

HHS Public Access

Drug Resist Updat. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2023 December 03.

Published in final edited form as:

Author manuscript

Drug Resist Updat. 2022 December ; 65: 100885. doi:10.1016/j.drup.2022.100885.

Dual use of antifungals in medicine and agriculture: How do we help prevent resistance developing in human pathogens?

Paul E. Verweij^{a,b,*}, Maiken C. Arendrup^{c,d,h}, Ana Alastruey-Izquierdo^e, Jeremy A.W. Gold^f, Shawn R. Lockhart^f, Tom Chiller^f, P.Lewis White^g

^aDepartment of Medical Microbiology and Radboudumc-CWZ Center of Expertise for Mycology, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

^bCentre for Infectious Diseases Research, Diagnostics and Laboratory Surveillance, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, the Netherlands

^cUnit for Mycology, Statens Serum Insitut, Copenhagen, Denmark

^dDepartment of Medical Microbiology, University Hospital Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark

^eMycology Reference Laboratory, Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Madrid, Spain

^fMycotic Diseases Branch, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, USA

⁹Public Health Wales Mycology Reference Laboratory, Cardiff, United Kingdom

^hDepartment of Clinical Medicine, Copenhagen University, Copenhagen, Denmark

Abstract

Azole resistance in *Aspergillus fumigatus* is a One Health resistance threat, where azole fungicide exposure compromises the efficacy of medical azoles. The use of the recently authorized fungicide ipflufenoquin, which shares its mode-of-action with a new antifungal olorofim, underscores the need for risk assessment for dual use of antifungals.

Keywords

Aspergillus fumigatus; DHODH inhibitor; One Health; triazole resistance; olorofim

Appendix A. Supporting information

This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

^{*}Correspondence to: Department of Medical Microbiology, Radboud University Medical Center, PO box 9101, 6500HB Nijmegen, the Netherlands. Paul.verweij@radboudumc.nl (P.E. Verweij).

Disclaimer

The findings and conclusions of this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

Declaration of Competing Interest

Paul E Verweij declares grants from F2G and Gilead Sciences and payments for lectures and advisory boards by F2G, Gilead Sciences, Pfizer and Mundipharma. All payments to institute. Maiken C Arendrup, Ana Alastruey-Izquierdo, Jeremy A W Gold, Shawn R Lockhart, and Tom Chiller declare no competing interests. P Lewis White declares grants from F2G, CERBA, IHMA, payments for lectures and advisory boards by F2G, Gilead Sciences, and Pfizer, and support for travel from OLM.

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the online version at doi:10.1016/j.drup.2022.100885.

Verweij et al.

Considering the interconnectedness of humans, animals, and the environment can foster our health and continued existence. Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is a complex challenge that could benefit from a One Health perspective. In recent decades, AMR policies have focused on bacterial resistance and animal-environment-human interface, with limited attention to fungal resistance. However, the emerging threat of fungal resistance is increasingly recognized by public health institutes. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control 2019 Antibiotic Resistance Threats Report and the World Health Organization (WHO) Fungal Priority Pathogen List include *Candida auris* as an urgent public health threat (CDC, www.cdc.gov) and recently added azole-resistant *Aspergillus fumigatus* to the pathogen watchlist (WHO, www.who.int).

The dual use of azoles in the environment and in the clinic has been shown to be an important driver for azole-resistant A. fumigatus infections in humans (Snelders et al. 2012; Fisher et al., 2022). Recent surveillance studies show resistance rates varying between 1.4 % and 11.4 % in clinical A. fumigatus isolates, which predominantly (72 %, 95 % CI: 69–74) involve resistance mutations associated with environmental resistance selection (Table 1). Triazole fungicides and medical azoles share structural characteristics and therefore, mutations in the cyp51A target gene confer cross-resistance (Snelders et al., 2012). Although not a plant pathogen, A. fumigatus is environmentally ubiquitous and inevitably exposed to azole fungicides used for crop protection (Verweij et al., 2009). A. *fumigatus* thrives on decaying plant material and becomes resistant in the presence of azole fungicide residues (Schoustra et al., 2019). In addition to agricultural practices, substantial contamination of residential gardens with tebuconazole-resistant A. fumigatus was recently shown in a U.K.-wide study (Shelton et al., 2022). Migration of resistance through horticultural products and dispersal of Aspergillus conidia with air currents has facilitated global spread and make control difficult (Dunne et al., 2017; Fisher et al., 2022). Adaptation to azole stress may also drive other adaptations potentially leading to increased virulence in host infection (Fisher et al., 2022). Current clinical implications of azole resistance are significant with 25 % day-90 excess mortality in patients with voriconazole-resistant invasive aspergillosis who were treated with voriconazole (Lestrade et al., 2019). Azoles are the first-line treatment and currently the only oral option for A. fumigatus infections, and few alternative treatment options exist for azole-resistant aspergillosis (Ostrosky-Zeichner et al., 2010; Verweij et al., 2015).

