

1 **Pharmacokinetic modelling to estimate intracellular**
2 **favipiravir ribofuranosyl-5'-triphosphate exposure to support**
3 **posology for SARS-CoV-2**
4

5 Henry Pertinez^{1,2}, Rajith KR Rajoli^{1,2}, Saye H Khoo^{1,2}, Andrew Owen^{1,2}.
6

7 ¹Department of Pharmacology and Therapeutics, Materials Innovation Factory, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, L7 3NY,
8 UK

9 ²Centre of Excellence in Long acting Therapeutics (CELT), University of Liverpool, Liverpool, L69 3BX, UK
10
11

12 **Author for correspondence:**

13 Professor Andrew Owen

14 Department of Pharmacology and Therapeutics

15 Materials Innovation Factory

16 University of Liverpool

17 51 Oxford Street,

18 Liverpool L7 3NY

19 United Kingdom

20 Email - aowen@liverpool.ac.uk

21 Phone - +44 (0)151 795 7129

22 **Key words:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Coronavirus, Pharmacokinetics, intracellular, active metabolite
23
24

25 **Conflicts of interest statement**

26 AO is a Director of Tandem Nano Ltd and co-inventor of patents relating to drug delivery. AO has
27 received research funding from ViiV, Merck, Janssen and consultancy from Gilead, ViiV and Merck
28 not related to the current paper. No other conflicts are declared by the authors.
29

30 **Funding**

31 The authors received no funding for the current work. AO acknowledges research funding from
32 EPSRC (EP/R024804/1; EP/S012265/1), NIH (R01AI134091; R24AI118397), European Commission
33 (761104) and Unitaid (project LONGEVITY).
34

35 **Abstract**

36

37 **Background:** The role of favipiravir as a treatment for COVID-19 is unclear, with discrepant activity
38 against SARS-CoV-2 *in vitro*, concerns about teratogenicity and pill burden, and an unknown optimal
39 dose. In Vero-E6 cells, high concentrations are needed to inhibit SARS-CoV-2 replication. The
40 purpose of this analysis was to use available data to simulate intracellular pharmacokinetics of
41 favipiravir ribofuranosyl-5'-triphosphate (FAVI-RTP) to better understand the putative applicability
42 as a COVID-19 intervention.

43 **Methods:** Previously published *in vitro* data for the intracellular production and elimination of FAVI-
44 RTP in MDCK cells incubated with parent favipiravir was fitted with a mathematical model to
45 describe the time course of intracellular FAVI-RTP concentrations as a function of incubation
46 concentration of parent favipiravir. Parameter estimates from this model fitting were then combined
47 with a previously published population PK model for the plasma exposure of parent favipiravir in
48 Chinese patients with severe influenza (the modelled free plasma concentration of favipiravir
49 substituting for *in vitro* incubation concentration) to predict the human intracellular FAVI-RTP
50 pharmacokinetics.

51 **Results:** *In vitro* FAVI-RTP data was adequately described as a function of *in vitro* incubation media
52 concentrations of parent favipiravir with an empirical model, noting that the model simplifies and
53 consolidates various processes and is used under various assumptions and within certain limits.
54 Parameter estimates from the fittings to *in vitro* data predict a flatter dynamic range of peak to
55 trough for intracellular FAVI-RTP when driven by a predicted free plasma concentration profile.

56 **Conclusion:** This modelling approach has several important limitations that are discussed in the main
57 text of the manuscript. However, the simulations indicate that despite rapid clearance of the parent
58 drug from plasma, sufficient intracellular FAVI-RTP may be maintained across the dosing interval
59 because of its long intracellular half-life. Population average intracellular FAVI-RTP concentrations
60 are estimated to maintain the K_m for the SARS-CoV-2 polymerase for 3 days following 800 mg BID
61 dosing and 9 days following 1200 mg BID dosing after a 1600 mg BID loading dose on day 1. Further
62 evaluation of favipiravir as part of antiviral combinations for SARS-CoV-2 is warranted.

