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Abstract

Large porous particles (LPPs) are well-known vehicles for drug delivery to the lungs. However, it remains uncertain whether or to which extent the **in vitro** drug release behavior of LPPs can be predictive of their **in vivo** performance (e.g., systemic exposure and therapeutic efficacy). With regard to this, three budesonide-loaded LPP formulations with identical composition but distinct **in vitro** drug release profiles were studied **in vivo** for their pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic behavior after delivery to rat lung, and finally, an **in vitro/in vivo** correlation (IVIVC) was established. All formulations reduced approximately 75% of the uptake by RAW264.7 macrophages compared with budesonide/lactose physical mixture and showed a drug release-dependent retention behavior in the lungs of rats. Likewise, the highest budesonide plasma concentration was measured for the formulation revealing the fastest **in vitro** drug release.

After deconvolution of the plasma concentration/time profiles, the calculated **in vivo** drug release data were successfully utilized for a point-to-point IVIVC with the **in vitro** release profiles and the predictability of the developed IVIVC was acceptable. Finally, effective therapy was observed in an allergic asthma rat model for the sustained drug release formulations. Overall, the obtained **in vitro** results correlate well with the systemic drug exposure and the therapeutic performance of the investigated lung-delivered formulations, which can provide an experimental basis for IVIVC development in the pulmonary-controlled delivery system.

Statement of Significance

Large porous particles (LPPs) are well-known vehicles for drug delivery to the lungs. However, it remains uncertain whether or to which extent the **in vitro** drug release behavior of LPPs can be predicted by their **in vivo** performance (e.g., systemic exposure and therapeutic efficacy). With regard to this, three budesonide-loaded PLGA-based LPP formulations with identical composition but distinct **in vitro** drug release profiles were studied **in vivo** for their pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic behavior, and finally, an **in vitro/in vivo** correlation (IVIVC) was established. It was demonstrated that the influence of the **in vitro** drug release profile was obvious during lung retention, systemic exposure, and therapeutic efficacy measurements. An IVIVC (Level A) was successfully established for the budesonide-loaded LPPs delivered to the airspace of rats for the first time. Taken together, the present work will clearly support research and development activities in the field of controlled drug delivery to the lungs.

1. Introduction

Asthma is an intricate respiratory disease characterized by airway inflammation, mucus hypersecretion, and acute hyper-responsiveness [1]. It is reported that approximately 334...
million people worldwide are suffering from this chronic airway disease, and this figure will increase up to 400 million by the year 2025 [2]. The direct/targeted administration of medications to the lungs by inhalation represents a promising strategy for the treatment of respiratory diseases. To increase patients’ convenience, it would be highly desirable to maintain “effective” drug concentrations in the lungs for a prolonged period of time [3]. However, presently, most inhalation products on the market are short-acting dosage forms, which require frequent dosing. Another evident disadvantage with current medications is their undesired pharmacokinetic profile, showing peak concentrations immediately after inhalation (with chance for adverse events) followed by a prompt decline (short duration of action) [4].

To achieve a sustained therapeutic effect within the lungs, a variety of formulation strategies such as large porous (micro)particles (LPPs) have been proposed [5,6]. Characterized by their large geometric diameter (>5 μm) and porous structure (bulk density of <1 g/cm³), LPPs evade macrophage phagocytosis while maintaining a suitable aerodynamic behavior. For example, it was previously shown by our group that LPPs prepared from poly(lactide-co-glycolide) (PLGA) served as a controlled drug delivery system, demonstrating a sustained therapeutic effect within the lungs for up to 4 h [7]. However, it remains uncertain to which extent the in vitro drug release behavior is predictive of therapeutic efficacy in vivo. With regard to this, the establishment of a valid in vitro/in vivo correlation (IVIVC) is desirable to allow for prediction of a therapeutic effect and dosing interval from a rather simple in vitro characterization.

The objective of our present study was to investigate the in vitro drug release behavior and in vivo performance of budesonide-loaded LPPs with distinct in vitro drug release rates after delivery to the lung. After a thorough physicochemical characterization, the influence of the in vitro drug release rates on the in situ lung retention, pharmacokinetic behavior, and in vivo therapeutic effect was investigated in rats. Fitting equations for IVIVC could be established from the obtained in vitro drug release and lung retention/pharmacokinetic data. This report correlates the in vitro drug release with retention, systemic exposure, and therapeutic efficacy of lung-delivered LPPs, which could provide a correlation database for the design and development of controlled drug release medication intended for the administration to the respiratory tract.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Materials

