Short Communication

Risk Assessment of Mechanism-Based Inactivation in Drug-Drug Interactions

Received May 6, 2012; accepted June 8, 2012

ABSTRACT:

Drug-drug interactions (DDIs) that occur via mechanism-based inactivation of cytochrome P450 are of serious concern. Although several predictive models have been published, early risk assessment of MBIs is still challenging. For reversible inhibitors, the DDI risk categorization using $[I]/K_i$ ($[I]$, the inhibitor concentration; K_i , the inhibition constant) is widely used in drug discovery and development. Although a simple and reliable methodology such as $[I]/K_i$ categorization for reversible inhibitors would be useful for mechanism-based inhibitors (MBIs), comprehensive analysis of an analogous measure reflecting in vitro potency for inactivation has not been reported. The aim of this study was to evaluate whether the term λ/k_{deg} (λ , first-order inactivation rate at a given MBI

concentration; k_{deg} , enzyme degradation rate constant) would be useful in the prediction of the in vivo DDI risk of MBIs. Twenty-one MBIs with both in vivo area under the curve (AUC) change of marker substrates and in vitro inactivation parameters were identified in the literature and analyzed. The results of this analysis show that in vivo DDIs with >2-fold change of object drug AUC can be identified with the cutoff value of $\lambda/k_{deg} = 1$, where unbound steady-state C_{max} is used for inhibitor concentration. However, the use of total C_{max} led to great overprediction of DDI risk. The risk assessment using λ/k_{deg} coupled with unbound C_{max} can be useful for the DDI risk evaluation of MBIs in drug discovery and development.

Introduction

Inhibitory drug-drug interactions (DDIs) are of serious concern in drug development because they can lead to restricted use or withdrawal of drugs from the market (Huang and Lesko, 2004; Wienkers and Heath, 2005). The clinical relevance of mechanism-based inactivators (MBIs) is illustrated by the fact that 24 (19%) of the identified 129 cytochrome P450 (P450) inhibitors on the U.S. market and 38% of the known strong inhibitors are MBIs of P450 enzymes (Isoherranen et al., 2009). Eight (33%) of the 24 MBIs caused strong interactions in vivo. The Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA) recently summarized the industry practices used in inactivation measurements and recommended practical methods for in vitro inactivation assays and for prediction of in vivo DDIs using in vitro data (Grimm et al., 2009). However, as described in the article, although several mathematical models for MBI predictions have been presented, quantitative prediction of in vivo DDIs is still challenging. For reversible inhibitors, the DDI risk categorization using $[I]/K_i$ ($[I]$, the inhibitor concentration; K_i , the inhibition constant) is widely used and accepted in drug discovery and development. For irreversible inhibitors, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) draft guidance for industry of drug interactions studies (released in February 2012; <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/Guidance->

[ComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM292362.pdf](http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/Guidance-ComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM292362.pdf)) recommends calculating an R -value equal to $\{k_{inact} \times [I]/(K_i + [I]) + k_{deg}\}/k_{deg}$ to assess the in vivo DDI risk of MBIs. In this equation, $[I]$ is the inactivator concentration calculated from the total (free and bound) systemic inhibitor concentration, k_{inact} is the maximal inactivation rate, K_i is the inactivator concentration when the rate of inactivation reaches half of k_{inact} , and k_{deg} is the rate constant for enzyme degradation in vivo. If this R -value is >1.1 (or 11 for CYP3A inhibition in the gut), the investigational drug is considered to be a possible P450 inhibitor in vivo and further evaluation is necessary. How well this R -value reflects the magnitude of in vivo DDI risk and whether false positives and false negatives are common has not been reported.

A recent review showed that 13 (42%) of 31 in vitro MBIs were neither moderate nor potent inhibitors in vivo (VandenBrink and Isoherranen, 2010). This suggests that drugs classified as in vitro MBIs do not always cause clinically significant DDIs. In another report of subset of MBIs, relatively accurate predictions of in vivo DDIs were reported (Fahmi et al., 2009). The published methods for quantitative prediction of in vivo DDIs for MBIs are shown in eqs. 1 and 2:

$$\text{predicted } \frac{AUC_i}{AUC} = \frac{CL_{int}}{CL_{int,i}} = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{f_{mCYP}}{1 + \left(\frac{[I] \times k_{inact}}{k_{deg} \times ([I] + K_i)} \right)} \right) + (1 - f_{mCYP})} \quad (1)$$

This work was supported in part by the National Institutes of Health National Institute of General Medical Sciences [Grant P01-GM32165].

Article, publication date, and citation information can be found at <http://dmd.aspetjournals.org>.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1124/dmd.112.046649>.

