Hydroxychloroquine is metabolized by CYP2D6, CYP3A4, and CYP2C8, and inhibits CYP2D6, while its metabolites also inhibit CYP3A \textit{in vitro}
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Abstract

This study aimed to explore the cytochrome P450 (CYP) metabolic and inhibitory profile of hydroxychloroquine (HCQ). Hydroxychloroquine metabolism was studied using human liver microsomes (HLMs) and recombinant CYP enzymes. The inhibitory effects of HCQ and its metabolites on nine CYPs were also determined in HLMs, using an automated substrate cocktail method. Our metabolism data indicated that CYP3A4, CYP2D6, and CYP2C8 are the key enzymes involved in HCQ metabolism. All three CYPs formed the primary metabolites desethylchloroquine (DCQ) and desethylhydroxychloroquine (DHCQ) to various degree. Although the intrinsic clearance (CL$_{int}$) value of HCQ depletion by recombinant CYP2D6 was >tenfold higher than that by CYP3A4 (0.87 vs 0.075 µl/min/pmol), scaling of recombinant CYP CL$_{int}$ to HLM level resulted in almost equal HLM CL$_{int}$ values for CYP2D6 and CYP3A4 (11 and 14 µl/min/mg, respectively). The scaled HLM CL$_{int}$ of CYP2C8 was 5.7 µl/min/mg. Data from HLM experiments with CYP-selective inhibitors also suggested relatively equal roles for CYP2D6 and CYP3A4 in HCQ metabolism, with a smaller contribution by CYP2C8. In CYP inhibition experiments, HCQ, DCQ, DHCQ and the secondary metabolite didesethylchloroquine were direct CYP2D6 inhibitors, with 50% inhibitory concentration (IC$_{50}$) values between 18-135 µM. HCQ did not inhibit other CYPs. Furthermore, all metabolites were time-dependent CYP3A inhibitors (IC$_{50}$ shift 2.2-3.4). To conclude, HCQ is metabolized by CYP3A4, CYP2D6, and CYP2C8 in vitro. HCQ and its metabolites are reversible CYP2D6 inhibitors, and HCQ metabolites are time-dependent CYP3A inhibitors. These data can be used to improve physiologically-based pharmacokinetic models and update drug-drug interaction risk estimations for HCQ.
Significance Statement

While CYP2D6, CYP3A4, and CYP2C8 have been shown to mediate chloroquine biotransformation, it appears that the role of CYP enzymes in hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) metabolism has not been studied. In addition, little is known about the CYP inhibitory effects of HCQ. Here we demonstrate that CYP2D6, CYP3A4 and CYP2C8 are the key enzymes involved in HCQ metabolism. Furthermore, our findings show that HCQ and its metabolites are inhibitors of CYP2D6, which likely explains the previously observed interaction between HCQ and metoprolol.
Introduction

The 4-aminoquinoline hydroxychloroquine (HCQ), an old antimalarial drug, is regarded as a safe and reasonably effective treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and systemic lupus erythematosus (Munster et al., 2002; Rainsford et al., 2015). Beyond its approved indications, HCQ repurposing for the prevention and treatment of various diseases, including diabetes, myocardial infarction, and various cancers, is currently assessed in several clinical trials, due to its anti-inflammatory/immunomodulating, antithrombotic, and anti-autophagic properties (Plantone and Koudriavtseva, 2018; Ulander et al., 2021). HCQ is preferred over chloroquine because of lower incidence of cardiac, gastrointestinal, and ocular adverse reactions. During the first stages of the Coronavirus Disease of 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, HCQ was among the most utilized repurposed therapeutic agents. Although the potential benefits of systemically administered HCQ for the management of COVID-19 are no longer considered to outweigh its potential risks (FDA, 2020; Recovery Collaborative Group et al., 2020; Skipper et al., 2020; Pan et al., 2021), investigation of its therapeutic and prophylactic use against COVID-19 still continues (47 recruiting and not yet recruiting clinical studies as of June 15, 2022, https://clinicaltrials.gov/).

HCQ has been in clinical use for more than 60 years, but its clinical pharmacology is not well understood (White et al., 2020). HCQ has a complex pharmacokinetic profile, displaying a high degree of variability in its concentrations and unclear pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic relationships in terms of therapeutic and adverse effects (Rainsford et al., 2015). Following oral administration, approximately 70-80% of HCQ is absorbed (Tett et al., 1989). In the body, HCQ distributes extensively to aqueous cellular and intercellular compartments. As a weak base, it accumulates in acidic organelles such as lysosomes and endosomes (Tett et al., 1993; Schrezenmeier and Dorner, 2020). Thereby, HCQ has an enormous distribution volume (700 l/kg based on plasma data) (Tett et al.,
1988). HCQ also concentrates in platelets and leukocytes, leading to approximately seven-fold higher concentrations in blood than in plasma (Tett et al., 1988; Tett et al., 1989; Brocks et al., 1994). Accordingly, whole blood is frequently used as the matrix in pharmacokinetic studies (White et al., 2020). HCQ is eliminated through both metabolism and renal excretion and has a long terminal elimination half-life of 26-53 days (Tett et al., 1988; Tett et al., 1989). The full mass balance profile of HCQ is unclear, but renal elimination is estimated to account for 20-55% of the total clearance (Tett et al., 1988; Tett et al., 1989; White et al., 2020).

HCQ is biotransformed into three active metabolites in humans: the major circulating metabolite desethylhydroxychloroquine (DHCQ), as well as desethylchloroquine (DCQ), and didesethylchloroquine (DDCQ) (Fig. 1) (McChesney, 1983; Tett et al., 1985; Charlier et al., 2018; Shimizu et al., 2022). Although many articles refer to cytochrome P450 (CYP) 2C8, CYP2D6, and CYP3A4 as the key enzymes involved in HCQ metabolism, these statements are based on chloroquine data only (Kim et al., 2003; Projean et al., 2003). In addition, except for a study showing no inhibition of CYP3A4 (Li et al., 2020), little is known about the in vitro inhibitory effects of HCQ on CYP enzymes. In healthy subjects, however, HCQ has increased the plasma exposure of the β1 adrenergic receptor antagonist and CYP2D6 substrate metoprolol by 65% (Somer et al., 2000), suggesting that HCQ is an inhibitor of CYP2D6. These reports implying that HCQ may be both a substrate and an inhibitor of CYP2D6 raise the concern of CYP2D6 autoinhibition and thereby of time-dependent nonlinear pharmacokinetics for HCQ. Due to this concern and these gaps in the knowledge of the metabolism and drug-drug interaction potential of HCQ, this study aimed to comprehensively investigate the in vitro CYP-mediated metabolism of HCQ and the CYP inhibitory effects of HCQ and its three main metabolites.
Materials and Methods

Chemicals and Microsomes.

Hydroxychloroquine sulfate was kindly provided by Orion Corporation (Espoo, Finland). Amodiaquine dihydrochloride dihydrate, astemizole, bupropion hydrochloride, desethylchloroquine, desethylhydroxychloroquine, desethylhydroxychloroquine-d4, dextrophan tartrate, dextrophan-d3 tartrate, didesethylchloroquine, didesethylchloroquine-d4, hydroxybupropion, hydroxybupropion-d6, hydroxychloroquine-d4, 7-hydroxycoumarin, 7-hydroxycoumarin-d5, ±4-hydroxymephenytoin-d3, 1-hydroxytacrine-d3, hydroxytolbutamide, hydroxytolbutamide-d9, N-desethylamodiaquine hydrochloride, N-desethylamodiaquine-d5, O-desmethy lamizole, S-4-hydroxymephenytoin, S-mephenytoin, montelukast sodium, tacrine hydrochloride dihydrate, tolbutamide were purchased from Toronto Research Chemicals (Toronto, ON, Canada). Coumarin, dextromethorphan hydrobromide monohydrate, formic acid, α-hydroxymidazolam, α-hydroxymidazolam-d4, β-NADPH tetrasodium, quinidine, and troleandomycin were bought from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO, USA). Acetonitrile and methanol were obtained from Honeywell Riedel-de Haén (Charlotte, NC, USA), and midazolam from Hoffmann-La Roche (Basel, Switzerland). Disodium hydrogen phosphate dihydrate was purchased from Merck (Darmstadt, Germany), sodium dihydrogen phosphate monohydrate from J.T. Baker & Mallinckrodt (Deventer, The Netherlands), 1-hydroxytacrine maleate and gemfibrozil 1-O-β-glucuronide from Santa Cruz Biotechnology (Dallas, TX, USA), O-desmethylastemizole-d4 from Medical Isotopes (Pelham, NH, USA), paroxetine hydrochloride from Synfine Research (Richmond Hill, ON, Canada), and ketoconazole from Janssen Biotech (Olen, Belgium).

Human liver microsomes (HLMs; XTreme 200 pooled, mixed-gender) used in metabolism, inhibition screening and inhibition constant (K_i) determination experiments, and a NADPH regenerating system
were purchased from Sekisui XenoTech (Kansas City, KS, USA). HLMs (UltraPool™ 150 pooled, mixed-gender) used in 50% inhibitory concentration (IC₅₀) determinations were from Corning (Woburn, MA, USA). Recombinant CYP Bactosomes (CYP1A2, CYP2A6, CYP2B6, CYP2C8, CYP2C9, CYP2C19, CYP2D6, CYP2E1, CYP2J2, CYP3A4, CYP3A5 and control Bactosomes) were from Cypex (Dundee, UK). Bovine serum albumin (BSA) was obtained from Biowest (Nuaillé, France). All solvents and commercially available reagents were of analytical grade and used without further purification.

