

Effectiveness and safety of dalbavancin in France: a prospective, multicentre cohort study

Johan Courjon, Eric Senneville, Hajnal-Gabriela Illes, Patricia Pavese, David Boutoille, Frederic C Daoud, Nathalie Dunkel, Pierre Tattevin

▶ To cite this version:

Johan Courjon, Eric Senneville, Hajnal-Gabriela Illes, Patricia Pavese, David Boutoille, et al.. Effectiveness and safety of dalbavancin in France: a prospective, multicentre cohort study. International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents, 2023, 62 (4), pp.106945. 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2023.106945. hal-04196650

HAL Id: hal-04196650

https://hal.science/hal-04196650

Submitted on 26 Oct 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



- 1 Effectiveness and safety of dalbavancin in France: a prospective, multicenter cohort study
- 2
- 3 Johan Courjon^a, Eric Senneville^b, Hajnal-Gabriela Illes^{c,1}, Patricia Pavese^d, David Boutoille^e,
- 4 Frederic C Daoud^f, Nathalie Dunkel^g, Pierre Tattevin^h

- ^aUniversité Côte d'Azur, CHU Nice, Nice, France, Infectious disease unit, 151 Route de St Antoine,
- 7 06200 Nice, courjon.j@chu-nice.fr
- 8 bInfectious Diseases Department, Gustave Dron Hospital, 155 Rue du Président Coty, 59200
- 9 Tourcoing, France, esenneville@ch-tourcoing.fr
- 10 cInfectious Disease Unit, Hospital of Mont-de-Marsan, 417 Avenue Pierre de Coubertin BP, 40024
- 11 Mont-de-Marsan, France
- 12 ¹Present address: Infectious Disease Unit, Private Hospital Francheville, Périgueux, France,
- 13 hajnal_gabriela.illes@yahoo.fr
- dinfectious Diseases Department, Grenoble Alpes University Hospital, Boulevard de la Chantourne,
- 15 38700 La Tronche, France, ppavese@chu-grenoble.fr
- 16 •Department of Infectious Disease and CIC-UIC 1413 INSERM, Nantes University Hospital, 5 Allée de
- 17 l'Île Gloriette, 44093 Nantes, France, david.boutoille@chu-nantes.fr
- 18 fINSERM U1219 BPH, Université de Bordeaux, 33076 Bordeaux, France, frederic.daoud-pineau@u-
- 19 bordeaux.fr
- 20 gADVANZ PHARMA Switzerland, Rue de Jargonnant 2, 1207 Geneva, Switzerland
- 21 Nathalie.Dunkel@advanzpharma.com
- ^hInfectious Diseases and Intensive Care Unit, Pontchaillou University Hospital, 2 Rue Henri le
- 23 Guilloux, 35033 Rennes, France, pierre.tattevin@chu-rennes.fr

24	Corresponding author: Johan Courjon, Université Côte d'Azur, CHU Nice, Nice, France, Infectious
25	disease unit, 151 Route de St Antoine, 06200 Nice. courjon.j@chu-nice.fr; Tel.: +33-(0)49-203-5461
26	
27	
28	

Abstract

Dalbavancin is a lipoglycopeptide antibiotic approved for the treatment of acute bacterial skin and
skin structure infections. However, several studies suggested that it is mostly used for off-label
indications. This prospective, observational, multicenter study conducted in France from September
2018 to April 2020 aimed to describe the use of dalbavancin in patients who received at least 1 dose
of the antibiotic. The primary outcome was the clinical response at 30 days after the last dalbavancin
dose.
A total of 151 patients in 16 centers were included in this study. The main infection sites were bone
and joint infections (55.0%), multisite infections (15.9%), and vascular infections (14.6%), and the
primary pathogens were coagulase-negative staphylococci (N=82), Staphylococcus aureus (N=51),
and enterococci (N=27). Most patients (71.5%) received 3 previous antibiotic treatments. The
number of dalbavancin injections per patient was 1 in 26 patients (17.2%), 2 in 95 patients (62.9%), 3
in 17 patients (11.3%), and more than 3 in 13 patients (8.6%), with a mean cumulative dose of 3,089
\pm 1,461 mg per patient. Among the 129 patients with a complete follow-up, clinical success was
achieved in 119 patients (92.2%). At least 1 adverse event was reported in 67 patients (44.4%),
including 12 (7.9%) patients with dalbavancin-related adverse events.

- The results of the study showed that dalbavancin is mostly used for off-label indications and in heavily pre-treated patients in France. The clinical response at 30 days after the last dose was favorable in most patients, with a good safety profile.
- 48 clinicaltrials.gov identifier: NCT03726216
- **Keywords:** Antibiotics, Dalbavancin, Effectiveness, Off-label, Safety

50 Abbreviations

- ABSSSI, acute bacterial skin and skin structure infection; AE, adverse event; MIC, minimum inhibitory
- 52 concentration; SD, standard deviation

