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ABSTRACT

Thrombocytopenia is a common side effect of linezolid, an oxazolidinone antibiotic often used to treat multidrug-resistant Gram-positive bacterial infections. Risk factors have been suggested, including linezolid dose and duration of therapy, baseline platelet counts and renal dysfunction; still the mechanisms behind this potentially treatment-limiting toxicity are largely unknown. A clinical study was conducted to investigate the relationship between linezolid pharmacokinetics and toxicodynamics and inform strategies to prevent and manage linezolid-associated toxicity. Forty-one patients received 42 separate treatment courses of linezolid (600 mg every 12 h). A new mechanism-based, population pharmacokinetic/toxicodynamic model was developed to describe the time-course of plasma linezolid concentrations and platelets. A linezolid concentration of 8.06 mg/L (101% between patient variability) inhibited the synthesis of platelet precursor cells by 50%. Simulations predicted treatment durations of 5 and 7 days to carry a substantially lower risk for platelet nadirs <100 x10^9/L compared to 10 to 28 day therapy. Risk for toxicity did not differ noticeably between 14 and 28 days of therapy and was significantly higher for patients with lower baseline platelet counts. Due to the increased risk of toxicity after longer durations of linezolid therapy and large between patient variability, close monitoring of patients for toxicity development is important. Dose individualization based on plasma linezolid concentration profiles and platelet counts should be considered to minimize linezolid-associated thrombocytopenia. Overall, oxazolidinone therapy over 5 to 7 days even at relatively high doses was predicted to be as safe as 10 day therapy of 600 mg linezolid every 12 h.
INTRODUCTION

The oxazolidinone linezolid remains an important antimicrobial agent against multidrug-resistant Gram-positive pathogens. Linezolid was originally approved for up to 28 days duration of therapy to treat indicated infections such as skin and skin-structure infections, community-acquired and nosocomial pneumonia, and vancomycin-resistant Enterococcus faecium (1). Still, linezolid has been and continues to be used for longer treatment durations (2), an approach facilitated by favorable pharmacokinetic (PK) properties such as close to 100% oral bioavailability (3, 4). Linezolid treatment is associated with reversible thrombocytopenia, particularly when used for ≥ 14 days (2, 5-7). Patients with baseline platelet counts of 241 x 10^9 / L or less (8) and renal insufficiency (9) are at particular risk for linezolid-induced thrombocytopenia. In this context, implementing systematic monitoring programs (10) and predicting and minimizing the extent of platelet decline in high-risk patients is important.

Evidence for a relationship between linezolid exposure and thrombocytopenia exists. Data from highly debilitated, critically-ill compassionate-use patients were used to develop a model relating changes in platelet counts to linezolid exposure, treatment duration and baseline platelet counts (11). A population model has recently been developed based on data obtained in 45 Japanese patients to quantitatively describe the relationship between linezolid exposure and platelet counts (12). In the present paper, we greatly extended the exposure-response relationship established by Forrest et al. (11) and performed an in-depth mechanism-based modeling analysis of the time-course and potential mechanisms of the toxicodynamics of linezolid. This allowed us to
predict the time-course of platelet counts for linezolid dosage regimens with different
dose levels, durations of therapy, and changing dose-intensity over time.

The mechanism(s) responsible for linezolid-induced thrombocytopenia have not
been clearly delineated. Classical myelosuppression has been implicated, in which
direct toxicity to bone marrow or hematopoietic cells is observed (13). Some case
reports support a drug-induced immune-mediated mechanism based on observations
including the presence of megakaryocytes or drug-related anti-platelet antibodies, and
the abrupt onset of platelet decline following initiation of linezolid therapy (14, 15).
Sasaki et al. depicted linezolid-induced immune thrombocytopenia in their model as the
inhibition of the proliferation of progenitor cells (12).

The current study aimed to characterize the relationship between linezolid
concentrations and thrombocytopenia over time and to predict the time-course and
extent of toxicity for standard and innovative linezolid dosage regimens. These analyses
helped guide strategies to predict and manage this toxicity. We utilized mechanism-
based population pharmacokinetic / toxicodynamic (PK/TD) modeling and explored risk
factors for the development of linezolid-induced thrombocytopenia.
MATERIALS AND METHODS

Design and patient population: This study was a prospective, open-labeled, observational study of patients receiving linezolid treatment at three hospitals: the Departments of Infectious Diseases at the Alfred and Austin Hospitals, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia and the Transplant Unit of the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (UPMC), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA. The study protocol was approved by relevant ethics committees/institutional review boards at the hospitals and Monash University, and was carried out in accordance with the revised version of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Patients were enrolled within a 28-month period between October 2004 and January 2007. Males or non-pregnant females of at least 18 years of age initiated on linezolid therapy by their treating physician were included in the study. Patient medical history, demographic data, previous and concomitant medication and linezolid dosage details were collected. Hematological parameters (including platelet and hemoglobin values) were measured up to 5 days before the start of linezolid therapy and collected at least weekly during treatment. Details on potential contributors to thrombocytopenia (e.g. pre-existing conditions, concomitant drugs, bleeding events and blood products) were collected before and during linezolid therapy.

