Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease 93 (2019) 154–158

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Disease

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/diagmicrobio

Surveillance of iclaprim activity: in vitro susceptibility of Gram-positive skin infection pathogens collected from 2015 to 2016 from North America and Europe

David B Huang [a,*], Sophie Magnet [f], Stefania De Angelis [f], Thomas L Holland [d], Thomas M File Jr [b], Matthew Dryden [c], G. Ralph Corey [d], Antoni Torres [e], Mark H Wilcox [g]

[a] Motif BioSciences, New York, NY
[b] Summa Health, Akron, OH
[c] Department of Microbiology and Infection, Hampshire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, UK
[d] Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC
[e] Department of Pulmonology, Hospital Clinic of Barcelona, University of Barcelona, Institut D'investigacions August Pi I Sunyer, and Centro de Investigación Biomedica En Red-Enfermedades Respiratorias, Barcelona, Spain
[f] IHMA, Monthey, Switzerland
[g] Leeds Teaching Hospitals & University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 4 December 2017
Received in revised form 6 June 2018
Accepted 4 September 2018
Available online 10 September 2018

Keywords:
Iclaprim
Surveillance
Skin
Soft tissue
In vitro

ABSTRACT

Iclaprim is a diaminopyrimidine, which inhibits bacterial dihydrofolate reductase, and surveillance data prior to 2006 suggested that iclaprim was active against Gram-positive pathogens including emerging drug-resistant pathogens. In an era of increasing antimicrobial resistance, we undertook testing iclaprim and comparators against 931 Gram-positive clinical isolates from the United States and Europe collected between 2015 and 2016. Susceptibility testing was performed according to the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) guidelines. Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) interpretations were based on CLSI and European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing criteria. MIC_{50}/MIC_{90} was 0.03/0.12 for all *Staphylococcus aureus*, 0.06/0.06 for methicillin-susceptible *S. aureus*, 0.03/0.12 for methicillin-resistant *S. aureus*, 0.12/0.5 for *Streptococcus agalactiae*, ≤0.015/≤0.015 for *Streptococcus anginosus*, 0.03/0.06 for *Streptococcus dysgalactiae*, and ≤0.015 / 0.03 μg/mL for *Streptococcus pyogenes*. Iclaprim was active against a contemporary collection (2015–2016) of Gram-positive bacteria isolated from the skin or soft tissue from patients with SSSI from the United States and Europe.

1. Introduction

Bacterial skin and soft tissue infections (SSTIs) are one of the most common causes of infection in patients of all ages (Stevens et al., 2014). In particular, these infections represent the most common infection type presenting in patients visiting emergency rooms and account for a substantial portion of hospital admissions (Stevens et al., 2014; Tognetti et al., 2012). Gram-positive bacteria are the most frequently isolated etiology of skin infections, occurring in more than 80% of acute bacterial skin and skin structure infections (ABSSSIs), with *Staphylococcus aureus* the most common pathogen as the cause of wound infections, abscesses, and cellulitis (Tognetti et al., 2012).

In 2014, the Infectious Diseases Society of America issued a practice guideline to provide recommendations for the diagnosis and management of SSTIs (Stevens et al., 2014). The recommendations were issued in response to the dramatic increase in the frequency and severity of these types of infections and the emergence of pathogens that are resistant to many of the antimicrobial agents commonly used to treat these infections. There are many antibiotics approved for the treatment of SSTIs, but all have safety concerns or reported resistant pathogens (Long et al., 2014; Mishra et al., 2012; Sanchez Garcia et al., 2010; Steenbergen et al., 2005; Steinkraus et al., 2007). Therefore, there is a medical need for a well-tolerated antimicrobial agent with rapid bactericidal action with activity against methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) and other Gram-positive pathogens, with an alternative mode of action, and without cross-resistance to available antibiotics.

