

# A physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) model exploring the blood-milk barrier in lactating species - A case study with oxytetracycline administered to dairy cows and goats

Jennifer Tardiveau, Lerica Leroux-Pullen, Ronette Gehring, Gaël Touchais, Marie-Pierre Chotard, Hélène Mirfendereski, Carine Paraud, Matthieu Jacobs, Reynald Magnier, Michel Laurentie, et al.

# ▶ To cite this version:

Jennifer Tardiveau, Lerica Leroux-Pullen, Ronette Gehring, Gaël Touchais, Marie-Pierre Chotard, et al.. A physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) model exploring the blood-milk barrier in lactating species - A case study with oxytetracycline administered to dairy cows and goats. Food and Chemical Toxicology, 2022, 161, pp.112848. 10.1016/j.fct.2022.112848 . hal-03615752

# HAL Id: hal-03615752 https://hal.science/hal-03615752v1

Submitted on 22 Jul 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Version of Record: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S027869152200045X Manuscript\_fafa92b16b4aa59c4205eb72f9c6b999

1	A Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic (PBPK) Model Exploring the Blood-Milk							
2	<b>Barrier in Lactating Species</b>							
3	-A case study with oxytetracycline administered to dairy cows and goats-							
4								
5	Jennifer Tardiveau <sup>1,2</sup> , Lerica LeRoux-Pullen <sup>3</sup> , Ronette Gehring <sup>3</sup> , Gaël Touchais <sup>4</sup> , Marie Pierre							
6	Chotard-Soutif <sup>4</sup> , Hélène Mirfendereski <sup>1,5</sup> , Carine Paraud <sup>6</sup> , Matthieu Jacobs <sup>7#</sup> , Reynald							
7	Magnier <sup>7</sup> , Michel Laurentie <sup>4</sup> , William Couet <sup>1,2,5</sup> , Sandrine Marchand <sup>1,2,5</sup> , Alexis Viel <sup>4\$</sup> ,							
8	Nicolas Grégoire <sup>1,2,5</sup> <sup>*</sup>							
9								
10	<sup>1</sup> INSERM** U1070, 1 rue Georges Bonnet, 86022 Poitiers Cedex, France							
11	<sup>2</sup> Université de Poitiers, UFR de Médecine Pharmacie, 6 rue de la Milétrie 86073 Poitiers Cedex, France							
12 13	<sup>3</sup> Department of Population Health Sciences: IRAS Veterinary and Comparative Pharmacology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht University, Yalelaan 104, 3508 TD Utrecht, The Netherlands							
14	<sup>4</sup> ANSES, Laboratoire de Fougères, 10B rue Claude Bourgelat, Bioagropolis, Javené 35306 Fougères, France							
15	<sup>5</sup> CHU de Poitiers, département de toxicologie et pharmacocinétique, 2 rue de la Milétrie 86073 Poitiers Cedex, France							
16	<sup>6</sup> ANSES, Laboratoire de Ploufragan-Plouzané-Niort, site de Niort, 60 rue de Pied de Fond 79024, Niort, France							
17	<sup>7</sup> Ceva Santé Animale, Libourne I&D Center, 10 Avenue de la Ballastière, 33500 Libourne, France							
18	<sup>#</sup> Present address: Servier, Quantitative Pharmacology department, 25 rue Eugène Vignat, 45000 Orléans, France							
19	<sup>§</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work							
20 21	*To whom correspondence should be addressed: nicolas.gregoire@univ-poitiers.fr ; Address: 1 rue Georges Bonnet, 86022 Poitiers Cedex, France.							
22 23	** National Institute of Health and Medical Research							
24	Abbreviations: AUC: area under the time concentration curve; BLQ: below the lower limit							
25	of quantification; C <sub>max</sub> : maximal concentration; CV: coefficient of variation; EW:							
26	extracellular water; GSA: global sensitivity analysis; IIV: inter-individual variability; IM:							
27	intramuscular; IMI: inter-milking interval; IV: intravenous; IW: intracellular water; LLOQ:							
28	lower limit of quantification; MAPE: mean absolute percentage error; MP: milk to plasma							
29	ratio; MRL: maximum residue limit; OTC: oxytetracycline; PBPK: physiologically based							
30	pharmacokinetic; PK: pharmacokinetic; PI: prediction interval; R <sup>2</sup> : coefficient of							
31	determination; RV: residual error; SAEM: stochastic approximation expectation-							
32	maximization; $T_{max}$ : time of the maximal concentration; ULOQ: upper limit of							
33	quantification; VASC: vascular space; VPC: visual predictive check; WHO: World Health							
34	Organization; WP: withdrawal period.							

# 1. Introduction

Understanding the passage of drugs into milk is important in order to manage residues in foodstuffs of animal origin thus optimizing the withdrawal period for both food safety (limiting risks for consumers), and for economic reasons such as milk being discarded where drug residues are below the maximum residue limits (MRLs). To address these issues, it is essential to accurately predict the concentration of a drug in milk over time.

41

42 After administration, drugs are absorbed, distributed, and eliminated, following 43 pharmacokinetic (PK) processes that depend on the physico-chemical properties of the 44 compound and the physiology of the animal. Their distribution in milk depends on the same 45 PK processes which are adapted to the particularities of the udder physiology and the 46 composition of the milk. Milk is an emulsion of fat globules in an aqueous medium 47 containing soluble proteins, casein, and minerals.

48

The distribution of a compound in the different milk fractions (*i.e.*, cream, curd, whey) depends on factors specific to the compound, such as its lipophilicity or ionization, as well as factors specific to the milk, such as its composition or volume (Hotham and Hotham, 2015; Ozdemir, 2018; Whittem, 2012).

53

54 Physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) models integrate the physico-chemical 55 properties of drugs and the physiological parameters of species (Lin *et al.*, 2016). In 56 particular, these models make predicting compound concentrations in various fluids and 57 tissues after different dosing regimens possible. They can be of particular interest for 58 predicting the excretion of compounds into the milk of various species.

59

In recent years, several PBPK models have been developed for use in veterinary medicine. Most of them are used to predict tissues residues and withdrawal periods in farm animals for food safety assessment (Lautz *et al*, 2019). Few PBPK models describing the excretion of drugs into milk exist for dairy cows (Leavens *et al*, 2014; Li *et al*, 2018; Woodward and Whittem, 2019). At present, there are no models for dairy goats or ewes.

65

66 Moreover, some essential factors affecting distribution in milk are not taken into 67 account in the currently published models. For instance, excretion into milk was modeled as a simple, first order elimination from plasma (Leavens *et al*, 2014) and did not account for udder size, composition, and perfusion, or variation in the volume of milk produced and milking frequency (Abduljalil *et al*, 2021). Other models are more physiological and describe the structure of the udder (Li *et al*, 2018; Woodward and Whittem, 2019), but they do not consider permeability-limited passive diffusion and active transport within mammary cells and they do not describe the distribution in the different milk fractions or the binding of molecules to the different milk constituents.

75

76 Oxytetracycline (OTC) is a broad-spectrum antibiotic from the tetracycline family. It is widely used in veterinary medicine to treat infectious diseases (Craigmill et al, 2000). OTC 77 78 PK is well-known in multiple veterinary species (Aktas and Yarsan, 2017; Craigmill, 2003; 79 Nouws et al, 1985b; Rule et al, 2001). Briefly, it has a good bioavailability in cattle after 80 intramuscular (IM) injection and, is distributed to most tissues and fluids such as milk. It is 81 mainly excreted unchanged in the urine by glomerular filtration and tubular secretion and, to a 82 lesser extent, it is excreted unchanged in bile (Nouws et al, 1985b). Its off-label use led to 83 various adverse effects at higher doses (in the kidneys and liver) as well as violative residues 84 in edible tissues (Riad et al, 2021). The published OTC PK studies have resulted in the development of PBPK models of OTC in non-lactating food animal species such as cattle 85 86 (Achenbach, 1995), sheep (Craigmill, 2003), and goats (Riad et al, 2021) as well as in dogs 87 (Lin et al, 2015) and salmon (Law, 1999), for different formulations. To the knowledge of 88 the authors of this study, however, there is no PBPK model to predict OTC distribution in 89 milk.

90

91 The objective of this study has been to develop a PBPK model to describe the 92 excretion of OTC in cow and goat milk. To be able to complete this model at a later stage and 93 come up with a generic model that can be used for other drugs and/or species, the 94 development a detailed model for OTC was attempted. Therefore, the development of a 95 rather detailed PBPK model, which could be adapted to the data available for these different 96 compounds and species was chosen.

97

98 The generic PBPK model thus developed was then applied in a case study to predict99 OTC concentrations in cow and goat milk.

#### 101 **2.** Materials and methods

102 OTC plasma and milk concentrations in cows and goats were obtained experimentally 103 prior to the development of the PBPK model in order to calibrate and/or validate the model. In vitro permeability studies, in a Parallel Artificial Membrane Permeability Assay (PAMPA), 104 105 were performed in order to calibrate the (transcellular) passive diffusion of OTC from plasma 106 to milk. In the following paragraphs, the experimental studies (properties of OTC, animal 107 study, in vitro experimentation, and analytical methods) will be presented first. Then, the development of the PBPK model (the global structure, the udder, and milk model). And 108 109 finally, the calibration and validation of the model will be elaborated.

110

111 2.1. Experimental studies

112 2.1.1. Chemicals

113 (All chemicals used in analytical assays were of analytical grade)

OTC in hydrochloride form (Terramycine solution injectable®; Zoetis, Malakoff, France)
was used for the *in-vivo* experiments. Its octanol-water partition coefficient (logP) and its pKa
were determined from Chemicalize ("Chemicalize - Instant Cheminformatics Solutions,"
n.d.). The logP of OTC was estimated to be -4.54.

118

OTC has several chemical groups which, depending on the pH, may have an electric charge. The two main groups of OTC that can have an electric charge in physiological pH (~7) have an acid pKa of 7.25 and a basic pKa of 5.80, respectively. According to Rodgers and Rowland's publications (Rodgers *et al*, 2005; Rodgers and Rowland, 2006), OTC was considered as a zwitterion of group 2 since it has no basic pKa  $\geq$  7. The ionization ratios of OTC in the different media were calculated from the equations reported by Rodgers and Rowland (see Equation 1) (Rodgers *et al*, 2005; Rodgers and Rowland, 2006).

126

$$Ionisation \ ratio = 1 + 10^{pKa_{Base} - pH_i} + 10^{pH_i - pKa_{Acid}}$$
(1)

127

where pH<sub>i</sub> is the pH of the i<sup>th</sup> media, and pKa<sub>Base</sub> and pKa<sub>Acid</sub>, the basic and acid pKa of OTC,
respectively.

# 131 2.1.2. Animals

132 Six (6) Prim' Holstein cows along with five (5) Alpine goats and one (1) crossbred goat 133 were included in the study which had been approved by the Animal Research Ethics Committee 134 (APAPHIS n° 19369-2019022111373719). Each animal received a drug-free diet and water ad 135 *libitum.* All animals were free of clinical mastitis. Goats and cows were milked twice daily: 136 at 8h and 16h--meaning a milking interval of 8 hours during the day and of 16 hours during 137 the night--by a milking unit and a milking robot, respectively. Each animal received a single dose of OTC conventional formulation at 10 mg.kg<sup>-1</sup> by intramuscular (IM) route in the neck, 138 139 at several injection points. Blood samples were taken from jugular vein by venipuncture at 140 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8-hours post-administration and then, twice daily (in the morning and evening, at the same time as milking) until the 4<sup>th</sup> day after the administration. Within 30 min 141 142 after sampling, blood samples were centrifuged at 3500 rpm at room temperature for 10 143 minutes and plasma was collected. Milk samples (about 20 mL) mixed from all the teats (4 144 for cows, 2 for goats) were taken at each milking starting at 8 hours post-administration and 145 continued up to 5 days. The volumes of milk collected were measured at each milking. The 146 butyrous and protein rates were quantified once for each individual's milk at the beginning of 147 the experiment (see the demographic characteristics of the animals are presented in the 148 Table S1 of the supplementary materials).

149

Blank samples of blood and milk (without drug) were collected before administration. All
samples were frozen and stored at -20°C and protected from light until analysis.

152

# 153 2.1.3. PAMPA experiments

The PAMPA, as first described by Kansy et al, was used as an in vitro model of passive 154 155 transcellular permeation (Kansy et al, 1998). PAMPA was performed using the Corning® 156 Gentest<sup>™</sup> Pre-coated PAMPA Plate System (Corning, NY 14831, USA). This plate system 157 consisted of pre-coated inserts of structured layers of phospholipids, composed of hexadecane 158 in hexane (5 % v/v). The PAMPA protocol published by Corning® (Chen et al, 2008), with 159 minor adaptations, was performed as follows: A stock solution of 10mM OTC in DMSO was 160 prepared and further diluted in PBS to a final concentration of 200 µM (100 mg/L). A 161 volume of 300 µL of solution was added to each well of the receiver plate and 200 µL of PBS

were added to the pre coated filter plate's wells. The plate was then incubated for four hours at room temperature, without agitation. After the incubation period, two (2)-100  $\mu$ L samples were collected from each well and stored at -80°C until analysis.

165

After analytical analysis of the samples, the apparent permeability of OTC over the synthetic membrane was calculated using the following formula (Equation 2) (Shanler *et al*, 2021):

$$P_{app} = \frac{-\ln\left(\frac{1-C_A(t)}{Ceq}\right)}{A \times \left(\frac{1}{V_D} + \frac{1}{V_A}\right) \times t}$$
(2)  
with  $C_{eq} = \frac{C_D(t) \times V_D + C_A(t) \times V_A}{V_D + V_A}$ 

where A is the filter area  $(0.3 \text{ cm}^2)$ , V<sub>D</sub> is the donor well volume (0.3 mL), V<sub>A</sub> is the acceptor well volume (0.2 mL), t is the incubation time (in seconds), C<sub>A</sub>(t) is the compound concentration in acceptor well at time t, C<sub>D</sub>(t) is the compound concentration in donor well at time t, C<sub>eq</sub> corresponds to the concentration at equilibrium.

173

# 174 2.1.4. Analytical Methods

175 Plasma samples were assayed by Shimadzu high-performance liquid chromatography 176 system (Shimadzu, SBM-20A, Marne la Vallée, France) coupled with an ultraviolet detector 177 (Shimadzu, SDP-20A). A volume of 100 µL of plasma sample was mixed with 50 µL of 178 internal standard solution: demeclocycline hydrochloride at 12 µg/ml in trichloroacetic acid 179 10% and centrifuged for 10 min at 14000 rpm at about 7°C. Supernate was transferred into a 180 vial with a polypropylene insert and 20 µL of the solution were injected into the 181 chromatographic system. The analytical column was a Luna Omega Polar  $C_{18}$  (150 \* 2.1 mm, 182 5  $\mu$ m), fitted with a Luna Omega C<sub>18</sub> precolumn (4 x 2.0mm) (Phenomenex, Torrance, 183 California, USA). The mobile phase was composed of KH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> solution at 0.025 mol/L and 184 pH 3.0 (adjusted with phosphoric acid), and an acetonitrile solution (90:10 [vol/vol]) and was 185 delivered isocratically at 0.3 mL/min. Rinsing of the needle with 100 µL of a 186 methanol/water/isopropanol/acetonitrile mixture (25:25:25) was done between each 187 injection and repeated rinsing of the system with ACN and HPLC grade water in gradient mode was used at the end of the run. The UV detection was at 355 nm. The retention time 188

was 8 min for OTC and 14 min for the internal standard. The lower and upper limits of quantification (LLOQ and ULOQ) of the method were 0.05  $\mu$ g/mL and 15  $\mu$ g/mL, respectively. The trueness and precision were characterized at five concentration levels (0.05, 0.2, 6, 10, and 15  $\mu$ g/ml) with a relative bias between -7.1% and 5.8% for goats; -5.1% and 10.2% for cows; a repeatability between 0.1% and 2.0% for goats; 0.6% and 3.1% for cows; and an intermediary precision between 1.5% and 3.0% for goats; 1.0% and 5.4% for cows.

