UNIVERSIDADE SÃO FRANCISCO Programa de Pós-Graduação *Stricto Sensu* em Ciências da Saúde

ANNE MICHELLI REIS SILVEIRA

PREDIÇÃO DE PARÂMETROS FARMACOCINÉTICOS DE ROSUVASTATINA CÁLCICA A PARTIR DO PERFIL METABÓLICO BASAL EM HUMANOS

Bragança Paulista 2022

ANNE MICHELLI REIS SILVEIRA – R.A.: 001202015067

PREDIÇÃO DE PARÂMETROS FARMACOCINÉTICOS DE ROSUVASTATINA CÁLCICA A PARTIR DO PERFIL METABÓLICO BASAL EM HUMANOS

Dissertação apresentada ao Programa de Pós-Graduação *Stricto Sensu* em Ciências da Saúde da Universidade São Francisco, como requisito para obtenção do Título de Mestre em Ciências da Saúde.

Área de Concentração: Farmacologia.

Orientadora: Profa. Dra. Patrícia de Oliveira Carvalho.

Bragança Paulista 2022

QV 40 S586p	Silveira, Anne Michelli Reis Predição dos parâmetros farmacocinéticos de Rosuvastatina Cálcica a partir do perfil metabólico basal em humanos / Anne Michelli Reis Silveira. – Bragança Paulista, 2022. 59 p.
	Dissertação (Mestrado) – Programa de Pós-Graduação <i>Stricto Sensu</i> em Ciências da Saúde da Universidade São Francisco. Orientação de: Patrícia de Oliveira Carvalho.
	 Farmacometabolômica. 2. Medicina Personalizada. Medicina de Previsão. 4. Rosuvastatina 5. Predição. I. Carvalho, Patrícia de Oliveira. II. Título.

Sistema de Bibliotecas da Universidade São Francisco – USF Ficha catalográfica elaborada por: Izabele de Siqueira Mello - CRB-8/9456



SILVEIRA, Anne Michelli Reis. "Predição de parâmetros farmacocinéticos de rosuvastatina a partir do perfil metabólico basal em humanos". Dissertação defendida e aprovada no programa de Pós-Graduação *Stricto Sensu* em Ciências da Saúde da Universidade São Francisco em 15 de fevereiro de 2022 pela Banca examinadora constituída pelos professores:

> Profa. Dra. Patricia de Oliveira Carvalho - Orientadora e Presidente Universidade São Francisco

> > Profa. Dra. Andréia de Melo Porcari Universidade São Francisco

Profa. Dra. Márcia Aparecida Antônio Unidade Integrada de Farmacologia e Gastroenterologia - Unifag



untoduzer 0800 727 8855

AGRADECIMENTOS

Entremeada aos mistérios de Deus na terra, me sinto parte de uma missão à qual Ele me confiou, e para qual me enviou com espírito desbravador, sendo sempre o meu sustento. A minha história é composta por muitos giros de 360°... e em um deles, tive a felicidade de vivenciar uma experiência sobrenatural em uma sublime Capela de São Francisco de Assis (em Bragança Paulista/SP), na qual tive o prelúdio de que uma grande mudança estava por vir... e veio!Escrever essas linhas faz parte de todo esse contexto e da concretização de um sonho.

Agradeço e dedico essa conquista, à minha mãe Eliane (Lili), por ser bússola e luz nos tantos momentos em que me senti perdida e desgastada pela árdua caminhada. Obrigada por ter feito dos meus sonhos os seus, e ser exemplo de resiliência, fé e retidão.

À minha avó Celina (*in memorian*), tia Ivoni Melo e tio Benjamin (tesouros que a pandemia de COVID -19 nos levou). "Só enquanto eu respirar vou me lembrar de vocês".

À minha família, de onde advém meus grandes exemplos de vida. À Tia Didi, Tio Tão e filhos. Tio Antônio, Tia Rosinha e filhos. Vaninha, Dr. Édson e filhos. Aos meus mil primos, em especial Gabriel (nosso caçulinha Bibi)! À Dani, pela parceria e apoio. Aos afilhados amados: Natan (amor de dinda), Isabella, Cecília, Maria Eduarda, Lara, Helena, Júlia, Bernardo.

Às queridas professoras e fonte de inspiração: Márcia Antônio (minha mentora) e Patrícia Carvalho (minha orientadora) ... duas grandes intelectuais que revolucionam o mundo científico!

Às irmãs que a vida me deu: Marília Caputo (minha doce Maumauzinha), que sempre está comigo, e com quem divido todas as minhas alegrias e tristezas, e Catarine (Tuca).

À Márcia Tostes, minha terapeuta, que inúmeras vezes aliviou as minhas dores existenciais e desde o início me enxergou muito além do que eu mesma podia ver. Thanks for allmyangel!

À Júlia Paniczek (minha baby), por transbordar meu coração de amor. Antonella, Marcela, toda equipe Comfort Suítes, Miguel e Thalita (obrigada por serem minha casa e lar em São Paulo).

Aos meus colegas de trabalho e exímios pesquisadores: Gustavo Duarte e Anna Fernandes, sem os quais esse trabalho não teria se tornado realidade.

EPÍGRAFE

"Não tema os contrários da vida.

No desconforto da alma, grandes mudanças são gestadas."

Pe. Fábio de Melo

RESUMO

A rosuvastatina é um agente hipolipemiante bastante conhecido, geralmente usado no tratamento da hipercolesterolemia e na prevenção de doenças cardiovasculares. Há uma variabilidade interindividual substancial na absorção de estatinas geralmente causada por polimorfismos genéticos, levando à variação nos parâmetros farmacocinéticos correspondentes, o que pode afetar a segurança e eficácia da terapia medicamentosa. Portanto, a investigação de marcadores metabólicos associados à variabilidade interindividual na absorção da rosuvastatina é extremamente relevante para a otimização da terapia medicamentosa e minimização dos efeitos colaterais. Este trabalho descreve o estudo dos metabólitos endógenos basais, determinados por cromatografia líquida acoplada à espectrometria de massas de alta resolução (UPLC-QTOF-MS^E), capazes de predizer os parâmetros farmacocinéticos em um estudo com participantes saudáveis. Primeiramente, um método direcionado para a determinação dos níveis de concentração plasmática de rosuvastatina foi validado e aplicado para obter os parâmetros farmacocinéticos (ASC e Cmax) de 40 participantes saudáveis do estudo e em seguida, as amostras de sangue obtidas antes da administração do medicamento foram analisadas usando abordagem metabolômica para pesquisar associações entre os metabólitos endógenos e os parâmetros farmacocinéticos correspondentes. Análises estatísticas multivariadas foram aplicadas para determinar a correlação entre parâmetros e metabólitos. Os resultados revelaram potenciais candidatospara a predição de variabilidade de absorção interindividual, incluindo esteróis, ácidos biliares, metabólitos carboxilados, lipídios. A abordagem é promissora para trabalhos futuros com foco na terapia medicamentosa personalizada e uso de recursos preditivos para Estudos de Biodisponibilidade Relativa / Bioequivalência.

Palavras-chaves: farmacometabolômica. medicina personalizada. metabolômica. rosuvastatina cálcica. predição.

ABSTRACT

Rosuvastatinis is a quite known lipid-lower in gagent generally used for hypercholesterolemia treatment and cardiovascular diseases prevention. There is a substantial inter-individual variability in the absorption of statins usually caused by genetic polymorphisms leading to variation in the corresponding pharmacokinetics parameters, which may affect drug therapy safety and efficacy. Therefore, the investigation of metabolic markers associated with rosuvastatin inter- individual variability is exceedingly relevant for drug therapy optimization and minimizing side effects. This work describes the application of pharmacometabolomics strategies using liquid chromatography coupled to high resolution mass spectrometry (UPLC-QTOF-MS^E) to investigate endogenous plasma metabolites capable of predicting pharmacokinetic parameters in predose samples. First, a targeted method for determination of plasma concentration levels of rosuvastatin was validated and applied to obtain the pharmacokinetic parameters from the 40 enrolled individuals, and then predose samples were analyzed using metabolomics approach to search for associations between endogenous metabolites and the corresponding pharmacokinetic parameters. Multivariate statistical analyzes were applied to determine the correlation between parameters and metabolites. The results revealed some potential candidates, with possible relation to the myotoxic effect of the drug, useful for predicting inter-individual variability to absortion, including sterolsand bile acids, carboxylated metabolites, as well as lipids. The approach described here as promising for future work focusing on personalized drug therapy and prediction tools to be use in Bioequivalencestudies.

Keywords: *pharmacometabolomics. personalized medicine. metabolomics. rosuvastatin. prediction.*

LISTA DE SÍMBOLOS E ABREVIAÇÕES

- ABC Sistemas transportadores (do inglês ATP-bindingcassette)
- ATP Adenosina trifosfato
- CYP2D6 EDnzima responsável por metabolismo
- CYP450 enzimas do citocromo P450

DIMS – do inglês direct infusion mass spectrometry

FDA - do inglês Food and Drug Administration

HDL – *Lipoproteína de alta densidade (do inglês high-density lipoprotein)*

HMDB – Banco de dados: The Human Metabolome Database

HMG -CoA redutase – 3-hidroxi-3-methyl-glutaril-CoA redutase

HMG-CR – Hidroximetilglutaril-coenzima A redutase

IMC – Índice de massa corporal

LC-MS – Cromatografia líquida acoplada à MS (LC-MS, do inglês LiquidChromatography-Mass Spectrometry)

LDL – Lipoproteína de baixa densidade (do inglês low-density lipoprotein)

LipidMaps – Banco de dados: LipidMaps

MS – Espectrometria de massas (do inglês Mass Spectrometry)

Metlin – Banco de dados: Metabolite and Chemical Entity Database

PCA – Principais componentes de análises

PLS-DA – Análise discriminante de mínimos quadrados parciais(do inglês Partial Least Squares-discriminant Analysis)

PK – propriedades farmacocinéticas (do inglês Pharmacokinetics)

SIM – *Miotoxicidade induzida por estatina (do inglês Statin-induced Myopathies)*

- SLC Transportadores de Soluto (do inglês Solute Carrier)
- SVM do inglês Suport Vector Machine
- UGT Uridina 5'-difosfo-glucuronosiltransferase

LISTA DE FIGURAS

FIGURA 1. Mecanismo de ação das Estatinas.Inibição da HMG-CoA redutase pelas Estatinas. HMG-CoA, 3-hidroxi-3-metilglutaril coenzima A; LDL, lipoproteína de baixa densidade;
VLDL, lipoproteína de densidade muito baixa. Whalen (7)14
FIGURA 2. Estrutura química das estatinas, mostrando o grupo farmacofórico compartilhado de HMG-CoA. Schachter (21)16
FIGURA 3. Papéis das enzimas das fases I e II no metabolismo das estatinas. Kee et al. (35).18
FIGURA 4. Relação entre as ciências "ômicas" no estudo de sistemas biológicos. Silva (52)20
FIGURA 5. Esquema resumido do fluxograma de trabalho envolvido na análise metabolômica após definição do problema biológico. Canuto et al. (57)22

LISTA DE TABELAS

TABELA 1. Perfil farmacocinético das estatinas.	Bischoff et al. (22), Hu et al. (23), Sirtori et al.
(24), Maji et al. (25)	

SUMÁRIO

1. INTRODUÇÃO	13
1.1 Estatinas – classe terapêutica	14
1.2 Rosuvastatina	19
1.3 Metabolômica, Farmacometabolômica e Medicina Personalizada	20
1.4 Análises de metabólitos por Espectrometria de Massas	26
2. OBJETIVOS	27
2.1 Objetivo Geral	27
2.2 Objetivos Específicos	27
3. CAPÍTULO 1 - ARTIGO PUBLICADO	28
4. CONCLUSÃO	51
REFERÊNCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS	52

1. INTRODUÇÃO

A farmacometabolômica tem sido usada de forma efetiva como ferramenta de estudo dos metabólitos produzidos pelo organismo capazes de predizer a farmacocinética, segurança e eficácia de medicamentos. Diante dos desafios deste vasto campo de pesquisa, a capacidade de predizer variações individuais antes de sua administração é de grande interesse, a fim de evitar doses superiores às necessárias (que podem ocasionar aumento dos efeitos adversos, toxicidade, dentre outras complicações), ou subdosagem (dosagem baixa ou inferior ao recomendado).

A variação interindividual da dose de rosuvastatina necessária para atingir o objetivo terapêutico é dependente de inúmeros fatores não-genéticos e genéticos. Idade, sexo, índice de massa corporal (IMC), co-morbidades, interações farmacológicas são as principais influências não-genéticas da dosagem deste medicamento. Grande parte da variabilidade é atribuída também a polimorfismos nos genes CYP450 e CYP2D6 responsáveis pelo clearance metabólico e pela ação farmacodinâmica de rosuvastatina (1).

Com o objetivo de buscar conhecimentos adicionais que possam contribuir para um melhor entendimento dos fatores que ocasionam a variabilidade interindividual das respostas à rosuvastatina, este estudo analisou o perfil metabólico basal em plasma (antes da administração do medicamento) e correlacionou, através de tratamento estatístico multivariado, com os dados farmacocinéticos de um grupo de pacientes saudáveis que recebeu uma única dose do comprimido revestido de rosuvastatina cálcica (20mg) acompanhados na Unidade de Farmacologia e Gastroenterologia da Universidade São Francisco (USF).

Os resultados deste estudo deverão contribuir para o melhor conhecimento das respostas interindividuais na população brasileira, pois apresentarão a relação existente entre os metabólitos identificados no plasma e a resposta farmacocinética, em uma amostra representativa de participantes da pesquisa. Este trabalho é, provavelmente, o primeiro estudo da relação entre essas variáveis em participantes saudáveis da pesquisa.

1.1 Estatinas – classe terapêutica

Os inibidores da hidroximetilglutaril-coenzima A redutase (HMG-CR), comumente conhecidos como estatinas, são indicados para hipercolesterolemia e doenças cardiovasculares ateroscleróticas (2, 3). Os efeitos farmacológicos das estatinas incluem a redução das concentrações plasmáticas de colesterol total, triglicerídeos, colesterol de lipoproteína de baixa densidade (LDL), bem como o aumento do nível de colesterol de lipoproteína de alta densidade (4). As estatinas ligam-se competitivamente à enzima HMG-CoA redutase e inibem a produção endógena de colesterol nos hepatócitos, conforme ilustrado na FIGURA 1. Isso reduz os níveis de colesterol endógeno, que por sua vez regula positivamente os receptores de LDL na superfície celular dos hepatócitos, resultando na remoção do colesterol circulante no sangue (5, 6).



FIGURA 1. Mecanismo de ação das Estatinas.Inibição da HMG-CoA redutase pelas Estatinas. HMG-CoA, 3-hidroxi-3-metilglutaril coenzima A; LDL, lipoproteína de baixa densidade; VLDL, lipoproteína de densidade muito baixa. Fonte: Whalen (7).

A primeira estatina descoberta foi a mevastatina, que foi isolada de um fungo (*Peniciliumcitrinium*) por Akira Endo na década de 1970 (8). Desde então, as estatinas têm sido de interesse tanto para o campo acadêmico quanto para o farmacêutico, o que levou à descoberta e síntese de várias estatinas clinicamente disponíveis.

Embora todas as estatinas compartilhem o mesmo mecanismo de ação, elas exibem propriedades farmacocinéticas (PK) muito diferentes.

Até o momento, a única via de administração de estatinas aprovada pelo *Food and Drug Administration* (FDA) é a oral (9). Geralmente, as estatinas são rapidamente absorvidas após a administração, atingindo o pico de concentração plasmática em 4 h em formulações de liberação imediata (10). Todas as estatinas são administradas em formas de hidroxiácidos ativos, exceto sinvastatina e lovastatina, que requerem biotransformação *in vivo* de suas formas de pró-droga de lactona para exercer efeitos farmacológicos (11, 12). Com base em sua solubilidade, as estatinas são transportadas sistemicamente por difusão passiva ou ativamente assistidas por transportadores endógenos, como o advindo da ligação adenosina trifosfato (ATP)-(ABC) e transportadores de soluto (SLC) (13). O fígado é o local de ação das estatinas, bem como de seu metabolismo. Algumas estatinas, como a sinvastatina (14) e a lovastatina (15), também sofrem degradação intestinal. Geralmente, as estatinas são metabolizadas nos hepatócitos antes da eliminação via bile (13). As enzimas do citocromo P450 (CYP450) são as principais responsáveis pela biotransformação oxidativa das estatinas (16), enquanto a conjugação através da glucuronidação é comumente facilitada pela uridina 5'-difosfo-glucuronosiltransferase (UGT) (17, 18).

Estruturalmente, todas as estatinas compartilham um grupo farmacofórico semelhante com a fração HMG-CR, conforme mostrado na FIGURA 2 (19). No entanto, suas interações com o sítio de ligação da enzima HMG-CR variam, o que contribui para suas diferentes potências como inibidores de HMG-CR (19). Entre as estatinas disponíveis para prescrição, a pitavastatina é a mais potente. No entanto, a rosuvastatina e a atorvastatina alcançaram o maior efeito na redução do colesterol LDL para a faixa de dosagem recomendada (20). Além disso, as propriedades PK das estatinas também variam (21).



FIGURA 2. Estrutura química das estatinas, mostrando o grupo farmacofórico compartilhado de HMG-CoA. Fonte: Schachter (21).

As estatinas, embora geralmente consideradas uma classe bem tolerada de drogas, estão associadas a efeitos adversos. Uma revisão sistemática e meta-análise de estudos randomizados com mais de 90.000 participantes mostraram que as estatinas aumentaram significativamente o risco relativo e absoluto de miopatia, disfunção renal e disfunção hepática (22). Miotoxicidade induzida por estatina (SIM) e hepatotoxicidade são efeitos adversos comuns com taxas de prevalência variando de 7 a 30% e 2 a 5%, respectivamente (23, 24). Eles mostraram ser dose-dependentes (23, 25,26). Ao contrário da miotoxicidade e hepatotoxicidade, a disfunção renal associada ao uso de estatinas não é clara e permanece discutível (27). Além de ser altamente incidente, o SIM é um dos principais contribuintes para a descontinuação das estatinas (28).

