

Matthew A. Wozniak
Faculty of Life Sciences (North Campus),
The University of Manchester, Moffat Building, PO Box 88,
Sackville Street, Manchester M60 1QD, UK

Richard J. Maude
Birmingham Heartlands Hospital, Birmingham B9 5SS, UK
Present address: Mahidol-Oxford Tropical Medicine
Research Unit, Faculty of Tropical Medicine,
Mahidol University, 420/6 Rajvithi Road, Rajthevee,
Bangkok 10400, Thailand

John A. Innes
Birmingham Heartlands Hospital, Birmingham B9 5SS, UK

Peter M. Hawkey
University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK

Ruth F. Itzhaki*
Faculty of Life Sciences (North Campus),
The University of Manchester, Moffat Building, PO Box 88,
Sackville Street, Manchester M60 1QD, UK

*Corresponding author. Tel.: +44 161 306 3879; fax: +44
161 306 3887.
E-mail address: ruth.itzhaki@manchester.ac.uk

2 July 2009

Available online 8 July 2009

© 2009 The British Infection Society. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All
rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2009.07.003

**The clinical efficacy of fluoroquinolone and macrolide
combination therapy compared with single-agent
therapy against community-acquired pneumonia
caused by *Legionella Pneumophila***

Legionella pneumophila pneumonia is an acute infectious disease that causes severe pneumonia.^{1,2} *Legionella* community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) has a mortality rate of 10%, which increases to 27% in patients who do not receive adequate antibiotic treatment as part of the empirical treatment on admission.³ Erythromycin has been the treatment of choice for Legionnaires disease since a retrospective study of the epidemic outbreak in Philadelphia in 1976 showed a significantly lower death rate in patients treated with this antibiotic.⁴ Recently, fluoroquinolones have been found to achieve high intracellular levels with a lower minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) against *Legionella* than erythromycin, resulting in successful treatment of patients with *L. pneumophila* pneumonia.^{5,6} Some clinical observations indicate that fluoroquinolones are highly effective especially for treating patients with severe illnesses or low immunosuppression.⁷ In addition, many physicians have opted to use a combination therapy against *L. pneumophila* pneumonia, especially in severe cases. Therefore, it is important to compare the efficacy of single-agent therapy with combination therapy. The aim of this study was to elucidate the characteristics of *L. pneumophila*

pneumonia and the clinical efficacy of combination therapy compared with single-agent therapy.

This retrospective study includes patients with CAP caused by *L. pneumophila* who were admitted to the Nagasaki University Hospital and 7 affiliated hospitals from April 1, 1999, to March 31, 2008. Data for each patient were collected from databases and medical records. Results are expressed as the mean value \pm standard deviation. Statistical analysis was performed by using StatView statistics software version 5.0. The mean values were compared using the Mann–Whitney *U*-test. Proportions were compared using the χ^2 test with Yates correlation.

Out of a total of 22 patients, 18 (81.8%) received a urinary antigen test; 16 (88.9%) of which had a positive result. Fifteen (68.2%) of the 22 patients had a history of smoking, with an average smoking index of 799.3 ± 435.9 . Fourteen (63.6%) of the 22 patients had underlying diseases, such as diabetes mellitus in 6 patients and pulmonary emphysema in 4 patients. In the laboratory findings at the time of admission, consistent with previous reports, the lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), creatine phosphokinase (CPK), blood urea nitrogen (BUN), serum creatinine (Cr), and aspartate aminotransferase (AST) were increased in the present study. Moreover, the average partial pressure of arterial oxygen (PaO₂) on admission was decreased (62.7 ± 12.6 torr), and the arterial alveolar oxygen tension gradient was increased (AaDO₂) (48.8 ± 12.9 torr). In the chest radiographs manifestation, the average chest X-ray score was 5.0 ± 2.1 . Fifteen (68.2%) cases showed consolidation alone. The average of P/F ratio and AaDO₂ were 225.95 ± 110.5 and 42.3 ± 4.5 , respectively. Seven (27.3%) cases showed consolidation with interstitial shadow. The average of P/F ratio and AaDO₂ were 177.7 ± 73.2 and 55.2 ± 6.1 , respectively. We noted statistically significant relationships between the presence of an interstitial shadow and abnormalities in the P/F ratio ($P < 0.05$) and AaDO₂ ($P < 0.05$). In the treatment, we compared the treatment regimens (fluoroquinolone alone, macrolide alone, and fluoroquinolone with macrolide) to clarify their clinical efficacy. Table 1 shows the background and outcome for each group. Although the average pneumonia severity index (PSI) score was higher in the combination group, the outcome was not significantly different as compared to the single-agent therapy groups. We also compared the clinical course of these 3 regimens by determining the degree of improvement on the 3rd and 7th treatment days. As shown in Table 2, on the 3rd treatment day, the clinical status was progressive or showed poor improvement even if the anti-*Legionella* drugs were selected correctly. Conversely, after the 7th treatment day, the clinical status was improved dramatically, especially in patients who received combination therapy; no statistical significance in patient outcome was found among the 3 regimens.

