

A mechanism-based model for the population pharmacokinetics of aflibercept in healthy subjects

H.T. Thai ^(1,2), C. Veyrat-Follet ⁽²⁾, N. Vivier ⁽²⁾, C. Dubruc ⁽²⁾, G. Sanderink ⁽²⁾ E. Comets ⁽¹⁾, F. Mentré ⁽¹⁾



⁽¹⁾ INSERM U738, University Denis Diderot Paris 7, Paris, France ⁽²⁾ Global Metabolism and Pharmacokinetics Department, Sanofi-aventis, Paris, France



Introduction

•Aflibercept, a novel antiangiogenic agent that binds to the vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), has been investigated for the treatment of cancer $^{\rm 1.2}$

• Aflibercept is a fusion protein of human VEGF receptor domains and a Fc fragment, and has therefore a higher affinity for VEGF than current anti-VEGF monoclonal antibodies

•Noncompartmental analysis from phase I studies has demonstrated that allibercept has a low volume of distribution and a dose-dependent clearance

•This population pharmacokinetic study was conducted to further understand its nonlinear pharmacokinetic properties in healthy subjects

Objectives

•to develop a mechanism-based pharmacokinetic model for aflibercept in healthy subjects

•to characterize its nonlinear disposition and its binding to VEGF

Methods

Study design & blood samples

•The data were collected from two phase I, single dose studies

Study	Description	Blood samples		
1	placebo-controlled, sequential ascending dose study, 48 subjects divided in 4 groups (placebo, dose of 1, 2 or 4 mg/kg), 1h-iv infusion	predose, 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 24 h post-start of infusion on day 1, thereafter 2h post-start of infusion on days 8, 15, 22, 29, 36 and 43		
2	open-label, single-dose, crossover study (sc vs.1h-iv infusion), two groups of 20 subjects, dose of 2 mg/kg	predose, 1, 2, 4, 6, 8h post-start of administration on day 1, thereafter 2h post-start of administration on days 2, 3, 5, 8, 15, 29 and 43 of each period		

• Free aflibercept and bound aflibercept (VEGF-aflibercept complex) plasma concentrations were measured in all collected samples by Elisa method (LOQ =15.6 ng/mL & 43.9 ng/mL for free and bound aflibercept, respectively)

Data management

 \bullet 36 subjects receiving treatment from study 1 and 20 subjects receiving IV infusions at the first period from study 2 were included in the analysis

•All concentrations recorded as being below quantification limit (BQL) were taken into account in the analysis

•The concentrations of bound aflibercept were expressed as equivalent concentrations of aflibercept

Modeling strategy

•Free aflibercept concentration-time data were first modeled alone, then bound aflibercept concentration-time data were included to develop the joint model

Population PK analysis

•The population PK analysis was performed using MONOLIX Version 3.1 with SAEM algorithm Model control files were written using MLXTRAN

Pharmacostatistical model

Interindividual variability: exponential model

•Residual variability: additive, proportional, combined error model

Model selection criteria

• For nested models: log likelihood ratio test

- •For non-nested models: smaller BIC
- Model evaluation

•Goodness of fit plots, SE of parameters and VPC

Figure 1, Proposed models for free and bound aflibercept

Central nonlinear binding



The differential equations describing the peripheral nonlinear binding are shown below



Peripheral nonlinear binding

Central volume of distribution of free aflibercept (L) Peripheral volume of distribution of free dilbercept [L] Peripheral volume of distribution of bound affibercept [L] Volume of distribution of bound affibercept [L] ..., Maximum binding capacity (mg/day) Concentration of free affibercept corresponding to half

 K_m : Concernment of the call of V_{max} (µg/mL) k_{gi} ; First order elimination rate constant of free aflibercept

 k_{ai}^{-} inits order elimination rate constant or free aniloerc from central compartment (day⁻¹) k_{ip}, k_{pi} . First order rate constants between central and peripheral compartment (day⁻¹) k_{ip} . First order rate constant of bound aflibercept internalization (day⁻¹)

Results

Data

- •1476 concentrations from 56 subjects were available for model development
 - 732 concentrations of free aflibercept • 744 concentrations of bound aflibercept (BQL data=32.5%)
- Final population pharmacokinetic model •Structural model: A three-compartment model with a Michaelis-Menten type binding to
- VEGF from the peripheral compartment (peripheral nonlinear binding)
 - Inspired from Michaelis-Menten approximation of TMDD model 3.4
 - •The first-order dissociation rate constant (k_{off}) was assumed to be negligible
 - ${}^{\bullet}V_{\rm b}$ was fixed to the mean value of $V_{\rm p}$ due to problem of identifiability

•The clearance of bound aflibercept was found 6.4 times lower than that of free aflibercept from the central compartment (0.14 L/day and 0.88 L/day, respectively)

Table 1. Parameter estimates for final model

Fixed effects		effects	Interindividual variability	Residual variability			
	Parameter	Estimate (CV)	ω (%) (CV)		$\sigma_a(\mu g/mL)$ (CV)	σ _p (%) (CV)	
	CL (L/day)	0.88 (4.0)	28.0 (10)	Free	0.05 (9.0)	17.1(3.0)	
	V _p (L)	4.94 (4.0)	27.3 (10)	Bound	-	12.6 (4.0)	
	Q (Ĺ/day)	1.39 (9.0)	49.8 (14)				
	V _t (L)	2.23 (7.0)	39.8 (14)				
	V _b (L)	4.94 (=V _p)	-				
	V _{max} (mg/day)	0.99 (5.0)	13.6 (17)				
	K _m (µg/mL)	2.91 (11)	45.6 (14)				
	k. (dav ⁻¹)	0.028 (5.0)	-				

CL: Clearance of free aflibercept from central compartment (CL=k_e*V_p) Q: Intercompartment clearance of free aflibercept (Q=k_{1p}*V₁=k_p*V_p)

Figure 2. Diagnostic plots



Figure 3. Visual predictive check



Conclusions

•The present pharmacokinetic model for aflibercept clearly characterizes the underlying mechanism of disposition of aflibercept and its nonlinear binding to VEGF

•The availability of free and bound aflibercept concentration data has an important role in defining the model structure

This model provides an useful support for further studies in clinical development

References

- Chu QS. Expert Opinion on Biological Therapy 2009 ; 9: 263-271. Holash J et al. PNAS 2002; 99(17); 11393-11398. Gibiansky L et al. J Pharmacokinet Pharmacodyn 2008; 35:573-591. Mager DE, Jusko WJ. J Pharmacokinet Pharmacodyn 2001; 28(6): 507-530. 3