www.ijarp.com ISSN 2456-9992 Page: 01-23

International Journal Advanced Research Publications

Review Article

Volume: 02
Issue: 03

THERAPEUTIC COUNTERMEASURES FOR BIOTERRORISM AGENTS: A NARRATIVE REVIEW

Movva Navya*[1], Pradnya deolekar[1], Kavitha Dongerkery[1], Akash sinha[1], Atharva Dahibhate[1], Prateek DT[1], Sankeerth Chanamolu[1], Shrirambabu V[1], Prathmesh Deolekar[2], Kawshik Movva[3], Reshma Pothugunta[4].

[1]Department of Pharmacology, D Y Patil Medical College, Navi Mumbai.

[2]Resident, General Medicine, Meenakshi Medical College, Enathur, Kancheepuram.

[3]Resident, General surgery, Siddhartha Medical College, Tumkur.

[4]Resident, Radiation Onchology, Viswabharti Medical college, Kurnool.

Article Received: 9 February 2026, Article Revised: 01 March 2026, Published on: 21 March 2026

***Corresponding Author: Movva Navya**

Department of Pharmacology, D Y Patil Medical College, Navi Mumbai.

DOI: https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijarp.1521

INTRODUCTION: Bioterrorism is a major global public health threat involving the deliberate release of microorganisms or their toxins to cause disease, death, and societal disruption. Advances in biotechnology and ease of dissemination through air, food, or water have increased concern regarding its use. High-priority agents such as *Bacillus anthracis*, *Yersinia pestis*, and viral hemorrhagic fever viruses are particularly dangerous due to their high infectivity and mortality. [1] From a pharmacological perspective, effective management requires rapid diagnosis and timely initiation of appropriate antimicrobial or antiviral therapy. Pharmacological countermeasures—including antibiotics, antivirals, monoclonal antibodies, and vaccines—play a crucial role, with pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic factors influencing therapeutic outcomes. [2]

Bioterrorism is defined as:

"The intentional use of biological agents, including bacteria, viruses, fungi, or toxins to cause illness or death in humans, animals, or plants, with the purpose of intimidating populations or influencing governments or policies." [2]

Classification of Bioterrorism Agents [3]

Bioterrorism agents are classified based on their risk to national security, ease of dissemination, and potential public health impact into three categories: A, B, and C.

Category	Criteria	Examples
Category A	High mortality, easily disseminated, requires special public health action	Bacillus anthracis, Yersinia pestis, Variola major, Francisella tularensis, Filoviruses, Arenaviruses
Category B	Moderately easy to disseminate, moderate morbidity	Brucella species, Salmonella species, Escherichia coli O157:H7, Vibrio cholerae, Alphaviruses
Category C	Easily produced, potential for high morbidity and mortality	Mycobacterium tuberculosis Nipah virus, Hantavirus

Historical Timeline of Bioterrorism Agents

The evolution of bioterrorism reflects the use of diverse biological agents across different time periods, later categorized based on their public health impact. Early incidents such as the 6th century BCE poisoned wells involved toxins like *Claviceps purpurea* (ergot), though these are not part of modern CDC classifications. During the Siege of Caffa (1346), *Yersinia pestis*—a Category A agent—was used due to its high mortality and ease of dissemination. Similarly, in 1763 (Fort Pitt), *Variola virus* (smallpox), another Category A agent, was utilized owing to its high transmissibility and lethality.

In the 20th century, Japan's Unit 731 (1930s–40s) employed multiple agents including *Yersinia pestis* and *Bacillus anthracis* (Category A) and *Vibrio cholerae* (Category B), highlighting a shift toward organized biological warfare. More recently, the 2001 anthrax letters involved *Bacillus anthracis*, reinforcing its classification as a Category A agent due to spore formation, high lethality, and ease of dissemination.[4]

This timeline demonstrates how historical use aligns with modern classification, emphasizing the importance of prioritizing high-risk agents for preparedness and pharmacological countermeasures.

History of *Bacillus anthracis* as a Bioterrorism Agent

Bacillus anthracis has long been recognized as a potent bioterrorism agent due to its spore-forming ability, environmental stability, and high lethality. First identified by Robert Koch in 1876, it was explored for military use during the World Wars and later involved in the 1979 Sverdlovsk outbreak. The 2001 Anthrax Attacks further demonstrated its potential for deliberate dissemination. Owing to its high mortality and ease of spread, it is classified as a Category A agent. As per the World Health Organization, release of 50 kg of anthrax spores over a large urban area could cause up to 1 lakh deaths, emphasizing its devastating public health impact.[5]

Pharmacological Countermeasures for *Bacillus anthracis:*

Drugs /Interventions	**Mechanism of Action**	**PK/PD Feature**	**Clinical Role**
Fluoroquinolones (Ciprofloxacin, Levofloxacin, Moxifloxacin)	Inhibit DNA gyrase (topoisomerase II) and topoisomeraseIV, preventing bacterial DNA replication and transcription	Excellent lung penetration High oral BA (70–100%) Good intracellular penetration Conc.-dependent bactericidal activity High Cmax/MIC ratio, PAE	First-line for inhalational, systemic, and post-exposure prophylaxis
Tetracyclines (Doxycycline, Minocycline)	Bind to the 30S ribosomal subunit, blocking attachment of aminoacyl-tRNA and inhibiting protein synthesis	Highly lipophilc → good tissue and intracellular penetration Long t1/2 (18–22 hours) TDK	Alternative first-line agent; used in PEP
Beta-Lactams (if susceptible) (Penicillin G, Ampicillin, Amoxicillin, Meropenem, Imipenem)	Inhibit bacterial cell wall synthesis by binding to penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs), causing cell lysis	High serum levelswith IV , useful in septicemic anthrax. Carbapenems penetrate CSF, for anthrax meningitis - TDK	Used when strain is penicillin-sensitive; carbapenems preferred if meningitis suspected
Protein Synthesis Inhibitors (for toxin suppression) (Clindamycin, Linezolid, Rifampicin)	Clindamycin: inhibits 50S ribosomal subunit; Linezolid: blocks initiation complex at 50S; Rifampicin: inhibits DNA-dependent RNA polymerase	Excellent tissue penetration, including lungs and soft tissues Linezolid has nearly 100% oral BAReduce exotoxin production	Used in combination therapy to reduce toxin production
Antitoxins (Raxibacumab, Obiltoxaximab, Anthrax Immune Globulin (AIGIV)	Neutralize anthrax protective antigen toxin, preventing toxin entry into host cells	Very long half-life (~2–3 weeks) sustained neutralization of circulating toxin kill bacteria but do not neutralize toxin already released.	Used with antibiotics in systemic/ inhalational anthrax
Post-Exposure Prophylaxis Ciprofloxacin, Doxycycline, Amoxicillin (if susceptible)	Same mechanisms as respective antibiotic classes (DNA gyrase inhibition, protein synthesis inhibition, or cell wall inhibition)	Anthrax spores can remain dormant in lungs for weeks.	60 day prophylaxis after aerosol exposure

