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Abstract: Effect of two antifilarials ivermectin (microfilaricidal) and CDRI Comp. 82/437 (macrofilaricidal) in combination with immunostimulator (CDRI Comp. 86/448) was evaluated on establishment of Acanthocheilonema viteae infection in Mastomys coucha. The immunostimulator along with the antifilarials was administered on single occasion (Day 0 of larval exposure). Immunostimulator when given in combination with macrofilaricidal agent (82/437), revealed significantly less percentage of worm recovery over untreated control as well as over treated (with either immunostimulator or antifilarial alone) infected controls. It is, thus surmised that establishment of filarial infection is affected by immunostimulant along with antifilarial agent. 
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INTRODUCTION 

Filariasis is a major parasitic disease of great public health importance affecting millions of people in India alone (NICD, 1994). Apart from chemotherapeutic measures, control of the disease in endemic areas largely depends upon the efficient preventive measures such as protection from infective larval invasion from vector bites. It is now well documented that like many other parasitic infections, filarial parasites also cause immunosuppression (Portaro et al., 1976; Ottesen et al., 1977; Piessens et al., 1980, a, b) which help them in their establishment in the host. Stimulation of host’s immune responsiveness by use of immunomodulators thus appears to be a logical approach in counteracting establishment process of infective larvae. This has been amply substantiated from our earlier studies in which establishment of A. viteae and B. malayi infections has been shown to be jeopardized significantly when host was primed with immunomodulators before infective exposure (Misra et al., 1991; Murthy et al., 1992). On the other hand there are certain antifilarial agents which are known to act only partially on developing forms of filariae. Combination therapy with such antifilarial agents along with immunopotentiator appears to be a practical proposition in crusade against establishment of invading and developing larvae in the host.
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Previous studies in our laboratory have indicated that chemotherapeutic efficacy of antifilarial agent can also be enhanced by using it along with immunomodulators (Chatterjee et al., 1988; Fatma et al., 1994). Thus, application of combination of immunostimulator and antifilarial agent might exert better and more efficient protection against infection. In the present study, efforts have been made to prevent the establishment of Acanthocheilonema viteae in Mastomys coucha with combination therapy using CDRI compound 82/437 or ivermectin along with a synthetic immunostimulator, CDRI Compound 86/448.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

**Experimental model:** Acanthocheilonema viteae in Mastomys coucha was used as experimental model. Six to eight weeks old male mastomys were exposed subcutaneously with 50 infective larvae (L3) of A. viteae collected from freshly dissected infected ticks (Ornithodoros moubata) following broadly the technique of Singh et al. (1988).

**Immunomodulator:** CDRI Compound 86/448, a synthetic glycopeptide, was used in the present study as immunostimulator. The Compound 86/448 is a structurally related congenor of muramyl dipeptide (MDP) and was originally synthesized in this Institute (Haq et al., 1990).

**Antifilarials:** Two antifilarials used in the study were ivermectin and a synthetic agent, compound 82/437. Ivermectin was procured from Merck Sharpe and Dohme, New Jersey. The compound 82/437 was originally synthesized in this Institute (Abuzar et al., 1986). The agent is a benzimidazole derivative (2,2' Dicarbomethoxy amino 5−5' dibenzimidazolyl ketone) having macrofilaricidal activity against three filarial species L. carinii, A. viteae and B. malayi in rodents (Fatma et al., 1989).

**Drug preparation and Dose schedule:** Compound 86/448 was prepared in sterile distilled water and used at a dose of 250μg/animal on single occasion subcutaneously. Ivermectin and compound 82/437 were used at 15μg/kg × 1 and 100mg/kg × 1 orally respectively. Both the compounds were prepared in distilled water containing 0.1% Tween−80. Dose of antifilarials and immunomodulator corresponded to the ED50 values.

**Experiment:** Four experimental groups, each consisting of 8−10 animals were used. Different groups receiving treatment and controls were:
1) treated with antifilarials only (ivermectin/Comp. 82/437).
2) treated with immunomodulator only (86/448).
3) treated simultaneously with antifilarial and immunomodulator.
4) untreated controls.

Animals belonging to different experimental groups were exposed to 50 L3 of A. viteae 2 hrs after administration of drug and/or immunomodulator. Untreated animals were also exposed under identical conditions. The effect of individual or combination of drugs was assessed by observing recovery of adult parasites on day 60 i.e., at the start of patency of infection.

**Adult worm recovery:** On day 60 of infective exposure, adult parasites were recovered from subcutaneous tissues of the infected animals. The percentage reduction in worm recovery was calculated by comparing the number of live adult worms recovered from experimental animals
with that recovered from untreated infected controls.