Developing antifungal drugs is challenging because of the homology of drug targets between fungal and human eukaryotic cells (Ostrosky-Zeichner et al., 2010). However, researchers have recently discovered the orotomide class, which targets the biosynthesis of pyrimidines by inhibiting the key enzyme dihydroorotate dehydrogenase (DHODH) (Oliver et al., 2016). Olorofim, an orally available drug currently undergoing clinical evaluation, is the first member of its class to show promising in vitro and in vivo activity against azole-resistant *A. fumigatus* and other difficult-to-treat mold infections (Jørgensen et al., 2018; Hoenigl et al., 2021). The U.S. Food and Drug Administration granted breakthrough drug therapy designation and orphan drug designation to olorofim for the treatment of invasive aspergillosis (FDA, www.fda.gov), reflecting the potential improvement the drug may offer over existing therapies.

Verweij et al.

We can learn from the One Health azole-resistant *A. fumigatus* challenge to preserve the clinical efficacy of new modes of action (MoA). Evaluating the use of similar compounds in medical and non-medical applications and incorporating an assessment of risk to human and animal health during the authorization process could prevent an environmental route of resistance selection for novel classes. Of concern is the use of the recently authorized fungicide ipflufenoquin (EPA, www.epa.gov). The Fungicide Resistance Action Committee (FRAC) has classified ipflufenoquin as a DHODH inhibitor, meaning ipflufenoquin shares its MoA with olorofim (FRAC, www.frac.info). Furthermore, the risk of resistance selection by ipflufenoquin is considered moderate to high, suggesting a potential human health concern.

Preliminary in vitro susceptibility testing of 21 *Aspergillus* isolates indicated that olorofim and ipflufenoquin display in vitro activity against all but four and five *Aspergillus* spp. isolates, respectively (Table 2). With all four isolates in Section *Aspergillus* demonstrating high MIC values to olorofim and 3/4 of these isolates also potentially resistant to ipflufenoquin which also appeared to be ineffective against *A. niger* at both 50 % and 100 % growth inhibition endpoints (Table 2)(Materials and methods are shown in supplementary material). In general, a good correlation was observed between the in vitro activity against *Aspergillus* spp., with *A. sydowii, A. flavus* and *A. terreus* species complex (sc) being most susceptible and *A. nidulans* sc, *A. niger* sc, *A. calidoustus*, Section *Aspergillus* being the least susceptible species. This was not the case comparing MICs against 16 other mold spp. with the exception of both agents being inactive against the *Rhizopus microsporus*, in agreement with the DHODH drug target being absent in Mucorales (Table S1).

On the basis of drug concentration (mg/L), olorofim was more potent against *Aspergillus* (MIC₅₀ 0.016/0.06 mg/L with 50 % and complete inhibition endpoints, respectively) than ipflufenoquin (MIC₅₀ 2/4 mg/L). With the difference slightly larger for *A. fumigatus* sensu stricto (MIC₅₀ 0.016/0.06 mg/L for olorofim versus MIC₅₀ 2/16–32 mg/L for ipflufenoquin). Our data suggest an overall similarity between the medical DHODH inhibitor olorofim and the agricultural pesticide ipflufenoquin against *Aspergillus* spp., supporting the concern that ipflufenoquin use may cause cross-resistance to olorofim in *Aspergillus*. However, the ability of ipflufenoquin to select for olorofim resistance and associated mutations in the target *PyrE*-gene would need to be demonstrated. If confirmed, environmental monitoring programs are needed to determine if resistance selection in *A. fumigatus* occurs in the field.

