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Abstract

The objective of the study was to establish primary cultured porcine brain microvessel endothelial cells (PBMEC) as an in vitro model to predict the blood-brain barrier (BBB) permeability in vivo. The intercellular tight junction formation of PBMEC was examined by electron microscopy and measured by Transendothelial Electrical Resistance (TEER). The mRNA expression of several BBB transporters in PBMEC was determined by RT-PCR analysis. The in vitro permeability of 16 structurally diverse compounds, representing a range of passive diffusion and transporter-mediated mechanisms of brain penetration, was determined in PBMEC. Except for the perfusion flow rate marker diazepam, the BBB permeability of these compounds was determined either in our laboratory or reported in literature using in situ brain perfusion technique in rats. Results in the present study showed that PBMEC had a high endothelium homogeneity, an mRNA expression of several BBB transporters, and high TEER values. Culturing with rat astrocyte-conditioned medium increased the TEER of PBMEC, but had no effect on the permeability of sucrose, a paracellular diffusion marker. The PBMEC permeability of lipophilic compounds measured under stirred conditions was greatly increased compared to measured under unstirred conditions. The PBMEC permeability of the 15 test compounds, determined under the optimized study conditions, correlated with the in situ BBB permeability with an r² of 0.60. Removal of the three system L substrates increased the r² to 0.89. In conclusion, the present PBMEC model may be used to predict or rank the in vivo BBB permeability of new chemical entities (NCEs) in a drug discovery setting.
**Introduction**

One major hurdle of successful central nervous system (CNS) drug delivery is to penetrate the blood-brain barrier (BBB) to reach the therapeutic targets. The BBB is a continuous layer of endothelial cells that are connected to each other through tight junctions. In contrast to the endothelial cells of peripheral blood vessels, the brain microvessel endothelial cells are characterized by unique intercellular tight junctions, the absence of fenestrations, and minimal pinocytic activity. The BBB represents a physiological barrier that efficiently restricts free paracellular passage of most substances from the blood to the brain extracellular environment. Furthermore, the brain microvessel endothelial cells possess a variety of metabolic enzyme systems, which further limit the brain entry of compounds (Pardridge 1983). Finally, a complex of membrane-bound transport systems, including active efflux transporters, such as P-glycoprotein (Pgp) (Schinkel et al. 1996; Miller et al. 2000) and Multidrug Resistance-Associated Protein (MRP) (Miller et al. 2000; Zhang et al. 2000), and active uptake transporters such as the system L amino acid transporter (LAT) (Pardridge 1983; Smith 1991), further regulates brain penetration.

Pharmaceutical companies have been actively pursuing various methods to accurately predict the brain penetration of new chemical entities (NCEs) at an early stage of drug discovery. Currently, several approaches are available for assessing brain penetration of NCEs, but they often pose a compromise between high throughput with low predictive potential and low throughput with high predictive potential. Passive diffusion permeability of NCEs may be predicted by high-throughput in silico modeling approaches based on the physical-chemical parameters (Liu et al. 2004). However, current in silico models do not account for metabolism, transporter-mediated processes, or any other drug-membrane or drug-protein interactions that
may affect the ability of a drug to cross the BBB. With in vivo approaches (i.e. equilibrium brain-to-plasma distribution ratios (logBB) and BBB permeability-surface area product (logPS)) (Oldendorf 1971; Smith 1996), high-throughput models that can accommodate screening of a large number of compounds in early discovery are difficult to develop. Thus, a well-characterized in vitro BBB cell model, which has the potential to account for the complex molecular interactions underlying BBB permeability and function as a moderate throughput screening tool for NCEs would be highly useful in the discovery process.

A range of in vitro BBB cell models, including primary cultured/low passage brain microvessel endothelial cells and immortalized brain microvessel endothelial cell lines have been generated by various academic laboratories. However, none of these models have been established as a widely used BBB permeability screen within the pharmaceutical industry. In recent years, the time and resource-sparing advantages have made immortalized BBB cell models such as conditionally immortalized rat brain microvessel endothelial cells (TR-BBB) (Terasaki and Hosoya 2001) attractive options. However, characterizations of immortalized BBB cell lines (Terasaki and Hosoya 2001; Reichel et al. 2002) and initial investigations in our laboratory with TR-BBB cells (data not shown) suggest that immortalized cell cultures generally fail to form a sufficiently tight barrier for use in permeability studies. Primary cultured bovine brain microvessel endothelial cells (BBMEC), first developed by Bowman et al. (1983) and subsequently modified in Borchardt’s laboratory (Audus and Borchardt 1986a; Audus and Borchardt 1986b; Miller et al. 1992), have been the most extensively investigated in vitro BBB model. Primary cultures of BBMEC phenotypically maintain many in vivo BBB characteristics such as tight junction formation and expression of active transporter proteins and metabolic enzymes. However, despite observation of a strong qualitative correlation between in vitro
BBMEC transcellular permeability and logBB (Guillot et al. 1993; Saheki et al. 1994; Cecchelli et al. 1999), a solid quantitative correlation derived from a structurally diverse set of compounds, representing passive and active brain penetration, is still lacking. Beginning in 1998, several groups have assessed the use of primary porcine brain microvessel endothelial cells (PBMEC) for in vitro permeability studies (Franke et al. 2000; Jeliazkova-Mecheva and Bobilya 2003; Torok et al. 2003). It has been suggested that the PBMEC model may offer a more restrictive paracellular pathway as compared with the BBMEC model (Franke et al. 2000). However, literature data regarding the tightness of cellular junctions of BBMEC or PBMEC models have been highly variable due to differences in cell isolation procedures, cell culture and experimental conditions among laboratories (Fischer et al. 2000; Jeliazkova-Mecheva and Bobilya 2003; Torok et al. 2003).

