

Welcome to this segment of the NIH principles of clinical pharmacology course  
recent lectures that you have listened to

My title is I'm Lionel Lewis

I'm a professor of pharmacology and medicine in Dartmouth Medical School

My title is Victims and Perpetrators in Therapeutics

What I want to do today is discuss with you in analyzing detail a clinical case where  
there has been a victim and a perpetrator of an adverse outcome in a patient in an unexpected  
clinical scenario

Lets get into the clinical case in detail and I'll summarize it for you

The case is that of a year-old Caucasian male

The gentleman had been diagnosed some months previously with colon cancer  
And this was now metastatic widely metastatic to his lungs and several lesions in his liver

During this period the patient had received a number of chemotherapeutic regimens

Namely he had the SALZ regimen which is Irinotecan FULeucovorin

He also received capecitabine which is oral FU oxaliplatin oral topotecan and lapatinib

And unfortunately the patient had progressed through all of these treatments

And at this point in his disease he was now not able because there wasn't to have any  
additional therapy and standard of care

So he was considered for a phase I study of a novel compound under an IND

And he was found to be eligible for this study and wanted to participate

The study was of an anti-inhibitor of apoptosis drug which means that the drug itself promotes  
apoptosis

And he was evaluated screened and entered the study

Of note his general health was pretty good

His laboratory testing of his hematological and metabolic profiles were normal particularly

his liver function tests

And at the time of entry into the study he was taking warfarin six milligrams alternating seven milligrams alternate days for a prior deep venous thrombosis that was diagnosed some three months before but remained on therapy because of the risk of further thromboembolic disease

His other therapy was that of one multivitamin tablet a day  
And I should add that he was taking no other over the counter medications and no nutraceuticals

And there was no history or evidence of recreational drug use

He was a nonsmoker and didn't partake of ethanol

But prior to entering into the study because the novel drug is given intravenously it was decided that he needed a port catheter a central catheter for the administration of the infusion

To do this perioperatively around it he required his warfarin dose to be reduced so that he would reduce the risk of hemorrhage  
And he subsequently entered the study to receive the new drug on a daily basis 0 milligrams per meters squared every day for seven days

At that point as you can see in this slide his INR was just subtherapeutic

And he was on four milligrams a day of warfarin

And during the period illustrated by the red bar he received the daily therapy of the novel agent

And his INR climbed into the therapeutic range and he subsequently remained on four milligrams per day of warfarin

At the end of the seven days treatment he was then discharged and he subsequently was followed in the clinic with a day break before he would enter the second cycle of treatment with a new agent

As you can see in the slide now on admission his INR was in the therapeutic range four

milligrams per day

But over a period of days when he was receiving the daily novel administration of the novel anti-inhibitor of apoptosis drug his INR escalated way out of the range in fact into

the severely elevated range of about

At this point we stopped his warfarin and we instituted some therapy and luckily for us there were no adverse events

There was no hemorrhage

He remained in-house in hospital and we were able to carefully monitor his INR as it dropped back into the therapeutic range on no warfarin

At the end of the investigational drug infusion she was discharged home and we reestablished his INR and warfarin dose as you can see in the graphic

So at this point I want to pose to you some questions as to what actually we did and what was the appropriate therapy to give this patient to mitigate and reduce the risk of serious hemorrhagic events

And as you can see on this slide I've done it as a multiple choice question

And the options I want to pose to you are the following: did we give him plasma protein fraction?

Did we give him phytonadione?

Did we give him idarucizumab?

Did we give him andexanet alfa?

Or did we give him recombinant factor VII?

I'm going to pause at this point for about 0 to 0 seconds to give you a chance to think about your answers and then we'll go through the possible answers in some detail and inform you which was the most appropriate therapeutic action that we undertook in this case. So hopefully you've collected your thoughts and you've come to a recommendation of which of these options is the most appropriate way to go.

