

**PHARMACOGENOMICS OF *ABCB1* IN
MAINTENANCE PHARMACOTHERAPIES FOR
OPIOID DEPENDENCE**

Daniel T Barratt BSc (Hons)

Discipline of Pharmacology

School of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences

University of Adelaide

August, 2010

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Table of contents

<i>Abstract</i>	<i>xix</i>
<i>Declaration</i>	<i>xxi</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>xxii</i>
<i>Publications in support of this thesis</i>	<i>xxiv</i>
<i>Abbreviations</i>	<i>xxv</i>
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
1.1. Opioid pharmacology	2
1.1.1. Mechanisms of action	2
1.1.1.1. Opioid analgesia	3
1.1.1.2. Opioid reward	3
1.1.1.3. Side effects	4
1.1.2. Endogenous opioids	5
1.1.3. Therapeutic use of opioids	5
1.1.4. Illicit opioid use	5
1.1.5. Summary	6
1.2. Opioid dependence	6
1.2.1. The path to opioid addiction	6
1.2.1.1. Opioid tolerance	7
1.2.1.2. Physical dependence and withdrawal	8
1.2.1.3. Psychological dependence, craving and relapse	9
1.2.1.4. Summary	10
1.2.2. Burden of opioid dependence	10
1.2.2.1. Prevalence and demographics of opioid dependence	10
1.2.2.2. Costs of opioid dependence	11
1.2.2.2.1. Morbidity and mortality	11
1.2.2.2.2. Economic costs	11
1.2.3. Summary	12
1.3. Opioid substitution therapy	12
1.3.1. Treatment goals and outcomes	12
1.3.2. Methadone maintenance treatment	13
1.3.2.1. Methadone pharmacology	13
1.3.2.2. General treatment protocol	15

1.3.2.3. Treatment effectiveness	15
1.3.3. Buprenorphine maintenance treatment	16
1.3.3.1. Buprenorphine pharmacology	16
1.3.3.2. General treatment protocol	16
1.3.3.3. Treatment effectiveness	17
1.3.4. Barriers to effective opioid substitution therapy	17
1.4. Variability in opioid response	20
1.4.1. Variability in response to heroin	20
1.4.2. Variability in response to methadone	23
1.4.2.1. Variability in methadone pharmacokinetics	23
1.4.2.2. Variability in methadone plasma PK/PD relationship	26
1.4.2.3. Genetic variability influencing methadone response	27
1.4.3. Variability in response to buprenorphine	28
1.4.4. Summary	29
1.5. P-glycoprotein efflux transporter	30
1.5.1. P-glycoprotein structure	30
1.5.2. Expression and function	31
1.5.2.1. Intestinal absorption	33
1.5.2.2. Brain distribution	34
1.5.2.3. Elimination	35
1.5.2.4. Summary	36
1.5.3. P-glycoprotein transport of opioids	36
1.5.3.1. <i>In vitro</i> and animal studies	36
1.5.3.2. Human studies	39
1.5.3.2.1. Methadone intestinal absorption	39
1.5.3.2.2. Opioid brain distribution	39
1.5.3.2.3. Opioid elimination	42
1.5.3.3. Summary	42
1.5.4. Variability in P-glycoprotein expression and function	43
1.5.4.1. Expression	43
1.5.4.2. Function (drug-drug interactions)	44
1.6. ABCB1 genetic variability	46
1.6.1. ABCB1 gene structure	46
1.6.2. Single nucleotide polymorphisms	46
1.6.3. ABCB1 haplotypes	47
1.6.4. Functional consequences of ABCB1 genetic variability	48

1.6.4.1. <i>In vitro</i> expression and function	49
1.6.4.1.1. Haplotypes	51
1.6.4.2. <i>Ex vivo</i> expression and function	53
1.6.4.3. <i>In vivo</i> function and clinical significance	55
1.6.4.3.1. Function in healthy subjects	55
1.6.4.3.2. Functional effects on opioids	56
1.7. Summary, aims and hypotheses	59
Chapter 2. Determination of ABCB1 genotypes and haplotypes	62
2.1. Genotyping	62
2.1.1. Introduction	62
2.1.1.1. Polymerase chain reaction	63
2.1.1.2. Restriction fragment length polymorphism analysis	64
2.1.2. Methods	64
2.1.2.1. Materials	64
2.1.2.2. Genomic DNA isolation, purification and quantification	65
2.1.2.3. General genotyping protocols	65
2.1.2.3.1. Polymerase chain reaction setup	65
2.1.2.3.2. Restriction enzyme digest setup	66
2.1.2.3.3. Agarose gel electrophoresis	68
2.1.2.4. C1236T PCR-RFLP assay development	69
2.1.2.4.1. Polymerase chain reaction	69
2.1.2.4.2. Restriction enzyme digest	69
2.1.2.5. Assay quality control.	70
2.1.3. Results	71
2.1.3.1. A61G, G1199A, G2677T, C3435T	72
2.1.3.2. C1236T	72
2.1.4. Discussion	73
2.1.5. Conclusion	73
2.2. Estimation of haplotypes and linkage disequilibrium	74
2.2.1. Introduction	74
2.2.2. Methods	76
2.2.2.1. Haplotype estimations	76
2.2.2.1.1. Validation of haplotype estimations	77
2.2.2.2. Linkage disequilibrium	78
2.2.3. Results	79
2.2.3.1. Haplotype estimations	79

