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**Context.** Paraquat poisoning is a medical problem in many parts of Asia and the Pacific. The mortality rate is extremely high as there is no effective treatment.

**Objective.** We analysed data collected during an ongoing cohort study on self-poisoning and from a randomized controlled trial assessing the efficacy of immunosuppressive therapy in hospitalized paraquat-intoxicated patients. The aim of this analysis was to characterise the toxicokinetics and toxicodynamics of paraquat in this population.

**Methods.** A nonlinear mixed effects approach was used to perform toxicokinetic/toxicodynamic population analysis in a cohort of 78 patients. Results. The paraquat plasma concentrations were best fitted by a two-compartment toxicokinetic structural model with first-order absorption and first-order elimination. Changes in renal function were used for the assessment of paraquat toxicodynamics. The estimates of toxicokinetic parameters for the apparent clearance, the apparent volume of distribution and elimination half-life were 1.17 L/h, 2.4 L/kg and 87 h, respectively. Renal function, namely creatinine clearance, was the most significant covariate to explain between patient variability in paraquat clearance.

**Abstract:**
model suggested that a reduction in paraquat clearance occurred within 24 to 48 h after poison ingestion, and afterward the clearance was constant over time. The model estimated that a paraquat concentration of 429 µg/L caused 50% of maximum renal toxicity. The immunosuppressive therapy tested during this study was associated with only 8% improvement of renal function.

Conclusion. The developed models may be useful as prognostic tools to predict patient outcome based on patient characteristics on admission and to assess drug effectiveness during antidote drug development.
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Structured summary

Context. Paraquat poisoning is a medical problem in many parts of Asia and the Pacific. The mortality rate is extremely high as there is no effective treatment.

Objective. We analysed data collected during an ongoing cohort study on self-poisoning and from a randomized controlled trial assessing the efficacy of immunosuppressive therapy in hospitalized paraquat-intoxicated patients. The aim of this analysis was to characterise the toxicokinetics and toxicodynamics of paraquat in this population.

Methods. A nonlinear mixed effects approach was used to perform toxicokinetic/toxicodynamic population analysis in a cohort of 78 patients.

Results. The paraquat plasma concentrations were best fitted by a two-compartment toxicokinetic structural model with first-order absorption and first-order elimination. Changes in renal function were used for the assessment of paraquat toxicodynamics. The estimates of toxicokinetic parameters for the apparent clearance, the apparent volume of distribution and elimination half-life were 1.17 L/h, 2.4 L/kg and 87 h, respectively. Renal function, namely creatinine clearance, was the most significant covariate to explain between patient variability in paraquat clearance. This model suggested that a reduction in paraquat clearance occurred within 24 to 48 h after poison ingestion, and afterward the clearance was constant over time. The model estimated that a paraquat concentration of 429 µg/L caused 50% of maximum renal toxicity. The immunosuppressive therapy tested during this study was associated with only 8% improvement of renal function.

Conclusion. The developed models may be useful as prognostic tools to predict patient outcome based on patient characteristics on admission and to assess drug effectiveness during antidote drug development.
What was already known about this subject:

- Although heavily restricted, paraquat remains widely used in the developing world.

- There is currently limited information on paraquat pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics in humans.

- Available prognostic tools for patients outcome after paraquat poisoning were not developed based on pharmacology and do not account for differences in treatment effects.

What this study adds?

- This is the first report on population pharmacokinetic and pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic analyses of paraquat in humans.

- The developed models can be used to quantitatively characterize treatment effects and therefore optimize prognostic tools dedicated to predict patient outcome after poisoning.
Introduction

Paraquat is a commonly used herbicide that causes many deaths from accidental or intentional ingestion. Although heavily restricted, it remains widely used in the developing world, especially in Asia. Ingestion of more than 15-30 ml of a 20% (w/v) paraquat can result in death from multiple organ failure or respiratory failure within a month of intoxication. Due to the lack of effective treatment, [1-5] the mortality rate after paraquat ingestion is around 60%, which is much higher than that of other commonly used herbicides such as glyphosate and chlorophenoxy herbicides (both around 5-30%). [6, 7]

Understanding the disposition of paraquat in humans is important for evaluating treatments that aim to reduce paraquat concentrations and/or effects. Animal studies indicate that paraquat, a cation of a strong base, is rapidly but poorly absorbed from the gastrointestinal tract. Only 5-15% reaches the blood stream where the peak level is obtained within 2-6 hours. [3] Protein binding of paraquat is very low and paraquat is not metabolized. [8] Small amounts of paraquat have been found in bile (post-mortem), indicating that some excretion via bile occurs. [8] However, up to 98% of paraquat is excreted unchanged via urine indicating that renal function is a key factor in the elimination of paraquat. [9-11] Paraquat toxicokinetics have been studied in several animal species including dogs, rats, and rabbits. [11-15] To date, only a few studies have focused on paraquat toxicokinetics in humans. [16,17] Moreover, the relationship between human toxicokinetics (TK) and toxicodynamics (TD) has not been studied. Over decades, many procedures and treatments have been used to modify toxicity of paraquat without any great success. [1, 18-20] The best predictors of outcome are volume of ingestion, kidney function and age.
Acute kidney injury (as measured by a change in creatinine) is very common and very strongly predicts death after paraquat poisoning. [21, 22] However, a rise in creatinine is a good predictor because it is both an indicator of the extent of ongoing toxicity and of the ability to eliminate paraquat. It would be useful to determine the relative contribution of these two factors as they have different implications for improving management.