Drug administration and PK sample collection: Patients received intravenous or oral linezolid 600 mg twice-daily for at least 4 days; some patients received both intravenous and oral therapy but not simultaneously. Blood samples were drawn at time-points in relation to one linezolid dose (pre-dose, and 2, 4 and 8 h post-dose) in all but one patient, whose samples were collected around two consecutive linezolid doses to generate peak and trough concentrations. Where possible, the PK samples were
collected within the first week of therapy to precede any drug-induced hematological toxicity. Blood samples were drawn into 10 mL K$_3$EDTA Vacutainer® tubes (Becton Dickinson, New Jersey, USA) and centrifuged to harvest plasma for immediate freezing and storage at -20°C. Plasma linezolid concentrations were measured using a validated high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) method (16).

**Population pharmacokinetic model structure:** Pharmacokinetic models with one or two disposition compartments and first-order absorption were evaluated. To describe an absorption delay, models with or without up to 10 serial absorption-lag compartments were assessed. Elimination was described by a first-order (linear), mixed-order (Michaelis-Menten), or parallel first-order and mixed-order process. Additionally, an inhibition compartment approach was considered to describe a time-dependent saturation of linezolid clearance (17-19). Oral bioavailability was initially estimated and eventually fixed at 100% (4).

The differential equations used to describe the amount of drug in the absorption lag compartments (Lag1, Lag2, and Lag3, Figure 1), in the gut and central (A1) compartment were:

\[
\frac{dLag1}{dt} = -k_{lag} \cdot Lag1 \quad \text{Initial condition (IC): 0} \quad (1)
\]
\[
\frac{dLag2}{dt} = k_{lag} \cdot (Lag1 - Lag2) \quad \text{IC: 0} \quad (2)
\]
\[
\frac{dLag3}{dt} = k_{lag} \cdot (Lag2 - Lag3) \quad \text{IC: 0} \quad (3)
\]
\[
\frac{dGut}{dt} = k_{lag} \cdot Lag3 - k_a \cdot Gut \quad \text{IC: 0} \quad (4)
\]
\[
\frac{dA1}{dt} = k_a \cdot Gut + R_{infusion} \cdot CL \cdot C1 \quad \text{IC: 0} \quad (5)
\]
The klag is the rate constant describing the absorption lag-phase, ka the absorption rate constant, \( R_{\text{infusion}} \) the rate of infusion, \( C1 \) the drug concentrations in the central compartment, and \( CL \) total clearance.

The area under the plasma concentration versus time curve over 24 h (AUC\(_{24h}\)), averaged over days 1 to 7 of treatment, was calculated by numerical integration of the individually fitted concentration profiles. For patients receiving linezolid for less than 7 days, the average AUC\(_{24h}\) was calculated over the reduced treatment period. The average AUC\(_{24h}\) was used, as dosing times changed slightly during therapy in some patients.

**Mechanism-based population pharmacokinetic / toxicodynamic model:** The effect of linezolid treatment on platelet counts was examined. A transit compartment approach (20) was employed to describe the lifespan of platelet precursor cells and platelets. Turnover models with 1, 3, 6, 9, 12, or 15 compartments each for platelet precursor cells and platelets were considered to describe different profiles of the lifespan distribution for platelets (21-23). The existence of a larger number of compartments for a specific cell type results in a narrower distribution of platelet lifespans for a given patient.

Different possible mechanisms of linezolid-induced thrombocytopenia have been described (13-15). In the current investigation, linezolid was assumed to either 1) inhibit the synthesis of platelet precursor cells, 2) kill platelet precursor cells, 3) kill platelets, or 4) stimulate the natural loss rate constant of platelets (kout, Figure 1). Mechanism 2 involved linezolid stimulating a loss of platelet precursor cells from compartments Pre\(_1\) to Pre\(_{15}\) and mechanism 3 a loss of platelets from compartments PL\(_1\) to PL\(_{15}\) (Figure 1).
Mechanisms 2 and 3 could be explained by an immune-mediated elimination (14) and were implemented using a saturable, Hill-type loss function.

Based on the results from Sasaki et al. (12) a homeostatic feedback mechanism was implemented contributing to a temporary increase in platelet counts above the baseline after cessation of linezolid therapy. Our models considered that a decline of platelets below the patient-specific platelet baseline either a) stimulated the synthesis (Kin) of platelet precursors or enhanced the transfer rate constant (ktr) of platelet precursors. The latter process was assumed to result in a shorter maturation time of platelet precursor cells.

