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Clinical Pharmacology = Disease Progress + Drug Action

Clinical pharmacology can be described as the science of understanding disease progress (clinical) and drug action (pharmacology). Disease progress implies that the disease changes with time. Drug action refers to the time course of drug effect and includes pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics and a link model to account for delays in effect in relation to drug concentration. Clinical pharmacology is not a static description of the use of a drug but includes the time course of disease, drug concentration and drug effect.
Old Model - New Meaning

\[ E = E_0 + \frac{E_{\max} \cdot \text{Conc}}{EC50 + \text{Conc}} \]

Disease Progress + Drug Action

Early approaches (e.g., Holford & Sheiner 1981) describing the time course of drug effect distinguished a constant baseline response (E0) from a varying concentration related response (e.g., the Emax model). The constant baseline parameter describes the response in the absence of drug and is the simplest form of disease progress model.

The use of the symbol E0 for the baseline response was not a good choice because the effect (E) when concentration is zero must be zero i.e. E0 is not the drug effect when concentration is zero but is the biological response (biomarker) that is being observed.


Disease Progression Model

- Quantitative model that accounts for the time course of disease status, S(t):
  - “clinical outcome”
    - Survival - Dead or alive (or had a stroke or not, etc.)
    - Symptoms - measure of how a patient feels or functions
  - “biomarkers”
    - Signs - physiological or biological measurements of disease activity

A more appropriate symbol to describe disease progress is ‘S’ i.e. the disease status. Disease status is expected to vary with time, S(t).

Disease status may be defined in terms of clinical outcomes such as survival and symptoms or in terms of a biomarker. Biomarkers are also known as clinical signs when used by clinicians as diagnostic or prognostic variables.
A biomarker description of disease progress. Bone mineral density (Knochenmasse) measured in men (Männer) and women (Frauen) is shown over ages (Alter) ranging from 0 to 90. Most therapeutic studies on bone mineral density (BMD) cover less than 10 years so there is a limited understanding of drug effects on disease progression. Note that this figure suggests that the rate of loss of BMD slows in older woman – as it must because BMD cannot go negative.

Disease progress models start with a baseline disease status, $S_0$. The change from baseline in the absence of drug treatment describes the natural history of the disease. When drugs are used then the active effect of the drug modifies disease status. In clinical trials it is also necessary to consider the placebo response as a separate component. Simple disease progress models are described in Holford NHG, Mould DR, Peck CC. Disease Progress Models. In: Atkinson A, editor. Principles of Clinical Pharmacology. San Diego: Academic Press; 2001. p. 253-62.

More complex effects based on turnover models have been described in Post TM, Freijer JI, De Jongh J, Danhof M. Disease system analysis: basic disease progression models in degenerative disease. Pharm Res. 2005 Jul;22(7):1038-49.
The simplest model to describe changing disease status with time is linear. In general if the change is relatively small in relation to the time scale of observation then any disease progress curve will reasonably described by a linear function.

With any disease progress model it is possible to imagine a drug action that is equivalent to a change in the baseline parameter of the model. This kind of effect on disease produces a temporary offset. When treatment is stopped the response to the drug washes out and the status returns to the baseline. In many cases it is reasonable to suppose that the processes governing a delay in onset of drug effect will also affect the loss of effect but the offset effects of levodopa treatment in Parkinson’s disease are one exception to this assumption.

The action of cholinesterase inhibitors in Alzheimer’s disease is very similar for all drugs in this class. There is a delayed onset of benefit taking 2 to 3 months to reach its peak followed by continuing progression of the disease at the same rate as expected from natural history progression. This is clear example of an offset type of drug action. If there is a protective effect it is small and hard to detect without withdrawal of treatment.
Offset Model Code

```plaintext
$ERROR
CE=F ; Immediate Effect PK

SO=THETA(1)*EXP(ETA(1))
ALPHA=THETA(2)*((1+ETA(2)) ; Note proportional ETA
BETA=THETA(3)*((1+ETA(3))

; Offset Drug Action
Y=S0 + ALPHA*TIME + BETA*CE + EPS(1)
```

This code assumes that the drug action is described by a PK model for concentration which has an immediate effect. Any PK model can be used and a delayed effect could be modelled by using an effect compartment model. The drug action is added to the baseline (S0) in order to produce an offset effect. Note that the rate of progression of disease (alpha) and the effect of the drug (beta) may be either positive or negative in an individual patient. It is important not to use an exponential model for the random effects so that both patterns of progress and drug action can be described.

