



1 26 June 2014
2 EMA/CHMP/211243/2014
3 Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP)

4 **Concept paper on qualification and reporting of**
5 **physiologically-based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modelling**
6 **and analyses**

7

Agreed by Pharmacokinetics Working Party	13 June 2014
Adopted by CHMP for release for consultation	26 June 2014
Start of public consultation	27 June 2014
End of consultation (deadline for comments)	30 September 2014

8
9

Comments should be provided using this [template](#). The completed comments form should be sent to PKWP@ema.europa.eu.

10

Keywords	<i>Pharmacokinetics, PBPK, Interactions, Physiologically based, Modelling, Simulation</i>
----------	---

11

12



13 **1. Introduction**

14 This Concept Paper proposes the drafting of a guideline on how to report the results from and
15 performance of a Physiologically-based Pharmacokinetic (PBPK) analysis. PBPK analysis is utilised in a
16 growing proportion of applications for marketing authorisation of new chemical entities. Systems
17 pharmacology models in general are expected to become more important in drug development.

18 PBPK is presently mentioned in several guidelines including the *Guideline on the Evaluation of the*
19 *Pharmacokinetics of Medicinal products in Patients with Impaired Hepatic Function*
20 (CPMP/EWP/2339/02), the *Guideline on the use of pharmacogenetic methodologies in the*
21 *pharmacokinetic evaluation of medicinal products* (EMA/CHMP/37646/2009) and the *Guideline on the*
22 *investigation of drug interactions* (CPMP/EWP/560/95/Rev. 1 Corr.*). PBPK will also be included as a
23 tool in upcoming new guidelines and guideline revision applications for marketing of new chemical
24 entities.

25 **2. Problem statement**

26 Available EMA guidance covers the principles and the general approach to the use of PBPK analysis.
27 The *Guideline on the Investigation of Drug Interactions* and the *Guideline on the use of*
28 *pharmacogenetic methodologies in the pharmacokinetic evaluation of medicinal products* also include
29 general advice regarding qualification requirements. However, there is no detailed guidance on the
30 expected level of reporting of the analyses nor on what should be included in the report to show the
31 performance of the system (e.g. software) and the limitations of the models in simulating a given
32 scenario. This lack of clear advice to applicants is reflected in differing levels of reported detail, which
33 can preclude adequate assessment of the modelling.

34 **3. Discussion (on the problem statement)**

35 Guidance is needed on how to qualify and present the results of a PBPK modelling analysis, in order to
36 provide sufficient detail to enable regulatory authorities to properly assess the analysis and its
37 conclusions. At present, the submitted reports are of variable quality and may not contain the
38 information needed to evaluate the performance of the model. PBPK analysis can be performed using
39 several different commercially available or in-house programs which may differ in how they present the
40 results of the analysis and in how robustly they support the adequacy of the model. The guideline will
41 give general advice applicable to the contents of PBPK reports and qualification of PBPK models in
42 general.

43 Evidence needs to be provided to demonstrate the predictive performance of the system for its
44 intended purpose (system model qualification). PBPK models are complex, consisting of the system
45 (e.g. equations and physiological parameters, the so called "system dependent parameters") but also
46 sometimes libraries of specific drugs and their parameters, as well as modelling data for populations
47 with different characteristics. If library drugs data included in the software are used in the analysis, the
48 adequacy of the library files needs to be supported. In addition, since the software modelling is
49 complex and involves a large number of equations, there is a risk that when new versions of software
50 are published, this may lead to changes in the predictions. The capacity to perform adequate
51 predictions in the version of the system used in the study needs to be confirmed.

52 The basis for all input parameters, their biological plausibility, uncertainty around their measurement
53 or calculation and details on optimisation process or updating undertaken based on in vivo data should
54 be presented. One consequence of the complex system models with numerous drug-dependent input

55 parameters is that multiple combinations of drug-dependent parameter values will equally well predict
56 the observed plasma concentration-time data. The choices made need to be justified and
57 consequences for simulations discussed. Finally, the ability of the model to simulate the PK behaviour
58 of the drug needs to be shown (verification of drug model).