For the model with mechanism 1, the decline of platelet counts was modeled through inhibition of platelet precursor synthesis by linezolid (Figure 1). The inhibitory function incorporated parameters for the maximal extent of inhibition (Imax) and the concentration (IC50) achieving 50% of Imax to inhibit the synthesis (Kin) of the first platelet precursor compartment:

\[
\frac{d\text{Pre}_1}{dt} = \left( 1 - \frac{\text{Imax} \cdot C_1}{\text{IC}_{50} + C_1} \right) \text{Stim}_{\text{Feedback}} \cdot \text{Kin} \cdot \text{ktr} \cdot \text{Pre}_1 - \text{IC} \cdot F_{\text{Ini,Pre}} \cdot \text{Base}_{\text{Pre}}
\]

The Kin is the zero-order rate of precursor synthesis, ktr the first-order rate constant for transfer of platelets precursor cells, and Base_{Pre} the steady-state value for platelet precursors in the absence of drug calculated as Base_{Pre} = Base_{PL} \cdot kout / ktr.

The Base_{PL} is the baseline of platelets at steady state (i.e. without drug) and kout the first-order rate constant for transfer of platelets. To account for a deviation of platelet precursor cells from their steady-state value at time zero, the factor F_{Ini,Pre} was included. This factor accounts for patients who are not at the baseline of platelet precursor cells and platelets. The inclusion of the factors F_{Ini,Pre} and F_{Ini,PL} (see below) allowed the
model to describe profiles with increasing or decreasing platelet counts during the first 201 days of linezolid therapy.

The stimulation factor \((\text{Stim}_{\text{Feedback}})\) in equation 6 affected the synthesis of platelet precursor cells based on a function of the ratio of the baseline of platelet count at steady state \((\text{Base}_{\text{PL}})\) and the current concentration of platelets in the circulation \((\text{PL})\); see below). The exponent \((\gamma)\) was included to describe the extent of feedback as described previously \((12, 24)\). For a positive \(\gamma\) value, \(\text{Stim}_{\text{Feedback}}\) is larger than 1 and therefore stimulates the synthesis of platelet precursors if \(\text{PL}\) decreases below \(\text{Base}_{\text{PL}}\).

\[
\text{Stim}_{\text{Feedback}} = \left(\frac{\text{Base}_{\text{PL}}}{\text{PL}}\right)^\gamma
\]  

If platelet counts increase above their steady-state value, the synthesis of platelet precursor cells is partially inhibited \((\text{Stim}_{\text{Feedback}} < 1, \text{if } \gamma > 0)\). Newly generated platelet precursor cells \((\text{Pre}_1)\) had to undergo transition through 15 transit compartments which reflects their maturation time. The differential equations for the second to fifteenth \((i = 2\) to 15) platelet precursor compartment were:

\[
\frac{d\text{Pre}_i}{dt} = k_{tr} \cdot (\text{Pre}_{i-1} - \text{Pre}_i) \\
\text{IC: } F_{\text{Ini,Pre}} \cdot \text{Base}_{\text{Pre}}
\]  

The differential equations for the fifteen platelet compartments were \((j = 2\) to 15):

\[
\frac{d\text{PL}_j}{dt} = k_{tr} \cdot \text{Pre}_{15} - k_{out} \cdot \text{PL}_j \\
\text{IC: } F_{\text{Ini,PL}} \cdot \text{Base}_{\text{PL}}
\]  

\[
\frac{d\text{PL}_{15}}{dt} = k_{out} \cdot (\text{PL}_{j=1} - \text{PL}_{15}) \\
\text{IC: } F_{\text{Ini,PL}} \cdot \text{Base}_{\text{PL}}
\]

To account for platelets not being at steady state at time zero, the \(F_{\text{Ini,PL}}\) was included as a factor with a fixed mean of 1 and an estimated between subject variability (BSV) similar to \(F_{\text{Ini,Pre}}\) for precursor cells (see equation 6 above). The output equation for the platelet count in the circulation \((\text{PL})\) was the average of the 15 platelet compartments:
\[ PL = \frac{1}{15} \sum_{j=1}^{15} PL_j \]  

**Parameter variability and residual error model:** The BSV was described by a log-normal distribution for all parameters (except \( I_{\text{max}} \) which was modeled using a logistic transformation). Residual error was described by an additive plus proportional model for linezolid concentrations and platelets as described previously \((25, 26)\).

**Covariate effect model:** Body size was described by weight (WT), representing the lower value of ideal body weight (IBW) \((27)\) and total body weight. A standard WT \((\text{WT}_{\text{STD}})\) of 65 kg was applied. Glomerular filtration rate (GFR) was estimated using the Cockcroft and Gault formula \((28)\) for a patient with normal body size \((\text{WT}_{\text{STD}} 65 \text{ kg})\) as described previously \((29, 30)\). GFR\(_i\) for the \(i\)th patient with a nominal weight of 65 kg (age is in years, \( F_{\text{Sex}} \) is 0.85 for females and 1 for males, and SCR is the serum creatinine concentration in mg/dL) was calculated:

\[
GFR_i = \frac{140 - \text{age}_i}{\text{SCR}_i} \cdot \frac{65}{72} \cdot F_{\text{Sex}_i}
\]  

(12)