63

64 Introduction

65 The urgent global public health threat posed by COVID-19 has led the global scientific community to
66 rigorously explore opportunities for repurposing existing medicines based upon either
67 demonstration of auspicious antiviral activity against SARS-CoV-2, or a plausible mechanistic basis
68 for anti-inflammatory / immunomodulatory activity. If sufficiently potent antiviral agents can be
69 identified, there is potentially significant opportunity for deployment either as prophylaxis or in early
70 infection to prevent development of severe disease. The role of antivirals in later stages of COVID-19
71 is less clear but cannot be rigorously assessed until sufficiently potent antiviral drug combinations
72 become available. Several groups have highlighted the importance of considering the fundamental
73 principles of clinical pharmacology when selecting candidates for investigation as antiviral agents [1-
74 3], including a nuanced understanding of the principles of plasma protein binding [4]. For most
75 successful antiviral drugs developed to date, a key principle is that plasma drug concentrations be
76 maintained above *in vitro*-defined target concentrations (EC_{90} or protein binding adjusted EC_{90}
77 where available) for the duration of the dosing interval. However, where the drug target resides
78 intracellularly, and generation of an intracellular active metabolite is a prerequisite to unmask the
79 pharmacophore, a more thorough understanding of the intracellular pharmacokinetics is required to
80 rationalise doses required to maintain antiviral activity. For example, nucleoside-based drugs or
81 prodrugs require intracellular phosphorylation by a cascade of host proteins, to generate tri-
82 phosphorylated metabolites that exert the activity on the viral polymerase [5, 6]. Indeed, antiviral
83 nucleoside analogues for HIV (e.g. tenofovir alafenamide), HCV (sofosbuvir) and several of the
84 repurposing opportunities for SARS-CoV-2 (e.g. remdesivir) have active triphosphate metabolites
85 with intracellular half-lives much longer than the parent drug in plasma [7-9]. Therefore, for many
86 nucleosides being explored for SARS-CoV-2 (including favipiravir, molnupiravir), the activity may be
87 maintained across the dosing interval despite plasma concentrations of the parent dropping below
88 the EC_{90} at trough concentration (C_{trough}).

89

90 Favipiravir is approved for influenza in Japan but not elsewhere and has been intensively studied as a
91 potential antiviral intervention for several other RNA viruses; most recently SARS-CoV-2. For several
92 reasons, considerable uncertainty exists about the suitability of favipiravir as a COVID-19
93 intervention. Concerns about teratogenicity and high pill burden may limit widespread uptake of the
94 drug during early infection, particularly in the absence of concomitant contraceptive use in women
95 of child-bearing age [10]. Furthermore, *in vitro* studies of favipiravir in Vero-E6 cell infected with
96 SARS-CoV-2 have yielded inconsistent findings[11-14], and low potency ($EC_{90} = 159 \mu\text{M}$; $24.9 \mu\text{g/mL}$)
97 has been described in those studies that have shown activity [14]. Favipiravir plasma concentrations

98 also appear to diminish, the longer that patients receive the medicine [10], and studies in severe
99 COVID-19 disease have shown that plasma exposures are almost entirely abolished [15]. Despite the
100 uncertainty and potential limitations, favipiravir has been demonstrated to exert antiviral activity
101 against SARS-CoV-2 in the Syrian Golden Hamster model [16], and despite extremely high doses
102 (1000 mg/kg intraperitoneally), C_{trough} values in this model were similar to those achieved in human
103 studies of influenza (4.4 $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$ in hamster versus 3.8 $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$ day 10 trough in human; [16, 17]). Cell-
104 free models have also demonstrated the ability of the intracellular ribofuranosyl-5'-triphosphate
105 metabolite (FAVI-RTP) to directly inhibit the SARS-CoV-2 polymerase [18].

106

107 The purpose of this work was to model from published plasma pharmacokinetic profiles, the likely
108 concentrations of the intracellular active moiety (FAVI-RTP) and evaluate whether putative target
109 concentrations necessary to inhibit SARS-CoV-2 can be pharmacologically attained in humans.

110 **Methods**

111 ***Prior In-Vitro Data***

112 Data for the intracellular formation and catabolism of intracellular favipiravir-RTP (FAVI-RTP) in
113 MDCK cells following incubation with parent favipiravir were digitised from previously published
114 work [19]. Briefly, the *in vitro* experiments carried out by Smee et al. involved incubation of
115 confluent layers of MDCK cells in T-25 flasks with media containing favipiravir at 32, 100, 320 or
116 1000 μM for varying durations. Smee et al. included 10% foetal bovine serum in media and plasma
117 protein binding of favipiravir is relatively low in humans (54%; [10]). Therefore, given that the
118 protein concentration in the media was low in these incubations, it was assumed that the nominal *in*
119 *vitro* media concentrations of favipiravir for the incubations equated to the free drug
120 concentrations.

