

1 **Linezolid population pharmacokinetic model in plasma and cerebrospinal fluid among**
2 **patients with tuberculosis meningitis**

3
4 Noha Abdelgawad,¹† Sean Wasserman,^{2,3}† Mahmoud Tareq Abdelwahab,¹ Angharad Davis,^{2,4,5}
5 Cari Stek,² Lubbe Wiesner,¹ John Black,⁶ Graeme Meintjes,^{2,7} Robert J. Wilkinson,^{2,3,4,8} Paolo
6 Denti¹

7
8 ¹Division of Clinical Pharmacology, Department of Medicine, University of Cape Town,
9 Observatory 7925, South Africa

10 ²Wellcome Centre for Infectious Diseases Research in Africa, Institute of Infectious Disease and
11 Molecular Medicine, University of Cape Town, Observatory 7925, South Africa

12 ³Division of Infectious Diseases and HIV Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Cape
13 Town, Observatory 7925, South Africa

14 ⁴ The Francis Crick Institute, London NW1 1AT, United Kingdom

15 ⁵ Faculty of Life Sciences, University College London, WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom

16 ⁶ Department of Medicine, Walter Sisulu University, Mthatha, South Africa

17 ⁷ Department of Medicine, University of Cape Town, Observatory 7925, South Africa

18 ⁸ Department of infectious Diseases, Imperial College London W12 0NN, United Kingdom

19 †Contributed equally to this manuscript

20 Running title: LZD PopPK plasma & CSF model in TBM

21 Keywords: Population pharmacokinetics, Tuberculosis Meningitis, Linezolid, Cerebrospinal fluid,
22 Modelling & Simulation

23 #Address correspondence to Paolo Denti, paolo.denti@uct.ac.za.

24 **ABSTRACT**

25 **Background.**

26 Linezolid is being evaluated in novel treatment regimens for tuberculous meningitis (TBM). The
27 pharmacokinetics of linezolid have not been characterized in this population, particularly in
28 cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) where exposures may be affected by changes in protein concentration
29 and rifampicin co-administration.

30 **Methods.**

31 This was a sub-study of a phase 2 clinical trial of intensified antibiotic therapy for adults with HIV-
32 associated TBM. Participants in the intervention groups received high-dose rifampicin (35 mg/kg)
33 plus linezolid 1200 mg daily for 28 days followed by 600 mg daily until day 56. Plasma was
34 intensively sampled, and lumbar CSF was collected at a single timepoint in a randomly allocated
35 sampling window, within 3 days after enrolment. Sparse plasma and CSF samples were also
36 obtained on day 28. Linezolid concentrations were analyzed using non-linear mixed effects
37 modelling.

38 **Results.**

39 30 participants contributed 247 plasma and 28 CSF linezolid observations. Plasma PK was best
40 described by a one-compartment model with first-order absorption and saturable elimination. The
41 typical value of maximal clearance was 7.25 L/h. Duration of rifampicin co-treatment (compared
42 on day 3 versus day 28) did not affect linezolid pharmacokinetics. Partitioning between plasma
43 and CSF correlated with CSF total protein concentration up to 1.2 g/L where the partition
44 coefficient reached a maximal value of 37%. The equilibration half-life between plasma and CSF
45 was estimated at ~3.5 hours.

46 **Conclusion.**

47 Linezolid was readily detected in CSF despite co-administration of the potent inducer rifampicin
48 at high doses. These findings support continued clinical evaluation of linezolid plus high-dose
49 rifampicin for the treatment of TBM in adults.

50 INTRODUCTION

51 Tuberculous meningitis (TBM) is the most fatal and debilitating form of tuberculosis with a
52 particularly high burden among people living with HIV [1]. One reason for severe outcomes is that
53 the current treatment regimen for TBM is based on treatment for pulmonary TB, and may result in
54 suboptimal central nervous system (CNS) concentrations [2]. Drugs targeted at TBM should cross
55 several barriers to reach the site of disease, including the blood-brain barrier (BBB) and the blood-
56 cerebrospinal fluid barrier (BCSFB) that separate the systemic circulation from their site of action
57 in the CNS. These barriers pose a therapeutic challenge by limiting entry of drugs into the CNS.
58 Moreover, disease-related changes in BBB permeability and dynamic changes in protein
59 concentrations may have important implications for drug penetration into the brain [3].

60
61 Linezolid, an oxazolidinone antibiotic, is highly effective for the treatment of drug-resistant
62 pulmonary TB. Linezolid is also used to treat Gram-positive bacterial infections in the CNS [4–
63 6], where good drug penetration has been documented, making it an attractive candidate for TBM
64 treatment [7–9]. Small observational studies have shown improved clinical parameters with
65 linezolid use in children and adults with TBM [10,11]. Based on these encouraging observations,
66 linezolid is being investigated as part of intensified antibiotic therapy in several clinical trials for
67 TBM [12].

68
69 Specific features of TBM may influence the pharmacokinetics (PK) of linezolid, with potential
70 implications for safety and efficacy, given its narrow therapeutic window. These include host
71 factors (such as body size) and disease factors, including CSF protein concentrations and BBB
72 permeability. Also, clinical trials provide linezolid along with high-dose rifampicin in TBM

73 treatment regimens. As a potent inducer of the cytochrome P450 system and upregulator of drug
74 transporters [13], rifampicin could potentially affect the PK of linezolid. Studies in healthy
75 volunteers and pulmonary TB have shown a moderate reduction in linezolid exposure when co-
76 administered with standard dose rifampicin [14,15]. The impact on site of disease (CSF)
77 concentrations and clinical implications of this pharmacokinetic interaction is unknown but could
78 theoretically lead to suboptimal treatment or the development of antimicrobial resistance.

79
80 The objectives of this analysis were to describe the PK of linezolid in plasma and CSF of adults
81 with TBM, to explore the effect of high-dose rifampicin on linezolid PK, evaluate covariate effects
82 on plasma and CSF drug levels, and simulate exposures for optimized dosing strategies.

