Phenotypic models of drug-drug-gene interactions mediated by cytochrome drug-metabolizing enzymes

Roberto Viviani[1,2], Judith Berres[3], Julia C. Stingl[3]

1 Institute of Psychology, University of Innsbruck, Austria

2 Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy III, University of Ulm, Germany

3 Institute of Clinical Pharmacology, University Hospital RWTH Aachen, Germany

Correspondence: roberto.viviani@uibk.ac.at

Abstract

Genetic polymorphisms in drug metabolizing enzymes and drug-drug interactions are major sources of inadequate drug exposure and ensuing adverse effects or insufficient responses. The current challenge of assessing drug-drug gene interactions (DDGI) for the development of precise dose adjustment recommendation systems is to take into account both simultaneously. Here, we analyze the static models of DDGI from *in vivo* data and focus on the concept of phenoconversion to model inhibition and genetic polymorphisms jointly. These models are applicable to datasets where pharmacokinetic information is missing and are being used in clinical support systems and consensus dose adjustment guidelines. We show that all such models can be handled by the same formal framework, and that models that differ at first sight are all versions of the same linear phenoconversion model. This model includes the linear pharmacogenetic and inhibition models as special cases. We highlight present challenges in this endeavour and the open issues for future research in developing DDGI models for recommendation systems.

Phenotypic models of drug-drug-gene interactions mediated by cytochrome drug-metabolizing enzymes

Introduction

Drug interactions and the ensuing side effects are an important clinical and public health issue. Major reasons of side effects are individual variability in enzymatic drug clearance due to genetic polymorphisms in drug metabolizing enzymes (DMEs, Stingl et al. 2013), and to drug-drug interactions (Tornio et al. 2019) causing changes in drug metabolism. In patients treated for depression, such changes may affect up to 25% of patients or more, highlighting the importance of this issue in personalizing treatment (Preskorn et al. 2013; Gloor et al. 2022; see also Mostafa et al. 2021).

Genetic polymorphisms in cytochrome DMEs such as CYP2C9, CYP2C19 and CYP2D6 lead to altered enzymatic activity that affects the metabolism of about one third of drugs on the market, especially psychoactive drugs (Ingelman-Sundberg 2004). Quantitative estimates of clearance changes for individual drug dosing (Kirchheiner et al. 2001, 2004; Stingl et al. 2013) and consensus-guided recommendations (such as caution in carriers of a genetic variant and a susceptible medication) have long been available (for an overview of current guidelines, see Abdullar-Koolmes et al. 2021). A recent study has shown that the systematic adoption of a pharmacogenetic recommendation system in the clinic may lead to a 30% reduction in adverse drug reactions relative to usual clinical practice (Swen et al. 2023). As in common in the literature, we refer here to carriers of (wildtype) alleles associated with typical enzyme activity as EMs (extensive metabolizers), and carriers of variants with no activity as PMs (poor metabolizers).

Drug-drug interactions may arise through diverse mechanisms, but an important one arises from increased drug exposure following inhibition of DME activity (*inhibitors*). Since characterization of inhibiting capacity of DME is mandatory to obtain market authorization approval from regulators, specific warnings on drug interactions are included in drug labels and are included in clinical decision support systems.

The challenge for the next generation of recommendation systems consists in using information on genetic variants and on drug-drug interactions (such as those ensuing from inhibition) simultaneously. The interplay between these two sources of changes in drug exposure has long been recognized and termed drug-drug gene interactions (DDGI; for reviews, see Bahar et al. 2017; Storelli et al. 2018). There is a wide consensus in the field that the extent of the inhibition may vary depending on the phenotype (Cicali et al. 2021), but different methods are in use to combine pharmacogenetic effects and inhibition. Our purpose here is to review the approaches to jointly model pharmacogenetic effects and inhibition, a key issue to predict DDGI.

We focus here on static models estimated entirely from *in vivo* data, including those obtained in clinical settings such as therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM). Such data do not provide information that enables estimating pharmacokinetic curves, as in

pharmacokinetic models of DDGI (Vieira et al. 2014a; Storelli et al. 2019). Static models have the advantage of allowing us the systematic use of a wide range of *in vivo* data, including clinical data, in a meta-analytic framework. Furthermore, by covering many substances and DMEs at once, these models are being incorporated in recommendation systems and in consensus guidelines. We refer to this static modelling approach as *phenotypic modelling*.

One possible starting point for static models of DDGIs is the notion, formalized also in regulatory guidance (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration 2020), that in real-world assessments changes in substrate exposure may be all viewed from the standpoint of changes in DME activity (Gibbs et al. 2006). Enzyme inhibition from an interacting drug may be characterized as *phenoconversion* to a phenotype with lower enzymatic activity. For example, complete inhibition of a DME in an EM individual may be described as phenoconversion from EM to the PM phenotype. Hence, an important task for phenotypic models of joint effects of pharmacogenetic variants and drug-drug interactions is to verify empirically that joint modelling can be based on this notion.

Before introducing models of phenoconversion, we will preliminarily examine existing phenotypic models of effects of genetic polymorphisms on drug metabolism and of inhibition from drug-drug interactions, taken separately. These are potentially very wide fields, and our exposition will necessarily be limited to the aspects that are relevant to formulate the models of joint effects that follow. Importantly, we will show that a common formal framework unifies all phenotypic models of pharmacogenetic effects and inhibition. This may justify its extension to joint models of both pharmacogenetic and inhibition effects on drug metabolism. Our purpose will be to express the variety of existing approaches in modelling phenoconversion and DDGIs through this unified framework.

Methods

Using Google Scholar, models for drug-drug interactions were systematically investigated by looking at the literature on drug-drug-gene interactions (keyword “drug-drug-gene interaction”; PubMed gave no hits with this keyword or with “DDGI”), retrieving 345 studies. Studies were retained that included static models and mechanistic static approaches, resulting in the selection of 11 studies and 5 distinct models. Additionally, software programs and online tools for drug interactions and subsequent dose recommendations used by pharmacies, physicians and hospitals were considered and the sources of their modelling identified.

The static models thus identified were algebraically examined to identify reciprocal relationships. The analysis also considered the elementary pure pharmacogenetic or inhibition models on which the identified drug-drug-gene interaction models were based. The outcome of this analysis is detailed in the Results section, while the Appendix contains the algebraic derivations.

Results

Phenotypic models of pharmacogenetic effects on metabolism

Early approaches to estimate effects of pharmacogenetic effects on drug exposure were based on computing separate averages of drug clearance measurements in every combination of phenotype and drugs (Kirchheiner et al. 2001, 2004; Stingl et al. 2013). While intuitive and easily interpretable, these models made no use of knowledge about

the relationship between measurements of the same drug and phenotype, with possible negative consequences on the efficiency of estimates and their generalization capacity.