The GFR was included as a time-dependent covariate; renal function (RF) was assumed to be linearly related to GFR and calculated by normalizing GFR\(_i\) to a standard GFR of 120 mL/min with RF\(_i = GFR_i / GFR_{\text{STD}}\). The assumption on the correlation of renal function and creatinine clearance enabled the estimation of renal (CL\(_R\)) and non-renal clearance (CL\(_{\text{NR}}\)) in the absence of urine data:

\[
CL = F_{\text{Size,CL}} \cdot (RF_i \cdot CL_R + CL_{\text{NR}})
\]  

(13)

The \( F_{\text{Size,CL}} \) is the allometric size factor for clearance using an allometric exponent of 0.75 and \( F_{\text{Size,V}} \) is the allometric scale factor for volume of distribution with a fixed exponent of 1 and a reference WT of 65 kg \((31)\).
Estimation: All parameters of the population PK/TD model were simultaneously estimated using the importance sampling algorithm (pmethod=4) in parallelized S-ADAPT (version 1.57) via the SADAPT-TRAN facilitator (25, 26). Models were compared using the objective function (-1 • log-likelihood in S-ADAPT), plausibility of parameter estimates, standard diagnostic plots, visual predictive checks (VPCs) (32) and the normalized prediction distribution error (NPDE) (33). Non-compartmental analysis using WinNonlin Pro™ (version 5.3) was performed to generate AUC$_{24h}$ values for the individual fitted concentration-time profiles that were predicted at 1000 time points for each patient.

Simulations of platelet time-courses for various linezolid dosage regimens:
Monte Carlo simulations in 1,000 patients over 8 weeks (including 4 weeks of treatment and 4 weeks of recovery) for different oral dosage regimens were performed using Berkeley Madonna (version 8.3.18) to simulate the probability of reaching a nadir platelet count below 100 x 10$^9$/L (threshold for clinically significant thrombocytopenia). Durations of therapy considered were 5, 7, 10, 14, and 28 days. The simulated patient population had a mean WT of 65 kg (18% CV) and a uniform distribution for creatinine clearance ranging from 15 to 125 mL/min. Simulations were performed for mean baseline platelet counts of 150, 250, and 400 x 10$^9$/L. To consider small deviations of platelet and platelet precursor counts at initiation of therapy from baseline, the factors $F_{\text{ini,Pre}}$ and $F_{\text{ini,PL}}$ were applied in conjunction with their respective estimated BSV values.

Statistical analysis: Univariate analysis was carried out to identify risk factors for development of thrombocytopenia (defined as <100 x 10$^9$/L). Variables evaluated (where available) included sex, age, weight, body mass index (BMI), baseline creatinine
clearance, duration of linezolid administration, AUC$_{24h}$ during the first 7 days, Charlson’s age-comorbidity score (34), comorbidities (diabetes, anemia, peripheral vascular disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, liver disease, malignancy, gastrointestinal bleeding and coagulopathy) and concomitant drug usage (heparin [including low molecular weight heparin], blood products, immunosuppressants, blood transfusion and darbepoetin alpha). The Mann-Whitney test for quantitative variables and the Fishers exact test for qualitative variables were applied. The statistical program SPLUS version 8.2 was utilized for all analyses (SPLUS, TIBCO).
RESULTS

Patient population: A total of 41 patients (25 male, 16 female; Table 1) were included in the study (7 from the Alfred Hospital, 21 from the Austin Hospital and 13 from UPMC). Patients were treated with linezolid (600 mg q12h) for a mean duration of 22 days (SD 15 days; range 5–54 days). A total of 42 treatment courses were evaluated as one patient from the UPMC was treated with linezolid on two separate occasions.

Population pharmacokinetics: A one-compartment disposition model with first-order elimination and three absorption lag compartments was chosen as the final PK model (Figure 1; Table 2). Inclusion of 3 absorption lag compartments significantly improved the objective function (p<0.05, likelihood ratio test) and provided improved curve fits compared to a one-compartment model with first-order absorption. The objective function was not improved by inclusion of a peripheral compartment or of saturable elimination, possibly due to the sparse nature of the dataset (161 linezolid concentrations from 41 patients / 42 treatment courses). Inclusion of creatinine clearance and weight as covariates reduced the variance in total clearance by 12% (from a coefficient of variation [CV] of 52.2% to 48.9%).

The AUC\textsubscript{24h} during up to the first 7 days had an average of 223 mg•h/L (52% CV) and the median [range] was 198 [65.2 – 551] mg•h/L. AUC\textsubscript{24h}/MIC values would have been above 100 in 90% of patients for an MIC of 1 mg/L, in 50% of patients for an MIC of 2 mg/L, and in 7% of patients for an MIC of 4 mg/L.