83 **METHODOLOGY**

84 **Study data**

85 This was a sub-study of LASER-TBM [16], a phase IIb, open-label trial that evaluated safety and
86 PK of intensified antibiotic therapy in adults with HIV and TBM [12]. Participants were enrolled
87 from 4 public hospitals in Cape Town and Gqeberha, South Africa, and randomized to study
88 interventions within 5 days of starting antituberculosis treatment. The standard of care (control)
89 group received fixed-dose combination oral tablets (rifampicin 10 mg/kg, isoniazid 5 mg/kg,
90 pyrazinamide 25 mg/kg, and ethambutol 15 mg/kg) according to World Health Organization
91 (WHO) weight bands. Participants allocated to experimental groups were administered the
92 standard regimen with a higher dose of rifampicin (35 mg/kg in total, using bespoke weight bands
93 [17]) and linezolid for 56 days (1200 mg once daily for the first 28 days, then reduced to 600 mg
94 once daily) with or without aspirin. All participants received adjunctive dexamethasone.

95
96 Pharmacokinetic sampling visits were scheduled on Day 3 (± 2 days) and Day 28 (± 2 days) after
97 study entry. At the Day 3 visit, plasma was collected at pre-dose, 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8-10, and 24 hours
98 post-dose (intensive) and on Day 28 at pre-dose, 2-, and 4-hours post-dose (sparse). Sparse
99 sampling was performed on Day 3 for participants who declined intensive sampling or for whom
100 intensive sampling could not be done. One lumbar CSF sample was collected at each
101 pharmacokinetic sampling visit, with sample timing randomized to intervals of 1-3, 3-6, 6-10, and
102 24 hours after dosing. Immediately following collection, samples were processed directly and then
103 stored at -80°C . Clinical information was collected, and full blood count and serum chemistry were
104 obtained at each visit. Total protein, albumin, and glucose were measured in CSF samples.

105 Linezolid plasma and CSF concentrations were measured in the Division of Clinical Pharmacology
106 at the University of Cape Town. The plasma assay summary has been described previously [18].
107 CSF samples were processed with a protein precipitation extraction method using linezolid-d3 as
108 the internal standard, followed by high-performance liquid chromatography with tandem mass
109 spectrometry detection (LC-MS/MS). Cholesterol and 4-beta hydroxy cholesterol (4 β -OHC) were
110 also measured in pre-dose plasma samples collected on both PK visits. 4 β -OHC was also measured
111 with an LC-MS/MS assay in the Division of Clinical Pharmacology at the University of Cape
112 Town. Cholesterol plasma concentrations were measured at the South African National Health
113 Laboratory using standard methodology. 4 β -OHC is a metabolite of cholesterol formed by
114 CYP3A4 and the ratio between its concentration and that of cholesterol is used a marker of
115 CYP3A4/5 endogenous activity [19].

116 Informed consent was obtained from all participants or their proxies. The study was approved by
117 the University of Cape Town Human Research Ethics Committee (UCT HREC reference:
118 293/2018), Walter Sisulu University (HREC reference: 012/2019), and the South African Health
119 Products Regulatory Authority (reference number 20180622). The trial is registered on
120 clinicaltrials.gov (NCT03927313).

121

122 **Pharmacokinetic modelling**

123 Nonlinear mixed-effects modelling was used to create a population PK model describing linezolid
124 PK in both plasma and lumbar CSF. The model was developed sequentially; first describing
125 plasma linezolid and then including CSF concentrations.

126

127 For the plasma PK, we tested one- and two-compartment disposition models with linear or
128 saturable elimination and first-pass effect. Lag time and transit compartments were tested to
129 capture the delay in the absorption process. Allometric scaling of clearance and volume parameters
130 was tested as per Anderson and Holford [20] using the fixed power exponents of 0.75 for clearance
131 and 1 for volume and either total body weight or fat-free mass (FFM) (calculated based on the
132 formula in Janmahasatian *et al.* [21]) as body size descriptors. The CSF concentrations were
133 described using a hypothetical effect compartment linked to the central (plasma) compartment,
134 which estimates the first-order equilibration rate constant of linezolid between the central and the
135 effect compartments ($k_{plasma-CSF}$) and the pseudo-partition coefficient (PPC). Further details on
136 modelling approach are available in the supplementary file. Between-subject, between-visit and
137 between-occasion variabilities were considered on various PK parameters. Each PK sampling day
138 (day 3 and day 28) was considered as a separate visit. Each dose and its following samples were
139 considered a separate occasion, therefore, the dose before the sampling visit along with the predose
140 concentration were treated as a separate occasion from the dose administered during the PK visit
141 and the following concentrations. Residual unexplained variability was best described by a
142 combined additive and proportional error model. Censored plasma values that were below the limit
143 of quantification (BLQ) were imputed to half the lower limit of quantification (LLOQ) and their
144 additive error component inflated by LLOQ/2 [22].

145
146 Following the development of the structural model, we tested the effect of potential covariates
147 including creatinine clearance (calculated with the Cockcroft-Gault equation [23]), age, study visit,
148 duration of concomitant rifampicin treatment, study site, and treatment arm. For the CSF PK
149 parameters PPC and $k_{plasma-CSF}$, we also tested the effect of CSF total protein, albumin, and

150 glucose concentrations. The precision of the parameter estimates of the final model, expressed as
151 95% confidence intervals, was assessed using sampling importance resampling (SIR) [24].

152

153 **Simulations**

154 The model-derived area under the concentration-time curve from time 0 to 24 hours post-dose
155 (AUC_{0-24h}) and the concentration at 24 hours post-dose (C_{24h}) were calculated for the available
156 profiles. Monte Carlo simulations (n=10,000) were performed using final model parameters to
157 simulate concentration-time profiles in plasma and CSF following daily linezolid doses of 600 mg
158 or 1200 mg at steady-state for a typical participant with median FFM of 45 kg and CSF protein of
159 0.995 mg/mL.

