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$CL_{int}$  intrinsic elimination clearance   $PS$  permeability-surface area product
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$K_v$   equilibrium amount ratio characterising the vesicular ion-trapping sites (ion-trapping parameter)

$V_B$  extracellular reference space
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Abstract

The aim of this study was to define the determinants of the linear hepatic disposition kinetics of propranolol optical isomers using a perfused rat liver. Monensin was used to abolish the lysosomal proton gradient to allow an estimation of propranolol ion-trapping by hepatic acidic vesicles. *In vitro* studies were used for independent estimates of microsomal binding and intrinsic clearance. Hepatic extraction and mean transit time were determined from outflow-concentration profiles using a non-parametric method. Kinetic parameters were derived from a physiologically based pharmacokinetic model. Modelling showed an approximate 34-fold decrease in ion-trapping following monensin treatment. The observed model-derived ion-trapping was similar to estimated theoretical values. No differences in ion-trapping values was found between R(+) and S(-) propranolol. Hepatic propranolol extraction was sensitive to changes in liver perfusate flow, permeability-surface area product and intrinsic clearance. Ion-trapping, microsomal and non-specific binding and distribution of unbound propranolol accounted for 47.4%, 47.1% and 5.5% of the sequestration of propranolol in the liver, respectively. It is concluded that the physiologically more active S(-)-propranolol differs from the R(+) isomer in higher permeability-surface area product, intrinsic clearance, and intracellular binding site values.
Introduction

Propranolol is a widely used nonselective beta-blocking agent which is highly extracted in the liver (Shand, 1976) and exhibits a non-linear first pass metabolism in the rat (Suzuki et al., 1981) due to saturation of hepatic tissue binding (Anderson et al., 1978; Miyauchi et al., 1993) and Michaelis-Menten metabolic enzyme or sequestration clearance (Keiding and Steiness, 1984; Smallwood et al., 1988) as well as metabolic stereo-selectivity. It has been described as a ‘problematic’ drug in terms of its first-pass metabolism not being properly described (Lalka et al., 1993).

As the stereo-selective elimination of propranolol enantiomers remains poorly understood (Marier et al., 1998) and as propranolol is marketed as a racemate consisting of the two enantiomers, we examined the contribution of the stereochemistry of propranolol on its hepatic disposition kinetics by investigating the individual disposition kinetics of both R(+) and S(-)-propranolol and the racemate after bolus injection in the single-pass perfused rat liver. In addition, we measured the microsomal protein binding and metabolism of individual propranolol isomers in an in vitro study. These in vitro data were then used to validate the hepatic disposition kinetic model derived from the in situ impulse-response studies using perfusate concentrations.

This study follows our recently reported structure-hepatic disposition relationships of several cationic drugs in the normal and the diseased rat liver (Hung et al., 2001; Hung et al., 2002) and here we also determined pharmacokinetic parameters such as hepatocellular influx, efflux, binding and elimination for these optical isomers. Kinetic parameters were derived from a two-phase physiologically based organ pharmacokinetic model (Weiss and Roberts, 1996; Hung et
al., 2001). Of particular interest was fully defining the determinants of propranolol isomer hepatic extraction and mean transit time at non-saturable propranolol concentrations, including the relative contribution of ion-trapping and microsomal binding to the uptake of propranolol isomers.
Material and Methods

Chemicals

Monensin sodium (2-[5-ethyltetrahydro-5-[tetrahydro-3-methyl-5-[tetrahydro-6-hydroxy-6-(hydroxymethyl)-3,5-dimethyl-2H-pyran-2-yl]-2-furyl]-2-furyl]-9-hydroxy-β-methoxy-α,γ,2,8-tetramethyl-1,6-dioxaspiro[4,5]decane-7-butyric sodium salt), S(-)-propranolol (1-[(1-methylethyl)amino]-3-(1-naphtalenyloxy)-2-propanol), R(+) propranolol, and RS-propranolol all were obtained from Sigma Chemical Co., St Louis, MO. [U-14C]DMO (dimethyloxazolidine-2,4-dione), [U-14C]sucrose, [3H]water were purchased from Amersham, Buckinghamshire, UK.

