TITLE

Old drugs with new tricks: Efficacy of fluoroquinolones to suppress replication of flaviviruses

Short Title

Fluoroquinolones suppress flavivirus replication

AUTHORS

Stacey L. P. Scroggs[1]*, Christy C. Andrade[1], Ramesh Chinnasamy[2], Sasha R. Azar[3], Erin E.

Schirtzinger[1], Erin I. Garcia[1], Jeffrey B. Arterburn[2], Kathryn A. Hanley[1], Shannan L. Rossi[4]

AFFILIATIONS

[1] Department of Biology, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM, USA

[2] Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM,

USA

[3] Institute for Translational Sciences, The University of University of Texas Medical Branch,

Galveston, TX, USA

[4] Department of Pathology, The University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX, USA

* Corresponding author (stpeters@nmsu.edu)

Present address: Stacey L. P. Scroggs, Biology of Vector-Borne Viruses Section, Laboratory of

Virology, Rocky Mountain Laboratories, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases,

National Institutes of Health, Hamilton, MT USA

Present address: Christy C. Andrade, Department of Biology, Gonzaga University, Spokane,

WA, USA

Present address: Erin E. Schirtzinger, Arthropod-borne Animal Diseases Research Unit , United

States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Manhattan, KS USA

Present address: Erin I. Garcia, Science Communication Program, University of California Santa

Cruz, Santa Cruz, CA, USA

Abstract

Antiviral therapies are urgently needed to treat infections with flaviviruses such as Zika

(ZIKV) and dengue (DENV) virus. Repurposing FDA-approved compounds could provide the

fastest route to alleviate the burden of flaviviral diseases. In this study, three fluoroquinolones,

enoxacin, difloxacin and ciprofloxacin, curtailed replication of flaviviruses ZIKV, DENV,

Langat (LGTV) and Modoc (MODV) in HEK-293 cells at low micromolar concentrations.

Time-of-addition assays revealed that enoxacin suppressed ZIKV replication when added at 6

hours post-infection, suggesting inhibition of an intermediate step in the virus life cycle, whereas

ciprofloxacin and difloxacin had a wider window of efficacy of 2, 6, and 8 hours post-infection

for difloxacin and 2 to 8 hours post-infection for ciprofloxacin. The efficacy of enoxacin to

suppress ZIKV replication in 5-week-old A129 mice was evaluated in two experiments. First,

mice were infected with 1×10^5 plaque-forming units (pfu) ZIKV FSS13025 (n=20) or PBS

(n=11) on day 0 and subsets were treated with enoxacin at 10mg/kg or 15mg/kg or diluent orally

twice daily on days 1-5. Treated and control mice did not differ in weight change or virus titer in

serum or brain. Mice treated with enoxacin showed a significant, 5-fold decrease in ZIKV titer

in testes relative to controls. Second, mice were infected with 1×10^2 pfu ZIKV (n=13) or PBS

(n=13) on day 0 and subsets were treated with 15mg/kg oral enoxacin or diluent twice daily on

days 0 (pre-treatment) and 1-5. Mice treated with enoxacin showed a significant, 2.5-fold

decrease in ZIKV titer in testes relative to controls, while weight and viral load in the serum,

brain, and liver did not differ between treated and control mice. Enoxacin efficacy in cultured

murine Sertoli cells was not enhanced compared to efficacy in HEK-293 cells. ZIKV can be

sexually transmitted, so reduction of titer in the testes by enoxacin should be further investigated.

Author Summary

Flaviviruses such as Zika and dengue virus pose a significant threat to public health

worldwide, and there are currently no antiviral therapies to treat any flaviviral infection.

Repurposing FDA-approved drugs as anti-flaviviral therapies can accelerate clinical use. We

demonstrated that fluoroquinolone antibiotics exhibit anti-flaviviral efficacy, suppressing

flavivirus replication in cultured human cells. Additionally, we found that the fluoroquinolone

enoxacin suppressed Zika virus replication in mouse testes. While Zika virus is primarily

transmitted via mosquitoes, the virus also undergoes sexual transmission.   The importance of

sexual transmission for the overall epidemiology of the virus remains unclear; nonetheless all

routes of potential transmission to pregnant women are of concern as fetal infection *in utero* can

have devastating effects. Thus, our data indicate that fluoroquinolones hold promise for

treatment of flaviviral infections, particularly infection of the testes by Zika virus, and that this

class of drugs warrants further study.

Introduction

Viruses of the genus *Flavivirus* (family Flaviviridae) are major causes of morbidity and

mortality worldwide (1–6). Moreover many flaviviruses, such as Zika (ZIKV), dengue (DENV),

tick-borne encephalitis (TBEV), West Nile (WNV), and Japanese encephalitis (JEV) virus (7–9)

are categorized as emerging pathogens due to rising incidence and expanding geographic range

(10,11). Effective antiviral drugs could abate flavivirus transmission and disease burden, but to

date no drugs for treatment of flavivirus infections have been brought to market because efforts

to develop anti-flaviviral drugs have been unsuccessful (12,13). Most anti-flaviviral drug

candidates have stalled at the point of hit-to-lead optimization due to poor drug-like properties

(14–16). This history of roadblocks in development of novel drugs suggests that repurposing

clinically approved drugs offers the fastest track to clinical treatments of flavivirus infections

(17).

78   The fluoroquinolones (FQs) are not an immediately obvious choice as anti-flavivirals.

The flavivirus genome comprises a single, positive-sense RNA, while FQs are primarily known

for inhibiting topoisomerases and gyrases in bacterial targets (18,19), neither of which play a role

in genome synthesis in positive-sense RNA viruses (20,21). However in the last several years, a

multitude of previously unsuspected effects of FQs on eukaryotic cell functions have been

revealed, including inhibition of cellular helicases (22,23), enhancement of RNAi (24–26),

attenuation of cytokines and pro-inflammatory reactive oxygen species (27–29), and

modification of apoptosis (30) and autophagy (31). Furthermore, FQs have been shown to

suppress hepatitis C virus (HCV, family *Flaviviridae*) replication *in vitro*, possibly by inhibiting

the viral helicase (32), but this suppression has not translated into an effective treatment for

patients with liver failure due to chronic HCV infection (33). Additionally, FQs suppress

rhinovirus infection by reducing expression of the viral receptor on cells (34). Recently, Xu and

colleagues demonstrated that a high concentration of enoxacin administered to human neuronal

progenitor cells (hNPC) and brain organoids prior to and after infection with ZIKV suppressed

viral replication and restored normal cellular proliferation, possibly by enhancing RNAi (35).

Here we evaluated the utility of repurposing FQs as anti-flavivirals by testing their ability

to suppress flavivirus replication in cell culture and a mouse model. We found that three FQs

tested, enoxacin, ciprofloxacin and difloxacin, generally suppressed replication of six

flaviviruses in HEK-293 cells at low micromolar concentrations. Enoxacin displayed the lowest

EC_{50} values in cell culture and was selected for evaluation in ZIKV-infected A129 mice.

Although enoxacin did not mitigate weight loss in ZIKV-infected mice or suppress ZIKV

replication in the serum, brain, or liver, the drug did suppress ZIKV replication in the testes.

Material and Methods

Viruses

The seven flaviviruses utilized in this study are listed in Table 1. Working stocks of

viruses were propagated in Vero cells and viral supernatants were collected either in 1X SPG

(2.18 mM sucrose, 38 mM potassium phosphate [monobasic], 72 mM potassium phosphate

[dibasic], 60 mM L-glutamic acid) [DENV-1,2 and 4, MODV, LGTV, ZIKV MEX 1-7] for

studies in culture or 1X DMEM supplemented with 5% heat inactivated fetal bovine serum

(FBS, Atlantica Biologicals, Flowery Branch, GA) and 100μg/mL penicillin/streptomycin

(Gibco, Life Technologies, Grand Island, NY) [ZIKV FSS13025] for studies *in vivo*.

Supernatants were clarified by centrifugation, aliquoted and stored at -80 °C. Viral titers were

determined via serial dilution onto HEK-293 cells followed by immunostaining using methods as

previously described (36,37). Briefly, each virus was subjected to serial tenfold dilution and

inoculated onto confluent HEK-293 cells in 24-well plates. After two hours of incubation at

37°C with occasional rocking, infected cells were overlaid with 1% methylcellulose in

OptiMEM (Gibco, Life Technologies, Grand Island, NY) that had been supplemented with 2%

FBS (Gibco, Life Technologies, Grand Island, NY), 2mM L-glutamine (Gibco, Life

Technologies, Grand Island, NY), and 0.05 mg/mL gentamycin (Gibco, Life Technologies,

Grand Island, NY). Plates were incubated for five days under maintenance conditions, after

which cells were fixed with ice cold methanol: acetone (1:1) for 30 minutes. Viral plaques were

immunostained using species-specific antibodies and peroxidase-labeled goat anti-mouse

secondary antibody (KPL, Gaithersburg, MD) then developed with KPL True Blue Peroxidase

Substrate (SeraCare, Milford, MA) and counted to calculate viral titer.

Cells

HEK-293 and murine Sertoli cells were purchased from ATCC (CRL-1573 and CRL-

2618, Manassas, VA). Vero cells were obtained from the lab of Stephen Whitehead (NIAID,

NIH). HEK-293 cells were maintained at 37°C with 5% CO_2 in DMEM/F12 medium (Gibco,

Life Technologies, Grand Island, NY) supplemented with 10% heat-inactivated FBS (Gibco),

2mM L-glutamine (Gibco), and 0.5% antibiotic-antimycotic (penicillin, streptomycin, and

amphotericin B; Gibco). Sertoli cells were maintained at 32°C with 5% CO_2 in DMEM/F12

(Gibco) supplemented with 10% heat-inactivated FBS, 2 mM L-glutamine, and

penicillin/streptomycin (100 units/mL and 100 μg/mL, respectively; Gibco). Vero cells were

maintained at 37˚ C with 5% CO_2 in DMEM (Gibco) supplemented with 10% heat-inactivated

FBS (Gibco).