We report on a nonlinear mixed effects approach to better characterise paraquat kinetics and toxicity in a paraquat intoxicated population (population TK/TD or pop TK/TD), the uncertainty around TK and TD and the potential covariates that could explain variability in paraquat disposition in intoxicated patients. The aims of the present study were: (1) to predict the time course of paraquat exposure based on information recorded on admission such as the initial kidney function and the ingested volume, (2) to better understand the relationship between paraquat exposure and toxicity in humans and (3) to assess the influence of patient characteristics on paraquat exposure and toxicity, including the effects of commonly used treatment approaches.

**Materials and methods**

**Patients**

The subjects (n = 78) included in the present analysis were from two different sources: (1) an ongoing cohort study on self-poisoning and (2) a nested randomized controlled trial (RCT) assessing the efficacy of immunosuppressive therapy on paraquat poisoning (ISRCTN85372848) in Sri Lankan tertiary hospitals. Demographic and clinical data were collected prospectively from all consenting patients. The studies were approved by the Ethical Review Committee of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka, and the Human Research Ethics
Committee of the Australian National University. Informed written consent was obtained from the patients or relatives where this was not possible.

Paraquat ingestion was initially diagnosed based on patient’s or relative’s history and/or by examination of the bottle or label brought to the hospital. Paraquat ingestion was then confirmed via these mi-quantitative urine dithionate test (done at least 4 hours after ingestion). The amount of paraquat ingested was estimated from the volume described by the patients or their relatives. A “little” or “a teaspoon” was interpreted as equivalent to 5 ml, a “mouthful” to 25 ml, a “small cup” to 100 ml, a “glass” to 300 ml, and a “bottle” to 400 ml of a commercial product containing 20% paraquat. If the patient reported a range of volumes of ingestion, the mean volume was used. [23]

Sixty-eight patients were included in the TD study. The patients were grouped by treatment regimen as: standard care (n = 19), standard care plus placebo (n = 26), and standard care plus immunosuppressive therapy (comprising pulse therapy with methylprednisolone and cyclophosphamide/MESNA, and dexamethasone) (n = 23) as described elsewhere. Standard care consisted of resuscitation (assessment and management of airway, breathing and circulation), decontamination using charcoal or Fuller’s earth, and intravenous fluids. Haemoperfusion/haemodialysis were not used in any patients.

**Blood and urine sampling**

Serial blood and urine samples were collected for the quantification of paraquat levels at admission (t=0), 4, 8, 16, and 24 hour (post admission) and then daily until discharge. After discharge, all patients were followed up at one month and three months at the clinic or their home. At follow-up, some clinical data, blood and urine samples were collected. Around 6-8 ml
blood were withdrawn at each time point and were transferred to two EDTA tubes and mixed thoroughly. Then soon after collection, blood samples were centrifuged for 10 minutes at 3000 rpm and plasma was separated. Urine volumes were not recorded, but where possible 20 ml of urine was also collected at these time points, and centrifuged at 2000 rpm for 10 minutes. Clear supernatant was then transferred into small tubes. Plasma and urine samples were then carefully labeled and immediately transferred to a -20°C freezer, and later shipped to Australia for further analysis.

**Paraquat analysis**

Paraquat concentrations in plasma and urine were determined using the LC–MS/MS system consisting of an SLC-10AVP system controller, two LC-10AD pumps, an SIL-20AC-HT autosampler (Shimadzu, Kyoto, Japan) and an API2000 triple quadrupole(Applied Biosystems Inc., Foster City, CA, USA) a mass spectrometer coupled with an electrospray ionization (ESI) source and a divert valve. Briefly, plasma and urine samples were carried out by one-step protein precipitation using cold acetonitrile (−20 to −10 ºC). After centrifugation, an aliquot of 10 µl of supernatant was injected into a KinetexTM hydrophilic interaction chromatography (HILIC) column with a KrudKatcherTM Ultra in-line filter. The chromatographic separation was achieved using the mobile phase mixture of 250 mM ammonium formate (with 0.8% aqueous formic acid) in water and acetonitrile at a flow rate of 0.3 ml/min. The calibration curve was linear over the concentration range of 10–5000µg/L, with an LLOQ of 10 µg/L. The inter- and intra-day precision (% R.S.D.) was<8.5% with accuracy within the range of 95.1–102.8%. Paraquat in plasma and urine samples was stable when stored at -20°C for 3 freeze–thaw cycles.
Descriptive statistics and graphic generation

Graphics and descriptive statistics were generated using GraphPad Prism version 6.01 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, USA). The relationship between paraquat plasma and urine concentration over time was also plotted to provide a rough model-independent assessment of the expected change over time in renal paraquat clearance.