**Incubation Conditions and Sample Handling in Metabolism Experiments.**

All metabolism incubations were carried out at 37°C in sodium phosphate buffer (0.1 M, pH 7.4) in triplicate (CYP screening incubations in duplicate). HLM or recombinant CYP isoform and buffer were premixed and kept on ice until the start of the experiment. With the exception of studies including time-dependent CYP-selective inhibitors, experiments were started by premixing HCQ for 10 min with HLM or recombinant CYP buffer mixes on a heated shaker (37°C, 350 rpm), and followed by the addition of 1 mM NADPH to initiate the reactions. Reactions were stopped by moving a sample of the incubation mixture to acetonitrile containing internal standard (1:3). Samples were kept on ice for at least 10 min before centrifugation at 21,000g for 10 min at 8°C and further processing (**Supp. Materials and Methods**).

All stock solutions of HCQ, its metabolites, and inhibitors were prepared in methanol or acetonitrile. All incubations (including controls) contained the same concentration of organic solvent (1%). When the metabolite formation rate was measured in enzyme kinetic experiments, the incubation time was optimized within the linear range for metabolite formation, depending on the substrate turnover rate in each specific experiment (<20% turnover of substrate was required).
Metabolism by Recombinant CYPs.

The metabolism of HCQ was first investigated in a recombinant CYP screening. HCQ (30 µM) was incubated with CYP enzyme (CYP1A2, CYP2A6, CYP2B6, CYP2C8, CYP2C9, CYP2C19, CYP2D6, CYP2E1, CYP2J2, CYP3A4, CYP3A5) or control Bactosomes at a protein concentration of 0.3 mg/ml with NADPH or without NADPH (negative controls) for 90 min. Based on the obtained data, six CYP isoforms (CYP1A2, CYP2C8, CYP2C9, CYP2C19, CYP2D6, CYP3A4, CYP3A5) were selected for a linearity experiment. Herein, the depletion of HCQ (1 and 10 µM) was measured at two protein concentrations (0.1 and 0.2 mg/ml) for up to 45 min. Samples were collected at 0, 7.5, 15, 30, and 45 min. Furthermore, the depletion of HCQ at a low initial concentration of 0.3 µM was studied in CYP2C8, CYP2D6, and CYP3A4 incubations (0.1 mg/ml). Samples were collected at the same time points as above. Finally, the enzyme kinetics of HCQ metabolite formation was tested in CYP2C8 (0.2 mg/ml), CYP2D6 (0.05 mg/ml), and CYP3A4 (0.2 mg/ml) incubations. The incubation times corresponded to 20, 10, and 20 min, respectively.

Metabolism in Human Liver Microsomes.

The depletion of HCQ, DHCQ, and DCQ at initial concentrations of 0.3 and 3 µM were also studied in HLMs (0.5 mg/ml) in the presence of NADPH. Samples were collected at 0, 15, 30, 60, 90, and 120 min. To study the effects of CYP inhibition on HCQ metabolism, the time-dependent inhibitors gemfibrozil 1-O-β-glucuronide (75 µM; CYP2C8), paroxetine (15 µM; CYP2D6), and troleandomycin (100 µM; CYP3A) were first premixed with HLM (0.5 mg/ml) for 10 min before the addition of NADPH. After preincubation for 15 min, HCQ (3 µM) was included in the mix and the reactions were allowed to incubate for 40 min. In addition, the effects of the reversible inhibitors montelukast (1 µM; CYP2C8), quinidine (10 µM; CYP2D6), and ketoconazole (1 µM, CYP3A) were studied by premixing...
the inhibitor with HCQ (3 µM) and HLM for 10 min before the addition of NADPH. The reactions were allowed to incubate for 30 min. In an additional experiment with a low initial HCQ concentration of 0.3 µM, the effects of the time-dependent inhibitors listed above were tested (identical incubation conditions) on HCQ depletion. Samples were collected at 0, 15, 30, 60, and 90 min.

**Incubation Conditions and Sample Handling in Inhibition Experiments.**

The potential of HCQ, DCQ, DHCQ and DDCQ to inhibit nine major CYP enzymes (CYP1A2, 2A6, 2B6, 2C8, 2C9, 2C19, 2D6, 2J2, and 3A4) by direct inhibition, slow-binding inhibition or time-dependent inhibition was investigated in HLMs, using a previously described automated probe substrate cocktail approach (Kahma et al., 2021).

Briefly, all incubations were performed in sodium phosphate buffer (0.1 M, pH 7.4) in triplicate in 96-well plates using an automated liquid handler (Tecan Freedom EVO 150 with Freedom EVOware software, Tecan Group, Männedorf, Switzerland) and a heated shaker (550 rpm, 37°C). Probe substrates with incubation concentrations approximating to their K_m values were mixed into two cocktails (Supp. Table 1) to assess several CYP activities in one experiment. The HLM protein concentrations corresponded to 0.05 mg/ml and 0.1 mg/ml for cocktail 1 and 2, respectively. BSA (0.5% (w/v), final concentration) was included in cocktail 2 incubations to enhance CYP2C19 activity. The final solvent (methanol) concentration in all incubations was ≤ 1%.

In direct inhibition incubations, the inhibitors or solvent controls, probe substrates, BSA (for cocktail 2) and HLMs were diluted in buffer, and the mixture was prewarmed on the heated shaker for 3 min. Incubations were initiated by the addition of NADPH (1 mM)/NADPH regenerating system (100 mM NADP, 500 mM glucose-6-phosphate, 100 units/ml glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase) and terminated after 5 min by mixing 30 µl of the incubation mixture with 90 µl of ice-cold methanol.
containing internal standards. All samples were kept at 4°C for 30 min before further processing and determination of metabolite concentrations (Supp. Materials and Methods, Supp. Table 2).

In slow-binding inhibition incubations, the inhibitors or solvent controls were preincubated with HLMs in buffer for 30 min on the heated shaker. Towards the end of the preincubation, the probe substrates and BSA (for cocktail 2) were included before CYP-mediated reactions were initiated by the addition of NADPH (1 mM)/NADPH regenerating system (100 mM NADP, 500 mM glucose-6-phosphate, 100 units/ml glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase). Reactions were terminated after 5 min and samples were handled as described above.

In time-dependent inhibition incubations, the inhibitors or solvent controls were preincubated with HLMs and NADPH (1 mM)/NADPH regenerating system (100 mM NADP, 500 mM glucose-6-phosphate, 100 units/ml glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase) in buffer for 30 min on the heated shaker. Towards the end of the preincubation, BSA (for cocktail 2) was included before final incubations were initiated by adding the probe substrates. Reactions were terminated after 5 min and samples were processed as described above.

Inhibition Screening and IC₅₀ Experiments.

In an initial screening, the direct, slow-binding, and time-dependent inhibitory potential of HCQ and its metabolites were tested at two inhibitor concentrations (10 and 50 µM). Based on the findings, IC₅₀ experiments (direct and time-dependent inhibition) were carried out by incubating seven inhibitor concentrations (0.5-1,000 µM) with HLMs and the substrate cocktails. To determine the potential effect of BSA on the inhibition of the CYPs of cocktail 2, direct inhibition experiments were also carried out in the absence of BSA for HCQ and the primary metabolites.
**Ki Experiments.**

Based on the findings of IC$_{50}$ experiments, several incubations were carried out to determine the Ki values for the direct inhibition of CYP2D6 and 2J2 by HCQ and its metabolites, and to characterize the type of inhibition (competitive, noncompetitive, uncompetitive or mixed inhibition). A series of inhibitor concentrations (1/4 to 5 times the direct IC$_{50}$ values) were simultaneously incubated with four concentrations of dextromethorphan or astemizole (K$_{m}$/3, K$_{m}$, 3×K$_{m}$, and 9×K$_{m}$). All incubations were performed by hand without BSA.

**Data Analysis of Metabolism Findings.**

The kinetics of substrate depletion in HLM and recombinant CYP incubations was analyzed using GraphPad Prism (version 7.03; GraphPad Software, Inc., San Diego, CA, USA). Depletion rate constants (k$_{dep}$) were determined using nonlinear regression, and the intrinsic clearance (CL$_{int}$) of HCQ and its metabolites was expressed as CL$_{int}$ = k$_{dep}$/[M], where [M] is the HLM or recombinant CYP concentration used in the incubations. The kinetics of DCQ and DHCQ formation by CYP2C8, CYP2D6, and CYP3A4 were analyzed with the Michaelis-Menten, substrate inhibition, allosteric sigmoidal (Hill), and two enzymes models using GraphPad Prism. Selection of the best model for each reaction was based on the Akaike information criterion, R$^2$ values, and a visual examination of Michaelis-Menten and Eadie-Hofstee plots. CL$_{int}$ values of each reaction were calculated according to CL$_{int}$ = V$_{max}$/K$_{m}$, where V$_{max}$ is the maximal velocity and K$_{m}$ is the Michaelis-Menten constant.

