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CS vs. PBPK

Objectives:

- Define NOAEL, LOAEL, and cardiac sensitization (CS);
- Describe the use of epinephrine challenge dose to elicit CS in dogs;
- Explain the relationship between the epinephrine challenge dose and chemical agents such as CFC and CF$_3$I.
- Explain a PBPK Model and its valid use.
Definitions:

- NOAEL (No observed adverse effect level): Negative to a test chemical dose administered during epinephrine-challenge; less than the lowest positive dose.

- LOAEL (Lowest observed adverse effect level): Positive at the lowest test chemical dose administered during epinephrine-challenge dose that is just below that which will evoke a cardiac response even without a test chemical administered.
LOAEL (Lowest observed adverse effect level):

- The lowest level of test chemical that produced cardiac response when high dose of exogenous epinephrine is given to challenge the experimental animals (called an epinephrine-challenge).
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LOAEL (Lowest observed adverse effect level):

- Without an exogenous epinephrine-challenge, animals will not respond to a test chemical unless much higher dose is given.
- Thus, high level of epinephrine-challenge is required in the CS testing to evoke a clinical response.
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CS Test Protocol:
(Continuous monitoring)

1. Start ECG recording at 0 min,
2. First epinephrine-challenge injected at 2 min,
3. Test chemical inhaled at 7 min,
4. Second epinephrine-challenge injected at 12 min,
5. Stop test chemical and ECG at 17 min.
Figure 1. Hypothetical relationship between epinephrine dose and chemical that produces cardiac response.
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Fig 1. Hypothetical relationship between epinephrine dose and chemical agent that produces cardiac response.
Figure 2. Relationship between epinephrine (Epi) dose vs. chemical agent (CFC).
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$\text{CF}_3\text{I}$ (Dodd and Vinegar, Drug and Chemical Toxicology, 21(2): 137 - 149, 1998)

- Used a total of 9 pure-bread male Beagle dogs,
- Each dog received varying doses of epinephrine (1, 4, 8, and 12 $\mu$g/kg),
- Each dog received a dose of $\text{CF}_3\text{I}$ where the test is performed in singlicate, $n = 1$. 
Three dogs (33%) were rejected due to adverse response to an epinephrine reaction before CF$_3$I given.

Two dogs were struggling even at 1 µg/kg epinephrine,

Thus, 5/9 (56%) dogs showed clinical effects without CF$_3$I given.
Comments of the CF₃I Experimentation

- Manipulated Experiment: An excess level of exogenous epinephrine-challenge doses that correspond to a normal human plasma (4-83 pg/ml):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>µg/kg</th>
<th>Human Eql.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>167 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>670 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,300 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,000 X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Comments of the CF$_3$I Experimentation

- Biological Variability:
  The dogs were showing clinical effect caused by epinephrine-challenge without CF$_3$I given. The other biological variability includes gender, age, nutrition, health state, psychological factors, and physiological difference.
Comments of the $\text{CF}_3 \text{I}$ Experimentation

- Statistical Significance:
  Only one dog is used per $\text{CF}_3 \text{I}$ dose in which one died at 0.4% (at 8 $\mu$g/kg epinephrine-challenge). The test was performed in singlicate, not using multiple dogs for the $\text{CF}_3 \text{I}$ (0.4%) in question to verify the reproducibility of test results.
Comments of the CF₃I Experimentation:

- Based on this one experiment, the NOAEL was then assigned as 0.2% (2,000 ppm) and the LOAEL, 0.4% (4,000 ppm).
Comments of the CF$_3$I Experimentation

However, when 2.5% CF$_3$I was exposed to dogs without epinephrine-challenge, no cardiac response observed (12.5 times higher than the NOAEL). Tachycardia began to show at 5% level . . . ICF Kaiser/Huntingdon, 1998 in Clewell, H. and Lawrence, G., May 21, 1999.
Comments of the $\text{CF}_3\text{I}$ Experimentation

- Scientific confirmation of data: As of Aug 20, 2002, there is no other publication repeating and reproducing the same experimental results.
Comments of the CF$_3$I Experimentation

- No arterial epinephrine level was determined during the experiment. As a result, I cannot determine what really killed the dog (additional endogenous epinephrine produced by the dog during the stress or the actual test chemical administered).
Comments of the CF3I Experimentation

