International Journal of Life Sciences, Biotechnology and Pharma Research Vol. 14, No. 3, March 2025 Online ISSN: 2250-3137
Print ISSN: 2977-0122

DOI: 10.69605/ijlbpr_14.3.2025.98

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Future Trends in Fungal Pathogen Resistance: A Prospective Study on Antifungal Efficacy and Emerging Threats

[1]Dr. Deepak Kumar, [2]Dr. Rashid Iqbal, [3]Dr. Sanjay Nag

[1]Tutor, [2]3rd Year Post Graduate Student, [3]Associate Professor & HOD, Department of Microbiology, Anugrah Narayan Magadh Medical College, Gaya, India

Corresponding author
Dr. Deepak Kumar
Tutor, Department of Microbiology, Anugrah Narayan Magadh Medical College, Gaya, India

Received: 30 January, 2025 Accepted: 25 February, 2025 Published: 13 March, 2025

ABSTRACT

Aim: The aim of this study was to assess future trends in fungal pathogen resistance, focusing on antifungal efficacy and emerging threats in a cohort of patients with invasive fungal infections (IFIs). **Materials and Methods:** This prospective, observational cohort study enrolled 100 patients diagnosed with invasive fungal infections or at high risk for such infections at a tertiary care hospital. Inclusion criteria included adults aged 18 years or older, diagnosed with confirmed or suspected fungal infections such as candidiasis, aspergillosis, cryptococcosis, and mucormycosis, and requiring antifungal treatment. Data collected included demographic characteristics, clinical history, microbiological profiles, and antifungal susceptibility testing. Whole-genome sequencing (WGS) was performed on treatment failures and relapses. **Results:** The most common infections were candidiasis (40%), aspergillosis (25%), and cryptococcosis (15%). *Candida albicans* was the predominant pathogen (40%), followed by *Aspergillus fumigatus* (18%). Fluconazole resistance was observed in 30% of isolates, with *Candida glabrata* exhibiting the highest fluconazole resistance (60%). The overall treatment efficacy was 75%, with 10% relapse and 5% new resistance observed. Cancer, diabetes, organ transplantation, prolonged antifungal therapy, and prior antifungal use were significantly associated with increased antifungal resistance. **Conclusion:** Antifungal resistance, particularly in *Candida glabrata*, remains a significant challenge in managing invasive fungal infections. While antifungal treatment remains effective in most cases, resistance emergence during therapy highlights the need for vigilant monitoring and tailored treatment strategies. Continuous surveillance and the development of novel antifungal agents are essential to counteract emerging resistance and improve patient outcomes.

Keywords: Fungal resistance, antifungal therapy, *Candida glabrata*, invasive fungal infections, emerging threats

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of fungal infections has become a significant global health concern, particularly due to the increasing prevalence of fungal pathogens that are resistant to existing antifungal therapies. As the human population continues to grow, urbanization intensifies, and climate patterns shift, the incidence of fungal infections, especially in immunocompromised individuals, is on the rise. These infections, caused by a variety of fungal species, can result in debilitating diseases, ranging from superficial skin infections to life-threatening systemic diseases. In recent years, the growing resistance of fungal pathogens to antifungal drugs has compounded this issue, making the management of these infections more complex. As a result, there is an urgent need to understand the trends in fungal pathogen resistance and explore future strategies for combating this emerging threat.[1]

Fungal pathogens are a diverse group of microorganisms, encompassing species such as *Candida*, *Aspergillus*, *Cryptococcus*, and *Fusarium*, among others. These organisms possess remarkable adaptability, which enables them to survive in a wide range of environments, including within the human body. Over the past few decades, advancements in antifungal drug development have provided effective treatments for a variety of fungal infections. However, the emergence of antifungal resistance has raised concerns about the effectiveness of these treatments. The increasing resistance of fungal pathogens to commonly used antifungal drugs, such as azoles, echinocandins, and polyenes, presents a critical challenge in clinical settings, particularly in immunocompromised patients who are more susceptible to these infections.[2]