2.2.3.2. Linkage disequilibrium _____	81
2.2.4. Discussion _____	81
2.2.5. Conclusion _____	82
2.3. Summary _____	82
<i>Chapter 3. ABCB1 pharmacogenetics in standard dose opioid substitution treatment _____</i>	84
3.1. Introduction _____	84
3.2. Aims _____	85
3.3. Materials and methods _____	85
3.3.1. Subjects _____	85
3.3.2. <i>ABCB1</i> genotyping _____	86
3.3.3. Haplotype prediction and linkage disequilibrium _____	86
3.3.4. Subject data _____	87
3.3.4.1. Opioid withdrawal and adverse effects _____	88
3.3.4.2. Treatment outcome _____	89
3.3.5. Statistical methods _____	90
3.3.5.1. <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability and opioid dependence _____	90
3.3.5.2. <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability and opioid substitution treatment _____	91
3.4. Results _____	93
3.4.1. <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability and opioid dependence _____	93
3.4.1.1. Subject demographics _____	93
3.4.1.2. <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes _____	94
3.4.1.3. <i>ABCB1</i> haplotypes _____	96
3.4.1.3.1. Validation check _____	96
3.4.1.3.1.1. Linkage disequilibrium _____	96
3.4.1.3.2. Haplotype frequencies _____	97
3.4.1.4. <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability and pre-treatment heroin use _____	99
3.4.2. <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability and opioid substitution treatment _____	100
3.4.2.1. Subject demographics _____	100
3.4.2.2. Methadone maintenance treatment _____	102
3.4.2.2.1. Dose requirements _____	102
3.4.2.2.1.1. Covariates _____	104
3.4.2.2.2. Trough plasma (R)-methadone concentrations _____	105
3.4.2.2.2.1. Covariates _____	108
3.4.2.2.3. Methadone pharmacokinetics _____	109
3.4.2.2.3.1. Covariates _____	109

3.4.2.2.4. Methadone maintenance treatment response _____	111
3.4.2.2.4.1. Successful versus poor treatment outcome _____	111
3.4.2.2.4.2. In-treatment withdrawal and opioid side-effects _____	112
3.4.2.2.5. Summary _____	113
3.4.2.3. Buprenorphine maintenance treatment _____	114
3.4.2.3.1. Dose requirements _____	114
3.4.2.3.1.1. Covariates _____	115
3.4.2.3.2. Trough plasma concentrations _____	116
3.4.2.3.3. Buprenorphine pharmacokinetics _____	116
3.4.2.3.4. Buprenorphine maintenance treatment response _____	119
3.4.2.3.5. Summary _____	119
3.5. Discussion _____	119
3.5.1. <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability and opioid dependence _____	120
3.5.1.1. Validation of haplotype predictions _____	121
3.5.1.2. <i>ABCB1</i> haplotypes and opioid dependence _____	122
3.5.2. <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability and opioid substitution treatment _____	123
3.5.2.1. Methadone maintenance treatment _____	124
3.5.2.1.1. Methadone requirements and pharmacokinetics _____	124
3.5.2.1.1.1. Covariates _____	127
3.5.2.1.2. Methadone maintenance treatment response _____	129
3.5.2.1.3. Comparisons with other literature _____	130
3.5.2.2. Buprenorphine maintenance treatment _____	135
3.5.2.2.1. Buprenorphine requirements and pharmacokinetics _____	135
3.5.2.2.2. Treatment outcome _____	136
3.5.2.2.3. Comparisons with other literature _____	136
3.5.3. Study limitations _____	137
3.6. Conclusions _____	138
<i>Chapter 4. ABCB1 pharmacogenetics in high dose methadone maintenance treatment</i> _140	
4.1. Introduction _____	140
4.2. Materials and methods _____	141
4.2.1. Subjects _____	141
4.2.2. Demographics, methadone requirements and pharmacokinetic data _____	141
4.2.3. <i>ABCB1</i> genotyping and haplotyping _____	142
4.2.4. Data analysis _____	142
4.3. Results _____	144

4.3.1. Subject demographics _____	144
4.3.2. <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability and opioid dependence _____	144
4.3.3. <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability and methadone requirements _____	149
4.3.4. <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability and methadone pharmacokinetics _____	151
4.3.5. Summary _____	154
4.3.6. <i>ABCB1</i> haplotype effects when ND and HD MMT subjects are combined _____	154
4.4. Discussion _____	155
<i>Chapter 5. Ex vivo expression and function of P-glycoprotein _____</i>	165
5.1. Introduction _____	165
5.2. Method development and validation _____	166
5.2.1. Introduction _____	166
5.2.2. Materials _____	167
5.2.3. Isolation of CD4 ⁺ , CD56 ⁺ and CD8 ⁺ lymphocytes _____	169
5.2.3.1. Methods _____	169
5.2.3.1.1. Isolation of peripheral blood mononuclear cells _____	169
5.2.3.1.2. Magnetic positive selection _____	170
5.2.3.1.2.1. Basic protocol _____	170
5.2.3.1.2.2. Validation of cell selection by flow cytometry _____	172
5.2.3.1.2.3. Optimised protocol _____	172
5.2.3.1.2.4. Processing of positive fractions _____	173
5.2.3.1.3. Qualitative detection of CD4, CD56 and CD8 expression _____	175
5.2.3.2. Results _____	176
5.2.3.2.1. Isolation of PBMCs _____	176
5.2.3.2.2. Magnetic positive selection _____	177
5.2.3.2.2.1. Basic protocol _____	177
5.2.3.2.2.2. Optimised protocol _____	178
5.2.3.2.3. Qualitative detection of CD4, CD56 and CD8 expression _____	178
5.2.3.3. Discussion _____	179
5.2.3.4. Conclusion _____	180
5.2.4. <i>ABCB1</i> mRNA expression by qRT-PCR _____	181
5.2.4.1. Methods _____	181
5.2.4.1.1. mRNA isolation _____	182
5.2.4.1.2. cDNA synthesis _____	182
5.2.4.1.2.1. Protocol development _____	182
5.2.4.1.2.2. DNase treatment and cDNA purification _____	184
5.2.4.1.2.3. Optimised protocol for cDNA synthesis _____	185