Population toxicokinetic-toxicodynamic analysis

Pop TK: Structural model

The concentration-time data for paraquat in plasma were analysed by a non-linear mixed-effect modeling approach using Phoenix NLME version 1.2 Build 6.3.0.395 (Pharsight Corporation, Mountain View, CA, USA). Initial toxicokinetic model selection was performed using graphical analysis. Plots of paraquat plasma concentration versus time were generated for each individual and examined to determine the appropriate descriptive model. During this analysis, it was assumed that the renal function modified by paraquat had already reached a steady state at the time most of plasma paraquat concentrations were measured. This was based on the fact that renal function has been shown to decrease exponentially after paraquat ingestion before reaching a steady state impaired renal function within the first 48 hours. Based on the graphical analysis and the known physicochemical and TK properties of paraquat, a two-compartment model with first-order absorption and first-order elimination was used as the toxicokinetic structural model. Data were fitted using the extended least squared first order conditional estimation method (FOCE ELS) as implemented in Phoenix software. The model was parameterised in terms of paraquat apparent oral clearance (CL_PQ/F), apparent volume of distribution of central compartment after oral administration (V_1/F), apparent volume of
distribution of peripheral compartment after oral administration ($V_2/F$), inter-compartmental clearance after oral administration ($Q/F$), absorption rate constant ($K_a$) and bioavailability factor ($F$). $K_a$ was fixed to 1 h$^{-1}$ given the lack of data during the absorption phase and given that the reported mean $T_{\text{max}}$ in human was 3 h.[3] As the ingested dose was estimated from volume of ingestion, the varying doses were imputed as covariates on the bioavailability factor and the median dose of paraquat (10 g) was given as the amount administered to each patient. In order to avoid numerical issues due to boundaries of $F$ between 0 and 1, the logit of bioavailability factor ($XF$) was first estimated, and the bioavailability factor was subsequently regenerated using the following formula:

$$F = \frac{XF}{1 + XF} \quad (1)$$

*Pop TK: Stochastic model*

Inter-individual variability (IIV) in TK parameters were modeled using an exponential model as illustrated below:

$$P_i = P^* \exp(\eta_i) \quad (2)$$

where $P_i$ is the parameter estimate of the $i^{th}$ individual, $P$ is the typical value for the population, and $\eta_i$ is the random effect for individual $i$, $\eta$ was assumed to be normally distributed with a mean value of 0 and a variance of $\omega^2$. IIV terms were added on all the TK parameters.

Residual errors were best described using a combined model (additive and proportional) as depicted below:

$$C_{ji} = C_{0ji}^* (1 + \varepsilon_{1ji}) + \varepsilon_{2ji} \quad (3)$$

where $C_{ji}$ and $C_{0ji}$ are the $i^{th}$ measured (observed) and model predicted paraquat plasma concentrations for the $j^{th}$ patient, respectively. $\varepsilon_{1ji}$ and $\varepsilon_{2ji}$ denote the proportional and the additive.
terms for random residual error, respectively. They were assumed to be normally distributed with a mean of 0 and variances of $\sigma_1^2$ and $\sigma_2^2$.

**Pop TK: Covariate model**

A stepwise approach was used for toxicokinetic covariate model building with forward inclusion followed by backward exclusion. The following covariates were assessed for their effects on paraquat disposition: body weight (BW, kg), gender, age (years), amount ingested (g) and renal function markers: serum creatinine concentration (sCr, mg/dL) and estimated creatinine clearance (eCL$_{cr}$, L/h). eCL$_{cr}$ was estimated using the Cockcroft-Gault equation. [26] Covariates first tested separately according to their biological plausibility and where considered to be significant when their addition to the base model led to a decrease of at least 3.84 points in the objective function value (OFV) (P-value < 0.05 in the approximate $\chi^2$ distribution with 1 degree of freedom). [27, 28] The continuous covariates were normalized to their corresponding medians and introduced into the model as shown by Equation 4:

$$P_k = \theta_{k1} \times (\frac{Cov}{Cov_{median}})^{\theta_{k2}} \tag{4}$$

where $P_k$ is the TK parameter, $\theta_{k1}$ is the typical value of the TK parameter in the population, $\theta_{k2}$ is the effect coefficient of the covariate, Cov is the value of the covariate and Cov$_{median}$ is the median of the covariate in the population under investigation.