In addition to orotomides, other new MoA's are in clinical development, including fosmanogepix, an inhibitor of fungal protein Gwt1. Pyridine fungicides that target this same enzyme, such as aminopyrifen, are in development with a potential risk for cross resistance emerging in human fungal pathogens (Hatamoto et al., 2019).

Increased emphasis and inclusion of antifungal resistance by research and surveillance programs could help inform policymakers about the risks and benefits of antifungal applications. For example, global action plans involving the quadripartite WHO, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, World Organization for Animal Health, and the UN Environment Progamme, could address risk assessment strategies

for new MoA in relation to the development of cross-resistance in medically relevant (non-target) fungi. International surveillance programs could detect and monitor trends in AMR, especially those taking a combined One Health approach, but need to incorporate antifungal resistance. The incorporation of fungi in the Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda of the Joint Programming Initiative on AMR (JPIAMR) represents a first step to address urgent questions related to fungal AMR (Fisher et al., 2022). Leading international mycology societies, including the European Confederation for Medical Mycology (ECMM), the International Society for Human and Animal Mycology (ISHAM), the Mycoses Study Group Education and Research Consortium (MSGERC), and the ESCMID Fungal Infection Study Group (EFISG), have endorsed the need to prioritize One Health antifungal resistance research and policies that protect antifungal drugs developed for treatment of fungal diseases and to incorporate these into the early steps of fungicide development. Furthermore, fungicide producers are also stakeholders that need to take responsibility for safeguarding crop protection without unintended effects for human health. In order to complete our understanding of the One Health perspective, it is imperative that they are involved in future discussions on managing this critical issue. Together, these actions may help to curb fungal AMR on a global scale.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- Snelders E, Camps SM, Karawajczyk A, Schaftenaar G, Kema GH, van der Lee HA, Klaassen CH, Melchers WJ, Verweij PE, 2012. Triazole fungicides can induce cross-resistance to medical triazoles in *Aspergillus fumigatus*. PLoS One 7 (3), e31801. 10.1371/journal.pone.0031801. [PubMed: 22396740]
- Fisher MC, Alastruey-Izquierdo A, Berman J, Bicanic T, Bignell EM, Bowyer P, Bromley M, Brüggemann R, Garber G, Cornely OA, Gurr SJ, Harrison TS, Kuijper E, Rhodes J, Sheppard DC, Warris A, White PL, Xu J, Zwaan B, Verweij PE, 2022. Tackling the emerging threat of antifungal resistance to human health (Sep). Nat. Rev. Microbiol 20 (9), 557–571. 10.1038/ s41579-022-00720-1. [PubMed: 35352028]
- Hsu TH, Huang PY, Fan YC, Sun PL, 2022. Azole resistance and cyp51A mutation of *Aspergillus fumigatus* in a Tertiary Referral Hospital in Taiwan. Aug 26 J. Fungi 8 (9), 908. 10.3390/ jof8090908.
- Wang Y, Zhang L, Zhou L, Zhang M, Xu Y, 2022. Epidemiology, drug susceptibility, and clinical risk factors in patients with invasive aspergillosis. Apr 15 Front Public Health 10, 835092. 10.3389/ fpubh.2022.835092. [PubMed: 35493371]
- Ener B, Ergin Ç, Gülmez D, A ca H, Tikve li M, Aksoy SA, Otkun M, Si AK, Ö ünç D, Özhak B, Topaç T, Özdemir A, Metin DY, Polat SH, Öz Y, Koç N, Atalay MA, Erturan Z, Birinci A, Çerikçio lu N, Timur D, Ek i F, Genç GE, Findik D, Gürcan, Kalkanci A, Arikan-Akdagli S, 2022. Frequency of azole resistance in clinical and environmental strains of *Aspergillus fumigatus* in Turkey: a multicentre study. Jun 29 J. Antimicrob. Chemother 77 (7), 1894–1898. 10.1093/jac/dkac125. [PubMed: 35445259]