5.2.4.1.3. Quantitative real-time PCR	185
5.2.4.1.3.1. General protocol	186
5.2.4.1.3.2. Data analysis	187
5.2.4.1.4. Validation experiments	189
5.2.4.2. Results	191
5.2.4.3. Discussion	195
5.2.4.3.1. mRNA isolation and cDNA synthesis	195
5.2.4.3.2. Quantitative real-time PCR	195
5.2.4.4. Conclusion	196
5.2.5. P-gp protein expression by Western blot	196
5.2.5.1. Methods	198
5.2.5.1.1. Protein isolation and quantification	198
5.2.5.1.2. SDS-PAGE	200
5.2.5.1.2.1. Gel preparation	200
5.2.5.1.2.2. Sample preparation	200
5.2.5.1.2.3. Gel electrophoresis	200
5.2.5.1.3. Gel transfer	201
5.2.5.1.4. Western blot	201
5.2.5.1.4.1. Membrane treatment	202
5.2.5.1.4.2. Chemiluminescence imaging and data analysis	203
5.2.5.1.5. Dot blot optimization of antibody dilutions	203
5.2.5.1.5.1. P-glycoprotein dot blot	203
5.2.5.1.5.2. Calnexin dot blot	204
5.2.5.1.6. Additional Western blot trial experiments	204
5.2.5.2. Results	206
5.2.5.2.1. Dot blot optimization	206
5.2.5.2.2. Trial experiment 1: Further optimisation of calnexin detection	207
5.2.5.2.3. Trial experiment 2: Differences between lymphocyte populations	208
5.2.5.2.4. Trial experiment 3: Effects of lysate preparation	209
5.2.5.2.5. Trial experiment 4: Positive control for P-gp detection	211
5.2.5.3. Discussion	211
5.2.5.3.1. Sensitivity and specificity	212
5.2.5.3.2. Quantitative validity	213
5.2.5.4. Conclusion	213
5.2.6. P-gp function by rhodamine efflux assay	214
5.2.6.1. Methods	214
5.2.6.1.1. Lymphocyte preparation	215

5.2.6.1.2. Step 1: Substrate loading	216
5.2.6.1.3. Step 2: Quantifying substrate accumulation	217
5.2.6.1.4. Step 3: Substrate efflux	218
5.2.6.1.5. Step 4: Quantifying substrate efflux	218
5.2.6.1.6. Rhodamine quantification	218
5.2.6.1.6.1. Extracellular rhodamine quantification	219
5.2.6.1.6.2. Intracellular rhodamine quantification	221
5.2.6.1.6.2.1. Normalisation to protein content	222
5.2.6.1.7. Quantifying cell loss	223
5.2.6.1.8. Data analysis	223
5.2.6.2. Results	223
5.2.6.2.1. Substrate loading	223
5.2.6.2.2. Substrate efflux	224
5.2.6.2.3. Cell loss	225
5.2.6.3. Discussion	225
5.2.6.4. Conclusion	227
5.2.7. Summary	227
5.3. Pilot study	227
5.3.1. Introduction	227
5.3.2. Methods	228
5.3.2.1. qRT-PCR	230
5.3.2.2. Western blot	230
5.3.2.3. Functional assay	231
5.3.2.4. Data analysis	231
5.3.3. Results	231
5.3.3.1. Subject demographics & genetic variability	231
5.3.3.2. Lymphocyte isolation	232
5.3.3.3. <i>ABCB1</i> mRNA expression	233
5.3.3.4. P-glycoprotein protein expression	236
5.3.4. Discussion	238
5.3.4.1. Protocol performance in opioid-dependent subjects	238
5.3.4.2. Pilot study findings	240
5.4. Conclusions	241
Chapter 6. <i>In vitro</i> P-glycoprotein transport of opioids	242
6.1. Introduction	242
6.2. Transport assay development and validation	243