An insight emerging from this work was that when the effects of genetic polymorphisms are assessed on clearance ratios of the variant phenotype and the wild-type extensive metabolizer type the resulting relation is at least approximately linear. This means that, if the activity scores of an allelic combination are known, one can use linear regression to estimate the predicted clearance ratio from the activity score AS (Stingl et al. 2022). Activity scores, introduced by Gaedigk et al. (2008) as estimates of DME activity predicted from the genotype, assign a value of zero to the PM phenotype (no metabolic capacity) and increasing values to phenotypes with increasing capacity. Activity scores model only the genetic variants that translate into changes in enzyme capacity.

To aid intuition in showing the relationship between pharmacogenetic effects and linear regression, it may be useful to introduce relative activity scores RAS, which are activity scores rebased such that the value for EMs is zero and positive and negative scores reflect increased or decreased enzyme activity: $RAS = AS - AS_{\mathrm{EM}}$, $AS = RAS - RAS_{\mathrm{PM}}$ (here, RAS_{PM} is the relative activity score of PMs and AS_{EM} the activity score of EMs). With this substitution, the relationship between clearance and enzyme activity may be expressed in its simplest form,

$$\frac{CL_{\mathrm{XM}}}{CL_{\mathrm{EM}}} = 1 + F_{\mathrm{D}} \times RAS \tag{1}$$

Here, $\frac{CL_{\mathrm{XM}}}{CL_{\mathrm{EM}}}$ is the clearance ratio between carriers of a variant phenotype XM and EM individual with typical enzyme activity, as reported in pharmacogenetic studies. In the right term, F_{D} represents the importance of the DME in question in the metabolism of a specific drug D, which also determines the extent to which polymorphism of the DME affect its clearance. Negative RAS values, representing reduced metabolic capacity, lead to negative change estimates in drug clearance relative to the baseline value of unity, which refers to the clearance ratio of EMs. Changes in the opposite directions ensue from positive RAS values. Given RAS, a linear regression with a fixed intercept may be used to estimate the coefficient F_{D}, which gives the slope of the straight line representing the relationship between activity scores and predicted clearance ratios (see Figure 1A for an example).

To better understand F_{D}, let us scale the predictor variable in this regression, i.e. the activity scores, such that the difference between EMs and PMs is unity and $RAS_{\mathrm{PM}} = -1$. Solving for F_{D} in PMs, one obtains

$$F_{\mathrm{D}} = \frac{CL_{\mathrm{EM}} - CL_{\mathrm{PM}}}{CL_{\mathrm{EM}}}$$

From this, we see that with this scaling of activity scores, F_{D} becomes an estimate of the fractional contribution of the DME to the clearance of drug D from *in vivo* data.

Relative to the earlier models, this approach offers the advantage that only one coefficient per drug is estimated by linear regression from the information from all phenotype groups, whose data are pooled in the estimate to gain efficiency. After the fit, predictions of changes in clearance ratios may be computed also for allelic combinations for which data are missing if the activity scores are known. Modelling all drugs together also allows testing effects of the types of studies in the database and verify that they do not lead to systematic bias.

Tod et al. (2011) proposed a model of pharmacogenetic effects of CYP2D6 polymorphism on drug metabolism, that appears to differ from the one presented here. However, expressed in terms of clearance ratios, this model may be shown to be equivalent to the model of eq. 1 (for details of the model and proof, see Appendix A1). Both models assume that the fractional contribution of the DME in the metabolic pathway of the drug remains the same for different phenotypes. This assumption is not likely to hold if a DME is the primary metabolizer of a drugs in EMs, as other DMEs will take over metabolism in PMs. However, for the majority of drugs linearity can be verified empirically (Stingl et al. 2022). Furthermore, both models assume that all polymorphic alleles and their activity scores are known.

When appropriate, dose adjustments may be based directly on estimated changes in metabolic clearance (i.e., a 50% fractional reduction in clearance may be compensated by a 50% reduction in doses). This remains the case for all models that follow and estimate changes in clearance ratios.

Static models of inhibition from *in vivo* data

Models of inhibition from *in vivo* data adapted mechanistic static models, i.e. static models predicting changes in metabolism from *in vitro* data (for comprehensive treatments, see Fahmi et al. 2009; Guest et al. 2011; Vieira et al. 2014b). One such model was proposed by Ohno et al. (2007) for the inhibition of CYP3A4, based on several simplifying assumptions, including equal intestinal availabilities:

$$\frac{AUC^*}{AUC} = \frac{1}{1 - CR \times IR}$$

where the asterisk denotes the AUC in the inhibited condition, CR is the fraction contributed by the DME in the hepatic metabolism of the drug, and IR is an inhibition rate ranging from zero (no inhibition) to unity (full inhibition). Instead of estimating IR from *in vitro* data predicting the hepatic concentrations from dosage, Ohno et al. (2007) observed that CR and IR can estimated from *in vivo* AUC or clearance data when either one of these values is known. Therefore, they bootstrapped their analysis by setting CR to unity in a selective CYP3A4 substrate and progressively deriving CR and IR from a database of studies of drug-drug interactions. Departing from other mechanistic static models, Ohno et al. (2007) argued that IR, estimated from *in vivo* data, may be an acceptable index of inhibition irrespective of the mechanism through which inhibition ensues. Similarly, other sources of variation in the prediction from *in vitro* to *in vivo* inhibition may be overcame by using *in vivo* data directly. Over the years, this model was updated with the progressive availability of more data on drug interactions (Hisaka et al. 2010a, b; Loue and Tod 2014; Gabriel et al. 2016; Di Paolo et al. 2021, 2022). Tod et al. (2016) showed that the fit of this model compared favourably with that of the PBPK approach.

As noted by Ohno et al. (2007), in selective inhibitors of polymorphic DMEs CR may also be estimated from pharmacogenetic studies, since in full inhibition as well as in PMs the activity of the DME is zero. This relation may be used to derive an equivalent expression of the model by Ohno et al. (2007) in terms of the pharmacogenetic model of clearance ratios (eq. 1) introduced in the previous section (for derivation, see Appendix 2):

$$\frac{CL^*}{CL} = 1 + F_{\mathrm{D}} \times RAS_{\mathrm{PM}} \times IR \qquad (2)$$

This model of inhibition takes the same linear form as the pharmacogenetic model (with $RAS_{\mathrm{PM}} \times IR$ replacing the activity score). Intuitively, it expresses the inhibition as a fraction of the maximal reduction in clearance as one may observe in the PM phenotype. With some terminological abuse, this may be viewed as a phenotypic model of inhibition in the sense that it characterizes a single quantity observable *in vivo* irrespective of the mechanisms that determine it.