Fluoroquinolone compounds

For each experiment, a fresh working stock of enoxacin (Sigma-Aldrich, E3764, St.

Louis, MO), difloxacin (Sigma-Aldrich, D2819, St. Louis, MO), or ciprofloxacin (Corning,

86393-32-0, Manassas, VA) at a concentration of 1.5 mM was sonicated in nanopore water with

3 mM lactic acid (Sigma-Aldrich, L1750, St. Louis, MO) and sterilized *via* passage through a 0.2

μm filter. The compounds were diluted to their final concentrations in cell culture media for

assays in cell culture, or nanopore water for *in vivo* treatments.

Determination of half-maximal effective concentration (EC$_{50}$) against select flaviviruses

To determine the EC$_{50}$ of enoxacin, difloxacin, and ciprofloxacin, monolayers of 80%

confluent HEK-293 cells in 24-well plates were infected with either ZIKV, DENV-1, DENV-2,

DENV-4, LGTV, or MODV in triplicate at a multiplicity of infection (MOI) of 1. The virus was

allowed to adsorb for 2 hours at 37 °C after which cells were washed with 1 mL 1x phosphate

buffered saline (PBS) to remove unadsorbed virus. Each drug was diluted in a two-fold dilution

series in cell culture media, with final concentrations ranging from 150 μM to 4.7 μM, and one

mL was added to triplicate treatment wells. Triplicate control wells were treated with cell

culture media alone and another set of controls were treated with cell culture media containing

3mM concentration lactic acid, the drug diluent. Infected cells were incubated for five days at

normal conditions, after which viral supernatants were collected and viral titers were determined

as described above.

As enoxacin was found to suppress ZIKV in the mouse testes, enoxacin efficacy was

evaluated in one testicular cell line (murine Sertoli cells) and compared to the efficacy in HEK-

293 cells. The EC$_{50}$ methods described above were repeated for ZIKV MEX 1-7 in Sertoli cells

and HEK-293 cells, both incubated at 32 °C to control for potential differences in enoxacin

activity at the lower temperature required for Sertoli cell viability. For both cell types, two MOIs

were tested, 0.1 and 1.0, and virus was collected at two time points, 2 days post infection (p.i.)

and 5 days p.i. Viral titers were determined in HEK-293 cells as described above.

Determination of half-maximal cytotoxic concentration (CC_{50}) of fluoroquinolones

To determine the toxicity of enoxacin, difloxacin, and ciprofloxacin, HEK-293 cells were

grown in 96-well plates until confluent at which time the media was removed. Each filter-

sterilized FQ was diluted two-fold, starting at 500 μM, and added to wells in triplicate at a total

volume of 100 μL. Control wells were treated with 100 μL of cell culture media containing 3

mM lactic acid. Plates were incubated at normal conditions for five days, after which the media

was removed and 110 μL of 10% resazurin dye (Milllipore Sigma, St. Louis, MO) diluted in cell

culture media was added to each well. After two hours incubation, absorbance was measured on

a plate reader at 600 nm and normalized to the mean absorbance of the control wells.

Time-of-addition assay

A time-of-addition assay was conducted to gain insight into the potential mechanism of

action of each drug (39–43). The impact of enoxacin, difloxacin, and ciprofloxacin on ZIKV

replication was tested at two concentrations (enoxacin: 18.1 μM and 24.4 μM; difloxacin: 35.9

μM and 50.0 μM; ciprofloxacin: 25.0 μM and 116.1 μM). The concentrations for the first assay

(24.4 μM enoxacin, 35.9 μM difloxacin, and 116.1 μM ciprofloxacin) were the EC_{50} values

based on an infection MOI of 0.2. Concentrations in the second assay (18.1 μM enoxacin, 50.0

180 µM difloxacin, and 25.0 µM ciprofloxacin) were chosen to give substantial but not complete

181 suppression at MOI of 1.0.

182  Eight timepoints were evaluated during both time-of-addition assays: two hours prior to

183 infection, at the time of infection (drug mixed with ZIKV), 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, and 18 hours p.i. These

184 time points capture flavivirus binding and entry (-2 and 0 hrs p.i.), translation (2 and 4 hrs p.i.),

185 genome replication (6 and 8 hrs p.i.), and virion assembly and budding (12 and 18 hrs p.i.) (44).

186 At time zero, monolayers of 80% confluent HEK-293 cells in 24-well plates were infected with

187 ZIKV MEX 1-7 at MOI 0.2 or 1. After two hours of incubation, media was removed from all

188 wells, the cells were washed with 1 mL of 1x PBS, and 1 mL of media per well was replaced. At

189 each time point, media was removed from designated triplicate wells, cells were washed with 1x

190 PBS, and 1 mL of drug at the specified concentration was added. Dilution of FQs to final

191 concentration occurred at the time of treatment. Control wells infected with ZIKV were washed

192 two hours p.i. and treated with 1 mL of media per well. At 24 hours p.i. all the viral supernatants

193 were collected, clarified, and stored as described above.

195 **Murine FQ dosing studies**

196  The impact of enoxacin, the FQ with the lowest EC_{50}, on ZIKV infection of A129 mice

197 was tested. Mice were infected at 5 weeks of age because our previous work shows that in this

198 age group ZIKV infection caused sustained weight loss that did not require euthanasia until 8

199 days p.i., ensuring that the majority of mice would survive a 5-day trial (45). Mice were housed

200 in sterile caging in colonies at the University of Texas Medical Branch, an AALAS-accredited

201 facility, and research was conducted in accordance with UTMB policy under IACUC Protocol

202 #1708051.

The efficacy of enoxacin to suppress ZIKV replication *in vivo* was tested in two separate

experiments (Fig. 1). In experiment 1, we tested two concentrations of enoxacin at 10 mg/kg and

at 15 mg/kg in A129 mice infected with $1x10^5$ pfu ZIKV, the viral dose used to in our previous

work to characterize ZIKV infection in 5-week-old A129 mice (45). The two concentrations, 10

mg/kg and 15 mg/kg, were selected because in an average sized mouse (20 g) these doses

correspond to peak serum concentrations (6.2 μM and 9.4 μM) that are comparable to the peak

serum concentrations achieved in humans receiving a typical clinical dose, wherein 200 mg and

400 mg oral dosages result in peak serum concentrations of 5.0 μM and 11.2 μM, respectively

(46,47). In experiment 2, we tested the impacts of a lower dose of virus ($1x10^2$ pfu) and a pre-

infection treatment of enoxacin on ZIKV infection in mice. The experiment was limited to a

single concentration of enoxacin, 15 mg/kg, in order to utilize the minimum number of mice.

Experiment 1 (Fig. 1a): Mice were intradermally injected on day 0 with $1x10^5$ pfu ZIKV

FSS13025 diluted in 1x PBS (n=19) or 1x PBS as a control (n=11) in a total volume of 100 μL

and subsets of infected and uninfected mice were treated with oral enoxacin or drug diluent (3

mM lactic acid) (Table 6) twice daily on days 1-6 p.i. Weight and body condition were recorded

twice daily. Two days p.i., 70 μL of blood was collected from the retro-orbital sinus, clarified by

centrifugation (5 minutes at 3380 x g), and serum was stored at -80 °C. Six days p.i., mice were

euthanized and brain and testes were collected. Each tissue, along with a sterile steel ball, were

placed into a 2 mL Eppendorf tube containing 500 μL DMEM supplemented with 2% FBS and

penicillin/streptomycin and homogenized in a Qiagen TissueLyser II shaking at 26 pulses/second

for 5 minutes. Homogenates were clarified by centrifugation at 3380 x g for 5 minutes and

stored at -80 ˚C. Viral titers from serum and tissues were determined in Vero cells in 12 well

plates essentially as described above (45).

<u>Experiment 2 (Fig. 1b):</u> Mice received a pre-treatment of 15 mg/kg enoxacin (n= 14) or drug

diluent (n = 13) and were intradermally injected with $1x10^2$ pfu ZIKV FSS13025 or 1x PBS 8

hours later as specified in Table 2. Subsets of infected and uninfected mice were treated with

oral enoxacin or lactic acid diluent twice daily on days 1-5. Weight and body condition were

recorded daily. Serum and organs were collected, and viral titers determined as described above.

Statistical analysis

EC_{50} values were calculated using nonlinear regression of inhibition dose response for log

drug concentration and viral titer and CC_{50} values were calculated using nonlinear regression of

inhibition dose response for log drug concentration and cell viability in GraphPad Prism (version

5 for Mac OS X, GraphPad Software, La Jolla California USA). The selectivity index for each

FQ and virus combination was calculated by dividing the CC_{50} by the EC_{50} values. Mean viral

titers at each time point from the time-of-addition assays were tested for normality then analyzed

using ANOVAs. If the overall ANOVA was significant, t-tests were used to detect pairwise

differences. Mean viral titers from mice were assessed for normality and compared using

ANOVAs or t-tests as appropriate, and differences in ZIKV replication in Sertoli cells and HEK-

293 cells at 32 °C were evaluated using general linear models in R (48).