6.2.1. Introduction	243
6.2.2. Methods	246
6.2.2.1. Materials	246
6.2.2.2. Cell culture	247
6.2.2.3. Balimane and Chong (2005) method	247
6.2.2.4. „Classical“ method	248
6.2.2.4.1. Original protocol	248
6.2.2.4.2. Optimised protocol	249
6.2.2.5. Quantification of radiolabelled [H^3]-digoxin	250
6.2.2.6. Quantification of FITC-inulin	250
6.2.2.7. Data analysis	251
6.2.3. Results	252
6.2.3.1. Cell culture	252
6.2.3.2. Balimane and Chong (2005) method	253
6.2.3.3. Classical method	253
6.2.4. Discussion	257
6.3. <i>In vitro</i> transport of opioids	258
6.3.1. Methods	258
6.3.1.1. (R)-methadone quantification	259
6.3.1.2. Buprenorphine quantification	259
6.3.2. Results	261
6.3.3. Discussion	263
6.4. Conclusion	266
Chapter 7. Discussion	267
7.1. New methods	267
7.2. <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability as a determinant of substitution opioid requirements	268
7.2.1. Confounding factors	270
7.3. Secondary findings	271
7.3.1. <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability and maintenance treatment response	271
7.3.2. Methadone requirements/exposure and <i>ex vivo</i> P-gp expression	272
7.3.3. <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability and opioid dependence	272
7.4. Summary	273
7.5. Conclusion	274

<i>Chapter 8. References</i>	275
<i>Appendix A: Supplementary tables</i>	296
Additional references for Appendix A	311
<i>Appendix B: Supplementary figures</i>	317
<i>Appendix C: Genomic locations, primer recognition sites and PCR product sequences for ABCB1 SNPs</i>	319
<i>Appendix D: Publications in support of this thesis</i>	321

List of in-text tables

Table 1-1. Summary of opioid P-gp substrates.....	37
Table 1-2. Clinically relevant drug-drug interactions due to P-glycoprotein inhibition.	45
Table 1-3. Common <i>ABCB1</i> single nucleotide polymorphisms found in Caucasians.	47
Table 2-1. Primer sequences and expected product size for polymerase chain reaction amplification.	67
Table 2-2. Optimal polymerase chain reaction conditions.	71
Table 2-3. Restriction digest enzymes for PCR-RFLP analysis.	71
Table 3-1. Criteria for treatment outcome classification.	89
Table 3-2. Pre-treatment alcohol, tobacco and illicit drug use demographics of opioid-dependent subjects.....	94
Table 3-3. <i>ABCB1</i> SNP variant allele and genotype frequencies in control and opioid-dependent subjects.....	95
Table 3-4. Linkage disequilibrium between pairs of <i>ABCB1</i> SNP variant loci.....	97
Table 3-5. <i>ABCB1</i> haplotype frequencies in control and opioid-dependent subjects.	98
Table 3-6. <i>ABCB1</i> diplotype frequencies in control and opioid-dependent subjects.....	99
Table 3-7. Demographics, drug use and treatment parameters of methadone and buprenorphine maintenance subjects included in the analysis of <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability in opioid maintenance treatment.	100
Table 3-8. Relationships between daily methadone maintenance dose requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes.....	102
Table 3-9. Relationships between daily methadone maintenance dose requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> haplotypes not displayed in Figure 3-1.....	103
Table 3-10. Relationship between (R)-methadone C_{trough} requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes not displayed in Figure 3-3.....	106
Table 3-11. Relationship between (R)-methadone C_{trough} requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> haplotypes not displayed in Figure 3-4.....	107
Table 3-12. Summary table of results from Fisher’s Exact Tests comparing the frequency of <i>ABCB1</i> variant alleles between successful and poor MMT outcome subjects.	111

Table 3-13. Comparison of <i>ABCB1</i> haplotype frequencies between male MMT subjects with successful or poor treatment outcome.	112
Table 3-14. Summary table of results from Fisher’s Exact Tests comparing the frequency of <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes between subjects who did or did not experience withdrawal or opioid side-effects.	113
Table 3-15. Summary of major findings in MMT subjects.	113
Table 3-16. Associations between daily buprenorphine maintenance dose requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes.....	114
Table 3-17. Associations between daily buprenorphine maintenance dose requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> variant haplotypes.	114
Table 3-18. Sex differences in the relationships between dose-adjusted trough plasma buprenorphine concentrations and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes/haplotypes.....	117
Table 3-19. Sex differences in the relationships between dose-adjusted trough plasma norbuprenorphine concentrations and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes/haplotypes.	118
Table 3-20. Summary of major findings in MMT subjects.	119
Table 4-1. Demographics of high dose methadone maintenance subjects.	144
Table 4-2. <i>ABCB1</i> SNP variant allele and genotype frequencies in high dose methadone maintenance, standard dose methadone maintenance and non-opioid-dependent control subjects.	145
Table 4-3. <i>ABCB1</i> haplotype frequencies in high dose methadone maintenance, standard dose methadone maintenance and non-opioid-dependent control subjects.	146
Table 4-4. <i>ABCB1</i> diplotype frequencies in high dose methadone maintenance, standard dose methadone maintenance and non-opioid-dependent control subjects.	147
Table 4-5. <i>ABCB1</i> 3-locus (C1236T, G2677T, C3435T) haplotype frequencies in high dose methadone maintenance, normal dose methadone maintenance and non-opioid-dependent control subjects.	148
Table 4-6. <i>ABCB1</i> 3-locus (C1236T, G2677T, C3435T) diplotype frequencies in high dose methadone maintenance, normal dose methadone maintenance and non-opioid-dependent control subjects.	149
Table 4-7. Relationships between daily methadone maintenance dose or (R)-methadone C _{trough} requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes.	150