Categorical covariates were entered into the model using an exponential model. For example, the following model was used to assess gender effect on PD parameters:

$$P_j = \theta_0 \times \exp(\theta_{1j} \times X_{1j}) \tag{5}$$

where $X_{1j} = 0$ and 1 for males and females respectively, $\theta_0$ is the typical value of the TD parameter in the population and $\theta_{1j}$ is the effect coefficient for females.
**TK model evaluation**

Criteria for selecting the final model included change in the OFV, precision of parameter estimation (coefficient of variation (CV) estimates smaller than 50%), [29] graphical analysis and quality of goodness-of-fit plots. All of these criteria were taken into account when evaluating alternate models. Lead TK models were evaluated with regards to their accuracy and their stability using nonparametric bootstrapping and visual predictive check (VPC) methods. [30] A nonparametric bootstrapping method was allowed to assess the stability and uncertainty of the final model and estimate the confidence intervals (CI) around parameter estimates in order to characterise the precision of their estimation. [31, 32] One thousand replicates of the data sets were generated by randomly sampling the patient data, and the final model was fitted individually to each of them. All of the model parameters were estimated, and their median and 95% CI were generated. The VPCs were performed using the final model parameters to simulate TK data for 1000 virtual subjects. The 95% prediction interval of simulated concentrations or effects was computed and plotted against the observed values. Bayesian estimates of parameters for individual patients were also computed from the final model. The final TK model was used to generate individual predicted concentrations at times of TD measurements. These individual predicted concentration values were used as input for the TD model. TD parameters and their associated variability were estimated in a subsequent step as described below.

**Population toxicodynamic model development**

**TD: Structural model**

Acute renal failure is a common and important acute toxic effect, and the extent of injury predicts death in severe paraquat poisoning. [3, 21] Estimated \( \text{CL}_{\text{cr}} \) (\( \text{eCL}_{\text{cr}} \)) was used as the
marker of paraquat renal toxicity. Initial Pop TD model selection was carried out using graphical analysis. Plots of paraquat plasma concentration and TD effect (eCL_{cr}) was constructed for each individual and examined to determine the appropriate descriptive model. Based on this graphical analysis, the inhibitory fractional sigmoid E_{max} model including the baseline was chosen and is described as follows:

\[ E(t) = E_0 \times (1 - E_{max} \times C^{\gamma}/(IC_{50} + C^{\gamma})) \] (6)

where \( E(t) \) is the TD effect (eCL_{cr}) at time \( t \), \( E_0 \) is the baseline eCL_{cr} of each patient at admission, \( E_{max} \) is the maximal fractional decrease of eCL_{cr} caused by paraquat, IC_{50} is the concentration of paraquat causing a 50% of maximum paraquat induced eCL_{cr} decrease, and \( \gamma \) is a shape factor characterizing the slope of the response.\(^{25}\)

**TD: Stochastic model**

Inter-individual variability in TD parameters was also assumed to be log-normally distributed and was also modeled using an exponential model. IIV terms were imputed on all TD parameters.

The residual errors were best described using a log-additive error model as depicted below:

\[ \log E_{oi} = \log E_{ij} + \epsilon_{ij} \] (7)

Where \( E_{oi} \) is the observed effect (eCL_{cr}) for the \( i^{th} \) individual at concentration \( j \), \( E_{ij} \) is the individual predicted effect (eCL_{cr}) for the \( i^{th} \) individual at concentration \( j \), \( \epsilon_{ij} \) is the residual error term. \( \epsilon_{ij} \) is assumed to be normally distributed with a mean of 0 and a variance equal to \( \sigma^2 \).

**TD: Covariate model**

The following covariates were tested on the baseline parameter given that they plausibly affected baseline CL_{cr}: age, gender, body weight. The effects of different treatments were tested
as covariate on $E_{\text{max}}$, $IC_{50}$ and $\gamma$. Continuous covariates were entered using power models and categorical covariates were entered into the model using exponential models as previously described.

When the covariate had more than 2 categories, such as treatment groups, the following equations were used:

\[
\begin{align*}
P_j &= \theta_0 \quad \text{if treatment group} = \text{placebo} \\
P_j &= \theta_0 \cdot \exp(\theta_{1j}) \quad \text{if treatment group} = \text{immunosuppressive} \\
P_j &= \theta_0 \cdot \exp(\theta_{2j}) \quad \text{if treatment group} = \text{control} \quad (8)
\end{align*}
\]

$\theta_{1j}$ and $\theta_{2j}$ are the effect coefficients of the covariate

**TD model evaluation**

Lead TD models were also evaluated by a bootstrapping approach and visual predictive checks (VPC) as previously described. Bayesian estimates of parameters for individual patients were also computed from the final model.

**Results**

**Patient demographics and plasma: urine paraquat ratios**

A total of 698 plasma concentrations from 78 paraquat poisoned patients were included in the TK analysis. The demographics of the patients in this study are shown in Table 1. Most paraquat plasma concentrations were proportional to urine concentrations with a median ratio (plasma:urine) of 0.17 (Fig. 1) in this population. The plasma:urine paraquat ratio was variable but overall did not change significantly over time.