All CL$_{int}$ values were corrected for non-specific binding to protein by CL$_{int,u}$ = CL$_{int}$/f$_{u,mic}$, where CL$_{int,u}$ is the unbound intrinsic clearance and f$_{u,mic}$ is the unbound fraction of drug at various protein concentrations. f$_{u,mic}$ values were predicted as described in **Supp. Table 3**. To estimate the relative contributions of CYP2C8, CYP2D6, and CYP3A4 to the metabolism of HCQ, Cypex LR intersystem
extrapolation factors (ISEFs) and CYP expression values were obtained from Simcyp Population-Based Simulator (V20; Simcyp Ltd, Certara, UK). The ISEFs corresponded to 0.982, 1.11, and 1.09, and the CYP expression levels to 24, 9.4, and 137 pmol/mg for CYP2C8, CYP2D6, and CYP3A4, respectively. In addition, for CYP2D6 and CYP3A4, CL\textsubscript{int}-based ISEFs (CLISEFs) were calculated based on the reported marker activities for the used lots of recombinant enzymes and HLM (Proctor et al., 2004). A CLISEF value was not calculated for CYP2C8, as different marker substrates had been used for recombinant enzyme and HLM. For CYP2D6 and CYP3A4, the CLISEFs corresponded to 0.57 and 0.42, respectively. The recombinant CYP CL\textsubscript{int, u} values were then multiplied with the respective ISEF or CLISEF and CYP expression value to obtain HLM CL\textsubscript{int, u} values. Measured and scaled HLM CL\textsubscript{int, u} values were further scaled to CL\textsubscript{int, in vivo} using 39.79 mg microsomal protein/g liver, and liver volume and density values of 1.65 l and 1,080 g/l liver (Simcyp Population-Based Simulator V20). In the final step, hepatic blood clearance (CL\textsubscript{H}) values were calculated using the well-stirred model (Yang et al., 2007),

\[
CL_H = \frac{Q_H \times f_{u,B} \times CL\textsubscript{int, in vivo}}{Q_H + f_{u,B} \times CL\textsubscript{int, in vivo}}
\]

where Q\textsubscript{H} is the hepatic blood flow (1.610 l/min) (Pelkonen and Turpeinen, 2007) and f\textsubscript{u,B} is the unbound fraction of HCQ in blood. f\textsubscript{u,B} was calculated according to \( f_{u,B} = f_{u,p} \times \frac{1}{BP} \), where f\textsubscript{u,p} and BP are the unbound fraction in plasma (0.48) and blood-to-plasma concentration ratio (7.2) of HCQ, respectively (Tett et al., 1988; McLachlan et al., 1993). The calculated f\textsubscript{u,B} equaled to 0.067.
**Data Analysis of Inhibition Findings.**

IC$_{50}$ and K$_i$ values were determined by nonlinear regression using GraphPad Prism (version 8.4.3). Inhibitor concentration-response data were fitted to the following four-parameter log-logistic equation (variable slope sigmoidal model):

\[
Y = \text{Bottom plateau} + \frac{\text{Top plateau} - \text{Bottom plateau}}{1 + \left( \frac{X}{IC_{50}} \right)^n}
\]

where Y is the percentage of remaining CYP activity compared to the solvent controls, X is the inhibitor concentration and n is the Hill slope. The bottom plateau was set to zero when no bottom plateau could be reliably inferred; otherwise, parameters were not constrained. In cases where a stronger CYP inhibition was observed following preincubation of the inhibitor, IC$_{50}$ shift (IC$_{50}$ value obtained without preincubation/IC$_{50}$ value obtained with preincubation) values were determined. An IC$_{50}$ shift value $\geq$1.5 was used to denote time-dependent inhibition.

Rate *versus* probe substrate concentration data were fitted to the following equations for competitive inhibition (Eq.1), noncompetitive inhibition (Eq.2), uncompetitive inhibition (Eq.3), or mixed-type inhibition (Eq.4) (Copeland, 2000):

\[
v = \frac{V_{\text{max}} \times S}{K_m \times (1 + [I]/K_i) + S} \quad \text{Eq.1}
\]

\[
v = \frac{V_{\text{max}} \times S}{K_m + S} \times \left(1 + \frac{[I]}{K_i}\right) \quad \text{Eq.2}
\]

\[
v = \frac{V_{\text{max}} \times S}{K_m + S \times (1 + [I]/\alpha K_i)} \quad \text{Eq.3}
\]

\[
v = \frac{V_{\text{max}} \times S}{K_m \times (1 + [I]/K_i) + S \times (1 + [I]/\alpha K_i)} \quad \text{Eq.4}
\]
where \( v \) is the velocity of the reaction; \( V_{\text{max}} \) is the maximum velocity; \( S \) is the substrate concentration; \( K_m \) is the Michaelis constant (substrate concentration at \( V_{\text{max}}/2 \)); \([I]\) is the inhibitor concentration; \( K_i \) is the inhibition constant describing the affinity of the inhibitor for the enzyme; and \( \alpha K_i \) describes the affinity of the inhibitor for the enzyme-substrate complex. The type of inhibition was determined based on the Akaike information criterion (AICc), and further confirmed by visual examination of Michaelis-Menten and Eadie-Hofstee plots. The latter were created by plotting the transformed data and the following lines:

- for direct inhibition: y-intercept = \( V_{\text{max}} \); slope = \( -\alpha \times K_m \), \( \alpha = 1 + [I]/K_i \)
- for mixed inhibition: y-intercept = \( V_{\text{max}}/(1 + [I]/\alpha K_i) \); slope = \( -K_m \times (1 + [I]/K_i)/(1 + [I]/\alpha K_i) \)

**Prediction of Clinical Drug-Drug Interactions Due to CYP2D6 Inhibition.**

The combined effects of HCQ and its metabolites on the plasma exposure of the CYP2D6 substrate metoprolol were predicted using a static mechanistic model equation (Templeton *et al.*, 2016),

\[
\text{AUCR} = \frac{\text{AUC}_{\text{with HCQ}}}{\text{AUC}_{\text{without HCQ}}} = \left( \frac{1}{1 + [I]_{HCQ} + [I]_{DCQ} + [I]_{DHCQ} + [I]_{DDCQ} \times \alpha K_i + (1 - \alpha K_i) f_m} \right)
\]

where AUCR is the fold change in metoprolol area under the concentration-time curve (AUC) in the presence (AUC\text{with HCQ}) and absence (AUC\text{without HCQ}) of the perpetrators, DCQ is desethylchloroquine, DDCQ is didesethylchloroquine, DHCQ is desethylhydroxychloroquine, HCQ is hydroxychloroquine, \([I]\) is the inhibitor concentration, and \( f_m \) is the fraction of the metoprolol dose cleared by CYP2D6. A \( f_m \) value of 0.8 was used, estimated based on clinical pharmacogenetic and interaction data available in the UW Drug Interaction Database (DIDB, Copyright University of Washington, accessed on February 11, 2021). Experimental reversible inhibition constants (\( K_i \)) were used and adjusted for non-specific binding to HLM at 0.1 mg/ml (Supp. Table 3). Because HCQ and its three metabolites accumulate
largely in blood and tissues, six sets of interaction predictions were carried out, based on their blood (1), corresponding plasma (2), and estimated liver (3-6) concentrations. In (1), the total blood concentrations of the metabolites were estimated from HCQ concentrations and HCQ/metabolite ratios in blood (Supp. Table 4). In (2), the corresponding total plasma concentrations of HCQ and its metabolites were calculated from their blood concentrations and blood-to-plasma values (Supp. Table 4). In (3), their total liver concentrations were estimated from the blood concentrations and mouse tissue-to-blood concentration (Kp) values (Chhonker et al., 2018) (Supp. Table 4). In (4), their total liver concentrations were estimated from plasma concentrations and tissue-to-plasma partition coefficients predicted in Simcyp Population-Based Simulator V20 as described in Supp. Table 4. In (5-6), their unbound liver concentrations were estimated by multiplying the total liver concentrations by the unbound fraction values in plasma (thus assuming an unbound fraction in the hepatocytes that equals that observed in plasma for each compound; Supp. Table 4).
Results

Metabolism in Recombinant CYP incubations.

In screening experiments, considerable HCQ depletion was observed in CYP2D6 and CYP2C8 incubations (Supp. Fig. 1). The highest concentrations of the primary metabolites DCQ and DHCQ were formed in CYP2D6, CYP2C8, and CYP3A4 incubations (Supp. Fig. 1). CYP3A5, CYP2C19, CYP2C9, and CYP1A2 also formed small amounts of these metabolites. The secondary metabolite DDCQ was formed abundantly in CYP2D6 incubations, while only very small amounts were produced by CYP2C8 and CYP3A4.

In follow-up experiments, when the metabolism of HCQ was studied, CYP2D6 and CYP2C8 formed the highest concentrations of HCQ primary metabolites (data of the 1 µM HCQ/0.1 mg/ml protein experiment is shown in Fig. 2A-D). CYP3A4 also formed smaller amounts of the metabolites. DDCQ was only formed by CYP2D6. At a low HCQ concentration of 0.3 µM, the CL_int of the CYP2D6-mediated depletion of HCQ was 4.3-fold and 12-fold higher than the depletion mediated by CYP2C8 and CYP3A4, respectively (Table 1, Supp. Fig. 2A).

DHCQ and DCQ formation by CYP2C8, CYP2D6, and CYP3A4 followed Michaelis-Menten kinetics, with evidence of substrate inhibition type kinetics in some cases (Fig. 3A-F). CYP2D6 displayed the lowest K_m values of 20 and 7.5 µM for DCQ and DHCQ formation, respectively.

Although the depletion rate of HCQ in recombinant CYP2D6 incubations was more than tenfold higher than the one in CYP3A4 incubations, scaling of the recombinant data to HLM level resulted in almost equal CL_int values for CYP2D6 and CYP3A4, due to the much greater abundance of CYP3A4
compared to CYP2D6 (Table 1). The ISEF-based scaled HLM \( CL_{\text{int}} \) value of CYP2C8 was approximately half of those of CYP2D6 and CYP3A4.