Iclaprim is a diaminopyrimidine, which inhibits bacterial dihydrofolate reductase (DHFR) and is active against emerging drug-resistant pathogens (Sader et al., 2009; Schneider et al., 2003). It is in the same class as trimethoprim, the only FDA-approved dihydrofolate reductase inhibitor. Iclaprim was designed to be more active than

* Corresponding author. Tel. +1-936-577-5770; fax: +1-609-514-5104.
E-mail address: david.huang@motifbio.com (D.B. Huang).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2018.09.002
0732-8893/

trimethoprim and overcome trimethoprim resistance among Gram-positive pathogens (Oefner et al., 2009). In addition, iclaprim does not need to be combined with a sulfonamide, which is commonly associated with adverse events including renal toxicity, hepatotoxicity, blood dyscrasias, anaphylaxis, and hypersensitivity reactions. Iclaprim exhibits in vitro activity against Gram-positive pathogens such as *S. aureus* and beta-hemolytic streptococci (BHS), including resistant phenotypes that cause SSSIs (Morrissey et al., 2009; Sader et al., 2009). In two Phase 3 clinical trials, iclaprim has shown clinical cure rates comparable to vancomycin among patients treated for ABSSSIs (Huang et al., 2018b; Holland et al., 2018). Because of these findings, iclaprim is potentially well suited for treating patients with ABSSSIs caused by or suspected Gram-positive bacteria, including multidrug resistant pathogens, and is presently in Phase 3 clinical development for the treatment of ABSSSIs. In an era of increasing antimicrobial resistance, we report contemporary surveillance data on 931 methicillin-susceptible *S. aureus* (MSSA), MRSA, *S. agalactiae*, *S. anginosus, S. dysgalactiae,* and *S. pyogenes* isolated from the skin or soft tissue from patients with SSSI in the United States and Europe.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Collection of bacterial isolates

A total of 931 nonduplicative, nonconsecutive isolates of MSSA (n = 314), MRSA (n = 304), *S. pyogenes* (n = 159), *S. agalactiae* (n = 100), *S. dysaglactiae* (n = 40), and *S. anginosus* (n = 14) were collected from skin or soft tissue from patients with SSSI in multiple locations in the US and EU between 2016 and 2016. Clinical isolates were identified by the submitting laboratories and confirmed by IHMA Laboratories using the Bruker matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization–time of flight mass spectrometry biotyper for all isolates. The distribution of pathogens by country is shown in Table 1. Of the 931 isolates, 467 (50.2%) were collected from North America and 464 (49.8%) from Europe.

2.2. Susceptibility testing

Antibacterial susceptibility testing was conducted by IHMA Laboratories (Monthey, Switzerland). Susceptibility testing was performed by broth microdilution in accordance with the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) guidelines M07-A10 (2015) and the standard operating procedures at IHMA laboratories. Minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) interpretations were based on CLSI and European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST) criteria (2017). There are no published breakpoints for iclaprim. *S. aureus*, both methicillin-susceptible and methicillin-resistant, were tested in cation-adjusted Mueller–Hinton broth (CA-MHB), and streptococci were tested in CA-MHB supplemented with 5% lysed horse blood. Quality controls and interpretation of results were performed in accordance with CLSI M100 (2017). QC ranges for iclaprim were those approved by CLSI and published in M100. Iclaprim and comparator antibiotic MIC results were within the CLSI published ranges against *S. aureus* ATCC 29213 (0.06–0.25 μg/mL) and *S. pneumoniae* ATCC 49619 (0.03–0.12 μg/mL).

Table 1
Distribution of organisms collected from North America and Europe, 2015–2016.

Organism	North America	Europe	Total
S. aureus	307	311	618
MRSA	154	160	314
MSSA	153	151	304
S. agalactiae	50	50	100
S. anginosus	11	3	14
S. dysgalactiae	20	20	40
S. pyogenes	79	80	159
Total	467 (50.2%)	464 (49.8%)	931

Isolates were tested with standard broth microdilution MIC panels (ThermoFisher Scientific, Cleveland, OH) of iclaprim and comparator antibiotics (trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (TMS), erythromycin, clindamycin, gentamicin, cefoxitin, penicillin G, levofloxacin, tetracycline, vancomycin, linezolid, and daptomycin against *S. aureus* and ceftriaxone, meropenem, ampicillin, azithromycin, clindamycin, TMS, levofloxacin, tetracycline, linezolid, and penicillin G against streptococci).

