

**Title page. Invited Commentary**

**Potential for Underestimation of d-Methylphenidate Bioavailability  
Using Chiral Derivatization-Gas Chromatography**

Kennerly S. Patrick and Wendy Rodriguez

*Department of Drug Discovery & Biomedical Sciences (K.S.P., W.R.)*

*Medical University of South Carolina*

*280 Calhoun St, Charleston, SC 29425*

**Running title:** (53/60)

Underestimation of d-Methylphenidate Bioavailability

**Corresponding author:**

Kennerly S. Patrick, Ph.D.

Department of Drug Discovery and Biomedical Sciences

280 Calhoun St., QF218; P.O. Box 250140

Charleston, South Carolina, USA 29425

Fax (843)-792-1617; Phone (843)-792-8429; [patrickk@musc.edu](mailto:patrickk@musc.edu)

**Text pages:** 6

**Tables:** 1

**Figures:** 0

**References:** 26

**Number of words in abstract:** 250

**Number of words in the invited commentary:** 1,421

**Nonstandard abbreviations:** ADHD: Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder; GC: Gas chromatography; CES1: carboxylesterase 1; dl-MPH: dl-Methylphenidate; ECD: Electron capture detection; %F: Absolute bioavailability; HFB: N-heptafluorobutyryl-S-prolyl ; IR: immediate-release; LC: Liquid chromatography; MR: Modified-release; MS: Mass spectrometry; OROS: Osmotic controlled-release oral delivery system; pAUC partial area under the curve; TFA: Trifluoroacetyl; TFP: Trifluoroacetyl-S-prolyl;  $T_{1/2}$ : Half-life;  $T_{max}$ : Time to maximum plasma concentration.

## ABSTRACT

A tenable hypothesis is presented which explains disparities between older oral dl-MPH bioavailability data generated using chiral derivatization-gas chromatography versus more recent findings using chiral liquid chromatography. These disparities persist in current literature. The gas chromatographic methods found that the absolute bioavailability of d-MPH is 23% and that of l-MPH is 5% (i.e., 82% as the active d-isomer), while liquid chromatographic methods consistently report that approximately 99% of circulating MPH is d-MPH. Older methods used perfluoroacylated S-prolyl derivatizing agents which have a history of imprecision due to the susceptibility of the prolyl S-configuration to isomerize to the R-enantiomer. Accordingly, any R-prolyl impurity in the chiral derivatization reagent yields the (R,R,R)-MPH-prolyl diastereomer which, in being related as the opposite enantiomer of (S,S,S)-prolyl-MPH, co-elutes with l-(S,S)-MPH. This results in overestimation of the percent l-MPH at the expense of underestimating d-MPH. Unless compelling reasons exist to justify use of *any* chiral discriminators, less complex and less costly achiral analysis of plasma MPH appears appropriate for d-MPH quantitation since 99% exists as d-MPH. However, simultaneous plasma monitoring of d-MPH and l-MPH may be warranted when alterations in first-pass hepatic metabolism by carboxylesterase 1 (CES1) occurs. For example, (a) with transdermal dl-MPH delivery; (b) in cases of concomitant dl-MPH and a CES1 inhibitor, e.g., ethanol, which elevates l-MPH and d-MPH concentrations; (d) in forensic studies of intravenous or intranasal dl-MPH abuse; (e) were dl-MPH to be formulated as a free base sublingual product; or (f) as emerging advances in dl-MPH gene-dose effects warrant isomer correlations.

We wish to reevaluate the extent to which immediate-release dl-methylphenidate (IR-dl-MPH) is subject to enantioselective presystemic metabolism from the context of existing biomedical literature. The following discussion is intended to better define the pharmacokinetics (PK) of oral IR-dl-MPH. In addition, this letter offers a rationale for considering selection of less-complex, cost-curtailing bioanalytical methods which obviates chromatographic chiral discriminators when monitoring the psychoactive d-MPH isomer component of this racemate (Patrick et al., 1987; Patrick and Straughn, 2016). Understanding the PK of IR-dl-MPH underpins rational study designs of new modified-release (MR) dl-MPH formulation technologies (at least 6 unique branded MR-dl-MPH products have been approved in the last 5 years, with a 7<sup>th</sup> tentatively approved (Drugs@FDA); others are in the regulatory pipeline (Patrick et al., 2019). Further, understanding dl-MPH absorption and disposition provides guidance for bioanalytical methods used for ongoing gene-dose effect studies which are now showing increasing promise in the advancement of personalized attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) pharmacotherapy (Lyauk et al., 2016; Stage et al., 2017; Stage et al., 2019; Zhu et al., 2008).