121 At given timepoints, medium was removed, and cells were washed, lysed and FAVI-RTP was
122 quantified in the lysate using HPLC with UV detection. For catabolism/elimination experiments
123 MDCK cells were incubated with favipiravir containing media at the specified concentrations for 24h
124 to allow production and accumulation of FAVI-RTP, before the media was removed and replaced
125 with favipiravir-free media. Incubation then continued for a series of timepoints at which media was
126 removed, and cell lysate was assayed for FAVI-RTP. Smee et al. present their FAVI-RTP quantification
127 in normalised units of $\text{pmol}/10^6$ cells according to the cell counts of the incubations, which was
128 taken to represent the normalised intracellular *amount* of FAVI-RTP. In this work a value provided by
129 Bitterman et al. [20] for the volume of an MDCK cell as 2.08 pL was then used to convert the FAVI-
130 RTP quantification of Smee et al. to units of $\text{pmol}/(10^6 \text{ pL}) = \text{pmol}/\mu\text{L} = \mu\text{M}$.

131

132 ***Modelling of In-Vitro Data***

133 The data for intracellular production and elimination of FAVI-RTP were fitted with a mathematical
134 model in the R programming environment (v 4.0.3) [21] to describe and parameterise the observed
135 data as a function of the incubation media concentrations and time. This fitting made use of the
136 Pracma library [22] and lsqnonlin function for nonlinear regression.

137

138 Data for intracellular production (in presence of favipiravir containing media) and elimination of
139 FAVI-RTP elimination (on removal of favipiravir containing media after a 24h incubation and
140 replacement with blank media) were combined into single time courses for each medium
141 concentration, to then be described with the following ordinary differential (rate) equation
142 mathematical model:

143

144 Equation 1:
$$d [\text{FAVI-RTP}]_{\text{cell}} / dt = k_{\text{in}} * [\text{FAVI}]_{\text{media}} - k_{\text{out}} * [\text{FAVI-RTP}]_{\text{cell}}$$

145

146 Where [] denotes concentration. The initial condition for $[\text{FAVI-RTP}]_{\text{cell}}$ is set to zero at time zero
147 and $[\text{FAVI}]_{\text{media}}$ switched to equal zero at the 24h timepoint to end the production rate of FAVI-RTP
148 and allow only the elimination rate to describe observed, declining concentrations from that time
149 forward. The parameter k_{in} has units of time^{-1} and simultaneously describes net influx/diffusion of
150 parent favipiravir from media into the cell and its (net) subsequent conversion to FAVI-RTP. The use
151 of k_{in} therefore simplifies a more detailed description of favipiravir net influx into cells and
152 conversion into FAVI-RTP into an empirical 1st order process dependent on media concentration of
153 favipiravir, to enable use of the information in the available data, where parent favipiravir itself is
154 not quantified.

155

156 Smee et al. do not explicitly quote the volume of media used in their incubations, but given the T-25
157 flasks used, a media volume of 5-10 ml could be expected. Across the lowest to highest favipiravir
158 media concentrations in the data (32 and 1000 μM), this therefore translates to a range of 0.16 to 10
159 μmol favipiravir present in the incubations at time = 0. The maximum amount of intracellular FAVI-
160 RTP produced after 24h in the 1000 μM incubation was 332 pmol / 10^6 cells ; with incubations
161 declared to contain approximately 7×10^6 cells on average, this gives a maximum total amount of
162 2,324 pmol = 2.3 nmol FAVI-RTP converted from favipiravir in 1:1 stoichiometry, which is $\ll 1\%$
163 conversion of the total amount of favipiravir available in the 1000 μM incubation at the start (with
164 similar calculations demonstrable at the other media concentrations). Therefore the $[\text{FAVI}]_{\text{media}}$
165 term in Equation 1 can be considered approximately constant for a given time course dataset of
166 incubations at a specified favipiravir concentration. In turn, this renders Equation 1 equivalent to a
167 zero order constant input model with first order elimination and with the zero order input being
168 switched off at 24h when media containing favipiravir was replaced with blank media.