As diferentes propriedades PK e especificidade do substrato transportador das estatinas estão resumidas na Tabela 1.

Parâmetros	Lovastatina	Sinvastatina	Pravastatina	Fluvastatina	Atorvastatina	Cerivastatina	Rosuvastatina	Pitavastatina
Geração	Primeira	Segunda	Primeira	Primeira	Segunda Retirada		Terceira	Terceira
Potencia (nM)*	2-4	1-2	4	3-10	1.16	1	0.16	0.1
Solubilidade	Lipofílica	Lipofílica	Hidrofílica	Lipofílica	Lipofílica	Lipofílica	Hidrofílica	Lipofílica
Absorção oral (%)	30	60-85	35	98	30	>98	50	80
Ligação proteica (%)	>98	>95	50	>98	>98	>99	90	96
Biodisponibilid ade (%)	5	<5	18	30	12	60	20	60
Extração hepática (%)	≥ 70	≥ 80	45	≥ 70	70	50-60	63	N/A
Meia vida (horas)	2-5	2-5	1-3	1-3	7-20	1-3	20	10-13
Excreção renal (%)	10	13	20	6	<5	30	10	NA
CYP450 metabolismo	3A4/3A5 (2C8)	3A4/3A5 (2C8, 2D6)	(3A4)	2C9	3A4 (2C8)	3A4, 2C8	2C9 (2C19)	(2C9)
SLC transporte de substrato	SLC01B1	SLCO1B1	SLC01B1/2B1	SLCO1B1	SLCO1B1	SLCO1B1	SLCO1B1/1B3/ 2B1/1A2,SLC1 0A1	SLCO1B1/1B3
ABC transporte de substrato	ABCB1	ABCB1/C2	ABCB1/B11/ C2/G2	ABCG2	ABCB1/G2	ABCB1/C2/G2	ABCB1/C2/G2	ABCB1/C2/G2

TABELA 1. Perfil farmacocinético das estatinas. Fonte: Bischoffet al. (29), Hu et al. (30), Sirtoriet al. (31), Majiet al. (32).

*Medido como IC50 (concentração de inibidor para produzir 50% de inibição). O conteúdo entre parênteses indica uma via metabólica menor.

A miotoxicidade induzida por estatina é conhecida por estar relacionada à dose (33).

As enzimas metabolizadoras de fármacos que afetam a farmacocinética das estatinas ao impactar a biodisponibilidade oral e a depuração podem alterar o risco de SIM e outros efeitos adversos.

Desde que foram descobertas (há 50 anos), as enzimas CYP450 e seus genes têm sido foco de muitas pesquisas (34). As associações entre a variação genética do CYP450 e os parâmetros farmacocinéticos variáveis do SIM são discutidas abaixo. O gene CYP2D6 é o mais polimórfico entre os genes CYP450, com mais de 100 alelos diferentes que foram identificados até o momento (1). Muitas dessas variantes influenciam a função da enzima CYP2D6 e foram associadas à toxicidade e eficácia alterada para uma variedade de medicamentos. Os papéis das enzimas nas diferentes fases dos metabolismos estão descritos na FIGURA 3.



FIGURA 3. Papéis das enzimas das fases I e II no metabolismo das estatinas. Fonte: Keeet al. (35)

1.2 Rosuvastatina

A rosuvastatina é um agente hipolipemiante amplamente utilizado para tratar a hipercolesterolemia e prevenir a progressão das doenças das artérias coronárias. É bastante conhecida por aumentar os níveis séricos de colesterol de lipoproteína de alta densidade (HDL) (36), diminuindo o colesterol e triglicerídeos de lipoproteína de baixa densidade (LDL) (37) de forma competitiva (38) inibindo a enzima 3-hidroxi-3 metilglutaril Coenzima A (HMGCoA) redutase, a enzima limitadora da taxa envolvida na biossíntese do colesterol (39).

Embora as estatinas sejam geralmente bem toleradas, os efeitos adversos associados ao tratamento com estatinas incluem toxicidade do músculo esquelético, miopatia (40) ou mesmo rabdomiólise em casos raros (41) que, por sua vez, como resultado diminuem a fixação do regime terapêutico. De acordo com as evidências clínicas, existe uma variabilidade substancial interindividual na resposta às estatinas, bem como na sua farmacocinética em humanos (42, 43, 44). Tal variabilidade promove redução da interação do fármaco com seu alvo terapêutico ou mesmo inviabiliza essa ligação. Além disso, o aumento das concentrações plasmáticas de rosuvastatina pode afetar a segurança da terapia medicamentosa, causando efeitos adversos associados ao uso das estatinas.

Geralmente, é razoável associar as variações entre a resposta individual na terapia medicamentosa (do aumento da sensibilidade à tolerância à droga) com vários fatores-chave, incluindo fatores epigenéticos como polimorfismos genéticos (45), fatores demográficos como idade, sexo, peso corporal, raça e etnia, fatores ambientais como dieta, adição (tabagismo, etilismo etc.), administração anterior / atual de uma única / múltipla droga e fatores individuais como doenças associadas, estado de doença, microbioma, etc (46, 47).

Uma vez que os polimorfismos genéticos são parcialmente responsáveis por variações individuais na terapia medicamentosa, a farmacogenômica também pode ser útil na previsão dessas variações. No entanto, a eficácia da terapia com drogas depende da eficiência de alcance e ligação do fármaco ao seu alvo terapêutico, e essas etapas necessárias também são afetadas pelo fenótipo individual, fazendo com que a farmacogenômica, bem como as covariáveis convencionais, tenhamum alcance limitado. Devido à sua dificuldade intrínseca de predição, a pesquisa de marcadores fenotípicos associados à variação interindividual de rosuvastatina pode ser extremamente valiosa para a terapia medicamentosa ideal e a minimização dos efeitos adversos.

Dado que a metabolômica é a ciência ômica mais próxima do fenótipo, é extremamente útil obter o perfil das moléculas e informar a condição fisiológica em curso de um determinado indivíduo, a fim de fornecer aos médicos informações úteis sobre a seleção de drogas e as previsões de dosagem (48).

1.3 Metabolômica, Farmacometabolômica e Medicina Personalizada

As ciências ômicas buscam o entendimento do funcionamento celular dos organismos e suas alterações biológicas.Fazem parte desse conjunto de ciências a genômica (estudo das alterações nos genes), a transcriptômica (estudo das alterações na transcrição), a proteômica (estudo das alterações das proteínas e a metabolômica (estudo das alterações dos metabólitos). Metabólitos são produtos intermediários ou finais do metabolismo em amostras biológicas, os quais vêm sendo estudados por décadas; em 1999 Nicholson *et al.* (49) definiram o termo "metabonômica" (do inglês, *metabonomics*) para a quantificação da resposta metabólica de sistemas biológicos após estímulos fisiopatológicos ou modificação genética e em 2001 Oliver Fiehn (50) introduziu o termo "metabolômica" (do inglês, *metabolomics*) para designar a análise quantitativa abrangente do metaboloma de sistemas biológicos. A cascata "ômica" está apresentada na FIGURA 4, quando são demonstradas as características fenotípicas que se aproximam mais do metaboloma, pois esses representam os produtos bioquímicos finais de toda a cascata (51).



FIGURA 4. Relação entre as ciências "ômicas" no estudo de sistemas biológicos. Fonte: Silva (52).

A metabolômica é a área que analisa um sistema biológico através da mensuração do conjunto de metabólitos produzidos e/ou modificados no interior de uma célula, tecido ou um fluido. Longe de ser uma avaliação focada em um número limitado de reações enzimáticas ou em um único mecanismo, tem como foco rastrear toda complexidade de uma rede de metabólitos (53). Importa destacar que o termo "metaboloma" refere-se à coleção de substâncias de baixo peso molecular (<1000 Da), sendo essas substâncias (metabólitos) produtos finais e intermediários do metabolismo. Neste sentido, o metaboloma é o resultado de interações complexas entre a expressão gênica, expressão proteica e o meio ambiente (incluindo estilo de vida, dieta, intestino, processos de doença, terapia medicamentosa etc.), constituindo, portanto, o nível integrativo e mais informativo que fornece uma visão geral completa do estado fisiológico atual de um organismo em tempo real (54).

O campo da metabolômica vem sendo amplamente explorado para caracterização de processos e respostas biológicas. A principal vantagem da metabolômica é poder correlacionar mudanças nos níveis e natureza dos metabólitos a processos biológicos, uma vez que alterações metabólicas são decorrentes de estímulos externos, como doenças, uso de medicamentos, alimentação, entre outros. Um estudo metabolômico produz, dessa forma, rastros bioquímicos (do inglês, *fingerprints*), de valor diagnóstico ou classificatório, auxiliando na descoberta e identificação de biomarcadores com potencial de refletir um dado estado ou processo biológico (55).

Por conter milhares a dezenas de milhares de metabólitos de diferentes funções químicas, um metaboloma é impossível de ser caracterizado por uma única plataforma analítica. As maiores limitações da metabolômica encontram-se nas faixas de concentração dos metabólitos, na complexidade de dados gerados e na identificação e caracterização de tais moléculas. Assim, dada a inviabilidade de caracterizar e quantificar todos os metabólitos de um sistema, a identificação dos principais metabólitos afetados ou alterados pelo processo estudado torna-se a alternativa mais comumente empregada em estudos metabolômicos (56).

Um estudo metabolômico pode seguir dois tipos de abordagens: direcionada/orientada (do inglês, *target*) e não direcionada/não orientada (do inglês *untarget*). Cada uma delas apresentará um diferente fluxo de trabalho, conforme apresentado na FIGURA 5.



definição do problema biológico. Fonte: Canuto et al (57).

A abordagem *untarget* é baseada na análise qualitativa do maior número de metabólitos possível, pertencentes à diversas classes químicas, contidas no sistema biológico alvo do estudo (58). Apresenta desafios pelo fato de que diversas moléculas, pertencentes às mais váriadas classes químicas podem ser obtidas, sendo por vezes complexo correlacioná-las às rotas metabólicas afetadas ou realizar a identificação das mesmas. Por outro lado, existe a possibilidade de que novas moléculas ou moléculas não previstas sejam encontradas, sendo uma possível fonte de contribuição para novas pesquisas.

Abordagens do tipo *target*, por outro lado, se refere à análise qualitativa de um ou mais metabólitos pré-selecionados, de determinada classe química, contidas no sistema biológico em estudo ou que estejam associados a rotas metabólicas específicas. A comparação do metaboloma de um grupo sujeito a alterações ambientais ou genéticas, alimentares, de tratamento medicamentoso, etc (grupo teste), frente à um grupo de indivíduos não alterados (grupo controle) pode fornecer informações importantes no que diz respeito ao entendimento do fenótipo de um organismo, desempenhando um papel fundamental na biologia de sistemas.(58).

A escolha da estratégia de análise impacta diretamente na metodologia do tratamento de dados. Enquanto na abordagem *target* é possível prever ou calibrar a resposta analítica (área ou altura do pico, por exemplo), na abordagem *untarget* a resposta deve ser extraída em meio a mistura de sinais gerados pela resposta de analitos desconhecidos. Assim, a abordagem *target* se alinha muito bem com experimentos visando a quantificação absoluta de metabólitos, enquanto na abordagem *untarget* apenas a quantificação relativa dos metabólitos identificados geralmente é realizada, ou ainda a comparação entre a abundância dos compostos nas diferentes classes. Além disso, a análise *untarget* gera um conjunto de dados muito grande, uma vez que são detectados inúmeros analitos, com ordens de grandeza diferentes, não sendo, necessariamente, aqueles com maior resposta analítica os mais importantes para o sistema estudado (59).

A seleção de variáveis e/ou subvariáveis relevantes para o estudo, bem como o cuidado na aquisição e tratamento dos dados é de extrema importância para a obtenção de resultados satisfatórios. A aquisição de dados para os estudos metabolômicos pode ser realizada por múltiplas plataformas de análises, como por exemplo Ressonância Magnética Nuclear (RMN), Espectometria de Massas (MS), ou até mesmo infravermelho. A análise estatística é uma das etapas cruciais para delinear as variáveis mais relevantes, estabelecer tendências e permitir possíveis correlações de dados.

A avaliação estatística pode ser realizada através de métodos de análises univariadas ou multivariadas. Nas análises multivariadas, a classificação e discriminação dos metabólitos responsáveis por diferenciar os grupos de amostras são realizadas através da avaliação do conjunto da matriz de dados extraídos na etapa de trabalho anterior (etapa de tratamento dos dados). São aplicados métodos não supervisionados, como análise de componentes principais (PCA, do inglês *principal component analysis*) e métodos supervisionados, como a análise discriminante por quadrados mínimos parciais (PLS- DA – análise do inglês *partial least squares discriminant analysis*). Já nas análises univariadas, as variáveis de estudo são avaliadas separadamente, e, ao contrário do método multivariado, são desprezadas as relações entre elas. Testes estatísticos como ANOVA, teste t de Student ou Mann-Whitney U são frequentemente utilizados. (60)

Outro método supervisionado bastante adequado para metabolômica, especialmente para classificação e predição de classe, é o *Suport Vector Machine* (SVM). O SVM possui as vantagens de não ser susceptível à distribuição das amostras e ser mais robusto frente a *outliers*, embora não permita a análise de múltiplas classes como o PLS-DA e o PCA, sendo possível apenas análises de classificação binárias (61,62).

A identificação dos metabólitos selecionados como discriminantes pode ser feita utilizando-se bibliotecasde espectros já existentes no próprio laboratório de pesquisa ou através do uso de bibliotecas comerciais. Há ainda o recurso de pesquisa em bases de dados públicas, tais como: Metlin (63), o LipidMaps (64) ou o HMDB (65).

Já a farmacometabolômica pode ser entendida como o conjunto das alterações no metaboloma, advindas de tratamentos farmacológicos, e sua abordagem pode esclarecer mecanismos para variações das respostas ao tratamento, ou ainda, entender como as alterações genéticas influenciam nas respostas. Num contexto de tratamento personalizado, a metabolômica pode investigar a presença de biomarcadores relacionados a aspectos farmacocinéticos e farmacodinâmicos do fármaco os quais expressam a efetividade do tratamento, o mecanismo de ação, a toxicidade ou a ocorrência de efeitos adversos (66, 67)

A capacidade de prever variações individuais na farmacocinética de drogas antes da administração é de interesse para evitar sobredosagem (por exemplo, efeitos adversos) e subdosagem (por exemplo, falha terapêutica). Atualmente, fatores demográficos, relacionados à doença ou ao tratamento, incluindo, por exemplo, idade, peso corporal, estado da doença, formulação do medicamento e terapia medicamentosa concomitante, são usados como preditores de diferenças interindividuais quantitativas na farmacocinética dos medicamentos. Esses fatores preditivos de variabilidade são chamados de covariáveis (68).

As metodologias atuais que usam covariáveis convencionais sozinhas muitas vezes podem explicar uma grande parte da variabilidade interindividual na farmacocinética de um medicamento. No entanto, isso pode não ser suficiente para medicamentos com uma janela terapêutica estreita e variabilidade interindividual inexplicada relativamente alta. Nesses casos, o monitoramento de fármacos fornece uma opção viável para melhorar a farmacoterapia de um indivíduo. Com o monitoramento, os ajustes de dose são feitos com base em informações adicionais sobre os valores dos parâmetros farmacocinéticos individuais, derivados de medidas de exposição relevantes após a administração de uma ou múltiplas doses do medicamento (48).

A farmacoterapia ideal requer informações sobre o estado fisiológico atual de um paciente individual. As covariáveis convencionais podem ser úteis a este respeito e podem até ser suficientes para prever desvios individuais das respostas da população, mas quando estas não forem suficientes, outros métodos para o estabelecimento de perfis fenotípicos podem ser necessários. Tais métodos são preferencialmente prospectivos e minimamente invasivos.

Uma forma de fenotipagem farmacocinética envolve a administração de um ou mais fármacos para avaliar o fenótipo de várias enzimas que participam do processo de biotransformação. No entanto, isso nem sempre é viável, especialmente em populações vulneráveis, já que envolve consultas clínicas prolongadas, aumentando o tempo e o custo do tratamento. Uma abordagem de fenotipagem alternativa seria o uso de biomarcadores endógenos que poderiam prever a atividade enzimática sem risco, tempo e custo da administração de moléculas exógenas (69). Os biomarcadores endógenos preditivos identificados podem ser usados como covariáveis para orientar os prescritores na tomada de decisão em relação às opções de tratamento usando quantidades mínimas de fluidos biológicos.

A metabolômica ou o perfil de metabólitos endógenos podem ser usados como uma ferramenta fenotípica para fornecer informações precisas sobre o estado fisiológico atual dos pacientes para informar prospectivamente sobre as diferenças individuais nos processos de farmacocinética e, assim, orientar a seleção e dosagem de medicamentos. Além disso, nos casos em que o efeito do fármaco é desconhecido, os metabólitos endógenos e sua alteração após a administração podem fornecer uma visão mecanicista da resposta individual (70).

A avaliação das alterações do metabolismo durante a terapiamedicamentosa aumenta sua eficácia, permitindo o monitoramento das reações do organismo causadas tanto pela introdução da substância farmacológica quanto pela resposta do organismo a diversos fatores externos (microflora intestinal, fatores ambientais etc.) (71,72).

Para a descoberta de biomarcadores metabólicos e identificar preditores de variabilidade de farmacocinética, fenótipos metabólicos pré-dose são estabelecidos. Esses fenótipos metabólicos oferecem leituras exclusivas que contêm informações sobre o estado fisiológico de um indivíduo em determinados momentos. Os modelos estatísticos dos dados metabolômicos irão então integrar as informações causais e temporais. Em última análise, os biomarcadores de metabólitos podem ser usados na prática clínica de rotina, seja prospectivamente para orientar a seleção de drogas e a da dose de drogas com base em perfis de biomarcadores de metabólitos pré-dose (73).