1. Introduction

Intensive and inappropriate antibiotic use leads to the emergence and spread of antimicrobial
resistance [1]. The estimated number of infections related to antibiotic-resistant bacteria in 2015 in
Europe was over 670,000, resulting in more than 33,000 deaths [2]. The World Health Organization
therefore adopted a global action plan to address antimicrobial resistance, with 5 main objectives
among which: "to optimize the use of antimicrobial medicines in human and animal health and to
develop the economic case for sustainable investment that takes account of the needs of countries
and to increase investment in new medicines, diagnostic tools, vaccines, and other interventions."
[3].
To ensure prevention and treatment of infectious diseases, effective antimicrobials are key [3].
Dalbavancin is a semisynthetic lipoglycopeptide antibiotic that is derived from teicoplanin and
disrupts the bacterial cell wall synthesis, resulting in cell death [4]. Its prolonged half-life of 14.5 days
allows an extended interval between doses; dalbavancin is administered intravenously as a single
1,500 mg dose or 1 dose each of 1,000 mg and 500 mg, 1 week apart [4, 5]. Its antibacterial
spectrum is close to that of vancomycin [4].
Dalbavancin efficacy was demonstrated for acute bacterial skin and skin structure infections
(ABSSSIs) caused by gram-positive bacteria in large phase III trials [6-8] and for the treatment of
osteomyelitis and Staphylococcus aureus bacteremia [9, 10]. Two long-acting lipoglycopeptides have
been approved in Europe for the treatment of ABSSSIs, i.e., dalbavancin and oritavancin [5, 11]. The
pivotal trials that lead to their authorization were non-inferiority trials, as compared to regimens
that include vancomycin [6, 12]. While these trials provide valuable information regarding
tolerability, efficacy data cannot be extrapolated for infections other than ABSSSIs. However, real-
world studies showed that dalbavancin has been used for the treatment of other bacterial
infections, such as bone and joint infections, prosthetic joint infections, osteomyelitis, and
endocarditis [13-18]. Linezolid, also originally approved for ABSSSIs, is a striking example of an

78	antibiotic with extensive off-label use [19], which subsequently required additional research efforts
79	to characterize its efficacy and tolerability in other indications [20].
80	The aim of this study was therefore to better characterize the use of dalbavancin in France, with a
81	specific emphasis on its safety.
82	
83	2. Materials and methods
84	2.1. Study design
85	This was a prospective, observational, multicenter study in France. Physicians who prescribed
86	dalbavancin or worked in hospitals and clinics that manage complex infections, especially
87	staphylococcal infections, were contacted by the sponsor via email. The planned number of centers
88	was 15 to 25. Physicians were asked to record eligible participants in screening logs.
89	Three study periods were defined: the baseline period when the infection was diagnosed, the
90	treatment period when dalbavancin was administered, and the end of treatment period being up to
91	30 days after the last dalbavancin injection.
92	At least 2 study visits were planned: the initial visit during which the first dalbavancin dose was
93	administered and the final visit, which occurred up to 30 days after the last dose was administered.
94	Interim visits could be planned, especially if multiple doses of dalbayancin were administered

2.2. Study population

Eligible patients were adults ≥18 years of age at the time of dalbavancin administration. These patients were registered with the French social security and consented to data collection. Patients enrolled in a clinical trial with dalbavancin were excluded. Patients were enrolled consecutively whenever possible.

2.3. Study objectives

The study objectives were (1) to determine patient demographic and baseline characteristics, disease characteristics, and pathogen characteristics; (2) to characterize the routine use of dalbavancin; (3) to evaluate the effectiveness and the safety of dalbavancin; and (4) to assess resource utilization.

2.4. Data collection

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

The following data were collected: (1) patient demographic and baseline characteristics, including laboratory parameters, comorbidities and Charlson comorbidity index [21], and the presence of a medical device; (2) primary infectious diagnosis; (3) pathogens, including in vitro susceptibility to dalbavancin whenever possible or susceptibility to vancomycin as a proxy, according to on-site protocols; (4) antibiotic administration before and during patient management; (5) details on the dalbavancin treatment, including dose, time between diagnosis and treatment initiation, number of injections, and interval between doses; (6) total duration of hospital stay; (7) clinical response (success or failure) with dalbavancin; and (8) adverse events (AEs). Clinical response was assessed at 30 days after the final injection and was defined as a success if the patient did not need an antibiotic or was switched to an oral antibiotic (except for expected suppressive treatments), or if the infection had improved clinically at the time of dalbavancin discontinuation. The clinical response was assessed as a failure if the patient discontinued dalbavancin treatment because of: (i) an AE or insufficient therapeutic effect, (ii) if the patient was switched to another intravenous antibiotic, (iii) if the infection had not clinically improved at the time of dalbavancin discontinuation. Treatment response was undetermined if the information was unavailable or incomplete. Patient analysis was stratified by infection type: ABSSSI, bacteremia, bone and joint infection, vascular infection, mediastinitis or pleural/pulmonary infection, and multisite infection, including infections in distant body locations or infections in adjacent but distinct anatomical structures (e.g.,

soft tissue, muscle, kidney, and circulatory system).

Microbiological and antibiotic susceptibility tests were performed according to each hospital's protocol. When available, dalbavancin minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) were reported in line with national guidelines (Comité de l'Antibiogramme de la Société Française de Microbiologie) [22]. Otherwise, vancomycin MICs were used as a surrogate indicator of dalbavancin susceptibility. Breakpoints used were defined by the European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing [23].

