Voriconazole greatly increases the exposure to oral buprenorphine

Mari Fihlman[1,2], Tuija Hemmilä[2], Nora M. Hagelberg[1,2], Janne T. Backman[3], Jouko Laitila[3], Kari Laine[4,5], Pertti J Neuvonen[3], Klaus T. Olkkola[6] and Teijo I. Saari[1,2]

[1]Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, University of Turku, Turku, Finland

[2]Division of Perioperative Services, Intensive Care and Pain Medicine, Turku University Hospital, Turku, Finland

[3]Department of Clinical Pharmacology, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland

[4]Department of Pharmacology, Drug Development and Therapeutics, University of Turku, Turku, Finland

[5]Medbase Ltd, Turku, Finland

[6]Department of Anaesthesiology, Intensive Care and Pain Medicine, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland.

Running title: Interaction of oral buprenorphine with voriconazole.

Corresponding author: Teijo Saari, Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, University of Turku; P.O. Box 52; Kiinamyllynkatu 4-8; FI-20520 Turku; Finland. Phone: +358-2-313 2967. Fax: +358-2-313 3960. E-mail: teisaa@utu.fi

Abstract

Purpose: Buprenorphine has low oral bioavailability. Regardless of sublingual administration, a notable part of buprenorphine is exposed to extensive first-pass metabolism by the cytochrome P450 (CYP) 3A4. As drug interaction studies with buprenorphine are limited, we wanted to investigate the effect of voriconazole, a strong CYP3A4 inhibitor, on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of oral buprenorphine**.**

Methods: Twelve healthy volunteers were given either placebo or voriconazole (orally, 400 mg twice on day 1 and 200 mg twice on days 2-5) for 5 days in a randomized, cross-over study. On day 5, they ingested 0.2 mg (3.6 mg during placebo phase) oral buprenorphine. We measured plasma and urine concentrations of buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine and monitored their pharmacological effects. Pharmacokinetic parameters were normalized for a buprenorphine dose of 1.0 mg.

Results: Voriconazole greatly increased the mean area under the plasma concentration-time curve (AUC_{0-18}) of buprenorphine (4.3-fold, $P < 0.001$), its peak concentration (C_{max}) (3.9-fold), half-life ($P < 0.05$), and excretion into urine (A_e; $P < 0.001$). Voriconazole also markedly enhanced the C_{max} ($P < 0.001$), AUC_{0-18} ($P < 0.001$) and A_e ($P < 0.05$) of unconjugated norbuprenorphine, but decreased its renal clearance ($P < 0.001$). Mild dizziness and nausea occurred during both study phases.

Conclusions Voriconazole greatly increases exposure to oral buprenorphine, mainly by inhibiting intestinal and liver CYP3A4. Effect on some transporters may explain elevated norbuprenorphine concentrations. Although oral buprenorphine is not commonly used, this interaction may become relevant in patients receiving sublingual buprenorphine together with voriconazole or other CYP3A4 or transporter inhibitors.

INTRODUCTION

Buprenorphine is a partial μ-opioid receptor agonist, which antagonizes κ-opioid receptor and acts as an agonist at the δ-opioid receptor and opioid receptor-like receptor [1, 2]. Buprenorphine is increasingly used for treating acute and chronic pain. Analgesic doses range from 0.3 to 0.6 mg when intravenous or intramuscular dosing routes are used. Buprenorphine is also a good option for substitution therapy to treat opioid dependence because of its pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties. Buprenorphine produces long-lasting subjective and physiologic effects without significant respiratory depression [3, 4]. Sublingual doses used in opioid substitution therapy are much higher than those used in treatment of chronic pain, but buprenorphine is considered to be safe because of its ceiling effects [4].

Buprenorphine has very low oral bioavailability because of its extensive first-pass metabolism [5, 6]. The bioavailability is higher, about 15-30%, when buprenorphine is administered sublingually [7, 8]. The mean time to maximum plasma concentration following sublingual administration varies from 1 to 3 hours [9 - 12]. After an oral and sublingual buprenorphine administration, extensive first-pass metabolism and large interindividual variability increase the susceptibility to drug interactions. Furthermore, many opioids are substrates to some transporter proteins, such as P-glycoprotein, which can affect their absorption and systemic clearance [13 - 15].

The main metabolic pathway (65%) of buprenorphine is cytochrome P450 (CYP) 3A4/5 mediated N-dealkylation of the drug, which yields an active metabolite, norbuprenorphine. CYP2C8 and CYP2C9 have been also shown to metabolize buprenorphine [16 - 19]. Buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine are conjugated to their 3-glucuronides mainly by the UDP-glucuronosyl transferases (UGT) 2B7 and 1A1, and 1A3

and 1A1, respectively [5, 20, 21]. Previous study with 63Ni electron-capture gas chromatographic assay evaluated the levels buprenorphine and its metabolites in human urine and feces [23], and approximately 10-30% of the dose was excreted in urine, mainly as conjugated metabolites. Similar results have been published, showing that 15% of conjugated metabolites are excreted in urine [5], and only small amounts of unconjugated parent drug or norbuprenorphine are excreted into urine; most of the dose is eliminated in the faeces [5, 22].

