

# New Topical Antibiotic May Thwart Resistance

BY BRUCE JANCIN  
Denver Bureau

LISBON — Five days of the novel topical antibiotic retapamulin is as effective in the treatment of uncomplicated skin infections as 10 days of an oral cephalosporin, Dr. Lawrence C. Parish reported at the 12th International Congress on Infectious Diseases.

Patients prefer topical over systemic therapy in this setting by a 3-to-1 margin. When retapamulin ointment becomes available—and GlaxoSmithKline anticipates Food and Drug Administration approval later this year—many physicians will prefer this new option, too, predicted Dr. Parish, a dermatologist at Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia.

Retapamulin is first in a new class of antibacterials known as pleuromutilins. They possess a novel mechanism of action and an extremely low propensity for development of bacterial resistance.

Retapamulin has excellent activity against gram-positive organisms, including the chief pathogens involved in skin and skin structure infections, such as *Streptococcus pyogenes*

**In a study of 546 patients with secondarily infected dermatitis, 5 days of retapamulin ointment were as effective as 10 days of oral cephalalexin.**

and *Staphylococcus aureus*, including the methicillin- and mupirocin-resistant strains. In vitro studies indicate the drug has no target-specific cross resistance to other antibiotic classes, so it's highly effective against bacteria resistant to antibiotics. Retapamulin's oral absorption is poor; it has therefore been developed as a topical agent. Allergy to the product is "almost nonexistent," according to Dr. Parish.

He reported on 546 patients with secondarily infected dermatitis who participated in a phase III, randomized, double-blind, double-dummy clinical trial conducted at 109 centers in North America, Europe, Asia, and Africa.

The patients, among them 124 children and adolescents, were assigned in a ratio of 2:1 to 5 days of retapamulin ointment 1% b.i.d. or 10 days of oral cephalalexin at 500 mg b.i.d. in a noninferiority trial involving physicians from multiple specialties. Dr. Parish served as principal investigator.

The primary efficacy end point was clinical response at follow-up on days 17-19. The rates—86% in the retapamulin group and 90% with oral cephalalexin—weren't statistically different. Nor were the microbiologic success rates of 87% and 92%, respectively.

Both drugs had 100% microbiologic success in patients with baseline methicillin-resistant *S. aureus*, although there were only seven affected patients, he said at the meeting, which was sponsored by the International Society for Infectious Diseases.

Clinical success rates at the end of therapy were also comparable: 92% in the re-

tapamulin arm on days 7-9, and 94% with oral therapy on days 12-14.

The two therapies were equally well tolerated. No serious adverse events occurred. The most common treatment-related adverse events were treatment-site itching in 1% of the retapamulin group and diarrhea and/or abdominal pain in 1.1% of the cephalalexin arm. Participants expressed a 3-to-1 preference for topical over oral therapy for their skin infection.

Dr. Parish said in an interview that the

traditional physician preference for oral treatment of bacterial infections and topical therapy for dermatophyte infections isn't based in science.

"I've tried to trace where the prejudice comes from, and I haven't been able to determine it," he said, adding that he believes many physicians, presented with evidence of equal efficacy, would prefer to use a topical medication rather than expose their patients to a systemic antibiotic.

He predicted that the topical pleuromu-

tilin will fill a role in clinical practice similar to that once occupied by mupirocin (Bactroban), which was widely prescribed for the topical therapy of secondarily infected inflammatory skin diseases until resistance became a major problem—a not-surprising development considering the drug has been marketed in the United States for 18 years.

He disclosed no ties to GlaxoSmithKline, but has received payment to conduct clinical research for the company. ■

Help your patients stay

## AWAKE, ALERT, and ENGAGED



Structurally distinct from amphetamines<sup>1</sup>

No effect on sleep when sleep is desired\*<sup>1,2</sup>

Proven safety profile

**PROVIGIL**<sup>®</sup>  
(MODAFINIL)<sup>®</sup>  
Tablets

PROVIGIL is indicated to improve wakefulness in patients with excessive sleepiness (ES) associated with narcolepsy, obstructive sleep apnea/hypopnea syndrome (OSAHS), and shift work sleep disorder (SWSD).

In OSAHS, PROVIGIL is indicated as an adjunct to standard treatment(s) for the underlying obstruction.

Patients with abnormal levels of sleepiness who take PROVIGIL should be advised that their level of wakefulness may not return to normal. Patients with excessive sleepiness, including those taking PROVIGIL, should be frequently reassessed for their degree of sleepiness and, if appropriate, advised to avoid driving or any other potentially dangerous activity.

In clinical trials, PROVIGIL was generally well tolerated. The most frequently reported adverse events (≥5%) were headache, nausea, nervousness, rhinitis, diarrhea, back pain, anxiety, insomnia, dizziness, and dyspepsia. Most adverse events were mild to moderate. PROVIGIL may interact with drugs that inhibit, induce, or are metabolized by cytochrome P450 isoenzymes.

For more information, visit [www.PROVIGIL.com](http://www.PROVIGIL.com) or call 1-800-896-5855.

Please see brief summary of prescribing information for PROVIGIL on next page.

\*No change from baseline to final visit in sleep efficiency.

References: 1. PROVIGIL full Prescribing Information. 2. Black JE, Hirshkowitz M. Modafinil for treatment of residual excessive sleepiness in nasal continuous positive airway pressure-treated obstructive sleep apnea/hypopnea syndrome. *Sleep*. 2005;28:464-471.

**Cephalon** ©2006 Cephalon, Inc. PRO722  
Jul 2006 All rights reserved. Printed in USA.