DOI: https://doi.org/10.53350/pjmhs2115112996

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Patients with Kidney Transplant: Maximizing Mycophenolic Acid Submission with Target Dose Intervention

MUJTABA ALI HASNAIN[1], SAMRAH MUJTABA[2], IQRA JAVED[3], SAIMA ABDUL WAHEED[4], MUHAMMAD SHAHZAD GUL[5], ABDUL GHAFFAR[6]

[1]*Consultant Nephrologist/Assistant Professor of Medicine, Albany Medical College Albany New York USA.*
[2]*Capital District Renal Physicians, Albany, New York USA.*
[3]*Mphil Anatomy,Demonstrator,Sahiwal Medical College, Sahiwal.*
[4]*Demonstrator,Anatomy Department, Postgraduate Medical Institute, Lahore.*
[5]*Nephrology department Mayo hospital,Lahore.*
[6]*Medical Officer,Dhq Hospital Toba Tek Singh*
Correspondence to Dr. Mujtaba Ali Hasnain

ABSTRACT

Background: Mycophenolate, an immunosuppressive agent choice. It is used readily in the transplantation of kidneys.
Aim: To find out utilization of this drug is considered safe but the exact dosage of this drug varies according to the choice.
Methods: It alters from fixed-dose to the dose optimization to the drug exposure target. It is the area under the concentration and time curve graph. This graph gives inconsistent results of concentration-controlled dosing in prospective studies. In this research paper, the evidence helping mycophenolate has been analyzed. The research includes finding out the pharmacological features, toxicities, and efficacy of this chemical ingredient. Randomized controlled trials along with dose optimization procedure and exposure have also been achieved.
Results: A fixed dose of mycophenolate continuously leads to either less exposure associated with unapproved strategy or over-exposure leading to toxicity. When concentration controlled dosing is measured via pharmacokinetic measurement to target concentration intervention, mycophenolate exposure is controlled successfully and clinical benefits are visible.
There is a need for agreement on practical aspects of drug-target concentration intervention in normal tacrolimus containing dosage and research to find maintenance phase subjection targets.
Conclusion: More preference should be given to the effects of over suppression and under suppression in transplantation of kidney affecting short term as well as long term benefits. A single dose should be given to the mycophenolate target concentration intervention.
Keywords: Mycophenolate, immunosuppressive agent, kidney transplant, target dose intervention

INTRODUCTION

Mortality and Graft Loss: Results from transplantation of kidneys remain substandard[1,2,3]. Successful immunosuppressive drugs with careful attention on the infection and cardiovascular diseases [4] have considerably less rates of organ rejection by 15%, loss of graft by 4%, and death by 3% in primary after transplant year for general risk recipients. [5] The time of allograft rejection become considerably shorter than normal recipient life expectancy after transplantation from persistent antibody-mediated rejection[6,7,8,9]. It is estimated that one-fifth of the kidney allograft receivers came back to dialysis after five years of transplantation. It increased to approximately 50% in 15 years after transplantation[10] simultaneously, toxicity is the main cause of death and immobility from heart disease, [11] infections, and poisonous [12, 13] diseases.

Mycophenolate and Immunosuppression: The dosing of immunosuppressant drugs targets the prevention of rejection. It also reduces toxicities due to dose dependency. Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics help in the understanding of both dose and subject variability. **[14, 15, 16]**

METHODOLOGY

Complete research on literature was done to find out the kidney transplant recipient studies after permission from IRB. It included:

- Finding out the relationship between mycophenolate exposure and its good effects
- Analyzing relationship between mycophenolate and toxicities
- Finding out the mycophenolate controlled concentration dose by randomized controlled trials

To analyze the exposure effect relationships, only those studies which gave the approximations of mycophenolate AUC0-12 were added. This step was taken to confirm the connection of reliable calculation of exposure of the drug. This AUC0-12 was analyzed from pharmacokinetic profiling in two ways. One way was to collect numerous samples and the other way was to find out the data from a limited number of recipients. A multilinear regression equation was used in this method.