195

The analytical method used to assay PAMPA samples in PBS was a modified version of the method in plasma. The same sample preparation method and chromatographic conditions were used as for plasma. The difference being the mathematical function for calibration which was quadratic instead of linear due to a slight flattening of the curve at high concentrations.

Milk samples were assayed by LC-MS/MS. Two (2) g of milk sample were mixed with 201 202 1 mL of water (HPLC grade). A volume of 200 µL of internal standard solution, 203 demeclocyclin hydrochloride at 1 µg/ml was added, and the mixture was vortexed and left for 204 at least 10 minutes away the light. Extraction was made by adding 10 mL of Mac 205 Ilvaine/EDTA buffer, vortexed during 30 seconds, mixed with a rotary stirrer at 100 rpm for 10 min, and centrifuged 10 min at 14000 g at 4°C. Deproteination was made by adding 1 mL 206 207 of TCA at 1 g/mL, vortexed, frozen for 15 min and centrifuged 5 min at 14000 g. Purification 208 was made by solid phase extraction (SPE) using Bond Elut C18 cartridges (200 mg/3cc -209 Agilent Technologies) and elution by oxalic acid solution at 0.01 mol/L before filtration with 210 0.45 µm filter. Five (5) µL were injected into the chromatographic system composed of 211 Quadrupole tandem mass spectrometer: Type TSQ Vantage (Thermo Scientific) with data acquisition station: Xcalibur version 2.2.SP1. The analytical column was a Kinetex® 212 Biphenyl C<sub>18</sub> (100 x 2,1 mm, 2.6 µm) (Phenomenex, Torrance, California, USA). The mobile 213 214 phase A was a formic acid solution at 0.2% in water, and mobile phase B was a formic acid 215 solution at 0.2% in methanol. The gradient for mobile phase B was set at 5%, 98%, and 5% at 216 0.01, 5, and 6.1 min, respectively, with a flow rate of 0.35 mL/min. Heated-electrospray 217 ionization (H-ESI) in positive mode was used for the detection of OTC. Ions were analyzed 218 in the multiple reaction monitoring, and the following transitions were inspected: 461.1 m/z219  $\rightarrow$  [M+H]<sup>+</sup> > 426.16 m/z and 465.1 m/z  $\rightarrow$  [M+H]<sup>+</sup> > 448.10 m/z for OTC and IS, respectively. 220 The ion used for quantification is the one with the m/z of 426.16 for OTC and the one with 221 the m/z of 448.10 for IS. The retention time was 4.4 min for OTC and 4.8 min for the internal

- standard. The lower and upper limits of quantification of the method were 20 µg/kg and 1000
- $\mu$  g/kg (0.2 to 10 times the MRL), respectively. The trueness and precision were characterized
- at six (6) concentration levels (20, 40, 100, 300, 500, and 1000  $\mu$ g/kg) with a relative bias
- between -0.1% and 1.8% for goats; -3.2% and 3.7% for cows; a repeatability between 0.5%
- and 1.7% for goats; 1.0% and 1.6% for cows; and an intermediary precision between 3.3%
- 227 and 4.8% for goats; 1.0% and 4.8% for cows.
- 228



Figure 1: (A) Schematic diagram of the whole PBPK model to explore the blood-milk barrier in lactating species. Intramuscular (IM) administration was considered through the IM injection site compartment. The "rest" compartment was composed of remaining organs with no specific interest. (B) Schematic representation of the udder sub-compartments. The udder is described as a multi-compartmental, permeability-limited model, composed of an interstitial space consisting of extracellular water (EW), an intracellular water (IW) and the milk which is produced in the udder alveolar cells (alveolar milk) and stored in the cistern (cisternal milk). Passive diffusion between sub-compartments and binding to several proteins (*i.e.*, casein, whey proteins), lipids (NL for neutral lipids, NP for neutral phospholipids and ions ( $Ca^{2+}$  for calcium,  $Mg^{2+}$  for magnesium) were considered.

232 The PBPK model was composed of ten compartments corresponding to the main body 233 organs and tissues (lung, adipose, muscle), blood compartments (arterial, venous), absorption 234 compartment (IM injection site), excretory organs (kidneys, liver), tissue of interest (udder: 235 see section 2.3), and a lumping compartment for the rest of the body (Figure 1A). All compartments interconnected by blood flows, with the exception of the IM injection site 236 237 compartment, were defined by volume and blood flow rates obtained from published 238 experimental studies with healthy animals for each species (see Table S2 in supplementary 239 **materials**) (Lin *et al*, 2020); (Li *et al*, 2021); (Jackson and Cockcroft, 2002); (Upton, 2008); (Lin et al, 2016); (Maltz et al, 1984); (Ji et al, 2017); (Lautz et al, 2020); (Williams et al, 240 2007); (McCutcheon et al, 1993); (Rodgers et al, 2005). The distribution of OTC from the 241 plasma to the tissues was considered as perfusion limited, consistent with previous PBPK 242 243 models of OTC in cattle, sheep and goats (Craigmill, 2003; Riad et al, 2021). A more 244 detailed model was developed for the udder, taking into account the permeability data generated in vitro (see section 2.1.3). 245

The IM absorption was modelled by a single IM injection site compartment connected to the venous blood compartment by an intramuscular absorption rate ( $k_{IM}$ ) (Equation 3).

248

$$\frac{dA_{injection}}{dt} = -k_{IM} \times A_{injection}$$
(3)

249

250 with A<sub>injection</sub> the drug quantity in the IM injection site compartment calculated as

 $A_{injection} = dose \times F_{IM}(\%)$  and  $F_{IM}$  as the intramuscular bioavailability. For each species  $k_{IM}$  value was estimated by fitting the PBPK model with experimental plasma data from the 253 current study (see section 2.4), whereas  $F_{IM}$  values were obtained in the literature (Nouws *et al*, 1985b; Rule *et al*, 2001) (see Table 1).

255

Drug partition between blood and plasma was based on the blood to plasma ratio (BP), (see details in section 2.2.2 of the supplementary materials) and used to convert plasma concentrations to blood concentrations.

259

Drug distribution was dependent on the tissue to plasma partition coefficient (k<sub>tissue</sub>) 260 for each tissue, defined as the ratio between total tissue drug concentration and total plasma 261 262 concentration (Yau et al, 2020). The k<sub>tissue</sub> values were obtained in the literature from OTC 263 tissue and serum residues in sheep (Craigmill, 2003), with the exception of the lungs which 264 were estimated from residues data in cattle (Achenbach, 1995) (see details in section 2.2.3 of 265 the supplementary material) (see Table 1). For the lumping compartment, the partition coefficient (k<sub>rest</sub>) was calculated as the weighted mean of the partition coefficients of the 266 267 lumped organs (Equation 4) (Nestorov et al, 1998). As partition coefficients were missing for 268 these lumped tissues, the partition coefficient of the muscle was used for poorly perfused 269 tissues (brain and gastrointestinal tracts) and the partition coefficient of the kidneys was used 270 for richly perfused tissues (bones, carcass, heart, pancreas, spleen) (Lin et al, 2015).

$$k_{rest} = \frac{k_{muscle} \times V_{poorly_{perfused}} + k_{kidneys} \times V_{richly_{perfused}}}{V_{poorly_{perfused}} + V_{richly_{perfused}}}$$
(4)

272 where 
$$V_{poorly_{perfused}} = V_{GItract} + V_{Intestines} + V_{Brain}$$

273 and 
$$V_{richly_{perfused}} = V_{Bones} + V_{Carcass} + V_{Heart} + V_{Pancreas} + V_{Spleen}$$

With k<sub>muscle</sub> and k<sub>kidneys</sub> as the tissue to plasma partition coefficient of the muscle and kidneys,
and V<sub>tissue</sub> as the volume of tissue.

277

Distribution of drug in the non-eliminating organs is described using the following equation(Equation 5):

$$\frac{dA_{tissue}}{dt} = Q_{tissue} \times \left(C_{art} - \frac{C_{tissue}}{k_{tissue}} \times BP\right)$$
(5)

280

with  $A_{tissue}$  the amount of drug in tissue,  $Q_{tissue}$  the tissue blood flow rate,  $C_{art}$  and  $C_{tissue}$  the concentration of drug in arterial blood and tissue, respectively, and BP the blood to plasma ratio and  $k_{tissue}$  the tissue to plasma partition coefficient.

284

285 OTC total plasma clearance values (CL<sub>plasma</sub>) for both species was obtained by 286 averaging values reported in several articles for cattle (Craigmill et al, 2004; Nouws et al, 287 1985b), and goats (Aktas and Yarsan, 2017; Rule *et al*, 2001) (see Table 1). These clearances 288 were split between renal and hepatic clearances only based on the unchanged excreted 289 fraction in urine (fekidneys) reported in the literature (Nouws et al, 1985b) (see Table 1). The 290 excretion clearance in milk was considered independently of the systemic clearance (see 291 section 2.3). The differential equation describing the variation in the amount of OTC in the 292 eliminating organs (liver and kidney) is as follows (Equation 6): 293

$$\frac{dA_{tissue}}{dt} = Q_{tissue} \times \left(C_{art} - \frac{C_{tissue}}{K_{tissue}} \times BP\right) - Q_{tissue} \times ER_{tissue} \times C_{art}$$

294

295 with ER<sub>tissue</sub> the extraction ratio of the corresponding tissue.

The extraction ratio of both organs were calculated based on CL<sub>plasma</sub> and fe<sub>kidneys</sub> as follows
(Equations 7 and 8):

(6)

$$ER_{blood,kidneys} = \frac{CL_{plasma} \times fe_{kidneys}}{BP \times Q_{kidneys}}$$
(7)

$$ER_{blood,liver} = \frac{CL_{plasma} \times (1 - fe_{kidney})}{BP \times Q_{liver}}$$
(8)

299

300

# 301 2.3. Udder and Milk Model

The udder is described as a multi-compartment, permeability-limited model (Figure 1B). It is composed of a vascular space (VASC), an interstitial space consisting of extracellular water (EW), an intracellular water (IW) of mammary epithelial secretory cells, and 2 compartments containing the milk. Between each milking, milk components were produced within the epithelial secretory cells (alveolar milk), then passed the canalicular membrane and reaching the cistern (cisternal milk) through the ducts.

308

This study hypothesized that only the unbound and unionized form of the drug diffused passively between EW and IW and between IW and alveolar milk. The fraction of ionized OTC in each sub-compartment was calculated based on the pH of these compartments and the pKas of OTC, and the diffusion rate between EW and IW and between IW and alveolar milk was estimated based on *in vitro* PAMPA results. In IW as in milk, OTC is presumed to be distributed between the fat and aqueous fractions and to bind to casein, whey proteins, ionized calcium, and magnesium.

316

# 317 2.3.1. Permeability

Passive diffusion, the main mechanism of OTC distribution into milk, was assessed by PAMPA experiments (Fujikawa *et al*, 2005) as detailed in section 2.1.3. This synthetic membrane permitted an estimation of the permeability ( $P_{app}$  in cm/s) (see Table 1) representing transcellular diffusion that could then be applied to sinusoidal and canalicular membranes.  $P_{app}$  was converted to passive milk clearance (CL<sub>diff</sub> in L/h) according to the following equation (Badhan *et al*, 2014) (Equation 9):

$$CL_{diff} = P_{app} \times SA \times Tissue weight$$

325

where SA represented *in vivo* endothelial surface area  $(cm^2/g)$  and tissue weight represented the weight of the udder (g).

328

329 SA was not found in the literature for the udders of cows or goats; therefore, it was calculated
330 considering the cylindrical structure of capillary from geometric formula (Ng and
331 Hungerbühler, 2013) (see section 2.3.1 of the supplementary materials for calculation
332 details).

333

334 2.3.2. Extracellular water

In both the EW and the VASC, the pH was considered to be 7.4 (Rodgers *et al*, 2005) (see Table 1), thus supposing instantaneous equilibrium in both spaces. The ratio between the total EW concentration and the total blood concentration in the tissue vascular space ( $K_{EW/B}$ ) was used, allowing only one differential equation to determine the concentrations of OTC in VASC and EW (Jamei *et al*, 2014).

340

In addition, OTC should bind to albumin in EW. Albumin concentration in EW was found in the literature (Vestweber and Al-Ani, 1984) (see Table 1) and its affinity constant for OTC was calculated based on the unbound fraction in plasma (see section 2.3.2.1 of the supplementary materials, equation S20) (Rodgers and Rowland, 2006).

345

346 The variations of the amount of drug in the EW ( $A_{EW}$ ) is described by the following 347 equation (Equation 10):

$$\frac{dA_{EW}}{dt} = Q_{udder} \times C_{art} - Q_{udder} \times \frac{Cu_{EW}}{fu_{EW}} \times \frac{1}{\frac{K_{EW}}{B}} + CL_{diff,sin} \times \left(\frac{Cu_{IW}}{X} - \frac{Cu_{EW}}{Y}\right)$$
(10)

348 with

(9)

349 
$$Cu_{EW} = \frac{A_{EW}}{V_{EW,eff}} \times fu_{EW};$$
  $V_{EW,eff} = V_{EW} + \frac{V_{VASC}}{K_{EW}};$ 

350  $V_{EW} = f_{EW} \times V_{udder}$ ;  $V_{VASC} = f_{VASC} \times V_{udder}$ 

351

where  $fu_{EW}$  is the unbound EW fraction, X and Y are the ionization ratios of OTC in IW and EW, respectively;  $K_{EW/B}$  is the quotient of total EW concentration and the total blood concentration in the tissue vascular space (VASC);  $CL_{diff,sin}$  is the clearance pertaining passive diffusion of drug across the sinusoidal membrane;  $Cu_{EW}$  is the unbound concentration in EW; Cu\_{IW} is the unbound concentration in IW;  $f_{vasc}$  and  $f_{EW}$  are vascular and EW fractions,  $V_{EW,eff}$ is the volume of effective extracellular space which is a combination of EW and VASC;  $V_{EW}$ , $V_{VASC}$  and  $V_{udder}$  are EW, vascular and udder volumes, respectively.