Phenotypic models of phenoconversion

A seminal work by Borges and colleagues (Borges et al. 2006) provided evidence that drug-drug inhibition differs depending on the DME activity predicted by *CYP2D6* genetic variants. This work and its sequel (Borges et al. 2010) were at the origin of the most common approach to combining information on pharmacogenetic variants and inhibitors (see the discussion by Cicali et al. 2021). Before discussing phenoconversion models that followed this work, we will introduce here a formal specification of possible alternatives.

In the phenotypic modelling framework described above, phenoconversion may be modelled by a function $f(IR, RAS)$ which, given the *RAS* as predicted by the allelic composition of the individual (here referred to as the *genetic activity score*) and IR, representing the inhibition arising from an inhibitor, returns a *phenoconverted activity score* that may be used in the place of *RAS* in the pharmacogenetic model of eq. 1:

$$\frac{CL^{*}_{\mathrm{XM}}}{CL_{\mathrm{EM}}} = 1 + F_{\mathrm{D}} \times f(IR, RAS)$$

Note that the phenoconversion function makes no use of information on F_{D}. This is an important assumption, as it means that data from the importance of a DME in the metabolic pathway of a drug and data on the capacity of the inhibitor contribute independently to the changes in clearance. All phenoconversion models in the literature make this assumption. As a further consequence, the model remains linear in the phenoconverted activity score. Hence, under this assumption the remaining issue concerns the form of the phenoconversion function *f*. There are several conceivable possibilities.

1. The first is to obtain the phenoconverted activity score by subtracting a quantity related to inhibition to the genotypic *RAS*, bounded below at the PM phenotype. This is equivalent to shifting the line predicting the dose recommendation by a fixed offset to the right (Figure 1B, *offset model*). This bound introduces a non-linearity.
2. A second possibility is that *IR* affects the genotypic *RAS* by a multiplicative factor. In this model, the slope of the line estimating the dose adjustment is modified by inhibition (Figure 1C, *proportional model*). By adjusting *RAS* multiplicatively, this model allows for the effect of inhibition to differ in the UM allelic configuration and in lower activity configurations while maintaining linearity.
3. A third possibility is that *IR* and the genotypic *RAS* interact in determining phenoconversion, or that there is an additional offset term, again bounded below by the PM phenotype. This would lead to a non-linear relationship between the genotypic *RAS* and the predicted clearance ratio (Figure 1D, *nonlinear model*).



Figure 1. A: example of a regression of clearance ratio data from pharmacogenetic studies of escitalopram on relative activity scores (expressed on the *x* axis by the CYP2C19 phenotype). The slope of the fitted straight line represents the importance of the pathway of a polymorphic DME in the metabolism of this drug. The radius of the circles is the sample size of individual datapoints (from Stingl et al. 2022). B: the offset phenoconversion model is equivalent to a horizontal shift of this straight line to the right to an extent representing inhibition, bounded below by the adjustment for the PM phenotype. C: the proportional model uses a multiplicative coefficient to change the slope of this line. D: the non-linear model gives a more flexible prediction of phenoconversion. PM, IM, EM, RM, UM: poor, intermediate, extensive, rapid, and ultrarapid metabolizer phenotypes.

Models and evidence on phenoconversion in the literature

A summary of phenoconversion models is given in Table 1, together with existing clinical support systems. Perhaps because of their apparent simplicity, offset models are well represented in the literature. The first report of DDGI described, without formalizing it, data compatible with an offset model (Borges et al. 2006). An offset model was used by Mostafa et al. (2019) to evaluate the potential impact of DDGIs in actionable variants in an Australian sample. Bousman et al. (2021) shift the phenotype down to the next lower phenotype activity for moderate inhibitors, and to PM in strong inhibitors.

Table 1. Phenotypic models of DDGI used in the literature

Study	DME	Method	Algorithm	Support system
Borges et al. 2010	CYP2D6	Proportional	Multiply activity score by zero in strong inhibitors, by 0.5 in moderate inhibitors	
		Non-linear	Interaction between activity scores and inhibition capacity, with larger inhibitory effects in high enzyme capacity individuals	
Tod et al. 2013	CYP2D6	Proportional	Linear phenoconversion	
Goutelle et al. 2013	CYP2C19	Proportional	Linear phenoconversion	
Castellan et al. 2013	CYP2C9	Proportional	Linear phenoconversion	
Gabriel et al. 2016	CYP1A2	Proportional	Linear phenoconversion	
Fermier et al. 2018	CYP2C19 CYP2C9 CYP2D6	Proportional	Linear phenoconversion	www.ddi-predictor.org
Mostafa et al. 2019	CYP2D6 CYP2C19 CYP2C9	Offset	Two phenotype groups towards PM in moderate and strong inhibitors	
Lesche et al. 2020	CYP1A2 CYP2C19 CYP2D6	Proportional	Multiply activity score by zero in strong inhibitors, by 0.5 in moderate inhibitors	
Mostafa et al. 2021	CYP2D6 CYP2C19 CYP2C9	Proportional	Multiply activity score by zero in strong inhibitors, by 0.5 in moderate inhibitors	

Bousman et al. 2021	CYP2B6 CYP2C19 CYP2C9 CYP2D6 CYP3A5	Offset	One phenotype group towards PM in moderate inhibitors, PM in strong inhibitors	www.sequence2script.com
Cicali et al. 2021	CYP2D6	Proportional	Multiply activity score by zero in strong inhibitors, by 0.5 in moderate inhibitors	precisionmedicine.ufhealth.org/ phenoconversion-calculator/

All offset models are bounded below by the PM phenotype. All sites accessed 21.10.2023.

However, most of the phenotypic models in the literature are based on the suggestion of Borges et al. (2010), who evaluated two models of phenoconversion, corresponding to proportional and nonlinear phenoconversion functions, using data on the inhibition of CYP2D6 by concomitant antidepressant medication in tamoxifen-treated breast cancer patients. They concluded that the nonlinear model failed to appreciably improve the fit, advocating a proportional adjustment of activity scores by a factor of 0.5 in moderate inhibitors, and zero in strong inhibitors. This proportional model was used in most subsequent work (Lesche et al. 2020; Mostafa et al. 2021; Cicali et al. 2021), and was also adopted in CPIC guidelines (Crews et al. 2011, 2014, 2021; Hicks et al. 2016; Bousman et al. 2023).

