REVIEW

Bacillus anthracis and antibacterial agents

A. Bryskier

Aventis Pharma SA, Infectious Disease Group, Romainville, France

Anthrax is one of the oldest threats to humankind, and remains endemic in animals in many parts of the world. Human cases are infrequent, and some result from biological warfare. This review summarizes the current knowledge on the antibacterial activity of available antibiotics. For potential use in the most severe cases of anthrax, antibacterials need to exhibit potent in vitro activity, intracellular bioactivity, and suitable locations in lymph nodes. In animal models, it has been shown that doxycycline and fluoroquinolones are the most active compounds. There is a lack of data for animal models for macrolides and ketolides, some of them exhibiting good in vitro activity. However, systemic anthrax (inhalation or gastrointestinal) is mainly due to anthrax toxin, and therapy directed against intoxication is needed as basic treatment.

Keywords Anthrax, fluoroquinolones, doxycycline, β -lactams, macrolides, ketolides, antibiotics

Clin Microbiol Infect 2002; 8: 467-478

INTRODUCTION

Anthrax is one of the oldest documented infectious diseases and is believed to be the fifth Egyptian plague at the time of Moses, described in the book of Genesis (Exodus 9); clinical cases were also clearly reported by the ancient Romans and Hindus. In 25 BC, Virgil, in the third Georgic Period, described the illness [1]. Anthrax was probably the disease behind the 'Black Bane' which swept through Europe in the Middle Ages, causing a large number of human and animal deaths. A panzootic of anthrax that killed approximately one-half of the sheep in Europe in the mid-1800s resulted in intensive research by early microbiologists. Rayer, in 1850 [2], showed that administration of anthrax-contaminated blood containing 'small bodies' from a sick animal could induce anthrax in healthy sheep. This observation was confirmed in 1855, by Pollender [3], who was unable to prove the involvement of these organisms in anthrax. Davaine demonstrated in 1868 that the 'bacteridia' is the causative agent of anthrax [4]. In 1877, Bacillus anthracis was isolated

Fax: +33 1 49 91 50 20

E-mail: andre.bryskier@aventis.com

in pure culture from the vitreous humour of a bovine eye and was proved to be the anthrax etiologic agent by Robert Koch [5–7]. Louis Pasteur in 1881 [8] and William Greenfield in 1880 [9] were pioneers in anthrax vaccination [10].

B. anthracis is a Gram-positive spore-forming bacillus; it is the etiologic agent of anthrax.

Anthrax commonly occurs in both wild and domestic mammals (e.g. sheep, cattle, horses, pigs, goats, camels, antelopes, bison, elephants, hippotami, kudu, and other herbivores) [11]. The results of studies of agricultural outbreaks have suggested that conditions for multiplication are favorable when the soil has a pH above 6.0 and is rich in organic matter [12].

Humans can develop anthrax infection following exposure to the organism through infected animals or tissue from infected animals, or by direct exposure to *B. anthracis* [13,14]. Sporadic outbreaks have occurred as a result of both agricultural and military disruptions. Anthrax is endemic in rural India [15], Pakistan, Sudan and Egypt, as well as in many parts of Asia.

In the last 25 years, only a few major outbreaks have occurred. The first was in Zimbabwe in 1979– 80, during the Rhodesian civil war, when failure of veterinary vaccination programs led to a human epidemic, causing 6500 anthrax cases and 200 fatalities [16]. The second outbreak was in Paraguay in 1980 [17]. In France, some human cases were

Corresponding author and reprint requests: A. Bryskier, Aventis Pharma SA, Infectious Disease Group, 102 route de Noisy, 93230 Romainville, France Tel: +33 1 49 91 51 21

reported in 1997, as well as two animal anthrax outbreaks in two areas [18]. An accident in the former Soviet Union in the research center at Sverdlosk (Ekateringburg) led to the death of 66 adults due to inhaled anthrax [19]. Sixteen anthrax cases in humans were recorded in the UK between 1980 and 2000; all were cutaneous cases, and associated with workers who handled bone meal, animal carcasses and skin [20]. Twenty-five human cases of anthrax occurred between 1978 and 1981 in Switzerland in textile workers handling infected goat hair from Pakistan [21]. In 1992, a family outbreak of anthrax was reported in northern Italy [22]. In 1971, outbreaks were reported in sub-Saharan Africa-(Chad) [23] and The Gambia-due to the use of communal loofahs when bathing [24]. In Thailand, a gastrointestinal anthrax outbreak was reported after ingestion of contaminated waterbuffalo meat [25].

In the USA, the microorganism remains endemic in the soil of Texas, Oklahoma, and the lower Mississippi [26]. Since 1974, due to the risk of contamination, importation of goat skins have been banned in the USA from Haiti [20,27]. In the USA, from 1955 to 1987, there were 233 human cases of anthrax, and before the current crisis following the atrocities of 11 September 2001, the last human report was published in August 2001, in which one patient was exposed to *B. anthracis* during an epizootic anthrax among livestock in North Dakota [28]. Anthrax has been reported in deer in the USA and in wood buffalo in Canada [20].

Anthrax was used as a biological weapon for the first time by Moses. In the 20th century, Germany developed plans during World War I to contaminate sheep herds from Romania. In 1917-18, in Argentina, livestock destined for the Allied forces was infected with anthrax and B. mallei (glanders), resulting in the death of more than 200 mules [29]. Japan conducted biological warfare experiments in Manchuria from 1932 to 1945. In Unit 731, located near the town of Ping Fan, prisoners were infected with *B. anthracis* and other biological organisms [30]. The Japanese also deliberately contaminated water supplies and food with *B*. anthracis. In 1941-42, to be prepared for retaliation against German biological weapons, the British carried out bomb experiments with weaponized spores of *B. anthracis* on Gruinard Island near the coast of Scotland. Viable spores of anthrax persisted for 45 years after World War II, until 1986 when the island was decontaminated with formaldehyde and sea water [31]. From the 1950s to 1970, the USA experimented with biological weapons, including anthrax spores, until President Nixon terminated the program.

A Japanese terrorist group (Aum Shirikyo) dispersed anthrax aerosols in Tokyo subway stations on many occasions in 1995 without succeeding to induce anthrax, due to the fact that they used the avirulent (non-capsulated) strain 'Sterne' [20,32]. During the Gulf War, it was clearly demonstrated that Iraq possesses anthrax as a biological weapon.

At least three clinical pictures can be described: cutaneous infection, gastrointestinal infection, and inhaled (pulmonary disseminated infection). There have been no reports in the literature of direct human-to-human transmission. Most cases in industrialized countries are associated with exposure to animal products, especially goat hair imported from Turkey, Sudan and Pakistan, where anthrax remains common among domestic livestock.

ANTIBACTERIAL ACTIVITY OF ANTIBIOTICS

In vitro activity of antibacterial agents

In the different studies carried out to investigate the in vitro susceptibility of *B. anthracis* to various antibacterial agents, there has been variation in the methodologies used to determine MICs.

In the studies of Heine et al. [33,34], the microbroth dilution method in cation-adjusted Mueller– Hinton was used. The strains were added in microwells in the log growth phase at an inoculum of 5×10^4 CFU/mL. In the CDC study [35], strains were grown on TSA blood agar and an inoculum adjusted to 0.5 MacFarland was prepared in Mueller–Hinton broth. MICs were determined in microbroth cation-adjusted Mueller–Hinton. When comparing MICs from both studies, there is an up to two doubling dilution difference, especially for ciprofloxacin, chloramphenicol, and doxycycline, but not for penicillin G. In other studies, MICs were determined using an agar dilution method, with incubation at 37 °C overnight in ambient air [36,37].

It has been shown that, with β -lactam antibiotics, the percentage of spores in the inoculum did not influence MICs of benzylpenicillin, amoxicillin, and amoxicillin–clavulanate (Heine, personal communication). However, available antibacterials against *B. anthracis* are not active against spores.

B. anthracis KC-1 was tested for its susceptibility to all new investigational compounds (Tables 1

and 2) at Kyoto University (Japan). The KC-1 strain is highly susceptible to benzylpenicillin and ampicillin or amoxicillin, but less susceptible to N-acylor α -sulfopenicillins. Even if some oral cephems, such as cefaclor or cefadroxil, display high in vitro activity, all the cephems have low activity or are inactive against *B. anthracis*. Flomoxef, an oxa-1cephamycin, displays interesting activity, with an MIC of 0.2 mg/L, in comparison with latamoxef, which has an MIC of 1.56 mg/L. Among carbape-

Table 1 In vitro activity of β -lactam and aminoglycoside antibiotics against *Bacillus anthracis*

Antibiotics	MIC (mg/L)
Benzylpenicillin	0.015
Amoxicillin	0.025
Ampicillin	0.025
Piperacillin	0.78
Sulbenicillin	0.78
Cefaclor	0.78
Cefadroxil	0.78
Cephalexin	1.56
Cefuroxime	25
Cefixime	>100
Cefetamet	100
Cefteram	6.25
Ceftibuten	>100
Cefpodoxime	6.25
Cefdinir	1.56
Cefditoren	6.25
Cefazolin	0.09
Cefoperazone	1.56
Cefpimizole	12.5
Cefotaxime	6.25
Ceftriaxone	12.5
Ceftizoxime	25
Cefmenoxime	12.5
Cefotiam	3.13
Ceftazidine	50
Cefepime	12.5
Cefpirome	12.5
Cefsulodin	50
Cefodizime	25
Latamoxef	1.56
Flomoxef	0.20
Cefminox	3.13
Imipenem	0.012
Panipenem	≤ 0.006
Ritipenem	0.10
Aztreonam	>100
Carumonam	>100
Gentamicin	1.56
Netilmicin	1.56
Amikacin	6.25
Dibekacin	3.12
Arbekacin (souche TMS-1)	3.12

Adapted from Nishino et al. *Chemotherapy* (Tokyo). Numerous supplements on new antibacterials.

