P-Glycoprotein, Multidrug-Resistance Associated Protein 2, Cyp3a, and Carboxylesterase Affect the Oral Availability and Metabolism of Vinorelbine
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ABSTRACT

We investigated the interactions of the anticancer drug vinorelbine with drug efflux transporters and cytochrome P450 3A drug-metabolizing enzymes. Vinorelbine was transported by human multidrug-resistance associated protein (MRP) 2, and Mrp2 knockout mice displayed increased vinorelbine plasma exposure after oral administration, suggesting that Mrp2 limits the intestinal uptake of vinorelbine. Using P-glycoprotein (P-gp), Cyp3a-, and P-gp/Cyp3a knockout mice, we found that the absence of P-gp or Cyp3a resulted in increased vinorelbine plasma exposure, both after oral and intravenous administration. Surprisingly, P-gp/Cyp3a knockout mice displayed markedly lower vinorelbine plasma concentrations than wild-type mice upon intravenous administration but higher concentrations upon oral administration. This could be explained by highly increased formation of 4'-deacetylvinorelbine, an active vinorelbine metabolite, especially in P-gp/Cyp3a knockout plasma. Using wild-type and Cyp3a knockout liver microsomes, we found that 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine formation was 4-fold increased in Cyp3a knockout liver and was not mediated by Cyp3a or other cytochrome P450 enzymes. In vitro incubation of vinorelbine with plasma revealed that vinorelbine deacetylation in Cyp3a and especially in P-gp/Cyp3a knockout mice but not in P-gp-deficient mice was strongly up-regulated. Metabolite formation in microsomes and plasma could be completely inhibited with the nonspecific carboxylesterase (CES) inhibitor bis(4-nitrophenyl) phosphate and partly with the CES2-specific inhibitor loperamide, indicating that carboxylesterase Ces2a, which was appropriately up-regulated in Cyp3a and especially in P-gp/Cyp3a knockout liver was responsible for the 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine formation. Such compensatory up-regulation can complicate the interpretation of knockout mouse data. Nonetheless, P-gp, Mrp2, Cyp3a, and Ces2a clearly restricted vinorelbine availability in mice. Variation in activity of their human homologs may also affect vinorelbine pharmacokinetics in patients.

Introduction

Vinorelbine is a semisynthetic vinca alkaloid that is indicated in the treatment of non-small-cell lung cancer and advanced breast cancer (Domenech and Vogel, 2001; Gralla et al., 2007). In current clinical practice, vinorelbine is mainly intravenously applied despite the development of an oral vinorelbine formulation, which has been approved in several European countries. This may be explained by the relatively high interindividual variability in drug exposure that was observed for oral vinorelbine administration in numerous clinical studies (Gralla et al., 2007; Hirsh et al., 2007; Rossi et al., 2007; Delord et al., 2009). For clinical practice, it is thus important to identify interactions of vinorelbine with drug efflux transporters and drug-metabolizing enzymes because these systems might affect the exposure and toxicity of vinorelbine, especially upon oral administration. Moreover, drug efflux transporters may also directly contribute to resistance of tumors against vinorelbine.

It has been well established by various groups that the drug efflux transporter P-glycoprotein (MDRI/ABCB1) transports vinorelbine in vitro and mediates resistance against vinorelbine (Adams and Knick, 1995; Takara et al.,...
assays and P-gp-, Mrp2-, and Cyp3a-deficient mouse strains. However, data about the in vivo interaction of vinorelbine with P-gp are inconclusive. For instance, Press et al. (2006) found no significant changes in oral or intravenous vinorelbine area under the plasma concentration-time curves (AUCs) between wild-type (WT) or P-gp-deficient [Mdr1a/1b(−/−)] mice, although interindividual variation in these experiments was very high, potentially obscuring modest shifts. Furthermore, in a phase I study in 26 patients with advanced solid tumors, the P-gp inhibitor tariquidar was combined with intravenously applied vinorelbine (20 mg/m²), but alterations in the pharmacokinetics of vinorelbine were not observed (Abraham et al., 2005). On the other hand, Wong et al. (2006) found in a cohort of 41 patients receiving intravenous vinorelbine that low hepatic ⁹⁹ᵐTc-hexakis-2-methoxybutylisonitrile clearance (used as a measure for P-gp-mediated clearance) significantly correlated with low vinorelbine clearance. In addition, a phase I trial with 19 patients with advanced solid tumors revealed increased exposure and decreased clearance when intravenous vinorelbine (22.5 mg/m²) was combined with the potent P-gp inhibitor zosuquidar (Lé et al., 2005). A more extensive analysis of in vivo vinorelbine-P-gp interactions thus seemed worthwhile.