**Metabolism in Human Liver Microsomes.**

An initial HLM experiment including negative controls (no NADPH) ruled out any HCQ metabolism that would take place without external cofactors (data not shown). In HLM incubations with HCQ (3 \( \mu \)M), both its primary metabolites were formed (Fig. 4A). In HLM incubations with DCQ and DHCQ (3 \( \mu \)M) as the substrate, only DDCQ was formed (Fig. 4B-C). In experiments with both a reversible and a time-dependent inhibitor for each enzyme, CYP2D6, CYP3A, and CYP2C8 inhibitors inhibited the formation of DHCQ from HCQ by 34-49%, 46-47%, and 27-32%, respectively (Fig. 4D). For DCQ formation, the experiments with CYP-selective reversible and time-dependent inhibitors suggested a slightly higher importance for CYP3A, with 24-44% inhibition by the CYP2D6 inhibitors, 52-57% inhibition by the CYP3A inhibitors, and 23-29% inhibition by the CYP2C8 inhibitors (Fig. 4E). In these experiments, HCQ depletion was too slow to reliably measure partial inhibition of the depletion rate by time-dependent CYP2D6, CYP3A and CYP2C8 inhibitors (data not shown).

The depletion of HCQ, DCQ, and DHCQ at a low initial concentration of 0.3 \( \mu \)M resulted in \( CL_{\text{int}} \) values of 5.6-12 \( \mu \)l/min/mg (Supp. Fig. 2B; Table 1). For HCQ, scaling of the \( CL_{\text{int}} \) resulted in a scaled hepatic clearance value of 4.1 l/h, which approximates to 71% of the published blood clearance of HCQ (Table 1).

**Inhibition Screening Using CYP Probe Substrate Cocktail Assays.**

In preliminary screening experiments, HCQ was shown to cause direct inhibition of CYP2D6 (Supp. Fig. 3); DCQ and DHCQ were direct inhibitors of CYP2D6, and of CYP2J2 to a lesser extent, as well
as time-dependent inhibitors of CYP3A (Supp. Fig. 4-5); while DDCQ appeared to have a broader inhibitory effect on CYP enzymes, with marked direct inhibition of CYP2D6 and CYP2J2, and time-dependent inhibition of CYP3A (Supp. Fig. 6). There was no evidence for slow-binding inhibition of any CYP enzyme by HCQ and its metabolites (Supp. Fig. 3-6).

IC₅₀ Experiments Using CYP Probe Substrate Cocktail Assays.

Based on the screening data, HCQ and its metabolites were further tested for direct and time-dependent inhibition of selected CYPs. All test compounds were direct inhibitors of CYP2D6, and all three metabolites were direct inhibitors of CYP2J2, with no evidence of time-dependent inhibition (Table 2; Fig. 5A-H). HCQ and its metabolites were moderate CYP2D6 inhibitors (IC₅₀ values ranging from 18 to 135 µM; Table 2), while the observed inhibition of CYP2J2 by the metabolites was in general weaker (IC₅₀ values between 63 and 504 µM; Table 2). Of the four compounds tested, DCQ was the most potent (direct) inhibitor of CYP2D6 (IC₅₀ = 18 µM), while DDCQ was the most potent (direct) inhibitor of CYP2J2 (IC₅₀ = 63 µM). BSA had little (≤1.3-fold difference) or no effect on the direct IC₅₀ values of CYP2D6 and CYP2J2 (Supp. Table 5).

Compared to no preincubation, CYP3A inhibition increased after preincubation for 30 min with NADPH for all three metabolites, indicating that they are time-dependent CYP3A inhibitors (Table 2; Fig. 5I-K; Supp. Table 5). Preincubation of DCQ with NADPH resulted in a 3.2-fold decrease in its IC₅₀ value for CYP3A4 inhibition from 149 µM to 46 µM. Preincubation of DHCQ with NADPH had a slightly weaker effect on CYP3A inhibition, with a 2.2-fold IC₅₀ shift (from 260 µM to 117 µM). DDCQ inhibited CYP3A with the lowest IC₅₀ values, with a 3.4-fold shift in IC₅₀ from 40 µM to 12 µM after preincubation with NADPH.
**K_i Determination Experiments for CYP2D6 and CYP2J2 Direct Inhibition.**

Statistical and visual examination of Michaelis-Menten and Eadie-Hofstee plots suggested that HCQ, DCQ, DHCQ and DDCQ competitively inhibited CYP2D6 in pooled HLMs with K_i values of 32.5, 10.4, 48.1, and 24.1 μM, respectively (Fig. 6). DCQ, DHCQ and DDCQ were mixed-type inhibitors of CYP2J2 with K_i values of 382, 508, and 41.8 μM, respectively (Fig. 7). All K_i values were in good agreement with the IC_{50} values determined during the IC_{50} shift experiments.

**Prediction of Clinical Drug-Drug Interactions Due to Direct CYP2D6 Inhibition.**

The predicted fold increase in metoprolol AUC (AUCR) following direct inhibition of CYP2D6 by HCQ and its three metabolites is shown in Fig. 8. AUCR were calculated based on HCQ, DCQ, DHCQ, and DDCQ total blood (1), total plasma (2), and total and unbound liver (3-6) concentrations. In a clinical study, administration of HCQ with metoprolol caused a 1.65-fold increase in metoprolol AUC in six patients, whose total HCQ blood concentrations ranged from 1.5 to 2.3 µM.

Based on these blood (1) or corresponding plasma (2) concentrations (0.21-0.32 µM) combined with the corresponding (predicted) metabolite concentrations in blood or plasma, the predicted metoprolol AUCR was ≤1.1 (Fig. 8A-B). However, when the corresponding (estimated) total liver concentrations (3-4) were used, the predicted metoprolol AUCR values exceeded 3.1 at the clinically relevant HCQ concentrations (Fig. 8C-D). On the other hand, with the corresponding unbound liver concentrations (5-6), the predicted AUCR values were slightly lower (2.4-2.8) (Fig. 8E-F). In all predictions, the contribution of metabolites was significant.
Discussion

Until now, there has been little direct evidence of the interactions of HCQ with CYP enzymes. In the present study, we thoroughly screened the CYP-mediated metabolism of HCQ, and tested the reversible and time-dependent inhibitory effects of HCQ and its three main metabolites on nine drug-metabolizing CYPs. Our collective findings from HLMs and recombinant enzymes suggest that HCQ is mainly metabolized by CYP3A4, CYP2D6, and CYP2C8. In addition, HCQ and its metabolites are reversible, competitive inhibitors of CYP2D6, and all three HCQ metabolites are mixed-type inhibitors of CYP2J2 and time-dependent inhibitors of CYP3A.

In the literature, CYP2D6, CYP3A4, and CYP2C8 are often claimed to be the enzymes responsible for HCQ metabolism. However, these studies generally refer to chloroquine data reported by Kim et al. (2003) and Projean et al. (2003). The present findings show for the first time that these same enzymes are, indeed, also responsible for HCQ metabolism. Although the HCQ depletion rate in recombinant CYP2D6 incubations was more than tenfold higher than that in CYP3A4 incubations, scaling of the data to the HLM level resulted in almost equal CLint values for CYP2D6 and CYP3A4 (Table 1). Depending on the scaling method used (ISEF or CLISEF), different hepatic clearance values were obtained for CYP2D6 and CYP3A4. Of these, the CLISEF-based hepatic clearance values for CYP2D6 and CYP3A4 (1.6 and 1.5 l/h, respectively) were best in line with the microsomal-derived CLH value (4.1 l/h). Unfortunately, we were unable to carry out CLISEF-based scaling of the CYP2C8 CLint value. Nevertheless, according to depletion and inhibition data, CYP2D6 and CYP3A4 seem to be equally important in the formation of DHCQ, whereas CYP3A4 plays a slightly larger role in DCQ formation. CYP2C8 seems to contribute slightly less, approximately 20-25% to both pathways.
There seems to be no published interaction studies investigating the effects of inhibitors of CYP2D6, CYP2C8, and CYP3A on the pharmacokinetics of HCQ. However, the DHCQ/HCQ ratio was associated with CYP2D6 genotype in Korean lupus patients receiving HCQ (Lee et al., 2016). Another study did not find any significant association between CYP genotypes and HCQ response in British patients, although there was a trend for CYP2C8*3 and CYP2C8*4 to be associated with greater odds of response (Wahie et al., 2011).

Except for a study showing no reversible inhibition of CYP3A4 by HCQ (Li et al., 2020), little is known about the inhibitory effects of HCQ on CYP enzymes \textit{in vitro}. In our study, all three metabolites of HCQ inhibited CYP3A in a NADPH- and time-dependent fashion, as evidenced by IC$_{50}$ shift values $>$1.5 (Table 2). Their inactivation constants will be determined in a follow-up study, since time-dependent inhibition may cause a longer-lasting inhibitory effect, as compared with reversible inhibition. In addition, it may result in hapten formation and in some cases trigger an idiosyncratic adverse reaction (Kalgutkar et al., 2007). There seems to be little data on the effects of HCQ on CYP3A substrates \textit{in vivo}, but HCQ has increased the plasma exposure of the CYP3A substrate MK-2206 by 16-92% in cancer patients (Mehnert et al., 2019).