AEs were collected in electronic case report forms. They were classified as treatment-emergent if they occurred between the first dalbavancin dose and the end of the 30-day follow-up period after the final dalbavancin injection.

2.5. Statistical analysis

The study was descriptive and sample size calculations were based on the assumption of a 90% cure rate of ABSSSIs. A sample size of 150 patients (i.e., 135 cured patients) was calculated to estimate a 90% cure rate with an exact 2-sided 95% confidence interval with a precision of ± 5% (0.84–0.94). Three study populations were defined: the total population, i.e., all patients included in the study, the eligible population, i.e., all patients meeting the inclusion criteria, and the safety population, i.e., all patients having received at least 1 dose of dalbavancin.

Continuous variables were described by mean ± standard deviation (SD) or median and quartiles 1 and 3. Categorical variables were described by the total and percentage of each response. The statistical analyses were performed using SAS software, version 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA).

2.6. Ethical considerations

This study complied with French regulations on patient observational clinical studies and with the Declaration of Helsinki. The protocol was approved by the French National Authority for Health (DEMESP/SEM/AA/MPi/TD/KLF/18.0221), received institutional review board approval (CPP

150	AU1420), and was registered with the competent authority in 2018 (n°ID-RCB 2018-A005080-50). It
151	complied with regulations on data protection (CNIL MR-3 approval n° 2152768 v 0). The study was
152	registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT03726216) and a substantial amendment was approved in 2019.
153	Patients signed a non-objection form.
154	
155	3. Results
156	3.1. Center and patient selection
157	Thirty-five centers were contacted. Eighteen centers accepted to participate, of which 16 centers
158	recruited patients (Figure 1). Among the participating centers, 78% were university hospitals. Eighty-
159	three percent of recruiting physicians were infectious diseases specialists.
160	From September 2018 to April 2020, 178 patients who received at least 1 dose of dalbavancin were
161	identified. Of these, 27 declined or could not sign the consent form, resulting in 151 eligible patients
162	of whom 9 were lost to follow-up (6.0%) and 8 died (5.3%). The causes of death were septic shock
163	(N=2), pulmonary aspiration (N=1), acute renal failure (N=1), cutaneous T-cell lymphoma (N=1),
164	acute pulmonary edema (N=1), status epilepticus due to cerebral metastases (N=1), and
165	undetermined (N=1).
166	3.2. Demographic and baseline characteristics
167	The demographic and baseline characteristics of the study population are presented in Table 1 . The
168	mean age at study entry was 66 years (SD \pm 16), and a majority of study participants were male

3.3. Indications and microorganisms

(62.3%) (Table 1).

169

170

171

172

Most infections were categorized as bone and joint infections (55.0%), followed by multisite infections (15.9%), and vascular infections (14.6%; 21 cases of endocarditis and 1 case of arteritis)

(**Table 2**). Among the 21 infective endocarditis cases, 4/21 (19.0%) occurred in patients with prosthetic valves. Ten infections (6.6%) were categorized as ABSSSI only (**Table 2**). More than half of the patients (56.3%) had a medical device-related infection, and 44.4% of patients had an infection on orthopedic implants (**Table 2**). A total of 253 pathogens were identified in 140 patients. The main pathogens were coagulase-negative staphylococci (N=82), *S. aureus* (N=51), enterococci (N=27), and *Corynebacterium striatum* (N=13) (**Table 2**). Most infections were monomicrobial (54.3%) (**Table 2**). Among the 137 strains tested for vancomycin susceptibility, 4 were resistant (2 strains of *S. epidermidis* and 2 strains of *Enterococcus gallinarum*), while the 29 strains tested for dalbavancin were susceptible. Three vancomycin-resistant strains were isolated in patients with polymicrobial infections with susceptible strains. The clinical responses of these patients were all successful after administration of 3,000 mg or 4,500 mg of dalbavancin. One vancomycin-resistant strain was monomicrobial, with a successful outcome after administration of 3,000 mg of dalbavancin. All patients with strains not covered by dalbavancin received additional concomitant antibiotics.

3.4. Antibiotic administration before and during patient management

Most patients received several prior antibiotic treatments for infections targeted by dalbavancin. Twelve patients (8.0%) received dalbavancin as first-line treatment, while 108 patients (71.5%) received 3 previous lines of treatment (**Table 3**). The median duration between the diagnosis and the initiation of dalbavancin was 29 days (**Table 3**). Among the 151 patients, 30.5% were treated with dalbavancin as a monotherapy. The main indications for the use of dalbavancin in association with another antibacterial treatment were multisite infections (21/24, 87.5%) and bone and joint infections (54/83, 65.1%) (**Supplementary Table 1**). The proportion of participants receiving combination treatment gradually increased with the number of previous antibacterial regimens: from 2/12 (16.7%) when dalbavancin was prescribed as first-line treatment, to 86/108 (79.6%) when it was first prescribed as fourth-line treatment (**Supplementary Table 2**). The concomitant antibiotics were primarily daptomycin (9.6%), linezolid (7.7%), and rifampicin (7.4%).

