LETTER TO THE EDITOR

PHARMACOKINETICS OF ANTIPYRINE AND THEOPHYLLINE : UNALTERED BY MULTI-DOSE OMEPRAZOLE TREATMENT IN RABBITS

(Received on Jannuary 1, 1994)

Sir.

Omeprazole contains a benzimidazole moiety which is essential for irreversble inhibition of the gastric enzyme H*K*ATPase. Ability to selectively inhibit this enzyme makes omeprazole a potent, safe, efficacious and widely used antiulcer agent (1). Omeprazole is completely metabolized by hepatic mixed function oxidase (MFO) system. Cimetidine, a well known H₂-blocker also contains the benzimidazole moiety and is extensively reported to inhibit the hepatic MFO system which results in numerous clinically significant drug interactions (2).

We studied the pharmacokinetic interactions of omeprazole with two marker drugs antipyrine and theophylline which are mainly metabolized by hepatic MFO system.

Healthy male rabbits weighing between 1.5 to 2.5 kg were used in the study. A single oral dose of antipyrine (20 mg/kg) was given to each one of 16 rabbits between 0700 to 0800h. One millilitre blood samples from marginal ear vein were collected just prior to antipyrine and at 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8h post-antipyrine. Plasma was separated by centrifugation and stored at -20°C till assayed spectrophotometrically for antipyrine (3). Intra-assay coefficient of variation was 4.35% and sensitivity 2 μg/ml.

These 16 rabbits were randomly divided into 2 groups (n=8). The first group received oral 4 ml 0.5% methylcellulose (vehicle) per day between 0700-0800h for 14 consecutive days while the second groups received oral omeprazole (4 µg/kg) suspended in vehicle per day between 0700-0800h for 14 consecutive days. Both groups received 1 ml of 4 mmol sodium bicarbonate just prior to vehicle/omeprazole administration to prevent acid degradation of omeprazole (4). On day 15, both groups again received on oral

dose of antipyrine (20 μ g/kg) at 0700-0800h. Blood samples were collected at similar time intervals as described earlier and plasma samples were assayed for antipyrine.

To a separate group of 16 rabbits, a single oral dose of theophylline (10 μ g/kg) was given to each rabbit at 0700-0800h. One ml blood samples from marginal ear vein were collected just prior to theophylline and at 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8h post-theophylline. Plasma was separated and assayed by HPLC technique for theophylline (5). Sensitivity and intra-assay coefficient of variation of the method were 1 μ g/ml and 5.25% respectively.

These 16 rabbits were randomly divided into 2 groups (n=8). For 14 consecutive days, the first group received oral vehicle (4 ml 0.5% methylcellulose) and the second group, oral omeprazole (4 mg/kg) suspended in vehicle at 0700=0800h. Both groups also received sodium bicarbonate (1 ml or 4 mmol) just prior to vehicle/omeprazole. On day 15, both groups again received on oral dose of theophylline (10 mg/kg) at 0700-0800h. Blood samples were collected as described above and plasma was separated and assayed for theophylline (5).

The steady state kinetics of theophylline were studied in another groups of 16 rabbits. The rabbits were administered oral theophylline (10 mg/kg) thrice a day at 0700, 1500 and 2300h for 5 consecutive days. On day 6, 1 ml blood samples were collected just prior to theophylline (at 0700h) and at 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8h post-theophylline. Plasma was separated and assayed for theophylline. These 16 rabbits were randomly divided into two groups (n=8). For 14 consecutive days, the first groups received vehicle and the second groups received omeprazole suspended in vehicle as described earlier. From day 10 onwards both groups also received oral

theophylline (10 mg/kg) thrice a day at 0700, 1500 and 2300 h. On day 15, blood samples were collected at similar time intervals as described earlier after 0700h administration of theophylline at a dose of 10 mg/kg. Plasma was separated from these samples and stored at -20°C until assayed for theophylline.

No significant difference was observed in Cmax, tmax, t½, AUC_0 -8 and AUC_0 - α of antipyrine or theophylline (single dose) before and after omeprazole and vehicle treatment (Table I). However, the AUC_0 - α was significantly different for antipyrine between post and preomeprazole treated groups, which could possibly due to higher Kel of antipyrine in postomeprazole treated group.

Table II shows the multi dose theophylline study. No significant difference was observed in any of the steady state pharmacokinetic parameters studied between the pre-omeprazole, vehicle and post-omeprazole treated groups of rabbits.

It has been reported that omeprazole is able to alter the drug metabolizing activity of hepatic MFO system through induction or inhibition (6). Omeprazole is reported to inhibit metabolism of diazepam and phenytoin in animal and human studies (7). Both the drugs are metabolized by MFO subfamily IIC. Omeprazole does not interact with cyclosporin, nifedipine and lignocaine (8, 9, 10) which are metabolized by MFO subfamily IIIA.