- Badali H, Cañete-Gibas C, McCarthy D, Patterson H, Sanders C, David MP, Mele J, Fan H, Wiederhold NP, 2022. Species distribution and antifungal susceptibilities of *Aspergillus* Section *Funigati* isolates in clinical samples from the United States. May 18 J. Clin. Microbiol 60 (5), e0028022. 10.1128/jcm.00280-22. [PubMed: 35400175]
- Ragozzino S, Goldenberger D, Wright PR, Zimmerli S, Mühlethaler K, Neofytos D, Riat A, Boggian K, Nolte O, Conen A, Fankhauser H, Schreiber PW, Zbinden R, Lamoth F, Khanna N, 2021. Distribution of *Aspergillus* species and prevalence of azole resistance in respiratory samples from Swiss tertiary care hospitals. Dec 18 Open Forum Infect. Dis 9 (2), ofab638. 10.1093/ofid/ofab638. [PubMed: 35111868]
- Risum M, Hare RK, Gertsen JB, Kristensen L, Rosenvinge FS, Sulim S, Abou-Chakra N, Bangsborg J, Røder BL, Marmolin ES, Astvad KMT, Pedersen M, Dzajic E, Andersen SL, Arendrup MC, 2022. Azole resistance in *Aspergillus fumigatus*. The first 2-year's Data from the Danish National Surveillance Study, 2018-2020 (Apr). Mycoses 65 (4), 419–428. 10.1111/myc.13426. [PubMed: 35104010]
- Simon L, Déméautis T, Dupont D, Kramer R, Garnier H, Durieu I, Sénéchal A, Reix P, Couraud S, Devouassoux G, Lina B, Rabodonirina M, Wallon M, Dannaoui E, Persat F, Menotti J, 2021. Azole resistance in *Aspergillus fumigatus* isolates from respiratory specimens in Lyon University Hospitals, France: prevalence and mechanisms involved (Dec). Int J. Antimicrob. Agents 58 (6), 106447. 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2021.106447. [PubMed: 34619334]
- Resendiz-Sharpe A, Merckx R, Verweij PE, Maertens J, Lagrou K, 2021. Stable prevalence of triazoleresistance in *Aspergillus fumigatus* complex clinical isolates in a Belgian tertiary care center from 2016 to 2020 (Dec). J. Infect. Chemother 27 (12), 1774–1778. 10.1016/j.jiac.2021.08.024. [PubMed: 34518094]
- Yang X, Chen W, Liang T, Tan J, Liu W, Sun Y, Wang Q, Xu H, Li L, Zhou Y, Wang Q, Wan Z, Song Y, Li R, Liu W, 2021. A 20-year antifungal susceptibility surveillance (from 1999 to 2019) for *Aspergillus* spp. and proposed epidemiological cutoff values for *Aspergillus fumigatus* and *Aspergillus flavus*: A study in a tertiary hospital in China. Jul 22 Front Microbiol. 12, 680884. 10.3389/fmicb.2021.680884. [PubMed: 34367087]
- Monpierre L, Desbois-Nogard N, Valsecchi I, Bajal M, Angebault C, Miossec C, Botterel F, Dannaoui É, 2021. Azole resistance in clinical and environmental *Aspergillus* isolates from the French West Indies (Martinique). Apr 30 J. Fungi (Basel) 7 (5), 355. 10.3390/jof7050355. [PubMed: 33946598]
- Prigitano A, Esposto MC, Grancini A, Biffi A, Innocenti P, Cavanna C, Lallitto F, Mollaschi EMG, Bandettini R, Oltolini C, Passera M, De Lorenzis G, Sargolzaei M, Crespan M, Cogliati M, Tortorano AM, Romanò L, 2021. Azole resistance in *Aspergillus* isolates by different types of patients and correlation with environment - An Italian prospective multicentre study (ARiA study) (May). Mycoses 64 (5), 528–536. 10.1111/myc.13241. [PubMed: 33438319]
- Xu Y, Chen M, Zhu J, Gerrits van den Ende B, Chen AJ, Al-Hatmi AMS, Li L, Zhang Q, Xu J, Liao W, Chen Y, 2020. *Aspergillus* species in lower respiratory tract of hospitalized patients from Shanghai, China: Species diversity and emerging azole resistance. Dec 29 Infect. Drug Resist 13, 4663–4672. 10.2147/IDR.S281288. [PubMed: 33402838]
- Escribano P, Rodríguez-Sánchez B, Díaz-García J, Martín-Gómez MT, Ibáñez-Martínez E, Rodríguez-Mayo M, Peláez T, García-Gómez de la Pedrosa E, Tejero-García R, Marimón JM, Reigadas E, Rezusta A, Labayru-Echeverría C, Pérez-Ayala A, Ayats J, Cobo F, Pazos C, López-Soria L, Alastruey-Izquierdo A, Muñoz P, Guinea J, ASPEIN study group, 2021. Azole resistance survey on clinical *Aspergillus fumigatus* isolates in Spain (Aug). Clin. Microbiol Infect. 27 (8), 1170.e1– 1170.e7. 10.1016/j.cmi.2020.09.042.
- Verweij PE, Snelders E, Kema GH, Mellado E, Melchers WJ, 2009. Azole resistance in Aspergillus fumigatus: a side-effect of environmental fungicide use? (Dec). Lancet Infect. Dis 9 (12), 789–795. 10.1016/S1473-3099(09)70265-8. [PubMed: 19926038]
- Schoustra SE, Debets AJM, Rijs AJMM, Zhang J, Snelders E, Leendertse PC, Melchers WJG, Rietveld AG, Zwaan BJ, Verweij PE, 2019. Environmental hotspots for azole resistance selection of *Aspergillus fumigatus*, the Netherlands (Jul). Emerg. Infect. Dis. 25 (7), 1347–1353. 10.3201/ eid2507.181625. [PubMed: 31211684]
- Shelton JMG, Collins R, Uzzell CB, Alghamdi A, Dyer PS, Singer AC, Fisher MC, 2022. Citizen science surveillance of triazole-resistant *Aspergillus fumigatus* in United Kingdom residential