3.5. Dalbavancin treatment

The mean cumulative dose of dalbavancin per patient was 3,089 mg (SD ± 1,461 mg), including 89 patients (58.9%) who received 3,000 mg (Table 3 and Supplementary Figure 1). Three patients (2.0%) received 1,000 mg, the lowest dose, and 1 patient (0.7%) received 12,000 mg, the highest dose. The distribution of dose administration is presented in Supplementary Figure 1, and the cumulative dose by indication in Supplementary Figure 2A. More than half of the patients (62.9%) received 2 injections of dalbavancin, and 17.2% received 1 injection. The maximum number of injections was 9 for a patient with a bone and joint infection (Table 3). For patients receiving multiple injections (N=125), the median interval between 2 injections was 7 days (Table 3).

Supplementary Figure 2B shows the total treatment duration with dalbavancin by indication.

For the 129 patients with a reported clinical outcome, the mean follow-up duration from the baseline visit to the last follow-up visit or final visit was 55 days (SD ± 37).

3.6. Hospitalization

The median duration of hospitalization was 19 days (N=148), with a median of 7 days (N=132) of hospitalization on dalbavancin treatment (**Table 3** and **Supplementary Figure 3**). Seven patients were treated in the intensive care unit, with a median duration of hospitalization of 76 days (**Table 3**).

3.7. Clinical response in patients with a complete follow-up

The effectiveness (success or failure) was determined in 129 (85.4%) patients with a complete follow-up. The clinical response was categorized as a success in 119 patients (92.2%; 95% confidence interval 86.2%–93.2%). A stratification by indication and by line of treatment is presented in **Table 4**. Among the 8 patients who received dalbavancin for ABSSSI, 7 (87.5%) achieved clinical success. The clinical success of dalbavancin treatment for off-label indications was ≥80.0%, with a 100.0% success rate for bacteremia, vascular infections, and multisite infections, an 80.0% success rate for

mediastinitis or pleural/pulmonary infections, and an 89.2% success rate for bone and joint infections (Table 4). Of the 10 patients (7.8%) with a clinical failure, 8 had a bone and joint infection, 1 had mediastinitis, and 1 had an ABSSSI (Table 4). The patient with an ABSSSI received dalbavancin as second-line treatment, and the patient with mediastinitis received it as fourth-line treatment. Six patients with a bone and joint infection received dalbavancin as fourth line treatment; the 2 remaining patients as third-line treatment. Baseline susceptibility testing was performed for 8 patients with a clinical failure. All strains were susceptible to either vancomycin or dalbavancin.

The 10 patients who received dalbavancin as first-line treatment achieved clinical success. When administered as second-, third-, and fourth-line treatment, 93.3%, 85.7%, and 92.2% of patients achieved clinical success, respectively (**Table 4**).

3.8. Safety

Sixty-seven patients (44.4%) developed a total of 125 AEs, of which 120 were classified as treatment-emergent AEs (**Table 5**). Thirty-one patients (20.5%) experienced 44 serious treatment-emergent AEs, and 7 patients had a fatal outcome post-treatment not deemed related to dalbavancin (**Table 5**). Twelve patients (7.9%) reported 14 AEs assessed as related to dalbavancin (**Table 5**). Two serious related AEs (syncope and hypotension) were reported for the same patient and required immediate discontinuation of dalbavancin. Both were resolved without sequelae.

4. Discussion

The results of the present study indicate that dalbavancin is effective and well tolerated for the treatment of ABSSSIs as well as for off-label indications, including bacteremia, vascular infections, mediastinitis or pleural/pulmonary infections, multisite infections, and bone and joint infections.

Dalbavancin treatment is mostly used for off-label indications in France as 6.6% of patients included in this study were treated for ABSSSIs only. These results are aligned with other European real-world

observational studies in Austria, Spain, and Germany where dalbavancin was used to treat ABSSSIs in 10.9% (11/101), 21.7% (15/69), and 33.3% (3/9) of patients, respectively [14, 24, 25]. However, there are no adapted protocols for the off-label use of dalbavancin, resulting in a heterogenic use of this antibiotic in France and other European countries [14, 16, 24, 25]. Additional studies to evaluate dalbavancin safety and efficacy in the identified off-label indications are therefore needed. In the context of bone and joint infections, a pharmacokinetic analysis was performed based on a predefined target of fAUC_{24h}/MIC >111.1. This analysis indicated that creatinine clearance would be the main factor to select between 1,000 and 1,500 mg for the second injection, using therapeutic drug monitoring based on trough plasma concentration to tailor optimal doses and intervals for the following injections [26]. As shown in Supplementary Figure 2B, the median time between first and second injection was 12 days for bone and joint infections in our study, with increasing use of therapeutic drug monitoring thereafter. This study showed an effectiveness of 92.2% at 30 days after the last dose of dalbavancin, regardless of the indication. These results are in line with previous European observational studies [14, 24, 25]. In an Austrian study with 94 evaluable patients, the clinical success at 90 days after treatment was 89.4% [14]. A Spanish study conducted over a 12-month period reported an effectiveness of 84.1% in 69 patients [24]. In another study conducted in Germany (N=9), the clinical success was 83.3% at 30 days after the last dalbavancin dose [25]. These data suggest that dalbavancin treatment is effective for a broad range of infections with gram-positive bacteria. This study also reported that dalbavancin is well tolerated, when used for both on- and off-label indications, which is in line with the results reported for other European territories [14-18, 24, 25]. The main strength of this study was the prospective, standardized collection of data in multiple centers across France (representing both university and non-university hospitals) with expertise in complex infections. This was also one of the largest prospective studies on dalbavancin so far, with

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

12

few patients lost to follow-up. In addition, the enrolled patients were representative for the current

prescribing pattern of dalbavancin in France as this was an observational study with less stringent criteria than a randomized controlled trial.