Results

Fluoroquinolones effectively suppress flavivirus replication in cultured human cells

As shown in Table 3, the EC_{50} values of enoxacin, ciprofloxacin and difloxacin against

DENV, ZIKV, LGTV and MODV in HEK-293 cells at 37 °C were all in the range of 4.3-56.8

µM, except for the EC_{50} of difloxacin for MODV, for which the EC_{50} value was greater than the

limit of detection in our assay (Table 3). CC_{50} values for enoxacin, ciprofloxacin, and difloxacin

were all substantially higher than the EC_{50} values (Table 3). Excluding MODV, difloxacin

yielded the highest selectivity indices for all viruses tested.

Fluoroquinolone suppression of different life cycle stages of ZIKV

A time-of-addition study was used to discern the viral life stage(s) inhibited by each of

the three fluoroquinolones. DENV-infected monolayers of HEK-293 cells were treated with

each of the three drugs at one lower and one higher concentration. While significance varied

between the two concentration treatments for each drug, the overall patterns were consistent. As

seen in Fig. 2a and 2b, enoxacin suppressed virus replication most strongly when added at 2, 4 or

6 hours p.i. Virus replication was suppressed by about 25% by 18.1 µM enoxacin and 50% by

24.4 µM enoxacin. At both concentrations, differences between viral titers by time of treatment

were significant (ANOVA: F (8, 18) = 2.6, P = 0.04 and F (8,18) = 3.6, P = 0.01, respectively).

Pairwise t-tests indicated that enoxacin treatment at 2, 4, and 6 hours p.i. significantly reduced

ZIKV titer compared to the media control (pairwise t-test P <0.05; full statistics in Table S1). At

both higher and lower drug concentrations of difloxacin, differences between viral titers by time

of treatment were significant (ANOVA: F (8,18) = 2.8, P = 0.04 and F (8,18) = 12.8, P = 5.2x10^{-}

^{6}, respectively). However, the higher concentration of difloxacin suppressed virus replication

when added two hours before infection, at the time of infection, 2, 4, 6, or 8 hours p.i. (Fig. 2d)

while the lower concentration of difloxacin suppressed virus replication when added 2, 6, 8, 12,

and 18 hrs p.i. (Fig. 2c) as detected by pairwise t-tests (full statistics in Table S1). Virus was

suppressed 37% by 35.9 µM difloxacin 2, 6, and 8 hrs p.i. and 50% by 50.0 µM difloxacin 2,4,

and 6 hours p.i.. As seen in Fig. 2e and 2f, ciprofloxacin most strongly and consistently

suppressed virus replication when added 2, 4, 6, or 8 hours p.i.. Virus was suppressed 40% by

25.0 µM ciprofloxacin and below the level of detection by 116.1 µM ciprofloxacin. The

differences in viral titers by time of treatment were significant for both the low and high

concentrations of ciprofloxacin (ANOVA: $F_{(8,18)} = 16.2$, $P = 2.3 \times 10^{-7}$ and $F_{(8,18)} = 14.7$, P =

1.9×10^{-6}, respectively). Pairwise comparisons with t-tests that ciprofloxacin treatment of 25.0

µM at 2 hours before infection, at the time of infection, and up until 8 hours p.i. significantly

reduced viral replication compared to the media control while treatment with 116.1 µM

ciprofloxacin reduced replication at 2, 4, 6, and 8 hours p.i. (full statistics in Table S1).

Enoxacin treatment of ZIKV-infected mice did not alleviate or exacerbate weight loss

In both experiments 1 and 2, all mice lost weight, irrespective of treatment (Fig. 3). Loss

of weight by control mice was unexpected, and likely resulted from the effects of dosing these

small (average 19.3 g) animals twice daily with 100 µL volume of liquid. In experiment 1, mean

percent of initial weight of ZIKV-infected mice treated with 10 mg/kg and 15 mg/kg were not

significantly different from each other (repeated measures ANOVA: $F_{(5,55)} = 0.7$, $P = 0.61$)

and mean percent of initial weight of uninfected mice treated with 10 mg/kg and 15 mg/kg were

also not significantly different from each other (repeated measures ANOVA: $F_{(6,54)} = 0.6$, P =

0.70); therefore, we combined the data on weight for infected mice treated with enoxacin and the

data for uninfected mice treated with enoxacin. After pooling by infection status, there was a

significant interaction between treatment group and day post infection (repeated measures

ANOVA: $F_{(12, 194)} = 3.1$, $P = 0.0006$). Pairwise comparisons with t-tests identified

differences in percent of initial weight on days 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 p.i. ($P < 0.05$). On days 1, 3, 4,

and 5 p.i. the percent of initial weight for the sham infected mice treated with enoxacin was

lower compared to the ZIKV-infected mice treated with enoxacin (pairwise t-test P<0.05; for full

statistics see Table S2). On day 6 p.i. the mean percent of initial weight of the uninfected mice

treated with enoxacin was greater than that of the infected mice regardless of treatment (pairwise

t-test P<0.05; for full statistics see Table S2). Additionally, at no point during the experiment

did the percent of initial weight differ between the ZIKV infected mice treated with enoxacin

compared to the diluent control mice (Figure 3a, Table S2). In experiment 2, weight loss by day

6 was less drastic than, and significantly different from, experiment 1 (mean percent of initial

weight (SE): experiment 1 = 84.0 (1.0), experiment 2 = 93.0 (0.9); t = -5.7, df = 55, P = 2.6x10^{-}

^{7}), likely due to improved technical facility in dosing these very small mice, and weight loss was

not significantly different among treatments (Fig. 3b, repeated measures ANOVA: F (18,132) =

1.4, P = 0.10).

Enoxacin suppressed ZIKV replication in mouse testes, but not serum, brain, or liver

Experiment 1. In this experiment, mice were infected with 1x10^{5} pfu ZIKV and subsequently

treated with enoxacin. ZIKV titer in the serum of mice treated with 15 mg/kg enoxacin was 0.6

log$_{10}$ pfu/mL, significantly higher than those mice treated with 10 mg/kg enoxacin (Fig 4a;

ANOVA F (2,17) = 4.7, P = 0.02; pairwise t-test P < 0.05). However, neither dose of enoxacin

altered ZIKV titers in serum significantly relative to control mice (Fig 4a; pairwise t-test P =

0.22 for both). Similarly ZIKV titer in the brains of mice treated with 15 mg/kg enoxacin was

1.2 log$_{10}$ pfu/g higher than those mice treated with 10 mg/kg enoxacin (Fig. 4b; ANOVA F(2,17)

= 4.2, P = 0.03; pairwise t-test P < 0.05) but these titers did not differ from the brains of control

mice (pairwise t-test, P = 0.73 for 10 mg/kg enoxacin and P = 0.06 for 15 mg/kg enoxacin). In

contrast to serum and brain, mean ZIKV titers in the testes of mice treated with 10 mg/kg and 15

mg/kg were not significantly different from each other (Fig. 4c; 5.4 $\log_{10}$ pfu/g ($\pm$ 0.1 SE) vs 5.7

$\log_{10}$ pfu/g ($\pm$ 0.1 SE); t = -1.6, df = 8, P = 0.14), and were both lower than the control group (6.2

$\log_{10}$ pfu/g ($\pm$ 0.5 SE)), albeit only the decrease from 10mg/kg treatment was significant

(ANOVA $F_{(3,19)}$ = 3.0, P = 0.05; pairwise t-test P < 0.05). To compensate for the decrease in

sample size inherent in analyzing only males, the data from the two enoxacin concentrations

were pooled. The mean ZIKV titer in testes for mice treated with any dosage of enoxacin was 5.5

$\log_{10}$ pfu/g ($\pm$ 0.1 SE), which was significantly lower than 6.2 $\log_{10}$ pfu/g ($\pm$ 0.5 SE) in the

control group (pairwise t-test P < 0.05).

<u>Experiment 2</u>. In experiment 2 mice were pre-treated with enoxacin after which they were

infected with 1×10^2 pfu ZIKV and subsequently dosed daily with enoxacin. As expected, ZIKV

titers in serum and brain were two orders of magnitude lower than those in experiment 1,

however titers in the testes were similar between the two experiments. Consistent with

experiment 1, ZIKV titers in sera, brains, and livers of enoxacin-treated mice were not different

from control mice (Fig. 5a-c, all P-values > 0.05), while ZIKV titer in testes of treated mice were

2-fold lower than those of control mice, and this difference was significant (Fig. 5d, pairwise t =

-5.4, df = 5, P = 0.003).

Anti-ZIKV efficacy of enoxacin is not enhanced in mouse Sertoli cells

To investigate why the effect of enoxacin on ZIKV infection in mice was limited to the

testes, the EC_{50} of this drug was quantified in both mouse Sertoli cells and HEK-293 cells at each

of two MOI: 0.1 and 1.0. As expected, at 32 °C, higher initial MOI generally resulted in higher

ZIKV titers, particularly at early timepoints p.i., in both cell lines. Sertoli cells must be cultured

at 32 °C, so in this experiment, for a fair comparison, the efficacy of enoxacin in HEK-293 cells

was re-tested at 32 °C. Moreover, to extend the window for comparison, virus was harvested at

both 2 days (Fig. 6a) and at 5 days p.i. (Fig. 6b).

As expected, at 32 °C, higher initial MOI generally resulted in higher ZIKV titers,

particularly at early timepoints p.i., in both cell lines. Kumar *et al.*, Siemann *et al.*, and Mlera

and Bloom have previously tested the replication of ZIKV in Sertoli cells and found them to be

highly susceptible to ZIKV infection (49–51). In our study, in the absence of enoxacin, there

was no difference in ZIKV replication in HEK-293 and Sertoli cells 2 days p.i. (linear model, β =

-0.2, P = 0.59), but 5 days p.i. ZIKV titers in Sertoli cells were significantly lower than in HEK-

293 cells (linear model, β = -1.4 , P = 7.4×10^{-7}).