Antifungal resistance is driven by a variety of factors, including genetic mutations, overuse, and misuse of

DOI: 10.69605/ijlbpr_14.3.2025.98

antifungal agents, as well as environmental factors such as climate change and agricultural practices. The emergence of multi-drug resistant strains has further complicated treatment options, leading to a need for new therapeutic approaches. In response, there has been a growing focus on understanding the molecular mechanisms underlying antifungal resistance, with an emphasis on the identification of novel targets for drug development and the exploration of alternative treatment strategies.[3]

One of the most significant challenges in addressing fungal pathogen resistance is the limited number of antifungal agents currently available. Compared to other classes of infectious agents, such as bacteria and viruses, the development of new antifungal drugs has lagged behind. This is primarily due to the unique biology of fungi, which shares many similarities with human cells, making it difficult to identify drug targets that are both effective and selective. As a result, the pipeline for new antifungal drugs remains relatively sparse, and the development of resistance to existing agents continues to outpace the introduction of new treatments.

In addition to the traditional approaches to antifungal therapy, there is a growing interest in exploring alternative strategies to combat fungal infections. These include the use of combination therapies, which aim to enhance the efficacy of existing drugs by targeting multiple pathways simultaneously, as well as the development of immunomodulatory therapies that aim to boost the host's immune response to fungal infections. Furthermore, the application of cutting-edge technologies, such as CRISPR-based gene editing and artificial intelligence-driven drug discovery, holds promise for identifying novel antifungal agents and strategies to overcome resistance.[4]

Climate change is also emerging as a critical factor in the future landscape of fungal infections. Rising temperatures, increased humidity, and altered precipitation patterns have been shown to influence the distribution and virulence of fungal pathogens. For example, some fungal species are shifting their geographical range as a result of climate change, exposing new populations to the risk of infection. Additionally, warmer temperatures may increase the growth and reproductive rates of certain fungi, potentially leading to a greater incidence of infections. This changing environmental dynamic could further exacerbate the burden of fungal diseases, particularly in regions that are already facing significant healthcare challenges.[5]

The future of antifungal resistance and the fight against fungal pathogens will likely depend on a multi-faceted approach, involving advancements in drug development, improved diagnostic techniques, and better infection control measures. Early detection of fungal infections and resistance profiles is crucial to ensure appropriate treatment and prevent the spread of resistant strains. In this context, the integration of rapid diagnostic technologies, such as next-generation sequencing and molecular assays, will be critical for timely and accurate identification of fungal pathogens and their resistance patterns.[6]

Furthermore, the development of vaccines against specific fungal pathogens remains an area of active research. Although significant progress has been made in vaccine development for bacterial and viral infections, the development of effective antifungal vaccines has proven to be more challenging. The complexity of fungal pathogens, combined with the need to balance immune response without causing harmful inflammation, presents significant hurdles. Nevertheless, the potential for antifungal vaccines to reduce the burden of fungal infections, particularly in high-risk populations, remains an exciting prospect for the future.[7]

Collaboration between researchers, clinicians, and policymakers will be essential in tackling the growing threat of fungal pathogen resistance. International efforts aimed at understanding the global epidemiology of fungal infections and resistance patterns will help guide the development of effective strategies for prevention, treatment, and control. Moreover, addressing the issue of antifungal resistance will require a holistic approach that includes stewardship programs to ensure the responsible use of antifungal drugs and the development of novel therapeutic strategies.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was a prospective, observational cohort study aimed at assessing future trends in fungal pathogen resistance, focusing on antifungal efficacy and emerging threats. The study enrolled 100 patients, recruited from a tertiary care hospital, who had been diagnosed with invasive fungal infections (IFIs) or were at high risk for such infections during the study period.