 Table 2 In vitro activity of fluoroquinolones, macrolides and other antibacterials against *Bacillus anthracis* KC-1

Antibiotics	MIC (mg/L)
Erythromycin A	0.20
Roxithromycin	0.39
Azithromycin	0.39
Clarithromycin	0.10
Josamycin	0.20
Midecamycin	0.39
Miokamycin	0.78
Rokitamycin	0.20
Leucomycin	0.39
Dalfopristin-quinupristin	0.20
Teicoplanin	0.20
Vancomycin	1.56
Minocycline	0.10
Nalidixic acid	6.25
Pipemidic acid	1.56
Miloxacin	3.13
Norfloxacin	0.39
Ofloxacin	0.10
d-ofloxacin	0.10
Levofloxacin	0.05
Sparfloxacin	0.05
Tosufloxacin	0.01
Pazufloxacin	0.05
Balofloxacin	0.05
Lomefloxacin	0.20
Enoxacin	0.39
Fleroxacin	0.39
Grepafloxacin	0.025

Adapted from Nishino et al. *Chemotherapy* (Tokyo). Numerous supplements on new antibacterials.

nems, panipenem seems to be highly active, as well as imipenem, with low MICs. Aminoglycosides have low activity. Vancomycin has low activity, but teicoplanin seems to exhibit good in vitro activity, with an MIC of 0.20 mg/L. In the macrolide field, clarithromycin exhibits the highest activother compounds share similar and ity, antibacterial activity. Fluoroquinolones are highly active; however, lomefloxacin, fleroxacin, enoxacin and norfloxacin are less active. MICs were determined using brain-heart infusion agar with an inoculum size of 10⁶CFU/mL. An inoculum effect has been demonstrated with β -lactams when increasing the size of inoculum from 10⁶ to 10^8 CFU/mL.

In other studies, more isolates have been tested, collected from different sources. In a study published in 1991, 22 isolates collected from cutaneous anthrax cases were shown to be highly susceptible to penicillin G, ampicillin, ofloxacin and ciprofloxacin (Table 3) [36]. In a second study, 70 isolates were tested, demonstrating good activity of benzylpenicillin and amoxicillin; however, two isolates were highly resistant to penicillin G (MIC 64 mg/ L), tetracycline and ciprofloxacin (Table 3) [37].

In vitro, *B. anthracis* is susceptible to rifampicin (MIC 0.5 mg/L); however, in an in vivo murine model, oral rifampicin caused only an increase in mean lifespan and had no significant effect on

survival rate [38]. Recently, the antibacterial susceptibilities of the isolates related to the recent infections in the USA, as well as other data, were released from the CDC [33–35,39] (Table 3).

A working group on MIC harmonization for *B. anthracis* was set up at the NCCLS subcommittee meeting, held in January 2002 in Tampa (Florida),