169

170 ***In-vivo Intracellular Simulations***

171 The model and parameter estimates from the fitting to *in vitro* intracellular data, describing
172 intracellular FAVI-RTP concentrations as a function of the media incubation concentrations were
173 then taken forward and combined with a population PK model for plasma exposure for favipiravir
174 described by Wang et al. in a Chinese population receiving the drug for influenza [17], substituting
175 the media incubation concentration driving the intracellular FAVI-RTP production rate with the free
176 plasma concentration predicted by the population PK model. This provided a prospective simulation

177 of *in vivo* intracellular concentrations of FAVI-RTP (assuming cells of similar disposition to MDCK
178 cells) as a function of *in vivo* plasma exposure.

179

180 The population PK model of Wang et. al is a 1-compartment PK disposition model with 1st order
181 absorption. Therefore, the equations for the model for *in vivo* intracellular simulations were as
182 follows:

183

184 Equation 2: $d A_{\text{FAVI_depot}} / dt = -k_a * A_{\text{FAVI_depot}}$

185 Equation 3: $d [\text{FAVI}]_{\text{plasma}} / dt = (k_a * A_{\text{FAVI_depot}} - CL * [\text{FAVI}]_{\text{plasma}}) / V$

186 Equation 4: $d [\text{FAVI-RTP}]_{\text{cell}} / dt = (k_{\text{in}} * [\text{FAVI}]_{\text{plasma}} * F_{\text{u,plasma}}) - k_{\text{out}} * [\text{FAVI-RTP}]_{\text{cell}}$

187

188 Where [] denotes concentration, CL and V are apparent values CL/F and V/F, and k_{in} and k_{out} used
189 values derived from the *in vitro* model fitting. The Wang et al. model also incorporated a time
190 dependent effect on CL, representative of favipiravir autoinduction of its own elimination, where:

191

192 Equation 5: $CL = CL_{\text{day}_0} * (1 + 0.0614 * \text{days of dosing})$

193

194 The model assumes a minimal proportion of the total mass balance of favipiravir transfers in from
195 the plasma before conversion into the intracellular FAVI-RTP (similar to how the *in vitro* model
196 assumes a constant $[\text{FAVI}]_{\text{media}}$) and was therefore similar in some respects to a PKPD effect
197 compartment model.

198

199 PK parameter population interindividual variabilities estimated by Wang et al. were used to simulate
200 a population of 1000 sets of PK parameters and their resultant predicted $[\text{FAVI}]_{\text{plasma}}$ and $[\text{FAVI-}$
201 $\text{RTP}]_{\text{cell}}$ profiles, from which 90% prediction interval profile envelopes were calculated. No population
202 distribution of body weight was incorporated into this simulation which is equivalent therefore to
203 assuming each simulated subject had a body weight of 70kg according to the Wang et al. population
204 PK model. No interindividual variability in the k_{in} or k_{out} parameters was available or assumed.
205 Parameter values used, and their inter-individual variabilities, quoted from the population PK model
206 of Wang et al. are provided in Table 2, with $F_{\text{u,plasma}}$ set at 0.46 [10].

207

208 Results

209 **Modelling of In-Vitro Data**

210 Data from the observed $[FAVI-RTP]_{cell}$ from Smee et al. at the four media concentrations
211 investigated, overlaid with the model fittings are given in Figure 1, with parameter estimates and
212 associated % relative standard errors in Table 1. The model was deemed to provide a satisfactory
213 description of the observed data with acceptable precision of parameter estimates. However, it
214 should be noted that k_{in} were not observed to be constant across the media incubation
215 concentrations. A plot of k_{in} vs. $[FAVI]_{media}$ (the latter on a log-scale) is provided in Figure 2, indicating
216 that some form of saturable relationship is most likely present, which may require an E_{max} type
217 model to be accurately described over the full range of media concentrations. However, with data
218 available at only four media concentrations there was insufficient information to adequately fit such
219 a saturable model. A log-linear model has therefore been fitted instead to the log-linear portion of
220 the k_{in} vs. $[FAVI]_{media}$ curve (the $[FAVI]_{media}$ range from 32 to 320 μM , which also encompasses a
221 typical range of *in vivo* plasma concentrations under standard human dosing regimens) and is
222 overlaid in Figure 2, where:

223

224 Equation 6: $k_{in} = \ln([FAVI]_{media}) * k_{in_slope} + k_{in_intercept}$

225

226 The values of k_{in_slope} and $k_{in_intercept}$ were then taken forward to the *in vivo* simulations instead of a
227 mean value of k_{in} , or the value from one $[FAVI]_{media}$ fitting alone, and were used via Equation 6
228 during simulations to calculate the value of k_{in} required for any free plasma concentration at any
229 given time as an input parameter value for Equation 4. k_{out} estimates from fittings were consistent at
230 the 4 *in vitro* $[FAVI]_{media}$ concentrations. Therefore, the mean of the 4 estimates ($0.108 h^{-1}$) was
231 taken as the input value for simulations using Equation 4.

232

233 **In-vivo Intracellular Simulations**

234 Simulations of predicted *in vivo* plasma and intracellular exposures for favipiravir and FAVI-RTP are
235 shown in Figure 3A for a dosing regimen of 1600 mg BID loading dose for day 1, followed by 800 mg
236 BID maintenance dosing for 9 further days. Simulations of predicted *in vivo* plasma and intracellular
237 exposures for favipiravir and FAVI-RTP are shown in Figure 3B for a dosing regimen of 1600 mg BID
238 loading dose for day 1, followed by 1200 mg BID maintenance dosing for 9 further days. In both
239 cases, reference to the K_m (Michaelis–Menten constant) for FAVI-RTP against the SARS-CoV-2 RNA-
240 dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp) enzyme [18] is overlaid. The plasma target exposure based on *in*
241 *vitro* EC_{90} for favipiravir of 159 μM against SARS-CoV-2 [14] is also shown but should be interpreted

242 with caution owing to the lack of clarity in *in vitro* free drug concentrations and whether human
243 plasma binding is high or low affinity.

244 **Discussion**

245 While studies in the Syrian Golden Hamster have demonstrated effectiveness of favipiravir against
246 SARS-CoV-2, *in vitro* activity data generated in the Vero-E6 cell model have questioned the utility of
247 the molecule when the derived target concentrations are compared to the pharmacokinetics after
248 administration to humans. Ultimately, robustly designed and executed clinical trials will be required
249 to determine the utility of favipiravir for SARS-CoV-2 but understanding the mechanisms which
250 underpin the clinical pharmacology is important to understand the plausibility for evaluation, which
251 should underpin selection of candidates for clinical evaluation. Furthermore, an *a priori*
252 understanding of likelihood of success for future candidates can only evolve from a thorough
253 understanding of the PKPD rules of engagement for SARS-CoV-2, which currently do not exist.
254 Antiviral drugs have only thus far been unequivocally successful for other viruses when given in
255 combination, and the requirement of combinations to improve potency and/or stem emergence of
256 resistance requires careful consideration so as not to obviate the lessons that should be learned
257 from other pathogens. Notwithstanding, favipiravir has been evaluated at several different doses
258 and schedules in numerous clinical trials globally, with mixed outcomes [23-25]. As of 29th December
259 2020, a total of 44 trials were listed on clinicaltrials.gov aiming to evaluate favipiravir, predominantly
260 as a monotherapy (with some exceptions) and in various use cases.

261

262 The current analysis aimed to apply a PK modelling approach to better understand the potential
263 efficacy of favipiravir for SARS-CoV-2 at doses readily achievable in humans. The simulations
264 synthesised available data for intracellular kinetics of FAVI-RTP in MDCK cells, plasma
265 pharmacokinetics in a Chinese patient population, *in vitro*-derived antiviral activity data (EC₉₀), and
266 cell-free inhibition data for FAVI-RTP against the SARS-CoV-2 RNA polymerase. Importantly, this
267 modelling approach indicates that despite rapid clearance of the parent drug from plasma, the peak
268 to trough variability in intracellular FAVI-RTP is such that activity may be maintained across the
269 dosing interval because of the long intracellular half-life. The simulations indicate that the
270 population average intracellular FAVI-RTP concentrations will maintain its Km for the SARS-CoV-2
271 polymerase for 3 days following 800 mg BID dosing and 9 days following 1200 mg BID dosing after a
272 1600 mg BID loading dose on day 1. Importantly, the flatter intracellular pharmacokinetic profile of
273 the phosphorylated form of favipiravir is in keeping with observations for other antiviral
274 nucleoside/nucleotide analogues such as tenofovir-diphosphate [26, 27], which underpins the
275 efficacy of these drugs for other viruses.