In healthy subjects, HCQ has increased the plasma exposure of metoprolol by 65%, suggesting that it acts as an inhibitor of CYP2D6 (Somer et al., 2000). According to our data, HCQ and all of its three metabolites are reversible, competitive CYP2D6 inhibitors. DCQ was the most potent inhibitor with an IC$_{50}$ value (18 µM) more than 3-fold lower than those of the other compounds and a K$_i$ value of 10.4 µM (Fig. 6B). Static predictions based on the \textit{in vitro} inhibitory data, however, suggested only a minimal ($<$1.1-fold) increase in metoprolol AUC when making the predictions using the total blood concentrations of HCQ measured at the end of the HCQ treatment in the clinical study (1.5-2.3 µM) or corresponding total plasma concentrations. However, HCQ and its metabolites accumulate extensively
into tissues, indicating that their intracellular concentrations are higher than those in the bloodstream. Accordingly, in predictions based on intracellular hepatocyte concentrations, estimated using mouse Kp or predicted human Kp values, we obtained much higher predicted AUC increases that were close to the observed interaction with metoprolol. Hence, our predictions suggest that the extensive accumulation of HCQ and its metabolites into tissues must be taken into account when predicting CYP-mediated interactions with HCQ as the perpetrator drug. Of note, the contribution of the metabolites to the total inhibitory effect was significant in all predictions. Nevertheless, the inhibitory effect of HCQ and its metabolites on CYP2D6 is of particular concern when used concomitantly with CYP2D6 substrates that, similarly to HCQ, prolong QT interval, such as ondansetron and haloperidol. Moreover, autoinhibition of CYP2D6 may reduce its contribution to the overall metabolism of HCQ, thereby also increasing the relative importance of CYP2C8 and CYP3A4. To the best of our knowledge, there are no clinical reports to date suggesting time-dependent nonlinear pharmacokinetics for HCQ.

HCQ and its metabolites have very complex and unusual pharmacokinetic profiles. In addition to their extensive accumulation in blood and tissues, as a complicating factor, they display stereoselective pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics, as well as toxic properties (McChesney, 1983; McLachlan et al., 1993; Brocks et al., 1994; Ducharme et al., 1995; Lim et al., 2009). Unfortunately, the individual HCQ and metabolite enantiomers were not commercially available at the time of our study. Hence, the present in vitro CL_int and scaled hepatic clearance values reflect those of the racemic compounds. The present hepatic clearance (4.1 l/h) calculated based on the depletion of HCQ in HLMs approximates to 71% of the measured total intravenous clearance (5.8 l/h). Our finding is in good agreement with clinical data showing that renal clearance accounts for approximately one third of the total plasma clearance of HCQ, whereas metabolism and biliary excretion is the predominant route of elimination (Tett et al., 1988; Tett et al., 1989).
Because of the complex pharmacokinetics of HCQ and the wide variability in its concentration profile, it has been difficult to relate measured HCQ concentrations to its therapeutic and adverse effects (Rainsford et al., 2015). Nevertheless, several pharmacokinetic and physiologically-based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) models have been developed for HCQ, in particular after the outbreak of COVID-19 (Collins et al., 2018; Themans et al., 2020; Idkaidek et al., 2021). Our data can be used to update these models, and to simulate the effects of CYP-mediated drug-drug interactions and variants in CYP genes. In addition to CYPs, HCQ interacts with drug transporters. HCQ is a substrate of P-glycoprotein in vitro (Weiss et al., 2020). There seem to be no studies investigating HCQ and transporter pharmacogenetics, but ATP-binding cassette transporter A4, organic anion transporting polypeptide (OATP) 1A2, and OATP1B1 have been associated with chloroquine pharmacokinetics and response (Grassmann et al., 2015; Sortica et al., 2017). With respect to transporter inhibition, HCQ does not affect the activities of breast cancer resistance protein, multidrug resistance-associated protein 1, organic anion transporter (OAT) 1, OAT3, OATP1B1, or OATP1B3 in vitro (Weiss et al., 2020; Telbisz et al., 2021; Yee et al., 2021). However, it is a potent inhibitor of multidrug and toxin extrusion proteins 1 and 2 (IC$_{50}$ 2-4 and 1-7 µM, respectively), and a moderate or weak inhibitor of P-glycoprotein (IC$_{50}$ 52 µM), organic cation transporter (OCT) 1 (IC$_{50}$ 20-47 µM), OCT2 (IC$_{50}$ ≥5 µM), OATP1A2 (IC$_{50}$ 9-19 µM), and OATP2B1 (IC$_{50}$ ≥84 µM) (Xu et al., 2016; Weiss et al., 2020; Martinez-Guerrero et al., 2021; Telbisz et al., 2021; Yee et al., 2021). Inhibition of OATP1A2 by HCQ in the retinal pigment epithelium has been suggested to contribute to the retinal degradation observed in patients using HCQ (Xu et al., 2016). Together, these novel transport data and our metabolism data can be combined in PBPK models to simulate the role of enzyme-transport interplay in HCQ pharmacokinetics.
In conclusion, the present study shows for the first time that CYP2D6, CYP3A4 and CYP2C8 are responsible for the \textit{in vitro} metabolism of HCQ. Furthermore, our data indicate that HCQ and its metabolites are reversible, competitive inhibitors of CYP2D6, and that HCQ metabolites are mixed-type inhibitors of CYP2J2 and time-dependent inhibitors of CYP3A. The current data can thus be applied to improve PBPK models and update drug-drug interaction risk estimations for HCQ. Collectively, our findings contribute to an improved understanding of the clinical pharmacology of HCQ.
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Figure captions

**Fig. 1.** Hydroxychloroquine main metabolic pathways, with the most important CYP enzymes indicated for each reaction, based upon the present findings. DCQ and DHCQ are primary metabolites of hydroxychloroquine, and DDCQ is formed via subsequent metabolism of either of these primary metabolites. CYP, cytochrome P450; DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DDCQ, didesethylchloroquine; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine.

**Fig. 2.** Depletion of HCQ (1 µM; A) and resulting metabolite formation (B-D) in recombinant CYP incubations (0.1 mg/ml, 45 min). An equal protein concentration was used in parallel experiments (resulting in variable CYP contents) to keep the possible nonspecific binding of HCQ equal across incubations. The data represent mean and standard deviation values of triplicate incubations of one experiment. CYP, cytochrome P450; DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DDCQ, didesethylchloroquine; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine.

**Fig. 3.** Enzyme kinetics of DCQ and DHCQ formation in recombinant CYP2C8, CYP2D6, and CYP3A4 incubations (A-F). Data represent mean and standard deviation values of triplicate incubations of one experiment. CL_{int}, intrinsic clearance; CYP, cytochrome P450; DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine; K_i, inhibition constant; K_m, Michaelis-Menten constant; V_{max}, maximum reaction rate.
Fig. 4. Depletion and CYP-selective inhibition experiments in HLMs. The depletion of HCQ 3 µM (A), DHCQ 3 µM (B), and DCQ 3 µM (C), and resulting metabolite formation in HLM incubations (0.5 mg/ml, 120 min) are shown in the top panel. In the bottom panel, the effects of CYP-selective reversible and time-dependent inhibitors on DHCQ (D) and DCQ (E) formation from HCQ (3 µM) are illustrated. The data represent mean and standard deviation values of triplicate incubations of one experiment. CYP, cytochrome P450; DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DDCQ, didesethylchloroquine; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; GEM-G, gemfibrozil 1-O-β-glucuronide; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine; HLMs, human liver microsomes; KETO, ketoconazole MON, montelukast; QUIN, quinidine; PAR, paroxetine; TAO, troleandomycin.

Fig. 5. The inhibitory effects of HCQ, DCQ, DHCQ, and DDCQ on dextromethorphan O-demethylation (CYP2D6 probe reaction), astemizole O-demethylation (CYP2J2 probe reaction), and midazolam 1’-hydroxylation (CYP3A probe reaction) in HLM incubations. IC50 values were determined following no preincubation (direct inhibition) or after a 30-min preincubation of inhibitor in the presence of NADPH (time-dependent inhibition), as described in Materials and Methods. The obtained IC50 values are given in Table 2. The data points show mean and standard deviations of measured CYP activity in inhibitor incubations as compared to that in solvent control incubations (triplicate incubations of one experiment). As the screening indicated no inhibition of CYP3A by HCQ, no CYP3A IC50 values were determined for HCQ. DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DDCQ, didesethylchloroquine; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine; HLMs, human liver microsomes; IC50, 50% inhibitory concentration.
Fig. 6. Direct inhibition of dextromethorphan O-demethylation (CYP2D6 probe reaction) by HCQ, DCQ, DHCQ and DDCQ in HLM incubations. The rate of metabolite formation was assessed at four substrate concentrations over a range of inhibitor concentrations to determine K_i values as described in Materials and Methods. The data points show mean and standard deviations of measured rates of metabolite formation in inhibitor incubations as compared to that in solvent control incubations (triplicate incubations of one experiment). DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DDCQ, didesethylchloroquine; DEX, dextromethorphan; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine; HLMs, human liver microsomes; Ki, inhibition constant.

Fig. 7. Direct inhibition of astemizole O-demethylation (CYP2J2 probe reaction) by DCQ, DHCQ and DDCQ in HLM incubations. The rate of metabolite formation was assessed at four substrate concentrations over a range of inhibitor concentrations to determine K_i values as described in Materials and Methods. The data points show mean and standard deviations of measured rates of metabolite formation in inhibitor incubations as compared to that in solvent control incubations (triplicate incubations of one experiment). AST, astemizole; DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DDCQ, didesethylchloroquine; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; HLMs, human liver microsomes; Ki, inhibition constant.