The effect of strong CYP3A4 inhibitors on the pharmacokinetics of buprenorphine is largely unknown, particularly after its oral ingestion. A previous study showed that ketoconazole does not have clinically significant interactions with transdermally delivered buprenorphine [24]. Other interaction studies have been conducted with patients receiving simultaneous buprenorphine substitution and antiretroviral therapy [25]. Voriconazole is frequently used in immunosuppressed patients with suspected aspergillosis. Voriconazole is a potent inhibitor of CYP3A4, CYP2B6, CYP2C9 and CYP2C19 enzymes [26 - 28]. Oral buprenorphine is not commonly used in clinical settings, but very large doses of sublingual buprenorphine from 16 mg to 32 mg are administered in substitution therapy [29, 30]. A considerable part of the sublingual dose can be swallowed, making buprenorphine susceptible to first-pass metabolism in the gut wall and liver [31, 32]. Here, we wanted to study the pharmacokinetics of oral buprenorphine after its immediate swallowing, with or without voriconazole, to evaluate the magnitude of interaction after their possible concomitant ingestion.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study participants

In view of our previous studies [12, 33], it was calculated that 10 subjects would be needed to detect a 30% difference in the area under the plasma concentration-time curve ($AUC_{0-\infty}$) of buprenorphine at a power of 80% and level of significance of $P < 0.05$. To also consider potential dropouts, we recruited 12 healthy non-smoking volunteers (4 females and 8 men; age range 18 to 29 yr; body-mass index from 20.5 to 27.8 kg/m^2). Email announcements, assigned to university students, were used to recruit participants. A written informed consent was obtained. The criteria for exclusion included concomitant drug therapy, previous history of intolerance to any of the drugs studied, past history of significant disease, alcoholism, drug abuse or psychological or emotional problems, blood donation within 4 weeks prior to study, and participation in any other studies involving drug products within one month prior to this study. Female participants were given instructions to use safe non-hormonal contraception during the study because hormonal contraceptives were not allowed. Clinical examination and routine laboratory tests were performed to evaluate participants' physical health. Their medical history was also evaluated and all twelve participants were found to be in good physical health. Urine toxicology and pregnancy tests were negative and ECGs were in normal limits. The Finnish translation of the Abuse Questions [34] was used to evaluate the risk of participants to develop opioid abuse and the risk was found to be low for every participant. Volunteers were not allowed to consume coffee, tea, and energy drinks or grapefruit juice during the study.

Study outline and drug administration

The study protocol was approved by the ethics committee of the Hospital District of Southwest Finland and by the Finnish National Agency for Medicines and was registered in the EudraCT clinical trials register under code 2011-001939-23. The clinical phase of the study was conducted in the research facilities of the Department of Clinical

Pharmacology and TYKSLab, University of Turku and Turku University Hospital, Finland. The volunteers ingested orally, in randomized order either voriconazole or placebo for 5 days. Dosing of voriconazole (Vfend® 200mg tablet; Pfizer, Sandwich, Great Britain) was 400 mg at 8.00 and 20.00 on day 1, 200 mg at 8.00 and 20.00 on days 2-4, and 200 mg at 10.00 and 20.00 on day 5. The wash-out interval in this cross-over study was 4 weeks. On the fifth day of pretreatment, all subjects ingested a single dose of 0.2 mg (3.6 mg during placebo phase) of oral buprenorphine (Temgesic® 0.2 tablet RB Pharmaceuticals Limited, Slough, Great Britain) with 200 ml of water at 11.00 on empty stomach.

Adherence with the voriconazole/placebo dosing schedule was assessed using mobile phone text messages. After taking each dose, the subjects sent a mobile phone text message to one of the investigators. The investigator contacted the subject if no text message was received within 15-20 min after scheduled dosing time and reminded them to take the dose. The volunteers fasted overnight (8 h) before the administration of buprenorphine. Standardized meals were served 4 and 8 h after buprenorphine ingestion.

Blood sampling and drug analysis

On the test days, a forearm vein was cannulated, and timed blood samples (10 ml) for pharmacokinetic measurements were collected into ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid–containing tubes immediately before and 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 18 h after the ingestion of buprenorphine. Plasma was separated within 30 min and stored at −70 °C until drug analysis. Urine was collected up to 18 h after buprenorphine administration. Urine aliquots were stored at – 70°C until analysis.

The concentrations of buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine in plasma and urine samples were analyzed with a validated liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometric

method as previously described [12]. The low limit of quantification (LLQ) for plasma and urine buprenorphine was 0.02 ng/ml, and for norbuprenorphine 0.05 ng/ml. Concentrations below the LLQ but clearly detectable were used as LLQ/2 in calculation of the mean (SD) concentrations. The interday coefficients of variation (CV%) were for buprenorphine 8.0% at 5.3 ng/ml, 8.7 % at 0.53 ng/ml and 6.1% at 0.053 ng/ml, and for norbuprenorphine 3.7% at 4.8 ng/ml, 8.7% at 0.48 ng/ml, and 11.9% at 0.048 ng/ml.

Plasma concentrations of voriconazole were determined from the samples taken on day 5 before administration of buprenorphine by using liquid chromatograph equipped with Waters Symmetry C8 column (Waters) and UV-detection at 255 nm wave length as described before [35]. Diazepam was used as the internal standard. The LLQ for voriconazole was 10 ng/ml. The CVs for voriconazole were below 10% at relevant plasma concentration range, i.e. 7.5% at 4000 ng/ml, 3.0% at 1100 ng/ml, and 5.5% at 110 ng/ml.

Pharmacokinetic measurements

The peak plasma concentrations (C_{max}) and corresponding time to C_{max} (t_{max}) of buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine were observed directly from the data. The areas under the buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine plasma concentration–time curves (*AUC*) from 0 to 18 h (AUC_{0-18}) were calculated by noncompartmental methods using WinNonlin pharmacokinetics program (version 4.1; Pharsight, Mountain View, CA). The terminal log-linear part of each concentration–time curve was identified visually, and the elimination rate constant (k_e) was calculated from the logarithmically transformed data using linear regression analysis. The $t_{1/2}$ was calculated using the equation $t_{1/2} = ln2/k_e$. The cumulative amount of unconjugated buprenorphine and unconjugated norbuprenorphine excreted into urine was calculated from 0 to 18 h (A_e), and the renal clearance (Cl_{renal})

using the equation $= A_e/AUC_{0-18}$. All pharmacokinetic parameters were normalized for a buprenorphine dose of 1.0 mg.

