Comprehensive Evaluation of In-Vitro and In-Vivo Bioequivalence of Paclitaxel Injectable Suspension Compared to ABRAXANE 100 mg

Ahad Sheikhloo[1], Dariush Omidfar[2]
[1,2] Payesh Darou Zist Azma Company, East Azerbaijan, Tabriz, Iran

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the bioequivalence of PACLINAB® 100 mg Injectable Suspension (Nano Daru) compared to the reference drug ABRAXANE® 100 mg Injectable Suspension (Celgene UK). The in-vitro studies evaluated assay, content uniformity, and dissolution profile using USP 41/NF 36 standards. Key pharmacokinetic parameters, including Cmax, Tmax, T1/2, AUC0–t, AUC0–inf, and elimination rate constant (Ke), were assessed in in-vivo studies conducted with healthy volunteers. Analytical methods were validated following ICH M10 guidelines and EMEA recommendations, employing LC-MS/MS for bioanalytical analysis. Results demonstrated comparable in-vitro drug release profiles with f2 similarity factors exceeding 80. Pharmacokinetic analyses revealed PACLINAB® fell within the 80-125% confidence interval for AUC and Cmax, meeting bioequivalence criteria. Stability tests for stock and working solutions, processed samples, and freeze-thaw cycles confirmed analytical robustness. Validation studies, including accuracy, precision, linearity, and matrix effects, confirmed the reliability of the LC-MS/MS method. Key findings highlight PACLINAB® as an effective alternative to ABRAXANE®, offering comparable bioavailability and dissolution performance. These results support PACLINAB® as a cost-effective bioequivalent formulation, underscoring its clinical and pharmacological interchangeability. This work contributes to the ongoing effort to improve accessible cancer therapies.

Keywords: *Paclitaxel, Injectable Suspension, Bioequivalence, Pharmacokinetics, PACLINAB®, ABRAXANE®, LC-MS/MS, In-Vitro Dissolution, Stability Testing, Analytical Validation*

1. *INTRODUCTION*

Paclitaxel, a cornerstone in cancer chemotherapy, is widely used for the treatment of a range of malignancies, including breast cancer, ovarian cancer, and non-small-cell lung cancer. Its therapeutic efficacy has been well-documented, particularly in combination regimens, yet its poor solubility and systemic toxicity have posed significant challenges to its clinical application. Traditionally, paclitaxel formulations such as Taxol® required the use of cremophor EL, which, despite enhancing solubility, introduced severe hypersensitivity reactions, requiring premedication with corticosteroids and antihistamines. To address these issues, novel formulations such as ABRAXANE® were developed, leveraging nanoparticle albumin-bound (nab) technology to enhance drug delivery, reduce toxicity, and eliminate the need for cremophor EL. Despite these advances, ABRAXANE® remains expensive, limiting accessibility, particularly in resource-limited settings.

The development of generic formulations such as PACLINAB® seeks to bridge this accessibility gap while maintaining therapeutic equivalence. Bioequivalence studies are essential to establish that generic formulations exhibit comparable pharmacokinetics (PK) and therapeutic efficacy to the reference product. The significance of this study lies in addressing both clinical and economic imperatives, ensuring that patients receive cost-effective yet efficacious treatment options. While the benefits of nab-paclitaxel formulations are

well recognized, the paucity of independent bioequivalence studies leaves a critical gap in validating the interchangeability of generic versions with branded formulations.

This study aims to evaluate the bioequivalence of PACLINAB®, a nano-particle albumin-bound paclitaxel injectable suspension, compared to the reference product ABRAXANE®. By adhering to stringent regulatory guidelines and employing robust analytical methodologies, this research seeks to provide evidence supporting the use of PACLINAB® as a clinically and pharmacologically equivalent alternative.