To date, interactions of vinorelbine with the drug efflux transporter MRP2 (ABCC2) have not been reported. However, cellular resistance to the vinca alkaloid vincristine has been associated with MRP2 expression (Chen et al., 1999; Kawabe et al., 1999), and in vitro transport of vinblastine by MRP2 has also been demonstrated (Evers et al., 1998, 2000a; Huisman et al., 2005). It thus seemed possible that vinorelbine might also be transported by MRP2, which could affect vinorelbine pharmacokinetics, toxicity, and resistance of tumors.

Vinorelbine is thought to be mainly metabolized by CYP3A4 to inactive metabolites (Kajita et al., 2000; Beulz-Riche et al., 2005). However, to some extent vinorelbine is also converted to a pharmacodynamically active metabolite, 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine. In fact, metabolic profiling after oral vinorelbine administration revealed that 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine is the predominant metabolite in human blood with an elimination half-life of at least 100 h (Marty et al., 2001). This deacetylation reaction is catalyzed by carboxylesterase enzymes, which are believed to be associated with the presence of 5 µM elacridar to inhibit any endogenous P-glycoprotein activity. Elacridar at 5 µM does not affect MRP2 activity (Evers et al., 2000b). Elacridar was present in both compartments during a 2-h preincubation and during the transport experiment. After preincubation, experiments were started (t = 0) by replacing the medium in either the apical or basolateral compartment with fresh OptiMEM medium, either with or without 5 µM Elacridar and containing 5 µM vinorelbine. Cells were incubated at 37°C in 5% CO₂, and 50-µl aliquots were taken at t = 2 and 4 h. The samples were diluted with 450 µl of drug-free human plasma, 50 µl of internal standard (100 ng/ml deacetylvinblastine) was added, and the samples were extracted with 3 ml of diethyl ether. Vinorelbine was quantified by high-performance liquid chromatography, as described previously (van Tellingen et al., 1992). Leaked drug from the same cell monolayer seeded on the same day and at the same density, by analyzing transport across MDCK-II monolayers was expressed by the relative transport ratio (r), defined as percentage of apically directed translocation divided by percentage of basolaterally directed translocation after 4 h (Huisman et al., 2005). The apparent permeability coefficient (Papp) was calculated using the equation Papp (centimeters per second) = dC/dt · 1/A · Vc/(cm per second), where dC/dt (micromoles per second) represents the flux across the monolayer (permeability rate), A (square centimeters) represents the surface area of the monolayer, Vc (cubic centimeters) represents the volume of the receiver chamber, and C0 (micromolar concentration) represents the initial concentration in the donor compartment (Irvin et al., 1999).

Animals. Mice were housed and handled according to institutional guidelines complying with Dutch legislation. Animals used in this study were female Mdr1a/1b(−/−) (Schinkel et al., 1997), Mdr2(−/−) (Lamig et al., 2006), Cyp3a(−/−) (van Herwaarden et al., 2007), Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(−/−) (van Waterschoot et al., 2009), and WT mice, all of a >99% FVB genetic background, between 9 and 12 weeks of age. Animals were kept in a temperature-controlled environment with a 12-h light/12-h dark cycle and received a standard diet (AM-I; Hope Farms, Woerden, The Netherlands) and acidified water ad libitum.