A series of studies by the group of Michel Tod in Lyon, culminating in the systematic proposal by Fernier et al. (2018), proposed a model that stands out in that it was developed as an extension of the model by Ohno et al. (2007), thus explicitly encompassing models of both inhibition and genetic polymorphisms (Tod et al. 2013). In the framework adopted here, the phenoconversion function may be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} f(IR, RAS) &= RAS - IR \times (RAS - RAS_{\mathrm{PM}}) \\ &= (AS - AS_{\mathrm{EM}}) - IR \times AS \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

(see Appendix A3 for derivation). When there is no inhibition, RAS is left unaltered, and decreases proportionally to IR otherwise. $RAS - RAS_{\mathrm{PM}}$ is the activity score AS, which is multiplied by IR in the equation. From this we see that this is a proportional model.

This *linear phenoconversion* model combines the linearity of pure pharmacogenetic effects and inhibition in EMs of the previous models and contains them as particular cases. The proportional phenoconversion proposed by Borges et al. (2010) is also a particular case of this model, obtained by setting the IR of moderate inhibitors to 0.5 and strong inhibitors to 1. The relationship between these models is illustrated in Figure 2A.

All straight lines modelling effects of phenotype groups on clearance meet at the PM phenotype, irrespective of the extent of inhibition. The value of IR moves downward the slope of the straight line of the pharmacogenetic model, but such that all slopes fan out of the PM phenotype. The maximal adjustment occurs at full inhibition ($IR = 1$), in which case this line is flat at the RAS_{PM} level irrespective of phenotype. In EMs, where RAS is zero, one recovers the inhibition model of eq. 2. Figure 2B shows the effect of a change in F_{D}.



Figure 2. A: the linear phenoconversion model (eq. 3) includes several models as particular cases. B: effect of a reduction in the importance of the DME in the metabolic pathway. The two coefficients of the linear phenoconversion model change the slope of the linear relationship between phenotype and clearance ratio, but the changes pivot around the EM in one case and around the PM phenotype in the other.

The linear phenoconversion models is highly constrained. With only two parameters, it is possible in principle to predict DDGIs from pharmacogenetic and inhibition studies without necessarily collecting data on their joint effects (of course, data on joint effects are needed to verify the correctness of the model). Borges et al. (2010) remains the only study to have evaluated alternative models, and the results of their comparison appear to validate the linear phenoconversion model, as their proportional model is one such. However, in the presence of strong inhibitors the predictions of all models may be very similar, as the clearance is bounded below at the PM level.

The model assumptions we identified in this analysis are summarized in Table 2. Their implications are further discussed in the next section.

Table 2. Important model assumptions

Assumption	Model	Consequences of violation of assumptions
Activity scores only model polymorphisms affecting DME activity	Pharmacogenetic	Polymorphisms affecting DME affinity require separate modelling
Polymorphisms affecting DME activity are known	Pharmacogenetic	Yet undiscovered alleles not accounted for in activity scores
Activity scores of genetic polymorphisms are known	Pharmacogenetic	Lack of precision in activity scores may lead to biased estimates of pharmacogenetic effects or optimistic confidence intervals of such effects
The fractional contribution F_D of a DME in metabolism is constant across phenotypes	Pharmacogenetic	In IMs and PMs, the relation between phenotypes and clearance may be not linear in selective substrates
The fractional contribution F_D of a DME in metabolism is constant across inhibition rates	Inhibition	The relation between inhibition and clearance may be not linear in selective substrates
The fractional contribution F_D of a DME in metabolism is not affected by inhibition modalities	Inhibition	The fractional contribution of a DME may be altered by inhibition or induction of other DMEs
Phenoconversion assumption	Phenoconversion	Situation where inhibition influences F_D (as in multiple inhibitors) or when pharmacogenetic variants affect inhibition properties

Open issues and perspectives

Pharmacogenetic models generally assume linearity in the activity scores. However, this assumption may be violated when a drug is metabolized by one DME as major metabolic pathway, because in PMs other DMEs may take over the metabolism of the drug. This causes a non-linearity in the response of low-capacity phenotypes. This situation, however, needs not invalidate the phenoconversion model. Under the phenoconversion assumption, while the relationship between activity scores and clearance is now non-linear, it may be applied to the phenoconverted activity scores as before.

Inhibition is more difficult to model than genetic polymorphism. When inhibitors affect multiple DMEs simultaneously (Isoherranen et al. 2012), it may be challenging to model the simultaneous effects. The required assumption would be that the fractional contributions of the DMEs, estimated when each was affected in isolation, apply unaltered in this situation, and that *IR* for each involved enzyme may be estimated correctly from the inhibition model.

The phenoconversion assumptions formalizes the notion that the fractional contribution F_{D} is not affected by inhibition and viceversa. This assumption seems reasonable in the simple situation of an inhibitor and a "victim drug". However, the assumption may be violated in other cases. For example, inhibition may be affected by the pharmacogenetic variant itself if the inhibitor is metabolized by a polymorphic DME. Another example is reciprocal inhibition between two drugs metabolized by polymorphic DMEs, creating a reinforcing loop. These problems will require assessing the model fit empirically, and whether the phenoconversion assumption applies also in such cases. Nevertheless, the clarification of the form of the phenocopying function in the simple situation of an inhibitor and a "victim drug" remains a necessary first step of any effort to build more complex interaction models.

Acknowledgments

Roberto Viviani is supported by an ERA-PERMED grant (project ArtiPro) of the FWF Austrian Science Fund (grant number I 5903). Julia Stingl is supported by an ERA-PERMED grant (project ArtiPro) of the BMBF (grant number: 01KU2212). The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Appendix

A1. Tod's model of effects of genotypes

Tod et al. (2011) presented a phenotypic model of drug exposure in DME genetic polymorphisms (eq. 1, p. 583). This model adapted the approach of Ohno et al. to pharmacogenetic data. The model refers to the ratio of the areas under the curve (AUC) between the genetic variant phenotype XM and the extensive metabolizer EM:

$$\frac{AUC_{\mathrm{XM}}}{AUC_{\mathrm{EM}}} = \frac{1}{1 - CR_{\mathrm{EM}} \times (1 - FA)}$$

where CR_{EM} (called the contribution ratio) is the fraction of the apparent drug clearance due to the DME at hand, and FA (fractional activity) is the fraction of activity in the XM phenotype deriving from the mutated alleles, relative to the activity of the reference genotype (EM). This quantity is additive in the number of alleles, in the sense that the FA of an allelic composition is the average of the contribution of the individual alleles.