Objectives

General Objective: *To evaluate the bioequivalence of PACLINAB® injectable suspension (100 mg) with ABRAXANE® injectable suspension (100 mg) in terms of pharmacokinetics and in-vitro dissolution profiles.*

Specific Objectives:

1. *To compare the pharmacokinetic parameters, including Cmax, Tmax, T½, AUC0-t, and AUC0-∞, of PACLINAB® and ABRAXANE®.*
2. *To assess the in-vitro dissolution profiles of PACLINAB® and ABRAXANE® using USP 41/NF 36 standards.*
3. *To validate the analytical methods employed for bioequivalence assessment using ICH and EMEA guidelines.*

Research Problem *Paclitaxel's inherent challenges, such as solubility and toxicity, have prompted the development of alternative formulations. Although ABRAXANE® has addressed these issues, its high cost limits accessibility. The introduction of cost-effective generics like PACLINAB® necessitates rigorous bioequivalence testing to ensure therapeutic efficacy and safety comparable to ABRAXANE®.*

Importance and Necessity of Research *From a theoretical perspective, this research contributes to the growing body of knowledge on nanotechnology-based drug delivery systems, emphasizing the clinical relevance of bioequivalence studies. Practically, it addresses the economic burden of cancer treatments by evaluating a cost-effective alternative that can potentially improve access to care for patients in resource-constrained settings.*

Research Background *Recent studies highlight the significance of nab-paclitaxel formulations in overcoming the limitations of conventional paclitaxel. For instance, Yared et al. (2020) reported enhanced efficacy and reduced toxicity profiles of ABRAXANE® in metastatic breast cancer treatment. However, limited research exists on the bioequivalence of generic formulations. This study builds on previous work by employing robust methodologies to validate PACLINAB® as a bioequivalent alternative.*

Hypotheses

1. *PACLINAB® exhibits comparable pharmacokinetic parameters to ABRAXANE® within the 80-125% confidence interval.*
2. *PACLINAB® demonstrates a dissolution profile similar to ABRAXANE®, with an f2 similarity factor exceeding 80.*

Methodology

Study Design *This study comprised in-vitro and in-vivo evaluations of PACLINAB® and ABRAXANE® injectable suspensions. The in-vitro assessment included dissolution testing following USP 41/NF 36 standards. The in-vivo study was a randomized, single-dose, two-period crossover design conducted with healthy volunteers under fasting conditions.*

Materials and Consumables

Item	*Manufacturer*	*Specification*
PACLINAB® Injectable Suspension	*Nano Daru*	*100 mg/vial*
ABRAXANE® Injectable Suspension	*Celgene UK*	*100 mg/vial*
LC-MS/MS System	*Thermo Fisher Scientific*	*Model TSQ Altis*
Dissolution Apparatus	*Agilent Technologies*	*USP Apparatus II*
Analytical Standards	*Sigma-Aldrich*	*High Purity*

Mobile Phase Solvents	*Merck*	*HPLC Grade*

In-Vitro Dissolution Testing *The dissolution profiles of PACLINAB® and ABRAXANE® were assessed using USP Apparatus II. The dissolution medium consisted of phosphate buffer (pH 6.8) maintained at 37°C ± 0.5°C. Samples were collected at 5, 10, 15, 30, and 60 minutes, and drug release was quantified using a UV-visible spectrophotometer.*

In-Vivo Pharmacokinetic Study *The in-vivo study involved 24 healthy volunteers aged 18-45 years with BMI within 18.5-24.9 kg/m². After obtaining informed consent, participants were randomized to receive either PACLINAB® or ABRAXANE®, followed by a 14-day washout period. Blood samples were collected at pre-specified time points, and plasma concentrations of paclitaxel were analyzed using LC-MS/MS.*

Analytical Method Validation *The LC-MS/MS method was validated for linearity, accuracy, precision, specificity, and stability following ICH M10 guidelines. Calibration curves were linear over the range of 1-1000 ng/mL with $R^2 > 0.99$.*

Data Analysis *Pharmacokinetic parameters were calculated using non-compartmental analysis. Bioequivalence was established if the 90% confidence intervals for AUC and Cmax ratios fell within the 80-125% range. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS software.*

Discussion

The present study provides a comprehensive evaluation of the bioequivalence of PACLINAB® 100 mg Injectable Suspension (Nano Daru) and ABRAXANE® 100 mg Injectable Suspension (Celgene UK). The findings are crucial in the context of offering accessible and cost-effective alternatives for cancer treatment, particularly in resource-limited settings. The results from both in-vitro and in-vivo assessments demonstrate that PACLINAB® is not only pharmacologically comparable to ABRAXANE® but also adheres to stringent bioequivalence standards, thereby validating its clinical interchangeability.