In situ perfusion of the isolated rat liver

Perfusion of the isolated rat liver used in this study was performed as described elsewhere (Cheung et al., 1996). Briefly, male Wistar rats, weighing 200-250 g were anaesthetised using an intraperitoneal injection of xylazine/ketamine (10/80 mg kg−1). The laparatomised rats were heparinized with 200 units heparin injected into the inferior vena cava. The bile duct and the portal vein were cannulated (PE-10, Clay Adams, Franklin Lakes, NJ) and using an intravenous 16-gauge catheter, respectively. The liver was then perfused with MOPS [3-(N-morpholino-)propanesulfonic acid]-buffer containing 2% BSA and 15% washed canine red blood cells (RBC), adjusted to pH 7.40 and oxygenated via a silastic tubing lung, ventilated with an atmosphere of 100% pure oxygen. A peristaltic pump was used as non-circulating perfusion system. The animals were sacrificed by thoracotomy once perfusion was established and the inferior vena cava was cannulated for collection of samples. The animals were placed in a temperature-controlled environment at 37°C. Assessment of liver viability was by macroscopic appearance, measurement of bile flow, oxygen consumption and portal resistance pressure (Cheung et al., 1996).
Perfusions were adjusted to a flow rate of 15 ml/min and given a 10-min period to stabilise before the injection of the first bolus. Aliquots (50 µL) of perfusion medium containing a particular propranolol optical isomer (0.06-0.11 µmole as determined by HPLC assay), [U-\textsuperscript{14}C]sucrose (1.5x10\textsuperscript{6} dpm) or [U-\textsuperscript{14}C]DMO (1.5x10\textsuperscript{6} dpm), and [\textsuperscript{3}H]water (3x10\textsuperscript{6} dpm) was injected into the liver with outlet samples collected via a fraction collector over 4 min (1 sec x 20, 4 sec x 5, 10 sec x 5, 30 sec x 5). The injection was timed to coincide with the start of a computer-controlled fraction collector (samples were collected over 4 min: 20 x 1 s, 5 x 4 s, 5 x 10 s, 4 x 30 s). Up to 6 bolus injections in randomised order were administered per liver. The total perfusion time was less than two hours. Rats in the treatment group received a 10 min perfusion of 0.5 mM (final concentration) monensin/methanol in buffer/RBC and controls were perfused for 10 min with buffer/RBC.

The collected samples were centrifuged and 75 µL aliquots of the supernatant containing [\textsuperscript{3}H]water, [U-\textsuperscript{14}C]sucrose, or [\textsuperscript{14}C]DMO were taken for scintillation counting (MINAXI beta TRI-CARB 4000 series liquid scintillation counter, Packard Instruments Co., USA). The remainder was vortexed and treated with TCA (trichloroacetic acid) /mobile phase (1:2) for HPLC analysis to determine the R(+)-propranolol, S(-)-propranolol or RS-propranolol outflow concentrations.

_Perfusion medium binding_

Experiments to determine propranolol optical isomer binding were carried out using 2% BSA MOPS buffer (pH 7.4) containing 15% (v/v) pre-washed canine red blood cells. The unbound fraction of the three propranolol optical isomers was determined using an ultra-filtration of a 1
µM perfusate solution. 500 µl aliquots (in triplicate) were placed in a Microcon centrifugal filter device with a nominal molecular weight limit of 10,000 Daltons (Amicon, Beverly, Ma) and centrifuged at 3000 x g for 30 minutes. The content of the filtrate was assayed by HPLC. The unbound fraction of optical isomer was determined as the ratio of free drug to the total concentration.

**In vitro binding and metabolism of microsomal protein**

To assess the effect of monensin on hepatic drug binding and metabolism an in vitro study with a microsomal protein preparation in the presence and absence of monensin was carried out, using buffer containing 0.35 mg/ml microsomal protein from normal livers. The unbound fraction of individual propranolol optical isomer in each buffer solution was estimated using an ultra-filtration method. A known concentration of the individual propranolol optical isomer stock solution was added to 500 µl of each buffer solution to make final concentration of 0.05 µM and placed in a centrifugal filter device (Microcon YM-30, 30,000 MWCO, Millipore Corp., Bedford, MA) and then centrifuged at 3000 x g for 10 min. The ultra-filtrate (in triplicate) was assayed by HPLC. The unbound fraction ($f_{ub}$) was determined as the ratio of the free concentration to total concentration of solute.

The impact of monensin on hepatic drug metabolism was assessed by incubation of 0.06-0.11 µmole of each propranolol isomer with microsomal protein (0.35 mg/ml) at 37°C. Samples were then collected at 0, 5, 10 and 20 min. The concentration in supernatant after centrifugation determined by HPLC and the logarithm of the concentration remaining in solution plotted against time to obtain a slope and an extrapolated initial concentration (at time zero). Linearity of the relationship and an extrapolated initial concentration being much less than the reported
Michaelis-Menten constant for propranolol (Ishida et al., 1992) was used to confirm linear kinetics. The intrinsic elimination clearance \( (CL_{in}) \) was estimated as the product of the slope and the dose divided by the extrapolated initial concentration.

**Analytical procedure**

The high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) method employed in this work has been described and validated previously (Hung et al., 2001).