Electronic databases were found out till the first month of 2019. Embassy and Medline were used as search engines in this strategy. The following keywords were used in this strategy:

- Population: “kidney transplant”
- Intervention: “pharmacy,” “mycophenolate,” “drug monitoring”
- Outcomes as “rejection,” “mortality,” “survival rate,” “anemia,” “adverse outcome,” “severity of illness,” “lymphocyte depletion,” “leucopenia”

RESULTS

Almost 6025 genuine articles were identified after complete literature search. 105 articles were extracted from this by abstract review and almost 470 by its title review. After a thorough review of these articles, we conclude 36 publications to be fit for this systemic review.

Exposure-Response Relationship Evidence for Acute Rejection Reduction: We recognized 24 associates that asserted the relationship between rejection and MPA AUC, consisting of 3971 individuals. Statistically a noteworthy affiliation between MPA AUCt0-12 and rejection was obvious in 18 of the 25 associates (including 3380 of 3791 individuals)**[17-23]** Additionally, 3 more studies presented a trend in approval of this association (5.68% of people), leaving behind only 4 associates (5% of people) without association.

For the recipient transplanted with cyclosporine co-treat, 11 of 15 associates (consisting of 1180 of 1517 individuals, 77.8%) reported a statistically prominent association between acute rejection and exposure of MPA**[17-23]** among the 4 left, 2 (18% of people) testified a trend between MPA exposure and

Received on 23-05-2021
Accepted on 19-10-2021

acute rejection. Only 2 associates showed no link (4.18% of people).

Exposure-response Relation for Reduction of Immunosuppressant Toxicity Evidence: Twenty-two associates involving 3224 kidney transplant recipients were recognized, which measured the relationship between MPA AUC_{t0-12} and hematological or infectious toxicities.

Only 8 of 21 associates stated a statistically noticeable relationship between MPA exposure and toxicities, consisting 1095 people (33.8% of the 3224 people). Two additional associates (3.08% of people) supported a behavior towards this cohorts. 11 of 21 associates (62.86% of people) showed no relation[17-23].

Improved Clinical Outcome and Evidence for CCD: 5 RCTs of mycophenolate CCD were identified. Each of them used the MMF method. 3 of them used TCI formulations: multiple objectives RCCT issued in 1998, [17] "APOMYGRE" released in 2007, [19] and "OPERA" presented in 2011.2 of them used a TDM formulation: the FDCC, presented in 2008 [18] and "Opticept" printed in 2009. [20]

MPA Dose Individualization Using TCI: All 3 TCI trials optimized mycophenolate dose using MAPBE. Two showed a statistically prominent and clinically important benefit. A third trial, with 2 distinct interventions in the treatment arm, neither supported nor refuted the benefit of TCI.

Multitarget RCCT: The first test [17] was the only RCCT, with multiple target-exposure arm. 150 recipients were divided separately into 3 targets of MPA AUC_{t0-12} arms: 16.09 mg/L.h (the low target), 32.18 mg/L.h (the medium target), or 60.59 mg/L.h (the high target). Nevertheless, concentration marks were exceeded in later periods of post-transplant (due to supposed "time-dependent clearance"), the task was progressive in splitting treatment arms into 3 separate MPA exposure sets. [17] In each arm, the inconsistency of within-group PK was lessened from 40%–49.98% to almost 29.9%. [17]

The basic conclusion, biopsy-proven acute rejection (BPAR) at 6 months, was less recurrent with growing exposure objective: 27.49%, 14.7%, and 11.4% in the given low, medium, and high AUC target supports (P = 0.042, low V/s medium/high target sets).

