CODEN [USA]: IAJPBB ISSN : 2349-7750

INDO AMERICAN JOURNAL OF
PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES

SJIF Impact Factor: 7.187

http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4537722

Avalable online at: http://www.iajps.com *Research Article*

SAFETY AND EFFICACY OF NOVEL CANDIDATE VACCINE AS PROPHYLAXIS FOR CLOSTRIDIUM DIFFICILE

[1]Doaa Osama Suliman Mohammed, [2]Sulafa Saeed Babiker Mahmoud, [3]AMNA AHMED OSMAN MADNI, [4]Susan Abdelrahman Elmahdi Musa, [5]Wefag Ibrahim Elkhider Ahmed

[1]Shendi University/Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences
[2]University of Gezira
[3]RED SEA UNIVERSITY
[4]University of khartoum Faculty of Medicine
[5]University of kordofan

Article Received: January 2020 **Accepted:** January 2021 **Published:** February 2021

Abstract:

Although substantial research has been conducted on C.difficile Difficult toxoid vaccines are still present in many areas of incoherence in the literature in recent years. Although vaccines have been shown in general to be well tolerated, their efficacy is questionable. In this review, all studies evaluating effectiveness found substantial immune responses after vaccination. However, there is no clear relationship between dose and reaction or between the formulation and reaction of adjuvants. There is also proof that levels of vaccine antibodies may decrease over the long term. These arguments show that further research into the optimal dosage, dosing schedule, and formulation of toxoid vaccines is necessary. Finally, from the surgical endpoints measured during these clinical trials, the vaccines' efficacy appears promising, but further research is needed to determine their clinical benefits.

Keywords: *disease prevention, prophylaxis, toxoid vaccine, vaccination, Clostridium infection, Clostridium difficile.*

Corresponding author:

Doaa Osama Suliman Mohammed,

Shendi University/Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences

QR code

Please cite this article in press Doaa Osama Suliman Mohammed et al, ***Safety And Efficacy Of Novel Candidate Vaccine As Prophylaxis For Clostridium Difficile.,*** *Indo Am. J. P. Sci, 2021; 08(02).*

INTRODUCTION:

The spore bacterium known to cause severe diarrhea is Clostridium difficile (C. difficile). Difficult infections are often contractually contracted and transmitted in medical settings, such as hospitals and long-term care facilities. One of the most vulnerable to CDI development in patients with prolonged hospitalization. Infections relating to healthcare are traditionally regarded for these reasons. However, the rates of CDI acquired by the community in health care settings are rising in most instances. Antibiotic use, advanced age, cancer chemotherapy, and the use of proton pumps are additional risk factors. The use of antibiotics increases the risk of CDI because of changes in C-based bowel flora. Difficult to prosper. The settlement between CDI From mild inflammatory diarrhea to colitis, megacolon toxicity, sepsis, and death, complicated infections can vary in severity.

The harsh effects on the GI tract are the release of two toxins that can bind to the intestinal epithelium and damage it. The pathophysiology of CDI in toxins A (enterotoxin) and B are different (cytotoxin). Toxin A is linked to fluid secretion in the GI tract and widespread inflammation. Toxin B is considered the primary determinant of virulence in recurrent CDI and is associated with more significant colon damage.

In the search for infection prevention measures, since CDI has harmful effects on both these toxins, they have become prominent targets. One field of research uses modified toxin structures, known as toxoid vaccines, as vaccine targets. The toxoid is altered to prevent disease prevention and, if present, detect and eliminate actual bacterial toxins to prevent harm to the GI tract. Many CDI toxoid vaccines are currently at an early stage of development, but there is little evidence of their efficacy. Previous research has shown a negative correlation between patients' antitoxin concentrations and their risk of recurrent CDI. Therefore, many scientists believe that a toxoid vaccine to promote antibody production is a promising research project.

Problematic toxic vaccines can neutralize exotoxins and help to avoid C-mediated toxin symptoms. Previous research has shown that toxoid vaccines can not prevent the colonization of C.difficile Difficult prevention or cytotoxicity of the GI tract. Moreover, they cannot prevent CDI. These spores are challenging to sporulate or dump into the environment and potentially increase the number of asymptomatic infection transporters.