Table 4-8. Relationships between daily methadone maintenance dose or (R)-methadone C_{trough} requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> haplotypes.	150
Table 4-9. Relationship between plasma (R)- and (S)-methadone pharmacokinetics and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes.	152
Table 4-10. Relationship between plasma (R)- and (S)-methadone pharmacokinetics and <i>ABCB1</i> haplotypes.	153
Table 5-1. List of antibodies (and their combinations) used for flow cytometry to test cell surface antigen expression in whole human PBMCs, magnetically isolated CD4 ⁺ , CD56 ⁺ and CD8 ⁺ lymphocytes, and the magnetic isolation negative fraction.	172
Table 5-2. PCR conditions trialled for the qualitative detection of CD4, CD56 and CD8 cDNA.	176
Table 5-3. Flow cytometric analysis of human whole PBMCs and lymphocyte cell fractions isolated by the basic magnetic separation procedure.	177
Table 5-4. Optimised CD4, CD56 and CD8 PCR conditions.	179
Table 5-5. Subject demographics, treatment history and <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability.	232
Table 5-6. <i>ABCB1</i> mRNA expression in CD4 ⁺ , CD56 ⁺ and CD8 ⁺ lymphocytes of each MMT subject relative to CD4 ⁺ lymphocytes of a non-opioid-dependent healthy control.	234
Table A-1. Clinically confirmed cytochrome P450-mediated drug-drug interactions affecting methadone pharmacokinetics.	296
Table A-2. Summary of <i>in vitro</i> studies investigating the functional effects of <i>ABCB1</i> SNPs and haplotypes on P-glycoprotein expression and function.	297
Table A-3. Summary of the relationships between <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability and P-gp <i>ex vivo</i> expression and function in healthy volunteers.	301
Table A-4. Summary of <i>in vivo</i> clinical studies examining the impact of <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variants on probe substrate pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics in healthy volunteers.	302
Table A-5. Sex effects on relationships between MMT dose requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes and haplotypes.	303
Table A-6. Treatment outcome effects on relationships between MMT dose requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes and haplotypes.	304

Table A-7. Sex effects on relationships between (R)-methadone C_{trough} requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes and haplotypes.....	304
Table A-8. Treatment outcome effects on relationships between (R)-methadone C_{trough} requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes and haplotypes.	305
Table A-9. Relationships between (R)-methadone C_{trough} /dose and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes and haplotypes.	306
Table A-10. Sex effects on relationships between (R)-methadone C_{trough} /dose and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes and haplotypes.	307
Table A-11. Treatment outcome effects on relationships between BMT dose requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes.....	307
Table A-12. Sex effects on relationships between BMT dose requirements and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes and haplotypes.	307
Table A-13. Relationship between buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine C_{trough} and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes.	308
Table A-14. Relationship between buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine C_{trough} and <i>ABCB1</i> haplotypes.	308
Table A-15. Relationship between buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine C_{trough} /dose and <i>ABCB1</i> genotypes/haplotypes.	309
Table A-16. Summary table of results from Fisher's Exact Tests comparing the frequency of <i>ABCB1</i> variant alleles between successful and poor BMT outcome subjects.....	310
Table A-17. Summary table of results from Fisher's Exact Tests comparing the frequency of <i>ABCB1</i> variant alleles between BMT subjects who did or did not experience withdrawal. ..	310
Table A-18. Primer sequences for the qualitative PCR detection of CD4, CD56 and CD8 cDNA.....	310

List of in-text figures

Figure 1-1. Heroin metabolism.	22
Figure 1-2. P-glycoprotein sites of action important for opioid pharmacokinetics.	32
Figure 1-3. Functionally significant regions of the P-glycoprotein efflux transporter and the location of common <i>ABCB1</i> non-synonymous mutations.	49
Figure 1-4. Mfold predictions displaying how <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variants can significantly alter the folding and secondary structure of <i>ABCB1</i> mRNA.	52
Figure 1-5. The proposed multiple mechanisms by which <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability, affecting P-gp transport, could influence and individual's risk of opioid dependence, severity of addiction and substitution opioid treatment response.	58
Figure 2-1. Restriction fragment patterns for A61G, G1199A, G2677T and C3435T SNP genotypes.	72
Figure 2-2. Optimised <i>Eco</i> 0109I restriction fragment patterns for C1236T genotypes.	72
Figure 2-3. Examples of possible haplotype pairs (diplotypes) formed from unambiguous and ambiguous genotype combinations.	74
Figure 2-4. Example input file for PHASE version 2.1.	77
Figure 2-5. Example input file for Arlequin version 3.11.	78
Figure 2-6. Confidence probabilities of ambiguous phase calls made by PHASE.	80
Figure 3-1. Associations of wild-type AGCGC and variant AGCTT haplotypes of <i>ABCB1</i> with daily methadone maintenance dose requirements.	103
Figure 3-2. Sex differences in the relationship between the wild-type <i>ABCB1</i> haplotype (AGCGC) and MMT dose requirements.	104
Figure 3-3. Association between <i>ABCB1</i> C1236T genotypes and trough plasma (R)-methadone concentrations.	105
Figure 3-4. Association between <i>ABCB1</i> haplotypes and trough plasma (R)-methadone concentrations	107
Figure 3-5. Sex differences in <i>ABCB1</i> genotype- C_{trough} relationships for (R)-methadone in MMT.	108
Figure 3-6. Association between the <i>ABCB1</i> C1236T SNP and AGTTT haplotype variants and (S)-methadone C_{trough} /dose ratios.	110