Platelet data: There was high BSV in the observed baseline (mean 288×10\textsuperscript{9}/L, CV% 53.2; range: 31.0 to 679×10\textsuperscript{9}/L) and nadir platelet counts (mean 192×10\textsuperscript{9}/L, CV% 71.1; range: 13.0 to 598×10\textsuperscript{9}/L) as well as in the maximal percentage change of platelet counts during linezolid therapy (mean 32.5%, CV% 102; range: -79.2 to 91.0%).
Fourteen patients (34%) developed severe thrombocytopenia defined as a platelet count $< 100 \times 10^9/L$, of which 4 had platelet counts less than $100 \times 10^9/L$ at baseline. A total of 24 (57%) patients demonstrated $\geq 30\%$ decreases from baseline to nadir. Following removal of the 4 patients with baseline platelet counts $< 100x10^9/L$, baseline platelet count was the only variable identified to be associated with the occurrence of thrombocytopenia by univariate analysis ($p=0.0084$) (Table 1).

**Mechanism-based population PK/TD model:** A delay between initiation of linezolid therapy and the decline of platelets in most patients suggested that a precursor indirect response model would be more appropriate than a model without precursor compartments (35, 36). Models with 1, 3, 6, 9, 12 and 15 compartments each for precursor cells and platelets were evaluated. The objective function improved with the inclusion of transit compartments by a range of 4.4 to 86 leading to the acceptance of a final model with 15 transit compartments each for precursor and platelet cells (Figure 1). The objective function of a model with no precursors and only one platelet compartment was worse by 148 compared to that of the final model. The final model with 15 transit compartments performed also better than models with fewer transit compartments after inclusion of the feedback mechanism.

Platelet profiles for several patients suggested that platelet counts were not at steady state before initiation of linezolid therapy, as shown for patients 1, 12, 28, 31 and 42 (Figure 2). Overall, slightly over half of the patients showed a considerable increase or decrease of platelet count profiles during the first few days of therapy. This clearly suggested that inclusion of $F_{\text{Ini,Pre}}$ and $F_{\text{Ini,PL}}$ in the model was beneficial. Consistent with this, inclusion of the factors $F_{\text{Ini,Pre}}$ (estimated CV: 21.5%) and $F_{\text{Ini,PL}}$ (CV: 23.6%)
improved the objective function by 76 (p<0.001, Table 2). These CVs suggested considerable deviations of the baseline precursor and baseline platelet counts from their steady state value, which was considered in the Monte Carlo simulations.

Initially, models without a feedback mechanism were assessed. Inhibition of platelet precursor synthesis (mechanism 1) and direct killing of platelet precursor cells (mechanism 2) by linezolid yielded similar objective functions, whereas models with direct killing of platelets (mechanism 3) or stimulation of natural loss of platelets (kout; mechanism 4) resulted in worsening of the objection functions by approximately 50 compared to models with mechanisms 1 and 2. For this reason, mechanisms 1 and 2 were chosen for further investigation as potential mechanisms of linezolid-induced thrombocytopenia.

Inclusion of the feedback mechanism affecting the synthesis of precursor cells improved the objective function by 99 (p<0.001) for a model depicting inhibition of precursor synthesis (mechanism 1). A smaller improvement of 49 (p<0.001) was seen after inclusion of feedback for the model with mechanism 2. Specifying the feedback as an accelerated transfer (ktr) for platelet precursors did not significantly improve the objective function. Due to the best objective function for the model with mechanism 1, inhibition of precursor synthesis by linezolid and a feedback affecting the synthesis of precursor cells was chosen as the final model (Figure 1). Inclusion of direct killing of platelets (mechanism 3) in addition to inhibition of synthesis of platelet precursors by linezolid (mechanism 1) yielded no improvement and a very slow maximal killing half-life of 35 days. Therefore, the final model included mechanism 1, but not mechanism 3.
The final PK/TD model yielded good individual curve fits for the complex time course of platelet counts (Figure 2) including a lack of steady state at time zero and feedback. The IC$_{50}$ was estimated as 8.06 mg/L and had a large BSV with a CV of 101% (Table 2). Individual curve fits were precise and unbiased for plasma linezolid concentrations (slope: 1.04 and r: 0.95) and platelets (slope: 1.01 and r: 0.98) (Figure 3). The population fits were reasonably unbiased and precise for plasma concentrations (slope: 1.10 and r: 0.56). As expected, due to the large BSV in observed baseline platelet counts (observed CV of 52%), the population fits for platelets demonstrated no strong relationship (Figure 3). After adjusting the population fits for the individual observed baseline platelet count, a moderate relationship emerged (slope: 1.08 and r: 0.76) (Figure 3). The NPDE plots for plasma concentrations (results not shown) and platelets (Figure 3) were unbiased and reasonably mirrored a standard normal distribution.

The final mechanism-based model contained five estimated PK parameters and seven estimated PD parameters. The relative standard errors (SE%) were small (<20%) for all but two population means and slightly larger for these two parameters (Table 2). As expected, the SE% for the between subject variability estimates were larger for our dataset containing 42 plasma linezolid concentration and platelet profiles.

