

Attitudes to phage therapy among Australian infectious diseases physicians

1 Martin Plymoth^{1*}, Stephanie A. Lynch^{1,2,3*}, Ameneh Khatami^{3,4}, Holly A. Sinclair^{1,2,3}, Jessica C. Sacher
2 ^{1,2,5}, Jan Zheng^{1,2,5}, Ruby CY. Lin^{1,2,3,6} and Jonathan R. Iredell^{1,2,3+}.

3 *- co-first authors

4 +- corresponding author (Jonathan.Iredell@sydney.edu.au)

5 ¹ Westmead Hospital, Western Sydney Local Health District, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

6 ² Centre for Infectious Diseases and Microbiology, Westmead Institute for Medical Research, Sydney,
7 New South Wales, Australia

8 ³ Faculty of Medicine and Health, School of Medicine, Sydney Medical School, University of Sydney,
9 Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

10 ⁴ Department of Infectious Diseases and Microbiology, The Children's Hospital at Westmead, Sydney,
11 New South Wales, Australia

12 ⁵ Phage Directory LLC, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

13 ⁶ School of Medical Sciences, University of New South Wales, NSW, Australia

14 **Abstract:**

15 Due to the rise in antimicrobial resistance (AMR), there has been an increased interest in phage
16 therapy to treat multi-drug resistant infections. In Australia, phage therapy is predominantly used in
17 small clinical studies or for compassionate use, however, despite its potential expansion in modern
18 medicine, the perception of phage therapy among medical professionals remains largely unknown.
19 Therefore, we conducted a national survey of Australian infectious diseases and clinical microbiology
20 advanced trainees and specialists to assess their knowledge, areas of interest, and concerns around
21 the use of phage therapy in clinical practice in Australia. Our survey received 92 responses from
22 infectious diseases and clinical microbiology professionals across all states of Australia. The majority
23 of those surveyed believed that the current national plan for controlling AMR is inadequate and that
24 phage therapy may be an effective solution; with 97% of respondents indicating that they would
25 consider using phage therapy meeting established guidelines for purity and safety (United States Food
26 and Drug Administration and/or European Union guidelines). The respondents indicated a preference
27 for bespoke therapy, with Gram-negative pathogens highlighted as priority targets. Alongside the
28 phage therapy delivery protocols, therapeutic phage monitoring (TPM; like therapeutic drug
29 monitoring (TDM)) was considered important. Cystic Fibrosis, lung-infections, prosthetic device related
30 infections, and infections among patients following transplantation and/or immunosuppression were
31 highly ranked in terms of priorities for clinical syndromes. Accessibility was highlighted as a barrier to
32 phage therapy, specifically timely access (72%) and logistics of phage procurement and administration
33 (70%). Altogether, these results suggest the support of phage therapy among infectious diseases and
34 clinical microbiology advanced trainees and specialists in Australia, and highlights areas of focus and
35 priority in order to advance phage therapy in modern medicine.

36

37 **Introduction:**

38

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

39 For over a century, phage therapy has been used to treat infectious diseases, although largely
40 overshadowed by the discovery and development of antibiotics ^[1]. With the rise in antimicrobial
41 resistance (AMR), almost 5 million deaths globally were associated with resistant organisms in 2019 ^[2].
42 It is predicted that by 2050, antibiotic-resistant infections will become the leading cause of death
43 worldwide, resulting in approximately 10 million deaths annually ^[3]. To address this, there has been
44 increasing interest in the therapeutic application of phages, in particular for multi-drug resistant
45 infections ^[1, 4].

46 Like other therapeutic agents, phage therapy will fall under regulation by the Australian Therapeutics
47 Goods Administration (TGA), requiring adherence to strict manufacturing standards and
48 demonstration of safety in clinical trials ^[5]. Small clinical studies focusing on compassionate use of
49 bacteriophages have been performed or are currently underway in Australia ^[5-7]. With the potential
50 for expansion of phage therapy in human medicine, perceptions towards this among relevant medical
51 professionals remains largely unknown. A better understanding of this is necessary to inform future
52 clinical studies and protocols.