3. Results

3.1. Iclaprim and comparator activity against Gram-positive pathogens from 2015 to 2016

Iclaprim demonstrated antimicrobial activity against key Gram-positive pathogens, including strains with resistant phenotypes, isolated from the skin or soft tissue from patients with SSSI. Table 2 shows the in vitro activity of iclaprim and comparators against *S. aureus*, MSSA, MRSA, *S. agalactiae*, *S. anginosus, S. dysgalactiae,* and *S. pyogenes*. Table 3 shows the cumulative percentage of isolates inhibited at each iclaprim MIC value. Iclaprim MIC values ranged from ≤0.015 to >32 μg/mL. MIC values were similar (>99% within +/− 2 dilutions) to TMS.

3.2. Iclaprim and comparator activity against S. aureus

Table 2 shows iclaprim exhibited activity against all 618 *S. aureus* isolates. The MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} values were 0.03 and 0.12 μg/mL, respectively. For TMS, the MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} were ≤0.06 and ≤0.06 μg/mL, respectively. For isolates with a MIC for erythromycin of ≥1 μg/mL (n = 319), the MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} for iclaprim were ≤0.25 and ≤0.25 μg/mL, respectively. For isolates with a MIC for clindamycin of ≥1 μg/mL (n = 106), the MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} for iclaprim were ≤0.25 and ≤8 μg/mL, respectively. For isolates with a MIC for levofloxacin of ≥2 μg/mL (n = 235),), the MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} for iclaprim were ≤0.25 and ≤0.5 μg/mL, respectively. All isolates with a MIC for TMS of ≥4 μg/mL (n = 9) had a MIC for iclaprim ≥16 μg/mL. For the 9 isolates with a MIC for iclaprim ≥16 μg/mL, there were 2, 0, 0, 4, and 3 isolates that had a MIC for TMS of 2, 4, 8, 16, and 32 μg/mL, respectively.

Iclaprim maintained activity against *S. aureus* regardless of methicillin susceptibility. For MSSA, the MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} were both 0.06 μg/mL. For MRSA, the MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} were 0.03 and 0.12 μg/mL, respectively. By comparison, TMS MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} were both ≤0.06 μg/mL for MSSA, and ≤0.06 and 0.12 μg/mL for MRSA, respectively.

Iclaprim also maintained activity against *S. aureus* regardless of isolation from North America or Europe. For North America, the MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} were 0.03 and 0.12 μg/mL, respectively. For Europe, the MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} were 0.03 and 0.06 μg/mL, respectively.

3.3. Iclaprim and comparator activity against S. pyogenes

Iclaprim exhibited activity against all 159 *S. pyogenes* (Table 2). The MIC_{50}/MIC_{90} were ≤0.015/0.03 μg/mL, respectively. By comparison, MIC_{50}/MIC_{90} for TMS were ≤0.06/0.12 μg/mL, respectively (Table 2). Iclaprim showed activity against *S. pyogenes* independent of the prevalence of macrolide resistance. The MIC_{90} of iclaprim was 0.03 μg/mL against isolates of *S. pyogenes* susceptible to azithromycin (MIC ≤0.5 μg/mL, n = 133, 83.6%) and also against isolates resistant to azithromycin (MIC ≥2 μg/mL, n = 24, 15.1%).

3.4. Iclaprim and comparator activity against S. agalactiae

Iclaprim exhibited similar MICs against all 100 *S. agalactiae* (Table 2). The MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} were 0.12 and 0.5 μg/mL, respectively, for *S. agalactiae*. In comparison, MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} for TMS were both 0.12 μg/mL (Table 2). Iclaprim showed activity against *S. agalactiae*

Table 2
In vitro activity of iclaprim and comparators against isolates collected from North America and Europe, 2015–2016.