**Simulation results:** The predicted probability for nadir platelet counts below 100 x 10$^9$/L was lowest for durations of therapy of 5 and 7 days and was substantially higher for 10, 14 and 28 days of therapy (Figure 4). For a patient group with a simulated average baseline of 250 x 10$^9$/L, 600 mg linezolid q12h for 10 or 14 days yielded noticeably higher toxicity than linezolid dosage regimens of 400 mg q12h or 600 mg.
q24h (Figure 4A). In this patient group, front-loading of 1200 mg q12h or of 2400 mg q12h yielded similar levels of toxicity as 600 mg q12h, if the front-loading was constrained to two dosing intervals over the first day of therapy (Figure 4B).

As expected for a population with a mean baseline platelet count of 150 x 10^9/L, significantly more toxicity was predicted for all regimens (Figure 4C). Considerably less toxicity was predicted for a patient population with mean baseline of 400 x 10^9/L. At this higher baseline, front-loading of 1200 mg q12h for 5 days followed by 300 mg or 600 mg q12h yielded a comparable toxicity as the standard 600 mg q12h regimen (Figure 4D).
DISCUSSION

The relationship between linezolid PK and TD was first examined in a study of a highly debilitated, critically-ill compassionate-use population (10, 37, 38) and was further investigated in this study with a patient population more typical of post-approval usage patterns. Mechanism-based modeling was performed to explore potential mechanisms of linezolid toxicity and to describe and predict platelet counts over time for standard and PD-optimized linezolid dosage regimens with different durations of therapy. The modeling analysis by Sasaki et al. (12) for Japanese patients reported a considerably increased risk of toxicity in patients with impaired renal function or severe liver cirrhosis for common linezolid dosage regimens.

In the current study, patients were treated with linezolid for a wide range of infecting organisms, infection types and therapy durations (4 to 54 days; mean 22 days). Treatment extended beyond the maximum recommended duration of 28 days in eight patients (1). The high BSV in PK in the current study was consistent with that reported in other patient populations (18, 37) and has both potential efficacy and toxicity implications. The population pharmacodynamic model for the compassionate-use population (38) linked AUC/MIC values >100 to clinical cure and bacterial eradication endpoints. In the present study, 50% of patients would have failed to reach the reported target AUC/MIC exposure of 100 (38) based on an MIC90 of 2 mg/L for linezolid (39).

A one-compartment population PK model with first-order elimination and an oral absorption lag best described the current data. Our final PK model was linear and thus differed from that for the compassionate-use population data which included parallel linear renal clearance and Michaelis-Menten non-renal clearance pathways (37). The
sparsely sampled plasma linezolid concentrations and relatively small sample size of
the current study potentially contributed to these differences. In agreement with the
model by Meagher et al. (37), creatinine clearance explained some of the variability of
total clearance.

Approximately one third of patients in the current study developed
thrombocytopenia defined as platelet counts less than 100×10⁹/L, consistent with
reports on post-approval use (6, 7, 12). Baseline platelet count was the only variable
significantly associated with the occurrence of thrombocytopenia based on univariate
analysis. The small number of observed associations limited further exploration of risk
factors via multivariate analysis. This was potentially caused by our relatively small
sample size and other clinical factors in our patient group.

Several previously proposed mechanisms for linezolid-induced thrombocytopenia
(13-15) were used to guide our modeling analysis. Sasaki et al. (12) described the
toxicity of linezolid on platelets by a mechanism-based model with one progenitor pool
compartment, three transit compartments, and one compartment for circulating
platelets. This model was originally developed for the effect of anticancer drugs on
neutrophils and leukocytes (24) and assumes a linear inhibition of synthesis of
progenitor cells and a mono-exponential function (i.e. one compartment) for circulating
platelets.

As shown by prior studies (22, 23), the lifespan distribution of circulating platelets
is however complex and as such likely to be neither well described by a mono-
exponential process nor by a single lifespan for all platelets. Therefore, we evaluated
different shapes for the lifespan distribution for platelets and precursor cells by exploring
models with different numbers of transit compartments. As indicated by the final model
with 15 transit compartments, the modeled distribution of lifespans for platelets and
platelet precursor cells was narrower than that predicted by a mono-exponential
function as discussed previously (20, 40). The estimated mean transit times of 7.68
days (34.6% CV) for precursor cells and 6.80 (20.3%) for platelets (Table 2) were in
excellent agreement with literature estimates for the maturation (approximately 9 days)
and lifespan of platelets (5 to 10 days) (21-23).

The final model described the linezolid-induced thrombocytopenia by an
inhibition of the synthesis of platelet precursor cells by linezolid. Inclusion of a feedback
mechanism with a lack of platelets stimulating the production of platelet precursor cells
(Figure 1) improved the model fits significantly. The estimated exponent ($\gamma$) of 1.02
indicated a stronger feedback compared to the estimate of 0.203 by Sasaki et al. (12).
To further investigate this feedback, the model structure by Sasaki et al. was applied to
the current dataset and yielded an exponent of 2.3 suggesting an even stronger
feedback compared to the estimate by the present model (Table 2). While the reasons
for these different extents of feedback are not fully understood, our additional analysis
shows that this may be partly attributed to the different datasets used and feedback was
clearly beneficial.