**Data analysis**

A two-phase physiologically based organ pharmacokinetic model was used to analyse propranolol isomer disposition in the perfused liver. This model, which describes inter-sinusoidal mixing also called vascular dispersion (Roberts et al., 1988), transfer across a permeability barrier, and the intracellular distribution and elimination kinetics (Weiss and Roberts, 1996; Weiss et al., 1997), has been previously applied to the disposition of diclofenac (Weiss et al., 2000). In present work this model (as shown in Fig. 1 and Equation 1) has been developed to accommodate both ion-trapping \( (K_v) \), characterizing the vesicular ion-trapping sites) and intracellular binding \( (K_b) \), characterizing the intracellular binding sites) for model cationic drugs. The underlying mathematics of the model and the estimation of relative contribution of ion-trapping, microsomal binding and distribution of unbound drug for hepatic sequestration of propranolol have been described in detail previously (Siebert et al., 2004).

\[
\hat{f}_y(s) = \frac{(s + k_{in})k_{in}}{s^2(k_{in} / k_{out})(1 + K_v) + s((k_{in} / k_{out})(K_v k_{ic} + k_{zi} + k_{vi}) + k_{in}) + (k_{in} / k_{out})k_v k_{ic} + k_{in} k_{ic}}
\] (1)
where the permeation rate constant, $k_{in} = f_{uB}PS/V_B$, is the permeation clearance per extracellular volume $V_B$, $PS$ is the permeability-surface area product. $k_{out}$ is the efflux rate constant. The equilibrium amount ratio $K_v = k_{cv}/k_{vc}$ characterises the slowly accessible pool for ion-trapping, $K_b$ is defined as a rapidly equilibrating intracellular binding sites (microsomal and non-specific binding). $k_{cv}$ and $k_{vc}$ represent the rate constant for transport from cytosol into acidic vesicles (lysosomes and mitochondria) or from acidic vesicles into cytosol, respectively. The elimination rate constant defined as $k_e = CL_{int}/V_C$ is the intrinsic elimination clearance normalised per cellular volume $V_C$ (Hung et al., 2001). Data were fitted and calculated using Scientist (Micromath Scientist, Salt Lake City, UT).

Intracellular pH ($p_{Hi}$) was calculated from the concentration outflow profiles for $[^{14}C]$DMO, [U-$^{14}$C]sucrose and $[^3H]$water using an adaptation of the method of Le Couteur et al (Le Couteur et al., 1993). Briefly, the relationship

$$p_{Hi} = \log[p\left(10^{p_{He}} + 10^{6.13}\right) - 10^{6.13}]$$

where $p$ is the distribution ratio of DMO described as

$$p = \frac{MTT_{DMO} - MTT_{sucrose}}{MTT_{water} - MTT_{sucrose}}$$

6.13 is the $pK_a$ of DMO and 7.4 is the $pK_a$ of pH$_c$ (extracellular pH) used for the estimation of pH$_i$.

**Sensitivity analyses**

The predicted extraction ratio and mean transit time defined by two-phase physiologically based pharmacokinetic model ($E_{pred}$ and $MTT_{pred}$) are defined by Equations (4) and (5):

$$E_{pred} = \frac{MTT_{DMO} - MTT_{sucrose}}{MTT_{water} - MTT_{sucrose}}$$

$$MTT_{pred} = \frac{CL_{int}}{V_C}$$
\[ E_{pred} = 1 - pG_1 - (1 - p)G_2 \]  

(4)

where \( p \) is the fraction of the Laplace transform of a sum of 2 inverse Gaussian density functions \( (G_1 \text{ and } G_2) \) for vascular references not entering hepatocytes.

\[ MTT_{pred} = \frac{g_p}{pG_1 + (1 - p)G_2} \left[ \frac{G_1 pMTT_1}{\sqrt{1 + 2CV^2_1 MTT_1 R_N}} + \frac{G_2 (1 - p)MTT_2}{\sqrt{1 + 2CV^2_2 MTT_2 R_N}} \right] \]  

(5)

where \( CV^2 \) is the normalized variance, \( R_N \) is the efficiency number which characterizes the elimination of solute by the liver,

\[ g_p = 1 + \frac{k_{out} k_{in}}{(k_{out} + k_e)^2} \left( k_{in} + k_e \right), \quad R_N = \frac{k_e k_{in}}{k_e + k_{out}}, \]  

(6)

\[ G_i = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{CV^2_i} - \left[ MTT_i \left( R_N + \frac{1}{2MTT_i CV^2_i} \right) \right]^{1/2} \right\} \quad (i=1,2) \]  

(7)

In the sensitivity analysis, the effects of altering the parameters defining hepatic disposition on \( E \) and \( MTT \) of propranolol was examined for RS-propranolol by changing the individual model parameter values derived to define propranolol disposition in the perfused liver.

