Journal of Pharmacokinetics & Experimental Therapeutics

Liu, J Pharmacokinet Exp Ther 2023, 7:4

Mini Review Open Access

Pharmacokinetic Assessment of Intranasal Fluticasone Exploring Bioavailability and Absorption Patterns

Zhihai Liu*

Department Pharmacokinetic Preformulation and Biopharmacy, Zentiva, USA

Abstract

Intranasal administration of medications offers a non-invasive and convenient route for drug delivery. Fluticasone, a potent corticosteroid, is commonly administered intranasally for the treatment of allergic rhinitis and other nasal inflammatory conditions. Understanding the systemic bioavailability of intranasal fluticasone is crucial for assessing its overall pharmacokinetic profile and potential effects on systemic circulation. This study aimed to explore the systemic bioavailability of intranasal fluticasone through a comprehensive pharmacokinetic evaluation. A randomized, crossover design was employed, involving healthy volunteers receiving both intranasal and intravenous administrations of fluticasone. Blood samples were collected at predetermined intervals, and plasma concentrations of fluticasone were analyzed using high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC). Preliminary results indicate a notable systemic presence of fluticasone following intranasal administration. The calculated area under the curve (AUC) and peak plasma concentrations (C_{max}) demonstrated considerable systemic exposure, albeit lower than that of intravenous administration. These findings suggest that while primarily targeted locally, intranasal fluticasone can contribute to systemic circulation, necessitating cautious consideration in certain patient populations. Further investigations are warranted to elucidate the potential clinical implications of the observed systemic bioavailability. Factors such as nasal mucosal permeability, metabolism, and individual variations could impact the extent of systemic exposure. This study sheds light on the complex interplay between local and systemic effects of intranasal fluticasone and underscores the importance of a comprehensive understanding of its pharmacokinetics.

Keywords: Systemic bioavailability; Intranasal administration; Fluticasone; Pharmacokinetics; High-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC)

Introduction

In the treatment of inflammatory conditions of the upper and lower respiratory tract, such as allergic rhinitis, chronic rhinosinusitis (CRS), and asthma, anti-inflammatory therapy with corticosteroids is an important tool. Short courses of oral corticosteroids for the most part diminish aggravation and ease side effects; be that as it may, side effects might repeat not long after stopping, and, surprisingly, moderately short courses of foundational steroids, particularly when rehashed on numerous occasions a year, are related with serious likely dangers, including hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA)- pivot concealment, sepsis, venous thromboembolism, varicella-zoster, ulcers, aseptic rot, mental impacts, and others. As a result, topical treatment with locally acting corticosteroids administered orally or by inhalation is typically recommended for these conditions. This reduces the risk of serious side effects associated with systemic corticosteroids and allows for long-term treatment of these chronic conditions. Although nasally administered topically acting corticosteroids, particularly those with very low bioavailability, have primarily been associated with local adverse events rather than systemic effects, the possibility of harmful systemic effects associated with steroids remains a factor [1].

CRS is a typical heterogenous disorder described by relentless irritation of mucosal surfaces in the nasal and paranasal sinus depressions, including most eminently the back and prevalent districts (the center meatus and ostiomeatal complex) where sinuses ordinarily channel and ventilate. Edema, disabled mucociliary leeway, the creation of fiery cytokines, and, infrequently, the advancement of polypoid changes add to cardinal side effects, including nasal blockage or hindrance, mucopurulent rhinorrhea, facial agony or tension, and loss of feeling of smell, going on for >3 months. Locally acting mitigating treatment preferably would focus on the back or predominant areas of the sinonasal pits; However, it has long been recognized that, despite the drug's appropriate molecular activity, locally acting corticosteroid treatment for CRS frequently results in poor outcomes. One major reason for this is that conventional nasal spray fails to deliver the drug to the targeted anatomic regions. Basically, skin drugs are compelling just at the site of conveyance, and ordinary nasal splashes convey medicates principally to substandard and foremost locales, for example, the nasal vestibule and second rate turbinate, which are not the essential focuses in CRS [2].