Compounds N 50 90 Range References Ciprofloxacin 65 0.06 0.06 0.03-0.12 [35] 28 0.03 0.03 0.01-0.125 [39] 96 0.06 0.06 0.03-0.06 [37] 22 0.06 0.06 0.03-0.06 [37] 22 0.06 0.06-0.2 [34] 18 0.25 0.03-2.0 [37] Gatifloxacin 1 - - 0.025 [44] 6 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.12 [35] Gatifloxacin 1 - - 0.025 [44] Pefloxacin 96 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.12 Nalidixic acid 96 0.125 0.25 0.03-1.0 [37] Nalidixic acid 96 0.25 0.25 0.03-1.0 [37] Nalidixic acid 96 0.25 0.12-2.0 [33] [34]	MIC (mg/L)			.)		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Compounds	$oldsymbol{N}$	50	90	Range	References
28 0.03 0.03 0.01-0.125 [39] 96 0.06 0.06 0.03-0.06 [37] 22 0.06 0.06-0.2 [34] Levofloxacin 1 $-$ - 96 0.125 0.25 0.03-2.0 [37] Gatifloxacin 1 $-$ - 0.025 [44] 20 0.12 0.12 0.12 [35] [36] Gatifloxacin 1 $-$ - 0.025 [44] 20 0.12 0.12 0.12 [37] Trovafloxacin 1 $-$ - 1.6 [44] Pefoxacin 96 0.125 0.5 0.03-1.0 [37] Nalidixic acid 96 4.0 8.0 0.03-2.0 [34] Carithromycin 18 0.5 0.5 0.12-2.0 [33] Carithromycin 18 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 12 0.5	Ciprofloxacin	65	0.06	0.06	0.03-0.12	[35]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		28	0.03	0.03	0.01-0.125	[39]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		96	0.06	0.06	0.03-0.06	[37]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		22	0.06	0.06	0.03-0.06	[37]
		18	0.25	2.0	0.06-0.2	[34]
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Levofloxacin	1				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		96	0.125	0.25	0.03-2.0	[37]
Gatifloxacin 1 - - 0.025 [44] 20 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.12 135] Trovafloxacin 1 - - 1.6 [44] Pefloxacin 96 0.125 0.5 0.03-1.0 [37] Nalidixic acid 96 0.25 0.25 0.03-1.0 [37] Ofloxacin 96 0.25 0.25 0.03-1.0 [37] Ofloxacin 96 0.25 0.25 0.03-1.0 [37] Ofloxacin 18 1.0 2.0 0.65-8.0 [34] Sparfloxacin 18 0.5 0.12 0.12-2.0 [33] Clarithromycin 28 0.125 0.12-2.0 [33] Clarithromycin A 28 1.0 2.0 0.5-8.0 [39] Li 0.5 0.5 0.5 Data on file, 1997 70 0.5 1.0 0.25-1.0 [37] Azithromycin 12 1.0 1.0 1.0+4.0 [37] Azithromycin 96 <		18	0.25	1.0	0.06-2.0	[34]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Gatifloxacin	1	_	_	0.025	[44]
96 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.12 Trovafloxacin11.6[44]Pefloxacin96 0.125 0.5 $0.03-1.0$ [37]Nalidixic acid96 4.0 8.0 $0.03-32$ [37]Ofloxacin96 0.25 0.25 $0.03-1.0$ [37]22 0.06 0.06 $0.03-0.06$ [36]18 1.0 2.0 $0.5-8.0$ [34]Sparfloxacin18 0.5 0.5 $0.12-2.0$ [33]Clarithromycin28 0.125 $0.06-0.125$ [39]18 0.5 1.0 $0.25-2.0$ [33]Erythromycin A28 1.0 2.0 $0.5-8.0$ [39]12 0.5 0.5 0.5 Data on file, 199770 0.5 1.0 $0.25-1.0$ [37]Azithromycin12 1.0 1.0 $1.0-4.0$ 12 0.25 0.25 $0.3-0.25$ Data on file, 1997Azithromycin12 0.25 0.25 $0.3-0.25$ Data on file, 2001*12 0.25 0.25 $0.3-0.25$ Data on file, 2001*24 0.5 1.0 $<0.5-1.0$ [35]13 0.25 0.5 $0.12-1.0$ [33]Clindamycin64 <0.5 1.0 $<0.5-1.0$ 18 0.25 0.5 $0.25-1.0$ [33]Quinupristin-dalfopristin18 1.0 1.0 $1.0-8.0$ 18 0.0		20	0.12	0.12	0.12	[35]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		96	0.12	0.12	0.12	
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Trovafloxacin	1	_	_	1.6	[44]
Nalidixic acid964.08.0 $0.03-32$ 37]Ofloxacin96 0.25 0.25 $0.03-1.0$ 37] 22 0.06 0.06 $0.03-0.66$ $[36]$ 32 0.06 0.06 $0.03-0.66$ $[34]$ Sparfloxacin18 0.5 0.5 $0.12-2.0$ $[33]$ Clarithromycin28 0.125 $0.125-2.0$ $[33]$ Erythromycin A28 1.0 2.0 $0.5-8.0$ $[39]$ Erythromycin A28 1.0 2.0 $0.5-8.0$ $[39]$ 12 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 12 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 12 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.7 20 0.5 1.0 $0.25-1.0$ $[37]$ 32 0.03 0.25 $0.3-1.0$ 0.5 42 1.0 1.0 $0.5-2.0$ 0.3 42 0.03 0.25 $0.3-1.0$ 0.5 42 0.25 0.25 $0.3-1.0$ 0.5 43 0.03 0.03 $0.01-0.125$ 39] 43 0.03 0.03 $0.01-0.125$ 39] 44 0.5 1.0 $20.5-1.0$ 135 45 0.05 $0.25-1.0$ 135 45 0.06 0.25 $0.25-1.0$ 137 45 0.06 20.5 $0.25-1.0$ 137 48 0.25 0.5 $0.25-1.0$ <t< td=""><td>Pefloxacin</td><td>96</td><td>0.125</td><td>0.5</td><td>0.03 - 1.0</td><td>[37]</td></t<>	Pefloxacin	96	0.125	0.5	0.03 - 1.0	[37]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Nalidixic acid	96	4.0	8.0	0.03-32	[37]
220.060.060.03-0.06136181.02.00.5-8.0[34]Sparfloxacin180.50.120.12-2.0[33]Clarithromycin280.1250.1250.06-0.125[39]Erythromycin A281.02.00.5-8.0[39]651.01.00.5-1.0[35]120.50.50.5Data on file, 1997700.51.00.25-1.0[37]Azithromycin121.01.01.0-4.0188.08.02.0-8.0[33]211.01.01.0-4.0[37]Azithromycin121.01.00.5-2.0188.08.02.0-8.0[33]Telithromycin960.030.250.03-0.25120.250.250.03-0.25Data on file, 199713120.250.250.03-0.25ABT 773280.030.030.01-0.12519120.250.50.12-1.0180.250.50.12-1.019180.01.00.12-0.510120.250.25-1.0101.00.12-0.5111.00.12-0.5120.250.25-1.01314141.01.0150.50.25-1.0160.60.06-128173280.0618	Ofloxacin	96	0.25	0.25	0.03-1.0	[37]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		22	0.06	0.06	0.03-0.06	[36]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		18	1.0	2.0	0.5-8.0	[34]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Sparfloxacin	18	0.5	0.5	0.12-2.0	[33]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Clarithromycin	28	0.125	0.125	0.06-0.125	[39]
Erythromycin A281.02.00.5–8.0[39] 65 1.01.00.5–8.0[39]120.50.50.5Data on file, 1997700.51.00.25–1.0[37]Azithromycin121.01.00.5–2.0Data on file, 1997188.08.02.0–8.0[33]Telithromycin960.030.250.03–1.0Data on file, 2001*120.250.250.03–0.25Data on file, 2001*120.250.250.03–0.25Data on file, 1997ABT 773280.030.030.01–0.125Clindamycin64 ≤ 0.5 1.0 $\leq 0.5-1.0$ [33]180.250.50.12–1.0[33]960.120.250.25–1.0Data on file, 1997Quinupristin–dalfopristin181.01.00.12–0.5184.01.0–8.0[34]Penicillin G65 ≤ 0.06 ≤ 0.06 $\leq 0.06-128$ 960.128.00.12–16[37]1864>642.0 to >64[33]960.128.00.12–16[37]1864>642.0 to >64[33]960.128.00.12–16[37]1864>642.0 to >64[33]960.128.00.12–16[37]1960.128.00.12–16[37]1971864 <td></td> <td>18</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>0.25-2.0</td> <td>[33]</td>		18	0.5	1.0	0.25-2.0	[33]
Ley lation y late 1LeyIntLeyIntIntIntIntIntIntIntIntInt 65 1.01.00.5-1.0[35]120.50.50.5Data on file, 1997700.51.00.25-1.0[37]961.01.01.0-4.0[37]Azithromycin121.01.00.5-2.0Data on file, 1997188.08.02.0-8.0[33]Telithromycin960.030.250.03-1.0Data on file, 2001*120.250.250.03-0.25Data on file, 1997ABT 773280.030.030.01-0.125[39]Clindamycin64 ≤ 0.5 1.0 $\leq 0.5-1.0$ [35]180.250.50.12-1.0[33]960.120.250.25-1.0[37]Roxithromycin120.50.50.25-1.0[37]Quinupristin-dalfopristin181.01.00.12-0.5[33]Linezolid182.04.01.0-8.0[34]Penicillin G65 ≤ 0.06 ≤ 0.06 $\leq 0.06-128$ [35]700.060.1250.01-64[37]1864>642.0 to >64[33]660.128.00.12-16[37]18166416 to >64[33]960.128.00.12-16[37]	Erythromycin A	28	1.0	2.0	0.5-8.0	[39]