APOMYGRE: In the second RCT ("APOMYGRE") 136 renal transplant recipients were summarized to FD MMF (2 g/d) or TCI to an aim of MPA AUC_{t0-12} of 40 mg/L.h[19]**.**The main result was treatment disaster, a combination of acute denial, death, implant loss, and MMF extraction at 12 months. MPA exposure was improved by TCI. After fortnight (the first post-adjustment MPA AUC_{t0-12}), the number of patients above an MPA AUC_{t0-12} of 30 mg/L.h was 68.3% versus 30.2% in TCI versus FD groups, with all similarities in contrast above 60 mg/L.h (1.6% in each). At the next MPA AUC_{t0-12} evaluation (at first month), amounts were 90.78% versus 55.48%, respectively, with MPA AUC_{t0-12} above 60 mg/L.h in 13.78% versus 4.69%.

OPERA: The third RCT, "OPERA," was not a clear TCI experiment. It consisted of 246 kidney transplant receivers considered to be at a lower danger of refusal (basic allograft, panel reactive antibody at transplantation of 0%, cold ischemia time <36 h). Randomization was to either MMF 2 g/d (FD) or an MMF improvement arm with 2 features: an observable increased dose of 3 g/d for 10 days after the transplantation ("dose strengthening"), followed by TCI to a mark of MPA AUC_{t0-12} of 40 mg/L.h. Steroids were withdrawn on day 7 in both arms. In 7 days, steroids were withdrawn from both arms.

MPA Dose Individualization Using TDM:

Fixed-Dose Concentration-controlled Trial: The greatest of RCTs, "FDCC", with 902 kidney transplant receivers randomized to either FD of CCD or 2 g/d.31 However, intended to attain a goal MPA AUCt0-12 (45 mg/L.h), actual execution used a TDM methodology. [18] 30–60 mg/L.h of exposure was considered satisfactory. Clinicians, for each patient, could use a different target concentration, that based on their evaluation of immunological hazard, as long as this fell within the 30–60-mg/L.h range. [18] Finally, only MPA AUC_{t0-12} values were given. The decision to regulate the amount of dosage was left to the specific clinician.

Opticept: "Opticept," [19] was the second TDM trial. Trough MPA concentrations were only used by this one RCT of CCD. Seven hundred and nineteen participating individuals were grouped into three treatment arms with two intervention changes: CNI therapeutic range ("standard versus "reduced") and MMF dosing strategy (TDM versus FD). The control arm was the group 3: FD mycophenolate and "standard" CNI. Group A was the basic interference arm: MMF TDM and "lessened" CNI. Group B was in the middle of MMF TDM and "standard" CNI. The primary results of group A compared with C were superior, depending upon treatment failure at 12 months (a combined of BPAR, loss to follow-up graft loss, or withdrawal). To achieve MPA trough concentrations ≥1.3 or ≥1.9 μg/mL, MMF dose was optimized by TDM, together with cyclosporine or tacrolimus, correspondingly. Individualization of does for MPA was depending upon the clinician's judgment rather than the integrated PK-guided design.

DISCUSSION

After kidney transplantation, the out-turn of under or over-immunosuppression remains prominent with potential of morbidity and mortality prevention. The dosing pattern for chemical, mycophenolate, varies from case to case, from "one-dose-suits-all" (FD) to trough concentration monitoring, to MPA AUCt0-12 target stage.

In our research it was found that RCCT multitarget approach was, when assigned to participants, in 1998 showed productive results. It was found that BPAR was prominently reduced when target exposure was increased. In random assignment of participants, it was found through research that exposure to targets between MPA dose and BPAR were not significant, but the link between MPA exposure and BPAR were fruitful.

In OPERA trial, MPA exposure target was significantly maintained through effective TCI. Moreover, PK variability was declined with-in the group before the initial stage of high dose concentration. In three more trials of MPA high dose concentration in absence of TCI, in high risk or standard participants, depicted that this method alone can strongly impact outcomes. Prominent decline in rejection was found. Contrastingly, OPERA trial depicted no positive outcomes at 3 months period with less tolerance capacity. This research stated that high dose concentration i.e. 3g per day for 10 days following TCI, is not for the population that withdrew early from steroid intake and are at lower risk level.