Various other types of C.difficile vaccines are being developed too. For example, monoclonal anti kids' passive immunization on toxins A and B appears to be promising due to the long-lived half-life of monoclonal anti kids. A C-directed combined polysaccharide-II (PS-II) carbohydrate vaccine. Complicated cell wall components have also exhibited immunogenicity in animal models. Vaccine candidates, which inhibit bacterial colonization and bowel adherence, are also assessed in the instance of C. On the bacterial cell surface, two single gene proteins, Sipa, are challenging to find. In animal models to generate an antibody response, an active vaccination scheme using an extract of two SIP proteins with different adjuvants has been shown.
Methods for primary and secondary prevention of CDI are controversial at present. Many prophylaxis forms have been proposed, including probiotics and antibiotics, but the American Society of Infectious Diseases does not recommend any (IDSA). The only preventive measures currently included in the IDSA Guideline are antimicrobial stewardship and clean, disinfected surfaces to support health conditions.

Because of the potential seriousness and harm caused by CDI in conjunction with its increasing incidence, prophylaxis is a pressing public health concern. Previous research on several toxoid vaccines aimed to evaluate CDI toxoid prophylaxis vaccines' safety and efficacy in clinical trials.

Review:

A scholarly search was carried out to find research evaluating toxoid vaccines for CDI prevention. Safety measures (ADs) and adverse events (AEs) after administration of the vaccine) Moreover, efficacy measures were also exciting results. In this literature study, studies of effectiveness using several substitute markers, including seroconversion and geometric mean fold increases (GMFRs) and antibody level concentrations (GMCs), were evaluated. All methods of evaluation of efficacy were included.

Clostridium difficile and bacterial vaccines were used to conduct a MEDLINE search (2000–2017). Only clinical trials were included; studies not specifically researching C safety and effectiveness were included. Problematic vaccines were excluded.

In ClinicalTrials.gov (2000-2017), a search was conducted with the keywords' Clostridium difficile vaccine.' When the search was conducted, and the results were published, the search was limited to clinical trials closed and completed. As the findings

were published in a corresponding journal article, a trial with no results was included.

A third literary search for papers was conducted via the Web of Science using the keywords Clostridium difficile toxoid vaccine (2000-2017). Only clinical trials were included.

Six clinical trials were included in this review. Two tests met the inclusion criteria of the 85 direct MEDLINE search results when duplicate data were excluded. Of the 17 discovered in the initial search of ClinicalTrials.gov, 12 were completed during the search. Four of them met all the inclusion criteria. There were results in one clinical trial included in the review that was not published on ClinicalTrials.gov. Of the eight primary outcomes found on the Science Web, none met the criteria for inclusion.

RESULTS:

Efficacy and safety of C.difficile vaccine was evaluated in every trial. Complicated vaccination series (3-4 doses of vaccine) given to healthy patients at pre-specified times at varying intervals (from 21 to 180 days). Two variations of the toxoid vaccine were not included in the sixth trial: an aluminum-based adjuvant (alum) vaccine and a non-Alum vaccine. The researchers monitored participants one or more times in each test to collect blood samples and self-reported safety data from participants. All studies used a dose-escalating treatment scheme in which different vaccine doses were assigned to participants.

Local and systemic ARs and AEs were examined after vaccination in order to evaluate safety. Each test measured safety endpoints for at least six days after each dose, with the most frequent measurement period being seven days after each dose. All studies demonstrated mild local ARs. There were few moderate/severe ARs, or AEs reported in total. The injection sites (e.g., pain, erythema) were the most frequently identified ARs/AEs (e.g., malaise, fatigue, headache). For each test, detailed safety data is described in Table 1.

Safety outcomes most commonly reported by participants.

Trial	Collection Period (Days)	ARs and AEs Reported
Kotloff et al.	7 (after each dose)	Rash (26.7%) Pain at injection site (60%; more common with adjuvant, p = 0.004) Abdominal pain (20%) Malaise (16.7%) Swelling & erythema (increased with dose; p < 0.001, p = 0.04)
Bezay et al.	7 (after each dose)	18–65 cohort – Pain at injection site (21%, p = 0.001) 1
Greenberg et al.	7 (after each dose)	18–55 cohort – Pain (85–100%), erythema (42–50%), swelling (15–25%) & induration (8–33%) at injection site ≥65 cohort – Pain (33–67%) & erythema (8–25%) at injection site Increased eosinophil count (25–42%) Fatigue (17–25%)
de Bruyn et al.	ARs: 6 (after each dose) AEs: 30 (after each dose)	Pain at injection site (42.4–68.3%) Myalgia (33.3–45%) Malaise (29–33.7%) Headache (27.3–35.6%) Arthralgia (20.2–30%)
Sheldon et al.	ARs: 7 (after each dose) AEs: 365 (after 1st dose)	50–64 & 65–85 cohort Pain at injection site (lasting 1–2 days) Headache (1–3 days)