Fluoroquinolones such as Ciprofloxacin are preferred first-line agents due to concentration-dependent killing, high AUC/MIC ratios, and excellent lung penetration. Doxycycline serves

as an effective alternative with good intracellular penetration and prolonged action, while β-lactams are used in susceptible cases where time above MIC is critical. Adjuncts like protein synthesis inhibitors and antitoxins enhance outcomes by reducing toxin production, making therapy a combination of antimicrobial efficacy and toxin neutralization.[7,8]

History of *Yersinia pestis* as a Bioterrorism Agent

Yersinia pestis is a highly virulent Gram-negative bacillus causing plague, transmitted by fleas from infected rodents or via aerosols in pneumonic form. It was responsible for the Black Death (1346–1353), one of the deadliest pandemics in history, which killed nearly one-third of Europe's population. Due to its high mortality, rapid transmission, and potential for aerosolization, it is classified as a Category A bioterrorism agent. According to the World Health Organization, release of 50 kg of plague agent over a 250 km² area could result in tens of thousands of deaths, highlighting its potential as a biological weapon. [9]

Pharmacological Countermeasures for*Yersinia pestis:*

Drugs /Interventions	**Mechanism of Action**	**PK/PD Feature**	**Clinical Role**
Streptomycin, Gentamicin	Aminoglycoside → binds 30S ribosomal subunit → misreading of mRNA → abnormal protein synthesis → bactericidal effect	High serum conc. after IV/IM administration Good extracellular fluid distribution CDK - PAE	First-line drugs for severe plague; aminoglycosides traditionally drug of choice
Ciprofloxacin, Levofloxacin	Fluoroquinolone → inhibits DNA gyrase (Topo II) & Topoisomerase IV → DNA replication blocked → bacterial cell death	Excellent oral BA Good tissue and lung penetration - CDK High Cmax/MIC ratio	Widely used in modern treatment protocols
Doxycycline	Tetracycline → binds 30S ribosomal subunit → block aminoacyl-tRNA binding → protein synthesis inhibited → bacteriostatic effect	Good intracellular and tissue penetration - CDK	Alternative agent; used in prophylaxis
Chloramphenicol	binds 50S ribosomal subunit → inhibits peptidyl transferase → peptide chain formation blocked → protein synthesis inhibition	Excellent CSF penetration Achieves therapeutic CNS levels	Used in plague meningitis due to good CSF penetration
Doxycycline	Antibiotic prophylaxis → protein synthesis inhibition	Good oral BA → suitable for mass prop	Used for post-exposure prophylax

/ Ciprofloxacin	(doxycycline) OR DNA gyrase inhibition (ciprofloxacin) → prevents bacterial multiplication after exposure	hylaxis Suppress bacterial multiplication after exposure	is (7 days after last exposure)

Aminoglycosides like Streptomycin and Gentamicin produce rapid bactericidal action via concentration-dependent killing, while fluoroquinolones such as Ciprofloxacin show high efficacy based on AUC/MIC ratios. Doxycycline offers good intracellular penetration and is useful for treatment and prophylaxis, whereas Chloramphenicol is preferred in meningitis due to excellent CSF penetration.[10,11]

History of *Francisella tularensis* as a Bioterrorism Agent

Francisella tularensis, the causative agent of tularemia, is a highly infectious Gram-negative coccobacillus transmitted via tick bites, contact with infected animals, or inhalation of aerosols. Its extremely low infectious dose, high infectivity, and ability to cause severe pneumonic disease have led to its classification as a Category A bioterrorism agent.Historical aerosol research, including mid-20th century military programs, highlights its biowarfare potential, though no large-scale use has been reported. [1,12]

Pharmacological Countermeasures for *Francisella tularensis* :

Drugs	**Mechanism of Action**	**PK/PD Feature**	**Duration**	**Clinical Notes**
Streptomycin, Gentamicin (First-line for severe disease)	Binds 30S ribosomal subunit → mRNA misreading → abnormal proteins formed → bactericidal cell death	CDK, high Cmax/MIC, strong PAE	10–14 days	Preferred in severe disease
Ciprofloxacin	Inhibits DNA gyrase (Topoisomerase II) & Topoisomerase IV → DNA replication blocked → bacterial cell death	CDK, excellent intracellular penetration	10–14 days	Effective oral alternative
Doxycycline	Binds 30S ribosomal subunit → blocks aminoacyl-tRNA binding → protein synthesis inhibited → bacteriostatic effect	TDK, good intracellular penetration	14–21 days	Oral therapy; relapse risk

Aminoglycosides are first-line in severe disease due to their rapid bactericidal activity, concentration-dependent killing, and strong post-antibiotic effect. In contrast, doxycycline

and ciprofloxacin are preferred for mild cases and prophylaxis because of their good oral bioavailability, excellent intracellular penetration, and ease of administration. However, longer durations are required with doxycycline due to its bacteriostatic nature and risk of relapse. [13,14]

