Q fever) (by 43%, P=0.064) (54), and plaque 246 formation by the causative agent of Rocky mountain spotted fever, Rickettsia conorii (by 64%, P=0.003) (55). Interestingly, in *in vivo* studies the hydrophobic statin, simvastatin, at a 247 physiological concentration (0.5mg/kg), but not the hydrophilic statin pravastatin significantly 248 249 decreased (up tp 83%) the levels of the respiratory pathogen Chlamydiae pneumoniae in lung 250 cells of infected mice (56, 57). It was also found that cerivastatin (0.1 mg/l) reduced the cross infection of VSMC (vascular smooth muscle cells) by C. pneumoniae infected macrophages (56, 251

58). In these studies the authors also suggest that the reduced growth may be an indirect effectdue to cholesterol inhibition.

A number of studies report inhibition of the non-obligate intracellular growth of Mycobacterium 254 255 tuberculosis in peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) and macrophages. Parihar et al. demonstrated that *M. tuberculosis* growth was significantly reduced (circa 2-fold, P<0.05) in 256 257 human mononuclear cells and macrophages taken from atrovastatin-treated patients with familial hypercholesterolemia compared with healthy donors while also showing that simvastatin (20.6 258 mg/l) significantly reduced (circa 3-fold, P<0.01) M. tuberculosis growth in murine macrophages 259 260 and both simvastatin and rosuvastatin significantly decreased (circa 2 to 10 - fold P < 0.05 / 0.01) 261 the bacterial load in the liver, spleen and lungs of infected mice (20 mg/kg) (59). The study further demonstrated that the simvastatin-mediated decrease in bacterial growth was reversed by 262 263 mevalonate, the product of HMG-CoA reductase and suggested that statins control infection by 264 phagolysosomal arrest of *M. tuberculosis*. These results were corroborated by the study by 265 Lobato et al. whereby they showed that atorvastatin and simvastatin (2 µM) significantly 266 inhibited M. tuberculosis growth (circa 60% reduction) in macrophages and again this was 267 reversed by mevalonate (53). A previous study by Parihar et al. also demonstrated that simvastatin treatment (20.6 mg/l) could significantly reduce, by up to 4-fold, (P < 0.001) the 268 269 ability of the food borne pathogen *Listeria monocytogenes* to grow inside mouse and primary 270 macrophages, in a cholesterol dependent manner and significantly reduce the bacterial burden and dissemination (by 100-fold) to the liver (P < 0.001) and spleen (P < 0.05) in infected mice (60). 271 272 The intracellular growth of another food borne bacteria, the gastroenteritis-causing Salmonella 273 enterica serovar Typhimurium, was also attenuated more than 10-fold by lovastatin (50 nM & 30  $\mu$ M) treatment of murine macrophages, at least in part due to attenuation of the mevalonate 274

Chemotherapy

275 pathway (61). A key mechanism behind the attenuation of internalized bacterial infections by 276 statins appears to be the statin-mediated inhibition of lipid raft formation. Lipid rafts are 277 glycoprotein domains present in the cell membrane, which are formed as a result of cholesterol 278 spontaneously interacting with sphingoglycolipids. Bacteria can manipulate lipid rafts in order to 279 invade and survive within cells and induce apoptosis (62). However, statins are known to inhibit 280 the formation of lipid rafts due to inhibition of cholesterol biosynthesis (63). Two studies 281 investigating the effects of statins on the intracellular growth of L. monocytogenes and plaque

formation of *R. conorii* suggest their findings were due to the inhibition of lipid raft formation by 282 283 statins (55, 60).

284 As well as inhibiting intracellular growth, statin treatment at physiological concentrations also 285 promotes increased bacterial killing in host cells. Simvastatin significantly reduced the burden of 286 S. pneumoniae in the lungs of infected mice (dose = 1 / 10 mg/kg/day, 50/100-fold reduction, P=0.02 / 0.002) (64) and significantly increased bacterial clearance (65% reduction, P=0.01) and 287 288 reduced dissemination (90% reduction, P=0.01) of S. aureus in a mouse model of pneumonia (dose = 0.25 mg/kg/day) (65). Simvastatin (~ 41.7 mg/kg/day) also reduced S. aureus recovery 289 by circa 35 % from mouse peritoneal (P<0.005) and by 2-fold in lung cells (P<0.05) and 290 mevastatin (50  $\mu$ M) significantly reduced (40% reduction, P<0.005) the amount of S. aureus 291 292 recovered from intracellular infection of human neutrophils and mouse macrophages (66). In this 293 latter study evidence suggests that there was no direct effect on bacterial viability but that statins 294 promoted bacterial killing by inducing the formation of phagocyte extracellular traps.

295 Therefore, evidence suggests that, while the mechanisms by which physiological concentrations 296 of statins influence intracellular or in vivo bacterial infections are not fully understood, most

Chemotherapy

studies suggest indirect action mainly due to pleiotropic effects of modulating the mevalonate

298 pathway in the host.

299

#### 300 Effects of statins on bacterial virulence

An interesting development in the field of statins and bacterial infection is the discovery that sub 301 302 lethal doses of statins may influence bacterial virulence, raising the possibility that statins may be repurposed as specific anti-virulence therapeutics. A number of studies have investigated the 303 304 impact of statin treatment on *in vitro* bacterial virulence (Table 2). Wang et al. and Graziano et 305 al. both showed that S. aureus biofilm formation is inhibited by simvastatin (41, 43) while 306 Hennessy et al. demonstrated that both the *in vitro* motility and early biofilm formation of the 307 predominant cystic fibrosis-associated pathogen P. aeruginosa are attenuated by statin concentrations sub-inhibitory to growth (4 & 40 mg/l respectively) (67). Graziano and colleagues 308 also showed that simvastatin (4x MIC) could disrupt established S. aureus biofilms and 309 310 Thangamani et al. demonstrated that simvastatin at 2x and 4x MIC concentrations reduced 311 established biofilms of both S. aureus and S. epidermidis by approximately 40% (42, 43). This latter study by Thangamani et al. also showed that simvastatin suppressed the production of the 312 S. aureus toxins Panton-Valentine leucocidin (PVL) and  $\alpha$ -hemolysin (Hla) produced by MRSA. 313 314 They also showed that simvastatin inhibited bacterial protein synthesis and suggest that the 315 reduction in toxin production may be a reflection of this.