1010101010101010120.50.50.5Data on file, 1997700.51.00.25-1.0[37]961.01.01.0-4.0[37]Azithromycin121.01.00.5-2.0Data on file, 1997188.08.02.0-8.0[33]Telithromycin960.030.250.03-1.0Data on file, 2001*120.250.250.03-0.25Data on file, 1997ABT 773280.030.030.01-0.125[39]Clindamycin64 ≤ 0.5 1.0 $\leq 0.5-1.0$ [35]180.250.50.12-1.0[33]960.120.250.25-1.0[37]Roxithromycin120.50.50.12-1.0[33]180.01.00.12-0.5[33]Linezolid182.04.01.0-8.0[34]Penicillin G65 ≤ 0.06 ≤ 0.06 $\leq 0.06-128$ [35]1864>642.0 to >64[37]26triaxone7416324.0-32[35]18166416 to >64[33]	21 y throm y chi 11	65	1.0	1.0	0.5-1.0	[35]
12 0.5 1.0 $0.25-1.0$ $[37]$ 96 1.0 1.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[37]$ Azithromycin 12 1.0 1.0 $0.5-2.0$ Data on file, 1997 18 8.0 8.0 $2.0-8.0$ $[33]$ Telithromycin 96 0.03 0.25 $0.03-1.0$ Data on file, 2001* 12 0.25 0.25 $0.03-0.25$ Data on file, 2001* 12 0.25 0.25 $0.03-0.25$ Data on file, 1997ABT 773 28 0.03 0.03 $0.01-0.125$ Clindamycin 64 ≤ 0.5 1.0 $\leq 0.5-1.0$ 18 0.25 0.5 $0.12-1.0$ 18 0.25 0.5 $0.12-1.0$ 18 0.25 0.5 $0.25-1.0$ 18 0.25 0.5 $0.25-1.0$ 18 0.06 $0.12-0.5$ $[33]$ Linezolid 18 2.0 4.0 $1.0-8.0$ 18 64 >64 2.0 $to >64$ 20 0.12 8.0 $0.12-16$ 18 64 2.0 $0.25-16$ 96 0.12 8.0 $0.12-16$ 18 64 2.0 $to >64$ 33 96 0.12 8.0 $0.12-16$ $[37]$ 20 16 32 $4.0-32$ 35 16 64 16 18 16 64 16 18 16 64 16 18 16 <td></td> <td>12</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>Data on file 1997</td>		12	0.5	0.5	0.5	Data on file 1997
Azithromycin101.01.01.0-4.0[37]Azithromycin121.01.0 $0.5-2.0$ Data on file, 1997188.08.0 $2.0-8.0$ [33]Telithromycin960.03 0.25 $0.03-1.0$ Data on file, 2001*12 0.25 0.25 $0.03-0.25$ Data on file, 2001*ABT 77328 0.03 0.03 $0.01-0.125$ [39]Clindamycin64 ≤ 0.5 1.0 $\leq 0.5-1.0$ [35]18 0.25 0.5 $0.12-1.0$ [33]96 0.12 0.25 $0.25-1.0$ [37]Roxithromycin12 0.5 0.5 $0.25-1.0$ 18 0.25 0.5 $0.25-1.0$ [37]Quinupristin-dalfopristin18 1.0 1.0 $0.12-0.5$ 18 0.06 $\leq 0.06-128$ [35]19 0.06 0.125 $0.01-64$ [37]18 64 >64 2.0 to >64 [33]96 0.12 8.0 $0.12-16$ [37]18 64 >64 2.0 to >64 [33]96 0.12 8.0 $0.12-16$ [37]18 64 2.0 to >64 [33]96 0.12 8.0 $0.12-16$ [37]19 16 32 $4.0-32$ [35]10 16 64 16 to >64 [33]		70	0.5	1.0	0.25-1.0	[37]
Azithromycin121.01.01.01.01.01.01.01.0188.08.02.0-8.0[33]Telithromycin960.030.250.03-1.0Data on file, 1997ABT 773280.030.030.01-0.125[39]Clindamycin64 ≤ 0.5 1.0 $\leq 0.5-1.0$ [35]960.120.250.25-1.0[37]Roxithromycin120.50.50.12-1.0960.120.250.25-1.0[37]Quinupristin-dalfopristin181.01.00.12-0.5182.04.01.0-8.0[34]Penicillin G65 ≤ 0.06 ≤ 0.06 $\leq 0.06-128$ [35]1864>642.0 to >64[33]2960.128.00.12-16[37]Ceftriaxone7416324.0-32[35]18166416 to >64[33]		96	1.0	1.0	1.0-4.0	[37]
Initial of the second secon	Azithromycin	12	1.0	1.0	0.5-2.0	Data on file 1997
Telithromycin100.00.0100.010	<i>i</i> <u>i</u>	18	8.0	8.0	2.0-8.0	[33]
Terminolity chi12 0.25 0.125 $0.03 - 0.25$ Data on file, 1997ABT 77328 0.03 0.03 $0.01 - 0.125$ [39]Clindamycin64 ≤ 0.5 1.0 $\leq 0.5 - 1.0$ [35]8 0.25 0.5 $0.12 - 1.0$ [33]96 0.12 0.25 $0.25 - 1.0$ [37]Roxithromycin12 0.5 0.5 $0.25 - 1.0$ [37]Quinupristin-dalfopristin18 1.0 1.0 $0.12 - 0.5$ [33]Linezolid18 2.0 4.0 $1.0 - 8.0$ [34]Penicillin G65 ≤ 0.06 $\leq 0.06 - 128$ [35]70 0.06 0.125 $0.01 - 64$ [37]18 64 >64 2.0 to >64 [33]96 0.12 8.0 $0.12 - 16$ [37]Ceftriaxone74 16 32 $4.0 - 32$ [35]18 16 64 16 to >64 [33]	Telithromycin	96	0.03	0.25	0.03-1.0	Data on file 2001*
ABT 77328 0.03 0.03 $0.01-0.125$ $[39]$ Clindamycin64 ≤ 0.5 1.0 $\leq 0.5-1.0$ $[35]$ 18 0.25 0.5 $0.12-1.0$ $[33]$ 96 0.12 0.25 $0.25-1.0$ $[37]$ Roxithromycin12 0.5 0.5 $0.25-1.0$ $[37]$ Quinupristin-dalfopristin18 1.0 1.0 $0.12-0.5$ $[33]$ Linezolid18 2.0 4.0 $1.0-8.0$ $[34]$ Penicillin G65 ≤ 0.06 $\leq 0.06-128$ $[35]$ 70 0.06 0.125 $0.01-64$ $[37]$ 18 64 >64 2.0 to >64 $[33]$ Ceftriaxone74 16 32 $4.0-32$ $[35]$ 18 16 64 16 to >64 $[33]$	renditiontychi	12	0.00	0.25	0.03-0.25	Data on file 1997
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	ABT 773	28	0.03	0.03	0.01-0.125	[39]
Contracting can be a set of the set of	Clindamycin	64	< 0.5	1.0	<0.5-1.0	[35]
10 0.12 0.25 0.12 10 10 96 0.12 0.25 $0.25-1.0$ $[37]$ Roxithromycin 12 0.5 0.5 $0.25-1.0$ Data on file, 1997Quinupristin-dalfopristin 18 1.0 1.0 $0.12-0.5$ $[33]$ Linezolid 18 2.0 4.0 $1.0-8.0$ $[34]$ Penicillin G 65 ≤ 0.06 ≤ 0.06 $\leq 0.06-128$ $[35]$ 70 0.06 0.125 $0.01-64$ $[37]$ 18 64 >64 2.0 to >64 $[33]$ Ceftriaxone 74 16 32 $4.0-32$ $[35]$ 18 16 64 16 to >64 $[33]$	Childunty chi	18	0.25	0.5	0.12-1.0	[33]
Roxithromycin12 0.12 0.12 0.12 10		96	0.12	0.25	0.12 1.0	[37]
Rotation year12 0.0 <td>Roxithromycin</td> <td>12</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>0.25-1.0</td> <td>Data on file 1997</td>	Roxithromycin	12	0.5	0.5	0.25-1.0	Data on file 1997
Quintiplishin danoprishin101.01.0 0.12 0.02 100 100 Linezolid182.04.0 $1.0-8.0$ $[34]$ Penicillin G65 ≤ 0.06 ≤ 0.06 $\leq 0.06-128$ $[35]$ 700.060.1250.01-64 $[37]$ 1864 >64 2.0 to >64 $[33]$ 960.128.00.12-16 $[37]$ Ceftriaxone7416324.0-32 $[35]$ 18166416 to >64 $[33]$	Quinupristin_dalfopristin	18	1.0	1.0	0.12-0.5	[33]
Intercent101.01.01.01.01.01.1Penicillin G 65 ≤ 0.06 ≤ 0.06 $\leq 0.06-128$ [35]70 0.06 0.125 $0.01-64$ [37]18 64 >64 2.0 to >64 [33]96 0.12 8.0 $0.12-16$ [37]Ceftriaxone7416 32 $4.0-32$ [35]1816 64 16 to >64 [33]	Linezolid	18	2.0	4.0	10-80	[34]
remember 60 20.00 20.00 20.00 120 $[00]$ 70 0.06 0.125 $0.01-64$ $[37]$ 18 64 >64 2.0 to >64 $[33]$ 96 0.12 8.0 $0.12-16$ $[37]$ Ceftriaxone74 16 32 $4.0-32$ $[35]$ 18 16 64 16 to >64 $[33]$	Penicillin G	65	< 0.06	<0.06	<0.06-128	[35]
16 6.60 6.125 6.61 617 $[57]$ 18 64 >64 2.0 to >64 $[33]$ 96 0.12 8.0 $0.12-16$ $[37]$ Ceftriaxone 74 16 32 $4.0-32$ $[35]$ 18 16 64 16 to >64 $[33]$		70	0.06	0.125	0.01-64	[37]
10 04 >04 2.0 10 $[13]$ 96 0.12 8.0 $0.12-16$ $[37]$ Ceftriaxone 74 16 32 $4.0-32$ $[35]$ 18 16 64 16 $to >64$ $[33]$		18	64	_64	2.0 to > 64	[33]
Ceftriaxone 74 16 32 $4.0-32$ $[35]$ 1816 64 16 to >64 $[33]$		96	0.12	80	0.12-16	[37]
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Ceftriaxone	74	16	32	4.0-32	[35]
	Certifiaxone	18	16	64	16 to > 61	[33]
Ampicillin 22 0.03 0.03 $0.01-0.03$ 1361	Ampicillin	22	0.03	0.03	$10\ 10\ >04$	[36]
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	mpcmm	18	61	-61	$4.0 t_{0} > 64$	[33]
$\Delta mnicillin-sulhactam 22 0.01 0.01 0.01-0.02 [24]$	Ampicillin_sulbactam	10 22	0.01	0.01	1.0 10 > 04 0 01_0 03	[36]
Amovicillin 70 0.01 0.01 $0.01-0.05$ $[30]$	Amovicillin	70	0.01	0.01	0.01-0.03	[30]
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		22	0.00	0.125	0.01-04	[36]
18 64 >64 $80 to >64$ [33]		18	64	>64	80 to >64	[33]