160

161 **RESULTS**

162 **Study data**

163 Thirty participants underwent PK sampling on the first PK visit on day 3 of the study and 18
164 participants had PK sampling at the second PK visit on day 28, one of whom was excluded from
165 this analysis because all 3 samples were BLQ (later confirmed to have missed dosing). Reasons
166 for missing the second PK visit included death, interrupting linezolid dose due to adverse events,
167 or withdrawing consent. There were 247 plasma concentrations (6 were BLQ) and 28 CSF
168 concentrations (7 were BLQ) available for PK modeling. All participants were receiving linezolid
169 1200 mg daily at the first PK visit; on day 28, 13 received 1200 mg and 4 received 600 mg.
170 Baseline clinical characteristics are summarized in **Table 1**. Median duration on rifampicin therapy
171 was 5 days (range 0 – 7) at the Day 3 PK visit and 30 days (range 27 – 38) at the Day 28 visit.

172 Median CSF total protein concentrations decreased from 1.46 g/L (range 0.31 – 54.7) at Day 3 to
173 0.75 g/L (range 0.22 – 2.19) at Day 28.

174

175 **Pharmacokinetic modelling**

176 The plasma PK of linezolid was best characterized by a one-compartment disposition model,
177 saturable elimination with Michaelis–Menten, and first-order absorption preceded by a chain of
178 transit compartments. A schematic diagram of the model is shown in **Figure 1**. Two-compartment
179 disposition was tested but did not result in a significant improvement of fit. Maximal clearance
180 (CL_{max}) and volume of distribution (V) were allometrically scaled using FFM (drop in objective
181 function value (dOFV) = -30, compared to dOFV = -7.7 when using total body weight). In a typical
182 participant (median FFM 45 kg) the value of maximal clearance (CL_{max}) was 6.78 L/h, the
183 Michaelis-Menten constant (km), which is a parameter that governs saturable hepatic elimination
184 and represents the linezolid concentration at which half the CL_{max} is reached, was 33.0 mg/L,
185 and the volume of distribution (V) was 40.7 L. The inclusion of between-visit variability in CL_{max}
186 improved the model fit, but no systematic increase or decrease with time on treatment was
187 observed. Longitudinal changes in clearance were explored by testing auto-inhibition and duration
188 of rifampicin co-treatment, but no significant effect was found for either. We also could not find
189 any effect when testing the ratio of 4 β -OHC to cholesterol, creatinine clearance, or age on CL_{max}
190 and bioavailability (F). The final parameter estimates are presented in **Table 2**. A visual predictive
191 check showing adequate model fit is depicted in **Figure S1** in the supplementary file.

192

193 The CSF concentrations were linked to the plasma concentrations with an equilibration half-life
194 of 3.5 hours (95% confidence interval, 2.13 - 7.33) and the steady-state equilibrium ratio (PPC),

195 indicating the relative amount of linezolid exposure in CSF, which was dependent on CSF protein
196 levels. The *PPC*-CSF protein relationship was described using a piece-wise linear (broken-stick)
197 function, where the *PPC* increased with higher CSF protein levels until a maximal CSF protein
198 value where the *PPC* plateaued (i.e., a maximal *PPC* value). The breakpoint was estimated, while
199 the slope (i.e., the change in *PPC* per change in CSF protein) was calculated from the breakpoint
200 and the intercept (minimum *PPC*) which was fixed to be 0 to prevent the estimation of negative
201 values of *PPC* which are physiologically unplausible. For each 0.1 mg/mL increase in CSF protein,
202 we found an increase of 3% in *PPC* up to 1.18 mg/mL of CSF protein, after which the *PPC* reached
203 a maximal value of 36.5% (95% CI, 23.8% – 56.6%) (**Figure 2**). Both CSF protein and CSF
204 albumin were found to correlate significantly with *PPC*; however, the two are highly positively
205 correlated. Only CSF protein was included in the final model because it resulted in a more
206 significant drop in OFV and because albumin is a component of the proteins measured.

207

208 **Simulations**

209 The simulated plasma and CSF concentration time profiles for the typical participant in our cohort
210 following a once daily dose of either 600 mg or 1200 mg linezolid are depicted in **Figure 2** and
211 model-derived individual values for the steady-state AUC_{0-24h} and trough concentrations are
212 summarized in **Table 3**.

213 **DISCUSSION**

214 Linezolid is being evaluated in several clinical trials as part of enhanced antimicrobial therapy for
215 TBM. This is based on limited clinical evidence from small observational studies in TBM [10,11]
216 and reports of successful use in gram-positive CNS infection. However, there is scarce information
217 on linezolid exposure in the CSF, especially among patients with TBM, a presumed requirement

218 for clinical efficacy in this condition. We characterized the PK of linezolid in plasma and CSF
219 from a cohort of South African patients with HIV-associated TBM. The extent of linezolid
220 penetration into the CSF was ~30% on average of plasma exposure and correlated with CSF
221 protein concentrations – CSF penetration was higher in participants with higher CSF protein,
222 reaching a maximal value of ~37%. Co-administration with high-dose rifampicin (35 mg/kg/day),
223 when comparing the duration on rifampicin treatment on day 3 versus day 28 did not have a
224 significant effect on the PK of linezolid.