PLGA (Resomer® RG 503H) was purchased from Evonik (Germany). Micronized budesonide was acquired from Hubei Gedian Humanwell Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd. (China). Lactohale® 200 was received as a gift from DFE Pharma (China). Poly(vinyl alcohol) (PVA 205) and poly(vinyl pyrrolidone) (PVP-k12) were donated by Kuraray Trading Co., Ltd. (Japan) and International Specialty Products Inc. (USA), respectively. Pulsiric® Turbuhalier® (AstraZeneca, UK) was purchased from a local pharmacy. Phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) solution was purchased from Dalian Meilun Biotechnology Co., Ltd (Dalian, China). High-pressure liquid chromatography (HPLC)-grade methanol and dichloromethane (DCM) were supplied by Shandong Yuwang Co., Ltd. (China). Ovalbumin (OVA) was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (USA). Pentobarbital sodium was obtained from Applichem (Germany). Wright-Giemsa and Hematoxylin-Eosin staining solutions were supplied by Wanlebio (China) and Jiancheng (China), respectively. Rat IL-4 and IL-5 ELISA kits were obtained from Cusabio (China). TRIzol® reagent was bought from Ambion (USA). MasterMix Kit (abm®) and EvaGreen 2X qPCR MasterMix (abm®) were purchased from Takara Bio (China). All other reagents, unless otherwise specified, were of analytical grade and used as received.

2.2. Preparation of budesonide-loaded LPPs

2.2.1. Emulsion solvent evaporation (ESE) method

Budesonide-loaded LPPs (LPP-1 and LPP-2) were prepared by a modified single emulsion (O/W) solvent evaporation method as described previously [7]. Briefly, 66.7 mg budesonide were dissolved in 3 ml of DCM together with 600 mg of PLGA and 90 mg of PVP. Then, the resulting organic phase was injected into 300 ml (LPP-1) or 500 ml (LPP-2) of aqueous phase containing 0.5% (w/v) of PVA under high-speed homogenization (Ultra-Turrax® T25, IKA, Germany) for 30 s. The final emulsion was subsequently stirred to evaporate the DCM under a water bath at 25℃ for 4 h. The obtained LPPs were collected by centrifugation at 2000 rpm for 5 min, washed three times with distilled water, and finally freeze-dried (FDU-1100, Tokyo Rikakikai Co., Ltd, Japan) for 24 h.

2.2.2. Premix membrane emulsification (PME) method

Budesonide-loaded LPPs (LPP-3) were prepared by the PME method [8], using the same procedure as that for LPP-1. Briefly, budesonide (66.7 mg), PLGA (600 mg), and PVP (90 mg) were dissolved together in 3 ml of DCM. The resulting oil phase was injected into 50 ml of aqueous phase containing 0.5% (w/v) PVA under high-speed homogenization for 30 s. Next, by using a Shirasu-porous-glass (SPG) emulsification kit (SPG Technology Co., Ltd, Japan), the pre-emulsion (stored in a pressure-tight vessel) was passed through a SPG membrane (tube-shaped with an outer diameter of 10 mm) with pore size of 15 μm under nitrogen gas pressure of 0.065 MPa for three times. The obtained emulsion was rapidly added to 250 ml of aqueous phase containing 0.5% (w/v) PVA. The final emulsion was subsequently stirred to evaporate the DCM under a water bath at 25℃ for 4 h. The cleaning and drying processes were identical as outlined above.

2.3. Characterization of budesonide-loaded LPPs

2.3.1. Particle size measurement

The geometric particle size (i.e., the volumetric median diameter [Dv,50]) of the budesonide-loaded LPPs was determined by laser diffraction (Beckman-Coulter, LS 230, USA). The span value was calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Span} = \frac{D_{v,90} - D_{v,10}}{D_{v,50}}
\]

2.3.2. Drug loading

The loading content of budesonide in the LPPs was tested according to the following procedure: 10 mg of LPPs were weighed precisely and then dissolved in 1 ml of DCM, which was further diluted to 50 ml with methanol. The mixture was centrifuged at 10,000 rpm for 10 min. A sample from the supernatant was subsequently subjected to HPLC analysis. Agilent 1260 Infinity HPLC equipment (Agilent Technologies Inc., USA) was used, and the analysis was conducted on an Agilent Zorbax SB C18-H column (150 mm × 4.6 mm, particle size: 5 μm) (Agilent Technologies Inc., USA) equipped with a ColumnShield™ ACE-HP205 pre-column (Guangzhou FLM Scientific Instrument Co., Ltd, China) at 40℃. The detection wavelength was 248 nm and drug retention time was in the range of 5.1–5.2 min (mobile phase: water/methanol (28/72, v/v); flow rate: 1 ml/min). Under the above-mentioned chromatographic conditions, the limit of detection (LOD) was found to be 0.05 μg/ml, and the limit of quantitation (LOQ) was
0.15 μg/ml. The linearity of drug concentration to peak area was good in the range of 0.50–40.00 μg/ml (A = 21.109C-4.3517 (R² = 0.9999)). The precision and recovery met the requirements for in vitro analysis. The drug loading (DL) percent is defined in the following equation:

\[
DL\% = \frac{M_{\text{actual drug loaded}}}{M_{\text{dosage form weighed}}} \times 100\%
\]