Statistical analysis

The AUC_{0-18} of buprenorphine was the primary outcome variable in the study, and all other pharmacokinetic and all pharmacodynamic parameters were secondary variables. Geometric mean ratios with 90% CIs were calculated for the pharmacokinetic variables. Lack of interaction was assumed if the 90% CI of the geometric mean ratios for pharmacokinetic variables were within the acceptance limit of 0.8–1.25. Pharmacokinetic variables and pharmacological effects were compared with paired Student t-test. The values for t_{max} were compared by the use of Wilcoxon signed rank test. The statistical significance level was $P < 0.05$. The Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was used to investigate the possible relationship between the ratios of the AUC_{0-18} of buprenorphine during the treatment phase (voriconazole) to the AUC_{0-18} of buprenorphine during the control phase, as well as to the C_{trough} of voriconazole before the administration of buprenorphine. The associations of plasma buprenorphine concentrations with psychomotor and analgesic effects were also calculated using the Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient. The results are expressed as mean values and variation in data set is expressed as standard deviation (SD). R software (version 3.2.0) and ggplot2 (version 2.1.0) were applied for statistical analysis and graphical presentation.

RESULTS

Voriconazole affected strongly the pharmacokinetics of orally administered buprenorphine and increased its effects (Fig. 1, Supplementary Figures 1 - 2, Table 1, Supplementary Tables 1-2).

Buprenorphine. Compared to placebo phase, voriconazole increased the mean $AUC_{0\text{-}18}$ of oral buprenorphine 4.3-fold (90% CI 2.7, 6.7 $P < 0.001$), and its C_{max} 3.9-fold (90% CI 2.6, 5.9; $P < 0.001$) (Table 1, Supplementary Figure 2). Voriconazole had no significant effect on the t_{max} but it slightly prolonged the $t_{½}$ of buprenorphine ($P < 0.05$). Voriconazole increased the amount of unconjugated buprenorphine excreted in urine ($P < 0.001$, Supplementary Fig. 1) but had no significant effect on its Cl_{renal}. The A_e of unchanged (unconjugated) buprenorphine was less than 0.1% of the dose during 18 hours even during the voriconazole phase.

Norbuprenorphine. Voriconazole increased the mean $AUC_{0\text{-}18}$ of norbuprenorphine nearly 4-fold (90% CI 3.0, 5.3; $P < 0.001$), and its C_{max} 3.3-fold (90% CI 2.4, 4.4; $P < 0.001$) compared to placebo phase (Table 1). The metabolite to the parent drug ratio (AUCm/AUCp) was not changed by voriconazole. Voriconazole enhanced the A_e of unconjugated norbuprenorphine by only 1.5-fold ($P < 0.02$), and accordingly voriconazole significantly ($P < 0.001$) reduced its Cl_{renal} (Supplementary Fig. 2).

Voriconazole. The mean (SD) plasma concentration of voriconazole (C_{trough}) was 1022 (1509) ng/ml before the administration of buprenorphine during the voriconazole phase, and the concentrations ranged from 170 to 5715 ng/ml.

Pharmacological effects and adverse effects. Buprenorphine caused moderate pharmacological effects (Supp. Table 1), but their relevant comparison between the study phases is not possible due to different buprenorphine doses. The most common adverse effects were mild dizziness and nausea (Suppl. Table 2). There were no severe adverse effects, and tropisetron, naloxone or any other rescue medication were not needed.

DISCUSSION

We investigated the effect of voriconazole on buprenorphine pharmacokinetics when buprenorphine was swallowed immediately after its oral administration. Although oral ingestion is not commonly used in clinical practice with buprenorphine, a considerable part of the sublingual buprenorphine dose is usually swallowed and therefore susceptible to first-pass metabolism. Furthermore, in some deliberate overdoses, subjects can swallow buprenorphine concomitantly with other drugs, which could inhibit buprenorphine metabolism and increase respiratory depression. Our major finding was that voriconazole greatly increases the exposure to both parent buprenorphine and its active metabolite, norbuprenorphine, in some subjects even 6-fold. On average, voriconazole increased the AUC of oral buprenorphine 2-3 times more than what we observed in a previous study using sublingual administration [12].

There are only few previous studies characterizing the interactions between buprenorphine and drugs which affect its pharmacokinetics. Most of these studies have focused on high-dose sublingual buprenorphine substitution therapy. Atazanavir alone and with ritonavir increased the AUC of buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine nearly 2-fold and lead to an increased sedative effect [25]. Darunavir-ritonavir or fosamprenavir-ritonavir combinations did not cause significant changes in plasma buprenorphine or norbuprenorphine levels [36]. Boceprevir increased plasma buprenorphine concentrations slightly but decreased norbuprenorphine concentration in plasma [37]. Similarly, lopinavir-ritonavir did not affect buprenorphine pharmacokinetics but did increase the clearance of norbuprenorphine [38]. We showed recently, that voriconazole and posaconazole increase exposure to sublingual buprenorphine [12]. Rifampicin decreased the exposure to sublingual but not to intravenous buprenorphine [33]. These results seem to emphasize the significant role of CYP3A-mediated first-pass metabolism of buprenorphine, which sublingual administration only partially bypasses.

The metabolic fate of buprenorphine is complicated, and all its details are still not fully elucidated. Buprenorphine is extensively N-dealkylated to norbuprenorphine, mainly by CYP3A4 [16, 17] and to some extent by CYP2C8 [18]. Also minor CYP3A4- and CYP2C8- catalyzed buprenorphine hydroxylation pathways have been identified [19, 39, 18]. Voriconazole is a potent (K_i values $<<$ 10 µM) reversible inhibitor of CYP2B6, CYP2C9, CYP2C19 and CYP3A enzymes [28]. The K_i of voriconazole as a reversible inhibitor of the CYP3A4 dependent formation of norbuprenorphine has been estimated to be 5.91 µM [39]. In the present study, the average plasma trough concentrations of voriconazole were around 3 µM, which suggests a marked inhibition potential for CYP3A4 during the whole 12-hour dosing interval. The effects of voriconazole on parent buprenorphine can be mainly explained by inhibition of CYP3A4 during the first-pass and elimination phases. However, the substantial increases in the AUC and C_{max} of norbuprenorphine suggest the presence of additional mechanisms because inhibition of CYP3A4 should decrease the N-dealkylation of buprenorphine to norbuprenorphine.

Buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine are also glucuronidated. UGT2B7 accounts for more than 40% of buprenorphine glucuronidation, while norbuprenorphine glucuronidation is predominantly mediated by UGT1A3 [21]. Buprenorphine and norbuprenorhine are excreted in bile as their glucuronides but hydrolysis to unconjugated forms by colonic bacterial beta-glucuronidases allows their reabsorption and enterohepatic circulation. Faeces contain buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine predominantly in unconjugated form; in urine they are mainly in conjugated form [5]. Effects of voriconazole and its metabolites on different UGTs and glucuronidases are not known. However, according to a semiphysiological population pharmacokinetic model, voriconazole emerges as an UGT2B inhibitor in the gut and liver [40].

Voriconazole reduced the Cl_{renal} of norbuprenorphine but not that of buprenorphine. Previously, voriconazole has been shown to decrease the Cl_{renal} of diclofenac [41]. Reduction of Cl_{renal} –values can be explained by inhibition of membrane transporters as norbuprenorphine, but not buprenorphine, is a substrate of the efflux transporter P-glycoprotein [20]. Because the urinary excretion of (unconjugated) norbuprenorphine was very small, reduction of its Cl_{renal} cannot alone explain its high plasma concentrations. However, voriconazole (or its metabolites) may have affected transporters also in extrarenal tissues, and these effects may have influenced the tissue distribution of norbuprenorphine. P-glycoprotein is a major determinant of norbuprenorphine brain exposure [20], whereas buprenorphine as a lipophilic compound rapidly penetrates cell membranes without transporters. P-glycoprotein can be found in the intestinal wall, blood–brain barrier and many other tissues [42]. Thus, inhibition of P-glycoprotein and/or other transporters could influence, e.g., enterohepatic circulation and tissue concentrations of norbuprenorphine. Of note, norbuprenorphine does not have a ceiling effect on respiratory depression, and respiratory toxicity of buprenorphine can result from the blockade of P-glycoprotein-mediated efflux of norbuprenorphine at the blood-brain barrier [43]. Further studies are needed on the effect of drug interactions on norbuprenorphine tissue distribution and buprenorphine toxicity, keeping in mind also "opioid toxicity epidemic" [44].

In the present study, relevant comparison of pharmacological effects between the two phases was not possible because of different buprenorphine doses. We used only relatively small doses to minimize the risk of adverse events in healthy volunteers. The dose during the placebo phase (3.6 mg vs. 0.2 mg) was set higher, because we assumed a low oral bioavailability after immediate ingestion of the tablet. On the contrary, we wanted to keep the dose in the voriconazole phase smaller, because of the possibility of

strong inhibition of buprenorphine metabolism. We based this assumption on the previous results which have established that voriconazole and other CYP3A4 inhibitors can dramatically increase exposure to drugs that are metabolized via CYP3A4 [45 - 52]. We assumed dose-linearity since recent reports have demonstrated that buprenorphine shows a linear increase in the exposure across a wide dose range from 0.060 to 12 mg [53, 54].

We acknowledge that our study has limitations which include that it was designed mainly to evaluate the pharmacokinetics of buprenorphine. For this goal, we normalized the pharmacokinetic values to an oral buprenorphine dose of 1 mg. This made doze normalization challenging in pharmacodynamical calculations and in estimating subjective adverse effects. However, dose normalization cannot be used for pharmacodynamical results and subjective adverse effects. We drew blood samples for 18 hours, and longer sampling time might have increased the reliability in the pharmacokinetic calculations, especially in determining the elimination half-life. Therefore, the values of elimination half-life and renal clearance should be interpreted with these limitations in mind. The strengths of our study were the two-phase cross-over design and the controlled conditions that confirmed the compliance to blood sampling and urine collection. Using current study design, we could also avoid a possible pharmacokinetic interference caused by naloxone on the interaction between buprenorphine and voriconazole.

In conclusion, our results show that clinically used doses of voriconazole greatly increase the exposure to oral buprenorphine. Although oral buprenorphine is not commonly used in clinical settings, strong inhibition of its first-pass metabolism should be taken into account also when voriconazole or other potent CYP3A4 inhibitors are prescribed to patients receiving sublingual buprenorphine. Patients should be well informed and

familiarized with sublingual dosing, as some part of the dose is easily ingested and swallowed. Further studies are warranted on the effect of transporter inhibitors on norbuprenorphine pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics because its high concentrations could increase buprenorphine toxicity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have no conflicts of interest

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Authors' contributions Mari Fihlman took care of the clinical phase of the study and data collection, participated in data analysis and statistical analysis and wrote the manuscript. Klaus Olkkola and Kari Laine designed the study, wrote the protocol, supervised and coordinated the clinical implementation of the study, and participated in data analysis and manuscript preparation. Tuija Hemmilä participated the clinical phase and data collection. Janne T. Backman, Jouko Laitila and Pertti J Neuvonen performed the analytical assays and participated in manuscript preparation. Teijo Saari analyzed the data, performed statistical analysis, and wrote the manuscript. All authors materially participated in the research and/or manuscript preparation. All authors have contributed to and approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

1   Dum JE, Herz A (1981) In vivo receptor binding of the opiate partial agonist, buprenorphine, correlated with its agonistic and antagonistic actions. Br J Pharmacol 74:627-633.

2   Leander JD (1987). Buprenorphine has potent kappa opioid receptor antagonist activity. Neuropharmacology 26:1445-147.

3   Mattick RP, Ali R, White JM, O'Brien S, Wolk S, Danz C (2003) Buprenorphine versus methadone maintenance therapy: a randomized double-blind trial with 405 opioid-dependent patients. Addiction 98:441-452.

4   Walsh SL, Preston KL, Stitzer ML, Cone EJ, Bigelow GE (1994) Clinical pharmacology of buprenorphine: ceiling effects at high doses. Clin Pharmacol Ther 55:569-580.