Figure 3-7. Potential genotype (<i>ABCB1</i> G1199A)-sex interaction influencing (R)-methadone dose-adjusted C_{trough} .	110
Figure 3-8. The influence of treatment outcome on <i>ABCB1</i> wild-type (AGCGC) haplotype-dose relationship in buprenorphine maintenance treatment.	115
Figure 4-1. Correlation between HD subjects' time in treatment and MMT dose requirements.	151
Figure 4-2. Relationship between the AGCGC and AGCTT haplotypes of <i>ABCB1</i> and methadone dose and trough plasma (R)-methadone concentrations of all MMT subjects.	154
Figure 4-3. Summary of the multiple factors potentially influencing MMT dose requirements and response.	163
Figure 5-1. Basic protocol for magnetic bead positive selection and isolation of lymphocyte subsets.	171
Figure 5-2. Optimised protocol for magnetic bead positive selection and isolation of lymphocyte subsets.	174
Figure 5-3. Detection of both cDNA and DNA in $CD4^+$, $CD56^+$ and $CD8^+$ lymphocyte reverse transcription products.	183
Figure 5-4. DNase treatment components inhibit PCR amplification, but purification of DNase-treated mRNA is effective in removing these PCR-inhibitory DNase components, revealing that DNase treatment is effective in removing DNA contamination in mRNA.	185
Figure 5-5. Examples of <i>ABCB1</i> and <i>GAPDH</i> real-time PCR data graphs generated by the Rotor-Gene 6000 software and the designation of a fluorescence threshold.	188
Figure 5-6. Association between template concentrations and linearised C_T values from validation experiments.	193
Figure 5-7. Association between total template concentration and ΔC_T for quantification of <i>ABCB1</i> in lymphocytes.	194
Figure 5-8. Example of a BSA standard curve produced using the 10 μL microplate BCA protocol.	199
Figure 5-9. Dot blot experiment identifying optimal primary and secondary antibody dilutions for detecting P-gp.	207
Figure 5-10. Dot blot experiment identifying significant background staining for all primary and secondary antibody dilutions tested for detection of calnexin.	207

Figure 5-11. Additional dilution of secondary antibody from 1:10,000 to 1:50,000 produces reduction in background membrane staining, whilst maintaining adequate quantitative detection of calnexin by Western blot.	208
Figure 5-12. Western blot detection of P-gp in CD4 ⁺ and CD8 ⁺ lymphocytes but not whole PBMC cell lysate.....	209
Figure 5-13. Influence of protein sample preparation on detection of P-gp and calnexin in CD4 ⁺ lymphocytes.	209
Figure 5-14. Influence of protein sample preparation on correlations between BCA protein quantification and loading control (calnexin) band volume and peak height, and between loading control and P-gp band volumes and peak heights.	210
Figure 5-15. Confirmation of P-gp detection in CD4 ⁺ lymphocytes using overexpressing <i>MDR1</i> -transfected LLC-PK1 cells as a positive control.	211
Figure 5-16. Outline of proposed functional assay procedure.	215
Figure 5-17. Rhodamine fluorescence standard curves in the presence and absence of 100 µM verapamil.	220
Figure 5-18. Standard curves for quantification of intracellular rhodamine concentrations. .	222
Figure 5-19. Time-course of rhodamine efflux in the presence and absence of 100 µM verapamil.	224
Figure 5-20. Lack of significant correlations between CD4 ⁺ and CD56 ⁺ , CD4 ⁺ and CD8 ⁺ , or CD56 ⁺ and CD8 ⁺ lymphocyte <i>ABCB1</i> expression in MMT subjects.	234
Figure 5-21. Relationship between <i>ABCB1</i> diplotypes and <i>ex vivo</i> CD4 ⁺ , CD56 ⁺ and CD8 ⁺ lymphocyte <i>ABCB1</i> mRNA expression in MMT subjects.	235
Figure 5-22. Relationship between MMT dose requirements and relative <i>ABCB1</i> mRNA expression in CD4 ⁺ , CD56 ⁺ and CD8 ⁺ lymphocytes of MMT subjects.....	235
Figure 5-23. Relationship between (R)-methadone (MD) C _{trough} and relative <i>ABCB1</i> mRNA expression in CD4 ⁺ and CD8 ⁺ lymphocytes of MMT subjects.	236
Figure 5-24. Western blot detection of P-gp in CD4 ⁺ lymphocytes of MMT subjects.....	237
Figure 5-25. Relationship between <i>ABCB1</i> mRNA and P-gp expression in CD4 ⁺ lymphocytes of MMT subjects.	237
Figure 5-26. Relationship between CD4 ⁺ lymphocyte P-gp expression and MMT dose requirements and (R)-methadone C _{trough}	238