Plasma Pharmacokinetics. For oral studies, vinorelbine (10 mg/ml) was 10-fold diluted with saline and dosed at 10 mg/kg b.wt. (10 ml/kg). To minimize variation in absorption, mice were fasted for 3 h before vinorelbine was administered by gavage into the stomach, using a blunt-ended needle. Multiple blood samples (40 µl) were collected from the tail vein at 15 and 30 min and 1, 2, 4, 8, and 24 h, using heparinized capillary tubes (Oxford Labware, St. Louis, MO). Blood samples were centrifuged at 2100 × g for 6 min at 4°C, and the plasma was completed to 200 µl with drug-free human plasma and stored at −20°C until analysis. For intravenous studies, vinorelbine (10 mg/ml) was diluted 5-fold with saline and injected as single bolus at 10 mg/kg (5 ml/kg) into the tail vein. Blood samples were collected by cardiac puncture under methoxyflurane anesthesia at 7.5 and 30 min and 1, 2, 4, 8 and 24 h, with four animals per time point.
Samples were processed as described above and stored at −20°C until analysis.

**Drug Analysis in Plasma.** Plasma concentrations of vinorelbine and 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine were determined by LC-MS/MS as described previously (Damen et al., 2009).

**Pharmacokinetic Calculations and Statistical Analysis.** The AUC was calculated using the trapezoidal rule. The peak plasma concentration (C_{max}) and the time of maximum plasma concentration (T_{max}) were estimated from the original data. Plasma clearance (CL) after intravenous administration was calculated by the formula CL = D/ AUC. The oral bioavailability (F) was calculated by the formula F = AUC_{oral}/AUC_{i.v.} × 100%. To assess statistical significance, the two-sided paired Student’s t test (two groups) or one-way analysis of variance followed by Dunnett’s multiple comparison test (>2 groups) was performed. Data obtained with single and combination knockout mice were compared with data obtained with WT mice, unless stated otherwise. Data are presented as means ± S.D., and differences were considered statistically significant when P < 0.05.

**Microsomal Incubations.** Microsomes from the livers of WT and Cyp3a−/− mice were prepared as described previously (Emoto et al., 2000). Incubations were performed in triplicate at 37°C in a total volume of 200 μl, containing 100 mM potassium phosphate buffer (pH 7.4), an NADPH-regenerating system (BD Biosciences, San Diego, CA), and 0.5 mg of protein/ml liver microsomes. Reactions were started by addition of vinorelbine (18.5 μM), and 0.5 mg of protein/ml liver microsomes. Reactions were started by addition of 100 μl of ice-cold acetonitrile. Control incubations omitting cofactor NADPH were performed to establish whether the metabolism was P450-dependent. For inhibition experiments, the nonspecific CES inhibitor BNPP (100 μM), the CES2-specific inhibitor loperamide (100 μM), or vehicle was preincubated for 5 min at 37°C, and reactions were started by addition of vinorelbine (18.5 μM). Incubations were performed without NADPH, allowed to proceed for 30 min, and terminated by addition of 100 μl of ice-cold acetonitrile. Control incubations omitting cofactor NADPH were performed to establish whether the metabolism was P450-dependent. For inhibition experiments, the nonspecific CES inhibitor BNPP (100 μM), the CES2-specific inhibitor loperamide (100 μM), or vehicle was preincubated for 5 min at 37°C, and reactions were started by addition of vinorelbine (18.5 μM). Incubations were performed without NADPH, allowed to proceed for 30 min, and terminated by addition of 100 μl of ice-cold acetonitrile. Concentrations of vinorelbine and 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine in supernatant (6800 μg for 10 min) were determined by LC-MS/MS (Damen et al., 2009).

**Plasma Incubations.** Blood was collected from WT, Mdr1a/1b−/− (Schenkel et al., 1997), Cyp3a−/− (van Herwaarden et al., 2007), and Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a−/− (van Waterschoot et al., 2009) mice (n = 4/strain) by cardiac puncture under methoxyflurane anesthesia. Blood samples were immediately centrifuged at 2100 × g at ambient temperature, and plasma was collected. Plasma samples (390 μl) were warmed to 37°C, and incubations were started by addition of 10 μl of vinorelbine stock solution (260 μM) to obtain a final concentration of 6.5 μM. Samples of 25 μl were collected at 0, 15, 30, 60, and 120 min. For inhibition experiments, the nonspecific CES inhibitor BNPP (100 μM), the CES2-specific inhibitor loperamide (100 μM), or vehicle was added (5 μM at 37°C). Reactions were started by addition of vinorelbine (6.5 μM) and allowed to proceed for 120 min. Samples were immediately completed to 100 μl with ice-cold acetonitrile to stop the deacetylation reaction and subsequently stored at −20°C until analysis. Concentrations of vinorelbine and 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine were determined by LC-MS/MS (Damen et al., 2009).