ABBREVIATIONS: DDI, drug-drug interaction; MBI, mechanism-based inactivator; P450, cytochrome P450; FDA, U.S. Food and Drug Administration; AUC, area under the curve; CL_{int} , intrinsic clearance; f_m , the fraction of total clearance of the drug to which the affected P450 enzyme contributes.

$$\text{predicted } \frac{\text{AUC}_i}{\text{AUC}} = 1 + \frac{\left(\frac{[I] \times k_{\text{inact}}}{[I] + K_i}\right)}{k_{\text{deg}}} = 1 + [\lambda]/k_{\text{deg}} \quad (2)$$

where AUC_i/AUC is the fold increase in probe AUC, $\text{CL}_{\text{int}}/\text{CL}_{\text{int},i}$ is the fold decrease in probe CL_{int} , and λ is the apparent first-order inactivation rate at a given inhibitor concentration (Mayhew et al., 2000; Grimm et al., 2009). Equation 2 assumes that the probe is entirely cleared by a single, inhibited pathway ($f_m = 1$) in the liver, and it is mathematically equal to the R -value used in the FDA draft guidance for predicting inactivation risk for systemic clearance. Equation 2 can also be written as $\text{AUC}_i/\text{AUC} = 1 + \lambda/k_{\text{deg}}$, which is similar to the $\text{AUC}_i/\text{AUC} = 1 + [I]/K_i$ used in risk assessment of reversible inhibitors. The aim of this study was to determine whether the λ/k_{deg} value obtained from in vitro data could be reliably used to identify DDI risk of in vitro MBIs. The correlation between the magnitude of in vivo DDI and the predicted λ/k_{deg} was determined for known in vitro MBIs and the false-positive and false-negative rates were evaluated.

Materials and Methods

Data Collection. The University of Washington Metabolism and Transport Drug Interaction Database (<http://www.druginteractioninfo.org>) was queried to identify known P450 mechanism-based inactivators with K_i and k_{inact} values determined using human liver microsomes or recombinant systems, and to retrieve all reported in vivo interactions for the mechanism-based inactivators extracted. From the resulting list of in vivo interaction studies, those conducted with a known marker substrate (FDA Draft Guidance for Industry, 2012) were selected, and the change in object AUC was recorded. The inhibitor concentrations measured in the interaction study were used if available. For studies that did not measure the plasma concentrations of the inhibitor, literature data using the same dosing regimen were used to obtain steady-state C_{max} values for the inactivator. If data for the inactivator were not available at the dose level used in the in vivo interaction studies, the concentrations were dose-normalized to obtain predicted C_{max} values for the inactivator. The plasma or serum protein binding data for the inactivators were also collected from the literature. If multiple K_i and k_{inact} values for the inactivator were available, the value used for analysis was chosen according to the following criteria: 1) the K_i and k_{inact} were tested using the same probe as that used in the in vivo DDI study, and 2) the study with the lowest microsomal protein concentration was used.

Assessment of the Evaluation Methodology to Predict In Vivo DDI Risk. The steady-state inactivator concentrations and in vitro k_{inact} , K_i , and k_{deg} values were used to compute the λ/k_{deg} values. Both total and unbound C_{max} at steady state were used for inactivator concentrations because total C_{max} is used in the $[I]/K_i$ risk assessment for reversible inhibitors, whereas use of the unbound systemic C_{max} rather than total systemic C_{max} or estimated unbound portal C_{max} yielded the most accurate DDI predictions for MBIs in a previous study (Obach et al., 2007). The reported turnover half-life ($t_{1/2}$) of 36 to 51 h for CYP1A2, 32 h for CYP2B6, 104 h for CYP2C9, 26 h for CYP2C19, 70 h for CYP2D6, and 26 to 79 h for CYP3A4 were used to calculate k_{deg} (1/min) values (Yang et al., 2008). The median values were used for CYP1A2 and CYP3A4. Based on the λ/k_{deg} from eq. (2), the likelihood that a drug will cause in vivo interactions was classified as likely ($\lambda/k_{\text{deg}} > 1$), possible ($1 > \lambda/k_{\text{deg}} > 0.1$), or remote ($0.1 > \lambda/k_{\text{deg}}$), then compared with actual AUC change of object drug.