Unlike the dose response curve in HEK-293 cells incubated at 37 ° C, increasing

concentration of enoxacin in both cell lines at 32 °C did not result in a sharp inflection in ZIKV

titer, making it difficult to accurately quantify the EC_{50} via non-linear regression. Instead,

general linear models were used to test the relative efficacy in the two cell types at 32 °C.

Efficacy at 32 °C in either cell line was detectable at the higher concentrations of enoxacin on

day 2, but not on day 5 (Fig. 6a and 6b).

We tested two hypotheses for greater impact of the drug in testes: first that this effect

may have been due to the lower temperature of the testes and second that it may have been due

to a greater efficacy in testis cells. To test the first hypothesis, we compared enoxacin efficacy in

HEK-293 cells infected with ZIKV at MOI 1 incubated at 32 °C or 37 °C and harvested on day 5

(data at 37 °C was collected as part of the initial EC_{50} analysis). Counter to the hypothesis,

enoxacin efficacy was greater at 37 °C compared to 32 °C in this cell line (linear model, β = -0.2,

P = 4.7×10^{-15}).

363 We tested the second hypothesis by comparing the impact of enoxacin in HEK-293 and

364 Sertoli cells at 32 °C. We used Sertoli cells as our model testis cell, while acknowledging that the

365 testes are composed of many cell types and results from Sertoli cells cannot be generalized to the

366 testes as a whole. In this analysis enoxacin concentration, cell type, and MOI and their

367 interactions were all included in the model. On day 2 pi, interaction between enoxacin

368 concentration and cell type was not significant ($\beta = 0.01$, P = 0.83), while on day 5 p.i. there was

369 a significant interaction ($\beta = 0.7$, P = 0.0001). On both days, enoxacin concentration and Sertoli

370 cells continue to negatively impact ZIKV replication (day 2 linear model, $\beta = -0.4$, P = 3.2×10^{-12};

371 $\beta = -0.2$, P = 0.03, respectively; day 5 linear model, $\beta = -0.8$, P = 4.9×10^{-11}; $\beta = -1.4$, P = 1.9×10^{-8}

372 , respectively) meaning that ZIKV titer decreased as enoxacin concentration increased and

373 ZIKV infection of Sertoli cells resulted in lower titers overall compared to HEK-293 cells.

374 However, on day 5 the interaction between enoxacin concentration and Sertoli cells had a

375 positive impact on ZIKV titer, meaning that enoxacin was less effective in Sertoli cells than in

376 HEK-293 cells.

378 **Discussion**

379 Flavivirus infections are acute, and rapid initiation of treatment must occur for a therapy

380 to be effective (6,52,53). However, individuals infected with different flaviviruses often present

381 with similar symptoms (52,54), and in many places where flavivirus infections are common,

382 diagnostic capacity is limited (52,55). Thus, the ideal antiflaviviral drug will have broad efficacy

383 across different members of the genus (12,56,57). We found that the three FQs used in this

384 study, enoxacin, ciprofloxacin and difloxacin, all suppressed replication of the six flaviviruses

385 tested at low micromolar concentrations, with the exception that difloxacin lacked efficacy for

MODV. These six flaviviruses, DENV-1, DENV-2, DENV-4, ZIKV, LGTV, and MODV, span

the diversity of human pathogenic flaviviruses (58,59). While enoxacin consistently

demonstrated the lowest EC_{50} values, difloxacin exhibited the best selectivity indexes. The *in*

vivo half-life of difloxacin (3 hours) and ciprofloxacin (3 hours) are slightly longer than enoxacin

(1.75 hours) which could explain the differences in selectivity indexes (60–62). These findings

suggest that FQs could offer broad-spectrum anti-flaviviral activity, a very desirable property.

Though the anti-flaviviral mechanism of action of FQs remains unknown, FQs are

derived from the original quinolone, nalidixic acid, which is a biproduct of synthesizing

chloroquine, an antimalarial drug (63). Chloroquine has shown efficacy against ZIKV and

DENV in cultured mammalian cells, including Vero, HuH-7, U937, human neural progenitor

(hNPC), and human brain microvascular endothelial cells (hBMEC) cells, with a range of EC_{50}

values from 1 µM to 14 µM against ZIKV (64–68). Moreover initial studies in mouse and

monkey models were promising and demonstrated a reduction in viremia in the serum, placenta,

and fetal head of infected individuals as well as the duration of viremia (65,69,70). However,

one human clinical trial failed to find a reduction in DENV viremia following chloroquine

treatment (71). Another clinical trial did not detect a difference between chloroquine and

placebo groups in duration of DENV infection, but did find an improvement in some dengue-

associated symptoms, such as pain (72).

FQs and chloroquine share a 4-quinolone structure, and we speculate that this could be

the shared basis of their anti-flaviviral efficacy (18). As a weak base, chloroquine is known to

inhibit acidification during endocytosis (73). Studies that have evaluated the antiviral properties

of chloroquine have suggested that the compound inhibits viral entry by increasing the pH of

vesicles required for endocytosis-mediated cellular entry (66,73–75). Additionally, chloroquine

has demonstrated broad-spectrum pH-based antiviral activity against RNA viruses other than

flaviviruses, including chikungunya virus (75) and poliovirus (76,77). If chloroquine and FQs

share similar antiviral mechanisms of action, then results from studies of chloroquine could

offer insight into what modifications could be made to the FQs to increase their antiviral

efficacy.

The suppression of viral replication by FQs could also arise from alternate effects, such

as RNAi enhancement (RNAi) (25,26), a key antiviral defense in invertebrates whose role in

vertebrate antiviral immunity has been suggested (78–80) but not yet conclusively demonstrated

(81). Enoxacin is known to enhance RNAi by binding the trans-activation response region RNA

binding protein (TRBP) (25). However RNAi enhancement is not equal across all FQs;

compared to enoxacin, difloxacin has little to no effect on RNAi, while ciprofloxacin has a

moderate effect (25). Here we have demonstrated that all three FQs tested, enoxacin,

ciprofloxacin, and difloxacin, are potent inhibitors of the six flaviviruses tested, with the

exception of difloxacin and MODV, suggesting that the antiviral action of FQs is not exclusively

due to enhancement of RNAi. Khan et al. (32) demonstrated that many FQs, including enoxacin

and difloxacin, suppressed HCV replication and inhibited the viral helicase *in vitro* (32). Further

studies will be needed to assess the generality and *in vivo* relevance of this result.

To distinguish among some of these potential mechanisms of action, we conducted a

time-of-addition study of all three drugs. This approach has previously been used to reveal that

the action of chloroquine on ZIKV is mediated suppressing early life cycle stages, likely cellular

entry (66). In our study, we found that enoxacin suppression was restricted to 2 to 6 hours p.i.,

while the window of difloxacin and ciprofloxacin suppression activity was wider, encompassing

2 to 8 hours p.i. across assays, and prior to infection in a subset of assays. These results indicate

that difloxacin and ciprofloxacin may impact early and intermediate viral life cycle stages

whereas enoxacin's effect is limited to intermediate stages. All combined, these data suggest

that ciprofloxacin and difloxacin may share a mechanism-of-action that is different than that of

enoxacin. Like chloroquine, all three are bases, but difloxacin and ciprofloxacin are slightly

stronger bases than enoxacin (82) and could potentially be more effective than enoxacin at

inhibiting pH-mediated endocytosis during entry. All three FQs suppress ZIKV when added

during translation and replication time periods, consistent with both helicase inhibition or RNAi

enhancement as a mechanism of action.

440   In light of enoxacin's low EC_{50}, we tested the ability of this drug mitigate weight loss

(45) and suppress serum viremia and virus titer in key tissues including liver, brain and testes

(45) in ZIKV-infected A129 mice via two experiments. First, we infected A129 mice with a high

titer of ZIKV and then treated immediately after infection with drug diluent or 10 or 15 mg/kg of

enoxacin, which for the average weight of a 5-week-old mouse corresponds to 6 or 10 μM

enoxacin. These concentrations were selected because they are close, although slightly lower, to

the EC_{50} value for enoxacin in HEK-293 cells (18.1 μM) and also close to the peak human serum

concentration after oral consumption of clinically available dosages of enoxacin, which ranges

from 5 to 11 μM (46,47). Unexpectedly, all of the mice, including the sham-infected mice, lost

weight in this experiment. Two likely, non-exclusive explanations for the weight loss is that oral

administration of 100 μL liquid twice a day caused satiety and prevented the mice from eating

normally or that the drug diluent or enoxacin treatments caused stomach discomfort which also

prevented the mice from eating. Despite this, none of the mice lost more than 20% of their

weight and therefore did not reach the cutoff for euthanasia. Enoxacin treatment had no impact

on serum viremia or on virus titer in liver or brain. As FQs readily cross the blood-brain barrier

(83) and are metabolized in the liver (84), the absence of a drug effect in these tissues is unlikely

to be due to lack of enoxacin availability. Indeed, ZIKV titer was significantly greater in the

serum and brain of mice treated with 15mg/kg of enoxacin compared to 10 mg/kg. At present

we have no explanation for this finding, as we did not repeat the 10 mg/kg treatment. Given the

small sample sizes of this study, it is possible that this effect is due to random sampling, but

certainly further investigation of the dose effects of this drug *in vivo* are warranted.   The most

intriguing result of this experiment, however, was that male mice treated with enoxacin showed a

significant 50% decrease in ZIKV titer in the testes.

To assess the reproducibility of these findings under a different treatment regimen, we

next tested the effect of pre-treating mice with enoxacin and then infecting them with ZIKV. As

in the first experiment, all mice lost weight (though weight loss was less than in the first

experiment) and ZIKV titers in serum, liver and brain did not differ between enoxacin-treated

and control mice. Importantly, consistent with the first experiment, ZIKV was significantly

suppressed in the testes of enoxacin-treated mice relative to controls.