The purposes of the current study were to develop a primary cultured PBMEC model under optimized study conditions and to evaluate its use as a moderate to high throughput screening tool to predict in vivo BBB transport of structurally diverse compounds with passive and/or active brain penetration. To achieve this goal, we first developed a PBMEC culture and evaluated how well the PBMEC retain the characteristics of in vivo BBB in terms of endothelial origin, expression of BBB transporters, and tight-junction formation. Following the initial characterization, we evaluated a number of culture and experimental variables to optimize study conditions. Lastly, the ability of the PBMEC model to predict in vivo BBB penetration was evaluated by comparing the trans-endothelial permeability measured in the PBMEC model with the BBB penetration determined by in situ brain perfusion for a set of 16 structurally diverse compounds, representing a range of passive diffusion and transporter-mediated mechanisms of brain penetration.
Materials and Methods

Materials and reagents

\[^{14}\text{C}^-\text{sucrose}\] (600 mCi/mm), \[^{14}\text{C}^-\text{diazepam}\] (55 mCi/mm), and \[^{3}\text{H}^-\text{dopamine}\] (9 Ci/mm) were obtained from Amersham Biosciences (Buckinghamshire, UK). \[^{3}\text{H}^-\text{methotraxate}\] (16.9 Ci/mm), \[^{14}\text{C}^-\text{phenytoin}\] (53.1 mCi/mm), \[^{14}\text{C}^-\text{caffeine}\] (53 mCi/mm), \[^{3}\text{H}^-\text{vinblastine}\] (5.9 Ci/mm), \[^{3}\text{H}^-\text{metoprolol}\] (60.4 Ci/mm), and \[^{3}\text{H}^-\text{theophylline}\] (13.3 Ci/mm) were purchased from Moravek Biochemicals (Brea, CA). \[^{3}\text{H}^-\text{Mannitol}\] (17 mCi/mm) and \[^{3}\text{H}^-\text{taurocholic\ acid}\] (2 Ci/mm) were purchased from PerkinElmer Life and Analytical Sciences (Boston, MA). \[^{3}\text{H}^-\text{quinidine}\] (20 Ci/mm), \[^{3}\text{H}^-\text{testosterone}\] (90 Ci/mm), \[^{3}\text{H}^-\text{leucine}\] (60 Ci/mm), and \[^{3}\text{H}^-\text{phenylalanine}\] (80 Ci/mm) were obtained from American Radiolabeled Chemicals Inc. (St. Louis, MO). \[^{3}\text{H}^-\text{gabapentin}\] (44.15 Ci/mm) was synthesized in-house.

Minimum Essential Medium (MEM), Ham’s F-12 medium, Dulbecco’s modified Eagle’s Medium (DMEM) with low glucose, and rat tail collagen were purchased from Fisher Scientific (St. Louis, MO). Fibronectin and equine serum were purchased from Sigma Chemical Company (St. Louis, MO). Dispase and collagenase/dispase were obtained from Roche Diagnostics (Indianapolis, IN). Tissue culture Transwell™ inserts (24 mm diameter, 0.4 µm pore size, Costar Corp.) were obtained from VWR (Chicago, IL). Side-by-side horizontal diffusion chambers, chamber clamps, and H1 stirrer were purchased from PermeGear, Inc. (Bethlehem, PA).
Selection of compounds for method development

Sixteen structurally diverse compounds were selected for the evaluation of the present PBMEC model. As shown in Table 1, the compounds chosen are of diverse chemical classes, represent both passive diffusion and carrier-mediated BBB uptake or efflux processes (Hargreaves and Pardridge 1988; Drion et al. 1996; Kitazawa et al. 1998; Kusuhara et al., 1997; Martel et al., 1996; McCall et al., 1982; Miller et al. 2000; Potschka and Loscher 2001; Su et al., 1995). In addition, the BBB permeability of these compounds determined by in situ brain perfusion ranged from low to high (Murakami et al. 2000; Liu et al. 2004). The logPS of 8 test compounds (taurocholic acid, methotrexate, theophylline, phenytoin, caffeine, dopamine, phenylalanine, and testosterone) were reported by Liu et al. (Liu et al. 2004). The logPS of sucrose, mannitol, vinblastine, and quinidine were reported by Murakami et al. (Murakami et al. 2000), and the logPS of gabapentin, leucine, and metoprolol were determined in our laboratory. The highly permeable compound diazepam was used as the regional flow rate marker in brain perfusion studies (Liu et al. 2004); therefore, logPS value of diazepam was not calculable.

Isolation of Porcine Brain Microvessel Enodothelial Cells (PBMEC)

PBMEC were isolated from fresh porcine brains using a combination of enzyme digestion and ultra-centrifugation approaches as previously described (Miller et al. 1992) with minor modifications. Briefly, fresh porcine brains were obtained from a local slaughterhouse. The surface vessels and meninges of the brains were removed under aseptic conditions. The gray matter was collected by aspiration and then homogenized by sequential passing of the brain materials through a 1000 µm, then a 710 µm screen. The filtrate was digested with 12.5% (wt/vol) dispase for three hours followed by centrifugation at 1570×g for ten minutes. The pellet
was resuspended in 13% (wt/vol) dextran followed by a centrifugation at 9170 × g for ten minutes. After centrifugation, the supernatant was discarded and the dark red pellet was collected and subjected to further enzyme digestion in 0.52% (wt/vol) collagenase/dispase for 3.5 hours. Following the incubation, the endothelial cells were separated from cellular debris and red blood cells by Percoll gradient centrifugation at 1700 × g for ten minutes. The average yield of PBMEC was approximately 10 x 10^6 cells/brain. For cell preservation, cells were frozen in MEM:F12 media supplemented with 10% DMSO, 20% horse serum, 50 μg/ml gentamicin, 2.5 μg/ml amphotericin B, and 100 μg/ml heparin and stored in liquid nitrogen.

**Isolation of rat astrocytes**

Rat astrocytes were isolated from the cerebral cortex of newborn pups (1-2 day old) according to the method of McCarthy and de Vellis (McCarthy and de Vellis 1980). Briefly, the cortices, free of meninges, were dissected in Hanks’ balanced salt solution (Ca²⁺ and Mg²⁺-free) and incubated in 0.125% trypsin at 37°C for ten min followed by three washes with DMEM medium supplemented with 10% FBS, 1 U/ml penicillin and 1 mg/ml streptomycin. After the washing, cells were resuspended in the same medium and filtered through a nylon mesh with a pore size of 100 μm. Filtered cells were seeded on poly-D-lysine-coated culture flasks at a density of 1.5 x 10^5 cells/cm². On culture day nine, the oligodendrocytes and microglia were removed from the astrocyte cultures by vigorous shaking at a speed of 250 rpm at 37°C overnight. Astrocytes were seeded at a density of 2.4 x 10^5 cells/cm² in poly-D-lysine coated culture flasks for collection of astrocyte-conditioned medium (ACM). ACM was collected after 48 hr incubation, and was sterile-filtered. The ACM was used either immediately or stored at –20°C for future use.
Culture of cells