- Mode of administration of exogenous epinephrine: More epinephrine will reach the heart if injected in the artery than in the venous vein.
Comments of the CF$_3$I Experimentation

- Also one dog died when 2% of CFC-11 (12 $\mu$g/kg epinephrine) was administered. Does this mean that the NOAEL for CFC-11 is 2% or 20,000 ppm (the accepted NOAEL is 0.34% or 3,400 ppm). Note: The NOAEL for CF$_3$I was determined at 8 $\mu$g/kg epinephrine-challenge. Then, why the CFC-11 study was performed at high epinephrine-challenge of 12 $\mu$g/kg? The dose-response between the epinephrine dose and test chemical administered is inversely related.
Comments of the CF$_3$I Experimentation

- CFC-11 and CFC-12 are used in human oral inhalation propellant for Albuterol (asthma medication) as well as refrigerants even though the NOAEL is similar to CF$_3$I.

NOAEL: CFC-11 = 3,400 ppm
    CF$_3$I = 2,000 ppm
Comments of the CF$_3$I Experimentation

- If CFC-11 and CFC-12 are adequately safe for human use, then CF$_3$I should be safe. The toxic data profile of CF$_3$I obtained from an animal model falls within the range of toxicity data profiles of currently used inhalation propellant medications, fire extinguishants and refrigerants.

Note: I am not advocating this fire suppressant, CF$_3$I, for human medical use.
Comments of the \( \text{CF}_3\text{I} \) Experimentation

According to Skaggs and Rubenstein (Setting the Occupational Exposure Limit for \( \text{CF}_3\text{I} \), Halon Options Technical Conference, 27-29 APR 1999), the dogs without epinephrine-challenge when exposed to 5% \( \text{CF}_3\text{I} \) showed no adverse cardiac effects. This is about 12.5 times above the LOAEL (0.4%).
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Recommendations:

- A standardized protocol for CS study is needed:
  - Inverse dose relationship between the epinephrine-challenge and the test chemical administered,
  - Determine an appropriate epinephrine-challenge dose,
Recommendations:
A standardized protocol for CS study is needed:

- Inclusion of positive and negative controls for precision study,
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Recommendations:
- A standardized protocol for CS study:
  - Mode of epinephrine injection: venous vs. arterial,
  - Blood level of epinephrine before exposing to a test chemical,
  - Additional sensors such as BP and heart rate to monitor heart functions beside ECG,
  - Use multiple animals to confirm the positive results,
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Recommendations:
A standardized protocol for CS study is needed:

- Assess reproducibility of the positive test results by another laboratory,
- The CS data must not be used as an absolute basis to determine the safe use of a chemical in humans.
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Physiologically-Based Pharmacokinetic (PBPK) Model:
- Mathematical description of:
  » Uptake,
  » Absorption,
  » Distribution,
  » Pharmacodynamics,
  » Metabolism,
  » Elimination.
- Physiological and anatomical properties of animals,
- Specific chemical properties,
- Chemical concentrations in blood and duration of exposure (inhalation during the first second to minute),
- The link among the following data:
  - CS end-point in animals,
  - LOAEL at 5-minute exposure,
  - Human arterial concentration data obtained from:
    - Halothane, Isoflurane, and Desflurane,
    - CFC-11 (IV and Inhalation)
    - Monte Carlo Simulations (95 and 99%).
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- Resting and moderate activity level conditions,
- Based on 70 kg man.
## Time for Safe Human Exposure for CF$_3$I”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% v/v</th>
<th>PPM</th>
<th>Human Exposure Time (Minute)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General guidelines for Occupied vs. Unoccupied areas:

- If chemical concentration < LOAEL, use in Occupied area.
- If chemical concentrations > LOAEL, use in Unoccupied areas.

- Concentrations > LOAEL: < 30 sec to egress the area;
- Concentrations < LOAEL: < 60 sec to egress the area;
- No information of LOAEL: < 30 sec to egress the area.
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- PBPK currently in use:
  (NFPA 2001 Standard)

- US Environmental Protection Agency, EPA,
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration, OSHA,
- National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, NOISH,
- US Dept of Transportation, FAA.