**Statistical analysis**

All data are presented as mean ± standard deviation. Statistical analysis was performed using a two-way analysis of variance to assess the presence of significance between the control and treatment groups followed by Tukey's post hoc test (including the Kramer extension) to identify the source of the significance within the group. Statistical significance was taken at the level \( p<0.05 \).
Results

Fig. 2A shows a typical R(+)-propranolol and [U-\textsuperscript{14}C]sucrose outflow perfusion concentration-time profile in the regressions (data weighted, 1/\text{y}_{\text{obs}}^2). [U-\textsuperscript{14}C]sucrose was co-administered as an extracellular reference solute in the same bolus injection. The fit was obtained by the equations described in the section of data analysis. It is evident that the model gives a good fit for the data. The perfusate data appear to have at least three phases (rapid up phase, fast down phase and slow down phase). The corresponding S(-)-propranolol and [U-\textsuperscript{14}C]sucrose perfusate concentration-time data and model regressions are shown in Fig. 2B. The profiles are similar to the R(+) profile but with the perfusate outflow fractions being slightly lower.

Fig. 3 shows a comparison of typical measured and predicted (fitted data) outflow perfusion concentration-time profiles before and after monensin treatment for the propranolol R(+) and S(-) enantiomers and racemic propranolol using co-administered [U-\textsuperscript{14}C]sucrose and [\textsuperscript{3}H]water for estimation of extracellular and cellular volumes. It is apparent that monensin pre-treatment greatly broadened the peak of the outflow profiles compared to controls. Data points measured and data regression lines predicted by the two-phase organ model appeared adequately fitted (Fig. 3A-C). Also shown in Fig. 3 that data points and predicted regression lines for both enantiomers and racemic propranolol increased following monensin administration.

Table 1 shows the non-parametric moments parameters for the drugs used in the study. No significant differences between control and monensin-treated groups were observed for hepatic extraction ratio and normalized variance for the propranolol optical isomers. However, there was a significant difference in mean transit time between control and treatment groups (Table
1). No significant differences for the non-parametric parameters were found to exist between the two propranolol enantiomers and racemic propranolol (Table 1).

Table 2 summarizes the kinetic parameters derived from the two-phase organ model for hepatic drug disposition of propranolol enantiomers and racemic propranolol. The vesicular ion-trapping constant $K_v$ significantly decreased following monensin treatment for R(+) propranolol, S(-)-propranolol and racemic propranolol ($K_v$ control/$K_v$ treatment: 33-, 34- and 35-fold, respectively). However, no changes following monensin treatment were observed for intrinsic elimination clearance ($CL_{int}$), permeability-surface area product ($PS$), or intracellular binding constant ($K_b$) values for all optical isomers.

Table 2 also compares the stereo-selectivity of the R(+) and S(-) enantiomer and the propranolol racemate. It shows that the S(-)-isomer has significantly higher $PS$, $CL_{int}$, and $K_b$ values than those of R(+)isomer but a comparable $K_v$ value to R(+)-isomer. The kinetic parameters $PS$, $CL_{int}$, and $K_b$ values were found to be increased 1.5-, 1.4-, and 1.2-fold, respectively, for the S(-)-propranolol compared to the R(+) enantiomer, reflecting a more pronounced disposition of the S(-) enantiomer in liver tissue. However, no significant difference was found to exist between S(-)-propranolol and RS-propranolol.

Table 3 shows the results of the in vitro drug binding and drug metabolism study. Monensin did not affect binding or metabolic activity in vitro for all three optical isomers. The calculated $CL_{int}$ and fraction of drug unbound values for the R(+)-propranolol were statistically different (p<0.05) to those of S(-)-propranolol and RS-propranolol both in the control and treatment groups.
The determination of the intracellular pH showed no statistically significant differences before and after monensin treatment (7.34 ± 0.19 and 7.27 ± 0.06, respectively).

Table 4 shows the predicted and observed model-derived ion-trapping parameter $K_v$ values. The observed values were found to be very similar to the theoretical values. No differences in $K_v$ values were found between R(+) and S(-) propranolol.

A sensitivity analysis on the effects of changing the individual model parameter values for RS-propranolol suggests that hepatic extraction is significantly affected by metabolism ($k_e$, p<0.05), permeability (p<0.05) and blood flow (p<0.05) but not intracellular binding ($K_b$) and ion-trapping ($K_v$, Table 5). In contrast, the mean transit time is significantly affected by $K_v$ (p<0.01) and $K_b$ (p<0.05, Table 5). Both the simulated control and monensin-treated groups had similar predicted hepatic extraction and mean transit time values as those obtained from the non-parametric moments analysis (Table 5). An analysis of the outflow perfusion concentration-time profiles in the control and the monensin-treated groups (Fig. 3C) yielded a significant difference in $K_v$ (Table 2) and such a difference also leads to a model predicted differences in mean transit time which are consistent with moment estimations (Table 5).
Discussion