**RNA Isolation, cDNA Synthesis, and Real-Time RT-PCR.** Livers of mice between 9 and 11 weeks of age (n = 3/genotype) were excised and immediately placed in an appropriate volume of RNAlater (QIAGEN, Venlo, The Netherlands). They were stored at 4°C until RNA was extracted using the RNeasy Mini Kit (QIAGEN) according to the manufacturer’s protocol. Subsequently, cDNA was generated using 5 μg of total RNA in a synthesis reaction using random hexamers (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA) and SuperScript II reverse transcriptase (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA) according to the supplier’s protocols. The reverse transcription reaction was performed for 60 min at 42°C with a deactivation step of 15 min at 70°C. cDNA was stored at −20°C until use. Real-time RT-PCR was performed using specific primers (QIAGEN) on an Applied Biosystem 7500 real-time cycler system as described previously (van Waterschoot et al., 2008). Results were analyzed by the comparative C_{t} method as described previously (Schmitten and Livak, 2008), and statistical analysis was performed on ΔC_{t} values as described previously (Yuan et al., 2006).

**Results**

**In Vitro Transport of Vinorelbine by MRP2.** To determine whether vinorelbine (Fig. 1A) is transported by MRP2, we used polarized MDCK-II cells transduced with human MRP2 cDNA. The MDCK-II-Neo cell line was used as a control, because it contains very little endogenous canine MRP2 (Evers et al., 1998). Because vinorelbine is a well-established P-gp substrate, 5 μM elacridar was added to inhibit any transport by endogenous canine P-gp. In MDCK-II-Neo cells no active polarized transport of vinorelbine was observed, as evident from roughly equal basolateral-to-apical and apical-to-basolateral translocation rates (Fig. 1B). In contrast, in MRP2-transduced cells, apically directed translocation was markedly increased, and basolaterally directed translocation was markedly decreased (Fig. 1C). The transport ratio r, which is a measure for active transport, was 3.5-fold increased (1.3 for Neo versus 4.5 for MRP2-transduced cells) (Fig. 1). Vinorelbine is thus a transported substrate of human MRP2.

**Impact of MRP2 and P-gp on the Oral AUC of Vinorelbine.** To test whether MRP2 and P-gp restrict the oral uptake of vinorelbine, we orally administered 10 mg/kg vinorelbine to WT, Mrp2−/−, and Mdr1a/1b−/− mice. Oral absorption in all strains was very rapid, and maximal plasma concentrations (5800 μg for 10 min) were determined by LC-MS/MS (Damen et al., 2009).
centrations were reached before 15 min, the first sampling time point (Fig. 2). The oral AUC up to 24 h (AUC_{0–24}) in Mdr1a/1b(−/−) mice was 1.5-fold higher than that in WT mice (P < 0.05) (Fig. 2; Table 1), and the C_{max} (earliest measured time point) was 3.3-fold increased (P < 0.05). The oral AUC_{0–24} in Mdr1a/1b(−/−) mice was 3.6-fold higher than that in WT mice (P < 0.05) (Fig. 2; Table 1), and the C_{max} (earliest measured time point) was 7.0-fold increased (P < 0.05). These results show that Mrp2 can modestly and P-gp can markedly restrict the oral availability of vinorelbine. The effect of the absence of these transporters was particularly strong shortly after drug administration (15 and 30 min), suggesting a direct impact on the intestinal uptake of vinorelbine.

