In Vitro Testing - Predictive of in vivo performance of OIDPs?

Günther Hochhaus, Ph.D., University of Florida





Pulmonary Delivery is rather Complex



First-pass inactivation



- What is the dose available to the lung?
- What is the regional distribution of the deposited dose?
- How long does the drug stay in the lung?
- What is the systemic exposure?

Current FDA Recommendation



• Alternative approaches are needed

- In vitro studies
- Pharmacokinetic studies for assessing lung equivalence

- expensive, risky,
- Can often not differentiate between doses

Bioequivalence: What needs to be shown?

- Same dose available, deposited Ex throat dose ; ISM ? PK
- Same regional deposition
- Same post-deposition fate
 - **Dis**solution

Cascade impactor ? - PK ?

Dissolution Tests 💡 - PK

• Post-diss8^llution factors (not relevant?) Cell culture ²/₇ - PK

 $\begin{array}{|||} \\ \hline \\ central \\ \hline \\ peripheral \\ \hline \\ \\ \end{array}$

Dose

More central deposition:

- Mucociliary clearance: Lung dose \downarrow : AUC \downarrow , Cmac \downarrow
- Thicker membranes: ka \downarrow : Cmac \downarrow

FDA DPI Contract: Formulation Work

(Dr. Jag Shur, Robert Price, Univ of Bath)

Three formulations only differing in lactose fines (MMAD)

Product Name	Formulation (% w/w)	Lot Number	
Fluticasone Propionate DPI (Active)	FP: 0.80		
	Respitose SV003: 96.72	C-3.7µm	
	Lactohale LH300: 2.48		
Fluticasone Propionate DPI (Active)	FP: 0.80		
	Respitose SV003: 79.36	A-4.5μm	
	Lactohale LH201: 19.84		
Fluticasone Propionate DPI (Active)	FP: 0.80		
	Respitose SV003: 89.28	B-3.8μm	
	Lactohale LH230: 9.92		

Goal of study: Can PK detect differences in regional deposition?



PK Study Design

- 4-way, cross-over, double blind (24 subjects)
- Dose: 5 * 100 μg
- Non-compartmental Analysis
- Compartmental Analysis (population-PK)
- PBPK based evaluation of popPK results





Relevant in vitro Studies

- Pulmonary Dose
 - Anatomical throats
- Regional Deposition
 - Standard USP ACI/NGI studies
 - Anatomical throats/cascade impactor studies
- Absorption Rates
 - Dissolution Rates

Relevant in vitro Studies

- Pulmonary Dose
 - Anatomical throats
- Regional Deposition
 - Standard USP ACI/NGI studies
 - Anatomical throats/cascade impactor studies
- Absorption Rates
 - Dissolution Rates

Lung Dose: in vitro



Lung deposition: in vitro/in vivo



Further validation necessary

Comparison of 3 Throats





LD differs Rank order differs

Mike Hindle, VCU

In vitro/ in vivo Correlations

AUC_{0-inf} vs Ex-throat dose (ug)



Dissolution

In vitro methods: Dissolution rate and in vivo absorption rates



C-3.7 μm

MDT

10.3 hrs

MAT (PK) vs MDT



Correlation between MDT and MAT



Correlation between MDT and MAT seems to exist

Regional Deposition

• NGI/Preludium

• CFD



• PK





	c/p	KaC	kaP
		h ⁻¹	h ⁻¹
A-4.5	0.84	0.065	0.52
B-3.8	0.60	0.082	1.1
C-3.7	0.59	0.084	1.11

Relationship between NGI based c/p ratios (using NCRP) with popPK based estimates.





Is C_{max} sensitive to c/p ratio?



Summary

- In vitro method can provide information
 - Lung Dose
 - Dissolution
 - C/p
- PK is sensitive to: Dose, absorption rate, regional deposition
 - More work is necessary
- PK + in vitro provides "sufficient" detail on pulmonary fate of lipophilic corticosteroid (FP)

Study teams



UF Team

Guenther Hochhaus, Ph.D. Jürgen Bulitta, Ph.D. Mong-Jen Chen, Ph.D. Yuanyuan Jiao, Ph.D. Uta Schilling, Ph.D. Sharvari Bhagwat, Ph.D. Abhinav Kurumaddali

UF Team

Sandra Baumstein, Pharm.D Brandon Seay, MD Mutasim N Abu Hasan, MD Jie Shao D. Elham Amini, Pharm. D. Ann Ross, MHA

FDA Team

Denise Conti, Ph.D. Renish Delvadia, Ph.D. Minori Kinjo, Ph.D. Bavna Saluja, Ph.D. Murewa Oguntimein Funding: HHSF223201110117A, HHSF223201610099C, HHSF223201300479A (DPI),

<u>UB</u>

Jag Shur, Ph.D. Robert Price, Ph.D.

VCU Mike Hindle, Ph.D.

Xiangyin Wei, Ph.D.