Results and Discussion

Twenty-one inactivators with complete in vivo and in vitro data were identified, and the λ/k_{deg} values were calculated. Because several inhibitors had multiple DDI studies, a total of 160 in vivo studies were analyzed. Figure 1 shows the correlation between predicted risk (λ/k_{deg}) and the in vivo AUC change for all DDI studies analyzed. The analysis using unbound inhibitor concentrations and all reported in vivo DDI studies is shown in Fig. 1, A and B. The relationship between greatest observed in vivo DDI (the maximal in vivo DDI risk) with a given inhibitor and the predicted λ/k_{deg} with accepted P450 marker probes is shown in Fig. 1, C and D. The in vivo studies and in vitro parameters used

are summarized in Table 1. The DDIs with >2 -fold AUC change of object drugs could be identified using a λ/k_{deg} cutoff value of 1 and unbound inactivator C_{max} (Fig. 1, C and D). The use of total C_{max} in the λ/k_{deg} calculation resulted in exaggerated risk prediction and an increase in the number of false positives (Fig. 1E). These results suggest that unbound C_{max} rather than total C_{max} would be appropriate for DDI risk assessment with MBIs.

This analysis shows the effect of probe sensitivity in observed DDI risk. When all 160 in vivo studies were included, 58 (36%) were categorized into the zone between AUC change <2 -fold and $\lambda/k_{\text{deg}} > 1$. This demonstrates an overprediction of the in vivo risk with many substrates. Some inactivators distributed between the different zones from low to high DDI risk mainly due to different probes used and variable probe sensitivity (Fig. 1B). This is not unexpected, because it is known that the f_m of object drugs as well as the F_g of CYP3A4 substrates are important factors that affect the magnitude of in vivo DDIs. For example, for diltiazem, a 1.5- and 3.8-fold increase in AUC of quinidine ($f_{\text{mCYP3A4}} = 0.76$) and midazolam ($f_{\text{mCYP3A4}} = 0.94$) (Brown et al., 2005), respectively, were observed, despite the fact that dosing regimens in both studies were similar (Backman et al., 1994; Laganière et al., 1996). For paroxetine, a 1.7- and 5.2-fold increase in AUC of imipramine ($f_{\text{mCYP2D6}} = 0.46$) and desipramine ($f_{\text{mCYP2D6}} = 0.88$) (Brown et al., 2005), respectively, were observed (Albers et al., 1996; Alderman et al., 1997). This demonstrates that simple risk analysis does not take into account the effect of multiple clearance pathways, genetic polymorphisms, and polytherapy on the magnitude of the DDIs observed in individual patients.

When the in vivo data were analyzed for individual MBIs using only the largest observed in vivo interactions (Fig. 1, C and D), the portion of data points falling in the zone between AUC change <2 -fold and $\lambda/k_{\text{deg}} > 1$ was decreased [5 of 21 (24%)] but still showed a significant false-positive rate. Using the R -value of 1.1, which is equivalent to a λ/k_{deg} cutoff of >0.1 , the false-positive rate was 38%, demonstrating a significant overprediction of DDI risk even when unbound C_{max} was used. The false positives included the two CYP2B6 MBIs, clopidogrel and ticlopidine. The overprediction with these two MBIs is likely due to low f_m of the probe bupropion by CYP2B6 and the contribution of alternative elimination pathways (reduction to threohydrobupropion and erythrohydrobupropion) (Faucette et al., 2000; Reese et al., 2008). Hence, clopidogrel and ticlopidine are expected to cause more potent DDIs with a higher f_{mCYP2B6} substrate. Indeed, ticlopidine was a weaker MBI for CYP2C19 than CYP2B6 in vitro, but in vivo a 6-fold increase in the AUC of omeprazole (CYP2C19 probe) was observed. Zileuton, which had a λ/k_{deg} value >1 , suggesting a significant DDI risk in vivo, resulted in a weak interaction in vivo (1.92-fold increase in AUC of theophylline). In addition to CYP1A2, theophylline is also cleared by CYP3A4, CYP2E1, and renal clearance, suggesting that use of a higher f_m probe such as caffeine would result in a correct risk categorization. The fact that tadalafil induces CYP3A in vitro (Ring et al., 2005), and most likely in vivo, is a likely reason for overprediction of CYP3A4 inhibition in vivo. The reasons for the overprediction of CYP3A4 DDI risk by amiodarone and fluoxetine are unknown.