		Fatigue (1–3 days) Upper respiratory tract infection
Pfizer	7 (after 1st dose) 14 (after 2nd, 3rd dose)	50–64 cohort 2 Pain (16.7–66.7%), erythema (5.6–50%) & swelling (16.7–33.3%) at injection site Headache (5.6–33.3%) Fatigue (11.1–38.9%) 65–85 cohort 2 Pain (24.6–66%), erythema (6.7–30%) & swelling (3.3–26.4%) at injection site Headache (8.3–26.4%) Fatigue (8.3–39.6%) New/worsening muscle or joint pain (0–26.4%)

[1]This was the only AR/AE reported with a p-value of ≤ 0.05; 2 ARs/AEs reported >10% more frequently by participants in vaccine groups than placebo groups.

Besides safety endpoints, five studies assessed efficacy endpoints. The main parameter of efficacy was an immune response to vaccination in the form of anti-toxin antibody production. Table 2 summarizes the specific methodology used to measure the results of each trial in terms of efficacy. Serum conversion has been defined as an increase in antibody levels of at least four times the baseline (to four times the baseline increase). GMFR uses the average fold-up in log-transformed baseline antibody levels. GMCs use the absolute average antimicrobial level transformed in the log. Seroconversion rates and GMFRs are summarized in Table 2.

Summary of major efficacy outcomes.

Trial	Trial Design	N	Participant Age (Years)	Efficacy Results
Kotloff et al.	Sequential assignment, double-blind, phase 1 trial	30	23	Seroconversion Rates: 100% of participants in the 25 and 100 mcg dose groups 80% of participants in the 6.25 mcg dose group
Sheldon et al.	Placebo-controlled, randomized, observer-blinded phase 1 trial	192	50–64 (cohort 1) 65–85 (cohort 2)	GMFRs: Cohort 1—By 7 months (day 210): GMFR = 59–149.23 and 116.67–2503.75 compared to 2.47 and 2.48 in placebo groups (to Toxin A and B, respectively) Cohort 2—By 7 months (day 210): GMFR = 42.73–254.77 and 136.12–4922.8 compared to 2.03 and 1.58 in placebo groups (to Toxin A and B, respectively)
Bezay et al.	Multi-center, open label, partially	140	30.8 (Part A) 68.3 (Part B)	Seroconversion Rates (for 75 mcg

	randomized, phase 1 trial			non-Alum dose group): Part A—By day 28: 70% of participants and 80% of participants (to Toxin A and B, respectively) Part B—By day 56: 91% of participants and 55% of participants (to Toxin A and B, respectively)
de Bruyn et al.	Multi-center, Placebo-controlled, randomized, phase 2 trial performed in 2 stages	661	40–64 (cohort 1) 65–75 (cohort 2)	Highest Seroconversion Rates: By day 60: 97% of participants who received 100 mcg with Alum By day 60: 93.2% of participants who received 100 mcg non-Alum
Greenberg et al.	Two randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind, phase 1 trials	98	18–55 (cohort 1) ≥65(cohort 2)	Seroconversion Rates: Cohort 1—By day 56: 100% of participants who received any dose of vaccine Cohort 2—By day 56: 50%, 89%, and 100% of participants who received any dose of vaccine (2, 10, 50 mcg, respectively) Placebo—0% of participants at all time points

Trials Summary:

Kotloff et al. evaluated the safety, immunogenicity, and dosing response of a C.difficile Challenging vaccination against aluminum or non-aluminum toxins in 30 healthy participants (median age: 23 years). Individuals with a history of antibiotic-related diarrhea or antibiotic use have been excluded from the trial in the past month. One of three study doses was assigned to the participants: 6.25, 25, or 100 mcg sequentially. Vaccines were administered on days 1, 8, 30, and 60. By collecting peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) from participants and performing the appropriate enzyme-linked immunospot (ELISPOT) test on the collections, researchers evaluated IgA and IgG antibodies' production week before and after immunization. In the 6,25 mcg dose group, two participants (20 percent of the group) did not demonstrate a 4-fold increase in antibodies. A non-Alum vaccine was received from one unresponsive participant and a non-Alum vaccine from the other participant. The highest antimicrobial responses were found in the 25 mcg and 100 mcg non-aluminum dosage groups for Toxin A. Antimicrobial responses, on the other hand, increased with an increasing dose of Toxin B. The dose of vaccine and formulations were not found to be

significantly related to antibodies. It was found that serum antibody levels correlate with IgG serum anti-toxin A ($r = 0.83$, $p< 0.001$). The scientists reported that a three-dose series (on days 1, 8, and 30) appeared sufficient because serum IgG or antibodies were not significantly enhanced at the fourth dose.