History of *Variola major* as a Bioterrorism Agent

Variola major, the causative agent of smallpox, is a highly contagious DNA virus transmitted via respiratory droplets and fomites, associated with high mortality. It represents one of the earliest documented examples of biological warfare, notably during the Fort Pitt smallpox incident, where infected blankets were reportedly distributed to Native Americans. Due to its high transmissibility, severe disease, and lack of population immunity following eradication, smallpox is classified as a Category A bioterrorism agent. [1]

Pharmacological Countermeasures for *Variola major*

Drugs/ Interventions	**Mechanism of Action**	**PK/PD Feature**	**Clinical Role**
Tecovirimat (TPOXX) – First-line antiviral	Inhibits the VP37 envelope protein of orthopoxviruses, preventing formation of extracellular enveloped virus and blocking viral release from infected cells	Exposure-dependent antiviral activity; - good oral BA; - intracellular activity against orthopoxvirus	Preferred in severe disease
Cidofovir	Nucleotide analog that inhibits viral DNA polymerase, blocking viral DNA replication	-Conc.dependent inhibiton - long intracellular t½ (cidofovir diphosphate ≈ 17–65 hrs)	sustained inhibition of viral DNA polymerase
Brincidofovir	Lipid conjugate of cidofovir with improved cellular uptake; also inhibits viral DNA polymerase	-Conc.dependent inhibition - prolonged intracellular t½ (cidofovir diphosphate ≈ 3–4 days)	Improved safety, oral option
Supportive care (fluids, electrolyte correction, infection control)	Maintains fluid balance, electrolyte homeostasis, and prevents secondary infections		Strict isolation required

Tecovirimat is the drug of choice in smallpox due to its targeted inhibition of viral release (VP37), thereby limiting spread of infection. Cidofovir and brincidofovir provide sustained viral suppression due to prolonged intracellular activity of their active metabolite. Standard regimens include tecovirimat 600 mg orally twice daily for 14 days, while cidofovir (5 mg/kg

IV weekly) and brincidofovir (200 mg orally once weekly) are used with less frequent dosing due to their long intracellular half-life. Supportive care and strict isolation remain essential to reduce mortality and transmission. [15,16]

History and Epidemiology of Ebola Virus Disease

Ebola Virus Disease was first identified in 1976 near the Ebola River, from which it derives its name. The virus is a highly virulent zoonotic pathogen, with fruit bats serving as the natural reservoir and transmission occurring through direct contact with infected body fluids. One of the most significant outbreaks occurred during the West African Ebola epidemic, primarily affecting Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone, resulting in thousands of deaths due to its high case fatality rate. The rapid spread, high mortality, and potential for international transmission highlight its importance as a major global public health threat. [1,2]

Pharmacological Countermeasures for Ebola Virus

Drugs/ Interventions	**Mechanism of Action**	**PK/PD Feature**	**Clinical Role**
Inmazeb (REGN-EB3), Ebanga (mAb114) – Ebola-specific therapy	Monoclonal antibodies that bind to the Ebola virus glycoprotein (GP), blocking viral attachment and entry into host cells and promoting immune-mediated viral clearance	long plasma half-life (~20–30 days) typical of monoclonal antibodies	FDA approved for Ebola
No approved specific antiviral for Marburg virus	No targeted antiviral therapy currently approved; treatment focuses on maintaining physiological stability while the immune system clears the virus		Supportive care only
Supportive care (IV fluids, electrolyte correction, oxygen therapy)	Maintains hemodynamic stability, oxygenation, and electrolyte balance, preventing organ failure and complications during infection		Early aggressive supportive therapy improves survival

Monoclonal antibodies such as Inmazeb and Ebanga target the Ebola virus glycoprotein, preventing viral entry and facilitating immune-mediated clearance, with their long plasma half-life allowing sustained antiviral activity after a single administration. In contrast, no specific antiviral therapy is currently approved for Marburg virus, and management relies entirely on aggressive supportive care. Early initiation of supportive therapy (fluids, oxygen,

electrolyte correction) is crucial in both infections to maintain hemodynamic stability, reduce organ failure, and improve survival outcomes.[17,18]

History of Arenaviruses as Biothreat Agents

Arenavirus infections were first recognized in the mid-20th century, with Lassa fever identified in 1969 in Nigeria. Subsequently, other arenaviruses such as Argentine hemorrhagic fever (Junin) and Bolivian hemorrhagic fever (Machupo) were reported in South America. Arenavirus infections such as Lassa fever, Argentine hemorrhagic fever (Junin), and Bolivian hemorrhagic fever (Machupo) are zoonotic infections transmitted primarily through contact with infected rodents or their excreta. These viruses are of major public health concern due to their ability to cause severe hemorrhagic fever, high mortality rates, and nosocomial transmission. The absence of widely available vaccines and limited therapeutic options further increase their epidemic potential. Consequently, they are recognized as high-priority pathogens due to their capacity to cause widespread fear, healthcare disruption, and potential use in biothreat scenarios. [1,3]

Pharmacological Countermeasures for Arenaviruses

Drugs/ Interventions	Mechanism of Action	PK/PD Feature	Clinical Role
Ribavirin – First-line for Lassa fever	Guanosine nucleoside analog that inhibits viral RNA-dependent RNA polymerase, interferes with viral RNA synthesis, and induces lethal mutagenesis in RNA viruses	-Time-dependent antiviral activity -Requires early high plasma levels for efficacy -Good intracellular penetration	Most effective if started early
No approved specific antiviral for most arenaviruses (Junin, Machupo)	No widely approved targeted antiviral therapy; treatment relies on supportive management and immune response		Limited antiviral options
Supportive care (fluid management, hemodynamic support)	Maintains circulatory stability, electrolyte balance, and organ perfusion during hemorrhagic illness		Critical in severe hemorrhagic cases