In conclusion, the results show that the use of λ/k_{deg} with unbound steady-state C_{max} can be useful for identifying high DDI risk compounds, but this method is not applicable for accurate quantitative prediction. The presented approach does not account for probe f_m by inhibited pathway, gut extraction of the probe, possible simultaneous induction, and competitive inhibition by the inhibitor. Therefore, it is less accurate for predicting DDI magnitude than other existing static methods (Fahmi et al., 2009) or physiologically based modeling. However, the presented method is expected to provide the highest risk

FIG. 1. DDI risk assessment for the identified MBIs. A, all 160 in vivo DDI studies for the 21 inactivators were analyzed using calculated λ/k_{deg} coupled with unbound steady-state C_{max} . B, the relationship between λ/k_{deg} and AUC change for individual inactivators are categorized as shown. The numbers after each MBI indicate the number of in vivo studies conducted within that category. In vivo studies with the most sensitive probes for the inactivated P450 and highest in vivo interactions for the 21 inactivators were analyzed using λ/k_{deg} coupled with unbound steady-state C_{max} (C), and the relationship between λ/k_{deg} and AUC change for individual inactivators is shown for different risk categories in D. E, all 160 in vivo DDI studies for the 21 inactivators were analyzed using λ/k_{deg} coupled with total steady-state C_{max} . A λ/k_{deg} of 1 predicts a 2-fold AUC increase in vivo for an ideal probe substrate.

estimate, in comparison with other methods, for a potential MBI unless significant gut extraction of the object drug exists. More compounds with weak in vivo interactions and known in vitro MBIs need to be identified to determine the false-positive or false-

negative rates of this method. Because this dataset includes the currently known in vivo inhibitors that are MBIs, it would be especially important to obtain data from in vivo DDI studies of compounds in development that are MBIs to further demonstrate

TABLE 1
In vivo and in vitro data used for risk assessment

Inactivator	P450	Inactivator Dose	Object Drug	AUC Change of Object Drug (Observed)	K_1	k_{inact}	λ/k_{deg} Using Total C_{max}	λ/k_{deg} Using Unbound C_{max}	References ^a
					μM	min^{-1}			
Amiodarone	3A4	400 mg, q.d., 4 days	Simvastatin acid	1.8	42	0.02	7.8*	0.3*	Becquemont et al., 2007; Shoaf et al., 2005; Mori et al., 2009
Amprenavir	3A4	1200 mg, b.i.d., 10 days	Rifabutin	2.9	0.3	0.73	3268	2876	Polk et al., 2001; Ernest et al., 2005
Cimetidine	2D6	300 mg, q.i.d., 6 days	Imipramine	2.7	77	0.03	15	12	Wells et al., 1986; Kosoglou et al., 2000; Madeira et al., 2004
Clarithromycin	3A4	500 mg, b.i.d., 9 days	Simvastatin	10	5.5	0.07	133	36	Jacobson, 2004; van Haarst et al., 1998; Mayhew et al., 2000
Clopidogrel	2B6	75 mg, b.i.d., 4 days	Bupropion	1.4	1.4	1.9	78	4.7	Turpeinen et al., 2005; Kim et al., 2008; Walsky and Obach, 2007
Dasatinib	3A4	100 mg, single	Simvastatin	1.2	6.3	0.03	5.8	0.4	Product Label ^b ; Li et al., 2009
Diltiazem	3A4	60 mg, t.i.d., 2 days	Buspirone	5.3	3.7	0.07	37.6	11	Lamberg et al., 1998; Shum et al., 1996; Zhang et al., 2009
Erythromycin	3A4	500 mg, t.i.d., 2 days	Simvastatin	6.2	11	0.05	57.0	12	Kantola et al., 1998; Olkkola et al., 1993; McConnell et al., 2004
Fluoxetine	3A4	20 mg, q.d., 21days	Alprazolam	1.3	5.3	0.02	3.8	0.2	Hall et al., 2003; Harvey and Preskorn, 2001; Mayhew et al., 2000
Isoniazid	3A4	90 mg, b.i.d., 4days	Triazolam	1.5	228	0.08	9.7*	9.7*	Ochs et al., 1983; Dattani et al., 2004; Wen et al., 2002
Mibefradil	3A4	100 mg, single	Midazolam	8.9	2.3	0.40	553	4.0	Veronese et al., 2003; Welker et al., 1998
Nelfinavir	3A4	1250 mg, b.i.d., 14days	Simvastatin	6.1	0.48	0.22	952	77	Hsyu et al., 2001; Fang et al., 2008; Ernest et al., 2005
Paroxetine	2D6	20 mg, q.d., 17days	Atomoxetine	7.1	3.6	0.13	25	1.3	Belle et al., 2002; Perloff et al., 2009
Ritonavir	3A4	600 mg, single	Saquinavir	112	0.038	0.29	1315	913	Hsu et al., 1998; Luo et al., 2003
Rofecoxib	1A2	25 mg, q.d., 4 days	Tizanidine	12	4.8	0.07	44	6.7	Backman et al., 2006; Karjalainen et al., 2006
Saquinavir	3A4	1200 mg, t.i.d., 5 days	Midazolam	5.2	0.2	0.31	1223	102	Palkama et al., 1999; Cook et al., 2004; Ernest et al., 2005
Tadalafil	3A4	20 mg, q.d., 14 days	Lovastatin	1.12	12	0.21	76*	4.9*	Ring et al., 2005; Wrishko et al., 2008
Ticlopidine	2B6	250 mg, b.i.d., 4 days	Bupropion	1.6	0.3	0.43	1067*	174*	Turpeinen et al., 2005; Lu et al., 2006; Walsky and Obach, 2007
Ticlopidine	2C19	200 mg, q.d., 8 days	Omeprazole	6.2	9.2	0.25	108	2.7	Ieiri et al., 2005; Lu et al., 2006; Atkinson et al., 2005
Tienilic acid	2C9	250 mg, q.d., 19 days	(S)-Warfarin	2.9	12.5	0.13	846	30	O'Reilly, 1982; Dubb et al., 1979; Hutzler et al., 2009
Verapamil	3A4	80 mg, t.i.d., 2 days	Simvastatin	4.7	4.6	0.43	195	21	Kantola et al., 1998; Johnson et al., 2001; Wang et al., 2004
Zileuton	1A2	800 mg, b.i.d., 5 days	Theophylline	1.9	117	0.04	16	1.2	Granneman et al., 1995; Lu et al., 2003