Finally, Clostridium difficile vaccine-related local and systemic ARs were evaluated by a national clinical trial. Challenging toxoid vaccine, but efficacy endpoints have not been assessed. As mentioned earlier, this clinical trial has safety results on ClinicalTrials.gov, but these results have not been published.

DISCUSSION:

As research into CDI prevention toxoid vaccines develops, the results of individual studies should be summarized so that the development of the research field as a whole is understood. This review assessed the methodology and results of six clinical studies testing the safety and effectiveness of CDI toxoid vaccines.

Each study included in this review found mild ARs consistent with those found to accompany vaccine administration in general. From this point of view, tolerability and safety, toxoid vaccines appear promising. However, two studies have shown that participants have only been able to report ARs pre-specified by the researchers. Such ARs tended to be well documented associated with vaccines (such as injection site pain, fever, and headache). This methodology may have biased participant reporting and led to researchers overlooking less common ARs or AEs. Future research should continue to focus on the safety of vaccines, particularly as more participants and patients participate in subsequent research phases.

The lack of a dose-response relationship with the vaccine was an interesting finding from several studies. The relationship between increasing vaccine doses and ARs or AEs or increasing immune doses to the body was not clearly or consistently demonstrated. In order to determine an optimum dose, the vaccine regimens of the trials are not directly compared because they differ. The formulations and vaccines themselves. However, the best doses of the vaccines included in the review are still unclear and further studies are required to identify the lowest doses that optimize immune reactions and minimize side effects.

Three studies have shown that antibody responses have been significantly reduced by 145-160 days after the last vaccine. De Bruyn et al. have tested different dosing schedules, and their findings show that timing of vaccine administration can play an important role in the body's response to vaccination. The results of the studies in this study address the long-term effects of vaccines and increase the potential requirement for additional vaccine doses of stimulants, so that patients have long-term clinical benefits.

In the studies assessing the use of adjuvants with their vaccines there have been no clear links between the use of an adjuvant and the outcome measurements; while two studies have found that non-alum formulations have resulted in higher immune responses, one has found the Alum formulations to lead to higher immune responses. Adjuvants are generally used to increase the body's immune reaction to vaccines, but are often linked to a higher degree of ARs and AEs. In the review, the studies have not reliably detected an increased immune response or rate/series of adverse reactions in adjuvant vaccines, compared to non-adjuvant vaccines.

Five studies distinguished participants' immune response to Toxin A from Toxin B. All these studies found increases of both toxins in antibodies at different times following vaccine administration. However, the results did not show whether there were significant differences in the magnitude among antibodies which produced toxin A or toxin B and, if so, those which had a stronger reaction. As noted earlier, although the two toxins contribute to the pathophysiology associated with CDI, Toxin B is usually associated with worse results. Therefore, an optimal C. This could be due to a difficult vaccine that aims to produce antibodies against toxin B over toxin A, if feasible. The results of the studies included in this review did not reliably react to one toxin over the other. These are important points for further research, particularly in view of how toxins contribute to the disease's clinical manifestations.

Finally, both primary and recurrent/secondary CDIs are serious problems in public health and must be taken into account in order to fully understand the extent of the infection. While recurrent CDI vaccines have not been evaluated in clinical trials, Sougioultzis et al. found no additional recurrence six months after the last 4 dose series in three repeat-infected patients. However, the response to vaccinations in these three patients was variable; only two showed significant increases compared to the baseline. These results emphasize that the substitute endpoints used as efficacy measurements are not

sufficient to claim toxoid vaccines are effective or efficient.

Bezlotoxumab is a monoclonal antibody that has been more widely studied in CDI patients. Bezlotoxumab reduced the risk of recurring / secondary CDI in combination with antibiotic therapy for primary CDI significantly. Since this medication has proven to be clinically effective in the target population, it challenges the timing and placement of appropriate toxoid vaccines in therapy.