Ribavirin is the drug of choice for Lassa fever and is most effective when initiated early, as it inhibits viral RNA polymerase and reduces viral replication, thereby improving survival. The recommended regimen includes an IV loading dose of 30 mg/kg, followed by 16 mg/kg every 6 hours for 4 days, then 8 mg/kg every 8 hours for 6 days, with efficacy dependent on

achieving adequate intracellular levels early in the disease course. In contrast, no specific antivirals are widely approved for other arenaviruses such as Argentine hemorrhagic fever and Bolivian hemorrhagic fever, making early aggressive supportive care including fluid balance, hemodynamic stability, and organ perfusion, the cornerstone of management to reduce mortality.[19]

History of Brucella as a Biothreat Agent

Brucellosis, caused by Brucella species, has long been recognized for its potential in biological warfare due to its low infectious dose and ability to be aerosolized. During the mid-20th century, it was investigated in military research programs, including work conducted at Fort Detrick, highlighting its feasibility as a biological agent. Although rarely fatal, the disease causes prolonged illness, chronic disability, and significant healthcare burden, making it a suitable incapacitating agent. Consequently, it is classified as a Category B bioterrorism agent. [1,3]

Pharmacological Countermeasures for Brucella

	Mechanism of Action	**PK/PD Feature**	**Clinical R**
-line	Doxycycline: binds to 30S ribosomal subunit, inhibiting protein synthesis. Rifampicin: inhibits DNA-dependent RNA polymerase, blocking bacterial RNA synthesis	Doxycycline – Time-dependent; good intracellular penetration Rifampicin – Concentration-dependent; high Cmax/MIC, enzyme inducer → Combination: synergistic intracellular activity and relapse prevention	6-week sta
lternative regimen	Doxycycline: inhibits protein synthesis via 30S ribosome. Streptomycin: aminoglycoside that binds 30S ribosomal subunit, causing	Doxycycline – Time-dependent; good intracellular penetration Streptomycin – Conc.-dependent; high Cmax/MIC,	Streptomyc

			misreading of mRNA and bactericidal protein synthesis inhibition	strong bactericidal with PAE → Combination: intracellular + rapid bactericidal effect	
Aminoglycoside	(e.g., Gentamicin)	Severe/Complicated disease	Combination therapy targets protein synthesis (doxycycline, aminoglycosides) and RNA synthesis (rifampicin), improving intracellular bacterial clearance	Doxycycline – Time-dependent; intracellular penetration Rifampicin – Conc.-dependent; good intracellular activity Aminoglycoside (e.g., Gentamicin) – Conc,-dependent; high Cmax/MIC, bactericidal with post-antibiotic effect → Combination: synergistic intracellular + rapid bactericidal action	Prolonged
lfamethoxazole	(TMP-SMX)	Children/Pregnancy	Rifampicin: inhibits RNA polymerase. TMP-SMX: sequential inhibition of folate synthesis (trimethoprim inhibits dihydrofolate reductase; sulfamethoxazole inhibits dihydropteroate synthase)	Rifampicin – Conc.-dependent; good intracellular penetration Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole – Time-dependent; inhibits folate synthesis with good oral bioavailability → Combination: effective intracellular activity with safer profile	Doxycyclin / pregnancy

In Brucellosis, the combination of Rifampicin with or without Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole is preferred in children and pregnancy due to safety considerations, as tetracyclines are contraindicated. This regimen provides effective intracellular activity against the organism while minimizing toxicity. Prolonged therapy (usually ≥6 weeks) is required to prevent relapse due to the intracellular persistence of Brucella. [20]

History of Rajneeshee Bioterror Attack (1984)

The Rajneeshee bioterror attack represents the largest bioterrorism incident in U.S. history. It occurred in The Dalles, Oregon, affecting local residents through deliberate contamination of restaurant salad bars with Salmonella, leading to over 750 cases of food poisoning. The attack was carried out by followers of Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh (Osho), from whom the term "Rajneeshee" is derived, rather than the place or victims. The objective was to incapacitate the local population and influence county elections, highlighting the vulnerability of food systems and the potential use of biological agents for public disruption. [1,21]

Pharmacological Countermeasures for Salmonella infections (Including Typhoid fever)

Drugs/ Interventions	**Mechanism of Action**	**PK/PD Feature**	**Clinical Role**
No antibiotics required (supportive care) – Uncomplicated gastroenteritis	Supportive therapy maintains hydration, electrolyte balance, and gastrointestinal recovery; antibiotics generally avoided because they may prolong bacterial shedding		-ORS -IV fluids if needed; - antibiotics avoided as they may prolong carrier state
Ciprofloxacin – Severe / systemic infection	Fluoroquinolone that inhibits DNA gyrase (topoisomerase II)	Concentration-dependent killing (CDK); high Cmax/MIC; good intracellular penetration	Dose: 500–750 mg PO BD for 7–14 days (adults) • First-line where

	and topoisomerase IV, preventing bacterial DNA replication and transcription		sensitivity retained
Ceftriaxone, Azithromycin – Alternative agents	Ceftriaxone: β-lactam that inhibits cell wall synthesis by binding penicillin-binding proteins (PBPs). Azithromycin: macrolide that binds the 50S ribosomal subunit, inhibiting bacterial protein synthesis	Ceftriaxone – Time-dependent killing (TDK); prolonged t½ → maintains levels above MIC Azithromycin – Time-dependent; high intracellular accumulation; long half-life Combination Rationale - ceftriaxone provides sustained bactericidal plasma activity, while azithromycin ensures intracellular action, improving efficacy in resistant or complicated Salmonella infections	Ceftriaxone: 1–2 g IV OD for 7–14 days Azithromycin: 500 mg OD for 5–7 days Used in resistant strains or children
Ceftriaxone, Azithromycin, Ciprofloxacin (if sensitive) – Typhoid fever	Combination of cell wall inhibition (ceftriaxone), protein synthesis inhibition (azithromycin), and DNA replication	Ceftriaxone – (TDK); maintains levels above MIC Azithromycin – Time-dependent; high intracellular conc,; long t1/2 Ciprofloxacin (if sensitive) – (CDK); high Cmax/MIC; excellent intracellular penetration	Ceftriaxone: 2 g IV OD Azithromycin: 500 mg OD Ciprofloxacin: 500–750 mg BD (if sensitive) Based on susceptibility

	inhibition (ciprofloxacin) depending on susceptibility	**Combination Rationale** ceftriaxone ensures sustained extracellular bactericidal levels, azithromycin and ciprofloxacin target intracellular organisms, leading to improved efficacy and reduced relapse in Typhoid fever	pattern