2.3.3. Scanning electron microscopy

The morphology of the budesonide-loaded LPPs was observed using a scanning electron microscope (S-3400N, Hitachi, Japan). For surface morphology observation, a small amount of powder sample was sprinkled onto a double-sided adhesive conductive tape attached to a copper stub and then sputter-coated with gold under vacuum. The images were captured at an accelerating voltage of 15 kV. A frozen sample was prepared for particle cross-section observation. Drug powders were soaked in an aqueous solution containing 20% gelatin-5% glycerin for 3 h at 37 °C. After solidification by storing in -20 °C, the microspheres coated with gelatin-glycerin jelly were frozen in liquid nitrogen for 5 min and cryo-sectioned. The prepared frozen sections were then placed on the copper stub and sputter-coated with gold under vacuum. The images were captured at an accelerating voltage of 15 kV.

2.4. In vitro drug release

To evaluate the in vitro release behavior of budesonide from the LPPs, ~2.50 mg of drug-loaded LPPs were weighed precisely and dispersed into 5 ml of phosphate buffer (10 mM, pH 7.3) in a centrifuge tube. Sodium dodecyl sulfate (0.15% (w/v)) was added for solubilization, and the solubility of budesonide in the medium was 175.3 μg/ml (sink condition). The dispersion was continuously incubated in an air-bath oscillator (THZ-928, Shanghai Boxun Co., Ltd, China) at 37 (±1) °C with a speed of 80 rpm. At predetermined time points (2, 4, 8, 12, 24, 36, 48, and 72 h), the release medium was collected, and after centrifugation, the supernatant was analyzed for drug content by HPLC. The rest of the sample was centrifuged, and 10 μl of the supernatant was used to quantify the protein content using a BCA assay kit. The final cell uptake was calculated according to the following equation:

\[
\text{Celluptake} = \frac{M_{\text{budesonide}}}{M_{\text{protein}}} (\mu g/mg \text{ protein})
\]

2.7. Animals

Male Sprague Dawley rats (~200 g) were purchased from the Laboratory Animal Center of Shenyang Pharmaceutical University. Rats were housed under conditions of temperature at 23 ± 3 °C with a relative humidity of 55 ± 10% and a 12 h light–dark cycle. All the procedures were in compliance with ethical standards and guidelines issued by the ethics committee and Shenyang Pharmaceutical University for the care and use of laboratory animals (approval number: SYPU-IACUC-C2018-10-8-205).

2.8. In vivo retention study

The residence behavior of drug-loaded LPPs was analyzed after intra-tracheal powder insufflation to rats as previously described [9]. Initially, rats were intraperitoneally anesthetized with 4.0% (w/v) chloral hydrate at a dose of 7.0 ml/kg, and the LPP-1, -2, and -3 formulations (the physical mixture of budesonide/Lactohale® 200 (5:95)) served as a control) were delivered to the airspace of 4 rats per group using a DP-4 Dry Powder Insulfator® (Penn-Century, USA). At predetermined time points (0, 2, 4, 8, and 12 h), the rats were sacrificed using a cervical dislocation maneuver, and the trachea was dissected. Subsequently, 2 ml of dimethyl sulfoxide was injected into the lungs and re-aspirated after 30 s. This procedure was repeated three times. One milliliter of the pooled bronchoalveolar lavage fluid (BALF) was mixed with 2 ml of methanol to precipitate the proteins. The mixture was homogenized and then centrifuged at 10,000 rpm for 10 min. The supernatant was analyzed by HPLC.

2.9. In vivo pharmacokinetic study

The plasma concentration/time profiles (systemic exposure) of budesonide were followed after formulation application to the lungs of rats. Again, LPP-1, -2, and -3 formulations (the physical
mixture (budesonide/Lactohale® 200 (5:95)) served as a control) were delivered to the airspace of 6 rats per group as outlined above. The entire administration dose was equivalent to 350 µg of budesonide per kg of animal body weight. After formulation application, blood samples were collected at predetermined time points (5, 15, and 30 min and 1, 1.5, 2, 3, 4, and 6 h) through the retro-orbital sinus (sodium heparin was used as the anticoagulant). Blood samples were centrifuged at 4,500 rpm for 10 min to isolate the plasma, which was stored at −20 °C until further analysis.

