

# Estimation of an appropriate dose of trazodone for paediatric insomnia, and the potential for a trazodone-atomoxetine interaction

**Author names:** Laura Oggianu<sup>1</sup>, Alice B Ke<sup>2</sup>, Manoranjenni Chetty<sup>2</sup>, Rossella Picollo<sup>1</sup>, Vanessa Petrucci<sup>1</sup>, Fabrizio Calisti<sup>1</sup>, Fabio Garofolo,<sup>1</sup> Serena Tongiani<sup>1</sup>

**Author affiliations:** <sup>1</sup>Angelini RR&D (Research Regulatory & Development), Angelini S.p.A., Piazzale della Stazione snc, 00071 S. Palomba-Pomezia (Rome), Italy; <sup>2</sup>Certara UK, Simcyp Division, Sheffield, United Kingdom.

**Name and address for correspondence:** Oggianu L. (Tel. +39 0691045393; Fax: +39 0691984597; laura.oggianu@angelinipharma.com)

## Author Contributions

M.C., L.O., R.P., V.P., F.G., and S.T. wrote the manuscript; A.B.K., L.O., R.P., V.P., F.G., and S.T. designed the research; A.B.K. performed the research and analysed the data.

**Conflict of Interest:** LO, RP, VP, FC, FG and ST are employees of Angelini S.p.A. ABK and MC are employees of Certara UK, Simcyp Division.

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1002/psp4.12480](https://doi.org/10.1002/psp4.12480)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

**Funding:** This work was performed by Simcyp as part of a consultancy project that was funded by Angelini S.p.A.

**Key words:** trazodone dose in paediatrics; predicting paediatric dose, atomoxetine-trazodone interaction; paediatric insomnia

**Running Title:** Estimating a paediatric dose for trazodone

## **ABSTRACT**

There is a paucity of clinical trials for the treatment of paediatric insomnia. This study was designed to predict doses of trazodone to guide dosing in a clinical trial for paediatric insomnia, using physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modelling. Data on the pharmacokinetics of trazodone in children is currently lacking. The interaction potential between trazodone and atomoxetine was also predicted. Doses predicted in the following age groups, with exposures corresponding to adult dosages of 30 mg, 75 mg and 150 mg once-a-day (QD) respectively were:

2-6 yr old group: doses of 0.35, 0.8 and 1.6 mg/kg QD,

>6-12 yr old group: doses of 0.4, 1.0 and 1.9 mg/kg QD,

>12-17 yr old group: doses of 0.4, 1.1 and 2.1 mg/kg QD.

An interaction between trazodone and atomoxetine was predicted to be unlikely.

Clinical trials based on the above predicted dosing are currently in progress and pharmacokinetic data obtained will enable further refinement of the PBPK models.

## INTRODUCTION

Insomnia is a common sleep disorder in children with neurodevelopmental disorders (NDD) such as Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disease (ADHD), Down syndrome and Rett Syndrome **1-4**. Managing sleep disorders in children is critical both for the child and for the family and it is often frustrating due to the refractory nature of the problem **5**. In children with NDD, behavioral techniques for sleep induction may not be successful, thus requiring pharmacological interventions **1,6**. However, due to the paucity of controlled clinical trials, medications for the treatment of paediatric insomnia in children with NDD still represent an unmet medical need.

Trazodone exerts its antidepressant activity acting as serotonin antagonist and reuptake inhibitor. It is indicated primarily for the treatment of depression in patients who do not respond to antidepressants, such as selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors **7**. Due to the combined serotonergic receptor antagonism and serotonin reuptake inhibition, trazodone has demonstrated unique therapeutic flexibility, which has given rise to its potential use in a broad range of co-morbidities of major depressive disorder, as well as off-label indications, including insomnia **8,9**. Trazodone also shows a sedating activity, with reviews indicating that insomnia is the most common reason for its off-label prescription and use in adult and paediatric populations **8,10**. The hypnotic effect of trazodone is promptly achieved, with possible beneficial effects on sleep architecture and quality in depressed patients **10**. Despite favorable anecdotal reports on the use of trazodone in paediatric insomnia, controlled clinical trials to evaluate its efficacy and safety and appropriate dosages in children are lacking. Currently, there are no clinical data on the pharmacokinetics or efficacy of trazodone in children, thus presenting challenges for the design of prospective clinical trials to evaluate the efficacy of this drug in children. Reliable prediction of relevant paediatric doses from known doses in adults is essential to support the conduct of prospective clinical trials in children.

Although the clinical pharmacokinetics (PK) of trazodone has been extensively studied in adults **11-13**, details relevant to the metabolism of trazodone remain unclear. *In vitro* studies have shown that it is metabolized predominantly by CYP3A4 and CYP3A5 to the active metabolite m-chlorophenylpiperazine (mCPP) **14,15**, with CYP2C19 and CYP2D6 contributing as well to trazodone metabolism into other (inactive) metabolites. Nevertheless, the fraction of the drug *in vivo* metabolized by CYP3A4 ( $f_{m_{CYP3A4}}$ ) has not been quantified. Results from a study following the intravenous administration of 25 mg  $^{14}\text{C}$ -trazodone in healthy volunteers suggested that mCPP formation accounts for at least 35% of trazodone dose **16**. However, once mCPP is formed, it undergoes extensive metabolism **17**, with clinical evidence confirming that the systemic exposure to mCPP in humans accounts for less than 5% of that of trazodone, on a molar basis **18**, suggesting a minimal contribution by the metabolite to the pharmacological effect of the drug.

The aim of this study was to develop a physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) model for trazodone to estimate an appropriate starting dose for a Phase 2 clinical study, designed to evaluate the use of trazodone in the treatment of insomnia in children with ADHD. To our



knowledge, this clinical study will be the first study with trazodone in children. In addition, the pharmacokinetic interaction potential between trazodone and atomoxetine (a drug commonly used to treat ADHD), would be predicted.

## METHODS

Clinical studies were conducted in compliance with the Declaration of Helsinki and the ICH guidelines for Good Clinical Practice. Study protocols and informed consent documents were reviewed and approved by the relevant institutional review boards of the investigational centres. All study patients provided written informed consent.

