

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/154676>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2017-12-05 and may be subject to change.

Breakpoints and Drug Exposure Are Inevitably Closely Linked

J. W. C. Alffenaar,^a O. W. Akkerman,^{b,e} M. S. Bolhuis,^a M. J. Boeree,^c W. C. M. de Lange,^{b,e} T. S. van der Werf^d

University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Department of Clinical Pharmacy and Pharmacology, Groningen, The Netherlands^a; University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Pulmonary Diseases and Tuberculosis, Groningen, The Netherlands^b; Radboud University Medical Center and University Lung Centre Dekkerswald, Nijmegen, The Netherlands^c; University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Department of Internal Medicine, Groningen, The Netherlands^d; Tuberculosis Center Beatrixoord, Haren, The Netherlands^e

It was with great interest that we read the article by Gumbo and colleagues titled “Redefining Multidrug-Resistant Tuberculosis Based on Clinical Response to Combination Therapy” (1). The authors performed a classification and regression tree (CART) analysis showing that MIC cutoff values above which therapy failure was observed are significantly lower than current breakpoints for isoniazid (INH) and rifampin (RIF). The consequence of the finding might be that the rate of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR TB) is much higher than previously assumed (1).

The impact to revise the definition of MDR TB based on these new critical concentrations will not only be statistical. Many patients will receive a second-line treatment regimen for at least 20 months that will be accompanied by a budget impact based on direct and indirect medical costs. The clinical outcome for these “new” MDR TB patients who will be treated with a second-line treatment regimen of drugs with unclear efficacy and more toxicity (2) needs to be established.

As the authors point out correctly, the identification of breakpoints should be a pharmacokinetics-pharmacodynamics (PK/PD)-derived calculation. The CART analysis showed cutoff MIC values lower than the current breakpoint MICs. The authors choose to adopt these values to distinguish between patients that would show a favorable result on first-line treatment and those who would likely fail on treatment. Alternatively, the authors could also have chosen to increase the doses of INH and RIF. This would have resulted in the same PK/PD indices and would reduce the potential increase in the number of patients labeled as MDR TB, thereby avoiding the inevitable consequence of starting a second-line treatment regimen. Increasing the doses of INH and RIF can be advocated based on *in vitro* and *in vivo* infection models showing that higher concentrations result in better outcome (3, 4). For RIF, it is already known that the current dose of 600 mg once daily is at the low end of the concentration-effect curve (5). Higher doses of RIF have even been evaluated in a randomized controlled trial to potentially shorten TB treatment (6); high doses of INH have been evaluated in the Bangladesh regimen (2). Both drugs appeared to be well tolerated. So instead of reducing the denominator of the PK/PD equation, we advocate increasing the numerator, likely resulting in the same clinical cure rate, thereby avoiding the increase of MDR TB and subsequent prolonged and toxic treatment.

We realize that our proposed strategy will likely also have a major impact on the current first-line treatment. A randomized study would ultimately be needed to compare clinical outcomes between standard treatment and treatment with high-dose INH and RIF. The publication of Gumbo and coworkers once again showed that new dosing strategies with currently available drugs are urgently needed to turn the tide of the MDR TB epidemic. It becomes clearer every day that drug susceptibility was and is important to be able to select an appropriate MDR TB treatment

regimen (7) and in addition tailor treatment further by optimizing drug exposure in patients (8).

REFERENCES

- Gumbo T, Pasipanodya JG, Wash P, Burger A, McIlleron H. 2014. Redefining multidrug-resistant tuberculosis based on clinical response to combination therapy. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 58:6111–6115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AAC.03549-14>.
- Aung KJ, Van Deun A, Declercq E, Sarker MR, Das PK, Hossain MA, Rieder HL. 2014. Successful ‘9-month Bangladesh regimen’ for multidrug-resistant tuberculosis among over 500 consecutive patients. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis* 18:1180–1187. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5588/ijtld.14.0100>.
- Jayaram R, Gaonkar S, Kaur P, Suresh BL, Mahesh BN, Jayashree R, Nandi V, Bharat S, Shandil RK, Kantharaj E, Balasubramanian V. 2003. Pharmacokinetics-pharmacodynamics of rifampin in an aerosol infection model of tuberculosis. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 47:2118–2124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AAC.47.7.2118-2124.2003>.
- de Steenwinkel JE, Aarnoutse RE, de Kneegt GJ, ten Kate MT, Teulen M, Verbrugh HA, Boeree MJ, van Soelingen D, Bakker-Woudenberg IA. 2013. Optimization of the rifampin dosage to improve the therapeutic efficacy in tuberculosis treatment using a murine model. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 187:1127–1134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201207-1210OC>.
- van Ingen J, Aarnoutse RE, Donald PR, Diacon AH, Dawson R, Plemper van Balen G, Gillespie SH, Boeree MJ. 2011. Why do we use 600 mg of rifampicin in tuberculosis treatment? *Clin Infect Dis* 52:e194–e199. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/cir184>.
- Boeree MJ, Diacon AH, Dawson R, Venter A, du Bois J, Narunsky K, Hoelscher M, Gillespie SH, Phillips PPJ, Aarnoutse RE. 2013. What is the “right” dose of rifampin?, p 148LB. *Abstr 20th Conf Retrovir Oppor Infect*, Atlanta, GA.
- Bastos ML, Hussain H, Weyer K, Garcia-Garcia L, Leimane V, Leung CC, Narita M, Penã JM, Ponce-de-Leon A, Seung KJ, Shean K, Sifuentes-Osornio J, Van der Walt M, Van der Werf TS, Yew WW, Menzies D, for the Collaborative Group for Meta-analysis of Individual Patient Data in MDR-TB. 5 August 2014. Treatment outcomes of patients with multidrug-resistant and extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis according to drug susceptibility testing to first- and second-line drugs: an individual patient data meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciu619>.
- Lange C, Abubakar I, Alffenaar JW, Bothamley J, Caminero JA, Carvalho AC, Chang KC, Codecaca L, Correia A, Crudu V, Davies P, Dedicoat M, Drobniowski F, Duarte R, Ehlers C, Erkens C, Goletti D, Günther G, Ibrahim E, Kampmann B, Kuksa L, de Lange W, van Leth F, van Lunzen J, Matteelli A, Menzies D, Monedero I, Richter E, Rüscher-Gerdes S, Sandgren A, Scardigli A, Skrahina A, Tortoli E, Volchenkov G, Wagner D, van der Werf MJ, Williams B, Yew WW, Zellweger JP, Cirillo DM. 2014. Management of patients with multidrug-resistant/extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis in Europe: a TBNET consensus statement. *Eur Respir J* 44:23–63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1183/09031936.00188313>.

Citation Alffenaar JWC, Akkerman OW, Bolhuis MS, Boeree MJ, de Lange WCM, van der Werf TS. 2015. Breakpoints and drug exposure are inevitably closely linked. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 59:1384. [doi:10.1128/AAC.04485-14](http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AAC.04485-14).

Address correspondence to J. W. C. Alffenaar, j.w.c.alfenaar@umcg.nl.

For the author reply, see [doi:10.1128/AAC.04688-14](http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AAC.04688-14).

Copyright © 2015, American Society for Microbiology. All Rights Reserved.

[doi:10.1128/AAC.04485-14](http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AAC.04485-14)