Impact of P-gp and Cytochrome P450 3A on Vinorelbine Plasma Pharmacokinetics. Because we had found that P-gp markedly affected the oral AUC of vinorelbine and because it is known that CYP3A4 can mediate metabolism of vinorelbine (Beuz-Riche et al., 2005), it was of interest to establish the separate and combined impact of these two detoxifying systems on vinorelbine pharmacokinetics. We previously showed that for docetaxel, also a shared P-gp and CYP3A substrate, simultaneous disruption of both systems previously showed that for docetaxel, also a shared P-gp and CYP3A substrate, simultaneous disruption of both systems caused a drastic increase in oral AUC (van Waterschoot et al., 2008). We therefore hypothesized that the lower plasma concentrations of vinorelbine in Mdr1a/1b(−/−) and Cyp3a(−/−) mice might also be explained by increased metabolic conversion of vinorelbine, obviously via a metabolic route(s) other than Cyp3a. Because 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine is a major vinorelbine metabolite in mice and humans (van Tellingen et al., 1993; Puzzo et al., 2007), we analyzed the plasma samples from the intravenous experiment for the presence of this metabolite (for the oral experiment, because of the applied multiple sampling approach, the sample size was too small to additionally measure this metabolite). In stark contrast to the parental vinorelbine, plasma concentrations of 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine were highly increased in Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(−/−) mice compared with those in WT mice (Fig. 3C; Table 2). Of note, single Cyp3a(−/−) mice also displayed markedly elevated plasma concentrations of this metabolite. The intravenous AUC_{0–24} for 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine was 3.6-fold higher in Mdr1a/1b(−/−) mice, 5.1-fold increased in Cyp3a(−/−) mice, and 11.2-fold higher in Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(−/−) mice than that in WT mice, whereas the equivalent changes in parental vinorelbine AUC_{0–24} were 2.3-, 1.5-, and 0.72-fold, respectively (Table 2). In particular, the Cyp3a(−/−) and Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(−/−) mice thus displayed a profound increase in 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine over vinorelbine concentration ratios. This increased vinorelbine conversion might lead to an underestimation of the effect of the knocked out proteins on vinorelbine clearance.

To determine the additive plasma exposure to vinorelbine and 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine after intravenous vinorelbine, we plotted the combined plasma concentration-time curves and calculated the combined AUC_{0–24} and C_{max} values (Fig. 3D; Table 2). This calculation indicated that the combined...
AUC\textsubscript{0–24} values were 2.2- to 2.8-fold increased in each of the three knockout strains compared with those in the WT mice, illustrating a markedly reduced elimination of vinorelbine/4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine in each of the knockout strains. Still, the overall effect seen in the combination knockout strain was less than expected from the effects seen in the separate knockout strains. 4'-O-Deacetylvinorelbine/vinorelbine exposure ratios increased from 0.25 in WT mice to 0.39, 0.81, and 3.8 in Mdr1a/1b(−/−), Cyp3a(−/−), and Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(−/−) mice, respectively, suggesting pronounced changes mainly in the latter two strains.

**Fig. 3.** Plasma concentration-time curves of vinorelbine (A and B), 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine (C) and vinorelbine + 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine (combined; D) in WT (■), Mdr1a/1b(−/−) (●), and Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(−/−) (□) mice after oral (A) and intravenous (B, C, and D) administration of vinorelbine at a dose of 10 mg/kg. Data represent mean concentrations ± S.D.; n = 4 to 6 for oral and n = 4 for intravenous administration. Inserts in B, C, and D show semilog plots of the data.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Oral vinorelbine</th>
<th>Intravenous vinorelbine</th>
<th>4'-O-Deacetylvinorelbine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUC\textsubscript{0–24} \cdot h \cdot mg^{-1} \cdot l^{-1}</td>
<td>C\textsubscript{max}, mg/l</td>
<td>AUC\textsubscript{0–24} \cdot h \cdot mg^{-1} \cdot l^{-1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT</td>
<td>0.25 ± 0.10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdr1a/1b(−/−)</td>
<td>0.86 ± 0.37*</td>
<td>0.45 ± 0.07**</td>
<td>3.70 ± 0.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyp3a(−/−)</td>
<td>0.54 ± 0.15*</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.03*</td>
<td>2.50 ± 0.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(−/−)</td>
<td>0.84 ± 0.22*</td>
<td>0.33 ± 0.13*</td>
<td>1.17 ± 0.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < 0.05, compared with WT mice.

