

Pharmacology of Liposomal Amphotericin B: An Introduction to Preclinical and Clinical Advances for Treatment of Life-threatening Invasive Fungal Infections

Thomas J. Walsh,¹ Russell E. Lewis,² and Jill Adler-Moore³

¹Departments of Medicine, Pediatrics, and Microbiology & Immunology, Weill Cornell Medicine of Cornell University, New York, New York; ²Unit of Infectious Diseases, Policlinico Sant'Orsola-Malpighi, Department of Medical Sciences and Surgery, University of Bologna, Italy; and ³Department of Biological Sciences, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Keywords. liposomal amphotericin B; LAmB; fungal infection.

Amphotericin B (AmB) is characterized by a broad spectrum of antifungal efficacy and is an essential compound in the antifungal armamentarium. However, the clinical utility of AmB has been restricted by dose-limiting and potentially fatal nephrotoxicity. During the past 4 decades, major advances have been achieved in the development of lipid formulations of AmB, with the key objective of attenuating its nephrotoxicity. Liposomal amphotericin B (LAmB; AmBisome) has emerged as the most widely used agent of the licensed lipid formulations of AmB for the treatment of invasive fungal infections [1–3]. For the purpose of this article, the term “LAmB” refers exclusively to AmBisome.

During a recent meeting of the authors, organized by Gilead to discuss the recent advances and unmet needs in the use of LAmB, a decision was made by the authors to provide a definitive review of this important compound. Written by distinguished experts in antifungal drug development, medicinal chemistry, pharmacology, medical mycology, immunopharmacology, infectious diseases, and hematology/oncology, this supplement consists of 2 important articles on the preclinical and clinical safety, tolerability, pharmacokinetics (PK), pharmacodynamics, and efficacy of LAmB [4, 5]. The two articles (Adler-Moore et al [4] and Groll et al [5]) presented in this supplement of *Clinical Infectious Diseases* provide an unprecedented, comprehensive body of knowledge on the mechanisms of action, toxicology, pharmacology, and efficacy of this important antifungal agent.

PRECLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY AND THERAPEUTICS

The first article by Adler-Moore et al on preclinical pharmacology and therapeutics begins with a review of the mechanisms of antifungal activity of AmB [4]. The review discusses AmB's interaction with ergosterol in the fungal cell membrane to form subunit oligomers of membrane-permeabilizing ion channels that promote leakage of intracellular K⁺ and Mg⁺⁺ ions with a reciprocal influx of Na⁺ and Ca⁺⁺ ions, resulting in a potentially lethal effect on fungal cellular viability [6–8], as well as other mechanisms of action. The authors then provide an in-depth review of recent data exploring how the binding affinity of liposomes for fungal cell walls contributes to the capacity of LAmB to traverse the cell wall and bind with cell membrane ergosterol in the targeted fungus [9, 10].

TOXICOLOGY

Adler-Moore et al then discuss how the reduction in drug-induced nephrotoxicity through the use of LAmB has been an important advance in antifungal therapy [11]. LAmB attenuates nephrotoxicity due to the presence of cholesterol within the liposome bilayer that binds to AmB, thus permitting AmB to remain associated within the liposome rather than interacting with renal tubular epithelial cells [12]. The authors continue with a review of the results in predictive animal models that have demonstrated this reduced nephrotoxicity compared with that of deoxycholate amphotericin B (DAmB) [13–15], as well as randomized clinical trials that have since demonstrated significant reductions in nephrotoxicity, particularly glomerular injury with LAmB compared with DAmB [16–18]. The authors discuss the mechanisms of infusion-related toxicity (IRT) associated with LAmB, the frequency and severity of which are also considerably reduced compared with IRT associated with DAmB [16]. The authors also elaborate on a distinctive severe acute infusion-related reaction associated with LAmB and classified as a unique type 1 hypersensitivity reaction termed “complement activation-related pseudoallergy” [19].

Correspondence: T. J. Walsh, Departments of Medicine, Pediatrics, and Microbiology & Immunology, Weill Cornell Medicine of Cornell University, 1300 York Avenue, A-421, New York, NY 10065, USA (thw2003@med.cornell.edu).