Budesonide plasma concentrations were determined by LC–MS [10]. Briefly, 100 µl of triamcinolone acetonide (60 ng/ml) was added as an internal standard, after which budesonide was extracted from 100 µl of plasma with 200 µl of acetonitrile. After vortexing for 5 min and centrifugation at 13,000 rpm for 10 min, the supernatant was used to determine the drug concentrations using an Agilent 1260–6420 tandem triple-quadrupole LC-MS/MS equipment. An Agilent Zorbax SB C18 column (2.1 mm × 50 mm, 1.8 µm) was used for separation. The mobile phase was acetonitrile/0.1% formic acid (50/50 (v/v)) with a flow rate of 0.2 ml/min. The injection volume was 1 µl, and the positive-ion mode was used as the ESI ionization source. Peak area ratios between calibration samples and internal standards were plotted against their concentrations, achieving a good linearity with R²-value of 0.999 in the range of 0.02–1.00 µg/ml. The obtained plasma concentrations of budesonide were then used to calculate the pharmacokinetic parameters (DAS.2.0 software, Mathematical Pharmacology Professional Committee, China).

2.10. Establishing IVIVC

In this study, Level A (point-to-point) correlation between the in vitro release profiles and the in vivo dissolved fractions was established for the distinct LPP formulations (i.e., LPP-1, -2, and -3) according to FDA recommendation on IVIVC study [11]. The in vivo dissolution [input, I(t)] was the key point for IVIVC establishment. If the in vivo property of the reference immediate-release dosage form (physical mixture of budesonide/Lactohale® 200 (5:95)) was regarded as a weight function [weighting, W(t)], then the other delayed behaviors (sustained dosage forms) could be viewed as a result of the superposition of small-dose weight functions at different time points in vivo, that is, the response function [response, R(t)] derived from in vivo plasma concentration/time data. The three functions constituted the relationship as shown in Scheme 1.

The mathematical relationship of the three functions is shown below:

\[ R(t) = \int_0^t I(\gamma)W(t - \gamma)d\gamma \]

The in vivo dissolution [input, I(t)] was obtained by deconvoluting the above formula using the IVIVC Toolkit of Phoenix WinNonlin® (v.6.4, Pharsight, USA). Thereafter, the in vivo dissolution/absorption was correlated with the in vitro release at identical time intervals by a linear regression method for the three LPPs.

Furthermore, a combination of two LPPs was used for the correlation according to the above procedures to establish a fitting formula, which was then applied to predict the in vivo dissolution/absorption of the third LPP formulation based on its in vitro release profile. The convolution method was utilized to obtain the predicted in vivo plasma concentration from the predicted in vivo dissolution/absorption profile, by which predictability validation could be evaluated. The predictability validation was concentrated on estimating the percent of prediction error (PE%) between the observed and predicted plasma concentration profiles (AUC, Cmax) according to the formula:

\[ \text{PE}\% = \frac{\text{AUC}_{\text{tested}} - \text{AUC}_{\text{predicted}}}{\text{AUC}_{\text{tested}}} \times 100\% \]

\[ \text{PE}\% = \frac{\text{Cmax}_{\text{tested}} - \text{Cmax}_{\text{predicted}}}{\text{Cmax}_{\text{tested}}} \times 100\% \]

2.11. In vivo pharmacodynamics study

2.11.1. Allergic asthma rat model and treatment

The allergic asthma rat model was established according to the method reported previously with minor modifications [13,14]. Briefly, each rat was sensitized twice with an intraperitoneal injection of a mixture containing 100 mg of ovalbumin (OVA) and 200 mg of aluminum hydroxide in phosphate buffer (1 ml) on days 0 and 7, respectively. One week later, the rats were consecutively once daily) challenged with an aerosol of 2% (w/v) OVA using a jet nebulizer for 13 days. Then, the rats were randomly divided into six groups consisting of five animals in each group: control group (no OVA challenge, no drug treatment); model group (OVA challenge only); budesonide-loaded LPP-1, -2, and -3 groups; and the physical mixture group (budesonide/Lactohale® 200 (5:95)). All experimental groups were administered (budesonide 87.5 µg/kg rat) once every three days using a dry powder insufflator (DP-7, Penn-Century, USA) before OVA irritation. On day 27, the rats were euthanized and their bronchoalveolar fluid (BALF) and lung tissues were collected for further analysis (Scheme 2).

2.11.2. BALF and cellular differential counts

To obtain BALF, the trachea and the lung lobes were isolated. The right bronchi were ligatured, and the left lobes were lavaged three times with phosphate buffer. The lavage fluid was centrifuged at 1000 rpm for 10 min at 4 °C, and the obtained supernatants were stored at −80 °C for cytokine examination. The cell pellet was re-suspended with 1 ml of phosphate buffer for total cell count using a hemocytometer and then smeared on a glass slide for Wright–Giemsa staining for differential cell counts.

2.11.3. Measurement of cytokines in BALF

The levels of cytokine (i.e., IL-4 and IL-5) in BALF were determined using ELISA kits according to the manufacturer’s instructions.