### PBPK modeling strategy

The Simcyp Population-Based Simulator (Version 14 release 1) was used for all the simulations (Simcyp Ltd, Sheffield, United Kingdom). The Simcyp Caucasian Healthy Volunteer population model was used for the adult simulations, while the Simcyp Paediatric population model was used for the simulations in children aged 2-6 years, >6-12 years and >12-17 years. A PBPK model for trazodone was developed using *in vitro* and clinical data. The strategy adopted for modelling and simulations for predicting paediatric doses is summarized in **Fig 1**.

### Development of Trazodone PBPK models

A PBPK model for trazodone was developed based on available physicochemical parameters, data from *in vitro* experiments, clinical PK parameters and predicted parameters. Derivation of key parameters is described below. The final parameters used in the model are shown in **Table 1**.

### Estimation of CYP3A4-mediated metabolism for trazodone

Details of trazodone metabolic pathway are still lacking, although available evidence suggests that CYP3A4 is predominantly involved. In the absence of an accurate estimate of  $f_{m_{CYP3A4}}$ , 100% was initially assumed. Initial simulations using the measured *in vitro* clearance of the unbound drug ( $CL_{int,u} = 0.37 \mu\text{L}/\text{min}/\text{pmol CYP3A4}$ ) **24**, predicted a clearance of intravenously administered trazodone ( $CL_{IV}$ ) of 5.72 L/h and an oral clearance ( $CL_{PO}$ ) of 7.47 L/h, compared with the observed values of 10 L/h and 13 L/h respectively **26**. In order to fully recover the observed clearances, input parameters for  $CL_{int}$  were back-calculated from the observed  $CL_{IV}$  using the well-stirred liver model (Equation 1 and Equation 2). The  $CL_{int}$  was then divided by average population values for

liver weight (1648 g) **27**, mg protein/gram of liver - MPPGL (39.8 mg protein/g liver) **28** and hepatic CYP enzyme abundance (137 pmol/mg for CYP3A4) **27** to give the  $CL_{int}$  in units of  $\mu\text{L}/\text{min}/\text{pmol}$  P450.

$$CL_{uH,int} = \frac{Q_H \times CL_{metH}}{f_{uB}(Q_H - CL_{metH})} \quad \text{Equation (1)}$$

$$CL_{metH} = CL_{IV} - CL_R \quad \text{Equation (2)}$$

where  $f_{uB}$  is the fraction of unbound drug in blood (calculated from fraction of unbound drug in the plasma divided by the blood to plasma ratio -  $f_{uP}/B:P$ );  $Q_H$  is the blood flow in the hepatic vein (90 L/hr);  $CL_R$  is the renal clearance (0 L/hr) and  $CL_{metH}$  is the hepatic metabolic clearance. A  $CL_{int}$  <sub>CYP3A4</sub> of 0.438  $\mu\text{L}/\text{min}/\text{pmol}$  was used in the model.

Trazodone  $fm_{CYP3A4}$  was subsequently refined by assessing the inhibition effect of clarithromycin treatment on trazodone systemic exposures and comparing it to those observed in the clinical study **29**. This optimized  $fm_{CYP3A4}$  was further verified by assessing the inhibition effect of ritonavir treatment on trazodone systemic exposures **30**. Consequently, trazodone  $fm_{CYP3A4}$  was set to 70% in the final model. The balance of the metabolism (30%) was assigned as undefined human liver microsome (HLM) metabolism in the PBPK model.

### Estimation of trazodone absorption parameters

Trazodone oral solution and immediate release (IR) tablets were shown to be bioequivalent **31**. Based on those findings, the first-order absorption model for the IR model was also used to describe the absorption kinetics of trazodone oral solution. *In vitro* data on the permeability of trazodone were used to predict the fraction absorbed ( $F_a$ ) for the IR tablets (see **Table 1**), based on equation 3.

$$F_a = 1 - (1 + 0.54 P_{eff,man})^{-7} \quad \text{Equation (3)}$$

The  $F_a$  was predicted to be 0.98, compared with the 0.72 to 0.91 that was previously reported **26**. A first-order absorption model was used to describe the absorption kinetics of trazodone extended release (ER) formulation. The  $k_a$  was estimated from clinical data following a single oral dose of 300 mg ER **25**, using the Weighted Least Square algorithm and Nelder-Mead method.

The initial estimate of  $k_a$  was  $0.1 \text{ hr}^{-1}$  with a range of 0.01 to  $2 \text{ hr}^{-1}$ . The final  $k_a$  estimate was  $0.07 \text{ hr}^{-1}$ .

### **Simulations for trazodone model development and verification in adults**

To verify the developed trazodone model, simulated plasma concentrations were compared with observed clinical data for:

- \* a single oral dose of 50 mg IR or 30, 60 or 90 mg oral solution **31**;
- \* multiple oral doses of 100 mg IR three times daily for 7 days **32**.

CYP3A4 contribution ( $fm_{\text{CYP3A4}} = 100\%$ ) to the model was assessed by comparing the simulated drug-drug interaction (DDI) between a single 50 mg oral dose (IR) of trazodone (given on Day 2) and clarithromycin (500 mg given at 24 h, 8 h and 1 h prior to and again at 8 h after administration of trazodone, to adult healthy volunteers) with clinical data **29**. The Simcyp default model for clarithromycin was used for these simulations and the performance of this model in recovering the observed CYP3A4 interaction has been verified by Ke and coworkers **33**. The  $fm_{\text{CYP3A4}}$  value of 100% resulted in an over estimation of the DDI (see results section). Sensitivity analysis was used to optimise the  $fm_{\text{CYP3A4}}$ , resulting in a value of 70%. This refined trazodone model with  $fm_{\text{CYP3A4}} = 70\%$  was further verified by simulating the DDI between a single 50 mg oral dose of trazodone (IR formulation that was administered on day 2) and ritonavir (200 mg BID) and comparing the PK to clinical data **30**. The Simcyp model for ritonavir (V15 release) was used for these simulations. Verification of the ritonavir model in recovering the observed CYP3A4 interaction is shown in the Supplementary Information (S5).

Study designs for all the above simulations matched the corresponding clinical studies (S1).

