W2099

A Model and Systems Based Approach to Safety and Efficacy Questions **Related to Generic Substitution - A Novel Oral Anticoagulants Case Study**

Sarah Kim¹, Karthik Lingineni¹, Amy Meng¹, Vishnu D. Sharma¹, Raymond Miller¹, Mirjam N. Trame¹, Joshua D. Brown², Lawrence J. Lesko¹, Stephan Schmidt^{1,*}

¹ Center for Pharmacometrics and Systems Pharmacology, Department of Pharmaceutics, University of Florida, Orlando, FL; ² Department of Pharmaceutical Outcomes and Policy, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL

Bioavailability (BA) and Bioequivalence (BE) defined by the FDA

- BA is defined as the rate and extent to which the active ingredient or active moiety is absorbed from a drug product and becomes available at the site of action.
- **BE** serves as a surrogate of therapeutic equivalence and relies on blood/plasma based pharmacokinetic (PK) measures such as AUC and C_{max} that are reflective of systemic exposure.
- Standard BE limits: the 90% confidence interval for the test/reference ratio of AUC and C_{max} must lie within **80-125%**.

PURPOSE

> The objective of this collaborative research was to determine the impact of hypothetical bio-IN-equivalence (BIN) on the efficacy and safety profiles of the novel oral anticoagulants (**NOACs**): dabigatran, edoxaban, rivaroxaban, and apixaban.

METHODS

- \succ To determine the impact of BIN in AUC and/or C_{max} on the probability of experiencing an ischemic stroke (efficacy) or a major bleeding event (safety), we simulated out 3 sets of BIN scenarios by altering the rate (k_a) and/or extent (F) at which the drug is absorbed from its product.
- Resulting changes in PK were then implemented into population pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic (pop-PK/PD) and time to event (TTE) models available for the NOACs from their respective New Drug Applications (NDAs) and the literature.
- > Comparison with real-world data: additional statistical analyses were performed to compare the results to the real-world data from FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS) and Truven MarketScan Health Analytics.

> Study cases

Case	BE in C _{max}	BE in AUC	Bio-IN-eq
1	Νο	No	C _{max}
2	Νο	Yes	C
3	Yes	No	A
4	Yes	Yes	

> Overall workflow

C	ase 1,2,3	Outputs	(exposure	
F	AUC	PK Cave, Cmin		
K _a	C _{max}	simulation etc.	simulation	

> Software

- R (version 3.4.0): pre- and post- processing of data and visualizations
- NONMEM[®] (version 7.3): pop-PK and TTE simulations
- WebPlotDigitizer (version 3.12): digitizing exposure-response (ER) curves





RESULTS

Figure 1. Exposure-Response curves



CONCLUSIONS

- Changes in absorption and PK of NOACs as a result of BIN have a greater impact on the probability of experiencing a major bleeding event than the probability of experiencing an ischemic stroke within 1 year.
- Future work has to be conducted in order to harmonize employed PK/PD indices across NOACs, which would allow for a direct comparison of efficacy and safety predictions.

* Corresponding author's email: SSchmidt@cop.ufl.edu

> The changes in number of stroke events of edoxaban and dabigatran are 5-fold lower respectively, than those of bleeding events. -> These findings show that the impact of BIN is high on bleeding events with steeper exposure-response (ER) curves compared to stroke events that have more shallow ER curves. > We did not test the impact of BIN on efficacy of apixaban and rivaroxaban as there is a shallow ER relationship for these drugs in the FDA reports. > The ER curves from the FDA reports were established using different PK inputs: C_{max} for rivaroxaban, AUC_{ss} for apixaban, C_{ava} and C_{min} for edoxaban, and C_{trough} for dabigatran. Therefore, computed probabilities provide trends but cannot be directly compared to one another.

	PK model	PD model
an	Dansirikul <i>et al</i> . (2012)	Digitized data (FDA NDA)
an	Krekels <i>et al</i> . (2016)	Proportional hazard model with Weibull function (FDA NDA)
ban	Mueck <i>et al</i> . (2008)	Digitized data (FDA NDA)
an	Leil <i>et al</i> . (2014)	Digitized data (FDA NDA)

Acknowledgments & Disclosures

This study was funded by the FDA Office of Generic Drugs (Grant # U01FD005210). The authors would like to acknowledge the FDA for their suggestions and funding this work. The presenting authors have nothing to disclose. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the FDA.



Figure 2. Comparison of risk probabilities

College of Pharmacy UNIVERSITY of FLORIDA