225
226 Several prior studies may help to contextualize our findings. A recent observational study reported
227 CSF linezolid concentrations from 17 TBM patients (only one with HIV) who received linezolid
228 600 mg daily [25]. The median CSF concentrations were 0.90 mg/L and 3.14 mg/L and the
229 CSF/serum ratios were 0.25 and 0.59 at 2- and 6-hours post-dose, respectively. CSF linezolid
230 concentrations have also been reported from two small cohorts of neurosurgical patients receiving
231 600 mg linezolid intravenously every 12 hours. In the smaller study (n = 7) the mean observed
232 CSF-to-plasma AUC ratio was 0.565 (n = 7), the mean (\pm standard deviation) $AUC_{0-\infty}$ after the
233 first dose was 37.7 (\pm 23.9) mg·h/L and AUC_{0-12h} after the fifth dose was 53.7 (\pm 50.3) mg·h/L. In
234 the slightly larger study (n = 14) mean observed CSF-to-plasma AUC ratio was 0.66 and mean
235 (\pm standard deviation) AUC in CSF was 101 \pm 59.6 mg.h/L [26,27]. Direct comparison is limited
236 because of differences in population (HIV status, disease type and severity), dosing and
237 administration, and drug assays. CSF/plasma concentration and AUC ratios should be cautiously
238 interpreted in these prior studies [25–27] since observed CSF and plasma concentrations were
239 compared at the same timepoints, not accounting for delay in distribution between the plasma and
240 CSF. Despite having access to only a single CSF sample per visit (due to the invasive nature of

241 lumbar puncture), using a model-based approach allowed us to describe the time course for
242 linezolid entry into CSF. The limitation of sparse CSF sampling in our study was further mitigated
243 by randomizing participants to different sampling times so that CSF samples could be obtained
244 over the full dosing interval.

245
246 Other studies have also reported a relationship between the levels of CSF total protein (or albumin)
247 and antituberculosis drugs in TBM [28,29]. In a pediatric population there was a linear relationship
248 between CSF protein concentration and the CSF penetration of rifampicin, with a 63% increase in
249 the penetration coefficient for every 10-fold change in protein levels [28]. In another pediatric
250 TBM cohort, an exponential function was used to describe the relationship between CSF protein
251 concentrations and the partition coefficient of rifampicin where an increase of 1 g/L in CSF protein
252 concentration resulted in a 1.28-fold increase in the partition coefficient [29].

253
254 There are two plausible, potentially overlapping, explanations for our finding of a correlation
255 between CSF protein levels and extent of CSF linezolid partitioning. In a healthy state, the BCSFB
256 is intact and only a small fraction of plasma proteins can enter into the CNS, leaving only unbound
257 drug fraction available for penetration into this compartment [7]. Inflammation associated with TB
258 meningitis may increase BCSFB permeability causing both plasma protein and total drug
259 concentrations to be higher in the CSF. Another possible explanation for this relationship is higher
260 endogenous CSF protein production from local inflammation leading to alterations in CSF drug
261 binding kinetics and higher concentrations of total drug in TBM. Quantification of free drug CSF
262 concentrations may help to further delineate CSF protein-drug relationships.

263 Linezolid is provided with high dose rifampicin (35 mg/kg/day) in ongoing efficacy trials for
264 TBM. Because of prior reports of a drug-drug interaction between rifampicin and linezolid, plus
265 the likelihood of a rifampicin dose effect on metabolizing enzyme activity [30] which could affect
266 the linezolid plasma exposure and hence the CSF exposure, we investigated a potential effect of
267 rifampicin on linezolid PK. In our study, there was no control group of participants who received
268 only linezolid without rifampicin to clearly identify a drug-drug interaction. However, estimated
269 linezolid clearance in our cohort was comparable to that reported from patients receiving linezolid
270 for drug-resistant pulmonary TB without concomitant rifampicin. In addition, since the maximal
271 cytochrome (CYP) P450 induction effect of rifampicin occurs after at least a week [31], we
272 investigated the effect of the duration of rifampicin therapy (rather than rifampicin co-
273 administration as categorical covariate) on linezolid PK, and could not detect any significant
274 trends. Furthermore, we found no relationship between 4 β -OHC:cholesterol or 4 β -OHC alone (as
275 predictive biomarker of enzyme induction by rifampicin) and linezolid clearance or bioavailability.
276 Our data indicate that even if rifampicin had an effect on linezolid exposures, it is unlikely to be
277 clinically relevant.

278
279 In contrast to our findings, other smaller studies among healthy volunteers and non-TB patients
280 have demonstrated a reduction in linezolid exposure when co-administered with rifampicin
281 [14,32–34]. This interaction has been variously attributed to either a large increase in the
282 expression of the CYP3A4 isoenzyme that typically has a small contribution to linezolid clearance
283 [14] or to increased upregulation of linezolid intestinal secretion by rifampicin induction of P-
284 glycoprotein (P-gp) [34]. There is no definitive evidence that linezolid is a substrate of P-gp, plus

285 it is mainly (~68%) metabolized in the liver via morpholine ring oxidation, which is independent
286 of the CYP450 system, with the remainder excreted unchanged via the kidneys [14].

287

288 As reported for pulmonary TB patients, saturable elimination was observed at higher linezolid
289 plasma concentrations, resulting in non-linear PK [35]. Despite subtle differences in Michaelis-
290 Menten elimination kinetics (km) our estimates for CL_{max} and V are in line with previously
291 published linezolid models [35–40]. Prior models based on data from non-TB [41] and pulmonary
292 TB patients [42], included an empirical inhibition compartment to describe concentration- and
293 time-dependent autoinhibition of elimination. We also tested this approach, but it did not result in
294 a better model fit for our data, and clearance values estimated by these models are similar to ours.