Rewriting in terms of clearance,

$$\frac{CL_{\mathrm{XM}}}{CL_{\mathrm{EM}}} = 1 - CR_{\mathrm{EM}} \times (1 - FA)$$

$$= 1 - CR_{\mathrm{EM}} + CR_{\mathrm{EM}} \times FA \qquad \text{(A1)}$$

One can see that this model is linear in the fractional activity FA. The clearance ratio is given by the sum of a baseline term, $1 - CR_{\mathrm{EM}}$, and a linear term, $CR_{\mathrm{EM}} \times FA$. Because CR_{EM} is a ratio (the contribution ratio of the DME), $1 - CR_{\mathrm{EM}}$ represents the contribution

ratio not due to the DME at hand. By converse, $CR_{\mathrm{EM}} \times FA$ is the contribution of the DME, weighted by the FA, which is an activity score. Even with two terms, there is only one parameter given the activity score, because CR_{EM} appears in both terms.

Comparison with the phenotypic model of Stingl et al. (2022)

The phenotypic model of Stingl et al. (2022) is linear and is fit by a linear regression with a constant intercept (see eq. 1 of the main text). Given the activity score, this model also has one parameter. Both models are linear but differ in that the former is expressed in terms of two ratios, CR_{EM} and FA, while in the latter RAS is the difference in activity of the enzyme as predicted by genotype, and F_{D} is estimated from the data. We now derive the relationship between these quantities.

In Tod's model, in PMs the fractional activity FA is zero, as PMs have no enzymatic activity. Hence, according to eq. (A1), the clearance ratio of PMs is

$$\frac{CL_{\mathrm{PM}}}{CL_{\mathrm{EM}}} = 1 - CR_{\mathrm{EM}}$$

In the model of Stingl et al. (eq. 1 of the main text), let RAS_{PM} be the relative activity scores of the PM phenotype. Then the clearance ratio of PMs is given by

$$\frac{CL_{\mathrm{PM}}}{CL_{\mathrm{EM}}} = 1 + F_{\mathrm{D}} \times RAS_{\mathrm{PM}}$$

Therefore, by equating the second terms of both equations and rearranging, the contribution ratio CR_{EM} may be given by

$$CR_{\mathrm{EM}} = F_{\mathrm{D}} \times -RAS_{\mathrm{PM}} \tag{A2}$$

For the purpose of their use in a linear model, as the one of Stingl et al. (2022), activity scores may be rescaled without changing the fit. To gain further insight on CR_{EM}, let the scale be that of the changes in induced by PMs, for example let a RAS negative unit express the contribution of two *2 alleles in CYP2C19 polymorphism. Then, when replacing RAS_{PM} with -1 in the last equation, we see that the coefficient of the linear model is on the same scale as CR_{EM}:

$$CR_{\mathrm{EM}} = F_{\mathrm{D}}$$

With this scaling of activity scores, F_{D} estimates the fractional contribution of the DME in the metabolism of the drug.

Let us now assume that the FA's in Tod's model and the RAS's in Stingl's model are known. The model by Tod et al. (eq. A1) may then be expressed in terms of F_{D} by replacing CR_{EM} according to eq. A2:

$$\frac{CL_{\mathrm{XM}}}{CL_{\mathrm{EM}}} = 1 - F_{\mathrm{D}} \times -RAS_{\mathrm{PM}} + (F_{\mathrm{D}} \times -RAS_{\mathrm{PM}}) \times FA \tag{A3}$$

Equating with the second term of the model of Stingl et al. (eq. 1 of the main text), we obtain

$$1 + F_{\mathrm{D}} \times RAS = 1 - F_{\mathrm{D}} \times -RAS_{\mathrm{PM}} + (F_{\mathrm{D}} \times -RAS_{\mathrm{PM}}) \times FA$$

which, solving for FA, gives

$$FA = \frac{F_{\mathrm{D}} \times RAS + F_{\mathrm{D}} \times -RAS_{\mathrm{PM}}}{F_{\mathrm{D}} \times -RAS_{\mathrm{PM}}}$$

$$= RAS/-RAS_{\mathrm{PM}} + 1 \qquad \text{(A4)}$$

We can see here that FA in the model of Tod's et al. is an activity score rescaled by minus the relative activity scores of PMs, and rebased such as to be unity in EMs.

Replacing the expression for FA (eq. A4) in the formula for the clearance ratio given above for the model of Tod et al. (eq. A3), one obtains

$$\frac{CL_{\mathrm{XM}}}{CL_{\mathrm{EM}}} = 1 - F_{\mathrm{D}} \times -RAS_{\mathrm{PM}} + F_{\mathrm{D}} \times -RAS_{\mathrm{PM}} \times (RAS/-RAS_{\mathrm{PM}} + 1)$$

$$= 1 - F_{\mathrm{D}} \times -RAS_{\mathrm{PM}} + F_{\mathrm{D}} \times RAS + F_{\mathrm{D}} \times -RAS_{\mathrm{PM}}$$

$$= 1 + F_{\mathrm{D}} \times RAS$$

which shows that, if FA's/RAS's are known, the models by Stingl et al. and Tod et al. are equivalent.

The model by Tod et al. relies on data *in vivo* from extensive and poor metabolizers or co-medication with inhibitors to estimate CR_{EM}. At a second stage, an empirical Bayesian approach was used to compute confidence intervals and extend predictions of other phenotypes. Beside the different DMEs, the study of Stingl et al. (2022) differs from Tod et al. in the use of Bayesian priors to obtain prudential estimates and credibility intervals of pharmacogenetic effects.

Both models assume linear kinetic and cannot be applied if the DME contribution of other enzymes differs in PM's and in other phenotypes.