59 In a PBPK report, the performance of the PBPK model used needs to be supported, i.e. it must be
60 shown to be qualified for the particular purpose. The drug-dependent parameters need to be supported
61 and how well the drug's in vivo PK behaviour is predicted needs to be shown. Furthermore the ability
62 of the full model to adequately predict behaviour in particular study situations for a specific drug, or
63 subpopulations (i.e. DDI, paediatric, geriatrics) needs to be substantiated.

64 It should be emphasised that the requirements on modelling and simulation methods are dependent on
65 the intended use of the model, e.g. the demands on model evaluation increase with the relative
66 importance of the analysis. The requirements of a simulation may also be dependent on the
67 therapeutic window of the affected drug. This will be further discussed in the guideline.

68 **4. Recommendation**

69 It is recommended that a CHMP guideline is developed to provide guidance on what should be included
70 in PBPK reports including model qualification. Aspects suggested to be considered when drafting the
71 guideline are listed below:

- 72 • Purposes of the simulation including regulatory use
- 73 • Qualification of the system i.e. the predictive performance of the system for the particular purpose
- 74 • Version control of the system and support of its predictive performance
- 75 • Justification of assumptions made and impact on the results
- 76 • Justification of system parameters incl. library files, physiological parameters of population
- 77 • Justification of drug parameters
 - 78 – Description of model building
 - 79 – Summary of parameter and sources (i.e. mean, known or predicted variability)
 - 80 – Data needed to support model building
- 81 • Justification of any adaptation of the model to optimise the fit of the simulation to in vivo results
- 82 • Sensitivity analysis of uncertain parameters
- 83 • Verification of drug model
 - 84 – Predictability of the model of in vivo pharmacokinetic characteristics including several
 - 85 representative PK studies, nonlinearities, etc.
 - 86 – Diagnostic plots
- 87 • Ability of the full model (drug + system) to predict the intended situation; e.g. prediction of
88 available in vivo study data or data in subpopulations such as poor metabolisers, in vivo data on
89 linearity
- 90 • Presentation of the simulation results
 - 91 – The details of all simulation conditions

- 92 – Outcome of sensitivity analysis of uncertain parameters
- 93 – Relevant pharmacokinetic parameters (e.g. AUC, C_{max}, t_{1/2}, C_{min}, interaction ration, including
- 94 inter-individual variability)
- 95 • Submission of model files in an executable format

96 Conclusions and implications of the results taking available data on exposure-response/safety into

97 account.

98 **5. Proposed timetable**

99 The Concept Paper will be released for 3 months external consultation. Following the receipt of

100 comments, the draft Guideline will be consolidated and released for 6 months external consultation.

101 **6. Resource requirements for preparation**

102 The preparation will mainly involve the Pharmacokinetics Working Party (PKWP) and the Modelling and

103 Simulation Working Group (MSWG).

104 **7. Impact assessment (anticipated)**

105 The most important anticipated impact of a guideline on the reporting of PBPK analyses lies in more

106 informative reports that allow for a satisfactory assessment of the analyses. The guideline may also be

107 expected to impact execution of these analyses by explicitly setting out regulatory standards. It is also

108 envisaged that regulatory confidence in extrapolations based on PBPK could increase, as the evidence

109 base supporting the validity of specific applications of PBPK (e.g., DDI, paediatrics, geriatrics) is

110 systematically and consistently strengthened.

111 **8. Interested parties**

112 Academia, international scientific societies, pharmaceutical industry.

113 **9. References to literature, guidelines, etc.**

114 Guideline on the investigation of drug interactions (CPMP/EWP/560/95/Rev. 1 Corr.*).

115 Guideline on the Evaluation of the Pharmacokinetics of Medicinal products in Patients with Impaired

116 Hepatic Function (CPMP/EWP/2339/02).

117 Guideline on the use of pharmacogenetic methodologies in the pharmacokinetic evaluation of medicinal

118 products (EMA/CHMP/37646/2009).

119 IPCS Characterization and Application of Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic Models in Risk

120 Assessment (WHO).