### **Trazodone model refinement for dose estimations in children**

Trazodone oral solution was the favored dosage form for the paediatric clinical study. Therefore, the final adult trazodone IR/oral solution model was used for the paediatric dose simulations using the age bands of 2 to 6 years, > 6 to 12 years and > 12 to 17 years. Ten by ten trials of paediatric subjects (proportion of female= 0.5) in the respective age bands were generated. The

prediction of dosage adjustment in children was based on matching the equivalent steady-state exposures ( $C_{\max}$ ) in adults following 30, 75 mg to 150 mg IR trazodone per day. Sensitivity analysis was used to determine the dose for each age band that resulted in a  $C_{\max}$  similar to that in adults, corresponding to the 30, 75 and 150 mg doses. For the treatment of sleeping disorder, the tested doses ranged from 30 to 90 mg/day **34**. Therefore, 30 mg was selected to represent the lowest dose levels and 75 mg was selected to represent an intermediate dosage between 60 and 90 mg. The approved doses for trazodone IR formulation in treating adult major depressive disorder is 150 to 400 mg/day, with an initial dose of 150 mg **20**.

It was assumed that the  $F_a$  and  $k_a$  of trazodone relating to the oral solution are not age-dependent. Preliminary simulations using the Simcyp mechanistic absorption module, i.e. the Advanced Dissolution, Absorption & Metabolism (ADAM) model, supported this assumption **35**. The paediatric ADAM module accounts for gastro-intestinal (GI) physiological changes in the paediatric population, including gastric fluid volumes in fasted and fed states, intestinal surface area, intestinal fluid volumes, gastric emptying time, elevated gastric pH in early neonatal period, etc. The lowest measured solubility for trazodone-HCL of 2.57 mg/mL was used as the intrinsic solubility input, with other formulation-specific parameters set to default Simcyp values for “solution with precipitation” formulation, due to trazodone sparing solubility. Simulations supported an  $F_a = 1.0$ . The systemic exposure of trazodone using the paediatric ADAM model was comparable to that simulated using the first order absorption model. Further details are shown in the Supplementary Information (S2). Ongoing research will explore the ADAM model further.

In the absence of experimental data, the main plasma binding protein for trazodone was assumed to be albumin. The maturation pattern for albumin (HSA) and for  $\alpha_1$ -acid glycoprotein (AAG) are comparable in paediatrics > 2 years old **36**. Thus, the age effect on plasma protein binding of trazodone to either HSA or AAG is expected to be similar. The Simcyp CYP3A enzyme ontogeny was applied to the model, where 70% of trazodone metabolism was assigned to CYP3A4. Thirty percent of the metabolism was assigned to undefined HLM metabolism and an ontogeny function was not applied.

### **Simulations to predict trazodone doses in children**

A thorough QT/QTc study in adults confirmed the moderate effects of trazodone on the QT interval and showed a weak correlation between QTc changes and maximum trazodone concentrations **37**. The paediatric dose projection in the 2-6 yr, >6-12 yr and >12-17yr groups primarily focused on matching the equivalent steady-state  $C_{max}$  in adults, so as to minimize the potential risks of QT/QTc changes in the paediatric population. To reach this aim, the dose in paediatric subjects giving equivalent  $C_{max}$  in adults were estimated using sensitivity analysis. The final simulated PK parameters and profiles following adult doses (IR formulation) of 30 mg QD, 75 mg QD and 150 mg QD were utilized.

The division of the paediatric population into the 2-6 yr, >6-12 yr and >12-17yr groups was based on advice from the regulatory authority, during discussions of the proposed clinical trial.

### Atomoxetine model development

The development of a 'fit-for-purpose' model for atomoxetine focused on the recovery of the clinically observed atomoxetine multiple-dose PK in CYP2D6 extensive metabolizers (EM) and poor metabolizers (PM), since the objective for model application was to assess drug interactions with trazodone as a victim drug.

Reported CL/F values (estimated using population pharmacokinetic analysis (Pop-PK) in CYP2D6 EMs and PMs **38** were used as clearance inputs. Initial simulations using the Pop-PK model estimated a  $V_{ss}$  of 0.85 L/kg, leading to an under-estimation of atomoxetine  $C_{max}$  in both EMs and PMs. Thus, the  $V_{ss}$  was further optimized ( $V_{ss} = 0.71$  L/kg) based on the fitting of concentration-time profiles following the administration of 20 mg BID atomoxetine in CYP2D6 PMs **39**.

The *in vitro* measured CYP3A4  $K_i$  **40** was verified by assessing the inhibition effect of atomoxetine treatment on midazolam (a CYP3A4 substrate) systemic exposure and comparing the predicted exposures with those clinically observed.

All input parameters used in the atomoxetine final model are presented in **Table 2**.

### Verification of atomoxetine model and application to DDI

The 'fit for purpose' model for atomoxetine was verified by comparing the simulated profiles of atomoxetine 20 mg or 40 mg following BID administration in healthy CYP2D6 EMs and PMs with the observed clinical data **38, 39**.

A sensitivity analysis was performed to verify the *in vitro* measured CYP3A4  $K_i$  **40** and  $f_{u_{mic}}$  for atomoxetine, using midazolam as a substrate. Details of the study designs and results of atomoxetine model verification are shown in the Supplementary Information (S3).

The verified atomoxetine model was then applied to prospectively predict the interaction between trazodone and atomoxetine. Ten virtual trials of 10 subjects each (aged 20-50 years, proportion of female = 0.5) were generated. Each subject received a single oral dose of 150 mg trazodone IR on Day-10, 2 hours after the morning dose of atomoxetine (60 mg BID for 12 days). The dose staggering of 2 hours was selected based on matching the simulated  $t_{max}$  of trazodone (~ 0.5 hr) and atomoxetine (~ 2.5 hr) to maximize the extent of interaction.

#### **Verification of the predictive performance of the PBPK models in this study**

Predictive performance of the models were evaluated by the ratios of the predicted: observed (pred:obs) PK parameters, such as AUC and  $C_{max}$ . Due to the potential variability in the clinical data and the more complex DDI mechanisms involved, model predictions were deemed to be acceptable when they were within 1.5-fold of the observed data **41**. In addition, predicted concentration-time profiles were compared with those observed in clinical studies (visual inspection).