The restriction of enoxacin's efficacy to the testes *in vivo* could be due to higher efficacy

in specific cell types in the testes or due to the lower temperature of the testes. However, counter

to these explanations, we found that enoxacin was less effective against ZIKV at 32˚C than 37˚C

and less effective against ZIKV in Sertoli cells than in human kidney cells. However, Sertoli

cells are one of many cell types in the testes, which also contain stem cells, spermatozoa and

Leydig cells, which vary in their susceptibility to ZIKV (50,51,85–87), thus our findings in

Sertoli cells do not reveal the action of enoxacin in the testes as a whole. Immunohistochemical

staining of ZIKV-infected mouse testes 7 days p.i. revealed the presence of viral antigen

primarily in the stem cells of the seminiferous tubules and in the seminal fluid from the vas

deferens (87). Using *in situ* hybridization, viral RNA of a mouse-adapted strain of ZIKV was

detected in the stem cells (spermatogonia and primary spermatocytes), Sertoli cells, and

spermatozoa of ZIKV-infected mouse testes at 7 days p.i. (86). ZIKV-infected germ cells were

detected in the basal layer of the seminiferous tubules of ZIKV-infected Olive Baboons via

immunofluorescence 11 days p.i. (88).

Recently, Xu *et al*. (35) reported that ZIKV infection of hNPCs activates the RNAi

antiviral response and elicits the production of virus-derived small interfering RNAs (vsi-RNA),

but infection of human neurons does not, indicating that cellular differentiation degrades the

functionality of RNAi. Additionally, Xu et al. (35) demonstrated that treatment with enoxacin, a

known enhancer of RNAi (25,26), significantly suppressed ZIKV replication in hNPCs. The

HEK-293 cells in which we demonstrated enoxacin efficacy against ZIKV have stem-cell like

properties (89). Our time-of-addition assays indicate that enoxacin, ciprofloxacin, and difloxacin

all suppress an intermediate life stage of ZIKV, which is consistent with enhancement of RNAi.

Furthermore, we detected an impact of enoxacin in testes, which are rich in stem cells, but not in

differentiated brain or liver cells. Thus, our results are generally consistent with those of Xu et

al. (35), which implicate RNAi enhancement as a key antiviral mechanism of enoxacin.

However, multiple alternative explanations for our *in vivo* findings must be considered.

First and foremost, Xu et al. (35) used 10-fold more enoxacin (100 μM vs 10 μM) in their study

than we used in ours. Additionally, testicular ZIKV infection results in oxidative stress, and

antioxidants such as ebselen have been shown to reduce oxidative stress, lessen testicular

damage, and prevent sexual transmission in mice (90). Like ebselen, FQs are also known to act

as antioxidants (27–29). FQs may also damage the testes and thereby restrict flavivirus

replication. Demir *et al*. (91) demonstrated that rats treated with oral ciprofloxacin at 150 mg/kg

for ten days experienced testicular damage to the germinal epithelium, tubular atrophy, and

swelling. As we did not evaluate the histopathological effects of enoxacin treatment in our study

we cannot discount the possibility that such damage occurred. However, Demir et al. (91) used a

much higher concentration of ciprofloxacin than we did in our study (150 mg/kg ciprofloxacin vs

15 mg/kg enoxacin). More research on the *in vivo* testicular toxicity of FQs is needed, especially

since ZIKV infection itself damages testicular tissues (86,92,93) although damage to human

Sertoli cells is minimal (50).

More generally, several caveats pertain to our study. First, although use of the A129

immunocompromised mouse model to initially test compounds for *in vivo* efficacy against ZIKV

has become a standard practice (65,94,95), nonetheless, these mice do lack an interferon

response, and the interplay between interferon and ZIKV clearly shapes pathogenesis (96–102).

Thus, the reproducibility of our findings in other, immunocompetent animal models, such as the

human STAT2 knockin mouse model or C57B1/6 mice treated with the anti-type I IFN receptor

antibody (102–104), should be tested. Second, as we only tested enoxacin across two

concentrations *in vivo*, a wider range of FQs and FQ concentrations should be investigated *in*

vivo for efficacy in suppressing ZIKV. Third, our investigation of the testes-specific efficacy of

enoxacin focused only on Sertoli cells, but efficacy in other testicular cells should also be

evaluated, particularly stem cells.

In summary, we found that FQs had reasonable efficacy against six flaviviruses in

cultured cells and enoxacin demonstrated efficacy against ZIKV in mouse testes. Limiting

replication of the virus in the testes is important, as ZIKV is capable of sexual transmission

(105–108). The results from this study and of Xu et al. (35) also suggest that testing the ability

of FQs to alleviate the teratogenic effects of ZIKV in relevant mouse models (103,109,110)

should be a priority.

Funding

This work was funded by a grant from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious

Disease, National Institutes of Health (1R21AI092041-02 to KAH and JBA and U01AI115577

to KAH and SLR), from institutional funds at the University of Texas Medical Branch. SLPS is

supported by a PEO Scholar Award from the International Chapter of the P.E.O. Sisterhood, and

the Biology Department and College of Arts and Sciences at New Mexico State University. SLR

is supported by NIH funding (5R01AI125902). SRA is funded by a McLaughlin Fellowship at

the University of Texas Medical Branch.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: SLPS CCA KAH SLR.

Investigation: SLPS CCA SRA EES EGJ KAH SLR.

Methodology: SLPS CCA KAH SLR.

Resources: RC JBA KAH SLR.

Supervision: KAH SLR.

Writing – original draft: SLPS KAH SLR.

Writing – review & editing: SLPS CCA RC SRA EES EGJ JBA KAH SLR.

References

543   1.   Bhatt S, Gething PW, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Farlow AW, Moyes CL, et al. The global

544   distribution and burden of dengue. Nature. 2013;496:504–7.

2.   Mlakar J, Korva M, Tul N, Popović M, Poljšak-Prijatelj M, Mraz J, et al. Zika Virus

Associated with Microcephaly. N Engl J Med. 2016;

3.   Honein MA, Dawson AL, Petersen EE, Jones AM, Lee EH, Yazdy MM, et al. Birth

Defects Among Fetuses and Infants of US Women With Evidence of Possible Zika Virus

Infection During Pregnancy. JAMA. 2016;30333(1):59–68.

4.   Cao-Lormeau V-M, Blake A, Mons S, Lastère S, Roche C, Vanhomwegen J, et al.

Guillain-Barré Syndrome outbreak associated with Zika virus infection in French

Polynesia: a case-control study. Lancet. 2016;387(10027):1531–9.

5.   Růžek D, Dobler G, Mantke OD. Tick-borne encephalitis: pathogenesis and clinical

implications. Travel Med Infect Dis. 2010;8(4):223–32.

6.   Kemenesi G, Bányai K. Tick-borne flaviviruses, with a focus on Powassan virus. Clin

Microbiol Rev. 2018;32(1):e00106-17.

7.   Weaver SC, Costa F, Garcia-Blanco MA, Ko AI, Ribeiro GS, Saade G, et al. Zika virus:

History, emergence, biology, and prospects for control. Antiviral Res. 2016;130:69–80.

8.   Le Flohic G, Porphyre V, Barbazan P, Gonzalez J-P. Review of climate, landscape, and

viral genetics as drivers of the Japanese encephalitis virus ecology. PLoS Negl Trop Dis.

2013;7(9):e2208.

9.   Petersen LR, Brault AC, Nasci RS. West Nile virus: review of the literature. JAMA.

2013;310(3):308–15.

10.   Mackenzie JS, Gubler DJ, Petersen LR. Emerging flaviviruses: the spread and resurgence

of Japanese encephalitis, West Nile and dengue viruses. Nat Med. 2004;10(12s):S98.

11.   Ishikawa T, Yamanaka A, Konishi E. A review of successful flavivirus vaccines and the

problems with those flaviviruses for which vaccines are not yet available. Vaccine.

2014;32(12):1326–37.

12.   Boldescu V, Behnam MAM, Vasilakis N, Klein CD. Broad-spectrum agents for flaviviral

infections: dengue, Zika and beyond. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2017;16(8):565.

13.   Saiz J-C. Therapeutic Advances Against ZIKV: A Quick Response, a Long Way to Go.

Pharmaceuticals. 2019;12(3):127.

14.   Lim S, Shi P-Y. West Nile virus drug discovery. Viruses. 2013;5(12):2977–3006.

15.   Lim SP, Wang Q-Y, Noble CG, Chen Y-L, Dong H, Zou B, et al. Ten years of dengue

drug discovery: progress and prospects. Antiviral Res. 2013;100(2):500–19.

16.   Kaptein SJF, Neyts J. Towards antiviral therapies for treating dengue virus infections.

Curr Opin Pharmacol. 2016;30:1–7.

17.   Zou J, Shi P-Y. Strategies for Zika drug discovery. Curr Opin Virol. 2019;35:19–26.

18.   Wolfson JS, Hooper DC. The Fluoroquinolones: Structures, Mechanisms of Action and

Resistance, and Spectra of Activity In Vitro. Antimicrob Agents Chemother.

1985;28(4):581–6.

19.   Kohanski MA, Dwyer DJ, Collins JJ. How antibiotics kill bacteria: from targets to

networks. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2010;8(6):423.

20.   Lindenbach BD, Rice CM. Molecular biology of flaviviruses. Adv Virus Res.

2003;59:23–62.

21.   Nagy PD, Pogany J. The dependence of viral RNA replication on co-opted host factors.

Nat Rev Microbiol. 2012;10(2):137.