The main limitation of the study was the follow-up of 30 days after the last dalbavancin administration as the study was designed for ABSSSI. This follow-up may not be sufficient to determine the effectiveness for certain other indications (e.g., bone and joint infections). Indeed, Matt et al. recorded a 47% success rate among 17 prosthetic joint infections managed with dalbavancin after on average 2 prior antibiotic treatment strategies and a median follow-up of 299 days [16]. Moreover, resistance data after dalbavancin treatment for patients with clinical failure were not collected nor documented, and no causal associations could be made due to the descriptive nature of the study. Despite its limitations, the present study provides valuable information on the current use and outcomes of dalbavancin treatment.

As previously reported [13], in our opinion, dalbavancin may be of interest for gram-positive infections other than ABSSSIs, either as single-drug regimen or in combination, with the following assets as compared to alternative regimens: (1) secure treatment adherence, (2) no requirement of central venous access, (3) good safety profile, (4) early discharge for management as outpatient, and (5) activity on most multi-resistant gram-positive bacteria. The latter is typically true for device-related multi-resistant coagulase-negative staphylococcal infections, with treatment options often restricted. Dalbavancin is also suitable for *vanB* vancomycin-resistant enterococci [27].

5. Conclusions

The results of the present study indicate that dalbavancin was mostly used off-label in heavily pretreated patients in France. The clinical success rate was high in ABSSSI (87.5%) and in off-label indications (≥80.0%), while the AE rate was low. These results are in line with previously published data from other European countries, indicating that dalbavancin treatment is effective and well tolerated when used for the treatment of ABSSSIs and off-label indications, including bacteremia,

- vascular infections, mediastinitis or pleural/pulmonary infections, multisite infections, and bone and
- joint infections.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the patients for their contribution to this registry as well as

Universal Medica and the International Clinical Trials Association. They thank all investigators and supporting staff at the participating sites for their collaboration in the study, in particular Dr.

Catherine Lechiche, Dr. Frédéric-Antoine Dauchy, Dr. Jérome Dimet, Dr. Benjamin Davido, Dr.

François Goehringer, Prof. Firouzé Banisadr, Dr. Yann Gérard, and Dr. Lydie Khatchatourian for their involvement in the study conduct. The authors thank Anaïs Lorne for study oversight and for reviewing the paper, and Edwige Yon for statistical support. The authors would also like to thank

Tina Van den Meersche (Akkodis Belgium, on behalf of ADVANZ PHARMA) for providing medical writing support.

Declarations

Funding: This study was sponsored by ADVANZ PHARMA Switzerland Sàrl, a company of the ADVANZ PHARMA group, previously known as Correvio International. The content of this article is solely the responsibility of the authors. Neither honoraria nor payments were made for authorship.

Competing interests: Johan Courjon received consulting fees from Menarini and personal fees from Advanz Pharma. Eric Senneville received consulting fees from Advanz Pharma, BioMérieux, Menarini, Shionogi and Pfizer. Hajnal-Gabriela Illes received personal fees from Advanz Pharma, ViiV and Pfizer. Nathalie Dunkel is an employee of Advanz Pharma. Pierre Tattevin received consulting fees from Advanz Pharma, Menarini, Shionogi and Pfizer. David Boutoille received consulting fees from Advanz Pharma and MSD. Patricia Pavese and Frederic C Daoud declare no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval: This study complied with French regulations on patient observational clinical studies and with the Declaration of Helsinki. The protocol was approved by the French National Authority for Health (DEMESP/SEM/AA/MPi/TD/KLF/18.0221), received institutional review board approval (CPP AU1420), and was registered with the competent authority in 2018 (n°ID-RCB 2018-

322	A005080-50). It complied with regulations on data protection (CNIL MR-3 approval n° 2152768 v 0).
323	The study was registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT03726216) and a substantial amendment was
324	approved in 2019. Patients signed a non-objection form.
325	
326	List of contributions
327	All authors conceptualized the presented work. Johan Courjon, Eric Senneville, Hajnal-Gabriela Illes
328	Patricia Pavese, David Boutoille, and Pierre Tattevin were involved in the study conduct. Frederic C
329	Daoud analyzed the data. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.
330	
331	Data statement
332	The study information is available at https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ (NCT03726216). The data that
333	support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, upon reasonable
334	request.
335	
336	