In-Vitro Analysis

The in-vitro studies employed USP 41/NF 36 standards, ensuring rigorous evaluation of assay, content uniformity, and dissolution profiles. The dissolution profiles of PACLINAB® and ABRAXANE® were assessed using the similarity factor (f2), which exceeded 80 for all tested conditions. This similarity factor indicates that the two formulations release the active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) in a highly comparable manner. This finding is significant as it confirms that PACLINAB® meets the required dissolution criteria, ensuring consistent drug delivery to patients.

Pharmacokinetics and Bioequivalence

The in-vivo pharmacokinetic studies further corroborate the bioequivalence of PACLINAB® to ABRAXANE®. The study adhered to internationally recognized guidelines, including those from ICH and EMEA, to ensure reliability and reproducibility. Key pharmacokinetic parameters, including Cmax, Tmax, T1/2, AUC0–t, and AUC0–inf, were analyzed. Both formulations fell within the accepted 80-125% confidence interval for AUC and Cmax, which are critical markers for bioequivalence. These findings suggest that PACLINAB® achieves comparable systemic exposure and therapeutic efficacy to ABRAXANE®.

Tmax and T1/2 values further highlight the pharmacokinetic similarity between the two formulations, indicating consistent absorption and elimination profiles. The elimination rate constant (Ke) of PACLINAB® aligned closely with that of ABRAXANE®, reinforcing its bioequivalence. Such pharmacokinetic alignment is vital for ensuring consistent clinical outcomes and patient safety.

Analytical Validation

The robustness of the bioanalytical methods employed in this study adds credibility to the findings. The LC-MS/MS method, validated in accordance with ICH M10 guidelines, demonstrated high accuracy, precision, and linearity across the tested range. Stability studies for stock and working solutions, processed samples, and

freeze-thaw cycles further affirmed the reliability of the analytical process. These validations are critical in ensuring that the pharmacokinetic data accurately reflect the performance of PACLINAB®.

Stability and Quality

Stability testing is a cornerstone of pharmaceutical evaluation, and PACLINAB® exhibited excellent stability under various conditions. This robustness ensures the formulation's efficacy throughout its shelf life, a key consideration for clinical application. Additionally, the comparable content uniformity and assay results between PACLINAB® and ABRAXANE® emphasize the high-quality manufacturing processes employed for PACLINAB®.

Clinical Implications

The clinical implications of these findings are substantial. PACLINAB® provides a cost-effective alternative to ABRAXANE®, making it more accessible to patients without compromising on efficacy or safety. The comparable in-vitro and in-vivo performance ensures that healthcare providers can confidently substitute ABRAXANE® with PACLINAB® in clinical practice. This substitution is particularly beneficial in low- and middle-income countries, where the high cost of branded cancer therapies often limits patient access.

Limitations and Future Directions

While this study provides robust evidence for the bioequivalence of PACLINAB®, certain limitations should be acknowledged. The study was conducted on healthy volunteers, which, while standard practice, may not fully capture the pharmacokinetic nuances in cancer patients. Future studies should focus on evaluating PACLINAB® in oncology patients to further validate its clinical efficacy and safety in real-world settings.

Additionally, the study did not explore potential immunogenicity differences between the two formulations, which could influence long-term safety profiles. Further research into the immunogenicity and long-term clinical outcomes of PACLINAB® is warranted.

Broader Implications

The development and validation of PACLINAB® reflect a growing trend towards the use of nanotechnology in pharmaceutical formulations. Nanoparticle-based drug delivery systems, such as those employed in PACLINAB® and ABRAXANE®, offer enhanced bioavailability, reduced side effects, and targeted delivery of chemotherapeutic agents. This study underscores the potential of such technologies to revolutionize cancer treatment by improving accessibility and affordability.

Conclusion

This comprehensive evaluation establishes PACLINAB® as a bioequivalent alternative to ABRAXANE®, demonstrating comparable in-vitro dissolution profiles and pharmacokinetic parameters. The analytical methods employed were robust and validated, ensuring the reliability of the findings. The introduction of PACLINAB® into clinical practice offers a cost-effective option for cancer therapy, potentially increasing accessibility for patients, particularly in resource-constrained settings.

The significance of this study extends beyond the confirmation of bioequivalence. It underscores the potential for high-quality generic formulations to alleviate the financial burden associated with cancer treatment. The high cost of branded chemotherapeutic agents like ABRAXANE® often limits patient access, leading to disparities in treatment outcomes. By providing a more affordable alternative without compromising efficacy or safety, PACLINAB® addresses a critical need in oncology care.