Figure 6-1. Example of P-gp apical expression in a confluent monolayer of polarised epithelial/endothelial cells.	244
Figure 6-2. Example of typical results from a „classical“ cell monolayer transport study.	244
Figure 6-3. Outline of the combined P-gp substrate and inhibitor assay described by Balimane and Chong (2005).	245
Figure 6-4. Example of a [³ H]-digoxin standard curve determined by liquid scintillation counting.	250
Figure 6-5. Example standard curve of FITC-inulin fluorescence.	251
Figure 6-6. Average basal-to-apical and apical-to-basal digoxin permeability alone and in the presence of 10 µM or 100 µM verapamil using the basic protocol.	254
Figure 6-7. Example of significant variability in digoxin B>A and A>B permeability within treatment groups over the course of a 4 hour experiment using the basic protocol.	255
Figure 6-8. Average basal-to-apical and apical-to-basal digoxin permeability alone and in the presence of 100 µM verapamil using the optimised protocol.	256
Figure 6-9. Digoxin basal-to-apical and apical-to-basal permeability alone and in the presence of 100 µM verapamil over the course of a 4-hour experiment when using the optimised protocol.	256
Figure 6-10. Example of HPLC chromatograms for detection of buprenorphine.	260
Figure 6-11. Example standard curve of buprenorphine by HPLC detection.	261
Figure 6-12. (R)-methadone apparent permeability across Caco-2 cell monolayers in the absence and presence of 100 µM verapamil.	262
Figure 6-13. Buprenorphine apparent permeability across Caco-2 cell monolayers in the absence and presence of 100 µM verapamil.	263
Figure 7-1. Revised summary of the mechanisms behind the impact of <i>ABCB1</i> genetic variability on opioid substitution treatment based on thesis findings.	273
Figure B-1. Confidence probabilities of ambiguous phase calls made by PHASE.	317
Figure B-2. Linear relationships between log ₂ (mRNA concentration) and <i>GAPDH</i> C _T values over the range of 0.6 to 28 mRNA units.	318

Abstract

Opioid dependence is a significant public health problem. Whilst long-term opioid maintenance is the most cost-effective approach for treating opioid dependence, the safe and effective use of substitution opioids like methadone and buprenorphine is complicated by their narrow therapeutic indices and a considerable, as yet unexplained, interindividual variability in their dose-effect relationships. Since there is evidence that the P-glycoprotein efflux transporter may influence the plasma pharmacokinetics and CNS distribution of opioids, it was hypothesised that genetic variability in the *ABCB1* gene (encoding P-glycoprotein) could play a major role in the interindividual variability in opioid maintenance treatment response. Therefore, the primary aim of this thesis was to investigate *ABCB1* genetic variability as a determinant of opioid requirements during maintenance therapy, as well as treatment outcome. This thesis also set out to identify the relationship between *ABCB1* genetic variability and the risk of illicit opioid use and dependence, as well as develop new methods for investigating the dynamic interactions between *ABCB1* genetic variability, P-glycoprotein expression/function and opioid exposure.

For the first major study of this thesis, opioid-dependent methadone maintenance treatment (MMT, n = 78) and buprenorphine maintenance treatment (BMT, n = 30) subjects, as well as non-opioid-dependent healthy controls (n = 98), were retrospectively genotyped and haplotyped for 5 common single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) of *ABCB1* (A61G, G1199A, C1236T, G2677T and C3435T). Whilst no link was observed between *ABCB1* genetic variability and the risk of opioid dependence, the wild-type AGCGC (61A-1199G-1236C-2677G-3435C) haplotype was associated with significantly higher maintenance opioid requirements among both MMT and BMT subjects. In addition, MMT subjects carrying one of the variant haplotypes, AGCTT, required significantly less methadone, presumably due to a decreased P-gp activity at the blood-brain-barrier. Interestingly, a second retrospective study of a specific cohort of 21 (very) high-dose (≥ 180 mg/day) MMT subjects could not replicate

these findings, suggesting that dose range and/or clinic policy may be important factors influencing the clinical significance of *ABCB1* genetic variability.

The third major study of this thesis incorporated the development and validation of new methods for quantifying *ex vivo* P-glycoprotein expression (mRNA and protein) and function in specific lymphocyte subsets ($CD4^+$, $CD56^+$ and $CD8^+$) of healthy and opioid-dependent subjects, with the aim of determining the combined effects of *ABCB1* genetic variability and opioid exposure on P-glycoprotein function. Applying these new methods in a pilot study of 6 MMT subjects, $CD4^+$ lymphocyte *ABCB1* mRNA and P-glycoprotein expression were found to be positively associated with methadone requirements, and were lowest in the only subject homozygous for the AGCTT haplotype (providing potential mechanistic support for the link between AGCTT haplotypes and low MMT dose requirements).

Therefore, this thesis provides the first evidence that *ABCB1* haplotypes contribute to variability in substitution opioid requirements. However, *ABCB1* genetic variability should not be considered alone, and a combined interpretation of multiple genetic and environmental factors will be required to provide a more complete picture of the factors governing the successful treatment of opioid dependence.

Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any University or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

The author acknowledges that copyright of the published work contained within this thesis (Coller JK, Barratt DT, Dahlen K, Loennechen MH, Somogyi AA. (2006) *ABCB1* genetic variability and methadone dosage requirements in opioid-dependent individuals. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics* **80**:682-90) resides with the copyright holder of this work (see Appendix D, page 321).

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Daniel T Barratt

18 August 2010

Acknowledgements

I would sincerely like to thank my supervisors, Professor Andrew Somogyi and Dr Janet Coller, for introducing me to the world of pharmacogenetics as an honours student, and then giving me the opportunity to pursue my newfound passion through this PhD. Your ongoing guidance and encouragement, in and out of the lab, has proved instrumental in my development as both a researcher and a member of the greater pharmacogenetics/genomics community. I greatly appreciate all that you have done for me over the years.