Organism	Drug	MIC_{50}	MIC_{90}	Range	CLSI			EUCAST		
					%S	%I	%R	%S	%I	%R
S. aureus	Iclaprim	0.03	0.12	≤0.015–>32	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB
($n = 618$)	Cefoxitin	>4	>4	1–>4	49.2	0	50.8	NB	NB	NB
	Clindamycin	0.12	>4	≤0.03–>4	82.9	0	17.2	82.9	0	17.2
	Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	0.12–1	100.0	0	0	100.0	0	0
	Erythromycin	16	>16	≤0.12–>16	48.4	0.7	51.0	48.4	0	51.6
	Gentamicin	0.25	0.5	≤0.06–>16	95.3	0.2	4.5	95.3	0	4.7
	Levofloxacin	0.25	>4	0.06–>4	62.0	0.5	37.5	62.0	0	38.0
	Linezolid	1	2	0.5–4	100.0	0	0	100.0	0	0
	Penicillin	>4	>4	≤0.06–>4	15.4	0	84.6	15.4	0	84.6
	Tetracycline	0.25	1	≤0.06–>16	92.6	0.3	7.1	91.10	1.13	7.8
	TMS	≤0.06	≤0.06	≤0.06–32	98.5	0	1.5	98.5	0.3	1.13
	Vancomycin	1	1	≤0.25–2	100.0	0	0	100.0	0	0
MRSA	Iclaprim	0.03	0.12	≤0.015–>32	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB
($n = 314$)	Cefoxitin	> 4	> 4	>4–>4	0.0	0.0	100.0	NB	NB	NB
	Clindamycin	0.12	> 4	≤0.03–>4	70.1	0.0	29.9	70.1	0.0	29.9
	Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	0.12–1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Erythromycin	> 16	> 16	≤0.12–>16	25.2	0.3	74.5	25.2	0.0	74.8
	Gentamicin	0.25	0.5	0.12–>16	92.7	0.0	7.3	92.7	0.0	7.3
	Levofloxacin	4	>4	0.06–>4	33.1	0.6	66.2	33.1	0.0	66.9
	Linezolid	1	2	0.5–4	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Penicillin	>4	>4	0.25–>4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	Tetracycline	0.25	2	≤0.06–>16	90.1	0.3	9.6	87.9	2.2	9.9
	TMS	≤0.06	0.12	≤0.06–32	97.5	0.0	2.6	97.5	0.6	1.9
	Vancomycin	1	1	≤0.25–2	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
MSSA	Iclaprim	0.06	0.06	≤0.015–>32	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB
($n = 304$)	Cefoxitin	4	4	1–4	100.0	0.0	0.0	NB	NB	NB
	Clindamycin	0.06	0.12	≤0.03–>4	96.1	0.0	3.9	96.1	0.0	3.9
	Daptomycin	0.25	0.5	0.12–1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Erythromycin	0.25	>16	≤0.12–>16	72.4	1.0	26.6	72.4	0.0	27.6
	Gentamicin	0.25	0.5	≤0.06–>16	98.0	0.3	1.6	98.0	0.0	2.0
	Levofloxacin	0.12	0.5	0.06–>4	91.8	0.3	7.9	91.8	0.0	8.2
	Linezolid	1	2	0.5–2	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Penicillin	1	>4	≤0.06–>4	31.3	0.0	68.8	31.3	0.0	68.8
	Tetracycline	0.25	0.25	≤0.06–>16	95.1	0.3	4.6	94.4	0.0	5.6
	TMS	≤0.06	≤0.06	≤0.06–16	99.7	0.0	0.3	99.7	0.0	0.3
	Vancomycin	1	1	≤0.25–2	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
S. pyogenes	Iclaprim	≤0.015	0.03	≤0.015–0.5	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB
($n = 159$)	Ampicillin	≤0.03	≤0.03	≤0.03–0.12	100.0	0.0	0.0	NB	NB	NB
	Azithromycin	0.12	>8	≤0.03–>8	83.7	1.3	15.1	83.7	0.0	16.4
	Ceftriaxone	0.03	0.03	≤0.015–0.06	100.0	0.0	0.0	NB	NB	NB
	Clindamycin	0.06	0.06	0.03–>2	97.5	0.6	1.9	98.1	0.0	1.9
	Levofloxacin	0.5	1	0.25–2	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Linezolid	1	1	0.5–1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Meropenem	≤0.015	≤0.015	≤0.015–0.06	100.0	0.0	0.0	NB	NB	NB
	Penicillin	≤0.06	≤0.06	≤0.06–≤0.06	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Tetracycline	0.12	>8	0.06–>8	85.5	0.6	13.8	85.5	0.0	14.5
	TMS	≤0.06	0.12	≤0.06–0.5	NB	NB	NB	100.0	0.0	0.0
S. agalactiae ($n = 100$)	Iclaprim	0.12	0.5	0.06–1	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB
	Ampicillin	0.12	0.12	0.06–0.25	100.0	0.0	0.0	NB	NB	NB
	Azithromycin	0.12	>8	0.06–>8	59.0	0.0	41.0	59.0	0.0	41.0
	Ceftriaxone	0.06	0.06	0.06–0.12	100.0	0.0	0.0	NB	NB	NB
	Clindamycin	0.06	>2	0.03–>2	72.0	2.0	26.0	74.0	0.0	26.0
	Levofloxacin	1	1	0.5–2	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Linezolid	1	1	0.5–1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Meropenem	0.03	0.06	0.03–0.06	100.0	0.0	0.0	NB	NB	NB
	Penicillin	≤0.06	≤0.06	≤0.06–0.5	99.0	0.0	1.0	99.00	0.0	1.0
	Tetracycline	>8	>8	0.06–>8	23.0	1.0	76.0	22.0	1.0	77.0
	TMS	0.12	0.12	≤0.06–0.5	NB	NB	NB	100.0	0.0	0.0
S. anginosus	Iclaprim	≤0.015	≤0.015	≤0.015–≤0.015	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB
($n = 14$)	Ampicillin	0.06	0.12	≤0.03–0.12	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Azithromycin	0.06	>8	≤0.03–>8	57.1	7.1	35.7	NB	NB	NB
	Ceftriaxone	0.12	0.25	0.03–0.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Clindamycin	0.03	>2	≤0.015–>2	78.6	0.0	21.4	78.6	0.0	21.4
	Levofloxacin	0.5	0.5	≤0.12–1	100.0	0.0	0.0	NB	NB	NB
	Linezolid	1	1	0.5–1	100.0	0.0	0.0	NB	NB	NB
	Meropenem	0.03	0.12	≤0.015–0.12	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Penicillin	≤0.06	≤0.06	≤0.06–≤0.06	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Tetracycline	4	>8	≤0.03–>8	42.9	7.1	50.0	NB	NB	NB
	TMS	≤0.06	≤0.06	≤0.06–≤0.06	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB
S. dysgalactiae ($n = 40$)	Iclaprim	0.03	0.06	≤0.015–>32	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB	NB
	Ampicillin	≤0.03	≤0.03	≤0.03–0.12	100.0	0.0	0.0	NB	NB	NB
	Azithromycin	0.12	>8	0.12–>8	77.5	0.0	22.5	77.5	0.0	22.5
	Ceftriaxone	0.03	0.06	≤0.015–0.06	100.0	0.0	0.0	NB	NB	NB
	Clindamycin	0.06	0.06	0.03–>2	97.5	0.0	2.5	97.5	0.0	2.5