Lets deal with them one by one

Plasma protein fraction in this situation doesn't contain the right components and would not be an option one would consider

Idarucizumab which is option C is actually a Fab monoclonal antibody targeted against dabigatran that is a thrombin inhibitor

And because the patient wasn't on a thrombin inhibitor would be an inappropriate therapy

Andexanet alfa is a full monoclonal antibody targeting the oral the novel oral antiXa agent such as apixaban rivaroxaban or edoxaban

And again because he wasn't on those drugs it would not be an appropriate therapy

I should add that option C and D are intravenous and are very expensive

Option E is recombinant factor VII which can be used in severe cases of hypocoagulable states where patients are developing severe hemorrhagic complications

In this case because the patient was an inpatient was monitored carefully and did not develop any signs of hemorrhage blood loss or volume loss we were able in fact to treat him with phytomenadione which is vitamin K

Phytomenadione is available as both an oral and an intravenous formulation

And currently the standards are to prefer the oral formulation to reduce the risk of allergic or anaphylactic reactions to the intravenous formulation

And indeed the studies show that oral formulation administration several times a day produces a time course of reduction in the INR that is acceptable and safe

So this is the patient's third cycle

And as you can see here as an outpatient he was maintained on six milligrams of warfarin per day as illustrated by the solid circles

And his INR on admission was just above the therapeutic range somewhere around three and a half

We started the treatment as indicated in the red bar and once again over a period

of a very short time only a matter of days there was an elevation in the INR which we then spotted early and stopped his warfarin and subsequently his INR dropped back from over six down into the therapeutic range

This to us represented a case where we rechallenged the drugs together and we found that there was a further abnormal and worrying elevation in the INR

So one thing I want to address with you guys at this point how do you address whether this was an adverse drug reaction?

And there are many strategies to do this

I would take you back to some simple questions and criteria one can think about that will give you an evaluation of the likelihood of whether this was an adverse drug reaction or not

As you can see in this slide the criteria questions you ask are the following and these are the Naranjo Criteria: does the timeframe fit which means are the drugs given at the same time?

And did the adverse outcome occur in a frame which you would expect?

Has it been reported before?

The problem here is that with a drug such as an under IND it's unlikely to be a literature that's in the public domain

And therefore reports of this are unlikely to be known

And of course in a drug which is still in investigation and in phase one first in man there is very little data

Have other causes ruled out?

Well in this situation the patient was an inpatient

We evaluated his liver function his renal function and his hematological function which remained stable and his platelets were normal

His LFTs were normal

We had no evidence of sepsis

We felt that this was other causes has been ruled out

And we were focused on the fact that there may be a drug-drug interaction here

Does it resolve when dechallenged?

Well when we stopped giving him the novel compound and reduced his warfarin and restarted

his warfarin we were able to reestablish anticoagulation at normal doses for him

And then on cycle three as the previous slides have demonstrated when we rechallenged the

patient on warfarin with a third dose a third cycle dosing of the novel compound

we saw that once again we ran into problems with an elevation of the INR

So if you score these criteria from not it doesn't occur it is not applicable to

two it is truly applicable you can see on this slide that for the first criterion yes

its time frame fitted

We did not have reports

Yes we ruled out other causes

We did have resolution on dechallenge

And we also had recurrence on rechallenge

And this gives us a score of eight out of 10 which means there's a highly probable

adverse drug reaction in this case

So thinking more mechanistically I'd like to pose you a few additional questions on

the likely mechanism of this drug-drug interaction

And here I'm asking which proteins do you think are dysfunctional in this drug-drug

interaction?

Is it factor one factor eight CYP2C9 CYP2C19 or CYP3A4?