Multimodality therapy, such as the combination of antimicrobials, corticosteroids, and sivelestat sodium, is generally considered for *L. pneumophila* pneumonia. However, there is no evidence to support the clinical efficacy of multimodality therapy. Several case studies have described the successful treatment of *L. pneumophila* pneumonia with fluoroquinolones.^{8,9} Clinically, many physicians tend to use a combination therapy against *L. pneumophila* pneumonia, especially in severe cases. Therefore, it is important

Table 1 Clinical differences between single-agent therapy and combination therapy.

	Total (n = 22)	Fluoroquinolone alone (n = 12)	Macrolide alone (n = 4)	Fluoroquinolone + macrolide (n = 6)
PSI score				
II	6	6	0	0
III	7	1	2	3
IV	5	2	2	2
V	4	3	0	1
Average	3.3 ± 1.2	3.2 ± 1.3	3.5 ± 4.1	3.6 ± 0.8
Fluoroquinolones	18			
Ciprofloxacin	15	10	—	5
Pazufloxacin	3	2	—	1
Combination				
Corticosteroid	6	3	0	3
Sivelestat	4	1	0	3
Ventilation	6	2	0	4
Dialysis	3	2	0	1
Duration of antibiotics (days)	12.8 ± 4.3	12.9 ± 3.6	14.8 ± 3.5	12.8 ± 6.0
Hospitalization length (days)	33.6 ± 20.9	29.6 ± 16.3	32.3 ± 21.7	33.3 ± 27.8
Deaths (mortality rate; %)	2 (9.1%)	1 (8.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (16.7%)

to compare the efficacy of single-agent therapy with combination therapy. Although Martin et al. reported that a combination of ciprofloxacin and clarithromycin show a synergistic effect against *Legionella* species *in vitro*,^{10,11} there has been no study comparing the clinical efficacy of combination therapy with fluoroquinolones and macrolides. In the present study, we retrospectively compared the clinical effects of single-agent therapies, fluoroquinolones and macrolides, with combination therapy in the treatment of *L. pneumophila* pneumonia. Although each treatment resulted in little or no improvement by the 3rd treatment day, the clinical course was improved greatly by the 7th treatment day, especially in the combination therapy group; nevertheless. The reason for early improvement in the group treated with fluoroquinolones and macrolide might be related to the immunomodulatory effects of macrolides.^{12,13} In Western countries, new macrolides and fluoroquinolones, such as azithromycin, levofloxacin, and moxifloxacin, are recommended for treating *L. pneumophila* pneumonia.^{2,7} However, the complications and mortality rate in patients with *L. pneumophila* pneumonia

depend on the administration timing of appropriate antimicrobial therapy and the presence of immunosuppression, the severity of the underlying diseases, and the severity of the pneumonia.^{2,14} The advantages of choosing macrolides, fluoroquinolones, or both for *L. pneumophila* pneumonia in healthy patients or CAP may only be those reported in this study: shorter time to apyrexia and thus a more rapid achievement of good health status. In these patients, complications and mortality are probably not influenced by the choice of either type of drug and combination therapy. Nevertheless, sufficient information currently supports the use of combination therapy in severe cases of *L. pneumophila* pneumonia.¹⁵ In conclusion, fluoroquinolone combined with macrolide may be able to improve the inflammation caused by *L. pneumophila* pneumonia earlier than single-agent therapy although there were no significant differences in outcome. However, this study had small numbers of patients and it is difficult to draw conclusion. A larger population sample is needed to definitively determine the treatment that is most effective for *L. pneumophila* pneumonia.

Table 2 Comparison of the improvement rate (%) at 3 treatment days and 7 treatment days between single-agent therapy and combination therapy.

Parameter	Total (n = 22)		Fluoroquinolone alone (n = 12)		Macrolide alone (n = 4)		Fluoroquinolone + macrolide (n = 6)	
	Day 3	Day 7	Day 3	Day 7	Day 3	Day 7	Day 3	Day 7
WBC ($\times 10^3/\text{mm}^3$)	13.0	10.9	17.9	2.1	18.1	4.2	4.9	81.2*
CRP (mg/dl)	28.1	61.8*	9.5	48.4*	6.2	29.4*	20.3	80.5*
P/F ratio	-9.0	34.7*	1.1	28.8*	-0.8	16.1*	9.1	38.4*
Decrease in body temperature (°C)	0.59	1.2	0.05	1.35	0.03	0.9	0.1	1.4
Chest X-ray score	-21.9	31.3*	-25.4	28.9*	-30.4	23.2*	-20.5	41.5*

* $P < 0.05$; improvement rate (%), day 0 (admission day) to day 3 versus day 3–day 7.