Bone Mineral Density – Slow Biomarker
Women's Health Initiative Randomized Trial

The Women's Health Initiative trial observed the time course of changes in bone mineral density in 1000 women who were treated with placebo or with hormone replacement therapy. Both groups were treated with vitamin D and calcium. Half of the placebo patients were given placebo vitamin D and calcium. This plot is a visual predictive check showing the median and 90% interval for the observed (black) and predicted (red) BMD changes. The increase in BMD in the placebo group (and some of the change in the HRT group) is attributable to treatment with vitamin D and calcium.

These figures shows some key results for the Hip and Spine models which represent two different types of bone. For the hip bone, there was a trend for bone loss with a progression rate of less than 0.01% per year. Maximum treatment effect was estimated to be 6% of baseline. But by year 6, 94% of treatment effect was observed. The effect compartment half-life at the hip was 1.53 years. At the lumbar spine, women gained bone mass during the trial. Approximately 52% of the women’s progression rate was 0.1% per year and the remaining women gained...
Muscular dystrophy causes a progressive loss of muscle strength. This graph shows the author’s belief that the natural history is essentially linear over 6 months. The effects of two doses of prednisone demonstrate a delayed onset of effect but no change in the rate of progression after the maximum effect is achieved. This seems to be an example of an offset type of drug effect. The response to placebo is also delayed but differs from prednisone by loss of effect and return to the natural history rate of progression. The difference in time course of drug action, placebo response and natural history components allows these three phenomena to be distinguished.

It is reasonable to suppose that the start of a clinical trial is the stimulus for the placebo response. The placebo response can be imagined to be due to the time course of placebo ‘concentration’ after a placebo ‘dose’ at time zero (the start of the trial). A basic pharmacokinetic first order absorption and elimination model can be used to describe the placebo time course. Differences in height of response between patients are determined by the apparent placebo ‘dose’. Differences in the rate of appearance and loss of response are determined by the ‘absorption’ and ‘elimination’ half-lives. This
type of placebo model function has been used to describe the placebo response in Alzheimer disease trials. Holford NHG, Peace KE. Methodologic aspects of a population pharmacodynamic model for cognitive effects in Alzheimer patients treated with tacrine. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1992;89:11466-70.

Drug effects on the slope of a linear model lead to permanent changes in the disease status which are not reversed when treatment is stopped. The permanent effect after stopping treatment is the hallmark of a protective action.

Note that protective effect models must be coded as differential equations because drug concentration (CE) varies with time.
There is no reason to think that drug effects must be either offset or slope types. It is possible to have both kinds of effect due to the same drug.

A trial was undertaken in China in patients with moderate renal functional impairment. After 2 years of follow up they were randomized to treatment with a lead chelating agent. Patients who received chelation treatment had a rapid improvement in function which could be described by an offset effect. There was also a marked slowing of the rate of decline of renal function. This could be described by a slope effect but without washout of treatment it is not possible to distinguish a true protective effect from a slow onset offset effect.

The shapes of the linear, exponential asymptote and Gompertz asymptote are shown based on estimates obtained in patient’s with Parkinson’s disease. The exponential and Gompertz models have different time courses. The exponential model has a more rapid initial slope.
Asymptotic Disease Progress

\[ \frac{dS}{dt} = \alpha \cdot f(Rx) \]

Linear

\[ \frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{\ln(2)}{T_{prog}} \cdot (S_{ss} \cdot f(Rx) - S) \]

Exponential

\[ \frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{1}{T_{prog} \cdot f(Rx)} \cdot (S_{ss} - S) \cdot S \]