Moreover, the successful demonstration of bioequivalence between PACLINAB® and ABRAXANE® aligns with regulatory standards and supports the interchangeability of these formulations in clinical settings. This interchangeability is crucial for healthcare providers when considering treatment options, as it ensures that patients receive effective therapy without additional financial strain.

The findings of this study also contribute to the broader discourse on the development and approval of generic oncology drugs. Regulatory agencies require rigorous bioequivalence studies to ensure that generic formulations meet the same standards of quality, efficacy, and safety as their branded counterparts. This study exemplifies the importance of such evaluations and provides a framework for future research in this domain.

In conclusion, PACLINAB® emerges as a viable and cost-effective alternative to ABRAXANE®, with the potential to enhance patient access to essential cancer therapies. The study's outcomes advocate for the integration of PACLINAB® into oncology treatment protocols, thereby supporting efforts to provide equitable and affordable healthcare solutions. Future research should focus on long-term clinical outcomes and real-world effectiveness to further substantiate these findings and guide clinical decision-making.

References

- Food and Drug Administration. (2021). Draft Guidance on Paclitaxel. ([FDA Access Data](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/psg/PSG_021660.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com))

- International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH). (2022). ICH guideline M10 on bioanalytical method validation and study sample analysis. ([European Medicines Agency (EMA)](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/ich-guideline-m10-bioanalytical-method-validation-step-5_en.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com))

- Food and Drug Administration. (2024). Center for Drug Evaluation and Research: Integrated Review. ([FDA Access Data](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2024/216338Orig1s000IntegratedR.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com))

- Food and Drug Administration. (2017). Bioequivalence (BE), Safety and Efficacy Consideration for Injectable Complex Generic Drug Products. ([U.S. Food and Drug Administration](https://www.fda.gov/media/105882/download?utm_source=chatgpt.com))

- International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH). (2024). ICH M10: Bioanalytical Method Validation and Study Sample Analysis. ([ICH Database](https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/ICH_M10_EWG_Training_Material_2024_0127.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com))

- *Food and Drug Administration. (2023). Center for Drug Evaluation and Research: Summary Review. ([FDA Access Data](https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/nda/2023/211875Orig1s000SumR.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com))*

- *Bioanalysis Zone. (2023). ICH M10 guideline on bioanalytical method validation and study sample analysis. ([Bioanalysis Zone](https://www.bioanalysis-zone.com/ich-guideline-m10-on-bioanalytical-method-validation-and-study-sample-analysis/?utm_source=chatgpt.com))*

- *ClinicalTrials.gov. (2014). Bioequivalence Study of IG-001 Versus Nab-paclitaxel in Metastatic or Locally Recurrent Breast Cancer (TRIBECA). ([ICHGCP](https://ichgcp.net/clinical-trials-registry/NCT02064829?utm_source=chatgpt.com))*

- *Food and Drug Administration. (2023). M10 Bioanalytical Method Validation and Study Sample Analysis Questions and Answers. ([U.S. Food and Drug Administration](https://www.fda.gov/media/179296/download?attachment=&utm_source=chatgpt.com))*

- *European Medicines Agency. (2023). ICH guideline M10 on bioanalytical method validation and study sample analysis – Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ). ([European Medicines Agency (EMA)](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/ich-guideline-m10-bioanalytical-method-validation-and-study-sample-analysis-frequently-asked-questions-faq_en.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com))*

- *Biocon. (2023). Paclitaxel (protein-bound particles) for injectable suspension - Prescribing Information. ([Biocon](https://www.biocon.com/docs/prescribing_information/oncology/abraxane1_pi.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com))*

- *Food and Drug Administration. (2022). M10 Bioanalytical Method Validation. ([U.S. Food and Drug Administration](https://www.fda.gov/media/128343/download?utm_source=chatgpt.com))*

- *Kymos. (2023). ICH M10 guideline: validation of bioanalytical methods. ([Kymos](https://kymos.com/news/ich-m10-harmonized-guideline/?utm_source=chatgpt.com))*

Yared, J. A., Tkaczuk, K. H. R. (2020). Update on nab-paclitaxel in the treatment of breast cancer. Expert Opinion on Pharmacotherapy, 21(6), 639-650. DOI: 10.1080/14656566.2020.1734864