In cell culture studies, simvastatin (4 mg/l) significantly increased ( $P \le 0.05$ ) the adhesion of *P*. *aeruginosa* to lung cells (68) but the translocation of *P. aeruginosa* across the apical membrane of kidney cells was significantly inhibited (P < 0.05) by simvastatin treatment (5  $\mu$ M / 2 mg/l) (69). Neither of these studies observed an alteration in the invasive potential of *P. aeruginosa* in

Chemotherapy

320 the presence of statin, however, the invasion of other pathogens is inhibited by statins. Horn et al. 321 demonstrated reduced invasion of S. aureus into vascular epithelial cells in the presence of physiological concentrations of simvastatin (0.04 - 0.4 mg/l) (70), while mevastatin (4 mg/l) 322 completely inhibited the internalization of Group B Streptococcus, a common cause of 323 324 meningitis, into HeLa cells (71), and attenuated the invasion of E. coli into bladder epithelial 325 cells (72). In these latter studies inhibition of bacterial invasion was proposed to be due to the 326 ability of simvastatin and mevastatin to inhibit the activation of Rho GTPase proteins as a result of the inhibition of the production of the isoprenoid intermediates farnesyl-pyrophosphate and 327 geranylgeranyl-pyrophosphate, which are required for the prenylation and activation of Rho 328 329 GTPases (73).

Therefore, there is promising evidence that statins may influence the invasiveness and/or biofilm 330 331 formation of some pathogens, however, a number of studies have observed the absence of stating 332 affecting other bacterial virulence factors (Table 2). Bacterial cell-cell communication may not 333 be impacted by statins as simvastatin, lovastatin and mevastatin failed to alter N-acylhomoserine lactone (AHL) or POS quorum sensing by P. aeruginosa and mevastatin failed to 334 alter AHL signaling by Burkholderia cenocepacia, both prominent causes of respiratory 335 infections in cystic fibrosis patients (67, 74). In the same studies transcription of the exoS Type 336 337 Three Secretion toxin and protease production, respectively, were not altered by the statins 338 tested. Furthermore, an in-depth study carried out using S. pneumoniae demonstrated that subinhibitory concentrations of simvastatin (1 mg/l) did not directly influence the activity of the 339 340 pneumolysin toxin against red blood cells (75). However, the same study showed that simvastatin did protect vascular endothelial cells from pneumolysin-induced cytotoxicity in 341 vitro. This protective effect was reversed by mevalonate, again suggesting an indirect effect. The 342

Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy protection was confirmed *in vivo* whereby it extended to reduced lung damage and increasedsurvival in a mouse model of infection.

Indeed, several studies have shown that statins can reduce the impact of bacterial toxins on host 345 346 cells. In a study that utilized S. aureus  $\alpha$ -toxin, leukocyte recruitment and adhesion in mice was attenuated by simulatin pretreatment (100  $\mu$ g/kg) by >70% (P<0.01) (76). This finding is 347 significant as it suggests that stating may reduce  $\alpha$ -toxin-mediated inflammation and 348 cardiovascular damage. In addition, lovastatin (1 mg/l) improved the survival of mice which 349 were exposed to another S. aureus toxin, enterotoxin B by 50% (77) and the cytotoxicity of 350 351 Bacillus anthracis lethal toxin against macrophages was reduced >60% by fluvastatin, 352 mevastatin, and simvastatin (78).

The protective mechanism(s) of statins against bacterial virulence has not been established, 353 however, the impact of statins on host cell isoprenoid metabolism appears to regulate at least 354 some of the effects observed on bacterial virulence in cell culture and infection models. Several 355 356 studies have shown that the observed statin effect on bacterial virulence can be reversed by the 357 addition of exogenous mevalonate (53, 58-60, 66, 70, 75, 77, 79), while statin-mediated cholesterol depletion is protective against bacterial toxins (75, 60) and contributes to the killing 358 of intracellular bacteria (44, 53, 59 - 61, 66). In addition, the regulation of the inflammatory 359 response by stating may account for some of these protective effects. For instance, cerivastatin 360 treatment attenuated the production of pro-inflammatory mediators and superoxide in 361 362 macrophages infected with C. pneumoniae, and this was associated with a reduced bacterial 363 infection rate (79). The inflammatory response in lipopolysaccharide-treated mice was also 364 reduced by cerivastatin treatment, leading to improved survival (80), while simvastatin treatment

Chemotherapy

reduced both lung injury and the production of pro-inflammatory chemokines in a mouse sepsis

366 model (81).

367

#### 368 Co-prescription of statins with antibiotics

It has been hypothesized that physiological or sub-inhibitory doses of statins could be used in 369 370 combination with antibiotics to increase the efficacy of treatment. Many researchers have proposed dual action combinations that remove the virulence threat, either toxin or biofilm, 371 facilitating clearance by the antibiotic. Indeed, the growing evidence for the effectiveness of next 372 373 generation anti-virulence approaches has been tempered by a realization that conventional 374 antibiotics will still be required to clear the infecting pathogen and resolve the infection. Current information on the synergistic relationship between statins and antibiotics is limited and 375 376 conflicting (Table 2). A significant synergistic effect resulting in increased bacterial lysis has been reported with sub-lethal doses of penicillin and simvastatin (7.8 mg/l) against 377 pneumococcal growth in vitro (38), while atorvastatin and simvastatin (0.2  $\mu$ M) increased the 378 379 efficacy of rifampin against *M. tuberculosis* and *M. leprae* infection in vitro by approximately 380 50% (53). In addition, in vivo mice studies showed that atorvastatin (80 mg/kg/day) increased the 381 efficacy of rifampin against M. leprae infection (P < 0.05) (53) and simvastatin (25 mg/kg) 382 increased the *in vivo* activity of first-line anti-TB antibiotics reducing the lung bacillary burden by  $>1 \log_{10} (P < 0.01)$  (82). Thangamani and colleagues demonstrated a positive synergistic effect 383 of simvastatin on the anti-microbial effect of four topical antibiotics, mupirocin, fusidic acid, 384 385 retapamulin and daptomycin, against clinical isolates of multi-drug resistant S. aureus. However, 386 Graziano et al. showed there was no synergistic effect between simvastatin and vancomycin against S. aureus (43). A recent study, which examined the in vitro effects of five statins, at 387