## **RESULTS**

### **Simulations of trazodone PK for single oral dose as 50 mg IR tablet or 30 mg, 60 mg or 90 mg oral solution formulation in healthy adults**

PK parameters and concentration time profiles of the observed and simulated data for 50 mg IR tablet and 30 mg, 60 mg or 90 mg oral solution formulation of trazodone in healthy adults are presented in **Table 3** and **Fig 2**. The AUC predicted/AUC observed and  $C_{max}$  predicted/ $C_{max}$

observed ratios were within 1.5-fold, thus indicating acceptable recovery of the clinical data by the trazodone PBPK model.

#### **Simulations of the PK of 100 mg IR tablet of trazodone given TID for 7 days in healthy adults**

This simulation resulted in a mean  $C_{max}$  of 1822 ng/mL, compared with the clinically observed mean  $C_{max}$  of 3026 ng/mL. The predicted mean  $AUC_{0-24}$  was 24982 ng\*h/mL compared with a clinically observed value of 32136 ng\*h/mL. The predicted/observed mean  $C_{max}$  and AUC ratios were 0.60 and 0.78, respectively. The observed diurnal variation on trazodone PK following 100 mg IR TID **42** was not accounted for in the simulations. The slight under-estimation of  $C_{max}$  can probably be attributed to the absence of the diurnal variation in the model.

#### **Simulation of trazodone interaction with clarithromycin**

To verify trazodone  $fm_{CYP3A4}$ , the inhibitory effect of clarithromycin (dosed as 500 mg at 24 h, 8 h and 1 h prior to and again at 8 h after administration of trazodone) on CYP3A4 and, consequently, on trazodone (single dose of 50 mg IR on Day-2) systemic exposure was assessed. A  $fm_{CYP3A4}$  of 100% in the base model led to an over-estimation of the DDI. The predicted trazodone AUC and  $C_{max}$  ratios were 2.77 and 1.45, respectively, compared with the observed ratios of 1.99 and 1.35, respectively **29**. Due to the uncertainty with the assumption of  $fm_{CYP3A4} = 100\%$ , a sensitivity analysis of  $fm_{CYP3A4}$  was subsequently conducted and a reduction of trazodone  $fm_{CYP3A4}$  to 70% allowed the recovery of the observed clarithromycin DDI data (**Table 3**). The refined model, assuming  $fm_{CYP3A4}$  of 70%, generated predicted trazodone AUC and  $C_{max}$  ratios of 2.09 and 1.28, respectively, consistent with the observed ratios of 1.99 and 1.35, respectively (**Table 3**).

#### **Simulation of trazodone interaction with ritonavir**

Using the refined trazodone model with the optimised  $fm_{CYP3A4}$ , trazodone predicted AUC and  $C_{max}$  ratios were 3.14 and 1.39, respectively, compared with the observed ratios of 2.37 and 1.34, respectively (**Table 3**). Since the predicted ratios were within 1.5-fold of the observed ratios, this trazodone model was considered acceptable.

## **Predicted doses and PK parameters based on matching paediatric and adult $C_{max}$ to relevant adult doses**

The final simulated  $C_{max}$ , AUC and concentration-time profiles corresponding to adult doses of 30 mg IR QD, 75 mg IR QD and 150 mg IR QD are shown in **Table 4** and **Fig 3**.

Predicted doses in the following age groups, based on predicted exposures corresponding to adult dosages of 30 mg, 75 mg and 150 mg QD respectively were:

- for 2-6 yr old group, doses of 0.35, 0.8 and 1.6 mg/kg QD
- for >6-12 yr old group, doses of 0.4, 1.0 and 1.9 mg/kg QD
- for >12-17 yr old group, doses of 0.4, 1.1 and 2.1 mg/kg QD

## **Simulations of 20 mg BID and 40 mg BID atomoxetine PK in healthy adults**

The mean simulated  $C_{max}$  and AUC values for atomoxetine 20 mg BID were 171 ng/mL and 1180 ng\*h/mL, respectively, in CYP2D6 EMs and 776 ng/mL and 8210 ng\*h/mL, respectively, in PMs. The corresponding  $C_{max}$  and AUC observed values were 160 ng/mL and 1080 ng\*h/mL, respectively, in EMs and 915 ng/mL and 8440 ng\*h/mL, respectively, in PMs **39**. The predicted/observed ratios for  $C_{max}$  and AUC were respectively 1.07 and 1.09 for EMs and 0.85 and 0.97 for PMs, indicating good recovery of the clinical data.

Mean simulated  $C_{max}$  and AUC values for atomoxetine 40 mg BID were 355 ng/mL and 2025 ng\*h/mL respectively in CYP2D6 EMs and 1608 ng/mL and 16602 ng\*h/mL respectively in PMs. The corresponding  $C_{max}$  and AUC observed values were 527 ng/mL and 2590 ng\*h/mL respectively in EMs and 1949 ng/mL and 18600 ng\*h/mL respectively in PMs **38**. The predicted/observed ratios for  $C_{max}$  and AUC were respectively 0.67 and 0.78 for EMs and 0.83 and 0.89 for PMs, indicating acceptable recovery of clinical data, although  $C_{max}$  was marginally under-predicted in EMs.

## **Simulation of the interaction between trazodone and atomoxetine**

Estimations of DDI potential indicates that in CYP2D6 PMs, where the DDI magnitude is expected to be the most significant, trazodone AUC and  $C_{max}$  predicted ratios were 1.06 and 1.05, respectively. In CYP2D6 EMs, trazodone AUC and  $C_{max}$  predicted ratios were 1.01 and 1.01,



respectively. These ratios indicate that an interaction between trazodone and atomoxetine is not likely to occur.

## DISCUSSION

This PBPK study was designed to predict appropriate paediatric doses of trazodone for its use in a paediatric clinical trial. In the absence of clinical data on PK and efficacy of trazodone in children, this approach was essential for initial dose prediction that enabled ethical and regulatory approval for the clinical trial. Traditional allometric methods of dose prediction in children are frequently inaccurate since they are based on body weight changes, without considering the impact of early childhood maturation in body composition, organ maturation and ontogeny of eliminating enzymes, which are generally nonlinear with age **43**. Scaling by body weight (BW), body surface area (BSA) or  $BW^{0.75}$  were tested for 30 different drugs. The BW scaling method under-predicted the majority of doses across the paediatric range. The BSA and  $BW^{0.75}$  methods over-predicted some doses by up to 2.86 fold **44**. PBPK modelling was the method approved for dose prediction by the regulatory authority in this case, since it has the potential to integrate information from age-specific physiological and biochemical data, as well as data from pre-clinical, clinical and *in-vitro* sources to elucidate PK changes in children and complement paediatric studies and investigational plans **45**.