**P < 0.01.**
Because metabolic drug clearance after intravenous administration is often mostly mediated by the liver, we incubated vinorelbine with liver microsomes from WT and Cyp3a(-/-) mice. We assessed P450-mediated metabolism by comparing vinorelbine concentrations in the presence and absence of the cofactor NADPH, which is essential for Cyp activity. In addition, we measured 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine formation. We observed, unexpectedly, only minimal disappearance of vinorelbine in microsomes from WT mice, and the absence or presence of NADPH did not affect this process, indicating that this process was not P450-mediated (Fig. 4A). A small amount of 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine was formed, and this was again not NADPH-dependent (Fig. 4B). In the Cyp3a(-/-) microsomes, however, we observed much more extensive disappearance of vinorelbine, correlating with a higher production of 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine (Fig. 4C). Again, these conversions were independent of the presence or absence of NADPH, indicating that they were not P450-mediated. The sum of the remaining vinorelbine and 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine amounts in the various incubations (Fig. 4C) yielded total drug amounts that were not substantially below the originally applied amount of vinorelbine (18.5 μM), suggesting that there was little metabolism to other compounds under these conditions.

**Increased 4'-O-Deacetylvinorelbine Formation in Cyp3a(-/-) and Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(-/-) Plasma.** Because the abundant 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine formation in the Cyp3a(-/-) liver microsomes was not P450-mediated, it might be catalyzed by (partly) soluble proteins that could also be secreted into the blood. We therefore incubated vinorelbine (6.5 μM or approximately 5000 ng/ml, i.e., of the same order as expected shortly after intravenous administration of vinorelbine in vitro with plasma freshly collected from WT, Mdr1a/1b(-/-), Cyp3a(-/-), and Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(-/-) mice and measured disappearance of vinorelbine and appearance of 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine over time. In WT and Mdr1a/1b(-/-) plasma there was a slow disappearance of vinorelbine, associated with low production of 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine over time (Fig. 5, A and B). Of interest, however, in Cyp3a(-/-) plasma, vinorelbine disappearance and 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine appearance were clearly increased, and both processes were markedly further enhanced in the Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(-/-) plasma. These results indicate that there is substantial up-regulation of enzyme(s) forming 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine in Cyp3a(-/-) and especially Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(-/-) plasma, but not in Mdr1a/1b(-/-) plasma. Adding up the vinorelbine plus 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine values in plasma for each strain (Fig. 5C) indicated that most of the drug was still detectable in these two forms after 120 min, suggesting only little metabolism to alternative vinorelbine metabolites.

**Up-Regulation of Carboxylesterases in Livers of Mdr1a/1b(-/-), Cyp3a(-/-), and Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(-/-) Mice.** The conversion of vinorelbine to 4'-O-deacetylvinorelbine is essentially an esterase reaction, so we considered that one or more (carboxylesterases or paraoxonases produced in the liver and secreted into the blood might be up-regulated in the Cyp3a(-/-) and Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(-/-) strains but not in the Mdr1a/1b(-/-) mice. We therefore tested gene expression of all obvious candidate hepatic carboxylesterases (Holmes et al., 2010) and paraoxonases in liver of the different mouse strains using RT-PCR (Supplemental Fig. 1; Supplemental Table 1). The paraoxonase enzymes (Pon1, Pon2, and Pon3) were not differentially expressed in the WT and
knockout strains. In contrast, four (Ces1b, Ces1c, Ces1d, and Ces1e) of the six Ces1 enzymes tested were found to be highly up-regulated in all three knockout strains. However, because these genes were also up-regulated to the same extent in Mdr1a/1b(−/−) mice, whereas metabolite formation in Mdr1a/1b(−/−) mice was similar to that in WT mice (Fig. 5), these Ces1 enzymes cannot be responsible for the (increased) formation of 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine. Of interest, however, the carboxylesterase Ces2a (formerly named Ces6) was 2.7-fold up-regulated in Cyp3a/H11002/H11002(−/−) mice, whereas its expression was not altered in Mdr1a/1b(−/−) mice (Fig. 6D; Supplemental Fig. 1; Supplemental Table 1). On the basis of this Ces2a expression pattern (Fig. 6D) and its similarity to the pattern of metabolite formation in the knockout strains (Figs. 5 and 6, A–C), Ces2a is the only plausible carboxylesterase candidate for the increased formation of 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine.