Patient Selection

Inclusion criteria

- Adults aged 18 years and older
- Diagnosed with a confirmed or suspected fungal infection, including but not limited to candidiasis, aspergillosis, cryptococcosis, and mucormycosis
- Immunocompromised patients (e.g., those with cancer, organ transplantation, diabetes mellitus, or HIV/AIDS)
- Patients requiring antifungal treatment and providing informed consent

Exclusion criteria

- Patients who were on antifungal treatment prior to enrollment
- Patients with significant renal or hepatic dysfunction
- Pregnant or breastfeeding women

DOI: 10.69605/ijlbpr_14.3.2025.98

Data Collection

Baseline demographic data, clinical history, and microbiological profiles were collected for each patient. The severity of the fungal infection was assessed using the clinical and laboratory scoring systems tailored to each infection type. Blood and tissue samples were collected to identify the fungal pathogens and determine susceptibility patterns to commonly used antifungal agents. These included azoles (fluconazole, voriconazole), echinocandins (caspofungin, micafungin), and polyenes (amphotericin B).

Fungal Pathogen Identification and Resistance Testing

All collected clinical samples were cultured on standard fungal media, and the identification of fungal species was done using conventional microbiological methods, including microscopy and biochemical tests, and molecular techniques such as PCR sequencing for species confirmation.

Antifungal susceptibility testing (AFST) was conducted using the broth microdilution method according to the guidelines of the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) or EUCAST. Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) were determined for each fungal isolate, and resistance patterns were classified as susceptible, intermediate, or resistant.

Antifungal Therapy

Patients were started on empirical antifungal therapy based on their clinical presentation and risk factors, with adjustments made according to the results of pathogen identification and susceptibility testing. The most commonly used antifungal agents included fluconazole, voriconazole, caspofungin, micafungin, and amphotericin B.

The duration of antifungal treatment varied depending on the type of infection and patient response, typically ranging from 2 weeks to several months.

Monitoring and Follow-Up

Patients were monitored for treatment efficacy and adverse events throughout the course of antifungal therapy. Clinical and microbiological assessments were performed at baseline, during treatment, and at follow-up visits (1 month, 3 months, and 6 months post-treatment) to evaluate the resolution of infection, recurrence, or development of resistance.

Emerging Threats and Resistance Trends

The study further evaluated emerging resistance trends by monitoring fungal pathogens for evolving resistance profiles, particularly in response to novel antifungal agents and therapeutic strategies. Samples from patients who showed treatment failure or relapse after initial antifungal therapy were subjected to whole-genome sequencing (WGS) to detect mutations associated with antifungal resistance.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize demographic and clinical characteristics. Comparative analysis between susceptible and resistant fungal isolates was performed using chi-square tests for categorical variables and t-tests for continuous variables. Statistical significance was defined as a p-value of less than 0.05. Logistic regression analysis was employed to identify risk factors associated with antifungal resistance.

RESULTS

Table 1: Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of the Study Population (n = 100)

The study cohort consisted of 100 patients with varying demographic and clinical characteristics. The age distribution revealed that 35% of participants were in the 51-70 age range, 30% were in the 31-50 range, 15% were aged 18-30, and 20% were above 70 years old. There was no significant difference in age groups (p-value = 0.45), indicating a broad age range of individuals susceptible to fungal infections.

Gender distribution was nearly balanced, with 55% male and 45% female participants, and no statistically significant difference was observed (p-value = 0.39).

Underlying conditions were prevalent among the patients, with cancer being the most common comorbidity, affecting 25% of participants (p-value = 0.02). Diabetes mellitus and organ transplantation were also significant factors, with 20% and 15% of the patients respectively suffering from these conditions (p-values = 0.03 and 0.01). HIV/AIDS was less common, present in 10% of the study population (p-value = 0.32), and other conditions, such as chronic lung disease, were seen in 30% (p-value = 0.12).

In terms of fungal infections, candidiasis was the most frequently observed infection (40%), followed by aspergillosis (25%), cryptococcosis (15%), mucormycosis (10%), and other rare infections such as Fusarium spp. (10%). There were no significant associations found between the type of fungal infection and the clinical characteristics of the participants (p-values for infection types ranged from 0.12 to 0.19).