276

277 The current approach has several important limitations that should be recognised. Favipiravir
278 pharmacokinetic exposures have been demonstrated to be lower in American and African patients
279 than in Chinese patients [28], and so the simulations may not be widely applicable across different
280 ethnicities. The modelling applied a direct *in vitro* to *in vivo* extrapolation of k_{in} and this should be
281 considered as a major assumption as it directly presumes the *in vitro* Favi_{media} concentration is
282 representative of free plasma concentration as derived from the PK model and that the umbrella k_{in}
283 parameter, which consolidates various underlying uptake and conversion processes, is directly
284 translatable. Importantly, the presented intracellular predictions are specific to data generated on
285 intracellular kinetics in MDCK cells. Therefore, accuracy of the intracellular FAVI-RTP concentrations
286 will be dependent upon the similarity of relevant human *in vivo* cells in terms of the *in vitro*
287 uptake/elimination as well as the rate and extent of metabolic activation of favipiravir to its
288 triphosphorylated active form. Furthermore, there are no data with which to model the inter-patient
289 variability in the intracellular uptake or conversion to FAVI-RTP and so intracellular concentration
290 variability shown in Figure 3 is only derived from intracellular variability in plasma exposure. Finally,
291 the intracellular prediction is driven by the estimated free plasma concentration, whereas *in vivo* it is
292 possible local tissue free drug concentrations at the target organ for which there are no available
293 data may be higher or lower than in plasma.

294

295 Despite these limitations, additional confidence in the predictions come from two important
296 sources. Firstly, following the first day of dosing, there is generally good agreement between the
297 point at which the plasma favipiravir concentrations intersect the *in vitro* derived EC_{90} and the
298 corresponding intracellular FAVI-RTP value being close to its K_m value derived separately in a cell-
299 free system with the SARS-CoV-2 polymerase (Figure 3). It should be noted that no data are available
300 with which to derive a protein-adjusted EC_{90} value for favipiravir. Secondly, the clear activity of
301 favipiravir in the Syrian Golden Hamster model when C_{trough} values are similar to those in humans
302 gives additional confidence in the predictions [16].

303

304 In summary, these simulations indicate that favipiravir maintenance doses between 800 mg and
305 1200 mg BID may be sufficient to provide therapeutic concentrations of the intracellular FAVI-RTP
306 metabolite across the dosing interval. Further evaluation of favipiravir as an antiviral for SARS-CoV-2
307 appears to be warranted and will provide additional clarity on its putative utility. However, the
308 recent emergence of variants of the virus requires careful consideration of the drug resistance threat
309 posed by using repurposed agents as monotherapies, particularly when they are likely not to be fully
310 active in all patients. The polymerase, along with the protease and spike are likely to be extremely

- 311 important drug targets for new chemical entities and care should be taken not to compromise their
312 utility before the first-generation specific SARS-CoV-2 antivirals emerge.

313 **Acknowledgements**

314 The Authors wish to thank Professor Leon Aarons (University of Manchester) for helpful discussions

315 during development of this work.

316

317

318 **Figure Captions:**

319 **Figure 1**

320 PK model fittings to time courses of [FAVI-RTP]_{intracellular} generated by Smee et al. in MDCK
321 monolayers

322

323

324 **Figure 2**

325 Log-linear fitting to k_{in} as a function media favipiravir concentration

326

327


328 **Figure 3**

329 Favipiravir Plasma and Intracellular concentration predictions based on the Population-PK model of
330 Wang et al. combined with *in-vitro* intracellular PK modelling, for a dosing regimen of 1600 mg BID
331 loading dose for day 1, followed by 800 mg BID maintenance dosing for 9 further days (A), or 1600
332 mg BID loading dose for day 1, followed by 1200 mg BID maintenance dosing for 9 further days (B).
333 Dashed red line represents the previously published K_m for inhibition of SARS-CoV-2 polymerase by
334 FAVI-RTP [18], dotted red line represents C_{trough} plasma concentrations of favipiravir following 1000
335 mg/kg/day dose in hamster [16] and solid red line represents the *in vitro* EC_{90} of favipiravir against
336 SARS-CoV-2 in Vero-E6 cells [14].