22.   Sharma BN, Li R, Bernhoff E, Gutteberg TJ, Rinaldo CH. Fluoroquinolones inhibit

human polyomavirus BK (BKV) replication in primary human kidney cells. Antiviral Res.

2011;92(1):115–23.

23.   Simon N, Bochman ML, Seguin S, Brodsky JL, Seibel WL, Schwacha A. Ciprofloxacin is

592   an inhibitor of the Mcm2-7 replicative helicase. Biosci Rep. 2013;33(5):e00072.

593   24.   Melo S, Villanueva A, Moutinho C, Davalos V, Spizzo R, Ivan C, et al. Small molecule

594   enoxacin is a cancer-specific growth inhibitor that acts by enhancing TAR RNA-binding

595   protein 2-mediated microRNA processing. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2011;108(11):4394–9.

596   25.   Shan G, Li Y, Zhang J, Li W, Szulwach KE, Duan R, et al. A small molecule enhances

597   RNA interference and promotes microRNA processing. Nat Biotechnol. 2008;26(8):933–

598   40.

599   26.   Zhang Q, Zhang C, Xi Z. Enhancement of RNAi by a small molecule antibiotic enoxacin.

600   Cell Res. 2008;18(10):1077.

601   27.   Dalhoff A. Immunomodulatory activities of fluoroquinolones. Infection. 2005;33(2):55–

602   70.

603   28.   Tazi KA, Moreau R, Hervé P, Dauvergne A, Cazals-Hatem D, Bert F, et al. Norfloxacin

604   reduces aortic NO synthases and proinflammatory cytokine up-regulation in cirrhotic rats:

605   role of Akt signaling. Gastroenterology. 2005;129(1):303–14.

606   29.   Akamatsu H, Niwa Y, Sasaki H, Matoba Y, Asada Y, Horio T. Effect of pyridone

607   carboxylic acid anti-microbials on the generation of reactive oxygen species in vitro. J Int

608   Med Res. 1996;24(4):345–51.

609   30.   Poon IKH, Chiu Y-H, Armstrong AJ, Kinchen JM, Juncadella IJ, Bayliss DA, et al.

610   Unexpected link between an antibiotic, pannexin channels and apoptosis. Nature.

611   2014;507(7492):329.

612   31.   Fukumoto R, Cary LH, Gorbunov N V, Lombardini ED, Elliott TB, Kiang JG.

613   Ciprofloxacin modulates cytokine/chemokine profile in serum, improves bone marrow

repopulation, and limits apoptosis and autophagy in ileum after whole body ionizing

irradiation combined with skin-wound trauma. PLoS One. 2013;8(3):e58389.

32. Khan IA, Siddiqui S, Rehmani S, Kazmi SU, Ali SH. Fluoroquinolones inhibit HCV by

targeting its helicase. Antivir Ther. 2012;17:467–76.

33. Kojima H, Kaita KDE, Hawkins K, Uhanova J, Minuk GY. Use of fluoroquinolones in

patients with chronic hepatitis C virus-induced liver failure. Antimicrob Agents

Chemother. 2002;46(10):3280–2.

34. Yamaya M, Nishimura H, Hatachi Y, Yasuda H, Deng X, Sasaki T, et al. Levofloxacin

inhibits rhinovirus infection in primary cultures of human tracheal epithelial cells.

Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2012;56(8):4052–61.

35. Xu YP, Qiu Y, Zhang B, Chen G, Chen Q, Wang M, et al. Zika virus infection induces

RNAi-mediated antiviral immunity in human neural progenitors and brain organoids. Cell

Res. 2019;29(4):265–73.

36. Durbin AP, Karron RA, Sun W, Vaughn DW, Reynolds MJ, Perreault JR, et al.

Attenuation and immunogenicity in humans of a live dengue virus type-4 vaccine

candidate with a 30 nucleotide deletion in its 3′-untranslated region. Am J Trop Med Hyg.

2001;65(5):405–13.

37. Hanley KA, Nelson JT, Schirtzinger EE, Whitehead SS, Hanson CT. Superior infectivity

for mosquito vectors contributes to competitive displacement among strains of dengue

virus. BCM Ecol. 2008;8(1).

38. Pletnev AG. Infectious cDNA clone of attenuated Langat tick-borne flavivirus (strain E5)

and a 3′ deletion mutant constructed from it exhibit decreased neuroinvasiveness in

immunodeficient mice. Virology. 2001;282(2):288–300.

39.   Qing M, Zou G, Wang QY, Xu HY, Dong H, Yuan Z, et al. Characterization of dengue

virus resistance to brequinar in cell culture. Antimicrob Agents Chemother.

2010;54(9):3686–95.

40.   Xie X, Wang Q-Y, Xu HY, Qing M, Kramer L, Yuan Z, et al. Inhibition of dengue virus

by targeting viral NS4B protein. J Virol. 2011;85(21):11183–95.

41.   Byrd CM, Grosenbach DW, Berhanu A, Dai D, Jones KF, Cardwell KB, et al. Novel

benzoxazole inhibitor of dengue virus replication that targets the NS3 helicase.

Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2013;57(4):1902–12.

42.   Byrd CM, Dai D, Grosenbach DW, Berhanu A, Jones KF, Cardwell KB, et al. A novel

inhibitor of dengue virus replication that targets the capsid protein. Antimicrob Agents

Chemother. 2013;57(1):15–25.

43.   Kato F, Ishida Y, Oishi S, Fujii N, Watanabe S, Vasudevan SG, et al. Novel antiviral

activity of bromocriptine against dengue virus replication. Antiviral Res. 2016;131:141–7.

44.   Pierson TC, Diamond M. Flaviviruses. In: Fields Virology: Sixth Edition. Wolters Kluwer

Health Adis (ESP); 2013.

45.   Rossi SL, Tesh RB, Azar SR, Muruato AE, Hanley KA, Auguste AJ, et al.

Characterization of a novel murine model to study zika virus. Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2016;

46.   Chang T, Black A, Dunky A, Wolf R, Sedman A, Latts J, et al. Pharmacokinetics of

intravenous and oral enoxacin in healthy volunteers. J Antimicrob Chemother.

1988;21(suppl B):49–56.

47.   Naber KG, Bartosik-Wich B, Sörgel F, Gutzler F. In vitro activity, pharmacokinetics,

clinical safety and therapeutic efficacy of enoxacin in the treatment of patients with

complicated urinary tract infections. Infection. 1985;13(5):219–24.

48.   RCoreTeam. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R foundation for

661   statistical computing, Vienna, Austria. 2016.

662   49.   Kumar A, Jovel J, Lopez-Orozco J, Limonta D, Airo AM, Hou S, et al. Human sertoli

663   cells support high levels of zika virus replication and persistence. Sci Rep. 2018;8(1):1–

664   11.

665   50.   Siemann DN, Strange DP, Maharaj PN, Shi P-Y, Verma S. Zika virus infects human

666   Sertoli cells and modulates the integrity of the in vitro blood-testis barrier model. J Virol.

667   2017;91(22).

668   51.   Mlera L, Bloom ME. Differential Zika Virus Infection of Testicular Cell Lines. Viruses.

669   2019;11(1):42.

670   52.   Katzelnick LC, Coloma J, Harris E. Dengue: knowledge gaps, unmet needs, and research

671   priorities. Lancet Infect Dis. 2017;17(3):e88–100.

672   53.   WHO. Dengue: guidelines for diagnosis, treatment, prevention and control. World Health

673   Organization; 2009.

674   54.   Sips GJ, Wilschut J, Smit JM. Neuroinvasive flavivirus infections. Rev Med Virol.

675   2012;22(2):69–87.

676   55.   Racsa LD, Kraft CS, Olinger GG, Hensley LE. Viral hemorrhagic fever diagnostics. Clin

677   Infect Dis. 2015;62(2):214–9.

678   56.   Debing Y, Neyts J, Delang L. The future of antivirals: Broad-spectrum inhibitors. Curr

679   Opin Infect Dis. 2015;28(6):596–602.

680   57.   Vigant F, Santose MC, Lee N. Broad-spectrum antivirals against viral fusion. Nat Rev

681   Microbiol. 2015;13(7):426–37.

58.   Blitvich BJ, Firth AE. Insect-specific flaviviruses: a systematic review of their discovery,

host range, mode of transmission, superinfection exclusion potential and genomic

organization. Viruses. 2015;7(4):1927–59.

59. de Bernardi Schneider A, Machado DJ, Janies DA. Enhanced genome annotation strategy

provides novel insights on the phylogeny of Flaviviridae. bioRxiv. 2019;674333.

60. Bedos J-P, Azoulay-Dupuis E, Moine P, Muffat-Joly M, Veber B, Pocidalo J-J, et al.

Pharmacodynamic activities of ciprofloxacin and sparfloxacin in a murine pneumococcal

pneumonia model: relevance for drug efficacy. J Pharmacol Exp Ther. 1998;286(1):29–

35.

61. Chartrand SA, Scribner RK, Marks MI, Dice J. Enoxacin pharmacokinetics and efficacy

in CF-1 mice. J Antimicrob Chemother. 1987;19:221–4.

62. Abd El-Aty AM, Goudah A, Ismail M, Shimoda M. Disposition kinetics of difloxacin in

rabbit after intravenous and intramuscular injection of Dicural. Vet Res Commun.

2005;29:297–304.

63. Emmerson AM, Jones AM. The quinolones: decades of development and use. J

Antimicrob Chemother. 2003;51(90001):13–20.

64. Shiryaev SA, Mesci P, Pinto A, Fernandes I, Sheets N, Shresta S, et al. Repurposing of the

anti-malaria drug chloroquine for Zika Virus treatment and prophylaxis. Sci Rep.