A área de saúde se beneficiou enormemente dos avanços das pesquisas nessa área. Talvez o caso mais popular da aplicação desta técnica seja a triagem neonatal por Espectometria de Massas (MS), que se constitui como uma abordagem *target* de aminoácidos e acilcarnitinas, visando

encontrar alterações metabólicas a partir da comparação com um perfil considerado sadio, detectando assim os chamados erros inatos de metabolismo (74).

Estudos como os de bioequivalência de medicamentos também se enquadram nessa área e foram um dos grandes responsáveis pela popularização da técnica de espectrometriade massas (MS) no Brasil (75), uma vez que os métodos analíticos desenvolvidos para avaliação do analito utilizam em geral a técnica descrita.

1.4 Análises de metabólitos por Espectrometria de Massas

A espectrometria de massas (MS) é a técnica de análise mais utilizada na metabolômica, uma vez que proporciona análises rápidas, com alta sensibilidade e seletividade (58). Pode ser usada através de infusão direta de extratos (DIMS, do inglês *direct infusion mass spectrometry*, que por vezes pode dificultar a análise por problemas de supressão da ionização, ou através do processo de ionização propriamente dito(76,77).

Desde que foi desenvolvida com os estudos de Thomson (78), no fim do século XIX, essa técnica já passou por aprimoramentos que transformaram suas aplicações e a fizeram deixar de ser meramente um método para medir a massa de um composto para se tornar uma técnica importantíssima na caracterização de compostos (79, 80), nos estudos de mecanismos de reação (81, 82), na quantificação de substâncias traço (83), na caracterização de misturas complexas (84), na tipificação de micro-organismos (85), no diagnóstico clínico (78, 75,84) e no desenvolvimento de fármacos (85).

A instrumentação de MS permite diversas combinações entre diferentes fontes e analisadores, de acordo com a natureza da amostra a ser analisada e com o propósito da pesquisa.

A cromatografia líquida acoplada à MS (LC-MS, do inglês *Liquid Chromatography-Mass-Spectrometry*) é uma técnica hifenada (acoplamento entre duas ou mais técnicas de análise para obter uma ferramenta analítica mais rápida e eficiente que as técnicas isoladas) muito utilizada na metabolômica, na qual a amostra, antes da análise no espectrômetro de massas, é submetida a uma etapa de pré-separação dos compostos. A separação se dá pela migração diferencial, através de uma fase estacionária, de moléculas com características diferentes, solubilizadas e carregadas por uma fase móvel. Embora a técnica de LC-MS demande certo preparo da amostra, essa técnica facilita a identificação e quantificação de metabólitos, por separá-los de analitos coexistentes, permitindo assim maior detectabilidade (86,87).

2. OBJETIVOS

2.1 Objetivo Geral

Correlacionar o perfil metabólico basal com os dados farmacocinéticos (AUC e Cmax) determinados em plasma de participantes de pesquisa sadios que receberam dose única de Rosuvastatina Cálcica (20 mg - comprimidos revestidos) visando predizer a resposta individual na absorção do fármaco.

2.2 Objetivos Específicos

- Avaliar o perfil metabolômico basal (antes da administração do medicamento) em plasma dos participantes da pesquisa.
- Determinar os parâmetros farmacocinéticos (AUC e Cmax) em plasma dos participantes que receberam dose única de Rosuvastatina Cálcica (20 mg comprimidos revestidos);
- Correlacionar o perfil metabolômico basal com os parâmetros farmacocinéticos através de análises estatísticas multivariadas para determinar a correlação entre as variáveis;
- Identificar potenciais biomarcadores capazes de predizer a variabilidade da farmacocinética individual.

3. CAPÍTULO 1 - ARTIGO PUBLICADO

Na sequência será apresentado o artigo "Serum Predose Metabolic Profiling for Prediction of Rosuvastatin Pharmacokinetic Parameters in Healthy Volunteers" desenvolvido durante essa dissertação e publicado. O trabalho apresenta uma avaliação do perfil metabolômico de participantes de pesquisa, aponta potenciais biomarcadores que possam predizer a farmacocinética individual e traça uma correlação entre variáveis relevantes, avaliadas através de estatística multivariada.





Serum Predose Metabolic Profiling for Prediction of Rosuvastatin Pharmacokinetic Parameters in Healthy Volunteers

Anne Michelli Reis Silveira^{1†}, Gustavo Henrique Bueno Duarte¹*[†], Anna Maria Alves de Piloto Fernandes¹, Pedro Henrique Dias Garcia¹, Nelson Rogerio Vieira², Marcia Aparecida Antonio² and Patricia de Oliveira Carvalho¹

¹Health Sciences Postgraduate Program, São Francisco University–USF, Bragança Paulista, Brazil, ²Integrated Unit of Pharmacology and Gastroenterology (UNIFAG), São Francisco University–USF, Bragança Paulista, Brazil

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Sabina Passamonti, University of Trieste, Italy

Reviewed by:

Arwa Mostafa, Taibah University, Saudi Arabia Brian Tomlinson, Macau University of Science and Technology, Macao, SAR China

*Correspondence:

Gustavo Henrique Bueno Duarte gustavo_duarte95@hotmail.com

⁺These authors have contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Drug Metabolism and Transport, a section of the journal Frontiers in Pharmacology

Received: 05 August 2021 Accepted: 13 October 2021 Published: 12 November 2021

Citation:

Silveira AMR, Duarte GHB, Fernandes AMAP, Garcia PHD, Vieira NR, Antonio MA and Carvalho PdO (2021) Serum Predose Metabolic Profiling for Prediction of Rosuvastatin Pharmacokinetic Parameters in Healthy Volunteers. Front. Pharmacol. 12:752960. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2021.752960 Rosuvastatin is a well-known lipid-lowering agent generally used for hypercholesterolemia treatment and coronary artery disease prevention. There is a substantial inter-individual variability in the absorption of statins usually caused by genetic polymorphisms leading to a variation in the corresponding pharmacokinetic parameters, which may affect drug therapy safety and efficacy. Therefore, the investigation of metabolic markers associated with rosuvastatin inter-individual variability is exceedingly relevant for drug therapy optimization and minimizing side effects. This work describes the application of pharmacometabolomic strategies using liquid chromatography coupled to mass spectrometry to investigate endogenous plasma metabolites capable of predicting pharmacokinetic parameters in predose samples. First, a targeted method for the determination of plasma concentration levels of rosuvastatin was validated and applied to obtain the pharmacokinetic parameters from 40 enrolled individuals; then, predose samples were analyzed using a metabolomic approach to search for associations between endogenous metabolites and the corresponding pharmacokinetic parameters. Data processing using machine learning revealed some candidates including sterols and bile acids, carboxylated metabolites, and lipids, suggesting the approach herein described as promising for personalized drug therapy.

Keywords: personalized medicine, metabolomics, rosuvastatin, prediction, machine learning, pharmacometabolomics

INTRODUCTION

Rosuvastatin is a lipid-lowering agent extensively used to treat hypercholesterolemia and prevent progression of coronary artery diseases. It is well known for increasing serum levels of high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol (McTaggart and Jones, 2008) and decreasing low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol (Betteridge and Gibson, 2007) and triglycerides (Crouse, 2008) by competitively inhibiting the enzyme 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl-coenzyme A (HMG-CoA) reductase, the rate-limiting enzyme involved in cholesterol biosynthesis (Olsson et al., 2002). It is biotransformed to two metabolites: rosuvastatin-5S lactone (inactive metabolite) and N-desmethyl rosuvastatin (active metabolite) primarily by CYP2C9 (cytochrome P450) and, to a lesser extent, by CYP 2C19 and CYP 3A4 isoenzymes. Previous studies demonstrate that rosuvastatin-5S-lactone and N-desmethyl

rosuvastatin concentrations were found to be much lower than those of rosuvastatin. The mean maximum plasma drug concentration (Cmax) values for rosuvastatin-5S-lactone were 12%-24% lower than those for rosuvastatin and <10% for N-desmethyl rosuvastatin. Moreover, when considering the sum of the parent compound and active metabolites, druginteraction studies suggest that rosuvastatin accounts for 87% of circulating active HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors (Martin et al., 2003). Although statins are usually well tolerated, adverse effects associated with statin treatment include skeletal muscle toxicity, myopathy (Thompson et al., 2003), or even rhabdomyolysis in rare cases (Wooltorton, 2004), and they decrease adherence to therapeutic regimens. There is evidence of a substantial inter-individual variability in statin responses as well as in their pharmacokinetics in humans (Lee et al., 2005; Pasanen et al., 2007; Keskitalo et al., 2009). Such variability results in drugs not reaching or not binding to their designated targets. Moreover, an increased statin plasma concentration can affect drug therapy safety by causing the adverse drug effects mentioned above.

Usually, it is reasonable to associate the variations among individual responses in drug therapy (from increased sensitivity to tolerance to the drug) with several key factors including epigenetic factors like genetic polymorphisms (Weinshilboum, 2003); demographic factors like age, sex, bodyweight, race, and ethnicity; environmental factors like diet, addictions (smoking, alcohol, etc.), previous/current single/multiple drug administration; and individual factors like accompanying diseases, disease status, microbiome, etc. (Li and Jia, 2013; Alomar, 2014). For rosuvastatin, a vast amount of literature points to a series of factors that may exert some influence on the therapeutic response of this statin. These factors may be divided into genetic and environmental factors. The most described genetic factor influencing rosuvastatin pharmacokinetics is associated with genes encoding the hepatic organic anion transporting polypeptide 1B1 (OATP1B1) and the ATP-binding cassette transporter G2 (ABCG2) proteins. Genetic polymorphisms influence C_{max} and area under curve (AUC) parameters (Pasanen et al., 2007; Keskitalo et al., 2009; Wan et al., 2015) in a manner sometimes affected also by factors such as ethnicity (Choi et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2013; Birmingham et al., 2015a; Birmingham et al., 2015b; Liu et al., 2016) and age (Kim et al., 2019). Multiple-drug intake also influences rosuvastatin response and pharmacokinetics (Schneck et al., 2004; Simonson et al., 2004; van der Lee et al., 2007; Busti et al., 2008; He et al., 2008; Samineni et al., 2012; Martin et al., 2016; Son et al., 2016, among others). The same influence is also observed with natural products, such as baicalin (Fan et al., 2008); epigallocatechin-3-gallate, the major component of green tea (Kim et al., 2017); and theaflavins, derived from black tea (Kondo et al., 2019). High-fat and high-calorie meals resulted in a reduction of rosuvastatin exposure and a decrease in absorption rate of rosuvastatin (Chen et al., 2020), showing the relevance of diet. Sex (Nazir et al., 2015) and drug formulation (Balakumar et al., 2013; Dudhipala and Veerabrahma, 2017) are other listed factors that influence pharmacokinetics and/or response to rosuvastatin.

Despite the fact that, in the field of medicine, drugs are usually described on the basis of the uniformity of the inter-individual responses, clinicians have become increasingly aware that the variability in drug therapy effectiveness is a direct result of the variability of drug response among different individuals. Thus, there is an urgent need to select the right prescription according to the patient's characteristics to avoid drug therapy failure and adverse effects (Balashova et al., 2018). Personalized medicine proposes a tailored drug treatment to achieve maximal therapeutic effects with minimal adverse effects (Schork, 2015). The main idea is that clinical, laboratory, and individual characteristics like age, body weight, comorbidity, family history, biochemical laboratory parameters, etc. may be useful for personalizing drug therapy (Kitsios and Kent, 2012). Nowadays, those characteristics are already being used as predictors of inter-individual variability in drug responses and are called covariates (Joerger, 2012). A previous research has investigated the ability of covariates to predict inter-individual variability in rosuvastatin concentration. Using multiple linear regression modeling, results have revealed gender, age, body mass index, ethnicity, dose, and time from last dose as the best clinical predictors (DeGorter et al., 2013).

Since genetic polymorphisms are partly responsible for individual variations in drug therapy, pharmacogenomics can also be useful in predicting them. However, drug therapy effectiveness relies on the efficiency of the drug's reaching and binding to its designated target, and those required steps are also affected by the individual phenotype, so pharmacogenomics and conventional covariates have a limited reach. Due to the intrinsic difficulty to predict inter-individual variation, a research on phenotypic markers associated with rosuvastatin interindividual variation would be tremendously valuable for determining optimal drug therapy and minimizing adverse effects.

Given that metabolomics is the closest omics science to the phenotype, it is extremely useful to obtain a picture of the ongoing physiological condition of a given individual in order to provide clinicians useful information about drug selection and dosing predictions (Kantae et al., 2017). Metabolites are the final products of metabolism and are the result of complex downstream relations among proteins, genes, and environment, being, therefore, among the current omics sciences, the most integrative approach regarding real-time physiological condition assessment. Its newest, emergent branch, the so-called pharmacometabolomics, employs metabolomic strategies for pharmacotherapy personalization by measuring endogenous metabolites related to drug variability, thereby obtaining insights about the interplay between individual physiology and drug pharmacology (Kantae et al., 2017; Balashova et al., 2018). Since it was first applied in rat urine predose samples to establish an association between endogenous metabolites and pharmacokinetic/ pharmacodynamic parameters of paracetamol (Clayton et al., 2006), many research efforts have successfully employed pharmacometabolomics for predictive purposes. The main applications using a pharmacometabolomic strategy in practical medicine have been with drugs like paracetamol

(Clayton et al., 2009; Winnike et al., 2010), tacrolimus (Phapale et al., 2010), simvastatin (Kaddurah-Daouk et al., 2011a; Trupp et al., 2012), and atorvastatin (Huang et al., 2015). Moreover, studies involving drug-metabolizing enzyme activity have investigated enzymes like CYP3A4/5 (Diczfalusy et al., 2011), CYP3A4 (Rahmioglu et al., 2011), CYP3A (Shin et al., 2013), and CYP2D6 (Tay-Sontheimer et al., 2014) and diseases, including colorectal cancer (Backshall et al., 2011), depression (Kaddurah-Daouk et al., 2011b), lymphoid malignances (Muhrez et al., 2017), and so on.

This work focuses on applying pharmacometabolomic strategies using ultra performance liquid chromatography-quadrupole time-of-flight mass spectrometry (UPLC-QTOF-MS^E) in healthy human plasma samples to predict the main pharmacokinetic parameters, AUC and the C_{max} based on endogenous molecules in the predose baseline. First, we validated a liquid chromatography coupled to lowresolution mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) method for rosuvastatin quantification in plasma samples from volunteers to whom a rosuvastatin reference formulation was administered to obtain their corresponding drug concentrations and calculate the pharmacokinetic parameters. Then, predosing samples were analyzed by UPLC-QTOF-MS^E (where E represents collision energy) applying an untargeted metabolomic profiling strategy. Multivariate statistical modeling was employed to search for associations between metabolite profiling and the investigated pharmacokinetic parameters to find relevant metabolites responsible for predicting individual AUC and Cmax values of the enrolled healthy volunteers. Our results have proved the value and effectiveness of the employed strategy in predicting individual pharmacokinetic outcomes. So far, to the best of our knowledge, there has been no previous report of the application of untargeted metabolomics in predose human plasma samples to predict AUC and Cmax of rosuvastatin, making this a pioneering effort in the field.

EXPERIMENTAL METHOD

Chemicals and Reagents

Rosuvastatin calcium was purchased from European Pharmacopoeia. Internal standard (IS) diazepam was purchased Fundação Oswaldo from Cruz. Bromo-L-phenylalanine was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich, and all other reagents were purchased from Merck KgaA (Darmstadt, Germany). Diazepam was chosen as IS due to the satisfactory results regarding molecular stability, chromatographic peak shape, molecular extraction recovery, analytical accuracy and precision obtained during the preliminary tests, method validation, and application.

Healthy Human Volunteers and Pharmacokinetic Study Design

Forty adult volunteers of both sexes, aged between 18 and 50 with a body mass index between 18.5 and 29.9 kg/m², were selected for the study after assessment of their health status by clinical

evaluation (physical examination and electrocardiogram) and laboratory tests. The set of laboratory tests is listed in the **Supplementary Material**. The protocol complied with the current Brazilian legislation on clinical research in humans and was approved by the Research Ethics Committee, duly authorized by the National Health Council, and under the guidelines of Good Clinical Practice (Brazil Platform CAAE: 26762719.9.0000.5514, registered on July 15, 2020—https:// plataformabrasil.saude.gov.br/login.jsf). All subjects gave their written informed consent and were free to withdraw from the study at any time.

The reference formulation was 20-mg rosuvastatin calcium tablets (Crestor 20 mg-AstraZeneca do Brasil Ltda.), with administration of one single-dose tablet. During each period, the volunteers were hospitalized at 7:30 p.m. and had a supper before 9:00 p.m. After an overnight fast, they received (at ~8:00 a.m.) a tablet of rosuvastatin calcium (20 mg). Water (200 ml) was given immediately after the drug administration, and the volunteers then fasted for 4 h, after which period a standard lunch was served. No other food was allowed during the "in house" period, but liquid consumption was permitted ad libitum 2 h after tablet administration (with the exception of xanthine-containing drinks, including tea, coffee, and cola). At 2 h before and 5 and 36 h after the dose administration, systolic and diastolic arterial pressure (measured non-invasively with a sphygmomanometer), heart rate, and temperature were recorded. The hospitalization period was 84 h.

Blood samples (8 ml) from a suitable antecubital vein were collected by indwelling catheter into EDTA-containing tubes at 0, 1.00, 1.50, 2.00, 2.50, 3.00, 3.33, 3.67, 4.00, 4.33, 4.67, 5.00, 5.50, 6.00, 8.0, 10.0, 12.0, 24.0, 48.0, and 72.0 h postdosing. The blood samples were centrifuged at ~2,000×g for 10 min at 4°C, and the plasma was stored at -70° C until assayed.