5   Cone EJ, Gorodetzky CW, Yousefnejad D, Buchwald WF, Johnson RE (1984) The metabolism and excretion of buprenorphine in humans. Drug Metab Disp 12:577-581.

6   Elkader A, Sproule B (2005) Buprenorphine: clinical pharmacokinetics in the treatment of opioid dependence. Clin Pharmacokinet 44:661-680.

7   Mendelson J, Upton RA, Everhart ET, Jacob P 3rd, Jones RT (1997) Bioavailability of sublingual buprenorphine. J Clin Pharmacol 37:31-37.

8   Nath RP, Upton RA, Everhart ET, Cheung P, Shwonek P, Jones RT, Mendelson JE (1999) Buprenorphine pharmacokinetics: relative bioavailability of sublingual tablet and liquid formulations. J Clin Pharmacol 39:619-623.

9   McAleer SD, Mills RJ, Polack T, Hussain T, Rolan PE, Gibbs AD, Mullins FG, Hussein Z (2003) Pharmacokinetics of high-dose buprenorphine following single administration of sublingual tablet formulations in opioid naïve healthy male volunteers under a naltrexone block. Drug Alcohol Depend 72:75-83.

10 Ciraulo DA, Hitzemann RJ, Somoza E, Knapp CM, Rotrosen J, Sarid-Segal O, Ciraulo AM, Greenblatt DJ, Chiang CN (2006) Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of multiple sublingual buprenorphine tablets in dose-escalation trials. J Clin Pharmacol 46:179-192.

11 Bullingham RE, McQuay HJ, Moore A, Bennett MR (1980) Buprenorphine kinetics. Clin Pharmacol Ther 28:667-672.

12 Fihlman M, Hemmilä T, Hagelberg NM, Kuusniemi K, Backman JT, Laitila J, Laine K, Neuvonen PJ, Olkkola KT, Saari TI (2016) Voriconazole more likely than posaconazole increases plasma exposure to sublingual buprenorphine causing a risk of a clinically important interaction. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 72:1363-1371.

13 Kharasch ED, Hoffer C, Whittington D, Sheffels P (2003) Role of P-glycoprotein in the intestinal absorption and clinical effects of morphine. Clin Pharmacol Ther 74:543–554.

14 Drewe J, Ball HA, Beglinger C, Peng B, Kemmler A, Schächinger H, Haefeli WE (2000) Effect of P-glycoprotein modulation on the clinical pharmacokinetics and adverse effects of morphine. Br J Clin Pharmacol 50:237-246.

15 Dagenais C, Graff CL, Pollack GM (2004) Variable modulation of opioid brain uptake by P-glycoprotein in mice. Biochem Pharmacol 67:269-276.

16 Iribarne C, Picart D, Dréano Y, Bail JP, Berthou F (1997) Involvement of cytochrome P450 3A4 in N-dealkylation of buprenorphine in human liver microsomes. Life Sci 60:1953-1964.

17 Kobayashi K, Yamamoto T, Chiba K, Tani M, Shimada N, Ishizaki T, Kuroiwa Y (1998) Human buprenorphine N-dealkylation is catalyzed by cytochrome P450 3A4. Drug Metab Dispos. 26:818-821.

18 Moody DE, Slawson MH, Strain EC, Laycock JD, Spanbauer AC, Foltz RL (2002) A liquid chromatographic-electrospray ionization-tandem mass spectrometric method for determination of buprenorphine, its metabolite, norbuprenorphine, and a coformulant, naloxone, that is suitable for in vivo and in vitro metabolism studies. Anal Biochem 306:31-39.

19 Picard N, Cresteil T, Djebli N, Marquet P (2005) In vitro metabolism study of buprenorphine: evidence for new metabolic pathways. Drug Metab Dispos 33:689-695.

20 Brown SM, Holtzman M, Kim T, Kharasch ED (2011) Buprenorphine metabolites, buprenorphine-3-glucuronide and norbuprenorphine-3-glucuronide, are biologically active. Anesthesiology 115:1251-1260.

21 Rouguieg K, Picard N, Sauvage FL, Gaulier JM, Marquet P (2010) Contribution of the different UDP-glucuronosyltransferase (UGT) isoforms to buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine metabolism and relationship with the main UGT polymorphisms in a bank of human liver microsomes. Drug Metab Dispos 38:40-45.

22 Brewster D, Humphrey MJ, Mcleavy MA (1981) Biliary excretion, metabolism and enterohepatic circulation of buprenorphine. Xenobiotica 11:189-196.

23 Cone EJ, Gorodetzky CW, Yousefnejad D, Darwin WD (1985) 63Ni electron-capture gas chromatographic assay for buprenorphine and metabolites in human urine and feces. J Chromatogr 337:291-300.

24 Kapil RP, Cipriano A, Michels GH, Perrino P, O'Keefe SA, Shet MS, Colucci SV, Noveck RJ, Harris SC (2012) Effect of ketoconazole on the pharmacokinetic profile of buprenorphine following administration of a once-weekly buprenorphine transdermal system. Clin Drug Investig 32:583-592.

25 McCance-Katz EF, Moody DE, Morse GD, Ma Q, DiFrancesco R, Friedland G, Pade P, Rainey PM (2007) Interaction between buprenorphine and atazanavir or atazanavir/ritonavir. Drug Alcohol Depend 91:269-278.

26 Murayama N, Imai N, Nakane T, Shimizu M, Yamazaki H (2007) Roles of CYP3A4

and CYP2C19 in methyl hydroxylated and N-oxidized metabolite formation from voriconazole, a new anti-fungal agent, in human liver microsomes. Biochem Pharmacol 73:2020-2026.

27 Niwa T, Shiraga T, Takagi A. Effect of antifungal drugs on cytochrome P450 (CYP) 2C9, CYP2C19, and CYP3A4 activities in human liver microsomes (2005) Biol Pharm Bull 28: 1805-1808.