Chemotherapy

388

389 atrovastatin, pravastatin = 0.01, 0.05, 0.1 mg/l; fluvastatin = 0.1, 0.2, 0.3 mg/l), on the MICs of six antibiotics against four clinically important Gram-negative strains - P. aeruginosa, A. 390 baumanii, E. coli and K. pneumoniae – found that the stating did not significantly change the 391 392 susceptibility of any of these bacteria to any of the antibiotics tested (83). However, this in vitro 393 study may not reflect the true activity in an in vivo setting and therefore further in vivo 394 investigations are warranted. This is particularly relevant given that the majority of the studies reviewed here that looked at the mechanism by which statins influence bacterial growth or 395 396 virulence *in vivo* suggest indirect effects as a result of interactions with host cells. In addition, the 397 anti-biofilm activity of statins towards Gram-negative pathogens, which would be expected to reduce the MIC of antibiotics in biofilm forming populations (accounting for approximately 80% 398 of all infections), would not be reflected in the planktonic *in vitro* MIC assays performed. 399

concentrations equivalent to recommended physiological doses (simvastatin, lovastatin,

It is important to note, however, that the repurposing of statins for use as combinatorial 400 401 antibiotics would rely on their compatibility with currently administered antibiotics. While data 402 in this aspect of antimicrobial therapy is limited, certain antibiotics may interfere with the 403 metabolism of stating which can lead to increased serum levels and thus an increased risk of adverse effects (84). For instance, certain statins including simvastatin, lovastatin, and 404 405 atorvastatin are metabolised by cytochrome P450 3A4 (CYP3A4) isoenzymes and studies have 406 shown that co-prescription with drugs that inhibit CYP3A, such as macrolide antibiotics, can 407 lead to increased adverse effects including rhabdomyolysis in elderly patients (85-92). In light of this the US FDA has stated that 'caution should be exercised when prescribing clarithromycin 408 409 with statins' and in particular 'concomitant use of clarithromycin with lovastatin or simvastatin is contraindicated' (89). In contrast they suggest that the concomitant use of statins not 410

Chemotherapy

411 dependent on CYP3A metabolism (e.g. fluvastatin) could be considered. However, a recent study 412 by Li and colleagues demonstrated significantly increased adverse effects when clarithromycin 413 was co-prescribed with statins not metabolized by CYP3A4 (94), suggesting additional 414 mechanisms of drug interactions independent of the CYP3A4 pathway, possibly related to 415 impaired hepatic uptake of statins. In contrast to studies on macrolide-statin interactions, no 416 additive harmful effects have been attributed to the combined use of statins and the lipopeptide 417 antibiotic daptomycin, despite both agents being associated with muscle injury (95).

#### 418

#### 419 Summary

The repurposing of statins as anti-microbial agents held promising potential when clinical studies 420 revealed that patients on cholesterol lowering statins showed improved outcomes from bacterial 421 422 infections. However, as outlined in this review the most convincing evidence of significantly 423 improved infection outcomes is when patients are pretreated with statins and the anti-microbial 424 effect is probably indirect. There is little evidence of significantly improved outcomes when 425 infections are treated with de-novo statins. However, while the evidence for statin effectiveness thus far has been provided from prophylactic studies, the anti-virulence activity emerging for 426 statins, whereby pathogens may be silenced rather than killed, offers an alternative perspective 427 on their potential clinical utility. In addition, statins may also offer selectivity in targeting 428 429 pathogenesis rather than the microbial population or microbiome as a whole, which is a major factor in maintaining host homeostasis. This could have the added advantage of removing the 430 selective pressure that underpins the continued spread of antibiotic resistance among populations. 431 Thus, further RCTs and prospective studies have been recommended and based on this review 432 433 the design of these new studies will be crucial as *in vitro* and mouse studies clearly show that the

434 most gain may be achieved by matching particular statins with particular infecting pathogens. 435 Moreover, one of the most limiting factors is the concentration of statins required for the 436 inhibition of bacterial growth in vitro. In almost all cases cited the in vitro MICs far exceed the general plasma levels found in patients receiving cholesterol-lowering statins and the feasibility 437 of raising the dose is questionable due to cytotoxicity and increased risk of debilitating side 438 439 effects. One area where specific targeted studies may be particularly beneficial is in the treatment 440 of infections caused by intracellular pathogens. Many in vitro cellular studies outlined here show significant results when using statins at physiological concentrations, while again suggesting the 441 effect is indirect. It would be interesting to see if these beneficial effects could be mimicked in in 442 vivo clinical studies. 443

The effect of statins on *in vitro* virulence of some pathogens is interesting but again is hindered 444 445 by the high concentrations required for significant results. However, this may be overcome by using sub-inhibitory concentrations of statins in combination with existing antibiotics. The 446 447 evidence presented here regarding the repurposing of statins in combination therapies is promising but again may be statin / pathogen specific. While the most significant results have 448 again been against intracellular bacteria there are few in vivo / clinical studies available against 449 extracellular pathogens. When designing these studies however, the possibility of adverse effects 450 451 associated with drug-drug- interactions should be an important consideration.

Therefore, while overall clinical studies regarding the repurposing of statins as anti-microbials are inconclusive, the evidence presented here suggests further prospective studies focusing on statin and pathogen specificity, bacterial virulence, combinatorial therapy and/or means of drug administration are warranted.

#### 457 **References**

- Endo A, Kuroda M, Tanzawa K. 1976. Competitive inhibition of 3-hydroxy-3 methylglutaryl coenzyme A reductase by ML-236A and ML-236B fungal metabolites,
   having hypocholesterolemic activity. FEBS Lett. 72:323–326.
- 461 2. Endo A, Kuroda M, Tsujita Y. 1976. ML-236A, ML-236B, and ML-236C, new
  462 inhibitors of cholesterogenesis produced by *Penicillium citrinium*. J. Antibiot. (Tokyo).
  463 29:1346–1348.
- 464 3. Istvan ES, Deisenhofer J. 2001. Structural mechanism for statin inhibition of HMG-CoA
  465 reductase. Science (80-.). 292:1160–1164.
- 466 4. Hamelin BA, Turgeon J. 1998. Hydrophilicity/lipophilicity: relevance for the
  467 pharmacology and clinical effects of HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors. Trends Pharmacol.
  468 Sci. 19:26–37.
- 469 5. Rodriguez AL, Wojcik BM, Wrobleski SK, Myers DD, Wakefield TW, Diaz JA.
  470 2012. Statins, inflammation and deep vein thrombosis: a systematic review. J. Thromb.
  471 Thrombolysis 33:371–82.
- 472 6. Quist-Paulsen P. 2010. Statins and inflammation: an update. Curr. Opin. Cardiol.
  473 25:399–405.
- 474 7. Chow SC. 2009. Immunomodulation by statins: mechanisms and potential impact on
  475 autoimmune diseases. Arch. Immunol. Ther. Exp. (Warsz). 57:243–251.

Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy 476

8.

Curr. Cancer Drug Targets 6:15-37. 477 Dulak J, Józkowicz A. 2005. Anti-angiogenic and anti-inflammatory effects of statins: 9. 478 relevance to anti-cancer therapy. Curr. Cancer Drug Targets 5:579-594. 479 10. Tleyjeh IM, Kashour T, Hakim\_FA, Zimmerman\_VA, Erwin PJ, Sutton AJ, 480 481 Ibrahim T. 2009 Statins for the prevention and treatment of infections: a systematic 482 review andmeta-analysis. Arch Intern Med 169:1658-67. Janda S, Young A, FitzGerald JM, Etminan M, Swiston J. 2010. The effect of statins 483 11. 484 onmortality from severe infections and sepsis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J 485 Crit Care 25:656.e7-22. 12. Chopra V, Rogers MAM, Buist M, Govindan S, Lindenauer PK, Saint S, Flanders 486 SA. 2012. Is statin use associated with reduced mortality after pneumonia? A 487 488 systematicreview and meta-analysis. Am J Med 125:1111-23.

Swanson KM, Hohl RJ. 2006. Anti-cancer therapy: targeting the mevalonate pathway.

- Ma J, Wen X, Peng J, Lu Y, Guo Z, Lu J. 2012. Systematic review and meta-analysis
  on the association between outpatient statins use and infectious disease-related mortality.
  PLoS ONE 7:e51548.
- 492 14. Liappis AP, Kan VL, Rochester CG, Simon GL. 2001. The effect of statins on
  493 mortality in patients with bacteremia. Clin. Infect. Dis. 33:1352–1357.

Chemotherapy

15. Nseir W, Mograbi J, Khateeb J, Abu-Elheja O, Bishara J, Jihad B, Assy N. 2012. The
impact of prior long-term versus short-term statin use on the mortality of bacteraemic
patients. Infection 40:41–48.

- 497 16. Schlienger RG, Fedson DS, Jick SS, Jick H, Meier CR. 2007. Statins and the risk of
  498 pneumonia: a population-based, nested case-control study. Pharmacotherapy 27:325–332.
- 499 17. Mortensen EM, Restrepo MI, Anzueto A, Pugh J. 2005. The effect of prior statin use
  500 on 30-day mortality for patients hospitalized with community-acquired pneumonia.
  501 Respir. Res. 6:doi:10.1186/1465-9921-6-82.
- 18. Ridker PM, Danielson E, Fonseca FAH, Genest J, Gotto AM, Kastelein JJP, Koenig
  W, Libby P, Lorenzatti AJ, MacFadyen JG, Nordestgaard BG, Shepherd J,
  Willerson JT, Glynn RJ. 2008. Rosuvastatin to prevent vascular events in men and
  women with elevated C-reactive protein. N. Engl. J. Med. 359:2195–2207.
- Novack V, MacFadyen J, Malhotra A, Almog Y, Glynn RJ, Ridker PM. 2012. The
  effect of rosuvastatin on incident pneumonia: results from the JUPITER trial. CMAJ
  184:E367–372.
- 509 20. Majumdar SR, McAlister FA, Eurich DT, Padwal RS, Marrie TJ. 2006. Statins and
  510 outcomes in patients admitted to hospital with community acquired pneumonia:
  511 population based prospective cohort study. BMJ 333:999.
- 512 21. Mermis JD, Simpson SQ. 2012. HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors for prevention and
  513 treatment of severe sepsis. Curr. Infect. Dis. Rep. 14:484–492.

Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy

- 514 22. Dobesh PP, Swahn SM, Peterson EJ, Olsen KM. 2010. Statins in sepsis. J. Pharm. 515 Pract. 23:38–49.
  - 516 23. Kouroumichakis I, Papanas N, Proikaki S, Zarogoulidis P, Maltezos E. 2011. Statins
    517 in prevention and treatment of severe sepsis and septic shock. Eur. J. Intern. Med. 22:125–
    518 133.
  - 519 24. Dobesh PP, Olsen KM. 2014. Statins role in the prevention and treatment of sepsis.
    520 Pharmacol Res. 88:31-40.
  - 521 25. Wan YD, Sun TW, Kan QC, Guan FX, Zhang SG. 2014. Effect of statin therapy on
    522 mortality from infection and sepsis: a meta-analysis of randomized and observational
    523 studies. Crit Care. 18(2):R71.
  - 524 26. Tralhão AF, Cés de Souza-Dantas V, Salluh JI, Póvoa PM. 2014. Impact of statins in
    525 outcomes of septic patients: a systematic review. Postgrad Med 126(7):45-58.
  - Thomas G, Hraiech S, Loundou A, Truwit J, Kruger P, McAuley DF, Papazian L,
    Roch A. 2015. Statin therapy in critically-ill patients with severe sepsis: a review and
    meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. Minerva Anestesiol Feb 18. [Epub ahead of
    print]
  - Almog Y, Shefer A, Novack V, Maimon N, Barski L, Eizinger M, Friger M, Zeller L,
    Danon A. 2004. Prior statin therapy is associated with a decreased rate of severe sepsis.
    Circulation 110:880–885.

Chemotherapy

533 29. Mortensen EM, Restrepo MI, Copeland LA, Pugh JA, Anzueto A, Cornell JE, Pugh MJ. 2007. Impact of previous statin and angiotensin II receptor blocker use on mortality 534 in patients hospitalized with sepsis. Pharmacotherapy **27**:1619–26. 535 30. Martin CP, Talbert RL, Burgess DS, Peters JI. 2007. Effectiveness of statins in 536 reducing the rate of severe sepsis: a retrospective evaluation. Pharmacotherapy 27:20–6. 537 538 31. Schmidt H, Hennen R, Keller A, Russ M, Müller-Werdan U, Werdan K, Buerke M. 539 2006. Association of statin therapy and increased survival in patients with multiple organ dysfunction syndrome. Intensive Care Med **32**:1248–51. 540 Dessap AM, Ouanes I, Rana N, Borghi B, Bazin C, Katsahian S, Hulin A, Brun-541 32. Buisson C. 2011. Effects of discontinuing or continuing ongoing statin therapy in severe 542 543 sepsis and septicshock: a retrospective cohort study. Crit Care 15:R171. Ou SY, Chu H, Chao PW, Ou SM, Lee YJ, Kuo SC, Li SY, Shih CJ, Chen YT. 2014. 33. 544 545 Effect of the use of low and high potency statins and sepsis outcomes. Intensive Care Med. 40(10):1509-17. doi: 10.1007/s00134-014-3418-1. Epub 2014 Aug 5. 546 34. Wu A, Good C, Downs JR, Fine MJ, Pugh MJ, Anzueto A, Mortensen EM. 2014. The 547 548 association of cardioprotective medications with pneumonia-related outcomes. PLoS One. 28;9(1):e85797. 549 550 35. Papazian L, Roch A, Charles PE, Penot-Ragon C, Perrin G, Roulier P, Goutorbe P, Lefrant JY, Wiramus S, Jung B, Perbet S, Hernu R, Nau A, Baldesi O, Allardet-551 Servent J, Baumstarck K, Jouve E, Moussa M, Hraiech S, Guervilly C, Forel JM; 552 STATIN-VAP Study Group. 2013. Effect of statin therapy on mortality in patients with 553