The paediatric dose projection primarily focused on matching the equivalent steady-state  $C_{max}$  in adults, to minimise the potential risk of QT/QTc changes. However, corresponding AUCs were also evaluated and shown to be within the corresponding adult ranges. The developed and verified model for trazodone showed acceptable recovery of clinical data in the adult population, prior to its application to the paediatric population for dose prediction.

Doses predicted in the following age groups, for exposures corresponding to adult dosages of 30 mg, 75 mg and 150 mg QD, were:

- 2-6 yr old group, doses of 0.35, 0.8 and 1.6 mg/kg QD, respectively;
- >6-12 yr old group, doses of 0.4, 1.0 and 1.9 mg/kg QD, respectively;
- >12-17 yr old group, doses of 0.4, 1.1 and 2.1 mg/kg QD, respectively.

Based on these predictions, the following dosing strategy was adopted and approved by the regulator for a Paediatric Investigational Plan:

10 children will be recruited in each of the age groups (2-6 yrs, >6-12 yr and >12-17yr) and stratified by age and dose level as follows:

- Arm 1: 0.25mg/kg QD corresponding to 20 mg QD in adults
- Arm 2: 0.4mg/kg QD corresponding to 30 mg QD in adults
- Arm 3: 0.5mg/kg QD corresponding to 40 mg QD in adults.

The use of the doses predicted using PBPK modelling marked an important milestone towards the prospective testing of trazodone for insomnia in children. Data generated from the clinical trial based on these predicted doses will inform further model refinement in the future. The approach adopted for trazodone can be extended to other drugs where initial dosing in children presents a challenge.

Assumptions and limitations of the models are discussed below. Firstly, it is assumed that the pharmacodynamic effects of trazodone are equivalent with similar exposure in adults and children. No information is currently available to support the contrary. Although a key component of the trazodone model was a robust  $fm_{CYP3A4}$  parameter, data for a precise estimate of this parameter was unavailable. Based on *in vitro* data and relevant drug interaction studies, an estimate of 70% was obtained for  $fm_{CYP3A4}$ . A mass balance study would be useful in obtaining a more accurate estimate for this parameter. CYP3A4 is the main enzyme contributing to the elimination of trazodone. The ontogeny profile of CYP3A4 showed that the hepatic CYP3A4 activity reached the adult level by the approximate age of 2 years. Therefore, the key factors that drove dose projection in the paediatric populations included age, body mass, liver size, liver blood flow and plasma protein binding. The main plasma binding protein for trazodone was assumed to be albumin. However, the maturation pattern for albumin (HSA) and for  $\alpha_1$ -acid glycoprotein (AAG) are comparable in paediatrics > 2 years old **36**. Thus, the age effect on plasma protein binding of trazodone to either HSA or AAG is expected to be similar. A first-order absorption model was used in all the paediatric simulations with the same adult  $k_a$  and  $F_a$  values, based on the assumption that  $k_a$  and  $F_a$  of trazodone oral solution are not age-dependent.

Preliminary investigations using the ADAM model showed no age-dependent effect on  $F_a$  and provided systemic exposure of trazodone comparable to that simulated from the first-order absorption model with the same adult  $k_a$  and  $F_a$  values.

Simulations of the trazodone interaction with atomoxetine indicated that no potential interaction is expected. Since atomoxetine is frequently used in NDD, these predictions are reassuring and indicate that trazodone can be used concurrently with atomoxetine.

It can be concluded that the above predicted doses of trazodone can be used to guide dosing in the initial clinical trials in paediatrics as endorsed by the EMA (ref. EMEA-002142-PIP01-17), prior to conducting the first controlled clinical study in paediatrics. The conduct of a clinical trial in paediatrics is now in progress, based on the dose predictions above. Ethical and regulatory approval for the clinical trial were based on the doses predicted in this analysis. PK data collection was recommended during the clinical trial for further verification of the doses and refinement of the PBPK models.

## STUDY HIGHLIGHTS

### **What is the current knowledge on topic?**

Paediatric insomnia is a common comorbidity in neurodevelopmental disorders (NDD). Although trazodone is frequently used for its ability to induce and maintain sleep in adults with depressive disorders, equivalent doses for children have not been defined.

### **What question did this study address?**

This study aimed to predict doses of trazodone to guide dosing in a clinical trial on paediatric insomnia in NDD. In addition, the interaction potential between trazodone and atomoxetine (frequently used in the treatment of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorders) was predicted.

### **How does this study add to our knowledge?**

Paediatric doses of trazodone were predicted from commonly prescribed adult doses used in insomnia, using a PBPK strategy.