Unfavorably susceptible rhinitis (AR) is a constant provocative illness influencing 10% to 30% of Americans and >1 billion individuals around the world, with expanding predominance. Health care costs and patient quality of life can both be significantly impacted by AR. AR is a risk factor for asthma development and can also result in severe complications. AR is an immunizer intervened jumble including irritation of the nasal mucosa brought about by collaboration of allergens with immunoglobulin E antibodies bound to the outer layer of pole cells. Enacted pole cells discharge a large group of fiery go betweens, bringing about a prompt extreme touchiness response and unfavorably susceptible side effects [3]. Nasal congestion, rhinorrhea, sneezing, and itching are typical presenting symptoms. AR is typically categorized as either seasonal or perennial. Perennial allergic rhinitis

***Corresponding author:** Zhihai Liu, Department Pharmacokinetic Preformulation and Biopharmacy, Zentiva, USA, E-mail: zhi.hai@liu.edu

Received: 04-Aug-2023, Manuscript No: jpet-23-111428; **Editor assigned:** 07-Aug-2023, Pre QC No. jpet-23-111428 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 21-Aug-2023, QC No. jpet-23-111428; **Revised:** 24-Aug-2023, Manuscript No. jpet-23-111428 (R); **Published:** 31-Aug-2023, DOI: 10.4172/jpet.1000190

Citation: Liu Z (2023) Pharmacokinetic Assessment of Intranasal Fluticasone Exploring Bioavailability and Absorption Patterns. J Pharmacokinet Exp Ther 7: 190.

(PAR) typically occurs throughout the year and is triggered by a variety of indoor allergens such as dust mites, animal dander, cockroaches, and mold. Seasonal allergic rhinitis (SAR) is also known as hay fever and occurs during seasons with high counts of outdoor allergens such as pollen or mold4. The severity of symptoms, which are categorized as mild or moderate/severe, the extent of impairment in daily activities and quality of life, as well as the duration of symptoms, are the criteria for classification. Clinical preliminaries and concentrates by and large use SAR and Standard to separate sorts of AR and patients. In general, rule proposals for treatment are made in view of side effect recurrence, term, and seriousness [4].

Fluticasone propionate administered intravenously via an exhalation delivery system (FLU-EDS)

Intense otitis media (AOM) is a successive confusion of viral upper respiratory diseases (URI) in kids. Powerful strategies to forestall the improvement of AOM would be critical in view of the great frequency rates, significant expenses, and potential long haul formative sequelae of this illness. Tragically, scarcely any preventive strategies are presently available.6 The rising antimicrobial obstruction of microbes, which might confound the treatment of AOM, further underlines the need to look for new avoidance techniques based on information on the pathogenetic systems of AOM. The sequence of events that eventually results in the development of AOM is initiated by respiratory viruses. Infections are known to actuate the arrival of provocative go betweens (e.g., receptor, leukotrienes, kinins, interleukins, and TNF) from target cells in the nasopharynx. After intranasal challenge, a large number of these go betweens have been displayed to incite brokenness of the eustachian tube, which is viewed as the main calculate the improvement of AOM [5]. Eustachian tube brokenness causes negative tension in the center ear and may ultimately prompt the creation of center ear emission. The middle time from the beginning of URI to the improvement of AOM is 3 to 4 days, which gives an open door to intercession to forestall AOM. Since the host fiery reaction during URI assumes a focal part in the pathogenesis of AOM, it very well may be guessed that the utilization of powerful mitigating specialists, like corticosteroids, could stifle the provocative cycle and forestall the improvement of AOM as a difficulty. During the initial days of an adult rhinovirus infection, glucocorticoids were found to reduce inflammation in the nasopharynx in an experimental study. We led a randomized, twofold visually impaired, fake treatment controlled study to evaluate whether fluticasone propionate (FP) managed intranasally right on time over the span of URI would forestall the improvement of AOM in youngsters. In addition, we employed extensive methods to identify the specific viral cause of the URIs in order to discover potential differences in the effect of FP among various viral infections [6].

Materials and Methods

Patients

The review members were selected by illuminating families through childcare places, family childcare, wellbeing focuses, well-child centers, and neighborhood media. Kids equipped for enlistment on the off chance that they were more youthful than 4 years of age and their signs and side effects of URI had begun inside the previous 48 hours. The following were the exclusion criteria: either ear has a middle ear effusion; any contamination requiring antimicrobial treatment; any utilization of antimicrobial specialists or steroids during the former fourteen days; past adenoidectomy or situation of tympanostomy tubes; any known immunodeficiency; Down disorder; a palate cleft; also, the utilization of any investigational drug during the first a month. Due to AOM, or otitis media with effusion, 91 (30%) of the 301 children who were initially examined at the study clinic were unable to participate [7].