Table 2: Fungal Pathogen Distribution

The most common fungal pathogen identified in this cohort was *Candida albicans* (40%), followed by *Aspergillus fumigatus* (18%), and *Candida glabrata* (10%). *Cryptococcus neoformans* (8%), *Rhizopus spp.* (6%), *Fusarium spp.* (5%), *Mucor spp.* (5%), *Alternaria spp.* (4%), and other pathogens like *Pseudallescheria boydii* (4%) were less frequently identified. No significant differences were observed in the distribution of pathogens across the study population, as indicated by the p-values, which ranged from 0.15 to 0.45.

DOI: 10.69605/ijlbpr_14.3.2025.98

Table 3: Antifungal Susceptibility Testing Results
Resistance to antifungal agents was observed across several drugs. Fluconazole resistance was seen in 30% of isolates (p-value = 0.04), which was statistically significant. Voriconazole showed resistance in 15% of isolates (p-value = 0.06), although the result was not statistically significant. Resistance to caspofungin, micafungin, and amphotericin B was lower, with 8%, 5%, and 3% resistance, respectively, indicating that echinocandins and polyenes remain more effective in treating fungal infections. Overall, 33% of all fungal isolates showed some level of resistance (p-value = 0.02), highlighting concerns about emerging antifungal resistance.

Table 4: Resistance by Pathogen Type
Resistance to antifungal agents varied significantly between different fungal pathogens. *Candida albicans* exhibited fluconazole resistance in 20%, voriconazole resistance in 10%, and caspofungin resistance in 5%, with amphotericin B remaining highly effective (1% resistance). *Candida glabrata* demonstrated the highest fluconazole resistance (60%) and voriconazole resistance (40%), followed by a small percentage of resistance to caspofungin (10%) and amphotericin B (2%). Other pathogens such as *Aspergillus fumigatus* and *Fusarium spp.* displayed lower resistance rates across antifungals. Statistically significant differences were found in fluconazole resistance in *Candida glabrata* (p-value = 0.03). Overall, the table illustrates the growing resistance, especially in *Candida glabrata*, which requires attention due to limited treatment options.

Table 5: Efficacy of Antifungal Treatment (n = 100)
The overall efficacy of antifungal treatment was high, with 75% of patients experiencing resolution of infection (p-value = 0.02). However, relapse occurred in 10% of cases, which was not statistically significant (p-value = 0.12). Interestingly, 5% of patients developed new resistance during the treatment (p-value = 0.05), highlighting the importance of monitoring for emerging resistance. Adverse drug reactions were reported in 8% of patients (p-value = 0.14), and the mortality rate due to fungal infections was low, with only 2% of patients succumbing to the disease (p-value = 0.26).

Table 6: Resistance and Risk Factors
Several risk factors were associated with an increased likelihood of antifungal resistance. Cancer had an odds ratio (OR) of 2.5 (95% CI: 1.2 - 5.3), suggesting that cancer patients were 2.5 times more likely to experience antifungal resistance (p-value = 0.02). Diabetes mellitus and organ transplantation were also significant risk factors, with ORs of 1.8 (95% CI: 1.1 - 3.2, p-value = 0.04) and 3.0 (95% CI: 1.4 - 6.5, p-value = 0.01), respectively. Prolonged antifungal therapy (OR = 2.2, p-value = 0.03) and prior antifungal use (OR = 4.1, p-value = 0.002) were also associated with a higher likelihood of developing resistance. Severity of infection was another important factor, with an OR of 2.8 (95% CI: 1.3 - 5.9, p-value = 0.03), indicating that more severe infections are linked to increased resistance. These findings emphasize the need for tailored antifungal treatment strategies for patients with these risk factors.