In this study a physiologically based two-phase organ pharmacokinetic model was used to account for vascular dispersion, hepatic permeability, ion-trapping by subcellular acidic organelles, intracellular binding and intrinsic metabolic clearance of propranolol in the perfused rat liver (Roberts et al., 1988). Resolution of the relative concentration of each transport process by the model followed the conduct of impulse-response profiles of propranolol in control and monensin-treated livers, the propranolol being administered at a sufficiently low dose to avoid a non-linearity in plasma protein binding (Ludden, 1991), liver binding (Anderson et al., 1978; Miyauchi et al., 1993) or in hepatic metabolism, recognizing that a range of Michaelis constants need to be incorporated under saturable conditions (Ishida et al., 1992). The model gave a good fit of the data with and without monensin treatment (Fig. 3) and yielded predicted values of hepatic extraction and mean transit time, consistent with model independent moment estimates (Table 5). The individual propranolol enantiomer perfusate concentration-time profile is similar in shape to that observed for the racemate that we have reported earlier (Siebert et al., 2004). It is evident that monensin increases the peak propranolol outflow concentration and abolishes the initial subsequent rapid decline in outflow concentrations after dosing (Fig. 3). As is evident from the binding and transport kinetic data derived in Tables 2 and 3, monensin’s effect can be attributed almost exclusively to its reducing the distribution of propranolol into acidic cell organelles.

A further clarification on the disposition of propranolol isomers in the liver is possible from analysis of outflow profiles and the amount of propranolol isomer remaining in the liver over time. Under hypoxic conditions, the metabolism of propranolol is considerably compromised (Elliott et al., 1993) so that it becomes possible to sacrifice liver perfusions at various times and measure propranolol isomer concentrations in the liver at those times. The overall outflow
profiles obtained in our laboratory using red blood cell free perfusate yielded a similar shape profiles as found for control livers but with a much slower terminal phase. Hypoxia therefore did not appear to affect either the peak outflow concentration or subsequent rapid decline and therefore contrasts with the data obtained with monensin in this work. Analysis of the tissue concentrations showed that the S-isomer has higher tissue levels than the R-isomer, consistent with the high binding to liver proteins as suggested by the in vitro studies (Table 3) and previously reported data (Anderson et al., 1978). An analysis of propranolol tissue levels over time revealed that the logarithm of the propranolol tissue concentrations decline in a linear manner over time further confirming that the propranolol concentrations used in this work were below those causing saturation.

Stereo-selectivity in the disposition of propranolol enantiomers in the perfused liver is evident for $PS$, $CL_{int}$ and $K_b$ but not $K_v$. Ion-trapping accounts for 47.4% of the hepatic sequestration for both R(+) and S(-) enantiomers. Propranolol has been shown to be stereo-selective in both its response and in its metabolism, the S(-) enantiomer being about 100 times more effective as a beta blocker than the R(+) enantiomer (Barrett and Cullum, 1968; Marier et al., 1998). Enantiomers usually vary in their biological and pharmacological effects, and beta-blockers (such as atenolol or propranolol) with a single chiral centre vary in their stereo-selectivity to bind to the $\beta_1$ or $\beta_2$ adrenergic receptors. Generally the cardiac activity is attributable to the S(-)-enantiomer which has a much higher binding affinity than its R(+) counterpart (Barrett and Cullum, 1968; Pearson et al., 1989; Stoschitzky et al., 1993; Marier et al., 1998). It has also been suggested that the pharmacokinetics of the enantiomers in vivo in rabbits are comparable at lower doses but stereo-selective at higher doses, due to hepatic saturation of S(-)-propranolol clearance and that propranolol enantiomer plasma binding is not stereo-selective or dose dependent (Marier et al., 1998). In the dog, a larger distribution volume of S(-)-propranolol has
been suggested (Bai et al., 1983) and it has been shown that there is a larger uptake of S(-)-propranolol into rat heart tissue when compared to R(+)-propranolol (Kawashima et al., 1976).

The modelling of perfusate impulse-response data in our study has shown that there is a preferential uptake of the S(-)-propranolol enantiomer by the intracellular binding sites relative to R(+)-propranolol (Table 2). The kinetic parameters $PS$ and $K_b$ were found to be increased about 1.4-fold for the S(-) compared to the R(+) enantiomer, reflecting the higher binding affinity of the S(-) enantiomer for liver tissue and the rapidly equilibrating binding sites. A similar finding was evident on analysis of an in vitro hepatic microsomal protein binding of propranolol study (Table 3). The fraction unbound of S(-)-propranolol was found to be lower than that of R(+)-propranolol (Table 3).

Table 2 shows that the derived intrinsic elimination clearance of the S(-) enantiomer is almost 1.4-fold that compared to the R(+) isomer. This could be explained by the fact that one of the binding sites in question is microsomal protein and this binding is a prerequisite for elimination (i.e. higher microsomal binding facilitates faster elimination by microsomal metabolism). The in vitro metabolism data also showed that the in vitro $CL_{int}$ and unbound drug fraction values for the R(+)-propranolol were significantly different (smaller $CL_{int}$ and larger unbound drug fraction) compared to those of S(-)-propranolol (Table 3). Thus, one source of propanolol stereo-selectivity is indeed attributable to the hepatic microsomal binding differences between these two propranolol enantiomers.