**Population toxicokinetic model**
As described in the methods section, a two-compartment toxicokinetic structural model with first-order absorption and first-order elimination was fitted to the data. Parameter estimates for the TK base model are presented in Table 2. Given the lack of data in the early distribution phase, $V_2/F$ value was fixed to 0.17 L/kg based on a sensitivity analysis and taking into account previously reported values of paraquat volume of distribution and patient body weights.

Parameter estimates for the final model are also shown in Table 2. Ingested dose and renal function markers were found to be significant covariates on the paraquat bioavailability ($F$) and apparent paraquat clearance ($CL_{PQ}$), respectively. Estimated $CL_{cr}$ or $sCr$ were tested to assess which marker performed better in reflecting renal contribution to $CL_{PQ}$. Even though smaller standard error estimates were obtained when $sCr$ was used (data not shown) as a renal function marker, the OFV was significantly higher than when $CL_{cr}$ was used (Table 2). Inclusion of body weight in the model also significantly reduced the OFV. The goodness-of-fit plots obtained from the final toxicokinetic model are shown in Fig. 2, which indicate the model satisfactorily fitted the data.

**Population toxicodynamic model**

The final TK model was used to predict individual paraquat concentrations at times of TD measurement. Based on graphical analysis, an inhibitory fractional sigmoid $E_{max}$ model including the baseline as shown in Equation (5) was chosen as structural TD model. Parameter estimates for the base TD model are presented in Table 3. Parameter estimates for the final model are also included in Table 3.

The final PopTD model (model 7) included age, sex and body weight as covariates on baseline $eCL_{cr}$ and method of treatment as covariate on maximum reduction of $eCL_{cr}$ ($E_{max}$).
(Table 3). Immunosuppression treatment slightly lowered the $E_{\text{max}}$, by 8% compared to the placebo group. The $E_{\text{max}}$ was 24% lower in the patients treated with standard treatments outside the RCT compared to the placebo group (suggesting these two standard treatment only groups may differ due to the inclusion criteria for the RCT, in a way not accounted for by measured covariates). Goodness-of-fit plots were generated for the final model and the weighted residual showed no apparent visual bias for the prediction (Fig. 3).

**Model evaluation**

The accuracy and stability of these models were assessed by nonparametric bootstrap and VPC. As shown in Table 4, the mean population parameters estimated from the bootstrapping were stable and comparable to the estimates from the final model. The estimates of the parameters from the final model all fell within the 95% CIs of the corresponding parameters obtained with the 1,000 bootstraps, indicating that the final model was fairly robust. The VPCs showed that approximately 95% of the observed data appear to fall within the 95% confidence interval (Fig. 4), suggesting that the final model accurately described the observed data. The estimated TK and TK/TD parameters of the individual patients are listed in Table 5.

**Clinical usefulness of the model**

The change of estimated $\text{CL}_{\text{PQ}}$ over time is shown in Fig. 5 showing that after an initial rapid decrease the $\text{CL}_{\text{PQ}}$ was stable over time. The resulting median paraquat concentrations and $\text{CL}_{\text{cr}}$ were simulated for three different values $\text{CL}_{\text{cr}}$ at admission: the minimum, the median and the maximum values (0.3, 6 and 13L/h, respectively) in this cohort of patient. The results displayed in Fig. 6 show that the model is able to predict paraquat exposure and toxicity given
patient characteristics on admission. It could therefore serve to optimize prognostic tools dedicated to predict patients outcome on admission and could serve as a tool to evaluate treatment options and candidate antidotes.

Discussion

We used a population approach to describe paraquat disposition and its effects on renal function in poisoned patients. A two compartment toxicokinetic model with rapid absorption fitted the data well. Renal function was the most important factor influencing paraquat clearance. As a function of paraquat concentration, there was a variable but rapid reduction in paraquat clearance within 24 to 48 hours, which then was constant and low (around 10ml/min). The time at which most of paraquat samples were collected is estimated to be more than 48 hours after ingestion. Whilst paraquat does induce an immediate and variable change in renal function, this renal function appears to reach an impaired new steady state renal function within 48 hours. [13] Accordingly, the PK model used in this work used the simpler constant impaired renal function after paraquat ingestion and did not consider the time variant changes in renal function at early times. Renal injury occurred with relatively low concentrations of paraquat (IC$_{50}$ =429 µg/L).

This analysis has implications for the development of better prognostic tools, for evaluation of candidate antidotes and for the design of the optimal methods to enhance elimination.