2017;7(1):1–9.

65. Li C, Zhu X, Ji X, Quanquin N, Deng YQ, Tian M, et al. Chloroquine, a FDA-approved

Drug, Prevents Zika Virus Infection and its Associated Congenital Microcephaly in Mice.

EBioMedicine. 2017;24:189–94.

66. Delvecchio R, Higa LM, Pezzuto P, Valadão AL, Garcez PP, Monteiro FL, et al.

Chloroquine, an endocytosis blocking agent, inhibits zika virus infection in different cell

models. Viruses. 2016;8(12):1–15.

67.   Farias KJS, Machado PRL, da Fonseca BAL. Chloroquine inhibits dengue virus type 2 replication in Vero cells but not in C6/36 cells. Sci World J. 2013;2013.

68.   Farias KJS, Machado PRL, de Almeida Junior RF, de Aquino AA, da Fonseca BAL. Chloroquine interferes with dengue-2 virus replication in U937 cells. Microbiol Immunol. 2014;58(6):318–26.

69.   Cao B, Parnell LA, Diamond MS, Mysorekar IU. Inhibition of autophagy limits vertical transmission of Zika virus in pregnant mice. J Exp Med. 2017;214(8):2303–13.

70.   Farias KJS, Machado PRL, Muniz JAPC, Imbeloni AA, da Fonseca BAL. Antiviral Activity of Chloroquine Against Dengue Virus Type 2 Replication in Aotus Monkeys . Viral Immunol. 2015;28(3):161–9.

71.   Tricou V, Minh NN, Van TP, Lee SJ, Farrar J, Wills B, et al. A randomized controlled trial of chloroquine for the treatment of dengue in Vietnamese adults. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2010;4(8):e785.

72.   Borges MC, Castro LA, Fonseca BAL da. Chloroquine use improves dengue-related symptoms. Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz. 2013;108(5):596–9.

73.   Browning DJ. Pharmacology of chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine. In: Hydroxychloroquine and Chloroquine Retinopathy. Springer; 2014. p. 35–63.

74.   Savarino A, Boelaert JR, Cassone A, Majori G, Cauda R. Effects of chloroquine on viral infections: an old drug against today's diseases. Lancet Infect Dis. 2003;3(11):722–7.

75.   Khan M, Santhosh SR, Tiwari M, Lakshmana Roa PV, Parida M. Assessment of in vitro prophylactic and therapeutic efficacy of chloroquine against chikungunya virus in Vero cells. J Med Virol. 2010;88:817–24.

729   76.   Zeichardt H, Wetz K, Willingmann P, Habermehl KO. Entry of poliovirus type 1 and

730   Mouse Elberfeld (ME) virus into HEp-2 cells: Receptor-mediated endocytosis and

731   endosomal or lysosomal uncoating. J Gen Virol. 1985;66(3):483–92.

732   77.   Kronenberger P, Vrijsen R, Boeye A. Chloroquine induces empty capsid formation during

733   poliovirus eclipse. JVirol. 1991;65(12):7008–11.

734   78.   Maillard P V, Ciaudo C, Marchais A, Li Y, Jay F, Ding SW, et al. Antiviral RNA

735   Interference in Mammalian Cells. Science (80-). 2013;342(6155):235–8.

736   79.   Li Y, Lu J, Han Y, Fan X, Ding S-W. RNA interference functions as an antiviral

737   immunity mechanism in mammals. Science (80-). 2013;342(October):231–4.

738   80.   Qiu Y, Xu Y, Zhang Y, Zhou H, Deng YQ, Li XF, et al. Human virus-derived small

739   RNAs can confer antiviral immunity in mammals. Immunity. 2017;46(6):992-1004.e5.

740   81.   Schuster S, Miesen P, van Rij RP. Antiviral RNAi in Insects and Mammals: Parallels and

741   Differences. Viruses. 2019;11(5):448.

742   82.   Babić S, Horvat AJM, Mutavdžić Pavlović D, Kaštelan-Macan M. Determination of pKa

743   values of active pharmaceutical ingredients. Trends Anal Chem. 2007;26(11):1043–61.

744   83.   Scheld WM. Quinolone therapy for infections of the central nervous system. Rev Infect

745   Dis. 1989;11(Suppl 5):S1194–202.

746   84.   Outman WR. Metabolism and the fluoroquinolones. Am J Med. 1989;87(6C):37S-42S.

747   85.   McDonald EM, Duggal NK, Brault AC. Pathogenesis and sexual transmission of

748   Spondweni and Zika viruses. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2017;11(10):1–13.

749   86.   Govero J, Esakky P, Scheaffer SM, Fernandez E, Drury A, Platt DJ, et al. Zika virus

750   infection damages the testes in mice. Nature. 2016;540(7633):438.

87.   Kawiecki AB, Mayton EH, Dutuze MF, Goupil BA, Langohr IM, Del Piero F, et al.

Tissue tropisms, infection kinetics, histologic lesions, and antibody response of the

MR766 strain of Zika virus in a murine model. Virol J. 2017;14(1):1–10.

88.   Peregrine J, Gurung S, Lindgren MC, Husain S, Zavy MT, Myers DA, et al. Zika virus

infection, reproductive organ targeting, and semen transmission in the male olive baboon.

J Virol. 2019;94(1).

89.   Debeb BG, Zhang X, Krishnamurthy S, Gao H, Cohen E, Li L, et al. Characterizing

cancer cells with cancer stem cell-like features in 293T human embryonic kidney cells.

Mol Cancer. 2010;9(1):180.

90.   Simanjuntak Y, Liang JJ, Chen SY, Li JK, Lee YL, Wu HC, et al. Ebselen alleviates

testicular pathology in mice with Zika virus infection and prevents its sexual transmission.

PLoS Pathog. 2018;14(2):1–23.

91.   Demir A, Türker P, Önol FF, Sirvanci S, Findik A, Tarcan T. Effect of experimentally

induced Escherichia coli epididymo-orchitis and ciprofloxacin treatment on rat

spermatogenesis. Int J Urol. 2007;14(3):268–72.

92.   Ma W, Li S, Ma S, Jia L, Zhang F, Zhang Y, et al. Zika virus causes testis damage and

leads to male infertility in mice. Cell. 2016;167(6):1511–24.

93.   Clancy CS, Van Wettere AJ, Morrey JD, Julander JG. Zika Virus Associated pathology

and Antigen presence in the testicle in the Absence of sexual transmission During

subacute to Chronic Infection in a Mouse Model. Sci Rep. 2019;9(1):8325.

94.   Deng Y-Q, Zhang N-N, Li C-F, Tian M, Hao J-N, Xie X-P, et al. Adenosine analog

NITD008 is a potent inhibitor of Zika virus. In: Open forum infectious diseases. Oxford

University Press; 2016. p. ofw175.

95.   Li C, Deng YQ, Wang S, Ma F, Aliyari R, Huang XY, et al. 25-Hydroxycholesterol

Protects Host against Zika Virus Infection and Its Associated Microcephaly in a Mouse Model. Immunity. 2017;46(3):446–56.

96. Grant A, Ponia SS, Tripathi S, Balasubramaniam V, Miorin L, Sourisseau M, et al. Zika virus targets human STAT2 to inhibit type I interferon signaling. Cell Host Microbe. 2016;19(6):882–90.

97. Kumar A, Hou S, Airo AM, Limonta D, Mancinelli V, Branton W, et al. Zika virus inhibits type-I interferon production and downstream signaling. EMBO Rep. 2016;17(12):1766–75.

98. Wu Y, Liu Q, Zhou J, Xie W, Chen C, Wang Z, et al. Zika virus evades interferon-mediated antiviral response through the co-operation of multiple nonstructural proteins in vitro. Cell Discov. 2017;3:17006.

99. Smith DR, Hollidge B, Daye S, Zeng X, Blancett C, Kuszpit K, et al. Neuropathogenesis of Zika Virus in a Highly Susceptible Immunocompetent Mouse Model after Antibody Blockade of Type I Interferon. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2017;11(1):1–22.

100. Xia H, Luo H, Shan C, Muruato AE, Nunes BTD, Medeiros DBA, et al. An evolutionary NS1 mutation enhances Zika virus evasion of host interferon induction. Nat Commun. 2018;9(1).

101. Chen J, Yang YF, Yang Y, Zou P, Chen J, He Y, et al. AXL promotes Zika virus infection in astrocytes by antagonizing type i interferon signalling. Nat Microbiol. 2018;3(3):302–9.

102. McDonald EM, Duggal NK, Delorey MJ, Oksanish J, Ritter JM, Brault AC. Duration of seminal Zika viral RNA shedding in immunocompetent mice inoculated with Asian and African genotype viruses. Virology. 2019;

103. Gorman MJ, Caine EA, Zaitsev K, Begley MC, Weger-Lucarelli J, Uccellini MB, et al.

An Immunocompetent Mouse Model of Zika Virus Infection. Cell Host Microbe.

2018;23(5):672-685.e6.

104. Salazar V, Jagger BW, Mongkolsapaya J, Burgomaster KE, Dejnirattisai W, Winkler ES,

et al. Dengue and Zika virus cross-reactive human monoclonal antibodies protect against

Spondweni virus infection and pathogenesis in mice. Cell Rep [Internet].

2019;26(6):1585-1597.e4. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2019.01.052

105. Mansuy JM, Dutertre M, Mengelle C, Fourcade C, Marchou B, Delobel P, et al. Zika

virus: High infectious viral load in semen, a new sexually transmitted pathogen? Lancet

Infect Dis. 2016;16(4):405.

