

SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION OF UNDERLYING MODELS THAT **IMPROVE PURELY IN-SILICO HIGH-**THROUGHPUT MECHANISTIC PBPK **PREDICTIONS ACROSS SPECIES**

Jeremy Jones, Rafal Bachorz, David Miller, Michael Lawless, Vladimir Chupakhin, Robert Fraczkiewicz, Simulations Plus

Jeremy.jones@simulations-plus.com

MAIN POINTS

The ability to quickly and accurately predict key PK properties based solely on chemical structure can aid in several tasks:

- Prioritizing HTS hits
- Accelerating drug design/optimization - Triaging environmental chemicals

The high-throughput Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic (HTPK Simulation) module in ADMET Predictor® (AP) achieves this task by integrating a simplified version of the GastroPlus® Advanced Compartmental Absorption and Transit (ACAT) model.





HT-PK produced comparable results to full PBPK modeling but reduced the simulation time from hours to seconds – Roche analysis



Scatter plots comparing AUC_{inf}, C_{max} , and F_{oral} predictions of the back-calculated clearance scaling method using the PBPK module (x-axis) vs the HTPK module (y-axis). Pure *in silico* simulation, no experimental properties required!

Mol Pharm. 2022 Jul 4; 19(7): 2203–2216

Liver microsome clearance (human, rat, mouse) Hepatocyte clearance (human, rat, mouse) NEW: Fraction unbound to hepatocytes - Previous Austin correction still available

Fraction unbound to microsomes Biorelevant solubilities (FaSSIF, FeSSIF) Adipose, brain, gut, heart, kidney, liver, etc.

New route of administration (IR solution) Predict 14 tissue partition coefficients Lipid-adjusted fup returned as output Cp-time curves displayed as total or free conc.

Fup_ Fup_i Fup_r LMCI LMCI LMCI_ HepCl HepCl HepCl Fu_mi FaSSI FeSSI RBP_ RBP RBP

silico predictions Compared to httk results, which used measured fup and CLint values

"This will change the way we discover medicines by bringing PBPK simulations to early drug design and optimization"

ADMET Predictor												Simulate fraction absorbed and bioavailable	¢
VIEW DATA CHE	DATA CHEMISTRY TOOLS DESIGN LIBRARY HELP								Process status:				
୭୯ ୫୫୫୫ ୫୫	ы <mark>й</mark> ь	🗄 🖶 🇞 🗞 🛗 MET -	🕨 🛃 📈 🚮 🛃	y 🔆 🚾	🔨 %F 🖉 🖄 🕅	10 · 10 · 10 · 10	-€ ≰₽₀∢	? ≟ ∣∢ ∢	▶ ▶ 🗖 🗖]			
trols 🔻 🕈 🗙		Structure	Identifier	Geometry	3D Quali *Risks*	*PCB*	ADMET_Ri	ADMET_Co	S+Acidic_pKa	S+Mixed_p	S+Basic_p		
T PINCOL	1		8Y93-Amitriptyli	3D	1.000		4.739	Kow; Vd; hERG; Xm; 2D6	None	None	9.14		
0.00	2		8HFF-norepinep	3D	1.000		2.000	HBD; CL-	12.20	9.71; 8.63	None	Species Rat Human Mouse Dosage form IR Tablet IR Solution IV Bolus	
> • 0.00	3		(S)-Viloxazine	2D	-		5.733	8 hERG-; MUT 1A2; 2C19; 2D6; CL-	None	None	7.94	Dose(s) [mg] Dose_(mg) Number of dose intervals 1 % Absorbed Prefix: %Fa_hum-	
> •	4		8Y92-atomoxeti	3D	1.000		3.573	Kow; hERG; Xm; 2C9; 2D6	None	None	9.65	% Bioavailable Prefix: %Fb_hum- Clearance parameter Type Liver microsomes v uL/min/mg LM v	
> •	5		reboxetine	2D			2.000) 2C19; 2D6	None	None	7.68	Preferred value CYP_HLM_CLint Preferred %unbound <unbound></unbound>	
	6		0	2D	2		1.611	1A2; CL	None	None	None	Fallback value CYP_HLM_CLint Fallback %unbound <unbound> Minimize Advanced Save Run Cancel</unbound>	j
	< Co	mpounds Classes	R Tables	Pairs	Keys							Pop-up windows showing Clearance: liver microso Measured values can rep	g i me ola

New and improved models in AP12

Fraction unbound in plasma (human, rat, mouse) Ratio of blood to plasma (human, rat, mouse)

