

SCY-078 Displays Significant *In-Vitro* Activity Against Multi Drug Resistant (MDR) *Candida albicans* and *Candida glabrata* Isolates

K. Borroto-Esoda¹, D. Angulo¹, S. Moser³, J. Whiddon³, P. Pappas², and S. Wring¹

¹Scynexis Inc, Jersey City, NJ ²Univ. of Alabama, Birmingham Division of Infections Diseases, Dept of Clinical Micro/Pathology, ³Univ. of Alabama Birmingham Department of Pathology

Background

- Patients infected with multi-drug resistant (MDR) *Candida* typically experience worsened clinical outcomes^a.
- 2016 IDSA treatment guidelines for candidiasis recommend lipid formulations of amphotericin B (LFAMB) for these patients^b.
- However, LFAMB is associated with significant adverse events that limits its use^c.
- SCY-078 is a 1,3- β -D-glucan synthesis inhibitor (GSI) and first-in-class of structurally novel triterpene antifungals in clinical development as both oral and intravenous formulations for the treatment of candidemia and invasive candidiasis.
- SCY-078 has demonstrated *in vitro* activity against echinocandin (ECH) and fluconazole (FLU) resistant strains (see posters 45 and 44).
- Here we report the *in vitro* activity of SCY-078 against multi-drug resistant (MDR) *Candida* strains with resistance to both ECHs and FLU.

Methods

- To identify MDR strains, *in vitro* MIC data for caspofungin (CASP), micafungin (MICA) and fluconazole (FLU) were analyzed across 2 independent studies that evaluated over 400 clinical *Candida spp* isolates collected between 2005 and 2015.
- In both studies, the *in vitro* susceptibility (MIC: 50% inhibition at 24 hrs) was determined by broth micro-dilution using CLSI methods (M27-S3).
- Resistance to CASP, MICA and FLU was determined according to the CLSI guidelines (M27-S4).
- Resistance to SCY-078 was defined as isolates having an MIC values >4-fold that of wild-type (WT)

Results Summary

- Twenty one clinical isolates comprising 8 *C. albicans* and 17 *C. glabrata* isolates met the criteria for ECH and FLU resistance.
- In vitro* MIC values for FLU were ≥ 16 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ and ≥ 64 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ for *C. albicans* and *C. glabrata* respectively
- MIC values for CASP were ≥ 1 and ≥ 2 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ against *C. albicans* and *C. glabrata*, respectively.
- MIC values for MICA against the *C. glabrata* strains was ≥ 0.25 $\mu\text{g/mL}$.
- Overall, SCY-078 was active *in vitro* against 6/8 (75%) of the MDR *C. albicans* strains and 12/17 (71%) *C. glabrata* strains tested.

Activity of SCY-078 and Comparators Against MDR *C. albicans* Isolates^d

CLSI MIC ($\mu\text{g/mL}$)			
SCY-078*	CASP	MICA	FLU
0.5	1	ND	64
0.5	2	ND	16
0.25	2	ND	128
0.125	2	ND	64
2	1	ND	128
0.25	1	ND	128
0.25	1	ND	32
1	8	ND	64

^dData from Pfaller et al., JAC 2013
^eSCY-078 MIC₅₀ vs. WT *C. albicans* = 0.125 mg/mL; Resistance to SCY-078 defined as MIC ≥ 1 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ against *C. albicans*

Activity of SCY-078 and Comparators Against MDR *C. glabrata* isolates^d

CLSI MIC ($\mu\text{g/mL}$)			
SCY-078	CASP	MICA	FLU
2	1	ND	128
1	2	ND	64
1	16	ND	128
1	16	ND	64
1	0.5	ND	64
1	8	ND	128
1	ND	4	64
2	ND	2	64
1	ND	2	64
2	ND	2	64
1	ND	1	64
2	ND	0.5	64
2	ND	0.5	64
1	ND	0.25	64
1	ND	0.25	64
1	ND	0.25	64
0.5	ND	0.25	64

^dCASP data from Pfaller et al., JAC 2013

^eSCY-078 MIC₅₀ vs. WT *C. glabrata* = 0.5 $\mu\text{g/mL}$; Resistance to SCY-078 defined as MIC ≥ 2 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ against *C. glabrata*

CLSI Resistance Guidelines:
C. albicans – CASP ≥ 1 , MICA ≥ 1 , FLU ≥ 8
C. glabrata – CASP ≥ 0.5 , MICA ≥ 0.25 , FLU ≥ 64

SCY-078 Retains Activity Against the Majority of MDR Clinical Isolates

75% of MDR-*C. albicans* Isolates Remain Sensitive to Inhibition by SCY-078



71% of MDR-*C. glabrata* Isolates Remain Sensitive to Inhibition by SCY-078



Conclusions

In vitro, the majority of MDR *C. albicans* and *C. glabrata* clinical isolates remained sensitive to inhibition by SCY-078 with MIC values ≤ 1 $\mu\text{g/mL}$. These results suggest that SCY-078 may be a suitable option for the treatment of selected infections caused by echinocandin and azole resistant *C. albicans* and *C. glabrata* strains.

References
^aFarmakiotis et al., Emerging Infectious Diseases 2014
^bPappas et al., CID 2015
^cDupont, B. JAC 2002