Fig. 8. Prediction of the total inhibitory effect of HCQ and its metabolites on the pharmacokinetics of the CYP2D6 substrate metoprolol in vivo. In a clinical interaction study between HCQ and metoprolol in six healthy volunteers, an eight day treatment with HCQ increased the area under the plasma concentration-time curve (AUC) of a single dose of metoprolol (on day 9) by 1.65-fold (average fold increase indicated by the bold dashed line, with individual values ranging from 1.1 to 2.4 indicated by the dashed lines).
In the clinical study, HCQ blood concentrations were 1.5-2.3 µM at single time points on days 8 and 9 (pink area). In predictions based on the present CYP2D6 direct IC\textsubscript{50} values and total blood (A) or plasma (B) concentrations of HCQ and its metabolites, HCQ concentrations of the measured magnitude did not explain the observed interaction (AUCR <1.1). When the predictions were based on estimated total liver concentrations (C-D), AUCR values of >3.1-fold were obtained. However, predictions based on unbound liver concentrations (E-F; assuming an unbound fraction in the hepatocytes that equals that observed in plasma for each compound), AUCR values of the clinically observed magnitude were obtained. A fraction metabolized by CYP2D6 (f\textsubscript{m,CYP2D6}) of 0.8 for metoprolol was used in the predictions, and several assumptions were made (Materials and Methods). Metoprolol AUCR, metoprolol AUC\textsubscript{with HCQ}/metoprolol AUC\textsubscript{without HCQ} ratio; DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DDCQ, didesethylchloroquine; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; EMs, extensive CYP2D6 metabolizers; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine; K\textsubscript{p}, tissue-to-blood or tissue-to-plasma concentration coefficient.
Tables

Table 1.

Measured intrinsic and scaled hepatic clearance values of HCQ depletion (0.3 µM) in HLM and recombinant CYP2C8, CYP2D6, and CYP3A4 incubations. Values shown are mean ± standard deviation of triplicates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enzyme source</th>
<th>$\text{CL}_{\text{int}}$ (µl/min/mg or µl/min/pmol)$^a$</th>
<th>$\text{CL}_{\text{int,u}}^b$ (µl/min/mg or µl/min/pmol)$^a$</th>
<th>Scaling of HLM data</th>
<th>ISEF</th>
<th>CLISEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{CL}_{\text{int,u}}$ (µl/min/mg)</td>
<td>$\text{CL}_H$ (l/h)$^c$</td>
<td>% of $\text{CL}_{\text{iv}}$ (5.76 l/h)$^d$</td>
<td>$\text{CL}_{\text{int,u}}$ (µl/min/mg)</td>
<td>$\text{CL}_H$ (l/h)$^c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLM</td>
<td>7.47 ± 1.54</td>
<td>15.1 ± 3.10</td>
<td>15.1 ± 3.10</td>
<td>4.08 ± 0.81</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2C8</td>
<td>0.200 ± 0.034</td>
<td>0.241 ± 0.042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enzyme source</td>
<td>CL_{int} (µl/min/mg or µl/min/pmol)^a</td>
<td>CL_{int,u} (µl/min/mg)</td>
<td>Scaling of HLM data</td>
<td>ISEF</td>
<td>CLISEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HLM CL_{int,u} (µl/min/mg)</td>
<td>CL_H (l/h)^c</td>
<td>% of CL_{iv} (5.76 l/h)^d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2D6</td>
<td>0.870 ± 0.092</td>
<td>1.05 ± 0.11</td>
<td>10.9 ± 1.16</td>
<td>3.00 ± 0.31</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP3A4</td>
<td>0.0752 ± 0.0142</td>
<td>0.0905 ± 0.0170</td>
<td>13.5 ± 2.55</td>
<td>3.69 ± 0.67</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CL_H, hepatic clearance; CL_{int}, intrinsic clearance; CL_{int,u}, unbound intrinsic clearance; CLISEF, CL_{int}-based intersystem extrapolation factors; CL_{iv}, intravenous clearance; CYP, cytochrome P450; HLM, human liver microsome; ISEF, intersystem extrapolation factors.

^a µl/min/mg for HLM, µl/min/pmol for recombinant CYP.

^b These values have been corrected for non-specific binding to protein according to CL_{int,u} = CL_{int}/f_{u,mic} (f_{u,mic} was estimated at a protein concentration of 0.5 mg/ml in HLM incubations, and 0.1 mg/ml in recombinant CYP incubations) ([Supp. Table 3](#Supp_Table_3)).
c These values were calculated from HLM CL\text{int,u} using equations from Yang et al. (2007).

d Intravenous blood clearance value obtained from Tett et al. (1988).

e For recombinant enzyme data, these values were obtained by multiplying recombinant CYP CL\text{int,u} values with their respective ISEF and CYP expression values, or with their respective CL\text{ISEF} and CYP expression values (CYP2D6 and CYP3A4).
Table 2.

Inhibitory effects of HCQ, DCQ, DHCQ, and DDCQ on CYP activities in HLM incubations. IC$_{50}$ values were determined following no preincubation (direct inhibition) or after a 30-min preincubation of inhibitor in the presence of NADPH (time-dependent inhibition), as described in Materials and Methods. A full table of the obtained results of the IC$_{50}$ experiments (also showing lack of inhibition and the effects of BSA exclusion in cocktail 2) can be found in the supplement (Supp. Table 5). IC$_{50}$ values are reported as means of three determinations with their 95% confidence intervals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhibitor</th>
<th>Enzyme</th>
<th>IC$_{50}$ (µM)</th>
<th>IC$_{50}$ shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct inhibition</td>
<td>Time-dependent inhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>CYP2D6</td>
<td>91.2 (86.1-106)</td>
<td>170 (157-185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYP2J2</td>
<td>&gt; 1,000</td>
<td>&gt; 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ</td>
<td>CYP2D6</td>
<td>18.4 (17.5-20.2)</td>
<td>30.3 (24.7-33.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYP2J2</td>
<td>374 (310-412)</td>
<td>341 (271-398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYP3A</td>
<td>149 (130-193)</td>
<td>45.8 (30.4-52.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHCQ</td>
<td>CYP2D6</td>
<td>135 (109-149)</td>
<td>146 (134-158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYP2J2</td>
<td>504 (445-581)</td>
<td>491 (441-560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYP3A</td>
<td>260 (231-293)</td>
<td>117 (79.2-144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibitor</td>
<td>Enzyme</td>
<td>IC₅₀ (µM)</td>
<td>IC₅₀ shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct inhibition</td>
<td>Time-dependent inhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDCQ</td>
<td>CYP1A2</td>
<td>186 (139-203)</td>
<td>141 (60.7-168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYP2B6</td>
<td>182 (141-199)</td>
<td>199 (138-230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYP2C8</td>
<td>132 (115-143)</td>
<td>109 (62.1-122)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYP2C9</td>
<td>107 (81.2-135)</td>
<td>87.7 (60.9-111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYP2C19</td>
<td>170 (93.2-206)</td>
<td>142 (30.5-202)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYP2D6</td>
<td>54.7 (38.6-64.0)</td>
<td>90.9 (17.2-115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYP2J2</td>
<td>62.9 (41.9-70.8)</td>
<td>50.0 (9.3-64.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYP3A</td>
<td>40.5 (25.7-45.0)</td>
<td>12.1 (5.0-14.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DDCQ, didesethylchloroquine; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine; IC₅₀, 50% inhibitory concentration; IC₅₀ shift, IC₅₀ (direct inhibition)/IC₅₀ (time-dependent inhibition) ratio.
Figure 1

Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) → CYP2D6, CYP3A4, CYP2C8 → Desethylhydroxychloroquine (DHCQ)

CYP3A4, CYP2D6, CYP2C8 → Desethylchloroquine (DCQ)

CYP2D6 → Didesethylchloroquine (DDCQ)
**Figure 2**

(A) Depletion of HCQ by rCYPs

(B) Formation of DHCQ by rCYPs

(C) Formation of DCQ by rCYPs

(D) Formation of DDCQ by rCYPs
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- **Control bactosomes**
- **CYP1A2**
- **CYP2C8**
- **CYP2C9**
- **CYP2C19**
- **CYP3A4**
- **CYP3A5**
A. DHCQ formation by CYP2C8

- \( V_{\text{max}} = 2.95 \text{ pmol/min/pmol} \)
- \( K_m = 139 \mu M \)
- \( \text{CL}_{\text{int}} = 0.021 \mu l/min/pmol \)

B. DCQ formation by CYP2C8

- \( V_{\text{max}} = 1.41 \text{ pmol/min/pmol} \)
- \( K_m = 163 \mu M \)
- \( K_i = 444 \mu M \)
- \( \text{CL}_{\text{int}} = 0.010 \mu l/min/pmol \)

C. DHCQ formation by CYP2D6

- \( V_{\text{max}} = 2.49 \text{ pmol/min/pmol} \)
- \( K_m = 7.48 \mu M \)
- \( K_i = 1.180 \mu M \)
- \( \text{CL}_{\text{int}} = 0.33 \mu l/min/pmol \)

D. DCQ formation by CYP2D6

- \( V_{\text{max}} = 0.538 \text{ pmol/min/pmol} \)
- \( K_m = 20.4 \mu M \)
- \( \text{CL}_{\text{int}} = 0.026 \mu l/min/pmol \)

E. DHCQ formation by CYP3A4

- \( V_{\text{max}} = 1.16 \text{ pmol/min/pmol} \)
- \( K_m = 188 \mu M \)
- \( \text{CL}_{\text{int}} = 0.0062 \mu l/min/pmol \)

F. DCQ formation by CYP3A4

- \( V_{\text{max}} = 0.564 \text{ pmol/min/pmol} \)
- \( K_m = 120 \mu M \)
- \( \text{CL}_{\text{int}} = 0.0047 \mu l/min/pmol \)
**Figure 4**

(A) Depletion of HCQ in HLMs

(B) Depletion of DHCO in HLMs

(C) Depletion of DCQ in HLMs

(D) Inhibition of DHCO formation in HCQ incubations

(E) Inhibition of DCQ formation in HCQ incubations
Figure 5

A. HCQ - CYP2D6
B. DCQ - CYP2D6
C. DHCQ - CYP2D6
D. DDCQ - CYP2D6

E. HCQ - CYP2J2
F. DCQ - CYP2J2
G. DHCQ - CYP2J2
H. DDCQ - CYP2J2

I. DCQ - CYP3A
J. DHCQ - CYP3A
K. DDCQ - CYP3A

% remaining CYP activity

- O No preincubation
- ● 30 min preincubation
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Figure 6

A. $K_i = 32.5 \ (29.0-36.4) \ \mu M$

B. $K_i = 10.4 \ (9.61-11.3) \ \mu M$

C. $K_i = 48.1 \ (43.7-53.0) \ \mu M$

D. $K_i = 24.1 \ (21.4-27.2) \ \mu M$
Figure 7

A

\[ K_i = 382 \ (297-500) \ \mu M \]

B

\[ K_i = 508 \ (359-753) \ \mu M \]

C

\[ K_i = 41.8 \ (35.5-49.5) \ \mu M \]
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Materials and Methods

Sample Processing and Analysis of Metabolism Samples.