Table 2 *(continued)*

Organism	Drug	MIC_{50}	MIC_{90}	Range	CLSI			EUCAST		
					%S	%I	%R	%S	%I	%R
	Levofloxacin	0.5	1	0.25–>8	97.5	0.0	2.5	97.5	0.0	2.5
	Linezolid	1	1	1–1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Meropenem	≤0.015	≤0.015	≤0.015–≤0.015	100.0	0.0	0.0	NB	NB	NB
	Penicillin	≤0.06	≤0.06	≤0.06–≤0.06	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Tetracycline	0.25	>8	0.12–>8	67.5	10.0	22.5	67.5	0.0	32.5
	TMS	≤0.06	0.12	≤0.06–>16	NB	NB	NB	97.5	0.0	2.5

Abbreviations: NB = no breakpoint; S = susceptible; I = intermediate; R = resistant.

independent of the prevalence of macrolide resistance. The MIC range (0.06–1 μg/mL) and MIC_{90} (0.5 μg/mL) for iclaprim were identical for isolates resistant (MIC ≥2 μg/mL, 41%) or susceptible to azithromycin (59%).

3.5. Iclaprim and comparator activity against S. anginosus and S. dysgalactiae

Iclaprim exhibited activity against all 14 *S. anginosus* (Table 2). The MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} were both ≤0.015 μg/mL for *S. anginosus*. In comparison, MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} for TMS were both ≤0.06 μg/mL (Table 2). Iclaprim showed activity against *S. anginosus* independent of the prevalence of macrolide resistance. The MIC for iclaprim against all *S. anginosus* isolates tested was constant at ≤0.015 μg/mL for an azithromycin MIC range ≤0.03–>8 μg/mL.