Ciprofloxacin shows concentration-dependent killing (high Cmax/MIC) with excellent intracellular penetration; dose 500–750 mg BD for 7–14 days. Ceftriaxone exhibits time-dependent killing with prolonged half-life maintaining levels above MIC; dose 1–2 g IV OD. Azithromycin has time-dependent action with high intracellular accumulation and long half-life; dose 500 mg OD for 5–7 days. In typhoid fever, combining ceftriaxone (extracellular action) with azithromycin ± ciprofloxacin (intracellular action) to ensure both extracellular and intracellular eradication, thereby reducing relapse. [22.23]

History of Escherichia coli O157:H7 (EHEC)

Escherichia coli O157:H7 is considered a potential bioterrorism-related agent due to its very low infectious dose (10–100 organisms) and ability to spread easily through food and water contamination. It produces Shiga toxin, leading to severe disease such as hemorrhagic colitis and Hemolytic uremic syndrome, especially in vulnerable populations. Its capacity to cause high morbidity and public panic, along with initially nonspecific symptoms that delay detection, increases its threat potential. Additionally, the limited role of antibiotics and reliance on supportive care make management challenging in large-scale exposure, emphasizing the importance of strict food safety measures and public health surveillance. [24,25]

Pharmacological Countermeasures for Escherichia coli O157:H7 (EHEC)

Drugs/ Interventions	**Mechanism of Action**	**PK/PD Feature**	**Clinical Role**
Supportive care (IV fluids, electrolyte replacement) –	Restores fluid balance, electrolyte homeostasis, and renal perfusion,	- Rapid intravascular volume expansion - Direct physiological	Antibiotics generally NOT recommended

Primary management	preventing dehydration and kidney injury during diarrheal illness	correction (no antimicrobial action)	
Supportive management for HUS (dialysis, transfusion if required)	Dialysis removes waste products and excess fluids in cases of acute kidney failure caused by hemolytic uremic syndrome	-Extracorporeal clearance of uremic toxins - Maintains acid-base, electrolyte balance	Dialysis used in severe renal impairment
Avoid antibiotics and antimotility drugs	Antibiotics may increase Shiga toxin release from bacteria; antimotility drugs slow intestinal clearance of toxin		May worsen disease or increase risk of hemolytic uremic syndrome

In infections caused by Escherichia coli O157:H7, management is primarily supportive, focusing on maintaining hydration and renal perfusion to prevent complications. Intravenous fluids rapidly restore intravascular volume, while electrolyte correction ensures physiological stability. In patients who develop Hemolytic uremic syndrome, interventions such as dialysis aid in toxin removal and maintenance of acid–base balance. Importantly, antibiotics and antimotility agents are avoided because they may enhance Shiga toxin release or prolong toxin exposure, thereby increasing the risk of HUS. Thus, treatment emphasizes supportive PK/PD effects—restoring homeostasis rather than targeting the organism directly. [26]

History of Vibrio cholerae as Biothreat Agents

Vibrio cholerae, identified by Robert Koch in 1883, is primarily known for causing devastating pandemics via contaminated water, which highlighted its potential for bioterrorism. Although studied during World War II by Japan and later evaluated by the United States and Soviet Union, it was not widely weaponized due to limited stability and oral transmission. Currently, it is classified as a Category B agent by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention because of its ability to cause large outbreaks through water contamination. [27]

Pharmacological Countermeasures of Vibrio cholerae

Drugs/ Interventions	**Mechanism of Action**	**PK/PD Feature**	**Clinical Role**
Oral Rehydration Salts (ORS) – Primary treatment	Glucose–sodium co-transport in intestinal mucosa enhances water and electrolyte absorption, counteracting toxin-	Rapid intestinal absorption even during active diarrhea; works despite ongoing	Most important therapy

	induced secretion	toxin activity	
IV Ringer's Lactate – Severe dehydration	Restores circulating blood volume, electrolyte balance, and tissue perfusion during severe dehydration	Immediate systemic effect; distributes in extracellular fluid	Rapid correction needed Used in severe dehydration/shock;
Doxycycline (single dose) – Antibiotic therapy for severe cases	Binds to 30S ribosomal subunit, inhibiting bacterial protein synthesis	Long half-life allows single-dose therapy; good intestinal penetration	Reduces duration of diarrhea and bacterial shedding
Azithromycin, Ciprofloxacin – Alternative antibiotics	Azithromycin: macrolide that binds the 50S ribosomal subunit, inhibiting protein synthesis. Ciprofloxacin: fluoroquinolone that inhibits DNA gyrase and topoisomerase IV, preventing bacterial DNA replication	Azithromycin: High tissue concentration; prolonged half-life Ciprofloxacin: Concentration-dependent killing; good oral bioavailability	Azithromycin: effective in resistant strains Ciprofloxacin: Used based on local resistance patterns

Management of cholera caused by Vibrio cholerae primarily focuses on rapid correction of dehydration and electrolyte imbalance. Oral Rehydration Salts (ORS) remain the cornerstone of therapy by enhancing intestinal water absorption via glucose–sodium co-transport, while IV fluids (Ringer's lactate) are essential in severe dehydration for rapid volume restoration. Antibiotics such as doxycycline, with alternatives like azithromycin and ciprofloxacin, are used as adjuncts to reduce the duration of diarrhea and bacterial shedding. [28]