53 Previous studies among the general public and certain patient populations have shown initial poor
54 awareness, but high levels of support for, and acceptance of, phage therapy post briefing ^[8, 9]. To the
55 best of our knowledge, there have been no studies investigating knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions
56 regarding phage therapy among infectious diseases clinicians, clinical microbiologists or trainees in
57 such fields. Similarly, there have been no investigations regarding priorities for phage therapy
58 implementation, or perceived barriers against this. In this cross-sectional study, we conducted a survey
59 of Australian infectious diseases and clinical microbiology advanced trainees and specialists'
60 knowledge, areas of interest, and concerns around the use of phage therapy in clinical practice in
61 Australia.

62

63 **Method:**

64 The study was based on a scoping qualitative survey attempting to identify priority areas for phage
65 therapy which was conducted among infectious diseases and microbiology trainees and physicians
66 between March 31st and April 10th, 2021 (78 replies; **Supplement 1**). Based on replies to this survey, a
67 quantitative survey containing 16-questions was developed with further input from experts in the field,
68 including adult and paediatric infectious diseases physicians with established experience in phage
69 therapy.

70 The survey was disseminated to infectious diseases physicians via the Australian Society of Infectious
71 Diseases (ASID) OzBug mailing list (1,068 members, including non-prescribers). It was further
72 advertised through local networks of infectious diseases clinicians. All participants were asked to agree
73 to study participation with an electronic informed consent form. Survey results were collected via an
74 online survey platform (JotForm Enterprises, San Francisco, CA) between 2 November 2021 and 30
75 October 2022. Appropriate statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows,
76 version 27 (IBM Corp., Armonk, N.Y., USA), including Kruskal-Wallis H test, Mann-Whitney U test, and
77 Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-rank test. A p-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

78 Ethical approval was obtained from Western Sydney Local Health District Human Research Ethics
79 Committee (2022/ETH00432). See **Supplement 1** for ethics application.

80

81


82 **Results:**

83 One hundred and six replies were collected during the survey period. Four identified as non-
 84 prescribers, and ten identified as trainees or specialists in fields other than infectious diseases or
 85 clinical microbiology and were excluded from further analysis. Among the remaining 92 respondents,
 86 80 (87.0%) were specialists within the field of infectious diseases and/or microbiology, and a further
 87 12 (13.0%) were advanced trainees. Participants were from across Australia, and approximately
 88 reflected the distribution of physicians across the country, although no respondents originated from
 89 the Australian Capital Territory (New South Wales 29%; Victoria 32%; South Australia 9%; Queensland
 90 14%; Tasmania 1%; Western Australia 11%; Northern Territory 2%) [10].

91 Awareness of phage therapy as either adjunct or an alternative to antibiotics was scored on a Likert
 92 scale (1-5; 1 – minimal knowledge, 5 – expert knowledge) with most respondents admitting to a
 93 moderate level of knowledge of phage therapy (median 3/mode 3, interquartile range [IQR] 2-3; **figure**
 94 **1**). No difference in self-reported awareness was identified based on participants’ geographic location
 95 ($p=0.940$); however, infectious diseases physicians in training positions reported lower awareness than
 96 specialists (median 2, IQR 1.25-3 vs. median 3, IQR 2-3.75, respectively; $p=0.014$).

97 The majority of respondents ($n=76$, 83%) believed that Australia's national AMR action plan is currently
 98 inadequate in controlling the spread of AMR in Australia and around two-thirds (65%) believed phage
 99 therapy could be an effective solution to AMR. Most respondents (89; 97%) would consider using
 100 phage therapy meeting established guidelines for purity and safety (United States Food and Drug
 101 Administration and/or European Union guidelines); and the same number would participate in a
 102 clinical trial of phage therapy for their patients if given adequate support and resources. Most
 103 respondents had identified patients (multiple patients, $n=35$; 38%, or single patient $n=28$; 30%) who
 104 would have benefited from targeted phage therapy within the last year.

105 Perception of the relative importance of phage therapy availability as a combination ‘cocktail’
 106 formulation or bespoke therapy was ranked on a Likert scale (1-5), with apparent preference for
 107 bespoke phage therapy (median 3, mode 2, IQR 2-4 for cocktails vs. median 4, mode 4, IQR 4-5 for
 108 bespoke; $p<0.001$). Therapeutic monitoring of phage therapy was also considered important by
 109 respondents (**figure 1**).