Acknowledgments

The first two authors (S.N. and K.Y.) contributed equally to this work. The authors thank Drs. Akira Kondo, Tetsuya Iida, Toyomitsu Sawai, Yasuhito Higashiyama, Koji Hashiguchi, Naofumi Suyama, and Kinichi Izumikawa for their contributions to this study.

References

1. Stout JE, Yu VL. Legionellosis. *N Engl J Med* 1997;337:682–7.
2. Diederer BM. Legionella spp. and Legionnaires' disease. *J Infect* 2008;56:1–12.
3. Falco V, Fernandez de Sevilla T, Alegre J, Ferrer A, Martinez Vazquez JM. Legionella pneumophila. A cause of severe community-acquired pneumonia. *Chest* 1991;100:1007–11.
4. Meyer RD, Finegold SM. Legionnaires' disease. *Annu Rev Med* 1980;31:219–32.
5. Schulin T, Wennersten CB, Ferraro MJ, Moellering Jr RC, Eliopoulos GM. Susceptibilities of Legionella spp. to newer antimicrobials in vitro. *Antimicrobial Agents Chemother* 1998;42:1520–3.
6. Walz A, Nichterlein T, Hof H. Excellent activity of newer quinolones on Legionella pneumophila in J 774 macrophages. *Zentralbl Bakteriol* 1997;285:431–9.
7. Unertl KE, Lenhart FP, Forst H, Vogler G, Wilm V, Ehret W, et al. Ciprofloxacin in the treatment of legionellosis in critically ill patients including those cases unresponsive to erythromycin. *Am J Med* 1989;87:128S–31S.
8. Haranaga S, Toyama M, Arakaki N, Miyara T, Shinzato T, Koide M, et al. Legionella pneumophila pneumonia successfully treated with intravenous ciprofloxacin. *Intern Med* 2002;41:1024–8.
9. Edelstein PH. Antimicrobial chemotherapy for legionnaires' disease; a review. *Clin Infect Dis* 1995;21:S265–76.
10. Martin SJ, Pendland SL. Bactericidal activity and postantibiotic effect of clarithromycin and 14-hydroxyclearithromycin, alone and in combination, against Legionella pneumophila. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 1998;41:643–8.
11. Martin SJ, Pendland SL, Chen C, Schreckenberger PC, Danziger LH. In vitro activity of clarithromycin alone and in combination with ciprofloxacin or levofloxacin against Legionella spp.: enhanced effect by the addition of the metabolite 14-hydroxy clarithromycin. *Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis* 1997;29:167–71.
12. Shinkai M, Henke MO, Rubin BK. Macrolide antibiotics as immunomodulatory medications: proposed mechanisms of action. *Pharmacol Ther* 2008;117:393–405.
13. Giamarellos-Bourboulis EJ. Macrolides beyond the conventional antimicrobials: a class of potent immunomodulators. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2008;31:12–20.
14. Pedro-Botet ML, Sabria M, Sopena N, Garcia-Nunez M, Dominguez MJ, Reynaga E, et al. Legionnaires' disease and HIV infection. *Chest* 2003;124:543–7.
15. Roig J, Rello J. Legionnaires' disease: a rational approach to therapy. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2003;51:1119–29.

Shigeki Nakamura

Division of Molecular & Clinical Microbiology, Department of Molecular Microbiology & Immunology, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Medical Science, Nagasaki, Japan

Katsunori Yanagihara*

Department of Laboratory Medicine, Nagasaki University Hospital, Nagasaki, Japan

*Corresponding author. Department of Laboratory Medicine, Nagasaki University School of Medicine, 1-7-1 Sakamoto, Nagasaki 852-8501, Japan. Tel.: +81 95 819 7418; fax: +81 95 849 7257. E-mail address: k-yanagi@nagasaki-u.ac.jp

Koichi Izumikawa

Masafumi Seki

Hiroshi Kakeya

Yoshihiro Yamamoto

Division of Molecular & Clinical Microbiology, Department of Molecular Microbiology & Immunology, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Medical Science, Nagasaki, Japan

Hideaki Senjyu

Course of Health Sciences, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, Nagasaki, Japan

Atsushi Saito

Japanese Red Cross Nagasaki Genbaku Isahaya Hospital, Nagasaki, Japan

Shigeru Kohno

Division of Molecular & Clinical Microbiology, Department of Molecular Microbiology & Immunology, Nagasaki University Graduate School of Medical Science, Nagasaki, Japan

12 June 2009

Available online 21 June 2009

© 2009 The British Infection Society. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2009.06.008