The freshly isolated or cryopreserved PBMEC cells were seeded (7.5 x 10^4 cells/cm^2) on collagen-coated, fibronectin-treated polycarbonate Transwell™ membranes and cultured in MEM:F12 media supplemented with 10% horse serum, 50 µg/ml gentamicin, 2.5 µg/ml amphotericin B, and 100 µg/ml heparin. For PBMEC culture in the absence of ACM, the MEM:F12 growth media was added to the top and bottom wells, and was renewed every other day until the cells reached confluence (typically five to six days). For PBMEC culture with ACM, the MEM:F12 growth medium from the bottom well of the Transwell plates was replaced by the ACM once the PBMEC reach near-confluence around day 4 in culture. Fresh MEM:F12 growth medium for PBMEC was added to the top well of the Transwell plates. The PBMEC cells were then incubated for another two to four days in the humidified 37°C incubator with 5% CO₂ supply before beginning the permeability studies.

Electron Microscopy for PBMEC

PBMEC monolayers grown in collagen-coated, fibronectin-treated Transwell™ inserts were fixed with 2% (wt/vol) paraformaldehyde and 2.5% (vol/vol) glutaraldehyde in 0.1 M sodium cacodylate (pH 7.4) containing 5% (wt/vol) sucrose. The cell monolayers were then post-fixed in 0.1M sodium cacodylate buffer containing 1% (wt/vol) osmium tetroxide, 0.5% (wt/vol) potassium ferricyanide, and 5% (wt/vol) sucrose for 1 h and embedded. The cells were visualized through an FEI-Philips CM100 BioTwin electron microscope operated at 60 kV. Imaging was performed with a Kodak 4.2i digital camera from Advanced Microscopy Techniques, Inc. (Danvers, MA).
Histocytochemistry for PBMEC

PBMEC grown on LabTek glass chambered slides (Nalge Nunc International Corp., Naperville, IL) were fixed in ice-cold 80% methanol for 20 minutes, and air-dried for 1 hour. Non-specific staining was blocked by incubation with serum-free protein blocker (DakoCytomation, Carpinteria, CA) for 30 minutes. The cells were first incubated with primary antibodies (1:100 dilution) of either rabbit polyclonal anti-von Willebrand Factor (Factor VIII) (DakoCytomation, Carpinteria, CA) or normal rabbit IgG as negative controls for one hour at room temperature. Cells were then incubated with a secondary anti-rabbit biotinylated antibody (Vector Laboratories, Burlingame, CA) for another 45 minutes, followed by application of streptavidin-Alexa Fluor 488 (Molecular Probes, Eugene, OR) for 35 minutes. Cells were counterstained with the nuclear dye DAPI (Molecular Probes, Eugene, OR) for ten minutes, and then mounted with ProLong mounting media (Molecular Probes, Eugene, OR). Cell staining was visualized using a Zeiss Axiovert 200 fluorescent microscope equipped with fluorescent filters for FITC and DAPI visualization. Images for the two fluorescent channels were collected separately and combined using the Axiovision software package (Zeiss, Thornwood, NY).

Reverse Transcription-Polymerase Chain Reaction (RT-PCR) in PBMEC

The mRNA expression of various transporters was determined by RT-PCR using glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase (GAPDH) as an internal control. The primers used for each gene are listed in Table 2. Total RNA from confluent PBMEC monolayers was isolated using an RNeasy Mini Kit (QIAGEN, Valencia, CA) according to manufacturer’s instructions. RT-PCR was accomplished by using “SuperScript™ One-Step RT-PCR with Platinum® Taq”
(Invitrogen, Carlsbad, California). The reaction of RT was carried out at 50°C for 30 min. For all transporters and the reference gene GAPDH, identical thermal cycling conditions for PCR were used: 2 minutes at 94°C to denature followed by 35 cycles of 94°C for 15 seconds, 55°C for 30 seconds, and 68°C for 45 seconds. The products (20 µl) from the PCR amplification were separated on 2% agarose gel and stained with ethidium bromide to check product integrity. The identity of the selected positive RT-PCR products was verified with sequence analysis.

Transendothelial Electrical Resistance (TEER) Measurement with PBMEC

The TEER was used as a measure of tight junction formation by the PBMEC monolayers. The TEER value (Ω) was determined using an EndOhm Chamber connected to an EVOM resistance meter (World Precision Instruments, Inc. Sarasota, FL), and reported as Ω•cm² after correcting for the surface area of the membrane (4.5 cm²). The EndOhm system provided a more reproducible TEER measurement as compared with the traditional “chopstick” electrode system. The variation of resistance measured from the same membrane insert was approximately 3 and 30 Ω•cm² using the EndOhm and “chopstick” systems, respectively (data not shown). The TEER value of a blank membrane was subtracted from the apparent TEER values of membranes with cells to obtain the effective TEER value of the PBMEC monolayer. In order to use cells with ideal tight junction formation, TEER values were monitored from day 4 to day 13 for various PBMEC cultures. No permeability studies were performed when the TEER values were below 300 Ω•cm².
In vitro Permeability Studies in PBMEC

The in vitro permeability studies in PBMEC were performed as described by Mark and Miller (Mark and Miller 1999) with minor modifications. Confluent PBMEC cells were pre-incubated with assay buffer (122 mM NaCl, 25 mM Na₂CO₃, 10 mM D-glucose, 3 mM KCl, 1.2 mM MgSO₄·7H₂O, 0.4 mM K₂HPO₄, 1.4 mM CaCl₂, 10 mM HEPES, pH 7.4) for 30 min at 37°C. After pre-incubation, the filter membranes, with or without a PBMEC monolayer, were cut off from the Transwell inserts and placed between donor and receiver chambers in a side-by-side diffusion chamber. At time 0, 3 ml of assay buffer containing ¹⁴C-radiolabeled sucrose (1 µCi/ml) as a paracellular diffusion marker and ³H-radiolabeled test compounds (0.2 µCi/ml) were added into the donor chamber facing the apical side of the cell monolayer. When using ¹⁴C-caffeine, ¹⁴C-phenytoin, or ¹⁴C-diazepam as test compounds, ³H-mannitol was used as the paracellular diffusion marker instead. The temperature of the medium in the donor and receiver chambers was maintained at 37°C by a continuous flow of water generated from a temperature-regulating circulating bath (Lauda E100, Brinkmann Instruments Inc., Westbury, NY). At 0, 5, 10, 20, and 40 minutes after adding test compound, 10 µl and 3 ml samples were taken from donor and receiver chambers, respectively. For the substrates of efflux transporters, including vinblastine, quinidine, and methotrexate, the last sample was taken at 60 min. The receiver chamber was immediately replaced with 3 ml of blank assay buffer after removal of each sample. The experiment was performed at 37°C under either unstirred or well-stirred (600 rpm) conditions. Radioactivity levels of the samples collected from the donor (10 µl) and receiver (50 µl) chambers were determined using a liquid scintillation counter (Packard, Tri-Carb).
The apparent *in vitro* permeability coefficient of a compound ($P_{\text{app}}$) was obtained from the slope of the linear plot of compound flux into the receiver chamber over time according to the following equation:

$$P_{\text{app}} = \frac{\text{Flux}}{(C_{D,t} \times A)} = \frac{(M_{R,t}/t)}{(C_{D,t} \times A)}$$

where $C_{D,t}$ is the concentration of the compound in the donor chamber at time $t$; $M_{R,t}$ is the amount of compound in the receiver chamber at time $t$; and $A$ is the surface area of the membrane exposed between the side-by-side chamber (0.636 cm$^2$).

The effective permeability of a compound ($P_e$) was determined according to the following equation:

$$\frac{1}{P_e} = \frac{1}{P_{\text{app}}} - \frac{1}{P_m}$$

where $P_m$ is the permeability of the compound across a collagen-coated, fibronectin-treated membrane without cells.

Because both $P_{\text{app}}$ and $P_m$ followed a normal distribution for the tested compounds, the standard error (SE) of the $P_e$ was approximated using the Delta method as follows (Casella and Berger 1990):

$$SE_e^2 = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left[ \left( \frac{\bar{P}_m^2}{(\bar{P}_m - \bar{P}_{\text{app},i})^2} \right)^2 SE_{P_{\text{app},i}}^2 + \left( \frac{\bar{P}_m^2}{(\bar{P}_m - \bar{P}_{\text{app},i})^2} \right)^2 SE_{P_m,i}^2 \right]$$

where $d$ equals the number of days on which experiments were conducted to determine $P_{\text{app}}$ and $P_m$.

**In Situ** Rat Brain Perfusion and Data Analysis

The *in vivo* blood-to-brain influx permeability for gabapentin, leucine, and metoprolol was determined in our laboratory using the *in situ* rat brain perfusion technique reported by...
Smith et al. (Smith 1996). Briefly, male Sprague-Dawley rats (300-350 g, Charles River Breeding Laboratories, Portage, MI) were anesthetized intramuscularly with ketamine (80 mg/ml) and xylazine (12 mg/ml) at a dose of 0.1 ml/100g BW. After exposure of the right carotid artery, the external carotid artery and pterygopalatine artery were ligated. The right common carotid artery was cannulated with a PE50 tubing filled with sodium heparin saline (100 IU/ml). After the cannula was in place, the ventricle of the heart was severed and the rats were perfused with Krebs Ringer perfusion fluid (2.4 mM NaH₂PO₄, 4.2 mM KCl, 24 mM NaHCO₃, 128 mM NaCl, 1.5 mM CaCl₂, 0.9 mM MgSO₄) for 10 to 40 seconds at a rate of 10 ml/min using a perfusion pump. ³H-labeled gabapentin, leucine, or metoprolol was added to the oxygenated and bicarbonate-buffered perfusate to yield a final perfusion concentration of 0.3-0.5 µCi/ml for each compound. The perfusion was terminated by stopping the pump. The rats were decapitated, and brains were immediately excised. The excised brains were stored at -20°C until analysis. For the analysis of radioactivity in the brain cortex, the tissues were homogenized in 3 volumes (w/v) of water. An aliquot of brain homogenate (0.1 ml) were digested at 50°C overnight in 1 ml of tissue solubilizer. After cooling, the samples were prepared for scintillation counting by addition of 15 ml of scintillation cocktail. To determine the concentration of compound in the perfusion fluid, an aliquot of 20 µl of perfusion fluid was placed in a scintillation vial containing 15 ml of scintillation cocktail. The radioactivity in the brain or perfusion fluid samples was measured with a liquid scintillation counter (Packard, Tri-Carb).

The brain uptake constant ($K_{in}$) was calculated from the following equation:

$$A_{br}/C_{pf}=K_{in}*T+V_v$$
where \( A_{br} \) is the brain tissue concentration (dpm/g); \( C_{pf} \) is the perfusion fluid concentration (dpm/ml); \( T \) is the perfusion time (s); and \( V_v \) is the brain vascular volume (ml/g). \( K_{in} \) was estimated from the slope of the initial linear portion of \( A_{br}/C_{pf} \) versus \( T \) plot.

The permeability surface product (PS) (\( \mu l/s/g \)) was calculated from the following equation:

\[
PS = -F \times \ln(1 - K_{in}/F)
\]

where \( F \) is the regional flow rate estimated from diazepam \( K_{in} \) data (70 \( \mu l/s/g \)) (Liu et al. 2004).

**Results**

**Morphology of the PBMEC Monolayer**

Porcine brain microvessel endothelial cells grown on collagen-coated, fibronectin-treated culture dishes retained the characteristic morphology of capillary endothelial cells (Fig. 1a-1c). On day 2 in culture, the cells preferentially grew in clusters (Fig. 1a). They showed cobblestone-shaped morphology on day 4 in culture (Fig 1b). When the cells reached confluence on day 6 (Fig. 1c), PBMEC formed a continuous monolayer with an elongated, spindle-shaped morphology, which is typical for differentiated capillary endothelial cells. After another 3-4 days in culture, post-confluent cells developed multiple layers with some contaminated astrocytes and fibroblasts (data not shown).