garden soils. Feb 22 Appl. Environ. Microbiol 88 (4), e0206121. 10.1128/AEM.02061-21. [PubMed: 34986003]

- Dunne K, Hagen F, Pomeroy N, Meis JF, Rogers TR, 2017. Intercountry transfer of triazole-resistant Aspergillus fumigatus on plant bulbs. Jul 1 Clin. Infect. Dis 65 (1), 147–149. 10.1093/cid/cix257. [PubMed: 28369271]
- Lestrade PP, Bentvelsen RG, Schauwvlieghe AFAD, Schalekamp S, van der Velden WJFM, Kuiper EJ, van Paassen J, van der Hoven B, van der Lee HA, Melchers WJG, de Haan AF, van der Hoeven HL, Rijnders BJA, van der Beek MT, Verweij PE, 2019. Voriconazole resistance and mortality in invasive aspergillosis: a multicenter retrospective cohort study. Apr 24 Clin. Infect. Dis 68 (9), 1463–1471. 10.1093/cid/ciy859. [PubMed: 30307492]

Ostrosky-Zeichner L, Casadevall A, Galgiani JN, Odds FC, Rex JH, 2010. An insight into the antifungal pipeline: selected new molecules and beyond (Sep). Nat. Rev. Drug Disco 9 (9), 719–727. 10.1038/nrd3074.

- Verweij PE, Ananda-Rajah M, Andes D, Arendrup MC, Brüggemann RJ, Chowdhary A, Cornely OA, Denning DW, Groll AH, Izumikawa K, Kullberg BJ, Lagrou K, Maertens J, Meis JF, Newton P, Page I, Seyedmousavi S, Sheppard DC, Viscoli C, Warris A, Donnelly JP, 2015. International expert opinion on the management of infection caused by azole-resistant *Aspergillus fumigatus* (Jul-Aug). Drug Resist Updat 21-22, 30–40. 10.1016/j.drup.2015.08.001. [PubMed: 26282594]
- Oliver JD, Sibley GEM, Beckmann N, Dobb KS, Slater MJ, McEntee L, du Pré S, Livermore J, Bromley MJ, Wiederhold NP, Hope WW, Kennedy AJ, Law D, Birch M, 2016. F901318 represents a novel class of antifungal drug that inhibits dihydroorotate dehydrogenase. Nov 8 Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. Usa 113 (45), 12809–12814. 10.1073/pnas.1608304113. [PubMed: 27791100]
- Jørgensen KM, Astvad KMT, Hare RK, Arendrup MC, 2018. EUCAST determination of olorofim (F901318) susceptibility of mold species, method validation, and MICs. Jul 27 Antimicrob. Agents Chemother 62 (8), e00487–18. 10.1128/AAC.00487-18. [PubMed: 29784842]
- Hoenigl M, Sprute R, Egger M, Arastehfar A, Cornely OA, Krause R, Lass-Flörl C, Prattes J, Spec A, Thompson GR 3rd, Wiederhold N, Jenks JD, 2021. The antifungal pipeline: fosmanogepix, ibrexafungerp, olorofim, opelconazole, and rezafungin (Oct). Drugs 81 (15), 1703–1729. 10.1007/ s40265-02101611-0. [PubMed: 34626339]
- Hatamoto M, Aizawa R, Kobayashi Y, Fujimura M, 2019. A novel fungicide aminopyrifen inhibits GWT-1 protein in glycosylphosphatidylinositol-anchor biosynthesis in *Neurospora crassa* (May). Pest. Biochem Physiol 156, 1–8. 10.1016/j.pestbp.2019.02.013.