Clinical Infectious Diseases® 2019;68(S4):S241–3

© The Author(s) 2019. Published by Oxford University Press for the Infectious Diseases Society of America. All rights reserved. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial reproduction and distribution of the work, in any medium, provided the original work is not altered or transformed in any way, and that the work is properly cited. For commercial re-use, please contact journals.permissions@oup.com. DOI: 10.1093/cid/ciz091

Adler-Moore et al continue with a review of the preclinical studies of LAmB in the treatment of different fungal infections including pulmonary aspergillosis [13], cryptococcal meningitis [20], central nervous system aspergillosis [21], *Candida* meningoencephalitis [22], mucormycosis [23, 24], and coccidioidal meningitis [25]. The authors discuss the pharmacodynamic effects of DAmB and LAmB in several different animal model systems as being principally determined by the C_{max} /minimum inhibitory concentration ratio [26–28].

CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY AND THERAPEUTICS

In the second article, Groll et al [5] initially review the PK studies of LAmB in healthy adult volunteers, as well as adult and pediatric patients [29–33]. The authors then review the clinical studies of the efficacy of LAmB against candidiasis [34–37], aspergillosis [38], cryptococcosis [39, 40], histoplasmosis [18], mucormycosis [41, 42], and other less common, deeply invasive mycoses, such as fusariosis [43]. The review delineates the role of LAmB in early treatment and preventive strategies of empirical antifungal therapy [17, 44] and prophylaxis [45, 46] in high-risk patient populations.

When considering future directions, both articles underscore the need for new dosing strategies of LAmB for the treatment and prevention of invasive fungal infections that are based on predictive preclinical and sound clinical PK data for invasive mycoses, particularly infections with emerging triazole-resistant pathogens.

Notes

Acknowledgments. This supplement was made possible by funding from Gilead Sciences; however, Gilead had no input into the content. Editorial assistance in the preparation of this manuscript was provided by Christine Drewienkiewicz of OPEN Health Medical Communications (London, United Kingdom) and was funded by Gilead. T. J. W. was supported as a Scholar of the Henry Schueler Foundation for his work on this manuscript.

Disclaimer. The views, opinions, assumptions, or any other information set out in this article are solely those of the authors and should not be attributed to the funders or any person connected with the funders. Liposomal amphotericin B is not approved for prophylaxis.

Financial support. This work was supported by Gilead Sciences.

Supplement sponsorship.

Potential conflicts of interest. T. J. W. has received grants for his institution from Amlyx, Astellas Pharma, Merck, SCYNEXIS, Allergan, Medicines Company, Lediand Biosciences, and Tetrphase and has received honoraria from Astellas Pharma, Merck, SCYNEXIS, Allergan, Medicines Company, Gilead Sciences, and Lediand Biosciences. R. E. L. has received grants and personal fees from Gilead Sciences and Merck. J. A.-M. has received grants, honoraria, and nonfinancial support from Gilead Sciences outside the submitted work and was involved in the discovery and development of liposomal amphotericin B by Vestar Inc. All authors have submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest. Conflicts that the editors consider relevant to the content of the manuscript have been disclosed.

References

1. Aversa F, Busca A, Candoni A, et al. Liposomal amphotericin B (AmBisome®) at beginning of its third decade of clinical use. *J Chemother* 2017; 29:131–43.