111 Figure 1. Knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions around phage therapy among Australian infectious
 112 diseases and microbiology clinicians (n=92). Ordinal scale: 1=lowest, 5=highest.

113 Key areas for phage therapy development

114 Prioritised areas for targeted phage therapy (specific microorganisms and clinical syndromes) are
 115 displayed in **figure 2a**. Gram-negative organisms (*Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, Enterobacterales,
 116 *Acinetobacter baumannii*, and *Burkholderia* spp.) ranked highly as did mycobacterial species including
 117 *Mycobacterium abscessus*. Gram-positive organisms (*Enterococcus* spp. and *Staphylococcus*
 118 *aureus*) were least prioritised. Other non-listed target microorganisms identified by respondents
 119 included *Neisseria* spp. (n=2), *Sternotrophomonas* spp. (n=1), *Nocardia* spp. (n=1), *Brucella* spp. (n=1),
 120 *Coxiella* spp (Q fever) (n=1), *Achromobacter* spp. (n=1), *Clostridium difficile* (n=1), Coagulase-negative
 121 staphylococci (n=1), *Streptococcus pneumoniae* (n=1), *Helicobacter pylori* (n=1), and *Mycoplasma* spp.
 122 (n=1).

123 Cystic fibrosis-related lung infections, bone and joint infections, prosthetic device related infections,
 124 and infections among patients following transplantation and/or immunosuppression were highly
 125 ranked in terms of priorities for clinical syndromes (**figure 2b**), while skin and gastrointestinal infections
 126 were least prioritized. Other clinical syndromes identified by respondents included vascular graft
 127 infections (n=4), and central nervous system infections (n=3). The selection of ‘uncertain’ to the order
 128 of priority was generally higher among the clinical syndromes listed than microorganisms listed.



129 Figure 2 - Prioritization areas for phage therapy development for (a) microorganisms; and (b) clinical
 130 syndromes by infectious diseases and microbiology clinicians (n=92); E. coli: *Escherichia coli*; ESBL:
 131 Extended-spectrum beta-lactamases; CPE: Carbapenemase-producing Enterobacterales; VRE:
 132


133 Vancomycin-resistant Enterococci; MRSA: Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*; CF: cystic
134 fibrosis

135
136 Useful modes of delivery and administration of phage therapy were identified as follows: intravenous
137 (85, 92%), inhalation (56, 61%), oral (56, 61%), instillation into body cavities and/or organs (32, 47%),
138 phage-coated devices including prosthetic devices and indwelling catheters (36, 39%), and topical (31,
139 34%).

140 Barriers to implementing phage therapy

141 Concerns regarding timely access to phage therapy, logistics of phage procurement and
142 administration, as well as efficacy were primarily highlighted by respondents (72%, 70%, 58% of all
143 respondents, respectively), while recruitment into clinical trials and bacterial resistance development
144 were less concerning (23%, 20%, respectively; **Figure 3**).

145



146
147 **Figure 3 – Primary considerations and perceived barriers against implementation of phage therapy, as**
148 **identified by infectious diseases and microbiology clinicians. Absolute number in graph boxes.**

149

150 **Discussion**

151
152 In this study we report priorities for phage therapy in terms of microorganisms and clinical syndromes
153 as identified by Australian infectious diseases and microbiology clinicians. In this study we further
154 highlight the perceived concern by clinicians in current efforts to control the spread of AMR in
155 Australia. This data also highlights their support for phage therapy as an adjunct or alternative to
156 current antibiotics regimens and as a potential solution to this issue.

157
158 Prioritisation of phage therapy targeting Gram-negative organisms among respondents corresponds
159 to the World Health Organisation (WHO) list of antibiotic-resistant bacteria that pose the greatest
160 threat to human health, which identifies carbapenemase-producing *A. baumannii*, *P. aeruginosa*, and
161 *Enterobacteriaceae* as critical priority pathogens for research and development ^[11].