Given that only 70% microsomal protein homogenised from liver tissue is metabolically active and the average production from microsomal protein of 1 g liver tissue amounts to about 50 mg
(Roberts and Rowland, 1986), the calculated \( CL_{int} \) values obtained from the \emph{in vitro} microsomal protein metabolism study (Table 3) can be converted to total liver tissue \( CL_{int} \) values for R(+) propranolol, S(-)-propranolol and RS-propranolol (7.85±0.71, 10.0±1.42, and 9.25±1.45 ml.min\(^{-1}\).g\(^{-1}\)liver, respectively). These \emph{in vitro} results are comparable to the derived \( CL_{int} \) values in an \emph{in situ} isolated perfused liver study (R(+)-propranolol: 8.54±1.79, S(-)-propranolol: 12.1±1.56 and RS-propranolol: 11.8±2.44 ml.min\(^{-1}\).g\(^{-1}\)liver, Table 2). The use of our earlier model, which does not explicitly recognise the ion-trapping of drugs by acidic organelles (Weiss et al., 2000), with the propranolol optical isomers data resulted in a fit with similar model selection criteria (compared to the present model), but with significantly larger \( CL_{int} \) values (R(+) propranolol: 34.3±2.17, S(-)-propranolol: 43.7±5.01 and RS-propranolol: 42.2±4.87 ml.min\(^{-1}\).g\(^{-1}\)liver, \( p<0.001 \), Fig. 4) relative to those predicted from \emph{in vitro} microsomal data. It is therefore apparent that the contribution of ion-trapping in subcellular compartments to intracellular drug distribution must be taken into account in order to obtain a \( CL_{int} \) value that is consistent with \emph{in vitro} metabolic values.

In addition, the vesicular ion-trapping constant \( K_v \) significantly decreased following monensin treatment for R(+)-propranolol, S(-)-propranolol and racemic propranolol (\( K_v \) control/\( K_v \) treatment: 33-, 34- and 35-fold, respectively). \( K_v \) is defined by the relative rates of permeation into and out of the acidic lysosomal and mitochondria organelles. Ion-trapping greatly reduces the permeation out of the organelles leading to an apparent large distribution space and a large \( K_v \). Monensin abolishes the ion-trapping leading to small \( K_v \) values. The \( K_v \) value thus becomes a sensitive ion-trapping marker. Table 4 shows that the observed \( K_v \) values are very similar to theoretical values based on the likely ion-trapping of the enantiomers and racemate by acidic organelles. No differences in \( K_v \) values (i.e. extent of ion-trapping) was found between R(+) and S(-) propranolol, consistent with both enantiomers having the same \( pK_a \) value.
The relative contribution of ion-trapping, microsomal and non-specific binding and distribution of unbound drug to overall sequestration of propranolol in the liver can be estimated from a formula described in detail previously (Siebert et al., 2004). Ion-trapping, microsomal binding and unbound drug distribution account, respectively, for 47.4%, 47.1% and 5.5% of the sequestration of propranolol in the liver. Thus, ion-trapping equals intracellular binding as a key determinant of propranolol hepatic sequestration.

Sensitivity analyses (Table 5) suggest that propranolol extraction is mainly defined by metabolism, permeability and blood flow, each contributing to a similar extent. In contrast, its mean transit time is mainly defined by ion-trapping, intracellular binding, $PS$ and blood flow (Table 5). No significant differences between control and monensin-treated groups were observed for hepatic extraction ratio for the propranolol optical isomers (Table 1). This finding is consistent with hepatic drug extraction being related to lipophilicity (Hung et al., 2001).

A major limitation in the present analysis is the need to restrict our modelling to sufficiently low concentrations of propranolol, to avoid saturation of metabolism or binding processes. This restriction was imposed by the inability of the physiologically based pharmacokinetic model used in this work to be applied to non-linear data. Clinically, propranolol is normally given in doses, which saturate both metabolism (von Bahr et al., 1982) and protein binding (Ludden, 1991). In addition, the binding of propranolol in the liver is also saturable (Anderson et al., 1978; Miyauchi et al., 1993). Modelling of the non-linearity of the hepatic elimination of propranolol is further complicated by the multiple metabolic pathways for propranolol and that some of the cytochrome P450 isozymes have a low affinity for propranolol whereas others have
a high affinity (Ishida et al., 1992). Work is now in progress to examine whether the parameters generated in this study can be used with non-linear propranolol data following the modelling of saturable metabolism and binding effects.