2. Bulbake U, Doppalapudi S, Kommineni N, Khan W. Liposomal formulations in clinical use: an updated review. *Pharmaceutics* 2017; 9:12.
3. Stone NR, Bicanic T, Salim R, Hope W. Liposomal amphotericin B (AmBisome®): a review of the pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, clinical experience and future directions. *Drugs* 2016; 76:485–500.
4. Adler Moore J. Preclinical safety, tolerability, pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, and antifungal activity of liposomal amphotericin B. *Clin Infect Dis* 2019; 68(S4):S244–59.
5. Groll AH, Rijnders BJA, Walsh TJ, Adler Moore J, Lewis Russell E, Brüggemann RJM. Clinical safety, tolerability, pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, and efficacy of liposomal amphotericin B. *Clin Infect Dis* 2019; 68(S4):S260–74.
6. Cass A, Finkelstein A, Krespi V. The ion permeability induced in thin lipid membranes by the polyene antibiotics nystatin and amphotericin B. *J Gen Physiol* 1970; 56:100–24.
7. Grudzinski W, Sagan J, Welc R, Luchowski R, Gruszecki WI. Molecular organization, localization and orientation of antifungal antibiotic amphotericin B in a single lipid bilayer. *Sci Rep* 2016; 6:32780.
8. Starzyk J, Gruszecki M, Tutaj K, et al. Self-association of amphotericin B: spontaneous formation of molecular structures responsible for the toxic side effects of the antibiotic. *J Phys Chem B* 2014; 118:13821–32.
9. Adler-Moore J, Proffitt RT. AmBisome: liposomal formulation, structure, mechanism of action and pre-clinical experience. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2002; 49(Suppl 1):21–30.
10. Walker L, Sood P, Lenardon MD, et al. The viscoelastic properties of the fungal cell wall allow traffic of AmBisome as intact liposome vesicles. *MBio* 2018; 9:e02383–17.
11. Loo AS, Muhsin SA, Walsh TJ. Toxicokinetic and mechanistic basis for the safety and tolerability of liposomal amphotericin B. *Expert Opin Drug Saf* 2013; 12:881–95.
12. Readio JD, Bittman R. Equilibrium binding of amphotericin B and its methyl ester and borate complex to sterols. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1982; 685:219–24.
13. Francis P, Lee JW, Hoffman A, et al. Efficacy of unilamellar liposomal amphotericin B in treatment of pulmonary aspergillosis in persistently granulocytopenic rabbits: the potential role of bronchoalveolar D-mannitol and serum galactomannan as markers of infection. *J Infect Dis* 1994; 169:356–68.
14. Bekersky I, Boswell GW, Hiles R, Fielding RM, Buell D, Walsh TJ. Safety, toxicokinetics and tissue distribution of long-term intravenous liposomal amphotericin B (AmBisome): a 91-day study in rats. *Pharm Res* 2000; 17:1494–502.
15. Bekersky I, Boswell GW, Hiles R, Fielding RM, Buell D, Walsh TJ. Safety and toxicokinetics of intravenous liposomal amphotericin B (AmBisome) in beagle dogs. *Pharm Res* 1999; 16:1694–701.
16. Walsh TJ, Finberg RW, Arndt C, et al. Liposomal amphotericin B for empirical therapy in patients with persistent fever and neutropenia. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Mycoses Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 1999; 340:764–71.
17. Prentice HG, Hann IM, Herbrecht R, et al. A randomized comparison of liposomal versus conventional amphotericin B for the treatment of pyrexia of unknown origin in neutropenic patients. *Br J Haematol* 1997; 98:711–8.
18. Johnson PC, Wheat LJ, Cloud GA, et al. U.S. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Mycoses Study Group. Safety and efficacy of liposomal amphotericin B compared with conventional amphotericin B for induction therapy of histoplasmosis in patients with AIDS. *Ann Intern Med* 2002; 137:105–9.
19. Roden MM, Nelson LD, Knudsen TA, et al. Triad of acute infusion-related reactions associated with liposomal amphotericin B: analysis of clinical and epidemiological characteristics. *Clin Infect Dis* 2003; 36:1213–20.
20. Albert MM, Stahl-Carroll TL, Luther ME, Graybill JR. Comparison of liposomal amphotericin B to amphotericin B for treatment of murine cryptococcal meningitis. *J Mycol Med* 1995; 5:1–6.
21. Clemons KV, Stevens DA. The contribution of animal models of aspergillosis to understanding pathogenesis, therapy and virulence. *Med Mycol* 2005; 43(Suppl 1):S101–10.
22. Groll AH, Giri N, Petraitis V, et al. Comparative efficacy and distribution of lipid formulations of amphotericin B in experimental *Candida albicans* infection of the central nervous system. *J Infect Dis* 2000; 182:274–82.
23. Luo G, Gebremariam T, Lee H, et al. Efficacy of liposomal amphotericin B and posaconazole in intratracheal models of murine mucormycosis. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2013; 57:3340–7.
24. Lewis RE, Lortholary O, Spellberg B, Roilides E, Kontoyiannis DP, Walsh TJ. How does antifungal pharmacology differ for mucormycosis versus aspergillosis? *Clin Infect Dis* 2012; 54(Suppl 1):S67–72.
25. Clemons KV, Sobel RA, Williams PL, Pappagianis D, Stevens DA. Efficacy of intravenous liposomal amphotericin B (AmBisome) against coccidioidal meningitis in rabbits. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2002; 46:2420–6.