295

296 Our analysis had a few limitations. First, the sparse plasma sampling (3 samples) performed during
297 the 2nd PK visit does not allow for robust estimation of the non-linearity in clearance, especially
298 since only 7 participants were on the reduced dose (600 mg). However, the model fit improved
299 significantly (p -value < 0.001) when including saturation of clearance with higher concentrations,
300 supporting this conclusion. Secondly, A limitation of the PPC -CSF protein relationship in our
301 model is that the minimum PPC was fixed to 0, i.e., no CSF protein means no linezolid gets into
302 the CSF in order to prevent the estimation of negative values of PPC which are physiologically
303 implausible. However, a CSF protein value of 0 is not plausible in clinical practice. The total
304 protein concentration of CSF varies between 0.2% and 0.5% of the total protein concentration of
305 blood [43]. It is considered that 80% of CSF proteins originate in blood and that CSF proteins are
306 diluted in a molecule-size-dependent concentration gradient [44]. Thirdly, there was high
307 variability in the observed CSF concentrations (driven by the large proportion of undetected

308 concentrations 25%) which was reflected in estimation of the proportional error for the CSF
309 observations (91.5%). Finally, we did not undertake simulations to estimate probability of target
310 attainment. While our simulations do suggest that 1200 mg daily dosing will achieve linezolid
311 concentrations above the critical concentration MIC of 1 mg/L for *M. tuberculosis*, it is important
312 to note that a PK efficacy target is not established for TBM and that drug protein binding (and
313 relative free fraction of active drug) in the CSF is unknown.

314

315 In conclusion, we successfully developed a population PK model for linezolid among adults with
316 HIV-associated TBM, demonstrating that CSF concentrations of linezolid are around 30% of those
317 in plasma, even with concomitant use of high-dose rifampicin. These findings support continued
318 clinical evaluation of linezolid together with rifamycins for the treatment of TBM in adults. Our
319 model provides a platform that can be used for exploring alternative linezolid dosing strategies in
320 TBM once treatment targets are established.

321 **FUNDING**

322 SW was supported by the National Institutes of Health (K43TW011421 and U01AI170426). MA
323 received training in research that was supported by the Fogarty International Center of the National
324 Institutes of Health under Award Number D43 TW010559. This work was supported by the
325 Wellcome through core funding from the Wellcome Centre for Infectious Diseases Research in
326 Africa (203135/Z/16/Z). AGD was supported by a UCL Wellcome Trust PhD Programme for
327 Clinicians Fellowship (award number 175479). RJW receives support from the Francis Crick
328 Institute which is funded by Wellcome (CC2112), Cancer Research UK (CC2112) and UK
329 Research and Innovation (CC2112). He also receives support from NIH (R01145436) and
330 Meningitis Now. The University of Cape Town Clinical PK Laboratory is supported in part via

331 the Adult Clinical Trial Group (ACTG), by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious
332 Diseases (NIAID) of the National Institutes of Health under award numbers UM1 AI068634, UM1
333 AI068636, and UM1 AI106701; as well as the Infant Maternal Pediatric Adolescent AIDS Clinical
334 Trials Group (IMPAACT), funding provided by National Institute of Allergy and Infectious
335 Diseases (U01 AI068632), The Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and
336 Human Development, and National Institute of Mental Health grant AI068632. The content is
337 solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the
338 sponsors. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish,
339 or preparation of the manuscript. For the purpose of Open Access, the authors have applied a CC-
340 BY public copyright license to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this
341 submission.

342 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

343 All authors declare no competing interests for this work.

344 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

345 Computations were performed using facilities provided by the University of Cape Town's ICTS
346 High Performance Computing team: <https://ucthpc.uct.ac.za/>. Study data were collected and
347 managed using REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) tools hosted at the University of Cape
348 Town. REDCap is a secure, web-based software platform designed to support data capture for
349 research studies [45,46].

350 REFERENCES

- 351 1. Dodd PJ, Yuen CM, Sismanidis C, Seddon JA, Jenkins HE. The global burden of tuberculosis mortality in
352 children: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Glob Heal* **2017**; 5:e898–e906. Available at:
353 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2214109X17302899>. Accessed 4 October 2021.
- 354 2. Wasserman S, Davis A, Wilkinson RJ, Meintjes G. Key considerations in the pharmacotherapy of
355 tuberculous meningitis. *Expert Opin Pharmacother* **2019**; 20:1791–1795. Available at:
356 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14656566.2019.1638912>. Accessed 2 October 2022.
- 357 3. Pardridge WM. Drug transport across the blood–brain barrier. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab* **2012**; 32:1959.
358 Available at: [/pmc/articles/PMC3494002/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22711111/). Accessed 26 July 2022.
- 359 4. Pintado V, Pazos R, Jiménez-Mejías ME, et al. Linezolid for therapy of *Staphylococcus aureus* meningitis: a
360 cohort study of 26 patients. *Infect Dis (London, England)* **2020**; 52:808–815. Available at:
361 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/23744235.2020.1789212>. Accessed 24 October 2022.
- 362 5. Beer R, Pfausler B, Schmutzhard E. Management of nosocomial external ventricular drain-related
363 ventriculomeningitis. *Neurocrit Care* **2009**; 10:363–367.
- 364 6. Hoefnagel D, Dammers R, Ter Laak-Poort MP, Avezaat CJJ. Risk factors for infections related to external
365 ventricular drainage. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* **2008**; 150:209–214.
- 366 7. Nau R, Sorgel F, Eiffert H. Penetration of Drugs through the Blood-Cerebrospinal Fluid/Blood-Brain
367 Barrier for Treatment of Central Nervous System Infections. *Clin Microbiol Rev* **2010**; 23:858–883.
368 Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20930076/>. Accessed 4 April 2022.
- 369 8. Rupprecht TA, Pfister H-W. Clinical experience with linezolid for the treatment of central nervous system
370 infections. *Eur J Neurol* **2005**; 12:536–542. Available at:
371 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-1331.2005.01001.x>.
- 372 9. Villani P, B. Regazzi M, Marubbi F, et al. Cerebrospinal Fluid Linezolid Concentrations in
373 Postneurosurgical Central Nervous System Infections. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **2002**; 46:936–937.
374 Available at: <https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AAC.46.3.936-937.2002>.
- 375 10. Sun F, Ruan Q, Wang J, et al. Linezolid manifests a rapid and dramatic therapeutic effect for patients with
376 life-threatening tuberculous meningitis. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **2014**; 58:6297–6301. Available at:
377 <https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AAC.02784-14>. Accessed 7 April 2022.