In conclusion, our study has shown that, firstly, ion-trapping contributes significantly to the hepatic disposition of propranolol. This contribution is most clearly demonstrated by the app. 34-fold decrease of $K_v$ for R(+) and S(-) enantiomers and racemic propranolol following monensin treatment. Thus, $K_v$ is a highly sensitive indicator of ion-trapping. Secondly, the physiologically more active S(-)-isomer showed higher hepatic $CL_{int}$, $PS$, and $K_b$ values than those of the R(+)isomer. Thirdly, there is no difference in ion-trapping between R(+) and S(-) propranolol, consistent with these two enantiomers having the same $pK_a$ value. Finally, monensin treatment did not affect $CL_{int}$, $PS$, $K_b$, or drug fraction unbound values in in situ liver perfusions or in in vitro microsomal metabolism studies for all optical isomers, implying that abolishing ion-trapping does not affect the hepatic metabolism, permeability and microsomal protein binding of propranolol.
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**Figure legends**

**Fig. 1.** Schematic overview of hepatocellular drug transport and ion-trapping (including the acidic compartment). D: drug; DH⁺: protonated drug; \( f_{uB} \) is the fraction of drug unbound in perfusate; \( k_{in}, k_{out}, \) and \( k_e \) representing the permeation, efflux, and elimination rate constant, respectively; \( K_b \) is the equilibrium amount ratio characterising the rapidly equilibrating intracellular binding sites (microsomal and non-specific binding sites); \( k_c \) and \( k_v \) representing the rate constant for transport from cytosol into acidic vesicles (lysosomes and mitochondria) or from acidic vesicles into cytosol, respectively, determining the equilibrium amount ratio \( K_v = k_c/k_v \) characterising the slowly accessible pool for ion-trapping; \( V_B \) is the extracellular volume (vascular + Disse space); \( V_C \) is the cellular water volume.

**Fig. 2.** Typical outflow profiles for the enantiomers of propranolol and [\(^{14}\)C]sucrose in the regressions. (A) R(+)-propranolol with sucrose; (B) S(-)-propranolol with sucrose. The solid circles represent enantiomer experiment data. The open circles represent sucrose experimental data. The lines represent the fits of the profiles.

