

Human Pharmacokinetics Prediction

Chandasana H*

Department of Pharmaceutics, College of Pharmacy, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA

*Corresponding author: Chandasana H, Department of Pharmaceutics, College of Pharmacy, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA, Tel: +1-352-213-9228; E-mail: hardik4587@gmail.com

Received date: Oct 20, 2016; Accepted date: Oct 21, 2016; Published date: Oct 26, 2016

Copyright: © 2016 Chandasana H. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Editorial

Drug development is very time consuming and costly process. Only few candidates enters in to clinical trials can eventually become a drug. Accurate prediction of the right dose before entering in to clinical study can reduce time as well as cost of drug discovery process. Pharmacokinetic plays an essential role in the selecting the right dose and dosage regimen [1-5]. Thus early prediction of human pharmacokinetic based on animal and *in-vitro* data is the challenging task for the scientist. Predictions of human pharmacokinetic parameters include the clearance, volume of distribution, half-life, bioavailability, effective dose and dosage regimen, plasma concentration time profile; inter individual variability and drug-drug interaction. There are numerous methodologies available in the literature for human prediction. Most widely used methods are the *In-vitro In-vivo* Extrapolation (IVIVE), allometric scaling and Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic modeling (PBPK) [6-8]. Best results in the prediction can be obtained by applying one or two methods in a combination.

In-vitro in-vivo extrapolation

IVIVE approach utilizes the *in-vitro* metabolic clearance and protein binding data to scale to *in-vivo* clearance. Major route of the elimination for most of the drugs are through biotransformation such as Phase I (CYP mediated) and Phase II (Conjugated enzyme through). In this methodology *in-vitro* studies with hepatocytes or liver microsomes can be used for the scaling. There are basically three models available to calculate *in-vivo* clearance such as well-stirred, parallel tube and dispersion models. Among all three models well stirred model is widely used model because of its mathematical simplicity. These liver models predict the *in-vivo* clearance based on some assumptions such as: 1) Only unbound drug can cross the membrane and interact with the enzymes; 2) There is no diffusion barrier exist and drug distribution is perfusion rate limited; 3) Metabolic enzymes are homogenously distributes in the liver. Basically two steps involved in this methodology. First step is to scale intrinsic clearance to *in-vitro* hepatic clearance by using the appropriate scaling factors. In second step it further reconstructed by applying the blood flow and binding (Protein and microsomal binding) parameters [9-11].

Allometric scaling approach

Allometric scaling is widely used for the human clearance prediction based on animal data. Allometric is the study of size and its consequences. Its empirical form based on mathematical equation to extrapolate pharmacokinetic parameters to the species of the interest. Many important PK parameters such as clearance, volume of distribution and half-life are predicted using this methodology. Although this approach is very widely used but major drawback is not to

consider the metabolic differences among the species. Allometry can be used for the interpolation and extrapolation but variability is very high in the extrapolation particularly when predicting from small animal to humans. There are many methods available in this approach to predict human pharmacokinetic parameters such as: Simple allometry; Single species allometric approach; Rule of exponents; Allometric scaling of unbound clearance; Allometric scaling for renally and biliary excreted drugs and f_u (Fraction unbound) corrected intercept method. Over the years many improvements have been included in the allometric scaling approach for better prediction [12-15].

Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic Approach (PBPK)

PBPK was first described by Teorell in 1937. PBPK modeling gains much attention in recent past due to its more holistic and dynamic approach for the modelling. In this approach drug dependent parameters (Solubility, Log D, pKa, Metabolism, Protein binding, Blood partitioning etc.) and system dependent parameters such as (Tissue volume, Tissue composition, Blood flow etc.) utilized to generate the structural model using mathematical equations. This structural model utilized to predict the plasma and tissue pharmacokinetics. PBPK is more often used in the drug discovery to predict early pharmacokinetics in the humans to minimize the late failures. Moreover it utilizes to predict the drug-drug interaction as well as dosage regimen in the children. PBPK has advantage over the IVIVE and allometric scaling because it utilize all the factors which leads to predict the pharmacokinetics [16-19].