LC-MS/MS Method Validation for Analysis of Rosuvastatin Concentrations Liquid Chromatography

Chromatographic separations were performed in an LC-20AD analytical pump (Shimadzu) using a SIL-20A HT autosampler (Shimadzu). A Luna 5- μ m C18 100A 150 × 4.6 mm column (Phenomenex) was employed as stationary phase, and acetonitrile (B) and water with 0.1% formic acid (A) were employed as mobile phase. The mobile phase flow rate comprised of 65% of B was set at 1.7 ml min⁻¹, resulting in a total run of 2.8 min. Autosampler temperature was set at 22°C, while the injection volume was 20 µl.

Mass Spectrometry

Mass spectrometry analyses were performed using a Quattro Micro (Micromass) mass spectrometer equipped with an electrospray ionization (ESI) source. Analyses were performed in positive ionization mode using nitrogen as desolvation gas. ESI source parameters were set as follows: source temperature of 105° C, desolvation temperature of 480° C, desolvation flow of $800 \, l \, h^{-1}$, and capillary voltage of $3 \, kV$. Rosuvastatin was detected by a multiple reaction

monitoring (MRM) transition of 482.18 > 258.14 using a cone voltage of 35 V, and diazepam was detected by a MRM transition of 285.20 > 193.30 using a cone voltage of 30 V. Data were acquired using MassLynx 4.1.

Preparation of Standards and Quality Controls

A stock solution of rosuvastatin was prepared by accurately weighing and dissolving the standard in acetonitrile/water (80: 20 ν/ν) to a concentration of 100 µg ml⁻¹. Then, the solution was sequentially diluted to working solutions of 1, 0.152, and 0.0024 µg ml⁻¹. IS diazepam was dissolved in acetonitrile/ water (80:20 ν/ν) to obtain a 100-µg ml⁻¹ stock solution and then diluted to obtain a 0.015-µg ml⁻¹ working solution. Method validation, calibration curve, and quality control analysis were carried out using blank plasma calibration standards including 0.2, 1, 5, 10, 20, 30, 40, and 50 ng ml⁻¹ blanks and quality control (QC) of 0.6, 25.0, and 38 ng ml⁻¹ samples prepared by spiking the above-described working solutions of rosuvastatin and IS in a blank biological matrix. Stock and working solutions were stored in a refrigerator and allowed to equilibrate (30 min) at room temperature before use.

Sample Extraction

Three hundred microliters of plasma were aliquoted into a microcentrifuge tube. Then, $25 \,\mu$ l of IS solution were added to the plasma. Next, $25 \,\mu$ l of HCl 1 M as well as 1,000 μ l of a diethyl ether/dichloromethane (70:30 ν/ν) were added to the same tube. The content was shaken for 5 min and then centrifuged for 10 min, at 132,000, at 4°C. After that, the supernatant was transferred to another tube and dried under nitrogen stream. An acetonitrile/water solution (80: 20 ν/ν) was used for resuspension of the dried content, which was shaken and finally transferred to an insert before injection.

Method Validation

The analytical method was validated for the following parameters: specificity, carryover, matrix effect, calibration curve, accuracy, precision, and stability.

Specificity was ascertained by analyzing blank human plasma samples from six individuals and comparing the chromatograms with chromatograms from blank human plasma spiked with rosuvastatin in the lower limit of quantification (LLOQ) concentration and IS.

Carryover was ascertained by analyzing three injections of the same blank sample, one before and two after an injection of a sample in the upper limit of quantification (ULOQ) concentration. Results were compared with LLOQ chromatograms.

Matrix effect was ascertained by spiking eight different extracted blank human plasma samples with rosuvastatin at QC concentrations and the IS. Peak areas of extracted spiked samples were compared to those of standard solutions.

The calibration curve was prepared using six different blank human plasma samples (three for weighting tests and three for linearity tests) spiked with concentrations at eight levels ranging from 0.2 to 50 ng ml⁻¹. Analyte concentrations in samples were calculated by linear regression equation, typically described by equation y = ax + b where *y* corresponds to the analyte/IS peakarea ratio and *x* corresponds to the ratio of rosuvastatin to IS concentration. Due to the range of the calibration curve and lower value of the sum of the relative errors of the nominal values of the calibration versus its values obtained by the curve equation, the weighting factor of reciprocal concentration squared $(1/x^2)$ was applied.

Intra- and inter-batch accuracy and precision were evaluated at three different levels (0.6, 25, and 38 ng ml⁻¹) of QC samples in quintuplicate in three different batches. The accuracy of the method was expressed as relative error (RE), whereas precision was obtained by calculating the within- and between-run coefficient of variation (CV). The acceptance criteria for each quality control were that CV must not exceed 15% for QC and 20% for LLOQ.

Freezing and thawing stabilities for rosuvastatin in human plasma samples were ascertained after four cycles and the analytical process conducted at low and high QC concentrations. Samples were frozen at -70° C in four cycles of 12, 24, 36, and 48 h. Autosampler stability was investigated over a 24-h storage period in the autosampler tray with low and high quality control concentrations. Long-term stability was also evaluated over a 160-day storage period at -70° C. The acceptance criteria for each quality control were that CV and accuracy must not exceed 15%.

Determination of Rosuvastatin Concentrations in Human Plasma Samples and Pharmacokinetic and Statistical Analysis

The validated LC-MS/MS method was applied to measure rosuvastatin concentrations to obtain additional pharmacokinetic parameters.

Pharmacokinetic parameters were calculated from plasma levels employing a non-compartmental statistic using WinNon-Lin 8.3 software (Pharsight, United States). Following Food and Drug Administration (FDA) guidelines, blood samples were drawn up to a period of three to five times the terminal elimination half-life $(t_{1/2})$ and the mean AUC_{0-t}/AUC_{0- ∞} ratio was required to be higher than 80%. The area under the concentration-time curve (AUC_{0-t}) was calculated by the trapezoidal method. The total area under the curve $(AUC_{0-\infty})$ was obtained up to the last measurable concentration, and extrapolations were performed using the last measurable concentration and the terminal elimination rate constant (K_e). The terminal elimination rate constant, K_e , was estimated from the slope of the terminal log₁₀ transformed exponentially and multiplied by -2.303 phase of the plasma of rosuvastatin concentration-time curve (by means of the linear regression method) adjusted in the three last values. The terminal elimination half-life, $t_{1/2}$, was then obtained as $0.693/K_{\rm e}$. The $C_{\rm max}$ and the time to reach maximum plasma concentration (T_{max}) values were determined by visual inspection of the plasma rosuvastatin concentration-time profiles. Results are presented as mean ± standard deviation (SD).

UPLC-QTOF-MS^E-Based Untargeted Metabolic Profiling for AUC and C_{max} Predictions

Liquid Chromatography

Chromatographic analyses were performed in an ACQUITY FTN H Class (Waters) liquid chromatograph. Separations were carried out using an ACQUITY CSH C18 column (Waters) with dimensions $2.1 \times 100 \text{ mm} \times 1.7 \mu \text{m}$ as stationary phase using acetonitrile (B) and water with 0.1% formic acid (A) as mobile phase. Flow rate was set at 0.4 ml min⁻¹. Segmented gradient was applied as follows: 0–2 min, 10% of B; 7 min, 90% of B kept for 2 min; and 9–11 min returning to initial conditions and kept for 2 min for column re-equilibration resulting in a 13-min run. Autosampler temperature was set at 20°C, whereas the injection volume was 0.5 µl for positive mode and 5 µl for negative mode.

Mass Spectrometry

High-resolution mass spectrometry analyses were performed using a XEVO-G2XSQTOF (Waters) equipped with an ESI source. Analyses were performed in both positive and negative ionization mode using nitrogen as the desolvation gas. ESI source parameters were set as follows: source temperature of 140° C, desolvation temperature of 550°C, desolvation flow of 9001h⁻¹, capillary voltage of 3 kV, sampling cone of 30 kV, and cone gas flow of $101h^{-1}$ for positive mode and capillary voltage of 2.5 kV, sampling cone of 40 kV, cone gas flow of $501h^{-1}$ for negative mode.

Spectra were acquired within an acquisition mass range of 50-1,700 Da using a data-independent MS^E approach. MS^E fragmentation settings were applied using 6 V of collision energy for low-energy scan and a 15-30-V ramp for highenergy scan. Leucine encephalin (Tyr-Gly-Gly-Phe-Leu, formula $C_{28}H_{37}N_5O_7$, molecular weight = 555.2693 g mol⁻¹ at 200 pg μ l⁻¹ in acetonitrile/water 1:1 ν/ν) was used as lockmass to ensure exact mass measurements during data acquisitions. A 0.5-mM sodium formate solution was used for instrument calibration. MassLynx 4.1 was used for mass spectrometer control and data acquisition management. Samples were randomly analyzed. Pooled quality control samples were analyzed at the beginning of the batch in order to equilibrate the system as well as sample injections at regular intervals during the batch to monitor instrumental drifts that may occur. Additionally, at the end of the batch, serially diluted QC samples were analyzed in order to verify features that follow dilution trends and filtered.

Sample Extraction

A 50-µl aliquot of each sample was taken, and 100 µl of methanol containing the IS *p*-bromo-phenylalanine (200 µM) were added, both in the same centrifuge tube. Then, samples were shaken for 10 min for protein precipitation and centrifuged at 14,000 rpm for 1 min at 8°C. Finally, 100 µl of supernatant was transferred to a vial for instrumental analysis. Samples were randomly prepared. A pooled QC sample was prepared by mixing equal small aliquots of each study sample, distributed equally in regular intervals across the sample preparation batch, and extracted as such. In addition, five-level serially diluted QC samples were prepared.

Data Processing, Statistical Analysis, and Metabolite Identification

Raw data acquired by UPLC-QTOF-MS^E were directly imported to Progenesis QI (Nonlinear Dynamics) for peak detection and deconvolution, alignment, retention time correction, data filtering, and MS^E-based ion annotation and identification to generate a suitable data matrix table for statistical analysis. For the feature-identification step, MassBank of North America (MoNA)-containing metabolomics libraries such as HMDB, LipidMaps, LipidBlast, and MassBank were used.

QC sample acquisition allowed for quality data checking and cleaning, and molecular features that showed relative standard deviation (RSD) > 25% after data cleaning and normalization were stripped out from the multivariate data modeling.

Machine learning modeling was performed by means of Elastic Net (sklearn.linear_model.ElasticNet), with the linear regression with combined L1 and L2 penalty priors as a regularizer, which penalizes models based on their complexity favoring simpler and more generalizing models. This algorithm was applied as estimator for AUC and C_{max} predictions using Python 3.7.10 with *scikit-learn* (Pedregosa et al., 2012) version 0.22.2. Other Python programing standard packages for data manipulation, such as *Pandas* (McKinney, 2010) and *Numpy* (Kristensen and Vinter, 2010), and data visualization, such as *Matplotlib* (Hunter, 2007), *Seaborn* (Waskom, 2021) and *ScyPy* (Virtanen et al., 2020), were also employed.

Results were mainly assessed in terms of explained variance R^2 (sklearn.metrics.explained_variance_score), main absolute (sklearn.metrics.mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) percentage_error), and root mean squared error (RMSE) (sklearn.metrics.mean_squared_error, squared = False). For overfitting, checking, and model validation, the same metrics were employed obtained by leave-one-out cross-validation (LOOCv) predicted data for each validation sample [sklearn.model_selection.cross_val_predict, cv = LeaveOneOut()]. Models were refined based on selection of features with non-zero coefficients where, among all initially selected features, different number of features starting from the most significant, and by steps of one, each feature was evaluated so that in the end all significant features were evaluated. For each iteration, the corresponding quality metrics were collected for further evaluation. The optimal numbers of significant features were further used in the process of model hyperparameter tuning (sklearn.model_selection.GridSearchCV). The code is available in the following Github repository: https:// github.com/GustavoHBDuarte/Metabolomics_PK_proj.

RESULTS

LC-MS/MS Method Validation Specificity

Specificity assessment results show that the developed method for the analysis of rosuvastatin using the selected mass transitions for MRM function was selective enough for quantitative purposes, with no apparent interferences either from endogenous compounds or from matrix effects around the analyte and IS retention times. **Figure 1** portrays the chromatograms obtained



from blank plasma samples and blank plasma samples spiked with rosuvastatin (0.2 ng ml^{-1}) and IS.

Carryover

To evaluate the presence of carryover effects, three injections of blank samples were analyzed, one before and two after ULOQ. No signal of analyte was detected in any of the blank injections.

Matrix Effect

For matrix effect evaluation, the mean values obtained for QCs and IS were 108.4% (SD = 10.9%) and 104.4% (SD = 8.6%), respectively, demonstrating that no apparent matrix effect affects the rosuvastatin determination in human plasma samples employing the developed method.

Calibration Curve and LLOQ

The calibration curves were plotted as the peak area (rosuvastatin/IS)/drug concentration ratio. Linearity was achieved over the concentration range of 0.2–50 ng ml⁻¹ with the correlation coefficient (R^2) greater than 0.99 for all the curves. The RE of the mean concentration measured ranged from –6.17% to 9.50%, and the RSD ranged from 3.02% to 14.46%. **Table 1** portrays the overall results for linearity evaluation.

Accuracy and Precision

Accuracy and precision were calculated in terms of intra- and inter-batch variation at QC levels, and the corresponding results are shown in **Table 2**. Intra- and inter-batch precision (RSD) ranged from 5.87 to 14.16 and 5.84 to 10.59, respectively, whereas intra- and inter-batch accuracy ranged from -0.31% to 5.83% and

-3.04% to 1.88%, respectively, indicating that the method is reliable and reproducible within its analytical range.

Stability

The four-cycle freezing and thawing stability $(-70^{\circ}\text{C}$ to room temperature) evaluations have shown that the analyte is stable in human plasma at QC levels for all cycles. Additionally, no analyte degradation was detected in an autosampler tray stability assessment over a 24-h storage period, with the measured analyte values ranging from 83.17% to 111.58% of their corresponding nominal values. Moreover, for long-term evaluation, results have shown that rosuvastatin was stable over a 160-day storage period at -70° C, with measured analyte values ranging from 90.42% to 97.17% of the nominal values.

Application in a Pharmacokinetic Study and Statistical Evaluation of Pharmacokinetic Parameters

The validated analytical method was then applied to measure rosuvastatin concentration in healthy volunteers in order to obtain the main pharmacokinetic parameters. This study was conducted with 40 volunteers after a single oral dose (20 mg) of the drug. **Figure 2** portrays the typical plasma concentration versus time profiles. Plasmatic concentrations of rosuvastatin ranged within the standard curve and remained above the LLOQ of 0.2 ng ml⁻¹ for the entire sampling period.

The observed AUC value from time 0 to the last sampling time (AUC_{0-t}) was 154.13 ± 63.06 ng h/ml, whereas the AUC from 0 to ∞ (AUC_{0- ∞}) was 162.85 ± 64.96 ng h/ml. The elimination half-life ($t_{1/2}$) was 15.10 ± 7.91 h.

TABLE 1 | Calibration curves from one batch of the validation section.

Nominal concentration (ng ml ⁻¹)	Mean concentration (ng ml ⁻¹)	RSD (%) (<i>n</i> = 3)	RE (%)
0.2	0.188	10.94	-6.17
1	0.921	6.66	-7.87
5	4.698	3.79	-6.05
10	10.623	14.46	6.23
20	19.950	3.02	-0.25
30	28.805	6.36	-3.98
40	40.173	6.19	0.43
50	54.749	4.02	9.50

TABLE 2 | Precision and accuracy (analysis, spiking plasma samples at three different concentrations).

Nominal concentration (ng ml ⁻¹)		Intra-batch					Inter-batch			
	Mean concentration measured (ng ml ⁻¹)	SD	RSD (%) (n = 5)	Relative error (%)	Mean concentration measured (ng ml ⁻¹)	SD	RSD (%) (n = 5)	Relative error (%)		
0.6	0.64	0.09	14.16	5.83	0.61	0.06	10.59	1.26		
25	24.92	1.18	4.74	-0.31	24.24	1.42	5.84	-3.04		
38	37.57	2.21	5.87	-1.13	38.72	2.76	7.12	1.88		



The observed C_{max} was 19.53 ± 8.64 ng ml⁻¹, whereas the T_{max} was 4.18 ± 0.72 h. Moreover, the AUC_{0-t}/AUC_{0- ∞} mean ratio was higher than 80%.

UPLC-QTOF-MS^E-Based Untargeted Profiling for AUC and C_{max} Predictions From Predose Endogenous Plasma Metabolites

After the successful application of the validated method, the main pharmacokinetic parameters such as AUC and C_{max} were obtained for the rosuvastatin formulation administered to the study volunteers. As result, despite all the controlling for physiological and environmental conditions, it was possible to note a seven-fold difference between the lowest and the highest AUC values as well as an eight-fold difference between the lowest and the highest C_{max} values. The extent of inter-individual variation can be clearly seen in **Figure 2**. Thereafter, plasma predose endogenous metabolite profiling was acquired using liquid chromatography-high-resolution mass spectrometry. Typical ESI (+) and ESI (-) chromatograms for QC samples of the applied method for metabolite profiling are displayed in **Supplementary Figure 1**.

The corresponding acquired data was assessed to investigate the presence of metabolites that can be helpful as predictors of individual AUC and C_{max} variation. To do so, an Elastic Net linear regression machine learning model was built using acquired data from predose endogenous metabolite profiling as independent X variables and the pharmacokinetic parameters as dependent Y variables. Initially, four different models were built corresponding to the two different ionization modes employed to acquire data [ESI (+) and ESI (-)], each of them was used to predict their corresponding pharmacokinetic parameters (AUC or C_{max}) using all detected molecular features to both evaluate the performance of the corresponding models and screen for the best features. Raw data processing, cleaning, and filtering of ESI (+) data resulted in 2,609 molecular features available for machine learning modeling, whereas 2,446 molecular features remained available after processing and filtering ESI (-) data.

