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Abstract

There are many published international recommendations and guidelines for the management of Invasive Fungal Infections (IFIs). It is very important to develop Iranian recommendations to implement those guidelines in a daily routine practice in Iran considering the local specifications. This was the objective of this meeting, which was held on November 3rd, 2011 in Tehran. 17 Iranian scientific leaders met and reviewed all the available published International Guidelines for management of IFIs in different groups of patients. This was followed by an open discussion to develop local recommendations for appropriate implementation of International Guidelines using the available treatments in Iran. This review shows the outcome of this meeting. We believe that, putting these recommendations into practice may lead to better results of the management of cases with IFIs.

Introduction

The incidence of Invasive fungal infections is increasing. IFIs remain a major cause of morbidity and mortality among immune-compromised patients. And Candida species are an increasing cause of sepsis among non-neutropenic patients receiving intensive care. Advances in diagnostic modalities have yield in earlier diagnosis of IFIS. Also clinical prediction rules have been developed to identify patients in ICU who are at high risk of Candidiasis. On the other hand new antifungal agents have improved the outcome of treatment. This review is the result of experts’ meeting which was held to develop Iranian Guidelines for treatment of invasive fungal infections. Guidelines have focused on three major groups: 1) Neutropenic patients (including Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation) 2) Solid Organ Transplant (SOT) recipients. 3) Intensive Care Unit (ICU) patients. In each groups, two major topics are addressed:

A) Prophylaxis
B) Treatment

1) Neutropenic patients

A1: Prophylaxis against candida infection:
It is recommended in allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplant (HSCT) recipients or those undergoing intensive remission-induction or salvage induction chemotherapy for acute Leukemia. For this purpose oral fluconazol (400 mg/ daily) is drug of choice. Other azoles such as itraconazole, voriconazole and posaconazole are alternative. Caspofungin may be used if azoles are contra indicated.

A2: Prophylaxis against invasive Aspergillus infection:
When prophylaxis must be directed against aspergillosis?
- Prior invasive aspergillosis
- Anticipated prolonged neutropenic periods of at least 2 weeks.
- Prolonged period of neutropenia immediately prior to HSCT
- Induction phase for Acute Myeloid Leukemia (AML)
- Induction phase for Myelodysplastic Syndrome (MDS)
For this purpose Posaconazole is the only FDA Approved drug. But, Itraconazole and Voriconazole may be also be used.

1-A3: Duration:
For acute leukemia, prophylaxis must be continued till myeloid reconstitution. For HSCT recipients, prophylaxis must be continued for at least 75 days after transplantation or till cessation of immunosuppressive therapy.

1A4: Antifungal prophylaxis is not recommended for: patients in whom the anticipated duration neutropenia is less than 7 days.

1-B: Treatment of IFIs in neutropenic patients:

Two approaches are recommended:

1) Empirical approach: Antifungal should start for high risk patients with persistent fever after 4-7 days with antibiotics, and duration of neutropenia is expected to be >7 days. Investigations for IFIs should start with antifungal. But for all patients, antifungal with anti-mold coverage will be initiated; Caspofungin or L Amph B. Voriconazole is alternative. For patients receiving Anti-mold prophylaxis, switching to an IV form of anti-mold agent within a different class of antifungal is recommended.

2) Pre-emptive approach: is acceptable alternative approach for patients with unexplained fever (persistent fever for more than 4-7 days despite antibiotic) but clinically stable. CT-Scan of chest and Para nasal sinuses serial serum galactomannan test should be performed. If patient has a sign of IFI, anti-fungal with anti-mold activity should be initiated. For patients receiving Anti-mold prophylaxis, switching to an IV form of anti-mold agent within a different class of antifungal is recommended.