TABLE I: Single dose pharmacokinetics of antipyrine and theophylline in Rabbits.

	Cmas (µg.ml ⁻¹)	tmax (h)	t½B (h)	$AUC_{q.s} \ (\mu g.ml^{-1}.h)$	$AUC_{\sigma \cdot u}$ $(\mu g. ml^{-1}.h)$
Antipyrine					and the same
Pre-omeprazole (n=16)	15.62 ± 0.94	1.00 ± 0.00	7.71 ± 0.86	86.34 ± 5.99	184.53 ± 22.22
Vehicle (n=8)	16.26 ± 0.53	1.00 ± 0.00	6.33 ± 0.62	89.93 ± 4.67	164.42 ± 21.16
Post-omeprazole (n=8) Theophylline	16.15 ± 0.47	1.12 ± 0.08	5.87 ± 0.37	83.50 ± 0.33	128.58 ± 10.97*
Pre-omeprazole (n=16)	11.37 ± 1.40	1.12 ± 0.08	2.30 ± 0.03	32.86 ± 3.35	38.30 ± 03.29
Vehicle (n=8)	11.94 ± 1.17	1.00 ± 0.00	2.00 ± 0.04	36.68 ± 1.97	42.33 ± 03.17
Post-omeprozole (n=8)	12.43 ± 0.35	1.12 ± 0.08	2.49 ± 0.13	35.40 ± 2.31	43.49 ± 01.99

Values are expressed as Mean ± SEM

TABLE II: Steady state pharmacokinetics of theophylline in Rabbits.

	C ^{ss} max (µg.ml ⁻¹)	C ^{ss} min (µg.ml ⁻¹)	$AUC_{0\cdot 8} \ (\mu g.ml^{\cdot 1}.h)$	tmax (h)
Pre-omeprazole (n=16)	19.77 ± 0.71	5.67 ± 0.32	99.18 ± 4.34	1.00 ± 0.00
Vehicle (n=8)	18.30 ± 2.79	5.18 ± 0.30	92.64 ± 1.89	1.00 ± 0.00
Post-omeprazole (n=8)	20.11 ± 4.24	4.78 ± 0.49	97.07 ± 1.90	1.00 ± 0.00

Values are expressed as Mean ± SEM

^{*}P < 0.05 as compared to pre-omeprazole group.

Antipyrine and theophylline are both mainly metabolized by MFO subfamily IA. The present study suggests that omeprazole may not alter activity of subfamily IA. Therefore, theophylline which has a narow therapeutic index may not require dosage adjustment on concurrent administration with omeprazole.

S. M. CHANDRASHEKHAR, A. CHAKRABARTI AND S. K. GARG

Department of Pharmacology,
Postgraduate Institute of Medical
Education & Research,
Chandigarh - 160 012

REFERENCES

- Wallmark B. Omeprazole: mode of action on acid secretion in animals. Scand J Gastroenterol 1989; 24:12-18.
- Somogyi A, Gugler R. Drug interaction with cimetidine. Clin Pharmacokinet 1982; 7: 42-56.
- Brodie B, Axelrod J. The fate of antipyrine in man. J Pharmacol Exp Ther 1950; 98:97-104.
- Regardh CG, Gabrielsson M, Hoffman KJ et al. Pharmacokinetics and metabolism of omeprazole in animals and man: an overview. Scand J Gastroenterol 1985; 20: 79-95.
- Subramaniam S, Garg SK, Dhand R, Malik SK, Sharma PL. Measurement of theophylline concentration by high performance liquid chromatography. *Bull PGI* 1986; 20:63-68.
- Andersson T. Omeprazole drug interaction studies. Clin Pharmacokinet 1991; 21:195-212.

- Gugler R, Jensen JC. Omeprazole inhibits oxidative drug metabolism-studies with diazepam and phenytoin in vivo and 7-ethoxycoumarin in vitro. Gastroenterol 1985; 89:1235-1241.
- Bargetzi MJ, Aoyama T, Gonzalez FJ, Meyer UA. Lignocaine metabolism in human liver microsomes by cytochrome P-450 IIIA. Clin Pharmacol Ther 1989; 46:521-527.
- Gonzalez FJ, Schmidt BJ, Umeno M, McBride OW, Hardwick JP. Human P-450 PCN1 sequence, chromosome localisation and direct evidence that P-450 PCN1 in nifedipine oxidase. DNA 1988; 7:79-86.
- Kronbach T, Fischer V, Meyer UA. Cyclosporin metabolism in human liver: identification of cytochrome P-450 III gene family as major cyclosporin metabolising enzyme explain interactions of cyclosporin with other drugs. Clin Pharmacol Ther 1988; 43:630-635.

^{*} Corresponding author