337

338 Figures


339 Figure 1



340

341


342 **Figure 2**



343

344

345 **Figure 3**



347 **Tables**

348 **Table 1**

349 Parameter estimates from *in vitro* PK model fittings

350

[FAVI] _{media}		k_{in} (h ⁻¹)	k_{out} (h ⁻¹)
1000 μM	Est.	0.020	0.126
	%RSE	13.9	11.4
320 μM	Est.	0.021	0.089
	%RSE	14.7	15.6
100 μM	Est.	0.033	0.112
	%RSE	12.0	10.7
32 μM	Est.	0.048	0.105
	%RSE	15.3	14.3

351

352

353 **Table 2**

354 Summary of favipiravir POP-PK model parameter estimates used for simulation, from Wang et. al.

355

Parameter	Est.	Inter-Individual Variance (ω^2 , log parameters)
F (apparent, fractional)	1 (fixed)	0.0921
k_a (h^{-1})	1.5	1.05
CL/F (L/h)	2.96	0.274
V/F (L)	37.1	0.128
Time dep. Eff. On CL/F (% per day)	6.14	-
Interindividual Covariance for k_a and V/F ($\omega^2_{k_a} \sim \omega^2_{V/F}$)	-	0.23

356

357

358 **References**

- 359 1. Venisse, N., et al., *Concerns about pharmacokinetic (PK) and pharmacokinetic-*
360 *pharmacodynamic (PK-PD) studies in the new therapeutic area of COVID-19 infection.*
361 *Antiviral Res*, 2020. **181**: p. 104866.
- 362 2. Alexander, S.P.H., et al., *A rational roadmap for SARS-CoV-2/COVID-19 pharmacotherapeutic*
363 *research and development: IUPHAR Review 29.* *Br J Pharmacol*, 2020. **177**(21): p. 4942-4966.
- 364 3. Arshad, U., et al., *Prioritization of Anti-SARS-Cov-2 Drug Repurposing Opportunities Based on*
365 *Plasma and Target Site Concentrations Derived from their Established Human*
366 *Pharmacokinetics.* *Clin Pharmacol Ther*, 2020. **108**(4): p. 775-790.
- 367 4. Boffito, M., et al., *Toward Consensus on Correct Interpretation of Protein Binding in Plasma*
368 *and Other Biological Matrices for COVID-19 Therapeutic Development.* *Clin Pharmacol Ther*,
369 2020.
- 370 5. Owen, A. and S.H. Khoo, *Intracellular pharmacokinetics of antiretroviral agents.* *J HIV Ther*,
371 2004. **9**(4): p. 97-101.
- 372 6. Back, D.J., et al., *The pharmacology of antiretroviral nucleoside and nucleotide reverse*
373 *transcriptase inhibitors: implications for once-daily dosing.* *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*,
374 2005. **39 Suppl 1**: p. S1-23, quiz S24-25.
- 375 7. Callebaut, C., et al., *In Vitro Virology Profile of Tenofovir Alafenamide, a Novel Oral Prodrug*
376 *of Tenofovir with Improved Antiviral Activity Compared to That of Tenofovir Disoproxil*
377 *Fumarate.* *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*, 2015. **59**(10): p. 5909-16.
- 378 8. German, P., et al., *Clinical Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of*
379 *Ledipasvir/Sofosbuvir, a Fixed-Dose Combination Tablet for the Treatment of Hepatitis C.* *Clin*
380 *Pharmacokinet*, 2016. **55**(11): p. 1337-1351.
- 381 9. Ko, W.C., et al., *Arguments in favour of remdesivir for treating SARS-CoV-2 infections.* *Int J*
382 *Antimicrob Agents*, 2020. **55**(4): p. 105933.
- 383 10. Hayden, F.G. and N. Shindo, *Influenza virus polymerase inhibitors in clinical development.*
384 *Curr Opin Infect Dis*, 2019. **32**(2): p. 176-186.
- 385 11. Choi, S.W., et al., *Antiviral activity and safety of remdesivir against SARS-CoV-2 infection in*
386 *human pluripotent stem cell-derived cardiomyocytes.* *Antiviral Res*, 2020. **184**: p. 104955.
- 387 12. Hattori, S.I., et al., *GRL-0920, an Indole Chloropyridinyl Ester, Completely Blocks SARS-CoV-2*
388 *Infection.* *mBio*, 2020. **11**(4).
- 389 13. Choy, K.T., et al., *Remdesivir, lopinavir, emetine, and homoharringtonine inhibit SARS-CoV-2*
390 *replication in vitro.* *Antiviral Res*, 2020. **178**: p. 104786.