### **How might this change drug discovery, development, and/or therapeutics?**

Currently there are no approved drugs for the treatment of paediatric insomnia in NDD. These predicted doses of trazodone were used to guide dosing in a Paediatric Investigational Plan to address this need. Prediction of the lack of a potential drug-drug interaction between trazodone and atomoxetine suggests that these two drugs can be co-administered.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Souders, M.C., *et al.* Sleep behaviors and sleep quality in children with autism spectrum disorders. *Sleep*. **32**, 1566-1578 (2009).
- 2 Angriman, M., Caravale, B., Novelli, L., Ferri, R., Bruni O. Sleep in children with neurodevelopmental disabilities. *Neuropediatrics*. **46**, 199-210 (2015).
- 3 Hvolby, A., Jørgensen, J., Bilenberg, N. Actigraphic and parental reports of sleep difficulties in children with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. **162**, 323-329 (2008).
- 4 Miano, S., & Ferri, R. Epidemiology and management of insomnia in children with autistic spectrum disorders. *Paediatr Drugs*. **12**, 75-84 (2010)
- 5 Blackmer, A.B., & Feinstein, J.A. Management of sleep disorders in children with neurodevelopmental disorders: A review. *Pharmacotherapy*. **36**, 84-98 (2016).
- 6 Pelayo, R., & Yuen, K. Pediatric sleep pharmacology. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*. **21**, 861–883 (2012).
- 7 Santarsieri, D., & Schwartz, T.L. Antidepressant efficacy and side effect burden: a quick guide for clinicians. *Drugs in Context*. **4**, 212290 (2015).
- 8 Bossini, L., Casolaro, I., Koukouna, D., Cecchini, F., Fagiolini, A. Off-label uses of trazodone: a review. *Expert Opin Pharmacother*. **13**, 1707-1717 (2012)
- 9 Bossini, L., *et al.* Off-Label Trazodone Prescription: Evidence, Benefits and Risks. *Curr Pharm Des*. **21**, 3343-3351 (2015).
- 10 Bruni, O. *et al.* Angriman Practitioner Review: Treatment of chronic insomnia in children and adolescents with neurodevelopmental disabilities. *J Child Psychol and Psychiat*. **59**, 489–508 (2018)
- 11 Bayer, A.J., Pathy, M.S., Ankier, S.I. Pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic characteristics of trazodone in the elderly. *Br J Clin Pharmacol*. **16**, 371-376 (1983)
- 12 Nilsen, O.G., & Dale, O. Single Dose Pharmacokinetics of Trazodone in Healthy Subjects. *Basic and Clin Pharmacol and Toxicol*. **71**, 150-153 (1992).
- 13 Nilsen, O.G., Dale, O., Husebe, B. Pharmacokinetics of Trazodone During Multiple Dosing to Psychiatric Patients. *Basic and Clin Pharmacol and Toxicol*. **72**, 286-289 (1993)

- 14 Rotzinger, S., Fang, J., & Baker, G.B. Trazodone is metabolized to m-chlorophenylpiperazine by CYP3A4 from human sources. *Drug Metab Dispos* **26**:572-575 (1998).
- 15 Tolonen A. Identification of metabolizing enzymes for trazodone, using liver microsomes with CYP-inhibitors and recombinant enzymes from rat and human Angelini, Internal Report, 49001 – v 1.0, (2016) – unpublished.
- 16 Jauch, R., Kopitar, Z., Prox, A., Zimmer, A. Pharmacokinetics and metabolism of trazodone in man (author's transl)]. *Arzneimittelforschung* **26**:2084-2089 (1976).
- 17 von Moltke, L.L, *et. al.* Nefazodone, meta-chlorophenylpiperazine, and their metabolites in vitro: cytochromes mediating transformation, and P450-3A4 inhibitory actions. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* **145**:113-122 (1999).
- 18 Picollo R. Trazodone (TZ) and its metabolite m-chlorophenyl piperazine (mCPP). Evaluation of the exposure to the metabolite as compared to the parent compound in healthy volunteers Angelini, Internal Report, 49039 - v. 1.0, (2016) – unpublished.
- 19 Trazodone Investigator's Brochure, 8656B01 - v. 7.0, 2013
- 20 Desyrel (trazodone) US prescribing information. [https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\\_docs/label/2017/018207s032lbl.pdf](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2017/018207s032lbl.pdf)
- 21 Tang, J. *In vitro* human and rat blood partitioning of AF1161 and AF2066. Angelini, Internal Report, 47906 - v. 1.0, (2015) – unpublished.
- 22 Cozzi, E. Trazodone: Cross Species Plasma Protein Binding of Trazodone, Tramadol and their respective metabolites mCPP and M1. Angelini, Internal Report, 47911 - v. 1.0, (2015) – unpublished.
- 23 Rodgers, T., & Rowland, M. Mechanistic approaches to volume of distribution predictions: understanding the processes. *Pharm Res* **24**:918-933 (2007).
- 24 Gertz, M., Harrison, A., Houston, J.B., Galetin, A. Prediction of human intestinal first-pass metabolism of 25 CYP3A substrates from in vitro clearance and permeability data. *Drug Metab Dispos* **38**,1147-1158 (2010).
- 25 Karhu, D., Groenewoud, G., Potgieter M.A., Mould D.R. Dose Proportionality of Once-Daily Trazodone Extended-Release Caplets Under Fasting Conditions. *J Clin Pharmacol.* **50**,1438-1449 (2010)

- 26 Greenblatt, D.J., *et. al.* Trazodone kinetics: effect of age, gender, and obesity. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **42**,193-200 (1987).
- 27 Barter, Z.E., Tucker, G.T., & Rowland-Yeo, K. Differences in cytochrome p450-mediated pharmacokinetics between Chinese and Caucasian populations predicted by mechanistic physiologically based pharmacokinetic modelling. *Clin Pharmacokinet* **52**, 1085-1100 (2013).
- 28 Barter, Z.E., Chowdry, J.E., Harlow, J.R., Snawder, J.E., Lipscomb, J.C., Rostami-Hodjegan, A. Covariation of human microsomal protein per gram of liver with age: absence of influence of operator and sample storage may justify inter laboratory data pooling. *Drug Metab Dispos* **36**,2405-2409 (2008).
- 29 Farkas, D., Volak, L.P., Harmatz, J.S., von Moltke, L.L., Court, M.H., Greenblatt, D.J. Short-term clarithromycin administration impairs clearance and enhances pharmacodynamic effects of trazodone but not of zolpidem. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **85**:644-650 (2009).
- 30 Greenblatt, D.J., *et. al.* Short-term exposure to low-dose ritonavir impairs clearance and enhances adverse effects of trazodone. *J Clin Pharmacol.* **43**, 414-422 (2003).
- 31 Rusca, A., *et.al.* A bioavailability study of a new formulation of trazodone drops (6%) at three different dosages (30 mg, 60 mg and 90 mg) and of a marketed IR tablets formulation (Trazodone HCl) (50 mg) in healthy volunteers. Angelini, Internal Report, 44007 - v. 1.0, (2014) – unpublished.
- 32 Karhu, D., Gossen, E.R., Mostert A., Cronje, T., Fradette, C. Safety, tolerability and pharmacokinetics of once-daily trazodone extended-release caplets in healthy subjects. *Int J Clin Pharmacol and Ther* **49**,730-743 (2011)
- 33 Ke, A.B., Zamek-Gliszczynski, M.J., Higgins, J.W., Hall, S.D. Itraconazole and clarithromycin as ketoconazole alternatives for clinical CYP3A inhibition studies. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* **95**, 473-476 (2014).
- 34 Zucconi, M., Olivieri, L., Dionisio, P. Dose-finding study of trazodone in the treatment of patients with primary insomnia. Angelini, Internal Report, 32310 - v. 1.0, (2011) - unpublished.
- 35 Patel, N., Polak, S., Jamei, M., Rostami-Hodjegan, A., Turner, D.B. Quantitative prediction of formulation-specific food effects and their population variability from in vitro data with

the physiologically-based ADAM model: a case study using the BCS/BDDCS Class II drug nifedipine. *Eur J Pharm Sci* **57**, 240-249 (2014).