* The inactivator concentration was calculated with dose normalization.

^a References for in vivo AUC change, in vivo inactivator concentration (in cases where C_{max} was not measured in the DDI study), and in vitro MBI parameters.

^b http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2011/021986s009s0101bl.pdf.

the utility of this method. This evaluation methodology is simple and could be used in drug discovery and development for risk assessment of MBIs without accounting for probe-specific values such as f_m and gut metabolism.

Departments of Pharmaceutics
(Y.F., N.I.) and Medicinal Chemistry
(K.L.K.), School of Pharmacy, University of
Washington, Seattle, Washington

YASUSHI FUJIOKA
KENT L. KUNZE
NINA ISOHERANEN

Authorship Contributions

Participated in research design: Fujioka, Kunze, and Isoherranen.

Performed data analysis: Fujioka, Kunze, and Isoherranen.

Wrote or contributed to the writing of the manuscript: Fujioka, Kunze, and Isoherranen.

References

- Albers LJ, Reist C, Helmeste D, Vu R, and Tang SW (1996) Paroxetine shifts imipramine metabolism. *Psychiatry Res* **59**:189–196.
- Alderman J, Preskorn SH, Greenblatt DJ, Harrison W, Penenberg D, Allison J, and Chung M (1997) Desipramine pharmacokinetics when coadministered with paroxetine or sertraline in extensive metabolizers. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* **17**:284–291.
- Atkinson A, Kenny JR, and Grime K (2005) Automated assessment of time-dependent inhibition of human cytochrome P450 enzymes using liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry analysis. *Drug Metab Dispos* **33**:1637–1647.
- Backman JT, Karjalainen MJ, Neuvonen M, Laitila J, and Neuvonen PJ (2006) Rofecoxib is a potent inhibitor of cytochrome P450 1A2: studies with tizanidine and caffeine in healthy subjects. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* **62**:345–357.
- Backman JT, Olkkola KT, Aranko K, Himberg JJ, and Neuvonen PJ (1994) Dose of midazolam should be reduced during diltiazem and verapamil treatments. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* **37**:221–225.