2.11.4. Real-time-PCR for IL-4 and IL-5 mRNA expression in lung tissues

After recovery of BALF, the samples from left lobes were stored at −80 °C for real-time PCR (RT-PCR) analysis of gene expression. Briefly, total RNA was extracted from lungs using the TRIzol® reagent according to the manufacturer’s protocol, and then the reverse transcription reaction was performed using the 5X All-In-One RT MasterMix Kit (abm®) in an RNase-free environment for cDNA synthesis. The target genes were determined by RT-PCR using SYBR Premix Ex Taq. The PCR protocol consisted of 10 min at 95 °C followed by 33 cycles of 15 s at 95 °C and 60 s at 60 °C. The primer sequences used for quantification are shown in Table 1. The relative expression of the target gene was calculated using the comparative 2−ΔΔCt method [15].
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Primer sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β-Actin</td>
<td>Forward: 5′-TTGCTGACAGCAGATGCAAG-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reverse: 5′-CAGTCGGCCGAGCTAGACG-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL-4</td>
<td>Forward: 5′-TGATGTACCTCCGTGCTTGA-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reverse: 5′-CAGTGAGGCCAGGATAGGC-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL-5</td>
<td>Forward: 5′-TTGCTGACAGGATGCAAG-3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reverse: 5′-CAGTCGGCCGAGCTAGACG-3′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Phycochemical properties of the utilized budesonide-loaded LPPs. Values are presented as the mean ± SD (n = 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formulation</th>
<th>Preparation method</th>
<th>O/W phase ratio (v/v)</th>
<th>Particle size [μm] (span value)</th>
<th>Tap density [g/ml]</th>
<th>Drug loading [%]</th>
<th>MMADe [μm]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPP-1</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>3:300</td>
<td>20.1 ± 0.2                          (1.71)</td>
<td>0.26 ± 0.01</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.6 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPP-2</td>
<td>ESE</td>
<td>3:500</td>
<td>12.6 ± 0.1                          (1.11)</td>
<td>0.43 ± 0.02</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.4 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPP-3</td>
<td>PME</td>
<td>3:300</td>
<td>9.2 ± 0.1†                          (0.95)</td>
<td>0.38 ± 0.01</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.7 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are presented as the mean ± SD (n = 3). Statistically significant difference:
† p < 0.05 compared to LPP-1,
* p < 0.05 compared to LPP-2,
** p < 0.05 compared to LPP-3.
3.2. In vitro aerodynamic properties of LPPs

The aerodynamic properties of the LPPs were evaluated and compared. As shown in Fig. 4, the three formulations displayed comparable aerodynamic diameter distributions (Stages 1–7), indicating a similar deposition zone in the lungs. In addition, experimental mass mean aerodynamic diameters (MMAD_e) were calculated according to the aerodynamic diameter distributions, and the results are shown in Table 2. All the three formulations showed suitable aerodynamic properties for inhalation with MMAD_e values of <4 \mu m and FPF% values >20% [19]. Data implied that all the LPPs with different particle sizes had comparable deposition properties.

3.3. Macrophage uptake

Before the in vivo studies, the ability of the LPP formulations to evade macrophage phagocytosis was tested. For this purpose, LPP-1, 2, and 3 were incubated with RAW264.7 macrophage cells, and a physical mixture (budesonide/Lactohale\textsuperscript{\textregistered} 200 (5/95)) was used as a control. It was found that the physical mixture was rapidly phagocytized by macrophages (Fig. 5). The increase in intracellular budesonide concentration caused by passive diffusion of the dissolved drug can be neglected owing to the low solubility of budesonide in the cell culture medium. In contrast, all the LPPs investigated could reduce the macrophage uptake significantly (p < 0.05) for up to 12 h, and nearly 75% decrease in uptake was observed when compared with the physical mixture group. No statistical difference in macrophage uptake was found among the LPPs investigated.

3.4. In vivo retention of budesonide-loaded LPPs

When the physical mixture (budesonide/lactose blend) was delivered to the airways of rats, a rapid decline in drug
concentration in the BALF was detected, with no measurable content already after 4 h (Fig. 6). By contrast, all LPP formulations displayed a prolonged retention in the lungs, which was in general agreement with the findings from the macrophage uptake study (Fig. 5). Compared to LPP-2 and LPP-3, LPP-1 showed a lower drug residual at each time point, which was associated with the rapid drug release behavior (Fig. 2).

3.5. In vivo pharmacokinetics of budesonide-loaded LPPs

The budesonide concentration in the plasma and the calculated pharmacokinetic parameters after intratracheal administration of the distinct LPP formulations were studied and compared with those of the physical mixture (budesonide/lactose blend) (Fig. 7).
Table 3. LPP-1, -2, and -3 showed significantly lower systemic exposure of drug as evidenced by the C_{max} and AUC_{0-t} when compared with the physical mixture group. The systemic drug concentration after delivery of LPP-1 to the lungs was significantly higher than those in the LPP-2 and LPP-3 groups (\(p < 0.01\)). Compared with the LPP-1 group, LPP-2 administration led to a 3.7- and 1.7-fold reduction in C_{max} and AUC_{0-t}, respectively (2.9- and 1.6-fold reduction of LPP-3). Thus, to decrease the extent of systemic drug exposure (and potential side effects), it is essential to control the burst release behavior of budesonide-loaded LPPs.