- 36 Johnson, T.N., Rostami-Hodjegan, A., Tucker, G.T. Prediction of the clearance of eleven drugs and associated variability in neonates, infants and children. *Clin Pharmacokinet* **45**, 931-956 (2006).
- 37 Rusca A., et. al. Effect on cardiac repolarization (QTc interval duration) of single and repeated dose of orally administered trazodone in healthy subjects. Angelini, Internal Report, 21680 - v. 1.0, 2008 – unpublished.
- 38 FDA, CDER. Strattera Clinical Pharmacology and Biopharmaceutics Review. Study HFBJ; [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\\_docs/nda/2002/21-411\\_Strattera\\_biopharmr\\_P2.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2002/21-411_Strattera_biopharmr_P2.pdf)
- 39 Sauer, J.M., et. al. Disposition and metabolic fate of atomoxetine hydrochloride: the role of CYP2D6 in human disposition and metabolism. *Drug Metab Dispos* **31**, 98-107 (2003).
- 40 Sauer, J.M., et. al. Atomoxetine hydrochloride: clinical drug-drug interaction prediction and outcome. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* **308**, 410-418 (2004).
- 41 Wagner, C., Pan, Y., Hsu, V., Sinha, V., Zhao, P. Predicting the Effect of CYP3A Inducers on the Pharmacokinetics of Substrate Drugs Using Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic (PBPK) Modeling: An Analysis of PBPK Submissions to the US FDA. *Clin Pharmacokinet* **54**, 117-127 (2015).
- 42 Nell, A., Burger, M., Rosignoli, M.T., Picollo, R., Dionisio, P. A randomised, two-way cross-over study to compare the bioavailability of 300 mg trazodone hydrochloride extended release caplets (containing Contramid®) (administered once daily) and 100 mg trazodone hydrochloride immediate release tablets (administered three times daily) at steady state Angelini, Internal Report, 30025 – v 1.0, (2010) – unpublished.
- 43 Johnson, T.N., Rostami-Hodjegan, A., Tucker, G.T. A comparison of methods to predict drug clearance in neonates, infants and children. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* **57**, 677– 678 (2004).
- 44 Johnson, T.N. Modelling approaches to dose estimation in children. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* **59**, 663– 669 (2005).



45 Maharaj, A.R., Edginton, A.N. Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic Modeling and Simulation in Pediatric Drug Development. CPT Pharmacometrics Syst. Pharmacol. **3**, e148 (2014).

### Legends for Figures

**Fig 1:** Summary of PBPK modelling strategy for predicting exposure of trazodone in children.

**Fig 2:** Predicted (black line represents mean and grey lines represent individual trials) and observed (circles – A, B, C, D: **31**; E: **32**; F: **25, 32**) trazodone plasma concentration profiles following administration of different doses and formulations.

**Fig 3:** Predicted median total plasma concentration-time profiles of trazodone following the respective predicted final doses in 2 to 6 years old; >6 to 12 years old and >12 to 17 years old. These were based on matching the adult  $C_{max}$  following 30 mg IR QD for 7 days (A and B); 75 mg IR QD for 7 days (C and D) 150 mg IR QD for 7 days (E and F).

### Supplementary File

*(Supplemental Material: Text.PDF)*

### Supplementary Information

**Table 1. Input parameter values used to simulate the kinetics of trazodone**

Parameter Name	Value	Method/Source
<b>Physical Chemistry and Blood Binding</b>		
<b>MW (g/mol)</b>	408.32	<b>19</b>
<b>Log P</b>	2.87	Calculated from experimental value of logD7.4 (=2.79) <b>20</b>
<b>Compound type</b>	Monoprotic Base	<b>20</b>
<b>pK<sub>a</sub></b>	6.61	Measured <b>20</b>
<b>B/P</b>	0.68	Calculated from measured E:P ratio of 0.2. <b>21</b>
<b>fu<sub>p</sub></b>	0.0354	Measured by equilibrium dialysis. <b>22</b>
<b>Model</b>	<b>Full-PBPK</b>	
<b>Vss (L/kg)</b>	1.0	Predicted (Method 2) <b>23</b>
<b>Absorption</b>		
<b>F<sub>a</sub></b>	0.98	Predicted from mean P <sub>app</sub> (24.2*10 <sup>-6</sup> cm/s) obtained in Caco-2 cells and calibrated using metoprolol data (28.1*10 <sup>-6</sup> cm/s). <b>24</b>
<b>k<sub>a</sub> (hr<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	IR/oral solution: 1.60 ER: 0.07	IR: Predicted from mean P <sub>app</sub> (24.2*10 <sup>-6</sup> cm/s) obtained in Caco-2 cells and calibrated using metoprolol data (28.1*10 <sup>-6</sup> cm/s) <b>24</b> ER: fitting of concentration-time data following a single oral dose of 300 mg ER trazodone <b>25</b>
<b>fu<sub>gut</sub></b>	1.0	Default value
<b>Elimination</b>		
<b>CL<sub>int,CYP3A4</sub> (μL/min/pmol)</b>	0.438	Retrograde calculation-assign 70% of hepatic metabolism to CYP3A4 (see Methods section)
<b>Additional HLM CL<sub>int</sub> (μL/min/mg)</b>	25.7	Retrograde calculation-assign 30% of hepatic metabolism to undefined pathways (see Methods section)