- 378 11. Li H, Lu J, Liu J, Zhao Y, Ni X, Zhao S. Linezolid is Associated with Improved Early Outcomes of
379 Childhood Tuberculous Meningitis. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* **2016**; 35:607–610. Available at:
380 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26901441/>. Accessed 7 April 2022.
- 381 12. Davis AG, Wasserman S, Stek C, et al. A phase 2A trial of the safety and tolerability of increased dose
382 rifampicin and adjunctive linezolid, with or without aspirin, for HIV-associated tuberculous meningitis (The
383 LASER-TBM Trial). *Clin Infect Dis* **2022**; Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36482216/>.
384 Accessed 22 March 2023.
- 385 13. Finch CK, Chrisman CR, Baciewicz AM, Self TH. Rifampin and Rifabutin Drug Interactions: An Update.
386 *Arch Intern Med* **2002**; 162:985–992. Available at:
387 <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamainternalmedicine/fullarticle/211417>. Accessed 26 October 2022.
- 388 14. Gandelman K, Zhu T, Fahmi OA, et al. Unexpected Effect of Rifampin on the Pharmacokinetics of
389 Linezolid: In Silico and In Vitro Approaches to Explain Its Mechanism. *J Clin Pharmacol* **2011**; 51:229–
390 236. Available at: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1177/0091270010366445>.
- 391 15. Gebhart BC, Barker BC, Markewitz BA. Decreased serum linezolid levels in a critically ill patient receiving
392 concomitant linezolid and rifampin. *Pharmacotherapy* **2007**; 27:476–479. Available at:
393 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17316160/>. Accessed 26 October 2022.
- 394 16. Davis AG, Wasserman S, Maxebengula M, et al. Study protocol for a phase 2A trial of the safety and
395 tolerability of increased dose rifampicin and adjunctive linezolid, with or without aspirin, for HIV-
396 associated tuberculous meningitis [LASER-TBM]. *Wellcome Open Res* **2021**; 6. Available at:
397 </pmc/articles/PMC8283551/>. Accessed 19 July 2022.
- 398 17. Wasserman S, Davis A, Stek C, et al. Plasma pharmacokinetics of high-dose oral versus intravenous
399 rifampicin in patients with tuberculous meningitis: a randomized controlled trial. *Antimicrob Agents*
400 *Chemother* **2021**; 65.
- 401 18. Garcia-Prats AJ, Schaaf HS, Draper HR, et al. Pharmacokinetics, optimal dosing, and safety of linezolid in
402 children with multidrug-resistant tuberculosis: Combined data from two prospective observational studies.
403 *PLOS Med* **2019**; 16:e1002789. Available at:
404 <https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1002789>. Accessed 28 March 2023.
- 405 19. Diczfalusy U, Nylén H, Elander P, Bertilsson L. 4 β -hydroxycholesterol, an endogenous marker of

- 406 CYP3A4/5 activity in humans. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* **2011**; 71:183. Available at:
407 </pmc/articles/PMC3040538/>. Accessed 13 October 2022.
- 408 20. Anderson BJ, Holford NHG. Mechanism-based concepts of size and maturity in pharmacokinetics. *Annu*
409 *Rev Pharmacol Toxicol* **2008**; 48:303–332.
- 410 21. Janmahasatian S, Duffull SB, Ash S, Ward LC, Byrne NM, Green B. Quantification of Lean Bodyweight.
411 *Clin Pharmacokinet* **2005**; 44:1051–1065.
- 412 22. Beal SL. Ways to fit a PK model with some data below the quantification limit. *J Pharmacokinet*
413 *Pharmacodyn* **2001**; 28:481–504.
- 414 23. Cockcroft DW, Gault MH. Prediction of creatinine clearance from serum creatinine. *Nephron* **1976**; 16:31–
415 41.
- 416 24. Dosne A-G, Bergstrand M, Karlsson MO. An automated sampling importance resampling procedure for
417 estimating parameter uncertainty. *J Pharmacokinet Pharmacodyn* **2017**; 44:509–520. Available at:
418 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5686280/pdf/10928_2017_Article_9542.pdf.
- 419 25. Kempker RR, Smith AGC, Avaliani T, et al. Cycloserine and Linezolid for Tuberculosis Meningitis:
420 Pharmacokinetic Evidence of Potential Usefulness. *Clin Infect Dis* **2022**; 75:682–689. Available at:
421 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab992>.
- 422 26. Viaggi B, Paolo A Di, Danesi R, et al. Linezolid in the central nervous system: Comparison between
423 cerebrospinal fluid and plasma pharmacokinetics. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/003655482011582140> **2011**;
424 43:721–727. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.3109/00365548.2011.582140>. Accessed
425 4 April 2022.
- 426 27. Myrianthefs P, Markantonis SL, Vlachos K, et al. Serum and cerebrospinal fluid concentrations of linezolid
427 in neurosurgical patients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **2006**; 50:3971–3976.
- 428 28. Svensson EM, Dian S, Te Brake L, et al. Model-Based Meta-analysis of Rifampicin Exposure and Mortality
429 in Indonesian Tuberculous Meningitis Trials. *Clin Infect Dis* **2020**; 71:1817–1823.
- 430 29. Panjasawatwong N, Wattanakul T, Hoglund RM, et al. Population Pharmacokinetic Properties of
431 Antituberculosis Drugs in Vietnamese Children with Tuberculous Meningitis. *Antimicrob Agents*
432 *Chemother* **2020**; 65. Available at: </pmc/articles/PMC7927832/>. Accessed 7 June 2021.
- 433 30. Williamson B, Dooley KE, Zhang Y, Back DJ, Owen A. Induction of influx and efflux transporters and