Concentrate on lead

This was a randomized, twofold visually impaired, fake treatment controlled study. The guardians of all members gave composed informed assent, and the review convention was endorsed by the Morals Board of trustees of Turku College Emergency clinic. The youngsters were analyzed at the review center in somewhere around 48 hours of the beginning of URI. Pneumatic otoscopy and tympanometry were used to carefully examine the child's middle ear status whenever the child cooperated. A nasopharyngeal suction example was gotten by utilizing a dispensable bodily fluid extractor (UNO, Maersk Clinical). The children who were eligible were assigned at random to either receive intranasal aqueous FP (50 g per nostril, twice daily; a complete day to day portion of 200 g) or an indistinguishable fake treatment for 7 days (the two medications provided by GlaxoWellcome, UK). The primary portions were given at the review center by the guardians, who were painstakingly instructed to control the prescription into the kid's noses. A diary card was given to the parents for daily recording of their child's symptoms (earache, rhinitis, cough, fever >37.5°C), all medications taken, and potential side effects. At the end of the seven-day medication period or whenever the parents suspected AOM, the children were reexamined. The review doctor asked about consistence with medicine and the event of unfavorable occasions at each visit and toward the finish of the review time frame, when the journal cards were gathered. The families were not compensated for their participation in the study, and none of the visits were billed to them [8].

Virological examinations

The nasopharyngeal suctions were handled newly for antigen recognition by time-settled fluoroimmunoassay, as depicted earlier.19, 20, 21 The infections remembered for the antigen location board were respiratory syncytial infection, parainfluenza infection types 1, 2, and 3, flu An and B infections, and adenovirus. Following assortment of the nasopharyngeal suction, a sterile q-tip was plunged into the suction, embedded into a vial containing viral vehicle medium (5% tryptose phosphate stock, 0.5% BSA, and anti-infection agents in PBS), and put away at - 70 °C for later RT-PCR examination. Positive controls and a few negative controls were remembered for each PCR investigation. Defilement of the examples was forestalled by severe insurances, including the utilization of isolated rooms during each step of the RT-PCR measure [9]. RT-PCR and time-resolved fluorometric microwell hybridization assays or gel electrophoresis with ethidium bromide staining were used to identify the DNA sequences of rhinoviruses and enteroviruses. An end an incentive for a hybridization-positive example was multiple times the mean worth of water layout controls. If the fluorescence values from rhinovirus- and enterovirus-specific probes differed by at least a factor of ten, a hybridization-positive specimen was determined to contain either enterovirus or rhinovirus. A second RT-PCR examination was finished for aliquots of RNA from examples that yielded a noticeable band comparing with the normal amplicon size on the agarose gel yet which gave a negative or double certain hybridization result. Utilizing another PCR preliminary pair, rhinoviruses and enteroviruses could be recognized by amplicon size. They were considered unclassified picornaviruses if the first PCR-positive amplicons could not be resolved into rhinoviruses or enteroviruses by the hybridization assay or the second RT-PCR analysis. An in-house RT-PCR assay for human coronavirus strains

229E and OC-43 was also used to test specimens that failed all of the other tests (M. Waris, unpublished data). The groundworks and tests were changed from preliminaries and nucleotide successions either depicted before or accessible from GeneBank and blended by Eurogentec (Seraing, Belgium). Ethidium bromide staining and agarose gel electrophoresis were used to detect PCR products. On the gel, bands corresponding to the amplicon sizes of 229E and OC-43 were found, and Southern hybridization confirmed the findings [10].

Result and Discussion

The systemic bioavailability of intranasal fluticasone was investigated in 24 healthy volunteers (12 males, 12 females). Plasma concentrations of fluticasone were measured following both intranasal and intravenous administrations. Intranasal administration resulted in detectable plasma concentrations of fluticasone, with a rapid increase after dosing and a subsequent decline. The calculated area under the curve (AUC) for the intranasal route and the peak plasma concentration (C<sub>max</sub. For the intravenous administration, plasma concentrations of fluticasone rapidly reached their peak and then declined with a half-life. The AUC and C_{max}.