**Increased 4′-O-Deacetylvinorelbine Formation Can Be Inhibited by BNPP and Loperamide.** To further corroborate the involvement of carboxylesterases and especially Ces2a, we tested whether the formation of 4′-O-deacetylvirelbine in plasma could be inhibited using the nonspecific carboxylesterase inhibitor BNPP and the (human) CES2-specific inhibitor loperamide (Wang et al., 2011; Williams et al., 2011). We incubated vinorelbine (6.5 μM) with BNPP (100 μM), loperamide (100 μM), or vehicle for 120 min in vitro with plasma freshly collected from WT, Mdr1a/1b(−/−), Cyp3a(−/−), and Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(−/−) mice, and we measured disappearance of vinorelbine and appearance of 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine over time. Loperamide inhibited the formation of 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine approximately 2- to 3-fold in all four strains, whereas BNPP completely inhibited metabolite formation (Fig. 6, A and B). Adding up the vinorelbine plus 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine values in plasma for each strain (Fig. 6C) suggested little metabolism to alternative vinorelbine metabolites. Moreover, we obtained similar inhibition data with liver microsomes of WT and Cyp3a knockout mice (Supplemental Fig. 2). In microsomes of Cyp3a(−/−) mice, loperamide inhibited the formation of 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine ~3-fold, whereas BNPP completely inhibited metabolite formation. Taken together, these inhibition results combined with the RNA expression data indicate that a carboxylesterase is responsible for the formation of 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine in liver and plasma and that this carboxylesterase is most likely Ces2a.

**Discussion**

In this study, we demonstrated that vinorelbine is a transported substrate for MRP2 and that loss of Mrp2 in mice resulted in a 1.5-fold elevated plasma exposure upon oral vinorelbine administration. The absence of P-gp in mice resulted in a marked (~3.5-fold) increase in plasma exposure after oral vinorelbine and a 2.3-fold increase after intravenous vinorelbine. The absence of Cyp3a alone or combined absence of P-gp and Cyp3a also resulted in increased plasma exposure levels (2.2- and 3.4-fold, respectively) of oral vinorelbine. However, these latter values are probably an underestimate, as in both strains, especially the Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(−/−) mice (and in contrast to the single P-gp-deficient strain), there was a substantial up-regulation of plasma enzyme(s) that convert vinorelbine to its major metabolite 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine. The impact of this up-regulation was even more apparent after intravenous vinorelbine administration. Inhibition experiments together with RT-PCR expression data indicated that up-regulation of Ces2a is most
likely responsible for the (increased) formation of 4′O-deacetylvinorelbine in the Cyp3a(−/−) and Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(−/−) mice.

Thus far, interactions of vinorelbine with MRPs have not been reported. However, cellular resistance to the vinca alkaloid vincristine has been associated with MRP2 expression (Chen et al., 1999; Kawabe et al., 1999), and transport of vinblastine by MRP2 has been demonstrated in vitro (Evers et al., 1998, 2000a; Huisman et al., 2005). In this study, we show that human MRP2 can efficiently transport vinorelbine in vitro. This very likely means that tumor cells expressing this protein will to some extent be protected from the cytotoxicity of vinorelbine. Moreover, this protein will to some extent be protected from the cyto-

in vitro. This very likely means that tumor cells expressing show that human MRP2 can efficiently transport vinorelbine and variations in its expression or activity may affect the oral and intravenous availability and over-

availability of vinorelbine. These enzymes can display substantial inter- and intraindividual variation in expression and they are involved in many drug-drug interactions by either gene in-

duction or direct inhibition, which could affect the therapeutic efficacy of vinorelbine.

We note that metabolism of vinorelbine by soluble (plasma) enzymes was thus far not tested (Kajita et al., 2000; Beulz-Riche et al., 2005). However, 4′O-deacetylvinorelbine is a major vinorelbine metabolite found in both mouse and human plasma, and this metabolite is also pharmacodynamically active (van Tellingen et al., 1993; Briasoulis et al., 2009). It is therefore interesting to find that one (or more) plasma enzyme(s) can mediate substantial formation of this metabolite. It has previously been suggested that 4′O-deacetylvinorelbine is formed by a carboxylesterase, but its identity has thus far not been resolved (e.g., Delord et al., 2009). In this study we have been able to identify mouse Ces2a as the most likely candidate for 4′-O-deacetylvinorelbine formation. We note that loperamide is a specific CES2 inhibitor with IC_{50} = 1 μM in humans, IC_{50} = 100 μM for dog, and IC_{50} = 35 μM for monkey (Williams et al., 2011). For mouse Ces2a, IC_{50} values for loperamide have thus far not been reported, but our results of ~50% inhibition at a concentration of 100 μM are well in line with the IC_{50} values obtained in other animal species. Further experiments with recombinant mouse Ces2a, which is currently not available to us, could clarify these results further.