CONCLUSION:

Although a considerable amount of research has been done on Clostridium difficile vaccine, there have been many areas of inconsistency in the literature of problematic toxoid vaccines in recent years. Although vaccines are generally well tolerated, their effectiveness is questionable. All studies in this review that assessed efficacy found substantial immune responses after vaccination. However, there were no clear connections between dose and response or between adjuvant and answer formulation. Furthermore, there is evidence that vaccine antibody levels may decrease over the long term. These contention points demonstrate the requirement for further research on the optimal dose, the dosing schedule, and the formulation of toxoid vaccines. Finally, the vaccines' effectiveness seems promising from the surrogate endpoints measured in these clinical trials, but further research is required to determine their clinical benefit.

REFERENCES:

1. Gerding D.N., Johnson S. Clostridium difficile infection, including pseudomembranous colitis. In: Kasper D., Fauci A., Hauser S., Longo D., Jameson J.L., Loscalzo J., editors. Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine. 19th ed. McGraw-Hill Education; New York, NY, USA: 2014. [Google Scholar]
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Healthcare associated infections. [(accessed on 15 February 2017)]; Available online: https://www.cdc.gov/hai/organisms/cdiff/cdiff_clinicians.html.
3. Martin S., Jung R. Gastrointestinal infections and enterotoxigenic poisonings. In: DiPiro J.T., Talbert R.L., Yee G.C., Matzke G.R., Wells B.G., Posey M., editors. Pharmacotherapy: A Pathophysiological Approach. 9th ed. McGraw-Hill Education; New York, NY, USA: 2014. [Google Scholar]
4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Frequently asked questions about Clostridium difficile for healthcare providers. [(accessed on 5 June 2017)]; Available online: https://www.cdc.gov/hai/organisms/cdiff/cdiff_faqs_hcp.html.
5. Cohen S.H., Gerding D.N., Johnson S., Kelly C.P., Loo V.G., McDonald L.C., Pepin J., Wilcox M.H. Clinical practice guidelines for Clostridium difficile infection in adults: 2010 update by the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America (SHEA) and the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol. 2010;31:431–455. doi: 10.1086/651706. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
6. Leong C., Zelenitsky S. Treatment strategies for recurrent Clostridium difficile infection. Can. J. Hosp. Pharm. 2013;66:361–368. doi: 10.4212/cjhp.v66i6.1301. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
7. Natarajan M., Walk S.T., Young V.B., Aronoff D.M. A clinical and epidemiological review of non-toxigenic Clostridium difficile. Anaerobe. 2013;22:1–5. doi: 10.1016/j.anaerobe.2013.05.005. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
8. US Department of Health & Human Services Basics. [(accessed on 15 February 2017)]; Available online: https://www.vaccines.gov/basics/
9. Leav B.A., Blair B., Leney M., Knauber M., Reilly C., Lowy I., Gerding D.N., Kelly C.P., Katchar K., Baxter R., et al. Serum anti-toxin B antibody correlates with protection from recurrent Clostridium difficile infection (CDI) Vaccine. 2010;28:965–969. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2009.10.144. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
10. Siddiqui F., O'Connor K.N., Nagaro K., Cheknis A., Sambol S.P., Vedantam G., Gerding D.N., Johnson S. Vaccination with parenteral toxoid B protects hamsters against lethal challenge with toxin A-negative, toxin B-positive Clostridium difficile but does not prevent colonization. J. Infect. Dis. 2012;205:128–133. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jir688. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
11. Spencer J., Leuzzi R., Buckley A., Irvine J., Candlish D., Scarselli M., Douce G.R. Vaccination against Clostridium difficile using toxin fragments: Observation and analysis in animal models. Gut Microbes. 2014;5:225–232. doi: 10.4161/gmic.27712. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
12. Monteiro M.A., Ma Z., Bertolo L., Jiao Y., Arroyo L., Hodgins D., Mallozzi M., Vedantam G., Sagermann M., Sundsmo J., et al. Carbohydrate-based Clostridium difficile