Web references

- 2022 https://www.cdc.gov/drugresista;nce/pdf/threats-report/2019-ar-threats-report-508.pdf [accessed September 2022].
- 2022 https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240006355 [accessed September 2022].
- 2022 https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/opdlisting/oopd/listResult.cfm [accessed August 2022].
- 2022 https://www3.epa.gov/pesticides/chem_search/ppls/008033-00139-20220329. pdf [accessed August 2022].
- 2022 https://www.frac.info/docs/default-source/publications/frac-code-list/frac-code-list-2022-final.pdf?sfvrsn=b6024e9a_2 [accessed August 2022].

Table 1

Azole resistance rates in clinical *A. fumigatus* isolates in recent surveillance studies.

Continent	Country; Years	Prevalence ^{<i>a</i>}	Characteristics ^b	Reference
Europe	Denmark; 2018–2020	6.1 % (66/1083)	National surveillance TR_{34} (39/66; 59 %)	Risum et al., 2022
	Belgium; 2016–2020	7.1 % (85/1192)	Single center TR ₃₄ (74/78; 95 %)	Resendiz-Sharpe et al., 2021
	Netherlands; 2018– 2021	9.2 % (567/6134)	Multicenter (10 centers) TR ₃₄ (392/660; 59 %); TR ₄₆ (132/660; 20 %)	https://swab.nl/nl/ nethmap
	Turkey; 2018–2019	3.3 % (13/392)	Multicenter (21 centers) TR ₃₄ (9/19; 47 %)	Ener et al., 2022
	France; 2017	2.1 % (4/195)	Single center No TR resistance mechanisms	Simon et al., 2021
	Switzerland; 2018– 2019	1.4 % (3/365)	Multicenter (7 centers) TR ₃₄ (3/3; 100 %)	Ragozzino et al., 2021
	Italy; 2016-2018	6.6 % (19/286)	Multicenter, isolate denominator TR_{34} (12/19; 63 %)	Prigitano et al., 2021
	Spain; 2019	4.7 % (34/725)	Multicenter TR ₃₄ (19/34; 56 %); TR ₄₆ (1/34; 3 %)	Escribano et al., 2021
Americas	USA; 2015–2020	3.5 % (73/2072)	Multicenter, isolate denominator TR ₃₄ (7/73; 10 %); TR ₄₆ (7/73; 10 %)	Badali et al., 2022
	Martinique; 2014–2018	11.4 % (4/35)	Single center, isolate denominator TR_{34} (1/4; 25 %)	Monpierre et al., 2021
Asia	China; 2019–2020	4.1 % (3/73)	Single center, patients with IA. TR_{46} (2/3; 67 %)	Wang et al., 2022
	China; 2009–2019	4.3 % (19/445)	Single center TR ₃₄ (4/19; 21 %); TR ₄₆ (3/19; 16 %)	Yang et al., 2021
	China; 2016–2018	7.0 % (4/57)	Two hospitals TR_{46} (1/4; 25 %)	Xu et al., 2020
	Taiwan; 2015–2020	1.8 % (2/113)	Single center TR ₃₄ /L98H (2/2; 100 %)	Hsu et al., 2022

^aNumber of patients with a positive *A. fumigatus* is used as denominator, unless stated otherwise.

 $b_{\text{TR}_{34}}$ and TR_{46} refer to the genetic background of the resistance mutations. IA, invasive aspergillosis.