In humans, there is limited data on absorption of paraquat. Any uncertainty on the ingestion dose and time of ingestion in our study would be expected to propagate into uncertainty on TK and TD parameter estimates. There is only one study that has reported the complete recovery of paraquat after oral dosing, [16] and they estimated a V of 1.4 L/kg. If this value is substituted into our V/F estimated, the bioavailability(F) is estimated to be around 0.58.
Other studies have estimated values for V/F ranging from 1.2 to 2.75 L/kg. [33, 34] and thus the V/F of about 2.4 L/kg estimated from our TK model is in the range of estimates. Several factors are known to influence paraquat distribution. The extent to which the herbicide is actively taken up by lung, liver, kidney and other tissues determines V/F. Therefore, if tissue binding of paraquat increased over time, V/F will increase as well. However, a high V/F estimation could be due to the over-estimation of the ingested doses. A limitation of this study is the lack of any way to accurately quantify ingestion volume, which impacts on estimated TK and TK/TD parameters (in both our and all other human studies). Moreover, the uncertainty in the estimation of some key covariates (e.g. renal function) also affects the degree of precision in these models.

The deep compartment consists of tissues where the toxic effects are manifested (in particular lungs and kidneys) and other tissues which act as a reservoir. Paraquat is actively taken up into type II pneumocytes resulting in slow elimination of paraquat from lung compared to other tissues. [1] Active renal uptake and excretion of paraquat is also concentration dependent and saturable; [35] consequently, high levels of paraquat are seen in kidney. Impairment of kidney function in turn leads to higher concentrations of paraquat in the plasma. [12] Muscle is an important paraquat reservoir explaining the persistence of paraquat in plasma and urine for several weeks after exposure. [16] The long elimination half-life ($t_{1/2\beta}$) of 3-4 days in our study reflects the combined effects of reduced clearance from the decline in renal function and the slow release of paraquat from tissues into the circulation.

An obvious large change in paraquat renal clearance in these patients was not observed and the plasma/urine paraquat ratio changed little over time (Fig. 1) which could wrongly suggest a simple and static first-order elimination process. Modeling individual patient concentrations did demonstrate a progressive decline in clearance. Several previous reports also indicate that
Paraquat renal clearance (and total clearance) is a nonlinear function of time. A large decrease over time in $C_{\text{LPQ}}$ occurs with nephrotoxicity.[8, 13] At low doses, $C_{\text{LPQ}}$ may exceed 12 L/h in humans with normal kidney function. $^{36}$ The mean estimate for $C_{\text{LPQ}}/F$ (1.17 L/h) obtained from our PopTK model is considerably lower than that reported in some previous human case reports (mean = 4.39 L/h), [34] and they showed a rapid change in $C_{\text{LPQ}}/F$ from 8.77 to 2.72 L/h within 12 h. Substituting $F = 0.58$ into $C_{\text{LPQ}}/F$ yields an estimated mean $C_{\text{LPQ}}$ of 0.68 L/h (11.33 ml/min) in our study. This $C_{\text{LPQ}}$ is similar to those reported by Houze et al which range from 0.47 to 0.59 L/h (7.9 to 9.9 ml/min). [16] It seems likely we and Houze et al have missed a very short early phase of high $C_{\text{LPQ}}$ reported by others. [34, 36] The low $C_{\text{LPQ}}$ reflects the very rapid onset of paraquat induced renal impairment. [12, 13, 35, 37-39] Therefore, the low estimated $C_{\text{LPQ}}/F$ in the present study reflects that most blood samples were collected 6 or more hours post-paraquat ingestion when renal damage was already established. While a further modest decline in estimated $C_{\text{LPQ}}/F$ was found over 24 to 48 h (Fig. 5), thereafter the estimated clearances were constant over time.

In our analysis, the effect of the e$C_{\text{cr}}$, (reflecting GFR), on $C_{\text{LPQ}}$ was lower than one would expect. This probably reflects errors in the estimate of GFR rather than the model. [40] The Cockcroft-Gault equation has at least a 30% variance around actual renal function in chronic kidney disease population with $sCr \leq 1.5$ mg/dl. [41] It also performs very poorly when $Cr$ is changing (i.e. it assumes steady-state). However, other estimation methods perform equally poorly (when compared with gold standard methods such as iohexol clearance). Future studies should ideally use more accurate direct measurements of GFR or creatinine clearance.

The model suggested a very small effect of immunosuppressive treatment (8% lower $E_{\text{max}}$ compared to placebo group). This is consistent with the clinical outcomes reported in this trial.
which was a very small favourable treatment effect that was not statistically significant. However, this difference was less than that seen in the non-RCT patients (24% lower $E_{\text{max}}$); which might be a result of the RCT inclusion criteria aiming to select people who had significant poisoning but also who would survive long enough to measure renal injury. Further, another RCT has also reported that immunosuppressive therapy did not improve renal function. So, these results should not be used to imply that immunosuppressive treatment has substantial effects on renal injury.