vaccines. Expert Rev. Vaccines. 2013;12:421–431. doi: 10.1586/erv.13.9. [PubMed] [CrossRef]
13. Rebeaud F., Bachmann M.F. Immunization Strategies for Clostridium difficile infections. Expert Rev. Vaccines. 2012;11:469–479. doi: 10.1586/erv.12.18. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
14. Goldberg E.J., Bhalodia S., Jacob S., Patel H., Trinh K.V., Varghese B., Yang J., Young S.R., Raffa R.B. Clostridium difficile infection: A brief update on emerging therapies. Am. J. Health. Syst. Pharm. 2015;72:1007–1012. doi: 10.2146/ajhp140645. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
15. Kociolek L.K., Gerding D.N. Breakthrough in the treatment and prevention of Clostridium difficile infection. Nat. Rev. Gastroenterol. Hepatol. 2016;13:150–160. doi: 10.1038/nrgastro.2015.220. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
16. NLM Identifier: NCT02117570. A study to investigate a Clostridium difficile vaccine in healthy adults aged 50 to 85 years, who will each receive 3 doses of vaccine. [(accessed on 1 March 2017)]; Available online: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/
17. Kotloff K.L., Wasserman S.S., Losonsky G.A., Thomas W., Jr., Nichols R., Edelman R., Bridwell M., Monath T.P. Safety and immunogenicity of increasing doses of a Clostridium difficile toxoid vaccine administered to healthy adults. Infect. Immun. 2001;69:988–995. doi: 10.1128/IAI.69.2.988-995.2001. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
18. Bezay N., Ayad A., Dubschar K., Firbas C., Hochreiter R., Kiermayr S., Kiss I., Pinl F., Jilma B., Westritschnig K. Safety, immunogenicity and dose response of VLA84, a new vaccine candidate against Clostridium difficile, in healthy volunteers. Vaccine. 2016;34:2585–2592. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.03.098. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
19. Greenberg R.N., Marbury T.C., Foglia G., Warny M. Phase I dose finding studies of an adjuvanted Clostridium difficile toxoid vaccine. Vaccine. 2012;30:2245–2249. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2012.01.065. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
20. de Bruyn G., Saleh J., Workman D., Pollak R., Elinoff V., Fraser N.J., Lefebvre G., Martens M., Mills R.E., Nathan R., et al. Defining the optimal formulation and schedule of a candidate toxoid vaccine against Clostridium difficile infection: A randomized phase 2 clinical trial. Vaccine. 2016;34:2170–2178. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.03.028. [Pub HYPERLINK "https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27013431" HYPERLINK "https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27013431" HYPERLINK "https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27013431" HYPERLINK "https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27013431" HYPERLINK "https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27013431" HYPERLINK "https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27013431"Med] [CrossRef]
21. Sheldon E., Kitchin N., Peng Y., Eiden J., Gruber W., Johnson E., Jansen K.U., Pride M.W., Pedneault L. A phase 1, placebo-controlled, randomized study of the safety, tolerability, and immunogenicity of a Clostridium difficile vaccine administered with or without aluminum hydroxide in healthy adults. Vaccine. 2016;34:2082–2091. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.03.010. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
22. Evans D.G. Persistence of tetanus antitoxin in man following active immunization. Lancet. 1943;242:316–317. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(00)72515-3. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
23. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Possible side-effects from vaccines. [(accessed on 28 February 2017)]; Available online: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/vac-gen/side-effects.htm.
24. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Vaccine adjuvants. [(accessed on 28 February 2017)]; Available online: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccinesafety/concerns/adjuvants.html.
25. Sougioultzis S., Kyne L., Drudy D., Keates S., Maroo S., Pothoulakis C., Giannasca P.J., Lee C.K., Warny M., Monath T.P., et al. Clostridium difficile toxoid vaccine in recurrent C. difficile-associated diarrhea. Gastroenterology. 2005;128:764–770. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2004.11.004. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
26. Wilcox M.H., Gerding D.N., Poxton I.R., Kelly C., Nathan R., Birch T., Cornely O.A., Rahav G., Bouza E., Lee C., et al. Bezlotoxumab for prevention of recurrent Clostridium difficile infection. N. Engl. J. Med. 2017;376:305–317. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1602615. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]