IR-dl-MPH typically provides four hours of efficacy in the treatment of ADHD. This psychostimulant undergoes extensive oral first-pass metabolism in humans (Chan et al., 1983; Table 1), monkeys and rats (Wargin et al., 1983), whereby the absolute bioavailability of the combined MPH enantiomers has been reported to be approximately 30%, 22% and 19% in these species, respectively. These early 1980s determinations utilized achiral (non-enantiospecific) gas chromatographic (GC) methods. Subsequently, an enantiospecific GC approach using chiral MPH

derivatization, chlorphentermine as an internal standard and electron capture detection, found that the isomeric composition of the absolute bioavailable fraction following an oral racemic MPH dose exists as 23% d-MPH (the R,R-isomer) and 5% l-MPH (S,S-isomer) in humans (Srinivas et al., 1993); equating to 82% of total plasma MPH exposure representing the d-MPH enantiomer (Table 1). Similar percentage differences between d-MPH and l-MPH plasma exposure have persisted in more contemporary secondary (Srinivas 2004) and tertiary biomedical literature (Goodman & Gilman's, 2019).

This reported PK relationship between the d:l percentages of plasma MPH isomers notwithstanding, more recent relative bioavailability studies (i.e., no comparative intravenous dl-MPH PK were conducted) have consistently shown that approximately 99% of total dl-MPH exposure is attributable to the d-MPH isomer. This was revealed by Ramos et al. (1999) in the course of validating a vancomycin-based chiral liquid chromatography-mass spectrometric (LC-MS) method using IR-dl-MPH in a test subject prior to conducting bioavailability studies of a new MR-dl-MPH product (Lee et al., 2003). This determination of approximate 99% of oral dl-MPH reaching the systemic circulation has since been replicated in multiple studies of both IR-dl-MPH (Modi et al., 2000a; Patrick et al., 2007; 2013; Table 1) and MR-dl-MPH formulations (e.g., Modi et al., 2000b). We note that a 99%:1% d-MPH:l-MPH systemic exposure following oral dl-MPH could be viewed in practical terms as representing presystemic biocatalytic resolution of racemic dl-MPH to the racemic switch drug, pure d-isomer dexmethylphenidate. Indeed, the package labeling for dexmethylphenidate

recommends using one-half the mg dose of when converting a maintenance dose of dl-MPH in an ADHD patient to the enantiopure d-MPH product (Drugs@FDA).

More recent bioanalytical studies characterizing enantiospecific plasma MPH concentrations have utilized chiral liquid chromatographic (LC) stationary phases rather than the GC method for MPH enantiomeric separations. These LC methods avoid problematic chiral derivatization (see below), provide the molecular specificity of tandem mass spectrometry (MS) to suppress chemical noise, and incorporate deuterated internal standards which offer optimal analytical control of potential: (a) variability in extraction recovery, (b) extent of post-sampling hydrolysis (Ramos et al., 1999) and (c) changes in intra-day instrumental performance. Advantages of such an LC-MS analytical approach are evident from published representative chromatograms from LC-MS (Zhu et al. 2011) compared to chiral derivatization-GC studies where chemical interferences and loss of base line resolution are clearly evident (Srinivas et al., 1987).

Chiral derivatization GC methods for PK studies of dl-MPH have most often used heptafluorobutyryl-S-prolyl chloride (HFP) to form the corresponding (S,R,R)- and (S,S,S)-HFP-MPH diastereomers from d-(R,R)-MPH and l-(S,S)-MPH. The commercial availability of HFP, as used by Lin et al. (1999) for the chiral derivatization of dl-MPH extracted from human plasma, ended many years ago due to the unacceptable degree of in situ racemization during chemical synthesis (Campbell Supply Co., Rockton, IL, enantiomeric excess < 80%, technical support personal communication, January 2019).