Table 3 In vitro susceptibility of Bacillus anthracis

Table 3 continued

Compounds N 50 90 Range References Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid 22 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 Piperacillin 22 0.01 0.01 0.02 5.5 33 Piperacillin 22 0.06 0.06 0.012-05 33 Mezlacillin 22 0.06 0.06 0.01-06 33 Cefazolin 22 0.01 0.01 0.02-32 33 Cefazolin 22 0.01 0.01 0.01-06 33 Ceritroxime 22 0.44 16 0.23 33 Ceritroxime 22 64 64 16-64 33 mipenem 18 6.00 0.12 0.10-65 33 Meropenem 18 0.06 0.12 0.10-20 37 GAP-96 18 0.06 0.12 0.03-0.05 34 Doxycycline 18 0.06 0.12 0.03-0.06 <th></th> <th></th> <th colspan="4">MIC (mg/L)</th>			MIC (mg/L)			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Compounds	N	50	90	Range	References
Amoxidilin-davulanic acid 22 0.01 0.01 0.01 66 Piperacillin 22 0.25 0.5 0.125-0.5 66 Piperacillin 22 0.06 0.06 0.01-0.06 56 Verlacillin 22 0.00 0.01 0.01-0.06 56 Cefazolin 22 0.01 0.01 0.01-0.03 56 Cephalothin 96 0.5 16 0.12-32 137 Cehroxime 22 64 64 164 166 Cehroxime 22 64 64 164 137 Imipenem 18 90.05 0.5 90.3 91.2 122.20 137 Meropenem 18 0.06 0.12 20.03-0.5 138 139 Meropenem 18 0.06 0.12 20.03-0.5 137 GAR-936 18 0.12 0.12-2.0 137 Cefazolin 22 0.2 0.0 0.06-1.0 <td></td> <td>96</td> <td>0.12</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>0.12–16</td> <td>[37]</td>		96	0.12	4.0	0.12–16	[37]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Amoxicillin–clavulanic acid	22	0.01	0.01	0.01	[36]
Piperacillin 22 0.25 0.5 0.125-05 [6] 96 1.0 1.0 0.25-32 [37] Mczlacillin 22 0.06 0.06 0.01-0.06 [36] Cefizolin 22 0.01 0.01 0.01-0.3 [36] Cephalabhin 96 0.5 1.6 0.12-32 [37] Cetroxine 22 64 64 1.6 to >64 [33] Cetroxine 96 0.12 0.018 to >64 [33] Imipenem 18 9.00 0.12 0.012-0.12 [33] Meropenem 18 0.06 0.12 0.02-0.12 [33] GAR-936 18 0.12 0.12 0.02-0.5 [34] Doxycycline 18 0.06 0.12 0.03-0.5 [34] Doxycycline 18 0.06 0.12 0.02-0.0 [37] Cetroxycline 74 4.0 4.0 2.0 [37] Chioramphenicol<		18	1.0	2.0	0.5–16	[33]
1864>>64161616131Mezlacillin220.060.060.01-0.03156Cefazolin220.010.010.01-0.03156Caphalothin960.5160.12-32137Ceturoxime22646416-64133To32641.0-64133Imipenem18 ≤ 0.03 0.120.030.5Meropenem180.060.120.12-20137Meropenem180.060.120.030.5131Rifampicin65 ≤ 0.25 0.5 $\leq 0.03-0.12$ 133Rifampicin65 ≤ 0.25 0.5 $< 0.03-0.12$ 131Oxycycline180.120.120.12-2.0137GAR-936180.120.120.12-0.25134Doxycycline180.060.120.03-0.16135Choramphenicol744.04.02.0-4.0137Z2.02.01.0-2.0137136Tetracycline650.120.12-2.0137Tetracycline742.02.01.0-4.0137Vancomycin742.02.01.0-4.0137Vancomycin182.02.01.0-4.0137Vancomycin182.02.01.0-4.0133Cortinoxazole182.02.01.0-4.0133Cortinoxazo	Piperacillin	22	0.25	0.5	0.125-0.5	[36]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		18	64	>64	16 to >64	[33]
		96	1.0	1.0	0.25–32	[37]
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Mezlacillin	22	0.06	0.06	0.01-0.06	[36]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Cefazolin	22	0.01	0.01	0.01-0.03	[36]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		0.5	1.0	1.0	0.5-8.0	[33]
$\begin{array}{cccc} Cefuroxime & 22 & 64 & 64 & 16-64 & 361 \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $	Cephalothin	96	0.5	16	0.12-32	[37]
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Cefuroxime	22	64	64	16-64	[36]
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		18	64	>64	16 to >64	[33]
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		70	32	64	1.0-64	[37]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Imipenem	18	≤ 0.03	0.12	≤ 0.03 to > 64	[33]
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		96	0.12	0.12	0.12-2.0	[37]
Rifampicin 65 ≤ 0.25 0.5 $\leq 0.25-0.5$ [35] 96 0.12 0.12 0.12-2.0 [37] GAR-936 18 0.12 0.5 $< 0.03-0.5$ [34] Doxycycline 18 0.06 0.12 $< 0.03-0.25$ [34] Doxycycline 65 0.03 0.06 0.03-0.25 [34] Tetracycline 65 0.03 0.06 0.03-0.06 [35] Tetracycline 70 0.125 0.125 0.06-1.0 [37] Chloramphenicol 74 4.0 4.0 2.0-8.0 [35] 2 2.0 2.0 1.0-2.0 [36] 18 16 16 8.0-64 [33] 70 4.0 4.0 2.0 2.0 [36] 71 2.0 2.0 1.0-4.0 [37] 72 1.0 1.0 0.25-1.0 [36] 74 2.0 2.0 1.0-4.0 [33] Ceicoplanin 96 0.25 0.5 0.12-2.0 [37]	Meropenem	18	0.06	0.12	$\leq 0.03-012$	[33]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Rifampicin	65	≤ 0.25	0.5	$\leq 0.25 - 0.5$	[35]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		18	0.5	0.5	$\leq 0.03 - 1.0$	[33]
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		96	0.12	0.12	0.12-2.0	[37]
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	GAR-936	18	0.12	0.5	<0.03-0.5	[34]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Doxycycline	18	0.06	0.12	<0.03-0.25	[34]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		96	0.12	0.12	0.12-0.25	[37]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Tetracycline	65	0.03	0.06	0.03-0.06	[35]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		70	0.125	0.125	0.06-1.0	[37]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Chloramphenicol	74	4.0	4.0	2.0-8.0	[35]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		22	2.0	2.0	1.0-2.0	[36]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		18	16	16	8.0-64	[33]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		70	4.0	4.0	2.0-4.0	[37]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		96	2.0	2.0	1.0-4.0	[37]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Vancomycin	74	2.0	2.0	0.5–2.0	[35]
18 2.0 2.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[34]$ Teicoplanin96 0.25 0.5 $0.12-2.0$ $[37]$ Daptomycin18 2.0 2.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[33]$ Novobiocin18 2.0 2.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[33]$ Clofazimine18 16 32 $8.0-64$ $[33]$ Co-trimoxazole 22 $3.2/16$ $3.2/16$ $1.6/8-3.2/16$ $[36]$ 0 $>4/76$ $>4/76$ $>4/76$ $[37]$ Sulfamethoxazole18 >64 >64 >64 $[33]$ Trimethoprim18 >64 >64 64 $[33]$ Oritavancin18 0.25 0.5 $<0.03-1.0$ $[35]$ Cefotaxime22 32 32 $8.0-32$ $[36]$ Ceftriaxone96 32 32 $4.0-64$ $[37]$ 65 16 32 32 $4.0-64$ $[33]$ Ceftriaxine22 32 32 $4.0-32$ $[35]$ Cefotetan18 16 16 8.0 >64 $[33]$ Cefotetan18 16 16 8.0 >64 $[33]$ Cefoyatine22 2.0 4.0 $0.5-4.0$ $[36]$ Cefoyatine22 2.0 4.0 $0.5-4.0$ $[36]$ Cefotetan18 >64 >64 >64 $[33]$ Ceforetan18 2.0 2.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[36]$ Cefoyatin 96 8 32 </td <td></td> <td>22</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>0.25-1.0</td> <td>[36]</td>		22	1.0	1.0	0.25-1.0	[36]
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		18	2.0	2.0	1.0-4.0	[34]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Teicoplanin	96	0.25	0.5	0.12–2.0	[37]
Novobiocin182.02.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[33]$ Clofazimine181632 $8.0-64$ $[33]$ Co-trimoxazole22 $3.2/16$ $3.2/16$ $1.6/8-3.2/16$ $[36]$ 18>64>642.0 to >64 $[33]$ Sulfamethoxazole18>64>64>64 $[33]$ Trimethoprim18>64>64 64 $[33]$ Oritavancin180.250.5<0.03-1.0	Daptomycin	18	2.0	2.0	1.0-4.0	[33]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Novobiocin	18	2.0	2.0	1.0-4.0	[33]
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Clotazimine	18	16	32	8.0-64	[33]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Co-trimoxazole	22	3.2/16	3.2/16	1.6/8-3.2/16	[36]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		18	>64	>64	2.0 to > 64	[33]
Sulfamethoxazole18>64>64 >64 [33]Trimethoprim18>64>64 $(4$ $[33]$ Oritavancin180.250.5 $<0.03-1.0$ $[35]$ Cefotaxime223232 $8.0-32$ $[36]$ 1832>6416 to >64 $[33]$ Ceftriaxone963232 $4.0-64$ $[37]$ 65163232 $4.0-32$ $[35]$ Ceftizoxime223232 $4.0-64$ $[36]$ Cefotetan181616 8.0 to >64 $[33]$ Ceftazidime22128128128-256 $[36]$ Cefoperazone222.0 4.0 $0.5-4.0$ $[36]$ Cefoxitin96832 $1.0-64$ $[37]$ Aztreonam22>128>128>128 $[36]$ B>64>64>64 $[33]$ Gentamicin22 0.06 0.125 $0.03-0.25$ $[36]$ 18 2.0 2.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[33]$ Gentamicin22 0.06 0.125 $0.06-0.5$ $[37]$ 96 0.15 0.5 $0.12-5.0$ $[37]$		96	>4/76	>4/76	>4/76	[37]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Sulfamethoxazole	18	>64	>64	>64	[33]
Ornavancin18 0.25 0.5 $<0.05-1.0$ $[35]$ Cefotaxime22 32 32 $8.0-32$ $[36]$ 18 32 >64 16 to >64 $[33]$ Ceftriaxone96 32 32 $4.0-64$ $[37]$ 65 16 32 32 $4.0-32$ $[35]$ Ceftizoxime22 32 32 $4.0-32$ $[35]$ Ceftotetan181616 8.0 to >64 $[33]$ Ceftotetan18 16 16 8.0 to >64 $[33]$ Cefoperazone22 2.0 4.0 $0.5-4.0$ $[36]$ Cefoxitin96 8 32 $1.0-64$ $[37]$ Aztreonam22 >128 >128 >128 $[36]$ Gentamicin22 0.06 0.125 $0.03-0.25$ $[36]$ 70 0.12 0.12 $0.06-0.5$ $[37]$ 96 0.15 0.5 $0.12-5.0$ $[37]$	Oriteren ein	18	>64	>64	64	[33]
Cerotaxime 22 32 32 32 $60-32$ $[36]$ 18 32 32 16 $[33]$ Ceftriaxone96 32 32 $4.0-64$ $[37]$ 65 16 32 32 $4.0-32$ $[35]$ Ceftizoxime 22 32 32 $16-64$ $[36]$ Cefotetan181616 8.0 to >64 $[33]$ Ceftzidime 22 128 $128-256$ $[36]$ Cefoperazone 22 2.0 4.0 $0.5-4.0$ $[33]$ Cefoxitin96 8 32 $1.0-64$ $[37]$ Aztreonam 22 >128 >128 >128 $[36]$ Gentamicin 22 0.06 0.125 $0.03-0.25$ $[36]$ 18 >64 >64 >64 $[33]$ Gentamicin 22 0.06 0.125 $0.03-0.25$ $[36]$ 18 2.0 2.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[33]$ 70 0.12 0.12 $0.06-0.5$ $[37]$ 96 0.15 0.5 $0.12-5.0$ $[37]$	Oritavancin	18	0.25	0.5	< 0.03-1.0	[35]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Cefotaxime	22	32	32	8.0-32	[36]
Ceftriaxone96 52 52 $4.0-64$ $[57]$ 65 16 32 32 $4.0-64$ $[57]$ 65 16 32 32 $4.0-32$ $[35]$ Ceftizoxime22 32 32 $16-64$ $[36]$ Cefotetan181616 8.0 to >64 $[33]$ Ceftzidime22 128 128 $128-256$ $[36]$ Cefoperazone22 2.0 4.0 $0.5-4.0$ $[36]$ Cefoxitin96 8 32 $1.0-64$ $[37]$ Aztreonam22 >128 >128 >128 $[36]$ Gentamicin22 0.06 0.125 $0.03-0.25$ $[36]$ 18 >64 >64 >64 $[33]$ Gentamicin22 0.06 0.125 $0.03-0.25$ $[36]$ 18 2.0 2.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[33]$ 96 0.15 0.5 $0.12-5.0$ $[37]$	Cathrievana	18	3Z 22	>04	10 t0 > 04	[33]
6516 52 52 $4.0-52$ $[55]$ Ceftizoxime22 32 32 $16-64$ $[36]$ Ceftotetan181616 8.0 to >64 $[33]$ Ceftazidime22 128 128 $128-256$ $[36]$ 18 >64 >64 >64 $[33]$ Cefoperazone22 2.0 4.0 $0.5-4.0$ $[36]$ Cefoxitin968 32 $1.0-64$ $[37]$ Aztreonam22 >128 >128 >128 $[36]$ Gentamicin22 0.06 0.125 $0.03-0.25$ $[36]$ 18 >64 >64 >64 $[33]$ Gentamicin22 0.06 0.125 $0.03-0.25$ $[36]$ 18 2.0 2.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[33]$ 70 0.12 0.12 $0.06-0.5$ $[37]$ 96 0.15 0.5 $0.12-5.0$ $[37]$	Certriaxone	96	32	32	4.0-64	[37]
Certizorine22323210-64[56]Cefotetan1816168.0 to >64[33]Cefotetan22128128128-256[36]18>64>64>64[33]Cefoperazone222.04.00.5-4.0[36]Cefoxitin968321.0-64[37]Aztreonam22>128>128>128[36]Gentamicin220.060.1250.03-0.25[36]182.02.01.0-4.0[33]700.120.120.06-0.5[37]960.150.50.12-5.0137]	65 Cofficiencia	10	3Z 22	3Z 22	4.0-32	[35]
Cerotetal16166.0 to >64[55]Ceftazidime22128128128-256[36]18>64>64>64[33]Cefoperazone222.04.0 0.5 -4.0[36]Cefoxitin96832 1.0 -64[37]Aztreonam22>128>128>128[36]Gentamicin220.06 0.125 0.03 - 0.25 [36]182.02.0 1.0 - 4.0 [33]60.120.12 0.06 - 0.5 [37]960.150.5 0.12 - 5.0 [37]	Cefeteter	10	3Z 16	3Z 16	10-04	[30]
Certazionne 22 128 126 $126-256$ $[56]$ 18>64>64[33]Cefoperazone 22 2.0 4.0 $0.5-4.0$ $[36]$ Cefoxitin968 32 $1.0-64$ $[37]$ Aztreonam 22 >128>128>128 $[36]$ B>64>64>64 $[33]$ Gentamicin 22 0.06 0.125 $0.03-0.25$ $[36]$ 18 2.0 2.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[33]$ 70 0.12 0.12 $0.06-0.5$ $[37]$ 96 0.15 0.5 $0.12-5.0$ 1371	Celteridime	10	10	10	0.0 10 >04	[33]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Centaziulline	22 19	120	120	120-200	[33]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Cofoporazono	10	>04	>0 4 4.0	>0 1 05 40	[36]
Ceroxini 90 6 52 $1.0-64$ $[37]$ Aztreonam 22 >128 >128 >128 $[36]$ 18 >64 >64 >64 $[33]$ Gentamicin 22 0.06 0.125 $0.03-0.25$ $[36]$ 18 2.0 2.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[33]$ 70 0.12 0.12 $0.06-0.5$ $[37]$ 96 0.15 0.5 $0.12-5.0$ $[37]$	Cetoperazone	22	∠.U o	4.0	0.0-4.0	[30]
Azirconant 22 >120>120>120[56]18>64>64[33]Gentamicin220.060.1250.03-0.25[36]182.02.01.0-4.0[33]700.120.120.06-0.5[37]960.150.50.12-5.0[37]	Aztroonam	90 22	0	>∠ >129	1.0-04	[37]
Gentamicin 22 0.06 0.125 $0.03-0.25$ $[36]$ 182.02.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[33]$ 70 0.12 0.12 $0.06-0.5$ $[37]$ 96 0.15 0.5 $0.12-5.0$ $[37]$		22 19	>120	>120	>120	[33]
22 0.00 0.125 0.05-0.25 [56] 18 2.0 2.0 1.0-4.0 [33] 70 0.12 0.12 0.06-0.5 [37] 96 0.15 0.5 0.12-5.0 [37]	Contamicin	10	>0 4 0.06	>0 4 0 1 2 5	20 1 0.02_0.25	[36]
10 2.0 2.0 $1.0-4.0$ $[33]$ 70 0.12 0.12 $0.06-0.5$ $[37]$ 96 0.15 0.5 $0.12-5.0$ $[37]$	Gentallilli	∠∠ 1Q	2.00	2.125	1040	[33]
96 0.15 0.5 0.12 0.00-0.5 [37]		10 70	∠.0 0.1 2	2.0 0.1 2	0.06-0.5	[37]
		96	0.12	0.5	0.12-5.0	[37]

Compounds	N	MIC (mg/L)				
		50	90	Range	References	
Streptomycin	22	2.0	4.0	1.0-4.0	[36]	
	18	4.0	8.0	4.0-16	[33]	
	70	1.0	1.0	0.5 - 4.0	[37]	
	96	1.0	1.0	0.5-2.0	[37]	
Amikacin	22	0.03	0.06	0.03-0.06	[36]	
	18	2.0	2.0	1.0-2.0	[33]	
Netilmicin	22	0.06	0.125	0.01-0.125	[36]	
	18	2.0	4.0	2.0-8.0	[33]	
Tobramycin	18	2.0	4.0	1.0-16	[33]	
	22	0.25	1.0	0.25 - 1.0	[36]	

Table 3 continued

*Partly replaced by Antibiotic susceptibilities of 96 isolates of Bacillus anthracis isolated in France between 1994 and 2000. Cavallo JD, Ramisse F, Girardet M, Vaissaire J, Mock M, Hernandez E. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2002; 46: 2307–9.

to propose the most accurate method to determine in vitro activity against *B. anthracis*.

When comparing the microbroth dilution methods and E test strip methods for *B. anthracis*, it was demonstrated that MICs obtained with the E test were up to eight times lower than those obtained with the reference methods [34,35].

Resistant mutants

Resistance can be developed experimentally to most of the current antibacterial agents.