- Becquemont L, Neuvonen M, Verstuyft C, Jaillon P, Letierce A, Neuvonen PJ, and Funck-Brentano C (2007) Amiodarone interacts with simvastatin but not with pravastatin disposition kinetics. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **81**:679–684.
- Belle DJ, Ernest CS, Sauer JM, Smith BP, Thomasson HR, and Witcher JW (2002) Effect of potent CYP2D6 inhibition by paroxetine on atomoxetine pharmacokinetics. *J Clin Pharmacol* **42**:1219–1227.
- Brown HS, Ito K, Galetin A, and Houston JB (2005) Prediction of in vivo drug-drug interactions from in vitro data: impact of incorporating parallel pathways of drug elimination and inhibitor absorption rate constant. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* **60**:508–518.
- Cook CS, Berry LM, and Burton E (2004) Prediction of in vivo drug interactions with eplerenone in man from in vitro metabolic inhibition data. *Xenobiotica* **34**:215–228.
- Dattani RG, Harry F, Hutchings AD, and Routledge PA (2004) The effects of acute ethanol intake on isoniazid pharmacokinetics. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* **60**:679–682.
- Dubb JW, Stote RM, Maass AR, Hwang BV, Familiar RG, and Alexander F (1979) Tienilic acid: pharmacokinetics, salicylate interaction and creatinine secretion studies. *Postgrad Med J* **55** (Suppl 3):47–57.
- Ernest CS 2nd, Hall SD, and Jones DR (2005) Mechanism-based inactivation of CYP3A by HIV protease inhibitors. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* **312**:583–591.
- Fahmi OA, Hurst S, Plowchalk D, Cook J, Guo F, Youdim K, Dickens M, Phipps A, Darekar A, Hyland R, et al. (2009) Comparison of different algorithms for predicting clinical drug-drug interactions, based on the use of CYP3A4 in vitro data: predictions of compounds as precipitants of interaction. *Drug Metab Dispos* **37**:1658–1666.
- Fang AF, Damle BD, LaBadie RR, Crownover PH, Hewlett D Jr, and Glue PW (2008) Significant decrease in nelfinavir systemic exposure after omeprazole coadministration in healthy subjects. *Pharmacotherapy* **28**:42–50.
- Faucette SR, Hawke RL, Lecluyse EL, Shord SS, Yan B, Laethem RM, and Lindley CM (2000) Validation of bupropion hydroxylation as a selective marker of human cytochrome P450 2B6 catalytic activity. *Drug Metab Dispos* **28**:1222–1230.
- Granneman GR, Braeckman RA, Locke CS, Cavanaugh JH, Dubé LM, and Awni WM (1995) Effect of zileuton on theophylline pharmacokinetics. *Clin Pharmacokinet* **29** (Suppl 2):77–83.
- Grimm SW, Einolf HJ, Hall SD, He K, Lim HK, Ling KH, Lu C, Nomeir AA, Seibert E, Skordos KW, et al. (2009) The conduct of in vitro studies to address time-dependent inhibition of drug-metabolizing enzymes: a perspective of the pharmaceutical research and manufacturers of America. *Drug Metab Dispos* **37**:1355–1370.
- Hall J, Naranjo CA, Sproule BA, and Hermann N (2003) Pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic evaluation of the inhibition of alprazolam by citalopram and fluoxetine. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* **23**:349–357.
- Harvey AT and Preskorn SH (2001) Fluoxetine pharmacokinetics and effect on CYP2C19 in young and elderly volunteers. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* **21**:161–166.
- Hsu A, Granneman GR, Cao G, Carothers L, el-Shourbagy T, Baroldi P, Erdman K, Brown F, Sun E, and Leonard JM (1998) Pharmacokinetic interactions between two human immunodeficiency virus protease inhibitors, ritonavir and saquinavir. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **63**:453–464.
- Hsyu PH, Schultz-Smith MD, Lillibridge JH, Lewis RH, and Kerr BM (2001) Pharmacokinetic interactions between nelfinavir and 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl coenzyme A reductase inhibitors atorvastatin and simvastatin. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **45**:3445–3450.
- Huang SM and Lesko LJ (2004) Drug-drug, drug-dietary supplement, and drug-citrus fruit and other food interactions: what have we learned? *J Clin Pharmacol* **44**:559–569.
- Hutzler JM, Balogh LM, Zientek M, Kumar V, and Tracy TS (2009) Mechanism-based inactivation of cytochrome P450 2C9 by tienilic acid and (+/-)-suprofen: a comparison of kinetics and probe substrate selection. *Drug Metab Dispos* **37**:59–65.
- Ieiri I, Kimura M, Irie S, Urae A, Otsubo K, and Ishizaki T (2005) Interaction magnitude, pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of ticlopidine in relation to CYP2C19 genotypic status. *Pharmacogenet Genomics* **15**:851–859.
- Isoherranen N, Hachad H, Yeung CK, and Levy RH (2009) Qualitative analysis of the role of metabolites in inhibitory drug-drug interactions: literature evaluation based on the metabolism and transport drug interaction database. *Chem Res Toxicol* **22**:294–298.