3.6. IVIVC evaluation

The in vivo performance is the sole criterion for pharmaceutical development [20]. On the one hand, the residence time in the target organ plays a vital role in prolonged drug therapy, and thus, a correlation between the in vitro drug release and in vivo retention of LPP formulations was established. As shown in Fig. 8, good/linear correlations were achieved for LPP-1, -2, and -3 (\(R^2\) values > 0.90). The slopes were greater than 1, indicating that the decline in retention in the lungs was faster than the in vitro release.

On the other hand, systemic exposure is a reflection of the drug released from the deposited formulations in the lungs. Then the in vitro (drug release) and in vivo (deconvoluted from the plasma concentration/time data) concentrations were plotted against each other at different time points, and an appropriate line was fit to the data (Fig. 9). Linear correlations between the in vitro drug release percentage and the in vivo absorbed fraction were successfully established for LPP-1, -2, and -3 (\(R^2\) > 0.99). The slope of the LPP-2 group was closest to 1, implying that LPP-2 exhibited the best consistency of the in vitro release to in vivo dissolution/absorption.

Level A IVIVCs developed by combining any two of the three formulations (LPP-1, -2, and -3) are shown in Fig. 10. Point-to-point linear relationships of the in vitro release and in vivo absorption were well established for all combinations, with fitting coefficients (\(R^2\)) greater than 0.90. Thereafter, the obtained fitting equation of a combination (e.g., LPP-2 and LPP-3) was used to predict the in vivo absorption of the other formulation (LPP-1) that was not included in the developed IVIVC, based on its experimental in vitro release.

Table 3
Pharmacokinetic parameters of budesonide-loaded LPP formulations and physical mixtures (budesonide/Lactohale\textsuperscript{®} 200 (5/95)) in rats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>C_{max} (\mu g/l)</th>
<th>T_{max} (min)</th>
<th>AUC (0–6) (\mu g*l/h)</th>
<th>MRT (0–6) (h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical mixture</td>
<td>417.6 ± 52.13</td>
<td>14.2 ± 1.1</td>
<td>492.4 ± 41.4</td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPP-1</td>
<td>236.4 ± 41.8*</td>
<td>11.6 ± 0.9</td>
<td>311.5 ± 35.2*</td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPP-2</td>
<td>64.2 ± 10.5*#</td>
<td>27.5 ± 1.5</td>
<td>187.3 ± 19.8*</td>
<td>2.5 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPP-3</td>
<td>82.3 ± 27.1*#</td>
<td>20.0 ± 1.0</td>
<td>192.5 ± 21.2*</td>
<td>2.6 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values are presented as the mean ± SEM (n = 6).

\* p < 0.01,
\# p < 0.001 compared to the physical mixture group;
\* p < 0.01 compared to the LPP-1 group.
Fig. 9. Linear correlations between the fractions released/dissolved in vitro and released/absorbed in vivo for LPP-1 (A), LPP-2 (B), and LPP-3 (C), respectively. The straight lines represent linear fits of the experimental data.

Fig. 10. Level A IVIVC between the fractions released/dissolved in vitro and released/absorbed in vivo for the three LPPs. (A) IVIVC developed using LPP-2 and LPP-3, (B) IVIVC developed using LPP-1 and LPP-3, and (C) IVIVC developed using LPP-1 and LPP-2. The straight lines represent linear fits of the experimental data.

Fig. 11. (A) Experimental and predicted in vivo release/absorption profiles of the three LPPs derived from Level A IVIVC. (B-D) Tested plasma concentrations and predicted plasma concentrations convoluted from predicted in vivo release/absorption of LPP-1, -2, and -3, respectively.
profile (LPP-1). As shown in Fig. 11A, the predicted in vivo release/absorption of each formulation was almost identical to the corresponding in vivo release/absorption profile derived from PK data. As a result, a robust IVIVC has been established.

The predictability (prediction error, PE%) of the in vivo performance from in vitro dissolution of the prepared inhalation formulations with varying release rates (slow, medium, and fast) was validated. According to FDA guidelines of the IVIVC study on extended-release oral dosage forms, internal prediction error should be calculated using the initial data used to develop the IVIVC [11]. As shown in Fig. 11B-D, predicted plasma drug concentrations were convoluted from the predicted in vivo release/absorption profiles for the three LPPs, and PE was calculated for $C_{\text{max}}$ and AUC of each formulation. The average absolute value of internal PE for AUC was 9.48%, 9.56%, and 9.87% for LPP-1, -2, and -3, respectively, while that for $C_{\text{max}}$ was 8.66%, 9.67%, and 8.28%, correspondingly. The data indicated that the internal PE values were all within the range of 10% or less as recommended. Thus, the developed IVIVC could be used to predict the in vivo performance of LPPs with equivalent composition from its in vitro release characterizations.