Chemotherapy

ventilator-associated pneumonia: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA. 310(16):1692-700.
doi: 10.1001/jama.2013.280031.

36. Mehl A, Harthug S, Lydersen S, Paulsen J, Åsvold BO, Solligård E, Damås JK, Edna
TH. 2014. Prior statin use and 90-day mortality in Gram-negative and Gram-positive
bloodstream infection: a prospective observational study. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis
34(3):609-17.

- Jerwood S, Cohen J. 2008. Unexpected antimicrobial effect of statins. J. Antimicrob.
  Chemother. 61:362–364.
- 38. Bergman P, Linde C, Putsep K, Pohanka A, Normark S, Henriques-Normark B,
  Andersson J, Bjorkhem-Bergman L. 2011. Studies on the Antibacterial Effects of
  Statins *In Vitro* and *In Vivo*. PLoS One 6:e24394.
- 39. Masadeh M, Mhaidat N, Alzoubi K, Al-Azzam S, Alnasser Z. 2012. Antibacterial
  activity of statins: a comparative study of atorvastatin, simvastatin, and rosuvastatin. Ann.
  Clin. Microbiol. Antimicrob. 11:doi:10.1186/1476-0711-11-13.
- Welsh A-M, Kruger P, Faoagali J. 2009. Antimicrobial action of atorvastatin and
  rosuvastatin. Pathology 41:689–691.
- Wang CC, Yang PW, Yang SF, Hsieh KP, Tseng SP, Lin YC. 2015. Topical
  simvastatin promotes healing of Staphylococcus aureus-contaminated cutaneous wounds.
  Int Wound J. 2015 Mar 8. doi: 10.1111/iwj.12431. [Epub ahead of print]

Chemotherapy

573

42.



Thangamani S, Mohammad H, Abushahba MF, Hamed MI, Sobreira TJ, Hedrick

48. Haeri MR, White K, Qharebeglou M, Ansar MM. 2005. Cholesterol suppresses
antimicrobial effect of statins. Iran J Basic Med Sci. 2015 Dec;18(12):1253-6.

Heuston S, Begley M, Gahan CGM, Hill C. 2012. Isoprenoid biosynthesis in bacterial
pathogens. Microbiology 158:1389–1401.

50. Eisenreich W, Bacher A, Arigoni D, Rohdich F. 2004. Biosynthesis of isoprenoids via
the non-mevalonate pathway. Cell. Mol. Life Sci. 61:1401–1426.

51. Wilding EI, Kim DY, Bryant AP, Gwynn MN, Lunsford RD, McDevitt D, Myers JE,
Rosenberg M, Sylvester D, Stauffacher C V, Rodwell VW. 2000. Essentiality,
expression, and characterization of the class II 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl coenzyme A
reductase of *Staphylococcus aureus*. J. Bacteriol. 182:5147–5152.

52. Mattos KA, Oliveira VCG, Berrêdo-Pinho M, Amaral JJ, Antunes LCM, Melo RCN,
Acosta CCD, Moura DF, Olmo R, Han J, Rosa PS, Almeida PE, Finlay BB, Borchers
CH, Sarno EN, Bozza PT, Atella GC, Pessolani MC V. 2014. *Mycobacterium leprae*intracellular survival relies on cholesterol accumulation in infected macrophages: a
potential target for new drugs for leprosy treatment. Cell. Microbiol.

53. Lobato LS, Rosa PS, Ferreira Jda S, Neumann Ada S, da Silva MG, do Nascimento
DC, Soares CT, Pedrini SC, Oliveira DS, Monteiro CP, Pereira GM, Ribeiro-Alves
M, Hacker MA, Moraes MO, Pessolani MC, Duarte RS, Lara FA. 2014. Statins
increase rifampin mycobactericidal effect. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 58(10):576674.

- 617 54. Botelho-Nevers E, Espinosa L, Raoult D, Rolain J-M. 2008. Lovastatin, but not
  618 pravastatin, limits *in vitro* infection due to *Coxiella burnetii*. J. Antimicrob. Chemother.
  619 62:845–847.
- 620 55. Botelho-Nevers E, Rolain JM, Espinosa L, Raoult D. 2008. Statins limit *Rickettsia*621 *conorii* infection in cells. Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents 32:344–348.
- 622 56. Erkkilä L, Jauhiainen M, Laitinen K, Haasio K, Tiirola T, Saikku P, Leinonen M.
- 2005. Effect of simvastatin, an established lipid-lowering drug, on pulmonary *Chlamydia pneumoniae* infection in mice. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 49:3959–3962.
- 57. Tiirola T, Jauhiainen M, Erkkilä L, Bloigu A, Leinonen M, Haasio K, Laitinen K,
  Saikku P. 2007. Effect of pravastatin treatment on *Chlamydia pneumoniae* infection,
  inflammation and serum lipids in NIH/S mice. Int J Antimicrob Agents 29(6):741-2.
- 58. Dechend R, Gieffers J, Dietz R, Joerres A, Rupp J, Luft FC, Maass M. 2003.
  Hydroxymethylglutaryl coenzyme A reductase inhibition reduces *Chlamydia pneumoniae*induced cell interaction and activation. Circulation 108:261–265.
- 59. Parihar SP, Guler R, Khutlang R, Lang DM, Hurdayal R, Mhlanga MM, Suzuki H,
  Marais AD, Brombacher F. 2014. Statin therapy reduces the mycobacterium
  tuberculosis burden in human macrophages and in mice by enhancing autophagy and
  phagosome maturation. J Infect Dis 209(5):754-63.