The research presented in this thesis would also not have been possible without funding from the University of Adelaide Faculty of Health Sciences, and a National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia (NHMRC) project grant, as well as financial assistance from a Faculty of Health Sciences (University of Adelaide) / Royal Adelaide Hospital, Institute of Medical and Veterinary Sciences Dawes Divisional Scholarship, and a NHMRC Postgraduate Research Scholarship. I am also extremely grateful for the many travel grants provided by the Australasian Society of Clinical and Experimental Pharmacologists and Toxicologists, as well as a Faculty of Health Sciences (University of Adelaide) Postgraduate travel grant, that, along with the financial support and encouragement from my supervisors, have allowed me to attend and present my research at numerous national and international conferences.

I would also like to acknowledge the work of the following people: Janet Coller, Karianne Dahlen and Morten Loennechen for their work with the *ABCB1* genotyping assays; all those involved in the original clinical studies from which I drew my subjects, in particular Prof Jason White, Peter Athanasos, Andrea Gordon, Richard Hallinan, Justin Hay, Sophie La Vincente, and Erin Morton; Aaron Farquharson for his assistance in obtaining subject samples for the *ex vivo* pilot study; Tanya Lewanowitsch for her generous support and advice with Western blotting; David Foster for his assistance with methadone LCMS detection and his work with Pop-PK analysis; and Andrew Menelaou and Glynn Morrish for their guidance with buprenorphine HPLC assay development. Thanks also to Karen Nunes-Vaz and Gordon

Crabb for their administrative support, as well as other past and present members of the Discipline of Pharmacology, particularly the “Bach Pad” and “Green Room”, whose support and friendship have helped me in many, often less tangible, ways.

To my family, thankyou for your unwavering moral, financial and dietary support that has provided me with a stable foundation from which to conduct my postgraduate studies. Thanks also to the Nicholls family for their constant offers of encouragement, meals and weekends at Tiddy Widdy, which have provided welcome stress relief for both me and Amy.

To the Marryatville boys, thankyou for your unwavering support of fishing, surfing, camping, drinking and numerous other activities aimed at preventing me completing my thesis, but all of which have helped keep me sane.

To Amy, thankyou for your patience, sacrifice, love and understanding. You have been with me every step of the way, and have shared many of the highs and all of the lows, and for that I am forever grateful. At last we can look forward to sharing a new and exciting chapter in our lives together.

Publications in support of this thesis

Original research

Coller JK, Barratt DT, Dahlen K, Loennechen MH, Somogyi AA. (2006) *ABCB1* genetic variability and methadone dosage requirements in opioid-dependent individuals. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **80**:682-90.

Invited review

Somogyi AA, Barratt DT, Coller JK. (2007) Pharmacogenetics of opioids. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* **81**:429-444.

Abbreviations

6-MAM	6-monoacetylmorphine
A>B	Apical-to-basal permeability
A ₂₆₀	Absorbance at 260 nm
A ₂₈₀	Absorbance at 280 nm
AAG	α_1 -acid glycoprotein
AUC	Area under the concentration-time curve
B>A	Basal-to-apical permeability
BBB	Blood-brain-barrier
BCA	Bicinchoninic acid
BMT	Buprenorphine maintenance treatment
bp	Base pairs
BSA	Bovine serum albumin
cDNA	Complementary DNA
CI	Confidence interval
CL/F	Oral clearance
CL _R	Renal clearance
C _{max}	Maximum plasma concentration
CNS	Central nervous system
CSF	Cerebrospinal fluid
C _{trough}	Trough plasma concentration
C _{trough} /dose	Dose-adjusted trough plasma concentration
CV	Coefficient of variation
DADLE	[D-Ala ² ,D-Leu ⁵]-enkephalin
DAMGO	[D-Ala ² ,N-Me-Phe ⁴ ,Gly ⁵ -ol]-enkephalin
DMSO	Dimethylsulfoxide
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
dNTP	Deoxynucleoside triphosphate
DPDE	[D-Pen ^{2,5}]-enkephalin
DPM	Disintegrations per minute
EDTA	Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid
FCS	Fetal bovine serum
HBSS	Hank's buffered salt solution
HD	High dose
HPLC	High performance liquid chromatography
IC ₅₀	50% inhibitory concentration
IDRS	Australian Illicit Drug Reporting System
IDU	Injecting drug users
kb	kilobases
LAAM	Levo-alpha-acetyl-methadol
LD	Linkage disequilibrium
M-6-G	Morphine-6-glucuronide

MEM	Minimal essential medium with Earl's salts
MMT	Methadone maintenance treatment
mRNA	Messenger RNA
NBD	Nucleotide binding domain
ND	Normal dose
OR	Odds Ratio
P_{app}	Apparent permeability
PBMC	Peripheral blood mononuclear cell
PCR	Polymerase chain reaction
PCR-RFLP	PCR - restriction fragment length polymorphism
P-gp	P-glycoprotein
PK/PD	Pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic
Pop-PK	Population-pharmacokinetic
qRT-PCR	Quantitative real time - PCR
RNA	Ribonucleic acid
SD	Standard deviation
SDS-PAGE	Sodium dodecyl sulphate – polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis
SNP	Single nucleotide polymorphism
$T_{1/2}$	Half-life
TDM	Therapeutic drug monitoring
TEER	Transepithelial electrical resistance
T_{max}	Time to maximum plasma concentration
TMD	Transmembrane domain
V	Variant allele or digest fragment
V_d	Volume of distribution
Wt	Wild-type allele or digest fragment