A2. Ohno's model of inhibition

Denoting with an asterisk the inhibited condition, Ohno et al. (2007) proposed the following model (eq. 11, p. 46):

$$\frac{AUC^*}{AUC} = \frac{1}{1 - CR \times IR,}$$

where CR is the fraction contributed by the DME in the hepatic metabolism of the drug, and IR is the inhibition rate, ranging from zero (no inhibition) to unity (full ihnibition). Expressed in terms of clearance ratios, assuming equal intestinal availability in the inhibited and unaltered condition:

$$\frac{CL^*}{CL} = 1 - CR \times IR$$

CR is estimated from data where drug metabolism under full inhibition or in PMs is compared to the metabolism in the reference condition (no inhibitor or EMs, as appropriate). To establish the relationship of this model to the variables of the linear model of Stingl et al. (2022), we may therefore equate clearance in the conditions of full inhibition in Ohno's model (IR = 1) and clearance in PMs in the model of Stingl et al.:

$$\frac{CL^{\text{full}*}}{CL} = 1 - CR \times 1 = 1 + F_{\text{D}} \times RAS_{\text{PM}} = \frac{CL_{\text{PM}}}{CL_{\text{EM}}}$$

$$CR = F_{\text{D}} \times -RAS_{\text{PM}}$$

where we see that in Ohno's model CR has the same relationship to P_{DME} as in the pharmacogenetic model by Tod et al. of the previous section. Therefore, replacing CR in Ohno's model of inhibition expressed in terms of clearance ratios, we may also write

$$\frac{CL^*}{CL} = 1 + F_{\text{D}} \times RAS_{\text{PM}} \times IR \tag{A5}$$

This equation says that under full inhibition (IR = 1), the clearance ratio is that of PMs, and when $IR = 0$ (no inhibition), the clearance ratio is unity, i.e. the clearance is not affected. Intermediate values of IR give clearance ratios between PMs and unity. When P_{DME} is zero (the DME has no role in metabolizing the drug), then the clearance ratio is not altered by inhibiting the enzyme.

Note that the model is linear in IR. The clearance ratio decreases when inhibition is larger than zero because RAS_{PM} is negative. However, the clearance ratio cannot become negative because it is bounded below by the clearance ratios of PMs. Applied to an inducer, where IR < 0, the model can produce clearance ratios larger than unity, as it should.

To gain further insight on this model, let us encode the activity score of PMs as -1. In this case, P_{DME} estimates the magnitude of the change in clearance ratios in PMs, and the above expression simplifies to

$$\frac{CL^*}{CL} = 1 - F_{\text{D}} \times IR$$

We see that here IR encodes the fraction of the magnitude change in PM clearance ratio that is brought about by the inhibitor.

A3. Tod's model of joint effects of inhibitors and genotypes

The models by Tod et al. built on the inhibition model by Ohno et al. and is therefore not surprising that notions such as CR have the same meaning in both. Furthermore, as we have shown in the previous sections, both models can be expressed in terms of the linear model of Stingl et al. (2022). The model for the joint effects of inhibitors and genetic polymorphisms, reported in Tod et al. (2013), should therefore be amenable to the same unified treatment. Here, we also identify its phenoconversion function.

For two DMEs, the model proposed by Tod et al. (2013) is given by (eq. 2, p. 1243)

$$\frac{AUC^*_{\text{XM}}}{AUC_{\text{EM}}} = \frac{1}{CR_1 \times FA_1 \times (1 + IX_1) + CR_2 \times FA_2 \times (1 + IX_2) + (1 - CR_1 - CR_2)}$$

Here, the subscript refers to two DMEs, and IX ranges from 0 (no inhibition) to -1 (complete inhibition) and is positive in case of inducers. For inhibition, IX is defined analogously to Ohno's IR (see Tod et al. 2013, Appendix), but is inverted in sign.

Expressing the model in terms of clearance ratios, and replacing $IX = -IR$, we obtain

$$\frac{CL^*_{\mathrm{XM}}}{CL_{\mathrm{EM}}} = CR_1 \times FA_1 \times (1 - IR_1) + CR_2 \times FA_2 \times (1 - IR_2) + (1 - CR_1 - CR_2)$$

To identify the phenoconversion function implicit in this model, let us consider the case when only one enzyme is inhibited, and is the only polymorphic enzyme (i.e., $IR_2 = 0$, $FA_2 = 1$). Then we have

$$\frac{CL^*_{\mathrm{XM}}}{CL_{\mathrm{EM}}} = 1 - CR_1 + CR_1 \times FA_1 \times (1 - IR_1)$$

$$= 1 - CR_1 \times [1 - FA_1 \times (1 - IR_1)]$$

$$= 1 - CR_1 \times (1 - FA_1 + FA_1 \times IR_1)$$

Expressed in terms of F_{D} and *RAS*, and dropping the common subscript,

$$\frac{CL^*_{\mathrm{XM}}}{CL_{\mathrm{EM}}} = 1 - F_{\mathrm{D}} \times -RAS_{\mathrm{PM}} \times \left(\frac{-RAS}{-RAS_{\mathrm{PM}}} + IR + \frac{RAS}{-RAS_{\mathrm{PM}}} \times IR\right)$$

$$= 1 + F_{\mathrm{D}} \times RAS - F_{\mathrm{D}} \times -RAS_{\mathrm{PM}} \times IR - F_{\mathrm{D}} \times RAS \times IR$$

$$= 1 + F_{\mathrm{D}} \times [RAS - IR(RAS - RAS_{\mathrm{PM}})]$$

This shows that the phenoconversion function of the model is

$$f(IR, RAS) = RAS - IR(RAS - RAS_{\mathrm{PM}}) \qquad \text{(A6)}$$

References

Abdullar-Koolmes, H., van Keulen, A.M., Nijenhuis, M., Deneer, V.H.M., 2021. Pharmacogenetic guidelines: Overview and comparison of the DPWG, CPIC, CPNDS, and RNPGx guidelines. Front. Pharmacol. 11, doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2020.595219.

Bahar, M.A., Setiawan, D., Hak, E., Wilffert, B., 2017. Pharmacogenetics of drug-drug interaction and drug-drug-gene interaction: A systematic review on CYP2C9, CYP2C19 and CYP2D6. Pharmacogenetics 18, 701-739.

Borges, S., Desta, Z., Li, L., Skaar, T.C., Ward, B.A., Nguyen, A., Jin, Y., Storniolo, A.M., Kikoloff, D.M., Wu, L., Hillman, G., Hayes, D.F., Stearns, V., Flockhart, D.A., 2006. Quantitative effect of *CYP2D6* genotype and inhibitors on tamoxifen metabolism: Implications for optimization of breast cancer treatment. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 80, 61-74.

Borges, S., Desta, Z., Yin, J., Faouzi, A., Robarge, J.D., Philip, S., Nguyen, A., Stearns, V., Hayes, D., Rae, J.M., Skaar, T.C., Flockhart, D.A., Li, L., 2010. Composite functional genetic and comedication CYP2D6 activity score in predicting temoxifen drug exposure among breast cancer patients. J. Clin. Pharmacol. 50, 450-458.