Model predictions may serve a number of purposes. From a clinical perspective, they can identify patients on admission who are very likely to develop kidney dysfunction. Using the TK model developed in this study, a paraquat plasma concentration-time profile can be predicted for individual patients on admission. Thereafter, a combination of the TK and the TD model could predict kidney function, namely creatinine clearance, changes over time. Prediction of toxicokinetics and acute kidney injury might in turn be used to identify patients most likely to benefit from enhanced elimination or who are most suitable for inclusion into clinical trials of strategies to prevent kidney injury and other manifestations of paraquat toxicity.

**Conclusion**

Renal function was the most significant covariate to explain between patient variability in paraquat clearance. Renal injury occurred with relatively low concentrations of paraquat ($IC_{50} = 429$ µg/L). A reduction in paraquat clearance occurred over 24 to 48 h after paraquat ingestion, and afterward the clearance was constant and low. The low clearance (around 10ml/min) and long half-life (3-4 days) in these cases suggest further studies of extracorporeal elimination would be worth exploring, as it is clear much greater clearance can be obtained by such methods.
After optimal methods for enhancing elimination have been developed, large clinical trials will still be needed to determine if such methods can improve clinical outcomes.
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Legends to figures

**Figure 1.** Scatter plot of plasma versus urine paraquat concentrations.

**Figure 2.** Diagnostic goodness-of-fit plots from the final population toxicokinetic model: Conditional weighted residuals versus time after ingestion (A), Conditional weighted versus population predicted concentration (B), Observed versus individual predicted concentrations (C), Observed versus population predicted concentrations (D). The open circles are the observed data, and the plotted line is the line of identity (y=x)

**Figure 3.** Diagnostic goodness-of-fit plots from the final population toxicodynamics model: Conditional weighted residuals versus paraquat plasma concentrations (A), Conditional weighted residuals versus population predicted $CL_{cr}$ (B), Observed versus individual predicted $CL_{cr}$ (C), Observed versus population predicted $CL_{cr}$ (D). The open circles are the observed data, and the plotted line is the line of identity (y=x)

**Figure 4.** Scatter plots for visual predictive check: observed and simulated concentrations versus time (A), observed and simulated $CL_{cr}$ versus paraquat plasma concentrations (B). Percentiles (5, 50 and 95) were calculated using the final PopTK and TD model.