- 434 cytochrome P450 3A4 in primary human hepatocytes by rifampin, rifabutin, and rifapentine. *Antimicrob*
435 *Agents Chemother* **2013**; 57:6366–6369.
- 436 31. Chen J, Raymond K. Roles of rifampicin in drug-drug interactions: Underlying molecular mechanisms
437 involving the nuclear pregnane X receptor. *Ann Clin Microbiol Antimicrob* **2006**; 5:3. Available at:
438 <http://ann-clinmicrob.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1476-0711-5-3>. Accessed 8 February 2021.
- 439 32. Okazaki F, Tsuji Y, Seto Y, Ogami C, Yamamoto Y, To H. Effects of a rifampicin pre-treatment on
440 linezolid pharmacokinetics. *PLoS One* **2019**; 14:1–8.
- 441 33. Hashimoto S, Honda K, Fujita K, et al. Effect of coadministration of rifampicin on the pharmacokinetics of
442 linezolid: clinical and animal studies. *J Pharm Heal Care Sci* **2018**; 4:1–9.
- 443 34. Egle H, Trittler R, Kümmerer K, Lemmen SW. Linezolid and Rifampin: Drug Interaction Contrary to
444 Expectations? *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **2005**; 77:451–453. Available at:
445 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1016/j.clpt.2005.01.020>. Accessed 3 November 2022.
- 446 35. Imperial MZ, Nedelman JR, Conradie F, Savic RM. Proposed Linezolid Dosing Strategies to Minimize
447 Adverse Events for Treatment of Extensively Drug-Resistant Tuberculosis. *Clin Infect Dis* **2022**; 74:1736–
448 1747. Available at: <https://academic.oup.com/cid/article/74/10/1736/6380680>.
- 449 36. Tietjen AK, Kroemer N, Cattaneo D, Baldelli S, Wicha SG. Population pharmacokinetics and target
450 attainment analysis of linezolid in multidrug-resistant tuberculosis patients. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* **2021**; :1–
451 10.
- 452 37. Alghamdi WA, Al-Shaer MH, An G, et al. Population Pharmacokinetics of Linezolid in Tuberculosis
453 Patients: Dosing Regimen Simulation and Target Attainment Analysis. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **2020**;
454 64. Available at: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1177/0091270009337947>.
- 455 38. Kamp J, Bolhuis MS, Tiberi S, et al. Simple strategy to assess linezolid exposure in patients with multi-
456 drug-resistant and extensively-drug-resistant tuberculosis. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* **2017**; 49:688–694.
457 Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2017.01.017>.
- 458 39. McGee B, Dietze R, Hadad DJ, et al. Population Pharmacokinetics of Linezolid in Adults with Pulmonary
459 Tuberculosis. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **2009**; 53:3981–3984. Available at:
460 <https://journals.asm.org/doi/10.1128/AAC.01378-08>.
- 461 40. Meagher AK, Forrest A, Rayner CR, Birmingham MC, Schentag JJ. Population pharmacokinetics of

- 462 linezolid in patients treated in a compassionate-use program. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **2003**; 47:548–
463 553.
- 464 41. Plock N, Buerger C, Joukhadar C, Kljucar S, Kloft C. Does linezolid inhibit its own metabolism? -
465 Population pharmacokinetics as a tool to explain the observed nonlinearity in both healthy volunteers and
466 septic patients. *Drug Metab Dispos* **2007**; 35:1816–1823.
- 467 42. Mockeliunas L, Keutzer L, Sturkenboom MGG, et al. Model-Informed Precision Dosing of Linezolid in
468 Patients with Drug-Resistant Tuberculosis. *Pharmaceutics* **2022**; 14:753. Available at:
469 <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-4923/14/4/753>.
- 470 43. Reiber H. Dynamics of brain-derived proteins in cerebrospinal fluid. *Clin Chim Acta* **2001**; 310:173–186.
- 471 44. Reiber H. Proteins in cerebrospinal fluid and blood: Barriers, CSF flow rate and source-related dynamics.
472 *Restor Neurol Neurosci* **2003**; 21:79–96.
- 473 45. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture
474 (REDCap)-A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research
475 informatics support. *J Biomed Inform* **2009**; 42:377–381. Available at:
476 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010>.
- 477 46. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, et al. The REDCap consortium: Building an international community of
478 software platform partners. *J Biomed Inform* **2019**; 95:103208. Available at:
479 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2019.103208>.
- 480

TABLES

Table 1 Clinical characteristics

	Median (Min. – Max.) or no. (%)	
	Visit Day 3 (n = 30)	Visit Day 28 (n = 17)
Males	18 (60%)	11 (65%)
Age (years)	40 (27 – 56)	37 (27 – 51)
Weight (kg)	58 (30 – 96)	61 (37 – 81)
Height (m) ^{a,c}	1.61 (1.48 – 1.80)	1.61 (1.57 – 1.80)
Fat-free mass (kg) ^{b,c}	45 (30 – 59)	48 (32 – 60)
Serum creatinine (mmol/L)	61 (27 – 87)	50 (34 – 86)
4-beta hydroxy-cholesterol to cholesterol ratio (.) ^d	0.000150 (0.0000300 – 0.000652)	0.000262 (0.0000474 – 0.000529)
Daily linezolid oral dose:		
1200 mg	30	10
600 mg	0	7
Duration of rifampicin treatment (days) ^e	5 (0 – 7)	30 (27 – 38)
CSF total protein (g/L)	1.46 (0.310 – 55.0)	0.750 (0.220 – 2.19)
CSF albumin (g/L)	3.32 (0.93 – 23.34)	4.47 (0.46 – 11.41)
CSF glucose (mmol/L)	2.9 (1.0 – 5.3)	3.2 (2.2 – 3.6)
Antiretroviral therapy (ART):		
Previous ART	11 (37%)	6 (35%)
ART Naïve	10 (33%)	5 (29%)
On ART	9 (30%)	6 (35%)

^a Heights were missing for 18/30 (60%) participants; The missing heights were imputed based on sex and weight according the details provided in the supplementary file.

