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To bear in Remembrance...

Whenever a theory appears to you as the only possible one, take this as a sign that you have neither understood the theory nor the problem which it was intended to solve. *Karl R. Popper*

Even though it’s *applied* science we’re dealin’ with, it still is – *science!* *Leslie Z. Benet*
Guidelines etc.

- Partial AUC (pAUC) in American guidances
  - ‘Early Exposure’
  - Mandatory PK metric if early onset is clinically relevant (effect or AEs) – similar to $t_{\text{max}}$ for EMA
    - US-FDA
      $$\text{AUC}_{t_{\text{max}},\text{ref}} = \text{pAUC truncated at population median } t_{\text{max}} \text{ of the reference}$$
      $$90\% \text{ CI of GMR within 80–125\%}$$
    - Canada-HPFB/TGD
      $$\text{AUC}_{t_{\text{max}},\text{ref}} = \text{pAUC truncated at subject’s } t_{\text{max}} \text{ of the reference}$$
      $$\text{GMR within 80–125\%}$$
Assumptions…

● Main assumptions in the concept of BE
  (1) Similar plasma concentrations →
  (2) Similar concentrations at the effect site →
  (3) Similar clinical efficacy and safety profile.
    If (1) and (2) hold, (3) can be waived →
    BE-study instead of therapeutic equivalence.

● Concept was empirically justified in the last three decades.

● Is it possible that with BE shown for AUC and $C_{max}$ ($t_{max}$) we get therapeutic inequivalence?
Some Doubts...

- Concept of BE was originally developed for IR formulations and later extended to MR
- Seems to ‘work’, but is it also justified for more advanced technologies?
  - Multiphasic formulations (IR + CR parts)
  - Osmotic pumps (OROS®)
  - Pulsatile formulations
  - Targeted delivery
- First doubts with CR methylphenidate → in most patients initial ‘ramp’ required for effect.
Remedies?

- Regulators have already some experience with partial AUCs (‘early exposure’)
- Discriminatory between formulations (which are passing AUC and $C_{\text{max}}$)
- Open questions:
  - Cut-off time point data-driven (like ‘early exposure’) or set a priori?
  - If set in the protocol, how to justify its value?
    - Based on pharmacology (effects)
    - Based on PK (e.g., visible trough between phases)
    - Different cut-offs in fasting/fed state?
Guidelines etc.

- FDA (Zolpidem ER 2009)
  - Truncated AUCs (at a time point based on clinical considerations)
  - First pAUC describes early onset, second pAUC maintenance of levels
    - $\text{AUC}_{0-1.5}$ (~ sleep onset)
    - $\text{AUC}_{1.5-t}$ (~ sleep maintenance)
    - $\text{AUC}_{0-\infty}, C_{\text{max}}$
    - pAUCs only in fasting study

FDA (Office of Generic Drugs, CDER)
Draft Guidance on Zolpidem (August 2009)
# Example Zolpidem

- **FDA (Zolpidem ER 2009)**
  - \( pAUC_{0-1.5} \) might be highly variable; reference-scaling?
    - (EMA’s MR Draft 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>parameter</th>
<th>( C_{max} )</th>
<th>( pAUC_{0-1.5} )</th>
<th>( pAUC_{1.5-t} )</th>
<th>( pAUC_{1.5-\infty} )</th>
<th>( AUC_{0-\infty} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>PE 90% CI</td>
<td>102% 96 – 110%</td>
<td>122% 101 – 146%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>96% 89 – 104%</td>
<td>99 92 – 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV(_{intra})</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>PE 90% CI</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>93% 85 – 103%</td>
<td>113%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV(_{intra})</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Midha KK and G McKay**
*Use of Partial Area Under the Curve for BE Assessment of Products with Complex PK Profiles; a View Point*
*Meeting of the Pharmaceutical Science and Clinical Pharmacology Advisory Committee, April 13, 2010*
*http://www.fda.gov/downloads/AdvisoryCommittees/CommitteesMeetingMaterials/Drugs/AdvisoryCommitteeforPharmaceuticalScienceandClinicalPharmacology/UCM209320.pdf*
Guidelines etc.