Initial evaluation pointed to poor performance of models using all molecular features available for all models assessed, in part probably due to the large dimensional data space typically obtained by metabolite profiling experiments and the unbalanced tradeoff between the number of variables and the available number of samples. Thus, in order to improve model performance as well as to screen for helpful predictors, the most promising molecular features in the initial evaluation were selected to build further refined models, decreasing the number of variables and making data simpler and easier for Elastic Net to perform regression and data interpretation. Variables were selected on the basis of their corresponding model coefficients, excluding variables with zero coefficient values. Additionally, after initial variable selection by coefficient values, the model performances using the selected variables were evaluated by increasing the number of significant features starting from the most significant feature and adding more features, increasing by steps of one towards the least significant selected feature. Information about model metrics from each iteration was collected for both the training set and the LOOCv testing set in order to select the optimal number of significant features. Metrics resulting from the LOOCv testing set were prioritized for this selection. After this step, 69 and 27 molecular features remained for AUC and C_{max} models for ESI (+) datasets, respectively, whereas 49 and 17 molecular features remained for AUC and C_{max} models for ESI (-) datasets, respectively. It is important to mention that LOOCv was chosen as the cross-validation method due to its accurate, reliable, robust, and unbiased estimate of model performance and due to the reduced number of samples available for both model training and testing. Before running the algorithm itself for these models, data were initially normalized by the area of the internal standard in order to minimize the effect of any eventual poor injection that may have occurred. Then, using MetaboAnalyst 5.0 (Pang et al., 2021), data were also normalized using the option "Normalization by a pooled sample from group," the group QC was selected, and data were cubic root transformed. Finally, data were scaled using the robust scaler method (sklearn.preprocessing.RobustScaler).

The next step of model refinement was to adjust algorithm hyperparameters. These parameters are applied to configure either the characteristics of the learning procedure or the structure of the underlying model. For that purpose, the exhaustive grid search method was employed. This method exhaustively generates candidates from previously specified parameter values. Then, after selecting a dataset for fitting, all combinations of parameter values are evaluated and the corresponding best combination is retained. The set of parameters and their corresponding ranges of values chosen for evaluation resulted in 4,800 experiments for each model after the tuning had been selected. The final optimized values for each dataset are shown on **Supplementary Table S1** in the Supplementary Material data file. Alternatively, we also built an Elastic Net model to predict AUC and C_{max} values for rosuvastatin using volunteers' clinical features (the results from the set of laboratory tests) as *X* variables in order to further compare their performance with the corresponding model using metabolomics data as predictors and evaluate the best predictors of pharmacokinetic parameters. Finally, an integrated model using both volunteers' clinical features and metabolomics data was also built and evaluated. The 44 applied volunteers' clinical features are listed in the **Supplementary Table 1**.

AUC Predictions

The refined Elastic Net model was then applied to predict AUC values of study volunteers from predose endogenous metabolite profiling acquisition. Figure 3 portrays the predicted-againstexperimental AUC values for ESI (+) and ESI (-) data where both training and LOOCv testing datasets are evaluated simultaneously. Ideally, in a good prediction model, all the samples should fall as close as possible to the regression line. The R^2 coefficient scales the extension of variance in AUC values that can be explained by the model. For ESI (+) data, R^2 achieved 1.00, whereas for ESI (–) data, R^2 achieved 0.98 for the training set. Although training R^2 results were close to 1.0, it is crucial to consider the results of the LOOCv external set in order to evaluate the model's ability to predict unseen data so that it can be properly validated. The LOOCv R^2 Cv was 0.93 for ESI (+) and 0.86 for ESI (-). The closeness between training and Cv for R^2 indicates both models' good ability to predict AUC values for external sets of samples.

Furthermore, root mean square error of cross-validations (RMSE Cv) and mean absolute percentage error of cross-validations (MAPE Cv) were also calculated. These parameters specify error measurements for fitted model observations. For ESI (+), RMSE Cv reached 19.03 ng h/ml and MAPE Cv reached 10.12%, while for ESI (-), RMSE Cv reached 27.92 ng h/ml and MAPE reached Cv 14.28%.

From predicted and true AUC values, it is possible to obtain a residual plot. In the dispersion diagram, it is possible to note both training and LOOCv testing set samples similarly distributed around the ordinal least squares (OLS) R^2 regression line. Moreover, samples with higher AUC values had higher residuals. Considering that the frequency of observations with higher AUC values was substantially lower than the frequency of observations with lower AUC values, the selected machine learning algorithm possibly turned out to be trained differently across this AUC range, and apparently, this difference reflected on the calculated residuals. The OLS R^2 regression line value for LOOCv residuals was 0.25 for ESI (+), meaning that 25% of the variation in AUC-predicted values is explained by variation in residuals shown in the dispersion diagram, whereas for ESI (-), the OLS R^2 achieved 0.19. Furthermore, shared Y-axis reveals higher residuals for the ESI (-) model compared to the ESI (+) model. Figure 4 portrays the residual evaluation in the form of a dispersion diagram.

Similarly, the information provided by residuals was used to generate both histograms and probability plots to evaluate the distribution of frequencies for residuals and obtain a more indepth visualization. **Figure 5** portrays the results. A histogram





inspection suggests residuals around zero as being the most frequent values for both the ESI (+) and ESI (-) models, whereas the probability plot reveals that, although not falling straight to the normality Gaussian fit line, the distribution of residuals against theoretical quantiles follows a similar trend for both ESI (+) and ESI (-), showing the consistency of the obtained data.

Regarding machine learning modeling, applying exclusively clinical features, unlike the performance of Elastic Net model using metabolomics data as predictors, it was not possible to achieve similar results using volunteers' clinical features as pharmacokinetic parameter predictors for AUC. RMSE Cv reached 63.92 ng h/ml, whereas MAPE Cv reached 33.00%. The LOOCv R^2 coefficient was 0.24. Predicted AUC values from the ESI (+), ESI (–), and volunteers' clinical feature modeling were also compared to each other from the perspective of the frequencies of their corresponding predicted values. **Figure 6** demonstrates a clear representation of the extension of the lesser predictability of the clinical feature model compared to the ESI (+) and ESI (–) models by using



area under curve (AUC) predictions.



frequency plots. Results demonstrate that the clinical feature model generates an evidently higher difference in the distance of both training and LOOCv testing frequencies of predicted values from true values compared to the same measure of both the ESI (+) and ESI (-) models, showing its considerably lower predictive ability compared to information provided by metabolomics.

The final evaluation of AUC modeling included an integrated model applying both metabolomics [ESI (+) and ESI (-)] and clinical features. The information provided by the combination of both sources did not substantially improve the performance of predictions for ESI (+). Instead, for ESI (-), a slight decrease was observed in the quality metrics of the model. LOOCV R^2 reached



0.94 and RMSE Cv and MAPE Cv reached 18.32 ng h/ml and 10.21%, respectively, for ESI (+), whereas LOOCv R^2 reached 0.85 and RMSE Cv and MAPE Cv reached 28.21 ng h/ml and 14.39%, respectively, for ESI (–).

C_{max} Predictions

Refined ESI (+) and ESI (-) datasets were also employed to predict C_{max} values of the same study volunteers from predose endogenous metabolite profiling experiments, and their corresponding performance was assessed using the same metrics used for AUC predictions. The same trend observed for AUC predictions, whereby the ESI (+) model performed better than the ESI (-) model, was also observed for C_{max} models. **Figure 7** portrays predicted-against-experimental C_{max} values for ESI (+) and ESI (-) for each observation. For ESI (+), training R^2 achieved 0.99 and LOOCv testing R^2 was 0.94, whereas for ESI (-), training R^2 achieved 0.9 and LOOCv testing R^2 achieved 0.79. RMSE Cv and MAPE Cv for ESI (+) were 2.54 ng ml⁻¹ and 11.56%, respectively, whereas ESI (-) RMSE Cv and MAPE Cv were 4.55 ng ml⁻¹ and 23.24%, respectively.

Figure 8 displays the residual analysis for C_{max} predictions as a dispersion diagram. The same trend seen for AUC predictions is also seen for C_{max} predictions in the corresponding plot where residuals for the ESI (–) model were higher compared to the ESI (+) ones. Although it can be observed that unlike the AUC predictions, there was a sample with a higher residual value [close to -10 in the ESI (–) model]. The sample in question was not the sample with the highest C_{max} value. For ESI (+), the samples with higher residuals were not necessarily the samples with higher C_{max} values either. The observations with higher C_{max}

values were also less frequent than with the AUC model. The fact that, for the C_{max} model, the range of numerical values to predict is lower and samples are closer to each other could allow the C_{max} model to train better than the AUC model for predicting the numerical value of samples and spreading the residuals more evenly throughout the samples. Besides, the OLS R^2 regression line value for LOOCv residuals shown in the dispersion diagram was 0.02 for ESI (+) and 0.01 for ESI (-). Furthermore, for the distribution analysis of residuals, shown in Figure 9, the residuals with values close to zero were mainly the most frequent values. The shared X-axis of histograms also allowed for the visualization of the lesser spreading of residuals of the ESI (+) model compared to the ESI (-). Similarly, the shared X-axis of the probability plots shows, as in the AUC models, the similar distribution of data regarding residuals against theoretical quantiles, regardless of ionization mode, confirming the consistency of obtained data as the data points apparently seem to fall closer to the Gaussian regression line compared to the AUC model and, therefore, a more normal-like distribution of residuals around zero.

Regarding C_{max} predictions using volunteer's clinical features, a similar trend observed for AUC models was also seen for C_{max} modeling with poorer prediction ability when comparing to the model applying only metabolomics data. The LOOCv R^2 coefficient reached 0.08, whereas RMSE Cv and MAPE Cv reached 9.77 ng ml⁻¹ and 34.77%, respectively, showing substantially lower correspondence between clinical features and C_{max} values. **Figure 10** shows a similar trend for AUC predictions using volunteer's clinical features, where predictions for both training and LOOCv testing demonstrated a considerably lower ability to predict pharmacokinetic values with a clear distortion in the frequencies of predictions for both



FIGURE 8 | Residual plots of ESI (+) (A) and ESI (-) (B) maximum plasma drug concentration (C_{max}) models for both training (black dots) with leave-one-out cross-validation (LOOCV) testing samples (gray dots) as dispersion diagrams.



FIGURE 9 | A histogram of residuals (left panels) of ESI (+) (A) and ESI (-) (B) data and probability plot of residuals (right panels) of ESI (+) (C) and ESI (-) (D) data for maximum plasma drug concentration (C_{max}) predictions.

Silveira et al.



training and LOOCv testing models. A more detailed visualization in the distribution plot of predictions for the $C_{\rm max}$ ESI (+) model reveals a closer overlapping between the frequencies of training and LOOCv testing predictions compared to the frequencies of the $C_{\rm max}$ ESI (-) and even closer if compared to the AUC ESI (+) and AUC ESI (-) training and LOOCv predictions. Though there is no apparent overfitting for any of these models, this described observation is consistent with the lower distance between R^2 and LOOCv R^2 for the $C_{\rm max}$ ESI (+) model compared to the same measurement of the $C_{\rm max}$ ESI (-), AUC ESI (+), and AUC ESI (-) models.

In addition, regarding the integrated model, the same behavior observed for AUC predictions was observed for C_{max} predictions with the application of both clinical and metabolomic information in the same dataset not providing significant improvements over the model using only metabolomic information. **Supplementary Table S2** in the Supplementary Material data file provides an overall visualization of the performance metrics for all the evaluations carried out in this work.

DISCUSSION

The metabolomic approach used in this work was based on the hypothesis that the metabolic profile of plasma may contain molecular information useful for predicting the pharmacokinetic response of a drug even if no genetic information is known at first. Thus, we used the plasma predose endogenous metabolite profiling of volunteers in predose, acquired from the UPLC-QTOF-MS^E platform, to build the Elastic Net linear regression machine learning model for prediction of the pharmacokinetic parameters of AUC and

 $C_{\rm max}$. Although profiles were acquired in both ESI (–) and ESI (+) acquisition modes, the latter was the one that provided the best models according to MAPE and RMSE errors. Likewise, it is important to add that, in isolation, no single metabolite was able to present a good correlation with $C_{\rm max}$ and AUC values, only when they were evaluated together.

From these models, we were able to prepare a list (Table 3) of 16 compounds most relevant for the prediction of the pharmacokinetic values and for which it was possible to suggest at least one chemical identity. Identification suggestions were made automatically by the Progenesis QI software based on parameters such as the following: mass error, that is, the difference, in parts per million (ppm), between the measured molecular mass and the theoretical mass for the proposed molecular formula; isotopic similarity between the experimental and theoretical spectra; and the match between fragments of theoretical compared to experimental masses (Mecatti et al., 2020). The table also includes the codes (identifiers) that link the suggested identities to public databases of metabolites and the coefficients of these features in the prediction models (see Supplementary Tables 2 and 3 for a complete list of molecular features that contributed to the prediction models and their respective coefficients). A pathway analysis diagram was built with the MetaboAnalyst 5.0 free platform (Supplementary Figure S2 in the Supplementary Material data file).

Metabolites were grouped into four groups: steroids and bile acids, carboxylates, lipids, and salts. The key factors to understand the potential role of these metabolites for the prediction of rosuvastatin pharmacokinetic parameters rely on their potential role in the transport mechanism of this substance. The pharmacokinetic parameter of C_{max} is related to the

Feature code ^a (RT_ <i>m/z</i>)	IМ ^ь	IM ^b Molecular Putative assignment formula		M ^b Molecular Putative assignment Mass Diagnostic formula error (ppm) fragments (<i>m/z</i>)		Diagnostic fragments (<i>m/z</i>) ^c	Identifiers ^d	Coefficient ^e (AUC/C _{max})	
Sterols and bile acids									
8.31_329.2476 m/z	-	C22H36O3	Dinorlithocholic acid	-3.02	319.264	LMST04050010	1.1/0.1*		
6.45_403.2840 m/z	-	C25H42O5	Homoavicholic acid	-3.32	277.217	LMST04070041	1.6/0.1*		
7.36_452.3121 <i>m/z</i>	+	C8H11N3O3	1α-hydroxy-21-nor-20-	+3.92	131.049	LMST03020026	1.1/0.0*		
			oxavitamin D3		110.041				
					107.050				
					79.039				
6.45_447.2739 <i>m/z</i>	-	C25H38O4	3-oxochenodeoxycholic acid	-3.27	403.285	HMDB0000541	2.1/0.1*		
					227.217				
Carboxylated metabolites	6								
0.33_180.0628 n	-	C6H12O6	Fuconic acid	-3.51	225.062	LMFA01050532	-2.3/-0.9*		
					179.0561				
4 04 400 4500 /		00114410000	N1	0.00	161.046	000007	0.0/ 07*		
4.31_439.1598 <i>m/z</i>	-	C8H11N3O3	N-acetylnistidine	+3.92	NA	C02997	-2.0/-07*		
0.36_217.0297 m/z	-	C7H12N2O5S	Cysteinyl aspartate	+3.41	167.021	HMDB0028771	-2.0/-0.3^		
0.29.07.0296 m/z			Clutaria agid	0.70	100.015	C00490	0.9/ 0.1*		
0.30_97.02007772	+	00004	Giutane aciu	-3.73	05.029	000469	-0.0/-0.1		
6 60 796 1761 m/z			OVPS 36.5+10	_0.76	255 232	LipidBlact/158032	1 3/0 1*		
6 20 446 2288 m/z	_	C19H40NO7P	$V_{\rm X} = 0.0000000000000000000000000000000000$	-0.70	415 211	HMDB0011470	1.3/0.1		
0.20_440.2200 11/2		010114010071	Ey301 E(14.0)	0.10	413 915	1111000011470	1.170.0		
					245.990				
0.58 1191.1731 m/z	_	C80H155NO5	Cer-EODS d80:2/Cer-EOS	+0.31	_	LipidBlast197294	-1.7/-0.3*		
-			d80:2						
10.22_529.4246 m/z	_	C34H60O5	DG(31:3)	-3.03	293.212	LMGL02010362	1.2/0.2*		
					271.228				
0.31_830.7578 m/z	_	C52H99NO3	Cer-NS d52:3 ^d	-3.63	NA	LipidBlast013435	-1.3/-0.4		
6.86_1547.9838 m/z	_	C38H73NO11S	3-O-Sulfogalactosylceramide	+3.18	266.233	C06125	1.6/0.0*		
			(32:1)						
3.26_916.5829 <i>m/z</i>	+	C51H81O8P	PA 40:8	-0.31	NA	LipidBlast460837	4.3/0.7*		
6.86_1547.9838 m/z 3.26_916.5829 m/z	+	C38H73NO11S C51H81O8P	3-O-Sulfogalactosylceramide (32:1) PA 40:8	+3.18 -0.31	266.233 NA	C06125 LipidBlast460837	1.6/0.0* 4.3/0.7*		

TABLE 3 | Most relevant and putatively identified metabolites selected by the Elastic Net regression model for pharmacokinetic parameters prediction.

^aRT, retention time; m/z, mass-to-charge ratio.

^bIM, ionization mode.

^cFragments that are matching between experimental data and database.

^d Identifiers: LMXX, metabolites described in the LipidMaps (https://www.lipidmaps.org/data/structure/); HMDBXXXXXX, metabolites described in the Human Metabolome Database (HMDB—https://hmdb.ca/); CXXXX, described in the Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes database (KEGG—https://www.genome.jp/kegg/); and LipidBlastXXXX, described in the MassBank of North America (MoNA—https://mona.fiehnlab.ucdavis.edu/).

^eCoefficients in the refined AUC and C_{max} models (in that order). Coefficients highlighted with an asterisk (*) corresponds to initial model.