**Figure 5.** Time course of empirical Bayes estimates of $CL_{PQ}$ in PQ-poisoning patients.

**Figure 6.** Time course of median predicted PQ concentrations for initial $CL_{cr}$ of 0.3, 6 and 13L/h.
Tables

Table 1. Demographics of the patients enrolled in the population toxicokinetic and toxicodynamic studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Toxicokinetic study (n= 78) Median (Range)</th>
<th>Toxicodynamic study (n= 68) Median (Range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male/female (n)</td>
<td>52/26</td>
<td>45/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (y)</td>
<td>28 (14-76)</td>
<td>30 (14-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (kg)</td>
<td>51 (35-66)</td>
<td>51 (35-66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sCr (mg/dl)</td>
<td>2 (0.3-12.6)</td>
<td>2 (0.3-12.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL_{cr} (L/h)</td>
<td>1.89 (0.29-13.25)</td>
<td>2.05 (0.29-13.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingestion volume (ml)</td>
<td>50 (5-750)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingestion dose (g)</td>
<td>10 (1-150)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sCr, serum creatinine; CL_{cr}, creatinine clearance
Table 2. Toxicokinetic model of paraquat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of model</th>
<th>OFV</th>
<th>Parameter (RSE(%))</th>
<th>Covariate effect (RSE(%))</th>
<th>IIV % (RSE(%))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V₁/F</td>
<td>CL/F</td>
<td>Q/F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base model with mixed error model</td>
<td>9496</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final model with ingestion dose effect on F, CLₜₜ effect on CLₚQ, BW on V₁</td>
<td>9449</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFV, objective function value; IIV, Inter-individual variability; F, bioavailability; V₁/F, apparent volume of central compartment; CL/F, clearance; Q/F, apparent inter-compartmental clearance; XF, the logit of bioavailability; BW, body weight; %CV, coefficient of variation; %SE, standard error
Table 3. Toxicodynamic model of paraquat
OFV, objective function value; IIV, Inter-individual variability; IC₅₀, the concentration of PQ causing a 50% of maximum PQ induced-creatinine clearance reduction; γ, a shape factor characterising the slope of the response; E₀, the baseline creatinine clearance; Eₘₐₓ, the maximum fractional decrease of creatinine clearance; BW, body weight; %CV, coefficient of variation; %SE, standard error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of model</th>
<th>OFV</th>
<th>Parameter (RSE(%) )</th>
<th>Covariate effect (RSE(%) )</th>
<th>IIV % (RSE(%) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base model with log-additive error model</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>IC₅₀ 346 γ 24.02 E₀ 3.35 Eₘₐₓ 0.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final model with age, sex and BW effect on E₀, Treatment effect on Eₘₐₓ</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>IC₅₀ 207 γ (0.7) E₀ 3.23 Eₘₐₓ 0.62</td>
<td>Age: -0.07 (0.7) Male: 0.14 (0.7) BW: 1.39 (0.7)</td>
<td>Active: -0.08 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male: -0.08 (0.7) Control: -0.27 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>369 γ (0.1) E₀ (0.1) Eₘₐₓ (0.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Results of nonparametric bootstrap analysis of paraquat population toxicokinetics and toxicodynamics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Final model</th>
<th>Bootstrap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean %CV 2.5%CI 97.5% CI</td>
<td>Mean %CV Median 2.5% CI 97.5% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicokinetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_V$ (L)</td>
<td>13.63 16 9.28 17.98</td>
<td>14.64 36 13.59 6.62 27.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_CL$ (L/h)</td>
<td>0.15 31 0.06 0.24 0.22 86</td>
<td>0.16 0.02 0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_Q$ (L/h)</td>
<td>0.84 11 0.67 1.02 0.87 27</td>
<td>0.85 0.48 1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional residual error (%)</td>
<td>0.48 39 0.12 0.84 0.80 148</td>
<td>0.44 0.11 4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive residual error (µg/L)</td>
<td>0.89 ² - - 1.26 77</td>
<td>0.98 0.1 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicodynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_{IC50}$ (µg/L)</td>
<td>207 1.04 202.91 211.36 286 80</td>
<td>208 126 806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_r$</td>
<td>5.02 0.74 4.94 5.09 5.49 15</td>
<td>5.15 3.97 6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_{ED}$ (L/h)</td>
<td>3.23 0.73 3.18 3.27 3.17 9</td>
<td>3.17 2.69 3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta_{Emax}$ (L/h)</td>
<td>0.62 0.72 0.61 0.63 0.62 7</td>
<td>0.62 0.54 0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log additive residual error(L/h)</td>
<td>0.58 - - - 0.58 6</td>
<td>0.58 0.51 0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\theta_V$, typical value of the volume distribution; $\theta_CL$, typical value of the clearance, $\theta_Q$, typical value of the inter-compartmental clearance; $\theta_XF$, typical value of the logit of bioavailability; $\theta_{IC50}$, typical value of the concentration of PQ causing a 50% of maximum PQ induced-creatinine clearance reduction; $\theta_r$, typical value of a shape factor characterising the slope of the response; $\theta_{lgf}$, typical value of the baseline creatinine clearance; $\theta_{Emax}$, typical value of the maximum fractional decrease of creatinine clearance; %CV, coefficient of variation; CI, confidence interval.
Table 5. Distribution of empirical Bayes estimates of population toxicokinetic and toxicodynamic parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>2.5%</th>
<th>97.5% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toxicokinetics (n = 78)</td>
<td>$V_1$ (L/kg)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$V_2$ (L/kg)</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$K_a$ (h$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$CL_{PQ}$ (L/h)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_{1/2P}$ (h)</td>
<td>168.98</td>
<td>189.2</td>
<td>41.53</td>
<td>132.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxicodynamics (n = 68)</td>
<td>$IC_{50}$ (µg/L)</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$E_{max}$ (L/h)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$V_1$, volume of distribution of central compartment; $V_2$, volume of distribution of peripheral compartment; $K_a$, absorption rate constant; $CL_{PQ}$, paraquat clearance; $t_{1/2P}$, elimination half-life; $IC_{50}$, the concentration of PQ causing a 50% of maximum PQ induced-creatinine clearance reduction; $E_{max}$, the maximum fractional decrease of creatinine clearance; SD, standard deviation; %CI, confidence interval.
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Figure 1. Scatter plot of plasma versus urine paraquat concentrations.
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Figure 2. Diagnostic goodness-of-fit plots from the final population toxicokinetic model: Conditional weighted residuals versus time after ingestion (A), Conditional weighted versus population predicted concentration (B), Observed versus individual predicted concentrations (C), Observed versus population predicted concentrations (D). The open circles are the observed data, and the plotted line is the line of identity (y=x).
Figure 3. Diagnostic goodness-of-fit plots from the final population toxicodynamics model: Conditional weighted residuals versus paraquat plasma concentrations (A), Conditional weighted residuals versus population predicted CLcr (B), Observed versus individual predicted CLcr (C), Observed versus population predicted CLcr (D). The open circles are the observed data, and the plotted line is the line of identity (y=x).
Figure 4. Scatter plots for visual predictive check: observed and simulated concentrations versus time (A), observed and simulated CLcr versus paraquat plasma concentrations (B). Percentiles (5, 50 and 95) were calculated using the final PopTK and TD model.
Figure 5. Time course of empirical Bayes estimates of CLPQ in PQ-poisoning patients.
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Figure 6. Time course of median predicted PQ concentrations for initial CLcr of 0.3, 6 and 13 L/h.
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