History of Alphaviruses as Biothreat Agents

Alphaviruses such as Venezuelan equine encephalitis virus are mosquito-borne RNA viruses capable of causing outbreaks of encephalitis in humans and animals. Historically, large epidemics in Central and South America, including the 1969 outbreak, demonstrated their rapid spread and significant morbidity. Due to their ability to be transmitted via aerosols and cause incapacitating illness, these viruses were investigated for potential biological warfare use. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention classifies VEE virus as a potential biothreat agent due to its infectivity and aerosol transmission potential. [29]

Pharmacological Countermeasures of Alphaviruses [30]

Drugs/Interventions	**Mechanism of Action**	**Clinical Role**
No approved antiviral drugs – Specific antiviral therapy	Currently no licensed antiviral agents targeting alphaviruses; treatment	No specific antiviral therapy

	focuses on host immune response and symptomatic management	available
Supportive care (antipyretics, fluids, electrolyte management)	Maintains hydration, electrolyte balance, and temperature control, reducing complications from systemic viral infection	Fever control and fluid replacement
ICU supportive management (respiratory support, neurological monitoring)	Supports vital organ function, cerebral perfusion, and oxygenation during severe encephalitis or neurologic complications	Used in severe neurologic cases

History of Mycobacterium tuberculosis as Biothreat Agents

Mycobacterium tuberculosis, the causative agent of tuberculosis, has long been recognized as a major global health threat rather than a classical bioweapon. Identified by Robert Koch in 1882, TB spread extensively during the 19th and early 20th centuries, particularly in crowded and unsanitary conditions, demonstrating its potential for airborne transmission. Although not widely used as a biological weapon, its high prevalence, persistence within macrophages, and emergence of MDR/XDR strains raise concerns about potential misuse.Modern perspectives consider Mycobacterium tuberculosis a potential biothreat because it can cause chronic, long-lasting illness, but its slow progression and need for prolonged exposure limit its ability to cause rapid mass casualties.[31]

Pharmacological Countermeasures of Mycobacterium tuberculosis

Drugs	Mechanism of Action	Clinical Role
Isoniazid, Rifampicin, Pyrazinamide, Ethambutol (HRZE) – First-line (Drug-sensitive TB)	Isoniazid: inhibits mycolic acid synthesis, disrupting mycobacterial cell wall. Rifampicin: inhibits DNA-dependent RNA polymerase, blocking RNA synthesis. Pyrazinamide: disrupts mycobacterial membrane energetics and fatty acid synthesis in acidic environments. Ethambutol: inhibits arabinosyl transferase, impairing cell wall synthesis	Standard HRZE regimen (2-month intensive phase)
Isoniazid + Rifampicin – Continuation phase	Same mechanisms as above (cell wall synthesis inhibition and RNA polymerase inhibition)	Usually 4-month continuation phase
Levofloxacin, Moxifloxacin, Bedaquiline, Linezolid, Clofazimine, Cycloserine – Second-line (MDR-TB)	Fluoroquinolones (levofloxacin/moxifloxacin): inhibit DNA gyrase. Bedaquiline: inhibits ATP synthase of mycobacteria. Linezolid: binds 50S ribosomal subunit, inhibiting protein synthesis. Clofazimine: interferes with mycobacterial DNA replication and membrane function. Cycloserine: inhibits cell wall synthesis by blocking D-alanine metabolism	Used in resistant TB
Bedaquiline,	Delamanid / Pretomanid: inhibit mycolic acid	WHO-

Linezolid, Delamanid, Pretomanid – XDR-TB regimens	synthesis and generate reactive nitrogen species toxic to mycobacteria	recommended newer regimens: Bedaquiline, Pretomanid, Linezolid, Moxifloxacin (BPaLM regimen)
Isoniazid, Rifampicin, Isoniazid + Rifapentine – Latent TB	Inhibit mycolic acid synthesis (isoniazid) and RNA polymerase (rifamycins), preventing activation of latent infection	Preventive therapy

Pharmacological management of Mycobacterium tuberculosis involves prolonged combination therapy (HRZE) for drug-sensitive TB, followed by a continuation phase to prevent relapse and resistance. In drug-resistant TB, newer all-oral regimens like BPaLM recommended by the WHO have improved treatment outcomes and reduced duration. [32,33]

History of Nipah virus as Biothreat Agents

The Nipah virus was first identified during an outbreak in Malaysia in 1998, associated with pig farming and transmission from fruit bats. Subsequent outbreaks occurred in Bangladesh and India, notably the 2018 Kerala outbreak, demonstrating human-to-human transmission and high mortality. Due to its severe encephalitis, respiratory involvement, and lack of specific antiviral therapy, Nipah virus is considered an emerging infectious disease of global concern. (1)

Pharmacological Countermeasures of Nipah virus [34]

Drugs/ Interventions	**Mechanism of Action**	**Clinical Role**
No approved specific antiviral therapy	Currently no universally approved antiviral drug tar geting Nipah virus replication; management depend s on host immune response aand supportive care	No definitive anti viral availab le
Ribavirin (investigational use)	Guanosine nucleoside analog that inhibits viral R NAdependent RNA polymerase, interfering with viral RNA synthesis and replication	Limited clinical evi dence; used insome outbreaks
m102.4 monocl onal antibody (investigational)	Neutralizing monoclonal antibody that binds to the Nipah virus G glycoprotein, preventing viral attach ment and entry into host cells	Used under co mpassionate orexper imental protocols
Supportive care (ICU managem ent, ventilation)	Maintains oxygenation, fluid balance, and organ fu nction during encephalitis or acute respiratory distr ess syndrome (ARDS)	Critical care ofte n required