I'll give you a few seconds to think about this and then we'll discuss the options on

which is the correct response

So once again I hope you've had enough time to thoughtfully go through the options

Factor one is fibrinogen and therefore really not applicable

Factor eight is not involved in the intrinsic pathway

A and A are not really involved in the drug metabolism of warfarin

And the drug itself the anti-ILP agent is predominantly renal excreted without very much hepatic metabolism

So C9 is not involved

And the correct answer is CYP2C9

So CYP2C9 really is the CYP that is involved in metabolizing the S stereoisomer of warfarin

So here you can I want to just review with you quickly some of which you've heard

in the recent lecture about what do CYPs do

And here you can see on this slide a rotating video of CYP2C9

The important thing about it is the heme protein

It's a monooxygenase

It's found in the endoplasmic reticulum

And it has multiple binding sites at the center of which is a heme center with a ferric ion

And this is pivotal to the action of these agents which are effectively oxidoreductases

And they therefore convert and add oxygen with the removal of an electron from a chemical entity to make it more polar

Many of you will be aware as shown in this part of the slide that the dominant CYP in

drug metabolism is CYP2C9 with about 20 percent drug metabolism CYP3A4 about

10 CYP2C9 about high teens and less effects with CYP2C9 et cetera

And many of you have seen this pie chart before

And this next part of the slide just shows the actual chemical processes that are undertaken by the CYP where it acts the P450 acts via its heme center to take away an electron

And subsequently with the reductase adding oxygen and subsequently make the chemical molarity more polar and more easily excreted

So to remind ourselves about warfarin metabolism which I think is important here this next slide shows that warfarin is a racemic mixture of the R and S enantiomers. Predominantly in a 1:1 proportion the S-warfarin is the most potent as its target and inhibits vitamin K epoxide reductase.

And in so doing by inhibiting the epoxide reductase it compromises the ability to change oxidized vitamin K to reduce vitamin K. And by blocking this action it subsequently limits the ability of gamma glutamyl carboxylase to carboxylate the hypofunctional coagulation factors two, seven, nine and ten.

And therefore you get a hypocoagulable state because these coagulation factors are not activated and functional.

Many of you would be aware from your knowledge and prior lectures that there are multiple variants of CYP2C9.

And this subdiagram shows that the wild type has a higher activity than the star three star three which has a much lower activity.

And there's also a [unintelligible] type variability in the activity of the vitamin K epoxide reductase. Importantly these two genetic tests, these two genetic variants have been brought together in some guidances around how you might use testing for them to specifically enhance our ability to therapeutically prescribe and appropriately use warfarin.

So what PGx tests could be informative here?

And in light of my prior in the prior scribble I'm going to run through this rather quickly.

The options I put forward in a multiple choice format are: CYP2A factor one, A factor eight, AC, BCYP2C9, CYP2C9D, CYP2C9VKORC or CYP2D and factor seven.

And of course based on my prior discussion of warfarin metabolism and its target and the genetic variability in the CYP metabolism and the variability in the target the correct answer of course is CYP2C9VKORC testing.

We actually did this on our patient.



And it is no surprise based on the dosing that he was on remember alternating six milligrams and seven milligrams alternate days his CYP2C9 was wild type was a heterozygous wild type and star two

And his VKORC1 was wild type which means she had a fairly standard dose of warfarin to give him his normal anticoagulant control

We did this in retrospect because we felt it was important to complete the workup on this patient

As is the case and in the next slide to remind us all that it is very important to report all adverse drug reactions to the FDA particularly in the context of a drug that is under investigation in an IND situation where it is early in its clinical development But also for drugs that are already on the market that have recently been approved or older drugs that have been approved for sometime where there is a significantly unusual reaction

And this we do using the MedWatch form that is shown in this slide

So before I finish I want to I was rather humble and always am by this statement by Paracelsus in the late 15th and early 16th century that says All substances are poisonous

There is none which is not a poison

The right dose differentiates a poison from a remedy

Then to wrap up I would like to tell you in my native tongue *Diolch am eich sylw* which for those of you not conversant with the Welsh language means Thank you for your attention

I appreciate your time

I hope you've found this presentation informative and useful

Thank you very much