28 Jeong S, Nguyen PD, Desta Z (2009) Comprehensive in vitro analysis of voriconazole inhibition of eight cytochrome P450 (CYP) enzymes: major effect on CYPs 2B6, 2C9, 2C19, and 3A. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 53:541-551.

29 Fudala PJ, Bridge TP, Herbert S, Williford WO, Chiang CN, Jones K, Collins J, Raisch D, Casadonte P, Goldsmith RJ, Ling W, Malkerneker U, McNicholas L, Renner J, Stine S, Tusel D; Buprenorphine/Naloxone Collaborative Study Group (2003) Office-based treatment of opiate addictionwith a sublingual-tablet formulationof buprenorphine and naloxone. N Engl JMed 349:949–958.

30 Johnson RE, Chutuape MA, Strain EC,Walsh SL, Stitzer ML, Bigelow GE (2000) A comparison of levomethadyl acetate,buprenorphine, and METH for opioid dependence.N Engl J Med 343:1290–1297.

31 Mendelson J, Upton RA, Everhart ET, Jacob P 3rd, Jones RT (1997) Bioavailability of sublingual buprenorphine. J Clin Pharmacol 37:31-37.

32 Das NG, Das SK (2004) Development of mucoadhesive dosage forms of buprenorphine for sublingual drug delivery. Drug Deliv 11:89-95.

33 Hagelberg NM, Fihlman M, Hemmilä T, Backman JT, Laitila J, Neuvonen PJ, Laine K, Olkkola KT, Saari TI (2006) Rifampicin decreases exposure to sublingual buprenorphine in healthy subjects. Pharmacol Res Perspect 4(6):e00271.

34 Michna E, Ross EL, Hynes WL, Nedeljkovic SS, Soumekh S, Janfaza D, Palombi D, Jamison RN (2004) Predicting aberrant drug behavior in patients treated for chronic pain. J Pain Symptom Manage 28:250-258.

35 Chhun S, Rey E, Tran A, Lortholary O, Pons G, Jullien V (2007) Simultaneous quantification of voriconazole and posaconazole in human plasma by high-performance liquid chromatography with ultra-violet detection. J Chromatogr B, Analyt Technol Biomed Life Sci 852:223-228.

36 Gruber VA, Rainey PM, Moody DE, Morse GD, Ma Q, Prathikanti S, Pade PA, Alvanzo AA, McCance-Katz EF (2012) Interactions between buprenorphine and the protease inhibitors darunavir-ritonavir and fosamprenavir-ritonavir. Clin Infect Dis 54:414-423.

37 Hulskotte EG, Bruce RD, Feng HP, Webster LR, Xuan F, Lin WH, O'Mara E, Wagner JA, Butterton JR (2015) Pharmacokinetic interaction between HCV protease inhibitor boceprevir and methadone or buprenorphine in subjects on stable maintenance therapy. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 71:303-311.

38 Bruce RD, Altice FL, Moody DE, Morse GD, Andrews L, Lin SN, Fang WB, Ma Q, Friedland GH (2010) Pharmacokinetic interactions between buprenorphine/naloxone and once-daily lopinavir/ritonavir. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr 54:511-514.

39 Moody DE, Liu F, Fang WB (2015) Azole antifungal inhibition of buprenorphine, methadone and oxycodone in vitro metabolism. J Anal Toxicol 39:374-386.

40 Frechen S, Junge L, Saari TI, Suleiman AA, Rokitta D, Neuvonen PJ, Olkkola KT, Fuhr U.A (2013) semiphysiological population pharmacokinetic model for dynamic inhibition of liver and gut wall cytochrome P450 3A by voriconazole. Clin Pharmacokinet 52:763-781.

41 Hynninen VV, Olkkola KT, Leino K, Lundgren S, Neuvonen PJ, Rane A, Valtonen M, Laine K (2007) Effect of voriconazole on the pharmacokinetics of diclofenac. Fundam Clin Pharmacol. 21:651-656.

42 DuBuske LM (2005) The role of P-glycoprotein and organic anion-transporting polypeptides in drug interactions. Drug Saf 28:789–801.

43 Alhaddad H, Cisternino S, Declèves X, Tournier N, Schlatter J, Chiadmi F, Risède P, Smirnova M, Besengez C, Scherrmann JM, Baud FJ, Mégarbane B (2012) Respiratory toxicity of buprenorphine results from the blockage of P-glycoprotein-mediated efflux of norbuprenorphine at the blood-brain barrier in mice. Crit Care Med 40:3215-3223.

44 Soelberg CD, Brown RE Jr, Du Vivier D, Meyer JE, Ramachandran BK (2017) The US Opioid Crisis: Current Federal and State Legal Issues. Anesth Analg 125:1675-1681.

45 Saari TI, Laine K, Leino K, Valtonen M, Neuvonen PJ, Olkkola KT (2006) Effect of voriconazole on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of intravenous and oral midazolam. Clin Pharmacol Ther 79:362-370.

46 Hagelberg NM, Nieminen TH, Saari TI, Neuvonen M, Neuvonen PJ, Laine K, Olkkola KT (2009) Voriconazole drastically increases exposure to oral oxycodone. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 65:263-271.

47 Olkkola KT, Ahonen J, Neuvonen PJ (1996) The effects of the systemic antimycotics, itraconazole and fluconazole, on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of intravenous and oral midazolam. Anesth Analg 82:511–516.

48 Kaukonen KM, Olkkola KT, Neuvonen PJ (1997) Itraconazole increases plasma concentrations of quinidine. Clin Pharmacol Ther 62:510-517.

49 Varhe A, Olkkola KT, Neuvonen PJ (1994) Oral triazolam is potentially hazardous to patients receiving systemic antimycotics ketoconazole or itraconazole. Clin Pharmacol Ther 56:601–607.

50 Backman JT, Kivistö KT, Olkkola KT, Neuvonen PJ (1998) The area under the plasma concentration-time curve for oral midazolam is 400-fold larger during treatment with itraconazole than with rifampicin. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 5453–5458.