Gompertz

\( \alpha \) = Linear progression rate

\( T_{prog} \) = Progression time constant

\( S_{ss} \) = Asymptotic ‘burnt out’ steady state

Asymptotic Progress Code

```plaintext
$PK
S0=THETA(1)*EXP(ETA(1)); baseline
Sss=THETA(2)*(1+ETA(2)); asymptote steady state status
DLTA=Sss-S0; change from baseline to asymptote
THALF=THETA(3)*EXP(ETA(3)); half-life of asymptotic process
BETA=THETA(4)*(1+ETA(4)); drug effect parameter
KPROP=LOG(2)/THALF;

$DES
CE=A(1)
STATUS=A(2)
DADT(1)=-CL*CE; PK model
DADT(2)=KPROP*(DLTA*(1+BETA*CE)-STATUS); exponential asymptote

$ERROR
DISPRG=A(2)
Y=S0+DISPRG+EPS(1)
```

The drug effect is shown as an action on the steady state asymptote (SSS). Alternatively, it could have been on the exponential rate constant (Kprop) or on both SSS and Kprop.

A Real Example

Disease Progression in Parkinson’s Disease
The DATATOP study was performed over a 2-year period but patients enrolled in the study were subsequently followed up for 8 years. The time course of disease status in Parkinson's disease and the effects of treatment were described by a disease progress model. The NM-TRAN code for this analysis can be found in Holford et al. 2006. Holford NHG, Chan PL, Nutt JG, Kieburz K, Shoulson I. Disease progression and pharmacodynamics in Parkinson disease - evidence for functional protection with levodopa and other treatments. J Pharmacokin Pharmacodyn. 2006 Jun;33(3):281-311.

Disease status was followed with the Unified Parkinson’s Disease Response Scale (UPDRS). The UPDRS patterns were quite variable from patient to patient. A major source of variability was the response to individual drug treatments.

The first patient in the DATATOP cohort shows the patterns that were eventually used to build a disease progress and drug action model. The initial rate of progression seems to be slowed when treatment with levodopa and deprenyl is used. In addition, there is a marked symptomatic effect which is primarily attributable to levodopa. It is not obvious what disease progress model is most suitable but it could be linear. Testing different models led to the conclusion that the disease progress approached an asymptote using a Gompertz model.
The effects of levodopa and deprenyl are shown. Both have offset effects and protective effects which was described by an action on the time constant of a Gompertz asymptotic model. See Holford et al 2006 for details of the model code.

The Parkinson Study Group which performed the DATATOP study was interested in asking if levodopa changes the rate of progression of Parkinson’s disease. They designed a trial that was simple in principle but it rested on a key assumption that symptomatic effects of levodopa would wash out within 2 weeks of stopping treatment. When treatment was stopped after 9 months there was a loss of UPDRS response over the next 2 weeks but it did not approach the response seen in a parallel placebo treated group. The marked difference from placebo could be due to a true protective effect or a very slow loss of symptomatic effect.

The ELLDOPA study was prospectively simulated using the model for disease progress and levodopa effects obtained from the DATATOP cohort. The predicted difference from placebo in three levodopa dose groups was very similar to the observed response. This is a form of external validation of the DATATOP model. Chan PL, Nutt JG, Holford NH. Levodopa slows progression of Parkinson’s disease. External validation by clinical trial simulation. Pharm Res. 2007 Apr;24(4):791-802.
What Happened in ELLDOPA?

Using the parameters describing the washout of levodopa symptomatic effects obtained from a small group of patients originally in the DATATOP cohort (Hauser & Holford 2002) along with the disease progress and levodopa symptomatic and protective effects it was possible to predict the symptomatic contribution to the observed difference from placebo after 2 weeks of levodopa washout. This is an example of the utility of modelling both disease progress and drug action. Not only can trial results be predicted but also the results can be interpreted in a more meaningful way.


Disease Progress Models

- **Alzheimer's Disease**
  - Progress: Linear
  - Action: Offset
- **Post-Menopause Bone Loss**
  - Progress: Linear
  - Action: Offset? Slope?
- **Parkinson's Disease**
  - Progress: Non-Linear
  - Action: Offset and Protective

The time course of biomarkers in Alzheimer's disease, post-menopausal bone loss and Parkinson's disease has been used to identify the shape of the natural history curve for the biomarker. Drug actions can also be identified. For post-menopausal bone loss the time course of response is very slow and it is not clear if the drug action is simply a slow offset effect of if there may also be protective actions as well.
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