History of Hantaviruses as Biothreat Agents

Hantaviruses gained major attention after the 1993 outbreak in the Four Corners region of the United States, where a severe respiratory illness was identified as hantavirus pulmonary syndrome (HPS). The causative agent, Sin Nombre virus, was later discovered to be transmitted through inhalation of aerosolized rodent excreta. Since then, hantaviruses have been recognized globally as zoonotic pathogens causing either HPS or hemorrhagic fever with renal syndrome (HFRS). Due to their high mortality and aerosol transmission potential, they are considered possible biothreat agents. (1,2)

Pharmacological Countermeasures of Hantaviruses [35]

Drugs/Interventions	Mechanism of Action	Clinical Role
No approved antiviral ther apy – Hantavirus Pulmonary Sy ndrome (HPS)	No specific antiviral drug currently proven eff ective; treatment focuses on supporting respira tory and cardiovascular function while immun e response clears the virus	Supportive car e is the mainst ay
Ribavirin – Hemorrhagic Fever with Renal Syndrome (HFRS)	Guanosine nucleoside analog that inhibits vira l RNAdependent RNA polymerase, interferi ng with viral RNA synthesis and replication	More effective in HFRS tha n HPS when given early
Supportive management (o xygen therapy, mechanic al ventilationhemodynamic support, dialysis)	Maintains oxygenation, circulatory stability, a nd renal function, preventing organ failure dur ing severe infection	Early ICU care improves s urvival

History of Nerve agents as Biothreat Agents

Nerve agents such as Sarin, Tabun, Soman, and VX are highly toxic organophosphorus compounds developed for chemical warfare that act by irreversibly inhibiting acetylcholinesterase, leading to accumulation of acetylcholine and cholinergic crisis. They were first developed in Germany before World War II and later stockpiled by several nations. Due to their rapid action, high lethality, and potential for mass casualties, they are classified among the most dangerous chemical threat agents. [1,2]

Pharmacological Countermeasures of Nerve agents

Treatment of nerve agent poisoning from agents like Sarin and VX is an emergency and involves rapid antidote administration and supportive care. Atropine is given to block muscarinic effects of excess acetylcholine, while pralidoxime (2-PAM) reactivates acetylcholinesterase if administered early before enzyme “aging.” Diazepam is used to control seizures, and patients often require airway management, oxygen, and ventilatory support.[36]

History of Burkholderia mallei as Biothreat Agents

Burkholderia mallei causes glanders, a zoonotic disease primarily affecting equines but transmissible to humans through contact, aerosols, or contaminated materials. Historically used as a biological warfare agent, it is considered a potential biothreat due to its high infectivity, low infectious dose, and high mortality if untreated. Its ability to cause severe systemic disease and limited natural immunity further increases concern, leading to its classification as a Category B agent. [1,2]

Pharmacological Countermeasures of Burkholderia mallei [37]

Drugs/Interventions	Mechanism of Action	PK/PD Feature	Clinical Role
Ceftazidime	Inhibits cell wall synthesis by binding to PBPs	Time-dependent killing	First-line in acute severe infection
Imipenem – Alternative IV therapy	Carbapenem; inhibits cell wall synthesis; resistant to β-lactamases	Time-dependent killing	Used in severe or resistant cases
Trimethoprim–Sulfamethoxazole (TMP-SMX) – Eradication phase	Inhibits folate synthesis (DHPS + DHFR inhibition)	Concentration-dependent with time component (AUC/MIC)	Prolonged oral therapy to prevent relapse
Doxycycline – Alternative oral therapy	Binds 30S ribosomal subunit → inhibits protein synthesis	AUC/MIC dependent	Used in combination or as alternative

History of Staphylococcal Enterotoxin B as Biothreat Agents

Staphylococcal Enterotoxin B is a potent superantigen produced by Staphylococcus aureus, first identified in the mid-20th century. During the Cold War, it was extensively studied in the United States Biological Weapons Program as a potential biological incapacitating agent because it can cause severe but usually non-fatal illness. SEB acts by triggering massive T-cell activation and cytokine release, leading to systemic toxicity. Its potential as a bioterrorism agent is due to its high potency, low effective dose, ability to be aerosolized, rapid onset of symptoms, and the lack of a specific antidote or widely available vaccine. [1,2]

Pharmacological Countermeasures of Staphylococcal Enterotoxin B

Drugs/Interventions	Mechanism of Action	Clinical Role
Supportive care (O_2, IV fluids, ventilation)	Maintains oxygenation and hemodynamic stability	Mainstay of treatment
Corticosteroids	Suppress excessive immune	May reduce severity of

	response and cytokine storm	inflammation
NSAIDs / Antipyretics	Inhibit prostaglandin synthesis	Symptomatic relief (fever, myalgia)
Antibiotics (e.g., cloxacillin, vancomycin)	Act against *S. aureus* (not toxin)	Used if active infection present
Experimental therapies (IVIG)	Neutralizes circulating toxin and modulates immunity	Considered in severe cases

Management of Staphylococcal Enterotoxin B exposure is mainly supportive, focusing on oxygenation, IV fluids, and ventilatory support to maintain hemodynamic stability. Corticosteroids may help reduce the cytokine-mediated inflammatory response, while NSAIDs/antipyretics provide symptomatic relief. Antibiotics such as cloxacillin or vancomycin are used only if active Staphylococcus aureus infection is present, and IVIG may be considered in severe cases for toxin neutralization. [38]

History of Botulinum toxin as a Bioterrorism Agent

Botulinum toxin, produced by Clostridium botulinum, was first recognized in the 19th century as a cause of foodborne "sausage poisoning." Its extreme potency—being one of the most lethal toxins known—led to its investigation during World War II and later the Cold War as a potential biological weapon. Several military programs explored its use due to its ability to cause flaccid paralysis and respiratory failure in minute doses, making it a significant bioterrorism concern.[1,2]

Pharmacological Countermeasures of Botulism [39]