337 References [1] Ventola CL. The antibiotic resistance crisis: part 1: causes and threats. PT 2015;40:277-83. 338 339 [2] Cassini A, Högberg LD, Plachouras D, Quattrocchi A, Hoxha A, Simonsen GS, et al. Attributable 340 deaths and disability-adjusted life-years caused by infections with antibiotic-resistant bacteria in the 341 EU and the European Economic Area in 2015: a population-level modelling analysis. Lancet Infect Dis 2019;19:56-66. 10.1016/s1473-3099(18)30605-4 342 [3] World Health Organization. Global action plan on antimcrobial resistance. 343 344 https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241509763; 2015 [accessed 30 September 2022]. 345 [4] Smith JR, Roberts KD, Rybak MJ. Dalbavancin: A Novel Lipoglycopeptide Antibiotic with Extended 346 Activity Against Gram-Positive Infections. Infect Dis Ther 2015;4:245-58. 10.1007/s40121-015-0077-7 347 348 [5] European Medicines Agency. Xydalba. Summary of product characteristics. 349 https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/product-information/xydalba-epar-product-350 information en.pdf; 2015 [accessed 30 September 2022]. 351 [6] Boucher HW, Wilcox M, Talbot GH, Puttagunta S, Das AF, Dunne MW. Once-weekly dalbavancin 352 versus daily conventional therapy for skin infection. N Engl J Med 2014;370:2169-79. 353 10.1056/NEJMoa1310480 354 [7] Dunne MW, Puttagunta S, Giordano P, Krievins D, Zelasky M, Baldassarre J. A Randomized Clinical 355 Trial of Single-Dose Versus Weekly Dalbavancin for Treatment of Acute Bacterial Skin and Skin Structure Infection. Clin Infect Dis 2016;62:545-51. 10.1093/cid/civ982 356 357 [8] Jauregui LE, Babazadeh S, Seltzer E, Goldberg L, Krievins D, Frederick M, et al. Randomized, 358 double-blind comparison of once-weekly dalbavancin versus twice-daily linezolid therapy for the 359 treatment of complicated skin and skin structure infections. Clin Infect Dis 2005;41:1407-15.

17

360

10.1086/497271

361	[9] Rappo U, Puttagunta S, Shevchenko V, Shevchenko A, Jandourek A, Gonzalez PL, et al.
362	Dalbavancin for the Treatment of Osteomyelitis in Adult Patients: A Randomized Clinical Trial of
363	Efficacy and Safety. Open Forum Infect Dis 2018;6:ofy331. 10.1093/ofid/ofy331
364	[10] Gonzalez PL, Rappo U, Akinapelli K, McGregor JS, Puttagunta S, Dunne MW. Outcomes in
365	Patients with Staphylococcus aureus Bacteremia Treated with Dalbavancin in Clinical Trials. Infect
366	Dis Ther 2022;11:423-34. 10.1007/s40121-021-00568-7
367	[11] European Medicines Agency. Tenkasi. Summary of product characteristics.
368	https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/product-information/tenkasi-previously-orbactiv-epar-
369	product-information_en.pdf; 2015 [accessed 23 June 2023].
370	[12] Lodise TP, Redell M, Armstrong SO, Sulham KA, Corey GR. Efficacy and Safety of Oritavancin
371	Relative to Vancomycin for Patients with Acute Bacterial Skin and Skin Structure Infections (ABSSSI)
372	in the Outpatient Setting: Results From the SOLO Clinical Trials. Open Forum Infect Dis
373	2017;4:ofw274. 10.1093/ofid/ofw274
374	[13] Dinh A, Duran C, Pavese P, Khatchatourian L, Monnin B, Bleibtreu A, et al. French national
375	cohort of first use of dalbavancin: A high proportion of off-label use. Int J Antimicrob Agents
376	2019;54:668-72. 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2019.08.006
377	[14] Wunsch S, Krause R, Valentin T, Prattes J, Janata O, Lenger A, et al. Multicenter clinical
378	experience of real life Dalbavancin use in gram-positive infections. Int J Infect Dis 2019;81:210-4.
379	10.1016/j.ijid.2019.02.013
380	[15] Illes H-G, Lupu A, Loutfi B, Hoskovec C, Rogero J-M, Delbast L, et al. Efficacy and safety of
381	dalbavancin monotherapy as salvage treatment for bone and joint infection. Clinical Medicine
382	Research 2022;11:74-80. 10.11648/j.cmr.20221103.16
383	[16] Matt M, Duran C, Courjon J, Lotte R, Le Moing V, Monnin B, et al. Dalbavancin treatment for
384	prosthetic joint infections in real-life: a national cohort study and literature review. J Glob
385	Antimicroh Resist 2021:25:341-5 10 1016/i igar 2021 03 026