359

# 360 (Details for calculations of X, Y, fuew and Kew/B were presented in section 2.3.2 of the 361 supplementary materials)

362

363 2.3.3. Intracellular water

In IW the pH was considered to be 7.0 (Rodgers *et al*, 2005) (see Table 1). Unionized OTC is assumed to bind to neutral lipids and phospholipids. The concentration of neutral lipids and phospholipids were fixed based on available information in the literature (Kinsella and McCarthy, 1968) (Larson, 1978). Their OTC affinity constants were calculated based on the drug lipophilicity (logP) and ionization rate in IW (X) following Rodgers and Rowland's equations (Rodgers *et al*, 2005; Rodgers and Rowland, 2006) (**see section 2.3.2.2 of the supplementary material**).

371

In addition, the IW compartment should contain the same components as milk, (*i.e.*, fat, casein, whey proteins [lactalbumin and lactoglobulin] and ionized calcium and magnesium). OTC should be distributed and bind to these components in IW as in milk.

375

The concentration of milk fat, casein, and whey proteins in IW were assumed to be identical to those in milk and are described in section 2.3.4.2. The concentration of ionized magnesium in IW was found in the literature (Martens and Stumpff, 2019). The concentration of ionized calcium in IW was calculated based on the total concentration of
calcium in IW (Neville and Watters, 1983), and the free calcium fraction in IW that was
supposed to be the same as in milk (7%, see section 2.3.4.2). Calculations of their OTC
affinity constants are detailed in section 2.3.4.2.

383

384 The variation of the amount of drug in the IW  $(A_{IW})$  was described by the following 385 equation (Equation 11):

386

$$\frac{dA_{IW}}{dt} = CL_{diff,sin} \times \left(\frac{Cu_{EW}}{Y} - \frac{Cu_{IW}}{X}\right) + CL_{diff,can} \times \left(\frac{Cu_{alveolar\ milk}}{Z} - \frac{Cu_{IW}}{X}\right)$$
(11)

387 with

388 
$$Cu_{IW} = \frac{A_{IW}}{V_{IW}} \times fu_{IW}$$
;  $V_{IW} = f_{IW} \times V_{udder}$ 

389

390 where  $fu_{IW}$  is the unbound IW fraction; Z is the ionization ratio of OTC in milk;  $CL_{diff,can}$  is 391 the passive diffusion of drug across the canalicular membrane;  $f_{IW}$  is the intracellular water 392 fraction;  $V_{IW}$  is the volume of udder intracellular water; and  $Cu_{alveolar milk}$  is the unbound 393 concentration in alveolar milk space.

# 394 (Details for the calculations of Z and furw are presented in section 2.3.2.2 of the 395 supplementary materials)

396

397 2.3.4. Milk

398 2.3.4.1. Production of milk

399 Milk is produced by the mammary epithelial secretory cells, exported into the alveolar 400 lumen, and transported by the ducts to the cistern where it is stored. The volume of milk 401 contained in the udder ( $V_{milk,tot}$ ) is divided with 70% ( $f_{alveolar}$ ) (see Table 1) in the alveolar 402 space (the alveolar lumen plus the ducts and the residual, see below) and 30% (1- $f_{alveolar}$ ) in 403 the cistern (Ayadi *et al*, 2003; Caja *et al*, 2004).

404

405 At each milking of the cows, the volume of milk collected ( $V_{milk,obs}$ ) corresponded to 95% 406 (1-f<sub>residual</sub>) of  $V_{milk,tot}$  with 5% (f<sub>residual</sub>) remaining in the alveolar space ( $V_{residual}$ ) (Whittem, 2012), regardless of the value of inter-milking interval (IMI). In goats, f<sub>residual</sub> was considered
to be 13% for an IMI of 16h and 19% for an IMI of 8h (Peaker and Blatchford, 1988).

In the current PBPK model, the volume of milk produced over a milking interval ( $V_{milk}$ (t)) used to compute the milk concentrations over time, is presumed to increase linearly over time until reaching the  $V_{milk,obs}$  at the end of the milking interval (*i.e.*, when t = IMI). In this study, the volume of the available alveolar milk ( $V_{alveolar}$  or milk volume of alveolar space and ducts, minus the residual milk) and the volume of the cisternal milk ( $V_{cisternal}$ ) so that  $V_{milktot}$ , or total milk, was defined as the sum of alveolar, cisternal, and residual milk volumes (*e.g.*,  $V_{milktot} = V_{alveolar} + V_{residual} + V_{cisternal}$ ).

417

418 Linear production of V<sub>milk</sub>, V<sub>alveolar</sub>, and V<sub>cisternal</sub> is described in the following equations
419 (Equations 12-14):

420

$$V_{milk}(t) = (1 - f_{residual}) \times V_{residual} + t \times \left(\frac{V_{milk,obs} - (1 - f_{residual}) \times V_{residual}}{IMI}\right)$$
(12)

421

422 where  $f_{residual}$  is the fraction of residual milk;  $V_{residual}$  is the volume of milk remaining in the udder after 423 the previous milking; *t* represents the time since the last milking;  $V_{milk, obs}$  the volume of milk collected 424 at each milking; and IMI the inter-milking interval (8 or 16h). 425 Thus,

426

427 
$$V_{milk,tot}(t) = \frac{V_{milk}(t)}{1 - f_{residual}}$$

428 Hence,

$$V_{alveolar}(t) = (f_{alveolar} - f_{residual}) \times V_{milk,tot}(t)$$

$$V_{cisternal}(t) = (1 - f_{alveolar}) \times V_{milk,tot}(t)$$
(13)
(14)

429 2.3.4.2. Drug distribution in udder and in milk

The pH of milk was inferred to be 6.68 for cattle and 6.65 for goats (Park *et al*, 2007) (see
Table 1). As described above, OTC in milk is distributed within the fats and aqueous phases
and bound to casein, whey, and ionized calcium and magnesium.

433

434 Milk concentrations of fat, casein, and whey proteins were calculated based on 435 experimentally measured butyrous and protein rates (see Table S1 in supplementary 436 materials). The concentration of fat (g/L) was determined by multiplying the butyrous rate 437 measured (g/kg) by the density of milk (kg/L) (Park et al, 2007). The total milk protein 438 concentration (g/L) was determined by multiplying the protein rate measured (g/kg) by the 439 density of the milk. The concentrations of casein and whey proteins were calculated 440 according to their respective proportions in the milk of each species (i.e., 88/12% for cows 441 and 65/35% for goats) (Balthazar et al, 2017).

442

443 The percentage of free magnesium in milk (16%) was obtained in the literature (Oh and 444 Deeth, 2017) and multiplied by the total concentration of magnesium in milk of each species 445 (Balthazar et al, 2017) to obtain the ionized concentration of magnesium (see Table 1). The 446 percentage of free calcium in milk was estimated in cow's milk based on the ratio of free 447 calcium concentration (Neville and Watters, 1983) to total calcium concentration (Balthazar 448 et al. Due to missing values for free calcium concentration in other species, this percentage 449 in cattle was multiplied by the total calcium concentration in milk of each species (Balthazar 450 et al, 2017) to obtain the ionized calcium concentration (see Table 1).

451

452 Affinity constants for fat (ka<sub>fat</sub>) and casein (ka<sub>casein</sub>) were estimated from the measurement 453 of milk distribution of 15 drugs, published by Shappell and Lupton (Lupton et al, 2018; 454 Shappell et al, 2017). The ka<sub>fat</sub> and ka<sub>casein</sub> of each drug was calculated as the ratio of the 455 concentration in fat--or the concentration bound to casein--to the free concentration in milk 456 (total concentration in milk multiplied by the free fraction in milk). Then, a linear regression 457 was built between the logarithm of ka<sub>fat</sub> and the distribution coefficient (logD) of each drug 458  $(R^2 = 0.83)$  (Equation 15) and another between the logarithm of ka<sub>casein</sub> and the distribution 459 coefficient of each drug ( $R^2 = 0.80$ ) (Equation 16). Finally, the ka<sub>fat</sub> and ka<sub>casein</sub> of OTC in 460 milk and IW were calculated based on the logD of OTC using these equations.

 $log(ka_{fat}) = 0.49 \times log D - 3.112$   $log(ka_{casein}) = 0.29 \times log D - 2.09$ with log D = log P - log X for IW log D = log P - log Z for milk(15)

462 The affinity constant of OTC for whey proteins (ka<sub>whey</sub>) was found in the literature 463 (Shappell *et al*, 2017).

464

The affinity constants of OTC for calcium  $(ka_{Ca^{2+}})$  and magnesium  $(ka_{Mg^{2+}})$  were estimated based on the results of Carlotti *et al* (Carlotti *et al*, 2012). Similar to fat and casein, a linear regression was built between the logarithm of the OTC affinity constant for both metal ions  $(ka_{Ion}^{2+} \text{ in L/mol})$  and the pH (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.99) (Equation 17). Thus, the  $ka_{Mg}^{2+}$  and  $ka_{Ca}^{2+}$  were converted in L/g by dividing  $ka_{Ion}^{2+}$  by the molecular weight of each metal ion and calculated as a function of the pH of IW or milk.

471

$$\log(ka_{lon^{2+}}) = 0.7085 \times pH - 2.0478 \tag{17}$$

472

473 where  $ka_{Ion}^{2+}$  is in L/mol and pH is the pH of IW (7.0) or milk (6.68 for cows, 6.65 for goats).

474 Hence, the unbound fraction in milk was defined in equation 18:

$$fu_{milk} = \frac{1}{\left(1 + ka_{fat} \times [fat] + ka_{casein} \times [casein] + ka_{whey,prot} \times [whey,prot] + ka_{Mg^2} \times [Mg^{2+}] + ka_{Ca^2} \times [Ca^{2+}]\right)}$$
(18)

# 475 (see calculation details in section 2.3.2.3 of the supplementary materials.)

The amount of drug in the alveolar (A<sub>alveolar</sub>) and cisternal (A<sub>cisternal</sub>) milk were described
by the following equations (Equations 19- 20):

$$\frac{dA_{alveolar\,milk}}{dt} = CL_{diff,can} \times \left(\frac{Cu_{IW}}{X} - \frac{Cu_{alveolar}}{Z}\right) - Q_{cistern} \times C_{alveolar}$$
(19)

$$\frac{dA_{cisternal\,milk}}{dt} = Q_{cistern} \times C_{alveolar} \tag{20}$$

478 with  $Q_{cistern} = (1 - f_{alveolar}) \times \frac{V_{milk,obs}}{IMI}$ ;  $Cu_{alveolar} = \frac{A_{alveolar}}{V_{alveolar}} \times fu_{milk}$ 

480 where  $CL_{diff,can}$  is the passive diffusion clearance across the canalicular membrane; X and Z 481 the ionization ratios in IW and alveolar milk;  $Q_{cistern}$  the flow of milk from alveoli to cistern; 482  $C_{alveolar}$  the OTC concentration in the alveolar milk;  $Cu_{IW}$  and  $Cu_{alveolar}$  the OTC free 483 concentrations in IW and alveolar milk;  $fu_{milk}$  the unbound fraction of OTC in milk;  $f_{alveolar}$ 484 the fraction of alveolar milk; and  $V_{alveolar}$  is the volume of alveolar milk.

485

486 Finally, the milk concentrations used for the PBPK model predictions over time (Equation 21) 487 were calculated as the sum of alveolar and cisternal amounts of OTC divided by  $V_{milk}(t)$ , as 488 defined in Equation 12.

489

$$C_{milk}(t) = \frac{A_{cisternal}(t) + A_{alveolar}(t)}{V_{milk}(t)}$$
(21)

490

491 Parameters generally used to describe and evaluate the passage of a molecule into milk,
492 such as the milk to plasma ratio (M/P) (Equation 22), the milk clearance (CL<sub>milk</sub>) (Equation
493 23), and the percentage of the dose excreted in milk (Dose<sub>percentage,milk</sub>) (Equation 24), were
494 calculated.

$$M/P = \frac{AUC_{0-t,milk}}{AUC_{0-t,plasma}}$$
(22)

$$CL_{milk} = \frac{A_{excreted}}{AUC_{96h, plasma}}$$
(23)

$$Dose_{percentage,milk} = \frac{A_{excreted}}{Dose \times BW_i}$$
(24)

495 With  $AUC_{0-t}$  the area under the curve of milk or plasma total OTC concentrations over time 496 (t); A<sub>excreted</sub> the total amount of OTC excreted in milk as predicted by the model; Dose the 497 weight-adjusted dose (10 mg/kg); and BW<sub>i</sub> the body weight of animal "i".

- 499 Table 1: Parameter values used in the PBPK Model.
- 500

501 Parameters in g/kg in the literature were converted to g/L using udder density (1.06 kg/L) 502 (Upton, 2008) or milk density (1.031 kg/L for cows, 1.034 kg/L for goats) (Park et al, 2007). One value per row means that the same value was used for both species. The parameters 503 504 identified by an asterisk were evaluated in the global sensitivity analysis (see section 2.6).

505

Parameter		Abbreviation	Cow	Goat				
Species physiology								
Alveolar fraction *		f <sub>alveoli</sub>	$0.7^{1}$					
Blood cell pH *		pH <sub>BC</sub>	$7.22^{2}$					
Plasma pH *		pH <sub>P</sub>	$7.4^{2}$					
Udder extracellular wa	ater pH *	pH <sub>EW</sub>		$7.4^{2}$				
Udder intracellular wa	ter pH *	pH <sub>IW</sub>		$7.0^{2}$				
Milk pH *		pH <sub>milk</sub>	6.68 <sup>3</sup>	6.65 <sup>3</sup>				
Udder vascular fractio	n*	f <sub>VASC</sub>	0.124					
Udder extracellular wa	ater fraction *	$\mathbf{f}_{\mathrm{EW}}$	0.445					
Udder intracellular wa	ter fraction *	f <sub>IW</sub>	0.245					
Udder neutral lipid fra	ction *	f <sub>NL</sub>	0.0120 <sup>a</sup>					
Udder neutral phospho	olipid fraction *	f <sub>NP</sub>	0.0	0.0094ª				
Plasma albumin (g/L)	*	alb <sub>P</sub>	30.81 <sup>6</sup>	31.80 <sup>7</sup>				
Udder extracellular all	oumin (g/L) *	alb <sub>EW</sub>	14.52 <sup>8</sup>					
Udder intracellular cal	cium (g/L) *	Ca <sup>2+</sup> <sub>IW</sub>	0.0114 <sup>9,10</sup>					
Udder intracellular ma	gnesium (g/L) *	Mg <sup>2+</sup> <sub>IW</sub>	0.024 <sup>11</sup>					
Milk calcium (g/L) *		Ca <sup>2+</sup> <sub>MILK</sub>	0.089,10	0.09319,10				
Milk magnesium (g/L)	) *	Mg <sup>2+</sup> <sub>MILK</sub>	0.018 <sup>10,12</sup> 0.024 <sup>10,12</sup>					
Molecule parameters								
Compound type			Zwitterion of group 2 <sup>13</sup>					
pKa of acid function *		pKa <sub>Acid</sub>	7.25 <sup>14</sup>					
pKa of basic function	*	pKa <sub>Base</sub>	5.8014					
Partition coefficient be	etween octanol and water *	logP	-4.54 <sup>14</sup>					
Fraction unbound in p	lasma *	fup	0.8115	0.80 <sup>b</sup>				
Intramuscular bioavail	ability *	FIM	$0.88^{16}$	0.9217				
Intramuscular absorpti	on rate (1/h) *	k <sub>IM</sub>	0.17 <sup>c</sup>	0.45 <sup>c</sup>				
Total plasma clearance	e (L/h/kg) *	CL <sub>plasma</sub>	0.09 <sup>d</sup> 0.14 <sup>e</sup>					
Dose fraction excreted	unchanged in urine	fekidneys	0.85 <sup>18</sup>					
Blood to plasma ratio		BP	0.79 <sup>f</sup>	0.82 <sup>f</sup>				
Partition coefficient	Muscle *	k <sub>muscle</sub>	0.9019	0.8919				
	Lung *	k <sub>lung</sub>	$2.30^{20}$	$2.27^{20}$				
	Kidneys *	k <sub>kidneys</sub>	6.6219	6.5419				
	Liver *	k <sub>liver</sub>	1.8719	1.8419				
	Adipose *	k <sub>fat</sub>	0.09 <sup>19</sup>	0.09 <sup>19</sup>				
	Lumping	k <sub>rest</sub>	1.41 <sup>g</sup>	2.03 <sup>g</sup>				
Udder permeability	Udder permeability							
Capillary radius (mm)	*	r	0.0025 <sup>21</sup>					
Udder blood flow frac	tion to lobules *	fvasc <sub>Lobules</sub>	0.9822					
PAMPA permeability	(cm/s) *	Papp	1.4 * 10 <sup>-7 h</sup>					

<sup>506</sup> 507

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Calculation based on lipid repartition of Kinsella et al (Kinsella and McCarthy, 1968) and total phospholipid concentration of Bruce et al (Larson, 1978).