Rifampicin

In the population of various strains of *B. anthracis*, formation of spontaneous rifampicin-resistant mutants was detected at a rate of 10^{-8} . The level of rifampicin resistance in the mutants ranged from 16 to 512 mg/L. The clones of the rifampicin-resistant population of the virulent strain CH-7 were heterogeneous in their biological properties [40]. Rifampicin-resistant mutants were selected from UV-light-treated attenuated B. anthracis (strain Ames pXO1-pXO2), and spontaneous rifampicinresistant mutants were also isolated on selective media. Mutations conferring rifampicin resistance are commonly due to mutations in the β -subunit of RNA polymerase, encoded by the *rpoB* gene. These mutations are located in four clusters in the Nterminal section. The majority of mutations occur in cluster I. Twelve amino acid positions are known to interact directly with rifampicin. Mutations were observed at four of these positions for *B. anthracis*. Of four amino acid mutations surrounding the rifampicin-binding pocket, two of these changesposition 450 (Ser \rightarrow Cys) and 468 (Lys \rightarrow Gln)—are unique for *B. anthracis*. There is a greater diversity among UV-generated rifampicin-resistant *B. anthracis* strains (positions 472, 468, 459, 467, 450, 453, 450, 454 and 467) than among spontaneously occurring mutants (positions 454, 467 and 472). The spontaneous rate of resistance was estimated at 1.57×10^{-9} mutations/generation by a Luria–Delbrück fluctuation test [41,42].

Fluoroquinolones

In a serial passage study, the potential for ofloxacin and doxycycline to select mutants of the vaccine strain *B. anthracis* Sterne was investigated. Repeated subcultures of *B. anthracis* Sterne increased the MIC of ofloxacin on the 13th passage from 0.20 mg/L to 0.80 mg/L. The MIC of 0.8 mg/ L was stable for the next five passages. However, *B. anthracis* remains susceptible to ofloxacin according to the available breakpoints (not given for *B. anthracis*) [43] (Table 4).

B. anthracis Sterne was used to investigate the selection of resistant mutants after 21 sequential subcultures in subinhibitory concentrations of doxycycline, ciprofloxacin, trovafloxacin, and gatifloxacin. The number of passages required for selection of resistant mutants varied from nine (trovafloxacin) to 10 (ciprofloxacin and gatifloxacin). Currently, the mechanism of resistance to fluoroquinolones of *B. anthracis* is unknown.

After sequential passages with a single fluoroquinolone, each isolate was cross-resistant to other fluoroquinolones. In this study, MICs were determined using a macrodilution method in brainheart infusion broth [44] (Table 4).

Antibacterial agent	Number of subcultures	Initial MIC (mg/L)	MIC at 21 subcultures (mg/L)	Number of passages required to increase MIC 4-fold or greater
Ciprofloxacin	21	0.1	1.6	10
Trovafloxacin	21	1.6	12.5	9
Gatifloxacin	21	0.02	1.6	10
Ofloxacin	18	0.2	0.8	13
Doxycycline	21	0.02	0.1	14
Erythromycin A	15	6.25	6.25-50	4
Azithromycin	15	12.5	12.5-50	8
Clarithromycin	15	0.2	0.4–1.6	14

Doxycycline

In one study, no mutants were detected [43] after 18 passages, but in another study, after 14 passages, the initial MIC of 0.025 mg/L increased to 0.1 mg/L [44]. Strains resistant to doxycycline have been reported [45].

Macrolides

The number of passages required for selection of resistant mutants varied from four (erythromycin A) to 14 (clarithromycin). Mutants resistant to azithromycin were obtained after eight passages [44] (Table 4).

Resistance to antibacterial agents

A constitutive cephalosporinase is often produced by wild-type strains. Resistance to penicillins and doxycycline has been reported, and these strains are believed to have been engineered. *B. anthracis* CH-7 harbors the penicillinase gene in the repressed state [46]. There have been only a few reports on penicillin G resistance in *B. anthracis* [46–48]. The following antibiotics are naturally inactive against *B. anthracis*: sulfamethoxazole, trimethoprim, cefuroxime, cefotaxime and other 2-amino-5-thiazolyl cephems (such as ceftriaxone, ceftazidime, cefepime and cefpirome), and aztreonam.

Sensitivity to penicillin G has been used as a diagnostic tool to differentiate between *B. anthracis* and *B. cereus* isolates [49–51].

In *B. anthracis*, there are at least two β -lactamases which show more than 93% amino acid homology to the class A and B enzymes of *B. cereus* [52]. The main β -lactamase in *B. anthracis* seems to be a chromosomal metalloenzyme (class B).

In a study performed using the Microscan device, all *B. anthracis* isolates tested were suscep-

tible to penicillin G. In the same study, the hydrolysis was quantitatively investigated. The hydrolysis speeds expressed in micromoles of β lactam hydrolyzed per minute were 1.98×10^{-3} 2.09×10^{-7} , 1.72×10^{-6} , 1.59×10^{-6} , 1.95×10^{-7} , $4.07\times10^{-7},\,{\leq}2.0\times10^{-7}$ and ${\leq}1.0\times10^{-7}$ for penicillin G, cephaloridine, cefotaxime, cefuroxime, cefazolin, imipenem, cephalexin and cephradine, respectively, and the relative rates of hydrolysis versus penicillin G (100) were 1.1, 8.7, 8.0, 0.99, 2.1, \leq 1.0 and \leq 0.5 for cephaloridine, cefotaxime, cefuroxime, cefazolin, imipenem, cephalexin and cephradine, respectively [52]. In Kruger National park in South Africa, there is an area contaminated with B. anthracis spores. The in vitro susceptibilities of 44 B. anthracis isolates from this area were assessed against 16 antibacterial agents using a disk diffusion method in comparison with diameter zones obtained with *Staphylococcus aureus* NCTC 6571 on Mueller-Hinton agar according to Ericsson and Sherris [53]. Sensitivity to penicillin G, novobiocin and cefamandole was encountered in 84.1%, 86.4% and 68.18% of the isolates, respectively. Several isolates were moderately susceptible to penicillin G (15.9%), clindamycin (6.8%), fusidic acid (84%), novobiocin (13.6%), and cefamandole (31.8%) [54].

Animal models

The protective effects of ciprofloxacin, pefloxacin and lomefloxacin were investigated in animal anthrax induced with *B. anthracis* spores of three vaccinal strains. Protection was 50–80%, 40–70% and 40–70% for 10LD₅₀, 100LD₅₀ and 1000LD₅₀, respectively [55]. A high therapeutic efficacy of minocycline was reported, irrespective of the contaminating dose and strains [45].

Female Dunkin–Hartley guinea pigs (500–600 g) were challenged for 7 min with aerosols of *B. anthracis* spores of Ames strain or Vollum strain to obtain a lung dose of 10^4-10^6 spores. Animals received either ciprofloxacin or doxycycline by the subcutaneous route for 21 days after bacterial exposure. Antibiotic levels were determined in non-infected animals.

Doxycycline and ciprofloxacin protected animals from infection following inhalation of up to 10^6 spores of both strains of *B. anthracis*, so long as administration of the antibiotics was continued. After antibiotic administration had been discontinued, some animals died, more quickly in the ciprofloxacin group than in the doxycycline group. *B. anthracis* was isolated from the lung tissue of these guinea pigs [56].

The in vivo efficacies of penicillin G, ofloxacin, trovafloxacin and gatifloxacin were investigated after B. anthracis challenge by the intratracheal route 4 days after ⁶⁰Co irradiation of female B6D2AF 1/J mice (16-20g). The endpoint was the survival rate 30 days after challenge. The antibacterial therapy was started 6, 24 and 48 h after bacterial exposure, and continued for 7 or 21 days. It was demonstrated that non-lethal irradiation associated with a B. anthracis Sterne spore challenge increased the translocation of intestinal microflora. Antibacterial treatment must start within 24 h and be completed at 21 days to significantly reduce the mortality rate after exposure to B. anthracis Sterne following non-lethal irradiation. The survival rates after therapy with trovafloxacin, gatifloxacin, penicillin G+ ofloxacin, penicillin G and ofloxacin were 90%, 79%, 55%, 25% and 21%, respectively [57].

RATIONALE FOR LONG-TERM ANTIBIOTIC TREATMENT

In inhalation anthrax, the mortality rate is high. In the Sverdlovsk (Russia) outbreak, it was reported that 66 of 79 patients died, although the reliability of the diagnosis in the surviving patients is questionable. However, it seems that patients whose onset of disease was 30 or more days after inhalation had a higher rate of recovery in comparison with those who had early onset of the disease. In the case of fatalities, the interval between onset of symptoms and death averaged 3 days. In monkeys, there is a similar course of the disease, even after a latency of 58 days. After inhalation of anthrax spores, the sporebearing particles of $1-5\,\mu\text{m}$ were deposited in alveolar spaces. The spores are engulfed by alveolar macrophages, and many of them are able to survive within their phagocytes, even if most of them are lyzed. Surviving spores are transported via the lymphatic system to mediastinal lymph nodes, where germination may occur up to 60 days later [58,59]. In the Sverdlovsk outbreak, clinical onset occurred from 2 to 43 days after exposure. In experimental monkeys, fatal disease occurred up to 98 days after exposure. Viable spores have been shown in the mediastinal lymph nodes of monkeys 100 days after exposure.

LIMITS OF ANTIBIOTIC THERAPY

Main characteristics needed for an antibacterial agent to be efficacious against *B. anthracis*

Owing to the pathophysiology of inhaled anthrax, the following studies are needed to determine potential clinical efficacy and possible use of the antibiotic for prevention after exposure to anthrax spores:

- 1. In vitro activities, determined by a mean of MIC values for a sufficient number of isolates collected from human and animal sources.
- 2. Mutant selection needs to be investigated.
- 3. Bactericidal activity has to be determined.
- 4. Animal infections (rhesus monkeys, guinea pigs, rabbits, and mice) must be assessed with determinations of pharmacokinetic parameters [60–62].
- 5. Determination of plasma levels in humans must be assessed, as well as respiratory tissue levels (bronchial mucosa, alveolar macrophages, epithelial lining fluid).
- 6. Intracellular concentration and efflux in macrophages must be assessed as well as antibacterial localization within the cell, *B. anthracis* being mainly located in the phagolysosome; intracellular bioactivity against this pathogen could be investigated. Although *B. anthracis* is an extracellular pathogen, it appears to require an intracellular step to initiate infection.
- 7. *B. anthracis* spores and germination occur in the lymph nodes [58,59]; determination of antibacterial levels at this site is therefore an important parameter. However, when the capacity of the lymph node is overwhelmed, the infection spreads to successive nodes, and the bacilli then enter the bloodstream and multiply.