635	60.	Parihar SP, Guler R, Lang DM, Suzuki H, Marais AD, Brombacher F. 2013.
636		Simvastatin Enhances Protection against Listeria monocytogenes Infection in Mice by
637		Counteracting Listeria-Induced Phagosomal Escape. PLoS One 8:e75490.
638	61.	Catron DM, Lange Y, Borensztajn J, Sylvester MD, Jones BD, Haldar K. 2004.
639		Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium requires nonsterol precursors of the cholesterol
640		biosynthetic pathway for intracellular proliferation. Infect. Immun. 72:1036–1042.
641	62.	Riethmüller J, Riehle A, Grassmé H, Gulbins E. 2006. Membrane rafts in host-
642		pathogen interactions. Biochim. Biophys. Acta 1758:2139-2147.
643	63.	Hansen GH, Niels-Christiansen LL, Thorsen E, Immerdal L, Danielsen EM. 2000.
644		Cholesterol depletion of enterocytes. Effect on the Golgi complex and apical membrane
645		trafficking. J. Biol. Chem. 275:5136–5142.
646	64.	Boyd AR, Hinojosa CA, Rodriguez PJ, Orihuela CJ. 2012. Impact of oral simvastatin
647		therapy on acute lung injury in mice during pneumococcal pneumonia. BMC Microbiol.
648		<b>12</b> :doi: 10.1186/1471–2180–12–73.
649	65.	McDowell SA, Ma Y, Kusano R, Akinbi HT. 2011. Simvastatin is protective during
650		Staphylococcus aureus pneumonia. Curr. Pharm. Biotechnol. 12:1455–1462.
651	66.	Chow OA, von Kockritz-Blickwede M, Bright AT, Hensler ME, Zinkernagel AS,
652		Cogen AL, Gallo RL, Monestier M, Wang Y, Glass CK, Nizet V. 2010. Statins
653		enhance formation of phagocyte extracellular traps. Cell. Host. Microbe 8:445-454.

Downloaded from http://aac.asm.org/ on November 5, 2019 at UNIV COLLEGE CORK

Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy

654	67.	Hennessy E, Mooij MJ, Legendre C, Reen FJ, O'Callaghan J, Adams C, O'Gara F.
655		2013. Statins inhibit in vitro virulence phenotypes of Pseudomonas aeruginosa. J.
656		Antibiot. (Tokyo). 66:99–101.
657	68.	Hennessy E, O'Callaghan J, Mooij MJ, Legendre C, Camacho-Vanegas O, Camacho
658		SC, Adams C, Martignetti JA, O'Gara F. 2014. The Impact of Simvastatin on
659		Pulmonary Effectors of Pseudomonas aeruginosa Infection. PLoS One 9:e102200.
660	69.	Shibata H, Nishitani N, Yaohara S, Arakaki N, Higuti T, Kawazoe K, Minakuchi K.
661		2012. Simvastatin represses translocation of Pseudomonas aeruginosa across Madin-
662		Darby canine kidney cell monolayers. J. Med. Invest. 59:186–191.
663	70.	Horn MP, Knecht SM, Rushing FL, Birdsong J, Siddall CP, Johnson CM, Abraham
664		TN, Brown A, Volk CB, Gammon K, Bishop DL, McKillip JL, McDowell SA. 2008.
665		Simvastatin inhibits Staphylococcus aureus host cell invasion through modulation of
666		isoprenoid intermediates. J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther. 326:135-143.
667	71.	Burnham CA, Shokoples SE, Tyrrell GJ. 2007. Rac1, RhoA, and Cdc42 participate in
668		HeLa cell invasion by group B streptococcus. FEMS Microbiol. Lett. 272:8–14.
669	72.	Martinez JJ, Hultgren SJ. 2002. Requirement of Rho-family GTPases in the invasion of
670		Type 1-piliated uropathogenic <i>Escherichia coli</i> . Cell Microbiol. <b>4</b> :19–28.
671	73.	Goldstein JL, Brown MS. 1990. Regulation of the mevalonate pathway. Nature
672		<b>343</b> :425–430.

AAC

673 74. O'Grady EP, Viteri DF, Sokol PA. 2012. A unique regulator contributes to quorum sensing and virulence in Burkholderia cenocepacia. PLoS One 7:e37611. 674

Rosch JW, Boyd AR, Hinojosa E, Pestina T, Hu Y, Persons DA, Orihuela CJ, 675 75. Tuomanen EI. 2010. Statins protect against fulminant pneumococcal infection and 676 677 cytolysin toxicity in a mouse model of sickle cell disease. J. Clin. Invest. **120**:627–635.

- 678 76. Pruefer D, Makowski J, Schnell M, Buerke U, Dahm M, Oelert H, Sibelius U, Grandel U, Grimminger F, Seeger W, Meyer J, Darius H, Buerke M. 2002. 679 Simvastatin inhibits inflammatory properties of Staphylococcus aureus alpha-toxin. 680 Circulation 106:2104-2110. 681
- 77. Tilahun ME, Kwan A, Natarajan K, Quinn M, Tilahun AY, Xie C, Margulies DH, 682 683 Osborne BA, Goldsby RA, Rajagopalan G. 2011. Chimeric anti-staphylococcal enterotoxin B antibodies and lovastatin act synergistically to provide in vivo protection 684 against lethal doses of SEB. PLoS One 6:e27203. 685
- deCathelineau AM, Bokoch GM. 2009. Inactivation of rho GTPases by statins attenuates 686 78. anthrax lethal toxin activity. Infect. Immun. 77:348-359. 687
- 688 79. Kothe H, Dalhoff K, Rupp J, Muller A, Kreuzer J, Maass M, Katus H a. 2000. Hydroxymethylglutaryl coenzyme A reductase inhibitors modify the inflammatory 689 690 response of human nacrophages and endothelial cells infected with Chlamydia pneumoniae. Circulation 101:1760-1763. 691