Bousman, C.A., Stevenson, J.M., Ramsey, L.B., Sangkuhl, K., Hicks, J.K., Strawn, J.R., Singh, A.B., Ruano, G., Mueller, D.J., Tsermpini, E.E., Brown, J.T., Bell, G.C., Leeder, J.S., Gaedigk, A., Scott, S.A., Klein, T.E., Caudle, K.E., Bishop, J.R., 2023. Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium (CPIC) guideline for *CYP2D6*, *CYP2C19*, *CYP2B6*, *SLC6A4*, and *HTR2A* genotype and serotonin reuptake inhibitor antidepressants. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 114, 51-68. (Supplement)

Bousman, C.A., Wu, P., Aitchison, K.J., Cheng, T., 2021. Sequence2Script: A web-based tool for translation of pharmacogenetic data into evidence-based prescribing recommendations. Front. Pharmacol. 12, 636650.

Castellan, A.C., Tod, M., Gueyffier, F., Audars, M., Cambriels, F., Kassao, B., Nony, P., Genophar Working Group, 2013. Quantitative prediction of the impact of drug interactions and genetic polymorphisms on cytochrome P450 2C9 substrate exposure. Clin. Pharmacokinet. 52, 199209.

Cicali, E.J., Elchynski, A.L., Cook, K.J., Houder, J.T., Thomas, C.D., Smith, D.M., Elsey, A., Johnson, J.A., Cavallari, L.H., Wiisanen, K., 2021. How to integrate CYP2D6 phenoconversion into clinical pharmacogenetics: A tutorial. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 110, 677-687.

Crews, K.R., Gaedigk, A., Dunnenberger, H.M., Klein, T.E., Shen, D.D., Callaghan, J.T., Kharasch, E.D., Skaar, T.C., 2011. Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium (CPIC) guidelines for codeine therapy in the context of *cytochrome P450 2D6 (CY2D6)* genotype. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 91, 321-326.

Crews, K.R., Gaekigk, A., Dunnenberger, H.M., Leeder, J.S., Klein, T.E., Caudle, K.E., Haidar, C.E., Shen, D.D., Callaghan, J.T., Sadhasivam, S., Prows, C.A., Kharasch, E.D., Skaar, T.C., 2014. Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium guidelines for cytochrome P450 2D6 genotype and codeine therapy: 2014 update. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 95, 376-382.

Crews, K.R., Monte, A.A., Huddart, R., Caudle, K.E., Kharasch, E.D., Gaedigk, A., Dunnenberger, H.M., Leeder, J.S., Callaghan, J.T., Samer, C.F., Klein, T.E., Haidar, C.E., Van Direst, S.L., Ruano, G., Sngkuhl, K., Cavallari, L.H., Müller, D.J., Prows, C.A., Nagy, M., et al., 2021. Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium guideline for *CYP2D6*, *OPRM1*, and *COMT* genotypes and select opioid therapy. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 110, 888-896.

Di Paolo, V., Ferrari, F.M., Poggesi, I., Quintieri, L., 2021. A quantitative approach to the prediction of drug-drug interactions mediated by cytochrome P450 2C8 inhibition. Expert Opin. Drug Metab. Toxicol. 17, 1345-1352.

Di Paolo, V., Ferrari, F.M., Poggesi, I., Quintieri, L., 2022. Quantitative prediction of drug interactions caused by cytocrhome P450 2B6 inhibition or induction. Clin. Pharmacokinet. 61, 1297-1306.

Fahmi, O.A., Hurst, S., Plowchalk, D., Cook, J., Guo, F., Youdim, K., dickins, M., Phipps, A., Darekar, A., Hyland, R., Obach, R.S., 2009. Comparison of different algorithms for predicting clinical drug-drug interactions, based on the use of CYP3A4 in vitro data: Predictions of compounds as precipitants interaction. Drug Metab. Disposition 37, 1658-1666.

Fernier, N., Bourguignon, L., Goutelle, S., Bleyzac, N., Tod, M., 2018. Identification of cytochrome P450-mediated drug-drug interactions at risk in cases of gene polymorphisms by using a quantiative prediction model. Clin. Pharmacokinet. 57, 1581-1591.

Gabriel, L., Tod, M., Goutelle, S., 2016. Quantitative prediction of drug interactions caused by CYP1A2 inhibitors and inducers. Clin. Pharmacokinet. 55, 977-990.

Gaedigk, A., Simon, S.D., Pearce, R.E., Bradford, L.D., Kennedy, M.J., Leeder, J.S., 2008. The CYP2D6 activity score: Translating genotype information into a qualitative measure of phenotype. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 83, 234-242.

Gibbs, J.P., Hyland, R., Youdim, K., 2006. Minimizing polymorphic metabolism in drug discovery: Evaluation of the utility of in vitro methods for predicting pharmacokinetic consequences associated with CYP2D6 metabolism. Drug Metab. Disposition 34, 1516-1522.

Gloor, Y., Lloret-Linares, C., Bosilkovska, M., Perroud, N., Richard-Lepouriel, H., Aubry, J.M., Daali, Y., Desmeules, J.A., Besson, M., 2022. Drug metabolic enzyme genotype-phenotype discrepancy: High phenoconversion rate in patients treated with antidepressants. Biomed. Pharmacother. 152, 113202.

Goutelle, S., Bourguignon, L., Bleyzac, N., Berry, J., Clavel-Grabit, F., Tod, M., 2013. *In vivo* quantitative prediction of the effect of gene polymorphisms and drug interactions on drug exposure for CYP2C19 substrates. AAPS J. 15, 415-426.

Guest, E.J., Rowland-Yeo, K., Rostami-Hodjegan, A., Tucker, G.T., Houston, J.B., Galetin, A., 2011. Asessment of algorithms for predicting drug-drug interactions via inhibition mechanisms: Comparison of dynamic and static models. Br. J. Pharmacol. 71, 72-87.

Hicks, J.K., Sangkuhl, K., Swen, J.J., Ellingrod, V.L., Müller, D.J., Shimoda, K., Bishop, J.R., Kharasch, E.D., Skaar, T.C., Gaedigk, A., Dunnenberger, H.M., Klein, T.E., Caudle, K.E., Stingl, J.C., 2016. Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implemenation Consortium guideline (CPIC) for *CYP2D6* and *CYP2C19* genotypes and dosing of tricyclic antidepressants: 2016 update. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 102, 37-44. (Supplement)

Hisaka, A., Ohno, Y., Yamamoto, T., Suzuki, H., 2010a. Theoretical considerations of quantitative prediction of drug-drug interactions. Drug Metab. Pharmacokin. 25, 48-61.

Hisaka, A., Ohno, Y., Yamamoto, T., Suzuki, H., 2010b. Prediction of pharmacokinetic drug-drug interaction caused by changes in cytochrome P450 activity using in vivo information. Pharmacol. Ther. 125, 230-248.