**Immunocytochemical Characterization of PBMEC**

The PBMEC demonstrated extensive positive immunostaining for Factor VIII, an endothelial cell marker, predominantly in the cytoplasm with a characteristic granular and diffused staining pattern (Fig. 2a). There was no fluorescent staining in the negative control.
where primary anti-rabbit IgG was applied instead of anti-Factor VIII antibody (Fig. 2b). Electron microscopic examination of confluent PBMEC showed the cells grew into a confluent monolayer on top of the collagen/fibronectin coated Transwell inserts with apparent intercellular tight junction formation (Fig. 3a-3d, indicated by arrows). The cells were linked to each other either by an overlapping membrane (Fig. 3a-3b) or direct contact (Fig. 3c-3d). Regardless of the type of connection, the tight junctions were consistently localized towards the apical side of the cell membranes (Fig. 3a-3d, indicated by arrows). Furthermore, the in vitro cultured PBMEC resembled in vivo BMECs in that there were no fenestrations, few pinocytotic vesicles, and an abundance of mitochondria.

**Transporter Expression in PBMEC**

As shown in Figure 4, positive RT-PCR products of corresponding size were detected in the PBMEC for a tight junction-associated protein, specifically ZO-1, several BBB uptake transporters, including the glucose transporter 1 (GLUT1), system L amino acids transporters 1 and 2 (LAT1 and LAT2), and efflux transporters including P-gp, MRP1, MRP4, MRP5, and breast cancer resistant protein (BCRP). MRP2 was not detected in current study. The sequence for the RT-PCR product of BCRP, of which the primers were designed based on porcine sequence, showed 99% homology to their porcine gene. The sequence for the RT-PCR product of MRP4, of which the primers were designed based on human and rodent MRP4 conservative regions, showed 89% and 84% identity to their corresponding human and rodent genes, respectively.
TEER of PBMEC monolayer

Prior to each transendothelial permeability study, the “tightness” of the PBMEC monolayer was assessed by TEER measurement. Figure 5 demonstrates the change of TEER values with duration of culture. The TEER values were slightly varied from one primary culture to another. The TEER values typically ranged from 300 to 550 Ω•cm^2 on day 5 to day 9 post-seeding. After 9 days in culture, the TEER values started to decline.

TEER values obtained from PBMEC cultured with ACM of one representative study are shown in Figure 6. The results showed that culture with ACM significantly enhanced the TEER values of PBMEC by 10 – 25% on culture days 6 through 9, post-seeding.

Permeability Measurement in PBMEC

Sucrose permeability, a measure of paracellular flux, was compared between PBMEC cultured in the presence and absence of ACM. Although culture with ACM enhanced the TEER values of PBMEC (Fig. 6), it had no effect on the P_e of the paracellular marker, sucrose (data not shown).

To test the influence of stirred versus unstirred conditions on compound permeability in the PBMEC cultures, the permeability of eight test compounds, including sucrose as a paracellular marker, was examined under both conditions. As shown in Table 3, stirring in both donor and receiver chambers (600 rpm) increased the in vitro permeability of the medium and high permeability compounds (i.e., caffeine, metoprolol, testosterone, and diazepam) but had little effect on the low permeability compounds (sucrose, mannitol, taurocholic acid, and vinblastine). The dynamic range (i.e. ratio of diazepam P_e to sucrose P_e) in this PBMEC model was enhanced from 34.8 under unstirred conditions to 62.8 under stirred conditions.
To assess the possibility of using cryopreserved PBMEC cultures for determination of the \textit{in vitro} permeability of compounds, the average logPe values for 16 compounds determined in fresh and frozen cells under stirred conditions were statistically compared for similarity. As shown in Figure 7, the average logPe had strong agreement between fresh and cryopreserved cell preparations. Using the Total Deviation Index (TDI) (Lin, 2000), the average logPe values for 95\% of the measured compounds from fresh and frozen cell preparations fall within 0.16 log units of each other.

In the subsequent permeability studies, the logPe of the 16 compounds was determined in PBMEC solo-culture under stirred conditions using both fresh and cryopreserved cells.

\textit{In vitro-to-in situ correlation}

Table 4 summarizes the \textit{in vitro} permeability of the 16 selected compounds as determined by the PBMEC model. The PBMEC cultures demonstrated a large dynamic range, with Pe values ranging from 92 to 3702 x10^{-6} \text{ cm/second} for the 16 compounds. In addition, the rank order of the PBMEC permeability was comparable with that of the \textit{in situ} BBB penetration for the data set except for the three LAT substrates (leucine, gabapentin, and phenylalanine), which were underestimated by the \textit{in vitro} PBMEC. The compounds that were highly permeable \textit{in situ}, including diazepam and testosterone, demonstrated a high permeability in the PBMEC model. The compounds with moderate permeability \textit{in situ} (theophylline, quinidine, metoprolol, phenytoin, dopamine, and caffeine) were found to have a moderate permeability in PBMEC. Lastly, a similar trend emerged for the low permeability compounds (sucrose, mannitol, taurocholic acid, methotrexate and vinblastine). Furthermore, Figure 8 depicts the correlation between the logPe values measured in the PBMEC model and the logPS values observed \textit{in situ}.
for the 15 test compounds (except for diazepam). The PBMEC logPe correlated with the in situ logPS with an $r^2$ of 0.60 for the 15 compounds. When the three system L substrates were excluded from the correlation, the $r^2$ increased to 0.89.

**Discussion**

The main objective of the present study was to develop a simple yet robust in vitro BBB cell model to predict the net permeability (passive and active transported processes) of NCEs across the BBB in vivo.

Our initial characterization of the PBMEC model suggested that it maintained many important BBB properties. First, the extensive staining with Factor VIII signified the homogeneity of the endothelial cells. Second, visualization of the intercellular tight junctions and the moderate to high TEER values (300-550 $\Omega \cdot cm^2$) indicated an acceptable “tightness” of the PBMEC monolayer. Third, the PBMEC expressed the mRNA of several BBB uptake and efflux transporters, including GLUT1, LAT1, MRP1, MRP4, MRP5, Pgp, and BCRP. Moreover, preliminary study of the functional activity of Pgp in the PBMEC showed that the basolateral-to-apical/apical-to-basolateral (B-to-A/A-to-B) permeability ratio of Rhodamine 123, a Pgp substrate, was 1.73. Addition of a Pgp inhibitor, cyclosporin A, reduced the B-to-A/A-to-B ratio of Rhodamine 123 to 1. The B-to-A/A-to-B permeability ratio of sucrose, the paracellular marker, was 1 under both conditions (data not shown). This apparent polarized transport of the Pgp substrates suggested that P-gp was functionally active and was predominantly located on the apical membrane in the PBMEC. Lastly, the PBMEC model took
only 5-6 days to reach confluence as compared with 10-12 days with the BBMEC model, which added to the advantage of the PBMEC as an in vitro BBB screening tool.