If platelets decline below their steady-state baseline, the feedback up-regulates
the synthesis of platelet precursor cells for the duration of linezolid therapy. Therefore,
the model predicts that the lowest platelet count occurs usually after 2 to 3 weeks of
linezolid therapy, if the linezolid exposure is constant during therapy. This feature was
consistent with our dataset (see patients 2 and 23 in Figure 1, for example).
The proposed mechanism-based model (Figure 1) contained twelve structural model parameters which were estimated with good precision (SE% < 20% for all but two population means). As expected, the uncertainty of the estimated BSV parameters was larger. However, the NPDE (Figure 3) suggested that the variability between patients was well captured by our model and BSV parameter estimates. While our study only contained 42 plasma linezolid concentration and platelet profiles, these results suggested that our sample size and study design were adequate to support the proposed mechanism-based model (Table 2). This is in agreement with a previous simulation-estimation study using a much more complex PK/PD model with 45 structural model parameters that were simultaneously estimated based on data from 48 patients using a sparse sampling design. (26)

Our Monte Carlo simulations predicted a substantially lower risk for nadir platelet counts below 100 x 10^9/L for therapy durations of 5 to 7 days compared to durations of 10 to 28 days (Figure 4). This prediction was in good agreement with the observed probability of thrombocytopenia in the study by Nukui et al. (41) and with the reported higher incidence of thrombocytopenia development after 14 days of treatment (2, 5). While the predicted probability for platelet toxicity did not differ noticeably for therapy durations of 14 or 28 days, this prediction may be affected by a time-dependent auto-inhibition of linezolid clearance (not included in the current model). The latter model feature was previously reported based on healthy volunteer data (18, 42). Overall, therapy duration was a more important predictor of toxicity compared to linezolid dose.

As expected, a higher risk for toxicity was predicted for a low baseline platelet count of 150 x 10^9/L compared to baseline counts of 250 x 10^9/L or 400 x 10^9/L.
Therefore, high-dose linezolid regimens seem not warranted for patients with low baseline platelet counts. Front-loaded linezolid regimens have recently demonstrated promising bactericidal activity (43, 44). Based on the predicted toxicity for patients with normal to high baseline platelet counts (Figure 4), more aggressive, PD-optimized dosing of 1200 mg linezolid q12h for up to 5 days followed by 600 (or 300) mg q12h may have utility in patients with baseline platelet counts of 400 x 10^9/L or above.

In summary, baseline platelet counts and therapy durations of 10 days or longer were the most important predictors of linezolid toxicity. Even at relatively high linezolid doses, therapy for 5 to 7 days was predicted to be substantially safer than longer treatment durations. For patients with normal and high baseline platelet counts, innovative, PD-optimized, front-loaded dosage regimens were predicted to be at least as safe as a standard regimen of 600 mg every 12 h. Inhibition of synthesis of platelet precursor cells was identified as the most likely mechanism of toxicity. The developed mechanism-based model can be used to individualize linezolid therapy, maximize the efficacy and minimize the risk for toxicity. In view of the demonstrated increased risk of toxicity observed after two weeks of linezolid therapy and large variability in PK and TD, close monitoring of patients for toxicity development remains important.
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Figure legends:

Figure 1: Structure of the final mechanism-based population pharmacokinetic / toxicodynamic model. The pharmacokinetic model is comprised of three absorption lag compartments, a gut and a central compartment. One series of 15 transit compartments was used to describe platelet precursor cells in the bone marrow and another series of 15 transit compartments to describe platelets in the circulating pool. Platelets displayed a feedback effect on the synthesis of platelet precursor cells. A lack of platelets in the circulating pool compared to the platelet count at steady-state caused a stimulation of platelet precursor synthesis and an excess of platelets in the circulating pool caused an inhibition of platelet precursor synthesis.

Figure 2: Observed (markers) and individual fitted (lines) plasma linezolid concentrations (rows 1 and 3) and platelet counts (rows 2 and 4) for a representative selection of patients. Note that the platelet profiles for patients 12, 28, and 31 were rising during the first week and therefore did not start at steady-state.
Figure 3: Observations vs. individual (left) and population fitted (middle) plots for linezolid concentrations in plasma (top) and platelet counts (bottom). The right column shows normalized prediction distribution errors (NPDE) for platelets and the baseline adjusted population fit plot. For baseline adjustment, the population fitted profiles were multiplied by the ratio of the individual observed baseline at time zero for the respective patient and the population mean baseline.