In FDCC and Opticept, desired MPA exposure target was not attained through unconsistent TDM dosing advice. Resultantly, these both trials also failed to show clinical positive impacts of CCD. It is complicated to assess the real exposure level attained in CCD trials. In one case, low or standard dose of cyslosporine depicted inferiority over low dose of tacrolimus. Where the target exposure level in latter arm was 3 to 7ng per mL, the concentrations gained were quite higher. The mean trough dose concentration were held above 7ng per mL for early 8 weeks. By 12 months, mean standard deviation of tacrolimus dose was held at 6.3 ± 2.3 ng/mL, and at the time span of 3 years it was reduced to 6.3 ± 2.2 ng/mL. Promising results were gathered through these trials after following for the period of 3 years after transplant. However, the results from these trials where inferiority of cyslosporine over tacrolimus was found, cannot be used to go in favor of 3 to 7ng per mL range. Similarly, it is inaccurate to state that CCD trial with less difference in exposure gives less beneficial results in favor of CCD. The relationship between toxicity development and target exposure has made it difficult to explain the process, especially in cyclosporine case.

When different renal impairments occur, these lead to decline in excretion of MPA's major metabolite, MPA-gluuronide (MPAG). This causes hype in unbound as well as total MPA cocentrations due to MPAG reactivation and EHC. However, this issue can be handles through cyslosporine therapy where reactivation of MPAG is reduced to MPA. High concentration of MPAG also causes MPA displacement from albumin. But, again, here only unbound toxic levels can be missed if total MPA concentration is known.
In recent years, formation of antihuman leukocyte antigen antibody (dnDSA) was also observed in recent years as the result of tacrolimus exposure. On the other hand, in many cases it was also found that use of mycophenolate lead to reduction in dnDSA development. The data on effect of MPA exposure or its dose on dnDSA development was not found.

This research provided strong proof that MPA TCI approach was fruitful in kidney transplantation. However, dire need rose up to clearly elaborate the target concentration level beyond the early stage in steroid continuation recipients and to find the link between MPA exposure with dnDSA. In addition, need for mutual consensus upon the practical implementations of MPA TCI approach lies here. Recently, in cyclosporine cotreated cohorts AUC estimation has been suggested in the pattern: in first week after transplant, every week in first three months, and subsequently every 3 months till 1 year. This was owing to the 30 to 50% rise in dose exposure for the early 3 months to prevent overshooting target. However, in the absence of dose-dependent inhibitory impact of cyclosporine on EHC, the variations in exposure in early phase proves less substantial in tacrolimus regimens, thus less frequency should be able to serve properly.

More research is required to gather data over optimal unbound MPA exposure in early phase of post kidney transplant which will aid in settling of prominent hypoalbuminemia or delayed graft functions. Moreover, data is required on basis of clinical trials to prove the theory that use of intracellular doses of MPA in lymphocytes of peripheral region or pharmacodynamic measurement of Inosine-5'-monophosphate dehydrogenase activity can provide a different alternative to systemic exposure estimation.

CONCLUSION

Two appropriately designed and implemented trials depicted the positive outcomes of dosing to a target MPA exposure, showing clinically effective and statistically positive benefits. No appropriate evidence demolish these results. However, here needs a dire for consensus on frequency and concentration of exposure in the initial phase; to clearly elaborate exposure targets in the maintenance phase; to provide better access to methods which will ultimately increase precision and practicality; and to precisely elaborate the exposure-effect link for un-specified concentration/dose level. These aspects should be given priority as immune-mediated graft loss and mortality ratio increasing toxicities are prevailing. The imperfect method of one-dose-suits-all approach should be replaced with TCI approach which will be based upon scientific evidence and clinically approval.