One of the continuing challenges to develop an in vitro BBB permeability model is the lack of standardized study conditions, which makes it difficult to interpret and compare models from lab to lab. Protocols in the literature describing various in vitro BBB models varied in many respects including cell origins, cell isolation procedures, cell culture conditions, and permeability study conditions (Audus and Borchardt 1986b; Rubin et al. 1991; Cecchelli et al. 1999; Franke et al. 2000; Jeliazkova-Mecheva and Bobilya 2003). Therefore, the TEER and sucrose permeability values reported for the primary cultures of BBMEC or PBMEC were highly variable among different laboratories (Pardridge et al. 1990; Rubin et al. 1991; Jeliazkova-Mecheva and Bobilya 2003; Torok et al. 2003) and difficult to compare. Thus, initial experiments were conducted in our laboratory to develop the optimal culture and permeability assay conditions for the present PBMEC model.

First, we tested the influence of a stirred vs. unstirred condition on the permeability measurements in the PBMEC model. Physiologically, there is virtually no unstirred water layer (UWL) at the surface of the endothelium of the in vivo brain (Pardridge 1991). However, many in vitro permeability studies were conducted under unstirred conditions (Pardridge et al. 1990; Rubin et al. 1991; Franke et al. 2000). It has been reported that in Caco-2 cells, the thickness of the UWL can be greater than 1000 µm under unstirred conditions, which is greater than the thickness of the UWL in the in vivo intestinal lumen (30–100 µm) (Lennernas 1998). The increased thickness of the UWL in vitro conceivably presents an artificial, rate-limiting barrier to passive diffusion across the cell monolayer. In the present PBMEC model, stirring in both donor and receiver chambers (600 rpm) greatly increased the transendothelial flux of the moderate and
high permeability compounds, but had little effect on the low permeability compounds. In turn, the dynamic range (i.e. the ratio of $P_e$ of high permeability compounds to the $P_e$ of low permeability compounds) of PBMEC permeability was greatly increased. These data suggest that permeability studies performed under stirred conditions reduce the influence of the UWL, and therefore, better mimic the in vivo BBB environment as compared with unstirred conditions.

Second, considering the close apposition of astrocytes to brain capillary endothelial cells in vivo, some researchers speculated that factor(s) produced by astrocytes are important for the establishment of a fully functional BBB in vitro (Raub et al. 1992). In fact, co-culture with astrocytes or the culture of in vitro BBB cells in ACM has been shown to enhance the tight-junction formation and decrease sucrose permeability in several in vitro BBB models (Cecchelli et al. 1999; Megard et al. 2002). However, these results varied from one laboratory to another. Torok et al. (2003) reported that ACM led to a 60% increase in TEER of their PBMEC model, but had no effect on the paracellular permeability of sucrose. In addition, it was found there was only a slight (14%) reduction of the sucrose permeability in the presence of ACM in a BBMEC model (Pardridge et al. 1990). In the present study, PBMEC cells cultured with ACM resulted in only a 10–25% enhancement of TEER values and showed no effect on the permeability of sucrose. Although still lower than the TEER value in vivo (>1000 Ω•cm²) (Butt et al. 1990), the TEER of the PBMEC model (300-550 Ω•cm²) were higher than that reported for most other solo-cultures of PBMEC (≤ 400 Ω•cm²) (Fischer et al. 2000; Jeliazkova-Mecheva and Bobilya 2003; Torok et al. 2003) and BBMEC (80-140 Ω•cm²) (Rubin et al. 1991), as well as for TR-BBB cells (5-20 Ω•cm²) (unpublished observation in-house). While the paracellular restrictiveness of the PBMEC model may still warrant further improvement to be close to that reported in vivo (e.g., in vitro permeability of sucrose of $90 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cm} \cdot \text{sec}^{-1}$ much higher than that
estimated $in\ vivo$ $(0.03-0.1 \times 10^{-6} \text{cm} \cdot \text{sec}^{-1})$ (Levin 1980; Rechthand et al. 1987)), a much tighter monolayer may not be critical for the PBMEC to serve as a BBB permeability screen for assessing low, medium, and high brain penetration. Furthermore, the advantages gained under influence of astrocytes may be offset by a loss of culture precision since concentrations of astrocyte-related factors may differ from study to study.

Third, the PBMEC model from the current study remains viable after more than eight months of storage in liquid nitrogen without significant loss of functionality. The average log$P_e$ of the 16 compounds tested in fresh PBMEC correlated well with those measured from cryopreserved cells, indicating both freshly isolated and cryopreserved PBMEC can be used to perform permeability studies of NCEs.

Upon defining the study conditions in the current PBMEC model (non-ACM culture, stirred condition, and using either fresh or cryopreserved cells), the primary goal of present study was to evaluate whether this PBMEC model could predict the $in\ vivo$ BBB permeability of structurally diverse compounds despite the mechanism of BBB penetration. Correlation between $in\ situ$ or $in\ vivo$ permeability and $in\ vitro$ permeability from primary cultured BMEC models has been reported for a variety of compounds, including small molecules (Guillot et al. 1993; Saheki et al. 1994; Cecchelli et al. 1999) and proteins (Pardridge et al. 1990). However, most previous studies tested either a small number of passive diffusion compounds (Saheki et al. 1994; Cecchelli et al. 1999) or a set of structural analogues (Guillot et al. 1993). In the present study, 8 of the compounds in the test set are known to be influenced by active uptake or efflux transport processes. A strong correlation ($r^2 = 0.89$) between the $in\ vitro$ log$P_e$ and the $in\ situ$ logPS was observed with the three LAT substrates excluded. Consistent with this strong correlation, the rank order of PBMEC permeability of these compounds, except for the system L substrates, was
comparable to that of the in situ BBB permeability in rats, with sucrose, mannitol, taurocholic acid, methotrexate, and vinblastine at the low end of the permeability range, theophylline, quinidine, phenytoin, metoprolol, dopamine, and caffeine in the moderate permeability range, and testosterone and diazepam at the high end of the permeability range. Moreover, this is the first study to demonstrate a significant quantitative correlation between the in vitro and in situ permeabilities of compounds that are known substrates of active efflux transporters at the BBB, including Pgp (vinblastine and quinidine), and MRP (taurocholic acid, phenytoin and methotrexate). This data provides clear evidence of the net activity of major BBB transporters in the PBMEC model.