- Jacobson TA (2004) Comparative pharmacokinetic interaction profiles of pravastatin, simvastatin, and atorvastatin when coadministered with cytochrome P450 inhibitors. *Am J Cardiol* **94**:1140–1146.
- Johnson BF, Cheng SL, and Venitz J (2001) Transient kinetic and dynamic interactions between verapamil and dofetilide, a class III antiarrhythmic. *J Clin Pharmacol* **41**:1248–1256.
- Kantola T, Kivistö KT, and Neuvonen PJ (1998) Erythromycin and verapamil considerably increase serum simvastatin and simvastatin acid concentrations. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **64**:177–182.
- Karjalainen MJ, Neuvonen PJ, and Backman JT (2006) Rofecoxib is a potent, metabolism-dependent inhibitor of CYP1A2: implications for in vitro prediction of drug interactions. *Drug Metab Dispos* **34**:2091–2096.
- Kim KA, Park PW, Hong SJ, and Park JY (2008) The effect of CYP2C19 polymorphism on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of clopidogrel: a possible mechanism for clopidogrel resistance. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **84**:236–242.
- Kosoglou T, Salfi M, Lim JM, Batra VK, Cayen MN, and Affrime MB (2000) Evaluation of the pharmacokinetics and electrocardiographic pharmacodynamics of loratadine with concomitant administration of ketoconazole or cimetidine. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* **50**:581–589.
- Laganière S, Davies RF, Carignan G, Foris K, Goernert L, Carrier K, Pereira C, and McGilveray I (1996) Pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic interactions between diltiazem and quiniidine. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **60**:255–264.
- Lamberg TS, Kivistö KT, and Neuvonen PJ (1998) Effects of verapamil and diltiazem on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of buspirone. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **63**:640–645.
- Li X, He Y, Ruiz CH, Koenig M, Cameron MD, and Vojtkovsky T (2009) Characterization of dasatinib and its structural analogs as CYP3A4 mechanism-based inactivators and the proposed bioactivation pathways. *Drug Metab Dispos* **37**:1242–1250.
- Lu P, Schrag ML, Slaughter DE, Raab CE, Shou M, and Rodrigues AD (2003) Mechanism-based inhibition of human liver microsomal cytochrome P450 1A2 by zileuton, a 5-lipoxygenase inhibitor. *Drug Metab Dispos* **31**:1352–1360.
- Lu WJ, Huang JD, and Lai ML (2006) The effects of ergoloid mesylates and ginkgo biloba on the pharmacokinetics of ticlopidine. *J Clin Pharmacol* **46**:628–634.
- Luo G, Lin J, Fiske WD, Dai R, Yang TJ, Kim S, Sinz M, LeCluyse E, Solon E, Brennan JM, et al. (2003) Concurrent induction and mechanism-based inactivation of CYP3A4 by an L-valinamide derivative. *Drug Metab Dispos* **31**:1170–1175.
- Madeira M, Levine M, Chang TK, Mirfazaalian A, and Bellward GD (2004) The effect of cimetidine on dextromethorphan O-demethylase activity of human liver microsomes and recombinant CYP2D6. *Drug Metab Dispos* **32**:460–467.
- Mayhew BS, Jones DR, and Hall SD (2000) An in vitro model for predicting in vivo inhibition of cytochrome P450 3A4 by metabolic intermediate complex formation. *Drug Metab Dispos* **28**:1031–1037.
- McConn DJ 2nd, Lin YS, Allen K, Kunze KL, and Thummel KE (2004) Differences in the inhibition of cytochromes P450 3A4 and 3A5 by metabolite-inhibitor complex-forming drugs. *Drug Metab Dispos* **32**:1083–1091.
- Mori K, Hashimoto H, Takatsu H, Tsuda-Tsukimoto M, and Kume T (2009) Cocktail-substrate assay system for mechanism-based inhibition of CYP2C9, CYP2D6, and CYP3A using human liver microsomes at an early stage of drug development. *Xenobiotica* **39**:415–422.
- Obach RS, Walsky RL, and Venkatakrishnan K (2007) Mechanism-based inactivation of human cytochrome P450 enzymes and the prediction of drug-drug interactions. *Drug Metab Dispos* **35**:246–255.
- Ochs HR, Greenblatt DJ, and Knüchel M (1983) Differential effect of isoniazid on triazolam oxidation and oxazepam conjugation. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* **16**:743–746.
- Olkkola KT, Aranko K, Luurila H, Hiller A, Saarnivaara L, Himberg JJ, and Neuvonen PJ (1993) A potentially hazardous interaction between erythromycin and midazolam. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **53**:298–305.
- O'Reilly RA (1982) Ticrynafen-racemic warfarin interaction: hepatotoxic or stereoselective? *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **32**:356–361.
- Palkama VJ, Ahonen J, Neuvonen PJ, and Olkkola KT (1999) Effect of saquinavir on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of oral and intravenous midazolam. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **66**:33–39.