162
163 A strong focus on Cystic Fibrosis, and its associated pathogens, as well as inhaled formulations of phage
164 therapy was noted among many respondents. This aligns with the review of emerging pathogens such
165 as *M. abscessus* that are identified as important targets for which antibiotic treatment options are
166 limited ^[12]. Furthermore, *P. aeruginosa* remains a poor prognostic factor in Cystic Fibrosis patients,
167 especially with extensively drug-resistant strains ^[13]. Introduction of effective new treatment regimens
168 targeting such pathogens could lead to better outcomes for these individuals ^[14].

169
170 Interestingly, while bone and joint infections and prosthetic device-related infections were highly
171 prioritised by respondents, targeted phage therapy towards *S. aureus*, the most frequent isolated
172 pathogen in these infections, was less so. This could reflect the availability of conventional therapeutic
173 options in these infections (antibiotics combined with surgical interventions such as irrigation,
174 debridement and/or removal of infected prosthetic devices). However, where surgical interventions
175 have failed, or are impractical, lifelong antibiotic suppressive therapy is often required. Case reports
176 have shown successful outcomes using phages targeting *S. aureus* in prosthetic joint infections,
177 suggesting they can potentially disrupt biofilm formation ^[15, 16] and provide additional benefit in
178 selected cases.

179
180 Timely access to bacteriophages was identified as a critical barrier to implementation. This could be
181 improved by a regulated framework supporting phage banks along with magistral preparations and
182 personalised patient-specific therapies ^[17]. Clinical collaboration, standardisation of protocols and
183 development of national phage and pathogen biobanks, and a national surveillance program, as
184 advocated by the Australian Phage Network are key ^[18]. Despite concerns about timely access,
185 clinicians indicated a preference for targeted ‘bespoke’ phage therapies for specific infections, as
186 compared to broad-spectrum phage cocktails, highlighting the need for companion diagnostics to
187 ensure effective phage therapy. This signifies the clinical need to continue to develop personalized
188 phage matching, and production of phages targeted towards bacterial strains causing infection in a
189 specific patient. Furthermore, development of standardized therapeutic monitoring for these
190 therapies should be prioritized.

191
192 Limitations of this study include the relatively small sample size and uptake of the questionnaire, with
193 only a minority of the estimated 600 infectious diseases physicians responding ^[19]. The sample size
194 lacked power for further sub-analysis. Furthermore, uncertainty in replies regarding prioritisation of
195 some clinical syndromes (for example, infections in cystic fibrosis and burns patients) was higher than
196 that regarding prioritisation of microorganisms, suggesting limited exposure to phage therapy and an
197 understanding of its role in polymicrobial infections, as observed in other countries ^[20]. With most
198 Australian physician being hospital based, and phage therapy currently requiring close follow-up
199 during its administration period, rural and remote medicine aspects were not fully considered in this
200 study. Lastly, while limiting respondents to Australia gave a focused insight into the local clinical needs,
201 it did not give a representation of Australasia as a whole, with other regions facing unique challenges
202 in terms of logistics and access to medications.

203
204 In conclusion, our survey on phage therapy identified that physicians around Australia expressed
205 support for properly conducted and supported clinical trials of phage therapy. Priority research areas
206 identified suggest an unmet need in antibiotic resistant and prosthetic device infections.

