

Dr. Grosset Replies for the Isoprodian Study Group

TO THE EDITOR:

The questions raised by Dr. Verduin are highly pertinent. However they are difficult to answer. First, the majority of the patients included in the Isoprodian study were not newly diagnosed patients. Second, the study was not a field trial but, to the contrary, a double-blind controlled clinical trial aiming to demonstrate whether or not the addition of isoniazid was detrimental. Only patients selected for possible supervised daily intake of drugs were included. Therefore, in their

conclusion, the authors have been careful enough neither to extrapolate their findings to routine field conditions nor to recommend that thioamide-containing regimens should replace the World Health Organization-recommended regimens.

—Jacques H. Grosset, M.D.

*Departement de Bacteriologie-Virologie
Faculte de Medecine Pitie-Salpetriere
91 Blvd. de l'Hopital
75634 Paris 13, France*

How Effective Is Monthly Rifampin? Response to the Letter to the Editor by Dr. J. G. Almeida

TO THE EDITOR:

I write in response to the Letter to the Editor by Dr. J. G. Almeida, entitled "How effective is monthly rifampin?"⁽¹⁾, in which he concludes that daily administration is many times more effective than monthly administration. Dr. Almeida's argument is flawed in that he draws conclusions with respect to the activity of the drug against *Mycobacterium leprae* in man from data obtained from work in mice. That rifampin is less active against *M. leprae* in the mouse than in man has been reported previously by Grosset^(2,4), among others. Dr. Almeida's extrapolation of the initial rates of bacterial killing in mice leads him to the outlandish conclusion that patients treated with monthly rifampin harbor at least 10⁸-fold more viable *M. leprae* after treatment for 14 weeks than do those treated with daily rifampin. In fact, the available data^(3,6-9) demonstrate that the rate at which *M. leprae* are killed in man decreases abruptly, after the number of viable organisms has been reduced 1000–10,000-fold, at which time the population of "persisters" is unmasked⁽¹⁰⁾. The decrease of the rate of bacterial killing and the size of the population of *M. leprae* surviving after the initial kill are indistinguishable in patients treated by a variety of rifampin-containing regimens^(3,9).

One cannot be entirely confident that monthly rifampin is as effective as daily rifampin. Were I to become ill with multibacillary leprosy, I would very likely prefer my rifampin daily rather than monthly. However, the difference of effectiveness cannot be great, and administering the drug monthly both "stretches" the supply and permits supervision of drug administration.

Moreover, there is room for serious argument with respect to the antimicrobial activity of rifampin against *M. leprae*. None of us is comfortable with the discrepancy between man and mouse. In fact, as Grosset has pointed out^(1,5), the pharmacokinetic behavior of rifampin is more favorable in the mouse than in man, a fact that is inconsistent with the apparently greater efficacy of the drug in man. Is the discrepancy between mouse and man the result of crossing species barriers—i.e., one demonstrates the viability of *M. leprae* by inoculating mice, whether the organisms have been recovered from mice or man? Or is it possible that shipment of the specimen, often if not always required when organisms are to be recovered from human lesions and inoculated into mice, and rarely if ever required when organisms are to be transferred from mouse to mouse, is injurious, particularly to *M. leprae* that have been exposed to rifampin? On the other hand, the available

data appear to be "all of a piece"—i.e., internally consistent, and consistent with what we know about other drugs. Finally, the accumulating data attesting to the efficacy of the World Health Organization multidrug therapy (WHO MDT) are entirely reassuring.

—Louis Levy, M.D., Ph.D.

Visiting Professor
Department of Dermatology
Hadassah Medical Organization
P.O. Box 12000
il-91120 Jerusalem, Israel

REFERENCES

1. ALMEIDA, J. G. How effective is monthly rifampin? *Int. J. Lepr.* **60** (1992) 81–82.
2. GUELPA-LAURAS, C.-C., GROSSET, J., TRUFFOT-PERNOT, C. and GIROIR, A. M. Activite bactericide comparee de la rifampicine seule sur *M. tuberculosis* et sur *M. leprae*. *Acta Leprol.* **86-87** (1982) 69–75.
3. GELBER, R. H. and LEVY L. Detection of persisting *Mycobacterium leprae* by inoculation of the neonatally thymectomized rat. *Int. J. Lepr.* **55** (1987) 872–878.
4. GROSSET, J. H. and GUELPA-LAURAS, C.-C. Activity of rifampin in infections of normal mice with *M. leprae*. *Int. J. Lepr.* **55** (1987) 847–851.
5. GROSSET, J., TRUFFOT-PERNOT, C., BISMUTH, R. and LECOEUR, H. Recent results of chemotherapy in experimental tuberculosis of the mouse. *Bull. I.U.A.T.* **58** (1983) 90–96.
6. LEVY, L., SHEPARD, C. C. and FASAL, P. The bactericidal effect of rifampicin on *M. leprae* in man: a) single doses of 600, 900 and 1200 mg; and b) daily doses of 300 mg. *Int. J. Lepr.* **44** (1976) 183–187.
7. SHEPARD, C. C., LEVY, L. and FASAL, P. Rapid bactericidal effect of rifampin on *Mycobacterium leprae*. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **21** (1972) 446–449.
8. SHEPARD, C. C., LEVY, L. and FASAL, P. Further experience with the rapid bactericidal effect of rifampin on *Mycobacterium leprae*. *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **23** (1974) 1120–1124.
9. Subcommittee on Clinical Trials of the Chemotherapy of Leprosy (THELEP) Scientific Working Group of the UNDP/World Bank/WHO Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases. Persisting *Mycobacterium leprae* among THELEP trial patients in Bamako and Chingleput. *Lepr. Rev.* **58** (1987) 325–337.
10. TOMAN, K. Bacterial persistence in leprosy. *Int. J. Lepr.* **49** (1981) 205–217.

Dr. Almeida Replies

TO THE EDITOR:

I thank Dr. Levy for his interesting comments on an earlier submission⁽¹⁾. I believe he is wise to choose daily (not monthly) rifampin for himself. He is right in stating that "persister" *Mycobacterium leprae* occur regardless of the regimen used. However, this will be poor comfort to patients who are on monthly rifampin. It is non-persister *M. leprae*, rather than "persisters," that are worrisome⁽³⁾. Monthly rifampin is far less effective than daily rifampin against nonpersister *M. leprae*.

In passing, I am sure that Dr. Levy has persuaded himself adequately of the relevance of mouse foot pad findings to human therapy⁽⁶⁾. Particular mouse foot pad findings may be inconvenient, but that is surely no reason to selectively discard them.

Dr. Levy seems to draw comfort from the record of WHO-MDT, based largely on self-

healing patients and those already smear-negative after previous treatment. Even placebos might have a fair measure of success under those circumstances. It is more meaningful to analyze results among previously untreated, smear-positive lepromatous patients, when a less comforting picture might emerge^(7,8).

Let us consider rifampin and cost-effectiveness. Daily rifampin is effective and the single initial dose of rifampin gives a surprisingly high initial kill^(2,4,5). However, monthly rifampin appears no more effective than daily dapsone or clofazimine^(2,4,5). If rifampin is continued beyond a single initial dose, it should be given daily or not at all. Monthly rifampin appears superfluous.

—Joel G. Almeida, M.B.B.S., Ph.D.

Consultant in Infectious Disease

P.O. Box 25

Kodaikanal 624101, India