Table 1. Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of the Study Population (n = 100)

Characteristic	Number	Percentage (%)	p-value
Age (years)			
18-30	15	15%	0.45
31-50	30	30%	
51-70	35	35%	
>70	20	20%	
Gender			
Male	55	55%	0.39
Female	45	45%	
Underlying Conditions			
Cancer	25	25%	0.02
Diabetes Mellitus	20	20%	0.03
Organ Transplantation	15	15%	0.01
HIV/AIDS	10	10%	0.32
Other (e.g., chronic lung disease)	30	30%	0.12
Infection Type			
Candidiasis	40	40%	0.12
Aspergillosis	25	25%	0.12
Cryptococcosis	15	15%	0.23
Mucormycosis	10	10%	0.19
Other (e.g., Fusarium spp.)	10	10%	0.19

DOI: 10.69605/ijlbpr_14.3.2025.98

Table 2. Fungal Pathogen Distribution

Pathogen	Number	Percentage (%)	p-value
Candida albicans	40	40%	0.15
Aspergillus fumigatus	18	18%	0.18
Candida glabrata	10	10%	0.28
Cryptococcus neoformans	8	8%	0.33
Rhizopus spp.	6	6%	0.38
Fusarium spp.	5	5%	0.42
Mucor spp.	5	5%	0.42
Alternaria spp.	4	4%	0.45
Other (e.g., *Pseudallescheria boydii*)	4	4%	0.45

Table 3. Antifungal Susceptibility Testing Results

Antifungal Agent	Number Resistant	Percentage (%)	p-value
Fluconazole	30	30%	0.04
Voriconazole	15	15%	0.06
Caspofungin	8	8%	0.12
Micafungin	5	5%	0.16
Amphotericin B	3	3%	0.27
Overall Resistance	33	33%	0.02

Table 4. Resistance by Pathogen Type

Pathogen	Fluconazole Resistant (%)	Voriconazole Resistant (%)	Caspofungin Resistant (%)	Amphotericin B Resistant (%)	p-value
Candida albicans	20%	10%	5%	1%	0.09
Aspergillus fumigatus	5%	5%	5%	0%	0.14
Candida glabrata	60%	40%	10%	2%	0.03
Cryptococcus neoformans	25%	20%	0%	0%	0.22
Rhizopus spp.	33%	25%	15%	0%	0.10
Mucor spp.	50%	20%	30%	0%	0.15
Fusarium spp.	40%	30%	10%	0%	0.18

Table 5. Efficacy of Antifungal Treatment (n = 100)

Outcome	Number	Percentage (%)	p-value
Resolution of Infection	75	75%	0.02
Relapse of Infection	10	10%	0.12
Development of New Resistance	5	5%	0.05
Adverse Drug Reactions	8	8%	0.14
Death (due to infection)	2	2%	0.26

Table 6. Resistance and Risk Factors

Risk Factor	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	p-value
Cancer	2.5 (1.2 - 5.3)	0.02
Diabetes Mellitus	1.8 (1.1 - 3.2)	0.04
Organ Transplantation	3.0 (1.4 - 6.5)	0.01
Prolonged Antifungal Therapy	2.2 (1.0 - 4.7)	0.03
Prior Antifungal Use	4.1 (2.0 - 8.5)	0.002
Severity of Infection	2.8 (1.3 - 5.9)	0.03

DISCUSSION

The results of our study on antifungal resistance and emerging threats in invasive fungal infections (IFIs) align with existing literature, reinforcing the challenges posed by antifungal resistance in clinical settings.

The study population comprised a broad age range, with the largest group in the 51-70 age range, which is consistent with previous findings. Kullberg and

DOI: 10.69605/ijlbpr_14.3.2025.98

Arendrup (2015) noted that the burden of invasive candidiasis increases with age, especially in immunocompromised individuals.[7] In our study, underlying conditions such as cancer (25%) and diabetes mellitus (20%) were common, which aligns with the findings of Pfaller and Diekema (2007), who highlighted the increased risk of IFIs in patients with these comorbidities. Interestingly, our study also found a relatively high prevalence of chronic lung disease, affecting 30% of patients, which could contribute to the increased susceptibility to fungal infections, particularly in immunocompromised patients.[8]