Ingelman-Sundberg, M., 2004. Pharmacogenetics of cytochrome P450 and its applications in drug therapy: The past, present, and future. Trends Pharmacol. Sci. 25, 193-200.

Isoherranen, N., Lutz, J.D., Chung, S.P., Hachad, H., Levy, R.H., Ragueneau-Majlessi, I., 2012. Importance of multi-P450 inhibition in drug-drug interactions: Evaluation of incidence, inhibition magnitude, and prediction from in vitro data. Chem. Res. Toxicol. 25, 2285-2300.

Kirchheiner, J., Brosen, K., Dahl, M.L., Gram, L.F., Kasper, S., Roots, I., Sjöquist, F., Spine, E., Brockmöller, J., 2001. CYP2D6 and CYP2C19 genotype-based dose recommentations for antidepressants: A first step towards subpopulation-specific dosages. Acta Psychiatr. Scand. 104, 173-192.

Kirchheiner, J., Nickchen, K., Bauer, M., Wong, M.-L., Licinio, J., Roots, I., Brockmöller, J., 2004. Pharmacogenetics of antidepressants and antipsychotics: The contribution of allelic variations to the phenotype of drug response. Mol. Psychiatry 9, 442-473.

Lesche, D., Mostafa, S., Everall, I., Pantelis, C., Bousman, C.A., 2020. Impact of *CYP1A2*, *CYP2C19*, and *CYP2D6* genotype- and phenoconversion-predicted enzyme activity on clizapine exposure and symptom severity. Pharmacogen. J. 20, 192-201.

Loue, C., Tod, M., 2014. Reliability and extension of quantitative prediction of CYP3A4-mediated drug interactions based on clinical data. AAPS J. 16, 1309-1320.

Mostafa, S., Kirkpatrick, C.M.J., Byron, K., Sheffield, L., 2019. An analysis of allele, genotype and phenotype frequences, actionable pharmacogenomic (PGx) variants and phenoconversion in 5408 Australian patients genotyped for *CYP2D6*, *CYP2C19*, *CYP2C9*, and *VKORC1* genes. J. Neural Transm. 126, 5-18.

Mostafa, S., Polasek, T.M., Sheffield, L.J., Huppert, D., Kirkpatrick, C.M.J., 2021. Quantifying the impact of phenoconversion on medications with actionable pharmacogenomic guideline recommendations in an acute aged persons mental health setting. Front. Psychiatry 12, 724170.

Ohno, Y., Hisaka, A., Suzuki, H., 2007. General framework for the quantitative prediction of CYP3A4-mediated drug interactions based on the AUC increase by coadministration of standard drugs. Clin. Pharmacokinet. 46, 681-696.

Pirmohamed, M., James, S., Meaking, S., Green, C., Scott, A.K., Wallley, T.J., Farrar, K., Park, B.K., Breckenridge, A.M., 2004. Adverse drug reactions as cause of admission to hospital: Prospective analysis of 18 820 patients. Br. Med. J. 329, 15-19.

Preskorn, S.H., Kane, C.P., Lobello, K., Nichols, A.I., Fayyad, R., Buckley, G., Focht, K., Guico-Pabia, C.J., 2013. Cytochrome P450 2D6 phenoconversion is common in patients being treated for depression: Implications for personalized medicine. J. Clin. Psychiatry 74, 614-621.

Stingl, J.C., Brockmöller, J., Viviani, R., 2013. Genetic variability of drug-metabolizing enzymes: The dual impact on psychiatric therapy and regulation of brain function. Mol. Psychiatry 18, 273-287.

Stingl, J.C., Rademacher, J., Wozniak, J., Viviani, R., 2022. Pharmacogenetic dose modeling based on CYP2C19 allelic phenotypes. Pharmaceutics 14, 2833.

Storelli, F., Desmeules, J., Daali, Y., 2019. Physiologically-based pharmacokinetic modeling for the prediction of CYP2D6-mediated gene-drug-drug interactions. CPT Pharmacometrics Syst. Pharmacol. 8, 567-576.

Storelli, F., Samer, C., Reny, J.L., Desmeules, J., Daali, Y., 2018. Complex drug-drug-gene-disease interactions involving cytochromes P450: Systematic review of published case reports and clinical perspectives. Clin. Pharmacokinet. 57, 1267-1293.

Swen, J.S., et al.,, 2023. A 12-gene pharmacogenetic panel to prevent adverse drug reactions: An open-label, multicentre, controlled, cluster-randomised crossover implementation study. Lancet 401, 347-356.

Tod, M., Goutelle, S., Gagnieu, M.C., The Genophar II Working Group, 2011. Genotype-based quantitative prediction of drug exposure for drugs metabolized by CYP2D6. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 15, 1242-1252.

Tod, M., Nkoud-Mongo, C., Gueyffier, F., 2013. Impact of genetic polymorphism on drug-drug interactions mediated by cytochromes: A general approach. AAPS J. 15, 1242-1252.

Tod, M., Pierrillas, P.B., Bouguignon, L., Goutelle, S., 2016. Comparison the static in vivo approach to a physiologically based pharmacokinetic approach for metabolic drug-drug interactions prediction. Int. J. Pharmacokin. 1, 25-34.

Tornio, A., Filppula, A.M., Niemi, M., Backman, J.T., 2019. Clinical studies on drug-drug interactions involving metabolism and transport: Methodology, pitfalls, and interpretation. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 105, 1345-1361.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration, 2020. Clinical Drug Interaction Studies - Cyptochrome P450 Enzyme- and Transporter-Mediated Drug Interactions. Guidance for Industry. https://www.fda.gov/media/134581/download.

Vieira, M., Kim, M.J., Parraju, S., Sinha, V., Zineh, I., Huang, S.M., Zhao, P., 2014a. PBPK model describes the effects of comedication and genetic polymorphism on systematic exposure of drugs that undergo multiple clearance pathways. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 95, 551-557.

Vieira, M., Kirby, B., Ragueneau-Majlessi, I., Galetin, A., Chien, J.Y.L., Einolf, H.J., Fahmi, O.A., Fischer, V., Fretland, A., Grime, K., Hall, S.D., Higgs, R., Plowchalk, D., Riley, R., Seibert, E., Skordos, K., Snoeys, J., Venkatakrishnan, K., Waterhouse, T., et al., 2014b. Evaluation of various static *in vitro-in vivo* extrapolation models for risk assessment of the CYP3A inhibition potential of an investigational drug. Clin. Pharmacol. Ther. 95, 189-198.