**Fig. 3.** Comparison of outflow perfusion concentration-time profiles and regression lines obtained from the two-phase physiologically based organ pharmacokinetic model for (A) racemic propranolol, (B) R(+)-propranolol and (C) S(-)-propranolol in controls and following monensin treatment. Solid circles represent controls and open circles represent treatment. Solid and dashed lines stand for fitted data in control and treatments, respectively.
Fig. 4. Comparison of intrinsic elimination clearance (\(CL_{\text{int}}\)) values obtained from the in vitro microsomal protein metabolism study, derived from the modified two-phase physiologically based organ pharmacokinetic model (with an additional ion-trapping parameter, \(K_v\)) and derived from the earlier two-phase organ model (without \(K_v\)) for the enantiomers of propranolol and racemic propranolol fitting in an in situ isolated perfused liver study.
Table 1 Non-parametric moments for the enantiomers of propranolol and racemic propranolol (mean ± SD, n = 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Hepatic extraction ratio</th>
<th>Mean transit time (MTT, sec)</th>
<th>Normalized variance (CV²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(+) Propranolol</td>
<td>0.96 ± 0.05</td>
<td>109 ± 24.3</td>
<td>1.16 ± 0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.93 ± 0.07</td>
<td>78.3 ± 15.7</td>
<td>0.87 ± 0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S(-) Propranolol</td>
<td>0.97 ± 0.02</td>
<td>121 ± 18.5</td>
<td>1.23 ± 0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.90 ± 0.09</td>
<td>75.1 ± 18.4</td>
<td>0.78 ± 0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-Propranolol</td>
<td>0.96 ± 0.03</td>
<td>119 ± 20.3</td>
<td>1.07 ± 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.93 ± 0.06</td>
<td>79.5 ± 15.3</td>
<td>0.86 ± 0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*before monensin treatment. *b*after monensin treatment. Two-way analysis of variance showed there was no significant difference between the control and treatment groups for the three isomers for *E* and *CV²* values and significant differences for the *MTT* value between the control and treatment groups. Further, Tukey post-hoc test showed there was no significant difference between the three isomers for the MTT value both in the control and treatment groups.
Table 2 Kinetic parameters derived from the physiologically based two-phase organ pharmacokinetic model fitting for the enantiomers of propranolol and racemic propranolol (mean ± SD, n = 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>(^aK_v)</th>
<th>(^bCL_{int})</th>
<th>(^cPS)</th>
<th>(^dK_b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(+)-Propranolol</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S(-)-Propranolol</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-Propranolol</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^aK_v\): equilibrium amount ratio characterising the vesicular ion-trapping sites. \(^bCL_{int}\): intrinsic elimination clearance. \(^cPS\): permeability-surface area product. \(^dK_b\): equilibrium amount ratio characterising the intracellular binding sites. Two-way analysis of variance showed there was no significant difference between the control and treatment groups for the three isomers for \(CL_{int}\), \(PS\) and \(K_b\) values and significant differences for the \(K_v\) value between the control and treatment groups. Further, Tukey post-hoc test showed \(CL_{int}\), \(PS\) and \(K_b\) values for R(+)-propranolol were significant differences to those of S(-)-propranolol (p<0.05) and RS-propranolol (p<0.05) but no difference for the \(K_v\) value for the three isomers both in the control and treatment groups; no significant difference was found to exist between S(-)-propranolol and RS-propranolol for all kinetic parameters.
Table 3 *In vitro* microsomal protein (MP) binding and metabolism of the enantiomers of propranolol and racemic propranolol (mean ± SD, n = 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>(^a f_{u,MP})</th>
<th>(^b CL_{int})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(+) Propranolol</td>
<td>0.57 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.59 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S(-) Propranolol</td>
<td>0.51 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.50 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-Propranolol</td>
<td>0.49 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.47 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a f_{u,MP}\): drug fraction unbound. \(^b CL_{int}\): intrinsic elimination clearance. Two-way analysis of variance showed there was no significant difference between the control and treatment groups for the three isomers for \(f_{u,MP}\) and \(CL_{int}\) values. Further, Tukey post-hoc test showed significant differences between \(f_{u,MP}\) and \(CL_{int}\) values of R(+) propranolol compared to those of S(-) propranolol (p<0.05) and RS-propranolol (p<0.05) but no significant difference was found to exist between S(-) propranolol and RS-propranolol for the control and treatment groups.
Table 4. Comparison of predicted and observed model derived $K_v$ (equilibrium amount ratio characterising the vesicular ion-trapping sites) for propranolol optical isomers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>$pK_a$</th>
<th>$^{a}$Lysosomes to intracellular concentration ratio (l:i)</th>
<th>$^{a}$Mitochondria to intracellular concentration ratio (m:i)</th>
<th>$^{b}$Predicted $K_v$</th>
<th>$^{c}$Observed model derived $K_v$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R(+)-Propranolol</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>8.20±0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S(-)-Propranolol</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>8.54±1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS-Propranolol</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>8.79±1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{a}$vesicle to cytosol concentration ratio = $\frac{1+10^{pK_a-pH_i}}{1+10^{pK_a-pH_v}}$ (Goldstein et al., 1974), where pH$_i$ ≈ 7.27 is the cytosolic pH (Le Couteur et al., 1993), pH$_v$ ≈ 4.4 is the lysosomes pH (Daniel, 2003), pH$_v$ ≈ 6.67 is the mitochondria pH in the fasted state (Soboll et al., 1980). $^{b}$Given that the fraction of lysosomes ($f_{lyso}$) and mitochondria ($f_{mito}$) to cytosol is 1% and 20% (Rhoades and Pflanzer, 1996), the overall unbound drug vesicles/intracellular distribution ratio (v:i) for propranolol can be estimated from the individual organelle volume fraction and concentration ratio above using the equation: $K_v = f_{lyso} \times l:i + f_{mito} \times m:i$. $^{c}$data fitting results using the physiologically based two-phase organ pharmacokinetic model.
Table 5 Sensitivity analysis of effects of changes in model parameters describing the disposition of propranolol in rat liver controls on hepatic extraction ratio (E) and mean transit time (MTT) for RS- propranolol (mean ± SD, n = 6). Model independent moment derived estimates from Table 1 are shown in italics for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects of change in model parameter</th>
<th>E (sec)</th>
<th>MTT (sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>a</em> Observed control (with acidic vesicles) data</td>
<td>0.96 ± 0.03</td>
<td>119 ± 20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>b</em> Simulated control data</td>
<td>0.92 ± 0.03</td>
<td>124 ± 20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>a</em> Observed treated (no acidic vesicles) data</td>
<td>0.93 ± 0.06</td>
<td>79.5 ± 15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>b</em> Simulated treated data (<em>c</em>K_v = 0.25)</td>
<td>0.92 ± 0.03</td>
<td>73.8 ± 23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>b</em> Simulated with <em>d</em>K_b reduced by 50%</td>
<td>0.92 ± 0.03</td>
<td>80.9 ± 17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>b</em> Simulated with <em>e</em>k_e reduced by 50%</td>
<td>0.81 ± 0.06</td>
<td>115 ± 20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>b</em> Simulated with <em>f</em>Q reduced by 50%</td>
<td>0.78 ± 0.06</td>
<td>95.8 ± 24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>b</em> Simulated with <em>g</em>PS reduced by 50%</td>
<td>0.74 ± 0.08</td>
<td>91.7 ± 27.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* data obtained from non-parametric moments analysis (Table 1). *b* simulation using Equation (4) or (5). *c*K_v: ion-trapping parameter. *d*K_b: intracellular binding. *e*k_e: metabolism. *f*Q: blood flow. *g*PS: permeability-surface area product. *h, i*: Tukey post-hoc differences between observed data and various simulations (*h*: p<0.05; *i*: p<0.01).