Candida albicans was the most common pathogen in our study, identified in 40% of patients, followed by *Aspergillus fumigatus* (18%) and *Candida glabrata* (10%). This pathogen distribution is in line with previous studies. For instance, Kullberg and Arendrup (2015) identified *Candida albicans* as the predominant pathogen in invasive candidiasis, although *Candida glabrata* was noted to be increasingly problematic due to its resistance to commonly used antifungals.[7] The relatively high frequency of *Candida glabrata* (10%) in our cohort echoes these concerns, as *Candida glabrata* is known for its elevated resistance to azoles, especially fluconazole, which is consistent with our results showing 60% fluconazole resistance in this species. Additionally, the detection of *Aspergillus fumigatus* in 18% of cases highlights the ongoing challenges posed by mold infections in immunocompromised patients, as noted by Borman et al. (2017), who emphasized the emergence of resistant *Aspergillus* species.[9]

Antifungal resistance remains a critical issue in the treatment of IFIs, and our study revealed fluconazole resistance in 30% of isolates, with *Candida glabrata* exhibiting the highest resistance (60%). This finding is consistent with the work of Alastruey-Izquierdo et al. (2014), who reviewed the growing antifungal resistance worldwide and noted that *Candida glabrata* is one of the most resistant species, particularly to fluconazole.[10] Moreover, voriconazole resistance was observed in 15% of isolates in our cohort, which mirrors the findings of Mignard et al. (2022), who documented increasing resistance to azoles like voriconazole, highlighting the growing difficulty in treating *Candida* and *Aspergillus* infections with traditional antifungals.[11]

Resistance to echinocandins like caspofungin (8%) and micafungin (5%) was lower, which is consistent with findings from Arendrup and Patterson (2017), who indicated that echinocandins remain effective against many Candida species, including *Candida glabrata*.[12] Amphotericin B resistance was minimal in our study (3%), confirming its continued utility in treating resistant fungal infections, as noted by Denning and Bromley (2015).[13]

The varying resistance patterns observed across different fungal species in our study reflect the global trends in antifungal resistance. *Candida albicans* exhibited lower resistance rates to fluconazole (20%) compared to *Candida glabrata* (60%), consistent with the findings of Choi et al. (2021), who reported that *Candida glabrata* is more resistant to fluconazole than *Candida albicans*.[14] The resistance rates in *Aspergillus fumigatus* were relatively low (5% for fluconazole and voriconazole), which aligns with Patterson et al. (2020), who noted that *Aspergillus fumigatus* resistance is still emerging but remains relatively low compared to Candida species.[15]

The resistance rates for *Rhizopus spp.*, *Fusarium spp.*, and *Mucor spp.* were also found to be lower in our study, with *Rhizopus* showing no resistance to amphotericin B, which is a critical antifungal treatment for mucormycosis. This is consistent with the work of Papon et al. (2020), who stated that *Rhizopus spp.* and other Mucorales species still respond well to amphotericin B, although emerging resistance in these pathogens remains a concern.[16]

The overall efficacy of antifungal treatment in our cohort was high, with 75% of patients achieving infection resolution, which aligns with the clinical outcomes observed in previous studies. Kullberg and Arendrup (2015) reported that while treatment outcomes in invasive candidiasis can be good, antifungal resistance often leads to poor outcomes, especially in patients with *Candida glabrata* infections.[7] In our study, relapse occurred in 10% of cases, and 5% of patients developed new resistance during treatment. This is concerning as it highlights the dynamic nature of antifungal resistance and the need for vigilant monitoring and adjustment of therapy. Similar findings were reported by Shapiro and Cowen (2018), who discussed how antifungal drug resistance continues to emerge during treatment, necessitating early detection and adaptation of treatment regimens.[17]

Our study identified several significant risk factors for antifungal resistance, including cancer, diabetes mellitus, organ transplantation, prolonged antifungal therapy, and prior antifungal use. These findings are consistent with those of Arendrup and Patterson (2017), who highlighted the increased risk of antifungal resistance in immunocompromised patients, particularly those with cancer and diabetes mellitus.[12] Moreover, the odds ratio for prior antifungal use (OR = 4.1) reflects the established risk of developing resistance due to previous antifungal treatments, as discussed by Denning and Bromley (2015), who noted that prior exposure to antifungals is a well-documented risk factor for resistance.[13]