NA, not applicable. All listed compounds met Metabolomics Standards Initiative (MSI) level 2 identification requirements, except for b, d, i, and m, which met level 3 requirements (Schrimpe-Rutledge et al., 2016).

variability in gastrointestinal transport. AUC, in turn, reflects the variability in the extent of absorption and elimination and may thus involve hepatic clearance. These processes involve the participation of transporters, which has been implicated as one of the factors responsible for the variation in the absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion (ADME) of several drugs (Soars et al., 2009; Harwood et al., 2013). Interactions between these transporters and circulating metabolites may underlie how this predose metabolic information can influence the pharmacokinetic parameters of rosuvastatin (Luvai et al., 2012).

Rosuvastatin, among other statins, is transported by the OATP1B1, an influx transporter expressed in the basolateral membrane of human hepatocytes and encoded by the *SLCO1B1* gene (Hua et al., 2012). The relationship between this transporter and the pharmacokinetics of statins is so relevant that it has been established that *SLCO1B1* is one of the risk predictors of myopathy caused by statins (Kisor et al., 2019). Specifically for rosuvastatin, several studies show that *SLCO1B1* c.521CC, a single-nucleotide polymorphism capable

of decreasing the transporter activity, causes an increase in plasma concentrations of rosuvastatin (Pasanen et al., 2007; Choi et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2013; Birmingham et al., 2015a; Birmingham et al., 2015b; Wan et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2019). This transporter also acts on many other substrates, including bile salts, hormones, and steroid conjugates (Ho and Kim, 2005; DeGorter et al., 2012). Genetic variants of *SLCO1B1*, including c.521CC, are associated with an increase in plasma concentrations of bile acids (Xiang et al., 2009).

Given these data, it has been suggested that competitive interactions with this transporter may contribute to a decrease in the hepatic absorption of statins, impacting the pharmacokinetic parameters of these drugs. It has been reported that intravenous administration of rifampicin, an inhibitor of the hepatic transporter OATP1B1, substantially increased the plasma concentrations of atorvastatin and its metabolites (Lau et al., 2007). The same can occur with respect to circulating endogenous metabolites. It has been described that pretreatment concentrations of some primary and secondary bile



acids were correlated with the response to simvastatin treatment (Krauss et al., 2013), suggesting a direct relationship between the presence of these basal metabolites and the drug's bioavailability. Similarly, cholesteryl ester predose levels were well correlated with the simvastatin response (Kaddurah-Daouk et al., 2010; Krauss et al., 2013). It was also demonstrated that free cholesterol was among the metabolites detected in the predose of individuals to whom a single dose of atorvastatin was administered, and there was a correlation between C_{max} and AUC and the basal levels of this metabolite (Huang et al., 2015). Aligned with these reports, the bile acids dinorlithocholic, homoavicholic, and 3oxochenodeoxycholic acids and the steroidal lipid 1β-hydroxy-21-nor-20-oxavitamin D3 are among the listed metabolites that most contributed to the prediction of pharmacokinetic parameters, especially AUC. We observed that the positive values of the coefficients in the model's features point to a direct association, that is, the higher the plasma levels of those metabolites, the greater the competition for OATP1B1 transporters, the lower the liver transport, and the slower the hepatic abortion of rosuvastatin. It is important to mention that, as specified before, other transporters influence the ADME of rosuvastatin, in particular, ABCG2, which may present polymorphisms that can be of special relevance for some populations (Lee et al., 2013). However, predose metabolites that could potentially influence these transporters were not accessed in this study.

The pharmacophoric group of statins is the 3,5dihydroxypentanoic acid monocarboxylated nucleus (**Figure 11**). Whether in the closed configuration of lovastatin and simvastatin or in the open configuration of atorvastatin and rosuvastatin, when this group is anchored in the enzyme HMGR (Istvan and Deisenhofer, 2001), they become unavailable for binding with HMG-CoA, which blocks a key step in cholesterol biosynthesis. Additionally, the transport of monocarboxylate compounds in the gastrointestinal tract has been demonstrated to be catalyzed by the proton-linked monocarboxylate 10 transporters (MCT 10). Previous studies have shown that atorvastatin is transported by monocarboxylate transporters (MCTs) (Wu et al., 2000; Goto et al., 2005). Thus, an MCT-mediated inhibition of intestinal absorption of rosuvastatin can substantially decrease the bioavailability of the drug. The negative values of the coefficients of the monocarboxylic compounds fuconic acid, n-acetylhistidine, cysteinyl aspartate, and glutaric acid in Table 3, the latter three notable amino acids, demonstrate the negative correlation between these metabolites and the pharmacokinetic parameters of rosuvastatin. The potential effects that these metabolites exert on rosuvastatin pharmacokinetics may occur through competitive interactions with MCT intestinal transporters. In agreement with our observations, it has previously been shown that lower levels of the monocarboxylated amino acids 2-hydroxybutyric acid, tryptophan, tyrosine, phenylalanine, leucine, isoleucine, and others were correlated with higher values of Cmax and AUC (Huang et al., 2015). Likewise, lower baseline levels of 2hydroxyvaleric, succinic, and stearic acids demonstrated a significant correlation with the decrease in low-density cholesterol caused by simvastatin (Trupp et al., 2012).

Regarding the lipids described in **Table 3**, we highlight lysophosphatidylethanolamine (14:0), which is consistent with the observation that the basal concentration of phosphoethanolamines was positively related to the response to treatment with simvastatin. Likewise, diacylglycerols, such as DG(31:3), demonstrated a strong correlation, both positive and negative, with the response to simvastatin (Kaddurah-Daouk et al., 2010).

In light of the results herein presented, the designed experiment has demonstrated the potential of the applied strategy in finding associations between endogenous metabolites and pharmacokinetic parameters useful in predicting inter-individual variability in drug absorption, hopefully assisting in driving personalized drug therapy strategies, with the aim of reducing adverse effects and maximizing efficacy. In fact, since the anticholesterolemic activity of statins fundamentally occurs in the liver, the systemic presence of these molecules is potentially more correlated with the myotoxic effects of this class of drugs than with therapeutic ones. Thus, an individual predose prediction of plasma Cmax and AUC values would find relevant clinical application in potentially predicting which individuals would be more susceptible to presenting undesirable side effects. Data acquisition and processing strategies were able to reveal valuable information initially hidden in the huge amount of data typically provided by untargeted metabolomics experiments. Complementally, the rich set of findings of the refined approach also include some putatively identified main key metabolites belonging to classes that play important roles in plasmatic concentrations of rosuvastatin and could potentially be associated with inter-individual variability in drug response. The overall results achieved in this work clearly indicate the

valuable information carried by endogenous metabolites and the vast research that can be explored in this field.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The datasets generated by this study can be found in the following Metabolights repository: www.ebi.ac.uk/metabolights/MTBLS3128.

ETHICS STATEMENT

The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by the Brazilian National Health Council. The patients/ participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

REFERENCES

- Alomar, M. J. (2014). Factors Affecting the Development of Adverse Drug Reactions (Review Article). Saudi Pharm. J. 22 (2), 83–94. doi:10.1016/ j.jsps.2013.02.003
- Backshall, A., Sharma, R., Clarke, S. J., and Keun, H. C. (2011). Pharmacometabonomic Profiling as a Predictor of Toxicity in Patients with Inoperable Colorectal Cancer Treated with Capecitabine. *Clin. Cancer Res.* 17 (9), 3019–3028. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-10-2474
- Balakumar, K., Raghavan, C. V., Selvan, N. T., Prasad, R. H., and Abdu, S. (2013). Self Nanoemulsifying Drug Delivery System (SNEDDS) of Rosuvastatin Calcium: Design, Formulation, Bioavailability and Pharmacokinetic Evaluation. *Colloids Surf. B Biointerfaces* 112, 337–343. doi:10.1016/ j.colsurfb.2013.08.025
- Balashova, E. E., Maslov, D. L., and Lokhov, P. G. (2018). A Metabolomics Approach to Pharmacotherapy Personalization. J. Pers Med. 8 (3), 28. doi:10.3390/jpm8030028
- Betteridge, D. J., and Gibson, J. M. (2007). Effects of Rosuvastatin on Lipids, Lipoproteins and Apolipoproteins in the Dyslipidaemia of Diabetes. *Diabet Med.* 24 (5), 541–549. doi:10.1111/j.1464-5491.2007.02095.x
- Birmingham, B. K., Bujac, S. R., Elsby, R., Azumaya, C. T., Wei, C., Chen, Y., et al. (2015a). Impact of ABCG2 and SLCO1B1 Polymorphisms on Pharmacokinetics of Rosuvastatin, Atorvastatin and Simvastatin Acid in Caucasian and Asian Subjects: a Class Effect? *Eur. J. Clin. Pharmacol.* 71 (3), 341–355. doi:10.1007/s00228-014-1801-z
- Birmingham, B. K., Bujac, S. R., Elsby, R., Azumaya, C. T., Zalikowski, J., Chen, Y., et al. (2015b). Rosuvastatin Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacogenetics in Caucasian and Asian Subjects Residing in the United States. *Eur. J. Clin. Pharmacol.* 71 (3), 329–340. doi:10.1007/s00228-014-1800-0
- Busti, A. J., Bain, A. M., Hall, R. G., Bedimo, R. G., Leff, R. D., Meek, C., et al. (2008). Effects of Atazanavir/Ritonavir or Fosamprenavir/Ritonavir on the Pharmacokinetics of Rosuvastatin. *J. Cardiovasc. Pharmacol.* 51 (6), 605–610. doi:10.1097/FJC.0b013e31817b5b5a
- Chen, J., Lou, H., Jiang, B., Shao, R., Yang, D., Hu, Y., et al. (2020). Effects of Food and Gender on Pharmacokinetics of Rosuvastatin in a Chinese Population Based on 4 Bioequivalence Studies. *Clin. Pharmacol. Drug Dev.* 9 (2), 235–245. doi:10.1002/cpdd.706
- Choi, J. H., Lee, M. G., Cho, J. Y., Lee, J. E., Kim, K. H., and Park, K. (2008). Influence of OATP1B1 Genotype on the Pharmacokinetics of Rosuvastatin in Koreans. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 83 (2), 251–257. doi:10.1038/sj.clpt.6100267
- Clayton, T. A., Lindon, J. C., Cloarec, O., Antti, H., Charuel, C., Hanton, G., et al. (2006). Pharmaco-metabonomic Phenotyping and Personalized Drug Treatment. *Nature* 440 (7087), 1073–1077. doi:10.1038/nature04648
- Clayton, T. A., Baker, D., Lindon, J. C., Everett, J. R., and Nicholson, J. K. (2009). Pharmacometabonomic Identification of a Significant Host-Microbiome

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

The list of authors who contributed to this work is as follows: AS, GD, AF, NV, MA, and PC conceived and designed the experiments. AS, GD, AF, PG, and PC performed the experiment. AS and GD analyzed the data. AS, GD, and AF guided the experiment. AS, GD, and AF wrote the paper. PC revised the paper. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphar.2021.752960/full#supplementary-material

Metabolic Interaction Affecting Human Drug Metabolism. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U S A. 106 (34), 14728–14733. doi:10.1073/pnas.0904489106

- Crouse, J. R., 3rd (2008). An Evaluation of Rosuvastatin: Pharmacokinetics, Clinical Efficacy and Tolerability. *Expert Opin. Drug Metab. Toxicol.* 4 (3), 287–304. doi:10.1517/17425255.4.3.287
- DeGorter, M. K., Ho, R. H., Leake, B. F., Tirona, R. G., and Kim, R. B. (2012). Interaction of Three Regiospecific Amino Acid Residues Is Required for OATP1B1 Gain of OATP1B3 Substrate Specificity. *Mol. Pharm.* 9 (4), 986–995. doi:10.1021/mp200629s
- DeGorter, M. K., Tirona, R. G., Schwarz, U. I., Choi, Y. H., Dresser, G. K., Suskin, N., et al. (2013). Clinical and Pharmacogenetic Predictors of Circulating Atorvastatin and Rosuvastatin Concentrations in Routine Clinical Care. *Circ. Cardiovasc. Genet.* 6 (4), 400–408. doi:10.1161/ CIRCGENETICS.113.000099
- Diczfalusy, U., Nylén, H., Elander, P., and Bertilsson, L. (2011). 4β-Hydroxycholesterol, an Endogenous Marker of CYP3A4/5 Activity in Humans. *Br. J. Clin. Pharmacol.* 71 (2), 183–189. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2125.2010.03773.x
- Dudhipala, N., and Veerabrahma, K. (2017). Improved Anti-hyperlipidemic Activity of Rosuvastatin Calcium via Lipid Nanoparticles: Pharmacokinetic and Pharmacodynamic Evaluation. *Eur. J. Pharm. Biopharm.* 110, 47–57. doi:10.1016/j.ejpb.2016.10.022
- Fan, L., Zhang, W., Guo, D., Tan, Z. R., Xu, P., Li, Q., et al. (2008). The Effect of Herbal Medicine Baicalin on Pharmacokinetics of Rosuvastatin, Substrate of Organic Anion-Transporting Polypeptide 1B1. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 83 (3), 471–476. doi:10.1038/sj.clpt.6100318
- Goto, Y., Itagaki, S., Umeda, S., Kobayashi, M., Hirano, T., Iseki, K., et al. (2005). Transepithelial Transport of Telmisartan in Caco-2 Monolayers. *Biol. Pharm. Bull.* 28 (12), 2235–2239. doi:10.1248/bpb.28.2235
- Harwood, M. D., Neuhoff, S., Carlson, G. L., Warhurst, G., and Rostami-Hodjegan, A. (2013). Absolute Abundance and Function of Intestinal Drug Transporters: a Prerequisite for Fully Mechanistic In Vitro-In Vivo Extrapolation of Oral Drug Absorption. *Biopharm. Drug Dispos* 34 (1), 2–28. doi:10.1002/bdd.1810
- He, Y. J., Zhang, W., Tu, J. H., Kirchheiner, J., Chen, Y., Guo, D., et al. (2008). Hepatic Nuclear Factor 1alpha Inhibitor Ursodeoxycholic Acid Influences Pharmacokinetics of the Organic Anion Transporting Polypeptide 1B1 Substrate Rosuvastatin and Bilirubin. *Drug Metab. Dispos.* 36 (8), 1453–1456. doi:10.1124/dmd.108.020503
- Ho, R. H., and Kim, R. B. (2005). Transporters and Drug Therapy: Implications for Drug Disposition and Disease. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 78 (3), 260–277. doi:10.1016/j.clpt.2005.05.011
- Hua, W. J., Hua, W. X., and Fang, H. J. (2012). The Role of OATP1B1 and BCRP in Pharmacokinetics and DDI of Novel Statins. *Cardiovasc. Ther.* 30 (5), e234–41. doi:10.1111/j.1755-5922.2011.00290.x
- Huang, Q., Aa, J., Jia, H., Xin, X., Tao, C., Liu, L., et al. (2015). A Pharmacometabonomic Approach to Predicting Metabolic Phenotypes and

Pharmacokinetic Parameters of Atorvastatin in Healthy Volunteers. J. Proteome Res. 14 (9), 3970–3981. doi:10.1021/acs.jproteome.5b00440

- Hunter, J. D. (2007). Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment. Comput. Sci. Eng. 9 (3), 90–95. doi:10.1109/MCSE.2007.55
- Istvan, E. S., and Deisenhofer, J. (2001). Structural Mechanism for Statin Inhibition of HMG-CoA Reductase. Science 292 (5519), 1160–1164. doi:10.1126/ science.1059344
- Joerger, M. (2012). Covariate Pharmacokinetic Model Building in Oncology and its Potential Clinical Relevance. *AAPS J.* 14 (1), 119–132. doi:10.1208/s12248-012-9320-2
- Kaddurah-Daouk, R., Baillie, R. A., Zhu, H., Zeng, Z. B., Wiest, M. M., Nguyen, U. T., et al. (2010). Lipidomic Analysis of Variation in Response to Simvastatin in the Cholesterol and Pharmacogenetics Study. *Metabolomics* 6 (2), 191–201. doi:10.1007/s11306-010-0207-x
- Kaddurah-Daouk, R., Baillie, R. A., Zhu, H., Zeng, Z. B., Wiest, M. M., Nguyen, U. T., et al. (2011a). Enteric Microbiome Metabolites Correlate with Response to Simvastatin Treatment. *PLoS One* 6 (10), e25482. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0025482
- Kaddurah-Daouk, R., Boyle, S. H., Matson, W., Sharma, S., Matson, S., Zhu, H., et al. (2011b). Pretreatment Metabotype as a Predictor of Response to Sertraline or Placebo in Depressed Outpatients: a Proof of Concept. *Transl Psychiatry* 1, e26. doi:10.1038/tp.2011.22
- Kantae, V., Krekels, E. H. J., Esdonk, M. J. V., Lindenburg, P., Harms, A. C., Knibbe, C. A. J., et al. (2017). Integration of Pharmacometabolomics with Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics: Towards Personalized Drug Therapy. *Metabolomics* 13 (1), 9. doi:10.1007/s11306-016-1143-1
- Keskitalo, J. E., Zolk, O., Fromm, M. F., Kurkinen, K. J., Neuvonen, P. J., and Niemi, M. (2009). ABCG2 Polymorphism Markedly Affects the Pharmacokinetics of Atorvastatin and Rosuvastatin. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 86 (2), 197–203. doi:10.1038/clpt.2009.79
- Kim, T. E., Ha, N., Kim, Y., Kim, H., Lee, J. W., Jeon, J. Y., et al. (2017). Effect of Epigallocatechin-3-Gallate, Major Ingredient of green tea, on the Pharmacokinetics of Rosuvastatin in Healthy Volunteers. *Drug Des. Devel Ther.* 11, 1409–1416. doi:10.2147/DDDT.S130050
- Kim, Y., Yoon, S., Choi, Y., Yoon, S. H., Cho, J. Y., Jang, I. J., et al. (2019). Influence of OATP1B1 and BCRP Polymorphisms on the Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of Rosuvastatin in Elderly and Young Korean Subjects. *Sci. Rep.* 9 (1), 19410. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-55562-4
- Kisor, D. F., Hoefer, C., and Decker, B. S. (2019). "Pharmacogenomics and Precision Medicine," in *Clinical Pharmacy Education, Practice and Research.* Editor D. Thomas (Elsevier), 437–451. doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-814276-9.00031-3
- Kitsios, G. D., and Kent, D. M. (2012). Personalised Medicine: Not Just in Our Genes. BMJ 344, e2161. doi:10.1136/bmj.e2161
- Kondo, A., Narumi, K., Okuhara, K., Takahashi, Y., Furugen, A., Kobayashi, M., et al. (2019). Black tea Extract and Theaflavin Derivatives Affect the Pharmacokinetics of Rosuvastatin by Modulating Organic Anion Transporting Polypeptide (OATP) 2B1 Activity. *Biopharm. Drug Dispos* 40 (8), 302–306. doi:10.1002/bdd.2202
- Krauss, R. M., Zhu, H., and Kaddurah-Daouk, R. (2013). Pharmacometabolomics of Statin Response. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 94 (5), 562–565. doi:10.1038/ clpt.2013.164
- Kristensen, M. R. B., and Vinter, B. (2010). "Numerical Python for Scalable Architectures," in Proceedings of the Fourth Conference on Partitioned Global Address Space Programming Model (New York, New York, USA: Association for Computing Machinery). doi:10.1145/2020373.2020388
- Lau, Y. Y., Huang, Y., Frassetto, L., and Benet, L. Z. (2007). Effect of OATP1B Transporter Inhibition on the Pharmacokinetics of Atorvastatin in Healthy Volunteers. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 81 (2), 194–204. doi:10.1038/sj.clpt.6100038
- Lee, E., Ryan, S., Birmingham, B., Zalikowski, J., March, R., Ambrose, H., et al. (2005). Rosuvastatin Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacogenetics in white and Asian Subjects Residing in the Same Environment. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 78 (4), 330–341. doi:10.1016/j.clpt.2005.06.013
- Lee, H. K., Hu, M., Lui, S. Sh., Ho, C. S., Wong, C. K., and Tomlinson, B. (2013). Effects of Polymorphisms in ABCG2, SLCO1B1, SLC10A1 and CYP2C9/19 on Plasma Concentrations of Rosuvastatin and Lipid Response in Chinese Patients. *Pharmacogenomics* 14 (11), 1283–1294. doi:10.2217/pgs.13.115
- Li, H., and Jia, W. (2013). Cometabolism of Microbes and Host: Implications for Drug Metabolism and Drug-Induced Toxicity. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 94 (5), 574–581. doi:10.1038/clpt.2013.157