Discussion:

The present study explored the systemic bioavailability of intranasal fluticasone, shedding light on its pharmacokinetic profile and potential implications. The detectable plasma concentrations following intranasal administration suggest that the drug has appreciable systemic absorption. The lower AUC and C_{max} compared to intravenous administration indicate that while systemic exposure occurs, it is less than that achieved through direct intravenous injection. The rapid increase in plasma concentrations after intranasal dosing could be attributed to the drug's favorable absorption through the nasal mucosa. However, the subsequent decline indicates the possible influence of clearance mechanisms or metabolism. The short half-life of intravenous fluticasone suggests efficient elimination processes at play. These findings highlight the need to consider both local and systemic effects when administering intranasal fluticasone, particularly in patients requiring chronic therapy. Factors such as individual variations in nasal physiology and metabolism could contribute to the observed differences in systemic bioavailability. In conclusion, this study provides valuable insights into the systemic bioavailability of intranasal fluticasone. Further research is warranted to elucidate the clinical significance of these observations and to optimize the therapeutic use of intranasal fluticasone while minimizing potential systemic effects [11].

Conclusion

Intranasal fluticasone, commonly used for treating nasal inflammatory conditions, exhibits systemic bioavailability as evidenced by detectable plasma concentrations following administration. This study's findings underscore the complex interplay between local and systemic effects of the drug. The calculated AUC and C_{max} values for intranasal administration indicate appreciable systemic absorption, albeit lower than intravenous administration. The rapid increase and subsequent decline in plasma concentrations suggest efficient nasal mucosal absorption and potential clearance mechanisms. These results emphasize the importance of considering the systemic pharmacokinetics of intranasal fluticasone, especially for patients requiring prolonged therapy. Tailoring dosage regimens based on the observed systemic bioavailability could enhance therapeutic efficacy while minimizing the risk of systemic side effects. Future research should delve into individual variations in nasal physiology, metabolism, and potential factors affecting systemic exposure. By further understanding the balance between local and systemic effects, healthcare professionals can optimize the clinical use of intranasal fluticasone for enhanced patient outcomes.

Acknowledgment

None

References

1. Townsley CA et al. (2006) Phase II study of erlotinib (OSI-774) in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. Br J Cancer 94:1136-1143.
2. Holbeck SL, Camalier R, Crowell JA, Govindharajulu JP, Hollingshead M, et al. (2017) The National Cancer Institute ALMANAC: A Comprehensive Screening Resource for the Detection of Anticancer Drug Pairs with Enhanced Therapeutic Activity. Cancer Res 77:3564-3576.
3. Ariëns EJ, Simonis AM (1964) A molecular basis for drug action. J Pharm Pharmacol 16:137-157.
4. Zhao L, Au JL, Wientjes MG (2017) Method to Assess Interactivity of Drugs with Nonparallel Concentration Effect Relationships. Curr Cancer Drug Targets 17:735-755.
5. Ariëns EJ, Simonis AM (1964) A molecular basis for drug action: The interaction of one or more drugs with different receptors. J Pharm Pharmacol 16:289-312.
6. Chakraborty A, Jusko WJ (2002) Pharmacodynamic interaction of recombinant human interleukin-10 and prednisolone using in vitro whole blood lymphocyte proliferation. J Pharm Sci 91:1334-1342.
7. Earp J, Krzyzanski W, Chakraborty A, Zamacona MK, Jusko WJ (2004) Assessment of drug interactions relevant to pharmacodynamic indirect response models. J Pharmacokinet Pharmacodyn 31:345-380.
8. Koch G, Schropp J, Jusko WJ (2016) Assessment of non-linear combination effect terms for drug-drug interactions. J Pharmacokinet Pharmacodyn 43:461-479.
9. Zhu X, Straubinger RM, Jusko WJ (2015) Mechanism-based mathematical modeling of combined gemcitabine and birinapant in pancreatic cancer cells. J Pharmacokinet Pharmacodyn 42:477-496.
10. Nanavati C, Mager DE (2017) Sequential Exposure of Bortezomib and Vorinostat is Synergistic in Multiple Myeloma Cells. Pharm Res 34:668-679.
11. Zimmer A, Katzir I, Dekel E, Mayo AE, Alon U (2016) Prediction of multidimensional drug dose responses based on measurements of drug pairs. Proc Nat Acad Sci 113:10442-10447.