The severity of infection was another key factor linked to resistance in our study, with more severe infections showing higher resistance (OR = 2.8). This finding supports the conclusions of Shapiro and Cowen (2018), who emphasized that severe and complicated fungal infections are often associated with increased resistance, making timely and effective treatment even more critical.[17]

DOI: 10.69605/ijlbpr_14.3.2025.98

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study highlights the significant challenge posed by antifungal resistance in invasive fungal infections, particularly in immunocompromised patients. *Candida glabrata* exhibited the highest resistance to fluconazole, underscoring the need for alternative treatment options. Despite high overall treatment efficacy, new resistance emerged in 5% of patients, emphasizing the importance of ongoing monitoring and timely adjustments in therapy. Key risk factors, such as cancer, diabetes, and prior antifungal use, were strongly associated with increased resistance, reinforcing the need for tailored treatment strategies. Continuous surveillance and the development of novel antifungal agents are essential to manage emerging threats effectively.

REFERENCES

1. Brilhante RS, Cordeiro RA, Guedes GM, et al. Molecular epidemiology of *Candida* species: a critical update on antifungal resistance. *FEMS Yeast Res*. 2021;21(7):foab037.
2. Thompson GR, Barr DS, Nolfi DA, et al. The clinical impact of antifungal resistance in *Aspergillus* species: a review of current treatments. *Infect Dis Clin Pract*. 2022;30(4):281-7.
3. Galgóczy L, Varga J, Tóth J, et al. Antifungal resistance in human pathogens: current status and future trends. *Mycopathologia*. 2020;185(3):339-56.
4. Verweij PE, Hagen F, Sieswerda J, et al. The rise of antifungal resistance in *Aspergillus* and *Candida* species. *Curr OpinMicrobiol*. 2021;59:14-21.
5. Chowdhary A, Sharma C, Meis JF, et al. *Candida auris*—an emerging multidrug-resistant pathogen in hospitals. *Clin Microbiol Rev*. 2020;33(2):e00129-19.
6. Brown GD, Denning DW, Gow NA, et al. Hidden killers: human fungal infections. *Sci Transl Med*. 2012;4(165):165rv13.
7. Kullberg BJ, Arendrup MC. Invasive candidiasis. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;373(15):1445-56.
8. Pfaller MA, Diekema DJ. *Epidemiology of invasive candidiasis: a persistent public health problem*. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2007;20(1):133-63.
9. Borman AM, Szekely A, Linton CJ, et al. Emergence of antifungal resistance in *Aspergillus* species: a significant problem for clinical management. *J AntimicrobChemother*. 2017;72(4):1050-7.
10. Alastruey-Izquierdo A, Cuenca-Estrella M, Mellado E, et al. The global problem of antifungal resistance: a review of the literature. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2014;20(5):405-14.
11. Mignard S, Guyot S, Rolland C, et al. Recent trends in antifungal susceptibility testing and their clinical implications. *J AntimicrobChemother*. 2022;77(4):989-1000.
12. Arendrup MC, Patterson TF. Multidrug-resistant *Candida* infections: epidemiology, clinical outcomes, and management strategies. *Infect Dis Clin North Am*. 2017;31(3):643-59.
13. Denning DW, Bromley MJ. How to diagnose, prevent, and treat *Aspergillus* infections. *Med Mycol*. 2015;53(3):1-7.
14. Choi J, Park S, Kim J, et al. The emergence of antifungal resistance in *Candida* species: a global perspective. *Mycoses*. 2021;64(7):689-98.
15. Patterson TF, Thompson GR, Denning DW. Antifungal resistance in *Aspergillus* species: importance of timely identification. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;70(8):1622-8.
16. Papon N, Courdavault V, Clastre M, et al. The emergence of fungal pathogens: antifungal resistance and its impact on human health. *Fungal Genet Biol*. 2020;137:103335.
17. Shapiro RS, Cowen LE. Antifungal drug resistance: a current and emerging crisis. *Infect Dis Clin North Am*. 2018;32(2):409-27.