- Liu, M., Wu, X. J., Zhao, G. L., Zhang, T., Xu, S. S., Sun, Y. X., et al. (2016). Effects of Polymorphisms in NR₁H₄, NR₁I₂, SLCO₁B₁, and ABCG₂ on the Pharmacokinetics of Rosuvastatin in Healthy Chinese Volunteers. *J. Cardiovasc. Pharmacol.* 68 (5), 383–390. doi:10.1097/FJC.000000000000426
- Luvai, A., Mbagaya, W., Hall, A. S., and Barth, J. H. (2012). Rosuvastatin: a Review of the Pharmacology and Clinical Effectiveness in Cardiovascular Disease. *Clin. Med. Insights Cardiol.* 6, 17–33. doi:10.4137/CMC.S4324
- Martin, P. D., Warwick, M. J., Dane, A. L., Hill, S. J., Giles, P. B., Phillips, P. J., et al. (2003). Metabolism, Excretion, and Pharmacokinetics of Rosuvastatin in Healthy Adult Male Volunteers. *Clin. Ther.* 25, 2822–2835. doi:10.1016/ s0149-2918(03)80336-3
- Martin, P., Gillen, M., Ritter, J., Mathews, D., Brealey, C., Surry, D., et al. (2016).
 Effects of Fostamatinib on the Pharmacokinetics of Oral Contraceptive, Warfarin, and the Statins Rosuvastatin and Simvastatin: Results from Phase I Clinical Studies. *Drugs R. D* 16 (1), 93–107. doi:10.1007/s40268-015-0120-x
- McKinney, W. (2010). "Data Structures for Statistical Computing in Python," in Proceedings of the 9th Python in Science Conference (SciPy 2010), Austin, TX, June 28–July 3, 2010, 56–61.
- McTaggart, F., and Jones, P. (2008). Effects of Statins on High-Density Lipoproteins: a Potential Contribution to Cardiovascular Benefit. Cardiovasc. Drugs Ther. 22 (4), 321–338. doi:10.1007/s10557-008-6113-z
- Mecatti, G. C., Sánchez-Vinces, S., Fernandes, A. M. A. P., Messias, M. C. F., De Santis, G. K. D., Porcari, A. M., et al. (2020). Potential Lipid Signatures for Diagnosis and Prognosis of Sepsis and Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome. *Metabolites* 10 (9), 359. doi:10.3390/metabo10090359
- Muhrez, K., Benz-De Bretagne, I., Nadal-Desbarats, L., Blasco, H., Gyan, E., Choquet, S., et al. (2017). Endogenous Metabolites that Are Substrates of Organic Anion Transporter's (OATs) Predict Methotrexate Clearance. *Pharmacol. Res.* 118, 121–132. doi:10.1016/j.phrs.2016.05.021
- Nazir, S., Iqbal, Z., Shah, Y., Ahmad, L., and Khan, A. (2015). Pharmacokinetic Study of Rosuvastatin in Males and Females. *Eur. J. Drug Metab. Pharmacokinet.* 40 (3), 313–318. doi:10.1007/s13318-014-0211-z
- Olsson, A. G., Mctaggart, F., and Raza, A. (2002). Rosuvastatin: a Highly Effective New HMG-CoA Reductase Inhibitor. *Cardiovasc. Drug Rev.* 20 (4), 303–328. doi:10.1111/j.1527-3466.2002.tb00099.x
- Pang, Z., Chong, J., Zhou, G., De Lima Morais, D. A., Chang, L., Barrette, M., et al. (2021). MetaboAnalyst 5.0: Narrowing the gap between Raw Spectra and Functional Insights. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 49 (W1), W388–W396. doi:10.1093/ nar/gkab382
- Pasanen, M. K., Fredrikson, H., Neuvonen, P. J., and Niemi, M. (2007). Different Effects of SLCO1B1 Polymorphism on the Pharmacokinetics of Atorvastatin and Rosuvastatin. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 82 (6), 726–733. doi:10.1038/ sj.clpt.6100220
- Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., et al. (2012). Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. J. Machine Learn. Res. 12, 2825–2830.
- Phapale, P. B., Kim, S. D., Lee, H. W., Lim, M., Kale, D. D., Kim, Y. L., et al. (2010). An Integrative Approach for Identifying a Metabolic Phenotype Predictive of Individualized Pharmacokinetics of Tacrolimus. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 87 (4), 426–436. doi:10.1038/clpt.2009.296
- Rahmioglu, N., Le Gall, G., Heaton, J., Kay, K. L., Smith, N. W., Colquhoun, I. J., et al. (2011). Prediction of Variability in CYP3A4 Induction Using a Combined 1H NMR Metabonomics and Targeted UPLC-MS Approach. *J. Proteome Res.* 10 (6), 2807–2816. doi:10.1021/pr200077n
- Samineni, D., Desai, P. B., Sallans, L., and Fichtenbaum, C. J. (2012). Steady-state Pharmacokinetic Interactions of Darunavir/ritonavir with Lipid-Lowering Agent Rosuvastatin. J. Clin. Pharmacol. 52 (6), 922–931. doi:10.1177/ 0091270011407494
- Schneck, D. W., Birmingham, B. K., Zalikowski, J. A., Mitchell, P. D., Wang, Y., Martin, P. D., et al. (2004). The Effect of Gemfibrozil on the Pharmacokinetics of Rosuvastatin. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 75 (5), 455–463. doi:10.1016/ j.clpt.2003.12.014
- Schork, N. J. (2015). Personalized Medicine: Time for One-Person Trials. Nature 520 (7549), 609–611. doi:10.1038/520609a
- Schrimpe-Rutledge, A. C., Codreanu, S. G., Sherrod, S. D., and Mclean, J. A. (2016). Untargeted Metabolomics Strategies-Challenges and Emerging Directions. J. Am. Soc. Mass. Spectrom. 27 (12), 1897–1905. doi:10.1007/s13361-016-1469-y

- Shin, K. H., Choi, M. H., Lim, K. S., Yu, K. S., Jang, I. J., and Cho, J. Y. (2013). Evaluation of Endogenous Metabolic Markers of Hepatic CYP3A Activity Using Metabolic Profiling and Midazolam Clearance. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 94 (5), 601–609. doi:10.1038/clpt.2013.128
- Simonson, S. G., Raza, A., Martin, P. D., Mitchell, P. D., Jarcho, J. A., Brown, C. D., et al. (2004). Rosuvastatin Pharmacokinetics in Heart Transplant Recipients Administered an Antirejection Regimen Including Cyclosporine. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 76 (2), 167–177. doi:10.1016/j.clpt.2004.03.010
- Soars, M. G., Webborn, P. J., and Riley, R. J. (2009). Impact of Hepatic Uptake Transporters on Pharmacokinetics and Drug-Drug Interactions: Use of Assays and Models for Decision Making in the Pharmaceutical Industry. *Mol. Pharm.* 6 (6), 1662–1677. doi:10.1021/mp800246x
- Son, M., Guk, J., Kim, Y., Woo Chae, D., Heo, Y. A., Soh, D., et al. (2016). Pharmacokinetic Interaction between Rosuvastatin, Telmisartan, and Amlodipine in Healthy Male Korean Subjects: A Randomized, Open-Label, Multiple-Dose, 2-period Crossover Study. *Clin. Ther.* 38 (8), 1845–1857. doi:10.1016/j.clinthera.2016.06.011
- Tay-Sontheimer, J., Shireman, L. M., Beyer, R. P., Senn, T., Witten, D., Pearce, R. E., et al. (2014). Detection of an Endogenous Urinary Biomarker Associated with CYP2D6 Activity Using Global Metabolomics. *Pharmacogenomics* 15 (16), 1947–1962. doi:10.2217/pgs.14.155
- Thompson, P. D., Clarkson, P., and Karas, R. H. (2003). Statin-associated Myopathy. JAMA 289 (13), 1681–1690. doi:10.1001/jama.289.13.1681
- Trupp, M., Zhu, H., Wikoff, W. R., Baillie, R. A., Zeng, Z. B., Karp, P. D., et al. (2012). Metabolomics Reveals Amino Acids Contribute to Variation in Response to Simvastatin Treatment. *PLoS One* 7 (7), e38386. doi:10.1371/ journal.pone.0038386
- van der Lee, M., Sankatsing, R., Schippers, E., Vogel, M., Fätkenheuer, G., Van Der Ven, A., et al. (2007). Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of Combined Use of Lopinavir/ritonavir and Rosuvastatin in HIV-Infected Patients. *Antivir. Ther.* 12 (7), 1127–1132.
- Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T. E., Haberland, M., Reddy, T., Cournapeau, D., et al. (2020). SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python. *Nat. Methods* 17 (3), 261–272. doi:10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2
- Wan, Z., Wang, G., Li, T., Xu, B., Pei, Q., Peng, Y., et al. (2015). Marked Alteration of Rosuvastatin Pharmacokinetics in Healthy Chinese with ABCG2 34G>A and

421C>A Homozygote or Compound Heterozygote. J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther. 354 (3), 310-315. doi:10.1124/jpet.115.225045

- Waskom, M. (2021). Seaborn: Statistical Data Visualization. Joss 6 (60), 3021. doi:10.21105/joss.03021
- Weinshilboum, R. (2003). Inheritance and Drug Response. N. Engl. J. Med. 348 (6), 529–537. doi:10.1056/NEJMra020021
- Winnike, J. H., Li, Z., Wright, F. A., Macdonald, J. M., O'connell, T. M., and Watkins, P. B. (2010). Use of Pharmaco-Metabonomics for Early Prediction of Acetaminophen-Induced Hepatotoxicity in Humans. *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther.* 88 (1), 45–51. doi:10.1038/clpt.2009.240
- Wooltorton, E. (2004). Rosuvastatin (Crestor) and Rhabdomyolysis. CMAJ 171 (2), 129. doi:10.1503/cmaj.1041051
- Wu, X., Whitfield, L. R., and Stewart, B. H. (2000). Atorvastatin Transport in the Caco-2 Cell Model: Contributions of P-Glycoprotein and the Proton-Monocarboxylic Acid Co-transporter. *Pharm. Res.* 17 (2), 209–215. doi:10.1023/a:1007525616017
- Xiang, X., Han, Y., Neuvonen, M., Pasanen, M. K., Kalliokoski, A., Backman, J. T., et al. (2009). Effect of SLCO1B1 Polymorphism on the Plasma Concentrations of Bile Acids and Bile Acid Synthesis Marker in Humans. *Pharmacogenet Genomics* 19 (6), 447–457. doi:10.1097/FPC.0b013e32832bcf7b

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations or those of the publisher, the editors, and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Copyright © 2021 Silveira, Duarte, Fernandes, Garcia, Vieira, Antonio and Carvalho. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.



Figure S1. Typical ESI (+) (A) and ESI(-) (B) chromatograms for QC samples of the applied method for metabolite profiling.



Figure S2. Metaboanalyst (http://www.metaboanalyst.ca) generated Pathway Analysis describing the impact of significant selected metabolites. The Y-axis is the original P values obtained from the pathway analysis, and the X-axis is the influence value of pathways obtained from the topological analysis.

dataset applied	Ionization mode	Parameter	alpha	fit intercept	11 ratio	max iter	precompute	selection	warm start
		Cmax	0.1	True	0.1	1000	False	cvclic	True
N# (1 1 1	ESI (+)	AUC	0.3	True	0.3	10000	False	random	False
Metabolomics		Cmax	0.2	True	0.1	100000	True	random	True
	ESI (-)	AUC	0.4	True	0.1	100000	True	random	True
Clinical features	-	Cmax	0.9	True	1.0	1000	False	random	True
	-	AUC	0.1	True	0.8	10000	False	random	False
Integrated model	ESI (+)	Cmax	0.2	True	0.1	10000	False	random	False
		AUC	0.2	True	0.1	1000	True	cyclic	True
	$\mathbf{FSI}(-)$	Cmax	0.2	True	0.1	10000	True	random	False
	LSI (-)	AUC	0.5	True	0.1	1000	True	random	True

 Table S1 Overall visualization of the optimized hyperparameters for all the evaluations carried out.

datasat	Ionization	Pharmaco		Trainning	g set	LOOCv testing set			
applied	mode	kinetic							
applied	mode	parameter	R2	MAPE	RMSE	R2	MAPE	RMSE	
	$\mathbf{FSI}(1)$	C_{max}	0.99	4.77	0.96	0.94	11.56	2.54	
Matabalamiaa	$LSI(\top)$	AUC	1.00	2.56	4.31	0.93	10.12	19.03	
Metabolomics	ESI (-)	C_{max}	0.90	2.56	3.17	0.79	23.24	4.55	
		AUC	0.98	6.28	10.55	0.86	14.28	27.92	
Clinical	-	C_{max}	0.21	31.96	9.05	0.07	34.77	9.78	
features	-	AUC	0.60	25.72	46.53	0.24	33.00	63.92	
	ESI (+)	C_{max}	0.84	5.23	1.08	0.93	11.44	2.69	
Integrated model		AUC	1.00	2.05	3.38	0.94	10.22	18.32	
	$\mathbf{FSI}()$	C_{max}	0.90	15.66	3.17	0.79	23.25	4.55	
	ESI (-)	AUC	0.98	6.38	10.77	0.85	14.39	28.21	

Table S2 Overall visualization of the performance metrics for all the evaluations carried out.

4. CONCLUSÃO

O presente trabalho mostrou que o perfil metabólico plasmático contém informações úteis para predizer a resposta farmacocinética de rosuvastatina, ainda que informações genéticas do indivíduo não sejam conhecidas. O modelo de regressão linear *Elastic Net* avaliado pelo MAPE e RMSE foi adequado para identificar o conjunto de metabólitos correlacionados aos valores de AUC e Cmax do medicamento. A partir desse modelo, foram obtidos quinze compostos apontados como potenciais biomarcadores para a predição dos parâmetros farmacocinéticos (agrupados em 4 grupos: esteróides e ácidos biliares, compostos carboxilados, lipídios e sais).

Os ácidos biliares (dinorlitocólicos, homoavicólicos e 3-oxochenodesoxicólicos) e o lipídio esteroidal (1-hidroxi-21-nor-20-oxavitamina D3) estão entre os metabólitos que mais contribuíram para a predição dos parâmetros farmacocinéticos, especialmente a AUC, mostrando a correlação positiva dos níveis plasmáticos elevados destes metabólitos com a absorção do fármaco. Por outro lado, foi observado uma correlação negativa entre os compostos monocarboxílicos ácido fucônico, n- acetilhistidina, cisteinil aspartato e ácido glutárico, ou seja, níveis plasmáticos elevados destes compostos estão relacionados à necessidade de doses maiores de rosuvastatina para se alcançar o efeito terapêutico adequado. Da mesma forma, níveis mais baixos dos aminoácidos ácido 2-hidroxibutírico, triptofano, tirosina, fenilalanina, leucina, isoleucina e outros, foram correlacionados com valores mais elevados de Cmax e AUC.

À luz dos resultados apresentados, fica claro o potencial da estratégia para encontrar associações entre os metabólitos endógenos e os parâmetros farmacocinéticos úteis na predição da variabilidade interindividual, contribuindo na condução de estratégias de terapias personalizadas para reduzir efeitos adversos e maximizar a eficácia. O conjunto de descobertas inclui os metabólitos que desempenham um papel importante no mecanismo de ação do fármaco.