The strong electron withdrawing inductive effects of the seven fluorine bonds on the acyl group of HFP, taken together with the prolyl moiety existing as its acid chloride, can

be expected to render the  $\alpha$ -hydrogen atom especially acidic (Sykes 1986), and accordingly predisposing the stereogenic center to inversion of configuration to the unnatural amino acid R-proline antipode. Serving as a precedent, even when using the less fluorinated homolog N-trifluoroacetyl-S-prolyl chloride (TFP) as a chiral GC derivatization reagent required corrections to the relative GC peak areas to establish the enantiomeric excess in the course of preparative scale resolution of dl-MPH isomers. In this example, a reference standard of pure (S)-methamphetamine was derivatized with TFP in parallel with resolution product characterization to adjust for the extent of actual enantiopurity (Patrick et al., 1987). Further, Lui and Ku (1981) found that commercially available TFP contains 5-6% of the opposite R-enantiomer, thus again requiring analogous corrections for enantiospecific GC analysis of a range of amphetamine enantiomeric mixtures.

Any R-prolyl impurity in the (S)-HFP derivatization reagent will yield the (R,R,R)-MPH-prolyl diastereomer which, in being related as the opposite enantiomer of (S,S,S)-HFP-MPH, co-elutes with l-(S,S)-MPH to pose a likely potential for overestimating the percent of l-MPH at the expense of underestimating d-MPH. Were this to have been the case, the variance of the late 1980s and early 1990s reports regarding a lesser degree of enantioselective metabolism than now appears to occur finds a compelling scientific basis to explain these conflicting reports of differential isomeric extents of absorption. Thus, it would even appear rational to use less expensive and less complex achiral GC or LC methods for plasma d-MPH determinations in view of the vast preponderance of circulating MPH (~99%) existing as the active d-MPH enantiomer.

However, simultaneous quantitation of d- and –MPH is warranted for: (a) transdermal dl-MPH delivery PK where circumvention of the oral hepatic first-pass effect – the organ that expresses carboxylesterase 1 (CES1) which catalyzes dl-MPH hydrolysis – results in substantial l-MPH exposure (Patrick et al., 2010); (b) in cases of concomitant dl-MPH and the CES1 inhibitor ethanol where l-MPH concentrations rise (Patrick et al., 2007; 2013; Zhu et al., 2017), (c) dl-MPH in combination with other CES1 inhibitors used in clinical practice, e.g., aripiprazole and fluoxetine (Zhu et al., 2010); or (d) in forensic studies of intravenous or intranasal dl-MPH abuse which again circumvents hepatic first-pass effect. (Use of intravenous dl-MPH for barbiturate overdose, anesthesia recovery or intractable hiccups was discontinued in the 1960s.) Were dl-MPH to be formulated as a free base sublingual product, direct oral membrane solubility/transport would again by-pass the early hydrolytic effects of hepatic CES1 on dl-MPH (Patrick et al., 2010). It is noted that an orally disintegration tablet (Cotempla XR-ODT<sup>®</sup>) was approved in 2017 which contains dl-MPH, not as the hydrochloride salt, but rather bound to a non-absorbable exchange resin. In this formulation, the potential for appreciable oral cavity l-MPH absorption may warrant investigation.

Also included in Table 1 are 0-3 h partial area under curve (pAUC<sub>0-3h</sub>) analyses. Not only does this time interval cover the primary duration of therapeutic action of IR-dl-MPH, it extends a comprehensive study of pAUC<sub>0-3h</sub> values for a broad range of MR-MPH formulations (Patrick et al. 2019) and carries relevance to this specific pAUC metric in recently instituted bioequivalence parameters now required by the FDA for select dl-MPH products (Jackson 2014). Taken together with the T<sub>max</sub> and T<sub>1/2</sub>

parameters, Table 1 provides key aspects of both the rate and extent of dl-MPH oral bioavailability.