26. Groll AH, Piscitelli SC, Walsh TJ. Antifungal pharmacodynamics: concentration-effect relationships in vitro and in vivo. *Pharmacotherapy* **2001**; 21:133–48S.
27. Wiederhold NP, Tam VH, Chi J, Prince RA, Kontoyiannis DP, Lewis RE. Pharmacodynamic activity of amphotericin B deoxycholate is associated with peak plasma concentrations in a neutropenic murine model of invasive pulmonary aspergillosis. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **2006**; 50:469–73.
28. Andes D, Safdar N, Marchillo K, Conklin R. Pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic comparison of amphotericin B (AMB) and two lipid-associated AMB preparations, liposomal AMB and AMB lipid complex, in murine candidiasis models. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **2006**; 50:674–84.
29. Walsh TJ, Yeldandi V, McEvoy M, et al. Safety, tolerance, and pharmacokinetics of a small unilamellar liposomal formulation of amphotericin B (AmBisome) in neutropenic patients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **1998**; 42:2391–8.
30. Walsh TJ, Goodman JL, Pappas P, et al. Safety, tolerance, and pharmacokinetics of high-dose liposomal amphotericin B (AmBisome) in patients infected with *Aspergillus* species and other filamentous fungi: maximum tolerated dose study. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **2001**; 45:3487–96.
31. Bekersky I, Fielding RM, Dressler DE, Kline S, Buell DN, Walsh TJ. Pharmacokinetics, excretion, and mass balance of ¹⁴C after administration of ¹⁴C-cholesterol-labeled AmBisome to healthy volunteers. *J Clin Pharmacol* **2001**; 41:963–71.
32. Bekersky I, Fielding RM, Dressler DE, Lee JW, Buell DN, Walsh TJ. Pharmacokinetics, excretion, and mass balance of liposomal amphotericin B (AmBisome) and amphotericin B deoxycholate in humans. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **2002**; 46:828–33.
33. Hong Y, Shaw PJ, Nath CE, et al. Population pharmacokinetics of liposomal amphotericin B in pediatric patients with malignant diseases. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **2006**; 50:935–42.
34. Würthwein G, Young C, Lanvers-Kaminsky C, et al. Population pharmacokinetics of liposomal amphotericin B and caspofungin in allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell recipients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **2012**; 56:536–43.
35. Juster-Reicher A, Leibovitz E, Linder N, et al. Liposomal amphotericin B (AmBisome) in the treatment of neonatal candidiasis in very low birth weight infants. *Infection* **2000**; 28:223–6.
36. Kuse ER, Chetchotisakd P, da Cunha CA, et al; Micafungin Invasive Candidiasis Working Group. Micafungin versus liposomal amphotericin B for candidaemia and invasive candidosis: a phase III randomised double-blind trial. *Lancet* **2007**; 369:1519–27.
37. Arrieta AC, Shea K, Dhar V, et al. Once-weekly liposomal amphotericin B as *Candida* prophylaxis in very low birth weight premature infants: a prospective, randomized, open-label, placebo-controlled pilot study. *Clin Ther* **2010**; 32:265–71.
38. Cornely OA, Maertens J, Bresnik M, et al; AmBiLoad Trial Study Group. Liposomal amphotericin B as initial therapy for invasive mold infection: a randomized trial comparing a high-loading dose regimen with standard dosing (AmBiLoad Trial). *Clin Infect Dis* **2007**; 44:1289–97.
39. Leenders AC, Reiss P, Portegies P, et al. Liposomal amphotericin B (AmBisome) compared with amphotericin B both followed by oral fluconazole in the treatment of AIDS-associated cryptococcal meningitis. *AIDS* **1997**; 11:1463–71.
40. Perfect JR, Dismukes WE, Dromer F, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for the management of cryptococcal disease: 2010 update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis* **2010**; 50:291–322.
41. Spellberg B, Ibrahim AS, Chin-Hong PV, et al. The Deferasirox-AmBisome Therapy for Mucormycosis (DEFEAT Mucor) Study: a randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled trial. *J Antimicrob Chemother* **2012**; 67:715–22.
42. Lanternier F, Poiree S, Elie C, et al; French Mycosis Study Group. Prospective pilot study of high-dose (10 mg/kg/day) liposomal amphotericin B (L-AMB) for the initial treatment of mucormycosis. *J Antimicrob Chemother* **2015**; 70:3116–23.
43. Nucci F, Nouér SA, Capone D, Anaissie E, Nucci M. Fusariosis. *Semin Respir Crit Care Med* **2015**; 36:706–14.
44. Walsh TJ, Teppler H, Donowitz GR, et al. Caspofungin versus liposomal amphotericin B for empirical antifungal therapy in patients with persistent fever and neutropenia. *N Engl J Med* **2004**; 351:1391–402.
45. Tollemer J, Ringdén O, Andersson S, et al. Prophylactic use of liposomal amphotericin B (AmBisome) against fungal infections: a randomized trial in bone marrow transplant recipients. *Transplant Proc* **1993**; 25:1495–7.
46. Kelsey SM, Goldman JM, McCann S, et al. Liposomal amphotericin (AmBisome) in the prophylaxis of fungal infections in neutropenic patients: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Bone Marrow Transplant* **1999**; 23:163–8.