Only a few families of antibacterial agents are able to concentrate in phagocytes: macrolides, ketolides, fluoroquinolones, cyclines, ansamycins (rifampicin and derivatives), streptogramins, clindamycin, and teicoplanin [63]. To combat *B. anthracis*, antibacterials need to be mainly concentrated in the phagolysosome. Data on lymph node concentrations are scarce. Data are available for ofloxacin [64], levofloxacin [65], pefloxacin [66], ciprofloxacin [67], fleroxacin [68], azithromycin [69], and doxycycline [70]. However, these studies have been carried out mainly in mesenteric lymph nodes for the treatment of typhoid fever.

B. anthracis

B. anthracis virulence depends on the bacterial capsule and the toxin complex, which is composed of three entities, a protective antigen, an edema factor, and a lethal factor. The three components of the anthrax toxin need to be associated for it to exert its effect [71].

Once germination occurs, disease follows rapidly. Replicating organisms release toxins, leading to hemorrhage, edema, and necrosis. In experimental animals, once toxin production has reached a critical threshold, death occurs even if sterility of the bloodstream is achieved with antibiotics.

No immune response has been demonstrated in experimental animals receiving antibiotic therapy during anthrax infection. Experimental studies demonstrated that treatment with penicillin G for 5–10 days, starting on day one after aerosol exposure of monkeys, was protective during the course of antibiotic treatment; however the monkeys died when the treatment was discontinued. Long-term protection was afforded only by combining penicillin G therapy with post-exposure immunization. Rhesus monkeys (Macaca mulatta) that survived the aerosol challenge were examined for evidence of an immune response 131–142 days after exposure, by measuring antibody to the protective component of anthrax toxin. No surviving animals treated with penicillin G, ciprofloxacin or doxycycline alone had an immune response. No protection was afforded against rechallenge of the surviving monkeys [72]. This suggests that even if the antibiotic-treated patients survive anthrax infection, the risk for recurrence remains for at least 60 days, due to the possibility of delayed germination of spores. Postexposure vaccination in those patients may shorten the duration of antibiotic therapy to 30–45 days.

THERAPY FOR ANTHRAX (ANTIBIOTICS)

Cutaneous anthrax

It has been shown in cutaneous anthrax that negativation of blister fluid occurs 5 h after the first 2 million units of benzylpenicillin [73]. The standard recommendation is 2 million units every 6 h intravenously until the edema subsides, at which time oral penicillin (phenoxypenicillin or penicillin V) therapy can be used. The duration of treatment is at least 7–10 days.

Doxycycline, chloramphenicol, macrolides and fluoroquinolone are considered to be alternative therapies.

Antibiotic therapy does not stop the progress of anthrax lesions to an eschar phase, but does decrease systemic manifestations and local edema.

Inhalation anthrax

Aerosolized anthrax spores $>5\,\mu m$ in size are deposited in the upper airways (pharynx, larynx, and trachea), and effectively trapped or cleared by the mucociliary system. Spores between 2 and $5\,\mu\text{m}$ in size are able to reach the alveolar ducts and alveoli. These spores are engulfed by alveolar macrophages and transported to mediastinal and hilar lymph nodes. In the phagocytes, *B. anthracis* is located in the phagolysosome [71]. The minimum infectious inhaled dose in humans has not yet been determined. The minimum infectious dose in chimpanzees is 40 000–65 000 spores [74]. The alveolar macrophages represent the primary site of toxigenic B. anthracis germination during infection by inhalation [75]. Early antibiotic administration is essential, due to the rapid onset of the disease (started from 12 h). A delay in antibiotic treatment for patients with anthrax infection, even for several hours, may substantially lessen the chances of survival.

However, there are no clinical studies on the treatment of inhalation anthrax in humans. No data have been released from the Russian outbreak [76], and there is only limited clinical experience with the recent events [77]. In rhesus monkeys, a major change occurred within 3–8 days after inhalation of a lethal dose. Hemorrhages are found in mediastinal, mesenteric and tracheobronchial lymph nodes, and small intestinal serosa [78].

In studies of small numbers of monkeys infected with susceptible strains of *B. anthracis*, oral

doxycycline proved efficacious. Doxycycline is the preferred option in the cycline class being investigated for efficacy in animal models [79]. However, reports have been published of a *B. anthracis* vaccine strain that has been engineered to be resistant to tetracycline and benzylpenicillin. In rhesus monkeys, after exposure to aerolized spores of *B. anthracis*, administration of benzylpenicillin was shown only to delay death in the animals [80]. The delay was generally proportional to the duration of penicillin G administration and probably related to the low intracellular concentration of β -lactam antibiotics.

Engineering of fluoroquinolone-resistant *B. anthracis* may also be possible; however, there are no published reports on this.

Even though only ciprofloxacin was licensed by the FDA for this purpose in July 2000, a report from the CDC in 1998 [81] recommended vaccination and the use of oral fluoroquinolones such as ciprofloxacin, 500 mg bid, levofloxacin, 500 mg qd or ofloxacin, 400 mg bid, for post-exposure prophylaxis in adults.

CONCLUSION

Although B. anthracis seems to be very susceptible to penicillins, it is important to note that β -lactam antibiotics are not concentrated in phagocytes. In contrast, fluoroquinolones, macrolides, ketolides and cyclines are highly concentrated in the cell. Long-term tolerance needs to be considered to allow patient compliance. In the recent outbreak in the USA, 19% of the patients receiving prophylaxis complained of adverse events, and about 5% discontinued their medication [82]. Furthermore the selection of resistant mutants is the risk to be highlighted during long-term treatment. Antibacterial agents will significantly decrease the bacterial burden; however, for inhalation anthrax, the main factor remains the intoxication, against which antibacterials are ineffective [83].

REFERENCES

- 1. Dirchx JH. Virgil on anthrax. *Am J Dermatopathol* 1981; 3: 191–5.
- 2. Rayer PFD. Inoculation de sang de rate. *Compte Rendu Soc Biol* 1850; 2: 141.
- 3. Pollender FAA. Mikroskopische und Mikrochemische unterschungen des Milbrandlute sowie über

wesen und kur des Milzbrandes. Veröffenlichung Gerigtliche Ôffentliche Med 1855; 8: 103.

- 4. Davaine CJ. Recherches sur les infusoires du sang dans la maladie connue sur le nom de sang de rate. *CR Acad Sci Paris* 1863; 47: 351, 386.
- 5. Davaine CJ. Recherches sur les infusoires du sang dans la maladie connue sur le nom de sang de rate. *CR Acad Sci Paris* 1864; 5: 149.
- 6. Koch R. Die Ätiologie der Milbrandkrankheit, begrüdet die Entwicklunsgesicht des Bacillus Anthracis. *Beitrag Biol Pflanzer* 1876; 2: 277–310.
- 7. Jay V. The legacy of Robert Koch. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 2001; 125: 1148–9.
- 8. Greenfield WS. Lectures on some recent investigations into the pathology of infective and contagious diseases. Lecture III.—Part I. Anthrax and anthracoid diseases. *Lancet* 1880; 1: 865–7.
- 9. Pasteur L, Chamberlain CE, Roux E. Compte rendu sommaire des expériences faîtes à Pouilly-le Fort près de Melun, sur la vaccination charbonneuse. *CR Séances l'Académie Des Sci* 1881; 92: 1378–83.
- 10. Zydowicz D. Anthrax: a disease from antiquity visits the modern world. *Minn Med* 1998; 81: 19–20.
- Koehler JM. Bacillus anthracis. In: Fichetti VA, Novick RP, Forretti JJ, Portnoy DA, Rood JJ, eds. Gram positive pathogens. Washington DC: American Society for Microbiology Press, 2000: 519–28.
- 12. LaForce FM. Anthrax. Clin Infect Dis 1997; 12: 28-30.
- 13. Davies JC. Transmission of anthrax. *Cent Afr J Med* 1980; 26: 47.
- 14. Bell JH. On anthrax and anthracemia in wool, heifers, and sheep. *BMJ* 1880; 2: 656–61.
- 15. Thappa DM, Karthikeyan K. Anthrax: an overview within the Indian subcontinent. *Int J Dermatol* 2001; 40: 216–22.
- 16. Turner M. Anthrax in Zimbabwe. Cent Afr J Med 1980; 26: 160–1.
- Harrisson LH, Ezzell JW, Abshico TG, Kidd S, Kauffmann AF. Evaluation of serologic tests for diagnosis of anthrax after an outbreak of cutaneous anthrax in Paraguay. J Infect Dis 1989; 160: 706–7.
- Patra G, Vaissance J, Weber-Levy M, Le Doujet C, Mock M. Molecular characterization of *Bacillus* strains involved in outbreaks of anthrax in France in 1997. *J Clin Microbiol* 1998; 36: 3412–14.
- Meselson M, Guillemin J, Hugh-Jones M et al. The Sverdlovsk anthrax outbreak of 1979. Sciences 1994; 266: 1202–7.
- 20. Hawley HB. Anthrax upon man. *Antimicrob Infect Dis Newslett* 2000; 18: 65–71.
- 21. Pfisterer RM. Eine milzbrandepidemie in der Schweiz. Schweiz Med Wschr 1991; 121: 813–25.
- 22. De Lalla F, Ezzell JW, Pellizzer G *et al*. Familial outbreak of agriculture anthrax in an area of Northern Italy. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 1992; 11: 839–42.
- 23. Sorol J, Delpy P, Guard D. Une épidémie de charbon humain—à propos de 25 cas observés à

l'hôpital de Fort-Lamy, Tchad. Presse Med 1971; 79: 1635–8.