Model improvements AP11 \rightarrow AP12

	Train/test set size	RMSE (test)	r² (test)
	1986/407→2451/649	1.333→1.098	0.508→0.606
	1264/317→1410/353	1.311→0.920	0.511→0.518
า	1112/292→1128/316	1.287→1.008	0.650→0.663
h	1569/277→3797/774	0.434→0.405	0.645→0.686
r	1431/358→3707/682	0.418→0.412	0.579→0.583
m	1075/269→1138/393	0.448→0.391	0.613→0.591
_h	1193/297→1492/383	0.518→0.393	0.458→0.497
_r	1074/269→1138/393	0.433→0.392	0.483→0.424
_m	218/55→214/71*	0.428→0.429	0.717→0.590
С	100/14→407/75	0.160→0.131	0.878→0.863
F	141/16→214/71	0.527→0.587	0.724→0.722
F	139/18→161/41	0.471→0.502	0.748→0.790
า	163/41→453/114	0.095→0.084	0.446→0.551
~	372/124→558/140	0.116→0.122	0.410→0.340
n	86/22→73/16*	0.113→0.162	0.451→0.501

Subset analysis: environmental chemicals

• Performed HTPK analysis on 45 mostly environmental chemicals (Wambaugh 2018) with known rat Cmax and AUC values Created predicted vs observed plots to ascertain

the accuracy of predictions using **purely in**

 The high throughput toxicokinetics (httk) platform is provided as a freely available R package from the US EPA

Effect of new models on in vivo PK predictions

Created a highly curated "Ground truth" PK dataset PK endpoints: AUCt, AUCinf, Total CL, Cmax, Fb, T1/2, Vd Only use data with a single, specified dose Divide by species (h/r/m) and route of administration

Compare AP11 to AP12



Conclusions:

-- IR solution route improved predictions for oral gavage delivery in rodents







puts into HTPK s or hepatocytes

Sample Cp-time curve showing once daily oral dosing of Amitriptyline over 7 days at 1 or 10 mg

PK dataset: # measured values								
	Fb	AUCinf	AUCt	Cmax	T1/2	CL	Vdss	
Human oral	78	42	27	61	39			
Mouse po	92	59	79	161	116	37		
Rat po	232	197	57	295	63	88		
Human iv						154	156	
Mouse iv						81		
Rat iv			47		103	98		

Swap in one new model at a time or all at once and evaluate metrics

Predicted/Observed plots Boundaries for predictions within 2-fold and 10-fold are displayed as black lines

Effects of individual new models were nearly all minor and somewhat unpredictable: some better, some worse Full combination of new models led to overall modest improvements in PK predictions

-- Although only modest improvements, the chemical space covered by the models increased significantly Future Directions: improve solubility/permeability models, optimize equations, increase size of PK dataset

	% with	in 2-fold	RMSE			
	httk	HTPK	httk	HTPK		
PO-AUCt	23.2%	16.3%	349.4	290.3		
PO-Cmax	11.1%	20.0%	42.5	55.8		
IV-AUCt	21.3%	36.2%	74.6	50.4		
IV-Cmax	38.8%	32.7%	77.8	77.1		

Conclusions:

- HTPK performs well against this small subset of environmental chemicals, but not as well as against the larger set of pharmaceutical compounds
- Outperforms httk in most metrics despite using in silico predictions vs measured
- Compared to other platforms, HTPK has: • More thorough mechanistic input
- Better underlying models Faster calculations
- More comprehensive output and analysis

CASE STUDY: Using HTPK in Early Drug **Discovery for Novel RORyT inverse agonists**

Automating the de novo drug design process: AIDD







Rela (Luc



1.29 μ M (predicted IC₅₀ was 1.28 μ M) and demonstrated activity in human T cells. This compound has an indolazine scaffold that has not yet been reported in the context of RORyT and represents an advanced pre-clinical lead from the very first round of the DMTA cycle.



SLP scientists collaborated with the Polish Academy of Sciences (PAS) to design novel RORyT inverse agonists. RORyT inhibitors have been proposed to treat autoimmune diseases, but current scaffolds have toxicitylimiting utility.

The AI-driven Drug Design (AIDD) module was used to create novel inverse agonists for testing at PAS.

- A QSAR model was built using RORyT inverse agonist data from the literature.
- AIDD optimization parameters used are shown above. • A multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) algorithm was used to rank compounds.
- The most similar commercially-available compounds were purchased from the Enamine REAL and WuXi GalaXi collections.
- These "AIDD-adjacent" molecules were evaluated in cell-based RORy luciferase reporter assays.



RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Despite limiting the universe of compounds to those from synthesis-on-demand collections, we found that 21/27 (78%) of the selected compounds inhibited RORYT activity in a cell-based assay by at least 25% at 10uM. These compounds have great predicted ADMET and PK properties, as these parameters were included in the design and optimization process.

The most potent compound had a measured IC_{50} of



www.simulations-plus.com