206

207 References

- 208 1. Brives C, Pourraz J. **Phage therapy as a potential solution in the fight against AMR: obstacles and**
209 **possible futures.** *Palgrave Communications* 2020; 6(1):1-11.
- 210 2. **Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019: a systematic analysis.** *Lancet*
211 *(London, England)* 2022; 399(10325):629-655.
- 212 3. O'Neill J. **Tackling drug-resistant infections globally: final report and recommendations.** 2016.
- 213 4. Suh GA, Lodise TP, Tamma PD, Knisely JM, Alexander J, Aslam S, et al. **Considerations for the Use**
214 **of Phage Therapy in Clinical Practice.** *Antimicrobial agents and chemotherapy* 2022; 66(3):e0207121.
- 215 5. Potent K. **The future of phage clinical trials in Australia.** *Microbiology Australia* 2019; 40(1):16-19.
- 216 6. Petrovic Fabijan A, Lin RC, Ho J, Maddocks S, Ben Zakour NL, Iredell JR, et al. **Safety of**
217 **bacteriophage therapy in severe Staphylococcus aureus infection.** *Nature microbiology* 2020;
218 5(3):465-472.
- 219 7. Khatami A, Foley DA, Warner MS, Barnes EH, Peleg AY, Li J, et al. **Standardised treatment and**
220 **monitoring protocol to assess safety and tolerability of bacteriophage therapy for adult and**
221 **paediatric patients (STAMP study): protocol for an open-label, single-arm trial.** *BMJ open* 2022;
222 12(12):e065401.
- 223 8. Macdonald KE, Stacey HJ, Harkin G, Hall LML, Young MJ, Jones JD. **Patient perceptions of phage**
224 **therapy for diabetic foot infection.** *PLoS one* 2020; 15(12):e0243947.
- 225 9. McCammon S, Makarovs K, Banducci S, Gold V. **Phage therapy and the public: Increasing**
226 **awareness essential to widespread use.** *PLoS one* 2023; 18(5):e0285824.
- 227 10. Australian Government Department of Health. **Physician 2016 Factsheet.** In; 2017.
- 228 11. Tacconelli E, Carrara E, Savoldi A, Harbarth S, Mendelson M, Monnet DL, et al. **Discovery,**
229 **research, and development of new antibiotics: the WHO priority list of antibiotic-resistant bacteria**
230 **and tuberculosis.** *The Lancet infectious diseases* 2018; 18(3):318-327.
- 231 12. Hashemi Shahraki A, Mirsaeidi M. **Phage Therapy for Mycobacterium Abscessus and Strategies**
232 **to Improve Outcomes.** *Microorganisms* 2021; 9(3).
- 233 13. Durda-Masny M, Goździk-Spychalska J, John A, Czański W, Stróżewska W, Pawłowska N, et al.
234 **The determinants of survival among adults with cystic fibrosis-a cohort study.** *Journal of*
235 *physiological anthropology* 2021; 40(1):19.
- 236 14. Chegini Z, Khoshbayan A, Taati Moghadam M, Farahani I, Jazireian P, Shariati A. **Bacteriophage**
237 **therapy against Pseudomonas aeruginosa biofilms: a review.** *Annals of clinical microbiology and*
238 *antimicrobials* 2020; 19(1):45.
- 239 15. Ramirez-Sanchez C, Gonzales F, Buckley M, Biswas B, Henry M, Deschenes MV, et al. **Successful**
240 **Treatment of Staphylococcus aureus Prosthetic Joint Infection with Bacteriophage Therapy.** *Viruses*
241 2021; 13(6).
- 242 16. Genevière J, McCallin S, Huttner A, Pham TT, Suva D. **A systematic review of phage therapy**
243 **applied to bone and joint infections: an analysis of success rates, treatment modalities and safety.**
244 *EFORT open reviews* 2021; 6(12):1148-1156.
- 245 17. Bretaudeau L, Tremblais K, Aubrit F, Meichenin M, Arnaud I. **Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP)**
246 **Compliance for Phage Therapy Medicinal Products.** *Frontiers in microbiology* 2020; 11:1161.
- 247 18. Lin RC, Sacher JC, Ceysens PJ, Zheng J, Khalid A, Iredell JR. **Phage Biobank: Present Challenges**
248 **and Future Perspectives.** *Current opinion in biotechnology* 2021; 68:221-230.
- 249 19. Foley DA, Tippet E. **COVID-19 response: the perspectives of infectious diseases physicians and**
250 **clinical microbiologists.** *The Medical journal of Australia* 2020; 213(9):431-431.e431.
- 251 20. Willy C, Bugert JJ, Classen AY, Deng L, Döchting A, Gross J, et al. **Phage Therapy in Germany-**
252 **Update 2023.** *Viruses* 2023; 15(2).

253 Author contributions:

254 Survey concept: JI, RL
255 Questionnaire design: JI, RL, MP, SL, AK, HS, and JS, JZ
256 HREC/methods design: SL, RL
257 Data analysis: SL and MP

258 Manuscript writing: SL, MP, RL
259 Members of the Phage Australia network were consulted.

260

261 **Supplement 1**