In summary, a very tenable hypothesis is presented which explains disparities between older dl-MPH PK data compared to more recent findings owing to evolving advances in the quality of chiral bioanalytical methodology. As described above, perfluoroacylated prolyl derivatizing agent have a history of imprecision in enantiospecifically quantifying drugs, including dl-MPH and amphetamines. dl-MPH serves as a first-line pharmacotherapeutic agent for the treatment of the most commonly diagnosed childhood and adolescent central disorder – ADHD. As empirical approaches to drug individualization give way to pharmacogenomics and precision medicine, fundamental knowledge of well-validated pharmacology is critically important to achieving desired outcomes. This letter serves to correct specific misunderstanding of dl-MPH absorption and disposition which have persisted in mainstream secondary and tertiary biomedical literature (Thummel et al., 2019).

**Authorship Contributions:**

*Performed data analysis:* Patrick, Rodriquez

*Wrote or contributed to the manuscript:* Patrick, Rodriquez

## References:

Chan YM, Swanson JM, Soldin SS, Thiessen JJ, Macleod SM, and Logan W (1983) Methylphenidate hydrochloride given with or before breakfast: II. Effects on plasma concentration of methylphenidate and ritalinic acid. *Pediatrics* **72**:56-59.

Jackson A (2014) Impact of release mechanism on the pharmacokinetic performance of PAUC metrics for three methylphenidate products with complex absorption. *Pharm Res* **31**:173-181.

Lee L, Kepple, J, Wang Y, Freestone S, Bakhtier R, Wang Y, and Hossain H (2003) Bioavailability of modified-release methylphenidate: Influence of high-fat breakfast when administered intact and when capsule content sprinkled on applesauce. *Biopharm Drug Dispos* **24**:233-243.

Lin S-H, Andrenyak MD, Moody DE, and Foltz RL (1999) Enantioselective gas chromatography-negative ion chemical ionization mass spectrometry for methylphenidate in human plasma. *J Anal Tox* **23**:524-530.

Lui JH and Ku WW (1981) Determination of enantiomeric N-trifluoroacetyl-L-prolyl chloride amphetamine derivatives by capillary gas chromatography/mass spectrometry with chiral and achiral stationary phases. *Anal Chem* **53**:2180-2184.

Lyauk YK, Stage C, Bergmann TK, Ferrero-Milliani L, Bjerre D, Thomsen R, Dalhoff KP, Rasmussen HB, and Jurgens G (2016) Population pharmacokinetics of methylphenidate in healthy adults emphasizing novel and effects of several carboxylesterase 1 (*CES1*) variants. *Clin Transl Sci* **9**:337-345.

Modi NB, Lindemulder B, and Gupta SK (2000a) Single- and multiple-dose pharmacokinetics of an oral once-a-day osmotically controlled-release OROS<sup>®</sup> (methylphenidate HCl) formulation. *J Clin Pharmacol* **40**:379-388.

Modi NB, Bei Wang MS, Noveck MD, and Gupta SK (2000b) Dose-proportional and stereospecific pharmacokinetics of methylphenidate delivered using an osmotic, controlled-release oral delivery system. *J Clin Pharmacol* **40**:1141-1149.

Patrick KS, Straughn AB, Minhinnett RR, Yeatts SD, Herrin AE, DeVane CL, Malcolm R, Janis GC, and Markowitz JS (2007) Influence of ethanol and gender on methylphenidate pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **81**:346-353.

Patrick KS, Radke J, Raymond J, Rodriguez, W, Nguyen L, Koller, L, and Straughn AB (2019) A Drug Regimen Individualization for Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder: Guidance for Methylphenidate and Dexamethylphenidate Formulations. *Pharmacotherapy: Journal Human Pharmacol Drug Ther*, in press 10-23-18, doi:10.1002/phar.2190.

Patrick KS, Straughn AB, Perkins JS, and Gonzalez, MA (2009) Evolution of stimulants to treat ADHD: Transdermal methylphenidate. *Human Psychopharmacol Clin Exper* **24**:1-17.

Patrick KS, Straughn AB, Reeves OT 3rd, Bernstein H, Bell GH, Anderson ER, and Malcolm RJ (2013) Differential influences of ethanol on early exposure to racemic

methylphenidate compared with dexamethylphenidate in humans. *Drug Metab Dispos* **41**:197-205.