- Perloff ES, Mason AK, Dehal SS, Blanchard AP, Morgan L, Ho T, Dandaneau A, Crocker RM, Chandler CM, Boily N, et al. (2009) Validation of cytochrome P450 time-dependent inhibition assays: a two-time point IC50 shift approach facilitates kinetic assay design. *Xenobiotica* **39**:99–112.
- Polk RE, Brophy DF, Israel DS, Patron R, Sadler BM, Chittick GE, Symonds WT, Lou Y, Kristoff D, and Stein DS (2001) Pharmacokinetic interaction between amprenavir and rifabutin or rifampin in healthy males. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **45**:502–508.
- Reese MJ, Wurm RM, Muir KT, Generaux GT, St John-Williams L, and McConn DJ (2008) An in vitro mechanistic study to elucidate the desipramine/bupropion clinical drug-drug interaction. *Drug Metab Dispos* **36**:1198–1201.
- Ring BJ, Patterson BE, Mitchell MI, Vandenbranden M, Gillespie J, Bedding AW, Jewell H, Payne CD, Forge ST, Eckstein J, et al. (2005) Effect of tadalafil on cytochrome P450 3A4-mediated clearance: studies in vitro and in vivo. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **77**:63–75.
- Shoaf SE, Elizari MV, Wang Z, Sekar K, Grinfeld LR, Barbagelata NA, Lerman J, Bramer SL, Trongé J, and Orlandi C (2005) Tolvaptan administration does not affect steady state amiodarone concentrations in patients with cardiac arrhythmias. *J Cardiovasc Pharmacol Ther* **10**:165–171.
- Shum L, Pieniaszek HJ Jr, Robinson CA, Davidson AF, Widner PJ, Benedek IH, and Flamenbaum W (1996) Pharmacokinetic interactions of moricizine and diltiazem in healthy volunteers. *J Clin Pharmacol* **36**:1161–1168.
- Turpeinen M, Tolonen A, Uusitalo J, Jalonen J, Pelkonen O, and Laine K (2005) Effect of clopidogrel and ticlopidine on cytochrome P450 2B6 activity as measured by bupropion hydroxylation. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **77**:553–559.
- VandenBrink BM and Isoherranen N (2010) The role of metabolites in predicting drug-drug interactions: focus on irreversible cytochrome P450 inhibition. *Curr Opin Drug Discov Devel* **13**:66–77.
- van Haarst AD, van 't Klooster GA, van Gerven JM, Schoemaker RC, van Oene JC, Burggraaf J, Coene MC, and Cohen AF (1998) The influence of cispripide and clarithromycin on QT intervals in healthy volunteers. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **64**:542–546.
- Veronese ML, Gillen LP, Dorval EP, Hauck WW, Waldman SA, and Greenberg HE (2003) Effect of mibefradil on CYP3A4 in vivo. *J Clin Pharmacol* **43**:1091–1100.
- Walsky RL and Obach RS (2007) A comparison of 2-phenyl-2-(1-piperidinyl)propane (ppp), 1,1',1''-phosphinothioylidynetrisaziridine (thioTEPA), clopidogrel, and ticlopidine as selective inactivators of human cytochrome P450 2B6. *Drug Metab Dispos* **35**:2053–2059.
- Wang YH, Jones DR, and Hall SD (2004) Prediction of cytochrome P450 3A inhibition by verapamil enantiomers and their metabolites. *Drug Metab Dispos* **32**:259–266.
- Welker HA, Wiltshire H, and Bullingham R (1998) Clinical pharmacokinetics of mibefradil. *Clin Pharmacokinet* **35**:405–423.
- Wells BG, Pieper JA, Self TH, Stewart CF, Waldon SL, Bobo L, and Warner C (1986) The effect of ranitidine and cimetidine on imipramine disposition. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* **31**:285–290.
- Wen X, Wang JS, Neuvonen PJ, and Backman JT (2002) Isoniazid is a mechanism-based inhibitor of cytochrome P450 1A2, 2A6, 2C19 and 3A4 isoforms in human liver microsomes. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* **57**:799–804.
- Wienkers LC and Heath TG (2005) Predicting in vivo drug interactions from in vitro drug discovery data. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* **4**:825–833.
- Wrishko RE, Dingemans J, Yu A, Darstein C, Phillips DL, and Mitchell MI (2008) Pharmacokinetic interaction between tadalafil and bosentan in healthy male subjects. *J Clin Pharmacol* **48**:610–618.
- Yang J, Liao M, Shou M, Jamei M, Yeo KR, Tucker GT, and Rostami-Hodjegan A (2008) Cytochrome P450 turnover: regulation of synthesis and degradation, methods for determining rates, and implications for the prediction of drug interactions. *Curr Drug Metab* **9**:384–394.
- Zhang X, Jones DR, and Hall SD (2009) Prediction of the effect of erythromycin, diltiazem, and their metabolites, alone and in combination, on CYP3A4 inhibition. *Drug Metab Dispos* **37**:150–160.

Address correspondence to: Dr. Nina Isoherranen, Department of Pharmaceutics, School of Pharmacy, University of Washington, Box 357610, H272 Health Science Building, Seattle, WA 98195-7610. E-mail: ni2@u.washington.edu