**Table 2. Input parameter values used to simulate the PK of atomoxetine**

Parameter Name	Value	Method/Source
<b>Phys Chem and Blood Binding</b>		
<b>MW (g/mol)</b>	291.82	<b>38</b>
<b>logP</b>	3.81	Predicted by Chemaxon
<b>Compound type</b>	Monoprotic Base	
<b>pK<sub>a</sub></b>	9.8	Predicted by Chemaxon
<b>B/P</b>	0.605	Predicted by Simcyp
<b>fu<sub>p</sub></b>	0.02	<b>38</b>
<b>Model</b>	Minimal-PBPK	
<b>Vss (L/kg)</b>	0.71	Optimized; observed Vss is 0.85 L/kg
<b>Absorption</b>		
<b>F<sub>a</sub></b>	1	
<b>K<sub>a</sub> (hr<sup>-1</sup>)</b>	0.926	Estimated by Pop-PK analysis <b>38</b>
<b>fu<sub>gut</sub></b>	1.0	Default
<b>Elimination</b>		
<b>CL/F (L/h)</b>	CYP2D6 EM: 26.4 (CV%: 55.7) CYP2D6 PM: 2.55 (CV%:18)	Estimated by Pop-PK analysis <b>38</b>
<b>CYP3A4 Inhibition</b>		

$K_i$ ( $\mu\text{M}$ )	34	Measured, measured $f_{u_{mic}}$ is not available; predicted $f_{u_{mic}}$ of 0.54 was applied initially and was optimized to 0.23 (see section 3.8)
-------------------------	----	--

**Table 3: Summary results of the verification of the trazodone and atomoxetine models**

Trazodone model verification using PK simulations of solutions and IR tablets								
Dose	50 mg IR		30 mg solution		60 mg solution		90 mg solution	
Parameter	C <sub>max</sub> (ng/mL)	AUC <sub>0-48</sub> (ng/mL.h)	C <sub>max</sub> (ng/mL)	AUC <sub>0-48</sub> (ng/mL.h)	C <sub>max</sub> (ng/mL)	AUC <sub>0-48</sub> (ng/mL.h)	C <sub>max</sub> (ng/mL)	AUC <sub>0-48</sub> (ng/mL.h)
Predicted mean	619.8	4660.3	387.9	2805.3	775.8	5610.5	1163.6	8415.8
Observed mean [31]	692	4970	446	2892	807	5610	1091	8811
Pred:Obs	0.90	0.94	0.87	0.97	0.96	1.0	1.07	0.96
Trazodone model verification using clarithromycin and ritonavir DDIs								
Dose	50 mg IR trazodone		50 mg IR trazodone + 500 mg clarithromycin		50 mg IR trazodone		50 mg IR trazodone + 200 mg BID ritonavir	
Parameter	C <sub>max</sub> (ng/mL)	AUC (ng/mL.h)	C <sub>max</sub> (ng/mL)	AUC (ng/mL.h)	C <sub>max</sub> (ng/mL)	AUC (ng/mL.h)	C <sub>max</sub> (ng/mL)	AUC (ng/mL.h)
Predicted mean	635	4470	812	9529	617	4455	850	12958
Observed mean [29,30]	681	4668	922	9275	842	5860	1125	13880
Predicted Ratio			1.28	2.09			1.39	3.14
Observed Ratio			1.35	1.99			1.34	2.37
Pred:Obs			0.95	1.05			1.04	1.32
Atomoxetine model verification using PK simulations of 20 mg BID and 40 mg BID in CYP2D6 EM and PM								
Dose	20 mg BID : EM		20 mg BID : PM		40 mg BID : EM		40 mg BID : PM	

Parameter	C <sub>max</sub> (ng/mL)	AUC (ng/mL.h)	C <sub>max</sub> (ng/mL)	AUC (ng/mL.h)	C <sub>max</sub> (ng/mL)	AUC (ng/mL.h)	C <sub>max</sub> (ng/mL)	AUC (ng/mL.h)
Predicted mean	171	1180	776	8210	355	2025	1608	16602
Observed mean	160	1080	915	8440	527	2590	1949	18600
Pred:Obs	1.07	1.09	0.85	0.97	0.67	0.78	0.83	0.89

**Table 4: Final predicted paediatric doses corresponding to adult exposure following relevant doses.**

Final predicted paediatric doses (QD) and PK parameters based on matching the adult trazodone $C_{max}$ following 30 mg IR QD for 7 days				
Age Range (yr)	Median BW in the virtual population (kg)	Dose (mg/kg QD)	AUC <sub>0-24h, Day 7</sub> (ng/mL*h) Geometric Mean (95% CI)	C <sub>max, Day 7</sub> (ng/mL) Geometric Mean (95% CI)
2-6	16	0.35	1876.2 (1736.8-2026.8)	408 (395.2-421.2)
> 6 – 12	28	0.4	2060 (1897.5-2236.4)	400.5 (386.9-414.6)
> 12-17	51	0.4	2178.7 (2012.5-2358.6)	376.7 (362.8-391.1)
Adult	73	30 mg	2619.2 (2402.7-2855.3)	416.9 (398.8-435.7)
Final predicted paediatric doses (QD) and PK parameters based on matching the adult trazodone $C_{max}$ following 75 mg IR QD for 7 days				
2-6	16	0.8	4304.6 (3963.3-4675.3)	945.9 (916.5-976.5)
> 6 – 12	28	1.0	4954.9 (4558.4-5385.8)	991.6 (959.3-1025.0)
> 12-17	51	1.1	5718.3 (5238.2-6242.5)	1037.5 (998.4-1078.2)
Adult	73	75 mg	6369.5 (5800.3-6994.7)	1025.2 (978.9-1073.6)
Final predicted paediatric doses (QD) and PK parameters based on matching the adult trazodone $C_{max}$ following 150 mg IR QD for 7 days				
2-6	16	1.6	8609.3	1891.9

			(7926.7-9350.6)	(1833.0-1952.7)
<b>&gt; 6 – 12</b>	28	<b>1.9</b>	9414.3 (8661.0-10233.1)	1884.1 (1822.6-1947.6)
<b>&gt; 12-17</b>	51	<b>2.1</b>	10916.8 (10000.2-11917.5)	1980.7 (1906.0-2058.4)
<b>Adult</b>	73	<b>150 mg</b>	12739.1 (11600.6-13989.3)	2050.4 (1957.9-2147.3)