<sup>509</sup> <sup>b</sup> This value is the average of the unbound fraction in cows and sheep from Ziv et al (Ziv and Sulman, 1972).

<sup>510</sup> <sup>c</sup> These values were estimated by fitting the PBPK model with experimental plasma data (see section 2.2).

511 <sup>d</sup> This value is the average between plasmatic clearance of the empirical model of Craigmill *et al* (Craigmill *et al*, 2004) and

512 Nouws *et al* (Nouws *et al*, 1985b).

513 <sup>e</sup> This value is the average between plasmatic clearance from Aktas *et al* (Aktas and Yarsan, 2017) and Rule *et al* (Rule *et al*, 514 2001).

515 <sup>f</sup> See calculation details in Supplementary Material.

517 <sup>h</sup> Experimental data (see section 2.1.2).

517Experimental data (see section 2.1.2).518Sources:  ${}^{1}(Ayadi et al, 2003; Caja et al, 2004); {}^{2}(Rodgers et al., 2005); {}^{3}(Park et al., 2007); {}^{4}(Snipes and Lengemann, 1972);519{}^{5}(Konar et al, 1972); {}^{6}(Bobbo et al, 2017); {}^{7}(Alberghina et al., 2010); {}^{8}(Vestweber and Al-Ani, 1984); {}^{9}(Neville and Watters,5201983); {}^{10}(Balthazar et al, 2017); {}^{11}(Martens and Stumpff, 2019); {}^{12}(Oh and Deeth, 2017); {}^{13}(Rodgers and Rowland, 2006);521{}^{14}("Chemicalize - Instant Cheminformatics Solutions," n.d.); {}^{15}(Ziv and Sulman, 1972); {}^{16}(Nouws et al, 1985a); {}^{17}(Rule et al., 2001); {}^{18}(Nouws et al, 1985b); {}^{19}(Craigmill, 2003); {}^{20}(Achenbach, 1995); {}^{21}(Prosser, 1996); {}^{22}(Thompson, 1980).$ 

523

# 524 2.4. Model calibration

525 Individual plasma concentrations measured in the current study (study A, see Table 2) 526 were used to calibrate the rate of OTC absorption after IM administration (k<sub>IM</sub>). The PBPK 527 model with all parameters fixed (except  $k_{IM}$ ) was used (see Table 1) and only  $k_{IM}$  and its 528 standard deviation were estimated using the Stochastic Approximation Expectation-529 Maximization (SAEM) algorithm method, for each species. For cows, four (4) concentrations 530 in milk and 8 concentrations in plasma were reported as below the LOQ. For goats, sixteen 531 (16) concentrations in milk and nineteen (19) concentrations in plasma were reported as 532 below the LLOQ. Data below the LOQ were treated as left-censored observations using the 533 M4 method (i.e., the likelihood that they were between zero (0) and the LLOQ) was 534 calculated) (Beal, 2001).

535

The residual errors (RV) of the PBPK model were set to the value of the intermediate precision of the analytical method (see section 2.1.4) in plasma and milk for each species, assuming that the errors due to model misspecification or other unknown sources were negligible.

<sup>516 &</sup>lt;sup>g</sup> See equation 4 in the text.

- 541 Table 2: Experimental studies of OTC in cows and goats used for calibration and validation
- of the PBPK Model

Modelling purpose	Study ID	Route	Dose (mg/kg)	Species (n)	BW (kg)	Matrix	IMI	V <sub>milk</sub>	ТВ, ТР
$\begin{array}{l} Calibration \\ (estimation \\ of k_{IM})^1 \end{array}$	A	IM	10 (SD)	Cow (6), Goat (6)	568	Р	8h, 16h	Yes <sup>a</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>
Internal evaluation <sup>1</sup>	A	IM	10 (SD)	Cow (6), Goat (6)	568	М	8h, 16h	Yes <sup>a</sup>	Yes <sup>b</sup>
External evaluation <sup>2</sup>	В	IV	5 (SD)	Cow (19)	603	Р, М	NA	NA	NA
External evaluation <sup>3</sup>	С	IM	10 (5 doses, OD)	Cow (20)	577	М	12h	Yes <sup>a</sup>	NA
External evaluation <sup>3</sup>	D	IV	10 (SD)	Cow (4)	643	М	12h	Yes <sup>a</sup>	NA
External evaluation <sup>3</sup>	E	IV + IM	10 (SD) for IV + 10 (4 days,OD) for IM	Cow (4)	634	М	12h	Yes <sup>a</sup>	NA
External evaluation <sup>4</sup>	F	IM	20 (SD)	Goat (5)	56	Р, М	24h	NA	NA
External evaluation <sup>4</sup>	G	IV	20 (SD)	Goat (5)	56	Р, М	24h	NA	NA

<sup>a</sup> At each milking; <sup>b</sup> Once per animal before OTC administration

Note: IM: intramuscular; k<sub>IM</sub>: intramuscular absorption rate; IV: Intravenous; SD: single dose; OD: once daily; P: plasma; M: milk; NA: not available; IMI: inter-milking interval; V<sub>milk</sub>: Volume of milk measured, TB: butyrous rate; TP: protein rate.Sources: <sup>1</sup>Current study; <sup>2</sup>(Nouws *et al*, 1985a); <sup>3</sup>Unpublished study; <sup>4</sup>(Rule et al., 2001)

# 2.5. Establishment of the Population PBPK (popPBPK) Model

551 Monte Carlo simulations were performed to generate a virtual population of cows and 552 goats (n=1000 each) taking into account the inter-individual variability (IIV) and uncertainties 553 of the parameters from the PBPK model. A log-normal distribution was assumed for all 554 parameters because of their asymmetric distribution and their strictly positive values 555 (Fenneteau *et al*, 2009), and was assumed to represent the IIV (for physiological parameters) and uncertainty (for physico-chemical parameters). Coefficients of variation (CV) were
found in the literature based on previous experimental data or set at 30% for physiological and
20% for drug-related parameters with no experimental values, (see Table S3 for cow and S4
for goat in the section 2.4 of the supplementary materials) (Clewell and Clewell, 2008;
Henri *et al*, 2017a; Li *et al*, 2019a).

561

The code was written to ensure that the sum of the volume fractions or that of the blood flow fractions did not exceed 1, (Fisher *et al*, 2020) (see code in section 4. of the supplementary materials).

565

566 2.6. Model Evaluation: Validation and Sensitivity Analysis

567 The evaluation of the popPBPK model was carried out by graphical goodness-of-fit 568 (GOF) and statistical criteria, with an internal validation comparing the model predictions to 569 the experimental data generated in the study (study A), and an external validation comparing 570 the predictions to data from the literature and unpublished data (studies B to G, see Table 2). 571 If predictions fell within a factor of 2 of the experimental data, the popPBPK model was 572 considered as acceptable by the World Health Organization (WHO) (WHO et al, 2010). The 573 mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) and the determination coefficient (R<sup>2</sup>), based on 574 linear regression of model observations vs simulations, were also calculated to assess GOF 575 and model performance (Cheng et al, 2016). The popPBPK model was considered as valid if 576 the MAPE value was lower than 50% and the R<sup>2</sup> was at least 0.75 (Li et al, 2018) (Li et al, 577 2019b). Visual Predictive Checks (VPC) were generated by performing Monte Carlo 578 simulations (n= 1000 animals), considering both IIV and RV. The milk and plasma predictions interval (PI) (5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles) were plotted against the experimental data. 579

580

The external validation was conducted using average concentrations (and the standard deviation if available) from external and independent datasets for each species treated with a conventional OTC formulation with different dosing regimens (dose and route of administration) (studies B to G see Table 2). Plasma and milk data found in the literature were extracted from selected studies using WebPlotDigitizer (version 4.4, year 2020, California USA, https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer).

588 For study B, the IMI was not specified in the article and was set at eight (8) and sixteen 589 (16) hours, as in the current study. When some parameters were not specified, such as 590 volume of milk produced per milking (for studies B, F and G), and fat, casein, and protein 591 levels (for all external data sets), they were simulated (as explained below).

592

In order to simulate milk volumes of the 1000 animals, a linear mixed effects model (SAEM algorithm with Monolix software) was fit to to the experimentally measured milk volumes (study A, see Table 2) (performed separately for cows than for goats). This model included an intercept, an effect of milking interval, and inter- and intra- animal variability. From this model different volumes of milk for each animal (n=1000) at each milking could be simulated.

599

To simulate the milk fat, casein and whey proteins levels and the body weights of the 1000 animals, data (mean and dispersion value) was used from the literature ((Balthazar *et al*, 2017; Leitner *et al*, 2004) for milk composition; (Nouws *et al*, 1985a; Rule *et al*, 2001) and unpublished study for body weight) to draw different values for each simulated animal (n=1000) of each species. The nominal doses administered (in mg) were adjusted to match the simulated weights for each animal of each species.

606

The ability of the model to predict concentrations of OTC in the milk of cows and goats,
with other doses and routes of administration, was assessed by comparing the external dataset
with the 90% PI from the VPC.

610

611 A global sensitivity analysis (GSA), using the "extended-FAST" method (Saltelli and 612 Bolado, 1998), was performed to assess the influence of sixty-six (66) input parameters on 613 milk model predictions (see parameters with an asterisk in Table 1 and Table S2 in 614 supplementary materials). A uniform law was considered and each parameter was changed 615 by  $\pm 10\%$  of the median value, simultaneously (Peters, 2012). With the GSA, input parameter 616 influence could be divided into main effects and total effects where the difference between 617 main and total effects (additional effects) represented parameter interactions. Because total 618 effects are the most robust indicators of PBPK parameter influences (Jarrett et al, 2016), they 619 are the only ones discussed here. The outputs considered were the area under the curve of 620 OTC total concentration in milk between time 0 hours and 96 hours (AUC<sub>96h</sub>) and OTC total 621 concentration in milk at 96 hours (C<sub>96h</sub>). Total effects above the typical threshold value of 0.1 622 indicated significantly sensitive parameters (Jarrett *et al*, 2016; Li *et al*, 2017; Peters, 2012).

623

Moreover, variations of a factor 10 of the nominal value of the Papp, which can vary far more than 10% between drugs, have been explored (see section 3.3).

626

627 2.7. Model Application

628 An estimation of the withdrawal period (WP) in milk was performed using the popPBPK 629 model, based on results of the Monte Carlo simulations (n=1000) with the IIV but without the 630 RV, with the standard dosing regimen specified in the SPC of the Terramycin® speciality (*i.e.*, 10 mg/kg/day for four (4) days or 5 mg/kg/day for three (3) days by IM route). The time 631 (rounded up to the next whole day) for which the 99<sup>th</sup> percentile is equal to the MRL (100 632 633 µg/kg for milk) since the last injection was defined as the (predicted) WP in milk. Volume of 634 milk and rate of milk fat, casein, and whey proteins, of each animal were drawn as explained 635 above (see section 2.6). Body weights were simulated based on mean and dispersion values 636 from the literature (Lautz et al, 2020).

637

638 2.8. Software

Monolix (version 2020R1. Antony, France: Lixoft SAS, 2020) was used to develop the
popPBPK model and Simulx (version 2020R1. Antony, France: Lixoft SAS, 2020) to run all
simulations. (See the model code available in Supplementary Materials). Graphs were
generated using GraphPad Prism (version 9.1.0 for Windows, GraphPad Software, San Diego,
California USA, www.graphpad.com). GSA was performed with Rstudio (v 1.4.1106,
RStudio Team, 2009-2021, PBC, Boston, MA, http://www.rstudio.com/) and the sensitivity
package (v 1.26.0; Iooss 2021; https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=sensitivity).

646

- 648
- 649 3.1. Model Calibration

3. **Results** 

The observed plasma data BLQ (18%) were used to estimate only the IM absorption rates ( $k_{IM}$ ) for each species with a very good confidence (RSE < 15%), given a typical value of 0.17 1/h and 0.45 1/h for cows and goats, respectively (see section 3.1.1 of the supplementary materials). The associated IIV values (used for the popPBPK model application, see below) were equal to 22% for cows and 30% for goats, with rather good precision (RSE < 30%).

656

657 3.2. Simulations from the popPBPK Model

One thousand (1000) virtual individuals of each species with specific body weight, volume, and composition of milk produced were simulated (see the distribution and range of all parameters of these virtual populations are presented in section 2.4. of the supplementary materials).

662

663 3.3. Model Evaluation: Validation and Sensitivity Analysis

For internal validation using the observed concentrations from the current study (study A,
see Table 2), the VPC showed that most of the observed data (95%) in both plasma and milk
were within the 90% PI for both species (Figure 2 for cows and Figure 3 for goats). The BLQ
data were also well predicted.

668

In cow's milk (Figure 2B and D), 73% of typical predictions were within a factor of 2 of the experimental data. The R<sup>2</sup> and the MAPE were 0.92 and 29%, respectively, which met the validation criteria in cow's milk (Figure 2F).

672

Similarly, to the cow model, 67% of the typical predictions in goat's milk were within 2fold of the experimental data (Figure 3B and D). The R<sup>2</sup> and MAPE of 0.99 and 12%, met the validation criteria in goat's milk (Figure 3F). The internal validation of our popPBPK model, based on this experimental data, was therefore considered successful.