51 Granfors MT, Backman JT, Neuvonen M, Ahonen J, Neuvonen PJ (2004)

Fluvoxamine drastically increases concentrations and effects of tizanidine: A potentially hazardous interaction. Clin Pharmacol Ther 75:331-341.

52 Saari TI, Grönlund J, Hagelberg NM, Neuvonen M, Laine K, Neuvonen PJ, Olkkola KT (2010) Effects of itraconazole on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of intravenously and orally administered oxycodone. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 66:387–397.

53 Huestis MA, Cone EJ, Pirnay SO, Umbricht A, Preston KL (2013) Intravenous buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine pharmacokinetics in humans. Drug Alcohol Depend 131:258-262.

54 Bai SA, Xiang Q, Finn A (2016) Evaluation of the Pharmacokinetics of Single- and Multiple-dose Buprenorphine Buccal Film in Healthy Volunteers. Clin Ther 38:358-369.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Mean (SD) plasma concentrations of buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine in 12 healthy subjects after 3.6 mg (placebo phase) or 0.2 mg (voriconazole phase) of oral buprenorphine on the fifth day of pretreatment with placebo (○) or voriconazole (●) 400 mg twice on day 1 and 200 mg twice on days 2-5. Concentrations are shown both on an arithmetic and a semilogarithmic scale (inset). Values are normalized for an oral dose of 1.0 mg.

Supplemental Figure 1. Individual pharmacokinetic parameters after oral buprenorphine. Values for maximum concentration (C_{max}), area under plasma concentration–time curve (AUC_{0-18}), elimination half-life ($t_{1/2}$) and amount of urinary buprenorphine excreted during 18 h ($A_{e\,(0-18)}$) in 12 healthy subjects after 3.6 mg (placebo phase) or 0.2 mg (voriconazole phase) of oral buprenorphine on the fifth day of pretreatment with placebo or voriconazole 400 mg twice on day 1 and 200 mg twice on days 2-5. The horizontal line in the box represents the median, white diamonds show the mean, the box shows the interquartile range, and whiskers show the 10th and 90th percentiles. Values are normalized for an oral dose of 1.0 mg.

Supplemental Figure 2. Individual pharmacokinetic parameters of norbuprenorphine after oral buprenorphine. Values for maximum concentration (C_{max}), area under plasma concentration–time curve (AUC_{0-18}), amount of urinary norbuprenorphine excreted during 18 h ($A_{e(0-18)}$) and renal clearance (Cl_{renal}) in 12 healthy subjects after 3.6 mg (placebo phase) or 0.2 mg (voriconazole phase) of oral buprenorphine on the fifth day of pretreatment with placebo or voriconazole 400 mg twice on day 1 and 200 mg twice on days 2-5. The horizontal line in the box represents the median, white diamonds show the

mean, the box shows the interquartile range, and whiskers show the 10th and 90th

percentiles. Values are normalized for an oral dose of 1.0 mg.

Table 1. Pharmacokinetic parameters of buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine after oral administration of 3.6 mg (placebo phase) or 0.2 mg (voriconazole phase) buprenorphine on the fifth day of pre-treatment with voriconazole (400 mg twice on day 1, 200 mg twice on days 2-5) or placebo in 12 healthy subjects.

Parameter	Placebo	Voriconazole	p-value	Geometric mean ratio (90 % CI)
Buprenorphine				
C_{max} (ng/ml)	0.057 ± 0.031	0.22 ± 0.23	<0.001	3.87 (2.55, 5.88)
t_{max} (h)	0.5 (0.5-18)	2 (0.5-10)	0.06	-
AUC_{0-18} (ng· h/ml)	0.43 ± 0.26	2.1 ± 1.4	<0.001	4.27 (2.71, 6.73)
$t_{1/2}$ (h)	9.1 ± 2.4	14.5 ± 6.8	0.042	1.43 (1.08, 1.89)
A_e (µg)	0.10 ± 0.063	0.53 ± 0.29	<0.001	6.76 (4.68, 8.83)
CL_{renal} (l/h)	0.31 ± 0.23	0.73 ± 1.3	0.206	0.51 (0.053 , 4.89)
Norbuprenorphine				
C_{max} (ng/ml)	0.11 ± 0.025	0.28 ± 0.26	<0.001	3.29 (2.44, 4.43)
t_{max} (h)	2 (0.5-12)	5 (0.5-8)	0.35	-
AUC_{0-18} (ng· h/ml)	1.07 ± 0.58	4.0 ± 2.1	<0.001	3.95 (2.97, 5.26)
$t_{1/2}$ (h)	13.1 ± 9.06	17.8 ± 7.9	0.12	1.52 (0.98, 2.38)
AUC_m/AUC_p	3.0 ± 1.5	3.8 ± 5.8	0.78	0.92 (0.57, 1.51)
A_e (µg)	6.9 ± 3.3	11.6 ± 7.8	0.029	1.54 (1.20, 1.98)
CL_{renal} (L/h)	7.2 ± 2.7	2.9 ± 1.2	<0.001	0.39 (0.29, 0.52)

CI, confidence interval; C_{max}, peak plasma concentration; t_{max}, concentration peak time; AUC_{0-18} area under curve from 0 to 18 h; $t_{1/2}$, elimination half-life; A_e, amount excreted into urine within 18 h; CL_{renal}, renal clearance. Values are normalized for an oral dose of 1.0 mg. Data are shown as mean ± standard deviation (SD) and as the geometric mean ratios with the 90% confidence interval (CI) in parenthesis - except for t_{max}, which is given as median and range.

Figure 1.

Supplementary Figure 1

Supplementary Figure 2.