Drugs/Interventions	**Mechanism of Action**	**Clinical Role**
Botulinum Antitoxin	Neutralizes circulating toxin, prevents further binding to nerve terminals	Most effective if given early; does not reverse established paralysis
Supportive care (ventilation, ICU care)	Maintains oxygenation and vital functions	Mainstay of treatment; required in respiratory paralysis
Antibiotics (Penicillin, Metronidazole)	Eradicate Clostridium botulinum in wound botulism	Not used in foodborne botulism; prevents further toxin production
Human Botulism Immune Globulin (BIG-IV)	Provides passive immunity by neutralizing toxin	Used mainly in infant botulism

CONCLUSION: A wide range of biological agents—including bacteria, viruses, and toxins—pose significant public health challenges as well as potential bioterrorism threats. A thorough understanding of their history, mechanisms of disease, and pharmacological countermeasures is essential for effective preparedness and response. Strengthening

surveillance systems, rapid diagnostics, and timely therapeutic interventions remains crucial to minimize morbidity and mortality in both natural outbreaks and intentional exposures.

REFERENCES:

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Bioterrorism Agents/Diseases Classification. 2023.
2. World Health Organization. Public health response to biological and chemical weapons: WHO guidance. 2022.
3. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. Biodefense and Emerging Infectious Diseases. 2021
4. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018 U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases, 2011; Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, 2020.
5. Mandell, Douglas, and Bennett's Principles and Practice of Infectious Diseases, 9th edition 2020.
6. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 2020; European Medicines Agency, 2018; Infectious Diseases Society of America, 2014.
7. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, 2020
8. Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine. 21st ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Education; 2022.
9. Infectious Diseases Society of America, 2014
10. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, 2019
11. World Health Organization, 2016
12. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, 2017
13. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. 30th ed. Wayne, PA: CLSI; 2020
14. European Medicines Agency. Tecovirimat SIGA. European public assessment report (EPAR). Amsterdam: EMA; 2021.
15. Katzung & Trevor's Basic and Clinical Pharmacology. Katzung BG, Vanderah TW. Basic & Clinical Pharmacology. 15th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Education; 2021.
16. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA approves first treatment for Ebola virus (Inmazeb). Silver Spring, MD: FDA; 2020.

17. Mulangu S et al. NEJM Ebola therapeutics trial. Mulangu S, Dodd LE, Davey RT Jr, et al. A randomized, controlled trial of Ebola virus disease therapeutics. *New England Journal of Medicine.* 2019;381:2293–2303.
18. World Health Organization. *Brucellosis in humans and animals.* Geneva: WHO; 2006.
19. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Investigating a bioterrorism event—The Rajneeshee Salmonella outbreak, Oregon, 1984.* MMWR; 1985.
20. Torok TJ et al. Salmonella outbreak Oregon 1984. Török TJ, Tauxe RV, Wise RP, et al. *A large community outbreak of salmonellosis caused by intentional contamination of restaurant salad bars.* JAMA. 1997;278(5):389–395.
21. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing. 34th ed. CLSI supplement M100. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute; 2024.
22. Infectious Diseases Society of America. Shane AL, Mody RK, Crump JA, *et al.* 2017
23. Infectious Diseases Society of America Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Management of Infectious Diarrhea. *Clinical Infectious Diseases.* 2017;65(12):e45–e80.
24. New England Journal of Medicine (N Engl J Med. 2005;353:220–232)
25. World Health Organization. *Enterohaemorrhagic Escherichia coli (EHEC) Fact Sheet*. Updated 2023.
26. Harris JB, LaRocque RC, Qadri F, Ryan ET, Calderwood SB. Cholera. *Lancet*. 2012;379(9835):2466–2476.
27. Harris JB, LaRocque RC, Qadri F, Ryan ET, Calderwood SB. Cholera. *Lancet*. 2012;379(9835):2466–2476. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60436-X.
28. Weaver SC, Barrett ADT. Transmission cycles, host range, evolution and emergence of arboviral disease. *Nat Rev Microbiol*. 2004;2(10):789–801. doi:10.1038/nrmicro1006.
29. Strauss JH, Strauss EG. The alphaviruses: gene expression, replication, and evolution. *Microbiol Rev*. 1994;58(3):491–562.
30. Daniel TM. The history of tuberculosis. *Respir Med*. 2006;100(11):1862–1870.
31. Nahid P, Dorman SE, Alipanah N, et al. Official American Thoracic Society/Centers for Disease Control and Prevention/Infectious Diseases Society of America Clinical Practice Guidelines: Treatment of Drug-Susceptible Tuberculosis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;63(7):e147–e195.
32. Conradie F, Diacon AH, Ngubane N, et al. Treatment of Highly Drug-Resistant Pulmonary Tuberculosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382:893–902.

33. Lo MK, Rota PA. The emergence of Nipah virus, a highly pathogenic paramyxovirus. *J Clin Virol*. 2008;43(4):396–400
34. Jonsson CB, Figueiredo LTM, Vapalahti O. A global perspective on hantavirus ecology, epidemiology, and disease. *Clin Microbiol Rev*. 2010;23(2):412–441.
35. Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. Nerve Agents Overview. 2023
36. Lipsitz R, Garges S, Aurigemma R, et al. Workshop on treatment of and postexposure prophylaxis for Burkholderia mallei and Burkholderia pseudomallei infection, 2010. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2012;18(12):e2. doi:10.3201/eid1812.120638.
37. Ulrich RG, Sidell FR, Taylor TJ, Wilhelmsen CL. *Staphylococcal enterotoxin B and related toxins.* In: Sidell FR, Takafuji ET, Franz DR, editors. Medical Aspects of Chemical and Biological Warfare. Washington, DC: Borden Institute; 1997.
38. Arnon SS, Schechter R, Inglesby TV, Henderson DA, Bartlett JG, Ascher MS, et al. Botulinum toxin as a biological weapon: medical and public health management. *JAMA*. 2001;285(8):1059–1070. doi:10.1001/jama.285.8.1059.