Figure 2: Visual predictive check of OTC concentrations in cow plasma (A, C) and milk (B, D) using the popPBPK model. The median is represented by a solid black line and the 90% prediction interval is represented by the area in blue. The experimental data (individual data points) from the current study are represented with circular points. The dotted line represents the lower limit of quantification (LLOQ, 0.05  $\mu$ g/ml for plasma, 0.02  $\mu$ g/ml for milk). Data below the LLOQ are marked in red and estimated by the model. The bottom graphs illustrate the result of a regression analysis between model predictions and measured OTC concentrations in plasma (E) and in milk (F). The coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) and mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) are shown in the graphs.



Figure 3: Visual predictive check of OTC concentrations in goat plasma (A, C) and milk (B, D) using the popPBPK model. The median is represented by a solid black line and the 90% prediction interval is represented by the area in blue. The experimental data from the current study are represented by circlular points. The dotted line represents the lower limit of quantification (LLOQ, 0.05  $\mu$ g/ml for plasma, 0.02  $\mu$ g/ml for milk). Data below the LLOQ are marked in red and estimated by the model. The bottom graphs represent the result of a regression analysis between model predictions and measured OTC concentrations in plasma (E) and in milk (F). The coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>) and mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) are shown in the panel.

679

For the external validation in cows, (see Figures S3 and S4 of the supplementary materials), after IV of 5 mg/kg (study B, see Table 2), the model underestimated the initial plasma concentration (the typical predictions for the first 0.6 hours were 33-47% of the 683 observed mean values), but concentrations measured at late time points were well predicted 684 (within a factor of 2 after one-hour post administration). In milk, 86% of the predictions were 685 within a factor of 2 of the observed data. After five (5) IM administrations of 10 mg/kg/day 686 (study C), the model well predicted (within a factor of 2) milk concentrations up to 168 hour 687 and under-estimated the final time points (predictions of the final time points were lower than 688 37% of the observed data). Overall, 78% of the milk predictions were within a factor of 2 of 689 the observed data. After IV administration of 10 mg/kg (study D), the model underestimated 690 the initial plasma concentrations, predicted milk concentrations well for up to ninety-six (96) 691 hours post-administration, but under-estimated the final time points. The LLOQ of the 692 unpublished data was 0.01 µg/mL, and 3, 4, 2, and 4 animals were BLQ at 108 hours, 120 hours, 132 hours, and 144 hours after administration, respectively. After one IV and four IM 693 694 injections of 10 mg/kg (study E), 72% of the predictions were within a factor of 2 of the 695 observed data.

696

For the external validation in goats, (see Figure S5 A-B in the section 3.2 of the supplementary materials), after IM administration of 20 mg/kg (study F), the model slightly underestimated the final time points in plasma (but still within a factor of 2). In milk, 60% of model predictions were within a factor of 2 of the observed data. After IV administration of 20 mg/kg (see Figure S5 C-D in the section 3.2 of the supplementary materials) (study G), the model overpredicted the late plasma concentrations. In milk, 88% of predictions were within a factor of 2 of the observed data.

704

Overall, based on external data on OTC concentrations in cow or goat milk from theliterature or unpublished dataset, the popPBPK model was considered to be valid.

707

A GSA was carried out for sixty-six (66) parameters of the PBPK model, (**identified by an asterisk in Table 1 and Table S2 in supplementary materials**). The results are presented in Figure 4 for AUC<sub>96h</sub> and C<sub>96h</sub> in cow and goat milk. Three parameters having a sensitivity coefficient (total effect) higher than 0.1 were considered to have a significant impact on AUC<sub>96h</sub> for both species. Seven (7) parameters for cows and height parameters for goats were considered to have a significant impact on C<sub>96h</sub>.

The predicted AUC<sub>96h</sub> in milk was sensitive to the acid pKa of OTC (0.42 for cows, 0.48 for goats), the pH of EW (0.39 for cows, 0.42 for goats) and the pH of milk (total effect of 0.15 for both species). The predicted C<sub>96h</sub> in milk was also sensitive to these three parameters but also to the pH of IW (0.77 for cows, 0.80 for goats), the total plasma clearance (CL<sub>plasma</sub>, coefficient of 0.23 for cows, 0.34 for goats), the partition coefficient in muscle (k<sub>muscle</sub>, coefficient of 0.21 for cows, 0.56 for goats), and in kidneys (k<sub>kidney</sub>, coefficient 0.10 for cows and of 0.54 for goats), and to the F<sub>IM</sub> (0.13) for goats.



Figure 4: Global sensitivity analysis of the PBPK model of OTC in cow milk (upper panel) and in goat milk (lower panel). The sensitivity coefficient was estimated after a + 10% variation of the sixty-six (66) input parameters on OTC area under the curve (AUC) between 0 and 96h (A, C), and concentration at 96h in milk (B, D). The main effects are presented in light blue and total effects in dark blue. The dotted lines represent the threshold of 0.1 for determining the impact of a parameter.

722

To illustrate the influence of the milk pH, a change of 10% of its initial value in cows (6.68), resulted in a variation of the AUC of its initial value (68 mg/L.h) ranging from -18%

(56 mg/L.h) when the pH is lower (6.01) to +84% (125 mg/L.h) when the pH is higher (7.35)
(see Figure 5A).

To illustrate the influence of the OTC acid pKa, a 10% change in its initial value (7.25), resulted in a variation of the AUC of its initial value (68 mg/L.h) ranging from -60% (28 mg/L.h) when the acid pKa is lower (6.53) to +67% (113 mg/L.h) when the pH is higher (7.98) (see Figure 5B).

732



Figure 5: PBPK model predictions of OTC in cow milk with a variation of  $\pm$  10% of milk pH (A) and acid pka of OTC (B).

733

734 The impact of permeability (Papp) on OTC excretion into milk with hypothetical lower or 735 higher permeability was also evaluated. The concentration profiles in cow's milk are presented for four (4) different Papp values in Figure 6. Thus, when Papp increases from 1.4 736 737 x  $10^{-8}$  cm/s (molecules with very low permeability) to 1.4 x  $10^{-5}$  cm/s (molecules with high 738 permeability), the model predicts that AUC<sub>96h</sub> increases by 626% (from 17 h.mg/L to 103 739 h.mg/L). Furthermore, in this case T<sub>max</sub> in milk decreases from 19 hours to 6 hours and the 740 maximum concentration (Cmax) increases from 0.4 mg/L to 4 mg/L. However, between a Papp of 10<sup>-5</sup> (AUC<sub>96h</sub> of 103 h.mg/L) and 10<sup>-6</sup> cm/s (AUC of 99 h.mg/L), the impact on AUC 741 742 was negligible.



Figure 6: PBPK model predictions of OTC in cow milk with a variation of Papp from  $10^{-8}$  to  $10^{-5}$  cm/s.

# 744 3.4. Drug distribution in udder and milk

745 The total and free OTC concentrations, over time, within the plasma, udder sub-746 compartments, and the milk as predicted by the popPBPK model are presented in 747 supplementary materials in Figure S6 A, C for cows and Figure S7 A, C for goats. Free 748 concentrations were higher in plasma and EW (which were superimposed) than in IW and 749 milk. In comparison, total concentrations were higher in IW but still lower than those in 750 plasma and EW. The elimination slopes were parallel in all sub-compartments. In total 751 concentrations, the  $T_{max}$  in plasma and EW were equivalent (5 hours for cows, 3 hours for 752 goats), whereas that of IW (7.5 hours for cows, 6 hours for goats) and milk (11 hours for 753 cows, 8 hours for goats) were delayed.

754

Proportions of free or bound OTC to each component are detailed on Figure S6 B for cows and Figure S7 B for goats in supplementary materials. In plasma and EW, the model predicts that OTC is mainly in unbound form (about 81% and 90% respectively) and weakly bound to albumin. In IW, the model predicts that OTC is more strongly bound (the unbound fraction is about 47%) and that binding is mainly to magnesium (Mg<sup>2+</sup>). In milk the model predicts that OTC is approximately 60% bound: primarily to Ca2+ (~40%) and Mg2+ (~15%).

Proportions of ionized or unionized OTC in each sub-compartment are presented in Figures S6 D for cows and S7 D for goats in supplementary materials. The fraction of ionized OTC was predicted to be 60% in plasma and EW (pH=7.4), 39% in IW (pH=7.0), and 29% in milk (pH=6.68 for cows, 6.65 for goats), highlighting again the strong influence of pH on OTC distribution.

768

Based on the results of the popPBPK model, the ratio of M/P (Eq 22, calculated between 0 hours and 96 hours), was 0.7 for cows and 0.5 for goats. The  $CL_{milk}$  was estimated as 0.44 L/h (7.76 \*10<sup>-4</sup> L/h/kg) and 0.051 L/h (7.67 \*10<sup>-4</sup> L/h/kg) for cows and goats, respectively.

773

Overall, 0.75% of the dose was excreted in the milk for cows, whereas it was 0.50% forgoats.

776

777 3.5. Model Application

In milk, the WP after IM injections of 10 mg/kg/day for four (4) days and 5 mg/kg/day for three (3) days were, predicted to be five (5) and four (4) days respectively for cow milk,

780 whereas it was predicted to be four (4) and three (3) days for goat milk (Figure 7).



Figure 7: Simulation of OTC administration in 10 mg/kg/day for four (4) days (A,C) and 5 mg/kg/day for three (3) days (B,D) by IM route in cow (A,B) and goat milk (C,D). The maximum residue limit (MRL) is represented by red dotted horizontal lines and the time when the 99<sup>th</sup> percentile is equal to the MRL by red dotted vertical lines. WP is calculated by the difference between this time and the time of the last injection: seventy-two (72) hours or forty-eight (48) hours.

782

# 783 **4. Discussion**

# 784 4.1. PBPK model objectives

A generic popPBPK model was developed, detailed in terms of udder physiology and milk composition, in order to exploit it to various compounds and species. To illustrate its usefulness, the model was used to predict the kinetic of OTC in cow and goat milk.

788

This model predicted the OTC concentrations measured in plasma and milk from cows and goats well. In this study, the M/P ratio for the cows was 0.7, which is slightly lower than the previously published value (1.2 to 2), but consistent with the observed value (0.7 calculated with a non-compartmental analysis from the observed data) (Nouws *et al*, 1985a). For goats, it was 0.5 (no value in the literature for comparison was found). The predicted percentage of the dose excreted in milk (0.8% for cows and 0.5% for goats) was equal to that
observed with the experimental data.

796

797 The model predictions compared to external data obtained in cows with different 798 dosing regimens were also satisfactory. However, the predicted milk concentrations for more 799 than ninety-six (96) hours after the last administration occasionally underestimated the 800 average concentrations measured (of that found in unpublished studies C, D, E). As these 801 concentrations were well below the quantification limits, this potential bias is perhaps 802 analytical. On the other hand, since the measured plasma concentrations are not available 803 with these external data sets, it cannot known whether this bias is due to poor plasma 804 predictions or only to poor milk predictions. During the external validation, an 805 underestimation of the initial plasma concentrations by this study model was also observed. 806 This bias may be due to choosing to use a flow limited model for the systemic portion. This 807 choice may have been valid for IM administration, but may not be valid for IV administration. 808 Indeed, during an IM administration, the initial distribution phase may be masked by the 809 absorption phase. It would therefore be useful, in order to develop a generic PBPK model, to 810 take into account a model with limited permeability for the systemic portion. This would 811 allow better extrapolation between different types of administration or formulations. Note 812 that if this PBPK model is selected for another formulation than the one used for this study 813 data on the release of the active ingredient as well as the absorption rate from the injection site 814 is available. Either these data are available in the literature, or they have to be determined 815 experimentally, as has been done here.

816

817 In goats, the model correctly predicted external concentrations of OTC in milk after IV 818 and IM of 20 mg/kg (Rule *et al*, 2001), with a slight overestimation of late concentrations 819 after IV administration, because of poor predictions of plasma concentrations.

820

4.2. Comparison to other PBPK model

822 4.2.1. PBPK model of OTC in non-lactating species

A few PBPK models are available for OTC in non-lactating species. The model of OTC in sheep (Craigmill, 2003) and that of cattle (Achenbach, 1995) allowed the tissue partition coefficients to be obtained for the current PBPK model. The model of Lin *et al* of OTC in dogs (Lin *et al*, 2015) considered some tissues as permeability limited (*i.e.*, fat, muscle, and 827 slowly perfused tissues), whereas the models of Craigmill and of Riad (Riad *et al*, 2021) 828 considered all tissues as perfusion limited. For the current model, a perfusion-limited model 829 structure was also chosen for tissue distribution, except in the udder, because it adequately 830 predicted the OTC plasma concentrations while avoiding the addition of uncertainties of 831 limited permeability parameters.

832

Some existing models use a two-compartments model (with two different rates) to describe the IM absorption of a long-acting formulation of OTC (Achenbach, 1995; Lin *et al*, 2015; Riad *et al*, 2021). In the current model, a simple first order absorption was sufficient to correctly predict the plasma kinetic of the conventional formulation of OTC. As the IM absorption rate ( $k_{IM}$ ) was not available for the target formulation and species, it was estimated with the current plasma data. This was the only parameter that was estimated in the model, with good confidence.

- 840
- 841 4.2.2. PBPK model of the udder

This new model is the first PBPK model to use a permeability-limited sub-model for the udder, distinguishing the VASC, EW, and IW spaces of the udder. Compared to perfusion-limited models, it allows describing the mechanisms by which slowly equilibrated drugs are distributed into the udder and reach the milk.

846

The udder IW acted as a deep compartment (see discussion below) in a more physiological manner than the empirical retention compartment mimicking the hypothetical drug adsorption on the alveolar epithelium described by Woodward *et al* (Woodward and Whittem, 2019). Moreover, the low permeability (Papp) of OTC impacted the rate of release into milk.

852

In the current model, exchanges between milk (alveolar space) and the IW of the udder were considered, mimicking reabsorption into the systemic circulation (Ziv and Sulman, 1975), as discussed by Li *et al* (Li *et al*, 2018).

856

Similarly to the model by Woodward *et al* (Woodward and Whittem, 2019), the current model considered milk production in the alveoli, transport via the ducts, storage in the cistern, and residual volume remaining in the ducts after milking. This studies model, however, did not take into account a delay before filling the cistern, but considered a passage
of milk from the alveolar space to the cistern at a rate equal to the average rate of increase of
the milk volume in the cistern during the milking intervals.

863

864 In order to be able to predict milk concentrations over time, and not only at the time of 865 milking, it was assumed a linear increase in the volume of milk produced during the milking 866 intervals. The Hill equation, described in several papers (Li et al, 2018; Whittem, 2012; 867 Woodward and Whittem, 2019), mimicking the nonlinear increase in milk volume, was not 868 used because it would have required the estimation of parameters from the volumes of milk 869 measured and it was preferred to use these experimental values directly. Furthermore, the 870 experimental data obtained here showed that milking volume was almost proportional to IMI, 871 which justified the linear increase in volume.