Voriconazole greatly increases the exposure to oral buprenorphine

European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology

Mari Fihlman, Tuija Hemmilä, Nora M. Hagelberg, Janne T. Backman, Jouko Laitila, Kari Laine, Pertti J Neuvonen, Klaus T. Olkkola and Teijo I. Saari

Corresponding author: Teijo Saari, Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, University of Turku, Finland. E-mail: teisaa@utu.fi

Electronic supplementary material

Measurement of pharmacological effects

We evaluated ten possible adverse effects using a questionnaire before, and 3 and 6 h after buprenorphine administration. Cold pressor test was used to evaluate the analgesic effect of buprenorphine as described earlier (Fihlman et al., 2016). Central processing of sensory information was assessed with the digit symbol substitution test (DSST) (Stone et al., 1984), the Maddox wing test was used to measure the central coordination of extraocular muscles (Hannington-Kiff, 1970) and pupil size was measured with Cogan's pupillometer (Cogan, 1941). Subjective effects of buprenorphine were assessed with 100-mm visual analogue scales as described previously (Fihlman et al., 2016). Pharmacological effects were evaluated prior to and at 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, and 12 h after buprenorphine administration. For each effect variable, peak maximum effect (Emax) and area under the response–time (AUEC) curve from 0 to 12 h (AUEC0–12) was determined using the trapezoidal rule.

Results for pharmacological effects

There was a linear correlation between plasma buprenorphine concentration and effect in all pharmacodynamic variables ($P < 0.001$). During the voriconazole phase, the high concentrations of buprenorphine were associated with sedative effects. The Emax and/or area under the plasma effect–time curve ($AUEC_{0-12}$) for drug effect and nausea during the voriconazole phase differed significantly from that in the placebo phase (Supplelementary Table 1 and Supplementary Figure 1). The Maddox wing test, Cogan's pupillometer and other tests for subjective effects showed no statistically significant differences between the phases.

Supplementary Table 1: Pharmacological effect parameters after oral administration of 3.6 mg (placebo phase) or 0.2 mg (voriconazole phase) buprenorphine on the fifth day of pre-treatment with voriconazole (400 mg twice on day 1, 200 mg twice on days 2-5) or placebo in 12 healthy subjects.

	Placebo	Voriconazole	p-value
Cold Pain Intensity			
E_{max} (s)	51 ± 15	47 ± 17	0.23
$AUEC_{0-12}$ (VAS units/h)	520 ± 223	495 ± 224	0.6
$AUEC_{0-12}$ ratio (voriconazole/placebo)		0.98 ± 0.31	
Digital Symbol Substitution Test			
E_{max} (symbols/3min)	157 ± 21	160 ± 18	0.64
$AUEC_{0-12}$ (symbols/3min/h)	1751 ± 249	1813 ± 225	0.73
$AUEC_{0-12}$ ratio (voriconazole/placebo)		1.0 ±0.1	
Nausea			
E_{max} (VAS mm)	44 ± 31	15 ± 19	0.05
$AUEC_{0-12}$ (VAS mm/h)	198 ± 188	86 ± 138	0.09
$AUEC_{0-12}$ ratio (voriconazole/placebo)		0.5 ±0.5	
Drug Effect			
E_{max} (VAS mm)	41 ± 26	20 ± 16	0.01
$AUEC_{0-12}$ (VAS mm/h)	215 ± 206	103 ± 123	0.05
$AUEC_{0-12}$ ratio (voriconazole/placebo)		0.67 ± 1.0	
Alertness			
E_{max} (VAS mm)	74 ± 17	83 ± 17	0.73
$AUEC_{0-12}$ (VAS mm/h)	495 ± 182	659 ± 254	0.16
$AUEC_{0-12}$ ratio (voriconazole/placebo)		1.4 ± 0.36	
Performance			
E_{max} (VAS mm)	81 ± 13	85 ± 16	0.90
$AUEC_{0-12}$ (VAS mm/h)	719 ± 194	836 ± 200	0.08
$AUEC_{0-12}$ ratio (voriconazole/placebo)		1.2 ± 0.22	

E_{max}, peak maximum effect; $AUEC_{0-12}$ area under the effect-time curve. Data are shown as mean ± SD.

Supplementary Table 2. Adverse effects experienced after oral administration of 3.6 mg (control phase) or 0.2 mg (voriconazole phases) of buprenorphine on the fifth day of pre-treatment with voriconazole 400 mg twice daily on the first day and 200 mg for 4 days) or placebo to 12 healthy volunteers.

Treatment	Time (h)	Adverse effect							
		Dizziness	Xerostomia	Weakness	Headache	Ataxia	Nausea	Restlessness	Sedation
Placebo									
	0	3/0/0*	1/0/0	1/1/0	2/0/1	0/0/0	1/1/0	0/0/0	0/1/0
	3	5/2/0	2/1/0	6/1/0	2/0/0	3/1/0	5/2/0	0/0/0	4/3/2
	6	4/0/1	2/0/0	3/1/1	2/0/0	2/1/0	1/4/1	1/0/0	4/3/2
Voriconazole									
	0	2/0/0	2/1/0	3/0/0	1/3/1	1/0/0	2/0/0	0/0/0	4/2/0
	3	0/0/0	1/0/0	1/1/0	4/0/0	0/0/0	3/0/0	2/0/0	5/2/0
	6	0/0/0	1/0/0	1/0/0	2/0/0	0/0/0	2/0/0	1/0/0	5/2/0

*The figures show the amount of subjects in each time point experiencing mild/moderate/strong adverse effects

References

Cogan D (1941) A simplified entoptic pupillometer. Am J Ophthalmol. 24:1431–1433.

Fihlman M, Hemmilä T, Hagelberg NM, Kuusniemi K, Backman JT, Laitila J, Laine K, Neuvonen PJ, Olkkola KT, Saari TI (2016) Voriconazole more likely than posaconazole increases plasma exposure to sublingual buprenorphine causing a risk of a clinically important interaction. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 72:1363-1371.

Hannington-Kiff JG (1970) Measurement of recovery from outpatient general anaesthesia with a simple ocular test. Br Med J 3:132–5.

Stone BM (1984) Pencil and paper tests--sensitivity to psychotropic drugs. Br J Clin Pharmacol 18 Suppl 1:15S–20S.