- FDA (Methylphenidate SR/ER 2010)
  - In fasting subjects the IR’s $t_{\text{max}}$ is $2 \pm 0.5 \text{ h} (\bar{x} \pm \text{SD})$
  - Two hours is also time at which maximal response compared to placebo is achieved
  - By three hours, expected that 95% of patients should achieve maximal early onset of response (since $\bar{x} + 2\times\text{SD} = 95\%$ of population)
  - Food delays IR absorption by about one hour
  - Truncation time point for pAUC in fed state therefore is $3 + 2\times0.5 \text{ h} = 4 \text{ hours}$

BM Davit
Use of Partial AUC: Case Studies and BE Approaches
Meeting of the Pharmaceutical Science and Clinical Pharmacology Advisory Committee, April 13, 2010

FDA (Office of Generic Drugs, CDER)
Example Methylphenidate

- Various MR formulations on the market
- Hybrid authorizations (PK + clinical data)
- Truncation time-point based on standard dosing interval of IR Ritalin (four hours)
  - Non-inferiority shown in clinical studies
  - Due to high between-subject variability of PK (high first-pass / polymorphism) and variable response dose-titration mandatory
  - Patients may be switched from b.i.d. IR to MR
  - Very low intra-subject CVs of PK metrics
Partial AUCs

Example Methylphenidate

- Approved formulations are *not* interchangeable; mainly differences in \( \text{pAUC}_{0-4} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>study (fed state)</th>
<th>PE (90% CI)</th>
<th>( CV_{\text{intra}} ) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritalin LA vs. Medikinet retard(^1)</td>
<td>80.4% ( 73.2 – 88.2%)</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equasym Retard vs. Medikinet retard(^2)</td>
<td>82.9% ( 72.6 – 94.7%)</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPH MR vs. Concerta(^3)</td>
<td>110.0% (102.1 – 119.3%)</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Haessler F, Tracik F, Dietrich H, Stammer H, and J Klatt**
   - A pharmacokinetic study of two modified-release methylphenidate formulations under different food conditions in healthy volunteers

   - Lack of bioequivalence between two methylphenidate extended modified release formulations in healthy volunteers

3. **A randomized, single-center, open-label, three-way-cross-over pilot study to investigate the comparative bioavailability of two novel methylphenidate sustained-release formulations as compared to Concerta\(^\circledR\) sustained-release tablets after single oral administration in healthy male subjects (2012, unpublished)**

---

Clinical Development Workshop
Prague, 15–16 October, 2013
Example Methylphenidate

- Although bioequivalent, variability of pAUC_{0–4} (CV ≈20%) higher than conventional PK metrics; typical:
  - AUC_{0–t} 7 – 12%
  - C_{max} 10 – 15%

_Fischer R, Schütz H, Grossmann M, Leis HJ, and R Ammer_
_Bioequivalence of a methylphenidate hydrochloride extended-release preparation: comparison of an intact capsule and an opened capsule sprinkled on applesauce_
Example Methylphenidate

- High variability of pAUC$_{0-4}$ reproducible between studies
Guidelines etc.

- EMA Q&A Rev. 4 (Feb. 2012)
  Requirements for demonstration of bioequivalence for generics of biphasic modified release formulations for oral use
  - Phases should be separated through a cut-off time point, which needs to be pre-specified and universally applied to all subjects and for both T and R.
  - [...] this cut-off time point should aim to describe the plasma concentrations in the 1st phase driven by the IR dose fraction whilst avoiding bias through an increasing contribution of the ER phase.
Guidelines etc.