872

4.3. Factors influencing passage into the milk

874 In this model the many physiological and physico-chemical factors were taken into 875 account, such as binding to milk components or passive diffusion, that can influence the 876 passage into milk. In the case of the passage of OTC into cow and goat milk, the global 877 sensitivity analysis (GSA) showed that the most influential factors were the ionization (pH 878 and pKa) on AUC<sub>96h</sub> and the systemic exposure (CL<sub>plasma</sub> and k<sub>tissue</sub>) on C<sub>96h</sub>. The rest of the 879 sixty-six (66) parameters tested in the sensitivity analysis (see parameters with an asterisk 880 in Table 1 and Table S2 in supplementary materials) had less impact on the predictions of 881 AUC<sub>96h</sub> and C<sub>96h</sub> of OTC in milk.

882

In addition to the factors identified by the GSA, influence of two other factors is discussed: binding in the whole udder ( $ka_{Ca}^{2+}$ ,  $ka_{Mg}^{2+}$ ...) (see section 4.3.3) and OTC permeability (Papp) (see 4.3.4) on the passage of OTC in milk.

# 4.3.1. Systemic circulation

In the current model, the exchange between plasma, IW, and milk acts by passive diffusion of the unbound and unionized form of OTC. Therefore, the same AUC<sub>96h</sub> of the unbound and unionized form of OTC in these 3 compartments, highlighting the strong impact of plasma PK on the passage into milk, was observed. In such a PBPK models, it is therefore important to have a reliable model for the systemic PK to adequately describe the passage of a compound over the blood-milk barrier. That's why the estimation of  $k_{IM}$  from was chosen for this experimental animal study.

896

897 A whole PBPK model, including systemic PK was chosen because of the available PK 898 models in cows and goats (*i.e.*, known CL<sub>plasma</sub>, fe<sub>kidneys</sub>, F<sub>IM</sub>, and fu<sub>p</sub>) and the available PBPK 899 models, allowed the partition coefficients for each tissue to be obtained. In addition, having a complete PBPK model, which is more generalizable, will allow easier future cross-species 900 901 and cross-molecule extrapolations. Alternatively, a classical compartmental model of the 902 plasma data could have been developed in order to have a reliable plasma PK model, and 903 established a minimal PBPK model including only the udder part as Woodward et al 904 (Woodward and Whittem, 2019). This could be interesting for species where physiological 905 data are lacking.

906

907 Plasma clearance had a significant impact on the C<sub>96h</sub> of OTC in milk. The impact of 908 CL<sub>plasma</sub> on the terminal elimination slope in plasma and milk explains its influence on the 909 predicted residual concentrations in milk. In this study model, CL<sub>plasma</sub> was obtained from the 910 literature and split between renal and hepatic clearances based on published data of 911 unchanged excreted fraction in urine (Nouws et al, 1985b). This elimination model is not the 912 most mechanistic one and for future cross-species extrapolations, it will have to be adapted 913 with more physiological data of hepatic or renal elimination (e.g. glomerular filtration and 914 tubular secretion), using also more mechanistic PBPK model for such pathway (Mevius et al, 915 1986; Viel, 2018).

916

Among the partition coefficients, the  $k_{muscle}$  and the  $k_{kidneys}$  significantly affected C<sub>96h</sub> in the GSA (see Figure 4). As these parameters were used in the calculation of the lumping compartment partition coefficient ( $k_{rest}$ , see Equation 4), and since the lumping compartment was the largest compartment in terms of volume (about 40% of the total weight), it is not 921 surprising that these partition coefficients were the most influential on systemic PK, 922 especially on the terminal slope, and therefore milk exposure. As observed in GSA, the 923 impact of  $k_{kidneys}$  is greater for goats than for cows. This is probably due to the fact that the 924 volume of the richly perfused tissue is greater in goats (8% of BW *vs* 4% for cows).

925

926 Several methods can be used to predict the  $k_{tissue}$  if *in vivo* data are missing from the 927 literature. For comparison, cow k<sub>tissue</sub> were calculated using the equations of Rodgers and 928 Rowland (RR) (Rodgers *et al*, 2005) (see Table S6 in section 3.3 of the supplementary 929 materials). Only the k<sub>tissue</sub> of fat calculated by RR is equivalent to that found in the literature, 930 while the others were lower (by 15% for kidneys to 52% for liver). The much lower systemic 931 distribution predicted using RR ktissue led to much lower plasma and milk elimination half-932 lives (4.5h vs 9.1h in milk and 4.2h vs 7.9h in plasma) (see Figure S8 in the section 3.3 of 933 the supplementary materials). The k<sub>tissue</sub> obtained from literature allowed a better 934 description of the experimental data, even if the predictions of RR were quite good, 935 confirming that when possible, experimental data should be preferred to predictions from 936 theoretical equations (Yau et al, 2020).

937

# 938 4.3.2. Ionization

The current PBPK model accounts for the ionization of OTC in each udder and milk sub-compartments. As observed in GSA, the acid pKa of OTC, as well as the pH of the udder and milk sub-compartments, had a significant impact on the AUC<sub>96h</sub> and C<sub>96h</sub> of OTC (see Figure 4).

943

944 Only the unionized form can passively diffuse across physiological membranes, but 945 equilibria are re-established once the membranes are passed depending on the pH of the 946 medium. As the acid pKa of OTC (7.25) is close to the plasma (7.4), IW (7.0) and milk (6.7)947 pH values, small variations in pKa or pH led to large variations in ionized fractions. Thus, 948 due to the lower pH in milk than in plasma, the ionized fraction was lower in milk (29% 949 instead of 60%). Since the non-ionized concentration of OTC is the same in the different 950 compartments (notably plasma and milk), and the ionized concentration is lower in milk than 951 in plasma, the whole free concentration in milk is predicted to be lower than that in plasma 952 (see Figure S6 and S7 in supplementary materials).

The pKa values of OTC were based on an empirical calculation (Szegezdi and Csizmadia, 2007, 2004) and were comparable to values reported in the literature (Carlotti *et al*, 2012; Stephens *et al*, 1956; Tongaree *et al*, 1999). However, as evidenced by these publications, for zwitterions (with multiple chemical groups), it is difficult to determine with certainty to which groups these pKa are assigned. This difficulty is probably related to the determination method and conditions (temperature, solvent) used (Reijenga *et al*, 2013).

960

961 Regarding cells and tissues, due to missing values in the literature for ruminants, pH 962 values were taken from other species (Rodgers et al, 2005; Waddell and Bates, 1969). These 963 have been shown to be equivalent for animal cells and tissues from different species (for 964 healthy and un-anesthetized animals). Regarding the milk, the pH is also similar between 965 species. However, it can change over time, e.g. colostrum has a lower pH (6.3) than milk at 966 the end of lactation (McIntyre et al, 1952), and according to certain physio-pathological 967 conditions, e.g. when the animal suffers from mastitis the pH is higher (7.4) (Ziv et al, 1974). 968 Hence, to refine the PBPK model it would be useful to include the physiological variation of 969 milk pH over the different lactation and (patho)physiological stages.

970

971 4.3.3. Binding

972 Our PBPK model has the advantage of accounting for the distribution of OTC in milk 973 fat and aqueous phase, its binding to casein, whey protein, ionized magnesium, and calcium. 974 Because the composition of milk varies between species (Balthazar et al, 2017; Park et al, 975 2007) and that affinities differ between molecules, it is important to account for all major milk 976 components for future cross-species and cross-molecule extrapolations. The binding of OTC 977 to ionized cations was taken into consideration as this is a known characteristic of tetracyclines (as for fluoroquinolones) (Ross and Riley, 1993) and since Ca<sup>2+</sup> and Mg<sup>2+</sup> 978 979 concentrations are high in milk. Somatic cell binding was neglected, because even in case of 980 serious mastitis (5 000 000 cells/ml), the volume of somatic cells represents less than 0.2% of 981 the milk volume (Campbell and Marshall, 2016). Furthermore, to the knowledge of the 982 authors of this study, no article mentions the binding of OTC to white blood cells.

983

984 The affinities of OTC for the milk components (*i.e.*, fat, casein, calcium, and 985 magnesium) were calculated using linear regressions constructed from experimental data 986 available in the literature for several drugs (Carlotti *et al*, 2012; Lupton *et al*, 2018; Shappell 987 *et al*, 2017). However, in case of extrapolation to other molecules, these data may not be 988 available. Recently, Abduljalil *et al* (Abduljalil *et al*, 2021) proposed an approach to calculate 989 the free fraction in milk ( $fu_{milk}$ ) from the lipophilicity (logP) of a molecule. However, this 990 approach would appear to have some limitations, as for OTC, which has a low logP (-4.54), 991 the  $fu_{milk}$  value estimated using the formula of Abduljalil *et al* is higher than 1 (1.26 for both 992 species).

993

According to this study model, OTC was predicted to be bound more in milk (~60%) than in plasma (~20%). OTC was predicted to be bound mainly to ionized calcium, ionized magnesium and lightly to whey proteins, so it was mainly within the skimmed milk. These findings could be interesting concerning milk by-products.

998

999 This PBPK model also takes into account the binding of OTC to different cellular 1000 components in the udder (*i.e.*, lipids and phospholipids). The partition coefficient of OTC 1001 between udder and plasma (kudder, ratio of udder and plasma concentrations) was calculated to 1002 be 0.75 for cows and 0.77 for goats. It is of the same order of magnitude as those of other 1003 tissues (i.e., muscle, liver, the rest) (see Table 1). As mentioned above, the binding in the 1004 udder IW resulted in drug retention and IW acted as a deep compartment. The slow release of 1005 the drug from the IW sub-compartment partly explains the delay of T<sub>max</sub> in milk compared to 1006 plasma. This compartment could thus be useful for extrapolation to other molecules, 1007 especially those with strong IW binding.

1008

1009 4.3.4. Passive diffusion

1010 The current PBPK model accounts for passive diffusion (CLdiff) between the udder and 1011 milk, calculated from *in vitro* permeability (Papp). Papp is a parameter that varies greatly between molecules (e.g. caffeine with a Papp of  $10^{-5}$  cm/s; norfloxacin with a Papp of  $10^{-7}$ 1012 cm/s (Chen *et al*, 2008) and amoxicillin with a Papp of  $10^{-8}$  cm/s in an internal unpublished 1013 study). A lower value of Papp ( $10^{-8}$  cm/s) slows down the passage into milk ( $C_{max}$  of 0.43 1014 mg/L at 19h vs 2.52 mg/L at 12h for a Papp of  $10^{-7}$  cm/s) whereas a higher value of Papp ( $10^{-5}$ 1015 1016 cm/s) increases the passage in the first hours after administration (C<sub>max</sub> of 4.27 mg/L at 6h) (Figure 6). The low permeability of OTC (Papp =  $1.4 \times 10^{-7}$  cm/s) was responsible for the 1017 1018 delay in appearance in milk (see Figure S6 and S7 in supplementary materials), but also for 1019 the slow release from the IW compartment that led to an increased elimination half-life in 1020 milk (7.9h). By simulating other values of Papp for the OTC, similar elimination half-life 1021 values for Papp of  $10^{-5}$  cm/s and  $10^{-6}$  cm/s (7.4 hours) and a value 30% higher for Papp of  $10^{-8}$ 1022 cm/s (9.8 hours) would have ben obtained. Therefore, permeability might be of importance 1023 for generalizing the PBPK model to other molecules.

1024

1025 4.4. Differences between cows and goats

1026 As explained above, this generic PBPK model is intended to be used in cross-species 1027 extrapolation. It was able to satisfactorily predict milk concentrations of OTC for both cows 1028 and goats, but the predictions did not differ much between the two species. As the milk pH is 1029 almost identical between the two species (6.68 for cows and 6.65 for goats), the rate of ionization of OTC is identical in the milk of cows and goats. A key difference between cow 1030 1031 and goat milk is the concentration of whey proteins (Balthazar et al, 2017), but as OTC has a 1032 low affinity for these proteins this difference has little impact on its binding in milk. OTC 1033 binds mainly to ionized calcium, which is in similar concentrations in both species (0.08 g/L for cows, 0.09 g/L for goats). Therefore, we did not predict any difference in the binding of 1034 1035 OTC in milk between the two species. Finally, the main differences in milk excretion between the two species were explained by the differences in the plasma profile of OTC. 1036

1037

1038For other molecules with stronger affinities for milk components that vary between1039species, such as fat and protein, greater differences in milk concentrations could be observed.

1040

1041 4.5. Model application to estimate withdrawal period in milk

1042 For the estimation of WP in milk, a literature was performed for estimates of inter-1043 individual variabilities (IIV) for the different parameters of the PBPK model. For some 1044 parameters the variability took into account the differences between animals of the same 1045 breed, for others it took into account the differences between breeds of the same species. For the few parameters without available experimental data, the fixed CV of 30% represents a 1046 moderate level of variability (Covington et al., 2007), while for chemical parameters, a CV of 1047 1048 20% represents the uncertainty of these parameters values. These CV values are well accepted in the field of PBPK modelling and are often used in recently published papers 1049 1050 (Clewell and Clewell, 2008; Henri et al, 2017a; Li et al, 2017, 2019a; Riad et al, 2021).

For cows, the model-predicted WPs (rounded up to the next full day) were slightly higher than the labelled milk discard time for both standard dosing regimens, *i.e.*, five (5) days *vs* four (4) days after four (4) repeated IM injections of OTC 10 mg/kg and four (4) days *vs* three (3) days after three (3) repeated IM injections OTC 5 mg/kg. These WPs are highly dependent on the prediction intervals, which were based on the IIV and uncertainty of the model parameters. The latter may have been overestimated and resulted in slightly higher estimated WPs.

1059

1060 For goats, predicted WPs were consistent with the labelled milk discard time for both 1061 standard dosing regimens, *i.e.*, four (4) days after four (4) repeated IM injections of OTC 10 1062 mg/kg and three (3) days after three (3) repeated IM injections OTC 5 mg/kg). Because total 1063 plasma clearance is higher in goats, plasma concentrations are lower and the time that 1064 residues fall below the established MRL is reduced compared to that of cows. This 1065 observation was also reported by Riad et al (Riad et al, 2021). In addition, for goats, the 1066 labelled WP of OTC have been fixed at the WP of cows (EMA, 2016) and do not take into 1067 account the physiology and particularities of the species. Thus, an experimental study would 1068 be necessary to confirm those predicted WP in goat milk.

1069

1070 Overall, the popPBPK model described in this study could be used as a tool to anticipate 1071 residue depletion studies. Such a model does not completely replace animal studies but it can 1072 help to design such studies.

1073

1074 4.6. PBPK model limitations

1075 Although this generic model accurately predicted OTC concentrations in milk of both1076 species, it has some limitations.

1077

First, passive diffusion is the only mechanism of drug distribution in milk that was considered in the current model. Indeed, although OTC is known to be a substrate of PgP (Schrickx and Fink-Gremmels, 2007), the latter is under expressed in the udder during lactation and does not play a role in transporting the molecule into milk (Yagdiran *et al*, 2016). However, other transporters that are highly expressed in the udder or whose expression increases during lactation (García-Lino *et al*, 2019) may have an important role in the exchange of drugs (and nutrients) between plasma and milk (Mahnke *et al*, 2016;
Ozdemir, 2018). Further studies will be conducted with other drugs to investigate the role of
active transport of molecules in milk. An influx and/or efflux clearance could then be added
to equations 8, 9, and 18.