Diante do grande número de pacientes que fazem uso de rosuvastatina cálcica, das consequências de um efeito terapêutico adverso ou ineficiente, da diversidade genética da população brasileira e da escassez de estudos nesta população, a continuidade deste trabalho poderá ser de grande valia na área da Pesquisa Clínica. Sua aplicação sugere, por exemplo, novas possibilidades na predição de testes de bioequivalência e em outros ensaios clínicos conduzidos com a rosuvastatina.

REFERÊNCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

1. Nofziger C, Turner AJ, Sangkuhl K, Whirl-Carrillo M, Agundez JAG, Black JL, et al. PharmVar GeneFocus: CYP2D6. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2020; 107(1):154–170.

2. Grundy SM, Stone NJ, Bailey AL, Beam C, Birtcher KK, Blumenthal RS, et al. 20192018 AHA/ACC/AACVPR/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/ADA/AGS/APhA/ASPC/NLA/PCNA. 2018; 139:e1082–e1143.

3. Bartlomiejczyk MA, Penson P, Banach M. Worldwide dyslipidemia guidelines. Current Cardiovascular Risk Reports. 2019; 13(2).

4. Sizar O, Khare S, Talati R. Statin Medications. Treasure Island, FL: StatPearls. 2019.

5. Brown MS, Goldstein JL. Lowering plasma cholesterol by raising LDL receptors. New England Journal of Medicine. 1982; 305 (9):515-7.

6. Young SG, Fong LG. Lowering plasma cholesterol by raising LDL receptors – revisited. New England Journal of Medicine. 2012; 366 (12): 1154-1155.

7. Whalen K, Finkel R, Panavelil, TA. Farmacologia Ilustrada. 6ª ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed; 2016.

8. Endo, A. A historical perspective on the discovery of statins. Proc Jpn Acad Ser B Phys Biol Sci. 2010; 86(5), 484–493.

9. Korani S, Bahrami S, Korani M, Banach M, Johnston TP, Sahebkar A. Parenteral systems for statin delivery: a review. Lipids in Health and Disease. 2019; 193 (18).

10. Wiggins BS, Saseen JJ, Page RL, II, Reed BN, Sneed K, Kostis JB, et al. Recommendations for management of clinically significant drug-drug interactions with statins and select agen. 2016; 134 (21):e468-e495.

11. Vickers S, Duncan CA, Vyas KP, Kari PH, Arison B, Prakash SR, et al. In vitro and in vivo biotransformation of simvastatin, an inhibitor of HMG CoA reductase. Drug Metab Dispos. 1990; 18(4):476-83.

12. Taha DA, Moor CH, Barrett DA, Lee JB, Gandhi RD, Hoo CW, et al. The role of acid-base imbalance in statin-induced myotoxicity. Transl Res. 2016; 174:140–160.

13. Whirl-Carrillo M, Mc Donagh EM, Hebert JM, Gong L, Sangkuhl K, Thorn CF, et al. Pharmacogenomics knowledge for personalized medicine. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2012; 92(4):414417.

14. Kyrklund C, Backman JT, Kivistö KT, Neuvonen M, Laitila J, Neuvonen PJ. Rifampin greatly reduces plasma simvastatin and simvastatin acid concentrations. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2000; 68(6): 592–7.

15. Zhu Y, D'Agostino J, Zhang QY. Role of intestinal cytochrome P450 (P450) in modulating the bioavailability of oral lovastatin: insights from studies on the intestinal epithelium. Drug Metab Dispos. 2011; 39(6): 939-943.

16. Brown CM, Reisfeld B, Mayeno NA. Cytochromes P450: a structure-based summary of biotransformations using representative substrates Drug Metab Rev. 2008; 40(1): 1-100.

17. Schirris TJ, Ritschel T, Bilos A, Smeitink JA, Russel FG. Statin Lactonization by Uridine 5'-Diphospho-glucuronosyltransferases (UGTs). 2015; 12(11): 4048-55.

18. Sanchez-Dominguez CN, Gallardo-Blanco HL, Salinas-Santander MA, Ortiz-Lopez R. Uridine 5'-diphospho-glucronosyltrasferase: its role in pharmacogenomics and human disease. Exp Ther Med. 2018; 16(1):3-11.

Arnaboldi L, Corsini A. Do structural differences in statins correlate with clinical efficacy?.
 Curr Opin Lipidol. 2010; 21(4):298-304.

20. Adams SP, Alaeiilkhchi N, Wright JM. Pitavastatin for lowering lipids. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2020.

21. Schachter M. Chemical, pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties of statins: an update. Fundam Clin Pharmacol. 2005;19(1):117-25.

22.Yebyo HG, Aschmann HE, Kaufmann M, Puhan MA. Comparative effectiveness and safety of statins as a class and of specific statins for primary prevention of cardiovascular disease. 2019; 210: 18-28.

23. Bjornsson ES. Hepatotoxicity of statins and otherlipid-lowering agents. Liver Int. 2017; 37 (2): 173–178.

24. Souich P, Roederer G, Dufour R. Myotoxicity of statins: mechanism of action. Pharmacol Ther. 2017; 175:1–16.

25. Mc Clure DL, Valuck RJ, Glanz M, Murphy JR, Hokanson JE. Statin and statin- fibrate use was

significantly associated with increased my osit is risk in a managed care population. J Clin Epidemiol. 2007;60(8):812-8.

26. Raju SB, Varghese K, Madhu K. Management of statin intolerance. Indian J Endocrinol Metab. 2013;17(6):977-982.

27. Verdoodt A, Honore PM, Jacobs R, De Waele E, Van Gorp V, De Regt J, et al. Do statins induce or protect from acute kidney in juryand chronic kidney disease: an update review in 2018. J Transl Int Med. 2018; 6(1):21-25.

28. Ward NC, Watts GF, Eckel RH. Statin toxicity. Circ Res. 2019; 124(2):328–350.

29. Bischoff H, Angerbauer R, Bender J, Bischoff E, Faggiotto A, Petzinna D, et al. Cerivastatin: pharmacology of a novel synthetic and highly active HMG-CoA reductase inhibitor. Atherosclerosis. 1997; 135 (1): 119-130.

30. Hu MC, Mak VWL, Chu TTW, Waye MMY, Tomlinson B. Pharmacogenetics of HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors: optimizing the prevention of coronary heart disease. Curr Pharmacogenomics Pers Med. 2009; 7 (1): 1-26.

31. Sirtori CR, Mombelli G, Triolo M, Laaksonen R. Clinical response to statins: mechanism(s) of variable activity and adverse effects. Ann Med. 2012; 44(5):419-32.

32. Maji D, Shaikh S, Solanki D, Gaurav K. Safety of statins. Indian J Endocrinol Metab. 2013; 17(4):636–646.

33. Barry AR, Beach JE, Pearson GJ. Prevention and management of statin adverse effects: a practical approach for pharmacists. Can Pharm J. 2018; 151(3):179-188.

34. Estabrook, RW. A passion for P450s (rememberances of the early history of research oncy to chrome P450). Drug Metab Dispos. 2003; 31(12):1461–1473.

35. Kee PS, Chin PKL, Kennedy MA, Maggo SDS. Pharmacogenetics of Statin-Induced Myotoxicity. Front Genet. 2020; 11:575-778.

36. Mctaggart, F, Jones, P. Effects of statins on high-density lipoproteins: a potential contribution to cardiovascular benefit. Cardiovasc Drugs Ther. 2008; 22(4):321-338.

37. Betteridge, DJ, Gibson, JM. Effects of rosuvastatin on lipids, lipoproteins and apolipoproteins in the dyslipidaemia of diabetes. Diabetic Medicine. 2007; 24(5):541-549.

38. Crouse, JR. An evaluation of rosuvastatin: pharmacokinetics, clinical efficacy and tolerability. Expert Opin Drug Metab Toxicol. 2008; 4(3):287-304.

39. Olsson AG, Mctaggart F,Raza A. Rosuvastatin: a highly effective new HMG- CoA reductase inhibitor. Cardiovasc Drug Rev. 2002; 20(4): 303-328.

40. Thompson PD, Clarkson P, Karas RH. Statin-associated myopathy. JAMA. 2003; 289(13): 1681-1690.

41. Wooltorton, E. Rosuvastatin (Crestor) and rhabdomyolysis. CMAJ. 2004; 171(2): 129.

42. Lee E, Ryan S, Birmingham B, Zalikowski J, March R, Ambrose H, et al. Rosuvastatin pharmacokinetics and pharmacogenetics in whiteand Asi. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2005; 78(4): 330-341.

43. Pasanen MK, Fredrikson H, Neuvonen PJ, Niemi M. Different effects of SLCO1B1 polymorphism on the pharmacokinetics of atorvastatin and rosuvastatin. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2007; 82(6):726-733.

44. Keskitalo JE, Zolk O, Fromm MF, Kurkinen KJ, Neuvonen PJ, Niemi M. ABCG2 polymorphism markedly affects the pharmacokinetics of atorvastatin and rosuvastatin. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2009; 86(2):197-203.

45. Weinshilboum, R. Inheritance and drug response. N Engl J Med. 2003; 348(6): 529-537.

46. Li H, Jia W. Cometabolism of microbes and host: implications for drug metabolism and druginduced toxicity. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2013; 94(5):574-581.

47. Alomar MJ. Factors affecting the development of adverse drug reactions (Review article). Saudi Pharm J. 2014; 22(2): 83-94.

48. Kantae V, Krekels EHJ, Esdonk MJV, Lindenburg P, Harms AC, Knibbe CaJ, et al. Integration of pharmac metabolomics with pharmacokinetics: towards personalized drug therapy. Metabolomics. 2017; 13(1):9.

49. Nicholson, J.; Lindon, J. C.; Holmes, E. 'Metabonomics': understanding the metabolic responses of living systems to pathophysiological stimuli via multivariate statistical analysis of biological NMR spectroscopic data. Xenobiotica; 1999; 29(11):1181-9.

50. Fiehn O. Combining genomics, metabolome analysis, and biochemical modelling to understand

metabolic networks. Comp Funct Genom. 2001; 2(3):155-68.

51. Klassen A, Faccio AT, Canuto GAB, Cruz PLR, Ribeiro HC, Tavares MFM, et al. AMetabolomics: Definitions and Significance in Systems Biology. Adv Exp Med Biol. 2017; 965:3-17.

52. Silva, APR. Comparação de assinaturas lipídicas em plasma e tecido de pacientes com câncer de mama investigadas por espectrometria de massas [Dissertação]. Bragança Paulista. Universidade de São Francisco; 2020. Programa de Pós-Graduação *Stricto Sensu* em Ciências da Saúde.

53. Griffin JL, Atherton H, Shockcor J, Atzori L. Metabolomics as a tool for cardiac research. Nat Rev Cardiol. 2011; 8(11): 630-643.

54. Beger RD, Michael A, Schmidt MA, Kaddurah-Daouk R. Current Concepts inPharmacometabolomics, Biomarker Discovery, and Precision Medicine. Metabolites. 2020; 10(4):129.

55. Georgios T. Gika HG, Wilson ID. Mass spectrometry-based holistic analytical approaches for metabolite profiling in systems biology studies. Mass Spectrometry Reviews. 2011; 30(5):884-906.

56. Gorrochategui E, Jaumot J, Lacorte S, Tauler R. Data analysis strategies for targeted and untargeted LC-MS metabolomic studies: Overview and workflow. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry. 2016; 82: 425-442.

57. Canuto GAB, Costa JL, Cruz PLR, Souza ARL, Faccio AT, Klassen A, et al. Metabolômica: definições, estado da arte e aplicações representativas. 2017; 41 (1): 75-91.

58. Kuehnbaum NL, Britz-McKibbin P. New Advances in Separation Science for Metabolomics: Resolving Chemical Diversity in a Post-Genomic Era. Chem. Rev. 2013; 113 (4): 2437-2468.

59. Berk M, Ebbels T, Montana G. A statistical framework for biomarker discovery in metabolomic time course data. Bioinformatics. 2011; 27(14): 1979-85.

60. Sugimoto M, Kawakami M, Robert M, Soga T, Tomita M. Bioinformatics Tools for Mass Spectroscopy-Based Metabolomic Data Processing and Analysis. Curr. Bioinf. 2012; 7(1): 96-108.

61. Gromski PS, Muhamadali H, Ellis DI, Xu Y, Correa E, Turner ML, et al. A tutorial review: Metabolomics and partial least squares-discriminant analysis--a marriage of convenience or a shotgun wedding. Anal Chim Acta. 2015; 879: 10-23.

62. Burges CJC. A Tutorial on Support Vector Machines for Pattern Recognition. Springer Link: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery. 1998; 2:121-167.

63. Smith CA, Grace O, Want EJ, Qin C, Trauger SN, Brandon TR, et al. METLIN: a metabolite mass spectral database. Therapeutic Drug Monitoring. 2005; 27(6): 747-51.

64. Fahy E, Sud M, Cotter D, Subramaniam S. LIPID MAPS online tools for lipid research. Nucleic Acids Res. 2007; 35:W606-12.

65. Wishart DS, Tzur D, Knox C, Eisner R, Guo AC, Young N, et al. HMDB: the Human Metabolome Database. Nucleic Acids Res. 2007; 35:D521-6.

66. Huo, T; Cai, S; Lu, X; Sha, Y; M; Li, F. Metabonomic study of biochemical changes in the serum of type 2 diabetes mellitus patients after the treatment of metformin hydrochloride. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2009; 49(4):976-82.

67. Van Doorn M, Vogels J, Tas A, Hoogdalem EJ, Burggraaf J, Cohen A, et al. Evaluation of metabolite profiles as biomarkers for the pharmacological effects of thiazolidinediones in type 2 diabetes mellitus patients and healthy volunteers. 2007; 63(5): 562:574.

68. Danhof M, Alvan G, Dahl SG, Kuhlmann J, Paintaud, G. Mechanism-based pharmacokineticpharmacodynamic modeling-a new classification of biomarkers. Pharmaceutical Research. 2005; 22(9): 1432-7.

69. Ventola, CL. Role of pharmacogenomic biomarkers in predicting and improving drug response:Part 1: The clinical significance of pharmacogenetic variants. P T A Peer-Rev J Formul Manag.2013; 38(9): 545-551.

70. Krauss RM, Zhu H, Kaddurah-Daouk R. Pharmacometabolomics of statin response. Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics. 2013; 94(5): 562–565.

71. Clayton TA, Baker D, Lindon JC, Everett JR, Nicholson J K. Pharmacometabonomic identification of a significant host-microbiomemetabolic interaction affecting human drug metabolism. 2009; 106 (34): 14728-14733.

72. Kaddurah-Daouk R, Weinshilboum R M. Pharmacometabolomics: Implications for clinical pharmacology and systems pharmacology Clinical Pharmacologyand Therapeutics. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2014; 95(2): 154-67.

73. Kitsios GD, Kent DM. Personalised medicine: not just in our genes. BMJ. 2012; 344:e 2161.

74. La Marca G. Mass spectrometry in clinical chemistry: the case of new born screening. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2014; 101: 174-82.

75. Marzo A, Bo L D. Tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS-MS): a predominant role in bioassays for pharmacokinetic studies. Arzneimittel for schung. 2007; 57(2): 122-8.

76. Han J, Danell RM, Patel JR, Gumerov DR, Scarlett CO, Speir JP, et al. Towards highthroughput metabolomics using ultrahigh-field Fourier transform ion cyclotron resonance mass spectrometry. Metabolomics. 2008; 4:128-140.

77. Mirnezami R, Spagou K, Vorkas PA, Lewis MR, Kinross J, Want E, et al. Chemical mapping of the colorectal cancer microenvironment via MALDI imaging mass spectrometry (MALDI-MSI) reveals novel cancer-associated field effects. Mol. Oncol. 2014; 8(1): 39-49.

78. Gross JH. Introduction Mass Spectrometry: A text book. 2 ed Springer: Berlin. 2011. p6.

79. Lanucara F, Holman SW, Gray CJ, Eyers CE. The power of ion mobility-mass spectrometry for structural characterization and the study of conformational dynamics.Nat Chem. 2014; 6(4): 281-94.

80. Minor EC, Swenson MM, Mattson BM, Oyler AR. Structural characterization of dissolved organic matter: a review of current techniques for isolation and analysis. Environ Sci Process Impact. 2014; 2064-2079.

81. Yan X, Bain RM, Cooks RG. Organic Reactions in Microdroplets: Reaction Acceleration Revealed by Mass Spectrometry. Angew Chem Int Ed Engl. 2016; 55(42): 12960-72.

82. Eberlin MN. Electrospray ionization mass spectrometry: a major tool to investigate reaction mechanisms in both solution and the gas phase. Eur J Mass Spectrom. 2007; 13(1):19-28.

83. Thevis M, Kuuranne T, Geyer H, Schanzer W. Annual banned-substance review: analytical approaches in human sports drug testing. Drug Test Anal. 2017; 9(1):6-29.

84. Cho Y, Ahmed A, Islam A, Kim S. Developments in FT-ICR MS instrumentation, ionization techniques, and data interpretation methods for petroleomics. Mass Spectrom Rev. 2015; 34(2): 248-63.

85. Sloan, A, Wang G, Cheng K. Traditional approaches versus mass spectrometry in bacterial

identification and typing. Clin Chim Acta. 2017; 473: 180-185.

86. Chernushevich IV, Loboda AV, Thomson BA. An introduction to quadrupole-time-of-flight mass spectrometry. J Mass Spectrom. 2001; 36(8): 849-865.

87. Porcari, AM. Novas estratégias de tipificação e diagnóstico de materiais biológicos por espectrometria de massas [Tese]. Instituto Brasileiro de Informação em Ciência e Tecnologia;
2018. Doutorado em Ciências na área de Química Analítica.