Following centrifugation, aliquots of the supernatants were collected. Analytes and internal standards were analyzed using a liquid chromatography–tandem mass spectrometric method (LC-MS/MS). The analytes were separated on a Zorbax RX-C8 column (2.1 x 150 mm, 5 µm, Agilent, Santa Clara, CA, USA) by liquid chromatography (Nexera X2, UHPLC system, Shimadzu, Kyoto, Japan) at a flow rate of 0.35 ml/min with 10 mM ammonium formate pH 4 as mobile phase A, and 0.1% formic acid in methanol as mobile phase B. The flow was operated in a stepwise gradient of mobile phase B, first increasing from 15-20% at 0-4.5 min, then 20-90% at 4.5-6 min, kept constant at 90% for 6-7 min and balancing at 15% before the next injection. Separated analytes were detected and quantified by use of an API3000 mass spectrometer (Sciex, Toronto, ON, Canada) operated in electrospray positive ionization mode (ESI +). The multiple reaction monitoring (MRM) transitions of the analytes [M+H]⁺ were m/z 336.2-247.2 for hydroxychloroquine, m/z 308.1-130.2 for DHCQ, m/z 292.2-114.3 for DCQ, and m/z 264.2-179.1 for DDCQ. Corresponding deuterium labelled molecules served as internal standards, except for DCQ where hydroxychloroquine-D4 was used.

Sample Processing and Analysis of Inhibition Samples.

All samples from the inhibition screening and IC₅₀ experiments were kept at 4°C for 30 min before precipitated proteins were removed by centrifugal filtration (1,800g for 15 min at 8°C, Strata Impact protein precipitation filter plates, Phenomenex, Torrance, CA, USA). Samples were then evaporated to dryness, resuspended in 40 µl of 20% methanol and centrifuged (2,000g for 15 min at 8°C) before UPLC-MS/MS analysis. All samples from the Kᵢ experiments were kept at 4°C for 30 min before precipitated proteins were removed by centrifugal filtration (1,800g for 15 min, Strata Impact protein precipitation filter plates, Phenomenex, Torrance, CA, USA). Samples were then centrifuged again (3,350g for 15 min) before UPLC-MS/MS analysis.

To quantify the metabolites of the nine probe substrates generated during the incubations, processed samples were analyzed with a Shimadzu Nexera X2 ultra-high-performance liquid chromatography system coupled to a Shimadzu LCMS-8050 triple quadrupole mass spectrometer (UPLC-MS/MS - Shimadzu, Kyoto, Japan) using a previously validated method (Kahma et al., 2021). Chromatographic separation was performed on a Luna Omega Polar C18 (100 x 2.1 mm, 1.6 µm) column (Phenomenex,
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Torrance, CA, USA) thermostated at 40°C. Eluent A was 0.05% formic acid in water, and eluent B was 0.05% formic acid in acetonitrile. Eluting conditions for cocktail 1 were a linear gradient of A and B at a flow rate of 0.3 ml/min, as follows: 0-1 min, B 10%; 1-3.5 min, B 10-27%; 3.5-5.5 min, B 27-90%; 5.5-10 min, B 90%; 10-10.1 min, B 90-10%; 10.1-15 min, B 10%. Eluting conditions for the analysis of cocktail 2 analytes and O-desmethyldostramizole alone (K_i experiments) were a linear gradient of A and B at a flow rate of 0.3 ml/min, as follows: 0-0.5 min, B 10%; 0.5-5 min, B 10-30%; 5-6 min, B 30-70%; 6-6.1 min, B 70-95%; 6.1-10 min, B 95%; 10-10.1 min, B 95-10%; 10.1-15 min, B 10%. Eluting conditions for the analysis of dextrorphan alone (K_i experiments) were a linear gradient of A and B at a flow rate of 0.3 ml/min, as follows: 0-0.5 min, B 10%; 0.5-5 min, B 10-30%; 5-5.01 min, B 30-95%; 5.01-7 min, B 95%; 7-7.01 min, B 95-10%; 7.01-10 min, B 10%. Detection was performed in positive or negative electrospray ionization mode (ESI+/−) depending on the analyte, and mass spectra were acquired in MRM mode. Analyte-specific MRM transitions are listed in Supp. Table S2. Data acquisition and treatment were performed using LabSolutions LCMS software (version 5.91; Shimadzu, Kyoto, Japan).
**Supplementary Tables**

**Supp. Table 1.** Composition of the substrate cocktails 1 and 2 used in the inhibition experiments. The processes of development, optimization, and validation of these cocktails have been described in Kahma et al. (2021) and in the Zenodo open-access data repository (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4554651).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cocktail</th>
<th>CYP</th>
<th>Probe substrate</th>
<th>Incubation concentration (µM)</th>
<th>HLM (mg/ml)</th>
<th>BSA (w/v)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1A2</td>
<td>Tacrine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2B6</td>
<td>Bupropion</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2C8</td>
<td>Amodiaquine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2C9</td>
<td>Tolbutamide</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3A4</td>
<td>Midazolam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2A6</td>
<td>Coumarin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5%&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2C19</td>
<td>S-Mephenytoin</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2D6</td>
<td>Dextromethorphan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2J2</td>
<td>Astemizole</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BSA, bovine serum albumin; CYP, cytochrome P450; HLM, human liver microsomes.

<sup>a</sup> In IC<sub>50</sub> experiments, the inhibitor effects on the activities of cocktail 2 CYPs were tested both in the presence and absence of BSA (**Supp. Table S3**).
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**Supp. Table 2.** Mass spectrometric parameters of the metabolites and internal standards of cocktails 1 and 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cocktail</th>
<th>CYP</th>
<th>Probe metabolites and their internal standards</th>
<th>MRM transition (m/z)</th>
<th>ESI +/−</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1A2</td>
<td>1-hydroxytacrine 1-hydroxytacrine-d3</td>
<td>215.2 &gt; 171.1 218.2 &gt; 200.0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2B6</td>
<td>Hydroxybupropion Hydroxybupropion-d6</td>
<td>256.2 &gt; 238.0 262.2 &gt; 244.0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2C8</td>
<td>N-desethylamodiaquine N-desethylamodiaquine-d5</td>
<td>328.3 &gt; 283.1 333.3 &gt; 283.1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2C9</td>
<td>4-hydroxytolbutamide 4-hydroxytolbutamide-d9</td>
<td>285.3 &gt; 186.1 294.2 &gt; 186.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3A4</td>
<td>1’-hydroxymidazolam 1’-hydroxymidazolam-d4</td>
<td>342.1 &gt; 323.9 346.1 &gt; 327.9</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2A6</td>
<td>7-hydroxycoumarin 7-hydroxycoumarin-d5</td>
<td>161.3 &gt; 76.9 166.1 &gt; 109.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2C19</td>
<td>S-4’-hydroxymephenytoin 4’-hydroxymephenytoin-d3</td>
<td>235.2 &gt; 150.1 238.2 &gt; 150.1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2D6</td>
<td>Dextrorphan Dextrorphan-d3</td>
<td>258.1 &gt; 157.0 261.1 &gt; 157.0</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2J2</td>
<td>O-desmethylestamizole O-desmethylestamizole-d4</td>
<td>445.3 &gt; 121.2 449.3 &gt; 125.2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CYP, cytochrome P450; ESI, electrospray ionization; MRM, multiple reaction monitoring.
Supporting Table 3. Predicted unbound fraction of hydroxychloroquine and its metabolites in microsomal incubations at different protein concentrations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Basic pK(a)</th>
<th>Log P(a)</th>
<th>(f_{u,mic}) at 0.05 mg/ml(b)</th>
<th>(f_{u,mic}) at 0.1 mg/ml(b)</th>
<th>(f_{u,mic}) at 0.2 mg/ml(b)</th>
<th>(f_{u,mic}) at 0.3 mg/ml(b)</th>
<th>(f_{u,mic}) at 0.4 mg/ml(b)</th>
<th>(f_{u,mic}) at 0.5 mg/ml(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>9.17; 7.19</td>
<td>3.937</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ</td>
<td>10.10; 7.23</td>
<td>4.609</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHCQ</td>
<td>9.45; 7.15</td>
<td>3.432</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDCQ</td>
<td>9.87; 7.21</td>
<td>3.553</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DDCQ, didesethylchloroquine; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; \(f_{u,mic}\), unbound fraction in microsomes; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine.

\(a\) Predicted in ADMET Predictor (version 10; Simulations Plus, Lancaster, CA, USA).