Conflict of interest: None to declare

REFERENCE

1. Neuberger JM, Bechstein WO, Kuypers DR, et al. Practical recommendations for long-term management of modifiable risks in kidney and liver transplant recipients: A guidance report and clinical checklist by the consensus on managing modifiable risk in transplantation (COMMIT) group. *Transplantation* 20171014S Suppl 2S1–S56 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
2. O'Connell PJ, Kuypers DR, Mannon RB, et al. Clinical trials for immunosuppression in transplantation: the case for reform and change in direction. *Transplantation* 20171011527–1534 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
3. Wadström J, Ericzon BG, Halloran PF, et al. Advancing transplantation: new questions, new possibilities in kidney and liver transplantation. *Transplantation* 2017101Suppl 2SS1–S41 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
4. Pilmore H, Dent H, Chang S, et al. Reduction in cardiovascular death after kidney transplantation. *Transplantation* 201089851–857 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
5. Ekberg H, Tedesco-Silva H, Demirbas A, et al. ; ELITE-Symphony Study Reduced exposure to calcineurin inhibitors in renal transplantation. *N Engl J Med* 20073572562–2575 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
6. Einecke G, Sis B, Reeve J, et al. Antibody-mediated microcirculation injury is the major cause of late kidney transplant failure. *Am J Transplant* 200992520–2531 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
7. Gaston RS, Cecka JM, Kasiske BL, et al. Evidence for antibody-mediated injury as a major determinant of late kidney allograft failure. *Transplantation* 20109068–74 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
8. Sellarés J, de Freitas DG, Mengel M, et al. Understanding the causes of kidney transplant failure: the dominant role of antibody-mediated rejection and nonadherence. *Am J Transplant* 201212388–399 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
9. Halloran PF, Chang J, Famulski K, et al. Disappearance of T cell-mediated rejection despite continued antibody-mediated rejection in late kidney transplant recipients. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2015261711–1720 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
10. Coemans M, Süsal C, Döhler B, et al. Analyses of the short- and long-term graft survival after kidney transplantation in Europe between 1986 and 2015. *Kidney Int* 201894964–973 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
11. Bamgbola O. Metabolic consequences of modern immunosuppressive agents in solid organ transplantation. *Ther Adv Endocrinol Metab* 20167110–127 [PMC free article] [PubMed]
12. Chapman JR, Webster AC, Wong G. Cancer in the transplant recipient. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med* 201336–11
13. Au E, Wong G, Chapman JR. Cancer in kidney transplant recipients. *Nat Rev Nephrol* 201814508–520 [PubMed]
14. Holford NH, Sheiner LB. Understanding the dose-effect relationship: clinical application of pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic models. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 19816429–453 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
15. Wright DF, Winter HR, Duffull SB. Understanding the time course of pharmacological effect: a PKPD approach. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 201171815–823 [PMC free article] [PubMed]
16. Duffull SB, Wright DF, Winter HR. Interpreting population pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic analyses–a clinical viewpoint. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 201171807–814 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
17. Hale MD, Nicholls AJ, Bullingham RE, et al. The pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic relationship for mycophenolate mofetil in renal transplantation. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 199864672–683 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
18. van Gelder T, Silva HT, de Fijter JW, et al. Comparing mycophenolate mofetil regimens for de novo renal transplant recipients: the fixed-dose concentration-controlled trial. *Transplantation* 2008861043–1051 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
19. Le Meur Y, Büchler M, Thierry A, et al. Individualized mycophenolate mofetil dosing based on drug exposure significantly improves patient outcomes after renal transplantation. *Am J Transplant* 200772496–2503 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
20. Gaston RS, Kaplan B, Shah T, et al. Fixed- or controlled-dose mycophenolate mofetil with standard- or reduced-dose calcineurin inhibitors: the Opticept trial. *Am J Transplant* 200991607–1619 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
21. Pillans PI, Rigby RJ, Kubler P, et al. A retrospective analysis of mycophenolic acid and cyclosporin concentrations with acute rejection in renal transplant recipients. *Clin Biochem* 20013477–81 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
22. Cattaneo D, Gaspari F, Ferrari S, et al. Pharmacokinetics help optimizing mycophenolate mofetil dosing in kidney transplant patients. *Clin Transplant* 200115402–409 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
23. Weber LT, Shipkova M, Armstrong VW, et al. The pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic relationship for total and free mycophenolic acid in pediatric renal transplant recipients: a report of the german study group on mycophenolate mofetil therapy. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 200213759–768 [PubMed] [Google Scholar]