Ramos L, Bakhtiar R, Majumdar T, Hayes M, and Tse F (1999) Liquid chromatographic/atmospheric pressure chemical ionization tandem mass spectrometry enantiomeric separation of dl-threo-methylphenidate, (Ritalin) using a macrocyclic antibiotic as a chiral separator. *Rapid Commun Mass Spectrom* **13**:2054-2062.

Srinivas NR, Quinn D, Hubbard JW, and Midha KK (1987) Stereoselective disposition of methylphenidate in children with attention-deficit disorder. *J Pharmacol Exper Ther* **241**:300-306.

Srinivas NR, Hubbard JW, Quinn D, and Midha KK (1992) Enantioselective pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of dl-threo-methylphenidate in children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **52**:561-568.

Srinivas NR, Hubbard JW, Korchinski ED, and Midha KK (1993) Enantioselective pharmacokinetics of dl-threo-methylphenidate in humans. *Pharm Res* **10**:14-21.

Srinivas NR (2004) Clinical pharmacokinetic data of racemic drugs obtained by the indirect method following precolumn diastereomer formation: is the influence of racemization during chiral derivatization significant? *Biomed Chromatog* **18**:342-349.

Stage C, Jurgens G, Guski LS, Thom R, Bjerre D, Ferrero-Miliani, Lyauk YK, Rasmussen B, Dalhoff K, and The INDICES Consortium (2017) The impact of CES1 genotypes on the pharmacogenomics of methylphenidate in healthy Danish subjects. *Pharmacogen* **83**:1506-1514.

Stage C, Dalhoff K, Rasmussen HB, Guski LS, Thomsen R, Bjerre D, Ferro-Miliani L Madsen MB and Jurgens G (2019) The impact of human *CES1* variation on enzyme activity as assessed by ritalinic acid/methylphenidate ratios. *Basic Clin Pharmacol Toxicol* doi: 10,1111/bcpt.13212.

Thummel KE, Shen DD and Isoherranen (Updated 10/05/2018) Design and optimization of dosage regimens: Pharmacokinetic data. Methylphenidate, *in: Goodman & Gilman's: The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics, 13e.* (Brunton LL, Hilal-Dandan R and Knollmann BC Eds) Appendix II: Table AII-1, McGraw-Hill Medical, New York, NY. <http://accesspharmacy.mhmedical.com/content.aspx?bookid=2189&sectionid=1724718> 18. Accessed March 08, 2019.

Sykes P (1986) The strengths of acids and bases, *in: Mechanisms In Organic Chemistry, 6<sup>th</sup> ed*, 59-61. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

Wargin W, Patrick K, Kilts C, Gualtieri C, Ellington K, and Breese G (1983) Pharmacokinetics of methylphenidate in man, rat and monkey. *J Pharmacol Exper Ther* **226**:382-386, 1983.

Zhu H-J, Patrick KS, Yuan H-J, Wang J-S, Donovan JL, DeVane CL, Malcolm R, Johnson JA, Youngblood GL, Sweet DH, Langaee TY, and Markowitz JS (2008) Two novel *CES1* gene mutations lead to dysfunctional carboxylesterase-1 activity in man: Clinical significance and molecular basis. *Am J Human Genetics* **82**:1241-1248.

Zhu H-J, Appel DJ, Peterson YK, Wang Z, and Markowitz JS (2010) Identification of selected therapeutic agents as inhibitors of carboxylesterase 1: Potential sources of metabolic drug interactions. *Toxicology* **270**:59-65.

Zhu H.-J, Patrick KS, and Markowitz JS (2011) Enantiospecific determination of *dl*-methylphenidate and *dl*-ethylphenidate in plasma by liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry: Application to human ethanol interactions. *J Chromatogr B* **879**: 783-788.

Zhu H-J, Patrick KS, Straughn AB, Reeves III OT, Bernstein H, Knight J, Johnson H, Malcolm R, and Markowitz JS (2017) Ethanol interactions with dexmethylphenidate and dl-methylphenidate Spheroidal Oral Drug Absorption Systems in healthy volunteers. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* **37**:419-428.