Chemotherapy

- 692 80. Ando H, Takamura T, Ota T, Nagai Y, Kobayashi K. 2000. Cerivastatin improves
  693 survival of mice with lipopolysaccharide-induced sepsis. J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.
  694 294:1043–1046.
- 81. Zhang S, Rahman M, Zhang S, Qi Z, Thorlacius H. 2011. Simvastatin antagonizes
  CD40L secretion, CXC chemokine formation, and pulmonary infiltration of neutrophils in
  abdominal sepsis. J. Leukoc. Biol. 89:735–742.
- Skerry C, Pinn ML, Bruiners N, Pine R, Gennaro ML, Karakousis PC. 2014.
  Simvastatin increases the in vivo activity of the first-line tuberculosis regimen. J
  Antimicrob Chemother 69(9):2453-7.
- Farmer AR, Murray CK, Mende K, Akers KS, Zera WC, Beckius ML, Yun HC.
  2013. Effect of HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors on antimicrobial susceptibilities for gramnegative rods. J. Basic Microbiol. 53:336–339.
- 84. Kellick KA, Bottorff M, Toth PP. 2014. A clinician's guide to statin drug-drug
  interactions. J. Clin. Lipidol. 8:S30–46.
- Patel AM, Shariff S, Bailey DG, Juurlink DN, Gandhi S, Mamdani M, Gomes T,
  Fleet J, Hwang YJ, Garg AX. 2013. Statin toxicity from macrolide antibiotic
  coprescription: a population-based cohort study. Ann. Intern. Med. 158:869–76.
- Kee AJ, Maddix DS. 2001. Rhabdomyolysis Secondary to a Drug Interaction between
  Simvastatin and Clarithromycin. The Annals of Pharmacotherapy, 35:26-31.

Chemotherapy

711 87. Pasqualetti G, Bini G, Tognini S, Polini A, Monzani F, 2012. Clarithromycin-induced rhabdomyolysis: a case report. International Journal of General Medicine, 5:283-285. 712 88. Trieu J, Emmett L, Perera C, Thanakrishnan K, Van Der Wall H. 2004. 713 Rhabdomyolysis resulting from interaction of simvastatin and clarithromycin 714 demonstrated by Tc-99m MDP scintigraphy. Clin Nucl Med 29:803-4. 715 716 89. Campbell G, Jayakumar U, McCracken S, Bene J. 2007. A cautionary tale: delayed 717 onset rhabdomyolysis due to erythromycin/simvastatin interaction. Age Ageing 36:597. 90. Mah Ming JB, Gill M. 2003. Case report: drug-induced rhabdomyolysis after 718 719 concomitant use of clarithromycin, atorvastatin, and lopinavir/ ritonavir in a patient with HIV AIDS Patient Care STDS 17:207-10. 720 721 91. Page SR, Yee KC. 2014. Rhabdomyolysis in association with simvastatin and dosage increment in clarithromycin. Intern Med J. 44(7):690-3. 722 92. Cully M. 2013. Dyslipidaemia: Risks of statin and antibiotic coprescription. Nature 723 Reviews Cardiology 10:432. 724 725 93. Biaxin Filmtab (clarithromycin tablets, USP), Biaxin XL Filmtab (clarithromycin extended-release tablets), Biaxin Granules (clarithromycin for oral suspension, USP). 726 727 Silver Spring (MD): US Food and Drug Administration; 2015. Available: www.fda .gov/Safety/MedWatch/SafetyInformation/ucm258816.htm (accessed 2016 Jan. 15). 728 729 94. Li DQ, Kim R, McArthur E, Fleet JL, Bailey DG, Juurlink D, Shariff SZ, Gomes T, 730 Mamdani M, Gandhi S, Dixon S, Garg AX. 2015. Risk of adverse events among older 35

#### adults following co-prescription of clarithromycin and statins not metabolized by 731 732 cytochrome P450 3A4. CMAJ 187(3):174-80.

- 95. Golightly LK, Barber GR, Barron MA, Page RL. 2013. Statins and daptomycin: safety 733 assessment of concurrent use and evaluation of drug interaction liability. Drug Metabol. 734 735
- 736
- 737
- 738

739

Accepted Manuscript Posted Online

Drug Interact. 28:49-58.

#### 740 Figure Legends

**Figure 1: Chemical structures of statins. A)** Type 1 statins are characterised by a conserved lactone ring (blue), a decalin structure (black) and a butaryl side chain (red), which is different in each statin. **B)** Type 2 statins differ from type 1 statins due to the replacement of the butaryl side chain with a flurophenyl group (green), and although the lactone ring structure is conserved in all statins, the decalin group of Type 1 statins is replaced by a longer distinct side chain. Statins marked with an asterisk (\*) are licensed to treat high cholesterol.

747

748 Figure 2: Statins modulate bacterial growth and virulence. A) In vitro effects of statins on bacterial species. Statins reduce in vitro bacterial growth, motility and attachment. B) Key anti-749 750 virulence mechanisms of statins. At physiological concentrations statin treatment can reduce 751 bacterial invasion and translocation, in addition to inhibiting lipid raft production. The inhibition of Rho GTPase activity and cholesterol production by statins contribute to reduced bacterial 752 virulence, decreased toxicity and impaired intracellular survival. C) At physiological 753 754 concentrations statin treatment can reduce bacterial load and dissemination and increase bacterial clearance in mouse models of infection. 755

- 756 757 758 759
- 760 761

			Statin MIC mg/I						
Bacteria	Gram	Sim	Fluv	Ator	Ros	Prav	Ref		
S. Aureus	pos								
MSSA		16 - 63	~200	42 - >250	208 - 342	>250	37, 39- 43		
MSSA clinical isolate		60.42	nt	52.08	341.67	nt	39		
MRSA		32 - 167	~250 - >1024	83 - >1024	100 - >1024	>250 - >1024	37, 39- 40, 42- 43		
MRSA clinical isolate		116.67	nt	108.33	500	nt	39		
VISA group of strains		32	nt	nt	nt	nt	42		
VRSA group of strains		32 - 64	nt	nt	nt	nt	42		
S. epidermidis	pos								
Type strains		26 - 32	nt	21	167	nt	39, 42		
Clinical isolate		35	nt	20	233	nt	39		
S. Pneumoniae	pos								
Type strains		16 - 167	>123	104	333	>50	38, 39, 42		
Clinical isolate		292	nt	229	417	nt	39		
Enterococci	pos								
VSE		50 - 52	300	83 - 250	100 - 333	nt	37, 39, 40		
VSE clinical isolate		292	nt	96	333	nt	39		
VRE		30 - 104	500	167 - 250	100 - 500	nt	37, 39, 40		
VRE clinical isolate		292	nt	217	500	nt	39		
<i>E. faecalis</i> group of strains		32	nt	nt	nt	nt	42		

#### 762 Table 1: MIC of statins against Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria

Downloaded from http://aac.asm.org/ on November 5, 2019 at UNIV COLLEGE CORK

Accepted Ma	Clinical isolate <i>L. monocytogene</i> Group of strain <i>B. anthracis</i> Type strains
	H. influenza
	Clinical isolate
	ATTC29247
	Moraxella catarrhalis
hera	Clinical isolate
Chemo	E. coli
	Type strains
	O157:H7 ATCO 700728
	Clinical isolate
	P. aeruginosa