^b Fat-free mass was calculated based on sex, weight, and height according to the formula in Janmahasatian *et al.* [21](#)

^c The median (min – max) values reported here are for the non-missing values (i.e., it does not include the imputed values).

^d The ratio of 4β-OHC to cholesterol was missing in 4 and 3 participants on day 3 and day 28, respectively.

^e This refers to the total number of days since the start of treatment which was ~1-3 days before the investigational product initiation date; Participants were on standard-dose (10 mg/kg) rifampicin when starting treatment and then switched to high-dose (35 mg/kg) rifampicin with the start of the study.

Table 2 Final population pharmacokinetic parameter estimates for linezolid in plasma and lumbar cerebrospinal fluid

Parameter	Estimate (95% confidence interval)^a
Maximal clearance, CL_{max} (L/h) ^b	7.25 (6.09 – 8.86)
Michaelis-Menten constant, km (mg/L)	27.2 (16.0 – 46.4)
Volume of distribution, V (L) ^b	40.8 (37.9 – 43.6)
Bioavailability, F (.)	1 Fixed
Mean transit time, MTT (h)	0.211 (0.112 – 0.342)
No. of absorption transit compartments, NN (.)	5.68 (2.36 – 11.8)
Absorption rate constant, ka (h ⁻¹)	1.21 (0.831 – 1.76)
Proportional error plasma (%)	21.5 (18.8 – 24.7)
Additive error plasma (mg/L) ^d	0.173 (0.0379 – 0.355)
Between-subject variability (BSV) in CL_{max} (%)	9.60 (3.44 – 13.9)
Between-visit variability (BVV) in CL_{max} (%)	20.3 (15.3 – 26.9)
Between-occasion variability (BOV) in ka (%)	87.9 (66.4 – 110)
BOV in MTT (%)	110 (75.8 - 144)
Equilibration rate constant to CSF, $k_{plasma-CSF}$ (h ⁻¹) ^e	0.198 (0.0849 – 0.340)
Maximal pseudo-partition coefficient to CSF, PPC_{max} (.)	0.365 (0.238 – 0.566)
CSF protein at which PPC_{max} is reached, $CSF\ protein_{max}$ (g/L) ^f	1.18 (0.730 – 1.90)
Proportional error CSF (%)	91.5 (63.3 – 151)
Additive error CSF (mg/L) ^d	0.02 Fixed

^a Values in parentheses are the 95% confidence interval, computed with sampling importance resampling (SIR) on the final model.

^b The values of CL_{max} and V were allometrically scaled, so the typical values reported here refer to the typical participant, i.e. a median FFM of 45 kg.

^d The estimate of the additive component of the error was not significantly different from its lower boundary of 20% of LLOQ, so it was fixed to this value.

^e Corresponds to an equilibration half-life of 3.45 (2.13 - 7.33) h

^f For $CSF\ protein < CSF\ protein_{max}$ (i.e., the *breakpoint*): $PPC_i = PPC_{max} \cdot (slope \cdot (CSF\ protein - breakpoint))$, where the *breakpoint* was estimated to be 1.18 mg/mL, and the *slope* was calculated to be 0.847 from the following equation: $slope = (amplitude - intercept) / (breakpoint - 0)$, where the *intercept* and *amplitude* were fixed to 0 and 1, respectively. For $CSF\ protein \geq CSF\ protein_{max}$: $PPC_i = PPC_{max}$. The *PPC-CSF protein* relationship is depicted in **Figure 2**, and more details are provided in the supplementary file.

Table 3 Linezolid model-derived area under the curve for 24 hours and concentrations at 24 hours post-dose

Median (Min. – Max.)				
	Plasma		Cerebrospinal fluid	
Daily oral dose	1200 mg (n = 40)	600 mg (n = 7)	1200 mg (n = 40)	600 mg (n = 7)
AUC_{0-24h} (mg · h/L)	278 (87.3 - 334)	93.7 (66.7 - 167)	81.6 (19.7 - 235)	24.0 (6.55 - 56.8)
C_{24} (mg/L)	1.69 (0.154 - 13.5)	0.406 (0.061 - 1.67)	1.32 (0.327 - 6.48)	0.369 (0.050 - 1.02)

FIGURES




Figure 1: Schematic representation of the final model. k_{tr} is the rate constant for the drug passage through the transit compartments, $k_{Plasma-CSF}$, equilibration rate constant plasma-cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) which describes how soon the change in plasma is reflected in the CSF; $PPC_{Plasma-CSF}$, the pseudo-partition coefficient which represents the ratio of drug in CSF to the plasma.




Figure 2: The relationship of *PPC* vs the CSF protein level using the piece-wise (broken-stick) function. The solid line represents the median and the shaded areas represent the uncertainty around the estimates of the breakpoint (the maximal CSF protein value at which *PPCmax* is reached) and the calculated slope. The dashed line depicts the extrapolated part of the *PPC*-CSF protein relationship for CSF protein values outside the range observed in the study cohort (The lowest observed value was 0.22 mg/mL). The red ticks represent the values of CSF protein observed in our cohort (values above 3 were truncated for better figure visibility).




Figure 3: Simulated typical concentration-time profiles for plasma and cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) for the 1200 mg and 600 mg oral daily dose of linezolid. The solid and dashed lines represent the median for the plasma and CSF, respectively and the shaded areas represent the 90% confidence intervals. The horizontal dotted line indicates the wild-type minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) value of linezolid for *M. tuberculosis*.




Figure 4: Box and whisker plots showing the secondary model-derived exposure parameters, AUC_{0-24h} and concentration at 24 hours post-dose (C_{24h}) stratified by dose. The dots represent individual values; whiskers are the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles ($n = 7$ for 600 mg and 40 (30 on day 3 plus 10 on day 28) for 1200 mg).