\(b\) Predicted using the online Simcyp prediction tool-\(f_{u,mic}\) (Simcyp, 2016), available from: https://members.simcyp.com/account/tools/fumic/ [Accessed on: May 13, 2021].
### Supp. Table 4. Parameters used in drug-drug interaction predictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhibitor</th>
<th>MW (g/mol)</th>
<th>Basic pKa</th>
<th>Log P</th>
<th>BP</th>
<th>HCQ/met</th>
<th>f_u, plasma</th>
<th>Mouse Kp</th>
<th>Predicted human Kp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCQ</td>
<td>335.88</td>
<td>9.17; 7.19</td>
<td>3.937</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCQ</td>
<td>291.826</td>
<td>10.10; 7.23</td>
<td>4.609</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHCQ</td>
<td>307.825</td>
<td>9.45; 7.15</td>
<td>3.432</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>114.3</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDCQ</td>
<td>263.772</td>
<td>9.87; 7.21</td>
<td>3.553</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>195.4</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BP, blood-to-plasma ratio; DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DDCQ, didesethylchloroquine; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; f_u, unbound fraction; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine; Kp, tissue-to-plasma or tissue-to-blood concentration ratio; met, metabolite; MW, molecular weight.

- **a** Predicted in ADMET. Parameters used in Simcyp predictions of tissue-to-plasma partition coefficients.
- **b** Data from Tett et al. (1988) and Frisk-Holmberg et al. (1984). BP of DDCQ was assumed to equal that of DCQ and DHCQ.
- **c** Steady state hydroxychloroquine/metabolite ratios in blood. DCQ and DHCQ data from Munster et al. (2002) (mean values from 123 patients) and DDCQ data from Tett et al. (1985) (single patient).
- **d** Values from McLachlan et al. (1993).
- **e** Total tissue-to-blood concentration ratios obtained from Chhonker et al. (2018).
- **f** Human tissue-to-plasma partition coefficients predicted in Simcyp Population-Based Simulator (V20; Simcyp Ltd, Certara, UK) based on Simcyp Method 2 (Rodgers and Rowland equation).
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**Supp. Table 5.** Inhibitory effects of hydroxychloroquine, DCQ, DHCQ, and DDCQ on CYP activities in HLM incubations. IC\(_{50}\) values were determined following no preincubation (direct inhibition) or after a 30-min preincubation of inhibitor in the presence of NADPH (time-dependent inhibition), as described in **Materials and Methods**. IC\(_{50}\) values are means of three determinations with their 95% confidence intervals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhibitor</th>
<th>Enzyme</th>
<th>BSA</th>
<th>IC(_{50}) (µM)</th>
<th>IC(_{50}) shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct inhibition</td>
<td>Time-dependent inhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HCQ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP1A2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2A6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2A6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2B6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2C8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2C9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2C19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2C19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2D6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>91.2 (86.1-106)</td>
<td>170 (157-185)</td>
<td>&lt;1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2D6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72.0 (57.6-77.4)</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2J2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>&gt; 1,000</td>
<td>&gt; 1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2J2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt; 1,000</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP3A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DCQ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP1A2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2A6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2A6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2B6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2C8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2C9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2C19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2C19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2D6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>18.4 (17.5-20.2)</td>
<td>30.3 (24.7-33.1)</td>
<td>&lt;1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2D6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.0 (14.3-20.0)</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2J2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>374 (310-412)</td>
<td>341 (271-398)</td>
<td>&lt;1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2J2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>349 (303-397)</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP3A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>149 (130-193)</td>
<td>45.8 (30.4-52.6)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhibitor</th>
<th>Enzyme</th>
<th>BSA</th>
<th>CYP1A2 IC₅₀ (µM)</th>
<th>CYP2A6 IC₅₀ (µM)</th>
<th>CYP2B6 IC₅₀ (µM)</th>
<th>CYP2C8 IC₅₀ (µM)</th>
<th>CYP2C9 IC₅₀ (µM)</th>
<th>CYP2C19 IC₅₀ (µM)</th>
<th>CYP2D6 IC₅₀ (µM)</th>
<th>CYP2J2 IC₅₀ (µM)</th>
<th>CYP3A IC₅₀ (µM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DHCQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct inhibition</td>
<td>Time-dependent inhibition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP1A2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>186 (139-203)</td>
<td>141 (60.7-168)</td>
<td>&lt;1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2A6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>260 (231-293)</td>
<td>117 (79.2-144)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2B6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>107 (81.2-135)</td>
<td>87.7 (60.9-111)</td>
<td>&lt;1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2C8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>54.7 (38.6-64.0)</td>
<td>90.9 (17.2-115)</td>
<td>&lt;1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2D6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>40.5 (25.7-45.0)</td>
<td>12.1 (5.0-14.2)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP2J2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>62.9 (41.9-70.8)</td>
<td>50.0 (9.3-64.2)</td>
<td>&lt;1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYP3A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>260 (231-293)</td>
<td>117 (79.2-144)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BSA, bovine serum albumin; CYP, cytochrome P450; DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DDCQ, didesethylchloroquine; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine; IC₅₀, 50% inhibitory concentration; IC₅₀ shift, IC₅₀ (direct inhibition)/IC₅₀ (time-dependent inhibition) ratio; ND, not determined; NI, no inhibition.
Supplementary Figures

Supp. Fig. 1. Metabolism of hydroxychloroquine (30 µM) by recombinant CYPs (0.3 mg/ml protein, 90 min). In the screening, hydroxychloroquine metabolites were most actively formed by CYP2D6, CYP2C8 and CYP3A4. The data represent mean and standard deviation values of duplicate incubations of one experiment. CYP, cytochrome P450; DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DDCQ, didesethylchloroquine; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine.
**Supp. Fig. 2.** Intrinsic clearance (CL_{int}) values obtained in depletion experiments in recombinant CYP (A) and HLM (B) incubations. In (A), the CL_{int} values of hydroxychloroquine (0.3-10 μM) in recombinant CYP2C8, CYP2D6, and CYP3A4 incubations (0.1 mg/ml protein) are shown. The depletion of hydroxychloroquine was measured for up to 45 min. In (B), the CL_{int} values of hydroxychloroquine, DHCQ and DCQ at initial incubation concentrations of 0.3 and 3 μM in HLM (0.5 mg/ml) are shown. The data represent mean values of triplicate incubations of one experiment. CYP, cytochrome P450; DCQ, desethylchloroquine; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine; HLM, human liver microsomes; rCYP, recombinant cytochrome P450.
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**Supporting Information**

Supp. Fig. 3. Inhibitory effects of hydroxychloroquine on CYP activities in HLM incubations in the initial screening experiments. The direct (DI), slow-binding (SLOW), and time-dependent (TDI) inhibitory effects of hydroxychloroquine were evaluated using an automated substrate cocktail approach (Supp. Table S1). In direct inhibition experiments, hydroxychloroquine was simultaneously incubated with the substrate cocktail and NADPH, in slow-binding experiments, hydroxychloroquine was first pre-incubated for 30 min before the addition of the substrate cocktail and NADPH, and in time-dependent inhibition experiments, hydroxychloroquine was first pre-incubated with NADPH for 30 min before the addition of the substrate cocktail. The substrate incubation time was 5 min. Bars represent means ± standard deviations of CYP activities expressed as the percentage of remaining activity compared to solvent controls (triplicate incubations of one experiment). CYP, cytochrome P450; HCQ, hydroxychloroquine.
**Supp. Fig. 4.** Inhibitory effects of DHCQ on CYP activities in HLM incubations in the initial screening experiments. The direct (DI), slow-binding (SLOW), and time-dependent (TDI) inhibitory effects of DHCQ were evaluated using an automated substrate cocktail approach (Supp. Table S1). In direct inhibition experiments, DHCQ was simultaneously incubated with the substrate cocktail and NADPH, in slow-binding experiments, DHCQ was first pre-incubated for 30 min before the addition of the substrate cocktail and NADPH, and in time-dependent inhibition experiments, DHCQ was first pre-incubated with NADPH for 30 min before the addition of the substrate cocktail. The substrate incubation time was 5 min. Bars represent means ± standard deviations of CYP activities expressed as the percentage of remaining activity compared to solvent controls (triplicate incubations of one experiment). CYP, cytochrome P450; DHCQ, desethylhydroxychloroquine.
**Supp. Fig. 5.** Inhibitory effects of DCQ on CYP activities in HLM incubations in the initial screening experiments. The direct (DI), slow-binding (SLOW), and time-dependent (TDI) inhibitory effects of DCQ were evaluated using an automated substrate cocktail approach (Supp. Table S1). In direct inhibition experiments, DCQ was simultaneously incubated with the substrate cocktail and NADPH, in slow-binding experiments, DCQ was first pre-incubated for 30 min before the addition of the substrate cocktail and NADPH, and in time-dependent inhibition experiments, DCQ was first pre-incubated with NADPH for 30 min before the addition of the substrate cocktail. The substrate incubation time was 5 min. Bars represent means ± standard deviations of CYP activities expressed as the percentage of remaining activity compared to solvent controls (triplicate incubations of one experiment). CYP, cytochrome P450; DCQ, desethylchloroquine.
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Supp. Fig. 6. Inhibitory effects of DDCQ on CYP activities in HLM incubations in the initial screening experiments. The direct (DI), slow-binding (SLOW), and time-dependent (TDI) inhibitory effects of DDCQ were evaluated using an automated substrate cocktail approach (Supp. Table S1). In direct inhibition experiments, DDCQ was simultaneously incubated with the substrate cocktail and NADPH, in slow-binding experiments, DDCQ was first pre-incubated for 30 min before the addition of the substrate cocktail and NADPH, and in time-dependent inhibition experiments, DDCQ was first pre-incubated with NADPH for 30 min before the addition of the substrate cocktail. The substrate incubation time was 5 min. Bars represent means ± standard deviations of CYP activities expressed as the percentage of remaining activity compared to solvent controls (triplicate incubations of one experiment). CYP, cytochrome P450; DDCQ, didesethylchloroquine.
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