- EMA Q&A Rev. 4 (Feb. 2012)
  - Equivalence needs to be shown for both extent and rate of absorption (reflecting AUC and $C_{\text{max}}$ for conventional bioequivalence criteria), separately for both phases:
    - For the 1\textsuperscript{st} phase, the assessment of equivalence should be based on the truncated AUC from $t=0$ until the cut-off time describing the immediate release dose fraction, and on $C_{\text{max}}$ during the first phase.
    - For the 2\textsuperscript{nd} phase, the assessment of equivalence should be based on the AUC from the cut-off time until the end of observation period, and on $C_{\text{max}}$ during the second phase.
Guidelines etc.

- EMA Q&A Rev. 4 (Feb. 2012)
  - Unambiguously BE of four PK metrics
    - $\text{AUC}_{0-T}$, $\text{AUC}_{T-t}$, $\text{C}_{\text{max},0-T}$, $\text{C}_{\text{max},T-t}$
  - Practically conventional PK metrics still requested
    - $\text{AUC}_{0-t}$, $\text{C}_{\text{max}}$
  - If early onset of clinical importance, additionally
    - $t_{\text{max},0-T}$
  - Consequence: BE of up to seven PK metrics.
    Tough to meet…
  - Q&A does not give suggestions on how to select the cut-off point. Reading tea-leaves: Based on PK?
Guidelines etc.

- EMA MR Draft XXIII (March 2013)
  - Pre-specified truncation time point. Justification?
  - Descriptive up to ten PK metrics (lines 787–792)
    - $\text{AUC}_{0-t}$, $\text{AUC}_{0-\infty}$, $C_{\text{max}}$, $t_{\text{max}}$
    - $\text{AUC}_{0-T}$, $\text{AUC}_{T-t}$, $C_{\text{max},0-T}$, $C_{\text{max},T-t}$, $t_{\text{max},0-T}$, $t_{\text{max},T-t}$
  - Statistical comparison (lines 800–805)
    - $\text{AUC}_{0-t}$, $\text{AUC}_{0-\infty}$, $C_{\text{max}}$, $\text{AUC}_{0-T}$, $\text{AUC}_{T-t}$
    - Conventional acceptance range 80.00–125.00% or widening if $\text{CV}_{WR} > 30\%$ (replicate design)
Pitfalls

- What to do if (due to deviations in sampling) a concentration was not measured at the scheduled truncation time point?
  - Exclude the subject from comparing the affected PK metrics. Easy & stupid.
  - Use an estimate, i.e., interpolate linear in the increasing part or lin/log in the decreasing part of the profile.
    Standard in Phoenix/WinNonlin.
Partial AUCs

Interpolation at cut-off

Clinical Development Workshop
Prague, 15–16 October, 2013
Guidelines etc.

- EMA MR Draft XXIII (March 2013)
  - Waiving of multiple dose studies of prolonged release formulations acceptable if:
    - Low accumulation (single dose $AUC_{0-t} > 90\%$ of mean $AUC_{0-\infty}$ for both test and reference) \textit{and}
    - BE for additional shape parameters demonstrated.

  ‘An early partial AUC and a terminal partial AUC separated by a predefined time point, which is usually the half of the dosage interval are recommended, unless otherwise scientifically justified.’
Partial AUCs

Guidelines etc.

- EMA MR Draft XXIII (March 2013)
  - Waiving of MD studies of PR formulations
    - Depending on the type of formulation pAUCs might not be optimal PK metrics. Not a single publication [sic] about pAUC\(_{0−\tau/2}\) and pAUC\(_{\tau/2−\tau}\).
  - Alternatives
    - Plateau time \(t_{75}\%\) (time interval where \(C \geq 75\%\) of \(C_{\text{max}}\); aka Peak-Occupancy-Time POT-25)
    - Half-Value-Duration HVD (time interval where \(C \geq 50\%\) of \(C_{\text{max}}\); aka Peak-Occupancy-Time POT-50)
    - pAUC of monoexponential PK truncated at the inflection point of the curve \((2\times t_{\text{max}})\)
Partial AUCs

$\text{t}_{75\%} \bullet \text{HVD} \bullet 2 \times t_{\text{max}}$

- Concentration (ng/mL)
- Time (h)
Thank You!
Partial AUCs
Open Questions?
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