- Scott G. Anthrax. In: Cook G, ed. Manson's tropical diseases, 20th edn. London: EIBS/WB Saunders, 1996: 914–17.
- 25. Kunanusont C, Limpakarjanarat K, Foy HM. Outbreak of anthrax in Thailand. *Ann Trop Med Parasitol* 1990; 84: 507–15.
- 26. Penn CC, Klotz SA. Anthrax pneumonia. Semin Respir Infect 1997; 12: 28–30.
- Anonymous. Cutaneous anthrax acquired from imported Haitiean drums—Florida. MMWR 1974; 23: 142–7.
- 28. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Human anthrax with epizootic among livestock— North-Dakota. *MMWR* 2001; 50: 677–80.
- 29. Christopher GW, Cieslak JJ, Pavlin JA, Eitzen EM. Biological warfare: a historical perspective. *JAMA* 1997; 278: 412–17.
- 30. Harris SH. Factories of death: Japanese secret biological warfare, 1932–45, and the American cover-up. London: Routledge, 1994.
- 31. Manchee RJ, Steward R. The decontamination of Gruinard Island. *Chem Br* 1988; 24: 690–1.
- 32. Sterne JL. Avirulent anthrax vaccine. Onderstepport J Vet Sci Anim Ind 1937; 21: 41–3.
- 33. Heine H, Dick R, Byrne WR. Determination of *Bacillus anthracis* antibiotic susceptibility by broth microdilution [Ab 517]. In: *Program and abstracts of the 40th Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy*, Toronto. Washington, DC: American Society for Microbiology, 2000: Abstract 517: 167.
- 34. Heine HS, Dick R, Andrews GP. In vitro activity of oritavancin (LY333328), levofloxacin, meropenem, GAR 936 and linezolid against strains of *Bacillus anthracis* [abstract 524]. In: *Program and abstracts of the* 41st Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy, Chicago. Washington DC: American Society of Microbiology Press, 2001, p. 173.
- 35. Mohammed J, Marton CK, Popovic T, Weynant RS, Tenover FC. Antimicrobial testing of *Bacillus anthracis*: comparison of results obtained by using the National Committee for clinical laboratory standards broth microdilution reference and E test agar gradient diffusion methods. *J Clin Microbiol* 2002; 40: 1902–7.
- Dogany M, Aydin N. Antimicrobial susceptibility of Bacillus anthracis. Scand J Infect Dis 1991; 23: 332–5.
- Lightfoot NF, Scott RJD, Turnbull PCB. Antimicrobial susceptibility of *Bacillus anthracis*. *Salisbury Med Bull* 1990; 68(suppl 95–98): 95–98.
- 38. Navashin SM, Fomina IP, Buravtseva NP, Nikitin AV, Ivanitskaya LP. Combined action of rifampicin and peptidoglycan in experimental anthracic infection [abstract 115]. In: *Program and abstracts of the 18th International Congress on Chemotherapy*, Stockholm. Washington DC: American Society of Microbiology Press, 1993, 308.

- 39. Klugman KP, Freen J, Arntzen L, Yeldand V, Bulcofzer S. In vitro activity of ABT-773, a novel ketolide, and other antibacterials against *Bacillus* anthracis [abstract UL-20]. In: Abstracts and addendum of the 41st Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy, Chicago. Washington DC: American Society of Microbiology Press, 2001: 7.
- Pomerantsev AP, Sukovatova LV, Marinin LI. Characterization of a rifampicin-resistant population of *Bacillus anthracis. Antibiot Khimiother* 1993; 38: 34–8.
- 41. Vogler AJ, Busch JD, Percy-Fine S, Tipton-Hunton C, Smith KL, Keim P. Molecular analysis of rifampin resistance in *Bacillus anthracis* and *Bacillus cereus*. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2002; 46: 511–13.
- Luria SE, Delbrück M. Mutations of bacteria from virus sensitivity to virus resistance. *Genetics* 1943; 28: 491–511.
- 43. Choe CH, Bouhaouala S, Brook I, Elliott TB, Knudson GB. In vitro development of resistance to ofloxacin and doxycycline in *Bacillus anthracis*. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2000; 44: 1766.
- 44. Brook I, Elliot TB, Pror HI *et al.* In vitro resistance of *Bacillus anthracis* Sterne to doxycycline, macrolides, and quinolones. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2001; 18: 559–62.
- 45. Pomerantsev AP, Shiskova NA, Marinin LI. Comparison of therapeutic effects of antibiotics of the tetracycline group in the treatment of anthrax caused by a strain inheriting *tet*-gene of plasmid pBC16. *Antibiot Khimiter* 1992; 37: 31–4.
- Pomerantsev AP, Shishkova NA, Doronia IP, Sukovatova LV, Marinin LI. Interaction of *Bacillus anthracis* with benzylpenicillin in vitro and in vivo. *Antibiot Khimioter* 1993; 38: 30–3.
- 47. Lalitha MK, Thomas MK. Penicillin resistance in *Bacillus anthracis. Lancet* 1997; 349: 1522.
- 48. Bradovic N, Punda-Polic N. Cutaneous anthrax due to penicillin resistant *Bacillus anthracis* transmitted by an insect bite. *Lancet* 1992; 340: 306–7.
- Weber DJ, Saviteer SM, Rutala WA, Thomann CA. In vitro susceptibility of *Bacillus* spp to selected antimicrobial agent. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 1988; 32: 642–5.
- 50. Pollock MR. Purification and properties of penicillinase from two strains of *Bacillus licheniformis*: physicochemical and physiological comparison. *Biochem J* 1965; 94: 666–75.
- 51. Sabath LD, Abraham EP. Cephalosporinase and penicillinase activity of *Bacillus cereus*. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 1965; 392–7.
- 52. Mikesell P, Hillebrand DA, Friedlander AM, Bush K. Antibiotic susceptibility profiles and β-lactamase activity in strains of *Bacillus anthracis* [A-122]. In: *Program and abstracts of the 92nd general meeting of the American Society for Microbiology*, New-Orleans. Washington DC: American Society of Microbiology Press, 1992: 21.

- 53. Ericsson HM, Sherris JC. Antibiotic sensitivity testing: report of an international collaborative study. *Acta Pathol Microbiol Scand B Suppl* 1971; 217: 3–90.
- Odendaal MW, Pieterson PM, de Vos V, Botha AD. The antibiotic sensitivity patterns of *Bacillus anthracis* isolated from the Kruger National Park. *Onderstepoort J Vet Res* 1991; 58: 17–19.
- D'iakov SI, Katsulukha VV, Lebedeva IK, Lukashjna AV, Raiskaia VA. Comparative evaluation of the effectiveness of fluoroquinolones in experimental anthrax infection. *Antibiot Khimiother* 1994; 39: 15– 19.
- Jones MN, Beedham RJ, Turnbull PCB, Manchee RJ. Antibiotic prophylaxis for inhalation anthrax. *Salisbury Med Bull* 1996; 87(suppl): 127–8.
- 57. Elliott TB, Brook I, Harding RA, Bouhaouala SS, Thakas JH, Knudson GB. Antibacterial therapy for Bacillus anthracis-induced mixed infection in ⁶⁰Coirradiated mice [abstract 1001]. In: Program and abstracts of the 40th Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy, Toronto. Washington, DC: American Society for Microbiology, 2001: 1001.
- Ross JM. The pathogenesis of anthrax following the administration of spores by the respiratory route. J Pathol Bact 1957; 73: 494–5.
- 59. Lincoln RE, Hodges DR, Klein F *et al.* Role of the lymphatic in the pathogenesis of anthrax. *J Infect Dis* 1965; 115: 481–94.
- Barnes JM. Penicillin and Bacillus anthracis. J Pathol Bacteriol 1947; 59: 113–25.
- 61. Brook I, Elliott TB, Harding RA *et al.* Susceptibility of irradiated mice to *Bacillus anthracis* Sterne by the intratracheal route of infection. *J Med Microbiol* 2001; 50: 702–11.
- 62. Kelly DJ, Chulay JD, Mikesell P, Friedlander AM. Serum concentration of penicillin, doxycycline and ciprofloxacin during prolonged therapy in rhesus monkeys. *J Infect Dis* 1992; 166: 1184–7.
- Labro MT. Interference of antibacterial agents with phagocytes functions: immuno modulation or 'immuno-fairy tales'. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2000; 13: 615– 50.
- 64. Stahl JP, Leclercq P, Croizé J et al. Traitement des fièvres typhoides par ofloxacine—expérience clinique et détermination de la diffusion ganglionnaire mésentérique de l'antibiotique. Pathol Biol 1986; 34: 505–7.
- Takahashi H, Mogi S, Kobayashi M, Fukaya T, Ohkawara A, Harada S. Assay of skin level and clinical investigation of levofloxacin in the treatment of skin infections. *Chemotherapy (Tokyo)* 1992; 40(suppl 3): 286–305.
- 66. Munera MI, Cuesta F, Abadia A, Vasquez J, Restrepo M. Determination of pefloxacin concentration in mesenteric lymph nodes by high-

performance chromatography. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 1994; 38: 632–4.

- Bergan T. Extravascular penetration of ciprofloxacin—a review. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis* 1990; 13: 103–4.
- 68. Nolting A, Ester KS. Pharmacokinetic profile: fleroxacin. *Antiinfect Drugs Chemother* 1995; 13(2): 73–8.
- Bergan T, Jorgensen NP, Olszewski W, Zhang Y. Azithromycin pharmacokinetics and penetration to lymph. *Scand J Infect Dis* 1992; 83(suppl): 15–21.
- Anderson KE, Dencker H, Maardh PA, Akerlund M. Relationships between the concentrations of doxycycline in serum and in thoracic duct lymph after oral and intravenous administration in man. *Chemotherapy* 1976; 22: 277–85.
- 71. Mock M, Fouet A. Anthrax. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 2001; 55: 647–71.
- 72. Friedlander AM, Welkos SL, Pitt ML *et al.* Post exposure prophylaxis against experimental inhalation anthrax. *J Infect Dis* 1993; 167: 1239–42.
- 73. Ronaghy HA, Azadeh B, Kahout E *et al.* Penicillin therapy of human cutaneous anthrax. *Curr Ther Res* 1972; 14: 721–5.
- 74. Albrink WS. Pathogenesis of inhalation anthrax. *Bacteriol Rev* 1961; 25: 268–73.
- Guido-Rotani C, Weber-Lévy M, Labruyère E, Mock M. Germination of *Bacillus anthracis* spores within alveolar macrophages. *Mol Microbiol* 1999; 31: 9–17.
- Abramova FA, Grinberg LM, Yampolskaya OV, Walter DH. Pathology of inhalation anthrax in 42 cases from Sverlosk outbreak of 1979. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1993; 90: 2291–4.
- 77. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Bioterrorism alleging use of anthrax and interim guidelines for management—United States. MMWR 1999; 48: 69–74.
- 78. Fritz DL, Jaax NK, Laurence WB. Pathology of experimental inhalation anthrax in the rhesus monkey. *Lab Invest* 1995; 73: 691–702.
- 79. Franz DR, Jahrling FB, Friendlander A *et al.* Clinical recognition and management of patients exposed to biological warfare agents. *JAMA* 1997; 278: 399–411.
- Henderson DW, Peacock S, Belton PC. Observation on prophylaxis of experimental pulmonary anthrax in the monkey. *J Hyg* 1956; 54: 28–36.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Update: investigation of bioterrorism-related anthrax and adverse events from antimicrobial prophylaxis. *MMWR* 2002; 50: 973–6.
- 82. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Update: adverse events associated with anthrax prophylaxis among postal employees—New Jersey, New York City and the district of Columbia Metropolitan Area, 2001. MMWR 2001; 50: 1051–4.
- 83. Dixon TC, Meselson M, Guillemenin J, Hanna PC. Anthrax. N Engl J Med 1999; 341: 815–26.