2) Solid Organ Transplant Recipients

2-A: Prophylaxis of fungal infections in solid organ transplant recipients:

2-A-1) Liver:
In the presence of one of these risk factors prophylaxis should be considered:
- Re-transplantation
- Renal failure
- Re-operation involving thoracic or abdominal cavity
For prophylaxis, lipid formulation of amphoterin or fluconazol is recommended. Echinocandins are alternative. Prophylaxis must be continued for 4 weeks after transplantation.

2-A-2: Lung:
For all lung transplant recipients, prophylaxis with anti-mold drug is recommended. For this purpose inhaled amphoterin B, Itraconazole 200 mg BID or Voriconazole 200 mg BID is recommended. Prophylaxis must be continued 4 months or longer.

2-A-3: Heart:
Patients who have one of these risk factors must receive anti-mold prophylaxis:
- Isolation of Aspergillus species in respiratory tract cultures
- Re-operation
- CMV disease
- Post transplant hemodialysis
- Existence of an episode of IA 2 months before or after heart transplant.

For this purpose Itraconazole 200 mg BID or Voriconazole 200 mg BID may be prescribed. Duration of prophylaxis is 50-150 days.

2-B: Treatment of IFIs in Solid Organ Transplant Recipients:

Empirical Treatment of IFIs:

The possible criteria to begin empirical treatment for suspected invasive candidiasis in SOT recipients are as follows: (1) Persistent fever (>38°C) despite broad spectrum antibacterial therapy for >96 hours. and (2) no other known cause of fever. plus (3) Candida colonization for the same Candida species from at least 2 noncontiguous (including nonsterile) sites and/or (4) the presence of specific risk factors and/or, (5) clinical-radiological suspicion of IC and/or detection of β-D-glucan in serum.

Suspect Candida:
- Fluconazole: in clinically stable patients with no prior exposure to azoles.
- Echinocandins in critically ill patient with previous exposure to azoles.
- L Amph B is an alternative.

Suspect Aspergillus:
- Voriconazole: for all patients with invasive Aspergillosis whatever the site of infection.
- L Amph B is an alternative
- Caspofungin: alternative and salvage therapy
- Posaconazole: alternative and salvage therapy

Treatment of established IFIs:

Consider the same treatment as empirical treatment for Candida and Aspergillus.

For Zygomycetes:
- Multiple debridements
- L Amph. high dose
- Amph B
- Posaconazole: is step-down from L Amph B or salvage therapy.

3) IFIs in ICU Patients

3-A: Prophylaxis against IFIs in ICU:

Following patients must be considered for antifungal prophylaxis in ICU:
1) ICU patients with recurrent GI perforation or anastomotic Leakage.(IV fluconazol 400 mg once daily)
2) Patients admitted to a tertiary referral center ICU (surgical or medical) with a baseline risk for candidemia of 10% or greater if there is an anticipated of stay more than 3 days.(oral fluconazol 400 mg daily)

3-B: Treatment of IFIs in ICU

Diagnosis of IFIs in ICU patients is a challenging issue. Invasive Candidiasis is the main cause of IFIs in those cases. There are some scoring systems such as Candida score. Characterized by high specificity but a low sensitivity., These systems allow identification of only a
small proportion of ICU patients who might develop candidiasis. Early initiation of antifungal therapy may reduce morbidity, mortality, and length of stay in critically ill patients, however the widespread use of these agents must be balanced against the risk of toxicity, costs, and the emergence of resistance.

Empirical antifungal therapy is recommended:

3-B-1 In critically ill patients or previous exposure to azoles:

**Conclusion**

Reviewing these recommendations, we considered the local specifications of Iran, and the available antifungal drugs in the Iranian market.

That's why, applying them in clinical practice is believed to improve the management of those patients in terms of decreasing mortality and morbidity especially for at risk patients. On the other hand, it may have a positive effect on decreasing hospitalization rate and duration of admission, which may have cost-effectiveness benefit. It's recommended to update these recommendations periodically based on the results of applying the current ones, the future update of international guidelines and the availability of newer antifungal therapeutic options.
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