**Statistical analysis:** The data was analysed and p values were taken out using Student’s T test.

**RESULTS**

**Effect of Compounds 86/448 and ivermectin:** Table 1 shows the effect of 86/448, ivermectin and their combination on establishment of *A. viteae* infection in mastomys. Treatment with compound 86/448 and ivermectin resulted in 60.2% reduction in adult worm recovery over control (p < 0.01). Ivermectin and compound 86/448 individually exerted respectively 52.8% and 42.9% reduction in worm recovery over untreated infected control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Dose*</th>
<th>No. of animals (no. of expls.)**</th>
<th>No. of worms recovered Mean±SD</th>
<th>% establishment of worms</th>
<th>% reduction in worm recovery</th>
<th>% reduction in worm recovery over control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivermectin (I) 15µg/kg × 1</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td>13.4±4.6</td>
<td>26.8±9.3</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82/437 (II) 100µg/kg × 1</td>
<td>12 (3)</td>
<td>18.5±5.4</td>
<td>37.0±10.9</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86/448 (III) 250µg/animal × 1</td>
<td>12 (3)</td>
<td>16.2±4.4</td>
<td>32.4±8.8</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivermectin (IV) 15µg/kg × 1</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td>11.3±1.5</td>
<td>22.6±3.0</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>60.2 (P&lt;0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86/448 (V) 250µg/animal × 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82/437 (VI) 100µg/kg × 1</td>
<td>12 (3)</td>
<td>4.3±3.8</td>
<td>8.7±7.8</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>84.8 (P&lt;0.001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86/448 (VII) 250µg/animal × 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infected control Vehicle</td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td>28.4±4.2</td>
<td>56.8±8.4</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Comp. 86/448 was administered subcutaneously whereas other agents were fed orally
**All animals were exposed to 50 L3 of *A. viteae*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treated groups</th>
<th>P values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I vs II</td>
<td>p&lt;0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I vs III</td>
<td>p&lt;0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I vs IV</td>
<td>p&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I vs V</td>
<td>p&lt;0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II vs III</td>
<td>p&lt;0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II vs IV</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II vs V</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III vs IV</td>
<td>p&lt;0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III vs V</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV vs V</td>
<td>p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I = Ivermectin
II = 82/437
III = 86/448
N = Ivermectin + 86/448
V = 82/437 + 86/448
Effect of compounds 86/448 and 82/437: A significant reduction (84.8%) in establishment of A. viteae infection was observed when animals were exposed following treatment with combination of compounds 86/448 and 82/437. Compound 82/437 alone exerted 34.8% reduction in adult worm recovery over controls (Table 1). Statistical significance of percent reduction in worm recovery (over control) amongst treated groups is shown in Table 1a.

DISCUSSION

Control of fillariasis appears difficult in absence of any effective macrofilaricide. Nevertheless, continuous infective larval exposure through vectors in endemic area challenges our strategies in chemotherapy. One of the major logistics for control of filariasis would be the protection of the population from establishment in host. This can be achieved either by vector control or by drugs having lethal effect on developing forms of filarial larvae in the host. The latter strategy i.e. control by use of filarial larvicidal agents has been evaluated in the present investigation. Earlier, a number of attempts on prophylaxis by chemical agents have been made using single or combination of antifilarial agents against different experimental filarial infections (Denham and Brandte, 1980; Zahner et al., 1987; McCall et al., 1993). Most of these studies however, did not yield desired results. The existing drug diethylcarbamazine (DEC) has strong effect on microfilariae but its effect on other developing forms of target parasite, W. bancrofti is not convincing (Jordan, 1958). However, the drug has been shown to be larvicidal with multiple doses as revealed in several experimental studies (Denham et al., 1978; Mak and Lim, 1983) including its use as chemoprophylactic agent against loaisis (Duke 1963).

As immune system plays an important role in exertion of drug activity in host (Ottesen et al., 1977; Kwa and Mak, 1980; Piessens et al., 1980) the strategy taken up in the present study is to boost the antifilarial larvicidal activity potential of the drug with the help of an immunostimulator. Two candidate antifilarials CDRI compound 82/437 and ivermectin which have been shown earlier to exert moderate action against infective larvae (Fatma et al., 1989; Singh et al., 1990) have been used in the present investigation along with immunostimulator to potentiate their larvicidal property. It may be recalled that certain immunostimulators themselves can effect to an extent the growth, development and establishment of larvae in the host (Misra et al., 1991; Murthy et al., 1992).

The single dose therapy with any individual antifilarial agent led to 35 to 53% effect on establishment of adult worms when compared with controls. The maximum efficacy of 53% was demonstrated with ivermectin alone followed by immunostimulator compound 86/448 with 42.9% activity and an activity of 34.8% was displayed by the adulticidal agent, compound 82/437. It is interesting to observe that though no significant enhancement in activity against worm establishment occurred with combination of ivermectin and the immunostimulator, very significant improvement in action of 82/437 occurred when this antifilarial was administered along with immunostimulator. The better performance of combination of 82/437 and immunostimulator (86/448) was primarily due to complementary action of the two agents against establishment of filariids. In our earlier studies (Misra et al., 1991) it was shown that peptide immunostimulators
like MDP and its derivatives could suppress filarial establishment in rodent hosts and subsequent development of microfilaraemia through enhancement in activity of reticuloendothelial system including macrophage functioning. A. viteae used in the present study is known to be susceptible to reactive oxygen intermediates (Batra et al., 1990). Nevertheless, the parasite also possesses an active enzyme system like SOD and catalase to protect itself against host’s oxidant attack. Compound 82/437 inhibits host’s oxidant attack. Compound 82/437 also inhibits significantly the antioxidants (catalase and glutathione peroxidase) of parasite rendering them prone to $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ toxicity leading to death (Batra et al., 1992). Thus on one hand presently used peptide immunostimulator enhanced the release of reactive oxygen intermediates and on the other hand compound 82/437 disrupted the antioxidant defence system of the parasites leading to chain of activity against establishment of filarial larvae in the host.

Though the immunostimulator used as combinant with ivermectin was the same, the mechanism of exertion of activity of the two agents differ (Turner and Schaeffer, 1989; Mak et al., 1991; Pal et al., 1991). None of these thus benefitted from the activity of the other with the result that no improvement in activity of the combination was observed. The combination of compound 82/437 and the peptide immunostimulator should be investigated further for their efficacy against establishment of filarial infection in higher models eg. monkey with human filarial infection.
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