1088

1089 Thus, the current model considers drug binding to milk components but does not vary 1090 the milk components concentrations over time, as observed in reality (Ciappesoni *et al*, 2011; 1091 Coulon *et al*, 1991). Further studies are needed to add variation over time of these parameters 1092 to this model. Similarly, changes in milk pH over time may be added to the model.

1093

1094 On the other hand, to build this population model variabilities and uncertainties on 1095 parameters (Balthazar et al, 2017; Craigmill et al, 2004, 2000; Lautz et al, 2020; Li et al, 1096 2021; Lin et al, 2020, 2016; Nouws et al, 1985b; Upton, 2008) were applied. The 1097 physiological data for cows and goats were mainly derived from two recent reviews of the literature (Li et al, 2021; Lin et al, 2020). These two reviews are compiled based on a number 1098 1099 of original experimental studies and represent the most accurate physiological parameter data 1100 for these species in the literature. Thus, uncertainty has been substantially decreased for 1101 many physiological parameters, but some are still missing. On the other hand, the 1102 correlations between the different physiological values are not described and considering 1103 independent variabilities may lead to an overestimation of the overall variability. The choice 1104 of the random effects model is critical for the determination of WP with population PBPK 1105 models. However, there is no real consensus on how to predict WP from popPBPK models. 1106 Some authors consider that the 99th percentile of the PI obtained by a population model is a 1107 good approximation of the 95th percentile of the tolerance interval, which is the criterion used 1108 by regulatory agencies, and can therefore be used to predict a WP (Chevance, 2017; Henri et 1109 al, 2017b; Viel, 2018). In this study case, the internal and external validations that were 1110 carried out give an indication that the choice of the random model was reasonable. However, the choice was arbitrary and since it incorporates both IIV and parameter uncertainty it is 1111 1112 difficult to determine whether the resulting interval was a prediction interval or a confidence 1113 interval.

In conclusion, the popPBPK model successfully predicted OTC concentrations in cow and goat milk after different doses and routes of administration. This is the first generic PBPK model to consider the udder as a permeability-limited compartment, accounting for vascular, EW, IW, alveolar, and cisternal spaces, as well as passive diffusion across physiological membranes, pH, ionization, and the composition of milk.

1121

By integrating inter-individual variability in the physiological values into the model, and uncertainty in the parameters used, the model allowed for a suitable estimation of the WPs of OTC for cows and goats for different dosing regimens.

1125

In the future, this model could be extrapolated to different drugs and chemicals, such as pesticides, with different affinities and physico-chemical properties, and to different species, such as sheep and humans, with a different milk composition and milk production.

1129

# 1130 Acknowledgements

1131 This work was financially supported by the Nouvelle Aquitaine Region and the laboratory Ceva Animal Health. We would like to acknowledge Christophe Buffet, Balladyne Tritsch, 1132 1133 Julian Laroche, Christophe Adier, Marie-Pierre Lagree, and Dominique Hurtaud-Pessel for 1134 their analytical support. We thank Emilie Wimmer, Denis Boulanger, Melaine Sauvee, 1135 Bertrand Minaud, Melanie Bouteille, Sylvie Ecalle, and Jeremy Roger, the team of the 1136 agricultural high schools of Melle and Venours, for the help in the realization of *in vivo* experimentations. We would additionally like to thank Thierry Vidard and Jean-Guy Rolland, 1137 1138 for technical support.

1139

# 1140 **References**

- Abduljalil, K., Pansari, A., Ning, J., Jamei, M., 2021. Prediction of drug concentrations in milk during breastfeeding, integrating predictive algorithms within a physiologicallybased pharmacokinetic model. CPT: Pharmacometrics & Systems Pharmacology 10, 878–889. https://doi.org/10.1002/psp4.12662
- 1145 Achenbach, T.E., 1995. Physiological and classical pharmacokinetic models of 1146 oxytetracycline in cattle 129.

Aktas, İ., Yarsan, E., 2017. Pharmacokinetics of Conventional and Long-Acting
Oxytetracycline Preparations in Kilis Goat. Frontiers in Veterinary Science 4.
https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2017.00229

- Alberghina, D., Casella, S., Vazzana, I., Ferrantelli, V., Giannetto, C., Piccione, G., 2010.
  Analysis of serum proteins in clinically healthy goats (Capra hircus) using agarose gel
  electrophoresis. Vet Clin Pathol 39, 317–321. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-165X.2010.00226.x
- Ayadi, M., Caja, G., Such, X., Knight, C.H., 2003. Use of ultrasonography to estimate cistern
   size and milk storage at different milking intervals in the udder of dairy cows. J. Dairy
   Res. 70, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0022029902005873
- Badhan, R.K.S., Chenel, M., Penny, J.I., 2014. Development of a Physiologically-Based
   Pharmacokinetic Model of the Rat Central Nervous System. Pharmaceutics 6, 97–136.
   https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics6010097
- Balthazar, C.F., Pimentel, T.C., Ferrão, L.L., Almada, C.N., Santillo, A., Albenzio, M.,
  Mollakhalili, N., Mortazavian, A.M., Nascimento, J.S., Silva, M.C., Freitas, M.Q.,
  Sant'Ana, A.S., Granato, D., Cruz, A.G., 2017. Sheep Milk: Physicochemical
  Characteristics and Relevance for Functional Food Development. Comprehensive
  Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety 16, 247–262. https://doi.org/10.1111/15414337.12250
- Beal, S.L., 2001. Ways to Fit a PK Model with Some Data Below the Quantification Limit. J
   Pharmacokinet Pharmacodyn 28, 481–504. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012299115260
- Bobbo, T., Fiore, E., Gianesella, M., Morgante, M., Gallo, L., Ruegg, P.L., Bittante, G.,
  Cecchinato, A., 2017. Variation in blood serum proteins and association with somatic
  cell count in dairy cattle from multi-breed herds. Animal 11, 2309–2319.
  https://doi.org/10.1017/S1751731117001227
- Caja, G., Ayadi, M., Knight, C.H., 2004. Changes in cisternal compartment based on stage of
   lactation and time since milk ejection in the udder of dairy cows. J. Dairy Sci. 87,
   2409–2415. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(04)73363-9
- 1175 Campbell, J.R., Marshall, R.T., 2016. Dairy Production and Processing: The Science of Milk1176 and Milk Products. Waveland Press.
- 1177 Carlotti, B., Cesaretti, A., Elisei, F., 2012. Complexes of tetracyclines with divalent metal
  1178 cations investigated by stationary and femtosecond-pulsed techniques. Phys. Chem.
  1179 Chem. Phys. 14, 823–834. https://doi.org/10.1039/C1CP22703C
- 1180Chemicalize Instant Cheminformatics Solutions [WWW Document], n.d. URL1181https://chemicalize.com/app/calculation/oxytetracycline (accessed 1.29.21).
- Chen, X., Murawski, A., Patel, K., Crespi, C.L., Balimane, P.V., 2008. A novel design of
  artificial membrane for improving the PAMPA model. Pharm Res 25, 1511–1520.
  https://doi.org/10.1007/s11095-007-9517-8
- Cheng, Y.-H., Lin, Y.-J., You, S.-H., Yang, Y.-F., How, C.M., Tseng, Y.-T., Chen, W.-Y.,
  Liao, C.-M., 2016. Assessing exposure risks for freshwater tilapia species posed by
  mercury and methylmercury. Ecotoxicology 25, 1181–1193.
  https://doi.org/10.1007/s10646-016-1672-4
- Chevance, 2017. The present and future of withdrawal period calculations for milk in the European Union: focus on heterogeneous, nonmonotonic data Chevance 2017 Journal of Veterinary Pharmacology and Therapeutics Wiley Online Library [WWW Document]. URL https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jvp.12351 (accessed 1193 11.8.19).

- Ciappesoni, G., JPřibyl, Milerski, M., Mareš, V., 2011. Factors affecting goat milk yield and
  its composition. Czech Journal of Animal Science 49, 465–473.
  https://doi.org/10.17221/4333-CJAS
- Clewell, R.A., Clewell, H.J., 2008. Development and specification of physiologically based
   pharmacokinetic models for use in risk assessment. Regulatory Toxicology and
   Pharmacology 50, 129–143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2007.10.012
- Coulon, J.B., CHILLIARD, Y., Rémond, B., 1991. Effets du stade physiologique et de la saison sur la composition chimique du lait de vache et ses caractéristiques technologiques (aptitude à la coagulation, lipolyse). INRA Productions Animales 4, 219–228.
- Covington, T.R., Robinan Gentry, P., Van Landingham, C.B., Andersen, M.E., Kester, J.E.,
   Clewell, H.J., 2007. The use of Markov chain Monte Carlo uncertainty analysis to
   support a Public Health Goal for perchloroethylene. Regulatory Toxicology and
   Pharmacology 47, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2006.06.008
- Craigmill, A.L., 2003. A physiologically based pharmacokinetic model for oxytetracycline
   residues in sheep. Journal of Veterinary Pharmacology and Therapeutics 26, 55–63.
   https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2885.2003.00451.x
- 1211 Craigmill, A.L., Holland, R.E., Robinson, D., Wetzlich, S., Arndt, T., 2000. Serum
  1212 pharmacokinetics of oxytetracycline in sheep and calves and tissue residues in sheep
  1213 following a single intramuscular injection of a long-acting preparation. J. Vet.
  1214 Pharmacol. Ther. 23, 345–352.
- Craigmill, A.L., Miller, G.R., Gehring, R., Pierce, A.N., Riviere, J.E., 2004. Meta-analysis of
  pharmacokinetic data of veterinary drugs using the Food Animal Residue Avoidance
  Databank: oxytetracycline and procaine penicillin G. J. Vet. Pharmacol. Ther. 27,
  343–353. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2885.2004.00606.x
- EMA, 2016. Guideline on safety and residue data requirements for pharmaceutical veterinary
   medicinal products intended for minor use or minor species (MUMS)/limited market
   26.
- Fenneteau, F., Li, J., Nekka, F., 2009. Assessing drug distribution in tissues expressing P glycoprotein using physiologically based pharmacokinetic modeling: identification of
   important model parameters through global sensitivity analysis. J Pharmacokinet
   Pharmacodyn 36, 495. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10928-009-9134-8
- Fisher, J.W., Gearhart, J.M., Lin, Z. (Eds.), 2020. Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic
  (PBPK) Modeling. Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-8185964.00013-8
- Fujikawa, M., Ano, R., Nakao, K., Shimizu, R., Akamatsu, M., 2005. Relationships between
  structure and high-throughput screening permeability of diverse drugs with artificial
  membranes: Application to prediction of Caco-2 cell permeability. Bioorganic &
  Medicinal Chemistry 13, 4721–4732. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bmc.2005.04.076
- García-Lino, A.M., Álvarez-Fernández, I., Blanco-Paniagua, E., Merino, G., Álvarez, A.I.,
   2019. Transporters in the Mammary Gland-Contribution to Presence of Nutrients and
   Drugs into Milk. Nutrients 11. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu11102372
- Henri, J., Carrez, R., Méda, B., Laurentie, M., Sanders, P., 2017a. A physiologically based
   pharmacokinetic model for chickens exposed to feed supplemented with monensin

- 1238during their lifetime. Journal of Veterinary Pharmacology and Therapeutics 40, 370–1239382. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvp.12370
- Henri, J., Jacques, A.-M., Sanders, P., Chevance, A., Laurentie, M., 2017b. The present and future of withdrawal period calculations for milk in the European Union: dealing with data below the limit of quantification. J. Vet. Pharmacol. Ther. 40, 116–122. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvp.12343
- Hotham, N., Hotham, E., 2015. Drugs in breastfeeding. Aust Prescr 38, 156–159.
  https://doi.org/10.18773/austprescr.2015.056
- Jackson, P.G., Cockcroft, P.D., 2002. Clinical Examination of Farm Animals. BlackwellScience.
- Jamei, M., Bajot, F., Neuhoff, S., Barter, Z., Yang, J., Rostami-Hodjegan, A., Rowland-Yeo,
  K., 2014. A Mechanistic Framework for In Vitro–In Vivo Extrapolation of Liver
  Membrane Transporters: Prediction of Drug–Drug Interaction Between Rosuvastatin
  and Cyclosporine. Clin Pharmacokinet 53, 73–87. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40262-0130097-y
- Jarrett, A.M., Gao, Y., Hussaini, M.Y., Cogan, N.G., Katz, D.F., 2016. Sensitivity Analysis of
   a Pharmacokinetic Model of Vaginal Anti-HIV Microbicide Drug Delivery. J Pharm
   Sci 105, 1772–1778. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xphs.2016.02.015
- Ji, S.K., Zhang, F., Sun, Y., Deng, K., Wang, B., Tu, Y., Zhang, N.F., Jiang, C.G., Wang, S.,
  Diao, Q.-Y., 2017. Influence of dietary slow-release urea on growth performance,
  organ development and serum biochemical parameters of mutton sheep. Journal of
  animal physiology and animal nutrition. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpn.12532
- Kansy, M., Senner, F., Gubernator, K., 1998. Physicochemical high throughput screening:
   parallel artificial membrane permeation assay in the description of passive absorption
   processes. J Med Chem 41, 1007–1010. https://doi.org/10.1021/jm970530e
- 1263 Kinsella, J.E., McCarthy, R.D., 1968. Lipid composition and secretory activity of bovine
  1264 mammary cells in vitro. Biochim. Biophys. Acta 164, 530–539.
  1265 https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-2760(68)90182-3
- Konar, A., Thomas, P.C., K.g, T., 1972. The composition of ovine mammary cells.
  Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Physiology 41, 195–203.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/0300-9629(72)90047-3
- Larson, B., 1978. The Mammary Gland/Human Lactation/Milk Synthesis. Elsevier.
   https://doi.org/10.1016/C2013-0-11043-4
- Lautz, L.S., Dorne, J.L.C.M., Oldenkamp, R., Hendriks, A.J., Ragas, A.M.J., 2020. Generic
   physiologically based kinetic modelling for farm animals: Part I. Data collection of
   physiological parameters in swine, cattle and sheep. Toxicology Letters 319, 95–101.
   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.toxlet.2019.10.021
- Lautz, L.S., Oldenkamp, R., Dorne, J.L., Ragas, A.M.J., 2019. Physiologically based kinetic
  models for farm animals: Critical review of published models and future perspectives
  for their use in chemical risk assessment. Toxicology in Vitro 60, 61–70.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tiv.2019.05.002
- Law, F.C.P., 1999. A Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic Model for Predicting the
  Withdrawal Period of Oxytetracycline in Cultured Chinook Salmon (Oncorhynchus
  Tshawytscha), in: Smith, D.J., Gingerich, W.H., Beconi-Barker, M.G. (Eds.),

- 1282
   Xenobiotics in Fish. Springer US, Boston, MA, pp. 105–121.