106. D'Ortenzio E, Matheron S, Yazdanpanah Y. Evidence of sexual transmission of Zika

Virus. N Engl J Med. 2016;374(22):2195–8.

107. Sheridan MA, Yunusov D, Balaraman V, Alexenko AP, Yabe S, Verjovski-Almeida S, et

al. Vulnerability of primitive human placental trophoblast to Zika virus. Proc Natl Acad

Sci. 2017;114(9):E1587–96.

108. Wu KY, Zuo GL, Li XF, Ye Q, Deng YQ, Huang XY, et al. Vertical transmission of Zika

virus targeting the radial glial cells affects cortex development of offspring mice. Cell

Res. 2016;26(6):645–54.

109. Lazear HM, Govero J, Smith AM, Platt DJ, Fernandez E, Miner JJ, et al. A mouse model

of Zika virus pathogenesis. Cell Host Microbe. 2016;19(5):720–30.

110. Duggal NK, Ritter JM, Pestorius SE, Zaki SR, Davis BS, Chang G-JJ, et al. Frequent Zika

virus sexual transmission and prolonged viral RNA shedding in an immunodeficient

mouse model. Cell Rep. 2017;18(7):1751–60.

Tables

Table 1. Passage history for flaviviruses utilized in this study

Virus	Strain	Obtained from	Passage history
Zika virus (ZIKV)	MEX 1-7	World Reference Center for Emerging Viruses and Arboviruses (WRCEVA)	C6/36 (x3)
Zika virus (ZIKV)	FSS13025		C6/36 (x1), Vero (x1)
Dengue virus-1 (DENV-1)	Thailand 160087-1A	Laboratory of Dr. Stephen Whitehead, NIAID, NIH	Vero (x5)
Dengue virus-2 (DENV-2)	NGC proto		C6/36 (x3), Vero (x2)
Dengue virus-4 (rDENV-4)	Dominica p4-3b (36)		Vero (x4)
Langat virus (LGTV)	E5 (38)	Laboratory of Dr. Alexander Pletnev, NIAID, NIH	Vero (x4)
Modoc virus (MODV)	7/26/61	WRCEVA	IC suckling mice (x9), Vero (x4)

834 **Table 2.** Number of ZIKV-infected and control mice treated with enoxacin or drug diluent

| | Experiment 1 | | Experiment 2 | |
	$1x10^5$ pfu ZIKV	PBS Control	$1x10^2$ pfu ZIKV	PBS Control
Drug diluent	7 (4 female, 3 male)	NA	7 (3 female, 4 male)	6 (3 female, 3 male)
Enoxacin (10 mg/kg)	7 (3 female, 4 male)	6 (2 female, 4 male)	NA	NA
Enoxacin (15 mg/kg)	6 (0 female, 6 male)	5 (3 female, 2 male)	6 (3 female, 3 male)	7 (5 female, 2 male)

852   **Table 3.** Efficacy and toxicity of enoxacin, difloxacin, and ciprofloxacin against flaviviruses in

853   HEK-293 cells

FQ	CC$_{50}$ µM (95% CI)	Virus	EC$_{50}$ µM (95% CI)	Selectivity Index [a]
Enoxacin	537.6 (378.8-763.0)	ZIKV	18.1 (14.6-22.4)	29.7
		DENV-1	6.6 (6.0-7.3)	81.5
		DENV-2	4.7 (3.5-6.2)	114.4
		DENV-4	7.6 (7.1-8.2)	70.7
		LGTV	4.3 (2.8-6.5)	125.0
		MODV	14.6 (7.4-29.0)	36.8
Difloxacin	763.0 (579.3-1005.0)	ZIKV	25.4 (20.8-30.9)	59.2
		DENV-1	10.9 (9.2-12.9)	138.0
		DENV-2	5.7 (4.8-6.9)	263.9
		DENV-4	10.1 (9.1-11.3)	148.9
		LGTV	8.2 (6.3-10.6)	183.4
		MODV	>150	n.d.
Ciprofloxacin	1504.0 (730.0-3099.0)	ZIKV	56.8 (39.6-81.5)	13.4
		DENV-1	27.8 (22.1-34.9)	27.4
		DENV-2	8.0 (5.0-12.9)	188.0
		DENV-4	19.6 (16.5-23.2)	38.9
		LGTV	7.4 (3.9-14.0)	103.1
		MODV	11.2 (3.8-32.6)	68.1

854   a: Selectivity Index: CC$_{50}$ divided by EC$_{50}$

855   n.d.: not determined

Figures

Fig 1. Experimental design. a) In experiment 1, 5-week-old A129 mice were injected with

ZIKV (1×10^5 pfu) or PBS then treated orally with enoxacin (10 or 15 mg/kg) or drug diluent

twice daily on days 1-6. b) In experiment 2, 5-week-old A129 mice were pre-treated with

enoxacin (15 mg/kg) or diluent 8 hours before injection with ZIKV (1×10^2 pfu) or PBS and then

were treated orally with enoxacin (15 mg/kg) or diluent twice daily on days 1-5 p.i.

Fig 2. **Enoxacin suppresses intermediate life cycle stages of ZIKV while difloxacin and**
875

ciprofloxacin suppress early and intermediate life cycle stages of ZIKV
876

Impact on replication of ZIKV at designated MOI by specified drug at designated concentration

when added at designated timepoint (a) 18.1 μM enoxacin, MOI 1.0; (b) 24.4 μM enoxacin, MOI

0.2; (c) 35.9 μM difloxacin, MOI 0.2; (d) 50.0 μM difloxacin, MOI 1.0; (e) 25.0 μM

ciprofloxacin, MOI 1.0; (f) 116.1 μM ciprofloxacin, MOI 0.2. † drug EC_{50} in Table 3. Viral

titers (n = 3 replicates per drug per time point) for each time point were normalized to the

average viral titer with media treatment and reported as average percent (titer at time

point/average media titer*100). Differences in mean viral titers ($\log_{10}$ pfu/mL) were detected

with ANOVA and pairwise t-tests; full pairwise statistics in Table S1. * $P < 0.05$ compared to

media control.

Fig 3. **Treatment had no significant effect on mouse weight loss**. (a) Daily percent of initial weight for experiment 1 was the same for ZIKV infected mice treated with enoxacin (10 mg/kg and 15 mg/kg combined) or diluent and uninfected mice treated with enoxacin (10 mg/kg and 15 mg/kg combined) until day 6 p.i. when the infected mice, regardless of treatment, lost significantly more weight than the uninfected controls (repeated measures ANOVA: $F_{(12, 194)}$ = 3.1, P = 0.0006; sample sizes in Table 2; full pairwise t-test statistics in Table S2); * at least

907   one group is different at $P < 0.05$. (b) Percent of initial weight for experiment 2 was not different

908   among treatment groups (repeated measures ANOVA: $F_{(18, 132)} = 1.4$, $P = 0.12$; sample sizes

909   in Table 2)

931 **Fig 4**. **Treatment with enoxacin following high-titer infection suppresses ZIKV replication**

932 **in mouse testes but not in sera or brain.** Individual (dots) and mean (line) ZIKV titers of mice

933 treated with the drug diluent or enoxacin from (a) sera, (b) brain, and (c) testes. Sample sizes for

934 each treatment are listed in Table 2.

Fig 5. **Treatment with enoxacin prior to and following low-titer ZIKV infection suppresses**

viral replication in the testes but not in serum, brain or liver. Individual (dots) and mean

(line) ZIKV titers of mice treated with the drug diluent or enoxacin from (a) sera, (b) brain, (c)

liver, and (d) testes. Sample sizes for each treatment are listed in Table 2.

Fig 6. **Enhancement of enoxacin efficacy to suppress ZIKV was not detected in Sertoli cells**

two days pi (a) or five days pi (b). Dose-response curves for enoxacin and ZIKV titer at 32 °C

in Sertoli cells (pink) and HEK-293 cells (blue) at two MOI, 0.1 (dashed) and 1.0 (solid). Dose-

response curve for enoxacin and ZIKV titer in HEK-293 cells at 37 °C (yellow) is included for

comparison on day 5 p.i. See the text for statistics.

972 **Supporting Information**

973 **S1 Table.** ANOVA results and pairwise t-test comparisons for ZIKV titer after treatment with

974 enoxacin, difloxacin and ciprofloxacin from the time-of-addition assays in Fig. 2.

	Enoxacin		Difloxacin		Ciprofloxacin	
Concentration (µM)	18.1	24.4	35.9	50.0	25.0	116.1
MOI	1.0	0.2	0.2	1.0	1.0	0.2
F (df), P	2.6 (8, 18), 0.04	3.6, (8,18), 0.01	2.8 (8, 18), 0.04	12.8 (8, 18), 5.2e-6	16.2 (8, 18), 2.3E-7	14.7 (8, 18), 1.9e-6
Time of addition (hour p.i.)						
Media	AB	AB	A	A	A	A
-2	AB	AB	AB	BC	CD	A
0	A	ABC	AB	CD	BC	A
2	BC	CD	B	CD	E	B
4	BC	D	AB	D	E	B
6	C	CD	B	D	DE	B
8	ABC	BCD	B	CD	DE	B
12	ABC	AB	B	A	BC	A
18	A	A	B	AB	B	A

988 **S2 Table**. Pairwise t-test comparisons of mean percent weight change from *in vivo* ZIKV

989 infection in Fig 3a

Virus + Treatment	Day 0	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5	Day 6
Sham + enoxacin	JK	FHI	DEG	BC	BC	B	BC
Zika + lactic acid	K	IJ	EFGH	BCDEFGH	BCDEFGH	BCD	A
Zika + enoxacin	JK	JK	GHI	DEFGH	EFGHI	CDEF	A

990