Iclaprim exhibited activity against all 40 *S. dysagalactiae* (Table 2). The MIC_{50} and MIC_{90} were 0.03 and 0.06 μg/mL, respectively, for *S. dysagalactiae*. By comparison, MIC_{50}/MIC_{90} for TMS were ≤0.06/0.12 μg/mL, respectively (Table 2). Iclaprim showed activity against *S. dysagalactiae* independent of the prevalence of macrolide resistance. Of the 9 isolates resistant to azithromycin (MIC ≥2 μg/mL, 22.5%), only 1 had a MIC for iclaprim >0.03 μg/mL. Based on EUCAST breakpoints (no breakpoints are available in CLSI for TMS against beta-hemolytic streptococci), only 1 *S. dysagalactiae* isolate was resistant to TMS (MIC ≥2 μg/mL), and the MIC of iclaprim was >32 μg/mL for this isolate.

4. Discussion

This study shows that iclaprim alone, without the synergistic combination of a sulfonamide, is active against a collection of 931 Gram-positive clinical isolates, including those with resistant phenotypes, collected from skin or soft tissue from patients with SSSI between 2015 and 2016 in the US and EU. Iclaprim in vitro activity (MIC_{50} 0.03 μg/mL and MIC_{90} 0.12 μg/mL) was similar to that of TMS (MIC_{50} ≤0.06 μg/mL and MIC_{90} 0.12 μg/mL). Although the in vitro activity of iclaprim alone was similar to TMS combination, not having to add a sulfonamide component to iclaprim may be clinically meaningful from a safety perspective. For example, sulfonamides are associated with the following severe toxicities: hypersensitivity reactions (Stevens Johnson syndrome), anaphylaxis, hepatotoxicity, and blood dyscrasias (Schnyder and Pilcher, 2013). The activity of iclaprim and the MIC_{50}/MIC_{90} of 0.03/0.12 μg/mL for *S. aureus,* 0.12/0.5 μg/mL for *S. agalactiae*, ≤0.015/0.03 μg/mL for *S. pyogenes,* ≤0.015 /≤0.015 μg/mL for *S. anginosus* and 0.03/0.06 μg/mL for *S. dysgalactiae* documented in this analysis were consistent (MIC_{90} values were within +/− 2 dilutions) with those in a surveillance study performed a decade earlier, comprising 5937 Gram-positive isolates from skin and soft tissue, blood stream, and respiratory clinical specimens from patients in the US and EU (Sader et al., 2009) and with those in a surveillance study performed in 2012–2014 (MIC_{90} values were within +/− 2 dilutions) comprising 2814 Gram-positive clinical isolates from skin and soft tissue from patients in the US and EU (Huang et al., 2018a, 2018b).

Resistance in *S. aureus* to dihydrofolate reductase inhibitors is determined by a single amino acid change (F98Y) within the trimethoprim-binding site of DHFR. Iclaprim was rationally engineered, using information from X-ray crystal data of isolated DHFR, for enhanced activity against Gram-positive bacteria including strains with mutational changes in DHFR that determine trimethoprim resistance (TMP-R). Iclaprim retains sufficient binding affinity to F98Y DHFR due to additional hydrophobic interactions with surrounding amino acids (Oefner et al., 2009). Its activity against TMP-R clinical isolates of *S. aureus* and BHS has been demonstrated in a number of studies and is driven by the greatly increased affinity of iclaprim to the DHFR target site including mutant DHFR. BHS are normally considered susceptible to TMP, although no clinical breakpoints for TMP exist, and consequently, no information concerning mechanisms of TMP resistance in such organisms is available.

In conclusion, the results from this surveillance study report iclaprim in vitro susceptibility data among contemporary (2015–2016) pathogens from the skin or soft tissue from patients with SSSI from the US

Table 3
MIC values and cumulative MIC distributions for iclaprim and TMS by pathogen group, 2015–2016.