27. Keessen EC, Gaastra W, Lipman LJ. Clostridium difficile infection in humans and animals, differences and similarities. Vet Microbiol. 2011;153:205–17. doi: 10.1016/j.vetmic.2011.03.020. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
28. al Saif N, Brazier JS. The distribution of Clostridium difficile in the environment of South Wales. J Med Microbiol. 1996;45:133–7. doi: 10.1099/00222615-45-2-133. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
29. Zidaric V, Beigot S, Lapajne S, Rupnik M. The occurrence and high diversity of Clostridium difficile genotypes in rivers. Anaerobe. 2010;16:371–5. doi: 10.1016/j.anaerobe.2010.06.001. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
30. Hall IC, O'Toole E. Intestinal flora in new-born infants: with a description of anew pathogenic anaerobe, Bacillus difficilis. Am J Dis Child. 1935;49:390–402. doi: 10.1001/archpedi.1935.01970020105010. [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
31. Bartlett JGMN, Moon N, Chang TW, Taylor N, Onderdonk AB. Role of Clostridium difficile in antibiotic-associated pseudomembranous colitis. Gastroenterology. 1978;75:778–82. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
32. Gerding DNMC, Muto CA, Owens RC., Jr. Measures to control and prevent Clostridium difficile infection. Clin Infect Dis. 2008;46(Suppl 1):S43–9. doi: 10.1086/521861. [PubMed] [CrossRef]
33. Vonberg RPKE, Kuijper EJ, Wilcox MH, Barbut F, Tüll P, Gastmeier P, van den Broek PJ, Colville A, Coignard B, Daha T, et al. European C difficile-Infection Control Group. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) Infection control measures to limit the spread of Clostridium difficile. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2008;14(Suppl 5):2–20. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2008.01992.x. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
34. Sorg JASA, Sonenshein AL. Bile salts and glycine as cogerminants for Clostridium difficile spores. J Bacteriol. 2008;190:2505–12. doi: 10.1128/JB.01765-07. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
35. Francis MB, Allen CA, Shrestha R, Sorg JA. Bile acid recognition by the Clostridium difficile germinant receptor, CspC, is important for establishing infection. PLoS Pathog. 2013;9:e1003356. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1003356. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
36. Wheeldon LJWT, Worthington T, Lambert PA. Histidine acts as a co-germinant with glycine and taurocholate for Clostridium difficile spores. J Appl Microbiol. 2011 doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2672.2011.04953.x. Forthcoming. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
37. Paredes-Sabja D, Sarker MR. Germination response of spores of the pathogenic bacterium Clostridium perfringens and Clostridium difficile to cultured human epithelial cells. Anaerobe. 2011;17:78–84. doi: 10.1016/j.anaerobe.2011.02.001. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
38. Sorg JASA, Sonenshein AL. Inhibiting the initiation of Clostridium difficile spore germination using analogs of chenodeoxycholic acid, a bile acid. J Bacteriol. 2010;192:4983–90. doi: 10.1128/JB.00610-10.[PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
39. Ridlon JM, Kang DJ, Hylemon PB. Bile salt biotransformations by human intestinal bacteria. J Lipid Res. 2006;47:241–59. doi: 10.1194/jlr.R500013-JLR200. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
40. Scaria J, Janvilisri T, Fubini S, Gleed RD, McDonough SP, Chang YF. Clostridium difficile transcriptome analysis using pig ligated loop model reveals modulation of pathways not modulated in vitro. J Infect Dis. 2011;203:1613–20. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jir112. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef]
41. Janvilisri T, Scaria J, Chang YF. Transcriptional profiling of Clostridium difficile and Caco-2 cells during infection. J Infect Dis. 2010;202:282–90. doi: 10.1086/653484. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
42. de la Riva L, Willing SE, Tate EW, Fairweather NF. Roles of cysteine proteases Cwp84 and Cwp13 in biogenesis of the cell wall of Clostridium difficile. J Bacteriol. 2011;193:3276–85. doi: 10.1128/JB.00248-11. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef]
43. Kirby JM, Ahern H, Roberts AK, Kumar V, Freeman Z, Acharya KR, Shone CC. Cwp84, a surface-associated cysteine protease, plays a role in the maturation of the surface layer of Clostridium difficile. J Biol Chem. 2009;284:34666–73. doi: 10.1074/jbc.M109.051177. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
44. Janoir C, Péchiné S, Grosdidier C, Collignon A. Cwp84, a surface-associated protein of Clostridium difficile, is a cysteine protease with degrading activity on extracellular matrix proteins. J Bacteriol. 2007;189:7174–80. doi:

10.1128/JB.00578-07. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
45. Voth DE, Ballard JD. Clostridium difficile toxins: mechanism of action and role in disease. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2005;18:247–63. doi: 10.1128/CMR.18.2.247-263.2005. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
46. Nusrat A, von Eichel-Streiber C, Turner JR, Verkade P, Madara JL, Parkos CA. Clostridium difficile toxins disrupt epithelial barrier function by altering membrane microdomain localization of tight junction proteins. Infect Immun. 2001;69:1329–36. doi: 10.1128/IAI.69.3.1329-1336.2001. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
47. Genth H, Dreger SC, Huelsenbeck J, Just I. Clostridium difficile toxins: more than mere inhibitors of Rho proteins. Int J Biochem Cell Biol. 2008;40:592–7. doi: 10.1016/j.biocel.2007.12.014. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
48. Shen A. Clostridium difficile toxins: mediators of inflammation. J Innate Immun. 2012;4:149–58. doi: 10.1159/000332946. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
49. Yamakawa K, Karasawa T, Ikoma S, Nakamura S. Enhancement of Clostridium difficile toxin production in biotin-limited conditions. J Med Microbiol. 1996;44:111–4. doi: 10.1099/00222615-44-2-111. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
50. Karlsson S, Burman LG, Akerlund T. Induction of toxins in Clostridium difficile is associated with dramatic changes of its metabolism. Microbiology. 2008;154:3430–6. doi: 10.1099/mic.0.2008/019778-0. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
51. Karlsson S, Dupuy B, Mukherjee K, Norin E, Burman LG, Åkerlund T. Expression of Clostridium difficile toxins A and B and their sigma factor TcdD is controlled by temperature. Infect Immun. 2003;71:1784–93. doi: 10.1128/IAI.71.4.1784-1793.2003. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
52. Pultz NJ, Donskey CJ. Effect of antibiotic treatment on growth of and toxin production by Clostridium difficile in the cecal contents of mice. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2005;49:3529–32. doi: 10.1128/AAC.49.8.3529-3532.2005. [PMC free article] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
53. Drummond LJ, Smith DG, Poxton IR. Effects of sub-MIC concentrations of antibiotics on growth of and toxin production by Clostridium difficile. J Med Microbiol. 2003;52:1033–8. doi: 10.1099/jmm.0.05387-0. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
54. Gerber M, Walch C, Löffler B, Tischendorf K, Reischl U, Ackermann G. Effect of sub-MIC concentrations of metronidazole, vancomycin, clindamycin and linezolid on toxin gene transcription and production in Clostridium difficile. J Med Microbiol. 2008;57:776–83. doi: 10.1099/jmm.0.47739-0. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
55. Aldape MJ, Packham AE, Nute DW, Bryant AE, Stevens DL. Effects of ciprofloxacin on the expression and production of exotoxins by Clostridium difficile. J Med Microbiol. 2013;62:741–7. doi: 10.1099/jmm.0.056218-0. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
56. Kyne L, Warny M, Qamar A, Kelly CP. Asymptomatic carriage of Clostridium difficile and serum levels of IgG antibody against toxin A. N Engl J Med. 2000;342:390–7. doi: 10.1056/NEJM200002103420604. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
57. Kyne L, Warny M, Qamar A, Kelly CP. Association between antibody response to toxin A and protection against recurrent Clostridium difficile diarrhoea. Lancet. 2001;357:189–93. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(00)03592-3. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
58. Bartlett JG. Narrative review: the new epidemic of Clostridium difficile-associated enteric disease. Ann Intern Med. 2006;145:758–64. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-145-10-200611210-00008. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
59. Geric B, Johnson S, Gerding DN, Grabnar M, Rupnik M. Frequency of binary toxin genes among Clostridium difficile strains that do not produce large clostridial toxins. J Clin Microbiol. 2003;41:5227–32. doi: 10.1128/JCM.41.11.5227-5232.2003. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
60. Stubbs S, Rupnik M, Gibert M, Brazier J, Duerden B, Popoff M. Production of actin-specific ADP-ribosyltransferase (binary toxin) by strains of Clostridium difficile. FEMS Microbiol Lett. 2000;186:307–12. doi: 10.1111/j.1574-6968.2000.tb09122.x. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
61. Gonçalves C, Decré D, Barbut F, Burghoffer B, Petit JC. Prevalence and characterization of a binary toxin (actin-specific ADP-ribosyltransferase) from Clostridium difficile. J Clin Microbiol. 2004;42:1933–9. doi: 10.1128/JCM.42.5.1933-1939.2004. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]