## Xenobiotica

## In vitro metabolism and in vivo pharmacokinetics of bentysrepinine (Y101), an investigational new drug for anti-HBV infected hepatitis: focus on interspecies comparison

Huirong Fan, Aijie Zhang, Cuiping Liao, Yuanhui Yang, Lihua Zhang, Jianfeng Liu,

Yuanyuan Xia, Duanyun Si, Shiqi Dong, Changxiao Liu

$\frac{1}{2}$								
species		Phase I (+NAD	PH)	In vivo				
	t <sub>1/2</sub>	CL <sub>int</sub>	$CL_{H}^{a}$	CL <sup>b</sup>				
	(min)	(mL/min/kg)	(mL/min/kg)	(mL/min/kg)				
Dog	58.2	22.1	12.9	25.5				
Monke	y 182	3.66	3.38	56.8				
Humar	u 385	1.48	1.38	NA <sup>c</sup>				

Table S1. Comparison of in vitro metabolic parameters in rat, dog, monkey and human liver microsomes (n = 2).

<sup>a</sup>, The hepatic clearance (CL<sub>H</sub>) of Y101 was obtained from in vitro data using well-stirred liver model disregarding all binding (Davies et al., 1997; De et al., 2007; Ring et al., 2011; zhang et al., 2018).

<sup>b</sup>, the value was calculated by intravenous pharmacokinetic study in dogs and monkeys. <sup>c</sup>, not applicable.

## References

Davies B, Morris T. (1993). Physiological parameters in laboratory animals and humans. Pharm

Res 10:1093-1095.

De Buck SS, Sinha VK, Fenu LA, et al. (2007). The prediction of drug metabolism, tissue

distribution, and bioavailability of 50 structurally diverse compounds in rat using

## Xenobiotica

mechanism-based absorption, distribution, and metabolism prediction tools. Drug Metab

Dispos 35:649-659.

Ring BJ, Chien JY, Adkison KK, et al. (2011). PhRMA CPCDC initiative on predictive models of human pharmacokinetics, part 3: comparative assessement of prediction methods of human clearance. J Pharm Sci 100:4090-4110.

Zhang C, Zhang X, Wang G, et al. (2018). Preclinical Pharmacokinetics of C118P, a Novel Prodrug of Microtubules Inhibitor and Its Metabolite C118 in Mice, Rats, and Dogs. Molecules 23: pii: E2883.

Table S2. The toxicokinetic parameters of Y101 in monkey plasma after oral administration of Y101 for 1 day and 14 days.

Parameters <sup>a</sup>	Unit	day1	day14	day1	day14
		P.O.(n=6)	P.O.(n=6)	P.O.(n=6)	P.O.(n=6)
Dose	mg/kg	30	30	100	100
$C_{max}$	ng/mL	$1199 \hspace{0.1 in} \pm \hspace{0.1 in} 1050$	$1410 \hspace{0.1in} \pm \hspace{0.1in} 879$	$1090 \hspace{0.1in} \pm \hspace{0.1in} 678$	$2092 \hspace{.1in} \pm \hspace{.1in} 1651$
AUC <sub>0-t</sub>	ng.h/mL	$2810 \hspace{0.1in} \pm \hspace{0.1in} 2621$	$2450 \hspace{0.1in} \pm \hspace{0.1in} 1163$	$5334 \hspace{0.1in} \pm \hspace{0.1in} 555$	$4527 \hspace{0.1in} \pm \hspace{0.1in} 2469$
AUC <sub>0-∞</sub>	ng.h/mL	$2832 \ \pm \ 2644$	$2466 \hspace{0.1in} \pm \hspace{0.1in} 1160$	$5441 \ \pm \ 628$	$4549 \hspace{0.2cm} \pm \hspace{0.2cm} 2455$

<sup>a</sup>, Sampling time points were selected at pre-dose, 0.25, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12 and 24 h post dose, respectively. The toxicokinetic parameters were evaluated using non-compartmental analysis with Phoenix WinNonlin (version 6.3; Pharsight, Certara Corp, Princeton, NJ, USA).