Organism	Drug	Number (cumulative percentage) inhibited by drug MIC (μg/mL)													
		≤0.015	0.03	≤0.06	0.06	0.12	0.25	0.5	1	2	4	8	16	>16	32	>32
S. aureus	Iclaprim	4.2	52.1	NA	89.97	93.0	93.9	94.3	94.8	94.8	95.1	95.5	96.4	NA	96.8	100
(*n* = 618)	TMS	NA	NA	91.9	NA	91.9	96.9	98.1	98.4	98.5	98.9	98.9	99.5	NA	100	100
MSSA	Iclaprim	5.6	45.7	NA	91.4	96.1	97.4	97.4	97.7	97.7	97.7	97.7	98.4	NA	98.4	100
(*n* = 304)	TMS	NA	NA	97	NA	97.4	98.7	99.3	99.7	99.7	99.7	99.7	100	NA	100	100
MRSA	Iclaprim	2.9	58.3	NA	88.5	90.1	90.4	91.4	92	92	92.7	93.3	94.6	NA	95.2	100
(*n* = 314)	TMS	NA	NA	86.9	NA	91.7	95.2	96.8	97.1	97.5	98.1	98.1	99	NA	100	100
S. pyogenes	Iclaprim	84.9	95	NA	99.4	99.4	99.4	100	100	100	100	100	100	NA	100	100
(*n* = 159)	TMS	NA	NA	65.4	NA	96.2	99.4	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	NA	NA
S. agalactiae	Iclaprim	0	0	NA	49	53	80	98	100	100	100	100	100	NA	100	100
(*n* = 100)	TMS	NA	NA	21	NA	93	99	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	NA	NA
S. anginosus	Iclaprim	100	100	NA	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	NA	100	100
(*n* = 14)	TMS	NA	NA	100	NA	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	NA	NA
S. dysgalactiae	Iclaprim	2.5	50	NA	95	95	95	97.5	97.5	97.5	97.5	97.5	97.5	NA	97.5	100
(*n* = 40)	TMS	NA	NA	65	NA	95	97.5	97.5	97.5	97.5	97.5	97.5	97.5	100	NA	NA

Abbreviation: NA = not applicable.

and EU that are unchanged a decade later compared to another large surveillance study (Sader et al., 2009). Continued surveillance is warranted to track the activity of iclaprim and to detect any potential emergence of resistance to iclaprim in the future.

Source of funding and conflict of interest

This study was supported by Motif BioSciences Inc., New York, USA.

DBH is an employee of Motif BioSciences. TLH has received consultancy fees from Basliea Pharmaceutica, Genentech, Medicines Company, and Motif Biosciences. TMF has served as a consultant for Motif BioSciences, Allergan, Medicines Company, Merck, Nabriva, Paratek, Shionogi, and GSK. AT has served as a consultant for Motif BioSciences. MHW has received consulting fees from Abbott Laboratories, Actelion, Astellas, Astra-Zeneca, Bayer, bioMèrieux, Cerexa, Cubist, Durata, The European Tissue Symposium, The Medicines Company, MedImmune, Merck, Motif Biosciences, Nabriva, Optimer, Paratek, Pfizer, Qiagen, Roche, Sanofi-Pasteur, Seres, Summit, and Synthetic Biologics; lecture fees from Abbott, Alere, Astellas, Astra-Zeneca, Merck, and Pfizer & Roche; and grant support from Abbott, Actelion, Astellas, bioMèrieux, Cubist, Da Volterra, MicroPharm, Morphochem AG, Sanofi-Pasteur, Seres, Summit, and The European Tissue Symposium, Merck. RC has received consultancy fees from Cempra Pharmaceuticals, PRA International, Furiex Pharmaceuticals, Inimex Pharmaceuticals, Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Cubist Pharmaceuticals, Cerexa/Forest Laboratories, AstraZeneca, GlaxoSmithKline, Pfizer, Merck, Trius Therapeutics, ContraFect, Theravance, and Astellas Pharma and served on an advisory board for Pfizer, Polymedix, Trius Therapeutics, Rib-x Pharmaceuticals, Seachaid Pharmaceuticals, BioCryst Pharmaceuticals, Durata Therapeutics, Achaogen, Gilead Sciences, ContraFect, Cempra, and Nabriva Therapeutics. RC received research grants from Theravance, Innocoll, and The Medicines Company.

References

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). M07-A10. Methods for dilution antimicrobial susceptibility tests for bacteria that grow aerobically; approved standard: tenth edition. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2015.

Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). M100. Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing: 27th informational supplement. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2017.

EUCAST. Breakpoint tables for interpretation of MICs and zone diameters. Version 7.0, January 2017; 2017.

Holland TL, O'Riordan W, McManus A, Shin E, Borghei A, File Jr TM, Wilcox MH, Torres A, Dryden M, Lodise T, Oguri T, Corey GR, McLeroth P, Shukla R, Huang DB. Phase 3, Randomized, Double-Blind, Multicenter Study To Evaluate the Safety and Efficacy of Intravenous Iclaprim versus Vancomycin for Treatment of Acute Bacterial Skin and Skin Structure Infections Suspected or Confirmed To Be Due to Gram-Positive Pathogens (REVIVE-2 Study). Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2018;26(62):e02580-17.

Huang DB, File Jr TM, Dryden M, Corey GR, Torres A, Wilcox MH. Surveillance of Iclaprim activity: in vitro susceptibility of Gram-positive pathogens collected from 2012–2014 from the United States, Asia Pacific, Latin American and Europe. Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis 2018a;90:329–34.

Huang DB, O'Riordan W, Overcash JS, Heller B. A phase 3, **R**andomized, double-blind, multicenter study to **EV**aluate the safety and efficacy of intravenous **I**claprim versus **V**ancomycin for the tr**E**atment of acute bacterial skin and skin structure infections suspected or confirmed to be due to Gram-positive pathogens: REVIVE-1. Clin Infect Dis 2018b;66:1222–9.

Long SW, Olsen RJ, Mehta SC, Palzkill T, Cernoch PL, Perez KK, et al. PBP2a mutations causing high-level ceftaroline resistance in clinical methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* isolates. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2014;58:6668–74.

Mishra NN, Bayer AS, Tran TT, Shamoo Y, Mileykovskaya E, Dowhan W, et al. Daptomycin resistance in enterococci is associated with distinct alterations of cell membrane phospholipid content. PLoS One 2012;7, e43958.

Morrissey I, Maher K, Hawser S. Activity of iclaprim against clinical isolates of *Streptococcus pyogenes* and *Streptococcus agalactiae*. J Antimicrob Chemother 2009;63:413–4.

Oefner C, Bandera M, Haldimann A, Laue H, Schulz H, Mukhija S, et al. Increased hydrophobic interactions of iclaprim with *Staphylococcus aureus* dihydrofolate reductase are responsible for the increase in affinity and antibacterial activity. J Antimicrob Chemother 2009;63:687–98.

Sader HS, Fritsche TR, Jones RN. Potency and bactericidal activity of iclaprim against recent clinical gram-positive isolates. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2009;53:2171–5.

Sanchez Garcia M, De la Torre MA, Morales G, Pelaez B, Tolon MJ, Domingo S, et al. Clinical outbreak of linezolid-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in an intensive care unit. JAMA 2010;303:2260–4.

Schneider P, Hawser S, Islam K. Iclaprim, a novel diaminopyrimidine with potent activity on trimethoprim sensitive and resistant bacteria. Bioorg Med Chem Lett 2003;13:4217–21.

Schnyder B, Pilcher WJ. Allergy to sulfonamides. J Allergy Clin Immunol 2013;131:256–7.

Steenbergen JN, Alder J, Thorne GM, Tally FP. Daptomycin: a lipopeptide antibiotic for the treatment of serious Gram-positive infections. J Antimicrob Chemother 2005;55:283–8.

Steinkraus G, White R, Friedrich L. Vancomycin MIC creep in non-vancomycin-intermediate *Staphylococcus aureus* (VISA), vancomycin-susceptible clinical methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* (MRSA) blood isolates from 2001–05. J Antimicrob Chemother 2007;60:788–94.

Stevens DL, Bisno AL, Chambers HF, Dellinger EP, Goldstein EJ, Gorbach SL, et al. Practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of skin and soft tissue infections: 2014 update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Clin Infect Dis 2014;59:e10–52.

Tognetti L, Martinelli C, Berti S, Hercogova J, Lotti T, Leoncini F, et al. Bacterial skin and soft tissue infections: review of the epidemiology, microbiology, aetiopathogenesis and treatment: a collaboration between dermatologists and infectivologists. J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol 2012;26:931–41.