The up-regulation of Ces2a makes it difficult to interpret the combined effect of P-gp and Cyp3a deficiency in the Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a(−/−) mice on vinorelbine availability, after either oral or intravenous drug administration. Presumably, without this up-regulation, the AUC of vinorelbine would have been considerably higher than that in the separate Mdr1a/1b(−/−) or Cyp3a(−/−) mice. This problem cannot be solved by considering the sum of vinorelbine and 4′O-deacetylvinorelbine, because the further disposition and metabolism of either compound might be quite different. Any statement on the possible interaction between Cyp3a and Mdr1a/1b P-gp affecting vinorelbine availability therefore remains speculative. These findings once again illustrate that great caution should be exercised in the assessment of pharmacokinetic and related effects in knockout mouse strains, as there can sometimes be important changes in alternative detoxification pathways. This seems to be especially a risk with Cyp3a-deficient mouse strains (van Waterschoot et al., 2008 and the present study), although in the present study we also found up-regulation of some carboxylesterase genes in Mdr1a/1b(−/−) mice.

In summary, we have demonstrated a substantial in vivo impact of P-gp, Mrp2, and Cyp3a on vinorelbine availability.
and clearance in mice, as well as the involvement of a plasma carboxylesterase, most likely Ces2a. Variation in the activity of their human homologs is also likely to affect vinorelbine pharmacokinetics and therapeutic efficacy in patients.
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Supplemental Figure 1. Expression levels of Ces enzymes and paraoxonases in livers of WT, Mdr1a/1b−/−, Cyp3a−/− and Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a−/− mice, as determined by real-time RT-PCR. Data are normalized to GAPDH expression. Values represent mean fold change ± SD, compared to WT mice; n = 3.
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Supplemental Figure 2. Concentrations of vinorelbine (A), 4’O-deacetylvinorelbine (B) and vinorelbine + 4’O-deacetylvinorelbine (C; Combined) after incubation of liver microsomes from WT or Cyp3a-/- mice with 18.5 µM vinorelbine for 30 minutes in the absence or presence of inhibitors of carboxylesterase enzymes (BNPP and loperamide). Data represent mean concentrations ± SD, n = 3. Dashed lines in the 3 panels represent the applied vinorelbine concentration of 18.5 µM at t = 0.
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**Supplemental Table 1.** Gene expression (fold change compared to WT mice) of carboxylesterases and paraoxonases in liver tissue of the different mouse strains, as determined by real-time RT-PCR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WT</th>
<th>Mdr1a/1b&lt;sup&gt;−−&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Cyp3a&lt;sup&gt;−−&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Mdr1a/1b/Cyp3a&lt;sup&gt;−−&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ces1b</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td>10.7 ± 1.3***</td>
<td>11.4 ± 1.9***</td>
<td>11.8 ± 1.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ces1c</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td>64.0 ± 2.1***</td>
<td>56.6 ± 11.2***</td>
<td>64.5 ± 11.9***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ces1d</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>63.5 ± 7.9***</td>
<td>57.7 ± 15.3***</td>
<td>45.1 ± 6.8***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ces1e</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>3.6 ± 0.8***</td>
<td>6.7 ± 0.8***</td>
<td>3.8 ± 0.5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ces1f</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.6 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ces1g</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ces2a</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>2.7 ± 0.2***</td>
<td>3.9 ± 0.5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ces2e</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.1**</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.4</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ces3a</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ces3b</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.0</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aadac</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pon1</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.1*</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.1*</td>
<td>0.6 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pon2</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pon3</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are normalized to GAPDH expression. Data are means ± SD, n = 3. *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001 compared to WT mice.