Figure 4: Simulated probabilities for nadir platelet counts below $100 \times 10^9/L$ for various normal and front-loaded linezolid dosage regimens. Panels A and B refer to a mean baseline of $250 \times 10^9/L$, panel C to a mean baseline of $150 \times 10^9/L$ and panel D to a mean baseline of $400 \times 10^9/L$. 
Table 1: Univariate evaluation of risk factors for development of thrombocytopenia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Thrombocytopenia (platelet counts &lt; 100×10⁹/L)ᵃ</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (n = 10)</td>
<td>No (n = 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous variables</td>
<td>Mean (CV%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>54.0 (32.6)</td>
<td>60.5 (25.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>73.1 (22.3)</td>
<td>75.1 (18.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body mass index (kg/m²)</td>
<td>24.4 (16.5)</td>
<td>26.1 (16.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline platelet count (×10⁹/L)</td>
<td>214 (37.2)</td>
<td>347 (41.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline creatinine clearance (mL/min/65kg)(28)</td>
<td>68.3 (49.9)</td>
<td>71.2 (56.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline serum albumin (g/L)</td>
<td>31.1 (21.6)</td>
<td>26.5 (26.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of linezolid treatment (days)</td>
<td>28.3 (63.7)</td>
<td>20.3 (62.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC₂₄h (mg•h/L)</td>
<td>243 (50.3)</td>
<td>213 (54.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlson’s age-comorbidity score(34)</td>
<td>4.70 (48.4)</td>
<td>5.14 (45.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical variables</td>
<td>Count (% within group)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>12 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemiaᵃ</td>
<td>6 (60%)</td>
<td>2 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral vascular diseaseᵃ</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>8 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver diseaseᵃ</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>8 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heparin</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>17 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood transfusion</td>
<td>7 (70%)</td>
<td>13 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunosuppressants</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>9 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darbepoetin alpha</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>5 (18%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ᵃ: Individuals with baseline counts <100×10⁹/L removed (n = 4)
ᵇ: Baseline comorbidity
Table 2: Parameter estimates of the mechanism-based population pharmacokinetic/toxicodynamic model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Population mean (SE%)</th>
<th>BSV(^a) (SE%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean absorption lag time</td>
<td>T(_{lag}) (^b)</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>69.2 (16%)</td>
<td>0.600 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption half-life</td>
<td>T(_{abs,1/2}) (^b)</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>10.3 (6.3%)</td>
<td>0.147 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total clearance</td>
<td>CL (^c)</td>
<td>L/h</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>0.489 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrenal clearance</td>
<td>CL(_{NR}) (^c)</td>
<td>L/h</td>
<td>4.55 (18%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal clearance</td>
<td>CL(_{R}) (^c)</td>
<td>L/h</td>
<td>2.17 (58%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of distribution</td>
<td>V (^c)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>44.3 (5.8%)</td>
<td>0.036 (106%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline of platelets</td>
<td>Base(_{PL})</td>
<td>10(^9)/L</td>
<td>252 (10%)</td>
<td>0.424 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial condition divided by individual steady-state estimate for platelet precursors</td>
<td>Fr(_{ini,Pre})</td>
<td>1 (fixed) (^d)</td>
<td>0.215 (^d) (43%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial condition divided by individual steady-state estimate for platelets</td>
<td>Fr(_{ini,PL})</td>
<td>1 (fixed) (^d)</td>
<td>0.236 (^d) (37%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasma linezolid concentration resulting in 50% of maximal toxicity (I_{max} fixed to 1.0)</td>
<td>IC(_{50}) (^e)</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>8.06 (^e) (35%)</td>
<td>1.01 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean lifespan of precursor cells</td>
<td>MTT(_{Pre}) (^f)</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>7.68 (11%)</td>
<td>0.346 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean lifespan of platelets</td>
<td>MTT(_{PL}) (^f)</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>6.80 (13%)</td>
<td>0.203 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma, describing the extent of feedback</td>
<td>γ (^f)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.02 (11%)</td>
<td>0.15 (fixed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation of the additive residual error for plasma linezolid concentrations</td>
<td>SD(_{in})</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>0.309 (56%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional residual error for plasma linezolid concentrations</td>
<td>SD(_{sl})</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.225 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation of the additive residual error for platelets</td>
<td>PD(_{in})</td>
<td>10(^9)/L</td>
<td>15.1 (19%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional residual error for platelets</td>
<td>PD(_{sl})</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0755 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\): Between subject variability (BSV) is expressed as the apparent coefficient of variation (i.e. the square root of the estimated variance). The estimate in parenthesis (SE%) represents the relative standard error (i.e. the uncertainty of the estimate).

\(^b\): The T_{lag} was calculated as 3/T\(_{lag}\) and k\(_a\) as Ln(2)/T\(_{abs,1/2}\).

\(^c\): Estimates for patients with a standard weight of 65 kg (as defined in the method section) and a standard creatinine clearance of 120 mL/min. If the volume of distribution and clearances were scaled using a standard body weight of 70 kg instead of 65 kg, the reported volume of distribution would be 7.69% and all clearances would be 5.72% higher than the values reported above.

\(^d\): The population means for Fr\(_{ini,Pre}\) and Fr\(_{ini,PL}\) were fixed to 1 and the associated BSV terms were estimated.

\(^e\): I_{max} was fixed to 1.0.

\(^f\): See references for details on the parameters.
e: A Hill coefficient and Imax were estimated and both were close to 1.0 and eventually fixed to 1.0 for the final model. This choice had a minimal impact on the objective function.

f: The ktr was calculated as 15 / MTT_Pre and kout as 15 / MTT_PL.