Author Manuscript

Table 2

Comparison of the in vitro activity of two DHODH inhibitors, olorofim and ipflufenoquin against Aspergillus species determined according to the EUCAST E.Def 9.4 with a complete inhibition endpoint and by applying a partial (50%) growth inhibition endpoint.

Verweij et al.

000 001 003 0104 0105 011 1 2 1 2 4 8 10 1 A:submittion 1 1 1 1 2 1<		0.002 0.004 0.015 0.016 0.015 0.01 0.015 0.01 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.12 0.11 1 <th< th=""><th>Inhibition endpoint criteria and species (n)</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>0</th><th>lorofim</th><th>Olorofim MIC (mg/L)</th><th>ng/L)</th><th></th><th></th><th>י ו</th><th></th><th>. –</th><th>Ipflufenoquin MIC (mg/L)</th><th>oquin]</th><th>MIC (I</th><th>ng/L)</th><th></th><th></th></th<>	Inhibition endpoint criteria and species (n)				0	lorofim	Olorofim MIC (mg/L)	ng/L)			י ו		. –	Ipflufenoquin MIC (mg/L)	oquin]	MIC (I	ng/L)		
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ f(t) = 1 = 2 \\ 1 = 1 = 1 = 2 \\ 2 = 2 = 2 = 2 \\ 2 = 2 = 2 = 2 = 2$	0.002	0.004			0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.5	4					7	4			
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 \\ 1 $	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Visual complete inhibition																		
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 &$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	A. sydowii (2)		-								2								
$ \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\$	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 3 \\ 1 & 1 & 3 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 &$	2 1 1 2 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 1 1 2 2 1 1 2 2 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	A. flavus SC (2)		1	-								1	1						
1 1 3 2 1 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 1	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 3 \\ 2 & & & & \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & & \\ 2 & & & & \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & & \\ 1 & 1 & & & \\ 1 & 1 &$	$ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 4 \\ & 4 \\ & 6 \\ & 7 \\ &$	A. terreus SC (2)			2										1 1					
2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	A. fumigatus SC [*] (5)			-	1	3									1^{**}	1^{**}	-	0	
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	A. nidulans SC (2)					2								2					
2 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		A. niger SC (2)				-	1												2	
4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	f'(4) = 4 = -4 = -4 = -4 = -4 = -4 = -4 = -	A. calidoustus (2)							7						5					
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Section Aspergillus# (4)										4							_	3
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 4 1 1 4 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 1	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Spec. 50% inhibition																		
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 4 1 4 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	A. sydowii (2)		1	-							1	1							
1 1 1 4 2 2 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 1	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1 1 1 1 1 1 5) 1 1 4 1 2 1 1 1 1 2 $\#(4)$ 1 1 1 1 1 2 $\#(4)$ 1 1 1 1 1 2 $sis, one A. chevalieri, two A. intermedius. 3 4 1 1## $	A. flavus SC (2)	-		П								2							
1 4 4 1 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 4 4 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 1 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	(5) $1 4 4 1 4 1 1 1 1 2 2 4 4 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 $	A. terreus SC (2)	-	-								-			-					
2 1 1 1 1 1 1 4	2 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 4 1 1 1 1 2	$f_{\rm eff}({\bf t}) = \left(\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	A. fumigatus SC $*(5)$			-	4									4		1			
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	$ \#(4) \qquad \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	A. nidulans SC (2)				2									1 1					
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	$\frac{1}{4}(4) \qquad 1 \qquad 1 \qquad 1 \qquad 1 \qquad 1 \qquad 1$ $\frac{1}{4}(4) \qquad \frac{1}{1}$ <i>sis</i> , one <i>A. chevalieri</i> , two <i>A. intermedius</i> .	A. niger SC (2)				1	1												2	
4	4 I##	$f^{\#}(4)$ 4 1 $f^{\#}(4)$ sis, one A. chevalieri, two A. intermedius.	A. calidoustus (2)							-	-					1					
	# One A. montevidensis, one A. chevalieri, two A. intermedius.	* One A. montevidensis, one A. chevalieri, two A. intermedius. ## one A. chevalieri.	Section Aspergillus [#] (4)										4					1##			3

Drug Resist Updat. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2023 December 03.

* Two A. fumigatus Cyp51A wild-type, one A. fumigatus Cyp51A TR34/L98H, and two A. hiratsukae.

** Two A. hiratsukae.