- 391 14. Wang, M., et al., *Remdesivir and chloroquine effectively inhibit the recently emerged novel*
392 *coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in vitro*. Cell Res, 2020. **30**(3): p. 269-271.
- 393 15. Irie, K., et al., *Pharmacokinetics of Favipiravir in Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19*. Clin
394 Transl Sci, 2020. **13**(5): p. 880-885.
- 395 16. Kaptein, S.J.F., et al., *Favipiravir at high doses has potent antiviral activity in SARS-CoV-2-*
396 *infected hamsters, whereas hydroxychloroquine lacks activity*. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 2020.
397 **117**(43): p. 26955-26965.
- 398 17. Wang, Y., et al., *Phase 2a, open-label, dose-escalating, multi-center pharmacokinetic study of*
399 *favipiravir (T-705) in combination with oseltamivir in patients with severe influenza*.
400 EBioMedicine, 2020. **62**: p. 103125.
- 401 18. Gordon, C.J., et al., *Remdesivir is a direct-acting antiviral that inhibits RNA-dependent RNA*
402 *polymerase from severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 with high potency*. J Biol
403 Chem, 2020. **295**(20): p. 6785-6797.
- 404 19. Smee, D.F., et al., *Intracellular metabolism of favipiravir (T-705) in uninfected and influenza A*
405 *(H5N1) virus-infected cells*. J Antimicrob Chemother, 2009. **64**(4): p. 741-6.
- 406 20. Bittermann, K. and K.U. Goss, *Predicting apparent passive permeability of Caco-2 and MDCK*
407 *cell-monolayers: A mechanistic model*. PLoS One, 2017. **12**(12): p. e0190319.
- 408 21. Team, R.C., *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for
409 *Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria*. <https://www.R-project.org/>. 2020.
- 410 22. Borchers, H.W., *pracma: Practical Numerical Math Functions*. R package version 2.2.9.
411 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=pracma>. 2019.
- 412 23. Doi, Y., et al., *A Prospective, Randomized, Open-Label Trial of Early versus Late Favipiravir*
413 *Therapy in Hospitalized Patients with COVID-19*. Antimicrob Agents Chemother, 2020.
414 **64**(12).
- 415 24. Ivashchenko, A.A., et al., *AVIFAVIR for Treatment of Patients with Moderate COVID-19:*
416 *Interim Results of a Phase II/III Multicenter Randomized Clinical Trial*. Clin Infect Dis, 2020.
- 417 25. Prakash, A., et al., *Systematic review and meta-analysis of effectiveness and safety of*
418 *favipiravir in the management of novel coronavirus (COVID-19) patients*. Indian J Pharmacol,
419 2020. **52**(5): p. 414-421.
- 420 26. Hawkins, T., et al., *Intracellular pharmacokinetics of tenofovir diphosphate, carbovir*
421 *triphosphate, and lamivudine triphosphate in patients receiving triple-nucleoside regimens*. J
422 Acquir Immune Defic Syndr, 2005. **39**(4): p. 406-11.
- 423 27. Baheti, G., et al., *Plasma and intracellular population pharmacokinetic analysis of tenofovir*
424 *in HIV-1-infected patients*. Antimicrob Agents Chemother, 2011. **55**(11): p. 5294-9.

- 425 28. Nguyen, T.H., et al., *Favipiravir pharmacokinetics in Ebola-Infected patients of the JIKI trial*
426 *reveals concentrations lower than targeted*. PLoS Negl Trop Dis, 2017. **11**(2): p. e0005389.
427