   1283
   https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-4703-7\_8
- Leavens, T.L., Tell, L.A., Kissell, L.W., Smith, G.W., Smith, D.J., Wagner, S.A., Shelver,
  W.L., Wu, H., Baynes, R.E., Riviere, J.E., 2014. Development of a physiologically
  based pharmacokinetic model for flunixin in cattle (Bos taurus). Food Additives &
  Contaminants: Part A 31, 1506–1521. https://doi.org/10.1080/19440049.2014.938363
- Leitner, G., Merin, U., Silanikove, N., 2004. Changes in Milk Composition as Affected by
  Subclinical Mastitis in Goats. Journal of dairy science 87, 1719–26.
  https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(04)73325-1
- Li, M., Cheng, Y.-H., Chittenden, J.T., Baynes, R.E., Tell, L.A., Davis, J.L., Vickroy, T.W.,
  Riviere, J.E., Lin, Z., 2019a. Integration of Food Animal Residue Avoidance Databank
  (FARAD) empirical methods for drug withdrawal interval determination with a
  mechanistic population-based interactive physiologically based pharmacokinetic
  (iPBPK) modeling platform: example for flunixin meglumine administration. Arch
  Toxicol. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00204-019-02464-z
- Li, M., Gehring, R., Riviere, J.E., Lin, Z., 2018. Probabilistic Physiologically Based
   Pharmacokinetic Model for Penicillin G in Milk From Dairy Cows Following
   Intramammary or Intramuscular Administrations. Toxicological Sciences 164, 85–
   100. https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kfy067
- Li, M., Gehring, R., Riviere, J.E., Lin, Z., 2017. Development and application of a population physiologically based pharmacokinetic model for penicillin G in swine and cattle for food safety assessment. Food Chem. Toxicol. 107, 74–87.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2017.06.023
- Li, M., Mainquist-Whigham, C., Karriker, L.A., Wulf, L.W., Zeng, D., Gehring, R., Riviere,
  J.E., Coetzee, J.F., Lin, Z., 2019b. An integrated experimental and physiologically
  based pharmacokinetic modeling study of penicillin G in heavy sows. Journal of
  Veterinary Pharmacology and Therapeutics 0. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvp.12766
- Li, M., Wang, Y.-S., Elwell-Cuddy, T., Baynes, R.E., Tell, L.A., Davis, J.L., Maunsell, F.P.,
  Riviere, J.E., Lin, Z., 2021. Physiological parameter values for physiologically based
  pharmacokinetic models in food-producing animals. Part III: Sheep and goat. J Vet
  Pharmacol Ther 44, 456–477. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvp.12938
- 1313 Lin, Z., Gehring, R., Mochel, J.P., Lavé, T., Riviere, J.E., 2016. Mathematical modeling and 1314 simulation in animal health - Part II: principles, methods, applications, and value of 1315 physiologically based pharmacokinetic modeling in veterinary medicine and food 1316 safety assessment. J. Vet. Pharmacol. Ther. 39, 421-438. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvp.12311 1317
- Lin, Z., Li, M., Gehring, R., Riviere, J.E., 2015. Development and application of a multiroute
   physiologically based pharmacokinetic model for oxytetracycline in dogs and humans.
   J Pharm Sci 104, 233–243. https://doi.org/10.1002/jps.24244
- Lin, Z., Li, M., Wang, Y.-S., Tell, L.A., Baynes, R.E., Davis, J.L., Vickroy, T.W., Riviere,
  J.E., 2020. Physiological parameter values for physiologically based pharmacokinetic
  models in food-producing animals. Part I: Cattle and swine. Journal of Veterinary
  Pharmacology and Therapeutics n/a. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvp.12861
- Lupton, S.J., Shappell, N.W., Shelver, W.L., Hakk, H., 2018. Distribution of Spiked Drugs
  between Milk Fat, Skim Milk, Whey, Curd, and Milk Protein Fractions: Expansion of

- 1327PartitioningModels.J.Agric.FoodChem.66,306–314.1328https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.7b04463
- Mahnke, H., Ballent, M., Baumann, S., Imperiale, F., von Bergen, M., Lanusse, C., Lifschitz,
  A.L., Honscha, W., Halwachs, S., 2016. The ABCG2 Efflux Transporter in the
  Mammary Gland Mediates Veterinary Drug Secretion across the Blood-Milk Barrier
  into Milk of Dairy Cows. Drug Metabolism and Disposition 44, 700–708.
  https://doi.org/10.1124/dmd.115.068940
- Maltz, E., Blatchford, D.R., Peaker, M., 1984. Effects of Frequent Milking on Milk Secretion
   and Mammary Blood Flow in the Goat. Quarterly Journal of Experimental Physiology
   69, 127–132. https://doi.org/10.1113/expphysiol.1984.sp002773
- Martens, H., Stumpff, F., 2019. Assessment of magnesium intake according to requirement in
   dairy cows. Journal of Animal Physiology and Animal Nutrition 103, 1023–1029.
   https://doi.org/10.1111/jpn.13106
- McCutcheon, S.N., Blair, H.T., Purchas, R.W., 1993. Body composition and organ weights in
   fleeceweight-selected and control Romney rams. New Zealand Journal of Agricultural
   Research 36, 445–449. https://doi.org/10.1080/00288233.1993.10417745
- McIntyre, R.T., Parrish, D.B., Fountaine, F.C., 1952. Properties of the Colostrum of the Dairy
  Cow. VII. pH, Buffer Capacity and Osmotic Pressure1. Journal of Dairy Science 35,
  356–362. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(52)93714-4
- Mevius, D.J., Vellenga, L., Breukink, H.J., Nouws, J.F., Vree, T.B., Driessens, F., 1986.
  Pharmacokinetics and renal clearance of oxytetracycline in piglets following
  intravenous and oral administration. Vet Q 8, 274–284.
  https://doi.org/10.1080/01652176.1986.9694056
- Nestorov, I.A., Aarons, L.J., Arundel, P.A., Rowland, M., 1998. Lumping of whole-body
   physiologically based pharmacokinetic models. J Pharmacokinet Biopharm 26, 21–46.
   https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1023272707390
- Neville, M.C., Watters, C.D., 1983. Secretion of Calcium into Milk: Review. Journal of Dairy
   Science 66, 371–380. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(83)81802-5
- Ng, C.A., Hungerbühler, K., 2013. Bioconcentration of Perfluorinated Alkyl Acids: How
  Important Is Specific Binding? Environ. Sci. Technol. 47, 7214–7223.
  https://doi.org/10.1021/es400981a
- Nouws, J.F.M., Breukink, H.J., Binkhorse, G.J., Lohuis, J., van Lith, P., Mevius, D.J., Vree,
  T.B., 1985a. Comparative pharmacokinetics and bioavailability of eight parenteral
  oxytetracycline-10% formulations in dairy cows. Veterinary Quarterly 7, 306–314.
  https://doi.org/10.1080/01652176.1985.9694004
- Nouws, J.F.M., Vree, T.B., Termond, E., Lohuis, J., van Lith, P., Binkhorst, G.J., Breukink,
  H.J., 1985b. Pharmacokinetics and renal clearance of oxytetracycline after intravenous
  and intramuscular administration to dairy cows. Veterinary Quarterly 7, 296–305.
  https://doi.org/10.1080/01652176.1985.9694003
- 1366Oh,H.,Deeth,H.,2017.Magnesium in milk.International Dairy Journal71.1367https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2017.03.009
- Ozdemir, Z., 2018. Behaviours of Drugs in the Milk -A Review. Atatürk Üniversitesi Vet. Bil.
   Derg.

- Park, Y.W., Juárez, M., Ramos, M., Haenlein, G.F.W., 2007. Physico-chemical characteristics
  of goat and sheep milk. Small Ruminant Research, Special Issue: Goat and Sheep
  Milk 68, 88–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2006.09.013
- Peaker, M., Blatchford, D.R., 1988. Distribution of milk in the goat mammary gland and its
  relation to the rate and control of milk secretion. Journal of Dairy Research 55, 41–48.
  https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022029900025838
- Peters, S.A., 2012. Physiologically-Based Modeling, in: Physiologically-Based
   Pharmacokinetic (PBPK) Modeling and Simulations. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 13–
   16. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118140291.ch2
- Prosser, 1996. Regulation of Blood Flow in the Mammary Microvasculature. Journal of Dairy
   Science 79, 1184–1197. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(96)76472-X
- Reijenga, J., van Hoof, A., van Loon, A., Teunissen, B., 2013. Development of Methods for
  the Determination of pKa Values. Anal Chem Insights 8, 53–71.
  https://doi.org/10.4137/ACI.S12304
- 1384 Riad, M.H., Baynes, R.E., Tell, L.A., Davis, J.L., Maunsell, F.P., Riviere, J.E., Lin, Z., 2021. 1385 Application an Interactive Development and of Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic (iPBPK) Model to Predict Oxytetracycline Tissue Distribution and 1386 Withdrawal Intervals in Market-Age Sheep and Goats. Toxicological Sciences 183, 1387 1388 253-268. https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kfab095
- Rodgers, T., Leahy, D., Rowland, M., 2005. Physiologically based pharmacokinetic modeling
  1390 1: predicting the tissue distribution of moderate-to-strong bases. J Pharm Sci 94,
  1391 1259–1276. https://doi.org/10.1002/jps.20322
- Rodgers, T., Rowland, M., 2006. Physiologically based pharmacokinetic modelling 2:
   predicting the tissue distribution of acids, very weak bases, neutrals and zwitterions. J
   Pharm Sci 95, 1238–1257. https://doi.org/10.1002/jps.20502
- 1395Ross,D.L., Riley,C.M., 1993. Physicochemical properties of the fluoroquinolone1396antimicrobials V. Effect of fluoroquinolone structure and pH on the complexation of1397various fluoroquinolones with magnesium and calcium ions. International Journal of1398Pharmaceutics 93, 121–129. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-5173(93)90170-K
- Rule, R., Moreno, L., Serrano, J., Roman, A.G., Moyano, R., Garcia, J., 2001.
  Pharmacokinetics and residues in milk of oxytetra-cyclines administered parenterally
  to dairy goats. Australian Veterinary Journal 79, 492–496.
  https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-0813.2001.tb13023.x
- Saltelli, A., Bolado, R., 1998. An alternative way to compute Fourier amplitude sensitivity
  test (FAST). Computational Statistics & Data Analysis 26, 445–460.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-9473(97)00043-1
- Schrickx, J., Fink-Gremmels, J., 2007. P-glycoprotein-mediated transport of oxytetracycline 1406 1407 in the Caco-2 cell model. J. Vet. Pharmacol. Ther. 30. 25 - 31. 1408 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2885.2007.00808.x
- Shanler, M.S., Mason, A.K., Crocker, R.M., Vardaro, R., Crespi, C.L., Stresser, D.M.,
   Perloff, E.S., 2021. Automation of Corning® BioCoat<sup>TM</sup> Pre-coated PAMPA Plates
   Improves Predictability, Reproducibility, and Efficiency 5.
- Shappell, N., Shelver, W., Lupton, S., Fanaselle, W., Doren, J., Hakk, H., 2017. Distribution
   of Animal Drugs among Curd, Whey, and Milk Protein Fractions in Spiked Skim Milk

- 1414and Whey. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry 65.1415https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.6b04258
- 1416 Snipes, M.B., Lengemann, F.W., 1972. Tissue Composition of Lactating Guinea Pia
  1417 Mammary Glands. Journal of Dairy Science 55, 1783–1786.
  1418 https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(72)85758-8
- Stephens, C.R., Murai, K., Brunings, K.J., Woodward, R.B., 1956. Acidity Constants of the
  Tetracycline Antibiotics. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 78, 4155–4158.
  https://doi.org/10.1021/ja01597a081
- Szegezdi, J., Csizmadia, F., 2007. A method for calculating the pKa values of small and large
  molecules.
- 1424 Szegezdi, J., Csizmadia, F., 2004. Prediction of dissociation co...
- Thompson, G.E., 1980. The distribution of blood flow in the udder of the sheep and changes
  brought about by cold exposure and lactation. J Physiol 302, 379–386.
- Tongaree, S., Flanagan, D.R., Poust, R.I., 1999. The Effects of pH and Mixed Solvent
  Systems on the Solubility of Oxytetracycline. Pharmaceutical Development and
  Technology 4, 571–580. https://doi.org/10.1081/PDT-100101396
- 1430 Upton, R.N., 2008. Organ weights and blood flows of sheep and pig for physiological
  1431 pharmacokinetic modelling. J Pharmacol Toxicol Methods 58, 198–205.
  1432 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vascn.2008.08.001
- 1433 Vestweber, J.G., Al-Ani, F.K., 1984. Udder edema: biochemical studies in Holstein cattle.
  1434 Cornell Vet 74, 366–372.
- Viel, A., 2018. A Population WB-PBPK Model of Colistin and its Prodrug CMS in Pigs:
  Focus on the Renal Distribution and Excretion | SpringerLink [WWW Document].
  URL https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11095-018-2379-4 (accessed
  1.15.19).
- 1439 Waddell, W.J., Bates, R.G., 1969. Intracellular pH. Physiol Rev 49, 285–329.
   1440 https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.1969.49.2.285
- Whittem, T., 2012. Modelling the concentration-time relationship in milk from cattle
  administered an intramammary drug. Journal of Veterinary Pharmacology and
  Therapeutics 35, 460–471. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2885.2011.01352.x
- WHO, 2010. Characterization and application of physiologically based pharmacokinetic
   models in risk assessment, Harmonization project document. World Health
   Organization, Geneva.
- Williams, P., Kurlak, L., Perkins, A., Budge, H., Stephenson, T., Keisler, D., Symonds, M.,
  Gardner, D., 2007. Hypertension and impaired renal function accompany juvenile
  obesity: The effect of prenatal diet. Kidney international 72, 279–89.
  https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ki.5002276
- Woodward, A.P., Whittem, T., 2019. Physiologically based modelling of the
  pharmacokinetics of three beta-lactam antibiotics after intra-mammary administration
  in dairy cows. J. Vet. Pharmacol. Ther. https://doi.org/10.1111/jvp.12812
- Yagdiran, Y., Oskarsson, A., Knight, C.H., Tallkvist, J., 2016. ABC- and SLC-Transporters in
   Murine and Bovine Mammary Epithelium Effects of Prochloraz. PLOS ONE 11,
   e0151904. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0151904

- Yau, E., Olivares-Morales, A., Gertz, M., Parrott, N., Darwich, A.S., Aarons, L., Ogungbenro,
  K., 2020. Global Sensitivity Analysis of the Rodgers and Rowland Model for
  Prediction of Tissue: Plasma Partitioning Coefficients: Assessment of the Key
  Physiological and Physicochemical Factors That Determine Small-Molecule Tissue
  Distribution. AAPS J 22, 41. https://doi.org/10.1208/s12248-020-0418-7
- Ziv, G., Bogin, E., Shani, J., G. Sulman, F., 1974. Penetration of radioactive-labeled
  antibiotics from blood serum into milk in normal and mastitic ewes. Annales de
  Recherches Vétérinaires 5, 15–28.
- 1465 Ziv, G., Sulman, F.G., 1975. Absorption of antibiotics by the bovine udder. J. Dairy Sci. 58, 1637–1644. https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(75)84762-X
- 1467Ziv, G., Sulman, F.G., 1972. Binding of Antibiotics to Bovine and Ovine Serum.1468Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy 2, 206–213.1469https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.2.3.206
- 1470

