Pharmacokinetics of Nano versus Conventional Formulations of A83B4C63, a Novel Inhibitor of DNA Repair in Rat



11

Forugh Sanaee¹, Marco Paladino², Sams Sadat ¹, Igor Paiva ¹, Dennis G. Hall², Michael Weinfeld³, Afsaneh Lavasanifar^{1*} ¹Faculty of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, T6G 2N8; ²Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada; ³Department of Experimental Oncology, Cross Cancer Institute, Edmonton, AB, Canada CONTACT INFORMATION: afsaneh@ualberta.ca

PURPOSE

The long term objective of this study is to develop nanodelivery systems for solubilization and tumor targeted delivery of A83B4C63, a novel inhibitor of polynucleotide kinase/phosphatase (PNKP) which is involved in single and double strand DNA repair. Here, we evaluated the potential of polymeric micelles based on poly(ethylene oxide)-*b*-poly(ϵ -caprolactone) and poly(ethylene oxide)-*b*-poly(α -benzyl carboxylate- ϵ -caprolactone)(PEO-PCL and PEO-PBCL, respectively) for delivery of A83B4C63, by studying the encapsulation, *in vitro* release and pharmacokinetics of encapsulated versus free drug after i.v. administration in rats.

METHOD

PEO-*b*-PCL and PEO-*b*-PBCL copolymer were synthesized and used to form micelles encapsulating A83B4C63¹. Micellar size and polydispersity index (PDI) as well as drug loading (DL) and encapsulation efficiency (EE) were determined. The release of A83B4C63 from Cremophor: ethanol (Control), PEG 400 (Control), PEO-*b*-PCL₄₄ and PEO-*b*-PBCL₂₆ formulations were assessed. Single 10 mg/kg i.v. dose of A83B4C63 formulations were administered to Sprague Dawley rats (n=4/group). Serial blood samples were collected up to 72 h and plasma A83B4C63 concentrations were determined using LC/MS/MS. Pharmacokinetic parameters were calculated using a non-compartmental method.

RESULTS

In vitro

There was no differences in %EE, %DL, size and PDI of different micellar formulations. The A83B4C63 was rapidly released from Cremophor: ethanol formulation and PEG 400. In comparison, both polymeric micellar formulations showed a significant ability to retain the drug. No significant differences were observed in the release pattern between the two polymeric micellar formulations.

Table 1. Characteristics of A83B4C63 formulations

Table 2 Pharmacokinetic narameters of A83B4C63

| Formulation | %DL | %EE | Size (nm) | PDI | % Release (24h) |
|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|
| PEO-PCL | 28.05±2.69 | 88.32±6.81 | 57.08±3.09 | 0.172±0.04 | 17.64±6.85 |
| PEO-PBCL | 19.56±7.25 | 57.18±17.28 | 70.28±11.25 | 0.204±0.02 | 25.31±11.80 |
| Cremophor | - | - | - | - | 63.18±0.56 |
| PEG 400 | - | - | - | - | 92.17±0.41 |
| | | | | | |



In vivo

Figure 1.Release profile of A83B4C63 formulations

Our pharmacokinetic results indicating both micellar formulations produced significantly longer MRT and $t_{1/2}$ when compared to Cremophor: ethanol and PEG formulations.

| Parameter | PEO-PBCL | PEO-PCL | Cremophor | PEG 400 | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| AUC (ng*h/mL) | 507.91±176.20 | 1243.46±1048.21 | 466.76±50.44 | 540.81±71.41 | | | |
| CL (mL/h per kg) | 21.22±5.56 | 20.73±18.45 | 23.98±5.46 | 18.86±2.85 | | | |
| T1/2 (h) | 84.89±69.37 | 40.67±29.86 | 2.33±2.47 | 2.86±0.77 | | | |
| Vdß (mL/kg) | 2596.47±2585.41 | 716.44±531.47 | 86.03±91.73 | 76.21±14.66 | | | |
| MRT (h) | 30.79±15.15 | 53.95±50.92 | 1.14±1.02 | 1.99±0.36 | | | |



CONCLUSION

Figure 2. Concentration-time curves of A83B4C63 formulations

Our results show that both PEO-*b*-PCL and PEO-*b*-PBCL micelles can prolong biological half life and residence time of A83B4C63, when compared to its PEG 400 or Cremophor: Ethanol formulation. At the same time both polymeric micellar formulations serve as good solubilizing carriers for i.v. administration of this drug.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT This research was funded by Alberta Cancer Foundation and

NanoMedicine Innovation Network (NMIN).

REFERENCES¹ Shire Z et al. Mol Pharm. 2018 Jun 4;15(6):2316-2326