S. pyogenes

ATTC19615

pos

62.5

146

nt

nt

Clinical isolate
ATTC29247
Moraxella catarrhalis
Clinical isolate
E. coli
Type strains
O157:H7 ATCC 700728
Clinical isolate
P. aeruginosa
Type strains
Clinical isolate
K. pneumoniae
Type strains
Clinical isolate

ocytogenes	pos			
of strains		32	nt	nt
e <i>thracis</i> e strains	pos	16	nt	nt
fluenza	neg			
al isolate		146 - >250	nt	104
C29247		52	nt	83
axella rrhalis	neg			
al isolate		16	nt	nt
coli	neg			
strains		52 - >250	nt	26 - >250
17 ATCC 0728		>256	nt	nt
al isolate		112	nt	100
ruginosa	neg			
strains		166 - >1024	>1024	83 - >1024
al isolate		121	nt	96

neg

167 ->256

242

32	nt	nt	nt	nt	42
16	nt	nt	nt	nt	42
146 - >250	nt	104	367	nt	38, 39
52	nt	83	167	nt	39
16	nt	nt	nt	nt	38
52 - >250	nt	26 - >250	104	>250	39, 40, 43
>256	nt	nt	nt	nt	42
112	nt	100	125	nt	39
166 - >1024	>1024	83 - >1024	100 - >10241	>250 - >1024	39, 40, 42, 43, 63
121	nt	96	292	nt	39

167

217

nt

nt

333

258

83.33

133.33

166.67

275

nt

nt

39

39

39, 42

39

nt

nt

AAC

A. baumannii	neg						
Type strains		104 - >256	nt	16	333	nt	39, 42
Clinical isolate		32	nt	22	300	nt	39
C. freundii	neg						
ATTC 8090		52	nt	83	167	nt	39
Clinical isolate		133	nt	108	333	nt	39
E. aerogenes	neg						
ATTC 29751		26	nt	16	104	nt	39
Clinical isolate		33	nt	20	183	nt	39
P. mirabilis	neg						
ATTC 12459		167	nt	63	250	nt	39
Clinical isolate		146	nt	133	275	nt	39
S. Tphimurium	neg						
ATCC 700720		>256	nt	nt	nt	nt	42

763

764 Key: Sim, Simvastatin; Fluv, Fluvastatin; Ator, Atorvastatin; Ros, Rosuvastatin; Prav,

765 Pravastatin; pos, Gram-positive; neg, Gram-negative; nt, not tested.

Downloaded from http://aac.asm.org/ on November 5, 2019 at UNIV COLLEGE CORK

766 Table 2. E	Effect of statins on bacterial	virulence	and antibiotic activity
----------------	--------------------------------	-----------	-------------------------

	Virulence tra	it										
	Reduced biofilm formation	Disrupt established biofilm	Motility	QS	Protease	T3SS ExoS	Increased adhesion to human cells	Reduce	ed on	Trans- location	Toxin prodn	
	Statin (mg/l)											
Bacteria	Sim	Sim	Sim/Lov	/Mev			Sim	Sim	Mev	Sim	Sim	Ref
S. aureus	0.98 - 62.5	62.5	-				-	-	-	-	-	43
	62.5	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	41
	-	64	-				-	-	-	1 40	40	42
	-	-	-				-	0.04 - 0.4	-	-	-	66
S.epidermitis	-	128	-				-	-	-	-	-	42
P. aeruginosa	4 & 40	-	40	NC		NC	4	NC	-	-	-	63,64
	-	-	-				-	NC	-	₩ 2	-	65
Streptococcus	-	-	-				-	-	4	-	-	67
E.coli	-	-	-				-	-	4	-	-	68
B. cepacia	-	-	-	NC	NC		-	-	-	-	-	70

41

Downloaded from http://aac.asm.org/ on November 5, 2019 at UNIV COLLEGE CORK

Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy

AAC

	Antibiotic synergy											
	In vitro	In vivo (mice)			-							
Bacteria	Antibiotic + statin	Statin conc.	Effect	Antibiotic + statin	Statin conc.	Effect	Ref					
Pneumococci	Pen + Sim	7.8	↑ Autolysis	-	-	-	38					
MRSA/VRSA	Mup/Fus/Dap + Sim	<32	$\Downarrow$ Growth	-	-	-	42					
S. aureus	Van + Sim	?	NC	-	-	-	43					
M. tuberculosis	Rif + Sim/Ator	0.2microM	↓ Viability	-	-	-	49					
				Rif, Pyr, iso + sim	25 mg/kg/d	↑ bacillary killing	78					
M. leprae	Rif + Ator	0.2microM	↓ Viability	Rif + Ator	80 mg/kg/d	↓ Viability	49					
A. baumanii,	Ami/Imi/Min + Prav/Sim/Ator/Fluv	-	NC	-	-	-	79					
P. aeruginosa	Cip/Cep/Pip + Ator/Fluv	-	NC	-	-	-	79					
K. pneumoniae	Cip/Cep/Pip + Ator/Fluv	-	NC	-	-	-	79					
E. coli	Cip/Cep/Pip + Ator/Fluv	-	NC	-	-	-	79					

767

768 Key: Statins: Sim, Simvastatin; Ator, Atorvastatin; Prav, Pravastatin; Fluv, Fluvastatin. Antibiotics: Pen, penicillin; Mup, mupirocin;

Fus, fusidic acid; Dap, daptomycin; Van, vancomycin; Rif, rifampicin; Pyr, pyrazinamide; Iso, isoniazid; Ami, amikacin; Imi,

Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy imipenem; Min, minocycline; Cip, ciprofloxacin; Cep, cefepime; Pip, piperacillin

AAC

771

Downloaded from http://aac.asm.org/ on November 5, 2019 at UNIV COLLEGE CORK

# Simvastatin\* соон

NOH

HO



HC

HO,

Pravastatin\*

соон OH



Atorvastatin\*

A. Type 1 statins

B. Type 2 statins HO

HO,

Lovastatin\*

соон

OH

HO,

Cerivastatin

соон

OCH<sub>3</sub>

"OH

Fluvastatin\*

HO

HC

Mevastatin

Rosuvastatin\*

Pitavastatin\*

AAC





Downloaded from http://aac.asm.org/ on November 5, 2019 at UNIV COLLEGE CORK

AAC