3.7. In vivo pharmacodynamics of budesonide-loaded LPPs

The above studies indicated that all the three budesonide-loaded LPP formulations presented sustained release profiles with distinguishable kinetics in vitro and in vivo. All of them avoided macrophage uptake successfully. To test whether there was a correlation between the in vitro behavior and the therapeutic efficacy in vivo, the distinct LPP formulations were delivered to the airspace of an established rat model of OVA-induced allergic asthma as planned (Scheme 2). The asthma model group was viewed as a negative control.

Inflammatory markers in the BALF and lung tissues [21] of the drug-administered groups were quantified and compared with those of the asthma model group (Fig. 12 and Supplementary materials, Fig. S1). The total number of inflammatory cells in the BALF was substantially lower after administration of budesonide, especially for LPP-2 and LPP-3 groups ($p < 0.01$ and $p < 0.05$) (Fig. 12A). Moreover, compared to the asthma model group, treatment with LPP-2 and LPP-3 resulted in a significant decrease in the amount of eosinophils and neutrophils ($p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.01$), the most representative inflammatory cell types in asthma. The LPP-1 group did not show a therapeutic effect when compared with the asthma model group ($p > 0.05$).

Interleukin-4 (IL-4) and interleukin-5 (IL-5) are T helper 2 (Th2) cytokines, which play an important role in the inflammatory reaction [22]. Hence, the level of IL-4 and IL-5 in the BALF was considered as a reflection of therapy, and IL-4 and IL-5 mRNA expression in the lung tissues was further measured to verify the results. Compared with the asthma model group, LPP-2 and LPP-3 treatment showed a significant decrease in the concentration and mRNA expression of IL-5 (Fig. 12B-C) and IL-4 (Supplementary materials, Fig. S1A-B). There was no obvious difference between LPP-1 and the asthma model group.

During histopathological evaluation, severe inflammatory cell infiltration around bronchioles and vessels and hyperplasia of goblet cells in the epithelium of airways were observed in the asthma Fig. 12. Therapeutic effect of successive treatment of OVA-induced allergic asthma in rats with budesonide-loaded LPPs. (A) Total white cell count. (B) IL-5 levels in BALF of OVA-sensitized rats measured by ELISA. (C) IL-5 mRNA expression in the lung tissue. (D) Airway inflammation was assessed by hematoxylin and eosin staining of lung sections (original magnification 100×). (E) Total histopathology scores: inflammation was categorized as none (score, 0), mild (score, 1–2), moderate (score, 3–4), or severe (score, 5–6). Values are presented as the mean ± SEM ($n = 5$). Statistics: *** $p < 0.001$ vs. control group. ### $p < 0.001$, ## $p < 0.01$, # $p < 0.05$ vs. Model group, && $p < 0.01$ vs. physical mixture group.
model (Fig. 12D, E). It was shown that treatment with LPP-2 and LPP-3 formulations attenuated the infiltration of inflammatory cells and hyperplasia of goblet cells ($p < 0.01$ and $p < 0.05$). Specifically, the LPP-2 group displayed the maximal level of airway wall thickness attenuation, followed by LPP-3 ($p < 0.01$) (Supplementary materials, Fig. S1C).

4. Discussion

IVIVC is defined as a predictive method, which would shorten the time for pharmaceutical development, save resources, and support biowaivers [23]. Once an IVIVC is established, it can be used to guide formulation and/or process development over various stages of drug product development [24]. However, the number of publications and overall understanding of IVIVC for inhalation products are yet limited. In this aspect, here we attempted to establish the correlations between in vitro release and in vivo retention/absorption for lung-delivered LPPs.

It has been recommended that two or more formulations with different release characteristics can define an IVIVC [25]. The pores of the LPPs were the tunnels for drug release [26]; thus, its porosity was adjusted by changing the extraction rate of DCM during the solidification of polymer carriers [27] or by premix membrane emulsification [28] to tune the drug release rate. As a result, the three prepared budesonide-loaded LPPs with equivalent composition displayed different release characteristics (slow, medium, and fast release rate) both in vitro and in vivo. Accordingly, they are suitable for the development of an IVIVC.

The LPPs were prepared to exhibit comparable deposition properties in the deep lung (MMADv values of <4 μm) and avoid uncontrollable interferences derived from macrophage uptake, so that more reliable IVIVC could be developed. It has been reported that particles with sizes in the range of 1–3 μm can be easily phagocytized by macrophages [29]. In accordance with this observation, the uptake by macrophages of the physical mixture group (in which particle size of budesonide was approximately 2 μm) was much larger and enlarged in a time-dependent manner. By contrast, LPP formulations ensured a reduced uptake by macrophages in vitro (geometric particle sizes were all in the range of 9–20 μm), which was a prerequisite to assure a prolonged residence time in the lungs.