References

1. Chandasana H, Chhonker YS, Bala V, Prasad YD, Chaitanya TK, et al. (2015) Pharmacokinetic, bioavailability, metabolism and plasma protein binding evaluation of NADPH-oxidase inhibitor apocynin using LC-MS/MS. *J Chromatogr* 985: 180-188.
2. Chhonker YS, Chandasana H, Kumar D, Mishra SK, Srivastava S, et al. (2014) Pharmacokinetic and metabolism studies of rohitukine in rats by high performance liquid-chromatography with tandem mass spectrometry. *Fitoterapia* 97: 34-42.
3. Chandasana H, Chhonker YS, Prasad YD, Laxman TS, Anil Kumar KS, et al. (2015) Pharmacokinetics and tissue distribution study of novel potent antiplatelet agent S007-867 in mice using HPLC-MS/MS. *Xenobiotica* 45: 530-537.
4. Chandasana H, Chhonker YS, Laxman TS, Prasad YD, Dikshit DK, et al. (2016) Assessment of the pharmacokinetics, tissue distribution and excretion studies of a novel antiplatelet agent S007-867, following administration to rats. *Drug Test Anal* 8: 723-729.
5. Shivhare R, Korthikunta V, Chandasana H, Suthar MK, Agnihotri P, et al. (2014) Synthesis, Structure-Activity Relationships, and Biological Studies of Chromenochalcones as Potential Antileishmanial Agents. *J Med Chem* 57: 3342-3357.

6. Obach RS, Baxter JG, Liston TE, Silber BM, Jones BC, et al. (1997) The prediction of human pharmacokinetic parameters from preclinical and *in vitro* metabolism data. J Pharmacol Exp Ther 283: 46-58.
7. Rowland M, Peck C, Tucker G (2011) Physiologically-based pharmacokinetics in drug development and regulatory science. Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol 51: 45-73.
8. Boxenbaum H (1982) Interspecies scaling, allometry, physiological time, and the ground plan of pharmacokinetics. J Pharm Biopharm 10: 201-227.
9. Shiran MR, Proctor NJ, Howgate EM, Rowland-Yeo K, Tucker GT, et al. (2006) Prediction of metabolic drug clearance in humans: *in vitro-in vivo* extrapolation vs. allometric scaling. Xenobiotica 36: 567-580.
10. Pelkonen O, Turpeinen M (2007) *In vitro-in vivo* extrapolation of hepatic clearance: biological tools, scaling factors, model assumptions and correct concentrations. Xenobiotica 37: 1066-1089.
11. Webborn PJH, Parker AJ, Denton RL, Riley RJ (2007) *In vitro-in vivo* extrapolation of hepatic clearance involving active uptake: theoretical and experimental aspects. Xenobiotica 37: 1090-1109.
12. Caldwell GW, Masucci JA, Yan Z, Hageman W (2004) Allometric scaling of pharmacokinetic parameters in drug discovery: Can human CL, Vss and t1/2 be predicted from *in-vivo* rat data? Eur J Drug Metab Pharmacokin 29: 133-143.
13. Lavé T, Portmann R, Schenker G, Gianni A, Guenzi A, et al. (1999) Interspecies pharmacokinetic comparisons and allometric scaling of napsagatran, a low molecular weight thrombin inhibitor. J Pharm Pharmacol 51: 85-91.
14. Zou P, Yu Y, Zheng N, Yang Y, Paholak HJ, et al. (2012) Applications of human pharmacokinetic prediction in first-in-human dose estimation. AAPS J 14: 262-281.
15. Huang Q, Riviere JE (2014) The application of allometric scaling principles to predict pharmacokinetic parameters across species. Expert Opin Drug Met 10: 1241-1253.
16. Chen A, Yarmush LM, Maguire T (2012) Physiologically based pharmacokinetic models: integration of *in silico* approaches with micro cell culture analogues. Curr Drug Metab 13: 863-880.
17. Zhao P, Zhang L, Grillo JA, Liu Q, Bullock JM, et al. (2011) Applications of physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modeling and simulation during regulatory review. Clin Pharmacol Ther 89: 259-267.
18. Ginsberg G, Hattis D, Russ A, Sonawane B (2004) Physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modeling of caffeine and theophylline in neonates and adults: implications for assessing children's risks from environmental agents. J Toxicol Environ Health A 67: 297-329.
19. Chen Y, Jin JY, Mukadam S, Malhi V, Kenny JR (2012) Application of IVIVE and PBPK modeling in prospective prediction of clinical pharmacokinetics: strategy and approach during the drug discovery phase with four case studies. Biopharm Drug Dispos 33: 85-98.