386	[17] Tobudic S, Forstner C, Burgmann H, Lagler H, Ramharter M, Steininger C, et al. Dalbavancin as
387	Primary and Sequential Treatment for Gram-Positive Infective Endocarditis: 2-Year Experience at the
388	General Hospital of Vienna. Clin Infect Dis 2018;67:795-8. 10.1093/cid/ciy279
389	[18] Tobudic S, Forstner C, Burgmann H, Lagler H, Steininger C, Traby L, et al. Real-world experience
390	with dalbavancin therapy in gram-positive skin and soft tissue infection, bone and joint infection.
391	Infection 2019;47:1013-20. 10.1007/s15010-019-01354-x
392	[19] Theil C, Schmidt-Braekling T, Gosheger G, Schwarze J, Dieckmann R, Schneider KN, et al. Clinical
393	use of linezolid in periprosthetic joint infections - a systematic review. J Bone Jt Infect 2020;6:7-16.
394	10.5194/jbji-6-7-2020
395	[20] Jean SS, Liu IM, Hsieh PC, Kuo DH, Liu YL, Hsueh PR. Off-label use versus formal
396	recommendations of conventional and novel antibiotics for the treatment of infections caused by
397	multidrug-resistant bacteria. Int J Antimicrob Agents 2023;61:106763.
398	10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2023.106763
399	[21] Charlson M, Szatrowski TP, Peterson J, Gold J. Validation of a combined comorbidity index. J Clin
400	Epidemiol 1994;47:1245-51. 10.1016/0895-4356(94)90129-5
401	[22] Société Française de Microbiologie. Comité de l'antibiogramme de la Société Française de
402	Microbiologie. Recommandations 2021 V.1.0 Avril. http://sante.rns.tn/images/eucastcasfm2021.pdf ;
403	2021 [accessed 30 September 2022].
404	[23] European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. Breakpoint tables for
405	interpretation of MICs and zone diameters Version 12.0, valid from 2022-01-01.
406	https://www.eucast.org/fileadmin/src/media/PDFs/EUCAST_files/Breakpoint_tables/v_12.0_Breakp
407	oint_Tables.pdf; 2022 [accessed 30 September 2022].
408	[24] Bouza E, Valerio M, Soriano A, Morata L, Carus EG, Rodríguez-González C, et al. Dalbavancin in
409	the treatment of different gram-positive infections: a real-life experience. Int J Antimicrob Agents
410	2018;51:571-7. 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2017.11.008

411	[25] Hanses F, Dolff S, Trauth J, Seimetz M, Hagel S. A Multicentre, Prospective, and Retrospective
412	Registry to Characterize the Use, Effectiveness, and Safety of Dalbavancin in German Clinical
413	Practice. Antibiotics (Basel) 2022;11:563. 10.3390/antibiotics11050563
414	[26] Cojutti PG, Tedeschi S, Gatti M, Zamparini E, Meschiari M, Siega PD, et al. Population
415	Pharmacokinetic and Pharmacodynamic Analysis of Dalbavancin for Long-Term Treatment of
416	Subacute and/or Chronic Infectious Diseases: The Major Role of Therapeutic Drug Monitoring.
417	Antibiotics (Basel) 2022;11. 10.3390/antibiotics11080996
418	[27] Kresken M, Klare I, Wichelhaus TA, Wohlfarth E, Layer-Nicolaou F, Neumann B, et al.
419	Glycopeptide resistance in Enterococcus spp. and coagulase-negative staphylococci from
420	hospitalised patients in Germany: occurrence, characteristics and dalbavancin susceptibility. J Glob
421	Antimicrob Resist 2022;28:102-7. 10.1016/j.jgar.2021.12.016
422	

423 Tables

424

Table 1 Demographic and baseline characteristics of the study population

Characteristic at baseline		N
Age (years)		
Mean ± SD	66 ± 16	151
Range	18-91	151
Sex, n (%)		
Male	94 (62.3)	151
Female	57 (37.7)	151
Pregnancy, n (%)	0 (0.0)	151
Breastfeeding, n (%)	0 (0.0)	151
Mean weight ± SD, kg	78.0 ± 16.6	110
Mean BMI ± SD, kg/m ²	27.6 ± 6.1	103
Mean body temperature ± SD, °C	36.9 ± 0.5	135
Biological analyses, mean ± SD		
White blood cells, /mm³	7,803 ± 3,600	118
Neutrophils, /mm³	5,401 ± 3,175	108
C-reactive protein, mg/L	46.6 ± 54.5	102
Creatinine clearance, mL/min	78 ± 38	147
Serum creatinine, µmol/L	103.8 ± 94.7	115
Comorbidities		
Charlson comorbidity index ± SD	4 ± 3	151
Mean number of major comorbidities ± SD	6 ± 5	151
Renal failure, n (%)	37 (24.5)	151
Hemodialysis, n (%)	6 (4.0)	150
Oxygen therapy, n (%)	11 (8.0)	137

N, total number of patients with available data; SD, standard deviation; n (%), number (percentage)

427

of patients in the specified category; BMI, body mass index

428 **Table 2** Infection characteristics and pathogens at baseline

Characteristic	N=151
Infection type, n (%)	
Bone and joint infection	83 (55.0)
Multisite infection ^a	24 (15.9)
Vascular infection	22 (14.6)
ABSSSI only	10 (6.6)
Bacteremia only	7 (4.6)
Mediastinitis or pleural/pulmonary infection	5 (3.3)
Infection on medical device, n (%)	
None	66 (43.7)
Orthopedic implant	67 (44.4)
Unspecified	8 (5.3)
Vascular access device	7 (4.6)
Aortic or vascular implant	3 (2.0)
Documented infections, n (%)	140 (92.7)
Monomicrobial infections, n (%)	82 (54.3)
Polymicrobial infections, n (%)	58 (38.4)
Characteristic	N'=253
Pathogens, n' (%) ^b	
Staphylococcus epidermidis	56 (22.1)
Staphylococcus aureus	51 (20.2)
Enterococcus faecalis	18 (7.1)
Corynebacterium striatum	13 (5.1)
Enterococcus faecium	7 (2.8)
Cutibacterium acnes	6 (2.4)
Pseudomonas aeruginosa	6 (2.4)
Escherichia coli	5 (2.0)
Klebsiella pneumoniae	5 (2.0)
Proteus mirabilis	5 (2.0)
Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus	5 (2.0)
Staphylococcus capitis	5 (2.0)
Staphylococcus haemolyticus	5 (2.0)