It is under debate whether the PK study should be investigated to assess the fate of drug for lung-delivered formulations, claiming that plasma drug levels might not necessarily represent drug concentrations at the target site or determine the effect [30]. Presently, the European authorities consider plasma concentrations obtained in a PK study to be indicative of the concentrations at the site of action because the plasma concentrations reflect the lung deposition of the drug measured in a compartment downstream the lungs [31]. Drugs can be absorbed only from the lung compartment into the systemic circulation, and thus, plasma concentration profiles can provide a variety of information such as pulmonary retention and dissolution character [32].

The in vivo absorption rate depends on both the rate of drug release from the formulations and drug permeation across the air/blood barrier. The faster the drug release rate and permeation, the higher is the systemic exposure. According to the Biopharmaceutical Classification System, budesonide is a class II drug with high permeability but low solubility [33]. Hence, the dissolution rate is the rate-limiting step controlling the appearance of budesonide in the plasma [34]. The strategy chosen in this study to obtain high budesonide concentrations in the lung and low systemic exposure was by decreasing the release rate of budesonide. Accordingly, data showed that the shortened retention in the lungs led to larger systemic AUC, which was due to the rapid release characteristics (when comparing LPP-1, -2, and -3). A desirable match between in vitro release behavior and in vivo systemic exposure was discovered qualitatively.

For IVIVC establishment mathematically, it is essential to assess the in vivo absorption profile from the plasma concentration/time data by a mathematical approach [35]. The model-independent deconvolution method with only simple and intuitive operations is recommended by the U.S. Pharmacopoeia, which does not rely on simulating the compartment [36]. In this paper, the method was employed, and acceptable correlations between in vitro release and in vivo absorption of the three LPPs were established.

Establishing an IVIVC for inhalation dosage forms is always considered extremely challenging owing to their complex nature and the lack of proper in vitro release methods mimicking the in vivo situation [37,38]. When using sink condition and 5 ml of PBS with pH of 7.3 for drug dissolution, Level A (point-to-point) IVIVC was successfully established, and furthermore, the obtained fitting equation from a combination of two LPPs was demonstrated to be able to accurately predict the in vivo performance for the third one, which indicated that the release testing method used here might be suitable for IVIVC development for inhalable LPPs.

The sustained release profiles of LPP-2 and -3 were confirmed by therapeutic outcomes in the allergic asthma rat model. Asthma is caused by chronic inflammation of the airways and characterized by high levels of inflammatory cells in BALF, pathological lung tissues, and thickened airway walls [39]. CD4+ Th2 lymphocytes are central to the disease process and exert their effects through a characteristic repertoire of inflammatory cytokines such as IL-4 and IL-5 [40]. Thus, in our PD study, apart from the inflammatory cell counts, IL-4 and IL-5 levels were viewed as an indicator of therapy. The unsatisfied therapeutic outcomes of LPP-1 and the budesonide/lactose physical mixture (no statistical difference between the two groups) were probably due to the rapid drug release rate accompanied by a high systemic exposure, resulting in insufficient local drug concentration in the lung for the therapeutic effect. The efficacy of LPP-2 and -3 was highlighted by a prolonged residence time in the lungs and a reduced AUC in the plasma. Moreover, owing to the sustained/slower drug release and lower $C_{\text{max}}$ in plasma, LPP-2 presented superior antiasthmatic effect to that of LPP-3.

Despite the progress made thus far, there remain some limitations in our present research. For example, the in vivo study was carried out only in male SD rats, which should be expanded to different animal models. The number of animal samples was small (e.g., 5 rats per group for PD study) and needed to be enlarged further. In addition, the measurements in the pharmacodynamics study were carried out at single time points. Multipoint measurement was highly desirable in the future study. In addition, the cellular uptake study in primary lung macrophages rather than RAW264.7 macrophage cell line should be investigated. In addition, despite the good correlation between in vitro release and in vivo absorption for the LPPs, it should be noted that the IVIVC evaluation here was based on animal PK data, and hence, further study on IVIVC using human PK data was required for further confirmation.

5. Conclusions

In this study, budesonide-loaded LPPs with varying in vitro release rates were prepared and used to investigate the corresponding in vivo behavior after delivery to the airways of rats. LPP-2 with the slowest drug release exhibited the longest lung residence time, lowest systemic exposure, and the best therapeutic efficacy. Level A IVIVC mathematical equation was successfully established using the three budesonide-loaded LPPs to predict...
the in vitro performance from the in vitro fraction dissolved, which could be used for screening desirable budesonide-loaded LPP formulations. Furthermore, in vitro release conditions were needed to be further investigated to better mimic the in vivo environment. Taken together, our work has set up a longitudinal example of IVIVC establishment in the field of inhalable controlled drug delivery.
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