However, the PBMEC underestimated the in situ BBB permeability for the three LAT substrates (phenylalanine, leucine, and gabapentin). One of the possible explanations is species difference in LAT expression level between rat and porcine at the BBB. Another explanation for this discrepancy may be down-regulation of LAT expression and/or function in vitro, which has been suggested by Pardridge et al. (1990). Preliminary data in our laboratory has demonstrated that the uptake of radiolabeled leucine into the PBMEC monolayers is a saturable process with an apparent $K_m$ of 170 µM, which is close to that reported both in vivo and in vitro (Cardelli-Cangiano et al. 1981; Audus and Borchardt 1986a). However, RT-PCR analysis shows mRNA expression of both LAT1 and LAT2 in the PBMEC model. In vivo, LAT1 protein is highly expressed in the BBB with little, if any, expression of LAT2 (Kageyama et al. 2000). The apparent expression of LAT2 in the current PBMEC model may suggest modulation of LAT expression in the PBMEC in vitro. Nevertheless, while amino acid transporter activity would be a beneficial feature of the PBMEC model, it may not be essential for the potential application of the PBMEC model as a screening tool for the majority of non-amino acid CNS compounds.
In summary, our data show that the PBMEC model maintains the complexities of the \textit{in vivo} BBB such as complex tight-junctions, moderate to high electrical resistance, and mRNA expression of active transporters. Most importantly, the current PBMEC model demonstrates the ability to predict the net passive and transporter-mediated BBB penetration with high success, medium throughput, and high reproducibility, thus, allowing the PBMEC model to be used as an effective BBB permeability screening tool in pharmaceutical research.
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Legends for Figures

Fig. 1
Phase contrast microscopy of primary cultured PBMEC on culture day 2 (a), day 4 (b), and day 6 (c) (100 X magnification).

Fig. 2
Immunostaining of PBMEC monolayers with anti-von Willebrand Factor VIII poly-clonal antibody (green fluorescence) (a). The negative controls were incubated with normal rabbit IgG (b). Cell nuclei are counterstained with DAPI (blue fluorescence).

Fig. 3
Transmission electron microscopy of PBMEC grown on collagen-coated, fibronectin-treated chamber slides. Two adjacent cells with slightly overlapping membrane (a, 2100 X magnification; b, 11,000 X magnification). Two adjacent cells with direct contact (c, 3800 X magnification; d, 15,000 X magnification). Arrows indicate the tight junction formation.

Fig. 4
RT-PCR analysis of transporter mRNA and tight junction protein mRNA expression in total RNA samples prepared from confluent PBMEC. 100bp DNA ladders are shown in lanes 1 and 13. Lane 2, ZO-1; Lane 3, GLUT1; Lane 4, LAT1; Lane 5, LAT2; Lane 6, MRP1; Lane 7, MRP2; Lane 8, MRP4; Lane 9, MRP5; Lane 10, MDR1; Lane 11, BCRP; Lane 12, GAPDH.

Fig. 5
TEER values of PBMEC monolayers on various days in cultures. Each data point represents the mean ± SD of 6 cell monolayers each day and results are from 13 isolations. The bar indicates TEER at 300 Ω•cm², under which no permeability studies were performed.

Fig. 6
Comparison of the TEER values between PBMEC treated with or without ACM. Each data point represents the mean ± SD of 6 cell monolayers each day in culture. *p<0.05, Student’s t-test.

Fig. 7
Comparison of average logP_e in freshly isolated PBMEC with cyropreserved PBMEC by Total Deviation Index approach (TDI). Studies were performed under stirred conditions. Each data point represents the mean of at least 3 cell monolayers per experimental group. TDI80% refers to the boundary such that at least 80% of the measurements are within 0.1 logP_e units of each other. TDI95% refers to the boundary such that at least 95% of the measurements are within 0.16 log P_e units of each other.