## Footnotes

Financial support: This work was supported solely through the National Institute of Health National Institute of Alcohol and Alcoholism [RO1AA016707]; the Medical University of South Carolina's Clinical & Translational Research Center with support from the National Institutes of Health [MO1RR01070-18]; and the National Institutes of Health National Center for Research Resources Southeastern Pre-doctoral Training in Clinical Research [1T32 RR023258].

**Table 1**

**d- and l-Methylphenidate (MPH) Exposure, Time Course Parameters and Methods**

N	Oral/I.V Dose (mg)	<sup>a</sup> Early Exposure pAUC <sub>(0-3h)</sub> (ng.h/mL)		Total Exposure AUC <sub>(0-∞)</sub> (ng.h/mL)		F (%)		T <sub>max</sub> (h)		T <sub>1/2</sub> (h)		Analytical Method
		d-MPH	l-MPH	d-MPH	l-MPH	d-MPH	l-MPH	d-MPH	l-MPH	d-MPH	l-MPH	
		Plasma % d-MPH		% d-MPH		d-MPH	l-MPH	d-MPH	l-MPH	d-MPH	l-MPH	
Chan et al., 1983 (IR-PMH)												
5	Oral 10 or 15	n/a		n/a		27.86* ±11.48 Total d- + l-MPH <sup>b</sup> (fasted)		1.6* ±0.4		2.1* ±0.4		Achiral TFA GC-MS
		n/a		n/a		31.40 ±15.87 Total d- + l-MPH (fed)		1.0 ±0.4		2.1 ±0.3		
5	I.V 10 or 15	n/a		n/a		"100"		0.5*		2.0* ±0.4		
Srinivas et al., 1987 (IR-MPH)												
5	Oral 10	9.00	1.13	30.46 ±9.57	6.66 ±1.38	n/a		2.2 ±0.5	2.01 ±1.16	3.1 ±1.1	5.59 ±1.07	Chiral HFB- GC-ECD
		89% d-MPH		82% d-MPH								
9	Oral 10	7.43	1.50	27.71 ±9.53	4.61 ±1.77	n/a		2.3 ±0.5	2.4 ±0.5	1.87 ±0.65	1.43 ±0.76	
Srinivas et al., 1992 (IR-MPH)												
13	Oral 40	19.50	3.75	120.21 ±30.68	14.79 ±4.14	23 (82%)	5 (18%)	2.4 ±0.8	2.14 ±0.64	5.7 ±1.2	3.93 ±0.76	Chiral HFB- GC-ECD
		84% d-MPH		89% d-MPH								
11	I.V 10	15.00	12.00	147.74 ±47.91	88.64 ±43.13	"100"	"100"	0.25	0.25	6.0 ±1.7	3.61 ±1.12	
Modi et al., 2000 (OROS-MPH)												
33	Oral 18	2.25	0.03	42.2 ±16	0.43 ±0.7	n/a		7.9 ±2.0	7.1 ±2.0	3.8 ±0.8	n/a	Chiral LC-MS
		99% d-MPH		99% d-MPH								
19	Oral 0.3 mg/kg	20.25	0.38	82.9 ±26.2	n/a	n/a		2.3 ±32.7	3	2.8 ±14.3	n/a	
Patrick et al., 2007 (IR-MPH)												
Patrick et al., 2013 (IR-MPH)												
24	Oral 0.15 mg/kg	25.10	0.27	52.1 ±29	0.77 ±73	n/a		2.4 ±47	1.8 ±49	2.9 ±19	2.1 ±41	Chiral LC-MS
		99% d-MPH		99% d-MPH								

<sup>a</sup>pAUC was calculated using the arithmetic trapezoidal rule. <sup>b</sup>Fasted; all other studies included breakfast,

generally light; n/a: not available; GC: Gas chromatography; ECD: Electron capture detection; HFB: N-Heptafluorobutyryl-S-prolyl chiral derivative; LC: Liquid chromatography; MS: Mass spectrometry; OROS: osmotic controlled-release oral delivery system; TFA:N-Trifluoroacetyl.

---