N, total number of patients; n (%), number (percentage) of patients in the specified category;

ABSSSI, acute bacterial skin and skin structure infections; N', total number of identified pathogens; n'

(%), number (percentage) of pathogens in the specified category

^aMultisite infections include infections in distant body locations and/or infections in adjacent but

distinct anatomical structures (e.g., soft tissue, muscle, kidney, and circulatory system)

^bIdentified in 140 patients; strains identified at least 5 times are reported

435

430

431

432

433

Table 3 Dalbavancin treatment

Treatment characteristic	
Dalbavancin treatment line, n (%) (N=151)	
1 st line	12 (8.0)
2 nd line	16 (10.6)
3 rd line	15 (9.9)
4 th line	108 (71.5)
Duration between diagnosis and treatment, days (N=150)	
Median (Q1–Q3)	29 (13–60)
Treatment regimen, n (%) (N=151)	
1 injection	26 (17.2)
2 injections	95 (62.9)
3 injections	17 (11.3)
4 injections	5 (3.3)
5 injections	3 (2.0)
6 injections	3 (2.0)
7 injections	0 (0.0)
8 injections	1 (0.7)
9 injections	1 (0.7)
Interval between injections, days (N=125)	
Median (Q1–Q3)	7 (3–20.7)
Cumulative dose administered, mg (N=150)	
Mean ± SD	3,089 ± 1,461
Hospitalization, days	
Length of stay, median (Q1–Q3) (N=148)	19.0 (5.0–35.5)
Length of stay on dalbavancin, median (Q1–Q3) (N=132)	6.8 (2.0–16.3)
Length of stay in intensive care unit, median (Q1–Q3) (N=7)	76.0 (38.0–146.0)

n (%), number (percentage) of patients in the specified category; N, total number of patients; Q1,

437

⁴³⁸ first quartile; Q3, third quartile; SD, standard deviation

Table 4 Effectiveness in patients with a complete follow-up by indication and line of treatment

441 (N=129)

440

Indication, n (%)	Success	Failure
ABSSSI only	7 (87.5)	1 (12.5)
Bacteremia only	4 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
Vascular infection	19 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
Mediastinitis or pleural/pulmonary infection	4 (80.0)	1 (20.0)
Multisite infection	19 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
Bone and joint infection ^a	66 (89.2)	8 (10.8)
Total	119 (92.2)	10 (7.8)
Treatment line, n (%)		
1 st line	10 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
2 nd line	14 (93.3)	1 (6.7)
3 rd line	12 (85.7)	2 (14.3)
4 th line	83 (92.2)	7 (7.8)

N, total number of patients; n (%), number (percentage) of patients in the specified category;

ABSSSI, acute bacterial skin and skin structure infection

^a61 patients had a bone and joint infection on a material, with 46 successes and 7 failures (8 were undetermined or could not be assessed)

446

443

444

Table 5 Number and percentages of patients reporting at least 1 adverse event with related adverse events' characteristics according to MedDRA

Type of AE	Number of patients	Number
	N=151	of events
Any AE, n (%)	67 (44.4)	125
TEAEs, n (%)	65 (43.0)	120
Serious	31 (20.5)	44
Fatal	7 (4.6)	7
Related AEs, n (%)	12 (7.9)	14
Type by MedDRA Preferred Term		
Blood and lymphatic system disorders		
Eosinophilia	1 (0.7)	1
Gastrointestinal disorders		
Diarrhea	1 (0.7)	1
Nausea	2 (1.3)	2
General disorders and administration site conditions		
Asthenia	2 (1.3)	2
Chills	1 (0.7)	1
Musculoskeletal and connective tissue disorders		
Arthralgia	1 (0.7)	1
Nervous system disorders		
Dysgeusia	1 (0.7)	1
Syncope ^a	1 (0.7)	1
Skin and subcutaneous tissue disorders		
Pruritus	2 (1.3)	2
Vascular purpura	1 (0.7)	1
Vascular disorders		
Hypotension ^a	1 (0.7)	1

N, total number of patients; AE, adverse event; n (%), number (percentage) of patients in the

453

449

450

451

452

447

specified category; TEAE, treatment-emergent adverse event; MedDRA, Medical Dictionary for

Regulatory Activities

^aTwo related AEs (syncope and hypotension, observed in the same patient) were reported as serious

454 Figures

- Figure 1 Recruitment of centers and reasons for exclusion
- 456 HCP, health care professional; n, number of centers in the specified category