Fig. 8
Correlation between in vitro logP_e from PBMEC and logPS determined by in situ brain perfusion in rats. The logP_e value represents the mean ± SE of at least 6 cell monolayers for each test compound. The full test set correlated with an r² of 0.60. The r² increased to 0.89 when the three system L substrates were excluded from the correlation (shown with the dotted line in the figure).
Table 1  Chemical class, BBB transport mechanism, and in situ logPS values of the 16 compounds selected for method development in the PBMEC model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compounds</th>
<th>Chemical class</th>
<th>BBB transport mechanisms</th>
<th>logPS (ml/sec/g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sucrose</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Passive Diffusion</td>
<td>-4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannitol</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Passive Diffusion</td>
<td>-4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurocholic acid</td>
<td>Acid</td>
<td>Active Uptake/Efflux</td>
<td>-4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methotrexate</td>
<td>Acid</td>
<td>Passive Diffusion/Active Efflux (MRP) a</td>
<td>-3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinblastine</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Passive Diffusion/Active Efflux (P-gp) b</td>
<td>-3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinidine</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Passive Diffusion/Active Efflux (P-gp) c</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophylline</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Passive Diffusion</td>
<td>-2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metoprolol</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Passive Diffusion</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabapentin</td>
<td>Amino Acid</td>
<td>Active Uptake (system L) d</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenytoin</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Passive Diffusion/Active Efflux (MRP) e</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dopamine</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Passive Diffusion/Active Uptake f</td>
<td>-2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Passive Diffusion/Active Uptake g</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leucine</td>
<td>Amino Acid</td>
<td>Active Uptake (system L) i</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenylalanine</td>
<td>Amino Acid</td>
<td>Active Uptake (system L) i</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diazepam</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Passive Diffusion</td>
<td>NC*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testosterone</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Passive Diffusion</td>
<td>( -1.10^j )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*NC, not calculable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (Kitazawa et al., 1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b (Miller et al., 2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c (Drion et al., 1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d (Kusuhara et al., 1997)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e (Su et al., 1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f (Potschka and Loscher, 2001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g (Martel et al., 1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h (McCall et al., 1982)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (Hargreaves and Pardridge, 1988)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j Liu et al. (Liu et al. 2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k Murakami et al. (Murakami et al. 2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l reported from our laboratory using the same method as Liu et al. (2004) and Murakami et al. (2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 Primers used in RT-PCR studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Gene</th>
<th>Forward Primer</th>
<th>Reverse Primer</th>
<th>Accession Number</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Size of PCR product*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDR1</td>
<td>ACAACATTATAATCC</td>
<td>ATAAAAAGAATAATTCC</td>
<td>AF403245</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGTCTAAAGAAA</td>
<td>AAGGATTAGAAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRP1</td>
<td>AGTGTGTTGGGCAACT</td>
<td>ATCGATGTTGACATTGA</td>
<td>AF403246</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GCATCGTCTCGTTT</td>
<td>TGTGCTTGAAGAAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRP2</td>
<td>ATGTGTCTTTTCCTGG</td>
<td>TCTGGCGAGGCTCTTT</td>
<td>AF403247</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATTATCTCCAACA</td>
<td>ATACAGTACA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRP4</td>
<td>CCAATGGAGATCTTCC</td>
<td>GGTGTATCAATCTGTGC</td>
<td>NM-005845</td>
<td>Human, rat, mouse</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TGG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRP5</td>
<td>GGATAACTTCTCATG</td>
<td>GGAATGGCAATCTCA</td>
<td>NM-005688</td>
<td>Human, rat, mouse</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GG</td>
<td>AAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCRP</td>
<td>AGTTTATCCGTTGTG</td>
<td>TTCAGGAGCAAAAAGGAC</td>
<td>AJ420927</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTCTGAGGGAGAAGA</td>
<td>AGCATTTGCTGTGC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLUT1</td>
<td>AGATGCTGATCTTGG</td>
<td>CTGAGAGCTCTCTACTTC</td>
<td>AB208987</td>
<td>Human, rat, mouse</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GCCGCTTCATCAT</td>
<td>CTTCTCTCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAT1</td>
<td>ACCGTGTTTCTCAC</td>
<td>AGTGGATGGAGAGGAAG</td>
<td>AB018009</td>
<td>Human, rat, mouse</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGAGGAATGAT</td>
<td>ATGGCTTGGAGA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAT2</td>
<td>TGGTTGAAACCGGAG</td>
<td>ATGATGTTCCCTACGATG</td>
<td>AB037669</td>
<td>Human, rat, mouse</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TGACCAGAAAGTGT</td>
<td>ATACAGGCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Accession Number</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZO-1</td>
<td>ACAGCTACAGGAAA</td>
<td>Human, rat, mouse</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TGACCGAGTTGCAAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCATCTTTGCTGCCAAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTATCTTTGGA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BC036090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAPDH</td>
<td>ATGGTGAGGGTCGGA</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTGAACGGATT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAGCAGTTGGTGTTACA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GGAGGCATT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AF017079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated based on corresponding porcine or human gene sequence.
Table 3 Comparison of $P_e$ values in PBMEC under stirred and unstirred conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>$P_e$ ($x 10^{-6}$ cm/sec)$^a$</th>
<th>Ratio of $P_e$</th>
<th>Permeability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stirred</td>
<td>Unstirred</td>
<td>Stirred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucrose</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannitol</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurocholic acid</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinblastine</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenylalanine</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testosterone</td>
<td>3702</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diazepam</td>
<td>5800</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Data represents the means of at least 3 cell monolayers per experimental group.
Table 4 Summary of the *in vitro* permeability of the sixteen compounds tested in PBMEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compounds</th>
<th>$P_{\text{app}}$ a (x10^{-6} cm/sec)</th>
<th>$P_{\text{m}}$ a (x10^{-6} cm/sec)</th>
<th>$P_{\text{e}}$ a (x10^{-6} cm/sec)</th>
<th>log $P_e$  (cm/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sucrose</td>
<td>80 ± 6</td>
<td>682 ± 10</td>
<td>92 ± 24</td>
<td>-4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannitol</td>
<td>94 ± 6</td>
<td>765 ± 14</td>
<td>107 ± 19</td>
<td>-3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurocholic acid</td>
<td>72 ± 5</td>
<td>521 ± 7</td>
<td>84 ± 20</td>
<td>-4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methotrexate</td>
<td>107 ± 7</td>
<td>669 ± 12</td>
<td>127 ± 40</td>
<td>-3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinblastine</td>
<td>107 ± 6</td>
<td>530 ± 9</td>
<td>140 ± 41</td>
<td>-3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophylline</td>
<td>185 ± 6</td>
<td>824 ± 7</td>
<td>241 ± 27</td>
<td>-3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinidine</td>
<td>272 ± 7</td>
<td>764 ± 12</td>
<td>422 ± 85</td>
<td>-3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metoprolol</td>
<td>274 ± 8</td>
<td>640 ± 6</td>
<td>486 ± 98</td>
<td>-3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabapentin</td>
<td>107 ± 6</td>
<td>805 ± 8</td>
<td>124 ± 33</td>
<td>-3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenytoin</td>
<td>240 ± 7</td>
<td>841 ± 7</td>
<td>336 ± 60</td>
<td>-3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dopamine</td>
<td>590 ± 11</td>
<td>1329 ± 18</td>
<td>1066 ± 173</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caffeine</td>
<td>416 ± 4</td>
<td>600 ± 7</td>
<td>1354 ± 192</td>
<td>-2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leucine</td>
<td>224 ± 7</td>
<td>890 ± 8</td>
<td>299 ± 50</td>
<td>-3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenylalanine</td>
<td>192 ± 8</td>
<td>849 ± 12</td>
<td>248 ± 66</td>
<td>-3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diazepam</td>
<td>746 ± 7</td>
<td>857 ± 9</td>
<td>5800 ± 3134</td>
<td>-2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testosteron</td>
<td>639 ± 8</td>
<td>786 ± 9</td>
<td>3702 ± 1458</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values represent the means ± SE of data from at least two experiments in triplicates*
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Figure 6.

![Graph showing TEER values over days in culture for cultured without ACM and cultured with ACM.](image)

- **Cultured without ACM**
  - Days 5 to 9 show higher TEER values compared to days 10 to 13.

- **Cultured with ACM**
  - Days 5 to 9 show lower TEER values compared to days 10 to 13.

*P* < 0.05, Student’s t-test
Figure 7.
Figure 8.

![Graph showing the relationship between LogP<sub>e</sub> (cm/sec) (PBMEC) and LogPS (ml/sec/g) (In Situ).](image)
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